U.S. Congress

Appendix

America and the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today our colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is speaking in London to the Royal Institute of International Affairs on the subject America and the Far East.

I think it is appropriate to insert this address in the appendix of the RECORD on the same day on which it is delivered in London.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AND THE FAR EAST

This opportunity of speaking before you is one for which I am most grateful. This is no perfunctory statement and I want to explain just why I am grateful.

We of the 20th century have become familiar with the concept of the rise and fall of a series of civilizations, some in succession, others concurrently or overlapping when sufficiently separated geographically to give each its proper arena. This concept is advanced to succeed the older one of a unitary civilization, of which Western civilization is the residual heir, from the first beginning of history on the Euphrates and the Nile.

Three of the historians of civilization—Flinders Petrie, Oswald Spengler, and Arnold Toynbee, have developed the theory of cycles. None of these men could have been historians of civilization until these latter days. It is only in the century past that archeology and historical scholarship have provided the data which could be so analyzed and organized that civilization could be distinguished, their characters defined, and their histories compared.

I cannot mention these names without referring to another in the great line of world historians, Mr. Lionel Curtis. His achievement is to set forth the essential contribution of Christianity to accomplishing the continued growth of our civilization, so that it will not repeat the pattern of the past. Further analysis of and support to this thesis I hope to present in other ways and at another time.

I am one of those convinced that civilizations are born, grow to maturity, and then either fall into a decline or stagnate at a level lower than their creative prime. I have furthermore concluded that our own Western civilization is now arriving at a time of such testing that our way of meeting that test will determine whether we continue to advance or, alternatively, we face a future in which uncertainty in our ideals and conflict between and in our institutions leads us to the era of decline.

Finally, I have concluded that Arnold Toynbee is right in his conviction that the strength and the testing of a civilization is determined by events in the field of morals.

If all this is true, a special responsibility is laid upon your country and mine. We have not made the greatest contributions to our civilization in any of the fine arts, except literature. We have been among the leaders in the sciences. We have been the leaders in the industrial evolution and the modern world of production and distribution is ours. This means that Britain and America have introduced into the world the vast changes which offer so much hope for the material improvement of mankind but which yet have undermined the social and spiritual institutions of whole races, without our being able to replace them with anything better and stronger.

Material problems we can solve. We are now face to face with the ultimate moral problems of this crucial age in Western civilization. What resources can we bring to the solution of this determining crisis in the long 1,500 years of Western civilization?

We cannot claim superior morals or spirtual insight. We do not have exclusive possession of these qualities. Yet our store is adequate if we rightly understand their functions.

What we do have are political institutions erected on a deep and solid spiritual foundation. That foundation is our conviction of the worth of the individual soul. We believe conventionally and instinctively that the state exists for men. Men do not exist for the state. These convictions have been handed down through you to us during 2,000 years of history. Their validity is now being challenged. The issue hangs in the balance. We must think together and act together if we are to apply this moral and spiritual content of our heritage to curing the confusion to which our material contribution has made the world susceptible.

This may seem a ponderous introduction to our topic, but in all truth I can find no easier way to tell you why I am glad to be here tonight.

Your secretary kindly suggested as the subject of this talk, America and the Far East, with the thought that it is sufficiently general to permit a range of choices in treatment. The area selected may be defined as American public opinion and the Chinese problem.

Let me say, first of all, that I never use the word "America" as a synonym for the United States without feeling a twinge of conscience. All of Latin America is America. Particularly is Canada America. But even our Canadian friends on occasion resign themselves to this improper designation of my country. Our official name is too clumsy. Besides that, the ties of race, history, and business with the Dominion are so close that in most connections no injustice is done.

I am supposing that our British friends find the American political scene to be a perplexing one. From time to time observers from your shores comment on the waves of opinion which sweep over us, on our proneness to engage in crusades, and on our irresponsibility. Of course, your comment is not all critical by any means. When you can find something to admire you find it comprehensible. It is the things which make living with us difficult that are incomprehensible to you.

Let me say at once that we are almost incomprehensible to ourselves when we try to analyze our own characteristics. What we do comes naturally and unself-consciously. When we are questioned by others we cannot always find the right explanations, but it is worthwhile to be questioned.

What, for example, explains the waves of opinion that sweep over us from time to time? This is tied into our proneness to go on crusades. It is true that some issues tend to present themselves to us emotionally so that we feel strongly about matters to which we may not have given enough thought. After VE–Day peace seemed to us to be a wonderful thing. War or the thought of war, after such a victory as had been won, was an unimaginable evil. Only a few were cynical enough to foresee the coming conflict with our former allies. "Get the boys home" was the insistent demand, and get them home we did.

However it may have been with you, with us I am sure it was moral indignation which supported the decision at Casablanca to inflict total defeat on Germany.

For a still earlier example of a popular crusade, we can refer to the Spanish-American War. The natural sympathy of our citizens for the Cuban rebels was fanned by journalistic experts into a frenzy of indignation. We won an easy victory in a largely bungled war. Its results were not totally evil. It gave us an experience in colonialism which enabled us to join the company of those nations which have prepared in some measure their subject peoples for freedom, and have then yielded it to them.

Earlier yet was the moral issue of secession of the Southern States and the conviction so simply and eloquently set forth by Abraham Lincoln that the people of our Nation had been entrusted with a sacred mission in the world, to preserve in peace and freedom government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

My own grandfather volunteered in the Northern Army and fought at Gettysburg. As a boy he told me that he didn't volunteer to "free the slaves"; he fought to save the Union. Hundreds of thousands of others risked their lives for the same end. Materialistic historians may analyze our civil war as being fundamentally a contest between a southern agricultural economy and northern industry. But those volunteers knew what they were fighting for. They sought to preserve freedom in unity. For those whose blood was willingly shed the issue was not economic, it was moral.

Let us go back further yet. We find Edmund Burke in your Parliament supporting the Colonies on what were essentially moral grounds. Our Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence and in the specific provisions of our Constitution proclaimed the worth of the individual human soul. That belief came down to them from your own forefathers. It is now the fundamental division between the Soviet and free world. Our common heritage bids us stand together in the present day.

Such are the noble beginnings of American tendencies which are today perhaps less clear, less easily justified. They have always been determinants of our best actions. They were recognized by that remarkable analyst and prophet, Alexis de Tocqueville, who published his studies of

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

American life in 1840. Without taking the time to quote him verbatim, let it be said that he recognized the strong religious spirit in American life, underdstood the terms on which heterogeneous democracy and absolute religious beliefs coexisted and reacted and defined the terms of successful cooperation.

Incidentally, this remarkable man a full century before the event, foresaw the conflict of our day. He said: "The Russians centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principle instrument of the Anglo-American is freedom; of the Russian, servitude." And again, speaking of Russia and America, he says: "Their starting points are different; their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destines of half the globe."

So much for the impulses which move us. Let us now consider where public opinion is lodged in America.

There are, first, certain basic beliefs from which we may wander on occasion but toward which we feel a constant pull. These include the common beliefs already mentioned—belief in the worth of the individual, and in service to the state to the citizen. This latter is of course balanced by the balancing service of the citizen to the state whenever and however that is needed to preserve the service of the state to the citizen.

These are the basic beliefs—the deeps over which pass the waves raised by the winds of passing events. These basic beliefs we must nourish and hold if we are to remain strong.

Above these depths come next the beliefs of groups, which play an important part in affecting public policy. I will give three examples of groups of opinions selected for their relevance to Far Eastern policy. They are: the do-gooders, the isolationists and the China lobby. Each of these groups has a hard core. From this core it reaches out to gain adherents, influence opinion, and affect policy. The effects vary. These ideas go up and down, down and up, at one time powerful and effective, at other times in eclipse. Our Nation's wealth moves the do-gooders to urge a policy of general benevolence toward all the peoples of the earth. They are constantly pressing for ever larger appropriations to support this or that really worthy cause. Their expansive benevolence obviously has had to be limited by budgetary considerations. However, there have been other restraints of a less direct character. We have come to realize that our national abilities lie so strongly in the field of production that it is better for us to be of what help we can in assisting other peoples to improve their productive practices, rather than to expend our own resources in direct aid.

In this connection I often think of our American Quakers, and your British also, who are unsurpassed in their generosity. Yet they are discerning in making their gifts and, more characteristically still, seldom give so lavishly as to injure the sources from which their wealth is derived. Only a major crisis justifies an individual or a nation in making drafts on the future for the sake of a present demand. That stern decision your Nation has had to make. It is one which is not entered into lightly.

You are all surely aware of the powerful group in America which goes under the name of isolationist. The moral exuberance of the do-gooder has been repressed, but that repression, carried beyond reasonable limits, results in the conviction that our duty lies in serving only the direct and narrow interests of America. In the extreme the isolationist tends to the belief that our entrance into two world wars was a terrible mistake. He sees no advantage accruing to us from participation in the recovery of world production and world trade. He believes not merely that we have wasted money in these ways but we have become the unrespected dupes of the people whom we have tried to help.

National interest is the watchword of the isolationists, and a not unworthy watchword it is. The danger comes when we interpret it narrowly and thoughtlessly. Unrestrained their policies would lead to a world under Communist domination wherein finally only Canada and the United States would remain as a beseiged fortress of freedom, constrained from trade, travel, or communication with the rest of the world except on terms set by a power stronger than ourselves. National interest, narrowly conceived, is self-defeating. Isolationism dies hard. Its doctrines are still stoutly supported. Yet I venture to predict that its influence is waning and that wiser counsels are in the ascendency.

The China lobby is the third of these opinion groups to which I will refer. Let it be said at once that China lobby, as a designation, is scarcely fair. A lobby in our parlance is an organized group seeking to direct legislation to serve private ends and as such may serve as useful a function as the attorney for the defense in courts of law. While there may be private ends to be served, the strength of the China lobby lies in the inner convictions of its members rather than in the pressure of special interests.

These convictions go back to a series of events. In the first place, there is in America a traditional interest in China, arising at first from trade, then strengthened by missionary undertakings and finally sealed by the educational contacts with Chinese students in both countries. Except for the narrow band of exclusionist sentiment on the Pacific coast, we have always liked the Chinese and have been interested in them.

Our imagination was captured by the superhuman effort by which the students and faculties of the Chinese colleges preserved their institutions from the invading Japanese armies. Chiang Kai-shek, as the leader of a heroic people, gained our admiration.

Unfortunately, a breach opened between the Congress and the administration. The Congress came early to the conclusion that Mao was primarily a Communist and only by expediency an agrarian reformer. It has been a strong conviction of successive Congresses that assistance voted to Chiang never was made effectively available to him. This was a sore spot in the relations between a strong group in the Congress and the Truman administration. It was evident both in the State Department and in the Pentagon. It is not necessary for our purposes to go into the details.

During the later years of this period, I endeavored to persuade the administration to a limited and controlled assistance which might or might not have been acceptable to Chiang. It did not interest the administration and no action was taken. "After the dust had settled," to use Secretary Acheson's phrase, Chiang was found to be within the sanctuary of Formosa, while the mainland was firmly in Communist hands, under the leadership of victorious Mao.

There has been another influence which rankles in the breast of many Americans when we let our minds dwell on the Chinese problem. With the support of many of the governments represented in the United Nations, the United States took the lead in resisting aggression when the North Koreans attempted to conquer the South of that divided country. This was a major war by any standards which were applied before our world conflicts. Through defeat and victory, with further success hanging in the balance, the United Nations' armies drove the Communists back beyond the mythical line of the 38th parallel and the limited objective of resisting aggression was achieved. It never seemed to us that this objective was enough. It was purely negative. It settled nothing. The same old problems continued in an aggravated form, and the solution of other Asiatic conflicts was made harder, not easier.

When in the summer of 1951 the Communist armies made a last desperate attempt to break through our lines, the opportunity of a greater achievement was open. It was General Van Fleet's testimony that after that attack was beaten back, the Communist armies were in disorderly retreat with their ammunition exhausted and their heavy equipment abandoned. A determined counterattack might well have carried our line to the narrow waist of the peninsula. Instead Van Fleet was held in leash. In our eyes the American forces suffered a defeat. Defeat is a new experience to us and one which we have been unable to assimilate. When you are perplexed about our point of view as to the problem of China, this is a matter which must be taken into account.

The arguments which supported this limited policy are well known. The principal one was that the Soviet Government might throw its enormous manpower into the contest as it had already thrown its planes and surface armament. This was a chance which would have had to be taken. The chance could have been minimized by diplomatic action, and subsequent events have not added strength to the fear of a broader involvement.

When the planned-for stalemate had been achieved, when the chance for victory had been thrown away, there was nothing left to do but to liquidate a negative enterprise. This, Mr. Eisenhower promised to consider, and this President Eisenhower successfully accomplished.

Let me say that I cannot review this episode in modern history without bitter thoughts. I can only hope that too much bitterness has not escaped into my words.

So far we have considered three currents of public opinion which relate to United States foreign policy in the Far East. The three are general benevolence, isolationism, and support for Nationalist China. The next matter to consider is the means by which such opinions affect national policy, if indeed they do affect it.

In the first place, let it be said that the effects are not necessarily, or even often, the result of having a policy adopted as party policy and supported by party discipline. The Republicans and Democrats both adopt party platforms at national conventions and nominally seek election on the basis of those platforms. Seldom indeed are the differences between them great enough to raise issues on which a national election can be decided. It is true that there are undefinable differences between the parties; there are significant historical backgrounds to each, but the differences between the parties are not as great as between northern urban Democrats and those from the South, or between isolationist Republicans and those whose outlook on national interest is international. The impact of opinion on policy is seldom directly through the machinery of party.

On the other hand, the successful presidential candidate of a party has powerful means of promoting or obstructing the translation of opinion into policy. For example, the sentiment for general benevolence found perhaps rather stronger support under Roosevelt than under either Truman or Eisenhower. With the two latter, better conceived plans have been the rule, such as the Marshall plan and technical assistance. Note that this docs not rule out simple human help for pressing human needs, such as support for the Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations or gifts of wheat under Asian and European famine conditions. But pure benevolence

is ruled out as the foundation of foreign assistance.

The strong but not overwhelming popular support for isolation has had no support from any President or his administration. Consequently, it has had little effect on policy except as it has slowed up or minimized foreign undertakings which nevertheless were authorized, appropriated for, and put into effect. The President is the key rather than the party; yet the two are not completely independent.

We have yet to examine the major determinant of American policy with regard to Red and Nationalist China. That determinant is our well-nigh universal hostility to communism. America has passed a moral judgment on that institution and found it to be evil. On this point we are loath to compromise. On this one point we gladly plead guilty to Nehru's complaint that with us an issue is black or white; there are no neutral grays. Finally, on this point it seems clear that public opinion is controlling the State Department, and not vice versa.

I need not tell you than one section of this anticommunism was dangerous, not so much to communism as to its enemies. I need not tell you how it introduced into American life alien practices akin to those of both Soviet and Hitlerian origin. We seem at the moment to have escaped these evils while our anticommunism remains strong in both fear and hatred.

Our fear is that, unchecked, communism may roll over country after country, in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America, and eventually in Europe.

Our hatred is not against the people whom it has brought under its power. Our hatred does not go even to the Russian people themselves, as it went, for instance, to the German people during World War II. Our hatred is leveled at active evil. Soviet philosophy and the practice of that philosophy denies the worth of the human soul and degrades man to the level of spiritless material to be molded and used to serve a soul-less state.

The experience of your returned prisoners and ours turned a bright light into the recesses of Communist evil. Ordinary, independent self-respecting citizens, by a skilled technique in brain-washing, were deprived of their moral judgment. They became bewildered in making distinctions between right and wrong. A high ranking American general acknowledged that had the psychological conditioning proceeded a little longer, there would have been no escape for him save by suicide.

When we consider that, while these were individual men, it is the purpose and practice of communism similarly to mold the minds and souls of whole populations, whole nations, whole generations into will-less tools of the state, then we become sure that we are facing more than men—we are facing evil itself.

And so the criticisms of European friends, the criticisms of Nehru are justified in form. We do see these things in black and white. We feel it proper to compromise on matters of economics, social practices, and most political institutions—on everything except evil itself.

This is an absolutist position and suppose that there are moral absolutes. May I refer you to a great English champion of the moral absolutes. Lord Acton said:

"Opinions alter, manners change, creeds rise and fall, but the moral law is written on the tablets of eternity.

"The principles of true politics are those of morality enlarged; and I neither now do, nor ever will admit of any other.

"That which we must obey, that to which we are bound to reduce all civil authorities, and to sacrifice every earthly interest, is that immutable law which is perfect and eternal as God Himself, which proceeds from His nature, and reigns over heaven and earth and over all the nations.

"For we must be at war with evil, but at peace with men, and it is better to suffer than to commit injustice."

Let me give you the authentic definition of the moral law. Its elements were defined through the centuries by the poets and prophets of a race with a genius for spiritual insight and spiritual growth. Their record is to be found in the Old Testament of our Bible.

In the New Testament Jesus clearly defined the moral law in answer to the lawyer's query as to which is the great commandment. Jesus said unto him "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

To this I like to add a derivative principle set forth in Saint Paul's address to the men of Athens, when he told them that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth."

Bear in mind that Lord Acton believed that the moral law is valid, natural law. It determines success or failure in human undertakings concerned with men as physical law does in dealing with matter and energy. We cannot break the moral law but we may break ourselves against it.

I have mentioned Mr. Lionel Curtis. Let me add his wise and perceptive formulation of the moral law in terms of personal and political responsibility. He has expressed it as an infinite duty of men to God and an infinite duty of men to one another.

Our way does not lie in conquest. My thesis is that it lies in contact and communication, so that the moral law may perform its perfect work.

We have now come down to the consideration of our policy as it relates to the problem of China. How do these principles apply?

1. Our heritage of Judeo-Christian ethics requires that we make no compromise with essential Communist theory and practice.

2. With available resources and with available wisdom we must actively assist those peoples threatened with Communist conquest. Help is needed, not imposed programs.

3. We should be clear in our minds as to the iniquity of curtains. While rights of citizenship or residence are matters of policy, the prohibition of personal contact and communication are insults to man and are in defiance of the laws of God.

4. Governments which erect curtains ask admission to the family of nations on the basis of falsehood. Experience with governments who have erected curtains but are nominally within the family plainly illustrates the fact that membership has been a means of attack from within with no intent of cooperation.

5. The terms of admission for Communist China into the United Nations must be stated and always left open. They include her return to the same freedom of travel and intercommunication as existed a generation ago and as now exists between the free nations of the world. They include the other requirements of a free people in a free world. Should these requirements endanger the existence of communism, that is an evidence of the weakness of that institution.

6. For China, for the Soviet peoples, for all the Communist-dominated world, the hand of friendship and cooperation must always be held out on the basis of free, human relationships.

These are particular applications of the moral law to a current situation. Mr. Curtis would truly say, I believe, that we have years, centuries, even millenia to bring our hearts and minds to the task of recognizing our infinite duty in these matters. Realizing this, I yet cannot free myself from the conviction that we face an immediate crisis, that our civilization may be weighed and found wanting, and that the forwarding of the kingdom of God may be left for a civilization which succeeds ours.

Our crisis is centered on the overhanging threat of a war which will end our opportunity and our stewardship. It is my belief that the test is coming in the willingness of our world to accept universal, complete and controlled disarmament, and to set up the international institutions for its administration.

We cannot treat this great project as a secondary matter to which we give fleeting attention when we are not beset with day by day problems. It is the great undertaking. It is the grand project. It is the one thing on which unwavering, persisting attention must be focused.

With regard to this, I would like to express my conviction that the Soviet Government can be so morally encircled, so morally penetrated, and the cause of disarmament presented to them so intelligently, that the necessary thoroughgoing action eventually will appear to their rulers as being in their own long range self interest.

The heads of the four great powers are soon to meet. There is pessimism as to any practical results from that meeting. If they attempt in detail to relieve the tensions of the tangled web of influences in which the world is caught, their task will be difficult indeed. If, on the other hand, they raise the question as to whether each of them is ready to consider complete universal controlled disarmament, then their attention can be focused on the vital center of tension and the central hope of release.

There is not time to go into the details of these hopes and possibilities. Their solution solves, or renders more easy of solution all the other problems with which the world is troubled. In this great undertaking your country and mine can see together eye to eye, and work together hand in hand.

Commencement Exercises at Washington and Jefferson and Waynesburg Colleges, Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, during the weekend I had the honor and pleasure of attending the commencement exercises of two historic colleges in southwestern Pennsylvania, Washington and Jefferson College, located at Washington, Pa., and Waynesburg College, located at Waynesburg, Pa.

Washington and Jefferson College, under the leadership of Dr. Boyd C. Patterson, and Waynesburg College, under the leadership of Dr. Paul R. Stewart, are functioning magnificently in upholding the ideals of America.

The problem of sustaining our small colleges each year is an important one in the United States. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Graduation Time Here for Colleges," published in the Washington Observer, of Washington, Pa., and also

an address which I delivered on June 11, 1955, at the Waynesburg College alumni dinner.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer]

GRADUATION TIME HERE FOR COLLEGES

It is commencement season for the colleges of Greene and Washington Counties.

These are Waynesburg, Washington and Jefferson, and California State Teachers College.

Both liberal arts institutions will graduate classes this weekend, Washington and Jefferson on Saturday and Waynesburg the next day.

All three schools, particularly the liberal arts schools, have long records of outstanding service. Washington and Jefferson will graduate its 156th class, and Waynesburg will confer degrees on its 104th class.

Their long history is a record of service—to community and Nation, to their long rolls of alunmni and those whose lives are influenced by those alumni.

W. & J. has a notable record of preparing large numbers of men for entry into medical and theological schools, and her alumni include a very large number of successful ministers and physicians, as well as scientists, teachers, and businessmen.

Waynesburg College has a record which over the years has virtually equalled that of W. & J. in sending men into the ministry and into medicine. Though her alumni rolls are not as large the record of success is little different, percentagewise.

It is doubtful whether many schools in the country have sent as large a percentage of their alumni into public service as ministers and physicians as have these two.

California founded as a teachers' school, has, of course, sent the larger number of her alumni into the teaching field, where they have achieved much.

The alumni of these schools, at this commencement time, may find much satisfaction in the past record of public service.

But that satisfaction will live only as long as that record is continued. There can be little pride in the present work of an institution which has ceased to live up to its past glories.

The meaning is that today's alumni, trustees, and faculty must express that pride in something more than words. It must be expressed in continued service, with continuation of the high ideals which have characterized the work of these schools through the many decades of their history.

And that means that faculties must be made up of individuals with high ideals—ideals of civic, moral, and spiritual service. They must be able to give instruction of the highest order.

Faculties of this type, backed by trustees and administrative officers with the same high hopes and ideals for the schools, will continue to send men and women into the world ready to play an outstanding part in the business of improving the character of the world's people, as well as advancing the world's technological processes.

Our colleges in this area have an outstanding record—we wish a continuance of that record. Commencement season is a time for alumni, faculty, and administrative personnel to renew the ideals which will continue it.

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT WAYNESBURG COLLEGE ALUMNI DINNER, SATURDAY, JUNE 11, 1955

This evening I would like to bring to your attention one of the great dangers confronting the colleges of America that depend upon voluntary sources for their support.

On numerous occasions—in public speeches and elsewhere—I have discussed the importance of keeping the educational system of the United States free from Government control.

I have emphasized the great contribution of the private colleges to the development and maintenance of the American way of life.

I have tried to impress upon my fellow citizens—that the independence of our educational system—has a direct bearing on the future of the United States—as a land of freedom and opportunity.

Unless our institutions of higher learning are sustained on a financial basis—adequate to meet their growing needs—the alternative will be Government support—and Government control.

That would be disastrous to the historic pattern of college administration—which has been so successful in the past.

If our schools and colleges ever come to depend upon Government for their support—academic freedom would be destroyed by bureaucratic dictatorship.

Let us review the situation as reported by eminent educational authorities.

A recent survey of the Nation's 900 private colleges and universities revealed that just about half of them are operating in the red.

About 200 are facing serious trouble unless they obtain immediate and substantial financial help.

In recent years the expenses that educational institutions have to meet have doubled and even tripled.

The cost of everything has gone up—without a corresponding increase in income.

In order to maintain their educational standards, the colleges need more buildings, more laboratories, more classrooms, more libraries, and expanded administration facilities.

It has been estimated that at least $30 million is needed right now to overcome the operating deficits of the colleges that are in financial trouble.

About $6 billion is required to bring plant facilities up to present-day requirements.

It should be a matter of deep concern to each of us that the independent liberal arts colleges have been hit hardest of all by financial difficulties.

It is a tragic situation that many of them—after long years of honorable and distinguished service—now find themselves facing a struggle for survival.

What is being done to keep them from being submerged by their financial difficulties?

For one thing—tuition fees have been increased.

But educators realize that many thousands of qualified young men and young women are being deprived of a college education because their families are unable to meet the increased costs.

It is true that business and industrial concerns have interested themselves in the growing needs of education and have made substantial contributions.

Other generous gifts have come from foundations established by public spirited citizens and families who have accumulated wealth under the American system of free enterprise.

But much more is needed to keep our private colleges independent and uncontrolled in their cultural—spiritual—and academic policies.

There is no doubt in my mind that every one of us will give this problem serious thought.

We of the alumni of Waynesburg can help erect a barrier against intervention by government in higher education.

We can help preserve for the future generations the advantages we have enjoyed under the historic American system which has given strength and stability to our way of life.

Commencement Address by Robert S. McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid commencement address delivered at the University of Alabama commencement exerises on Sunday, May 29, 1955, by Mr. Robert S. McNamara, vice president of the Ford Motor Co., and General Manager of the Ford Division. Mr. McNamara's speech is a thought-provoking reaffirmation of the value of individualism in preserving our American freedoms and furthering our economic progress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY ROBERT S. MCNAMARA, FORD MOTOR CO. VICE PRESIDENT AND FORD DIVISION GENERAL MANAGER, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, SUNDAY, MAY 29, 1955

It's a pleasure and an honor for me to be here with you today. As a one-time college professor, I was frankly a little overwhelmed at the prospect of speaking on this commencement platform. I have sat through a number of these occasions, and it is not comforting to recall the look of bright but cynical detachment which often lights the undergraduate eye.

There is a hallowed tradition about these events. The speaker wraps the universe in a ball and hurls it at you with the admonition to go out and clean up the mess. He assures you he is no philosopher, and then goes on to give you his philosophy of life, which, when followed to the letter, is guaranteed to bring you success, fame and worldly fortune.

While my sense of the traditional is strong, I hope to stray from that conventional path in one or two respects. Nothing I say here, for example, is intended to make a financial success of anybody.

I will speak as a businessman and, to some extent, about the business world, knowing that many of you will seek careers in industry. But it is very important to our future that those of us in industry and in the professions, in education and in Government understand and know each other better.

While I qualify neither as a philosopher nor, I trust, as a member of the older generation, I do wish to invoke the authority of the established sages to support my remarks today.

Two thousand years ago Socrates, the all-time dean of advisers to youth, wrote that "The unexamined life is not worth living." And that, I think, might well be repeated as a sort of invocation at the beginning and end of every educational assembly.

On a more earthy note was Socrates' advice to young men: "Marry," he said.

"By all means marry. If you get a good wife, you will achieve great happiness. If you get a bad one, you will become a philosopher, and that, of course, is good for every man."

A no less great man and thinker, Albert Einstein, shortly before his death, gave some equally cogent advice to a young man. He said: "Do not strive for success—strive to be a person of greater value."

This, I think, is the essence of wisdom in all times and all ages. The striving after

excellence—the effort to become a person of greater value—leads most directly both to the profound and the superficial rewards of life—the inner serenity and, perhaps, the outward trappings of fame and good fortune.

Part of being of greater value is a matter of increasing our competence, in learning to work more effectively, whatever our chosen field of activity. The other side of the coin is our moral and spiritual growth—and upon this, even more than upon our competence, vital as that is, our future depends.

What is involved in becoming a "person of greater value" has been pretty consistent over the ages. Yet each generation produces its own peculiar set of needs, and different virtues are particularly cogent to different times.

Today, I would like to try to examine with you what I view was some of the strengths and weaknesses of the present-day American society and the demands which that society will make on the individual members of the class of 1955.

I suspect that the world today looks much different to you than it did to my graduating class. In 1937, the year I graduated from college, we lived in a rather small and self-centered world. For 5 years our Nation had been in the grip of a paralyzing depression.

Hunger and poverty were commonplace. There were no jobs for a full fourth of our working people, and millions more had only a meager subsistence. The failure of 40 percent of our banks had wiped out the life savings of countless American families. The fear and insecurity of that very recent time must be hard for many of you to imagine.

Employment, just getting a job and keeping it, was the burning question of our day.

Hard times gave rise to bitter labor hostility. Industry, in the grip of forces beyond either its control or its comprehension, was made the goat for a Nation's anguish. Many politically conscious young Americans began to question the whole structure of American democracy and the worth of the private enterprise system. We had the formation of some Communist and other radical campus organizations. ROTC mutinies and campus peace strikes were commonplace. Some young men of the class of 1937 went to fight and some to die in the Spanish Civil War.

There just isn't any question that you members of the class of 1955 are living in a substantially changed world and a different America.

Not the least of that change has been economic. For out of the chaos of the thirties, in less than 20 years we in this country have built a new economic order.

No longer do we consider our economy to be mature, at the limit of its growth; we admit no limitations to our progress. No longer do we accept times of large-scale unemployment as a necessary evil of the private enterprise system. No longer do most of us hold that the individual is solely responsible for his own security; for we are finding ways collectively to pool our strength and limit our individual risks. We have nearly rid ourselves of the belief that economic law requires us to ricochet between the ecstasy of inflated prosperity and the agony of economic collapse.

For the first time in history, a Nation can look forward to the elimination of poverty and material insecurity.

Nor has the progress of the past two decades been limited solely to the accomplishment of economic goals. We have had also a quiet but meaningful growth in political and social maturity. We have turned sharply away from the blind isolationism of the 1930's. We have developed a more rational and effective approach to the difficult problems of racial and religious intolerance.

American industry has made particularly great strides toward a fuller understanding of its potential role in our society. Basically, the modern businessman recognizes that he cannot divorce the well-being of his own company from that of society at large.

Today, progressive taxation places limits on the earning power of the businessman, and hence upon his purely monetary motivation. More and more he draws his incentive from a sense of public responsibility. More and more, I believe, idealistic and progressive young people will seek and find in industry not just a road to personal enrichment, but a most direct and effective means of public service.

We have talked thus far about the wonderful growth in the technical competence and material well-being of America, about our increasing maturity, tolerance and sophistication as a people. But it would not be accurate to say that these gains have cost us nothing. In fact, they have cost us dearly, a price which the future may show was too great.

Modern man, in his search for progress and security, seems to be racing furiously against time. Enemies from without seek to trip him up. But there is also an enemy within which poses just as great a threat to his forward progress.

In our case, the enemy within is not communism or creeping socialism, or some other alien growth. The enemy within us is our own growing tendency toward a sterile conformity of thought and behavior—a perceptible loss of the robust individualism and sense of personal responsibility which was the hallmark of our people in past times.

Many of the pressures to conformity will grow more and more powerful in time. If we fail to recognize them and fight them, we may wake up one day to find it is too late.

It has been said that if individualism was the prevailing feature of American life in the 19th century, standardization is the prevailing feature now.

Have we as a people submitted too far or too readily to commercial pressures? Have we allowed our social and cultural tastes to be molded on the mass-production lines of industry? Writers and thinkers from Disraeli to Huxley and Orwell have warned of that competent society which mistakes comfort for civilization, a homogenized horror of a "brave new world," wrapped in cellophane and untounched by human hands.

It is easy to generalize and hard to prove that conformity is growing in American life, but there is evidence we cannot afford to ignore.

There are signs, for example, of a noticeable trend to conformity in the thought and actions of college graduates entering industry. Fortune magazine recently polled a large group of representative young businessmen averaging 25 years old. They found them by and large sound, well-balanced, and competent young men, wholeheatedly and primarily dedicated to the proposition of getting ahead. To a businessman concerned with finding talented young people for management jobs, this might seem at first a happy state of affairs. As a citizen, I'm not quite so certain that it is.

These same young businessmen showed a marked indifference to world affairs and to domestic political and social problems; they were generally hard to rouse on any theoretical issue; and even in such activities as church going, they seemed strongly motivated by the desire for social acceptance and business success.

There is a certain suggestion that the mature, middle-road outlook of this group is not so much a matter of conviction as one compounded of political innocence and commercial expediency.

In some cases, we find a heavy pressure to conformity being exerted by large business corporations. In a few instances it has been carried to ridiculous extremes. Personal habits are rigorously overseen. Whether the bright young man gets ahead may depend more upon his wife's steady hand at the tea service than upon his own business acumen.

I am happy to say that at Ford Motor Co. we still feel that a man's family life and his social and political ties are his own business. We are interested in performance, not conformance.

It is in the broad area of public actions and attitudes, however, that we find a much more grave pressure to conformity. As we all known, this pressure is the result of a generalized fear, often stimulated for political reasons, not of Communist espionage or sabotage or other violence but of Communist subversion of our schools and political institutions—which is surely a synthetic danger at the present time.

A recent survey reveals that 40 percent of the American public would not permit a high-school teacher to discuss Capitalism versus Communism. A majority of the public would not permit a person suspected of Communist sympathies to work in industry, regardless of whether the industry was associated with defense activities.

Apparently many of us need to refresh our faith and reaffirm our concern for the preservation of freedom of thought and speech—our belief in an individual's right to be wrong.

In the search for absolute purity and Americanism, we as a people have variously applauded or shrugged off a series of assaults on individual and academic freedom. We have submitted calmly enough to blackballing—the denial of employment in nonsensitive fields to those merely suspected of irregularity. We have begun to take more or less for granted the censoring of libraries and textbooks by self-appointed public protectors.

Once we surrender our freedom to think and speak and teach, all other freedom quickly disappears. During the past decade we have seen the emergence in American public life of practices which we used to think of as the private property of totalitarian regimes. We have had a great proliferation of public and private investigative activities. There has been an enormous growth in the private-detective business and also in the manufacture of electronic detection devices. We are all increasingly vulnerable to snooping and surveillance.

If the demands of national security require some surrender of personal privacy and a watering down of constitutional safeguards, we should be all the more jealous and watchful of our freedom. We should see that the dangerous powers of political surveillance are kept in the hands of competent, responsible authority and subject to the most careful safeguards under law.

Judge Learned Hand has stated the case far better than I could. Here is what he says:

"Risk for risk, for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumor and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry. I believe that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed, political as well as religious, is a mark of disaffection; where denunciation, without specification or backing, takes the place of evidence; where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith

in the eventual supermacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists to win or lose."

I have tried very briefly to suggest a number of areas which reflect a trend in American life to conformity and to the suppression of individual freedom. I am too thoroughly convinced of the basic soundness of our people to fear a complete breakdown of our regard for freedom.

I fear, however, any lowering of the freedom threshold. I believe the trend to narrow conformity threatens our national greatness, our economic strength and progress, and the fullness of our personal lives.

Our Nation has grown and prospered in a tradition of contentious nonconformity, of fearless individualism, and proud self-reliance. To the extent that we sacrifice these qualities to a mass-rule uniformity—a sort of bland mediocrity must result and our stature as a people must diminish.

American business has prospered in an atmosphere of vigorous, unfettered, and competitive individualism. Today as business becomes increasingly complex, it depends more and more on team action. Corporate management tends to become more and more elaborate and bureaucratic, and each company tends to develop its own traditions, outlook, and personality. If this process creates an atmosphere stale and hostile to individuality, business will lack increasingly in vigor, imaginativeness, and creativity, and ultimately our whole economy will suffer.

The fullness of our personal lives depends upon the broadest development of our personalities in an atmosphere of freedom. Indeed the prime objective of our society should be to make possible the fullest development of the individual. Emerson has said: "Who so would be a man must be a nonconformist."

If we surrender our natural right to become complete, self-reliant and inner-directed people, we necessarily become creatures of the mass—something less than we might be, something, perhaps, a little less than human.

As a businessman, I am convinced that in the long run, businesses which are most successful in encouraging individual initiative will win out over those which try to force their young people into a preconceived pattern.

If we do not have freedom of thought in our business operations, if we try to insist that our people think along certain uniform economic, political or social lines, we will inevitably restrict their ability to contribute fully their talents.

In our business, making automobiles, we eagerly search out young people whose thinking has not yet been frozen along approved lines. We expect of them a high potential of competence. But more than specialized knowledge, we are on the lookout for a balanced judgment, an ability to reason clearly, a broad curiosity, and the moral courage to make decisions and stand by them. We want young people to have questing minds, to deal easily with facts and imaginatively and creatively with ideas and theories.

In any corporation, and we are no exception, there is a certain inertia, a tendency to discourage fresh thought and innovation. There are chronic squelchers—you will meet them wherever you go—who will delight in inflating their own egos by deflating yours. It takes a degree of moral courage to withstand that pressure, particularly when you are in competition with half-a-dozen eager beavers who eagerly spout the party line. Sometimes, unfortunately, it also takes a certain dexterity to espouse an unpopular view and still keep your place in the pecking order.

Yet if the young people who move each year into the ranks of industry and the professions do not bring with them a strong sense of individuality, I do not know where else it will come from.

This is a genuine and significant issue.

In our industrial civilization business management occupies a great and increasing position of leadership, influence, and indeed power within our society. The outlook of business leadership is therefore vital to the future of our country and its institutions. If narrow, reactionary or conformist people dominate industry, the result will obviously be the same kind of national posture on the part of business.

Instead of social and economic progress we could have stagnation and perhaps the ultimate collapse of a business system which thus far has performed magnificently.

Let me conclude with this thought: The class of 1955 faces a prospect more brilliant than that of any preceding class in history. It is not smug or overconfident to believe that, barring a major catastrophe, it will be your lot to enjoy a richness and diversity of opportunity, good health, and material security unthought of in past ages. In all likelihood the test of your generation will not be how well you stood up under adversity, but how well you endured prosperity.

In a sense, the working out of your lives will test the values of what we call the American way of life. Will we seize upon our security, our enormous wealth, and productive power as a God-given opportunity to become better, more complete individuals, to extend our interests and strengthen our personalities intellectually, morally, and spiritually? Will we use our economic power throughout the world to foster freedom, to fight hunger and poverty and ignorance? Will the road of material progress lead to the achievement of noble and nonmaterial ends?

Or will the future be a fur-lined trap in which we sacrifice all-important human, moral, and spiritual values to self-indulgence, to easy popularity, or to an immature preoccupation with worldly success?

If we follow individually the course of easy conformity, there's no doubt in my mind what the result will be. We shall one day wake up to find ourselves in the brave, new world full of ersatz animal comforts and devoid of human values.

There is in each of us a sensitive nerve of pride which tells us we are important and different from any other man or woman who ever lived. That nerve is the source of our human dignity. It protests whenever the world seeks to force us into a common mold or to deny the full expression of our personalities. If we ignore its protests, it becomes weaker and weaker until we scarcely know when we are being deprived of our freedom and individuality.

This, it seems to me, is the great challenge of our day to each one of you: That you keep alive, strong, and sensitive that nerve of pride and individuality, in spite of the pressures upon you to think and act and talk like others. That you maintain a vigorous concern for basic human freedoms and a keen instinct for detecting threats to that freedom.

Do that and you will be able to steer your way through the many compromises which life will force upon you, without compromising essential values. Do that and you will grow, in Einstein's phrase, into people of ever greater value—greater value to your country, your jobs, and to yourselves. And when your day comes, as it will, to take up the reins of leadership in public or private life, we will have a group of American leaders dedicated to the advancement of fundamental human values.

That way lies our best hope for the fulfillment of our dream of an America rich not only in material wealth, but in the variety and excellence of its artistic, scientific, and cultural achievements, and in the vigor and character of a great and free people.

Good luck to you all.

The Fund for the Republic and Political Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been evidence of a renewed attack on philanthropic institutions such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Fund for the Republic. The purpose of these attacks seems to be twofold: To destroy public confidence in these organizations and to set the stage for an attack on certain tax benefits which such organizations enjoy. These groups are accused of advocating "communistic or socialistic" ideas and practices and of attempting to subvert "the American way of life." I for one feel these accusations to be grossly unfair and untrue. It seems evident to me that these foundations have been supporting some of the most worthwhile projects being undertaken in America today. All Members of Congress recently received the annual report of the Ford Foundation. If one takes the trouble merely to read over the table of contents in this volume it becomes obvious how many and how varied these undertakings are. It is also evident that the activities presented in brief form in the report are of a most worthwhile character and when completed will do much to increase our understanding of both ourselves and of other nations.

One of the most recent attacks has been on the Fund for the Republic. This organization has been engaged in studies concerned most especially with the status of civil liberties in the United States today. It has recently issued a study entitled "Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties." This book is but one example of the high caliber of the work being done by the fund. Surely such work should be given every encouragement and not subjected to backdoor sniping, for if we are to fight communism effectively and at the same time preserve the liberties of which America is so justly proud, we must have as many facts as possible at our disposal. I recommend that my colleagues take time to study this volume both for the purpose of understanding the subject matter contained therein and to realize the type of worthwhile material being presented by our philanthropic foundations. In connection with the accusations being made against the Fund for the Republic, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in Labor's Daily on June 16, 1955. That the charge of communism being made against the fund is patently ridiculous, is made clear in this article. The fund, as such, takes no stand on any issue but merely is interested in a presentation of the facts. It relies on men of great competency in preparing its studies. For example, among the men making or helping in the sudies is Daniel Bell, labor

editor of Fortune, John Cogley, editor of the Catholic magazine Commonweal, and Clinton Rossiter of the department of government of Cornell University. Included on the board of directors of the fund are such men as Robert M. Hutchins, Paul Hoffman, Chester Bowles, Erwin N. Griswold, Elmo Roper, and James D. Zellerbach. Certainly these men cannot be accused of the taint of communism, nor of having anything but the best interests of the United States in mind when they agreed to become associated with the Fund for the Republic.

The article follows:

FUND FOR REPUBLIC CONCERNED WITH DEFENDING CIVIL LIBERTIES

(By G. B. Holcomb)

Political columnist George Sokolsky wrote in his nationally-syndicated daily column last week a story which left two impressions:

That the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic which it sponsors are at odds with each other; and

That the Fund for the Republic is conducting "political propaganda" on behalf of communism.

Those impressions (whether intentionally promoted by Sokolsky or not) aren't correct, according to Ben Segal, labor consultant and the fund's representative in Washington.

The Ford Foundation set up the $15 million Fund for the Republic as a separate entity (with main offices in New York), but that doesn't mean they aren't speaking to each other.

Sokolsky wrote that the fund "has teams all over the country ostensibly investigating Communists, but actually seeking to discover what active anti-Communists have been doing."

As a matter of record, the fund is openly trying to find out what is being done to Communists, Socialists, atheists, fascists, Trotskyists, race bigots, security risks, fifth amendment Communists, etc., Segal said, in order to get a real picture of the effects on civil liberties in this country.

It has published a book on Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, which describes some of its findings.

It has published another book, called a Bibliography on Communism, containing a list of authoritative documents on the Communist ideology and political organization.

RECORD OF COMMUNISM

A Digest of the Public Record of Communism in the United States, 753 pages thick and with pages as large as those of Fortune magazine, has been published by the fund.

These studies deal, Segal said, with the impact of communism on America today.

Daniel Bell, labor editor of Fortune, heads a division of this vast study which deals with the impact of communism on the trade union movement.

Other studies will deal with student organizations, veterans, educational welfare, old-age pension, business, and other groups.

John Cogley, editor of the Catholic magazine Commonweal, heads the study on the effects of blacklisting in the entertainment field.

The whole impact study is under direction of Prof. Clinton Rossiter of Cornell University's government department.

Rossiter, the Reverend Joseph M. Snee, S. J., professor of law at Georgetown University, and Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland of the Harvard law school, edited the Digest.

These men, like the members of the fund's board of directors, are interested only in arriving at the facts about communism and avoiding the ignorance which, all too often, helps shape public attitudes.

IGNORANCE IS DANGEROUS

Board members are:

Robert M. Hutchins, president; Paul G. Hoffman, chairman; W. H. Ferry, vice president; David F. Freeman, secretary; Bethuel M. Webster, counsel; Meyer Kestnbaum, M. Albert Linton, John Lord O'Brian (80, and called by Life magazine one of America's elder statesmen of the law), Chester Bowles, Charles W. Cole, Russell L. Dearmont, Erwin N. Griswold, William H. Joyce, Jr., Jubel R. Parten, Elmo Roper, Robert E. Sherwood, George N. Shuster, Eleanor B. Stevenson and James D. Zellerbach.

The former president of Columbia University is quoted in the frontispiece of the Digest of the Public Record of Communism in the United States. He said:

"The truth about communism is, today, an indispensable requirement if the true values of our democratic system are to be properly assessed. Ignorance of communism, fascism or any other police-state philosophy is far more dangerous than ignorance of the most virulent disease."

The author of these lines is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

"A sort of slogan for the fund," Segal told us, "is 'Feel Free' which I guess would mean to look any controversial issue squarely in the face.

"It is a tragedy today that too many people fear to speak up on issues if perchance the Communists are making or have made noise about it.

"By this time," Segal added, "everyone should know Communists have never been sincere about causes they espouse, except that of furthering the interests of the Soviet Union. It is the issues which are important, not who makes the noise.

"We have to be careful not to use the same tactics used by the Communists."

STIMULATES DISCUSSION

These are Segal's views, and not necessarily those of the fund. The fund, as such, has no views, unless it might be said to be in favor of the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The fund "tries to avoid taking a position." It seeks, instead, to stimulate others to discussion, or argument, or dissension (depending on the point of view).

A long-time project is to determine what union members think about such controversial questions as, "Should an admitted Communist be expelled from the union?" and "Should a man who favors Government ownership of the railroads be expelled from the union?"

Segal was asked his own opinion on the first question.

"In a sensitive job, both the Government and the union have an obligation to see that the security of the country isn't endangered," he said. "But when it comes to other areas, union members ought to think pretty carefully before they conduct activities which would deprive a man of the right to earn a living. That is the acid test."

SEGAL'S BACKGROUND

He drew a clear distinction between a professed Communist and suspects or persons who might exercise his constitutional right to plead the fifth amendment.

As example of a situation he fears, he related, was a Florida union which expelled a man who had pleaded the fifth amendment before a congressional committee. The company wouldn't fire him, but the members made his job so miserable that he quit.

Although he's not quite 39, Segal has an extensive background in the field of labor and civil liberties.

His previous job was as associate director of the CIO department of education. Last year he was one of two senior Fulbright scholars on workers' education in England, where he studied British trade unions. Segal taught and visited in Norway, Denmark, Switzerland (for the International Labor Organization), Austria, Yugoslavia, and Israel.

For 5 years he organized in the South for the CIO Textile Workers, was a Midwest organizer for the AFL Ladies Garment Workers; directed the Council for Equal Job Opportunities in Philadelphia, and served as president of local 189 of the AFL Federation of Teachers.

He now is on the local's executive board and is a member of the national executive board of the National Religion and Labor Foundation.

Segal met his wife, Elizabeth, in North Carolina. "That was one of my southern victories," he chuckled. They have a 22-months-old daughter, Doris Marie.

SEGAL ENCOURAGED

Segal, a pipe-smoking and scholarly appearing man with thinning brown hair, says he is encouraged by the interest shown in the increasingly complex problem of loyalty and security programs being run by both the Government and private industry.

He's becoming a major source of material on the subject, yet has no secretarial staff on hand to assist him. He's trying to keep the paperwork bureaucracy out of his job if he can. But it's a struggle when various groups call him and ask for 3 copies of this report or 25 of that study.

Segal likes his job, is constantly busy, and he believes in it, Sokolsky or no Sokolsky.

Peronismo Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the more shocking anti-Christian acts of recent vintage is found in the behavior of the Peron government in Argentina. This unprincipled, lawless regime has long been known for its persecution of the church. This is culminated in today's deportation order of the Right Reverend Monsignor Manuel Tato, auxiliary bishop of Buenos Aires, and the Right Reverend Ramon Pablo Novoa, canon deacon of the archdiocese.

The situation is best summed up by an excellent editorial from the Wednesday, June 15, edition of Newsday, the largest daily paper published on Long Island, N. Y. The editorial is as follows:

PERONISMO POLITICS

Juan Peron's attacks on the Catholic Church in Argentina have gone beyond any decent principle of separation of church and state. Peron is out to destroy the church. Each day it looks more like a fight to the finish. One or the other will disappear in Argentina.

Considering that the principles of Catholicism have thrived for 2,000 years, and Peron has been in power for 12, we'll bet on the church. Catholicism has outlived bigger dictators in the past. There's no reason to expect it to collapse under the assault of a little tyrant to be a big dictator.

For 12 years the church tried to live with Peron. It deserves praise for having awakened to the realities of Peronismo and for having the courage to fight.

The Catholic Church has had governmental support in Argentina for more than 100 years. There was no problem, no in-

terference by either in the legitimate affairs of the other.

But when Peron came along in 1943, the church was wooed and won by his promises, and actively supported his regime.

The dictator, who is not expected to live by a code of ethics, gradually consolidated his position. Labor unions were purged and reorganized. Universities were forced to obey his decrees. The press was throttled until, last year, only one strong and independent group remained outside his regime. That was the Catholic Church.

Dictatorships cannot tolerate opposition. By their nature they must crush every sort of potential threat. Peron, to maintain power, had to move against the church.

He abolished compulsory religious training, banned nuns from schools, legalized divorce and prostitution, and has submitted to the people a referendum to abolish official recognition of Catholicism.

The Catholics have at last struck back. They have defended their places of worship and their right to gather in them. They have defied Peron's attempts to stop religious activity.

We salute their awakening and their displays of courage. We wish them well.

Address of the Honorable James P. McGranery, Recently the Attorney General of the United States, Formerly Judge of the United States District Court, Armed Forces Day, May 21, 1955, the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of hearing the Honorable James P. McGranery address the citizens of Portsmouth, Va., in my district on Armed Forces Day. Many of you know Judge McGranery personally, since he served in the Congress from 1935 to 1945. Others know him as a distinguished jurist, and a former Attorney General of the United States. I, therefore, commend to your reading Judge McGranery's address on May 21 at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va.:

As I greet you on this sixth Armed Forces Day, I wish to express my gratitude for the gracious welcome of the citizens of Portsmouth extended by my good friend and former colleague in the Congress, Norman Hamilton, whose civic leadership and journalistic vision have made him a tower of strength for good in Virginia and in the Nation.

I was pleased and happy to review today's parade in company with your distinguished Representative, now serving his fifth term in the Congress of the United States where he is esteemed and deeply respected by his fellow Members in the House, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, Jr.

The hospitality of this historic naval base is exemplified in the person of our host this afternoon, Rear Adm. Logan McKee, of the United States Navy, whose career of active service since graduation from the United States Naval Academy is in the great tradition of the naval officer: On the wartime seas of the North Atlantic; as engineering, designing, and planning officer supervising the building of our plane carriers and battleships; on naval technical missions, and as commandant of this great base.

Joined with Admiral McKee as cochairman of Armed Forces Day is our well-loved friend, Frank D. Lawrence, who symbolizes to Virginians and to Americans everywhere the national characteristics we prize most highly. Combining an intense love of his family, his community, the Old Dominion State, with consecrated devotion to the United States of America and her ideals of integrity and fair play, he has ever been ready to answer the call to service of his fellow citizens and of his country. As president of the American National Bank of Portsmouth, he has advanced the business development of the entire neighboring area, encouraged all who sought opportunity, stretched out a helping hand to neighbors whose temporary reverses would otherwise have been final. Community charities have never asked his aid in vain. His religion has been the sunlight illuming his every day; his warm personality has brightened the days of his fellowmen. To the great American sport—baseball—he has given unstintingly of his strength, his time, his private means, and his leadership. The boys who learn the ideals of sportmanship and develop fine bodies and clean minds on all the baseball lots across the country owe to Frank Lawrence their continued belief in and hope for integrity in the game of baseball and the game of life tomorrow.

If every community in our country had a Frank Lawrence there would be no problem of juvenile delinquency, and youth would be ready everywhere for the service of good citizenship in civil affairs and in the Armed Forces.

The parade of the Armed Forces today was a magnificent spectacle, but it was much more than that: It was the pledge of our country's youth for a peaceful tomorrow.

From your Norfolk Naval Base, from Langley Field, from Fort Monroe—the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, the Army of the United States have united to present a pageant of preparedness, displaying teamwork and technological advancements in the art and science of defense and retaliation, a guarantee of security by deterring attack, in every kind and type of warfare.

The military might that we glimpsed today in Virginia—inspiring, as it does, our admiration, our confidence and our appreciation—represents millions of uniformed men and women of our Armed Forces, with their many newly developed weapons of warfare, their varied, advanced aircraft and seagoing ships, guided missiles, radar warning systems, standing by for continental defense, and mobilized to retaliate against any foe even from the most distant periphery of our globe.

Conscious that we are provided with the necessary media of modern warfare: the electronic devices, jets, thermonuclear weapons and other technological developments, nevertheless we do not—we cannot—rest upon these alone our belief that our Nation's destiny is to survive, or our hope that free nations everywhere will continue free.

Indeed, we are aware that the flexibility and unity of our Armed Forces, their new technological skills, their readiness for changing strategy and tactics have not altered the basic missions of the services or changed their allegiance to their respective, unique and historic traditions.

The Navy of today is still manned by dedicated citizens, worthy successors to the naval heroes who battled in other years for freedom of the seas, for the protection of our shores from the invader, for the preservation of far-off peoples, our friends and our allies.

Likewise, the Marine Corps, the Army, the Air Corps of today are consecrated to the cause of liberty in the same spirit as their predecessors of earlier decades who fought on beaches, in trenches, and in the air to make the world secure for the democratic ideal.

United in shared devotion to their country, the armed services of the United States promise all freedom-loving men that the principles on which our Republic was founded will continue to be guarded and to triumph. The ideals of George Washington and of Thomas Jefferson, illustrious sons of your Commonwealth, are enshrined in the hearts of America's youth. And it is our youth who constitute our power for peace.

I like to think that, when Jefferson penned the immortal Declaration of Independence, he drew up articles of faith for the first nation to be formed upon a spiritual foundation. On behalf of his contemporaries, on behalf of all citizens of the future, he acknowledged belief in man's Creator, and in the natural law ordering the existence of God's creature. The dignity of individual man; his unalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; his equality with his brothers in origin, nature, and eternal destiny; these formed the stepping stones of thinking to our democratic way of life. And they still do.

Our forefathers declared again and again that all authority comes from God and is channeled to the holders of public office by the free choice of the people—who honor the office rather than its occupant. The public-spirited citizen, the member of our Armed Forces, who respects the law of the land, who is obedient to the command of his superior officer, thereby expresses his belief in his own freedom of choice and his affirmative recognition of authority, of which God is the ultimate source.

No wonder it is impossible for the godless Soviet to understand the true strength of our Armed Forces, or to appreciate the ultimate invincibility of the democratic ideal. The Communist dictators view their subjects as men without souls, animated machines, serfs to be used at the will of the state. They are blind to the existence of God, unaware of the trusteeship for which they must, nevertheless, ultimately answer. Material force and temporal power are the only language that has meaning to their eyes and to their ears.

They have built and they are building a "massive military machine" to realize their "vaulting ambition" to enslave mankind. Truth and justice have no part in their scheme of things or in their scheming.

The never-abandoned objectives of the Communist Soviet have not altered. They cannot. Only their methods and policies change, and then, like the chameleon's protective coloration, for an unpredictable period.

Hence, our Nation must continue to provide advanced scientific and technological weapons, equipment, and supplies of the armaments of war, adequate systems of warning, ground-to-air, air-to-air, and surface-to-surface missiles, and to maintain an enormous industrial capacity, for our Armed Forces and for the militant forces of other freedom-loving nations.

And we must continue the vigilance of preparedness for we can never assume that the Soviet has ceased to increase in offensive, striking strength. Like the venomous serpent, totalitarian Russia is skilled in the techniques of concealing her death-dealing weapons until she finds her victims disarmed. We rely on the advanced scientific military power of the Armed Forces of the United States to demonstrate to the Soviet Communists that they cannot intimidate or dominate us by force or violence.

Meanwhile, our citizens in civil life will keep high our guard against Communist subversion, infiltration, intrigue, and conspiracy.

For our Nation has a sacred destiny—to preserve the democratic ideal.

Although ready to meet force with force, we dare not—in our efforts to counter subversion—sacrifice the civil rights enunciated in our Constitution and its amendments.

It is because the United States in peace and in war, in emergency, and in crisis, has continued true to these principles of Washington and Jefferson—that today our youth come forth armored with spiritual strength, brave to defend the eternal law of justice and love.

And so, we know that America will triumph, and that peace will come—for our valiant youth who place their faith in God are America's power for peace.

Our Beloved Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting and enlightening article written by Raymond V. McNamara, postmaster in Haverhill, Mass., and president of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, which appeared in the June 1955 issue of the Postmasters Gazette.

Mr. McNamara has served this organization as national president with honor and distinction for many years and suffice to say he has always been an able, capable and sincere, conscientious employee of our Government. Respected and admired by all of us in Massachusetts, I know that his service to the postmasters and to the Post Office Department has always been most creditable:

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE: AMERICA IS BEAUTIFUL

Once in a spirit of levity, I impressed upon the editor of the Postmasters Gazette that the poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, was born in Haverhill, Mass., and there wrote many of his immortal verses.

"True," said the editor, "but Whittier sang in the long ago. Today, William Falkner, Tennessee Williams, and Hodding Carter, all Mississippians, write the books, the plays, and the editorials that win the Pulitzer awards and the national acclaim."

If this bit of pleasantry between friends has no significance to you, let us try again. I have traveled much lately, and I want to tell you how marvelously great is our country.

Learned and critical travelers from the Old World come to America to see our broad land, study its government, and to meet its people.

One of these visitors was interviewed aboard the ship that was to take him to his homeland. "What do you think of America?" the reporter asked. "I think it is beautiful," said the foreigner.

Yes, America is beautiful. Americans know that, but sometimes do not realize it. Today I am enthralled with its beauty, its culture, and its unlimited opportunities and the love of freedom in the hearts of its people, because I have visited the home States of those, who more than any other identifiable group, represent the people of America. They serve them; they speak with them, and they share all that our fair lands bestows and they give all the loyalty that America asks of them.

No State in America has all the resources, the culture, or the talent. These are equally distributed. This I have learned in my travels and during my visits with the postmasters of America. If the prose is written in one State, the poetry is inspired in another.

"The North! the South! the West! the East!
No one the most and none the least,
But each with his own heart and mind,
Each of his own distinctive kind,
Yet each a part and none the whole,
But all together form one soul;
That soul our Country at its best."

To few men has been given the opportunity which has come to me to visit and break bread with what I think is America's finest group—the postmasters of this country. I have met thousands and spoken to them in the States where they live and love and serve, and where they meet the high standards of our Government expressed in the official decree of the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission:

"They are recognized by the community as reliable citizens of good standing so that the community may have the confidence that the post office will be operated in the interest of the community."

I have not met any postmaster who is not so recognized. Knowing them has been a rare and enriching experience. As president of the National Association of Postmasters—the largest organization of postal administrators in the world—I am grateful to each of them in all of the States of this wonderful America that you and I—like the visitor from a foreign shore—think is beautiful.

And may I revert to the gentle poet—John Greenleaf Whittier—who wrote The Eternal Goodness in the town where I, too, strive to serve my fellowman:

"O, Friends, with whom my feet have trod
The quiet aisles of prayer,
Glad witness to your zeal for God
And love of man I bear.

I trace your lines of argument;
Your logic linked and strong
I weigh as one who dreads dissent,
And fear a doubt as wrong.

But still my human hands are weak
To hold your iron creeds:
Against the words ye bid me speak
My heart within me pleads.

Who fathoms the Eternal Thought?
Who talks of scheme and plan?
The Lord is God! He needeth not
The poor device of man."

RAYMOND V. MCNAMARA,
President.

The Peace-at-Any-Price Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 8, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, appearing in the Washington Star of June 15, 1955:

THE PEACE-AT-ANY-PRICE DOCTRINE—STEVENSON SUGGESTS UNITED STATES COMPROMISE WHERE BASIC PRINCIPLE IS CONCERNED

Is the Democratic Party to be characterized as the party of appeasement, and does its leadership still favor the same spirit of surrender which led to the Yalta agreements in 1945?

This would readily be answered in the negative, because of the fine statements of American purpose recently made by Senators LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, and WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia, were it not for the startling speech just delivered by Adlai Stevenson, who is conceded by most observers as likely to lead the Democratic Party in the 1956 presidential campaign.

Mr. Stevenson unashamedly comes out for "bargaining" and "trading" with the Red gangsters in Moscow and offers the curious disclaimer in advance that, "if things go wrong in the future" in the agreements made "at the summit" by the four-power statesmen, there should be no denunciation of the participants. He seems to sense already that the agreements might turn out to be bad.

"To want peace is to want compromise," says Mr. Stevenson. But is this truly the attitude of a nation that has been taught morality and idealism? Is there ever a justification for "compromise" with evil men and evil things? Mr. Stevenson seems to think that anything is "better than the alternative, which is a sharpening and prolonging of ugly, dangerous tensions."

This is really peace-at-any-price doctrine, and it is astonishing to find the leader of the Democratic Party openly advocating its equivalent.

"We shall have to be prepared to take some chances," argues the presidential nominee of 1952, "to risk something to win more." He adds that America should be willing to "take some reasonable chances." Does this mean that Mr. Stevenson is ready to see all American troops withdrawn from Europe, a distance of 3,000 miles, while the Russians go back just a few hundred miles? Does he mean that America is to agree to some more "coalition" cabinets such as led to the fall of the governments of Poland and Czechoslovakia, and later undermined the Nationalist Government in China? Would Mr. Stevenson be willing to accept the Communist idea of "free elections" in East Germany with Soviet-controlled troops coercing the electorate? Possibly it means that Mr. Stevenson would favor giving up the American stockpile of atomic bombs and agreeing to some kind of disarmament plan in which America takes plenty of chances while the dishonest men in the Kremlin take no chances, because they never would keep the agreements they signed anyway.

Mr. Stevenson, as the titular leader of the Democratic Party today, will probably be asked to spell out just what he does mean. Maybe there are other Democratic Party leaders who do not think he is reflecting the true spirit of America today and will tell him not to assume that he can speak for the Democratic Party in such terms. But, if not, there are Republicans surely who will want Mr. Stevenson to define what he meant in that speech delivered this week at the commencement exercises of Oberlin College.

What really requires explanation is Mr. Stevenson's clumsy attempt to apologize for what happened at Yalta as just an ordinary mistake in diplomacy, which he seems to think wasn't apparent at the time. Is the criticism of Yalta today really "hindsight?" The record in the newspapers and elsewhere shows that plenty of speakers and some writers, including this correspondent, called attention before and immediately after Yalta to the plan to sell Poland down the river. Mr. Stevenson put it this way:

We shall have to learn that diplomacy by hindsight is not good. We shall have to

learn not to denounce our representatives as traitors or suspicious characters if anything goes wrong in the future.

Now, nobody has denounced the top participants at the Yalta Conference as traitors or suspicious characters, but there is plenty of evidence that Alger Hiss had a hand in planning what went on in American diplomacy before and after Yalta and that the late Harry Dexter White, who held a post high up in the Treasury Department, had a hand in delaying the delivery of American financial aid to the Nationalist Government in China at a critical time—a circumstance that was helpful to the Communists in their conquest of the mainland of China. Does Mr. Stevenson wave Messrs. Hiss and White aside as merely suspicious characters?

Mr. Stevenson has challenged those who know the story of the Democratic administrations to bring it out in the open once more and show the American people how public policy under the Roosevelt regime was influenced by men sympathetic to Communist imperialism. By asking the Government of the United States to engage in compromise where basic principle and honor are concerned, is to disregard morality just because the alternative may be a period of ulgy tension. This is something new in the appeasement line.

The Republicans ought to be glad that Mr. Stevenson has thus early revealed the kind of campaign strategy he means to adopt for 1956. But the country will be saddened to see as fine a personality as Adlai Stevenson falling for the appeasement buncombe that has motivated the opposition parties in Europe and which the Kremlin must inevitably welcome as a symptom of the breakdown of the bipartisanship in America on the eve of the 4-power conference.

Patriotism Is What the Eisenhower Administration Says It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been in the Naval Reserve for over 14 years and who has served more than 8 years on active duty I regret that I had to take the floor last month to oppose the military Reserve bill, especially in view of the fact that I have been a longtime advocate of a strong Reserve program.

In the debate that accompanied the consideration of the measure in the House I took the floor on May 17 to set forth my reasons for voting against the measure as it was presented.

At this time I would like to include in the RECORD two articles from the New York Times bearing on this subject. One is an article by Hanson W. Baldwin which analyzes the bill; the second is a letter to the Times by Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

As Mr. Wilkins points out, an established Federal policy of nonsegregation is now in effect and functioning in all the Federal armed services. Indeed, the Eisenhower administration has made much of this in its claim that it has a good record on the segregation question. Mr. Wilkins says:

We take issue with the implication that we, as antisegregationists, are making "the defense of our country dependent upon all of us gettting our own ways here." The prosegregationists in the Congress who have served notice that they will sacrifice the defense of our country (by burying the bill) if their segregation formula is disturbed are the culprits deserving this rebuke. Let it be addressed to them.

The Eisenhower administration cannot eat their cake and have it too. They cannot appeal for votes of American Negroes in a campaign year and then charge colored Americans with being unpatriotic when they fight for those rights which are so basic to freedom everywhere—or can they?

The article by Mr. Baldwin and the letter by Mr. Wilkins follow:

[From the New York Times of June 9, 1955]

THE MILITARY RESERVE BILL—AN ANALYSIS OF PRESENT OBJECTIONS TO DEFENSE MEASURE BEFORE HOUSE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The compulsory military Reserve bill was the subject of intensive artificial respiration by the administration this week.

But the breath of legislative life appeared to have vanished, at least for this session, from a law that had been intended to be one of the cornerstones of the administration's new military policies.

The immediate causes of death were amendments barring segregation in the National Guard, but the bill was sick—almost to the point of death—even before these amendments caused it to be withdrawn from House consideration.

The Reserve bill in the form in which it was presented to the House is a compromise, a hybrid, about which nobody, not even the Pentagon, was really happy. If it should prove to be dead for this session, the outcome need not be the disaster so freely predicted; the interval between now and next January can be used to draw up legislation more in keeping with the military realities of the atomic age.

There are many objections to the current legislation. One of them is the inherent hostility of many Americans to any form of universal military training. Representative DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, senior Republican on the House Armed Services Committee, and a conscientious and enlightened legislator, voiced his objection in a speech opposing the current bill:

"This may not be UMT (universal military training)," he said, "but it is an attempt to get a foot in the door."

EQUITY OF SERVICE DOUBTED

Another objection to the current legislation is that it would not accomplish one of the purposes it was intended to accomplish: To provide equity of service for all.

The bill would permit, as amended, the voluntary enlistment of youths for 6 months' training, followed by 7½ years in the Reserve. No fewer than 100,000 annually, nor more than 250,000, would be so enlisted.

At the same time, regular draft calls for 2 years' active service would continue, and voluntary enlistments in the Regulars for various periods would be accepted—both to be followed by commitments to Reserve duty.

The manpower pool of the Nation is increasing steadily with in creasing population. The induction age for draftees is steadily being pushed back into the older-age brackets as draft calls are reduced. The budget and active-duty manpower for the Regular services are being reduced.

There are elements of incompatibility in these facts that the Pentagon will not admit but that make it certain that the new bill cannot provide equity of service. Indeed, the chances are that some able-bodied men may not have to serve at all.

The cost of the new program is another factor that has aroused misgivings.

By the fiscal year 1959 the proposed program would cost a minimum of more than $2 billion annually—more than double the cost of the present Reserve program. This increased Reserve cost would provide still another squeeze on the Regular Forces, if the balanced-budget concept was retained. If the current Reserve plan should be adopted our commitment to greatly increased Reserve costs would probably mean further cuts in the Regular services.

The greatest and most important objection to the Reserve plan is the emphasis it places on the militia concept in an age when military professionalism of the highest order is the primary requirement.

WEEKEND WARRIORS

The program would provide eventually a Ready Reserve of 2,900,000 men, with a Standby Reserve of perhaps 2 million more. Undeniably this Reserve would be in a better state of organization and training than our Reserve today. But it would necessarily be a half-trained Reserve, an organization of weekend warriors. The bulk of it would still need an additional 3 months or so of active training after war started before commitment to battle.

And it would be organized and trained for what? World War II battlefields? Repulse of ground invasion? A force as large as this could not be transported overseas for many months after mobilization, if then.

Its primary use, therefore, at least in the initial stages of any war, would be to stiffen and strengthen our civil-defense organization.

Yet there is to be no real training provided for this purpose, and the tactical organization of the new Reserve, strictly tailored to the battlefield, would not seem to fit civil-defense needs.

We should take a leaf from Britain's book and specially train and specially organize Reserve components for civil-defense duties.

But most important is to remember the preeminent role of the specialist, the highly trained soldier, sailor, and airman in the atomic age. Brig. Gen. Dale O. Smith, USAF, in his provocative study, United States Military Doctrine, very rightly stresses professionalism as one of our fundamental necessities today. If any Reserve bill strengthens the Reserves at the expense of the Regulars it is not worth the price.

[From the New York Times of Thursday, June 16, 1955]

SEGREGATION IN RESERVES—CONCERN OVER BILL SAID TO BE WITH A VITAL PHASE OF MILITARY SERVICE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your editorial of June 10 on the military reserves bill it is a source of some little gratification that you grant that the anti-segregation amendment proposed was not entirely extraneous. In this small and passing delineation you differ—and soundly—from Arthur Krock's assumption in his column of the same date, and from President Eisenhower's sweeping characterization in his press conference of June 8.

It seems to us that Mr. Eisenhower, the New York Times, and others have confused the public on a legislative technique and have placed an undeserved onus on the anti-segregationists. We all know that hundreds of amendments to bills are presented to the Congress each session, debated and adopted or rejected. In the vast majority of cases these are legitimate, germane proposals in tune with the substantive matter of the bills and helpful in effectuating the general goal. The term "rider" is seldom applied to the great bulk of such proposals. However, this label is reserved for those proposals which have little or no relation to the substantive matter under consideration.

ESTABLISHED POLICY

As you have conceded, the question of segregation of men in uniform is related to a military reserves bill. An established Federal policy of nonsegregation is now in effect and functioning in all the Federal armed services. Indeed, the Eisenhower administration has made much of this in its claim that it has a good record on the segregation question.

Are we now to set up a military Reserve plan for the training of men to defend the country, closing our eyes to the glaring repudiation of existing policy involved in permissive segregation in such a plan? Are two brothers, one in Korea and one in the homeland Reserves to be treated differently as they defend or prepare to defend their country? How can it be denied, logically, that a proposal to eliminate this probability is not germane to a military Reserves bill?

If certain groups were seeking to solve the gamut of problems of racial segregation in American life by advocating this amendment they would be fairly subject to the charge of using the "rider" technique; but here the only concern is with a vital phase of military service.

We take issue with the implication that we, as anti-segregationists, are making "the defense of our country dependent upon all of us getting our own ways here." The pro-segregationists in the Congress who have served notice that they will sacrifice the defense of our country (by burying the bill) if their segregation formula is disturbed are the culprits deserving this rebuke. Let it be addressed to them.

IMPLICATIONS SEEN

We are equally distressed that the New York Times should imply, as it does in its editorial, that the real purpose of the amendment was to block the original measure, rather than to defeat segregation.

We consider that both these implications unfairly and unjustifiably impugn the patriotism of antisegregationists, while setting scot-free (and enshrining with patriotism) those who have used their power in congressional committees to veto this measure until it meets their obsolete concept of race.

We feel similarly about the bill to aid the States in school construction. The Supreme Court has ruled public school segregation unconstitutional, but some Governors, legislatures, and United States Senators have vowed defiance. In such circumstances an amendment to insure that Federal moneys are not used to subsidize noncompliance with the Supreme Court ruling seems to us eminently fitting, proper, and germane—far from being extraneous.

We believe the President was ill-advised in his June 8 remarks.

ROY WILKINS,
Executive Secretary, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
NEW YORK, *June 10, 1955.*

Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a column by Arthur Krock in the New York Times today, June 16, 1955. He effectively answers a criticism directed at the Mundt-Courdert proposal—Senate Joint Resolution 3 and House Joint Resolution 4—by supporters of an alternative proposal.

The article follows:

THE GERRYMANDER ISSUE IN ELECTORAL REFORM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, June 15.—Whenever a new development is reported in the effort to reform the presidential electoral system there is immediate response from members of the devoted band which for years has vainly pressed for action. It is a pity this band is small. If it were as large as the subject, it might be capable of creating and articulating the public sentiment for reform without which Congress will probably continue to do nothing.

A dispatch published here under date of June 8 stated a preference for the Mundt-Coudert plan for revising the method of choosing Presidents as contrasted with the resolution sponsored by Senator DANIEL, of Texas, and 19 colleagues from both major parties. Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, and Representative COUDERT, of New York City, would revert to the pre-Jackson system whereby presidential electors were chosen by the voters in the same manner Senators and Representatives are: 2 in a statewide poll and 1 in each congressional district, the popular plurality determining all choices. Under the Daniel plan all the electors of a State would be divided among major presidential candidates in ratio to the popular vote they received.

THE OBJECTION

As always when these two proposals are about to come before Congress, supporters of the Daniel plan cite legislative gerrymandering as their reason for opposing the Mundt-Coudert resolution. Gerrymandering is the bipartisan political practice of rearranging counties in a State to form as many safe congressional districts as possible for the party in control of the State legislature when shifts in the decennial population statistics require reapportionment of the fixed House membership of 435. That happened again after the census of 1950, which cost some States one or more of the seats they held in the House and added them to the delegations of others.

In the gerrymandering process contiguity of the counties is ignored, as well as the principle of averaging the number of voters in each district. And rural influence usually predominates urban in the legislature. "Since the rural areas already control the United States Senate," writes one critic of Mundt-Coudert, "and have gerrymandered the House in their favor, what branch of the Federal Government will represent urban interests in fair proportion to their voting strength if this proposal is adopted?" This objection to Mundt-Coudert is valid.

THE REMEDY

But, as often reported in this space, the objection was anticipated and a remedy devised by Dr. Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, a pioneer in electoral reform. He would have Congress reenact those parts of the Apportionment Act of 1911 which required the States to choose their Representatives in Congress on the single district system. A section in point read:

"The Representatives * * * shall be elected by districts composed of a contiguous and compact territory and containing as nearly as practicable an equal number of inhabitants."

QUOTING DR. WILMERDING

"A statute of this character was on the books from 1842 down to 1932," Wilmerding pointed out, "when the Apportionment Act of 1911 was very surprisingly declared by the Supreme Court to have expired by its own limitation with the apportionment to which it related. In conjunction with article I, section 4, of the Constitution, which gives to Congress an original and concurrent power to make or alter State regulations respecting the election of Representatives, such a statute would, I think, serve to prevent any gross abuse of discretionary power by the State legislatures.

"I don't suppose it is possible absolutely to prevent gerrymandering. But a properly guarded single-member district system of choosing Representatives and casting electoral votes (the Mundt-Coudert constitutional amendment plus the reenacted Apportionment Act of 1911) is likely to work better than any alternative system, say the general ticket (direct election of the President) or proportional voting (the Daniel amendment to the Constitution)."

THE SENATE SITUATION

A Senate subcommittee held hearings in March and April on the several proposals to reform the system whereby all of a State's electors go to the Presidential candidate with the largest popular vote, however narrow his plurality. Hence roving pressure blocs, animated by self-interest and hoping for or encouraged to expect a quid pro quo, plump for a particular candidate and claim the credit and the booty for swinging the State in such circumstances. The subcommittee has reported favorably the Daniel amendment, to which Mundt-Coudert will be offered as a substitute if and when this legislation attains the floor.

For the reasons given it seems to this correspondent that Mundt-Coudert, with the statute advocated by Wilmerding, is the more desirable reform. But any will be as welcome as it is essential—and as surprising.

Monopolies and Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws submitted its report to the Congress on March 31. This Committee, appointed by the Attorney General, was charged with "a thoughtful and comprehensive study of our antitrust laws." The committees of the Congress are presently studying its report and are making their own review of these important statutes. In a sense, they are continuing the work of the Temporary National Economic Committee which was created pursuant to Public Resolution 113 of the 75th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming, Senator O'MAHONEY, and I are the only members of that Committee who are presently Members of the Congress. From my long association with this problem, I wish to make one observation—we cannot hope to clarify complex economic problems by name calling, character assassination and attacks on successful enterprises merely because they are big and successful.

Mr. Speaker, the study of monopoly is a complex problem which requires un-

emotional, analytical reasoning of the highest order. The Attorney General's Committee included distinguished lawyers, economists, Government officials, and other specialists. Only a few members among the 60 who constituted the Committee were critical of the final report. One of these was Prof. Walter Adams, of Michigan State College.

In order to appraise the dissents of Professor Adams it is appropriate to review some testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

On Tuesday, February 1, 1955, that committee met to discuss the subject of monopoly and antitrust policies with particular reference to the report of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The witnesses included Walter Adams, associate professor of economics at Michigan State College, and Mr. T. K. Quinn, president of the T. K. Quinn Co. of New York.

Professor Adams is apparently a great admirer of Mr. Quinn's. One of Mr. Quinn's books, entitled "Giant Business: Threat to Democracy—the Autobiography of an Insider," was published by the Exposition Press in 1953. The jacket of the book includes this endorsement by Professor Adams:

This book on the curse of bigness stands in the tradition of Jefferson, Woodrow Wilson, and Brandeis. It is written by a man who discusses problems which are an integral part of his rich industrial experience. His warning is timely and ominous: excessive concentration and the growth of industrial oligarchies add up to a one-way ticket down the last mile on the road to socialism or fascism. If we are to avoid totalitarianism in the political arena, the progress of private collectivism in the economy will have to be checked. * * * I hope this book will get the careful attention not only of Congressmen, academicians, and lawyers, but of ordinary citizens and businessmen (big and little) as well.

Representative PATMAN, the vice chairman of the committee, at the conclusion of Mr. Quinn's testimony, said:

I have certainly appreciated and enjoyed all of the statements that have been made, but there is one outstanding statement, to my mind, having worked with the Small Business Committee now for about 15 years, since it was organized, and having given a great deal of time and attention to small and independent business, I think Mr. Quinn made one of the finest, the most intelligent, and one of the most forthright statements I have ever heard (hearings, p. 530).

In view of this statement by the distinguished vice chairman of the joint committee, I felt it was important for me to learn more about Mr. Quinn through a detailed study of his writings. He has been on all sides of every issue, and his own writings are so contradictory that, in my opinion, his testimony cannot be given any more credence in the field of economics than Matusow's in the field of security. He has apparently so completely misled the vice chairman of the joint committee that I feel it incumbent upon me to place excerpts from his writings in the record. They reveal the character of this man.

Mr. Quinn was a vice president of the General Electric Co. and resigned from that organization in 1936 to become the president of Maxon, Inc., a national advertising agency. In 1943 he was the author of the book entitled "Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars." This book was printed 7 years after Mr. Quinn's departure from the General Electric Co. As will be shown in the material which follows, the book contains nothing but praise for big business, and there is no indication that he left General Electric because he was burdened with any conflict of conscience in serving the interests of that company and maintaining his own ideals.

In 1948 he was the author of another book entitled "I Quit Monster Business." This book contained the following introduction by the author:

I quit monster business because it is undemocratic, because it is inhuman and not socially responsible, because most of it is big only for the sake of bigness or for purposes of concentrated power and control, because it is inefficient and corruptive, because it is causing a dependent society where only masses count, genuine individual freedom languishes and opportunity and expression are restricted, because it glorifies leaders whose interest is too much in themselves, and because through its essentially collectivistic forms and methods and mockery of free enterprise, it is leading our country just as surely as the sun sets to a brand of totalitarianism, which is a perversion as far from individualism, civil liberties, and the democratic process as Russian communism.

In 1953 he released another book entitled "Giant Business: Threat to Democracy—the Autobiography of an Insider." This book amplifies the theme of his second publication: I Quit Monster Business.

This book for the first time reveals the basis for his present animosity towards big business. Immediately following the war, Mr. Quinn formed the Monitor Corporation to merchandise and distribute a diversified line of household appliances. The firms from whom he expected to purchase these appliances were unable to obtain sufficient steel, and it was necessary for the Monitor Corp. to be completely reorganized as a result of the failure of its suppliers to deliver appliances to it. I find that it was only after this occurred that Mr. Quinn remembered that he left General Electric 8 years before because of the reasons set forth in: I Quit Monster Business.

In Giant Business: Threat to Democracy Mr. Quinn said:

The recent history of the General Motors Corp. shows an interesting curve of steadily increasing sales: in 1945 sales totaled $1,900,000,000; in 1947, $3,815,000,000; in 1948, $4,701,000,000; in 1949, $5,700,000,000; in 1950, $7,531,000,000. As an associate of small manufacturers, I wonder where and how General Motors was able to get the enormous quantity of steel necessary for this production in a period of alleged shortage, when the little fellows were not able to get it. How ridiculous, how dishonest it is to say that all the people of the country have equal opportunities. What is meant is that equal opportunities are open to those who have the power to force themselves into advantageous positions and obtain preferment.

The thousands of tons of steel gobbled up by General Motors might have kept alive many fine smaller companies which were forced to the wall. The situation was so bad that General Motors itself, shamefacedly conscious of its advantage, joined the Government in demanding more production from the steel companies, though it continued to hog what steel there was.

Automobile manufacturers are not the only ones who have suffered. Before the war General Motors had very little stove, or range, business. Now, because of their inability to get steel during the shortage, a number of the small prewar manufacturers of these commodities are no longer with us. Electromaster of Detroit felt obliged to sell out to Philco; Globe-American, of Indiana, sold out to Maytag; Glenwood, of Massachusetts, discontinued; Crown Stove, of Illinois, has barely hung on; Robertson, of Tennessee, went broke. Monitor, of New York, had to go through financial reorganization. There were other victims. But Frigidaire—hardly a descriptive name for a cookstove—produced in sufficient quantities to become one of the leaders in volume of sales. General Motors' financial power was more than enough to get steel for unprecedented automobile production—it could also get steel for stoves. Other industries were similarly affected (p. 227).

In checking the facts, I find that General Motors, in 1941, produced 1,827,978 passenger cars, or 48 percent of the total number sold in the United States. The comparable figures for the early postwar years are as follows:

General Motors Sales Data

Year	Number of units sold	Share of passenger car market
		Percent
1946	817,215	38
1947	1,442,749	40
1948	1,563,295	40
1949	2,202,204	43
1950	3,046,593	46

It is apparent that the output of General Motors passenger cars did not reach the 1941 level until 1949, and its share of the market was less in all of the early postwar years than it was in 1941.

Mr. Quinn, when he wrote Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars in 1943, hoped that our large corporations would diversify after the war and provide jobs for our returning soldiers. He said:

Our large corporations have no intention whatever of deliberately shrinking their volume after the war. This is, in fact, one of our major hopes for continued employment. Beyond the pressing, weighty problems of immediate war production the chief concern of the large industrial organizations is how to replace guns, tanks, ships, planes, and munitions and materials for war with peacetime goods. What can the aircraft manufacturers, for example, profitably produce when the current demand for upward of 100,000 warplanes a year ceases? And what of the manufacturers of guns and tanks, etc., to the extent of billions of dollars in value when the war is over? We must not assume for a moment that they are not thinking and making plans to prevent liquidation (p. 130).

Because some were successful and his Monitor Corp. was not, the system is at fault.

Mr. Quinn's generalizations, I find, are too often influenced by his own personal experiences. While he served in the General Electric Co. he was responsible for their refrigerator business. He was confronted with competition from Frig-

idaire, the General Motors refrigerator. In Giant Business: Threat to Democracy Mr. Quinn said:

And General Electric proved to be a high-cost, inefficient manufacturer. The company was never an efficient manufacturer of anything to my best knowledge, except lamps or articles produced by outside companies which we purchased. Our position always depended upon capital advantage. During every month, for example, of the 10-year period in which I was interested in General Electric refrigerators, our factory cost was higher than the Kelvinator and Frigidaire selling prices to their distributors (p. 79).

This accounts for the generalized broad recommendations in his book Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars shown below:

In passing I must point a finger of moral and social disapproval at those large corporations which, having established themselves in some one industrial field, take advantage of their financial position to move into other unrelated lines, where they contribute nothing and often cut prices ruinously. The wanton, adroit method is to go after the cream or "easy picking" in the other field. Thus the position gained in one industrial line enables a large competitor to become a destructive raider in another. In this unfair practice they are encouraged and abetted by our well-intentioned, out-of-date antitrust laws (p. 87).

The automobile industry, where 3 companies have 87 percent of the business, was vindicated as to efficiency and competition. I find no reference to the bad practice of using capital to go into unrelated lines of business (p. 111).

What manner of man is Mr. Quinn? Mr. Quinn takes pleasure in supporting unconventional positions.

For example, chapter I of Giant Business: Threat to Democracy is entitled "I Decide To Be a Genius." The first line of the second paragraph of the book reads: "I decided to be a genius when I was 8 years old." In discussing his family background in Giant Business he said:

But most suspicious of all, he (my father) bore too many scars of bitter battles. He had taken me, a week or two before, to Lake Michigan to teach me to swim. When he got into his bathing trunks, I saw for the first time the marks of a knife gash at his right elbow, another longer one across his chest, and bullet scars on his left leg. The employers of those days had not yet been taught the humanitarianism which they now boast. My father's scars left an indelible impression on me. But there must be something wrong with a fellow who has to fight like that. Years later I came to know how the struggle with then-imperialistic England had made fighters of the Irish. I was congratulating a typical corncob Irishman in Dublin on the final victory of the Irish, their independence, and peace at last. "Yes," he said a little sadly; then his expression changed and his eyes brightened, "but ain't it a shame what their doin' to thim poor Hindoos?" He felt disconnected and was looking for a fuse (p. 19).

The willingness to fight was a family trait, which explains why it was that although Dad came from the Catholic part of Ireland, he was not a Catholic. According to the story, undoubtedly colored somewhat in favor of the Quinns, our great-great-grandfather was once walking down a country road in Limerick after a hard day's work, when he passed a priest on horseback. It was the custom of those times for the peasantry to doff their hats to the respected members of the clergy. But old Pat Quinn was just too tired—too tired, that is, to take off his hat—not too tired to fight. The priest made the mistake of hitting Pat with the butt end of his whip by way of punishment. A day later the priest wandered back to town in a dazed and torn condition. Further details are a family secret, but none of us has been Catholic since. Upon such slender threads of accident does destiny depend. It just occurs to me that the willingness to fight may also help to explain this book (p. 20).

In Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, he said:

Over 2 million babies are born annually in this country. Within 15 years about 750,000 of them will be dead, crippled, tubercular, mentally deficient, delinquent, or problem children. They never should have been born at all. While birth control is no longer a crusading movement, it is far from universally accepted. In 1890 my own grandfather, Dr. Theodore R. Kinget, was jailed in New York City by the persecution of Anthony Comstock's prudery for encouraging and publically advocating birth control. As late as 1942 the Catholic Church itself wrote an unfortunate chapter in Boston on this issue (p. 33).

He is very pleased with himself, as indicated by the following taken from Giant Business: Threat to Democracy.

To establish myself as a remarkable fellow and get that question settled quickly, I refer, modestly of course, to a few half-remembered childhood incidents (p. 21).

Upon my arrival at the office of the manager of sales, Mr. J. Robert Crouse, I was assigned as a stenographer to an assistant sales manager who was a company favorite, having married the daughter of an officer of the company. He was one of the most handsome, amiable, charming, and harmless of men. His dictation was rambling, lengthy, and often pointless. He had some ability but was not interested. We soon developed a working agreement under which he would tell me what he wanted to say and I would write it. From this point it was but a short step to my also doing whatever thinking was required. The whole business was a kind of nuisance to him anyway; he had already arrived. There was plenty of time left over to do the filing, and it was in connection with this work that I became familiar with the business (p. 54).

When I moved to New York and became a, if not the, top-ranking G. E. vice president, I became involved in all sorts of distasteful affairs. I was busier than anyone ought to be if he is to have any time left for reflection and for a personal life (p. 154).

True to a sketch labeling me a "philosophical promoter," which appeared in Fortune magazine after I left Washington, I proceeded to refuse several "safe" positions that were offered to me and chose instead a new and unexplored venture in the distribution of electrical appliances. Somehow I am reminded at this point of a penetrating question asked by my alert and charming daughter, Jean, when she was 6 years old. She had been taken to see a picturization of the life of Jesus. In the lobby of the theater there were huge and colorful reproductions of Jesus being stoned by the mob, carrying the cross and finally crucified. "Daddy," she inquired with alarming innocence, "how did Jesus ever get into so much trouble?"

The fellow who was asked, "Who gave you the black eye?" is alleged to have replied, "Nobody gave it to me, I had to fight for it."

Strangely, the black eyes I acquired came from no fault in this venture or its operation but rather from conditions quite beyond control, which I have resolved never to condone (pp. 189–190).

The following quotations are indicative of the general approach of Mr. Quinn toward serious public issues:

The animal man, who rose from the caves of antiquity, has been misbehaving badly. He still lives by instincts that he doesn't understand. Motives he only partially controls drive him to eat, to self-defense, to reproduce himself. Like any other animal he exhibits himself for deep, sexual reasons, has offspring and dies. But in his thought for tomorrow and in his spiritual search for beauty and truth, he is unlike the beasts. His existence never seems quite real. He is caught on a merry-go-round of business and social activity—and the fun is gone. He is opposed to war, but we have war. War is often mistakenly regarded as another unaccountable, natural phenomenon, like the growth of a little seed into a big watermelon; the birth of a baby or an elephant; the flight of a bird. Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, p. 31.)

Briefly examining the reasons for our predicament, we must go back a few million years. Mankind, our scientists agree, is a species of animal evolved in a manner still unexplained from extinct wild creatures.

Man's physical structure closely resembles that of all other mammals. Each of us goes through an evolutionary process, from a cell smaller in size than a pinhead, passing through the period of birth and ending with death. We retain through life muscles to wag a tail or move the ears. We never got over being animals. For millions of years, in fact, for more than 90 percent of the time man has been on earth he lived as a savage hunter. Slowly and tediously through the centuries he gradually learned from his experience and environment.

Civilization is not inborn. Had we born in Africa a thousand years ago we would talk and act as the Africans did then. We should have believed as they did. Actually, we have little personal responsibility for our ideas or notions. We had nothing to do with them. They are imposed upon us by the time and the environment in which we live. (Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, pp. 40–41.)

In reviewing Mr. Quinn's previous background, I find that he was Director of the War Production Drive in the War Production Board from the middle of 1943 until the end of 1944. During this period he apparently organized the T. K. Quinn Co. as industrial consultants and proceeded to publish, as a private venture, material which he had assembled in his capacity in the WPB. Former Congressman Jerry Voorhees, of California, excoriated Mr. Quinn on the floor of the House for the improprieties of his conduct while serving the Government—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 1, pages 822–825 and volume 91, part 10, page A1282. He said:

The war-production drive was established in March 1942 by Donald M. Nelson, then Chairman of the War Production Board. Its first Director was Michael W. Straus, now Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior, who was borrowed from the Interior Department by the War Production Board in March 1942 to organize the drive and the labor-management committee function. After 8 or 9 months, when the drive was well organized, Mr. Straus returned to the Interior Department and was succeeded as Director by Mr. William Marshall, a vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Co. Mr. Quinn did not come on the scene until the middle of 1943, when Mr. Marshall found it necessary to devote his full time to his work in Pittsburgh.

Prior to the time that Mr. Quinn had any connection with the war-production drive, the war-production-drive headquarters had worked out a full program of committee aids and services and of procedures for establishing and operating the committees. Although all this material and information is available from the War Production Board to whomever asks for it, nevertheless, this program and these procedures are now being sold privately in a manual being offered by the T. K. Quinn Co.

I cite this record simply to show that, prior to the connection of Mr. Quinn with the war-production drive, its program was fully developed and operating. It is that program and the techniques developed mainly by his predecessors, and wholly by Government employees, through the expenditure of Government funds, that Mr. Quinn now appears to be attempting to exploit privately.

Shortly after Mr. Quinn received his appointment as Director General of the war-production drive the Quinn Co. soon developed a keen interest in the business of serving labor-management committees and charging for their services. Various members of the staff of the war-production drive were approached to join the staff of the Quinn Co., and at least one of them did. Records that could be of value to the Quinn Co. were apparently scanned and copied. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, p. 823.)

This manual was not printed by the Government, but was printed privately and is now being offered at $5 per copy to the public under the title "The Original Labor-Management Committee Manual," by the T. K. Quinn Co.

The other interesting item is that, in his letter soliciting all of the Government-sponsored committees and dated December 15, Mr. Quinn, on the stationery of his private firm, announced his coming retirement from the War Production Board on January 1, 1945, and announced that the War Production Drive Section of the War Production Board would soon terminate its activities and would be disbanded with victory in Europe. This announcement made by Mr. Quinn on his private stationery in a letter in which he referred to himself as a public official had at that time not been made by the War Production Board. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, p. 824.)

The material which follows compares statements made during his appearance before the Joint Committee last February with statements from his own writings:

In the meantime, the antitrust laws should be strengthened in every possible way, and all other means taken to restore genuine and full freedom of opportunity and enterprise (hearings, p. 519).

In 1943, when Mr. Quinn wrote Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, he believed that the antitrust laws were outmoded and that they were preventing the efficient and proper operation of our economy.

It was not a steady continuation of the same old unrestricted competition. As early as 1890 it became evident that vicious competition could only result in wrecking all industry. Cooperative agreements began to appear and to control prices, production, and management. Cooperation became, in fact, the new badge of sanity. As one of the results was to raise prices at the expense of the consumer, the Government took a hand. The Sherman antitrust law was passed and the practices which were partly wise and inevitable and partly destructive were all made illegal.

For the past 40 years and more, we have lived in a period of industrial confusion. Industry was not legally permitted to be as efficient as it might have been and unquestionably we have not made the progress as a nation of which we are capable. We have an interesting illustration in a comparison with Germany. With little more than half our population and only a small percent of our resources and opportunities, Germany has forged rapidly ahead, except of course for the interruption of the World Wars, which she has fought almost single handed against all the Allies. In this current war Germany has demonstrated a remarkable capacity for industrial cooperation, self-sacrifice, hard work, meeting conditions and getting results which is the envy of the world. No—it is not all a simple matter of political manipulation by the fanatical Hitler. He and his gangsters could not have accomplished the results they have without the basic conditions which made them possible.

Let us inquire for a moment into the causes which retarded our natural industrial development. They did not stop it. We are the world's leading industrial Nation today, with fabulous resources, and we enjoy the highest standard of living, but we have had to push against brakes constantly applied by Government and by the hangover of outmoded notions and actual mistakes and abuses.

In large part the opposition comes from those who object to huge corporations and Big Business. There is a long list of reasons and causes and it is not easy to discover all of the truth or to know how to use it when it is found. (Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, pp. 10–11.)

Consider the economic experience and facts. We have a large number of industries in which an appreciable percentage of the total business is done by 1 to 4 or 5 individual corporations. In any mass-production industry, a single company with from 2 to 10 times the volume of any of its competitors, has a low, basic cost and, in the case of consumer goods, a public recognition and good will, which no small producer can possibly match. Under these circumstances, trade understandings and cooperation in some form are the only way, under the sun, of keeping the smaller competitors alive. Is it possible that our politicians and lawmakers are so economically uninformed that they do not know this? Mass production, where machines are used to a considerable extent, lowers cost amazingly.

The old theory of unrestricted competition was that it lowered prices to a point just far enough above the cost of production to assure a small margin of profit. Actually, as we have learned over and over and over again from experience, unrestricted competition forces prices down to a level which is less than the actual cost of production. The explanation is simply in the increasingly high proportion of fixed costs such as buildings, machinery and tools, depreciation and interest on investment. It is cheaper to run the modern, mass-production, average factory at a loss of from 10 percent to 20 percent of sales volume, than not to run the factory at all. For even when the factory is idle such costs as depreciation, interest, and taxes continue. Therefore, in any competitive fight the lowest economic price level is from 10 percent to 20 percent under cost. This means that the company with the greatest resources, that is, the largest, best-financed company, which can outlast the others, is bound to win at the end of any competitive war. It also means that in a price war competitors would fight on, gradually exhausting capital until the bitter end.

Is this the kind of competition which our well-intentioned Department of Justice is currently trying to restore? There are cases pending now which will result, if the Department prevails, in breaking up price and volume understandings and restoring unrestricted competition. When it comes, the little fellow will either be wiped out entirely or join with others to form larger single units. Thus the prosecutions only accelerate the trend toward larger and still larger corporations. Warfare always favors the strong and powerful.

This is the heyday of mass production and big business. Big business prospers because it attains lower, relative total costs. The secret of the lower cost is primarily in the volume of business handled with the same or less proportionate overhead charges in production and sales and also in the savings inherent in machine production and the division of labor. One of the greatest social assets we have as a Nation is these large low-cost, efficient production units. They need improvement, greater social conscience, and must learn to cooperate with others for the common good; but they should not be destroyed or their constructive, capital structures weakened. (Liberty, Employment and No More Wars, pp. 81–83.)

Competition is war. The gangster is a warrior. He goes to the individual laundry shop which has not yet been taken into a chain like the grocery store, the drugstore, the shoe store, liquor store, variety, 5 and 10, etc., "pay me," he says to the owner, "$50 a month and I'll see that no new laundries come into this district." (Good economics, if one is enough.) "Your prices can be raised to the level of our standard without fear of losing business, because we do not permit it and if you don't succeed here, or lose your lease, we'll find you another noncompetitive spot." He promises these conditions and makes good on his promise. One or more competitors could easily lower prices and fight, with the blessing of our antitrust laws, until all were bankrupt. Bankruptcies in our society are ordinary, legitimate affairs like clam bakes. Society does not realize that eventually it pays for all these failures. (Liberty, Employment and No More Wars, p. 90.)

Economic concentration and restraints of trade are obstacles to the growth of small business, as the Committee believes. But competition is the greatest obstacle. Under competitive conditions the large and strong survive and so, of course, the emphasis and effort is put upon becoming large and strong. If the competition which so many of our politicians and theorists think they want, were actually effective today, the result would be to put many more small concerns out of business. Does anyone suppose that in a competitive dog fight small steel companies could outlast U. S. Steel and Bethlehem? If General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler went out to gobble up the remaining 13 percent of the automobile industry, which they do not now have, who could stop them in a price war? Similarly, General Electric and Westinghouse are the strongest in the electrical field, Du Pont in chemicals, Standard Oil in oil, etc., etc. Only to the extent that industrial companies get together and reach livable understandings do any small companies find it possible to exist at all.

At the only NRA session which I ever attended we were treated to an exhibition by a group of small incandescent lamp manufacturers whose complaint was that General Electric and Westinghouse prices were too low. (The quality is certainly equal or better as Government reports show.) Our Department of Justice is now prosecuting the manufacturers under the antitrust laws, which the Temporary National Economic Committee wants more rigidly enforced. Every intelligent manufacturer knows perfectly well that if the price harmony among them is broken up and a commercial war ensues, every one may be wiped out except General Electric and Westinghouse; only the large companies will be selling above cost. That is the way competition works. Examples could be multiplied indefinitely.

(Liberty, Employment and No More Wars, pp. 113–114.)

A new era of teamwork is upon us. It is absurd to treat every effort at cooperation as a restraint to trade. Many of them are helpful and constructive. To discourage them is to interrupt and impede industrial production and prosperity. Our so-called antitrust laws do not stop anyone from following the price leadership of a competitor, simply as the exercise of his individual judgment. There is nothing to prevent price discussions among competitors so long as there are no actual agreements. These laws have had the effect in many cases of preventing cost reductions and disrupting employment. Of course, this was not intended, but the bad effect followed from the effort to preserve the old competition in a cooperative age. The antitrust laws have also been used to help the proper development of certain industries, to prevent cruel and wasteful competition, and to prevent enterprises, big and small, from cooperating. Intended originally, only to protect the consumers, they have been used for these other purposes purely by judicial interpretation.

All competition is not good competition, nor is all cooperation or even monopoly bad cooperation or bad monopoly. Such free enterprise as we may continue to hope for may best be promoted by friendly supervision. It is a grave mistake for the Government to be hostile and punitive, and to prevent economic, voluntary cooperation. We are now over 60 years behind Germany in capitalizing on the power of cooperative endeavor. (Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, pp. 190–191.)

Germany started its organization along cooperative lines, introduced social legislation comparable to that of our New Deal in the United States 60 years later, and absorbed militant socialism. It is a little difficult for us to realize now that Germany had old-age insurance, sickness insurance, and even unemployment insurance so long ago. The fear of old age, sickness, and unemployment, like the sword of Damocles, hung over the heads of the masses of people engaged in industry in certain other countries and undoubtedly made them a little less loyal than the Germans have been to their more paternal government.

Instead of fighting and contending against the corporate organization of industries, the German Government encouraged it. There was no hangover of individualism or economic freedom in opposition. Consolidation, combination, and even trusts followed but they were all under effective government supervision and control. Thus, in Germany, the individualistic age of laissez faire and everybody for himself gave way to a form of cooperative organization where everybody was required to work but was also guaranteed the right to live.

What died in the recent surrender of France was the era of extreme individualism there, just as other eras have passed before. This is most significant in the synopsis of events leading up to our situation today. (Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, p. 220.)

Mr. Quinn testified before the committee that:

Our national policy should be directed toward the active encouragement of new ventures, of the genuinely independent, and most efficient medium-sized firms, and the discouragement of the multiple-line giants grown huge through acquisition and absorptions that should, for them, be made illegal. They should be forced, wherever possible and practicable, to decentralize physically and financially (hearings, p. 519).

In Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, Mr. Quinn said:

Most all of this is the result of the working out of natural economic law and all the manmade laws in the world won't change it. Why not accept Ford, General Motors, United States Steel, General Electric Du Pont, A T. & T., etc., as the national economic assets they are. Of course, these types of concerns got 80 percent of the war orders. Who in the world should the orders be given to? Let us fear for performance on the other 20 percent, not on the 80 (pp. 115–116).

There are, of course, many ways to proceed and dozens of plans can and probably will be conceived, but they are all hopeless of accomplishment as long as we continue to believe that the resurrection of old-style competition offers any real hope.

If we really believe it possible or desirable to break the Du Pont Co., for instance, into 10 or 20 small companies, or General Motors, or Westinghouse, or United States Steel, etc., regardless of manufacturing costs and efficiencies and get better results, we have missed the whole point of our new cooperative era of mass production and mass distribution, with more goods for more people at less cost. Imagine trying to live and compete with a postwar Germany, or postwar England, organized as Germany is now and as England surely will be, on a huge collective basis, getting the lowest costs through large industry and big business and the highest possible division of labor. Small business has its proper place where there are no cost savings in mass production or mass distribution, or where such savings are negligible. Purely financial business combinations, forced in many instances by our antitrust laws, may be efficiently decentralized when and if our Government permits cooperative agreements, subject to regulation in the public interest. Those who loudly advocate the cause of small business simply because of the larger number of votes involved, are not helpful. The best argument for small business, that is, decentralized business, is that owners, managers, and workers can know each other, be human, and make social adjustments around their daily work which will give it meaning and purpose (pp. 118–119).

I agree with Senator O'MAHONEY's conclusion that we have mistakenly treated large industrial corporations as though they were clothed with natural human rights instead of having only the rights which the people, acting through their Government, see fit to bestow upon them. Individuals and local governments can no longer cope with the big national corporations. True, too, is the Senator's suggestion that the business of these huge private industrial corporations can no longer be considered private. The man has been losing out to organizations of men. (Certainly this is a cooperative age.) Do you think it can be taken by the neck and forced back by artificial law into the individualistic age? Corporate concentration has proceeded only in relatively small part because there was no national incorporation law. In much larger part it has proceeded in conformity with natural economic law around machines, the steam engine, and electrical power (pp. 121–122).

Mr. Quinn is fond of comparing businesses with various-sized animals. In Giant Business the author's note contained the following:

The grand proposition that a thing is not evil simply because it is big is being advanced by self-serving interests as though they were dealing with harmless static business giants when, in fact, "there ain't no such animal." No one assumes that comfortable position when a big tiger or leopard escapes from a zoo and goes on a free-enterprising spree. Without benefit of a public-relations department or paid advertising, they are known to be attractive, dangerous, predatory animals, safe enough perhaps among their own kind, but death itself in a community dedicated to the preservation and progress of the little fellow and to his freedom and opportunity.

Contrast this statement with what he said in 1943:

The confusion between big and little business and free private enterprise is a little beyond me. I gather that the report (Temporary National Economic Committee) favors freedom for all business from arbitrary control by either private organization or public organization. We are to make the economy democratic. This appears to mean enforcing antitrust laws and hampering big business but favoring and encouraging little business in every feasible way. I also am very sympathetic toward little children, little dogs, little business—in fact, anything little. But the effort to make little successful in comparison with big in modern times is pure humbug. How much better to let big business get just as big as it economically can as long as it behaves itself and is not built on purely financial advantage, and police and control it when it runs afoul of the public interest. Individuals are thus treated. Society is strengthened by supporting and helping the strong and efficient members, like Senator O'MAHONEY, for example. It does not fatally hamper or try to destroy him so long as he obeys the good law and observes the public interest. So it should be with respect to corporations, big and little, without standing in the way of natural economic evolution. (Pp. 123–124, Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars.)

Today's vision of America's industrial future is clouded and confused by the fact of huge and still growing corporations, on the one hand, and our sentimental and ideological heritage of preference for smaller units on the other. Actually, there is nothing substantial in the present practice or the projected future to encourage the notion that the century trend will be reversed in the postwar period. The war has developed a number of new giants, and giants continue to be the rule. A number of well-meaning politicians are indeed urging the restoration of small business and perhaps getting some uninformed votes thereby. They mistakenly propose greater competition for that purpose, despite the plain and proven fact that the old-style competition has failed as a constructive force in this new day. If it is further encouraged, then the trend toward larger units will be further accelerated as it has during the past 50 years. (Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, pp. 129–130.)

Instead of looking vaguely to the restoration of past conditions for a solution of modern problems, we would do much better to face the facts and deal with realities. And the reality is a new age of cooperation with huge corporations and millions of employees and the public, all dependent upon each other. These corporations have become, in effect, great social units with new responsibilities to the public. They cannot engage in commercial wars to kill each other. The public could not stand that cost. Questions of how to make the most of them constructively, in the general interest as well as in the interest of their owners, operators, and employees, should receive our attention. Only the foolhardy would seek to destroy or hamper them unnecessarily. Essentially, they are servants, not masters, and that is, among the most forward looking of them, their own conception and outlook. (Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, pp. 131–132.)

Mr. Quinn, in his presentation to the committee, recommended progressive taxes on corporations. He said:

Corporate taxes should be graded gradually upward as are personal income taxes so that as little as 10 percent would be assessed against profits of $10,000 and as high as 75 percent when profits reach a billion dollars a year (hearings, p. 519).

In Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, Mr. Quinn took exactly the opposite position. In fact, he said that taxes should not discriminate against bigness, as shown in the quotations which follow:

Collectively, all business is our business. It belongs to America and Americans. We all profit by it. Why do you suppose our living standards are the highest in the world? If you think that big business is owned by too few people and ownership should be more equitably distributed, I agree and point to the tax laws which are accomplishing that result in the good American evolutionary way. I refer now to income and inheritance taxes, not to any extra burdensome taxes which discriminate unfairly against our large industrial and commercial companies merely because they are doing a good job. That's like trying to build a better country by destroying or weakening the best things in it. It's the best men and women, the most able, hardest working and public spirited corporations upon whose shoulders our strength and prosperity depends. They lay golden eggs. What possible sense is there in damaging them? They are parts of all of us and we of them (pp. 119–120).

Let us highly favor the equitable distribution of wealth and preserve all the virtues of democracy in this country, including economic freedom, a meaningful life for every citizen of our Republic, but let us oppose unfair taxes, persecution, and unwarranted Government restrictions that tend to destroy uselessly our great, economic industrial and commercial organizations. Moreover, let us oppose the vain, costly, artificial attempts to preserve inefficiency, incompetence, and pitifully small business in this new collective era. More construction, less destruction, should be the rule (p. 116).

Mr. Quinn, in his presentation before the joint committee in February, made a new suggestion: namely, that—

Any remaining corporations with $250 million or more in gross assets, or more than 10 percent of the business in any major line, should be declared to be inevitably affected with a public interest. For each of these, at least, one new director should be appointed by the President of the United States, subject to Senate confirmation, and be in no way under any private influence. These directors, representing the public, would together constitute a national board of public directors where all of the policies and practices of the individual giants would be aired. The directors would be required through an effective central organization to widely publicize all irregular practices, coercion, undue advantages taken, illegal, and unjust actions or contracts, bring to bear the full weight of public opinion in the public interest, and continually recommend remedial legislation to the Congress (hearings, p. 519).

I was amazed to find that, while Mr. Quinn is now apparently concerned with the encroachment of big business on our democratic political institutions, in Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars he proposed the creation of an economic senate to be appointed by big business which would, among other things, operate our social security system. He said:

While we build mental windmills of outmoded competition and vainly enact laws and spend time and money thoughtlessly to prevent our economy from evolving naturally, we neglect conditions which could occupy us to much better advantage. Shall our economy meantime gradually drift along with its inseparable social aspects and attendants into more and more political control? Must we continue to depend upon political, bureaucratic policemen for the regulation which can only be intelligently and constructively managed by economic operation?

Industry and commerce—and perhaps later the farm groups (all those who constructively may provide employment) should organize, just as soon as possible, not as a resolutions or debating society for members to hear each other's speeches, and take no organized cooperative action, but to prepare to meet together the economic problems of the future which cannot possibly be met in any other way, except by governmental control and more political regimentation. Labor need not be initially included, except to the extent that labor is itself an employer and therefore responsible for providing jobs. The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce must present a common, unified front. In the presence of the threatening political bureaucracy, their differences are childish. From this start they could well elect an economic Senate, generally coordinating all of the Nation's activity in production and trade. Farm employers might later be represented (pp. 132–133).

We need have little fear over the effectiveness of such an economic organization. The public will judge accurately whether it is impartial and unselfish and public opinion in this country is the music to which all of our performers must dance.

The economic Senate could be supported by executive committees chosen from different industries. This would amount to an industrial, business government with the minimum necessary centralization, quite beyond anything heretofore realized or projected. It would not need nor would it have mandatory power of any kind outside its membership but would be based entirely upon mutual interest and teamwork. The officers of the economic Senate would be chosen by representatives of the various industries associated together as supporting groups. These representatives, in turn, would be elected by the member companies in each industry. Questions of general policy should, of course, be decided by majority vote of all members but questions of fact and those requiring special technical or professional knowledge must be decided by appointed specialists responsible to the governing Senate and through it indirectly to the whole membership and the public (pp. 133–134).

It is precisely at this point that industry through its economic senate must act if it is to fulfill its social mission. If industry fails to act collectively in some manner, as it has failed heretofore, then we may surely anticipate that Government will eventually act. Unfortunately, governmental action in this field is usually mistaken because politicians are not economists or businessmen. Government, being commercially inexperienced, is inclined to try stunts with such disastrous results as those involved in the gold tinkering fiasco. So in addition to the insurance against totalitarian political rulership, which a separate industrial social organization would provide, we need its professional and technical knowledge and qualifications.

Questions of general public policy that are not involved in professional qualifications and depend wholly on personal preference, dictated by no economic law, may be decided by majority vote and left to the governmental field. Here with superior but essentially negative power the Government would outline the area and framework of our lives. The constructive or positive, economic government, through its senate without mandatory power could be more permanent and largely self-perpetuating, consisting of men best qualified by training and experience for the general direction of the various productive and social activities of the country.

The political government, exercising inhibitory, and where absolutely necessary, regulatory power only, would continue, of course, to be elected as it is now at frequent intervals by the majority vote of all our citizens, having general supervisory power, the final decision on national policies and the absolute veto but preferably less administrative or executive power.

This is a form of dual government—a positive, constructive one and a negative, inhibitory one, toward which we should gradually tend. It would, in many respects, be like the very efficient, successful government of the old Roman Republic which lasted so many centuries. The Roman Senate was in those days the constructive power, represesnting the various national interests, and the people's tribunes represented the negative authority, with absolute veto power, and were therefore superior to all other officers. The tribunes were elected by all the people but they had no administrative power. This government finally failed because the Roman Empire spread over such a vast area that the tribunes ceased to represent all the people, having no adequate means of communication or transportation. For 300 years this form of government kept the civilized world in peace.

Thus our objective should be private ownership and operation, subject to necessary governmental restraint, and a liberal, capitalistic society in a democracy with a large prosperous middle class with every family able to provide for its reasonable, cultural needs.

Under such a balanced government, industry and commerce would be self-operating and largely self-disciplining and self-controlled. It would assume general responsibility for the constructive part of living and take hold of such old, recurring problems as booms and depressions (pp. 178–180).

It is interesting to compare Mr. Quinn's proposal for an economic Senate with this paragraph from his testimony before the joint committee:

Essentially, the difference now between our system and Russia's is that we still have political freedom and a degree of economic freedom, at least at the consumer retail level, whereas the Russians are completely subject to a single, concentrated, nonrepresentative authority—the Kremlin. Politically, we have representative authority concentrated in Washington and in the 48 States of the Union. Economically, we have about 250 major centers of private, nonrepresentative authority. These are the huge corporations that are gradually assuming political as well as economic roles. They were never contemplated by our Founding Fathers, nor is there any provision for their commanding positions in our basic law. Nevertheless, they are more intimately related to our daily lives than the political authorities. For they largely determine, directly or indirectly, where and how we work, for whom, how much we are paid, our housing, the goods we consume, travel, entertainment, etc. Unless this picture is grasped one cannot hope to understand our society (hearings, p. 519).

While Mr. Quinn now suggests adding public directors to the boards of corporations, he did not believe that political management would be helpful when he included the following in Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars:

Similarly, in the case of the Securities and Exchange Act, the Commissioners have gone

quite beyond the original intent of publicizing financial facts and preventing fraudulent representations and bad practices. They consider that they are required to control management by changing and opposing the plans of those placed in charge by the stockholders, directors, and managers and to reform the financial structure of corporations. The effect is to disturb security and confidence by making success or failure depend upon politically appointed commissioners rather than upon business managers. Here we have another illustration of good intentions by hard-working but inexperienced public officials who are trying conscientiously to make their interpretation of private enterprise serve the common good by tackling an overwhelming task that is too much for them (p. 194).

In, I Quit Monster Business, Mr. Quinn indicted big business "because it is causing a dependent society where only masses count, genuine individual freedom languishes, and opportunity and expression are restricted." (Foreword by the author.) This point of view was expressed again in Giant Business when he said:

The method of handling mass-production workers in huge corporations and treating them as mere impersonal labor, rather than as human beings, practically precludes their advancement to executive positions of any kind (p. 45).

There are tens of thousands of promising young men in monster-big corporations who never get a chance and whose talents are lost to society because of the complex nature, standardized routines and oversize of these organizations (p. 49).

Whatever laurels American industry can claim for its management in material technology, it has certainly failed in its human relations with its employees, as the existence of large and strong labor unions now so conclusively proves. The gains of labor and human welfare have had to be made by force or the threat of it, and against the strong opposition, particularly of giant, impersonal corporations. Labor unions, once established, can hardly be expected to differentiate, in pressing their cause, between large and small corporations (p. 50).

Mr. Quinn's own rapid rise in the General Electric Co. belies these statements. He completely refutes them by his own writings. In, Liberty, Employment and No More Wars, he said:

And now a word about personal opportunity. Enterprise is not necessarily stifled within big business; the contrary is true. Any man of genuine ability has a better chance in a big business than a small one; he's needed more. Many mistakes are made. Incompetents and misfits are everywhere, usually because they are mere personal favorites, but that fact isn't the final answer (p. 120).

Our large corporations have worked out better than Government, practical ways and means of getting men to work together in a common cause. Indeed, they have done such a good job of it that human adjustments, an equilibrium of desires and loyalties beyond anything attained by Government have been achieved by private industry (p. 83).

It may seem superficially that the day of industrial and commercial corporate activity for deliberate social purposes as well as for profits and dividends is far distant. But upon analysis it will be seen that we have already come much closer to this end than we think. Most of business, particularly big business, was being conducted very largely in the public interest before the war. In wartime, strangely enough, corporate activity with but a few unfortunate exceptions is exemplary. Products are of good quality and must be reliable; investors are practically guaranteed certain minimum dividends on war contracts; the necessary war materials are being made to the best advantage in measured quantities at conveniently located places by qualified, well-paid people. And what is of the greatest social significance, every worker everywhere knows what he is doing, his work is appreciated, and he has the almost inestimable inner satisfaction of being an active partner in a worthy cause, a conscious part of a great purpose, the success of which is also dependent upon him (pp. 141–142).

Contrast these statements with his testimony before the joint committee:

The giant collectives certainly do not encourage private initiative or price competition. Neither do they curb monopolistic tendencies nor promote greater opportunity. On the contrary, concentrated economic power imitates the dictators, crushes individualism, makes mere numbers out of people, and threatens our democratic institutions (hearings, p. 518).

Mr. Quinn professes great concern at the fate of the individual in the large corporation. Yet, I wonder how real this concern is in view of this statement from Liberty, Employment and No More Wars:

Populations, not individuals, make history, and the character of population depends upon climate, soil and food supply. The most cursory review of the people of the world, their conduct and progress, should be convincing. All power is in the current of human thought and ambition. The history of the world is the history of industry, arts, and commerce. Wars and revolutions, conquests and defeat, are merely the outward appearances, the signs or marks of the true history of the human race (pp. 60–61).

Mr. Quinn deprecates industrial research by large corporations. In fact, in Giant Business: Threat to Democracy, he said:

I know of no original product invention, not even electric shavers or heating pads, made by any of the giant laboratories or corporations, with the possible exception of the household garbage grinder, developed not by the research laboratory but by the engineering department of General Electric. But the basic idea of this machine came from a smaller concern producing commercial grinders. It was hardly an original invention (p. 117).

Yet, in this same volume he said:

I need not dwell upon the remarkable material achievements of the free-market capitalistic system. Every popular publication in the land extols them to the skies in the zealous promotion of the products of our machines. And they are all quite real. Production has increased to astronomic proportions and the welfare of our people has made remarkable gains. The real wages of the masses, measured in terms of what workhours will buy, have more than quadrupled in the past century (p. 288).

And in Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars he said:

As for the kind of work that discovers new opportunities and new industries, it is best done today by great research laboratories by big business. The chances of a small operator or an individual creating something to start a great, new industry are increasingly remote in our highly organized, complex society. But if it is felt that the lone individual is handicapped by being obliged to take his invention or creation to a big company (and this is often the fact; the real inventors are seldom adequately rewarded), then let him take it to a department of an economic senate. We don't have to change the whole economic system. Self-regulating, intelligent business will find its way if only it is not artificially and unnecessarily restricted by foolish laws and bureaucratic rules made and upheld to preserve outworn competitions (p. 120).

Mr. Quinn in Giant Business: Threat to Democracy, implies that contracts by big business are only obtained through favoritism. He said:

Like so many other small businesses, the little agency has to break the crust of its competitive situation with some concession, bestowal of favor, or brilliancy before it can get into the big leagues and belong. J. Walter Thompson, the biggest of the agencies, through a connection which I never understood, invariably had the accounts of the J. P. Morgan-financed companies (p. 164).

Yet, in the same book he refutes this statement with the following advice offered to those who hope to secure the patronage of big business:

If you have basic raw materials for sale, you had better go direct to the general purchasing agent, to whom you may ultimately be referred by any branch if the amount involved is large. If you can get a letter of commendation, recommendation, or introduction from an officer of the company, it may be helpful, providing there is nothing in it which indicates that the purchasing agent is asked to give you more than a hearing; they are often quite jealous of their prerogatives (p. 206).

Mr. Quinn, in Giant Business, casts a serious reflection on our defense program and indirectly on the Congress of the United States. He said:

It is the American public who will be called upon to protect the farflung properties of the giant corporations. We are building a $100 billion war machine. What a miracle it will be if we can avoid future wars with this combination of conditions. Much as we detest the imperialism of Joe Stalin, we can at least say that it is not our making. Our own force and power, which should give us no less profound concern, is of our making. How shall we answer for it to our Maker when it breaks loose upon the world?

This means another runaround in a power-mad world. We seem to have learned nothing from the old, dead democracies or from the imperialisms of the past, which have always led to devastating war (p. 292).

In Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars he took a different position. He said:

I have a friend who edits a little weekly paper. He had gone completely loco on the subject of the division of wealth. He hated Morgans, Mellons, Rockefellers, Du Ponts, and most all the rich—and he was blind to everything else. This war was just another capitalistic scheme to make money, so far as he was concerned. History, the rights of man, our democracy, American liberties, and all the cherished freedom which it took thousands of years to win, all meant little to him. He saw only a capitalistic class struggle, and there were thousands like him. The British in particular were said to be the arch conspirators with wholly selfish purposes (pp. 34–35).

The Congress, in deciding to oppose godless communism, has not appropriated billions of dollars to defend the farflung properties of the giant corporations. We all know that our force and power will only be used to protect our liberties.

Mr. Quinn, in Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, proposed trying Members of Congress, whom he branded as isolationists, as war criminals. He said:

To find Members of our Senate still talking and acting as though they propose to revert to their old selfish, blind isolationism (sometimes misleadingly called noninterventionalism) and face the prospect of still another war is almost despairing. One wonders what possible explanation they have in mind to make to the loved ones and mothers of sons who will never come back from this war. Could there be any crime greater than the one which these politicians under the cloak of Americanism appear ready to repeat? Is it not time while we are thinking in terms of prosecuting the leaders in Germany, Italy, and Japan for their brutality, to plan proceedings against Members of our own Congress for their blind, selfish, stupidity? (p. 203).

In Giant Business, Mr. Quinn endorses a proposal to require large corporations to secure Federal charters. He said:

Those which remain too big must be taken in hand and forced to operate under Federal charters (p. 312).

Yet in Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, Mr. Quinn attacked this proposal, which had been included in the Report of the Temporary National Economic Committee. Mr. Quinn said:

Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the committe, was strongly in favor of reviving free enterprise, free from interference by corporate monopoly as well as Government officials. But what an idle dream that is in this new era of great organization and collective enterprise. Federal incorporation of national corporations, as a remedy, has as much chance against the revolutionary economic trends of the past 50 years and more, as a lone soldier had against the German hordes (pp. 107–108).

In I Quit Monster Business, Mr. Quinn included inefficiency in his indictment of the evils of big business. In Labor, Employment, and No More Wars, he said:

So far as I can find in the voluminous reports, it occurred to no one that there must be some basic reason of efficiency why large concerns could continue to grow, earn greater profits, and require no Government help. Comparisons were made of production costs only. Actually, the greater advantages of large companies will be found in the selling costs, and selling costs are equal to or greater than production costs in most of our consumer goods lines. Also, the American public will wisely pay more for branded, quality goods and for the assurance that goes with reliable manufacturers.

The investigators could have turned on the radio or read the advertisements in magazines and newspapers in which millions of dollars are invested every year. All of them testify to the immense advantage of product and company recognition nationally, which in the case of a new and small company is practically unattainable today. Mass production and mass distribution are a part of our new economic world. We cannot go back to small business and little operations in this new day (pp. 110–111).

The basic fact is that taken as a whole, big business is most efficient. It can employ better people, or at least pay more and therefore have a better chance of getting them. Even in certain lines where big business has no great production cost advantages, or none at all, it almost always has reputation, prestige, and sales cost advantages. It is more difficult and expensive to sell unknown brands, and when a company or a brand becomes well and favorably known it doesn't remain small. These are facts, not theory. I know it from experience. Small producers know it, so do large producers. When they reach harmonious price understandings by intelligent realization or agreement, within or without the law, allowances are frequently made and invariably requested which recognize that the small producer cannot get as much money for his product, regardless of quality. The presumption is against him. People just will buy the known, reliable thing when they can afford it. You do it, so do I. We do not always know or have the time or ability to inquire, so we put our trust in names and reputations. Think for a moment of watches and admit that you buy a name; of shoes, hats, automobiles, refrigerators, radios, cigarettes, toothpaste, building material, etc., etc., etc. The field includes just about everything, even milk and dairy products, under new and widely advertised names. These are consumer goods. In the case of durable goods, we have a similar situation. Reliability and dependence upon reputation and performance make any gamble on the product of a little or unknown fellow unthinkable (pp. 114–115).

Increasing efficiency by a broad or narrow definition is at least one element in progress. We must recognize what the scientific method has proved, that large industry is efficient, and not try, for purely political reasons, to restore an era that has passed by destroying today's assets (p. 103).

The following colloquy between Congressman KELLEY and Mr. Quinn, taken from the hearings of the joint committee, is of interest:

Representative KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to Mr. Quinn. These monopolistic practices you set forth here, do they or do they not militate against the intent and the purposes of the Congress as set forth in the Full Employment Act; namely, that the objective should be the maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power?

Do you think those practices militate against the carrying out of the purposes and intent?

Mr. QUINN. Yes, I do (hearings, p. 536).

Yet, in Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars, Mr. Quinn said:

Arthur T. Hadley contends, in his Economics: An Account of the Relations Between Private Property and Public Welfare, that the increase in the size of industrial and commercial units has actually increased the ratio of wage payments to interest and dividends. In proportion to wages, profits were larger in the days of small factories and, of course, very much less was paid in taxes. The 1941 prewar taxes of many of our large corporations were equal to or greater than the total amounts paid out in interest and dividends to stockholders. This ability to pay higher taxes, higher salaries and wages, and sometimes also higher dividends is due to greater efficiency and larger sales volume. And the increased volume is largely the result of lower prices. This need of lower prices to increase sales is an automatic incentive which largely replaces the need for the old-time destructive price competition between producers and sellers of the same kinds of products. Today the larger competition is not so much between the manufacturers of automobiles, of refrigerators or radios, of furniture, of houses, as it is between these various types of products for the consumer's dollar (pp. 92–93).

Mr. Quinn completed his testimony with this statement:

One of the most dangerous of these rationalizations, expressed at the hearing, regards the trend toward giant private concentrates as natural and therefore inevitable. It follows, unconsciously perhaps, the manner and logic of Karl Marx's dialetic reasoning. What he predicted would undoubtedly have come true and capitalism would indeed have failed, except for the changes, improvements, and innovations we have wisely adopted. The doctrine of inevitability is fatalistic and fallacious. Why all of our efforts, our world building, our defense program, our hopes and aspirations if there is an unavoidable which is going to happen anyway? Every single act, every move we make denies its validity. "You can't do nuthin about it," is a complete and cowardly surrender (hearings, p. 521).

Yet, in Labor Employment, and No More Wars, Mr. Quinn once again took exactly the opposite point of view. He said:

Corporate concentration by itself is generally efficient in our modern world and under necessary regulation, in the public interest, may be highly beneficial as we have seen, particularly if it recognizes increasing social responsibilities. I am quite aware of the contrary contention that concentrated, corporate capitalism is not necessarily natural and that the tendency to this opinion is based upon a false premise that has led away from the liberal toward the authoritarian conception of society. It is true that our progress heretofore has been in almost direct proportion to our freedom from bondage and authority. But this refers primarily to political progress and avoids the basic distinction of whether the authority is one we help to establish by election or approval or whether it is forced upon us without reason, justication, or moral right. They are generalizations. One factory in a single locality could make all the electric refrigerators this country needs, do it at less cost, and be socially efficient providing its employees, owners, and managers had a relationship to the work, and standing and associations in their daily lives which gave meaning and purpose to their existence and enterprise (p. 149).

Mr. Quinn then would have apparently carried concentration to the point of one producer for the entire country.

In 1943 he also said:

Monopoly was seen to be an evil and as an antidote the antitrust laws were passed to enshrine the old competitive order and fix it on the future, regardless of growth, progress or evolution. Then natural law proceeded to make cynical jokes of our man-made antitrust laws. Within the past 40 years there has been a veritable slaughter of small-independent-business men. Corporations and combinations of them have grown by leaps and bounds, until the independent is the exception and the huge organization is the rule. Officially we have not yet recognized the immutability of the natural law. Instead, we continue to fight it, superficially and hopelessly, of course; but the fight is kept up at tremendous and useless, legal expense. I hasten to say that it is not all wasted. Some combinations and artificial price boosting agreements and practices are clearly antisocial, as mere forms of commercial larceny. But the overall trend toward big business within limits which have not yet been set, and a constantly higher and further division of labor means lower factory costs and is inevitable in the progress of civilization. The fact that we have badly handled the accompanying social developments does not change, one whit, the inevitable trend (pp. 85–86).

When we speak of the United States, its resources, abilities, and accomplishments, then Ford, General Electric, General Motors, American Telephone & Telegraph, United States Steel, du Pont, etc., are sources of American pride and strength as much as our great battleships, the George Washington and Golden Gate Bridges, the Smithsonian

Institution, or the Merrit Parkway. They are a part of this great country. Where would we be in this war without them?

Our Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton law were belated attempts to enforce the old competition. Both Federal laws were based upon the assumption that competition was still the beneficent force that it was in the early days of industrial development. Their authors saw competition vanishing before cooperation and consolidation and attempted by legal enactment to resurrect and revitalize it. They sought to break up trusts and combinations by law, as if legal enactments could change natural, economic laws. By prosecution and persecution industries may, indeed, be destroyed, the whole Nation may be plunged into disaster, but the old rugged individualism and unrestricted competition cannot be restored in this new age (pp. 83–84).

Mr. Quinn's statements completely discredit his testimony before the joint committee.

May I repeat the chronology. He left big business in 1936, praised it in 1943, then in 1948 remembered that 8 years before he had left it because of its sins of commission and omission.

League of United Latin-American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered on June 11 at the national convention of the League of United Latin-American Citizens, held in Galveston, Tex.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ, UNITED STATES SENATE, DEMOCRAT, NEW MEXICO, AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE LEAGUE OF LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS AT GALVESTON, TEX., JUNE 11, 1955

It is indeed a real and sincere pleasure to address the convention of the League of United Latin American Citizens and to meet with friends whom in the course of my public and personal and private life, I have had the opportunity to know and to come to love. With all the sincerity at my command I tell you that I am happy to have been invited to be with you and address you this evening.

The League of United Latin American Citizens, as you all know, was founded on the basic premise that through united efforts and understanding, we people of Latin American descent would and could afford our fellow Latin Americans in the United States the kind of leadership which can lead the way to a more wholesome life, not only for ourselves, but beneficial to the body economic and politic of the entire United States.

By wholesome life, I mean assuring all the benefits that rightfully accrue to every community in this country of ours, which reach all the component parts of these communities and not only a select few.

The LULAC organization has demonstrated that it does indeed offer the opportunity to exercise that kind of leadership. It is a non-partisan organization with wideawake members who have the interests of the citizens at heart and who constantly have worked toward the well-being of this sector of our population.

I wish to congratulate the leadership of the LULAC organization. Since its foundation, I believe I have known the majority of them and they have given their time and their money and their efforts and their hearts to improve and advance the welfare of their fellow Latin American citizens. I congratulate them, and I for my part, thank them for the many great accomplishments which they have achieved.

We have been hearing a lot about the "wild frontier" and of a mythical character who has been transferred from a man—a historical figure—to a more or less fabulous Robin Hood of the West. You will hear more of the wild frontier but this is the last that I will mention Davy Crockett.

I am glad to address your convention in the city of Galveston, because it was not too long ago that all the country that stretches from what is now New Orleans to Texas, Coahuila, Chihuahua, Sonora, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California was a real frontier, and believe me, it was wild. But here in the city of Galveston, named after Bernardo de Galvez, probably the greatest figure in 18th century Spain, who as a youth and a real hero of the wild frontier roamed these parts for 12 years. The city of Galveston was founded by a small group of Americans who had been disturbed by the turbulence of the American Revolution and during the governorship of this same Bernardo de Galvez. They named the city after him because of the many kindnesses which he extended them. They went even further—they asked him in a petition if he would give Spanish names to their homes so that they could in that way express the appreciation they felt for his help.

Bernardo de Galvez was a fabulous man. No disk jockey can make him famous. He established his fame by deeds which will ever be remembered. He came as a youth and fought in the wild frontier that I mention to you as second in command of the interior provinces which comprise this wild frontier. He led numerous expeditions against the Apaches and the Comanches and he was wounded—as a matter of fact at one time received many arrow wounds at the hands of the Indians at what is now Pecos, N. Mex. Later he became Governor of Louisiana, as I mentioned before. During that time and although the American history books fail to mention it, when Spain declared war on England, he aided the American colonies in their fight for freedom. He led successful expeditions and captured not only Mobile and Pensacola, but went across to the Bahamas and the lower Mississippi and captured them. Following this, he was appointed Governer General of Cuba and he continued as Governor of Louisiana and the Floridas. On the death of his father, Matias de Galvez, who at that time was Viceroy of New Spain, or Mexico, Bernardo de Galvez, was appointed Viceroy and continued in command and administration of the governorship of Cuba, of Louisiana. He was a great administrator and his treatment of the Indian though firm was benevolent at the same time.

At the age of about 42 years his health, having been weakened by the arduous campaigns, he died—but he left his name forever and it is a pleasure to speak in a city of this size and in this site which has been named after a real hero of the wild frontier.

Now, there still remains a frontier and in exactly the same places which I mentioned. We have in this region in the Southwest some 3 million persons of Spanish and Mexican descent and it still remains a frontier because of the condition of the people; unfortunately it is not a thing of which we can be proud. It is a frontier of poverty but not of despair, but there is much to be done. In this frontier it is a very well known fact that a very large part of our fellow citizens finds itself in dire circumstances. In many instances this is due to the lack of language orientation, as to their rights as members of the community, and, more often than not, to a lack of counsel and advice regarding opportunities for advancement such as jobs, education, public relations, and civic duties.

This is a sphere in which it seems to me organizations such as the LULACS are necessary. For this reason, the subject of my discourse is the role that the wild frontier and the people who now occupy it can play not only in the domestic field but also in the international, and the necessity and the importance that organizations such as yours, the American GI Forum, and others be perfected.

I come here not to talk at you or down to you, but to visit with you and exchange a few ideas in the hope that some of the knowledge and experience which I have acquired over many years of public life, and some of the knowledge I have obtained from personally experiencing as a child and as a young man, and witnessing all my life the ills and unfortunate circumstances that beset our people, that these may be of some use and perhaps assist you in the task you have before you—the continuing task of providing the leadership which our people so badly need and which can be of so much benefit to them, to you and to this great country which we love.

We know that in the wild frontier poverty, disease, economic injustice—these are the very food which feed and nourish the cancerous growth of communism. Communism is a problem to all of us, but the first problem which we have here is first to see that people are well fed, well clothed, well housed, and then I can assure you that the next step will inevitably follow—that the economic and the political and social position which we desire and which we must insist on will be brought about.

I am sure that the first generation of say, Italians, who came to this country worked hard, they lived in unfit places, they probably lacked for clothes—I am sure they spent their last nickel, however, to help educate their children and now those children have become lawyers, doctors, and professional people, and they in turn have obtained for themselves political importance so now they need not ask anyone to defend their rights. As a result they are contributing not only to increasing the national product of the United States and have become good citizens, but are assisting the United States in the foreign field, in the international field—not that they have become less Americans but that they have become greater Americans.

I am sure that all of us are grateful that the Italian-Americans organized together and sent money and wrote letters to their families in Italy asking them to vote against the Communist Party candidates in the recent elections. We can thank them that Italy has not gone communistic.

The problem is then, twofold. The first is to defend our political and economic and social rights to the best of our ability as the circumstances at the present time permit and at the same time do our best, through education and through political maneuvering, if necessary, through the weight of numbers, to see that poverty and slums and disease is eradicated from this wild frontier.

This can be done and it has been done to a large extent in some of our cities, but there is much left to be done. This neglected segment of our population must be made sound and wholesome and this only can be accomplished, in my opinion, by organizations which will have proper leader-

ship and will keep the interest of this group at all times.

We have in this wild frontier many Senators and many Congressmen, but in all this frontier only in New Mexico do you find a Congressman by the name of FERNANDEZ—only in New Mexico do you find a Senator by the name of CHAVEZ. But there is no reason why in this marvelous country of ours where we have the right to vote, where we have the right to express our opinions as we wish, why this wild frontier cannot have a Congressman from the El Paso district by the name of Garcia, nor why from the district in which Laredo, Tex., is located there cannot be a Congressman by the name of Terrazas. The congressional district which is now occupied by Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT is 70 percent Spanish-speaking. There is no reason why a man by the name of Martinez cannot represent that district as well as a man by the name of ROOSEVELT, particularly, and only if he is qualified and has the interest of our people at heart, and the people vote for him.

There are many fine Congressmen and Senators who are very close personal friends of mine and with whom I must live in order to get along with in order to properly represent my State because we have many similar problems and they occupy important committees, but what I am saying is this—that when we have good persons who are qualified and know our problems, then we should have the opportunity to elect them to public office if we wish.

Any Congressman, Senator, or Governor who does not respect the rights of these neglected citizens, then it should be firmly brought to his attention and they should be informed that the next time they come up for election they will not have the support of this sector of the population.

Let me tell you what took place one day not so long ago in New York. The Negroes there were not permitted to have jobs with the New York Telephone Co. They sent committees to see the officials. They were not received. They sent them letters. They were not answered. Finally, they sent them a letter and told them that on a certain day they would have a committee waiting to hear from the telephone company officials if they deemed it convenient, and on that day every Negro who owned a telephone in New York started dialing numbers at random. It so jammed the telephone exchanges that within 2 hours an official of the telephone company went to see the committee and invited them to come over to their offices and discuss the problem. All they wanted was for the telephone company to remove this ban of Negro employees so that competent Negro girls who could speak English and enunciate properly, could at least be employed as telephone operators.

Believe me, it just took 2 hours of the combined efforts of the Negroes in New York to bring the mighty American Telephone & Telegraph Co. to their knees.

That is what I say can be accomplished here and that is the kind of leadership the LULACS should provide. They should organize the people and lead them and guide them and counsel them and defend their rights. Eliminate the poverty I speak of, the slums and the disease—all this can be done with the help of organizations such as yours.

We must not overlook the international features of this wild frontier. Do not forget that we, after all, represent an outpost of the Spanish world, or maybe I should put that another way; that Mexico, Central America, and Latin America are merely an extension of our wild frontier. Think of what this means in the international field. We know that Communist Russia is exploiting the poverty and perhaps the discrimination of various unfortunate parts of our population—and don't believe for a minute that we have a monopoly of this unfortunate situation. Don't forget that the poor white people in the South are just as bad off as many of our people right here. And don't forget that at the same time the poor Negroes in various parts of our country are also suffering equal hardships, and don't forget that many descendants of many races are suffering intolerable conditions in the slums of New York, Baltimore, Chicago, Atlanta, and even here in Texas.

We do not have a monopoly on these conditions and it is these conditions which the Communists are exploiting for propaganda purposes in other parts of the world.

They are using these weapons, these tools, and they are beating us at the game. We talk democracy—they talk poverty. We talk about freedom—they talk about the mistreatment of GI's of Latin and other minorities, the discrimination in schools and the reluctance of many communities to accept integration.

In this connection it is a well-known fact throughout the 20 Latin American Republics that the inhabitants of these countries have always looked in respect to governmental policies of the United States, whether it be at the local, State, or national level, in the sense of the treatment accorded their fellow Latins living within the boundaries of the United States.

The Communist ideology has been exploiting any indiscretions on the part of that policy that would adversely affect the well-being of this numerous group in the United States. The consequences of such exploitation in the minds of 150 million Latin American neighbors we can all well understand.

It seems to me, therefore, that a positive aggressive program designed to demonstrate to our neighbors to the south that the efforts of such organizations such as the League of the United Latin American Citizens toward a better understanding and solution of problems would probably be a more useful approach in international relations than the usual diplomatic representations.

It is within this context that I personally feel that the usefulness of the LULACS can best be shown for our ideals, hopes, and aspirations for a better world.

CIO Fair Labor Standards Committee's Chairman Statement on Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement of Mr. Solomon Barkin, chairman, CIO Fair Labor Standards Committee, before the House Committee on Education and Labor, recommending an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour:

The modernization of the minimum wage is urgently needed. Millions of workers are unable to share in our rising national wealth and income. Their poverty and substandard conditions are a drain upon our public organizations and a drag upon our national economic activity, dangerously gnawing at its vitals. Our international prestige is being underminded by the continued existence of these low-wage areas.

We are seeking improvements of wages for the econmically disfranchised. They are people who have been unable to organize and to press for their own advancement. These are the people who receive low wages and substandard fringe benefits. Their lot is annually becoming relatively worse as the wage levels in American industry move ahead. We must not fear, as the employer representatives have urged, that the improvement of the lot of these people will generate a cycle of wage increases for the remainder of the American industrial population but rather must we be concerned with the disastrous national economic and social effects of the lag in wages in these industries as wages and benefits increase in leading and predominant ones. While we are discussing a rise in wages for these low-wage workers, new frontiers are being established by the automobile, steel, and other organized workers. These are here united in pleading with the Congress of the United States to narrow the gap and to make a modest improvement in the minimum wage to $1.25 so that these discriminated against may be brought more nearly abreast of the vast changes we have widely come to enjoy.

I. THE PRESENT MINIMUM WAGE IS NOW OBSOLETE AND MODERNIZATION OF THE ACT IS ESSENTIAL

In the discussion of the revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949, there is virtually no disagreement on one conclusion, namely, that the present minimum of 75 cents is obsolete. The 75 cents has no tangible effect upon the current wage schedule and is tantamount to the absence of legislation. Conditions have advanced beyond this level. The present administration finally recommended a 90-cent minimum. We believe this amount to be inadequate.

We urge the universal $1.25 minimum not because it will eliminate all forms of substandard wages, but because it is a step toward the eradication of the worst forms of underpayment, discrimination and exploitation of the bargaining weaknesses of groups of American workers. Every objective analysis of the wage problems of 1955 demonstrates the validity of the goal we have set in seeking the $1.25 minimum.

ESTIMATED EFFECTS OF THE HIGHER MINIMUM

Our estimates indicate that of the 22,200,000 persons covered by the act on April 1954, 3.56 million workers would be affected by a $1.25 minimum, with an increase in payroll of less than 2 percent, or $1,636,000,000. In contrast, the 90-cent minimum would affect hardly 691,000 workers or less than 3.1 percent of the covered workers and produce raises of $124 million or less than two-tenths of 1 percent. A $1 minimum would affect less than 1,271,000 workers, who comprise 5.7 percent of the employees and cost $343 million or four-tenths of 1 percent of the total payroll. A $1.10 minimum would affect less than 2,137,000 workers comprising less than 9.6 percent of the work force and increase payrolls by $727 million or nine-tenths percent.

We are submitting in fact sheets No. 12 and No. 21 a complete enumeration of the calculations upon which these conclusions have been obtained. We believe these to be conservative estimates of the direct impact of the minimum. They are derived primarily from a series of studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. As indicated in fact sheets No. 12 and No. 21, the above figures result from four basic corrections in the BLS figures. (Fact sheet No. 12, pp. 3–4, and appendix table 2 and fact sheet No. 21:)

1. The first is for the elimination of apprentices, beginners, handicapped workers and uncovered workers exempt from the minimum, and cases of noncompliance, as revealed in prior studies by the BLS.

2. The second is for the discrepancy between the distribution of earnings reported by the BLS in its basic study entitled "Wage Distribution for Factory Workers, April 1954," based on 4,000 plants and its individual industry studies of straight-time earnings and the average hourly earnings published monthly from payroll reports of 44,100 plants. After correcting the latter for overtime and the payments for shift differential and extra pay for weekends and holidays, there is still a discrepancy of 5 cents per hour. The BLS special study shows a straight-time average for all manufacturing of $1.68 for April 1954 whereas the regular monthly report, after correction for overtime, shows an average of $1.75 and after the special allowances for night shift premium, etc., an average of $1.73, which is still 5 cents higher than shown on the report on distributions. This discrepancy prevails for each region (fact sheet No. 12, table I, and appendix table 1). The discrepancy also exists in the individual surveys for which comparisons are possible. Here the difference between the straight-time average hourly earnings and the adjusted average hourly earnings range up to 15 cents per hour (fact sheet No. 12, appendix table 3). The BLS estimates a difference in wage levels of 3 cents, presumably ascribing the additional 2 cents of the 5 cents to the technical factors. We are therefore accepting the correction for a downward bias in the distribution study to be 3 cents.

3. The law permits employers to count shift differentials in determining compliance with the statutory minimum. Therefore, in calculating the impact of a new minimum, the earnings inclusive of shift differentials have to be considered.

4. Another factor which would reduce the impact has been the increases in average hourly earnings since April 1954 upon which the preceding figures were constructed. Straight-time average hourly earnings were then $1.75 and in April 1955 they were $1.81 for manufacturing workers. The increases in the durable goods industry average was 5 cents per hour and for nondurable goods industries, 5 cents; for nonmanufacturing industries, the following increases occurred in straight-time average hourly earnings between April 1954 and March 1955: Metal mining, 2 cents; petroleum and natural gas, 4 cents; nonmetallic mining and quarrying, 4 cents; telephone, 6 cents; telegraph, 7 cents; gas and electric utilities, 9 cents; wholesale trade, 5 cents; retail trade, 5 cents.

All four corrections have to be made. Substantial agreement exists on the magnitude of the adjustments. The corrections are difficult to apply to the individual industries without detailed studies. In addition to the correction made for learners, apprentices, handicapped workers, and for low wages of uncovered workers, the necessary adjustments are as follows: Slightly less than 1 cent difference in plant averages to account for the payment of shift differentials; 3 cents downward bias in the distribution study; and 5 cents for the increase in the general wage level since April 1954. The sum of these three adjustments is of the magnitude of 9 cents. To assure the most conservative estimate we have assumed the understatement due to these three factors would be approximately 5 cents in the wage levels under $1.25. This procedure was followed in order to avoid any doubts about the propriety of the final results.

The effect of these adjustments are set forth in the following estimates of the impact of the higher minimums:

TABLE I.—*Number and percent of covered employees affected and increase in payroll cost resulting from higher minimum wage rates, May 1955*

	90-cent minimum	$1 minimum	$1.10 minimum	$1.25 minimum
1. Number affected:				
(a) Uncorrected	1,122,000	1,825,000	2,846,000	4,436,000
(b) Corrected for inclusion of uncovered groups	1,029,000	1,612,000	2,567,000	4,099,000
(c) Corrected for (b) and for other deficiencies [1]	691,000	1,271,000	2,137,000	3,557,000
2. Percent of covered employees affected:				
(a) Uncorrected	5.1	8.3	12.9	20.0
(b) Corrected for inclusion of uncovered groups	4.6	7.3	11.6	18.5
(c) Corrected for (b) and for other deficiencies [1]	3.1	5.7	9.6	16.0
3. Annual increase in payroll cost (millions):				
(a) Uncorrected	$202	$497	$964	$2,056
(b) Corrected for inclusion of uncovered groups	$185	$435	$873	$1,886
(c) Corrected for (b) and for other deficiencies [1]	$124	$343	$727	$1,636
4. Annual increase in payroll cost per dollar of payroll (cents):				
(a) Uncorrected	0.3	0.6	1.2	2.6
(b) Corrected for inclusion of uncovered groups	.2	.6	1.1	2.4
(c) Corrected for (b) and for other deficiencies [1]	.2	.4	.9	2.1

[1] Corrected for overestimation due to exclusion of shift differential from hourly earnings in BLS surveys; discrepancies between BLS distribution study and its industry and monthly earnings reports; and wage increases since April 1954.

REASONS FOR HIGHER MINIMUM

Modernization of the minimum rate is imperative. The 1949 revision of the act was itself a compromise measure which the House Committee on Education and Labor characterized as inadequate. The cost of living has since risen; national productivity has been improved; the general level of wages is measurably high; the minimum wages in union contracts are far above 75 cents and exceed $1.25 in major industries; the minimum required for decent living is far above the current minimum; our national income has risen significantly. These facts place upon Congress the obligation to raise the minimum from the present level.

1. The cost of living has risen from January 1950 by some 14 percent. But in addition an allowance must be made for the fact that the rate of increase for the lowest-income group far exceeds that for the middle-income group on which current figures are founded. A previous study showed that the ratio is approximately 1.4 percent increase for the lowest-income group for each 1 percent rise in the middle-income group. For the purpose of preserving the greatest caution, the adjustment factor we are employing is 1.25. This will assure that any wartime excesses reflected in the 1.4 figures are not now applied. The significant fact is that the relatively greater rise in the price index for the low-income group was observed despite the fact that the price increases in food and rent for the low-income group and moderate-income group were alike. The differences in price trends for the other items were most marked. The disparity in the types of goods bought and not the different relative weights of the items bought, was responsible for the fact that the rise in living costs for low-income group was greater than for middle-income families. The addition of a margin allowing for this difference in price trends results in an increase in the cost of living of some 18 percent. (See CIO Fair Labor Standards Committee Fact Sheets Nos. 1, 15, and 21.)

2. The available evidence, moreover, indicates a rise in the rate of productivity in the national economy since 1949 of some 19 percent. (CIO Fair Labor Standards Committee Fact Sheet No. 1.)

3. The cumulative effect of the cost of living and the growth in the national productivity would in themselves justify a rise in the Federal minimum wage by 42 percent, or to at least $1.06.

It is significant to note that an analysis of the minimum wage problem by Dr. S. A. Levitan, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, concludes as follows: "The determination of a nwe minimum wage to become effective probably in 1956, would have to consider not only the increases in cost of living, but the rise in productivity during the 6 years since the last minimum wage became effective. * * * An equitable minimum wage, which would take into consideration increases in cost of living, and rise in productivity (at an annual rate of 3 percent) would justify an immediate minimum hourly wage rate of about $1.05." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 26, 1955, p. A2769.)

4. Actual average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries has risen from $1.418 in January 1950 to $1.86 in April 1955, a gain of 44 cents.

5. The basic wages in American industries under union contracts had been raised directly by the end of 1954 by sums ranging from 38.5 cents to 52.5 cents. In addition, incentive earnings have been liberalized. moreover, additional funds have been granted to eliminate inequities and to standardize the wage patterns; fringe benefits have been negotiated which are not reflected in these sums. The substandard workers have enjoyed few of these gains and their fringe benefits tend to be much lower than in the typical American industries. (CIO Fair Labor Standards Committee Fact Sheets No. 1, table I and No. 17.)

6. The minimum wages prescribed in union contracts far exceed 75 cents, ranging from $1.21 in the woolen and worsted textile industry to $1.75 in the automobile industry.

7. Decent living standards in the United States demand substantial improvements in the minimum. In the declaration of policy in the act, the Congress stated that "labor conditions (low wages) detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers" should be eliminated as rapidly as possible. The Congress intended that the goal of the Wage and Hour law should be a wage sufficient to guarantee to workers a standard of living that would enable them to live in health, to work efficiently, and to prepare their families for the responsibilities of citizenship. It is therefore important for us to determine precisely what the monetary equivalent for these goals would be.

A currently revised estimate of the Works Progress Administration budget for a family of 4 indicates that the annual cost would be $2,430, which on the assumption of a 2,000 hours-of-work per year would require a minimum rate of $1.22. The budget de-

veloped by the United States Department of Labor at the behest of the Congress, entitled a "City Worker's Family Budget," would cost between $3,812 and $4,454 for the 34 cities in which it had been priced in October 1951. Again on the assumption of a 2,000-hour year, it would require a minimum rate of $1.91 to earn enough to meet the lowest budget figure ($3,812 for New Orleans). Prices have since risen about 2 percent, so that in terms of current earnings it would be $1.95. Neither of these budgets provides for Federal or State income taxes.

Finally the adequacy of the minimum wage can be measured against the costs of a "minimum adequate maintenance and protection of health budget" measured by a number of State departments for a working woman living with her family. The cost in New York State in September 1954 was $2,488, or $1.25 per hour (inclusive of taxes). Comparable, though not identical, budgets for Arizona for February 1954 show an annual cost of $2,312; for the District of Columbia for May 1953, $2,209; and for the State of Washington for May 1952, $2,664.

These budget data indicate that the $1.25 minimum is hardly adequate to eliminate substandard wages for a family completely dependent upon the income of one person. It explains why supplementary earnings from other members of the family would have to be obtained in order to eke out even the most modest living. The present proposal would, therefore, be most modest in terms of these measures.

8. The gross national product and income have risen markedly during this period. Gross national product has risen from $257 billion in 1950 to $370 billion in the first quarter of 1955, a rise of 44 percent. Our disposable national income has grown in the same period from $188 million to $261 million, or 39 percent.

9. Another criterion for the determination of the level at which the new minimum should be set would be a change which would affect a comparable proportion of workers in the current legislation as that contemplated in the original act in 1938. Certainly we have the evidence that that adjustment was easily absorbed. A similar adjustment could be contemplated with equal confidence of success. In 1938 12.9 percent of the covered workers were receiving less than 40 cents per hour. Among the manufacturing workers, 18 percent were below 40 cents per hour. If we would apply the same percentages to the current distribution, we would get a figure between $1.10 and $1.25, or approximately $1.175 per hour. As we indicated, the $1.10 would affect 9.6 percent and the $1.25 16.0 percent. (CIO Fair Labor Standards Committee Fact sheets No. 12 and No. 21.)

Both Secretary of Labor Mitchell and the Solicitor of the Labor Department Rothman have placed great stress upon the desirability of restricting the wage increase under the new minimum to a magnitude not in excess of that experienced in 1950. Mr. Mitchell in his testimony declared that 1.3 million covered workers were affected by the 75-cent minimum and that they constituted 6 percent of the 21 million covered workers. (Incidentally, the study for manufacturing industries for July 1947 showed that 10.4 percent of the employees were below 75 cents, as compared with 6.6 percent in November 1948. A reduction of similar magnitude has taken place between April 1954 and June 1955 which the Secretary has not taken into account in his estimates)

After the corrections noted above, we find that the number of persons currently covered who will be affected by a 90-cent minimum would be 691,000, or 3.1 percent, and the direct increase in payrolls would be only two-tenths of 1 percent. A $1 minimum would affect 1,271,000 workers, or 5.7 percent of the covered employees, increasing the annual payroll by four-tenths of 1 percent, and a $1.10 minimum would affect 2,137,000 workers, or 9.6 percent of the covered employees, increasing the annual payroll by nine-tenths of 1 percent.

If the Department of Labor continued to use these same criteria of the magnitude of the 1950 increase, it would have recommended a minimum of about $1.05 per hour.

We do not believe that the 1950 comparison is an "outer limit" Mr. Rothman proposed. As a matter of fact, all comparisons suggest that the rise in that year was most modest and was probably the lowest effective increase experienced under Federal wage legislation. (See detailed criticism of the use of the 1950 increase, CIO Fair Labor Standards Committee Fact Sheet No. 21).

The above nine criteria suggest that the $1.25 minimum is an appropriate and modest step toward realizing the goal of establishing a fair national minimum rate. It is an absolute fall-back rate for the national economy to prevent a downward spiral of rates in unorganized plants and those unionized plants which would be competitively affected by a ruthless wage-cutting program initiated in unorganized plants. Unless we have such a floor, our entire economy might well be rocked by the cruel action of individual employers.

There is widespread endorsement of the $1.25 rate. Congressmen, Governors, local community officials, labor, church, civic, and business organizations and individuals have endorsed the proposal. We believe that it should be recommended by your committee to the House of Representatives of the United States.

Peron Versus Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 15, 1955:

PERON VERSUS CHURCH

The feud between Argentina's dictator Peron and the Catholic Church is one the Argentines must settle themselves. But that doesn't mean the United States can or should ignore it.

There is a lot of difference between intervention and appeasement. The United States can stop appeasing Mr. Peron without being guilty of intervention.

A pro-Peron policy was bad in the first place. Every day events confirm that a benice-to-Mr. Peron policy is intervention on his side and violates every principle for which this country stands.

It is not possible from here to evaluate the hour-to-hour events in Mr. Peron's battle with the church. But they have a familiar ring. They are from the same book the Communists used in Eastern Europe to liquidate the church, to put men like Cardinal Mindszenty in jail, and to terrify the faithful into giving lip-service to an antireligious regime.

Mr. Peron has been doing this kind of thing for years. He is a ruthless, antidemocratic, power-seeking dictator. He has wiped out freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech. Now he is trying to wipe out freedom of religion. He runs a police state devoid of justice—every bit as venal as a Communist police state. The rabble Peronistas take power into their own hands at will.

How long is the United States Government going to close its eyes to all this?

Earlier this spring the Scripps-Howard newspapers took exception to the Export-Import Bank giving Mr. Peron a credit of $60 million to build a steel mill.

Now the Government has initialed an atoms-for-peace agreement with Mr. Peron, under which he will get help from the United States to enter the atomic-power field. Under the President's proposed extension of this program, the United States would pay half the cost of an atomic reactor for Mr. Peron.

Upon his recent return from Europe, Secretary of State Dulles said a major factor in the change of Soviet tactics was the United States standing firmly on the side of high moral principles.

High moral principles are at stake in our relations with Mr. Peron. Decent, democratic Agentineans, who never have given up the fight against Mr. Peron, must find it discouraging to see the United States playing ball with a man who scoffs at principle and lets his gangster mobs bait the church, just as they baited such great democratic institutions as La Prensa a few years ago until Mr. Peron took over all the newspapers.

Philadelphia—Nation's Largest Importing Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Plain Speaker, Hazleton, Pa., Thursday, June 9, 1955, which reports that Philadelphia has become the Nation's largest importing port in terms of tonnage handled:

PHILADELPHIA BECOMES BIGGEST PORT

PHILADELPHIA, June 9.—Philadelphia in 1954 became the Nation's largest importing port in terms of tonnage handled, the Delaware River Port Authority says.

The Authority's port development department reported yesterday that an all-time high of 32,833,811 short tons of foreign waterborne commerce was handled through the port here last year. That represented 15.5 percent of the Nation's total. In 1953 Philadelphia port's portion of the total was 12.7 percent.

In handling of imports in 1954 Philadelphia showed a gain of 4,869,388 short tons over the previous year, a 19.1-percent increase.

The Authority's reports showed these gains for the individual ports making up the overall port of Philadelphia.

The area within the city of Philadelphia limits increased from 15,367,292 to 17,595,635. Paulsboro, N. J., went up from 6,599,490 to 7,247,104 tons, while Marcus Hook, Pa., and Claymont, Del., rose from 4,408,959 to 4,933,727 tons. The Trenton-Fairless area jumped from 243,021 to 2,399,486 tons.

Camden increased its foreign commerce from 173,262 to 309,919 tons; Wilmington, Del., from 278,288 to 355,959; Gloucester, N. J., from 58,772 to 59,937, and Chester from 30,788 to 32,944.

The Jaycees Meet Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to pay tribute to the United States Jaycees. Next week approximately 10,000 young men between the ages of 21 and 36 years will gather in Atlanta, Ga. They will be delegates to the 35th annual convention of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

I believe it is fitting at this time to briefly review the record of this organization during the past year and pay tribute to 250,000 young men, in over 2,800 chapters, in this country who believe that service to humanity is the best work of life.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in the past has received many eulogies from Members of this body and on the floor of our colleagues in the Senate. Therefore, it is not necessary to review the makeup and purposes of Jaycees.

I do believe, however, that the accomplishments of this young man's organization during the past 12 months will be of interest to you and will impress you as it has me.

During this past year new chapters of junior chamber have been established in over 400 communities, embracing over 15,000 new members.

This year Jaycees have conducted an intensive youth-welfare program in which each chapter in the 40 States was asked to conduct at least 5 projects involving teen-agers or children of lesser age. Although final figures are not available, it is estimated that this program alone has reached almost 5 million young people; 5 million young people learning a great lesson in democracy.

This has been a great individual effort on the part of this young man's organization and has undoubtedly made an outstanding contribution to the American way of life.

One of the projects undertaken by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with Junior Chamber International has been Operation Brotherhood. Recognizing the importance of Vietnam to the future of the free world, Jaycees worldwide have undertaken an all-out effort to assist the free peoples of Indochina. While Jaycees from all parts of the world have contributed to this effort, a major share of the assistance has come from the United States members.

To date the United States Jaycees have collected over $150,000 in cash contributions and enough needed clothing, medicine, tools and farm equipment to fill a large cargo vessel. This vessel, now in port on the west coast, is being loaded and will sail with its cargo of friendship within a few days.

The project is being recognized by free world leaders everywhere as being one of the most important contributions to the cause of freedom in recent years. This, a Jaycee effort, because Jaycees believe that "the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations."

There are many other outstanding achievements attained by members of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce during the past year. All of these activities have contributed immeasurably to the betterment of our communities, State, and Nation. In addition, the organization is affording leadership opportunities to the thousands of young men who make up its membership.

The slogan of the recent international convention held in Mexico City was "Young men can change the world." The Junior Chamber of Commerce has contributed much to a change for the better in the past 12 months.

I would like to conclude with the Jaycees creed which embodies for Jaycees a way of life:

JAYCEE CREED

That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life. That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations. That economic justice can best be won by freemen through free enterprise. That the government should be of laws rather than of men. That earth's great treasure lies in human personality and that service to humanity is the best work of life.

I offer my heartiest congratulations to the members of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce on their achievements and accomplishments and for their conrtibution toward making this a better country in which to live. I know my colleagues will join me in this expression.

The Folly Brook Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation for the Folly Brook project in Hartford, which was recommended by the Appropriations Committee and voted by the House, is the culmination of an effort that has been made for several years to complete this essential work.

As members of the Appropriations Committee will recall, I personally appeared before the committee and urged that this project be included in the bill, and I have discussed the merits of the project in great detail with members of the subcommittee having primary concern with appropriations of this type.

I am grateful to the Appropriations Committee, and particularly to Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Springfield, Mass., who was so helpful with respect to this particular item.

The people of my district who have been interested in this Folly Brook project are, I am sure, grateful to the committee and to the Members of the House.

The Urban Renewal Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the June 9 issue of the Wheeling News-Register, an independent Democratic newspaper published in Wheeling, W. Va. This editorial is an eloquent expression of the enthusiasms with which community after community has accepted the urban-renewal program and is equally applying for approval of its plans to improve and rehabilitate residential areas and to provide decent living conditions for its citizens.

The 84th Congress has recognized the need and essentiality of the urban-renewal program and the House has gone on record by providing the funds necessary to continue and strengthen the program. It should, therefore, be a source of gratification to every Member who voted in favor of this legislation that it is receiving nationwide approval and popular support.

The editorial follows:

WHEELING GETS HELP

Formal application for a Federal redevelopment grant of $519,600 brings a step closer to realization one of most challenging projects ever proposed for the city of Wheeling.

This undertaking is no mere shot in the dark. It is not just another gesture toward Washington based on no more than a vague hope that some loose Federal money may be snared. It is a carefully thought-out undertaking, fitting into the Government's far-flung-housing program and presented in full accordance with the intricate regulations governing urban redevelopment. It represents a year of intensive work by the Wheeling Redevelopment Authority, embracing among other things a detailed study of all of the property in the area and the factors qualifying it as a redevelopment project.

In short, here is a professional job of readying the city of Wheeling for participation in one of the most important improvement programs operated by the Government.

Roughly, the area marked for rehabilitation extends from 20th to 27th Streets, embracing all of the territory from the river to the hill. If the project wins final approval, the actual work of rehabilitation will involve clearing of the land, relocation of those now living there in housing elsewhere, determination of the type of development to be undertaken, etc. The Federal money would be used for planning for clearing, for assistance in relocation, housing, in making the cleared territory available for utilization, etc.

What use of the area will be made in event the project is carried through is yet to decided, and must await a professional study. Part of it might be used for industrial development, part for apartment housing, etc. In any event, such redevelopment would mark a tremendous advance in the rehabilitation of a once important section of the city and should set in motion an improvement movement in adjoining territory and in the city as a whole.

It is difficult to overestimate the contribution to civic advancement made by the redevelopment authority in this undertak-

ing. Because of the careful manner in which it has proceeded, there is every reason to believe that the project will be approved, and that Wheeling, at long last, will participate actively in and benefit from at least one phase of the Federal public works program.

Commissaries Operated by the Defense Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the subjects on which there has been much controversy during the past few years has been and still is the commissaries operated by the Defense Department. The Department maintains that these are necessary, while the small merchants near the Defense Department installations regard them as unfair competition, because they have been expanded over and above their original purposes. In this connection I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. Joseph L. Manning, secretary-manager of the Independent Retail Grocers and Meat Dealers Association of Baltimore, Inc., and a copy of the resolution adopted at the recent State convention of the Independent Retail Grocers Association on this subject. I think their views will be of interest to the Members of this body.

The letter and resolution follow:

THE INDEPENDENT RETAIL GROCERS AND MEAT DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF BALTIMORE, INC.,
June 9, 1955.

Congressman EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GARMATZ: I am enclosing a resolution adopted by the independent retail grocers of Maryland, numbering over 3,000, at their 27th annual State convention which was held on May 21, 22, and 23, at Bedford Springs Hotel in Pennsylvania, with over 700 independent grocers in attendance.

This resolution was adopted with a unanimous consent of all present and you will note in the resolution that we do not object to commissary stores where no other privately owned stores are available. Further, we do not object to military personnel as the recipients of benefits derived in their purchases from such commissaries.

We do feel, however, that civilian personnel should be penalized and should there be resale of any such merchandise, that it be made punishable. We are fully aware that Army personnel, or any other branches of the service, are entitled to greater consideration in these matters than are the public.

We feel further that every effort should be made wherever possible to take Government out of business and turn back, as much as possible, the opportunities to small business, who, through their efforts in the past history of this country, helped make it the greatest democracy on earth.

I am deeply grateful for your interest in this matter and certainly hope that some relief can be given independent business. With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH L. MANNING,
Secretary-Manager.

Whereas the Government of the United States, through the Department of Defense, has been engaged for nearly 70 years in the operation of commissary stores for the sale of food at cost prices to officers and enlisted men of the Army; and

Whereas this chainstore operation has grown to large dimensions, with 438 stores doing a total business of $306 million in 1954; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has stated, in a report on business enterprises published in May 1955, that "commissary operations have continually expanded to the extent that today they present a real problem of Government competition with private enterprise in many metropolitan localities," with a charge-up of only 3½ to 5 percent of cost, although it would require a markup of 10 to 14 percent to cover operating costs, not including tax exemption; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission cites these commissary stores as "a vivid illustration of how bureaucracy can expand against the intent of the Congress, accompanied by failure to include real cost": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Independent Retail Grocers and Meat Dealers Association of Maryland hereby records its opposition to the continued operation of tax-exempt commissary stores by the Department of Defense in competition with its taxpaying members and their affiliates in other lines of retail business; and be it further

Resolved, That this association hereby endorses the recommendations of the Hoover Commission that commissary stores be permitted only in localities where adequate privately owned stores are not available; that use of such commissaries be confined to military personnel; that prices be made adequate to cover all costs; that resale be punished; that consideration be given to contracting out the operation of the stores; and be it further

Resolved, That this association urge the Congress and the executive department to remove the Government from competitive business activities of all kinds as rapidly as may be possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Senators and Representatives from the State of Maryland.

My Plans for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following prize-winning essay written by Thomas English Hill, Jr., of Central High School, St. Paul, Minn., in the Thom McAn success awards contest:

MY PLANS FOR THE FUTURE
(By Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Central High School, St. Paul, Minn.)

It is my firm belief that every man should be striving throughout his life to create a better world. To me this means working toward a time when there will be freedom, justice, and opportunity for all, when hunger and fear will no longer prevail, and when men and nations will have learned the unselfish cooperation that comes from understanding. It is upon this principle that I have based my plans for the future.

I shall try to apply this principle to my life mainly in two ways. First of all, through my life's work as a teacher, I hope to help develop more enlightened, clear-thinking citizens. I shall attempt to do this by studying with a searching mind the progress and problems of mankind, past and present, and by teaching and perhaps inspiring my students, so that they may better solve the problems of tomorrow. Secondly, I hope to promote a better world by carrying out my duties as a good citizen. I think that anyone can be of great service to mankind merely by being an honest, open-minded, intelligent citizen, with a real concern for others. Such a person would be alert to national and international issues, would be active in community and welfare organizations, and would be unselfish and understanding in his dealings with his fellow men.

These, basically, are my plans for the future. However, being practical, I realize that I am not going to turn the world upside-down, nor do I suggest that it needs to be. My plan is merely to add my life, of whatever small service it may be, to those of the thousands of men and women, in all walks of life, who are striving for a better world.

Grassroots Peacemaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor of June 13, 1955, there appeared an editorial entitled "Grassroots Peacemaking," which has to do with our program of exchanging students and educators between this and other countries. I think the editorial supporting this worthy program is most significant, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRASSROOTS PEACEMAKING

Americans, as individuals, are strong on neighborliness. They are quick to make friends with people from other countries, happy to welcome them into their homes, eager to introduce visitors to the best features of American life. Increasingly, too, they have become a nation of travelers, keen to learn how other peoples live and work, no less keen to have America's aims and ideals understood abroad. But these attitudes are not always reflected fully in Washington.

Usually neighborliness makes for mutual appreciation. But hasty travel, especially under some conditions, can also create a sense of strangeness which is often akin to distaste. The more solid foundation of understanding, on which diplomats can build peace, often requires fuller acquaintance. This is especially fostered by the longer visits or continuing correspondence of students, business and professional men, soldiers, and artists who find common interests that bridge national borders.

So especially useful are exchanges of students and educators that several public and

private plans have been set up to foster them. The Fulbright Act and the Mundt-Smith Act provide particularly valuable machinery for this program. Since 1948 about 15,000 Fulbright scholars have gone abroad to study or come from 30 countries to the United States. Part of the expense has been met by sale of surplus property left overseas at the end of the war, certain colleges have granted scholarships, and some students have received aid under the Mundt-Smith Act.

Last year under all the programs reported on by the State Department there were more than 7,000 exchanges, roughly two-thirds being students coming to the United States from 76 countries.

Measuring the results is difficult, for they are so largely found in the broadening of mental horizons and the development of understanding. But tangible fruitage also is beginning to appear. In the Philippines is a school modeled after Berea College—founded by a Filipino girl who "discovered Kentucky." Top-flight American nuclear experts are going out to atom-hungry nations to explain peaceful uses. Many other examples of concrete gains are now coming to light.

This year President Eisenhower asked Congress for $22 million to provide for the international educational program. The House of Representatives cut it in half. Happily, the Senate Appropriations Committee has restored the cuts. But the appropriation still has to pass the Senate and then survive compromises in a conference committee. Improvements may be needed in the handling of the program. We cannot assume that merely bringing students to the United States is going to work wonders—sometimes they have serious adjustments to make during their stay and again in finding a suitable place in their own country's life. But chopping the program down will not improve it.

Certainly a Congress which is concerned about the spread of communism should not cripple a most effective weapon against communism. By comparison with Moscow's efforts the American program is small. The Soviet is sparing neither time nor money in drawing students from abroad; one non-Communist Asian country alone is sending thousands. There are many countries whose future leaders will study either in Russia or the United States. In the basic world struggle of ideas it can easily happen that less money than would build a bomber can win a strategic nation's friendship.

The essential neighborliness of the American people should be expressed in more active support of a program which cultivates much needed grass roots friendships. These are not only a defense against communism but essential foundations for peace.

What Will You Say About America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Benjamin H. Namm, president of Namm-Loeser's, Inc., of Brooklyn, and chairman of the international division of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, before the graduating class of the Maritime College of the State University of New York at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., on Friday, June 3, 1955:

WHAT WILL YOU SAY ABOUT AMERICA?

When Admiral Durgin first asked me to address the graduating class of America's oldest maritime school, I had some qualms about trying to match the admiral's seagoing experience. As fleet aviation officer, commanding officer of the U. S. S. *Ranger* in the North African invasion, commander of the task group that provided air support for the invasion of southern France, commander of the escort carrier force that helped to write history at Mindoro, Luzon, Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and, following the war, as commander of various naval air installations and Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Air, Admiral Durgin has had a career of service that few of us can hope to match.

By contrast, I felt very much like a landlubber. As a participant in two world wars, I have journeyed many times to and from the countries of Europe, and economic missions and Government chores have taken me again to Europe and South America. But it has always been as a passenger, with the confident security of having beneath my feet a stout ship manned by an able crew.

So in matters of naval lore, I am afraid that I am very much a "mug," which is something all of you here have been trying for 4 years to get over being.

I dismissed as pure folly, therefore, any attempt to talk to you about marine engineering or naval architecture, or the intricacies of admiralty law. All of this has been the meat and the substance of your preparation in 4 years at Maritime College.

During your time here you have also gained, I am certain, a sure sense of the romance and the meaning of man's mastery of the sea—not simply the huge body of policy whereby men and nations have learned to divide the sea lanes among them—but also the deep tides of human striving that have made international trade much more than just a matter of long-range buying and selling.

You have probably acquired, too, a feeling for the vast sweep and scope and freedom of the sea, and the independence of thought that is nourished by it. You have sensed, perhaps, what a heightened experience it can be to be on a tight, trim ship and to live and work intimately with other human beings in a miniature civilization in which each man's character must have a profound effect on the character of the whole company. This is a spiritual experience to be cherished. It is the real reason, I am told, why many men who go to sea can never be entirely happy on land, because this experience can never be duplicated among the fetters and foibles of life ashore. It is an experience that has been given rich verbal expression by such articulate seafaring men as Herman Melville and Joseph Conrad, to mention two of the greatest.

You have a knowledge, I am sure, of the importance of the role that each of you will play in the future—as a link in the vital interchange of goods among the nations of the world, without which the dream of world fellowship would surely collapse—and, if the time ever comes when we must defend that dream, as a soldier of supply, carrying sustenance to whatever corner of the free world is in need of it.

But there is another role that you will play, and I wonder if you have given it as much thought as it needs. As officers in the merchant marine or the Navy of the United States, you will step ashore and walk among people in foreign ports that most of the rest of us will never see. A knowledge of remote ways and strange customs will be as much a part of your lives as the customs of the workaday business world are of the lives of most of us. But you will not only observe. You will also be observed. You will be questioned and you will be listened to, and whether you know it or not, you will be looked upon with some wonder and awe and envy and resentment, all intermingled. You will be—I hate to use the word "ambassador," because I'm always reminded of the old saw that an ambassador is an honest man who is sent to lie abroad—let's say that you will be America in micorcosm, because you will be all that many people will ever see or know of America.

This is a unique opportunity and also a unique responsibility, and I hope you will give some thought to what you will say about America when you are in the cafes of Marseilles or the streets of Naples or on the docks of Yokohama.

What will you say about America? In a time of misunderstanding and misinterpretation, in an age when lying and brainwashing are the methods used by some nations to implant ideas, what we say about America has never been more important.

In searching about for a symbol which might help us to explain America to ourselves and to others, I think I have found what I was looking for right here—a symbol that you have lived with through your 4 years of study and fellowship, and during your summer cruises on the good ship *Empire State*. The symbol is that of a ship's crew, composed of men who are conscious of their status as individuals, but who are also part of a closely knit group working for a common cause.

As members of a crew, you are individuals first, and you can tell the people you meet that America's greatness is based on this fact. For every American, whether of high or low station, is endowed by his Constitution and his Government with this most precious freedom of all—the freedom to be treated as an individual. And within the limits of the laws required by civilized society, the development of his personality and his growth as a person constitute an inviolable right on which government or private forces dare not encroach.

This freedom is the essence of America. It is the recognition of the inherent value of individuals, so aptly expressed by Walter Lippmann in his book, The Good Society. He says:

"Human beings, however low and abject, are potentially persons. They are made in a different image. (The essence of their personality) is an energy, however we choose to describe it, which causes men to assert their humanity, and on occasion to die rather than to renounce it. This is the energy that seers discerned when they discovered the soul of man. It is this energy which has moved men to rise above themselves, to feel a divine discontent with their condition, to invent, to labor, to reason with one another, to imagine the good life and to desire it."

It is this quality that we recognize in our modern theory of education, which holds that the individual is a unique phenomenon, capable of untold development, and that the purpose of education is to guide his growth and development to its maximum potential rather than to cram him full of preconceived ideas.

Basically, of course, the attitude behind this great freedom is that of the great religious ethic—that each of us has been endowed by his Creator with an individuality—a spirit—that is more precious than all the physical wealth of the world and all the machinations of kings and statesmen.

This, you can say unequivocally, is the basic freedom on which our American system is based. All other freedoms are relative. This is an important point, because many of our friends abroad have formed the notion that either we live lives of irresponsible license or that much of what is said about our freedom is nothing but lies uttered in the interests of propaganda.

Naturally, our other freedoms are restricted. In a highly complex society, we could survive in no other way. As civilized persons, we have permitted these freedoms to be conditioned in return for the benefits of living together in harmony. Thus, we are

restrained from killing one another, from robbing one another, from impairing the morals of minors, and from advocating the overthrow of the Government—to cite a few of the restrictions that must temper all freedoms when people are joined together in a society.

But the basic freedom—to be treated as individuals capable of growth and achievement—cannot be impaired or conditioned in any way under our present American philosophy of government, and it is this freedom that is responsible for all our progress. For it is only by having our dignity as individuals affirmed and protected that we have been able to achieve the greatest example of cooperation in any society the world has ever known. And only through cooperation have we gained all that the world sees when it looks at the phenomenon that is America.

While the Kremlin taunts us for a preoccupation with creature comforts and large areas of the rest of the world see us only as the fortunate possessors of all the automobiles and television sets we want, we ought to remember that our high standard of living is only a byproduct of our basic freedom and the cooperative effort that follows naturally from it. Being able to go into a store and buy a washing machine or a refrigerator of our choice may seem a remarkable enough thing, if you think about it. But the real miracle lies behind it—in the cooperative effort of thousands of persons digging the ore, making the steel, putting together the motor, producing the machinery to fabricate the parts—all working together, very much like the crew of a ship, to achieve that one finished product.

Ashley Montagu, in his provocative book, On Being Human, says: "The probability of survival of individual or living things increases with the degree in which they harmoniously adjust themselves to each other and to their environment."

Industrialists are coming to realize, too, after years of talking about the American system of competition, that it is the ability to work together as well as to compete that is responsible for our vast American output and our resultant high standard of living. And you may be sure that it is only because of the respect and dignity accorded the individual that Americans have found success in group effort. What man in a totalitarian society, treated by his government as a machine with certain economic needs and values, is likely to find the supreme fulfillment that comes to dignified individuals working at capacity in a common cause?

These are some of the things that we need to tell our friends abroad—and those who might become our friends if they knew us better. But then I suppose, too, that describing the attitude of the American Government toward the American people may not be enough. Those who are outside the United States are, logically enough, more conscious of the American attitude toward other nations, and it may be in this realm that we can do the most good.

If you were able to travel unrestricted through Russia, you would hear many sincere people pose this pertinent question: Why do the American people want war with us? This national ignorance is an example of what happens when the gates of information are shut tight and a government manufactures the kind of information it wants and then crams it down the throats of a whole people. But the question may also be an echo of a worldwide assumption that we are militarists because we maintain troops on the soil of other countries.

Are we really militarists? Maybe you recall the late historian Charles Beard's definition of national interest. The national interest, said Beard, is "that of a nation concentrating on its own welfare in disregard of other people's wars."

There may have been a time when this was possible, but today two factors have pretty well relegated that kind of thinking to the political attic. Those two factors are the Soviet Union and the development of atomic energy. As a result, it's a far cry from that old vision of an isolationist America to the America of today, with armed troops scattered throughout the world, from Japan to Germany, from Africa to Greenland.

But the man you meet abroad may have seen only the uniform, and so he may think we are militarists. Tell him that though he sees us in uniform, we are still very much individuals, and it is only because we believe in his right and ours to be individuals that we are in his country in the first place. The simple fact is that you cannot believe in the dignity of individual Americans and not believe also in the dignity of individual Germans or Koreans or Poles or Russians. By affirming our faith in the individual, we have committed ourselves for all time to the ultimate defense of the individual everywhere.

Because of this belief in human beings, we put the burden of our defense on machines, and the money that we spend for guided missiles and long-range bombers and radar warning systems and atomic weapons is money well spent. We believe that human beings are not expendable, and so we substitute money for human lives in building up our defenses.

In contrast, the forces of Marxism still believe that man is just an expendable piece of property, valuable only as he can be used to further the interests of the state.

In recent weeks, of course, there has been an apparent change in the Communist attitude—a peace campaign. And yet we have no reason to believe that this new line is anything more than a change of tactics to achieve the same ojective—defined for us by Marx himself as world domination. For along with the fine gestures toward peace, Soviet armaments and heavy industry have continued to increase, and during the past year alone the Soviet Union has shifted some 7 percent of its national product from consumer goods to heavy industry and military production. Does this sound like a change of heart?

In testimony before a congressional committee the other day, Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made a statement that, on reflection, can be quite startling. "So far as I know," he said, "the Russians have never demobilized and they are practically, to all intents and purposes, on the same footing they were on during World War II. Their major effort is in support of their armed forces."

Tell our friends overseas that there will be no weakening of our present forces, either, as long as facts like this exist. But tell them, too, that our ship of state is not a warship. It's an unarmed merchantman, and our chief business abroad is still the business of world trade. Some of our most vital raw materials are imported, and God knows we would be hard pressed without them. But we also believe that trade is a two-way street.

Unfortunately, the impression has been created in some areas of the world that this is not so, and we had better do what we can to correct it. It is a sad fact that some people in our country fail to see that international trade—in both directions—is as necessary to world peace and advancement as our own free-enterprise industry is to the continued order and progress of this Nation.

It isn't only the critical materials of trade that are important, either. Let me tell you a little story about a seemingly insignificant one. While I was on an agricultural trade mission in northern Europe last year, I found that the producers of bleu cheese in a northern European country had come to a crisis in marketing their product, a good part of which had previously been exported to the United States.

It seems that a group of American producers, understandably concerned with their own immediate interests, had brought pressure to restrict imports of bleu cheese under the Government's price-support program.

The result of their action was hardly in keeping with the long-term interests of any of us. For while the European cheesemakers were debating what to do, another customer—obviously more interested in winning friends than in eating cheese—stepped up to the counter and expressed interest in importing their product. Do you know who the new customer was? It was the Soviet Union.

It is an inescapable fact that most of the countries abroad must either export or die. If they cannot trade with us they will inevitably trade with countries behind the Iron Curtain. We can do something about this, and Americans who are aware of the stakes involved are doing something. They are trying to revise the structure of our customs classification and modify our protectionist tariff legislation. You can tell the rest of the world that their exports would be welcome here, and that the difficulties that now beset a free interchange of goods are not an expression of the whole American people, but are rather part of the national personality that is still in a phase of growth.

These are things that should be first business for you, especially those of you who will spend your careers carrying the goods of the world. We all need to think about these things because we all need to find a deep meaning in our lives if we are to reach our full development as individuals, and sometimes it is only by figuring out what we want to say to others that we are able to know ourselves.

If you can tell the people you meet—and tell them sincerely—that the greatness of America is based on the fundamental freedom of each person to be treated as an individual, and on the great outpouring of energy that results when free individuals work together; if you can tell them honestly that the reason we maintain troops abroad and the reason we are determined to keep ourselves strongly armed is that we are committed to the defense of free individuals everywhere; if you can tell them that, as a Nation, we believe in free trade as a vital factor in the improvement of living standards and the growth of individual liberties throughout the world; if you can say all these things and believe them yourselves, then I think you have a real understanding of what America is all about.

And if you pass that test, you are not only good Americans, but also well on your way to becoming fully developed individuals. I can think of no greater success to wish you.

Are You Cooking With Gas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, in the case of most of us in the Buffalo area, the answer to the question contained in the above title is a loud "yes." It is only natural that we should be large consumers of gas in Buffalo. We have a long heating season and we appreciate

the cleanliness and convenience of gas heating. This, coupled with its efficiency as a cooking fuel, and rates that compare favorably with any in the country, make our city a big and appreciate user of gas. In fact, our only trouble in recent years has been getting all we can use, as many Buffalonians switched to gas over competing fuels. Industrial as well as residential consumers have invested millions in equipment that uses gas, and only gas.

This whole picture is threatened by bills now pending in both Houses of Congress. If the price of gas were to soar, we would be in a bad way. Gas is a monopoly, and you cannot very well switch to something else. But the bills now being considered would end existing price regulation at the point of production—the gas wells. At the present time, the price of gas is supervised and regulated from producer to consumer. The local gas company is regulated and its rates approved by the New York State Public Service Commission. The price of transporting the gas from the wells to our city is subject to Federal regulation, and so is the price of the gas at the wells, thanks to a decision of the United States Supreme Court. The bills in Congress, supported by the oil and gas producers, and aided by a $1,500,000 educational fund, seek to nullify that Supreme Court decision by removing regulation of the price of the gas charged by the producer. It is reminiscent of the tidelands oil bill which upset a Supreme Court decision that these valuable lands belonged to the entire Nation, and which turned them over to a few Southern and Western States. Just as I fought that tidelands "grab" as detrimental to all of the people of my district, so do I intend to fight this latest attempt to upset a Supreme Court decision at the expense of us who are the principal users of natural gas.

The local gas companies which distribute the gas to our homes could very well suffer substantial injury from the removal of price regulation at the well. That is because the rates which they are permitted to charge us are fixed by the State Public Service Commission, and if they must abruptly pay more for the gas which they sell, they could be caught in a disastrous squeeze while over a period of months or longer, they sought permission from the State to pass this increase on to the consumer. It is not a pretty picture.

When our industrial economy and the very usefulness of our homes depends on the natural gas which flows through the pipelines directly into those homes from the well, then we are completely at the mercy of everyone along the line who has anything to do with that gas—producer, transmitter, and distributor. To decree that one of them is to fix his charge without regulation is to destroy the chain.

The decision to be made in Congress is primarily the settlement of a political and economic conflict between regions. Should the rights and interests of 88 million people be disregarded at the request of several thousand so-called independent gas producers in Texas and Oklahoma because the good Lord put this valuable commodity in their earth and forgot to put it in ours. They are certainly entitled to the fair and reasonable profit they receive for their risk in taking it out of the earth, but we live in the same Nation, and we feel entitled to participate in the resources of another part of our Nation at a reasonable cost, because the Texans and Oklahomans did not put that gas into the earth.

In short, I am in perfect agreement with the distinguished, trained, judicial minds of the United States Supreme Court. The bills now before Congress which would upset their decision should be defeated in the public interest.

Rural Electric Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter from the Honorable Ancher Nelsen, REA Administrator, to Mr. Robert E. Estabrook, editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald of Washington, D. C.:

MAY 23, 1955.

Mr. ROBERT E. ESTABROOK,
Editorial Page Editor, the Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ESTABROOK: On your editorial page Saturday morning you quoted a statement implying that REA under this administration has so reduced services to the rural electric cooperatives as "to threaten the very life of REA."

This criticism, with which, I am convinced, the rank and file of co-op managers and directors do not agree, ignores the tremendous advances that REA electric borrowers have made in the last 20 years. These cooperative businesses which started from scratch have grown up into strong, mature, well-run, sound rural utilities. REA gave them help to get them started and that, in my opinion, was an entirely proper function for the Government agency. But today these thriving locally controlled organizations would be insulted to have a Government agent come out to tell them what they should or should not do. Moreover, it would be poor public policy and an unnecessary waste of public funds.

There are, of course, some borrowers out of the 1,000 that are not in as good shape as the rest. It is our policy to help these in every reasonable way. We concentrate our personnel on matters concerning them. It is our objective to help them become strong and self-reliant with the others. The advances the REA borrowers have made enable us to operate on this selective type of operation—helping those who need help and leaving alone those who are progressing nicely.

The rural electric cooperatives today are businesses with an average investment each of more than $2,500,000. Their repayment record to REA is fantastically good. As of today, only 13 of them are behind in their repayments more than 30 days.

Does that kind of a healthy business need to have the Government supply free audits each year?

Does a business handling operations of that size need to have the Government provide free engineering services?

Does a business that has succeeded in growing to that size need the help of the Government to fill out its applications for new financing that may be needed?

Does a business that has shown all the vigor of these co-ops need the Government to hold its hand in one and a hundred problems that may come up?

As a farmer myself who lived without electricity before REA came along and who helped organize our own rural electric cooperative, I can say with some conviction that I believe farmers resent people suggesting that they are so incompetent that they need bureaucrats out of Washington to do things for them.

As Administrator of REA I am as firm in my belief that REA would not be doing the co-ops a favor at all to take over functions that co-ops can do and should do for themselves.

Every time the Administrator of REA makes a loan he must, under the law, certify "that, in his judgment, the security therefor is reasonably adequate and such loan will be repaid within the time agreed." It seems to me an Administrator can make this certification only if he has strong confidence in the ability and determination of the local boards of directors and managers to run their businesses successfully.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator.

Administration Removes Welcome Mat From Door of TVA—Does Such Inhospitable Actions Strengthen Our Foreign Relations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, since its inception and up to the time the present administration removed the welcome mat from the door, TVA has been one of the major points of interest sought out by visiting foreign dignitaries when making tours of our country.

The reason for this tremendous interest of visiting foreigners in the TVA is due to the fact that TVA is one of the most striking examples in the world today of an enlightened approach to national development. These visitors are desirous of learning from TVA ways and means and methods which they can take back to their homelands and put to good use in their own national development. That is why they have traditionally been so anxious to visit TVA—and, because this Nation traditionally has wanted to by the helpful Good Neighbor that is why our country has heretofore taken pride in showing the TVA to people of other countries.

It has been apparent for the past 2½ years that TVA has been removed from a list of places to visit and see in our country. Fewer and fewer foreign visitors have been given the priivlege of visiting TVA—this has been most apparent.

But it has remained for the new TVA chairman, General Vogel, to jerk the welcome mat from the door of the TVA. He has done this most effectively in recent testimony before the House Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. The inauguration of a new era of inhospitality to foreign visitors came about as General Vogel was being questioned relative to a modest request of $30,000 for the entertainment of foreign visitors at TVA.

Said General Vogel before the subcommittee: "We receive a great many visits from foreign visitors during the year and it puts quite a burden upon us to take care of these people."

Now, Mr. Speaker, General Vogel has been at his present job considerably less than a year and to my knowledge he is the first official of TVA who has expressed displeasure of showing foreign visitors around TVA. He is the first official to my knowledge to complain of the great burden of demonstrating national hospitality.

General Vogel's attitude would appear to be another candid statement of the administration's determination to do nothing to promote and advance TVA, but I would remind those in charge of hospitality at TVA that the TVA is still a point of interest for visiting dignitaries, and that the failure to give visitors a chance to see and study its operations does not detract in any degree from this agency—it merely emphasizes the shortsightedness of the administration toward a national and international asset.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have included in the RECORD a list of dignitaries and official visitors to the TVA in years past who have come to this country anxious to see this agency in operation and to gain inspiration for advancement in their own countries—who have demonstrated a hunger for national advancement and progress and a desire to obtain from us the blueprints for the realization of a better life.

The visitors from foreign lands to the TVA have included:

Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard, of the Netherlands, in April 1952.

Ambassador and Mrs. Eban, of Israel, in May 1953.

Muhammed Khuda, Minister of Defense, Pakistan, in December 1952.

Admiral Renato Guillobel, Secretary of the Brazilian Navy, in September 1952.

Former Prime Minister Hans Hetoft, of Denmark, and Ambassador Henrik de Kauffmann, of Denmark, in July 1952.

Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, of Israel, in May 1951.

Prime Minister Joseph Pholien, of Belgium, in April 1951.

President Gabriel Gonzales Videla, of Chile, in April 1950.

Dr. Franz Bluecher, Vice Chancellor of West Germany, in February 1950.

Prime Minister Pundit Jawaharalal Nehru, of India, in October 1949.

President Enrico Gaspar Dutra, of Brazil, in May 1949.

Right Honorable Hector McNeil, British Minister of State, in April 1949.

The Khan of Kalat, ruler of Kalat, Pakistan, in April 1949.

Prince Charles, Regent of Belgium, in April 1948.

The Egyptian Minister of Public Works, in July 1947.

President Miguel Aleman, of Mexico, in May 1947.

Let us not permit the "No visitors" sign to be put up at TVA, but rather let us continue a policy of welcome to all.

Our Near Eastern Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a statement which I made on June 15, 1955, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Because of the seriousness of our relations with the countries of the Near East, I hope that my colleagues will give this statement their serious consideration.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES ROOSEVELT, 26TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, JUNE 15, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank this committee for the opportunity to make some comments on the mutual-security program with particular reference to its effect on current problems in the Near East.

I strongly support our program of economic development in the countries of the Near East. The way to promote peace, democratic procedures and democratic institutions is to lift living standards. I will not try to review what has been done in the Near East in recent years. This would be unnecessary here, for the members of this committee are themselves largely responsible for this program and are far more familiar with it than I am.

I would like, however, to express appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and the others of this committee for the highly constructive contribution that you have made to our foreign policy by these programs for the development and the strengthening of the economies of the countries of this region.

It is my understanding that these programs have been helpful to both Israel and to some of the Arab countries that wanted our help. I note, for example, that the development-assistance program in Israel has been going down. It was $73 million in fiscal year 1953, $53 million in fiscal year 1954, and $40 million in the current fiscal year. And, I am informed that in the new program, the amount will be even less. I assume that these cuts reflect progress and are based on the premise that Israel has been getting stronger. But I ask, Mr. Chairman, whether we are cutting this program down too rapidly. All of us are pleased that Israel has been able to reduce its imports and to expand its exports. We would like to see that steady progress towards economic independence continues and I hope that nothing will be done in the current program, either by the administration or by this committee to reduce the amount of our assistance to Israel and thus arrest the pace of that progress. It seems to me that it would be most wasteful if a drastic reduction in our aid program should slow down progress and thus prolong the period of Israel's dependence on outside assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the military assistance program in the Near East. It is, I believe, a mistake to send arms to any of these countries in the Near East in advance of an Arab-Israel peace. I have been told that the supply of arms is limited to Iraq and it has been argued that Iraq does not have a common frontier with Israel. Mr. Stassen testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that we are not giving arms either to Israel or to the states which border on Israel.

While this reassurance is welcome, I am still troubled. It is true that Iraq has no common frontier with Israel. But that did not prevent Iraq from sending its troops into Israel to try to prevent her establishment in 1948. Iraq has close and friendly relations with Jordan. There is nothing to prevent Iraq from sending troops and military equipment either through Jordan or Syria to be used against Israel. It is a well known fact that Iraq would like to enlarge its territory to include both Syria and Jordan. Moreover, the British have always sent arms to Jordan and are continuing to do so. I am not an alarmist and I don't suggest that Iraq is going to use our arms against Israel in a renewal of fighting tomorrow or next week. But no one can deny that Iraq maintains a state of war against Israel, that it is a leader in the Arab campaign against Israel and that, even though there my not be any fighting between Iraq and Israel at the moment, Iraq continually mobilizes its energies and the energies of its sister Arab states to intensify the boycott and blockade of Israel. She is so bitterly hostile to Israel that she has never to this day signed an armistice agreement with her. An example of Iraq's position occurred at the recent Bandung conference when the Iraqi spokesman denounced Israel in bitter terms and the Arab bloc, with the collaboration of Communist China's Chou En-lai, put through a resolution endorsing the Arab position in the Arab-Israel conflict. This maneuver succeeded after the Arab states arranged to have Israel excluded from the conference and thus denied her the opportunity to respond to the Arab attack.

The purpose of our arms shipments to the Arabs is stated in the tripartite declaration of May 25, 1950, between the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, and which presently guides our policy in the Near East. In this declaration, the three nations expressed their recognition that the Arab states and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces to insure their internal security and their self-defense and the defense of the area as a whole. Yet, we have refused Israel's request for United States military aid under the Mutual Security Act on the theory that she is in a position to purchase the arms she needs, even though President Eisenhower stated in his December 31, 1954, report on the mutual-security program that:

"Despite its growing achievements, Israel continues to face a troublesome financial situation. Its trade deficit of over $200 million and external debt of over $400 million make it most difficult for it to pay from its own resources for the essential commodities and capital items needed to sustain an adequate rate of development."

This we have done, despite continued hostilities between the Arab States and Israel; despite the fact that King Saud of Saudi Arabia has proclaimed Israel to be a "cancer on the body of the Arab world" which must be cut out. Similar statements have been made by other authoritative Arab leaders. This we have done despite the fact that in defiance of the United Nations, Egypt keeps the Suez Canal closed to shipping to and from Israel; despite the fact that the Pales-

tine war ended without either an accepted settlement or a genuine peace; and despite the fact that the Arab countries and Israel are still technically in a state of war with the Arab countries eager for a second round.

I stated that I favored economic aid to the Arab peoples—I do. Yet, I do wish to call this committee's attention to the fact that the Department of State held back the entire economic-aid program in Egypt so long as there was no agreement between Egypt and the British on the Suez Canal. Mr. Stassen so testified before the Senate committee during the hearings on this legislation. But immediately after the Anglo-Egyptian agreement was signed, we went forward with a very large program of economic aid to Egypt and we also offered Egypt military aid. It seems to me that we threw away a real opportunity to promote an Arab-Israel peace at that time. We might have insisted, as part of the Suez agreement, that Egypt call off its blockade of the Suez Canal—a blockade which affects all shipping to and from Israel, including American tankers. Last fall, after the Egyptians got what they wanted, both the Anglo-Egyptian agreement and a promise of some $40 million of economic aid, they still carried on the blockade of the Suez. They seized an Israeli ship. They still hold it. They have defied a U. N. Security Council resolution ordering them to call off this blockade.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose here to try to go into an extended discussion of all the rights and wrongs of the Arab-Israel conflict. I don't think that anything is gained by trying to fix the blame on a day-to-day basis. But the central fact is that the Arab States are still at war with Israel. It is the Arabs who refuse to negotiate with Israel or recognize her existence. So long as that situation continues, I think it is a blunder to send military aid to any one of the Arab States. I am firmly convinced that our policy will neither strengthen our defenses in the area nor will it win us friends. On the contrary, I have felt that the program will weaken our defenses, because it will make peace more difficult to attain. Instead, it is a blow at peace, for we encourage the Arabs to believe that they can get what they want from us without making any concessions to a peaceful settlement. From such a policy they are bound to infer that we are indifferent to the conflict, and that our attitude toward Israel has cooled. It will certainly tend to weaken Israel, the one country in the Near East which is firmly alined with the West.

Our arms program in the Near East calls for the closest scrutiny. It seems evident that the current program will make little appreciable difference in strengthening the region against Communist aggression. If I thought that the shipment of arms to Iraq was vital for our defense, I would not appear here. I believe that the shipment of arms to one side, in advance of peace, keeps the Arab-Israel conflict going and postpones the attainment of peace, which is an indispensable prerequisite to effective defense in the region. There is danger that once the Arab States secure arms from us, they will not feel that any concessions to peace are required as a condition of their acceptance in the free world partnership. Past experience invests that principle with substance. Iraq's record indicates that she cannot be relied upon to play an effective part in any war on the side of the West. Iraq was the one country in the Middle East that went over to the side of the Nazis in 1941. As for the rest, they remained on the sidelines waiting to see who was going to win before they entered the war in 1945. Accordingly, I see little to be gained in pouring arms into this area. In fact, should the Arab States be encouraged to renew this conflict, this would play into the hands of the Soviet Union which would exploit any new outbreak of hostilities.

I believe that the giving of arms without requiring that there be some substantial progress toward a real and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab States as a condition of our support would be failing to utilize one of the few remaining instruments for peace at our disposal. I believe that we will experience what the British learned to their bitter disappointment—that the gift of assistance and weapons did not necessarily win them friendship.

The people living in Israel must be gravely concerned about our policy. We promoted the recent Turkish-Iraqi agreement. It is open to all countries recognized by the two countries, that is, anyone can join except Israel. While we have not joined, we are arming both the contracting parties. The British have joined and have also reached agreements with Egypt and Jordan. Israel is the only country in the area which has no defense agreement with anyone. It is ringed by hostile states and is completely isolated, for, in a crisis, it can count on support from no one.

I believe that we should be taking measures to meet this serious problem. We have insisted that our policy is one of impartiality. But it is not impartiality to give arms to Iraq and to deny them to Israel which requested them as far back as 1952. This is clear discrimination, which must lead inevitably to an arms race, imposing disastrous burdens on the people of these countries and crippling economic development.

I hope that the administration will take another look at our policy in the Near East. If we cannot discontinue our arms shipments to Iraq, then at least before we make any future shipments, I believe that we should find some kind of formula for including Israel in our defense system, perhaps by negotiation of defense treaties with Israel and those Arab States which may want to be alined with the West. These treaties should provide that any armed aggression in this area will result in immediate active United States military support to the invaded country. I believe that it is only when both sides understand that the United States will not tolerate any further aggression by either side, that the issues may be resolved and a peaceful settlement of the tensions now existing in the Near and Middle East may be made. This has become all the more urgent, in my view, because our ally, England, has already entered into formal treaties with a number of Arab countries—Iraq, Egypt, and Jordan—and has not entered into any corresponding arrangement with Israel.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the mutual security program and I hope that this committee will report it out without substantial reductions. I also hope that the committee can find the proper amendments to assure the lessening of tensions in the Middle and Near East and the elimination of any future arms shipments to the countries of that area until permanent peace compacts have been negotiated.

Hon. Edna F. Kelly's Address at Her Daughter's College Commencement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, on June 1, our colleague, Representative EDNA F. KELLY, of New York, whom we all love and admire, had the happy experience of delivering the commencement address to a college graduating class which included her lovely daughter, Maura Patricia Kelly. The exercises took place at Marymount College, Tarrytown, N. Y., and were attended by Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, and other dignitaries.

Congresswoman KELLY, who is one of the outstanding members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—a conscientious, and I can attest, extremely hard working Member of the House—delivered an address on that occasion which I feel all of the Members will want to read. Deep spirituality, as well as a firm and realistic appraisal of international problems are found in this excellent commencement address and, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend it to the Members, as follows:

The gracious invitation extended to me on this happy occasion is one that I deeply appreciate. My acceptance is given with humble understanding of the honor accorded me, and with a deep sense of responsibility.

This responsibility is deepened, first, because of my long, personal association with the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary. No woman should ever admit this—but I shall take you into my confidence—and tell you that this association began very little less than a half century ago. My sisters and I were most fortunate to have our formal, religious training developed by the members of this community. Secondly, it is my great and good privilege to have a close bond of love in the Class of 1955, and also among your esteemed faculty.

I am well aware of the value of an education, particularly in these critical days, which is based upon the foresighted philosophy of education of the first American Superior General of the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary. As early as 1918, Mother M. Joseph Butler had in mind the establishment of international schools where girls from all countries could learn the meaning of true patriotism in an understanding of all peoples. This international aspect of education did not mean losing one's own nationality—nor diminishing love for one's own country. It meant, rather, bringing together the best in all countries.

The great spread of international movements is one of the striking phenomena of the present day. All over the world people are becoming conscious of belonging to a unified world. We believe that God speaks to mankind through the events of daily life. Today He speaks to us through the internationalization of worldwide problems.

These facts you know. You know also, from your present studies, the condition of affairs in the world—the struggle between the forces of good and evil. Ideological frontiers are set up that beggar nature's ancient barriers of sea and sky. Men in their pride boast of reaching out to encompass the mysteries that lie at the outer surface of the universe, while in their ignorance, they cannot exhaust the knowability of a single mote of dust. Veneration of things sacred is scoffed at. The very worship of God is denied him. The whole world of man, which should be the radiant shrine of the Almighty, is desecrated by hatred and impiety. I refer to this somber picture not to arouse fears but to present a challenge.

To the young ladies to whom I will now specifically address myself, I extend the congratulations which flood my mind and heart today. My felicitations pertain to your well-justified happiness and sense of accomplish-

ment, to the joys of your dear families and friends in this splendid day of the culmination of your collegiate careers, a day which has its very eye fixed on what the future holds for you. May that future ever mirror and reflect the joy which is in your hearts today. This is so much your day, dear young members of the class of 1955, you are so much the objects of our love and concern that all of our ideas and sentiments have you and your well being for their motivation.

There is a very special challenge which confronts each of you as an individual today. I am not going to speak in a prophetic vein as one revealing a truth not known before. On the contrary, I hope, in these few passing moments, to be able to bring into focus a challenge which all mankind has had to meet. It is not a challenge to remake the universe or a challenge to produce, within the short span of one of our lives, a millennium of peace and order and good will and universal worship of God, such as we dream of as the kind of world we would like to live in, if only all men could be brought to see the light.

The challenge we have to meet, every one of us, lies not in a special call to adjust, within a few days or years, the woes that afflict us, or to correct the terrible errors of history, and, in effect, as it were, to banish evil from the face of the earth. The challenge for each and every one of us is rather to overweigh and to diminish evil in the world by our individual contribution to the quantum of good in the world. It is quite clear that when an act of positive good is being performed, there is a double effect, not only the creation of goodness measurable by God, but, since good and evil cannot exist in the same time and place, evil is, at least relatively, being diminished by the good act.

The goodness of your actions will be the criteria of your meeting this challenge. Whatever vocation you choose, this must be your objective, to take into the wide world in the market place as well as in the home, the ideals and standards of living so well implanted in you here in this great Catholic college for women.

As individuals, you will now be expected to stand on your own feet. Many fields of endeavor are open to you, which, I am sure, will be enriched by your presence. Outside of the relatively narrow sphere of your own special calling there is a crying need for all of us to serve our communities. The question "Who is my neighbor?" must be answered on a worldwide scale. Isolationism is a thing of the past, both in its political and in its social sense. No American has given more evidence of the great charity and neighborliness of his heart than His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman.

Be alert and energetic in seeking the truth in every situation. Express your ideals and principles. At the root of many of today's problems we find apathy on the part of those who believe in truth and justice. Their apathy is in direct contrast to the missionaries of evil who are tireless in their initiative and resourcefulness. These are the doers today.

You must be the doers. In your every field of endeavor there never will be a conflict between your high ideals and the basic ideals of Americanism. The work of the welfare of our country and the good of humanity is done in the name of God. The Declaration of Independence of the United States of America appeals to "The Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of our intentions." America needs the best in its schools, in its hospitals, in its courts, in government, in its business firms, and, above all, in its homes. Survival and restoration of American principles must be maintained on all levels—at the grassroots and at the summit.

Reflect on the valiant souls of our forefathers. They were no afraid to face a situation. They blazed a trail in the wilderness of a continent and founded these United States—the great natural law nation in history, where the dignity of the human is recognized in his civil, his social, and his spiritual rights. Cowards tamper with these rights and invoke the very substance of our justice to undermine these truths.

As you know, this is part of the worldwide revolution of the Communists. To be successful, they must destroy the United States of America. In order to counteract this movement our Government has accepted reluctantly the leadership of the free world. Writers of the current scene have made sweeping indictments of failure concerning the political leaders of the first half of the 20th century. The aims for universal peace among nations and universal brotherhood among individuals have not been achieved even at the terrible cost of three wars. That blood has been shed for an ideal which is at present out of reach does not mean that the direction is wrong. But it does place on each and every one of us the onus of repaying the debt of a hero's life.

Each one of you can be an ambassador of good will carrying forward those ideals of internationalism upon which this school was founded. The cumulative effect of your goodness can be the leaven which will bring peace into the world. In the vanguard of our country you will take your place to obtain peace through justice. You are instilled with the fundamental precept of peace so well said by the recently canonized Pius X, "Peace without God is an absurdity. Where God is not present there is no justice and without justice it is vain to hope for peace."

May the best and holiest thoughts of today flow through your lives, the tide of them bearing your beautifully educated minds, your informed intellects, your strengthened wills, your serene hearts, upward to the very throne of heaven—at the foot of which may we, all of us, be one day gathered, seeing and knowing and possessing God, our creator, in eternity. Whatever degree you may receive today, whatever degrees and titles you may win hereafter, may your final degree be "blessed of my Father," from the loving hands of the Teacher who expounded the law to the sages in the synagogue and who teaches us the greatest lesson of all—the lesson of His love.

In this spirit ad for your commencement, I wish you from my innermost heart, "Happy beginnings, Eternally happy endings."

America To Benefit as TV Ruling Backs FCC Member's Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call attention to an editorial appearing in the Clarksburg (W. Va.) Sunday Exponent-Telegram, June 12, 1955, in reference to a recent decision in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia that may have a far-reaching effect on the granting of television rights by the Federal Communications Commission.

The editorial follows:

AMERICA TO BENEFIT AS TV RULING BACKS FCC MEMBER'S GRIT

One of the most important decisions ever handed down by the United States Court of Appeals of Washington affecting newspaper-radio-television media was rendered on June 9 in the television station grant made to Ohio Valley Broadcasting Corp. of Wheeling.

The effect of this decision will be far-reaching on all the American people. The question has been raised whether this country will be ruled by congressional acts or by interpretations placed on them by the various governmental commissions. Such commissions are appointed upon recommendation of the President and confirmation of Senate.

While these branches are necessary in our form of government, decisions of commissions do not necessarily mean that their interpretations are at all times correct. In the case of Federal Communications Commission, it is comprised of seven members including a Chairman. Among these seven members is an outstanding, high-class, fearless lady, Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock, who received her appointment upon recommendation of the late Senator Robert A. Taft to President Truman. She has more than proved her qualifications to serve on this Commission, and has served for the best interests of the American people. No influence, motive, nor pressure can swerve her from what she thinks is right.

On several occasions we have noted her dissenting opinions to certain grants. While we have no financial interest, direct or indirect, in channel 12 for Clarksburg, upon reading her comment that the grant was a concentration of news media we concluded she displayed good common sense. Further we felt that the people in and around Harrison County were entitled to know more about the FCC grant and the manner in which it was made.

We believe this is the first instance any newspaper, or any other interest, has taken such an issue to court—to find out whether or not the FCC had the legal authority to grant channel 12 for Clarksburg regardless of protest filed by others who were interested. The decision itself, as well as the manner in which it was rendered, seemed to us grossly unfair.

As will be remembered, Clarksburg Broadcasting Co., a local concern, had filed application for channel 12 in Clarksburg. In all probability others who were interested did not file for this particular channel.

During the hearing it was brought out that Clarksburg Broadcasting Co. withdrew its application on the evening of February 16, and it had received $14,390 in so-called expenses. The following morning, promptly at 10 o'clock, channel 12 was granted (without notice, without any hearing) to Ohio Valley Broadcasting Corp. We deemed this action very unfair to not only the people in this area, but throughout the State and Nation as well. No notice of withdrawal had been made known; no notice that the Wheeling outfit was granted the channel was given.

We deem the decision of the United States court of appeals one of the most important affecting the daily lives of our citizens. Further we urge that every reader give it his careful study when it appears in our columns, which it will soon.

Our opposition and protest are based on our belief that no chain should have a monopoly of newspaper-radio-television media in any concentrated area. If this is allowed, before long we would be in the same position as the people in Red Russia. We would have 1 newspaper, 1 radio station, 1 television station, and 1 boss to run all of them. That the American people will never tolerate. And that will never be the case so long as we have honorable courts and a free press in this Nation.

While we have not met Commissioner Hennock, from her opinions in the different applications coming before the FCC, we know she has a mind of her own, she has courage of her convictions, and she cannot be swayed by propaganda. The American people are fortunate indeed in recommendation of her

made by Senator Taft and her appointment by President Truman.

After the decision was handed down by the United States court of appeals on June 9, she made the statement which appears and which is self-explanatory. She is certainly deserving of congratulations on her courageous attitude and actions. She can take great pride in her record and achievements as a member of the FCC.

Referring to the grant for Channel 12 she stated:

"I have voted against 95 percent of the television grants, which includes all the large stations on the air, since July of 1952 because of this type of drop-out procedure, as I felt it was highly unfair and a highly unfair way of making a grant.

"It was saddling communities with ownership of stations that they had no knowledge of; it kept competitors from coming in. In other words, if two litigants settled their differences under the table, they were able to file a new application on Tuesday evening at 5 o'clock, and could get a grant Wednesday morning at 10 o'clock.

"It is hardly the way to grant an important facility like a television station when there is such a scarcity of VHF stations, and could control the opinion in some instances of an entire State."

The Enemies of TVA—Grassroots Sentiment Holds That Former President Hoover Would Be Best Advised To Exercise Silence on Such Public Matters as TVA—Not All Citizens Are Too Old To Remember the Hoover Administration and the Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in my hometown and home county weekly newspaper, the Smithville (Tenn.) Review, an excellent editorial by the well-known grassroots journalist, Mr. W. R. Lassiter, whose regular column A Farmer's Meditations is widely read.

In this column, which Mr. Lassiter addressed to enemies of TVA, we get an excellent idea of the grassroots sentiment regarding statements on TVA from such gentlemen as former President Herbert Hoover. It is worth giving thought to this article at this time, in the midst of vital debate which affects the future of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I ask consent that this fine column be included in the RECORD.

The column follows:

A FARMER'S MEDITATIONS

(By W. R. Lassiter)

To Enemies of TVA:

The report of the Hoover Commission regarding its recommendations dealing with TVA has caused a good deal of comment. And certainly it should cause indignant comment in the area that is being served by the Tennessee Valley Authority. No one thing has contributed more to the improvement of the Tennessee Valley area than has the contribution made by TVA. The results in the region are too obvious not to be seen and recognized except by the biased and jealous groups that have advocated abolishing or greatly crippling the TVA.

It no doubt would be an error to say that there has been no waste of money in developing the TVA program. It would be a very rare exception no doubt if any Government project could be found in which there was no waste of money in the opinion of many people. We would not have to go any farther than most of the investigating and studying committees and commissions to have many declare that the effective results are not sufficient to warrant the expense.

It just appears that it might be a good thing if Mr. Hoover (ex-President Herbert Hoover) would refrain from statements on public matters as far-reaching and effective as TVA. The events of his administration are still too much with many people for his recommendations to be accepted without grave questioning.

It is a rather unfair thing to pinpoint all the unfavorable events that may happen in a country on the ones who head the Government at the time the events took place. A depression may be caused by a combination of events far beyond the power of any one man to stop them. But maybe the unfair situation is offset by the fact that the one at the head of affairs would take to himself and his administration credit for all prosperity and advancement that might have been caused by various combinations of events outside his directing.

Anyway, a depression came during Mr. Hoover's administration, and he got the blame. With many of the 3 H's of the depression are more impressive than the 3 R's of their early schooldays. Any suggestions coming even now from the one heading the Government during this depression period will be received with suspicion or plain mistrust.

Of course there are many people today who know nothing of the depression days except from snatches of ancient history (that many years seems a long time to some people) they have heard as they rush around today. Many of the ones who have come up since these days honestly think that life consists of more chickens than there are pots in which to cook them, and more cars than there is parking space in which to park them if they ever are parked.

For those who can't remember the depression because of age, and those who can't remember because events don't register with them, a 1-day reenactment of those days might be a good thing. For those needing this reminder, on this day most all cars would be parked, rations would be short, and clothing thin from wear, and all people would be out early tramping all day looking for work they could not find. Even this 1 day should remind people what could happen. And for those who can remember, 1 night spent in bad dreams of depression days should be sufficient to "stir up their pure minds."

No doubt a number of people in disgust over something happening or not happening have made the statement that people need a good depression to bring them to a better understanding and appreciation. To infer such is meant from what has been mentioned here is wrong. But it may be inferred, and that correctly so, that all of us slip in our appreciation of living under conditions where want and hard times are exceptions rather than the general rule.

At times I am caused to wonder if the waste in so many things evidenced every day will not result in an accounting some time. Food is wasted, and still we have a surplus of food products. Here one might reason that waste is a good thing to help reduce the surplus. That is faulty reasoning. Someone is paying for what is being wasted, and, anyway, willful waste can't balance anything.

* * * * *

But, Mr. Hoover, many of us think that you are not the man to propose that certain very satisfactory and profitable activities be changed to other methods of your recommendation. We respect you very much, but we are fearful of your proposals. We still associate the depression along with your period as Chief Executive of the United States. Maybe you are trying to make amends now, but, thank, you, we will just keep what we have.

An Editor Who Contributed Not Only to Journalism But to the Dignity of Man—Tributes to Joseph Pulitzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, another Joseph Pulitzer has taken over the helm of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of the great newspapers not only of the United States, but of the free world. He is the third editor and publisher bearing that illustrious name to be charged with the responsibility for directing this outstanding newspaper. Under his direction, as under the direction of his father and grandfather, the Post-Dispatch continues to be a newspaper crusading for justice and for truth.

Since the recent death of the elder Joseph Pulitzer, who has been president of the Pulitzer Publishing Co. since 1912, messages of condolence and messages of tribute to his outstanding work in American journalism have come from the great and the humble, from people in all walks of life.

We in St. Louis always knew in the nearly 50 years he was associated with the Post-Dispatch and in the 43 years he directed it, that the second Joseph Pulitzer was a great newspaperman associated with a great newspaper. He always carried on the traditions of the first Joseph Pulitzer, a man who rightfully belongs among the giants of this demanding craft. Never a prophet without honor in his own hometown, the tributes to the late Mr. Pulitzer have served to confirm the high judgment that we in St. Louis have always had of him and of his work.

Since he has been a great figure in American journalism and in the development of today's modern American newspaper, I believe the Members will be interested in reading some of these tributes. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include them as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 1, 1955]

TRIBUTES PAID TO JOSEPH PULITZER BY GREAT AND SMALL—MESSAGES HAIL HIS DEVOTION, SERVICE TO PUBLIC WELFARE—CALL POST-DISPATCH HIS MONUMENT—EDITOR CITED FOR CONTRIBUTIONS, NOT ONLY IN MANY AREAS OF JOURNALISM, BUT TO DIGNITY OF MAN—HE IS TERMED "ONE OF GREAT NEWSPAPERMEN"

Messages paying tribute to Joseph Pulitzer, editor and publisher of the Post-Dispatch who died Wednesday night, have been received by his family and the newspaper from

many persons in all walks of life. The messages, in addition to calling attention to his personal devotion and service to the public welfare, assess the position in American journalism of the newspaper he directed since 1912.

Bernard M. Baruch, elder statesman and adviser to Presidents:

"My deepest sympathy on the loss of Joseph Pultizer, who always had as his inspiration the ideals set by his father. These I know you will carry on."

E. Lansing Ray, publisher, St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

"I have known Joseph Pulitzer for over 40 years. Although we were longtime business rivals in a field where competition is always keen, our personal relations were consistently pleasant. I am sure each respected the other's opinions as a publisher, and the fact that we frequently differed in our editorial assessment of problems international and national, did not preclude a sincere friendship.

"Mr. Pulitzer carried on the journalistic tradition of a famous father. He built a strong and prosperous newspaper, and in so doing contributed much to the betterment of St. Louis. In his death, the city has lost a helpful friend.

"May I extend my condolences to his family, to the employees of the Post-Dispatch, and to those who were privileged to know him."

Grayson Kirk, president of Columbia University, New York:

"On behalf of the trustees of Columbia University and the advisory board on the Pulitzer prices, please accept our deepest sympathy on the death of Joseph Pulitzer. His passing is a great loss to our country. He was one of the outstanding figures in American life, the distinguished heir to the tradition of crusading journalism founded by his father.

"Through his leadership as editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in the fight for a free and responsible press, his never failing support for our work here at Columbia, his kindly interest in our graduate school of journalism and his abiding influence in the development of the Pulitzer prizes in letters and journalism, Mr. Pulitzer enriched all our lives."

Carl W. Ackerman, dean of the graduate school of journalism, Columbia University:

"Mr. Pulitzer's death is a great loss to the graduate school of journalism. * * * Since 1931 when I was elected dean I have had his friendship and support. Throughout these years whenever a new project or a difficult problem confronted the school which his father founded we could always rely upon Mr. Pulitzer's friendly understanding and unwavering support.

"He participated in every significant move for the expansion and improvement of the services of this school, including the establishment of the first graduate school of journalism in the United States, the American Press Institute, and the transfer of the Statue of Liberty window from Park Row to Morningside Heights. Although such benefactions cannot be measured by monetary standards, they are of great value in public service and educational effectiveness."

Prof. John Hohenberg, secretary, advisory board on the Pulitzer prizes, New York:

"Joseph Pulitzer was an example and an inspiration to all of us who have spent our lives in the service of American newspapers and the advancement of American journalism. In his passing we have lost a leader and a friend. Because I am both a graduate and faculty member at the school where the Pulitzer tradition is revered, I have suffered in addition a deep sense of personal sorrow."

J. Montgomery Curtis, Walter Everett, and Ben Reese, American Press Institute, New York:

"The American Press Institute joins the entire Nation in mourning the loss of one of the greatest leaders in American journalism. The loss is personal and keen, for Mr. Pulitzer was a founder of the American Press Institute and one of its staunchest supporters down through the years. His standards of newspaper integrity and public service have been, and always will be, an example and inspiration to the Institute staff and to the 1,200 newspapermen who have attended seminars here."

Richard T. Baker, secretary of the faculty, Columbia University graduate school of journalism, New York:

"The finest tribute to the name of Joseph Pulitzer will be to keep the Post-Dispatch a vigorous and fighting liberal newspaper, a vital part of our American life."

Students at the Columbia University school of journalism, addressed "To the people of St. Louis":

"Your community has lost a fine and gentle person. His loss, great as it is to St. Louis, will be felt no less keenly in many circles in New York. We who have been inspired and encouraged by him in our studies here join in the nation-wide expression of regret. His name, as well as that of his father, represented constant concern for all people.

"Eric Adjorlolo, Howard Albert, Leonard Baker, Charles Ball, Peter Barrecchia, Jerrell Bennett, Richard Bergstrom, Robert Black, Harriet Blake, Thaddeus Bonus, Bernd Brecher, Melvyn Brokenshire, Paul Busch, Terence Byrne, Shepherd Campbell, John Clary, John Cummings, Joan Danforth, Anche Degramont, Evette Dykes, Russell Elman Christopher Elias, James Feron, Patricia Forlifer, Donald Forst, John Fox, Peter Goldman, Fred Goldzweig, Selma Gordon, Aaron Greenberg, John Grube, Walter Hennessey, Roderick Hohl, Douglas Jennings, Charles Kingsbury, Caroline Kirsch, Theodore Klemens, Raymond Koehler, Irwin Landau, William Leavitt, William Lively, I-Cheng Loh, Richard Lyons, Norman Mangouni, Russell Marchner, Matthew Melko, Hugh Muir, John Neal, Eugene Olivia, Eugene Palatsky, Edward Quigley, Jean Raga, Natalie Ressner, Philip Robbins, Lucy Rosenthal, Richard Saunders, Roger Schmutz, James Smith, Jack Thompson, Robert Wagner, Elmore Wallin, Florence Weil, Floyd Weil, Robert Westgate, Dorsey Woodson."

Roy A. Roberts, president, Kansas City Star Co.:

"Your father was first a grand gentleman, a practical idealist and a publisher who never lowered his standards, his faith or convictions to temporary expediency. Frankly, I think he left a greater impress on American journalism than did his illustrious father. The country, but above all, the newspaper profession, has suffered a great loss in his sidden death."

Turner Catledge, managing editor, New York Times:

"He left you a great heritage and set us all a fine example."

Philip L. Graham, president and publisher of the Washington Post and Times-Herald:

"We shall sorely miss your father as a friend and as distinguished leader of our craft. He lived his life in such a way as to make all newspaper men more aware of the importance and responsibilities of their profession. In doing this he made a genuine contribution to freedom and the dignity of man."

Robert McLean, president, Philadelphia Bulletin:

"He carried on the fine tradition of your grandfather through all his lifetime."

Arthur V. Burrowes, editor, St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press and Gazette:

"He inherited a great name and a great tradition in journalism from your grandfather and he made the name even greater. His life was serene and his soul gentle. Would more editors and publishers were of his sterling character."

Ralph McGill, editor, Atlanta Constitution:

"The staff of the Atlanta Constitution joins me in an expression of sincere sympathy in the loss of your distinguished father."

Irwin Maier, publisher, Milwaukee Journal:

"I was deeply impressed by his kindness, hospitality and understanding. The newspaper world has lost one of its ablest practitioners."

Ben McKelway, editor, Washington Star:

"All of free journalism shares your own and the Post-Dispatch's great loss."

John Cowles, board chairman of the Cowles publications, Minneapolis:

"He was one of the great newspaper men of his generation."

Robert Choate, publisher, Boston Herald:

"Your father represented all that was best in the greatest tradition of journalism."

Gardner Cowles, president, Des Moines Register & Tribune:

"He was a wonderful friend and a great citizen. The standards of journalism in the United States are higher because of the example he set."

Cranston Williams, general manager, American Newspaper Publishers Association, New York:

"He was a great newspaper man and will be greatly missed from our business."

Kent Cooper, executive director, Associated Press, New York:

"Joseph Pulitzer exerted a powerful force in journalism. No son ever felt the compelling urge of trying to follow the guiding principles set down by an able father nor came nearer to complete fulfillment thereof than did he in his work with the Post-Dispatch. To its welfare and to another institution founded by his father, the Columbia School of Journalism, he loyally, earnestly, and with a son's affection for his father gave practical devotion."

Alan J. Gould, executive editor of the Associated Press:

"I am deeply sorrowed by Joseph Pulitzer's death. Under his leadership the Post-Dispatch has always been a great force for honest, fearless, enterprising journalism. It has set high standards of achievement and contributed mightily to the cooperative success of the Associated Press."

New York Times Calls Pulitzer an Outstanding Influence in Journalism

New York, April 1.—Following is the New York Times editorial on Joseph Pulitzer:

"The death of Joseph Pulitzer yesterday at the age of 70 naturally recalls not only his own achievements but those of his famous father. Two quotations from the elder Pulitzer perhaps tell something about the younger. One is a brief introduction which the father sent to an editor who was about to employ his son. It ran as follows: 'This is my son Joseph. Will you try to knock some newspaper sense into his head?' Somebody did knock some newspaper sense into young Joseph's head, for as editor and publisher for a period of 43 years he showed an instinct for the newspaper profession and a growing mastery of it.

"But Joseph Pulitzer the younger was more than a successful newspaperman. He was a man of conscience and reponsibility. He lived up to the words of his father that may still be read in the Post-Dispatch building in St. Louis: 'It (the Post-Dispatch) will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties and never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing the news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong

whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.'

"Mr. Pulitzer operated under difficulties in his later years. His eyesight was so defective that, like his father before him, he had to have the news read to him. But this handicap did not diminish his energy and effectiveness. He was a bold and outstanding influence in American journalism. That his paper was a financial success was possibly a tribute to the public's appreciation of good journalistic qualities. Many of us who remember the old morning and evening World of New York found a nostalgic pleasure in turning to the Post-Dispatch. We were never disappointed. We will now hope that the qualities of Joseph Pulitzer the younger will live on even though he is absent."

Frank Starzel, general manager, Associated Press, New York:

"Joseph Pulitzer carried out a tradition of fearless journalism which was an inspiration and a challenge to all others in this profession. We mourn with his family and associates a great loss and pay high tribute to his deeds, which will be long remembered."

Hugh Baillie, president, United Press, New York:

"I am deeply shocked and distressed to learn of the death of your distinguished father, who was one of the giants of journalism. Not only St. Louis but the whole free world has lost a stalwart."

Leroy Keller, vice president, United Press, New York:

"Deeply shocked over death of your world-famous father, whom I had the honor and privilege to know. You can take comfort in the fact that he leaves one of America's greatest newspapers as a monument to his integrity and skill as a newspaper editor."

Seymour Berkson, general manager, International News Service, New York:

"He was a truly great newspaper man who stood courageously and steadfastly for the highest principles of American journalism—principles which we know you and the Post-Dispatch will carry on in the same spirit and tradition. Your father's career is a shining example to all newspaper men and his loss will be keenly felt by our profession."

Aloys P. Kaufmann, president of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce:

"The unexpected death of Joseph Pulitzer is a shock to me and to the community which he has so faithfully served since 1912, when he became president of the Pulitzer Publishing Co. He had, over the years, demonstrated to St. Louisans, and the Nation as well, his love for and sincere devotion to the principles of the free press, always remaining deeply concerned with public welfare and never being satisfied with merely printing the news. Although Mr. Pulitzer is gone, I am confident that his unequaled spirit of independence will live on."

David Sarnoff, board chairman, Radio Corporation of America, New York City:

"I am deeply grieved to learn of the passing of Mr. Pulitzer, and I extend to his family and to the members of his journalistic and communications staff my heartfelt sympathy. He was a good friend, and the splendid record that he made in journalism, faithful to the traditions of his distinguished father, as well as in the radio-television field, will long be remembered. St. Louis has lost an outstanding citizen whose influence for the public good spread afar."

Sol Taishoff, of Broadcasting Telecasting magazine, Washington:

"He was one of the Nation's outstanding figures and was in the forefront of his beloved and chosen field of journalism, which includes his pioneering operations in both radio and television."

Frank J. Nicht, general sales manager, King Features Syndicate, New York:

"He was a great newspaperman who carried on the traditions of your grandfather and added new laurels to a name that is synonymous with the best in journalism."

Sylvester L. Weaver, president, National Broadcasting Co.:

"His passing has deprived us of a great leader in journalism and communications."

L. M. White and Robert M. White, co-editors, Mexico Ledger, Mexico, Mo.:

"This is a day for turned column rules in American newspapers—one of the great men in the history of the American journalism has put 30 on his final page. But like the ideals he championed, the standards of Joseph Pulitzer will long stand as a beacon for those who carry on the eternal fight for liberty and justice for all. Our Nation, our State, your city is far better because he lived. Maybe that's the highest tribute a newspaperman can receive."

Lester A. Walton, former United States Minister to Liberia and a member of the staff of the old New York World:

"In the passing of Joseph Pulitzer, journalism has sustained the irreparable loss of a great publisher and editor of a great daily newspaper of recognized local, regional, and national influence."

United States Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, St. Louis:

"It was with deep regret and sorrow that I heard of the death of one of the great newspapermen of our time—Joseph Pulitzer.

"Under his leadership the St. Louis Post-Dispatch became one of the world's great newspapers.

"Those of us who believe in a free press know that the flag, now at half mast on his building, mourns for one who always carried high in his mind and heart the priceless tradition he inherited from his father—that the people should always read the truth.

"Those of us who cherished the friendship of Joe Pulitzer also knew that his life and his record of service can be summarized in one word—integrity.

"The people of Missouri and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen and I have lost a friend who cannot be replaced."

Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of St. Louis, inserted the following tribute in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday:

"I have just a few minutes ago learned with much sorrow of the death of a great newspaperman, publisher of a great newspaper, Mr. Joseph Pulitzer, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"I think every Member of the House recognizes the Post-Dispatch as one of the truly outstanding newspapers published in the world today—a fearless searcher for the truth, a crusader for justice. We who live in St. Louis consider ourselves extremely fortunate in having this newspaper available to us every day in the year.

"Mr. Joseph Pulitzer has published this newspaper in conscientious devotion to the principles established for the Post-Dispatch by its founder, his father, the late Joseph Pulitzer, who was one of the greatest figures in American journalism. Mr. Joseph Pulitzer has carried on the Pulitzer traditions in journalism and has been a credit to a famous name.

"To his son, Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., go the sympathies of all of us on the death of his father. As he carries on the family tradition in the publishing of this great newspaper, I am sure the words of the Post-Dispatch platform, as written by the original publisher on his retirement, will remain true as always."

Patrick Murphy Malin, executive director, American Civil Liberties Union, New York:

"Please share with your colleague and the family my professional and personal sympathy in the death of Joseph Pulitzer, a great defender of civil liberties."

STEVENSON CITES COURSE OF HONEST INDEPENDENCE THAT PULITZER FOLLOWED

The following message was sent by Adlai E. Stevenson, unsuccessful Democratic nominee for President in 1952, to Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., associate editor of the Post-Dispatch:

"I am saddened by your father's death. I counted myself among the many fortunate people who knew, respected, and admired him. As a publisher he carried on in the great, fearless tradition established by his father, and his loss is shared by countless millions who cherish an honestly independent press. To my esteem for him may I add my deep sympathy for you and your family."

"Your Respect for a Man Because He Is Human and Needs a Certain Pride in Himself, Includes a Respect for His Ideas"—Further Tributes to the Late Joseph Pulitzer

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks before the late Joseph Pulitzer, editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for 43 years, died at the age of 70, the employees of the Post-Dispatch and broadcasting station KSD-TV presented him with an illuminated hand-lettered tribute which is a very moving assessment of this outstanding journalist.

This and other tributes to the life and work of the late Joseph Pulitzer, following in the footsteps of his father who founded the Post-Dispatch, help to show the measure of a great citizen of my city. Some of these tributes are as follows:

EMPLOYEES' TESTAMENT OF ESTEEM FOR PULITZER

A tribute to Mr. Pulitzer from the people of the Post-Dispatch and KSD-TV was read to him on his 70th birthday, March 21, at a luncheon party attended by a representative group of employees. This tribute, hand-lettered and illuminated, served as the frontispiece of a leather-bound gift book containing reproductions of Post-Dispatch front pages that had been published on Mr. Pulitzer's birthdays during the 43 years of his management. Its text is as follows:

"Dear Mr. Pulitzer: The men and women of the Post-Dispatch are grateful for the occasion that permits us to offer you this direct testimonial of our esteem. Many of us can look back over a long association with you and the Pulitzer organization; and many of us are still happily scanning what we hope will be a long tomorrow. But all of us feel a strong personal identity with the public service performed under your guidance. We feel it is good—the best, in fact—and we feel good because we are a part of it.

"What makes it good has been described many times by disinterested outsiders, and though we concur in the general opinion without protest we know that the reasons cited are never complete. Only those who are involved in the operation of the news-

paper and KSD can assess the value of morale and locate its source.

"So what we, who know about it, can add to the good report our friends and supporters turn in from time to time is particularly concerned with the relations between you and us. For the spirit of these relations is what makes the favorable climate that surrounds us.

"In our experience you have always treated your associates and subordinates with the consideration you yourself would expect if the situation were reversed. If you are exacting in your requirements, as you must be, you have never breached the rule of courtesy in being so. Your respect for a man because he is human and needs a certain pride in himself, includes a respect for his ideas. We have learned that anyone who is true to his work can be true to himself with no risk to his sensibilities or his aspirations.

"They are fortunate men and women who can join their efforts to a great and vital enterprise; they are doubly fortunate when the enterprise does not swallow them whole but, on the contrary, serves as a proving ground for their best qualities.

"We count ourselves among the fortunate ones and the fact that we are able to do so, must be attributed largely to the generous breadth of mind that you bring to the responsibilities and decisions of management. To know that the organizations you direct have prospered under your stewardship must be a continuing source of satisfaction to you. But if we understand your character and temperament, it must be equally satisfying to know that so many others have profited—and in the best sense—from the success of your undertakings. This is the central thought we bring to you on your 70th birthday.

"May the years ahead be good to you.

"THE PEOPLE OF THE POST-DISPATCH AND KSD–TV."

NATION'S EDITORS JUDGE HIM GREAT CRUSADER WHO MADE DEEP IMPRESSION ON JOURNALISM—PUBLISHERS LIKE HIM "SUSTAINED PRIDE OF NEWSPAPERMEN IN THEIR CALLING," ONE EDITORIAL SAYS—HE IS PRAISED FOR NEVER BOWING TO EXPEDIENCY

(Following are some of the editorials from newspapers across the Nation paying tribute to Joseph Pulitzer:)

The Kansas City Star editorial today, entitled "Joseph Pulitzer, Idealist," was written by Roy A. Roberts, president of the Star, based on his long association and friendship with Mr. Pulitzer:

"When newspapermen mentioned Joseph Pulitzer, of the St. Louis-Post Dispatch, nearly always they would comment first: "What a grand gentleman." They said it instinctively for Joe Pulitzer was all of that always. But, oh, so much more. He was a great editor, one of the remaining few whose personality dominated and was reflected in his newspaper. One always thought of the P-D and Pulitzer as one. He was a successful publisher, eminently so as the results over the years showed, but his heart and thoughts were on the editorial page and the news columns first rather than the business side.

"The senior Pulitzer, now a legendary figure in American journalism, left two great properties—the New York World, then in its heyday of influence, power and enterprise, and the Post-Dispatch, of lesser importance, although it was his first newspaper child.

"The great New York World, with all its one-time brilliance, withered and died, one of the tragic episodes of American newspaperdom. The Post-Dispatch in St. Louis was handed to Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., then just a young man with a few years' experience in the newspaper field. That was back in 1912. Under the guiding leadership of young Pulitzer, it grew in stature, worth, and public esteem. Not spectacularly, but steadily and consistently. Mr. Pulitzer never deviated from the basic creed of his father, but he made it fit the changing tempo and times.

"BOTH COMMANDED RESPECT

"You couldn't always agree with the Post-Dispatch or Pulitzer. No one could. But both commanded respect. The senior Pulitzer was a great crusader. The son, named after the father, so mild in personality he often was misgauged, likewise was a great crusader. It was the only type of newspaper he would have ever wanted to run or could run. It was always the Post-Dispatch first, not Pulitzer, so the newspaper became even better known to the world at large than the modest editor and publisher. That's the way Joe Pulitzer wanted it.

"Handicapped early in years with almost failing eyesight, the close watch and study he kept on his cherished newspaper was astonishing. The continuous flow of notes signed just J. P. and written on everything from note paper to the back of envelopes, on style, writing, policy, and suggested stories, became a legend in the office. He was a newspaperman leader.

"NEVER BOWED TO EXPEDIENCY

"Always an intense liberal, even though realities often disappointed him, Mr. Pulitzer never deviated from the faith and conviction that was bred into him. In the changing newspaper world, he never bowed to expediency. He surrounded himself with some great editors and some mighty efficient business managers. He was a generous employer and one of his monuments was the Post-Dispatch pension system, an early one.

"Times might change and new problems arise but the basic tone and philosophy of the Post-Dispatch didn't change. It didn't because it reflected Joseph Pulitzer, Jr. His father was much more spectacular in a much more individual age. But in its lasting effect, Mr. Pulitzer's impress upon the country and American newspapers was probably deeper than even that of the father he idolized and whose creed he sought faithfully to carry on."

TRIBUTES TO JOSEPH PULITZER

I deeply regret to learn of the passing of Joseph Pulitzer, a great journalist in a family of great journalists. He made a notable contribution to and always will be remembered and esteemed as an outstanding leader of his chosen profession. His death is a distinct loss not only to the press he served so faithfully and so well, but to the entire State and Nation.

PHIL M. DONNELLY,
Governor of Missouri.

The American free press has lost a renowned champion and a man who enhanced the great newspaper heritage that was his. I send my sympathy.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

WASHINGTON.

The paper is a noble monument to this great newspaperman. Personally I shall always hold him in proud, grateful, and affectionate remembrance.

WALTER LIPPMANN.

WASHINGTON.

I am extremely sorry to hear of this illustrious editor's passing. He was a hard-working, successful son of a great journalist and I am sure Joseph Pulitzer, Jr. will carry on.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.

NEW YORK.

He was one of the greatest newspapermen of our time. His passing will be keenly felt not only locally but all over the country because of the high standards and ideals he brought to the newspaper profession.

Congressman FRANK M. KARSTEN.

I am shocked and grieved. Joseph Pulitzer was a brilliant and influential journalist, a fine gentleman, and a good friend whom I have held in affectionate esteem for a quarter of a century. His passing is a great loss to the public and to American journalism.

STUART H. PERRY,
Publisher Adrian (Mich.) Telegram; Member, Advisory Board on the Pulitzer Prizes.

To supply the world with one of its greatest newspapers as an instrument of enlightenment, justice, and richer living for all peoples is as noble and mighty a contribution as lies within the power of any man to make.

It requires of the editor a clear vision of a better world and the courage to pursue that vision however threatening the course may become. It calls for a sense of responsibility that holds fast unswervingly to recognizable principles no matter how powerful the pressures and prejudices may surge. It needs the urge of a deep and vital concern for the welfare and advancement of all mankind.

Joseph Pulitzer was such an editor. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was such a paper. As we deeply mourn his absence let us honor him by building further in line with the great blueprints he left for the future.

ARNOLD J. LIEN.

He advanced the stature of the American press and rendered outstanding public service. Both individually and as president of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, I express tribute and extend sympathy to all of you.

RICHARD W. SLOCUM.

PHILADELPHIA.

Joseph Pulitzer Junior High students extend sincerest sympathy. Passing of son of renowned Joseph Pulitzer is loss to country.

ROBERT COHEN,
President.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N. Y.

The Metropolitan Church Federation mourns the passing and deplores the loss to the St. Louis community and to the Nation of Joseph Pulitzer, head of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. We pay our sincere tribute to him not only as a defender of civil rights, a champion of democracy's basic freedoms, a patron of the arts, but a preserver and continuing pioneer of the highest tradition of American journalism.

We acknowledge our indebtedness to him and the splendid institution of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for all that has been done and is being done to nourish the things of the liberal mind, the exercise of the free spirit, the establishment of a just social order.

METROPOLITAN CHURCH FEDERATION OF ST. LOUIS.

Deeply grieved to learn of sad death of Joseph Pulitzer. Accept sincere condolences.

G. L. MEHTA,
Ambassador of India.

WASHINGTON.

Our respect for a great editor and citizen has often been expressed. I recall his warmth and courtesy as a person and send you all sympathy in a loss which is shared by all who knew him.

HENRY R. LUCE.

NEW YORK.

Joseph Pulitzer was born to be a great newspaper publisher. He well demonstrated his splendid heritage from his father by making the Post-Dispatch one of the Nation's best and most successful newspapers. He will be warmly remembered by those who knew him as an admirable man, a brilliant newspaperman.

EDWIN S. FRIENDLY,
Vice President, New York World-Telegram and Sun.

Mr. Pulitzer was a great asset to his country and to his generation. His going will leave us all poorer by far. We are proud of his life and sad at his death.

JACOB M. LASHLY.

His was a prophetic voice in our community. His guidance and leadership of a great newspaper were a source of strength to many good and just causes. A foe of corruption, a friend of righteousness, a champion of liberty, and a protagonist of the weak, he carried on his father's noble legacy, and made St. Louis one of the great centers of liberal thought in the world.

Rabbi FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN.

From ever-inspiring memories of 63 Park Row and Morningside we send our deepest sympathy.

Mr. and Mrs. M. LINCOLN SCHUSTER.
NEW YORK.

We are deeply sorrowed. St. Louis has lost a leading citizen and great publisher and editor.

NANNIE MITCHELL TURNER,
President, St. Louis Argus.

The faculty of the Missouri School of Journalism wishes to express its sense of the loss journalism suffered by the death of Joseph Pulitzer. He was a journalist of highest ability.

EARL ENGLISH,
Dean, School of Journalism, University of Missouri.
COLUMBIA, MO.

Mr. Pulitzer's passing has deprived us of a great leader in journalism and communications.

SYLVESTER L. WEAVER,
President, NBC, Inc.

I wish to add my condolences to those of all former Post-Dispatch men. The loss of Joseph Pulitzer is a real one to journalism. But we in the profession have the comforting and sure knowledge that the Pulitzer honesty and ideals are living and will go forward in the Post-Dispatch.

TOM L. SEARS,
Newsweek Magazine.
NEW YORK.

The Nation has lost a bold, courageous newspaperman. Devoted to the public welfare, Joseph Pulitzer made the Post-Dispatch one of the country's truly great newspapers. He was one who insisted the Constitution meant what is said when it guaranteed freedom of the press. I am sure that you will carry on a great tradition.

MELVIN H. BAKER.
BUFFALO, N. Y.

He was an unflinching warrior—a builder and keeper of the Post-Dispatch as a bulwark which always made me feel more secure against all despots who thirst for the blood of freedom and liberty.

HERMAN L. SCHUETTE.
HERRICK, ILL.

A NEWSPAPERMAN'S EDITOR
(By Lawrence Thompson)

(The following story, concerning Joseph Pulitzer's visit to Miami, Fla., appeared April 1 in the Miami Herald:)

It was about 4 weeks ago that a man named Joseph Pulitzer walked through the Herald city room.

Reporters working on deadline let their typewriters come to rest, copy desk men let their pencils come idle between their fingers as they—the professional craftsmen of the editorial side of the newspaper—displayed their open interest in a man who was a legend in the newspaper world.

Joseph Pulitzer, the son of a distinguished newspaperman of another generation, was a distinguished newspaperman of his own generation.

And in his profession, he was admired and his newspaper was admired.

Where newspapermen hang out and when they talk shop, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is referred to as "a newspaperman's newspaper."

That, possibly as much as the five Pulitzer prizes which the paper has won, is an indication of the integrity, the aggressiveness, the spirit of the paper which Joseph Pulitzer put out in St. Louis.

That is why the busiest reporter, the busiest copy desk veteran paused in his work to take a look at this man when he visited the Herald.

He was a man they wanted to see, since he and his paper represent the highest principles of the profession.

Pulitzer, on his side, was interested in the Herald.

He was particularly impressed by the thorough coverage the Herald gives in its women's sections and on his return to St. Louis ordered that an additional six columns of space be devoted daily to the Post-Dispatch women's sections.

He and John S. Knight, publisher and editor of the Herald and other Knight papers, not only were friends of long standing, but had a mutual respect for each other's newspapers and professional ideals.

In 1950, they shared as publishers, in the highest honor which can be paid to newspapers. The Chicago Daily News and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch were named winners of the Pulitzer prize for "the most disinterested and meritorious public service" in journalism for the previous year.

This was for the articles which both papers carried, based on their independent research and reporting on Illinois newsmen on the State payroll.

Further Tributes to the Late Joseph Pulitzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the editors of all of America's great newspapers and, in fact, leaders in all fields of journalism, joined recently in expressing their deep sense of loss in the death of Joseph Pulitzer, editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch from 1912 until this year.

Further tributes to his brilliant work follow:

The Post-Dispatch unit of the St. Louis Newspaper Guild:

"We, his employees, share your loss. He was our friend as well as our benefactor. He heard our requests, appreciated our efforts, and treated us with understanding and concern.

"Our sense of loss is lessened, as we hope yours might be, by the belief that he touched eternity by living as an example of the ideals that lift journalism to beneficent heights of dignity and responsibility."

Jack R. Howard, president and general editorial manager, Scripps-Howard Newspapers, New York:

"My deep sympathy to you on the loss of your distinguished father who so brilliantly and successfully met the challenge of a great name in American journalism, but mingled with your grief there is, I know, great pride in his lasting accomplishments and in the goodwill he enjoyed."

Robert W. Sarnoff, executive vice president, NBC, Inc., New York.

"All of us at NBC extend to you our sincere sympathy in this hour of grief over the passing of Mr. Pulitzer. He was one of the great leaders of our business who so faithfully advanced the inspiring principles embodied in the Pulitzer tradition. His loss will be keenly felt by the many with whose welfare and progress he was intimately concerned."

Robert G. Fuller, vice president, First National City Bank of New York, N. Y.:

"Distressed and shocked to learn of the death of your father. His distinguished career, marked by absolute integrity, strong convictions and outspoken advocacy of his beliefs, leaves you a heritage of which to be proud. Many who did not have the privilege of knowing your father will share your sense of personal loss."

Mark Ethridge, vice president and general manager, Courier Journal and Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.:

"He was not only a great newspaper man—he was a great man for whose genius and spirit I had the most extravagant admiration. No newspaper man could read of his death without knowing that one of the really big men of our profession had gone."

J. D. Ferguson, president and editor, Milwaukee Journal, Milwaukee, Wis.:

"The newspaper profession has lost a great leader. Personally, I have lost a great leader. Personally, I have lots of good friends. As a member of the Pulitzer Advisory Board, I treasure the hours I was able to be with him."

Cyril Clemens, editor, Mark Twain Journal, Kirkwood:

"All American journalism mourns the passing of Joseph Pulitzer who will go down in the history of American journalism as one of our truly great editors. His tireless activity, his broad humanity, and his humbleness in the best sense of the word will be long remembered. He lived up in everyway to the great traditions set by his father. His life will long serve as an inspiration to all who want to make America truly the land of the free."

Frank P. O'Hare, St. Louis civic leader:

"I remember how gracious Mr. Pulitzer was when he was a guest at the Dunkers Club, and can never forget the several occasions when he placed the enormous power of the Post-Dispatch back of my humble efforts on behalf of the victims of man's injustices. All America and a large share of the world's population mourn their champion."

The St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

"The sudden death of Joseph Pulitzer comes as a personal loss to the publisher of the Globe-Democrat, and to those on this newspaper who enjoyed the acquaintance of the 70-year-old publisher of the Post-Dispatch. Only the night before he died, he was the guest of the Globe-Democrat at its tra-

ditional reception prior to the gridiron dinner of the Advertising Club of St. Louis. At that time he appeared to be in better health than usual.

"Newspaper competition sometimes destroys friendships, in the relentless task of turning out a commodity which will please the public. There is such keen competition in the area of business between the Post-Dispatch and the Globe-Democrat, but the personal relationship between the latter's publisher and Mr. Pulitzer was never disturbed in the slightest. When only a few days ago Mr. (E. Lansing) Ray disposed of his holdings in the Globe-Democrat and turned over the ownership of the newspaper to another, he received many kind letters. One much cherished by him was from Mr. Pulitzer.

"The name of Pulitzer is famous in the field of journalism. The first Joseph Pulitzer was the founder of the Post-Dispatch and of the New York World. Before he died in 1911 he had provided in his will that his sons should carry on, and in 1905 the second Joseph came to St. Louis to learn the business from the ground up. In February 1912 he became the publisher and editor of the Post-Dispatch and was active in its direction until only a few hours before his death.

"He was proud to be called a working newspaper man, who certainly knew his way around the business office but whose chief interest, as he said many times, was in the editorial page and the news. Liberal in his views, he transferred those sentiments to his own newspaper, which has long been identified with crusades and campaigns which Mr. Pulitzer believed were due the public.

"Mr. Pulitzer was not a man known by large numbers of St. Louisans. He made few public appearances, due no doubt to the fact that he was approaching blindness, an affliction similar to that of his father. But although he needed a secretary to read to him, he insisted on detailed information on every topic of the day. His zest for living remained with him until he closed his desk at 6:30 on Wednesday night and went home, where he was stricken 2 hours later.

"In his departure, St. Louis has lost one of its good citizens. He contributed much to making it a better city. He will be missed. And as a personal friend, his going is sincerely regretted by the publisher of the Globe-Democrat."

The Washington Post and Times Herald:

"Joseph Pulitzer * * * created one of America's great newspapers. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch is one of the most brilliantly edited papers in the country and one of the most successful. It also is one of the most militant. The man primarily responsible for this journalistic achievement was Mr. Pulitzer, a quiet, modest person without show or bluster. At times he seemed out of place on a newspaper that is never quiet and usually is engaged in an impassioned crusade. His genius lay in his ability to pick extraordinary men and to allow them wide latitude in expressing their talents. He was never afraid of a fight or hesitant in printing the news. Near blindness never dulled his interest or his sense of responsibility.

"It has been one of the ironies of American journalism that the Post-Dispatch flourished after the other Pulitzer paper, the New York World, died. The first Joseph Pulitzer lavished his attention and interest on the World. He sent Joseph, the second of his three sons, off to St. Louis to work on the Post-Dispatch, which he had purchased in 1878 for $2,500. Like his father, the young editor of the Post-Dispatch devoted the bulk of his attention to the news and editorial departments, and his attention paid rich dividends in the business office.

"Likewise, it brought the paper a distinction which few American dailies have achieved. The newspaper itself won five Pulitzer prizes—prizes established by the senior Pulitzer and awarded under the auspices of Columbia University. In addition 4 members of the news staff, 1 editorial writer and the cartoonist won Pulitzer prizes. But Joseph Pulitzer was never satisfied that the paper was as good as it ought to be, and he was constantly seeking ways to strengthen his staff and to expand the editorial and news coverage. He thus built a notable newspaper and made an impressive contribution to the strength of the American democracy."

The Baltimore Sun:

"Joseph Pulitzer * * * regarded himself as the custodian of a tradition handed to him by his father. From this tradition of devotion to the public weal, he never permitted his paper to be diverted. He hands on to his son, the third Joseph Pulitzer, a newspaper of courage and integrity.

"In their competitive field, newspaper owners and editors are under constant temptation to resort to meretricious means to gain a temporary advantage. Human nature being what it is, the pressures are sometimes irresistible, as most of us know. But sustained by the principles inculcated by his father, Mr. Pulitzer was able to stand firm. He chose as his associates men as devoted to the truth as himself. Under him the paper developed an esprit de corps that is the envy of many other editors. The financial success of the Post-Dispatch is proof of the soundness of his attitude. Most newspapermen are proud of their calling * * * It is owners like Joseph Pulitzer and newspapers like the Post-Ditpatch which sustain that pride."

The Chicago Daily News editorial, signed personally by John S. Knight, editor and publisher, says:

" 'I know that my retirement will make no difference in its (the St. Louis Post-Dispatch's) cardinal principles: that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare; never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent; never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.' (Joseph Pulitzer, April 10, 1907.)

"To this creed, so cogently phrased by his father nearly 50 years ago, Joseph Pulitzer the son, was ever true.

"The editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who died this week, came from a famed newspaper ancestry. The journalistic profession still thrills to the elder Pulitzer's exploits on the New York World, now unhappily only a memory.

"The 'old man' didn't think much of young Joe's prospects and he was sent to St. Louis to try his hand on the Post-Dispatch. Two brothers, Herbert and Ralph, were designed as heirs apparent to the World.

"This was one of the elder Pulitzer's few important mistakes. Though the New York paper was staffed with such brilliant newspaper executives as Frank Cobb, Walter Lippmann, and Herbert Bayard Swope, it steadily declined in circulation and earnings.

"Not even the lusty crusaders, for which the World was noted, could reverse the trend and the World was ultimately sold to Roy Howard of the New York Telegram.

"The spark of old Joe's genius had been snuffed out.

"Meanwhile, young Joe was taking long strides in St. Louis. Under his direction, and with the help of the late O. K. Bovard, its able managing editor, the Post-Dispatch became one of the 3 or 4 outstanding newspapers in America.

"Superb news coverage, a zest for investigative reporting and a brilliantly provocative editorial page which always comforted the afflicted and afflicted the comfortable, brought the Post-Dispatch material success and national distinction.

"It has been my privilege to sit with Joe Pulitzer for many years on the advisory board of Columbia University which awards the Pulitzer prizes.

"Though he was afflicted by semiblindness, I have known few men who were better informed or took a greater pride in journalistic achievement.

"Joe Pulitzer was a stalwart member of his profession. When under political threat or economic pressure, he never wavered from the course which he deemed to be right.

"The Post-Dispatch, renowned at home and abroad for its editorial guts and general excellence, stands as a living memorial to one of the greatest newspapermen of our time."

The Louisville Courier-Journal:

"Pulitzer's death brings to an end a stewardship under which Post-Dispatch won more professional awards for work in public interest than any other newspaper. In each case—5 in all since the first in 1936 for exposure of local vote fraud—there was fearless adherence to the famous creed. * * * Under Joseph Pulitzer II the Post-Dispatch became the most intelligent and effective of frankly crusading newspapers."

Cleveland Plain Dealer:

"Mr. Pulitzer was successful in the way he most wanted to be—as an active newsman. He believed a newspaper's heart and soul was its staff. Its product was what counted and made people buy it. * * * He was a fighting newspaperman of the old tradition. * * * May there still be crusaders of his mold."

Chattanooga Times:

"The unshakable integrity of a newspaper is one of the fairest flowers of the land, and the rock-like integrity of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is living inspiration both to newspapermen and to the Nation as a whole. The two men most responsible for the universal respect for the Post-Dispatch were Joseph Pulitzer and his son, who bore the same name and who died after 43 years at the helm. The Post-Dispatch is regarded as a giant in the crusading field. It embraces and fights for any cause it sees in the interest of the community of St. Louis. It also digs deep at city, State, and National scandal not for the sake of crusade but in the belief that corruption is news. Joseph Pulitzer was careful to preserve this spirit preciously. He saw himself most proudly as a working newspaperman, and the Post-Dispatch was his life. The country is hopeful and confident that the Post-Dispatch will go on in the Pulitzer tradition."

The Atlanta Constitution:

"Joseph Pulitzer, a working newspaperman in the true and best sense of that phrase, died as he would have wished to go—at the close of the day with his desk closed on a day's work done.

"He was 70 years old. For 43 years he had been the working editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Under his guidance the paper took on, and reflected, his own courage and resolution to make of that newspaper a true servant of the people and their rights. He did not stint in service.

"The Post-Dispatch spent many thousands of its own money annually in research into political corruption. It became almost axiomatic the newspaper annually would bring to light some corrupt practice. It did this on a national as well as local scale. The historic Teapot Dome scandal in the Harding administration was but one of such examples * * *.

"To him the job of being a good and honest newspaper man was the highest calling a man could have.

"His son, Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., carries on in the same fine tradition.

"Every newspaperman in the Nation will share some of the sorrow in his passing and some of the pride in his profession which Pulitzer's life gave it."

The Atlanta Journal:

"Joseph Pulitzer was a great, crusading journalist. He was a fighting editor who held the highest contempt for those who would betray a public trust. His newspaper constantly kept a close check on governmental operations on local and national levels. If wrongdoing was discovered, Pulitzer printed the story. The death of Joseph Pulitzer is a genuine loss to the Nation. Wise crusaders are hard to find."

The Portland (Maine) Press-Herald:

"The greatest tribute that can be paid to Mr. Pulitzer is that he never betrayed his father's creed. With an almost angry adherence to truth and justice Mr. Pulitzer's Post-Dispatch continued to be one of the finest examples of how a newspaper should serve its community and its country, of how a newspaper should be a public trust rather than a private billboard.

"Death has ended Mr. Pulitzer's career, but not that of his newspaper or its platform, not that of a Pulitzer tradition solidly built on a foundation of honesty, courage, and good works."

The Phoenix (Ariz.) Republic:

"To Joseph Pulitzer, and his father before him, a newspaper was more than a business proposition. * * * The American newspaper world has lost an outstanding figure. * * * He kept in touch with all the other important details of running a great newspaper, but his main interest was the news and his main pride was in the editorial page. That interest and that pride, we believe, have given the St. Louis Post-Dispatch its stature in the American newspaper world."

The Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express:

"In his death the Nation loses a great newspaper man who insisted that the Constitution meant what it said when it guaranteed freedom of the press. * * * A hard-working active newspaper man who made his paper one of the great crusading journals of the country."

The Birmingham (Ala.) News:

"The second Joseph Pulitzer, executive head of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch * * * devotedly and ably carried on his work according to high principles and aims set for that paper by his father. * * * In firm allegiance to such policies the Post-Dispatch long has been one of the great newspapers of the Nation and of the world.

"Joseph Pulitzer the second, succeeded his father in 1912. For 43 years he gave himself to the direction of the paper, which has grown greatly in stature and scope under his leadership. He had deep concern and pride in its news and editorial operations. He bore also the responsibilities of president of the publishing company. Fidelity, ability, diligence, and zest marked his many-sided work. He liked to be thought of as an active newspaper man.

"The distinguished paper he served so well will continue onward the stronger for this lifetime of steadfast and superior contribution to it."

More Personal and Editorial Comment on Joseph Pulitzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, Senator HENNINGS, Representative KARSTEN, Representative PRICE, Senator NEUBERGER, and many others joined recently in paying tribute to the late Joseph Pulitzer, who died after 43 years at the helm of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Following are some of the statements by these and other outstanding Americans:

MORE PERSONAL TRIBUTES AND EDITORIAL COMMENT ON JOSEPH PULITZER—FRIENDS, ASSOCIATES, AND ADMIRERS MARK EDITOR'S PASSING AS PERSONAL, CIVIC, AND JOURNALISTIC LOSS—"OUR POLITICAL CONSCIENCE, TEACHER OF POLITICAL MORALS, FIGHTER FOR PROGRESS AND WELFARE—GENEROUS AND STANCH FRIEND," SAYS SENATOR HENNINGS

United States Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of St. Louis:

"To say farewell to Joseph Pulitzer—the man and the citizen—is a grave and sorrowful task. For long decades Joseph Pulitzer was an expression of our political conscience, a teacher of political morals, a fighter for progress and welfare. To those who knew him he was a generous and stanch friend.

"The death of such a man is an event of many implications. It is a tragic national and personal loss but it is also a reminder and a call for the continuation of his life's work—the fight for a responsible press and for honest, conscientious, unselfish, public service.

"Our cultural heritage rests on the idea of work and service. We all fulfill our allotted task in life. But there are only a few among us who feel that they are called and who are inspired by their calling. Joseph Pulitzer was one of these inspired. Unassuming and modest, he was a man of unreserved belief in his ideals and sustained in his dedication to see them live. His inspiration was the source of his serenity of character. The words of the wise are serene words, suggests an old saying. Joseph Pulitzer was an outstanding example of its truth.

"In his life's work Joseph Pulitzer was the spiritual successor of his great father. They shared the same philosophy of life and the same views on the function of a free press in our society. But the son was more than a follower of his father. He was in his own right and by his own work and his own courage the executor of their common ideas. The greatness of his personal effort becomes clear if we consider the changes in our life since the turn of the century. Only a sovereign mastery of ideas could have permitted Joseph Pulitzer to steer his course without losing touch with reality and becoming dogmatic.

"Our Constitution abolished orthodoxy as a test of worthiness culturally, politically, and economically. It protects our freedom of thought and belief. Our Constitution gave birth to a democracy that is conceived as a unity in diversity.

"A society so constructed lives by the dissemination of diversified information and free comment. Free government dies when the exchange of information and comment stop. In our midst the press thus acquires a singularly important position and it is the duty of every generation of Americans to see to it that the freedom of the press is protected and continues unabridged.

"The growth of the Nation's wealth tends to increase the size of business undertakings and the newspaper business is no exception. In fact, the publishing of a newspaper has become big business. We often hear, and we know it to be true, that economic considerations sometimes influence editorial policy and persuade some newspapers to yield too readily to the expedient of satisfying tastes and mores which sometimes are not compatible with integrity and the general welfare. It is often forgotten that, whatever the economic needs, the primary purpose of a business venture cannot be sacrificed. It is the primary purpose of the press to be the political conscience of the community and to watch that the stream of our life not be corrupted, and to protect the glorious individuality of every man to thrive and to pursue happiness and the fulfillment of the human spirit. It is the duty of the press to inform and to educate the people of our country, without prejudice or favor, interpreting the given facts in the light of the principles established by our Constitution.

"The soul of democracy is freedom. And democracy is not a system but a principle of growth. To growth within our democratic framework without impairing freedom is the paramount goal of a free people. Our people have a right to expect the press to adhere unalterably to these principles and to keep them constantly before us.

"These were the ideas that guided Joseph Pulitzer in his work as editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and he brought to us the much needed proof that a gifted man of business can manage a financially successful paper without surrender of ideals or compromise of principle.

"Our country has lost a brilliant and effective advocate of those things by which we live."

Ellsworth Bunker, president of the American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.:

"The Nation has lost one of the most distinguished journalists of this generation and a great humanitarian."

James W. Brown, president of Editor and Publisher:

"He certainly fought a good fight and kept the faith, and endeared himself to millions of his fellow citizens by his able, courageous, militant public service.

"He will be greatly missed."

William R. Mathews, editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson:

"As a member of the Pulitzer Prize Committee, I am deeply grieved to hear of the sudden death of my good friend, Joseph Pulitzer. His absence will be felt at the coming April meeting, where his eminent fairness and high professional standards have exercised a profound effect upon our decisions. As the editor and publisher of the Post-Dispatch, he has more than lived up to the high sense of public service which his father so well established. He has made the Post-Dispatch one of the greatest newspapers of our Nation, a tradition I am confident his son will carry on."

Former United States Senator Scott W. Lucas, Democrat, Illinois:

"Please convey to the Pulitzer family my personal sympathy at the passing of Joseph Pulitzer, one of America's most distinguished journalists."

Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times:

"What a splendid and wonderful life he had * * * and there is something to be said for quitting when you're on high."

Julius Ochs Adler, first vice president and general manager of the New York Times:

"Joseph Pulitzer was a forthright American, an outstanding editor and a master journalist. I shall always cherish the memory of his warm and treasured friendship."

Alexander C. Herman, president of the Alumni Association, Columbia University School of Journalism:

"It is with pleasant memory that we recall Joseph Pulitzer's last visit when he dedicated, so genially, a special room at the Journalism Building in which the stained-glass window from the old World Building was installed. For enriching the memories not only of our own school which his forebear founded, but for carrying on the Pulitzer tradition as a leading force for vigorous journalism and free press, we all salute his memory. The light that he and his family shed will be a beacon for many in the long time ahead."

United States Representative FRANK M. KARSTEN, Democrat, St. Louis, in a statement offered in the House:

"Mr. Speaker, St. Louis has lost one of its most distinguished citizens. While my city is saddened by the death of Joseph Pulitzer,

his passing is mourned throughout the world. He was one of the greatest newspapermen of our time.

"For over 43 years Joseph Pulitzer headed the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Succeeding his father, the founder of the paper, in 1912, he adopted the Post-Dispatch platform as his journalistic and editorial guide. It literally became his bible and in every issue of the Post-Dispatch there is printed a copy of this platform:

" 'I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform; never tolerate injustice or corruption; always fight demagogs of all parties; never belong to any party; always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers; never lack sympathy with the poor; always remain devoted to the public welfare; never be satisfied with merely printing the news; always be drastically independent; never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

" 'JOSEPH PULITZER.

" 'APRIL 10, 1907.'

"His steadfast adherence to these principles and high ideals has made the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a distinguished symbol of journalism at its best. When he personally supervised the various operations of the newspaper, his true love was his work as an active newspaperman. The news and editorial pages were closest to his heart. With his deep sense of public responsibility and public service, he personally led many of the campaigns which have been a distinguishing feature of the Post-Dispatch.

"He kept his newspaper abreast of all scientific and technological developments. He took an active interest in the development of radio, as well as television. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch station, KSD, which went on the air in 1922, was the first radio station to be operated by a newspaper. The same was true of the television station, KSD–TV, which began telecasts in 1947.

"The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was Mr. Pulitzer's life. Although he is gone, his great newspaper lives on, and I am confident it will keep alive the high standards and ideals which have earned for him an honored place in the world of journalism."

Floyd C. Shoemaker, secretary, State Historical Society of Missouri:

"He was a true friend of mankind, a generous benefactor, and an inspiration to many. His worthwhile influence will long be felt, not only by those who knew him, but by those who followed his life with appreciation."

Harold T. Jolley, vice chairman of the board, Boatmen's National Bank of St. Louis:

"St. Louis has lost one of its most outstanding citizens. I am sure he has left a worthy successor."

Wesley H. Maurer, chairman for the faculty in journalism, University of Michigan:

"He has been for newspapermen of this generation an inspiration, and the newspaper he built up is so beloved by the profession that it is widely accepted as a newspaperman's newspaper.

"He not only carried on the principles his father established but advanced those principles, employing the full resources of modern knowledge, its accompanying skill, and the speed and facilities of the new graphic arts and communications.

"His public extends far beyond the community to the world at large; his influence for what we consider good seems endless."

Web Printing Pressmen's Union No. 38, through Jack H. Bieber, secretary-treasurer:

"Our membership shall cherish the memory and privilege of our domestic and industrial association with him, always being grateful for his great humane contributions toward mankind, and those cardinal principles, which contributed so much toward the essentials of a great newspaper publication."

Paul P. Connole, St. Louis manager for State Division of Employment Security:

"We are grateful in the knowledge that he left behind a thoroughly indoctrinated staff to carry on the principles for which he stood."

Leo C. Fuller, board chairman of Stix, Baer & Fuller:

"No eulogy of Joseph Pulitzer could possibly do justice to the richness and fullness of his life. His imprint on the field of journalism and civic helpfulness will never be erased."

Samuel I. Newhouse, New York publisher and new owner of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

"Please accept my profound sympathies in the passing of Mr. Pulitzer, a great trustee of the Nation's free press."

United States Representative MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, East St. Louis, in remarks inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The death of Joseph Pulitzer last week removed one of the truly distinguished publishers of this generation. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was a nationally recognized newspaper when he inherited control from his father, one of the last giants of the era of personal journalism. It is a measure of the man that he left the Post-Dispatch, after more than four decades, stronger than he found it, proud of its tradition and respected everywhere in the world where honest opinions and courageous independence are sought.

"All through Joseph Pulitzer's career as publisher, the Post-Dispatch carried as part of its masthead the remarkable words of his father upon retirement: (Platform was quoted.)

"A creed such as this is not self-executing. The nobility of the sentiments is no guarantee that the ideal will be fulfilled. Only a vital and understanding personality could have transformed the words into deeds, could have made the Post-Dispatch through all the days of the years a living expression of the finest traditions of free American journalism.

"This was Joseph Pulitzer's achievement. The Post-Dispatch has had many able editors in both the news and editorial departments, but the best editors cannot function effectively unless they are given encouragement and creative support from those who also control the business office. It has been no accident that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch today conducts great crusades that match the most distinguished efforts of its past; that its news columns have continuously been used to explain as well as recount the news of the day, that its editorial page is genuinely distinguished for independence of thought, its fire and passion, its earnest search for the truth beneath controversy.

"It may safely be said that only one or two American newspapers are read so eagerly and faithfully in governmental and journalistic offices elsewhere as the Post-Dispatch. This St. Louis publication is sometimes called 'the Manchester Guardian of America,' and that is a high compliment, because the Guardian is recognized all over the world as a spokesman for the best in independent English thought. But something may be added—that the greatness of the Post-Dispatch is peculiarly American. It is respected because it expresses in our modern day the long American passion for the full flowering of our democracy.

"Newspapers like the Post-Dispatch, with the boldness to make their own assessments of events, with a dedicated devotion to the truth, have a great part reserved in our times, when human society is riven by anxieties, when even in our own land there are many voices counseling fear, when winds of suspicion are set in motion among us.

"Joseph Pulitzer maintained his Post-Dispatch as a fighter for freedom, for democracy, for the rights of man. His inner spirit lighted by his father's concept of what a great newspaper should be, he made that concept a living reality. He thought of himself, always, as a newspaper man and he was proudest of the thought that his personal contribution to the Post-Distpatch was the leadership he could give as a newspaper man. What finer thing could be said of any man than that he took something given into his hands and by his stewardship passed it on to others the better for his life?"

Rabbi Jacob R. Mazur, president of St. Louis Rabbinical Association:

"There is no manner of expressing our appreciation of Joseph Pulitzer than by praying that his spirit may become incarnated in the men whose duty it is to continue to write the truth.

"Would God, that Joseph Pulitzer might reappear, as it were, in the men whose privilege it may be to bring to the people of our community the thoughts and the truth, set forth by his father and by him. 'A good name is better than precious perfume.' "

Charles Zadock, vice president and director of Gimbel Bros., Milwaukee:

"The editorial tributes that are being paid to his courageous and noble career, in newspapers throughout the land, create a sense of loss for those of us who believe in a free press as Joseph Pultizer understood it."

Gerry Allard, Springfield, Ill.:

"He was able to demonstrate that while the real was often subject to change, the ideal was permanent, as permanent as the centuries.

"If a coal mine is a little safer, if a working man's home is a little more comfortable, if those who are fortunately situated are a little more tolerant, and if the radical has learned a new respect for the slow processes of democracy, the Post-Dispatch under the helm of Joseph Pulitzer certainly contributed its full share to these civilizing influences. We are better people because of him and his work."

United States Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon:

"His interests were never local or provincial. He was a citizen of the whole Nation in the truest sense. He realized that what happened to people and to resources in Oregon or anywhere in the Nation was also of concern to Missouri. The crusades and causes which he directed helped to make all of America a better place."

Dr. George W. Crane, Chicago, writer of a syndicated column on psychology:

"He was always deeply interested in the problems of young people * * * a stalwart defender of idealism."

Lt. Col. Glenn J. Harris, commanding St. Louis ordnance district:

"The history of the Post-Dispatch itself is sufficient evidence of his stature as a publisher. But he was inherently so modest that probably few are aware of the courageous and constructive influence he exerted for the welfare of his city over the years."

Norman E. Isaacs, former managing editor of the old St. Louis Star-Times, now managing editor of the Louisville (Ky.) Times:

"Having had a little St. Louis experience, I probably have a fuller realization than most outsiders for the strength and wisdom of J. P. He was one who richly deserved his rank among the journalistic greats."

Robert W. Otto, president of Laclede Gas Co.:

"His reputation as a great editor is known around the world and his many accomplishments were recorded almost daily in the newspaper to which he was so devoted. While he was stern and uncompromising in dealing with the news, those of us who have met him personally recognized a kind-

liness—a certain gentleness of manner—that certainly must have tempered many difficult decisions. He was a man who commanded great respect even among those who might differ with him in editorial matters."

Edgar Shook, Kansas City, attorney:

"Looking at the whole function and service of the Post-Dispatch, I wish to say that I regard its editorial page as the greatest in the country. For years I have continued the practice of securing the Sunday edition to read its splendid articles and editorials."

John Raeburn Green, St. Louis, attorney:

"The loss is not confined to his family, not to his friends, nor even to those who had met him personally. It will be felt by millions who knew him only through the Post-Dispatch. It is a national loss. * * *

"As I see it, what made him a great man, more than anything else, was his profound integrity."

"Son of Famous Editor, He Realized in Full the Ideals of His Father"—Statements From Newspaper Editorial Columns and Personal Tributes to Joseph Pulitzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, following the death of Joseph Pulitzer recently after 43 years as head of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, newspapers throughout the country devoted thoughtful editorials expressing their appreciation for the contributions this great editor made to American journalism.

Following are some of those editorials along with personal tributes from Americans in all walks of life:

NEWSPAPERS ATTEST THEIR RESPECT FOR CRUSADING ZEAL FOR REFORM AGAINST INJUSTICE AND CORRUPTION—"SON OF FAMOUS EDITOR, HE REALIZED IN FULL THE IDEALS OF HIS FATHER"—HIS "MARK IS ON THOUSAND OTHER NEWSPAPERS"—BIG SHOES TO FILL, "HE FILLED THEM WELL"

New York Herald Tribune:

"In his 43 years at the head of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Joseph Pulitzer maintained within the newspaper a vitality and a sense of public responsibility that made it a national institution. The vigor, the crusading zeal, of the Post-Dispatch never flagged. It held to a high standard of fairness in controversy and did not lose sight of the larger picture in exposing evils. As a result, even those who differed with Mr. Pulitzer and his paper politically, held them in high respect.

"Geographically, the Post-Dispatch is a newspaper of the Mississippi Valley. It exerts a powerful influence there, and much of its interest is concentrated on the events of the region. National and international news, however, is treated fully and authoritatively, and the viewpoint of the paper is never narrowly sectional.

"Mr. Pulitzer was the heir to the tradition of his father, founder of the Post-Dispatch and dynamic leader of the World in New York City. That tradition combined an active concern for local happenings with a broad outlook. The son adhered to these principles; he kept the application of them in key with the changing times and thus made the Post-Dispatch a modern newspaper in modern America. The profession of journalism will hold his memory in honor as an outstanding supporter of its finest code."

Milwaukee Journal:

"If a newspaper can be the extended shadow of one man, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under Joseph Pulitzer was such a paper.

"A crusading journal that exposed injustice and corruption and campaigned for reform, the newspaper reflected the high purpose and courage of the man who was its editor and publisher for more than 40 years. His unexpected death takes from American journalism one of its ablest, most respected figures.

"Son of a famous editor, he realized in full the ideals of his father. But where the elder Pulitzer won his greatest fame with the New York World, it fell to the son to make the family's original St. Louis paper a powerful, national institution.

"The measure of the man can be gaged by the good fights his paper waged—and won. They ranged from helping expose the Teapot Dome scandal of the Harding era to helping balk Franklin D. Roosevelt on his Supreme Court packing scheme; from uncovering vote frauds in St. Louis to campaigning against the city's smoke pall; from investigating the Centralia (Ill.) mine disaster to revealing corruption in the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue under Harry Truman.

"Joseph Pulitzer was a builder as well as a crusader. His paper contributed greatly to the well-being of his city, State, and Nation. In the process it also prospered. It stands ready to continue its vigorous way even though its leader—who always considered himself just an 'everyday newspaperman'—has departed."

Chicago Tribune:

"Joseph Pulitzer, son, namesake, and spiritual heir of the founder of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York World, died late last Wednesday. Our own great loss, suffered a day later, prevented us paying tribute earlier to this able editor and publisher.

"There is no newspaper in the United States from which the Tribune has differed more widely and consistently on national and international policy than the Post-Dispatch, but this did not blind us to the quality of its editor and the men he selected and trained to write and draw for his newspaper. In other fields than national policy, particularly where political corruption and attacks on the Bill of Rights were concerned, we frequently found ourselves shoulder to shoulder with Editor Pulitzer and his men.

"Mr. Pulitzer was, like every great newspaperman, an editor first. He was also a most able businessman, recognizing that the newspaper that expresses vigorous opinions must possess the financial strength to stand off any reprisals that its vigor evokes. He inherited a sound property and enhanced its prosperity many times. He recognized that it takes good men to put out a good newspaper. He assembled a large staff, paid it well, and worked it hard.

"Mr. Pulitzer was a shy man, and in his younger days (he undertook the management of the Post-Dispatch in 1911) must have suffered from the fact that he was the son of a very famous publisher. In the public eye he was sometimes overshadowed by some of his brilliant employees, but from the beginning of his regime, the Post-Dispatch was his newspaper, the product of his ideas and his direction."

Mexico (Mo.) Ledger:

"Under Joseph Pulitzer the Post-Dispatch became one of the most respected newspapers in America. Various authorities have called it 1 of the 5 best newspapers in the United States, and 1 of the 10 best in the world. * * *

"To fully understand what Joseph Pulitzer did, you must understand newspapers. Newspapers are never any better or worse than the people who put them out—their talent, dedication, and enthusiasm. Further, the production of newspapers is unlike the production of any other product you can pick up in your hands. Every day a newspaper must be different. It sells solely because it is different. And it must not sell just once, but sell every day, year in and year out. Yet, just selling is not enough. To be really good, to approach the greatness of the Post-Dispatch under Joseph Pulitzer, it must stand daily dedicated to the highest ideals of democracy, it must stand dedicated to fearless objectivity in reporting the news to its readers, it must stand dedicated to fearless, unobstructed expression of its own opinion on important issues and do it solely on one page—the editorial page.

"To do these things a newspaper requires day-to-day and often hour-to-hour decisions which, once made, must stand up in cold print for distribution into the homes of nearly all the people able to read in the newspaper's area of circulation.

"Thus these decisions come with great pressure, are important, must be highly responsible, and carry with them the danger of destruction as well as the possible blessing of building better things to come."

* * * * *

"The Post-Dispatch under Joseph Pulitzer was respected. It may well be the greatest crusading newspaper of his time. When the Post-Dispatch believed in a cause, it fought for it. It fought tooth and nail. Certainly, it lost sometimes. But it never lost without the more important honor of having done its best to win."

* * * * *

"To be such a newspaper was, inevitably, to inspire better newspapers, better government, better living for the living.

"Certainly, the mark of the Post-Dispatch under Joseph Pulitzer is on the ledger. While this newspaper has never agreed completely with the Post-Dispatch or any other newspaper, and it must never merely follow, the mark of the Post-Dispatch is here—as it is on a thousand other newspapers in this country.

"That mark—the mark of Joseph Pulitzer—is not primarily in terms of such important things as the typeface used in headlines, the means of engraving pictures, nor other decisions weighed heavily with the kind of equipment and the size of the staff available to the newspaper.

"His more important mark is in terms of courage, of doing well the all-important job of serving readers who depend upon the newspaper for facts, of being sincere and honest in expressing an opinion in an editorial. In short, his most important mark is in terms of rising above self, above human weaknesses, in trying to serve the high cause of American journalism—the people's right to know."

* * * * *

"Our country, our State, St. Louis, and a thousand other towns are better because Joseph Pulitzer lived.

"Because he published a newspaper dedicated to the high ideals of his profession, to the high ideals of democracy itself.

"Because his day-to-day, hour-by-hour decisions did more to build than to destroy.

"For men who dedicate their lives to publishing a newspaper, we know of no higher mark to make."

Chicago American:

"An outstanding personality in American journalism passed from the scene with the death of Joseph Pulitzer, editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"Young Joe or Young J. P., as he was known to distinguish him from his famous father of the same name, carried on the elder Pulitzer's example of courageous, crusading journalism. He wanted to be known as a

working newspaperman. He was, and a good one.

"Mr. Pulitzer originated many of his newspaper's crusades, and he fought hard for freedom of the press when it was threatened. In one notable instance, when an editorial writer and cartoonist were sentenced to jail for contempt of court, Mr. Pulitzer wrote a signed editorial, thus inviting the same sentence, and fought the case through to victory.

"He was in the great tradition."

New York Post:

"In an era when successful newspapers have too often let success become synonymous with complacent conservatism, Pulitzer's P-D has never lost its warm heart and its fighting spirit.

"Now Young Joe is dead, but the tradition endures; for his son—Joseph Pulitzer, Jr.—remains to carry on this great newspaper story. The same credo remains on the editorial page, and the name of Pulitzer will continue to stand for the worthiest instincts of American journalism."

Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier:

"Joseph Pulitzer bore a name justly respected in American journalism. A working editor and publisher at 70, he still was on the job when sudden illness cut him down. His father was founder of the Post-Dispatch and later publisher of the New York World, now absorbed in a combination. The elder Pulitzer died October 29, 1911, in Charleston Harbor. He had lived aboard his yacht in retirement after a fabulous rise to wealth and power. It is for him that the Pulitzer prizes in journalism and the arts are named.

"The Post-Dispatch, under guidance of Pulitzer's son and namesake, has upheld the best traditions of journalistic courage and service. Five times the Post-Dispatch has won Pulitzer awards—and earned them. Fortunately for the profession, a third Joseph Pulitzer has been trained in the business and succeeds his father as publisher."

The Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader:

"The bearer of a great name in American journalism, Joseph Pulitzer was his father's son. At the editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for 43 years when death claimed him * * *, he added new luster to the family escutcheon. No newspaper in America commands more respect than the enterprising and crusading Post-Dispatch, a monument he now shares with his illustrious parent.

"Joseph Pulitzer was primarily an editor, although he held the title of publisher. To him, the business end was incidental. He was a businessman by necessity, an editor by choice.

"A native of New York, Young Joe, as he was known to distinguish him from his father, learned the hard way. His father, no easy taskmaster himself, put him under the tutelage of Charles Chapin, who had a well-deserved reputation of being a hard-boiled news editor. Later, the father sent his namesake to St. Louis with a note to the editor which read: 'Will you try to knock some newspaper sense into his head?'

"Young Joe was an apt pupil, so the task was not difficult. Later, as an editor and publisher, he himself was exacting, but it was to carry out his father's parting admonition to 'fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogs of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing the news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.'

"He learned his lesson well."

St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press:

"Missouri has lost its most famous editor. * * *

"The Pulitzer name stands high in American journalism. The founder of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch (he bought the Post and the Dispatch and merged them) was a Hungarian Jew born in Budapest. He came to America a poor boy. The Civil War was raging and he at once joined the Union armies. At the close of the war he settled in St. Louis, already known as a haven for European refugees by the residence of the notable Senator Carl Schurz.

"The elder Joseph Pulitzer made the name great. This Joseph Pulitzer made it even greater. His life was serene and his soul was gentle. Yet this kind, soft-speaking, near-sighted editor and publisher was the general of many a crusading army.

"The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has come thousands of miles farther in progressive journalism in the 43 years of this Editor Pulitzer's reign than it did in the years from 1878 to 1911 of the father's regime.

"The influence of this Joseph Pulitzer was nationwide among newspapermen. Any well-considered list of America's 10 best newspapers would include the Post-Dispatch.

"The illustrious name of Joseph Pulitzer will not die. Joseph Pulitzer III has been associate editor of the newspaper and vice president of the corporation. May he continue in the grand traditions established by his grandfather and so nobly carried on by his sire."

Trenton (N. J.) Evening Times:

"The name of Joseph Pulitzer has lost nothing of its luster since that day in 1878 when Joseph Pulitzer, an immigrant who had managed to accumulate $2,500, bought the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

"Pulitzer was a man of genius and of ideals. He built one of the great independent newspapers of the Nation. It has remained faithful to his principles down to this day.

"A great measure of the credit for the preservation of its bright tradition belongs to his son, Joseph Pulitzer, editor and publisher, now dead at the age of 70, leaving Joseph Pulitzer III in command.

"The death of Mr. Pulitzer is a heavy loss to American journalism. The Post-Dispatch, however, is firmly wedded to cardinal principles which have made it a crusading newspaper, pledged to fight for progress and reform and against injustice and corruption."

Minneapolis Morning Tribune:

"The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was a great newspaper when Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., * * * took charge of it at the age of 27. For many years, it was overshadowed by its sister paper, the New York World, upon which the first Joseph Pulitzer and his heirs lavished most of their attention and resources.

"But the World passed out of existence nearly a quarter of a century ago while the Post-Dispatch increased steadily in influence and prestige. The Post-Dispatch of today is a monument to the able and courageous leadership given it over a period of 43 years by Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., as well as to the first Pulitzer who founded it.

"There is a third Joseph Pulitzer to guide the destinies of the Post-Dispatch. He inherits a staff trained by his father in the best traditions and techniques of independent journalism."

Missouri Typographical News:

"On March 31, the world was informed of the death of Joseph Pulitzer, Sr. To the reading public, so informed, the reaction could have been to any degree known. But to the employees of Mr. Pulitzer, all members of the Allied Printing Trades or American Newspaper Guild, this news brought the most genuine sorrow, knowing they had lost an understanding, interested friend.

"The St. Louis Post-Dispatch under Mr. Pulitzer and his father, the founder, has been consistent and wholly fair to organized labor for 75 years, perhaps without parallel amongst newspapers in the United States. A liberal pension plan, vacations and sick leave benefits were an established contractural practice under Mr. Pulitzer for years before reactionary publishers of the country were compelled to accede.

"Representatives on negotiating committees of the Post-Dispatch employees have always felt they had a friend in court when the chips were down and a break was prayerfully desired. We sincerely hope our Maker gives J. P. all the breaks the heavenly law allows."

Chicago Sun-Times:

"Joseph Pulitzer was one of the great newspaper editors of our time. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch is regarded throughout the world, especially among members of the newspaper profession, with profound admiration and respect.

"The Post-Dispatch was founded in 1878 by Mr. Pulitzer's father, for whom he was named. The elder Pulitzer also bought the New York World in 1883 and developed it, as he had the Post-Dispatch, into a crusading newspaper dedicated to the people.

"Young Joe Pulitzer, therefore, had big shoes to fill when in 1912 he took over the Post-Dispatch direction a few months after the death of his father. He filled them exceedingly well."

St. Louis Labor Tribune (AFL):

"He was the worthy son of a great father. He carried on the family responsibility of publishing a metropolitan daily on the high plane set by his sire, who rates among the immortals of the American press.

"Joseph Pulitzer worked hard his whole natural life toward furthering the enterprise that was his heritage. Under his 43 years of long and exacting supervision, this great liberal newspaper grew and expanded and almost fanatically adhered to following the course set by its founder to best serve the community, State, and Nation according to his lights.

"We have always entertained a large measure of respect and admiration for this powerful crusading newspaper and its devotion to high press standards.

"Joseph Pulitzer was the kind of man who inspired personal loyalty and devotion to duty and principle. He compensated outstanding work most liberally and sought the best qualified and ablest men for the job."

The (Tucson) Arizona Daily Star, in a front-page editorial signed by William R. Mathews, editor and publisher:

"Joseph Pulitzer, editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was one of the great editors and publishers of the United States. Although he inherited the paper from his distinguished father, he more than lived up to the standards of excellence that his father had established.

"As a member of the Pulitzer Prize Committee since 1945, I got to know him well. He presided at our meetings, which are held the last week in April each year at Columbia University in New York.

"As the presiding chairman, he was a model of fairness and patience. That is saying a whole lot, because this committee, composed of working newspaper editors, would find itself split wide open at times with differences of opinion. Every one of these editors was capable of expressing himself with piercing English language, and at times when these differences would develop the air was surcharged with intellectual electricity.

"How newspaper editors can differ in opinions.

"Amid it all Mr. Pulitzer would always remain calm. He seemed to enjoy the battle of wits, and knew when to intervene and bring about a conclusion. I can remember only a couple of occasions when he would press a point regarding an award. Only once did I hear him urgently protest a contemplated action, and in this instance I was on his side. Out of respect to him the action was modified.

"On the other hand, he was put in the embarrassing position by the feats of his newspaper in its repeated accomplishments in public service, particularly in exposing corruption, not only in Missouri and Illinois, but in Washington. Against his opposition, we unanimously awarded the Post-Dispatch the Pulitzer Prize twice.

"So few people of the country realize that the Post-Dispatch did more than anyone else to expose the corruption that went on in the Truman administration, particularly in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, where so much cheating on income-tax returns was done.

"As a newspaper the Post-Dispatch is 1 of the 4 most influential newspapers in the country. Its news columns as well as its editorial page are read in top places in Washington every day. It produces more original news of nationwide importance than any other paper in the country except the New York Times. Its editorial page is a powerful one, but also an interesting one, and frequently indulges in that scarcest activity in the country, good humor.

"The one outstanding caracteristic of the paper is that in carrying on its continuous and militant devotion to the general welfare, it is carrying out the policy established by the first Joseph Pulitzer. That is a great accomplishment for a son to carry out. And now another son has the same tradition to carry on."

Louis LaCoss, editor of the editorial page, St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

"I respected him tremendously as a great newspaperman, and admired him for his human qualities as I encountered them in my occasional social contacts with him. I shall never forget his kind note when I won the Pulitzer award in 1952. Coming from a Pulitzer, it was doubly prized."

Charles H. Williams, Litchfield, Ill.:

"I * * * worked for him nearly 30 years as circulation roadman. Respected and admired him very much, mostly from afar off, as I had only a few direct dealings with him.

"But I studied his editorials, greatly appreciated his treatment of employees, and listened often to * * * praise * * * of him and his high ethical standards. It was a pleasure to pass these on to prospective readers.

"He will be missed by his employees."

Homer A. Hill, managing editor of the Rural Electric Missourian:

"We feel a deep loss and we know that the rural people we serve feel that a real friend has passed on.

"Mr. Pulitzer, through the Post-Dispatch, has stood unshakably as a champion of their rights many times.

"When the history of today's journalism is written, we are sure that Mr. Pulitzer, like his crusading father, will stand as one of the great of all time.

"More than that, everywhere men who value freedom and the dignity of man will mourn the passing of this outstanding American."

Virgil L. Border, St. Louis director, National Conference of Christians and Jews:

"Mr. Pulitzer has not only been an outstanding newspaper man, but truly a champion of human rights and a strong voice for all that is just and decent."

C. H. Kwock, associate editor of the Chinese World, San Francisco:

"We join the world in mourning the loss of your father—a real inspiration to us all in the Chinese World office."

Stewart Alsop, newspaper columnist, Washington:

"He was a great and courageous publisher of a great and courageous paper. There are too few left, in both categories."

Paul Beisman, manager of theatrical enterprises, St. Louis:

"He was a tremendous force in journalism and St. Louis is a much better city because of the great newspaper he published."

George W. Healty, Jr., editor of the Times-Picayune, New Orleans:

"We of the Times-Picayune join with other newspapermen throughout the world in expressing our sorrow. * * * He was a fine editor and a fine friend."

Milton I. Goldstein, president of Jewish Community Relations Council of St. Louis:

"Under his guidance the St. Louis Post-Dispatch achieved a preeminent position as a newspaper devoted to the ideals of democracy. We are sure that his influence, in the great and honored tradition of the founder of the Post-Dispatch, will continue to guide its policies in the future."

Barry Bingham, president of the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times:

"I have admired him greatly, and his career has seemed to me the best of all arguments for the maintenance of high moral standards in journalism."

Paul Ghali, Paris Bureau, the Chicago Daily News:

"Mr. Pulitzer's life and achievements have been an example and an inspiration for all of us."

Phil M. Hitchcock, editor, St. Louis Labor Journal:

"Labor has lost a true friend."

Lester A. Walton, diplomat and newspaper writer, New York:

"Journalism has sustained the irreparable loss of a great publisher and editor of a great daily newspaper of recognized local, regional, and national influence."

J. Lukin Brown, Silex, Mo., in a letter to the editor:

"As one who has read, enjoyed, and admired your newspaper for many years, and, having read many others, consider it one of the best, I feel this is a fitting time to express my appreciation of its excellence. Often, when I have felt deeply on an issue and wished to write the editor about it, an editorial in the Post-Dispatch has so perfectly expressed my idea and attitude that my letter was made superfluous.

"For all of this, thanks. May the Post-Dispatch continue to be the thoughtful, liberal journal that it has been in the past. Perhaps the king is dead, but long live the king."

Ellen Pedroza, St. Louis, in a letter to the editor:

"I am a comparative stranger in St. Louis, having been here only 5 months. But I have developed a deep respect for your paper due to your fine editorial page. Until the day he died, I did not know the name of your publisher. I did not need to know his name to know that he was a fine man of high ideals."

D. Arthur Bowman, St. Louis, in a letter to the editor:

"Those privileged to know the late Joseph Pulitzer were conscious of his constant devotion to the community he graced and his unwavering support of its welfare."

"He was nonpartisan in the finest sense. He never faltered in his insistence on community betterment.

"How well do thousands of its readers recall the Progress or Decay series—a veritable clarion call which evoked thunderous response and public acclaim.

"Beyond the confines of his residence his activities were a tradition to many in the newspaper industry. To the people of his area his career was an inspiration."

Norman A. Goldberg, commander, Department of Missouri, Jewish War Veterans:

"We have always been proud of the newspaper he guided and built into one of the great progressive and liberal forces in our country."

Thomas J. Watson, board chairman, International Business Machines Corp., New York:

"His distinguished career as editor and newspaper publisher, along with his many other contributions in the public interest, will remain as a lasting monument to his memory."

Roy Howard, editor and president, New York World-Telegran and Sun (by cable from Karachi, Pakistan):

"My deepest sympathy to you and your family in your and American journalism's great loss."

Mark R. Holloran, St. Louis:

"By his work, Joseph Pulitzer became closely associated with all the people of this part of the country and we all share in a measure the loss and sorrow in his passing to a new life."

C. G. Renz, Barstow, Calif.:

"In the winning of the West, a man could not be a coward, nor weak, but had to be strong in order to survive.

"Now that applies to Mr. Pulitzer * * * a man who did not know what fear * * * meant."

Felix Frankfurter, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court:

"* * * I held him in high esteem, and though our direct meetings were few * * * I felt a strong congeniality of spirit between us. Not the least source of a community of feeling was his outlook on the function and responsibility of the press. His own expressed opinions have encouraged me in some of my convictions."

Julian S. Rammelkamp, Albion, Mich.:

"* * * I never met him, but from devoting several years to a study of the Post-Dispatch, I know he takes a place alongside his father in building and maintaining a tradition of journalism which is not repeated anywhere else in the United States."

Arthur H. Compton, former chancellor of Washington University:

"I must add a word of appreciation for what your father has meant, not only to the community and the Nation, but more particularly to the educational interests that I have represented. When it was needed most, the Post-Dispatch, with your father's cordial good wishes, gave to those of us who were struggling to bring Washington University into its vitally needed place in the city's life the help that was needed. The attitude of the St. Louis newspapers, of sympathetic (if sometimes constructively critical) concern for a healthy development of the city's university education, is one of the most important factors that are making it possible to build here something significant."

Arthur H. Motley, president of Parade Publication, Inc., New York:

"Nothing can remove the sting of the loss of a great person. But as I picked up the Kansas City Star, the Chicago Daily News, the New York Times, I read reflected there as it was in all the world, a recognition of the fineness of the man and the greatness of his contribution."

Lt. Col. Glenn Ryan, divisional commander, The Salvation Army, St. Louis:

"Because of his outstanding service to not only this community, but also to a considerable extent to the whole country, and because of the continual encouragement and help the Salvation Army has received from the Post-Dispatch, I write to express our sympathy to you. Nothing good is lost, and long after his physical presence is gone, the life of your father will continue in the thousands who have been informed, guided, and helped by him."

Miguel Aleman, former President of Mexico:

"Premit me to present to the Pulitzer family and to the great newspaper my condolences at the lamentable loss suffered by them and by the peoples of the free world."

Rogerio de la Selva, former chief secretary to the President of Mexico:

"The de la Selva family would like to manifest to the family of Joseph Pulitzer and members of the great newspaper the regrets they feel for such an immeasurable loss."

Robert M. White II, general manager of The Mexico Ledger, Mexico, Mo.:

"Trying to pay editorial tribute to your father is sort of like trying to climb Mount Everest."

Eddie Cantor, entertainer, Palm Springs, Calif.:

"My deepest sympathy to you in the passing of your illustrious father for whom I along with other millions of Americans, have had the greatest respect and admiration."

Mrs. J. E. Mitchell, St. Louis Argus Publishing Co.:

"In the passing of Joseph Pulitzer it is comforting to know that he was a community builder in every sense of the word. He was dedicated to the furtherance of the high ideals of journalism and ethical standards to which all true newspapermen aspire. We will always remember the forthright manner in which Mr. Pulitzer treated every question on human justice and fair play. Truly his philosophy was that of a true American."

Bela Kornitzer, New York:

"He was the first American public figure I had the privilege of meeting shortly after I took refuge from Hungary. The name Pulitzer will continue to be, I am sure, an inspiration to journalists everyhwere."

A Great Newspaper Sums Up Its Evaluation of Its Own Great Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many comments by many outstanding Americans and by outstanding newspapers on the life and work of Joseph Pulitzer, who died recently after 43 years as editor and publisher of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I think the most fitting statement to close this series of tributes to a great editor, who was the son of a great editor and is the father of the Joseph Pulitzer now continuing the tradition of the Post-Dispatch journalistic excellence, is to insert in the RECORD the Post-Dispatch's own editorial on their editor at the time of his death.

It is a tribute to a man who was "more at home in the editorial sanctum than in the countingroom." "Wherever he was, his heart was in the rolling Mississippi Valley of his newspaper. St. Louis was work and home."

The editorial Joseph Pulitzer, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, immediately after the death of that fine man, is as follows:

Next to his family, if not equal with it, Joseph Pulitzer's life was the Post-Dispatch. The man and the newspaper grew up together in a sense and together they lived through nearly the same three-quarters of a century. The newspaper was established by his father, the first Joseph Pulitzer, in 1878. It was only 7 years later that the Post-Dispatch's editor and publisher was born.

Mr. Pulitzer's personal association with the Post-Dispatch lacked but 1 year of rounding out to 50. Since 1912 he had been president of the Pulitzer Publishing Co. and in active charge of the editing and shaping of the daily and Sunday editions. In more recent years he had been a leader in the development of radio and television. Stations KSD and KSD–TV are monuments to his enterprise in the newer fields of communication.

These are essential facts in any summary of his life, but they hardly more than begin to tell what kind of man Joseph Pulitzer was or how he was regarded by his fellow newspaper men over the country.

Those who worked with Mr. Pulitzer came to know the many qualities that marked him for journalistic leadership. Outstanding among these was his ability to keep his mind open until the evidence was in. He steadily sought new information and was always ready to revise his judgments in the light of later data. Staff discussions led by him were frequent, free and searching. Then, when the newspaper's course was set, he stayed on it with purpose and determination.

The expression of the contrary view commanded his warm respect. He strongly invited opinions that differed from his own. The editors and department heads might be overruled in the final decision. Yet their ideas were ever welcomed and evaluated. And he usually accepted the advice provided, for he trusted the men he gathered around him.

As the staff wrote to Mr. Pulitzer on the occasion of his 70th birthday just 10 days ago, the common experience was that he treated his associates and subordinates with the consideration that he himself would have expected if the situation had been reversed. He was exacting in his requirements, as he needed to be, but he did not breach the rule of courtesy in being so. He respected a man because man is human and needs a pride in himself that includes a respect for ideas.

As an editor and publisher he gave a great deal of time to thinking about politics and political problems, invariably from the viewpoint of the independent voter. Under his direction, the Post-Dispatch, always independent itself, supported both Republicans and Democrats for mayor, for seats in Congress, for governor, for President of the United States. His disposition was to be tolerant of human frailties, but he could and often did lash out at officials who betrayed the public trust by faithlessness in office.

Underlying all this was his intense belief in the people's right to know, as requisite to informed self-government at every level. He demonstrated this countless times with long and exhaustive news investigations and burning editorial crusades. He was as ready to take up the unpopular cause of an unknown GI's immigrant war bride, unjustly held on Ellis Island, as to deal with some prominent subject currently talked about by everyone.

He preferred to be an editor and was widely acclaimed as one. As he said, his heart was "more at home in the editorial sanctum than in the counting room." But he was vigilant to see that the Post-Dispatch was financially successful because he knew that if its survival was in doubt it could not be independent and bold on its editorial page or strong and probing in its news columns.

As community leaders go Joseph Pulitzer was not known firsthand to many people. This was because of his profound conviction that the editor ought to do his work in his newspaper office, not on committees or public bodies, however worthy they might be. He believed that the newspaper's support of good works was the more effective because of the freedom that goes with detachment. He made few personal appearances, but when he talked in public his listeners observed that he spoke pointedly and felicitously.

Away from the office, his many friends knew him as a warm human being who thoroughly enjoyed the good things of life. He loved the rugged islands and blue waters of the Maine coast where he went in summer, but wherever he was his heart was in the rolling Mississippi Valley of his newspaper. St. Louis was work and home.

Joseph Pulitzer's career emphasizes the journalistic continuity that began with his father and now continues. The men and women of the Post-Dispatch salute his life and pledge anew their resolution to be guided each day by the newspaper's platform that was his daily creed.

Imports of Frozen Tuna

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the tuna situation grows more serious in southern California because of the increasing imports of duty-free frozen tuna, a practice perpetuated by the terms of the new Geneva agreement on foreign trade.

Under unanimous consent, I include as a portion of my remarks an editorial and a recent letter on the subject:

[From the San Diego Union of June 11, 1955]

TUNA STRATEGY CLEAR

This much can be said on the disclosure of agreements regarding importations of tuna: A period of indecision now is over and with the present announcement as a guide definite plans can be drawn for the effort which must be made to gain an equitable quota on tuna imports.

The agreement negotiated in Geneva with Japan contains some surprising setbacks, but there were few who expected this announcement to be highly favorable to local interests. It is notable that there are some loopholes in the Geneva agreement. But provision for a tuna quota must be made in Washington—not elsewhere.

A working trade agreement with Japan is understandable. The Nipponese islanders cannot exist without export markets. They also import some United States goods, like cotton. And some of their exports must come into the United States or the Japanese will be driven to Communist markets.

But under these provisions it still should be possible to arrange a quota agreement for an industry such as tuna. It would provide for more economically efficient fishing, and it would stabilize fishing in the United States and Japan.

President Eisenhower has said that "no American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure" (the foreign trade bill). The task ahead now is to make known the fact that the fishing industry is in jeopardy without a quota—that it would not be with a quota.

The United States cannot afford to lose its fishing fleet, a valuable reserve force in time of emergency.

All forces in the community should unite to help the fishing industry establish fair and equitable quotas.

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., June 7, 1955.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Public Services Division of the Department of State on May 25 issued a form letter to respond to letters received from persons in or connected with the tuna industry and designed "to clarify certain aspects of the foreign trade between the United States and Japan."

Important matters affecting tuna producers are covered in this release which require rather detailed answers. In order to do this we are writing you three letters, of which this is the first.

The third paragraph of the release says, in effect, that imports have increased but United States fishermen sold more fish in 1954 than before and figures are furnished to show this presumed relative prosperity.

Our position is that the facts should be given objectively and without minimizing one set of facts and maximizing another. A clear statement of the two sets of facts is in order as follows:

1. Imports of tuna have increased over recent years.

With specific reference to frozen tuna this may be shown as follows:

[Pounds round weight]

Year	Total [1]	Japan only [1]
1948	9,100,000	2,400,000
1949	20,600,000	2,800,000
1950	56,700,000	25,400,000
1951	62,100,000	35,700,000
1952	69,000,000	51,000,000
1953	95,100,000	77,400,000
1954	123,400,000	98,000,000

[1] U. S. Department of Commerce (nearest 100,000 pounds).

Imports of frozen tuna have increased over recent years (1948–54) from all countries combined in the amount of 1,256 percent, and from Japan only by 3,983 percent.

For the first 4 months of 1955 the following comparison in imports of frozen tuna may be made with the comparable period of 1954:

January-April 1954 33,700,000
January-April 1955 50,500,000

Imports of frozen tuna have increased 50 percent over the record year 1954.

The Public Services Division has limited its comment to the fisherman (producer); therefore, our comments and statistics are limited to his particular situation. There have been significant increases in canned tuna and tuna-like imports in addition to frozen tuna imports, and there have also been shifts of emphasis of imports from canned to frozen—all of which burden the American fisherman (producer). The ability of the domestic canner to stay in business depends on whether or not there is a domestic fleet and a domestic supply, irrespective of whether or not that particular canner buys only imported fish or both domestic and foreign fish. If the supply is almost entirely produced in Japan it will be almost entirely canned in Japan.

Hence our statement that the present problem is primarily that of the producer and should he be driven out of business the domestic processor or canner will shortly follow.

In order to preserve perspective and to read into the Public Service Division's words "over recent years" and "previous years" whatever meaning is intended, the record should show that the 5 year prewar annual average (1936–40) of Japanese frozen tuna shipments to the United States was 5,380,000 pounds, compared to 98 million pounds in 1954 and compared to 10,570,000 pounds in the month of April 1955 alone.

2. These same statistics, however, also demonstrate that United States fishermen sold more tuna in 1954 than in previous years.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior published Fishery Leaflet 393 (revised) under date of March 1955. The attention of the Public Services Division is invited to page 25 of that publication, setting forth the domestic catch of tuna and tuna-like fishes as follows:

Year:	*Pounds*
1948	328,872,000
1949	335,680,000
1950	392,373,000
1951	319,748,000
1952	324,914,000
1953	[1] 305,000,000
1954	[1] 325,000,000

[1] Estimated.

According to this presentation, United States fishermen did not sell more tuna in 1954 than in previous years. The tuna fishermen caught more in 1948, 1949, and 1950 than in 1954 and almost exactly the same amount in 1952. In 1953 the catch was lower because the fleet experienced one of its very rare years of poor fishing, a fact which is historically supportable. In 1951 the fleet was idled for a long period which extended into 1952—otherwise it is doubtful that 1954 production would have exceeded that year. It also should be pointed out that had not imports increased 25 million pounds domestic fishermen could have delivered more fish in 1954, as vessels were seriously delayed in unloading and sailing.

In 1955 deliveries are down 32 percent for the first 4 months of the year as compared to 1954 (not because of any failure of the fishery), a fact not revealed by the Public Service Division's report.

Again, from the standpoint of perspective and to read into the Public Service Division's words "over recent years" and "previous years" whatever meaning is intended, the record should show that the 5-year prewar annual average (1936–40) production of tuna and tunalike fish was 173,900,000 pounds, compared to the estimated 325 million pounds in 1954, an increase of 87 percent.

In light of the foregoing, paragraph 3 is not sufficiently informative and may very well be misleading inasmuch as we find:

1. Imports:

A. Imports of frozen tuna from all countries have increased over 1,200 percent since 1948.

B. Imports of frozen tuna from Japan have increased over 3,900 percent since 1948.

C. Imports for the first 4 months of 1955 are running 50 percent over the previous record year.

2. Domestic production:

A. According to published statistics United States fishermen did not sell more tuna in 1954 than in previous years. Domestic landings in 1948 rose because of additions to the fleet, continued upward in 1949 and 1950, declined in 1951, 1952, and 1953, increased in 1954, and have declined again in 1955.

B. Domestic deliveries for the first 4 months of 1955 are running 32 percent under 1954.

The Trade Agreements Act sets forth many factors for measuring injury to a domestic industry. The trend in those factors favorable to the domestic producer such as production, employment, prices, profits, wages, sales, share of the market, and size of the fleet, while subject to short periodic fluctuations, is definitely downward. The trend of those factors unfavorable to the domestic producer such as increase in actual imports and increase in relative amount of imports is steadily upward.

This is why the Department of State has received letters asking that this situation be remedied in a manner equitable to the interests of all concerned—foreign and domestic.

This is why we write this letter—in order that facts be presented as clearly as possible.

Respectfully yours.

AMERICAN TUNABOAT ASSOCIATION.
HAROLD F. CARY,
General Manager.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been drawn to correspondence to the editor of the New York Times from Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, director, economic research department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and a reply thereto by Mr. Hyman H. Bookbinder, chief of congressional research, Congress of Industrial Organizations. These two letters so clearly illustrate the fundamental differing points of view concerning the proposed increase in the minimum wage that I respectfully urge that they be compared by those who have not yet decided the merits of this issue.

The letters follow:

[From the New York Times of June 7, 1955]

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE—ABILITY OF ECONOMY TO WITHSTAND EFFECTS OF INCREASE EXAMINED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Debate on the question of raising the minimum wage often seems to be guided by a complex of political considerations. Perhaps some of the economic considerations of minimum-wage fixing should also be kept in mind.

Clearly a minimum-wage increase must be judged not by its political attractiveness but by the extent to which low-paid workers actually benefit—the extent to which the higher wage cost can be absorbed without disruptive effects.

Experience with the establishment of the 75-cent minimum in 1950 provides a means of judging the ability of the economy to adjust to a minimum-wage increase.

Labor Department figures indicate that the direct impact of the 75-cent minimum then corresponds closely with the direct impact which a 90-cent minimum would have now. In 1950, 6.6 percent of all manufacturing workers earned less than 75 cents, while 6.5 percent now earn less than 90 cents.

POSTWAR CONDITIONS

There were some unemployment effects in 1950, but they were not substantial. However, peculiar conditions prevailed in 1950 which are not now present—the backlog of postwar demand, the beginning of a building boom, and, most important, the Korean crisis, occurring within 5 months of the new minimum. These special conditions do not exist today. There is good reason to hope that we may be in for a period of continued stable prices and sound growth.

It would seem necessary to conclude that we certainly cannot risk an impact equal to that of 1950 and still realize our hopes

for price stability and an improved employment picture.

In view of the potential difficulties of a 90-cent minimum, the fact that Members of Congress are considering a $1 minimum needs to be noted. All available data indicate that the impact of a $1 minimum wage would be more than double that of a 90-cent minimum.

A 90-cent minimum reportedly would require an average hourly increase of 9 cents for workers directly affected. Obviously, a $1 minimum would require a 19-cent increase for those workers, while those earning between 90 cents and $1 would also receive increases—unless the higher minimum would simply bar them from jobs.

PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE

Labor Department studies show that in every low-wage industry, both in the United States as a whole and in the South, the required direct percentage increase in the wage bill for $1 is at least double that for 90 cents.

When the minimum goes up, furthermore, efforts are made to maintain traditional wage differentials above the minimum. Thus employers, or possibly consumers, may be asked to absorb much more than a mere increase of the minimum required by law.

Unless a minimum-wage increase can be absorbed it cannot benefit the low-paid workers for whom it is designed. The unusual circumstances of 1950 make a corresponding increase (to 90 cents) of doubtful wisdom at this time. Imposition of a $1 minimum wage, with more than double the impact of a 90-cent minimum, could have substantial unemployment effects.

EMERSON P. SCHMIDT,
Director, Economic Research Department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
WASHINGTON, *May 31, 1955.*

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1955]

RAISING OF MINIMUM WAGE—SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IS BELIEVED INDICATED AT THIS TIME

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In his letter Dr. Emerson Schmidt writes "Imposition of a $1 minimum wage could have substantial unemployment effects." This is hardly the optimism which should come from a leading spokesman for the chamber of commerce.

Dr. Schmidt has raised the same kind of fears about a modest increase in the Federal minimum wage which he and similar spokesmen have been voicing now for almost 20 years. The record is replete with warnings against the 25-cent minimum, the 40-cent minimum, and the 75-cent minimum. And the record is also replete with studies which have shown how successfully American business did in fact adjust to the various minimum-wage levels. It simply is not true, as alleged, that previous impacts were aided by wars.

This country can—and should—take a substantial increase in the minimum wage in stride at this time. Even the $1.25 figure supported by organized labor and by numerous independent economists and public officials would raise total payrolls in affected industries by only about 2 percent. The $1 minimum which has been voted out by the Senate Labor Committee would increase payrolls by one-half of 1 percent. It is this one-half of 1 percent increase in payrolls which leads Dr. Schmidt to fear substantial unemployment effects.

OPPOSITION IN MINORITY

Such fears flow not from a realistic analysis of the facts but from basic opposition to minimum-wage legislation in the first place. The chamber of commerce has constantly and consistently opposed such legislation, as a perusal of its economic publications will show. The chamber is certainly entitled to its viewpoint on the wisdom of minimum-wage legislation, but fortunately it is in a very tiny minority of opponents. Both political parties are agreed that the minimum wage should be raised; there is difference only on the amount.

In the recently concluded hearings before the Senate Labor Committee a wealth of impressive testimony was submitted in support of a $1.25 minimum, let alone a $1 minimum. Although there cannot be too precise a determination of such a wage, in the absence of specified criteria in the Fair Labor Standards Act, suggestive of the type of justification which has been made for $1.25 minimum is the following:

Since 1938, when the Congress decided that 40 cents was a reasonable minimum-wage objective, average wages in American industry have increased from 62 cents to $1.86—a threefold increase. A threefold increase in the minimum wage would come to $1.20. The $1.25 proposal would merely add 5 cents for the purpose of narrowing the differential between the lowest and highest wage groups.

Certainly the $1 minimum adopted by the Senate committee can be justified without any difficulty whatsoever. A prima facie case can be made on the simple grounds of increases in cost of living and national productivity alone. The cost of living since 1949 has risen by at least 15 percent. Productivity in the American economy has increased since then by at least 20 percent. Taken together, these factors require a minimum wage of more than $1 an hour. This does not take into consideration other relevant considerations such as general wage movements, budget requirements and competitive factors.

ORGANIZED LABOR'S STAND

Although organized labor is among the most active groups working for a realistic change in the minimum wage and extension of the law's coverage to as many people as possible, the fact is that this legislation is, in the best sense of the word, in the public interest. There are very few members of trade unions who would benefit directly from $1 or $1.25 minimum wage. Organized labor supports the increase as a matter of simple economic justice for persons who must look to the Federal Government for some protection of their wage position.

The case for a significant increase in the minimum wage is summed up in a simple statement made by the man who was President of the United States when the Fair Labor Standards Act was originally enacted in 1938. President Roosevelt declared: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

HYMAN H. BOOKBINDER,
Chief of Congressional Research, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
WASHINGTON, *June 7, 1955.*

The International Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President not long ago one of the leading weekly newspapers in my home State, the Hot Springs Star, published in Hot Springs, S. Dak., carried a thought-provoking editorial on the value of the International Educational Exchange Program conducted by the United States State Department. As a cosponsor of the Smith-Mundt Act which created this program, I found this editorial to be most interesting in its presentation of the underlying principles of the exchange program to promote world peace. For that reason I am having this editorial reprinted in the RECORD and commend it highly to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Another group of editors and publishers from foreign countries arrived in the United States early this month and are now making a 30-day tour of various parts of the country. The trip was arranged under the international educational exchange program of the Department of State.

The group of editors and publishers referred to arrived on March 4 and came from Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, and Peru. They are touring the United States, including such places as New York, Houston, Santa Fe, San Francisco, and Wichita.

This group is the first of three such groups which will visit the United States under the auspices of the State Department this year. It takes very little imagination to realize what this tour will mean to these newsmen.

In the first place, they will get a clear idea of United States customs, traditions, and democracy. They will see at first hand the people, the great cities, the great achievements of this country, and its amazing versatility. Naturally, as writers, these men will tell this story in the countries we have mentioned above.

More than any other group of foreign citizens, writers constitute an ideal field in which we can improve international understanding and good will. What they write will be read by millions of Central and South Americans and we North Americans are certainly willing to have our country honestly presented to our neighbors to the South.

With some State Department programs we take issue, but with this international educational exchange program we find ourselves in hearty agreement.

University Women of Ohio Support United States International Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very fine letter which I have received from the Ohio division of the American Association of University Women. This farsighted statement lends support to the full appropriation of $22 million requested by the Department of State for operation of the international educational exchange program. This matter is now in conference and I certainly hope that the full sum for this important program is granted.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN, OHIO DIVISION,
Toledo, Ohio, May 26, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASHLEY: By the time this letter reaches you it is possible that the Senate may have restored the $10 million cut of the House of Representatives in the appropriation requested by the Department of State for operation of the international educational exchange program. I sincerely hope that they will.

If such is the case, a joint committee from the House and Senate will meet to adjust differences. At this conference it is the desire of the members of the Ohio Division American Association of University Women to be on record as supporting the full restoration of funds to the international educational exchange program in the amount of $22 million.

We represent 7,911 university women in the State of Ohio who actively carry on a program of fellowships and international grants for higher education. We are dedicated to the increasing need of international understanding in this day of rapid communication, and we feel that an international education program is our greatest tool for furthering that understanding.

Likewise, we have supported the United States educational exchange program for the even broader extension of that international understanding. Its two-way exchange of persons increases chances for success in American foreign policy and we firmly believe that it must be continued.

Please use the good influence of your office in making our wishes known. My kind personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,
LOIS HARBAGE,
President, Ohio Division AAUW.
Mrs. DANIEL LAKIN,
Chairman, International Relations.
Miss M. LUCILE WALLACE,
Chairman, Education.
Mrs. JOHN WADE,
Chairman, Legislative Program.

The Career of W. T. Hudson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently the largest newspaper in my home State of South Dakota, the Daily Argus-Leader, published in Sioux Falls, printed an interesting résumé of the worldwide career enjoyed by Mr. W. T. Hudson. He is undoubtedly one of the most outstanding graduates from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, at Rapid City, S. Dak., and I am proud to present this article for publication in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER ROCK VALLEY RESIDENT ENJOYS WORLDWIDE CAREER

ROCK VALLEY, IOWA.—An extremely successful and varied career has come to W. T. Hudson, former Rock Valley resident, who among other things, has supervised construction jobs in nearly every nation of Europe, South America, and the Far East.

Hudson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hudson, was born in Delmar, Iowa, in 1901, and was reared here. In addition to his other accomplishments he has received an honorary doctor of engineering degree; has pioneered in the uranium development of Colorado's southwestern plateau area and has been named western division manager of a nationwide manufacturing company.

As a civil engineering graduate of the South Dakota School of Mines, Rapid City, in 1928, Hudson soon struck out on his worldwide assignments for the Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. For 16 years (from 1932 to 1948) he served this firm on construction projects in France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Italy, Syria, Palestine, India, the Far Eastern nations, and in Central and South America.

Following these travels, Hudson became a vice president of the Harbor Engineering & Salvage Co., of San Diego, Calif., where he served until 1951 when he became western division manager of the Graver Tank & Manufacturing Co., Inc., of East Chicago, Ind.

He supervised company activities from the Casper, Wyo., plant for 2 years, when he was promoted in 1953 to vice president of the Graver firm and placed in charge of a new company sales office in Los Angeles. This latter position he now holds with the company.

Since he has also been active in the development and production of uranium and vanadium ores, it is only natural that Hudson is one of the pioneers in what has since become a tremendous uranium boom which has swept the Western States.

His knowledge of this ore led him to be in on the ground floor of some of the most valuable uranium properties in the world. At present, Hudson is president of the Little Beaver Mining Co., Inc., and the LaSal Mining Co., as well as vice president of the Utex Exploration Co., Inc. All have headquarters in Moab, Utah, the center of uranium activity in the Colorado-Utah-Arizona-New Mexico plateau area.

Hudson, who is married and has six children, is a member of the Texas Society of Professional Engineers and the Western Society of Engineers, according to his biography listed in Who's Who in Engineering.

But probably the finest testimony to this former Rock Valley boy was made April 15, 1953, when he was awarded an honorary doctor of engineering degree from his own alma mater, the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology at Rapid City.

Accompanying the honorary degree was the following citation:

"To William T. Hudson for his preeminence in the field of civil engineering, for his supervision of significant construction and development projects on a worldwide scale, and for his constant adherence to the principle that man is his most important resource, whose use must be based upon moral concepts in the same manner that the use of material resources must be based upon physical laws."

Our Channel Is Paying Its Way Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 16, 1955:

OUR CHANNEL IS PAYING ITS WAY NOW

The American Revolution was fought in part to free this country from unreasonable restrictions upon its commerce and stupid obstacles to its trade.

The phenomenal economic growth of the United States has been due in large degree to the policy laid down by the Founding Fathers—a policy of keeping our arteries of commerce wide open and free.

That is why there are no trade barriers between States; no interstate customs stations as in Europe; no taxation on interstate commerce. That is why development and control of America's navigable rivers have been a traditional responsibility of the Federal Government which could keep them free, and not of the State which might find it profitable to hamper waterborne commerce. That is why, save for special facilities, there have been no tolls—up to now—on the great water arteries of our Nation.

Freedom of our rivers has been as universally accepted a doctrine as freedom of the seas.

Now, at this late date, some strange influences at Washington seek to reverse that policy. They would turn their backs on our national experience, and decree that the Founding Fathers of the United States of America were not as wise as history has shown them to be.

It is seriously proposed to levy tolls from the ships which use the Delaware River.

This proposition was put to Walter P. Miller, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, at a conference with Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams and Assistant Budget Director Donald Belcher. It was argued that the Delaware River should be put on a pay-as-you-go basis.

We are amazed that Messrs. Adams and Belcher do not know that the Delaware River is paying its way right now.

Commerce in the upper Delaware (where the Budget Bureau has opposed channel deepening unless United States Steel pays half the cost) has increased rapidly. So much so that a new customs station was established in the Trenton-Morrisville area 3 months ago.

Officials predicted that this station would further boost customs collections in this area. They already had been rising. For February last they had jumped to $3,628,037—or more than 25 percent over February 1954.

All that is income for the Federal Government. It is income which has been made possible by that "freedom of the river" policy which was established when the Nation's foundations were laid.

And there's still more to the story, if Messrs. Adams and Belcher are interested. Over the past 50 years, Delaware River development has cost the Federal Government $105 million. On that sum it has received a return of $14.25 for each dollar invested. In 1951 alone the port of Philadelphia customs receipts were $52,300,000.

Yet these gentlemen have the effrontery to suggest that the Delaware River be made to pay its own way.

Do they propose to levy tolls on all the other main rivers of the United States? Do they urge tolls to recoup the huge sums which Uncle Sam has invested in New York Harbor? The Federal Government paid the entire bill to deepen the Hudson River to accommodate just two ships, foreign ships: the *Queen Mary* and the *Normandy*, and no quibbling then. Is it planned to establish toll stations along the Mississippi, where vast sums are spent for channel maintenance?

We could go on, and on. We could even ask some embarrassing questions about the St. Lawrence seaway, and the interests which seem determined to promote that, and hold Delaware Valley down.

The fight for Delaware Valley's channel has just begun. It is incredible to us that

anyone in the Nation's Capital should seriously propose turning the clock back before the Revolution. It is particularly outrageous that anyone should tell Delaware Valley to pay its own way on its mighty river—when it is paying its way, many times over.

Address to Graduating Class of Baxter Seminary by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], to the graduating class of Baxter Seminary, Baxter, Tenn., on Friday, May 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER TO GRADUATING CLASS AT BAXTER SEMINARY, BAXTER, TENN., FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1955

I am happy to come here because I have such high admiration for the life and work of the president of this seminary, Harry Upperman. In the field of education and civic responsibility, he has met the test and contributed much.

I feel that we Americans today face three major problems. Broadly stated they are these:

1. To preserve the peace;
2. To preserve our constitutional liberties and our free way of life; and
3. To preserve our economic health and prosperity.

All three blend together and are really aspects of the same problem—the problem of preserving our free society. It is you young people who will ultimately decide how we face these problems. It is you and thousands like you who will decide whether we accept the role of world leadership or whether we step down and take the easy way out.

In the past other Americans have had to make similar decisions. In days gone by, their decisions affected only the United States, affected only our freedom, our way of life, our families, our friends. Today our decisions affect the entire world. Can the youth of America answer this challenge?

In some parts of the world, people say emphatically, "No." They will shout that American young people are hamstrung by an ancient tradition. They will call you capitalists and imperialists. They will say that we have a false idealism. Many people will listen to their arguments. And some people will believe them.

Those who believe could not have had much knowledge of the traditions that made this Nation great. My only fear is not that we are still following these traditions, but the fear that we are losing these traditions.

Those brave men that founded our great State of Tennessee faced a challenge, even as you face problems in the world today. They cocked back their hats, chewed their tobacco, listened to the odds against them, then went into the woods and carved out this State. When they had completed their work they framed a Constitution which is a model of what free men can do. Even in victory they guaranteed our basic right in this country—the right of dissent. They left the door open for others to challenge them. Secure in their beliefs, they did not fear the arguments of others. It was this tolerance, this understanding, that made the men of Tennessee great. It was this same understanding that made the United States the mighty nation it is.

Yet, today, it seems that we are losing some of this understanding and tolerance. On all sides of us, we find people who say, "Shut out the different idea." They say, "We already have the best, so why listen to new ideas." In reality, they are afraid of the idea.

That is why these people are afraid of our young people. For it is your new ideas that will change the content of our way of life in some direction. We may still keep the same traditional framework, but the picture will change. The new will replace the old, because change is inevitable. And that is the way it should be. That is the way it must be. When ancient Rome and Athens sat back to contemplate their greatness, they were ruined. It was when the new ideas of the ancient Greeks were frowned upon that their civilization came tumbling down on them.

We in America want our individualism. We want the Government to have a minimum of control over our private lives. We want to come and go without having to register at a police station, as they do in China today. We do not want to have someone come knocking on our door in the middle of the night to see if we have visitors who do not have a pass to be away from their own city. This is what goes on in China today.

If I want to say something against the President of the United States, or if you want to shout something against me as a Senator, that is your privilege. And what many people do not understand is that the President will fight for your right to shout against him and I will fight for your right to say terrible things about me.

In many nations, freedom of speech is just a dream. In Communist countries you may have freedom of speech as long as you talk about the things the state wants you to talk about and comment on these things in the accepted state line.

Most of us in Tennessee would last only a few moments under totalitarian rule. We like to say what we think, when we think. And we are better off for this.

In the heat of a political discussion, words fly freely. I can express my viewpoint and those on the other side can express their notions. After our discussion ends, I can keep my views and they can keep theirs. As soon as someone tried to take my freedom of speech away, or curtail my thoughts, my most vigorous political enemies would rally around me so quickly that the antagonist's head would spin. That's Tennessee. That's America. That's our tradition, and we are mighty proud of it.

All of these things are the traditions my generation and our forefathers pass on to you. Along with this wonderful heritage we pass to you, we give you many perplexing problems. Their enormity would have staggered the imagination of all those who came before you.

The Big Four Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reds Hold Loaded Dice at Parley," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS HOLD LOADED DICE AT PARLEY—THEY ARE SECURE IN THE KNOWLEDGE THAT APPEASEMENT TREND IS OVERWHELMING

(By Constantine Brown)

Like jockeys in a short race, the Kremlin boys, suave and smiling now, are trying to get themselves into an inside position to win the Geneva stakes, even if only by a nose.

Spokesmen for the Soviet Government—name commentators, editorialists, and other official propagandists inside and outside the U. S. S. R.—are already attempting to pull off the cleverest tricks in the Russian bag of magic, and pin the blame in advance on the United States for any failures of the forthcoming summit conference.

Using our own American slogan of deeds, not words, the Red artificers are demanding that United States good faith be proved by such actions as the dismantling of the American airbases ringing the Soviet Union, political and economic coexistence between the East and the West, and the prompt recognition of Red China with the neutralization of Formosa, that is, the abandonment of Chiang Kai-shek through the total withdrawal of all American air, naval, and military forces there.

Russia, say the sleight-of-hand artists, has already proved her good intentions with deeds. They point to the Austrian Treaty, which in reality serves Russian interests better than it serves Austria; they cite the benign action of Red China in permitting the Korean armistice, and they grow rapturous over the Red good will in accepting the Indochina truce. And every single one of these alleged deeds looking toward world peace has been a decided victory for the forces of communism.

And assuming a still more pious and sanctimonious air, these glib apologists for tyranny and world conquest call attention to the many disarmament proposals made by the Soviet Union, and sadly deplore the intransigence and warmongering of the West in refusing to accept these wonderful guaranties of peace.

Not letting the welkin rest even for a moment, the brashest of the Red mouthpieces hammer away at the frightening specter of a rearmed Germany while they appeal to the West Germans to remember that bad relations between the Germans and the Russians have invariably resulted in war. Comrade Konstantin Orlov, a top Moscow press agent for the archconspirators, adds to this interesting theory the flat statement that such bad relations have resulted from the machinations of the imperialists and colonialists of the West, who delight in egging on two basically friendly nations and peoples until bloody fighting results. "Who rejoiced," asks Comrade Orlov, "when our peoples bled to death and our countries were being ruined by war?" He supplies the answer by quoting an alleged statement made by Harry S. Truman in 1941, after Nazi Germany invaded Russia: "When we see that Germany is winning we must help Russian and if Russia is winning we must help Germany. Let them kill as many as possible."

It is difficult to assess at this time what, if any, effect the steady Russian propaganda barrage is having, particularly on free Germany. But now that West German sovereignty has been restored, Chancellor Adenauer is certain to have some lively political criticism from wolves in his fold, and the Soviet strategists will do all they can to encourage any such divisive activity they can find.

Belief in the United States that the summit meeting of the Big Four will be a mere

formality is rapidly fading. President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have been convinced, after talking with Adenauer, that the Russians mean the parleys to be lengthy and comprehensive. They have succeeded in talking most of Europe into acceptance of the premise that the conference represents the last chance to settle world tensions and avoid nuclear war. Thus, the Reds will enter the conference with the support of most of European public opinion, and that support is grounded in a peace-at-any-price feeling far more serious than that of Munich in 1938.

Despite the elaborate and costly intelligence apparatus maintained by the United States abroad, our official estimate of the climate of European opinion appears to have been woefully lacking in accuracy. It took the hard-hitting facts brought by Mr. Adenauer to awaken our officials to the fact that the free world has already lost the first round in the forthcoming conference.

The Soviet diplomats will be armed with loaded dice—secure in the knowledge that the forces of appeasement are overwhelming. If they fail to win a great victory for communism at Geneva, as they have done there previously under less favorable circumstances, most observers will be surprised.

Tragic Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter addressed to the editor of the Newark (N. J.) Evening News by Mr. Jack J. Stukas, member of supreme council of American-Lithuanian Community Organization, in commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the mass deportations of the Baltic peoples by the Soviets to slave-labor camps:

TRAGIC ANNIVERSARY

To the EDITOR:

SIR: Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians in the free world are solemnly commemorating this month the tragic 15th anniversary of the mass deportations of the Baltic peoples by the Soviets to slave-labor camps, and the forcible annexation of these peace-loving, unfortunate countries to the communistic hell called the Soviet Union.

The Baltic peoples were the first to experience the true face of Soviet communism with all its satanic brutality. In the dead of night hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children in all three countries were rudely awakened, forced to leave their homes without food, water or sufficient clothing, hustled into waiting trucks and then crammed into filthy railroad cattle cars, with no windows or sanitary facilities. The destination of these cargoes of human misery was the Arctic regions of the Urals and Siberia.

At the present stage of history—when the free people of the world are considering a possible coexistence with the Kremlin gangsters, the Baltic peoples who survive have more reason to be sad on this tragic anniversary. The only kind of coexistence they have found possible with the Kremlin is to become subservient to it. Millions of innocent peoples are still suffering and perishing in Soviet concentration camps. Should this continue indefinitely? The eyes of those vast suffering numbers of human beings are directed to us. Let us not forsake them; let us hold a beacon of hope to them.

In addressing a rally of Baltic peoples in New York last year, President Eisenhower stated: "Our faith that freedom will be restored to the Baltic peoples reflects our devotion to those fundamental principles of liberty and freedom on which the American Nation was founded. It is reinforced by the stirring example of the Baltic countries, where the harshest policies of terrorism and deportation have failed to extinguish the spirit of national independence. We are resolved to continue to do all we can to establish in the world conditions under which these countries will regain and retain their freedom."

On this solemn and sad occasion of remembrance, let us pray to God to protect these victims of Soviet imperialism and to ease their terrible burden. May He also protect our beloved America to whom He has entrusted leadership in the free world's struggle for peace and international decency. May God soon grant freedom to the oppressed Baltic nations and liberty to all the enslaved peoples who miraculously survive.

JACK J. STUKAS,
Member of Supreme Council of American-Lithuanian Community Organization.
HILLSIDE.

Judge John Knight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the people of western New York lost a great friend and a distinguished fellow citizen this week in the death of Federal District Judge John Knight. For the past 24 years Judge Knight had served on the Federal bench, having been appointed by former President Herbert Hoover. Before that he had had a long and distinguished career as a Senator from western New York and eventually as president pro tempore of the New York State senate. His death at the age of 84 deprives our State and Nation of a great citizen.

Judge Knight was born in Arcade, N. Y., and attended the public schools there and in Buffalo. He was graduated in 1893 from the University of Rochester, where he was captain of the football team, and in 1896 he was admitted to the bar. He practiced law in partnership with his father, the late Andrew Knight, and later with Lynn S. Bentley, in Arcade, and in 1903 became district attorney of Wyoming County, a post he filled for 10 years.

In 1912 he was elected to the New York State Assembly, and 4 years later he was elected to the Senate, serving there as the leader of his party through the regimes of Governors Whitman, Smith, Miller, and Roosevelt. Among his outstanding services in the legislature of the State of New York was a study which resulted in revision of the State's public service commission laws.

Government and jurisprudence were greatly enriched by virtue of Judge Knight's contributions over the years, and these will stand as an enduring monument to his stature as a man and the quality of his mind and heart. Those who knew him, however, have lost an irreplaceable counsellor and friend.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial about Judge Knight from the edition of Wednesday, June 15:

JUDGE JOHN KNIGHT

Few men will have the temerity to attempt to place a value on the services that Federal Judge John Knight rendered his country, his State, his community. We attempt no such accounting, for mere recital of the facts of an extraordinary career in public life show it to be inestimable.

Judge Knight could look back upon a full 60 years in the service of the public at the bar, on the bench, and in legislative councils. The slim young lawyer, who hung out a shingle in his home village of Arcade in 1896, went on to become presiding judge of the 17-county Western New York District of the Federal judiciary which duties he performed for 24 years. There he remained until his death at the mellow age of 84.

The span between office as town clerk and his later years as United States judge was inordinately active, for the venerable jurist had an enormous capacity for hard work. Whether it was a small job in local politics, as an elected member of State assembly or senate, or as leader of his party at Albany, he gave all he had of energy, judgment, and leadership. In all those posts he made distinguished contributions to public service.

But it was as a judge on the bench that Judge Knight was in the niche for which he was best fitted. His precise mind, teamed with quick intelligence and supported by conscientious performance, assured his success in the post to which he was appointed in 1931 by then President Herbert Hoover. Many are the tales that are told in legal circles of his acumen and his ability to sort through legal snarls to arrive at lawful truths and to render appropriate judgment.

In 24 years, Judge Knight presided over 6,000 trials in Federal court, 3,000 of them without a jury, a truly prodigious task. The case of a small bootlegger engaged his judicial attention as firmly as that of a gigantic corporation. He handled plenty of both. His career on the bench began at the height of prohibition. It was indicative of his character as a man that he had distaste for sentencing the little offender. He explored every legal avenue open to him to try to expose and bring to trial the one at the top whom, he felt, should be the one facing his bench.

There were infinite variety and inexhaustible complications in the cases that demanded his judgment. As a Republican appointee, he was called upon to adjudicate some of the ramifications of early New Deal Federal laws. Typical was that which involved priority for payment of Federal social-security taxes and State unemployment taxes from the estate of a bankrupt citizen. He worked out an algebraic formula by which each was entitled to receive part. The formula was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court and is standard throughout the country. His judgment and impartiality knew no politics.

Much is made of the fact that Judge Knight's heart remained in his native and beloved village of Arcade though his work was elsewhere. But Buffalo claims his memory, too—a great judge, a dedicated public servant, a fine human being.

TVA in Grave Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "TVA in Grave Danger," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA IN GRAVE DANGER

Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel's extraordinary behavior on the TVA Board of Directors is finally coming to light. The Board's functionings have been largely a mystery since the Eisenhower appointee became Chairman 8 months ago.

It has been known all along that General Vogel disagreed consistently with the two directors who antedated him on the Board, Dr. Harry A. Curtis and Dr. Raymond R. Paty.

But only now, with publication of testimony given last month to a House Appropriations Subcommittee, has it become public knowledge that General Vogel is trying to gain ascendancy over the two other directors, and to transform TVA in accordance with his own views.

The manner in which General Vogel seeks to make his 1 vote count more than Dr. Curtis' and Dr. Paty's 2 is simple—and lethal. He wants Congress to designate him as TVA's executive head. He then wants to set up his own private and personal special management staff which would come largely from outside TVA and would view TVA objectively; i. e., as he does.

Under any such arrangement, the two-man majority of the TVA Board would be scarcely more than figureheads; they would be advisers whose advice the executive head might not heed. The general manager of TVA, who administers the business of the agency in accordance with the policies laid down by the Board of Directors, would be placed in an impossible position, his office usurped by the Chairman-Executive Head.

Among the thousands of men and women who operate TVA, one group would form behind the Board majority and another behind General Vogel. Personal feelings would be bitter, and the affairs of the Authority would be in a condition approaching demoralization.

Soon too little of TVA that was worth saving would be left for anyone to want to fight to save it. An institution that had been the pride of the people of this country for a quarter century would have been destroyed from within.

In all this, General Vogel's role does him little credit. He was asked by Senator GORE, of Tennessee, when confirmation of his appointment was being considered in the Senate, whether as Chairman he would speak for the TVA Board or for himself. "What you mean," General Vogel replied, "is, Would I suppress the majority view. The answer to that is 'positively no.'"

Yet during these 8 months General Vogel has never spoken for the TVA Board and has always spoken for himself as Chairman. Perhaps he has not suppressed the majority view, but he has subordinated it as much as he could. He went so far, it is now disclosed, as to stigmatize as "premature and presumptuous" the Board majority's appeal to the Budget Bureau last March 7 to scrap the proposed Dixon-Yates power contract.

He has repeatedly presumed to speak for TVA as though it were a one-man board. When he has presented the majority's objections to his views he has done so as though it were a minority dissent.

His relations with his fellow directors have been so bad that, by his own account, after a majority vote was registered on Dixon-Yates he refused to accept the vote, and when Dr. Curtis started to leave the room he "directed" him to resume his seat. Dr. Curtis then walked out.

No wonder Representative CANNON, of Missouri, accuses General Vogel of trying to set up a dictatorship. This is the behavior of a martinet, of a man who does not believe in the principle of majority rule, and who is more accustomed to being obeyed than to being disagreed with.

So submerged has the Board majority become that it has apparently felt obliged to make its opinions heard in Congress and at the White House without publicity. During these 8 months TVA has not discharged its usual duty of giving the public its analyses and opinions of proposals affecting TVA. Instead there has only been a kind of cowed silence.

Congress has only begun to turn on the light. From here on, all General Vogel does, and all he has done, should be disclosed fully and promptly to the public he is supposed to be serving. Only so can the people judge how faithfully his sworn belief in the wisdom and feasibility of TVA is being borne out in practice.

The Civil Defense "Operation Alert"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Men First; Women, Children Last," written by Doris Fleeson and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEN FIRST; WOMEN, CHILDREN LAST—CD TEST FINDS WIVES STAYING BEHIND TO FACE MAKE-BELIEVE NUCLEAR BLAST

(By Doris Fleeson)

A few minutes before President Eisenhower led the White House staff to cars to start Operation Alert, 1955, a messenger was handing them the noon editions of a Washington newspaper bearing in big black headlines the legend: "Operation Alert Is a Dangerous Farce," official here says.

If they were amused, they hid it. The President is taking the new drill seriously and levity regarding it is not encouraged.

It is generally admitted, however, by most of the men that they had learned that morning from their wives something about the program's deficiencies. Apparently it had not dawned on these ladies until they actually saw their husbands pack a suitcase for a 3-day stay that no such plans had been made for them or their children. Their wives' farewell embraces were described by some of the men as rather lacking in warmth.

The women's point of view was defended by the protesting official, Deputy District Civil Defense Director Underhill. He said the first step should be strategic evacuation of women and children, the old and infirm, on the threat of war.

Mr. Underhill wants more, not less civil defense. He likes practically nothing about the present performance, asserting that what we have compared to what we need is the difference between an ant and a dinosaur and that the public knows it. His background: Chief military intelligence editor for the Army General Staff in World War II.

Congress continued to pretend not to notice either what was going on or the complaints about it but went on legislating. One shrewd House veteran said privately he thought those protesting White House wives had given the President a useful hint. As a politician, he explained, he wouldn't support any civil-defense program that didn't begin with families.

The President, of course, could retort that Congress actually hasn't done anything. It is possible that while he is on sound ground in the present exercise from the military point of view, he has overlooked some of those intangibles which are vital to the successful politician.

Federal civil defense officials will feel that if Operation Alert achieves nothing more than public discussion and argument, it will have served its purpose. The operation, incidentally, is actually the work of the Office of Defense Mobilization, which has responsibility for the executive branch. ODM is entitled to claim that it is doing the job assigned to it and that deficiencies elsewhere are not its fault.

Because it has not had an aroused public opinion behind it, civil defense has had trouble not just with Congress but in getting the military to open up on what it has to expect. It cannot make plans to counter weapons and possibilities about which it is not informed. The Atomic Energy Commission has not given CD its full confidence.

There are people here who feel that nuclear warfare has outdated civil defense no matter how intelligently conceived and expensively executed. They argue that alerts are waste motion on the periphery of the problem, that the problem can be solved only by creative political solutions at its heart.

This, too, is being attempted with such moves as the Big Four meeting at the summit. Apparently the President feels that the present maneuvers will at least contribute to general recognition that the problem is vital and that it is here.

The Public Interest in Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I urge Members of Congress to give careful consideration to a statement by Mr. Roland V. Rodman, president of Anderson-Prichard Oil Corp., Oklahoma City, Okla. Mr. Rodman is one of the most able oil and gas executives in our country. His analysis of the natural gas problem and the Harris bill, H. R. 6645, recently approved by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, merits the attention of every Member of the House and the Senate. The first part of Mr. Rodman's statement appears in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. His concluding remarks will be published on Monday next.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN NATURAL GAS

(By Roland V. Rodman at the semiannual meeting of the National Petroleum Association, Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, April 15, 1955)

INTRODUCTION

I am most happy to come to Ohio for the purpose of discussing the public interest in natural gas. I am especially happy because Ohio is located in the first petroleum province discovered in North America, the Appalachian Basin, and it was within this area that the first natural-gas pipeline was laid.

I am likewise happy to discuss this subject in Ohio because the great cities of Ohio represent points of manufacture of steel, valves, fittings, cables, rubber products, meters, gages, and many other items used by the natural-gas industry in making delivery to the ultimate consumer.

I am happy to be in a State conversant with the natural-gas industry, a State in which the industry has 1,600,000 domestic consumers and 133,000 industrial consumers and since Ohio, based upon surveys made by the industry, has more than 70,000 homes already on the waiting list for natural-gas service, I would consider that I am in a friendly atmosphere.

HISTORY OF DEVELOPMENT

Natural gas was the energy that brought the oil to the surface in the original Drake well drilled in 1859. For many years oilmen regarded natural gas as a nuisance because they lacked the knowledge to harness it or could find no use for it after it was harnessed. However, a few industries and communities within the producing areas began to utilize gas and in the late 70's, with distribution problems partially licked, metal pipelines began serving consuming centers in and adjacent to the Appalachian Basin and, once able to get to market, the oilman's peril became a community blessing.

In the 1920's new and more abundant reserves began to be developed. The Panhandle field in Texas, the Hugoton field in Kansas, and major areas in Louisiana, Oklahoma, and New Mexico were discovered. Other producing areas were found in California and in the older fields of Pennsylvania and Ohio.

The development of high-strength steel pipe and new techniques in welding opened the way for long distance gas transmission. Soon we had lines carrying gas in every direction until in 1953 we had only 5 States that were not enjoying the convenience of low-cost natural gas.

The total gas pipeline mileage at the end of 1953 was in excess of 390,000 miles, which included more than 125,000 miles of transmission lines, 225,000 miles of distribution mains, and 40,000 miles of field gathering systems. In the 43 States being served with natural gas in 1953, the industry had 20 million customers.

The consumption of natural gas in 1953 was 10 times as great as it was in 1920. Consumption is now increasing at a compound rate of almost 10 percent per year. Estimates for the year 1957 are almost 50 percent higher than used in 1953.

At the risk of boring you, I have given you this information as to the magnitude of the natural gas industry because it is necessary background to the remainder of my remarks.

NATURE OF SERVICE

The natural gas industry is by nature divided into three parts:

1. The production, gathering, and processing of natural gas in the field;
2. The transportation of natural gas by pipeline to consuming areas; and
3. The local distribution of natural gas to the ultimate consumers.

These three functions are almost invariably carried on by separate business entities. Local distribution is usually carried on by local utility companies. And, although a few transmission companies own or control some producing, gathering, or processing facilities, most of the gas moving in interstate commerce is supplied by independent producers having no affiliation of any character with companies engaged in transportation and distribution of natural gas.

We have long recognized that in business and commerce we have certain industries that are inherently monopolistic in character. These businesses are quite commonly referred to as public utilities, such as streetcar systems, metropolitan water companies, electric power companies, telephone companies, and railroad companies. Because of the monopolistic character of such companies they are, in the public interest, subject to public regulation, in return for which the public removes a great deal of the risk of loss by permitting the establishment of rates by public regulatory bodies that will usually guarantee a fair return upon invested capital.

The distribution and transportation of natural gas fall into this classification. The distributor of gas, like other public utilities, operates under rates set and regulated by State and city agencies for, while the distributor of other type of fuels compete in the same market, the natural gas distributor has no competition in marketing his particular commodity for the reason that he has a franchise for the area in which he serves and, hence, becomes subject to regulation.

The distributor buys the gas that he distributes from a pipeline operator or transporter. Without a long-term contract, the pipeline operator could not undertake the tremendous cost of constructing long-distance transmission systems.

Just as the distributor is a sole supplier of natural gas to consumers in his particular area, the interstate pipeline operator is usually the sole supplier to any given local distribution system. Because of the monopolistic character of this service the pipeline operator is subject to public regulation, in exchange for which he receives a sheltered position with reference to earnings based upon invested capital.

Of these three segments necessary for the supplying of natural gas to the American public, the producer is the only segment outside of the protective cloak of the law. He has no assurance of either price, market, or success. There is nothing monopolistic in his field. A new operator may enter tomorrow and be crowned with success or failure, as the case may be.

There are over 5,000 independent producers of natural gas in the United States. They are engaged in the risky business of exploration and development. They must sell gas in competition with all other producers who are in a position to supply the pipeline, and with all other areas to which interconnecting pipelines may be laid. Theirs is a business of producing a commodity and to market that commodity in full competition with all other gas producers, each in an arms-length transaction.

THE NATURAL GAS ACT

From the above description, it is readily apparent that the farflung operations of the natural gas industry would be subject to some type of Federal regulation. The regulatory bodies of the various States were without power to regulate interstate shipments. The Federal Government clearly had that power under the commerce clause of the Constitution, which declares that "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce among the States."

The Federal Trade Commission spent almost 10 years investigating the operations of public utilities and in 1953 rendered its report to Congress. In 1938 Congress passed the Natural Gas Act, vesting in the Federal Power Commission regulatory authority over the transportation and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce.

The Natural Gas Act in section 1 (b) states precisely what it was intended to cover. It reads as follows:

"The provisions of this act shall apply to the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, to the sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale for ultimate public consumption, and to natural gas companies engaged in such transportation or sale," but the act declares that "The provisions of this act shall not apply to any other transportation or sale of natural gas or to the local distribution of natural gas or to the production or gathering of natural gas."

Notwithstanding the positive declaration in the act that the production and gathering of natural gas were not subject to regulation, attorneys for the Federal Power Commission continuously attempted to procure such a ruling. However, on 11 separate occasions between 1938 and 1951 the Commission ruled that it had no jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers and gatherers.

In the Phillips case in 1951 the Federal Power Commission ruled that it had no such power, but on appeal the case was reversed by a 5 to 3 decision of the United States Supreme Court. That Court held, notwithstanding the clear declaration of Congress, that all sales of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale were subject to regulation whether made before, during, or after production or gathering.

Thereupon, the Federal Power Commission assumed full jurisdiction and control over the production of natural gas; declared every producer to be a natural gas company; and required certificates of convenience and necessity for the operation of each. It froze the price of natural gas to whatever price was being paid on June 7, 1954. It destroyed escalation clauses and favored nations clauses in contracts. It denied the producer the right to collect increases in State production taxes regardless of expressed provisions in the contract. It prevented the independent producer from ceasing the delivery of gas even though his contract of sale provided for such suspension. It required the producer to maintain his current volume of delivery even though it might be in defiance of State regulatory bodies. It brought about delays in the connection of new wells and the right to run the gas therefrom that caused discrimination as between producers to extend for many months. And, since each individual producer or person having an interest in the production from a well became a public utility entitled to a fair return upon his investment, an impossible administrative problem developed within the Federal Power Commission from which there was no hope of extrication except by congressional enactment.

THE HARRIS BILL

To correct the concern, confusion, and consternation of the unexpected decision of the Supreme Court, the so-called Harris bill is now pending in Congress. The bill seeks to relieve the independent production and gathering of natural gas of the burden of Federal regulation in a field that is highly competitive. The bill provides for protection of the consumer by establishing equitable criteria for determination of the reasonable market price of natural gas in a field should an interstate natural-gas company ask for increased rates. It assures protection for the consumer by providing that when an increase in rate of a natural-gas company is based upon a new or renegotiated contract the Commission will be required to determine if the price for such natural gas is the reasonable market price in the field where it is produced. The bill makes it clear that independent producers and gatherers are not utilities and should not be treated as such. It provides justice for the natural-gas company who purchases all or a part of its gas by permitting a reasonable market price therefor in the field where produced.

The Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the State, of Columbia, S. C., of June 12, 1955, be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial cogently points out that the Dinosaur National Monument—indeed, our entire national park system—should be protected from exploitation.

I want to emphasize that both distinguished Senators from South Carolina voted in the Senate in April for my amendment which sought to protect the Dinosaur National Monument and its marvelous chasms of the Green and Yampa Rivers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE LAST CHANCE

The case of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument continues to echo with intrigue and manipulation from within.

Late last week the House Interior Affairs Subcommittee, after voting to take Echo Park Dam out of the Colorado River project bill, voted to set up a study of the controversial dam site. This move is branded by the Citizens' Committee of Natural Resources and the Council of Conservationists as a deliberate attempt to deceive the public, as it amounts to taking the project out of the bill and putting it back in.

The subcommittee's board of engineers is referred to as "prejudiced" and it is believed that conservationists will oppose the measure all the more vigorously with this amendment in it. The facts in the matter have been thoroughly hashed and rehashed for 5 years and there would seem to be no merit in authorizing, at this late date, another study. Or, in the words of spokesmen for the two organizations mentioned above, "no board of engineers could do any better than the Bureau of Reclamation has done to try to make a case for Echo Park Dam. The fact is that it already has been demonstrated that this dam would be an unnecessary (and wasteful) invasion of the National Park System."

How well and hard the Bureau of Reclamation has fought for the project and the extent of its allies is testified to by another top-flight conservationist, Arthur H. Carhart. To qualify the witness it is interesting that Mr. Carhart is a man who is given the highest praise by conservationists who condemn to the deepest depths many outfits professing to be conservationists as phony and masquerading.

According to Mr. Carhart, "We now have evidence that the names and addresses of these conservationists (who wrote protesting Echo Park Dam last year) were supplied to the propaganda organization set up to 'sell' the dam to the Nation (by) the office of the Secretary of the Interior."

Since this writer, who was one of the many people who wrote him, referred to by Mr. Carhart, has received frequent dishes of propaganda from the dam-pushing outfit, his statement seems obviously correct.

The dam-pushers have gone all out, with no holds barred in the attempt to steamroller their plan through the Congress in defiance of the Government's sacred trust to preserve the National Park System; in defiance of the fact that pouring dollars into dust is lavish, useless waste, and in defiance of the fact that twice the amount of land that would be irrigated by the project is available in South Carolina alone at 5 percent of the cost of the upper Colorado, and would be far more fertile.

This is the kind of proposition which should arouse the indignant protests to their Congressmen of all redblooded Americans. The last chance to stop the project is in the National House of Representatives.

The Internal Revenue Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there has been a continuous effort on the part of a small group, politically inspired, I would say, to discredit the excellent Tax Revision Act of 1954. Most of the attacks are hit and run, but because they plug the same theme, they have a cumulative effect. The theme is that the act is a rich man's bill or the theme is sometimes varied to say it to a bill for the rich corporations. It is all one and the same, and the object is to stir up class hatred where in actuality there really are no classes, where actually we are all Americans, the closest to a classless society the world has ever seen.

The underlying thought in these attacks, however, on analysis is basically vicious and is of the vilest smear variety. The thought that is sought to be sown is that the members of the Republican Party are not interested in the welfare of the little man and that they purposely and through connivance are endeavoring to hurt him. Now, of course, if that is the motivating force behind the Republican Party and the individuals comprising it, there is no sense to discuss any issue. We are not worthy of being listened to. We are people devoid of the basic principles set forth in the Christian religion.

Of course, the Republican Party and those going to make it up are not motivated by such un-Christian feelings or objectives. The whole issue at stake between political parties and the individuals in them is not over the desire to help all our people but how do we best achieve these ends? Now anyone can properly argue that a particular procedure or program or law results in injustice, or discrimination, or inefficiency, but in pursuing that line of argument he should marshal his facts and resort only to proper logic. He should not appeal to prejudice or resort to smearing the motives of the person with whom he is in disagreement.

I took the floor of the House last year to defend the Democrat Party against a rather limited attack that had been made against its patriotism and that of its leaders as the result of certain policies pursued in quite recent years. I felt these attacks were uncalled for and unjustified and I said so. However, I thought the leaders of the Democrat Party were carrying what was a limited attack by just a few Republicans too far in claiming that the Republican Party had accused it of being disloyal. I thought also that they were making an issue of being insulted inasmuch as the President and many other responsible leaders of the Republican Party had publicly denounced the limited attacks that had been made and avowed that other statements that were alleged to be attacks were not so intended.

Now it appears that the top leaders of the Democrat Party are personally in this attack on the motives of the Republican Party. They are out to try to make the people believe that this great party is devoid of the basic Christian tenets, that the Republican Party is not equally interested with the Democrat Party in the welfare of all Americans.

I hope we will get back to issues. The only way to really demonstrate one's interest in the welfare of the people is to honestly discuss the public issues of the day so that through proper debate—marshaling the facts and using true logic—we may resolve as best we may what is the best for our people. I think we may all rest assured that there will be plenty of proper political issues upon which we differ to go to the people for their judgment in any election year.

I am placing in the RECORD a letter I received, at my request, from Laurens Williams, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, in which he discusses the rather complicated depreciation law as it applies to the purchase of automobiles. One of the favorite themes pursued at this juncture is saying that under the new tax law a rich motorist can, through manipulations, get his Cadillac free with the implication that it was planned that way for his special interest.

It is untrue and if it were true there is no question that every Republican or Democrat would move to change the law and all would recognize that an unintentional mistake had been made.

The tax revision law of 1954 is a fair law and is amazingly free of mistakes. There have been some unintentional mistakes made and these are being corrected. I am hopeful that the Democrat leadership will cease its smear campaign against the Republican Party, and in particular where they are using the complexities of tax legislation which is perforce technical and intricate to deliberately confuse and misinform the public.

The letter follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 18, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CURTIS: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 14, inquiring about "some loose statements made in regard to an alleged loophole in the new depreciation allowances permitted in" the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

I assume you refer to statements such as that which appeared some months ago in a local newspaper column in which the author used the following example: A "rich motorist," making $100,000 a year, buys a "superduper motorcar" for $4,600 for use in

his business. He takes a $2,300 depreciation deduction (50 percent) the first year, then sells the car for $3,400. Citing his "tax specialist," the columnist made the following computation:

Income tax saved by $2,300 depreciation deduction		$2,000
Cash received on sale of car		3,400
Total cash		5,400
Cost of car	$4,600	
Capital gains tax on sale of car (25 percent of $1,100) ($3,400−$2,300)	275	
		4,875
Net cash profit		525

Such statements are based on several wholly fallacious assumptions. In the first place, they ignore the salvage value of the property, erroneously assuming that depreciation may be taken on the whole cost of the property. Depreciation may be taken only on the difference between cost and salvage value. Moreover, assets may not be depreciated below a realistic salvage value. In determining realistic salvage value, consideration must be given to the taxpayer's use of the property, the retirement and maintenance practices he follows, and the salvage or other proceeds he realizes on disposition of the property. Junk or scrap value may be used only where the taxpayer follows the practice of using depreciable property for its full serviceable life. Where a taxpayer's practice is to dispose of depreciable property substantially before the end of its full useful life, the realistic salvage value will be the amount which probably will be realized at time of disposition. Thus, in the example, depreciation would be allowable only on the difference between the car's cost ($4,600) and its salvage value ($3,400).

In the second place, the allowable rate of depreciation is dependent on the useful life of the property, and the example erroneously ignores the fact that the useful life used in determining depreciation allowances is not the full, normally inherent useful life of the property. It is, rather, the useful life of the property determined in accordance with the practice of the particular taxpayer in his trade or business or in the production of income. If a taxpayer has no consistent practice regarding the disposition of depreciable property, the estimated useful life of his depreciable assets should be determined in the light of experience in the taxpayer's business or industry. Thus, in the example, since the taxpayer uses the property for but 1 year, his depreciation rate is 100 percent—the full difference between cost and salvage value—without regard to "straight-line," "sum-of-the-years digits," or "declining balances" method.

Application of correct criteria to the facts in the columnist's example produces this dollar result:

Cost of car		$4,600
Cash received on sale of car	$3,400	
Income tax saved by $1,200 depreciation deduction	1,044	
		4,444
Out-of-pocket cost		156

The apparent small out-of-pocket cost is not due to the amount of the depreciation allowance. It is due to application to the amount of the depreciation deduction of the taxpayer's top tax bracket—87 percent. On such line of reasoning, all of such a taxpayer's business deductions (salaries, wages, rent, etc.) cost him, out-of-pocket, only 13 cents on the dollar. It would be just as accurate to say that any other of such a taxpayer's expense deductions cost only 13 cents on the dollar. The fallacy in the reasoning is obvious.

Furthermore, the statement is fallacious in assuming that the alleged loophole (which, as you will see, is nonexistent) arises out of the new depreciation methods of the 1954 code. The loophole, if there is one, arises from the operation of section 117 (j) of the 1939 code (enacted in 1942) which gave long-term capital gains treatment to net profit on sales of depreciable property, though still allowing ordinary (100 percent) deduction of net losses from such sales. Depreciation allowances are ordinary 100-percent deductions. When such property (held more than 6 months) is sold for more than its depreciated cost, only half of the gain is taxed under the 1942 provision (now sec. 1231).

In addition, note that the new 1954 depreciation methods apply only "in the case of property * * * with a useful life of 3 years or more" (section 167 (c), I. R. C. 1954).

It is unfortunate that so many persons have lost sight of the fundamental, elemental function and purpose of depreciation allowances. Certainly the Congress does not intend depreciation allowances to be mere accounting gimmicks, or bookkeeping devices for saving taxes. We view them, and we believe Congress intended them, simply as methods of measuring, by a reasonably consistent plan, the amounts which should be set aside during a taxpayer's use of depreciable property, so that the aggregate of the amounts set aside plus the amount the taxpayer realizes from sale or salvage will equal the property's cost. Stated differently, they are simply methods of measuring the dollar difference between the cost of property used in a trade or business, or held for the production of income, and the amount the taxpayer probably will realize when he disposes of it. This amount, having been consumed in the production of taxable income, seems an eminently fair and proper tax deduction.

I trust this explanation will be helpful. If I can be of further service, advise me.

Sincerely,

LAURENS WILLIAMS,
Assistant to the Secretary.

Patronage of Mr. Willis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I note from the newspapers the passing from the Washington scene of Mr. Charles F. Willis, Jr. I cannot pretend that I am sorry or regret this development. As a matter of fact, it is long overdue.

For the benefit of my colleagues who may not be up on their patronage and civil service, this young man gained his great insight into latter-day politics while running the service concession at Idlewild Airport. I do not want the impression to get abroad that I think running a service concession is not an honorable profession. It is. But whether it provides an adequate background for service at the White House with a strong determining influence on the lives of Federal employees may be seriously doubted. As a matter of fact, the President must finally have come to the same conclusion, a conclusion, I might add, which was arrived at by the more than 2 million Federal employees last fall when the Willis directives were first uncovered by two enterprising newspapermen, Jerry Kluttz, of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and Joseph Young, of the Washington Evening Star.

I introduced on May 27 a number of bills designed to carry out the recommendations of the Task Force on Personnel and Civic Service of the Hoover Commission. My bills have as their purpose the improvement and strengthening of the Civil Service—one of the long-range objectives of the Democratic Party. I am indeed proud and happy to have contributed what I can to this laudable purpose. My introductory statement in support of my proposals was made on the floor of this House on May 26. The title of my remarks as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is How To Eat Your Cake and Have It. I said at that time in regard to the work of the Task Force on Personnel and Civil Service—

> At the same time that the members of the task force were earnestly engaged in the studies which led to what I believe to be one of the best reports developed by any of the task forces of the Hoover Commission there were other less dedicated men at work scheming and plotting for partisan political advantage and developing plans which would do more to destroy the merit system than the Task Force on Personnel and Civil Service could ever do to strengthen and improve it.
>
> I refer especially to Charles F. Willis, Jr., the so-called assistant to the assistance who, over at the White House, was making history in another direction from the task force.
>
> Charles F. Willis, Jr., developed and put into effect—with the support of the President, and the Republican Party leaders—one of the boldest and most cynical plans for destroying the merit system and the Civil Service ever developed in the entire history of our country.
>
> This is surely one of the historic chapters of politics and statecraft. The Willis scheme affords a unique insight into the thinking of one of the major political parties, and gives an instructive example of how to work both sides of the street—that is, taking bows for the work of the Hoover Commission while cynically planning to destroy the Civil Service.

This is the young man to whom the President writes, according to the New York Times—

> As an intimate member of the administration family, you have devoted yourself tirelessly, and effectively to our objectives. We shall greatly miss you. You take with you on your return to private affairs my full appreciation of the worth of your efforts along with my sincere thanks and best wishes for continued happiness and success.

That this feeling is not shared by Federal employees may be demonstrated best, perhaps by giving you the text of letters I have received from Luther C. Steward, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, and from James R. Watson, executive director of

the National Civil Service League. These letters are included here:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: We acknowledge with appreciation your statement of the attitude of the present administration toward Federal employees, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 6109–6118, both inclusive.

You have unquestionably assembled a great deal of factual material which is unassailable.

The attitude of the National Federation of Federal Employees was set forth by me in an address before the annual meeting of the Society for Personnel Administration on May 12, 1954, where I appeared on the program to present the employee viewpoint immediately following the appearance of the President.

We feel that every statement I made at that time has been verified by the actual day-to-day happenings.

We appreciate your vital and continuing interest in the problem of developing and maintaining a good Federal service free from political taint.

Sincerely,

LUTHER C. STEWARD,
President.

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE,
New York, N. Y., June 7, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I wish to commend you for the very strong position you have taken regarding the career civil service.

We will study your bills very carefully and will look forward to discussing them with you in the near future.

I believe that it is very important to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the material from the Hoover Commission task force and the so-called Willis directives. Our league has been working diligently in an effort to get the Willis directives rescinded to the extent that it does apply to career positions.

I am enclosing a copy of the statement we made in February and a speech on patronage which I recently gave in Washington.

We appreciate the constructive proposals you have made, and I am looking forward to meeting you.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. WATSON,
Executive Director.

Of course, I do not want the impression to get abroad that my introduction of bills to strengthen and improve the civil service and the statement I made on the floor of this House on May 27 had anything to do with Mr. Willis' almost immediate retirement from public life. It had "absitively and posolutely" nothing to do with the return of Mr. Willis to private life, a development which is chronicled in the following two news stories from the Washington Evening Star and the New York Times. If Mr. Willis in his new position as assistant to the chairman of the board of W. R. Grace & Co. takes his peculiar ideas as to personnel management with him I predict that the officials there will soon find that he is no great bargain.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 15, 1955]

SEC AIDE NAMED TO STAFF IN WHITE HOUSE SHIFTS

President Eisenhower today selected Edward T. Tate, 35-year-old Securities and Exchange Commission official, to replace on the White House staff Charles F. Willis, Jr., who has stirred considerable controversy as Federal job patronage dispenser.

At the same time, Mr. Eisenhower promoted Fred A. Seaton to a new position as deputy assistant to the President for administrative liaison.

In announcing these shifts, White House press secretary James C. Hagerty said that Mr. Tate would work under Mr. Seaton and have responsibility for personnel matters in liaison with the various Government departments and agencies.

ASSISTANT TO ADAMS

Mr. Willis had been an assistant to Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President and head of the White House staff.

Mr. Eisenhower accepted his resignation late yesterday "with deep regret," to be effective June 30. Mr. Tate's appointment is effective July 1.

The resignation of the 36-year-old Willis had been rumored for many months.

In accepting the resignation, the President told Mr. Willis: "You have devoted yourself tirelessly and effectively to our objectives. We shall greatly miss you."

Mr. Willis got into hot water last fall when he issued his now-famous directive to Federal agencies which ordered them to list all GS–14 and above civil service job vacancies with the Republican National Committee and not to fill them for 30 days. The directive was a move to give Republican applicants first crack at the jobs, although it was stated that the applicants must have civil service qualifications.

The resultant heat of criticism from the press and Democratic Members of Congress caused the directive to wither on the vine. Although it never was officially rescinded, it was quietly ignored by most agencies and the White House and the Republican National Committee, so far as is known, never followed up on it.

A Republican National Committee official later estimated that not more than 200 jobs were obtained by GOP applicants as a result of the Willis order.

EARLY EISENHOWER FAN

Mr. Willis made his entrance into politics in 1952 when he became coorganizer of the Citizens for Eisenhower Committee. Previously he had been a partner in a company selling supplies to airlines.

In January 1954, Mr. Willis married Elizabeth Firestone, daughter of Harvey Firestone, chairman of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

During the war he was a Navy pilot and received numerous decorations and citations for his record, including the Distinguished Flying Cross with four gold stars.

Mr. Tate, who lives at 8615 Lynbrook Drive, Bethesda, Md., now is executive assistant to the SEC Chairman.

Mr. Hagerty recalled that during the 1952 presidential election campaign he was a member of the Eisenhower campaign train staff. He is a native of Indiana, Pa.

He is scheduled to carry on the same type of work on personnel matters as Mr. Willis, but with Mr. Seaton having general direction of his work.

QUIT DEFENSE POST

Mr. Seaton, a former Republican Senator from Nebraska and a member of Mr. Eisenhower's 1952 personal advisory campaign staff, resigned as Assistant Secretary of Defense in February to become an administrative assistant to the President.

Another change of title on the White House staff announced today makes Howard Pyle deputy assistant to the President for intergovernmental relations. He has been handling the same work as an administrative assistant since February 1. Mr. Pyle is a former governor of Arizona.

Mr. Hagerty said that Mr. Pyle has been handling liaison work with Government departments and agencies in addition to his work with State and city governments. His responsbility for liaison with the departments and agencies now are shifted to Mr. Seaton.

[From the New York Times of June 16, 1955]

C. F. WILLIS, JR., QUITS AS WHITE HOUSE AIDE

WASHINGTON, June 14.—President Eisenhower accepted "with deep regret" today the resignation of Charles F. Willis Jr., as a White House staff member, effective June 30.

Mr. Willis, an early organizer of the Citizens for Eisenhower movement that helped bring General Eisenhower into politics, has been an assistant to Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President.

A White House announcement said that he would become assistant to the chairman of the board of W. R. Grace & Co. and make his home in New York after July 1. He formerly headed the Willis-Rose Corp., which had the service concession for aircraft at Idlewild Airport.

"As an intimate member of the administration family, you have devoted yourself tirelessly, and effectively to our objectives," the President wrote to Mr. Willis, "We shall greatly miss you. You take with you on your return to private affairs my full appreciation of the worth of your efforts along with my sincere thanks and best wishes for continued happiness and successs."

President Eisenhower also expressed his thanks to Mr. Willis for his "outstanding and significant" service in the Citizens for Eisenhower movement and in urging other young pepole "to associate themselves closely with the conduct of their Government."

Because of the importance of the issue and the widespread concern among Federal employees over the efforts of Mr. Willis and others in the present Republican administration to subvert the civil service, I would like to include here a splendid speech on patronage which Mr. Watson of the National Civil Service League gave recently here in Washington:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, distinguished commentators, ladies and gentlemen: my topic, as you have heard is: Is Patronage Obsolete? This of course a difficult question. I think patronage is obsolete, but not dead. However, I do think that the old-fashioned concept of political patronage is fading away. Wallace Sayre has said that patronage has gone underground. One thing is certain, at least, it is increasingly difficult to be a reformer.

In the good old days to be against political patronage was as holy as being against sin. The reformer was a knight on a white charger and carried the banner of the merit system. The answer to political corruption was the merit system. But what is the answer today?

The colossus of modern government has all but crushed the remnants of the Jackson-type patronage. At present at least 90 percent of Federal workers are under merit systems. The problem which remains is much more devious and more complicated to deal with.

SPOILS AS OLD AS GOVERNMENT

Every page of history will indicate the struggle over jobs. There is little doubt but that the concept of patronage with em-

phasis on spoils is as old as the concept of government itself. Certainly it predates the Jacksonian era. As a matter of fact I was recently a little startled to be reminded how ancient the concept really is when I heard a minister refer to the disappointment of some of the disciples of Christ because Christ did not emerge as a great political figure. It seems the disciples had already developed ideas as to the jobs they were to hold in such a political setup.

Leonard White has described the rise, persistence, and gradual decline of the patronage system as being one of the outstanding characteristics of the American public service. But the historical persistence of patronage doesn't make it right any more than the inevitability of sin.

I am speaking today of job patronage. The kind of patronage where the appointment to positions and advancement is based primarily on political or personal favoritism rather than on merit and the good of the service.

PATRONAGE ARGUMENTS

Today I think that the patronage advocates are on the defensive. They have three main arguments which they allege to be in the interest of the common good of the people.

1. The administration in power must have sufficient jobs to control the execution of the policies of the administration.

2. Civil service has become entrenched, inefficient, unduly protective of the incompetent, and has too much red tape.

3. The American political system is built on the two-party concept, and the parties need jobs to sustain themselves and to maintain the system.

1. Patronage and policy

I believe that we can dispose of the question of patronage and policy very directly. In the first place, I firmly believe that patronage actually interferes with executive control by the party in power rather than facilitating it.

(A) The freedom of the executive in making appointments is limited. Patronage appointments are made to satisfy the party organization. More often than not, the patronage pressures come from the State and county organizations who have little knowledge of or concern for important executive problems.

(B) One of the principal reasons given for allowing freedom of appointments at top levels is to provide the executive with the freedom to remove people as well as to appoint them. In spite of all of the allegations about excessive protection within civil service, and there are cases where this is true, it is very clear that the political appointee has more protection and is more difficult to remove for incompetence or misuse of office while his party is in power than is the civil servant. An example of this is shown by the statement in the biography of Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of Interior in President Wilson's Cabinet, who said:

"Never again will I make a removal. I did so once in the case of an incompetent and insubordinate woman, but when President Wilson took me into the window recess of the Cabinet room and begged me as a matter of 'balance' not to antagonize the Senator from Indiana, but to restore the lady to her position, I yielded."

On the basis of these observations, and for purposes of my discussion, I am going to eliminate the matter of policy control from further consideration as a patronage argument.

2. Patronage and civil service

Let us now turn to the second argument "civil service has become entrenched, inefficient, unduly protective of the incompetent and has too much red tape."

Those who fail to recognize the serious short-comings of our civil-service system in terms of modern personnel management and the need for better public service are doing themselves, as well as the public service, a grave injustice. There are several factors in the campaign for better personnel management which relate in one way or another to the patronage question. I would like to consider these now. First, however, let us make it clear—the patronage advocates do not have the answers to the civil-service problems. They in fact set up one of the more serious barriers to achieving adequate improvement.

A. Career Service Here To Stay

We know today that the Federal service is staffed and administered by career people and will continue to be. Every study of civil service yet made has substantiated this. A high percentage of those filling top level administrative positions today have had 15 or more years of service.

Even under schedule C which has been the first constructive attempt to clearly separate the so-called policymaking and confidential jobs, experience has shown the inability to get competent people through patronage procedures. There has been a consistent number of vacancies in schedule C positions and 70 percent of those filled are held by people who were in the Federal service prior to January 1953. It should not be surprising to the informed and conscientious observer to realize that the department heads in Washington today depend on career people more than on a confused patronage recruiting machinery to fill responsible positions. It is at this level that the public interest must be supreme and not the interests of a political party which come in conflict with the responsibility of the administration and the public interest.

B. Patronage Underground

My earlier reference to patronage going underground means primarily the efforts that are being made throughout the country in Federal, State, and local civil-service systems to inject partisan politics and favoritism into the appointments and advancements of career people. This is where the patronage problem is especially serious and why it is particularly difficult to be a reformer today. It is impossible to sufficiently emphasize the demoralizing effect of such efforts. This includes the recent obvious and clumsy attempt to placate the spoils element by politicalizing certain career positions in the Federal service through the so-called Willis directive.

If we are to have a system whereby certain so-called career people must get political endorsements and be subjected to political tests before receiving appointments to career positions, then we will never achieve the advancements in the civil-service system which we need.

If the career service is to be subjected to political test, Philip Young and his staff at the CSC might as well abandon their progressive efforts to improve executive development and training. The public cannot afford to train executives in the career service who will be subjected to political suspicion by future administrations. Adequate selection of people for training cannot be accomplished where political favoritism is involved.

If there are to be political tests then President Eisenhower might as well discontinue efforts for the President's incentive award program. What kind of incentive award system can we have if every person receiving an award is going to be suspected of being a political favorite?

D. It is time, however, for a serious word of caution. Some career people and personnel administrators are basically conservative. They inevitably have a belief in the status quo, therefore, they resist, and are suspicious of efforts to bring improvement. I have said to you before and say to you again, civil service needs improvement.

Just as we guard against favoritism, we must also be careful that we do not view every proposal for change as a raid on the merit system. In other words, civil service must be protected from the entrenched bureaucrat just as much as it must be protected from the pious politician who is going to save democracy from the civil service.

We have reached a point where conscientious administrators attempting to overcome some of the inadequacies in civil service are sometimes improperly accused of using patronage and favoritism. Just as some administrators have used civil service as a "whipping boy" for their own administrative and supervisory shortcomings, there is also the situation where some employees and employee groups label efforts to disturb the status quo as being patronage or favoritism. In other words, the "whipping boy" principal works in both directions.

The persistence of a patronage climate is one of the serious barriers to rapid advancement in modern personnel management. I would like to emphasize that the executive is responsible for maintaining and improving the personnel system. This must be completely eliminated from any concept of or argument for patronage.

PATRONAGE AND THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

3. We come now to the final argument on patronage, the argument that jobs are needed to sustain the two party system. To me this is the only argument from a patronage point of view that deserves careful analysis. I hope I have made it clear that the problem of political control of the executive branch and the problem of civil service shortcomings are matters completely outside of any patronage argument.

I do not feel qualified to take a dogmatic view on this question of patronage as the lifeblood of the two-party system.

Unfortunately, we have not had an exhaustive analysis of the party system and the patronage question for a long time. During the last 20 years when civil service has been greatly extended there have been 4 or 5 major civil service studies. Each has assumed that patronage in relation to a career service is undesirable. I would urge that a careful, disinterested analysis of the two-party system and means for sustaining it be undertaken. Personally, I believe that two things are quite clear:

First, on the basis of various observations I doubt if patronage does sustain a healthy and proper political organization, and,

Secondly, any patronage system yet devised is too expensive in terms of its effect on the Government administration to justify its existence. The patronage advocates must answer some pretty serious questions.

Can a patronage system be developed in such a way that it does not interfere with the skill, integrity, and prestige of the career system which is now the foundation of good government?

Can it be done in such a way that it does not deter outstanding community leaders from participating in politics?

Can a patronage system be developed which would overcome the negative corrupting reputation which patronage has historically carried with it?

Because many of you are familiar with the views of Mr. James C. Worthy, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and I think unduly concerned about his patronage proposal, I would like to take a moment to analyze it. I am certain that some people think it is shocking that someone who has made such a proposal for a specific patronage system would be invited to become a member of the National Civil Service League's executive committee. I am afraid that too many people have failed to read carefully Mr. Worthy's proposal and many are still inevitably on the defense about any such ideas.

Personally, I am not convinced as to the need for or the workability of the Worthy patronage scheme. I think, however, that it would be very shortsighted, indeed, not to recognize the careful distinction that Mr. Worthy made. As a result of his political experience he has accepted the theory that patronage is necessary to feed the two-party system. He has attempted, and I think in an honest fashion, to separate this patronage both from the career civil service and particularly from the political control level of government.

Mr. Worthy says that it does not take very many jobs to control a department and to assure its loyal adherence to the policies of the administration in power. Secondly, Mr. Worthy believes it is entirely improper to attempt to obtain patronage by politicalizing the career service. It is very clear from his paper that he disapproves of way in which the Willis order confuses the appointment system in higher level career positions.

Mr. Worthy then goes on to propose the development of a group of positions which would satisfy the grassroots organization of the political party from a patronage point of view. Naturally some politicians will take the Worthy theme out of context in an attempt to use it as an advancement of patronage which does interfere with the career civil service. One important thing is that Mr. Worthy carefully and emphatically isolated the negative factor of patronage.

The patronage advocates, including Mr. Worthy, must find the answers to the problems which arise as a result of patronage and the conclusions we have all come to accept; namely:

1. Patronage, as typically practiced in the Federal Government, weakens executive authority and interferes with proper executive responsibility. Many political leaders conscientiously believe the reverse. The political pressures and the local political organizations, the Members of Congress, as well as various special-interest groups, put such pressures on the executive that many appointments are not truly executive in their influence.

2. Patronage is demoralizing to career people who really do the work. When people are rewarded on a basis other than performance, the good people become demoralized and leave the service or they lack the incentive to do their best work.

3. Patronage degrades the service in the public eye. One of the reasons that the public service today lacks the prestige which it needs and to a large extent deserves is that the public lacks confidence in it. It is also degrading to the political party. I believe that the patronage program of the Republicans is a failure. A member of the Republican National Committee in referring to the administration's patronage program said, "The program has done us far more harm than good. It has given us a black eye in the press and furnished the Democrats with a lot of ammunition."

4. Patronage, by any method yet devised, is ultimately corrupting. People who want patronage are not interested in qualifications and standards. In fact, strong control of standards quickly makes the politician dissatisfied with patronage. It is most difficult to supervise politically appointed people. The combination of poorer standards and lack of supervision not only degrades the service, but allows corrupting influences to creep in which periodically shock the Nation.

5. Patronage generally reduces efficiency. Turnover increases and the more competent people are the first to leave to find more stable employment elsewhere.

These items are cited to remind us that we are looking at a personnel program and that any system which uses public office to reward the political victors and help maintain the party system must be able to deal successfully with these problems.

PATRONAGE AND THE RESPONSIBLE POLITICAL LEADER

To the responsible political leader, patronage is like other sacred cows. The records are full of statements by politicians that patronage is a headache. That it is more of a liability than an asset. Even such an eminent political realist as James Farley had recognized that patronage was used to build political machines and said that a shortsighted lust for jobs has broken up more political organizations both Republican and Democratic than any other single cause.

But in the final analysis few are willing to take the initiative and overthrow the patronage idea. Most people with experience don't like it. They don't believe in it. But they go along with it because they think everyone wants it.

PATRONAGE AND THE PUBLIC

No real discussion of patronage is complete without mention of the basis of real democracy—patronage and the public.

It can hardly be denied that the public overwhelmingly endorses the merit system. No man running for public office today would fail to immediately and vigorously endorse the merit-system principle. The party platforms of both the Republicans and the Democrats have for many years had a strong plank for civil service. Hardly any legislator or political leader speaks out directly against the merit system, no matter how much he wants to develop patronage appointments.

The press has also indicated its universal approval of the merit system. This was manifested again only recently by the extensive coverage and favorable editorial comment accorded Secretary of Labor Mitchell's appointment of Millard Cass, a career man, to be Deputy Under Secretary of Labor. A typical endorsement appeared in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator in an editorial entitled "A Welcome Appointment."

"The Hoover Commission's recommendation of a senior civil service bears fruit with the appointment of Millard Cass, a career civil cervant, as Deputy Under Secretary of Labor. Thus the Labor Department, through Secretary Mitchell's wise action, is assured the continuing services of an experienced executive.

"Hitherto politics and patronage have been responsible in part for failure to establish such a corps. Secretary Mitchell does the Nation a service by ignoring such considerations in appointing Mr. Cass."

There are two things about the public attitude that come to mind. First, people tend to distrust big government, but they expect more from it without accepting the accompanying responsibilities to them as citizens.

There is a certain amount of apathy over political activity which is inconsistent with their demands for good government and good civil service.

It is necessary that every possible opportunity be utilized to encourage broad public participation in political affairs. I really think that this more than any other single factor will remove the patronage threat in the healthiest possible way. I realize, of course, that this is of limited value to most of you since you are all under the Hatch Act and I think properly so.

The greatest contribution which professional personnel and career people can make in stemming the advocates of patronage is to develop and maintain a personnel system that services the public in a most efficient and effective manner.

I would like to repeat that patronage and not civil service is on the defensive. Therefore, we should not be afraid to admit deficiencies in the civil service system and work in an aggressive manner for improvement.

The role of the reformer is to see that you persevere in your task and we must also continually stimulate the public's interest in a more efficient public service. It is our aim and desire to help perfect the public service by improving its reputation and prestige. The more carefully the public looks at public service the more efficient it will become.

I must urge once more that the present administration clarify its policy regarding the career service and remove any cause for suspicion of partisan influence which will prevent the constructive programs now under way from realizing their full potential.

As an editorial in Time Magazine so effectively stated: "Federal patronage as a force in politics is dead. No amount of whipping will hurt it and no amount of wailing can restore it." I think we have all come to accept this. Our biggest problem today is not protecting the civil service, it's making it work. Our responsibilities are clear and I sincerely hope we will all succeed.

The Problem of Agricultural Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Bumper' Bumps," written by Alfred B. Stedman and published in the Sunday Pioneer Press of June 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BUMPER" BUMPS

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

"Bumper," in farm news lingo, means a mammoth crop is on the way. Heard over the radio, the word has a satisfying sound. It fits well in headlines. To consumers, it connotes living off the fat of the land. On the exchanges, it is music that maketh the farm trades purr.

But to the dirt farmer, the word can become a bit of a pain in the neck. Doesn't he like raising a huge crop? Of course. No joys compare with those of fine production—when his own big harvest is of things that are generally in moderate supply, that consumers really need, and that compensate him with good prices.

So what's wrong with the "bumper" tag? Not so much, maybe, when pinned on record production that's actually in the bag. But now, when the crops are just well started and most of the gantlet of bugs and plant disease and weather is still to be run, the word seems off cue. Its glib and lyrical gush doesn't tell farm or city people the story of toil and sweat and hazards of a season's food production.

There can be more in a crop story than meets the layman's eye. Farmers read that drouth is broken by showers, that a "bumper" crop is hoped for, and that prices have resumed their downward sag. Yet they know from sad experience things that others overlook.

Ah, yes, from auto seat or train window the grain does look lush. But the farmer's trained eye sees some fields heavily weed-infested and in crying need of sprays, others condemned by earlier drouth to light yields or (in other years) rotten with rust disease and doomed to destruction.

Sure, the corn looks fine and the clusters of holes just appearing in the leaves seem too tiny to talk about. But they tell the farmer corn borners are on the march already. And the crop has 3 months of assorted other risks to run.

And the alfalfa, so bright and lovely, is too short to yield a good first cutting. The

shortness tells that the drought's scarcity of moisture had run deep into the subsoil where the alfalfa roots go.

Farmers know that a few showers don't break a drought, but just ease it. They know that, as right now in northern Minnesota, crops can suffer from too much as well as too little rain. They know that high production depends on getting rainfall of adequate amounts at timely intervals.

And farmers know the true significance of recent rains does not lie as yet in a "bumper" prospect. Rather it lies in the rains' ending of danger that the crop might be overtaken by disaster at the start. The rains have restored to the crop an early season chance to develop normally.

Thinking things over, city folks can hardly find it in their hearts to blame the farmer for being gunshy of the word "bumper." The term suits those cashing in on buying farm stuff cheap and selling dear. It's all right for individual farmers who do fine in an average season.

But to farmers as a group there are opposite kinds of hazards—one of crop failure due to drought or other cause, and the other of production so big as to swamp them and knock the props from under their prices.

Farmers as a group don't find their best reward in raising the huge crops that are welcomed in headlines. They do better on moderate production. For instance, their record corn crop of 1948 was 1¼ billion bushels bigger than that of 1947, but its value was $400 million less. And they got almost twice as much for raising a moderate potato crop in 1952 as for producing an excessive one in 1950.

Thus to the farmer, a so-called "bumper" crop can be a doubtful blessing. Applied ahead of time, the word stands for bumping his prices down with rosy predictions. As of now, he has escaped the drought hazard, but isn't yet up against the hazard of raising a "bumper" crop.

Seven Questions by Chancellor C. C. Furnas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call to the attention of the Congress a well-timed and profound commencement day address by Clifford C. Furnas, chancellor of the University of Buffalo, at Buffalo, N. Y.

The address follows:

SEVEN QUESTIONS

(Commencement day address by C. C. Furnas, chancellor, University of Buffalo, June 5, 1955)

Commencement day is frequently the time when the older generation tries to evade its responsibilities by throwing the torch of civilization to the younger. The presentations are usually laced with a full quota of admonishments and good advice, which often fall on unwilling ears. Despite these multitudinous perennial passings, the torch of civilization still seems to remain alight and alive. It is my purpose, in taking what I trust will not be too many minutes, to uphold the tradition by posing seven interrelated questions.

I

One of the monumental efforts in the writing of history has been completed recently by Dr. Arnold J. Toynbee, of the University of London, in the form of a multivolume A Study of History. Although there is some argument in professional circles as to the acceptability of his treatment, it is certainly true that he has given us one of the most comprehensive views of the social forces and major trends which make up the story of what we call civilization. He delineates the rise and decadence of 20 different civilizations on which we have substantial written or physical evidence. One might judge from this that history will inevitably repeat itself and that modern-day western civilization is destined for a decline and fall. But it may be premature to assume that we are doomed. Dr. Toynbee has pointed out that something new has been added—an emotional situation which is now being evidenced on a worldwide scale. In a relatively recent article he expresses the opinion that the 20th century will not be remembered for world wars, or the automobile, the airplane, antibiotics, or even nuclear energy, but rather for "* * * having been the first age since the dawn of civilization, some five or six thousand years back, in which people dared to think it practicable to make the benefits of civilization available for the whole human race."

Question No. 1: Will it be physically and emotionally possible to accommodate this rising ambition of the human race?

II

Due in large measure to the effective and humanitarian work of the medical profession in saving lives, the world is now in a period of population expansion which can be characterized as explosive. The rate of population increase is far greater than it has ever been before, and the evidence is that the high rate of increase will continue for many years to come. At the present time there are about 2,400 million people living on the surface of the earth and the net increase is almost 100,000 human beings every day. A century hence, unless some great catastrophe intervenes, which we do not now foresee, the world population will be at least 6 billion. In the continental United States the present population is about 165 million and a century hence (only three generations away) it will be at least 375 million. This is almost a 250-percent increase. No social forces are in sight which will stop or reverse this trend.

We are already faced with many pressures resulting from these rising numbers. It is estimated that fully half the population of the world is malnourished, and many millions are on the verge or in the throes of starvation. In America we do not worry as much about starvation as we do about where to park our cars, but there are many population-pressure problems, even here.

In my opinion, it should be physically possible to supply the adequate means for the existence of these great numbers of people, but it is problematical whether we will make necessary sociological advances in time to prevent extremely serious upheavals.

Question No. 2: Can we adapt and expand our knowledge of science, technology and sociology rapidly enough to meet the needs of the ever-increasing population?

III

Our physical existence depends upon the resources which are available to us—thousands of items in various categories of food, water, energy and minerals. Even now shortages are beginning to appear and make themselves felt. For instance, when the Masabi Range in Minnesota came into use a half century ago, it was thought that there would be sufficient high-grade iron ore there to last America for many centuries. But the use of iron has increased so rapidly that by the mid-20th century the higher grades of Mesabi ore are already almost gone. This has been a major reason why the St. Lawrence Seaway has finally been accepted as a necessary pathway for bringing ore to the Great Lake ports from Labrador and other outside sources.

In the western half of the United States, and in many other parts of the world, water—which is one of our most necessary natural resources—is already in short supply.

The support of more and more people with a higher standard of living requires an ever-increasing degree of industrialization. This calls for rapidly increasing amounts of energy which, to date, we are largely taking from the fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gas. The curve of energy use is rising with extreme rapidity. The United States, which has only a little more than 6 percent of the world's population, utilizes almost 50 percent of the total energy of the world and correspondingly produces and uses almost one-half of the industrial goods and services. If the other 94 percent of the people of the world should be able suddenly to rise to our own level of industrial production, the demand for energy would be immediately increased by almost tenfold. Many trends indicate that the bona fide energy needs of the world a century hence may very well be almost a hundredfold greater than at present. The fossil fuels—coal, oil, and gas—will not, by any stretch of the imagination, be able to supply this need.

Balanced against this picture of depletion of energy is the fact that we are now beginning to learn to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The amount of power locked in the atoms which we can use, after we have developed the appropriate knowledge, is many times greater than that in the fossil fuels. Furthermore, 30,000 times as much energy as we are currently using falls on the earth each year in the form of sunlight. We do not know how to use it with any acceptable degree of efficiency as yet, but the supply is there, waiting for human cleverness to put it to work.

Question No. 3: Can the world advance rapidly enough, scientifically and sociologically, to make full and wise use of our natural resources in this and succeeding generations?

IV

In 1769 James Watt in England received his first patent on an improved steam engine. Subsequently steam power was adapted to manufacturing processes and the sociological development known as the industrial revolution was well underway. Although the industrial revolution is usually considered as something which was completed in western Europe in a generation or two, it is my contention that it is just now getting well started. We see the evidence of that in the rise within the last few months of a new term, "automation." Automation is merely a new word which is used as a label for the industrial processes wherein machines are used to operate or even build the machines which produce consumers' goods and services. There are those who fear that a rapid rise of automation will lead to widespread technological unemployment. But careful analysis shows that there will actually be more opportunities for employment. The kinds of jobs will change, but not the total number, and the productivity per worker will rise rapidly. If one lets his imagination roam, he can see tremendous potential benefits in terms of higher standards of living, more leisure, a better life for all people.

Question No. 4: Can we make the sociological and economic adjustments which are implicit in carrying the industrial revolution to its logical conclusions by the full utilization of the principles of automation?

V

It is obvious from the few situations I have already outlined, and others which you could readily add, that civilization is becoming quite complicated. This has had a major impact, particularly during the last half century, in the field of education. In order to have the adequate background for good citizenship and for appreciating life and for earning a living, it has been found necessary to maintain an ever-rising level of formal education. This is reflected in our own legal requirements for compulsory education through secondary schools and in the ever-increasing proportion of individuals who find it highly desirable, or even necessary, to go to college. Since education should serve the purposes of the next generation, rather than the past (an item which many persons seem to overlook), we find ourselves in a continuous quandary about the appropriate curriculum makeup and environmental conditions necessary for present-day colleges and universities. This poses very serious and continuing problems. We also have quantitative problems. Within the next 15 years in the United States the number who will be knocking at the doors of the academic halls of the colleges and universities will practically double.

Question No. 5: Can we adjust the structure, scope, and size of the colleges and universities to meet the needs of the next generation?

VI

World War II began in September 1939 and, more or less, formally ended in August 1945. The dominant factor in this greatest-of-all armed conflicts was the impact of airpower. In the span of 6 years the Allied Air Forces, using many thousands of airplanes, dropped almost 2 million tons of bombs on enemy targets. Those bombs contained about a million tons of high explosives. Less than 2 years ago on an atoll in the Pacific a so-called hydrogen bomb, which might have been carried by 1 airplane and delivered to a single target, was exploded. It reputedly had an explosive power 20 times greater than all of the bombs dropped by both the British and American Air Forces in the 6 years of World War II. I can leave to your own imagination the picture of the destruction that would probably be wrought in a world war III if both we and the Soviet Union were equipped with an adequate supply of hydrogen bombs.

Question No. 6: Can world war III be avoided?

VII

The previous six questions are merely prologue to my seventh and final one. If I may refer again to Dr. Toynbee and remind you that he has outlined the rise and fall of 20 civilizations of the past, the final question is obvious.

Question No. 7: Will Western civilization be No. 21 on the list of those which entered the race but failed to finish?

VIII

You may have either of two reactions to the questions I have posed. The first, and perhaps the most probable, is one of complete indifference. You may not deny the validity of the questions and the implied problems but may say: well those are things for someone else to worry about. Besides I couldn't do anything about them anyway.

This path of indifference is the easiest one to take, but it would probably lead to results that would be far from indifferent. If everyone ignores the problems involved and simply lets human nature take its course in random fashion, history will record that we arrived at a set of answers which will be far from the best.

An alternate reaction which some of you may adopt is a frantic feeling of desperation, that doom is upon us, and that we must do something—in capital letters—though we are not sure what. But if a substantial portion of the people adopted the frantic approach to international affairs, it would be analogous to attempting delicate surgery with a meat ax, the results would probably be fatal.

Since we are presumably reasonable people, I would like to leave with you the suggestion that the most appropriate and wisest course is somewhere between the two extremes. Middle-of-the-road policies are often lacking in glamor, but in the long run they are frequently the most effective. Such a pattern of thought and action in a democratic society necessarily embodies what I like to call collective intelligence.

I am fully aware that all of you who are graduating today will, for some time to come, for the most part be rightly concerned with quite personal problems in which the earning of a living will take a most dominant position. This is good. It is one of the things that has made America great because, from the beginning of our history, the average American has accepted the responsibility for the welfare of himself and his family and has not followed the easy path of letting someone else worry about it. May this feeling of individual responsibility ever continue. But over and above these individual problems are those paramount and still unanswered questions which involve all aspects of the world we live in. You cannot escape them, even on an atoll in the Pacific. Your physical welfare, your own enjoyment of life, the well-being of your children will depend on how wisely these questions are met and answered in the not-distant future. If the decision is left to a dictator, the answers will probably be wrong and very unpalatable. Satisfactory answers can only come from collective intelligence—and collective intelligence is not compiled by a lot of other people. It is formed by you, your family, and your associates. It is particularly important that the collective answers arrived at in the United States be approximately correct because, whether we like it or not, we are now in the dominant world position, politically and economically. Leadership has its grave responsibilities.

I will make no attempt to delineate ways and means for individuals to make their intellects effective in national and international affairs. The paths are many, varied, and ever changing. To the individual who is well informed, alert, and willing, many spheres of influence will keep opening up. Trying to do something about it, even in a modest way, will often require a high degree of moral and spiritual stamina—and sometimes courage. I trust that your college years have helped you to acquire or maintain these sterling virtues.

As you can see, I do not know the answers to any of my own questions and I am led to believe that neither does anyone else. But every graduating class in 1955, here and elsewhere, will inevitably play an important role by either ignoring the questions or trying to do something about the answers. So, as a representative of the older generation, as I proceed with the annual passing of the torch, I do so with an earnest plea—that your education never cease, that you cultivate and maintain an interest in these serious social problems of the world we live in, that whenever opportunity is afforded you bend your wills, your intelligence, and your spirit toward seeking the better solutions. May you all have the rich, fruitful, and enjoyable lives of which you have often dreamed and may you frequently have that additional glow of satisfaction which will come when you have contributed something to finding the better answers to the questions which face you, your family, your country, and your civilization.

The Belgrade Conference Being Hailed as a Victory for Tito May Well Be in Fact Advantageous to the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RUSSIA STANDS TO GAIN FROM DEFEAT BY TITO

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

A report by the able John M. Hightower, of the Associated Press, that the United States, Britain, and France intend to ask Marshal Tito just where he stands in the cold war is good news.

Just before the visit of the Soviet big shots to Belgrade I suggested that if the American administration wished to quiet the suspicion that Marshal Tito was a doublecrosser, it should induce him to state his position in some nonreversible manner. At a coming meeting with Tito in Belgrade, the three western countries are expected to do just that.

This act is long overdue.

True, American newsmen in Belgrade during the Russian visit almost unanimously talk of Tito's great diplomatic victory over the Russians, meaning that the fat Yugoslav did not (publicly) consent to rejoin the Soviet Communist church of Moscow.

This, in my eyes, is important evidence. The old (pre-1944) Chicago Daily News Foreign Service, of which I am proud to have been a member, had few rules for correspondents. But one of them was—the man on the spot is always right. The home office ought not argue with him about what he personally observes.

NO VICTORY

Therefore, I am slow to differ with my eminent news colleagues in Belgrade. They were there—and I was in Washington. Yet even after some days' reflection, I am still convinced that their interpretation of the Russian visit is misleading.

Tito, in my judgment, won no victory over the Russians. The Russians got from him exactly what they most needed—full support of their present policy of neutralizing the allied camp, beginning with West Germany. In fact, the final communique defining the relationship between the Moscow and the Belgrade governments used the exact phrases which Premier Bulganin had uttered in a Moscow speech last February 10. (A curious sort of defeat.)

In fact, I do not believe that Messrs. Krushchev and Bulganin were seeking to induce Tito publicly to rejoin the only true Communist church at this moment. For if he had, his usefulness to the Kremlin would not have increased, but lessened.

Back in the Kremlin fold, Tito's Yugoslavia would have been just another Soviet satellite, another Bulgaria or Hungary, whose diplomatic influence in the world would have been nil. (Who listens to a parrot?)

WIELDS INFLUENCE

Whereas Tito, as an "independent" and dynamic "friend of peace," a man outside both rival "blocs," can continue to exercise his not-inconsiderable influence on the wobbly West European publics, can talk with and get aid from the United States and meanwhile give his real support to the foreign policy of the U. S. S. R. precisely as In-

dia's Nehru and Krishna Menon are doing.

Westerners like this writer frequently speak of both India and Yugoslavia as "neutrals." Both countries deny this. And in one sense they are right.

The nature of true neutrality can be seen in the conduct of Switzerland and—to a lesser extent—of Sweden. These two countries keep out of international disputes and do not try to influence them in any sense. Not so India and Yugoslavia. They make a habit of sticking their oar into everything, expressing opinions about everything—all in the sacred name of "peace."

And for some reason, it just happens that every Indian venture into world affairs turns out to benefit Red China, and every Yugoslav venture strengthens Red Russian and Red Chinese policy. It was not different in Belgrade this time. Tito has announced his backing for admission of Red China to the United Nations, and, by implication, for the neutralization of West Germany, the two things the United States is trying hardest to prevent.

In other words, Tito is advocating acts which if realized would spell the disintegration of the freedom camp and its ultimate absorption by some sort of Communist or pro-Communist group.

HIS RIGHT

This, of course, is Communist Tito's good right. What is not—or should not be—his right is to do this with American economic and military backing.

Yet after 6 years of American assistance without which both Tito and his regime would have gone down the drain, there he is, publicly opposing the owner of the hand that fed him.

It is, of course, our fault. Tito has always insisted that he would promise nothing in exchange for what he got—except to defend himself in case of Soviet attack. He has not even promised to assist his so-called allies, Greece and Turkey, if one of them was attacked and Yugoslavia was not.

Now, behind the very thin mask of ostentatiously not rejoining the Soviet bloc, he is openly giving aid to Soviet policies. Surely it is time to tell this cocky lord of a small country that American taxpayers are tired of fattening those who oppose our efforts to preserve freedom.

A Statesmanlike Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly many of our colleagues noted that Echo Park Dam was eliminated from the upper Colorado project bill this week by our Interior Subcommittee. I hope this will cause many potential opponents of this meritorious project to reconsider their position. Such reconsideration is in order, as evidenced by the following editorial which appeared this week in the conservation-minded St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

REASON ON THE UPPER COLORADO

A statesmanlike solution to the bill for the upper Colorado storage project has been arrived at by the House Interior Subcommittee headed by Representative ASPINALL, of Colorado. The subcommittee has eliminated Echo Park Dam, a project of most questionable wisdom because it would have invaded Dinosaur National Monument. The subcommittee thus went as far as it could to insure the enactment of the upper Colorado project as a whole, to provide water for a group of Western States.

The subcommittee then went on to propose a study by a Presidential commission of alternatives to Echo Park. Water losses due to evaporation, differences in power production, scenic and recreational values and river regulation would all be considered in the commission's study.

Such a study has long been needed, and was proposed months ago both by Bernard De Voto in Harper's magazine and by the Post-Dispatch. Hot dispute has done little to compose the issue. The cool facts should help measurably.

How To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of June 14, 1955.

After reading this editorial it becomes evident that prompt action should be taken by the Congress to remedy this situation and it was with that thought in mind that I introduced in the House H. R. 5943, to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense. I hope that the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee will set this bill for early hearing.

The editorial is as follows:

HOW TO SURVIVE

Rarely has this newspaper printed an account more disturbing than the series on this Nation's civil-defense unpreparedness concluded yesterday. Confusion, lack of leadership, inadequate information, public apathy and major gaps in our warning system are among the key features unearthed in this examination of our readiness for the awful emergency of nuclear attack against our cities and people. The findings of this survey, plus the recent revelations of major Soviet advances in building long-range heavy bombers, make it clear that unless, as we hope and pray, the world achieves a lasting peace, the United States is open to a major attack in which the Nation's survival, and the lives of millions of our people, would be at stake.

The revelations appearing in these pages this week make clear that nothing less than a fundamentally new approach to the whole problem can hope to give us anything approaching a satisfactory defensive system. In such an approach the following elements must certainly be taken into account: The problem of nuclear defense is national, and requires the highest level national attention and very high priority; the system of leaving preparations to local communities and officials has been tried and found wanting, particularly now that the prospects of hydrogen bomb fallout make State and city lines meaningless in this connection.

Responsible officials must reexamine the question of how much the public is to be told, recognizing that past efforts at secrecy have not prevented Soviet nuclear progress but have grievously slowed down our own domestic defense planning. Civilian apathy must be countered by leadership from our very highest officials aimed at convincing our people that measures taken now can save innumerable lives should catastrophe strike. It is dubious that such leadership will be adequate if it comes from anywhere below the White House level. As Senator KEFAUVER and a Senate committee have already recommended, it is the President himself who must take charge to meet this unparalleled challenge to our survival.

Massachusetts Voters Oppose Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, citizens all over the country have written me opposing the upper Colorado storage project. Typical of this correspondence is a letter I received recently from Mr. and Mrs. Fred Foster, of Worcester, Mass. It is as follows:

WORCESTER, MASS., *June 14, 1955.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: The enclosed editorial from a conservative Republican newspaper brings to your attention the attitude of many Massachusetts voters toward the upper Colorado River storage project bill now before your Committee on Interior Affairs. My husband and I hope—urge—that you will vote to kill this bill promptly and will work to a wiser Government policy in regard to the use of water power and the preservation of the National Parks.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. FRED H. FOSTER.

The editorial referred to in the Foster's letter is from the Worcester Telegram of April 22, 1955, and is set forth for the information of the House:

THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED

It would take volumes to adequately tell the story of the fantastic scheme the Government planners have concocted for the upper Colorado River. But we can get at one pertinent fact by looking at the cost estimates. According to these, the bill to the taxpayer will run not $100 million nor $200 million, nor even $1 billion. The eventual cost is estimated at a cool $4 billion, and Reclamation Bureau estimates are never low.

But strangely enough, it is not this proposed enormous bite on our bank account that has aroused the most protest. The most irate voices against the upper Colorado project have come from conservation groups such as the Izaak Walton League, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Federated Women's Clubs, the Wilderness Society, the National Parks Association, and many others, who claim that the Government's plans for big dams will wreck 200,000-acre Echo Park, one of the most beautiful spots of unspoiled wilderness in America.

As if this were not enough to damn the enterprise, it is also claimed that these nine monstrous storage dams could never be filled by Colorado River water without ruining whole areas downstream in Utah, Arizona, and California.

Want some more arguments against this superboondoggle? Well, former Gov. Leslie Miller, of Wyoming, has compiled some figures to show that money will have to flow as deep as the water in some places if the bureaucrats' plans are to be realized. He shows that it is going to cost $947 per acre at La-

Plata, Colo., $1,540 per acre in the Navaho project of New Mexico, and $793 per acre in the central Utah project to reclaim the barren wastelands for cultivation. If we really want to add to our present $8 billion worth of crop surpluses, there must be a cheaper way to do it.

In the meantime, it has been estimated that millions of acres in the humid and semiarid zones of the Middle Western States are being lost to erosion forever because of the lack of good conservation practices. This is really good land, and could be retained and strengthened for a tithe of the cost of the upper Colorado project.

The fact is that the Government has gone dam crazy. This would be bad enough if only expense and waste were involved. But many studious conservationists believe that these big dams, flooding hundreds of thousands of the best acres in the West, are just about the poorest method conceivable for dealing with the problem. Yet the Senate has now approved this fantastic scheme.

The Eisenhower administration is committed to a policy of fiscal moderation, not to say sanity. It is inconceivable that the President can let this gargantuan pork barrel deal go through. It should never have been considered in the first place.

The Antitrust Laws of the United States Must Not Be Weakened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me by the House, I am including a resolution adopted by the Wichita Independent Businessmen's Association of Wichita, Kans. This resolution strictly opposes any attempt to weaken the antitrust laws of our country.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the executive committee of the Wichita Independent Business Men's Association, in meeting duly assembled on this 7th day of June 1955, has considered carefully the report of the Attorney General's Committee to study the antitrust laws; and

Whereas in such report the committee approves the result of the Standard Oil decision (340 U. S. 231) in which it was held that Standard Oil could practice discriminations promotive of monopoly when it could be shown that such discrimination was merely to meet competition in good faith, and

Whereas such report also favored allowing large buyers to form, and deal through their own brokerage firms and to take advantage of such fictitious brokerage set ups to secure discounts; and

Whereas the executive committee of the Wichita Independent Business Men's Association, after due consideration, feels that both of the above and foregoing recommendations, if enacted into law, would promote monopoly and discrimination against independent business and could, therefore, be highly detrimental to independent business: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Wichita Independent Business Men's Association, That they are strongly opposed to such recommendations and do vigorously object that such recommendations being enacted into law; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Senators and Congressmen from the State of Kansas.

ED G. FAHNESTOCK,
President of the Wichita Independent Business Men's Association.

Attested by

LOURAINE H. SHIELDS,
Executive Secretary.

Accounting for the Vaccine Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 15, 1955.

ACCOUNTING FOR THE VACCINE MUDDLE

The last week has seen statements issued by those chiefly involved in the polio vaccination program; and the net result has not been to relieve the confusion in the mind of the citizen. With no new vaccine released since June 6, with inoculations being rejected in some areas by as much as 50 percent of the eligible children, with continued doubts as to the advisability of proceeding through the warm weather months, the whole program can be said to lie under a cloud.

Meanwhile, what have the protagonists been saying? The Surgeon General, Dr. Scheele, delivered a long explanation to the head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; in it he blamed by implication both Dr. Salk and the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. Dr. Salk, he indicated, had provided an "original concept" for killing the live virus which was not always practicable. The foundation's statistical information had not been sufficient to establish satisfactory standards for checking on the manufacturers of the vaccine.

At the same time the Surgeon General revised the organization of the Public Health Service, which is charged with seeing that vaccines are safe. The question is why this had not been done earlier, when it might have been foreseen that the staff and the money available were a good deal less than adequate for dealing with the polio program.

The head of the National Foundation, Mr. Basil O'Connor, replied to Dr. Scheele with understandable resentment at not having been kept informed of developments. Dr. Salk, with great moderation, replied that, in his view, the new procedures established by the Government would insure the safety of the vaccine. In guarded language he went on to assert that the fault had not been in the concept as he originated it, but in the way it was implemented and interpreted by the Government.

Through all this there has been no indication as to what went wrong with the Cutter vaccine. The Government may be presumed to have information on this point which it has not released. For lack of this, the picture remains obscure.

The contrast is striking—dismally striking—between the way the polio program has been handled in Canada and in this country. The Canadians accepted the standards developed here, and worked them out quietly and efficiently. There have been no shifts, no alarms, no setbacks. Yet this country prides itself on being able to initiate vast projects and carry them through effectively. When the full story on the United States polio program is known, it will provide significant lessons—and significant warnings—for the future.

A Chapter in the Fish and Wildlife Service of Albert M. Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on June 8 the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] delivered a vitriolic attack on the conservation policies of the Interior Department and charged that Mr. Albert M. Day is being eased out of his job in the Department because he opposed pressure groups which are in favor of baiting waterfowl for hunters.

The implication of this charge was that the Department favors baiting and therefore found it necessary to get rid of Mr. Day because of his opposition to the practice.

In recent weeks the Department has been the target of a series of such attacks, inspired by political motives and designed to impair public confidence in its activities.

I have no doubt there will be more of the same as the 1956 election campaign approaches. Those well-meaning groups of conservationists who are seriously interested in the natural resources of the country would do well to look to the source of charges that are leveled at the Department in this period. Otherwise they may find that they have permitted themselves and their organizations to be used as part of a well-organized political smear of the Department and its officials.

It is not my purpose today to discuss in detail the policies of the Department relating to waterfowl. However, I note with pleasure that the distinguished Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. John L. Farley, lost no time in calling a news conference last week to reply to the charge that the Department is winking at the baiting of ducks by California hunters.

In the course of the conference, Mr. Farley said:

> The basic regulation is that there should be no baiting—period.

I do not see how any statement could be more forthright or to the point.

Mr. Farley further said that the arrest of hunters by Federal agents for game law violations, including baiting, throughout the country has risen from 4,929 in the 1952 fiscal year to 4,983 for the first 11 months of the current fiscal year.

Convictions have remained at a level of about 98 percent of those arrested. Fines imposed ranged from $50 to $1,000.

Does this sound as though the Department has softened its policies regarding waterfowl?

In similar fashion, certain elements recently have charged that the Department is planning to give away or destroy important parts of the national wildlife refuge system. I am sure it will surprise no one to learn that one of those most active in spreading this calumny is a former Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service under the previous administration.

What are the facts regarding refuges? Have they been diminished? Are they being given away?

Records of the Fish and Wildlife Service show that the purchase of 30,189 acres valued at $645,000 and the lease of 1,151 acres of land in various parts of the country for waterfowl conservation purposes took place during the 1955 fiscal year. These acquisitions were approved by the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission of which Secretary Douglas McKay is Chairman.

Far from being diminished, the land available for refuges has actually been increased by 21,000 acres over the total for 1954.

Since this matter has been opened on the House floor I feel certain that Members will want to be fully informed on the circumstances of Mr. Day's resignation from his Federal job.

I have here a letter which I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD at this point:

ARCTIC INSTITUTE OF NORTH AMERICA,
Washington Office, May 9, 1955.

Hon. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington 25, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Arctic Institute of North America is initiating a research project of great importance to all who are interested in the conservation of the natural resources of the North American Continent. It will provide for a thoroughgoing study and analysis of the various factors which influence the perpetuation of our migratory waterfowl. Authorities in wildlife conservation generally agree that waterfowl are more endangered than any of the important game species. The Arctic Institute has concern in the problem because many thousands of natives in the Arctic and sub-Arctic rely upon migratory birds as an important source of food and clothing.

It is anticipated that the findings of this research project will assist in guiding official agencies of the States and the Federal Government in land and water use policies which will more adequately recognize the fundamental needs of this important natural resource. The findings would be of interest of millions of American sportsmen and nature lovers.

In searching the field for talent to undertake this important program we have approached Mr. Albert M. Day, former director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of your Department. Due to his long and eminently successful career in wildlife conservation in the Federal service, Mr. Day is generally recognized as the outstanding authority in this field. We feel highly gratified that he is interested in our proposal.

Therefore, as an official representative of the Arctic Institute of North America, I am requesting that you release Mr. Day to undertake this important assignment under such terms and conditions as may be agreeable to you and Mr. Day.

Sincerely,

JOS. T. FLAKNE,
Programming Director.

It is from the Arctic Institute of North America and is addressed to the Secretary of the Interior. In it Mr. Joseph T. Flakne, programing director of the institute, requests the Secretary to release Mr. Day from his Federal job to undertake a research assignment from the institute.

I also have a copy of a letter to Mr. Flakne from the Secretary of the Interior which I also desire to insert in the RECORD at this point:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1955.

Mr. JOSEPH T. FLAKNE,
Programing Director, Arctic Institute of North America, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FLAKNE: This is in reply to your letter of May 9 requesting the release of Mr. Albert M. Day, Assistant to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, for assignment to the Arctic Institute of North America.

The Department will interpose no objection to Mr. Day's acceptance of your offer. Mr. Day's release will be arranged in accordance with the usual procedures pertaining to such cases.

I have asked the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service to arrange the details with Mr. Day.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary informs Mr. Flakne that the Department will not object to Mr. Day's acceptance of the offer from the Arctic Institute, and adds that Mr. Day's release will be arranged in accordance with the usual procedure in such cases.

On the same day, May 12, the Secretary signed a memorandum to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service requesting that the details of Mr. Day's release be arranged. I have a copy of this memorandum and ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington 25, D. C. May 12, 1955.

Memorandum

To: Director, Fish and Wildlife Service.
From: Secretary of the Interior.
Subject: Release of Albert M. Day to accept position.

I am attaching a letter which I received from Mr. Flakne, programing director of the Arctic Institute of North America, who has requested the release of Albert M. Day.

Will you please take care of the necessary details in this matter.

DOUGLAS MCKAY.

On May 25, Mr. Day wrote the Secretary expressing his appreciation for the approval of his request for optional retirement. I ask unanimous consent to insert a copy of this memorandum in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington 25, D. C., May 25, 1955.

Memorandum

To: The Secretary.
From: Albert M. Day.
Subject: Release from position.

I have today received from Director Farley notification of approval of my recent request for optional retirement. This is in accordance with request of May 9, directed to you by the Arctic Institute of North America, requesting that you release me from my present position with the Fish and Wildlife Service to undertake the wildlife research project being initiated by the institute.

I appreciate your action in this case, and am returning Mr. Flakne's letter for your files.

ALBERT M. DAY.

From these documents, copies of which were supplied me by the Department of the Interior at my request, it does not appear that Mr. Day was in any way forced out of his position in the Federal service. Quite the contrary seems to have been the case. Mr. Day received an attractive offer of employment from a privately endowed scientific organization and chose to exercise his right to retirement. Certainly his memorandum to the Secretary indicates complete accord in the handling of this case.

I also note in an Associated Press dispatch that when Mr. Day was asked to comment on the charge he had been forced out of his Federal job, he replied:

I don't want to get mixed up in this. But I am not leaving there with any bitterness of any kind. We've worked together here very nicely.

I pointed out at the outset of these remarks that Mr. Day's resignation was used as an excuse for attacking the conservation policies of the Department under this administration. The argument was that Mr. Day is a courageous conservationist who refused to accept the views of present Interior officials toward protection of waterfowl.

Since this matter has been opened up in such fashion as to gain wide publicity while damaging public confidence in the Department policies, I believe it is necessary to go further into it.

In the last Congress, when I was chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, members of the committee examined Mr. Day's record in the Fish and Wildlife Service and considered certain phases of his conduct as Director.

The investigation, the facts of which have been quite freely aired in the press are no longer confidential, showed quite conclusively that this "splendid career public servant" was directly involved in a number of situations that would have justified, and should have recommended, his immediate release from duty as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Servics.

In 1949 we have what has gained notorious recognition as the "Smith Island incident," in which Mr. Day, who was at the time the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and others were caught "red-handed" shooting ducks in an area which had been baited with corn a day earlier so that the hunting party would be assured of a good day's shooting. One of the "others" involved in this incident happened to be a Mr. David R. Gascoyne, who was at the time director in charge of region 5 of the Fish and Wildlife Service, which embraces most of the eastern seaboard and includes the Chesapeake Bay area known as Smith Island, Md., and this has been reported in the press. The report of this incident reveals the baiting violation as well as a violation of the prohibition against stirring up waterfowl by means of a motor-driven boat, was filed in the usual course of procedure in the office of the supervisor of law enforcement for region 5,

Mr. Gascoyne's domain, but no formal complaint was ever issued, and the matter was quietly laid to rest.

Constant reports of the conduct of Albert Day showed that shrubbery from the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, Laurel, Md., was transplanted at the residence of Mr. Albert M. Day, this "splendid career public servant," in late 1946 or early 1947. These shrubs were property of the United States Government. They were removed from United States Government property by United States Government personnel, using Government vehicles, burning Government gasoline, on Government time.

In 1948 certain incidents arose with reference to the administration of the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge. An investigation was ordered during Mr. Day's absence by Dr. Clarence Cottam, then Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and evidence indicating 10 or 11 charges of misuse of Government property was reported against the then superintendent of Patuxent, Dr. L. C. Morley. Dr. Morley tendered his resignation, but Mr. Day, upon his return to Washington and after a social evening with Dr. Morley, is reported to have marked "withdrawn" on the resignation, and launched into a tirade of profanity against Acting Director Cottam because "this man (Morley) is a close friend of mine."

There have been numerous other incidents, many of which have received considerable attention in the public press, showing that friction between Mr. Day and other key personnel in the Fish and Wildlife Service had developed to such an extent as to undermine the effective functioning of this important department of government.

The investigation further revealed that there was general feeling in the Service that the law enforcement section was seriously hampered by the Smith Island incident. Subsequent to this "incident" Maryland State officers refused to cooperate with Federal agents in enforcing Federal waterfowl regulations, which certainly reflected a vote of "no confidence" in the director.

Now it would appear that the Department of the Interior is being placed on trial for its so-called "easing out" of Albert M. Day. A fair view of the complete record certainly shows that he has not been fired, or in any way relieved of his employment in the Department. He should have been. It is not uncommon that a defendant in a jury trial seeks to establish his defense by trying the prosecuting witness. And it is not uncommon to hear the remark, "You can't fire me, I quit." It is rare, indeed, when an honorably separated employee deliberately says, in effect, "You can't let me quit, I'm fired." The motives of the individual should be carefully scrutinized.

A continued attack upon the Department of the Interior for its administrative handling of this matter will serve no useful purpose, and it would behoove the attackers to look well to their facts. Civil service regulations, designed to insure job security to the employee, can many times lay stumbling blocks in the way of departmental efficiency and harmony. The "Day incident" is a case in point.

A statement made on the Smith Island incident typifies this unsavory panorama. It was suggested to the game agent that the bait had been scattered to lure ducks for photographing. The agent's observation was, in effect, "If they were taking pictures, those were the noisiest cameras I ever heard." We should profit by the agent's perceptiveness.

TVA: Profit or Loss?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of grave concern to me that we are debating the additional funds needed for the TVA when, to my certain knowledge, the TVA is in itself unconstitutional. I can find nowhere in the Constitution the right given to the Federal Government to produce electric power, and in competition with private business.

The right of free enterprise is a basic right which our forefathers held came from God, not Government. Or to quote the Declaration of Independence, upon which our Constitution is founded:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Government is to protect our rights and freedom, not compete with them. The loss of economic freedom would mean the loss of all freedom. TVA and public power development, interest and tax free, is marching in that direction. "Promote the general welfare" does not permit power development, nor does any other part of our Constitution.

It is also interesting to note that under socialism, next to control of credit, the most important weapon is electric power. Through the TVA and other public power development, we are well on the way to establishing this basic principle of socialism. If socialism is bad for us in the United States, then a little bit of it is bad. Any degree of a disease is as bad as the disease itself. So let us not nurse public power in our midst when private enterprise and the profit system, which have always undergirded our form of government, are so flagrantly challenged as they now are.

Free enterprise cannot survive Government competition. Let us not call socialistic public power a part of our system. Let the Socialists stand up for what they believe. Let those who believe in free enterprise so state. The battle thus joined can in conclusion produce a clear-cut answer. We cannot have both and survive—one must go, either public power or private business. We are at this moment surviving in spite of public power development, not because of it.

TVA was intended primarily for flood control, now the power development is its greatest function, which is beyond its constitutional right.

Yet the TVA can do much more than administer a power plan. It can condemn, buy, and develop most properties unhindered by the protests of the owners or local and State authorities. It can rearrange highways, railways, bridges, mills, and electric-light plants at will; it can remove great sections of land from public tax rolls; in lieu of taxes it can dole out such money as it feels like to local and State government; it can arbitrarily determine the size of farm units to get the benefits of vital irrigation or flood protection; it can operate with unlimited funds a wide variety of businesses exempt from State restraints for the control of competition. It may eventually have hundreds of millions of its own funds to put into almost any activity that might occur to its directors.

WHERE NOW IS STATE GOVERNMENT, STATES RIGHTS, AND OUR CONSTITUTION?

Two wrongs do not make a right. A bad law should not be continued or tolerated by a reduction appropriation. Let us sell the TVA to the people of that area, let us not argue the merits of another steam generator, the elimination of fertilizer manufacture, or more or less annual running expense.

To further develop the study of the TVA, I wish to call my colleagues attention to this treatise by Professor Stephenson, of the University of Kansas, entitled "TVA: Profit or Loss?":

TVA: PROFIT OR LOSS?

(By Eugene A. Stephenson)

The casual visitor to the area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority is justifiably impressed by the magnificent dams, the smoothly functioning locks, occasional barges loaded with coal, fuel oil, automobiles, grain, and miscellaneous freight; by the lakes that provide both hydroelectric power and picturesque scenery as well as wholesome recreational facilities; by the great steam generating plants and the various industries that have taken advantage of the low rates at which power is available. However, many aspects of the enterprise cannot be readily seen by this casual observer, and a critical analysis of the accounting practices is necessary in order to determine whether or not this gigantic venture is a financial success.

Out of a maze of conflicting testimony, documentary and otherwise, a case can probably be made for the establishment of TVA as a conservation measure or for flood control, with promotion of navigation on the Tennessee River in order to compete with railroad transportation. Or it can be shown that TVA was designed to prove that public power can be produced and sold at much lower rates than are possible with private industry. It has also been suggested that TVA was planned to some extent as a punitive measure against the entire electric utility industry because of the scandals of a few of its prominent individuals, scandals that became prominent in the late twenties. Some evidence exists for all of these possibilities, and any discussion of TVA is likely to include some reference to one or more of them.

The basic TVA Act of 1933 was designed "to promote the national defense, to further the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River area and of related adjoining territory, to further the agricultural and industrial development and to promote the economic and social well-being of the people of that region. The methods provided by the act for bringing about these results are the maximum development of the Tennessee River for navigation purposes, flood control, and generation of electric power, incidental to and consistent with flood control and navigation, the disposition of the surplus power thus produced. * * * The most important considerations are the furthering of the public interest in making power available at the lowest rate consistent with sound financial policy, and the accomplishment of the social objectives which low-cost power makes possible."

Slight modifications were made when the original act was amended in August 1935, one of the most important of which was the following, in section 14, third paragraph:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act that, in order, as soon as practicable, to make the power projects self-supporting and self-liquidating, the surplus power shall be sold at rates which, in the opinion of the Board, when applied to the normal capacity of the Authority's power facilities, will produce gross revenues in excess of the cost of production of said power."

The broad powers granted to the TVA Board to allocate investment and costs to the various projects embraced in its program, subject only to the approval of the President of the United States, have raised a question as to the wisdom of this provision. Regardless of his competency and skill as an Executive, no President should be expected to add to his other arduous duties by taking time to analyze adequately the mass of details which should serve as the basis for such allocations. Since Presidential approval cannot be more than a mere perfunctory act, the Board is virtually its own arbiter on any question of policy and has thus been able to perform practically all of its activities under the blanket heading of general welfare or public interest, subject only to the restrictions laid down by Congress, the Federal Power Commission, and the courts which have been called upon to adjudicate disputes.

The most authentic sources of information relative to TVA are the congressional hearings and the TVA yearly reports which also embody the annual financial statements. Emphasis in these annual reports has shifted from time to time to stress different features, such as the cheapness of the power produced and sold, the increase in the per capita consumption of power under the stimulus of low rates, expansion in rural electrification, forest management, soil conservation, erosion control, malarial suppression, research and production of improved phosphates, effective processing of minerals, manufacture of ammonia and nitrates and elemental phosphorus for military purposes, development of wildlife refuges, and recreational facilities. Although many of these phases of TVA seem to bear little relation, if any, to the original TVA program, the concept of unified development for the region is certainly broad enough to encompass a highly diversified field.

One striking omission that characterizes the annual reports is the failure to mention the "self-supporting and self-liquidating" requirement of the amended TVA Act. While frequent claims are made of the net earnings, reported to range from 2 to 5.75 percent on the depreciated investment in power facilities before interest, the only precise statement of TVA's recognition of the obligation to pay interest is found in the 1941 report, page 38, which reads as follows:

"When the allocated portions of common costs are added to direct costs, including the costs of steam generating plants and transmission systems, the results establish the proportions of the Authority's total investment in water control and utilization facilities chargeable to the three programs. At present (1941) these proportions are: Navigation 21.8 percent, flood control 12.4 percent; and power 65.8 percent. If the Authority's power program is to be self-supporting, therefore, power revenues must cover all costs associated with the production of power, including depreciation and interest on 65.8 percent of the total investment." The percentages shown are for the year 1941 only and are considerably different for later years, but the principle announced therein is sound insofar as it goes, even though it fails to mention the self-liquidation feature specified by the 1935 amendment to the TVA Act. By the year 1953 the allocated portion of the total river investment devoted to power alone, plus single-use dams, powerlines, and steam plants, reached 73.2 percent before depreciation is considered. The investment in power facilities, after deductions for depreciation, is reported at $803,481,000, exclusive of interest during construction.

A Government corporation possesses unique advantages over its competitors in private industry through its relative freedom from certain expenses, notably interest and many forms of tax. Some of them also have the power to distribute their total investment among several different accounts—known as the allocation principle—and thus decide arbitrarily what portion of the investment that serves several purposes shall be devoted to any particular one. In the case of TVA, these advantages finally culminate in what appear to be smaller investments in power production facilities, reduced operating expenses, and lower cost per unit of power produced. Stated another way, the yardstick by which the cost of power production is measured is shy several inches in length. Public power seems cheaper than that produced by the privately owned ultilities simply because a few large expense items which must be borne by the privately owned corporation are avoided or are passed on to the unsuspecting taxpayers.

Since TVA is the outstanding example of power production by a Government unit, the study presented herewith was undertaken as an objective effort to discover, as nearly as possible, what are the real costs of producing "public power." By that is meant, what are the full costs, hidden and revealed, after elimination of all of the investment and operating expenses in connection with the other activities which are part of the elaborate series of the Authority's multifarious functions. On that account, no consideration is given herein to any phase of the Authority's programs, other than power production and sale. Flood control, navigation, fertilizer research and manufacture, munitions preparation, minerals beneficiation, reforestation, etc., are all charged off completely to the general welfare or public interest, even though these represent total contributions from Congress of more than $540 million. Nor is any attempt made to charge against TVA the cost of various forms of aid from other departments of Government, even though the cost of this aid necessarily came from the general tax funds. Still further, in order to view TVA as a going concern, and in recognition of the fact that it usually requires several years for an undertaking of such magnitude to reach the stage where its operations may be considered stable, this analysis excludes the results of the first 5 years of TVA operations, and limits its scope to the 15-year period 1939–53. The reader should realize, however, that this procedure will show the TVA financial picture to be more favorable than is actually the case.

The pertinent financial data are presented in the accompanying tables. Table 1 shows by years the income and expenses of the power program as reported in the annual statements, slightly modified to include as income all interest received and as expense all interest paid. TVA claims a gross income for the 15 years of $638,942,000 and expenses of $456,585,000 with a net income of $232,357,000.

Table 2 shows by years the various items of expense which are not included in the TVA operating costs, but which have either been paid by the taxpayers or have been lost to the Government as uncollected revenue. The latter would have been expense had TVA been subject to the same tax obligations as those borne by privately owned utilities. The two largest items of additional expense are unpaid interest and unpaid taxes.

Interest: The interest charges shown in column 1 of table 2, include interest on the invested capital devoted to power production—after depreciation—plus the interest on funds used during the construction of additional power facilities, less interest paid and included in the expenses shown in column 5. Under standard accounting practice, interest during construction is charged to investment, a procedure which has been followed herein. Even though Congress does not require any payment of interest on the huge sums appropriated to TVA, nevertheless such money was borrowed from banks and individuals or other lenders, and the average interest rate on such long-term borrowings has been approximately 2.5 percent, which is the rate used in all calculations herein. The additional investment represented by the capitalized interest amounts to $26 million, after depreciation, which raises the total invested capital to approximately $830 million for the year 1953.

The interest paid out by TVA has been chiefly on bonded indebtedness incurred by the purchase and rehabilitation of the properties of Tennessee Electric Power Co., Alabama Power Co., and Mississippi Power Co. The maximum amount of bonds outstanding at any time was $65,072,500. Most of the money was borrowed in 1939 from the RFC and the United States Treasury, and the bonds bore interest rates from 1¾ to 2½ percent, but some "special arrangements" were made with the United States Treasury for the payment the first year of only one-half percent interest on $52 million of the total amount. This was increased to 1 percent on $56 million in 1942, a rate which continued through August 15, 1949. By that time, the bonds outstanding had been reduced to $49 million, and the interest rate was raised to 2 percent, which was paid until August 15, 1950, when the rate was reduced to 1⅞ percent. That rate continued until August 15, 1952, but it was again raised to 2 percent through August 15, 1953. No explanation for these changes in rates appears in the annual reports. The total unpaid interest, after deduction of payments to bondholders of $9,545,000, amounts to $161,754,000, which is a contribution directly from the pockets of the taxpayers.

Taxes: It is inconceivable that the Government should tax itself to provide a source of income. Nevertheless, when it launches an enterprise that competes with private capital, it definitely suffers a loss of revenue in the form of taxes that would have flowed to the Government if that source of income had not been destroyed by its own business venture. Hence those unpaid taxes become one of the costs which the Government pays,

or foregoes, as the result of its entry into a field normally occupied by private individuals or corporations. On the part of the Government corporation, this becomes a form of unseen subsidy which enables it to operate with lower production costs than are possible with the private concern. These taxes, which TVA does not pay, include principally both State and Federal income, excise, franchise, unemployment, sales, use, electric energy, old-age benefits, automobile license, and State and Federal gasoline taxes.

Payments entitled "In Lieu of Taxes" are made to the States and certain counties of Alabama and Tennessee, as prescribed by the amended TVA Act. These have averaged 4.28 percent of the gross income, and have amounted to $29,500,000. But the privately-owned utilities would have been required to pay a tax of $147,759,000 on the same gross income, or at the average rate of 20.95 percent. Thus a tax deficit of $118,278,000 has been created, which under private ownership would have been paid to the Government; therefore, it is a loss to the Government, or a cost—paid by the Government—of producing TVA power.

Allocation of investment: Under its autonomous power to allocate investment to the various types of program, TVA allocated approximately 60 percent of the common investment in multipurpose dams to navigation and flood control and 40 percent to power production. These proportions were used until 1950 when slight changes were made. By 1953, they were 58 percent to navigation and 42 percent to power. When the direct investment in power facilities—such as turbines, generators, and other appurtenances—is added to the common investment, the part admittedly devoted to power production becomes 52.8 percent and that to navigation and flood control, 47.2 percent. These allocations are supposed to be based by TVA on the appraised values of flood control and navigation benefits, but have been subject to much criticism.

Common expenses: The activities of TVA embrace so many features—even though they are primarily power production, navigation, flood control, and national defense—that some degree of overlap is almost inevitable, particularly in the case of items that are usually considered common expenses or part of administration and overhead expenses. TVA segregates these common items and for 16 years has divided them equally between the three major activities, power, navigation, and flood control. Beginning with year 1950–51 the proportions were changed to a slightly different basis, whereby the amount chargeable to power was placed at 40 percent and the remainder of 60 percent to navigation and flood control. These proportions have also been used for the subsequent years. However, even these changes are inconsistent with the allocations of the common investment. Since 1949 the allocations of common investment to power are as follows:

	Percent
1949–50	40.4
1950–51	40.9
1951–52	41.5
1952–53	41.6

Whether the allocations of investment by TVA are sound or not (and many engineers consider them fantastically unsound) the proportion of the common expenses allocated to power should be on the same basis as the investment. In order to accomplish this objective, the common expenses allocated to power have been recomputed for the period 1939–49 on the basis of 40 percent to power, and for the years 1949–53 on the basis shown above. The net result is the addition of $1,880,000 to the cost of power production and the removal of this amount from the cost of navigation and flood control. The results by years are shown in column 4 of table 2.

Earnings: The total power production expense is the sum of columns 1, 2, 3, and 4, plus those already reported by TVA and shown in column 5 of table 2 (repeated from col. 3 of table 1). It amounts to $740,773,000. The boasted net income of $232,357,000 is completely erased and is replaced by a net loss of $51,831,000. These results are shown in summary below:

Net income claimed by TVA	$232,357,000
Additional expenses shown in table 2:	
Interest on depreciated investment in power facilities and on construction in progress of similar facilities	151,754,000
Depreciation on capitalized interest during construction	2,276,000
Common expenses transferred from flood control and navigation to power expense	1,880,000
Taxes lost by United States Government	118,278,000
Total additional expenses	284,188,000
Net loss	51,831,000

Amortization: The Government Corporation Appropriations Act of 1948 calls for payment to the United States Treasury by TVA of $348,239,000 within 40 years, or at the rate of $87,059,810 every 10 years, without interest (except for interest on outstanding bonds). If equal annual installments are assumed, this is equivalent to an average outstanding debt of $174 million for 40 years. If it be further presumed that the 2.5 percent interest rate on long-term Government loans will continue during the next 40 years, then the United States Treasury will have paid out in interest $174 million by the time TVA has repaid the capital sum required. Since TVA is not to pay that interest, it must come from the taxpayers instead of the users of the electricity.

A similar 40-year payment has also been permitted by Congress for all additional TVA power facilities constructed after 1948. The payments were originally scheduled to start as of the year the facilities are placed in service, but the original plan appears to have been modified. Out of a total of $351,059,000 which has been invested in power facilities since 1948, chiefly for steam plants, no specific payments are required toward this sum until 1990, by which year $17,745,840 must be paid. By that time, the interest on the $351,059,000 at 2.5 percent per year will have reached a total of $324,829,475. Other payments to be made in 1991, 1992, and 1993 are supposed to liquidate the remaining debt to the United States Treasury; but additional interest of approximately $21,300,000 will have accumulated by that time, plus interest on further additions to the steam plants now under construction but not yet shown on the TVA books as investment. By the year 1993, at least some $694 million in interest charges will thus have been paid by the United States Government. To these must be added the other losses on power production already listed, losses that will continue to grow in size if the present subsidies remain in effect. All of these enormous expenses must be paid by the taxpayers in order to perpetuate the myth of low-cost public power. It is here recognized, of course, that proper accounting procedure does not require that both depreciation and repayment of borrowed capital be entered as costs of production. But as long as the borrowed capital remains unpaid, the interest on it is still an inescapable cost to someone; in the case of TVA, the "someone" is the taxpayer.

Municipalities and cooperatives: Since TVA is authorized to give preference in its power sales to counties, States, municipalities, and cooperatives, and since it incorporates in the annual statements the financial status of the municipalities and cooperatives to whom it sells power, some students of the problem take the position that the financial position of all three organizations should be considered in any survey of power costs. Since the main objective has been to ascertain only the cost of TVA power production, that has not been done in this particular study. However, if the three units be considered together, the results may be summarized as follows, where in the same 15-year period is used:

(a) Combined gross income of TVA and the municipalities and cooperatives to which TVA sells power	$1,474,520,000
(b) Total taxes paid by above groups	$69,853,000
(c) Above taxes (b) expressed as percent of gross income (a)—percent	4.737
(d) Average percent of gross income paid by the electric utilities during the same period—percent	20.953
(e) Difference in tax rates expressed as percent, or line (d) minus line (c)—percent	16.216
(f) Additional taxes that would have been paid on gross income of line (a) if these groups had been taxed on the same basis as the electric utilities, 16.216 percent of line (a)	$239,108,000
(g) Deduct TVA tax deficit already shown in table 2, column 3	$118,278,000
(h) Tax loss due to municipalities and cooperatives	$120,830,000
(i) Add losses for TVA alone, table 2, column 8	$51,831,000
(j) Total loss due to combined operations of TVA and the municipalities and cooperatives to which it sells power	$172,661,000

Remedy: Lest we become utterly discouraged by the contemplation of the above results, it may be well to recall that a healthy democracy possesses the means by which it can rectify its own errors and chart new courses of action. Where it has already embarked on ventures of a socialistic character, the vigorously expressed will of the people can halt their further extensions, as has been clearly demonstrated in England. While the recovery from such an experiment is apt to be a slow, faltering process that has been aptly compared to attempts to put Humpty-Dumpty back on the wall, if the issue is squarely faced, practical and logical solutions will be available from many sources.

TABLE 1.—*Summary of 1939–53 annual expenses and income reported by TVA, modified to include interest actually received and paid*

Year	Power sales, kilowatt-hours (1)	Gross operating revenues (2)	Power expenses (3)	Reported net income (4)=(2)−(3)
	Millions	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
1939	1,618	$5,603	$4,125	$1,478
1940	3,630	15,429	11,129	4,299
1941	4,974	21,286	14,295	6,991
1942	5,983	25,466	21,793	3,673
1943	8,336	31,801	18,652	13,149
1944	9,110	35,545	21,429	14,116
1945	10,315	39,486	21,504	17,982
1946	9,059	35,343	19,129	16,214
1947	11,587	44,169	22,921	21,248
1948	12,225	48,775	32,157	16,618
1949	13,614	58,033	37,088	20,945
1950	14,166	57,787	31,719	26,068
1951	16,522	70,330	44,477	25,853
1952	20,177	95,004	69,908	25,096
1953	23,679	104,885	86,259	18,626
Total	164,995	688,942	456,585	232,357

TABLE 2.—*Summary of expenses incurred by U. S. Government in operation of TVA power program, plus taxes lost to the U. S. Government, the States, and municipalities (these are not shown in the annual reports)*

[In thousands]

	Interest not paid on investment (includes interest during construction) (1)	Depreciation on capitalized interest during construction (2)	Corporate taxes not paid (after deducting "in lieu" payments) (3)	Common expense previously allocated to navigation and flood control (4)	Reported expense of power program, including interest and depreciation (5)	Total expense (sum of cols. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) (6)	Reported gross income (7)	Net gain (+) or loss (−) (difference between col. 6 and col. 7) (8)
1939	$3,030	----------	$676	$33	$4,125	$7,864	$5,603	−$2,261
1940	4,458	$16	2,203	51	11,129	17,857	15,429	−2,428
1941	5,269	29	2,992	64	14,295	22,649	21,286	−1,363
1942	7,676	39	4,278	71	21,793	33,857	25,466	−8,391
1943	9,277	68	5,703	91	18,652	33,791	31,801	−1,990
1944	10,368	103	5,971	113	21,429	37,984	35,545	−2,439
1945	9,427	144	6,431	143	21,504	37,649	39,486	+1,837
1946	9,583	160	5,289	205	19,129	34,366	35,343	+977
1947	9,933	165	6,768	272	22,921	40,059	44,169	+4,110
1948	10,601	180	6,921	226	32,157	50,085	48,775	−1,310
1949	11,264	198	9,150	238	37,088	57,938	58,033	+95
1950	11,862	222	9,664	243	31,719	53,710	57,787	+4,077
1951	14,560	243	13,731	30	44,477	73,041	70,330	−2,711
1952	19,813	301	18,530	49	69,908	108,601	95,004	−13,597
1953	24,633	408	19,971	51	86,259	131,322	104,885	−26,437
Total	161,754	2,276	118,278	1,880	456,585	740,773	688,942	−51,831

1939–53 net income (profit) reported by TVA	$232,357,000
Actual net loss shown by this table	51,831,000
Discrepancy	284,188,000

The Lawyer and Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very fine address:

THE LAWYER AND LOYALTY

(By L. Dale Coffman, dean, School of Law, University of California at Los Angeles)

A lawyer, when he is admitted to the bar, becomes in fact and in law an officer of the court. Lawyers and the public alike should assume his loyalty to the government of which that court is a branch. Unfortunately, however, many people do not know what a lawyer does.

Lawyer jokes have been told for centuries. You remember the story of the altercation between St. Peter and the Devil over the repair of the line fence separating their two domains. The Devil, being what he is, had not kept his word and had not done his share of the repair. When St. Peter threatened the Devil with a law suit, the Devil replied, "And where will you get a lawyer?"

Even Shakespeare has one of his characters suggest, as a course of action: "The first thing we do, let's kill all the lawyers." You remember the tombstone which read, "Here lies a lawyer and an honest man." Some wag asks brightly, "Why did they bury two men in the same grave?" I heard this story on television not so long ago and the audience laughed heartily. It is an old story—much older than the comedian probably realized. Dean Roscoe Pound, formerly of Harvard and of our law school, became interested at one time concerning the origin of some of these stories. He found that this particular one dates back to the 15th century. During the Dark Ages there was no professional bar in our sense of the term and the members of the clergy handled, for a fee, many of the problems that lawyers are concerned with today. The Renaissance brought forth men trained in the law who gradually were taking this lucrative business away from the clergy. Some of these jokes we hear today were first told by some disgruntled members of the clergy in the Middle Ages.

I am not sure that the legal profession has done a very good publicity job. Even in our universities I find rather peculiar ideas about law and lawyers. The philosophers openly suspect us of having no basic philosophy, or at best, a pragmatic rudder in the shape of a dollar sign. The sociologists suspect that we deal with single trees and never look to the forest; that we are concerned with individual gain or individual liability in a vacuum of social unconsciousness. The theologian is shocked as a rule to find that moral principles do not, have not, and cannot supply all rules of human conduct and that the law, while incorporating a basic moral philosophy in its very fibers, is, and must of necessity in many respects be essentially a moral or unmoral. The physical scientist usually has trouble understanding what he considers are lawyers' tactics of obfuscation. He too often believes that the inability of the law to fit everything into easily understood and precise pigeonholed formulas must be due either to incompetence and stupidity, or to a willful desire to join what passes for profundity of thought with obscurity of expression, and the density of the latter increases in arithmetical, if not geometrical, ratio with the depth of the former. The historians usually like us because of necessity they have studied the careers of great lawyers. In the past many businessmen have looked upon lawyers as more or less professional obstructionists, or at best benevolent tricksters of a sort who always say "No" to brilliant business schemes. Law schools to many of these individuals are more or less socially accepted vocational institutions.

I submit that there is a greater need today for competently trained lawyers than at any time in our history. Our modern industrialized society has become so complex that it is impossible for any businessman to know all of the legal requirements which must be met even in the simplest type of business operation. He has problems of zoning, social security, workmen's compensation, price maintenance, public health regulations, labor regulations, labor organization problems, corporate or partnership organization, not to mention taxes which are always with us and which today vitally influence many business decisions.

Conducting a business and practicing law were much simpler 20 or 30 years ago. A young man coming to the bar today must be trained in, or at least have a nodding acquaintance with, a great many subjects which were not even part of the law school curriculum when lawyers still in their forties were in law school. Work in administrative law, trade regulation, labor law, legislation, State and Federal taxation, as examples, has all been added to the law school curriculum or greatly expanded. When I was in law school Harvard offered but one course in taxation which covered both State and Federal income, excise, inheritance, gift, etc. Today our law school offers four separate courses in taxation. Sometimes I think all good law schools are trying to compress at least 4 years of work into 3.

The last 30 years have seen a perfectly amazing development of the physical sciences. The last 30 years have seen the development of the modern motorcar and the modern highway and freeway systems of our cities. Sometimes I think the modern automobile and modern freeway permit us to get from one place to another faster so we can have more time to find a parking place. Radio and television have grown to their present size and have become industrial giants within the last 30 years. Many of the gadgets of the home which today are taken as commonplace were unknown 30 years ago. What we then considered the national debt was being reduced and governments were

living within their incomes. During the last 30 years we have gone through a terrible depression and have fought the most devastating world war of all history. Out of this war has come the development of the atom and hydrogen bombs. The instruments for making war have become so modern that war itself is obsolete as a means for the settlement of international disputes. The physical scientists have created for us a world, the progress of which and even the physical existence of which must depend upon skills over and beyond those of the scientists. Never has it been so important that we have a government of laws and not of men. Even in our Republic, however, the Government must do many things that were not necessary 30 years ago. The allocation of radio and television channels of these two new industries is one example.

If conditions have changed in America and life has become much more complex, all of these problems have been magnified many times over in California. California has everything, both good and bad, that any other place in America has, but here it is bigger, there is more of it, and it is in technicolor. Just a little over a hundred years ago California was a sleepy Mexican dependency with less than 3,000 Americans, and within 3 years after the discovery of gold in 1848, the population was increased a hundredfold to 300,000. Young men in search of adventure and gold flocked in from the East and from all over the world. Among them were lawyers and it was largely due to their influence that California was admitted as a State in 1850. In those days California was left pretty much to its own devices because communication with Washington was difficult. As a matter of fact, word of the granting of statehood did not reach San Francisco until 5 weeks after Congress had acted.

The early rapid growth and expansion of California has really faded into insignificance when compared with our recent growth and expansion. Since the 1950 census the population of the Los Angeles metropolitan area alone has been increasing by about 525 persons per day and is currently rising at about the same rate. This means that every 5 years we are adding about 1 million people to the Los Angeles area. These people must find work, must be housed, fed, educated and policed. Another 1 million people means that we shall provide approximately 400,000 additional jobs. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has figures to show that we have actually added over 400,000 jobs between 1950 and 1954. The population of southern California has rise from a little less than 4 million in 1940 to an estimated 7,325,000 on July 1, 1954. The Los Angeles metropolitan area is estimated now to be more than 5 million. Southern California has almost doubled in population since 1940. Incidentally, the number of active attorneys in Los Angeles County was a little over 6,000 in 1940 and in 1955 the number is 7,736 as of March 21. In other words, Los Angeles County has gained a little less than 1,700 lawyers since 1940, while southern California has gained close to 4 million people in the same time. The forecast is that southern California will have a population of close to 9 million by 1960 and more than 11 million by 1970.

But population is far from the sole criterion in determining how many lawyers are actually needed. It depends upon what that population is doing. In a state which is primarily rural and in which there are few new business enterprises starting, and maybe there were relatively few business enterprises in the first place, the ratio of lawyers to population need not be very high. Under such circumstances most of the people seldom need the services of an attorney and when they do, the type of legal work required is not very complicated. On the other hand, New York City and the District of Columbia have probably the highest ratio of attorneys to population of any localities in the country. The home offices of many of our national corporations are located in New York. There is a great deal of manufacturing; there is a great deal of new business starting; there is a great deal for lawyers to do; there is a need for legal services. Washington, too, has a need for more lawyers relative to population than many other localities. Today most businesses operating on a national scale must have business in Washington. Some people even think that there are too many controls emanating from Washington.

Let us take a quick look at some of the things the people of California have been doing. We know we have many more people. Our bank assets in an 11-year period between 1941 and 1952 more than trebled. In that period our percentage of the total bank assets in the United States increased over 2 percentage points. In comparison, New York's total bank assets increased approximately 77 percent, while California's increased 228 percent. Statewide our population increase between 1940 and 1950 has been better than 53 percent, while New York has increased 10 percent. Even Texas increased only 20 percent. The value of our manufactured products has increased in the period almost sevenfold. Retail sales have increased approximately fourfold. The number of corporations has increased almost 50 percent, and our per capita income has almost trebled. Certainly an area with high comparative economic activity in numbers and amounts will have more legal activity as well as more money with which to pay for needed and essential legal services.

The training of young men to be competent and well qualified members of the bar, not only for today but for 20 years from today, places a tremendous burden upon and is a wonderful and stimulating challenge to us in legal education. The legal profession is one which has long since expanded beyond the limits of office practice and court procedures into a ministry for good government and the preservation of fundamental liberties. As the medical doctor has become an adviser on public health, so the lawyer has become a counselor on public policy and good government. The law is a profession to be practiced and not a mere trade to be followed. The practice of law is not primarily a money-making business, but is an integral part of the machinery for the administration of justice. The bench is often but a mirror reflecting the competence of the bar. Proper training for the law, therefore, is a matter of concern not only to the bar, the bench, our law schools and universities, but to the public.

If the lawyer is to perform his function as a counselor on good government, he should be permitted to point out what seems to be errors in some types of propaganda and he should raise questions which might get people to thinking about their Government. For example, there are those who would characterize the last quarter century as a period of compromise and a tolerance of mediocrity. I believe that our Government compromised with what was right and just at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. I believe we have compromised with communism in permitting the acquisition of more territory and more peoples than by any conqueror in the history of the world. Mink coats and deep freezes caused hardly a ripple. We have put up with mediocrity in high places with a shrug of the shoulders and "well, that's politics." Many naive "bleeding hearts" have followed the Communist line and have caused dissention among our people. Some terminology and words have been deliberately misused by those engaged in subversive activities and that terminology and those words have been repeated by well-meaning people to convey the meaning of subversion. Let me give an example.

There are many good citizens today who want to be called liberal. This word has been subtly changed to refer to that group of professional liberals who advocate bigger big government and greater centralization of power in a few, who advocate a philosophy of the Government knows best what is good for you; don't upset things, give us your individual liberties and we shall take care of your physical needs. This is the real road to reaction. This is the road back to serfdom. This is the road to socialism and communism. But the road has been marked with the signpost "Liberal" and many well-meaning persons have been confused by it. Webster says it means "not narrow or contracted in mind; broadminded * * *. One having tendency toward democratic or republican, as distinguished from monarchical or aristocratic, forms" of government. Our Founding Fathers were true liberals. Our Revolution was a revulsion against a government of men and not of law—a revulsion against what we call today "dictatorship." Our ancestors believed in the importance and dignity of the individual man, endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights, not destined to live only by the will of another man. Our ancestors believed that all citizens, including all of our Government officials from the President down, should live together under God and the law in human dignity. This is the foundation of our Declaration of Independence and the cornerstone of our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers were liberals and this is American liberalism. The Communist propagandists, however, have twisted the meaning of words to the point that this true American liberalism is called, at best, conservatism (spoken as an epithet), or is designated as reactionary.

Other words, the meanings of which have been deliberately prostituted by Communist propaganda, are democracy, capitalism, free private enterprise, and even academic freedom. We must realize that the English language can be used to conceal and to prostitute as well as to convey thought. Possibly the biggest internal danger to our body politic today comes not from the dedicated and vicious and atheistic Communist, but comes rather from the soft and mushy emotional reactions of unthinking people who want to "do good." Too many people have been fooled by this phraseology designed to play upon the emotions. A word or phrase is but the skin of a living thought. A lawyer's advice is that we look at the living thought which is being conveyed by the words we are using at the time and in the place the word is being used. Words carry different meanings at different times and places. Words of greeting between two cowpuncher friends who hadn't seen each other for 6 months might be downright slanderous if spoken in Mrs. Vanderbilt's drawing room.

A great source of confusion today in the public mind concerns the effect of witnesses refusing to answer questions under oath and pleading the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The pertinent portion of the fifth amendment is that "No person * * * shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." This is the basis of the so-called privilege against self-incrimination. But the privilege against self-incrimination does not exist when the truthful answer would not tend to show the commission of a crime by the witness. When the witness refuses to answer the question: "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" raising the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, we are told by some that this means he is a Communist. We are told by others that no conclusions whatsoever may be drawn from this refusal to answer and the person should continue to have the respect and trust of his fellow

citizens. I think both conclusions are wrong. A witness' refusing to answer the question can, under no circumstances, be legal proof that the witness is a Communist. However, when a witness refuses to answer the 64-dollar question, raising the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, and recognizing that this does not necessarily mean that the witness is a Communist, we still can reach only 1 of 2 conclusions: (1) His truthful answer would give facts which would tend to incriminate him in a criminal prosecution, or (2) his truthful answer would not give facts which would so tend to incriminate him and if not, he is a liar when he says it would. Such a witness either knows facts which would tend to incriminate him in a criminal prosecution and has chosen not to be a witness against himself, or he is a liar. When the Federal crime is violation of the Smith Act which makes it a crime against the United States to teach or advocate the overthrow of our Government by force and violence, and the witness states that his truthful answer would tend to incriminate him of such a crime, how in the world can he expect to keep the confidence and respect of loyal Americans? If he lied about it, we Americans don't like liars either. The witness has a constitutional right not to be "compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself," but no man has any legal right to the confidence and respect of his fellows; nor does he have any constitutional right to be a lawyer or a teacher or occupy any position of trust, regardless of what commonsense conclusions may be drawn from known facts. The fifth amendment does not permit a witness to refuse to answer simply because the answer might be embarrassing to him, nor does the fifth amendment protect friends or associates of the witness; it is a personal privilege.

The Supreme Court of Mr. Lincoln's State of Illinois has recently refused admission to the bar to an applicant who, although he had passed the bar examintion, refused to answer the $64 question. That court, speaking through my good friend, Justice Joseph E. Daily, said: "It is our opinion, therefore, that a member of the Communist Party may, because of such membership, be unable truthfully and in good conscience to take the oath required as a condition for admission to practice, and we hold that it is relevant to inquire of an applicant as to his membership in that party. A negative answer to the question, if accepted as true, would end the inquiry on the point. If the truthfulness of a negative answer were doubted, further questions and information to test the veracity of the applicant would be proper. If an affirmative answer were received, further inquiry into the applicant's innocence or knowledge as to the subversive nature of the organization would be relevant. Under any hypothesis, therefore, questions as to membership in the Communist Party or known subversive front organizations were relevant to the inquiry into petitioner's fitness for admission to the bar. His refusal to answer has prevented the committee from inquiring fully into his general fitness and good citizenship and justifies their refusal to issue a certificate."

Mr. Justice Daily in this same case also said: "We also think * * * it is a matter of common knowledge that 'multitudes of people * * * regard with abhorrence the Communist Party and communism as that term is generally understood.' This thought of our people is becoming more and more evident and is reflected in the increasing efforts of their elected representatives to legislate both against the growth and the very existence of the Communist Party in our land."

While there is a constitutional right not to testify if a witness in good faith believes his testimony might incriminate him, this right flows as a right to an individual. It never was intended to protect a witness in an office or to protect one seeking admission to the bar and seeking to become an officer of the court. The fifth amendment cannot prevent the court from determining whether the lawyer witness publicly invoking the fifth amendment has not cast such a suspicion on his fitness as an officer of the court that he should no longer enjoy the privilege of remaining such an officer.

Of course, in a criminal prosecution, a man is presumed innocent until found guilty. There is no presumption of guilt in our criminal law, but there is also no presumption of moral fitness for every position in the field of private economic relations or for positions of public trust. Lawyers should never lose sight of the fact that the practice of law is not a right but a high privilege dependent upon continuing fitness for that trust. There is a distinction between an individual's status as a citizen and his status as an attorney and officer of the court. There should never be the slightest question of the loyalty to his government of an officer of the court which is a part of that government.

If the legal profession is to perform its high function of public responsibility, we must not only keep our own house in order but try to explain in language which all can understand the basic principles underlying the fifth amendment to our Constitution. I believe that the profession should assume the leadership in that eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty in any free society.

Mr. Dooley and Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have good reason to regret the absence from our national scene of the biting wit of a Mark Twain or a Mr. Dooley. Until a replacement comes along, however, perhaps we will just have to be content with occasional pieces like this recent editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

IN VINO VISAS

Nero, Grant, Peter the Great, Andrew Johnson, Henry VIII—to this list of important men whose drinking habits got into history must now be added Nikita Khrushchev.

It is too early for final judgments, but the preliminary data suggests that Khrushchev's fit of exhilaration on the last night of his visit to Tito may turn out to have been one of the most significant bats of history.

Khrushchev's condition as he teetered away from the embassy reception was well advertised. For on his way out—just before he heartily bussed several diplomats' wives—he met the press. Chiding an American newsman for knowing so little of Russia, he was instantly reminded that Russia has long excluded many correspondents. Khrushchev, lurching a bit, generously promised visas to all correspondents within earshot. Nevt day 13 applications went in.

The strange part of the story is that within a week six of the visas had been approved and approval was promised for the rest.

Much has been said about prying open the Iron Curtain, but nobody ever suspected that it might jerk upward some day to make good an alcoholic boast. Is that what is happening? Quien, as the Spanish say, sabe?

Bananas on Pike's Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the Pine River extension irrigation project in Colorado and New Mexico.

The Pine River project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Pine River extension irrigation project would be $1,850 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains and dairy products.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*_
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*___4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*___3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*___1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*____7304 Bradley Blvd. Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*___2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*_____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*_____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*_____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*_____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*_____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*_____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*_____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*_____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*___4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*_____
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*_____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*_____
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*_____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*____
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Granahan, William T., *Pa*__
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*___
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____The Coronet

Appendix

The Green Carpet Is Out in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Minot Daily News, published at Minot, N. Dak., under date of June 11, 1955.

This is a very interesting and readable article. I am sure that anyone reading Mr. Bob Cory's article will better understand North Dakota and its people. They will understand, too, why anyone who has ever lived in North Dakota for any length of time retains a great fondness for our great State throughout his life.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREEN CARPET IS OUT IN NORTH DAKOTA—HONESTLY, MR. T, WE THINK YOU'D LIKE IT HERE

(By Bob Cory)

This could be an open letter to the hypothetical technician (medical or industrial) who says his wife doesn't want to live in North Dakota, because she has heard that this State is deficient in recreational and cultural opportunities.

DEAR MR. T OF DECATUR: We are too close to the pioneering days to regard ourselves as noticeably cultured, or to exploit our leisure with conscientious effort, but, honestly, we think we have a pretty good life.

All in all, we doubt if any people anywhere live better, even though we have not given thought to comparing our ways of life here, and our opportunities, with those in other parts of the country.

We do know that when North Dakotans go east, south, or west either to live or to sojourn, they don't find themselves handicapped socially or in their capacities for recreation. They don't have to be shown what to do with leasure.

You may take that to mean:

North Dakotans know how to make friends, because they are used to having many friends. They know their way to church and to clubs and lodges. These associations are a vital part of their life. They are great joiners, great coffee drinkers, great chatting companions—generally modest and reserved in the statements they make about themselves and their State. They play bridge, pinochle, whist. They also go to PTA meetings and enjoy political rallies.

They take to travel readily, for they are used to ranging far from home base. They know how to hunt and fish. They take these diversions for granted, as part of the year's round for everyone. They find their way to concert halls, because they take pride in music made in their home communities.

They seek out the best hotels. They know where the best steaks are served, for they are used to good living and good cooking at home. You will find them at the baseball parks, the race tracks, the radio halls, the rodeos, the barn dances, and the basketball tournaments; and it is not because they are missing these diversions where they live.

Whatever you infer about our life from the habits of our people abroad, you hardly would be justified in interpreting their behavior as evidence of any thinness or drabness of life at home.

You are free to draw your own comparisons with the circumstances of your own life. All we shall do is tell you of the common diversions of our people.

We are far from being landlocked. Practically every family has a serviceable car and makes liberal use of it, both for the necessary family transportation and for pastime driving about the country.

Our highways aren't what you would call clogged even on holidays. Though North Dakota is supposed to be a land of snowy, blowy winters, everyone drives his car all the year around, and most of the winter our highways are listed in fair to good driving condition.

It is commonplace for North Dakotans of ordinary means and almost any occupation to go hunting regularly in the fall. Almost any dub hunter can bring home 25 or 30 ducks in the casual weekend hunting he does in one season. Deer hunting is a sport for the many, and usually the hunts are successful. Venison quite normally is on the dinner table many times during the winter. It is commonplace for parties of neighbors to climb into their cars and drive venturesomely into the Canadian northlands for a long weekend of hunting or fishing, for a man and his son, and the mother too, to go fishing before breakfast or after supper in one of our own prairie lakes or streams, returning with a 6, 8 or 10 pound northern pike, if not several of them.

Many, a rapidly increasing number, have cottages or hunting shacks on the wooded lakes or wildlands either in our own State or in the nearby Canadian provinces. The opportunities of cabin sites at reasonable cost have been multiplied by the creation of the Garrison Reservoir and other lesser reservoirs.

Hardly anyone lacks the chance to enjoy the pleasures of rural life in one way or another. Townspeople commonly have friends living on farms and vice versa. It is normal for North Dakotans living in town to have some kind of interest in a farming or ranching enterprise. Anyone who wants to, practically, can have a garden somewhere, as large or a small as he likes.

Life in the smaller cities of the State, we think, is especially rich in leisure, in friendships, and in social amusements.

The sense of belonging, and of acceptance by the community, is the normal experience of families. Participation in all kinds of neighborly and public activities is possible for all.

In such communities, it's a rare individual who fails to find stimulating companionship, whether his interests are scientific, artistic, musical, civic, humanitarian, or broadly intellectual.

Ordinarily, also, there is the active practice of appreciation of the other man's religion, race, or intellectual opinion. We are not unaffected by the anti-intellectual mood of our times—probably there is more of it than there was 20 years ago—but it isn't going unopposed.

A rather large proportion of North Dakotans in the small cities are college-trained or at least have education above high school. And of those who have not gone to college, a large proportion are well informed, taking a lively interest in current events, in politics, and in some special cultural activity or field of specialized knowledge.

It is normal for the community to take pride in its school facilities. There is intent, and considerable amount of will, to make the schools better. State aid through an equalization fund shores up the financial base of the schools. Every region of the State, practically, has a State-supported college within reasonable driving distance of most homes. The enrollments are large, and these colleges are expanding their services to the people of the State. They offer bachelor's degrees at least in liberal arts, science, and education, and provide foundational studies for work in many specialized fields. Besides, the State has its university and its agricultural college.

North Dakota is rich in its composition of nationalities and races, and the blending tends to richen and fertilize the common cultural heritage.

Except in a few rural localities, there is little clannishness of racial or national groups, though many neighborhoods cultivate proudly some of the customs, folkways, and cultural interests that grow out of the heritage of their forebears, sharing them with people of different heritage. In North Dakota, if a man's a German, a Russian, a Norwegian, Frenchman, Icelander, Irishman, or Finn, or a member of one of the native American groups, he is proud of it, but prouder still that he is an American. And many, many citizens are more cosmopolite than Midwest Yankee, or merely transplanted European, in their background and speech.

The ideal of equality is the accepted intention in practice.

There's just one thing. The scene our people live on does not have the backdrop of craggy mountains, remnants of great forests, and conifer-covered hills that please the romanticism, or the tree-dweller instinct, of some people.

You have to accept it, our topography is plainer than it is in some places, and it takes eastern villagers and metropolitan cave-dwellers a while to get used to it. But regardless of the casual tourist's impression, the plains environment does not make life flat.

You've heard perhaps of our sunsets and sunrises, but perhaps no one has told you of the long hours and the amplitude of the sunshine, how the stars dip down to the horizon at night, how the wideness of everything affects a man's heart and head just a little after he's lived here, making his personality just a little roomier, perhaps, than it would have been if he had stayed away.

Which reminds me. A Turtle Mountain dweller came down out of his haunts on North Dakota's lovely Lake Metigoshe in the State's largest natural forest. He drove to Kenmare, and then down to the Des Lacs Valley to Minot, and he told me in sincerity—speaking of the valley drive in June—"I have never seen anything so beautiful."

By the way, if you were thinking of a quick trip to North Dakota, just to let your wife convince you she won't like it here, the month of June is on our side. The great green carpet is out.

Proposed Sale of Rubber Plant at Institute, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., of June 16, 1955, entitled "Congress Should Clear Rubber Plant for Sale—It Makes Economic Sense." This editorial states ably and clearly the need for prompt approval of the bill, S. 2263, which I have this week introduced in the Senate, and which has been referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD CLEAR RUBBER PLANT FOR SALE; IT MAKES ECONOMIC SENSE

The Government-owned synthetic-rubber plant at Institute ceased operation in September 1953, after months of below-capacity production.

Since that time only a handful of maintenance men and warehouse workers have been employed at the facility, and keeping it on standby status has cost the Government an estimated $240,000 a year.

With the passage of months the plant has become more and more obsolescent, for advances in synthetic-rubber techniques are constantly being made and Institute still has only hot-rubber-manufacturing equipment.

When the rubber plant disposal program was put in action by the Government, not a single bid was made for purchase of the Institute property. Nobody wanted it.

But now Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Co. has expressed definite interest in buying the plant—and if this could be negotiated, the Kanawha Valley would stand to get its biggest single economic boost in years.

Carbide spokesmen have indicated that if they could be authorized to buy the property, rip out its old equipment and convert it to the production of important chemicals and plastics, they would get to work on the remodeling this fall.

This would mean employment for hundreds of construction workers, new and permanent jobs for chemical workers, aid to area businesses, millions of dollars in payroll and purchase money finding its way into West Virginia's economy.

And Carbide is the only logical potential purchaser for the plant. The company already flanks the site on three sides, and owns the utilities that supply it.

In order that the company can put its plan in action congressional action is mandatory, however.

The plant can't be put up for sale unless Congress renews the authority of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission to act on the matter; and it can't be remodeled unless the national security clause covering rubber-production potentials is waived.

Fortunately and wisely, moves to make these things possible have been proposed. An amendment motion was introduced in the House of Representatives on Tuesday by Representative ROBERT C. BYRD, and in the Senate yesterday by Senator KILGORE.

If swift passage of the motions is effected, all West Virginia can take heart—for all of West Virginia certainly has an economic interest in seeing the plant put to productive use.

Authorization of the sale would be a wise step from a Government standpoint, too. The Institute plant now is a costly deadweight in a surplus labor area, and if for some reason it ever were slated for reactivation, many months and millions of dollars would be required.

And, of course, it's improbable that it ever would be reactivated to produce rubber. Other, more modern plants can now produce much more synthetic rubber than was required during past emergencies.

Action is required now, though, if the plant is ever to be a productive member of the Kanawha Valley industrial family, which means so much to all the State's economy.

All members of West Virginia's congressional contingent should join with Senator KILGORE and Representative BYRD in working toward passage of these enabling amendments.

The utmost attention and effort is demanded, especially on the part of Representative BYRD and Representative MOLLOHAN, members of the House Armed Services Committee, to which the House measure has been referred.

And all of the State is watching to see what action is being taken.

Soviet Plane Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the most important question for our people is the defense of our Nation against Communist aggression. One of the major factors in that question is our air strength. I commend to the attention of the Senate a thoughtful editorial on the subject which appeared this morning in the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET PLANE PROGRESS

The impact of recent revelations concerning unexpected Soviet progress in long-range bomber production is manifest in Tuesday's action by the Senate Appropriations Committee on military appropriations for the next fiscal year. The Senate group approved a $356 million increase in Air Force funds, a sum which will permit a 35 percent rise in output of B–52 bombers. The B–52, an intercontinental jet bomber, is not yet in operational use, but for the period ahead it is intended to be our main reliance for the Strategic Air Command, whose primary mission is long-range retaliation should that need arise.

Over the past 6 weeks or so the Soviet Government has shown the world that Western estimates of Soviet air progress were seriously wrong. In the skies over Moscow Western observers have seen unmistakable evidence that the Soviet Union now has appreciable numbers of long-range jet bombers and other advanced aircraft. The numbers shown in these flights over Moscow suggest that these craft are now in quantity production. The possibility that the Soviet Union may be ahead of this country in the long-range bomber field is now being seriously discussed among qualified observers.

Whatever the full facts may be—and official disclosures to date by the Defense Department leave much to be desired—enough is known to indicate several important conclusions. First, Secretary of Defense Wilson was wrong when 2 years ago, on May 19, 1953, he reassured Congress that Russia was concentrating on a defensive air force composed primarily of fighter planes. This incorrect assumption has apparently been the base of much of our military planning. Second, once again—as in the case of atomic and hydrogen bombs earlier—the West has seriously underestimated Soviet development and production capabilities. Third, serious rethinking of our military policies seems required in the light of the new, disquieting information.

Appointment of General Ridgway to Mellon Institute of Industrial Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the people of Pittsburgh are very proud of the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research. Recently it has been announced that General Ridgway will become chairman of its board of trustees. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject which was published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIDGWAY APPOINTMENT

One of the Nation's most prestigious scientific agencies, the Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, is fortunate in obtaining the services of an equally prestigious administrator, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, who will become chairman of the Board of Trustees.

General Ridgway will assume his new duties in Pittsburgh sometime in September, following his retirement as Chief of Staff of the United States Army, a position he has held since May, 1953.

The appointment of this distinguished soldier marks a departure from the practice of having a scientist administer the Institute's affairs. It is made in recognition of the Institute's growth in recent years and of its ambitious expansion program, which make it desirable to relieve the agency's scientific leadership of an increasing administrative burden.

There can be no doubt as to General Ridgway's capacities both for administration and for leadership. Few military men in our history have enjoyed a more illustrious career. As leader of the 82d Airborne Division, and subsequently of the 18th Airborne Corps, in World War II; as commander of the Eighth Army in Korea; as United States commander in the Far East, succeeding General MacArthur; as supreme commander of the Allied Powers in Europe, succeeding General Eisenhower, and as Chief of Staff he has become one of the pre-eminent military figures of our time.

As General Ridgway assumes his administrative duties in Oakland, the Institute's

scientific work will remain in good hands. Dr. E. R. Weidlein, who has successfully directed the Institute's development for many years, will continue as president and a member of the board of trustees.

Both the Institute and General Ridgway are to be congratulated, the former for its broadened scope of activities, the latter for an enviable opportunity for further service as a civilian. General Ridgway is assured of a warm reception and a challenging future in this industrial capital.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, Before United Jewish Appeal Conference, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday evening, June 4, 1955, the United Jewish Appeal held an important conference at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, in Washington. During the course of the dinner, citations were given to a number of great American generals of World War II. I was privileged to speak on that occasion. I was very happy, indeed, to have the opportunity of expressing my great appreciation and my gratitude to President Eisenhower, who was, at the time to which I referred in my remarks, General Eisenhower. I expressed my deep appreciation for the great cooperation which General Eisenhower gave to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration during the years I was its director general, 1943–46, and the unfailing encouragement and help which he made available to us.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed the the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Rosenwald, honored guests, during many years of public life, I have been fortunate enough to be the recipient of a number of awards, yet never in my life have I felt more highly privileged than at this moment, in accepting this honor which you have chosen to bestow on me.

I think that is because the organization issuing this citation was born at a very special time, which I, for one, can never recall without emotion.

Those were troubled times.

Those were dark days indeed.

Those were the days when news of persecution, bestiality, of inhumanity beyond belief, formed the content of our fears and nightmares.

In those days, the leaders of American Jewry united to form this great lifesaving organization.

There were moments when under the impact of the tragic news from Europe, we believed that European Jewry was doomed.

But history was to erase those moments of despair.

We ourselves took hold of history.

It became abundantly clear in the midst of the dark moments that we could do something about the suffering of Jews in the areas dominated by Nazi Tyranny—that we could offer material aid, funds and food and clothing out of our own resources and give encouragement and hope to the millions of sorely threatened people abroad. At the same time we were comforted by the fact that men of other faiths and of good will were doing all they could to bring additional aid to those trapped in the shadow of the Nazi terror.

Whenever America practices democracy in action, it gains strength and it gains friends.

America must continue to demonstrate, clearly and forthrightly, what is meant by freedom, by democracy, by tolerance, by equal rights.

Thus do we win respect for our way of life. Thus can we open the eyes of many deluded by the glib promises of totalitarian rulers who offer so much but fulfill so little.

A splendid example of this vital obligation to practice what we preach was our participation in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—UNRRA—which I had the privilege of serving as first Director General, from 1943 to 1964.

To become an integral part of UNRRA was a stroke of great political wisdom and of a deep humanity on the part of the American people.

With Europe ravaged by so much destruction, we served greatly to rebuild lives and to sustain courage in many millions of suffering people in Europe, Asia, and Africa.

And when we sent our teams of nurses and doctors and social workers and administrators to Europe, a remarkable thing happened.

They came into contact with the soldiers and officers of our great American Army and the story from there on was a story of magnificent cooperation between the civilian administration and the military.

So began the historic undertaking of free nations acting together to restore war-torn Europe.

This work was accomplished in a miraculously short time.

In 1947 it was possible to dissolve UNRRA.

I am glad this evening that this great work is being commemorated.

I am glad because it gives us a chance to remember that his work not only physically strengthened our friends abroad but also gave them the impetus to take up where we left off.

It also proved in action the old American convictions of fair play and the helping hand. We must continue to prove that we know what democracy means by practicing it.

The generals we are going to honor tonight behaved with great compassion and understanding and a true concern for the welfare of those in their charge because they were brought up in our tradition of democracy—respect for the dignity of one's fellow men—the tradition of honesty and decent behavior at all times and in all situations.

I am very moved at this opportunity to pay tribute to these men who so much deserve it and to the others among us who served as their advisers on Jewish affairs.

I want to speak very briefly of the great help that was given to UNRRA by the great general who is now President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower. By his every word and deed he gave encouragement to those of us who were charged with carrying out the merciful and humane purposes of this first great international operating organization.

I will recount just one instance. In 1945 when we were seeking the appropriation of the second United States contribution of $1,350,000,000, to which we were obligated to our allies, we were held up for a considerable length of time in Congress in securing favorable action on the appropriation which was so sorely needed. I was not then a Member of Congress nor did I at that time know as much about congressional committees as I do now, but day after day my associates and I appeared before committees with a plea for prompt action. The situation was a critical one. Finally, General Eisenhower on Thanksgiving Day 1945 left his sickbed to appear before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. He dramatically, and in moving terms, told the story of the displaced-persons camps and the great help that UNRRA was giving to our military and to the nations of Europe in returning millions of people to their homes, if they had homes, and of caring for those who no longer had any homes. It was a powerful appeal to the Congress and it greatly helped to bring about early and favorable action. I shall never fail to be grateful to General Eisenhower for the humanity that he showed on that and many other occasions, and for the constant encouragement and help that he gave to UNRRA.

I am moved, too, at the thought that we have with us this evening representatives of those very displaced persons who in the days right after the war did not know where they were going to go or what they were going to do and since have come so far that they are able now to enrich our society by their contributions to public life.

In addition to the great honor you have conferred on me this evening, you have given an equally great honor in permitting me, in behalf of all us associated with the United Jewish Appeal, the privilege of presenting tonight's awards for distinguished humanitarian service.

These awards are beautiful clay lamps from the land of the Bible, dating from the ancient past, and symbolizing 20 centuries of Jewish history in which each generation renewed its devotion to freedom's ideal.

Each is inscribed with the name of the recipient and the caption "To one who has kept the lamp of freedom burning, presented in deepest gratitude by the United Jewish Appeal for his distinguished humanitarian service to victims of Nazi tyranny."

I should like now to present the first of these awards to Gen. John H. Hilldring.

No Room for the Stork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer a very short editorial entitled "No Room for the Stork." The editorial contains much food for thought, and has reference to the lack of adequate home building, these days, to take care of growing families. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO ROOM FOR THE STORK

A study by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials showing that the need for larger dwellings is growing in both public and private housing markets is one to which builders should give some attention.

Many a family finds that the standard three-bedroom houses going up on all sides are completely inadequate to their needs and that added rooms invariably run into prohibitive and seemingly unnecessary costs.

The only apparent response to the demand for larger homes seems to be in public housing as indicated by scattered reports from across the country revealing that from 15 to 20 percent of this type of construction is being devoted to 4 and 5 bedroom units. And that is little consolation to the citizen of moderate means who wants to live in his own home.

Certainly the building industry is as capable of providing economical housing for families with three or more children as it is for those with two or less. Many a prospective home buyer would like to see some proof of it.

Commencement Address by Paul G. Benedum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Paul G. Benedum, an outstanding young industrialist of Pittsburgh, delivered the commencement address at Waynesburg College, Pa., on June 12, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently I heard the story of a campaign that was being staged in a small American town to raise funds and otherwise to provide medical and surgical care for the community's crippled children. All the members of the town's service clubs somewhat perfunctorily pledged themselves to assist in the campaign. Perhaps few of them thought they would be called upon for any specific service.

Consequently, it was both surprising and disconcerting to one of them when he was called a few days later and asked if he would not cancel whatever plans he had for that day and take a crippled child from one of the community's poverty stricken homes to a hospital in a nearby city. He agreed to do so and drove to a two-room house on the other side of the railroad tracks to get the child, a bright-eyed boy of 7 who was as much thrilled by the prospect of the trip as by the hope of being made able to walk again.

They had not driven very far before the youngster asked his benefactor a surprising question: "Mister, are you God?" The man was stunned for a moment by the earnestness of the boy, and then he replied, "Of course not. Why would you think that I am God?"

"Because," the boy replied, "My mother said that God would get me to the hospital." Then, after a pause, the little polio sufferer added, "Well, if you are not God, you do work for him, don't you?"

The man said that in a way he supposed he did. "Gee," the little fellow exclaimed, "it must be wonderful to have God for a boss."

I am very happy to be here today and to have this opportunity to meet with those who enjoy the very great privilege of daily association with one who does have God for a boss. I do not have to tell any of you that I refer to the beloved and saintly president of Waynesburg College, Dr. Paul Stewart, who turns to his boss for guidance in everything that he undertakes. That divine influence is reflected in those qualities of heart and mind which have endeared him to every person whose life he had touched. It is mirrored in the character of this school and in the lives and achievements of its alumni and students. I cannot think of anything that would be more inspiring and ennobling than to rub shoulders with such a person every day.

I know that I have embarrassed Dr. Stewart by this reference to him, and I hope you will pardon the personal word. However, I feel so strongly that this institution and this community are genuinely blessed by having his leadership that I just could not let the opportunity pass. If I were called upon to appraise the worth of the school, I would rate that leadership as of far more value than any endowment fund that might be amassed.

A great philosopher with a touch of whimsy once observed that the human mind has an infinite capacity to resist the introduction of knowledge. Another and more cynical savant defined education as the inculcation of the incomprehensible into the minds of the ignorant by the incompetent.

If there be any among the members of this graduating class who accept any part of that misanthropic definition, I am not in very good position to criticize them, because there is upon my conscience the recollection that in my student days I subscribed to it in all of its implications. Much of that which was taught then was beyond my comprehension, and I must confess that some of it has not even yet penetrated my skull.

In any event, I have firsthand knowledge that this definition of education has no application whatever at Waynesburg College. On an average of about twice a month, for the last 10 years, I have matched wits at the luncheon table with your able and distinguished president and despite the fact that I have had the enthusiastic support and assistance of others more gifted and erudite than I, we have always come out second best in these intellectual encounters. Throughout the same period I have had a few business deals with alumni of this institution, and while I would not charge that I was swindled in any instance, I cannot refrain from telling you that I never made any money out of these transactions.

In view of these and other personal experiences and observations, I have the most impressive evidence that your instructors and those who have been under their tutelage are far from being ignorant or incompetent. I have found them to be extremely wise. Surely no one would want any stronger proof of the capacity and alertness of those who make up this class than to look at its members.

May I say in all sincerity that I count it not only an honor and privilege but also a real inspiration to address the 1955 graduates of this very wonderful institution.

I congratulate you individually and collectively upon having completed the courses required for your degrees. I know that I speak for everyone assembled here this afternoon in voicing the hope that your individual efforts in the life ahead may bring to each of you full realization of your dreams.

I am genuinely thrilled to see in your faces a radiance that comes from a sense of achievement, a solemnity akin to reverence that bespeaks a high sense of responsibility, and a look of serious determination that augurs good not alone for you as individuals, but for those fields to which you may direct your talents and energies, for the communities in which you may live, and for the common good of our country. There is one thing I do not see which is most pleasing. Not one of you gives the appearance of satisfaction or complacency.

Satisfaction is an intellectual opiate. It enervates the body, atrophies the spirit, and dwarfs the soul. It induces a complacent lethargy that stands as a roadblock in the path of individual achievement and the advancement of mankind. On occasion it does inflate one's vanity, but it has been my observation that in the case of at least 99 percent of us, nature requires no outside assistance in doing this job.

There is a characteristic of human nature which might be called the divine discontent that has been responsible for all the progress of the human race since man first emerged from the tribal governments of the caves. He was discontented with tools and weapons of stone, and so he found a way to fashion others of metal. He grew tired of using a forked stick for a plow, and so through a progression of his discontent the tractor came into being. Man was unhappy with the pace of the oxcart, and now he moves on wings at supersonic speeds. He was discontented with his ignorance of his own nature and of the world about him, and out of that discontent there came knowledge, enlightenment, and philosophy.

The divine discontent, which has been the stimulus to science, to social improvement and to intellectual and industrial achievement, is a vastly different thing from the restless and unreasoning discontent which has now seized upon the world and would lead millions to embrace unrealistic fancies of an era of peace and prosperity without work, without sacrifice, and without service. That is not discontent. It is what I would call malcontent—a Satanic malcontent that is today being fomented by those who would destroy individual liberty and make all men the helpless serfs of a superstate.

Those who possessed the divine discontent have found happiness and success in working overtime to make things better. That is why the world has made more progress in the last century than in all the previously recorded 6,000 years of human history. That is why in the free world of today men earn more in fewer hours of work, eat better food, live in finer houses, have greater opportunities, enjoy more of the cultural side of life and have more time for recreation than ever before.

If we of this generation are to make our contribution toward a continuation of mankind's upward climb, we must toil diligently not only in our trades and professions, but we must work to root out the hate, fear, and suspicion that are the products of the satanic malcontent. We must restore faith and confidence in their stead. The world is woefully short of those things right now.

The cynics and the doubting Thomases are the unconscious allies of the malcontents. They are the fellows who stand on the sidelines and scream, "You can't do that" when it actually is being done. They are not like the old fellow down at the Jacktown fair, who, when asked if he believed in baptism, quickly replied, "I sure do—I've seen it done."

We need more of that kind of faith—faith not only in the realities of today, but in the fulfillment of the dreams of tomorrow. We need more faith in ourselves, in our country, and in our God. If we have that kind of faith and support it with elbow grease there are no heights that cannot be attained.

It is only through the combination of faith and work that we can successfully combat the fears of this age of complexities and uncertainties. Those fears make a happy hunting ground for crafty demagogues, who prey upon the yearning of human beings for safety and security. Their purpose is to promote their socialistic concept of paternalism and collectivism, the industrial counterpart of which is nationalization. They say to a battered and depressed human spirit, wearied by the frenzied pace of modern existence and fearful of H-bomb terrors—"accept our doctrine and we will give you security against the vicissitudes of life." The catch in this is that they do not tell you the frightful price you will be called upon to pay—a price that will mortgage your body

and soul, forfeit your liberty of thought and action, and rivet the chains of bondage upon your children and your children's children.

They ask you to accept socialism by easy stages, while at the same time they proclaim their enmity for communism. They would have you believe that there is no connection between these two economic and political philosophies.

My friends, let me emphasize that the only difference between socialism and communism is that one carries a gun and the other does not. Socialism inevitably devolutes into communism, because at some point along the line it is compelled to take up a gun in order to enforce its decrees. Then it becomes communism in all of its most evil and awesome aspects. I would remind you that the official name of Communist Russia is "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Socialism destroys opportunity and productivity. The only opportunity it seeks is the opportunity to destroy opportunity, itself. It would make all men and women subject to the directions of the State. I submit in all sincerity that if James Watt and Thomas Edison had been denied the opportunity to work in a climate of political freedom, without interference from a political hierarchy, we would today be without the light, power, and mobility provided by steam and electricity.

The opportunity these men and their thousands of counterparts enjoyed is the kind of opportunity that you seek. It has nothing in common with the siren call of Satanic Malcontent that would undermine the individual, destroy his self-respect, and annihilate his dignity as a human being. Opportunity rejects the frenzied search to obtain something for nothing. Opportunity is willing to pay, knowing that ultimately you must give for what you get.

You, the members of the graduating class, can help to keep open this door of opportunity by recognizing that every privilege invokes a responsibility and in administering your own lives in the light of these obligations and in accordance with the dictates of conscience, your policies and practices should be such as to bring no discredit or impairment to the economic order which has made your country the last, best hope of earth.

You know, there are a great many people who think that socialism is a relatively new economic and political philosophy. They date its conception to Karl Marx. They regard the ascendancy of Lenin in Russia as its first practical application. Actually, as every student of history knows, the socialistic concept is as old as man himself. It has been tried a thousand times in a thousand places, and always it has been discarded and repudiated for the reason that it destroyed productivity, encouraged idleness, and reduced all men to the lowest level and elevated none to the highest.

Actually, socialism was one of the earliest forms of government in these United States. It was established by the Pilgrims in New England more than 300 years ago. It lasted just exactly 2 years. It was discarded by the colonists as a desperate measure of self-preservation. There, as everywhere else that it has ever been tried, socialism failed to produce. It brought the early settlers of New England to the brink of actual starvation.

I often think that the day in 1623 when the people of Massachusetts turned their backs upon socialism and established the American economic system based on private ownership of property and individual responsibility—is a more important anniversary than the Fourth of July. It certainly ought to be enshrined in the memory of every American citizen, generation after generation.

Now, why was it that relatively overnight the barren fields of Massachusetts blossomed into productivity? It was the same land, no less nor more fertile than before. It can be assumed that it enjoyed about the same amount of sunshine and rainfall. Those who tended the fields were the same men and women. Why did the same fields, tenanted by the same people, operated under the same physical conditions, produce abundance under the one system and scarcity and misery under the other?

The answer can be given in a single word: incentive. Under the Socialist system, which the settlers had accepted in their frenzied desire for ease and security, the production of every citizen went to the central communal warehouse, from which equal shares were doled out to the colonists. It was inevitable that the less industrious ones began to shirk, knowing they would get their equal share regardless of how little they produced. It was equally inevitable that the hard-working citizens would rebel at supporting the indolent ones. And so they, too, leaned on their spades and plows and refreshed themselves in the shade. The result was that within 2 years the Plymouth colony was face to face with starvation.

It was then that each family was given full ownership of its own parcel of land with complete possession of the fruits of its labor. It was then and there that private ownership of property became the fundamental base of the new world's economic system. With it came the blessing of individual freedom which we yet enjoy.

It is the incentive of proper reward for individual effort and enterprise that has made America the most productive Nation on the face of the earth. The genius of invention, the painstaking research of the laboratory, the hazards of pioneering in the field of production have combined to lift the drudgery from the backs of mankind and to bring more of the good things of life to more people here in our country than at any other time or place in the history of the world. The stimulus behind each of these forces was the incentive of reward in the invigorating climate of political freedom.

You can no more ignore this law of human nature than you can repeal the law of gravity. Man is so constituted that he just will not put forth effort without the assurance that he may enjoy the fruits of his labors. We submit ourselves to the rigid regimen of the physician because of the incentive of better health. The women—God bless them—turn their backs upon the sweets they so dearly love because of the inducement of shedding surplus weight. We invest our savings in this enterprise or that because of the consideration of a fair return upon investment.

To use an old expression that was common in the hills of Marshall County, W. Va., when I was a boy there, this incentive is the thing that makes the mare go. It certainly has been the spark plug of the industrial revolution of the last century. It has taken us out of the lethargy and darkness of candlelight and the oxcart into this fabulous age of electricity, jet airplanes and atomic power.

I know there are some who will say that we have achieved this unparalleled advance in the material and cultural spheres only because we were especially endowed by Providence with a greater share of natural resources than is possessed by any other nation. My friends, that simply is not true. We are humbly grateful to God for the vast treasures given to us, but we must recognize that providence played no favorites among His children. There are many countries that are even richer in natural resources than we are. The treasures of China, for instance, are more fabulous than anything ever known in America, and yet because they remain virtually untouched, the teeming millions of that country still live in an economic dark age. Not only does China have the natural resources, but over the centuries it has had the intellect as shown by the fact that it has produced some of the greatest philosophies and inventions of the ages. The most populous nation on earth, it certainly has had ample manpower to do the job.

Why, then, have not its resources been developed so as to bring comfort and prosperity to its people? Because there was one vital thing missing—a stable government that maintained an atmosphere of personal and political freedom, in which men might be protected in the ownership of that which they produced. In short, there was and is no incentive.

Some 5 or 6 years ago I attended a hearing of a committee of the United States Senate in the Capitol Building in Washington. One of the witnesses before the committee that day was Mr. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, with whose economic views I am not always in accord. A member of the committee asked him why it was that the British coal miner produced only 1 ton of coal per day, while the American miner produced more than 6 tons. Mr. Lewis quickly replied that while there were some other considerations, the principal reason was because of the difference in the economic systems of the two countries. Under socialism, he said, there was no incentive for men to produce.

I ask you to visualize what would happen if the right of private ownership of property were destroyed in this country. The ownership would be vested in an all-powerful central government. You would live in your home subject to the whim and caprice of some political commissar. The government would own the stores, and you would buy only what the government offered and at the prices it liked. You could not shop around for bargains.

The right of every American citizen, however humble, to acquire property and to be secure in his ownership, is the bulwark of our freedom against which the Socialists and Communists direct their most concentrated attack. If they could dislodge this keystone, they would strip us of our priceless heritage of freedom.

May I say to the members of this graduation class that you and those of your generation have been born in the most dynamic and exciting era of all time. We are closer today to the golden age envisioned by the Utopians of antiquity than ever before. Shall we continue to go forward to complete realization of the ages-old dream or shall we see the enormous gains of a century of progress reduced to ashes because we fail to keep the faith?

The answer to that question lies in the strength, in the character, and devotion of the people. After all, those qualities, and not material resources, make for the strength and greatness of America.

When the Founding Fathers were assembled in Philadelphia almost 200 years ago to establish the pattern of government in the Union of States, a large crowd assembled outside, awaiting news of the fateful decisions within. After many hours, Benjamin Franklin came out of the door, and someone in the crowd asked, "What have you given us, Mr. Franklin?" That wise old statesman and patriot measured his words carefully, as he replied: "A Republic—if you can keep it."

Those words reverberate down through the years as a ringing challenge to the men and women of today and tomorrow. Can we keep this Republic in all of its glorious traditions of freedom and achievement? No people, no generation, could dedicate itself to a more noble cause.

I had occasion the other day to be in the office of a young man who not more than 5 or 6 years ago received his degree. This man is no sentimentalist, but a hard-boiled, practical patriot. He spent over 370 consecutive days on the African-Italian-European fronts

as a sergeant in the combat infantry. On his desk was a framed reprint of Dean Alfange's creed. I should like to quote it to you and suggest that you will have no better guide as you face the responsibilities that are ahead of you.

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of Utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master, nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and say, 'This I have done.' All this is what it means to be an American."

I believe that with God's help we can and will maintain our freedom, and that America will continue to be a beacon light of hope, of faith, and of strength in a world of confusion, complexity, and oppression. Perform your occupation with reference to the will of God—and may He bless you in this momentous undertaking.

Don't Join the Book Burners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Montgomery Advertiser of June 13 appeared a very interesting article, written by a distinguished jurist, Judge Walter B. Jones, who writes regularly a column appearing in the Montgomery Advertiser under the caption "Off the Bench." In this case he chose as the title of his article a quotation from President Eisenhower, "Don't Join the Book Burners." I ask unanimous consent that the article, which is quite thought-provoking, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFF THE BENCH

(By Judge Walter B. Jones)

DON'T JOIN THE BOOK BURNERS

I get the title for Off the Bench today from a very famous speech made at Dartmouth College, June 14, 1953, by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I am using the title because I have just been reading with interest a little volume called Banned Books, by Anne Lyon Haight. The present 1955 edition is the second. The first came out in 1935. Banned Books tells the story of the books which have been banned, burned, and censored from 387 B. C. to 1954.

The three causes which seem to occasion most condemnation and censorship are religion, politics, and morality. If a man wrote a book on religion and the censors of his day did not like what he said, then they accused him of being a heretic and banned the book. If an author happened to differ with the powers in control of the state, politicians of his day, then he was said to be a traitor and the book was banned on the ground of treason to the state. If a man wrote on morality and his ideas of moral practice or action did not follow the current morals of his neighbors, then they banned his book because it was said to be obscene.

It is interesting to look back over the last 23 centuries and think about some of the books that have been banned, burned, and censored. They are books that have withstood the condemnation of their times—yesterday—and have become the classics of today.

I note among the books listed by the author of Banned Books many books that we cherish today, and regard as works of the highest class and acknowledged excellence. Back in Greece, 400 years before Christ, Plato suggested that much of Homer's Odyssey be expurgated. The Roman Emperor Caligula, in A. D. 35, wanted to suppress it because the book expressed Greek ideals of freedom and these were then very dangerous in autocratic Rome.

The Bible through the long centuries has had a rough time. In England, 1409, one of the synods issued a decree forbidding the translation of the Scripture from one tongue to another.

Around 1525 William Tyndale printed a partial translation of the New Testament. He was forced to flee to Worms, where he continued to secretly publish the New Testament. The sheets of 6,000 copies were smuggled into England where they were burned by the dignitaries of the church, thus becoming the first printed book to be banned in England. Laws die, books never.

In 1555 Queen Mary banned many books by Martin Luther, John Calvin, Erasmus, and Tyndale. As late as 1953, a Baptist minister in North Carolina burned a leaf from the Revised Standard Version.

In 1640 at Madrid, Spain burned Cervantes' Don Quixote because of one sentence: "Works of charity negligently performed are of no worth."

Many of Shakespear's great works, King Lear, The Merchant of Venice, and Richard II were banned. As late as 1815, Coleridge said: "Shakespeare's words are too indecent to be translated." And a year or two later a Dr. Bowdler published the Family Shakespeare, omitting "those words and expressions which cannot with propriety be read aloud in the family."

In 1644 John Milton's Areopagitica, a famed and eloquent plea for freedom of the pen, was condemned by Cromwell. Milton wrote: "As good almost kill a man as kill a good book." We must never forget John Peter Zenger and the great fight he made for liberty of the press. The Royal Governor of New York in 1734 suppressed his Weekly Journal. An organization was established for Zenger's defense. They called themselves the Sons of Liberty. They opposed the Stamp Act 30 years later, through the circulation of handbills and newspapers.

The greatest book of 18th century, Montesquieu's The Spirit of the Laws, was banned in France. It profoundly influenced political thought in America.

The writings of Tom Paine, which did so much for the independence of the Colonies, have also had rough sledding, and at one time in England they were banned, and printers publishing them were fined and put in prison.

Balzac's Droll Stories, a collection of humorous tales, as late as 1953 were banned in Spain by Franco. He called Balzac a disgraceful writer. For several years Balzac's books were banned in the United States. At one time or another many of Hans Christian Andersen's books and fairy stories were banned. George Elliot's Adam Bede was banned in England in 1859, and was attacked as the vile outpouring of a lewd woman's mind.

In 1905 the British Foreign Office tried to ban the Gilbert & Sullivan opera, the Mikado, because it might give offense to the Japanese, although at that time the music was being played and enjoyed on Japanese warships.

In 1927 Russia banned Henry Ford's book, My Life and Work. Twenty-six years later in the United States the Ford Foundation gave $15 million to its Fund for the Republic to help fight restrictions on freedom of thought, inquiry and expression.

Mrs. Margaret Sanger who wrote a book called My Fight for Birth Control, had her book banned not only in the United States but in many other countries.

Banned Books contains the names of about 500 books which were either banned or burned, but which today we find in all public libraries.

I quote these paragraphs from President Eisenhower's address mentioned:

"Don't join the book burners. Don't think you're going to conceal faults by concealing evidence that they ever existed. Don't be afraid to go in your library and read every book, as long as any document does not offend our own ideas of decency. That should be the only censorship.

"How will we defeat communism unless we know what it is, what it teaches, and why does it have such an appeal for men, why are so many people swearing allegiance to it? It's almost a religion, albeit one of the nether regions.

"And we have got to fight it with something better, not try to conceal the thinking of our own people. They are part of America. And even if they think ideas that are contrary to ours, their right to say them, their right to record them, and their right to have them at places where they're accessible to others is unquestioned, or it's not America."

Nomination of William C. Kern to the Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday, June 16, 1955, I appeared before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in opposition to the nomination of Mr. William C. Kern to the Federal Trade Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my testimony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I appear today before your committee—and I am very grateful to you for this opportunity—in opposition to the nomination of Mr. William C. Kern to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know Mr. Kern. I have made some inquiries concerning him but have not been able to find out very much about him, other than that he has been a trial lawyer for the Federal Trade Commission for a number of years, serving during the last year as Deputy Director of the Bureau of Litigation—a position to which he was appointed by the present Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Edward F. Howrey.

I have nothing against Mr. Kern personally. As I said, I do not know him personally. He has the qualification of experience with the Federal Trade Commission and the severe disqualification of the position he now occupies as Deputy Director of the Bureau of Litigation. I shall go into that in the course of my testimony.

I do not know what Mr. Kern's views are on the basic policy matters over which he would be required to preside as a member of the Federal Trade Commission—on the fundamental laws which it is the duty of the Federal Trade Commission to enforce. I trust that this committee will inquire into those views.

I do know, however, that Mr. Kern's qualifications—viewing them in their most favorable light—and I am perfectly willing to give him the benefit of every doubt, and to appraise him with the highest possible estimate—still pale and grow dim by comparison with the qualifications of the man he seeks to replace—or rather, the man whom the President has named him to replace—Commissioner James M. Mead.

I would now like to define the bases of my interest in this nomination—the interest which moves me to come before this committee and to oppose Mr. Kern's nomination. It is not my usual practice, Mr. Chairman—I have never done it before—to come before a committee of which I am not a member, to oppose the nomination of an individual designated by the President to fill an important policymaking position.

Mr. Kern is not from my State. He is from Indiana. Moreover, I believe that in general the President of the United States should have a wide latitude in making the appointments that are within his prerogative. Surely in the executive branch of the Government, the President is the responsible official, and I believe that generally speaking, the President should be allowed the widest latitude, within well-understood limits, in naming individuals to carry out the executive policies of Government in the executive branch of Government.

Strictly speaking, however, the Federal Trade Commission is not a part of the executive branch of the Government. It is a quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative agency. It renders judgments and makes decisions which are half legislative and half judicial. The Federal Trade Commission enjoys powers which are delegated to it by Congress—which the Congress has a right to do—a right which has been challenged in the past, but which the Supreme Court has repeatedly upheld.

So, Mr. Chairman, the first basis of my extreme interest in this nomination is the vital concern I have—and the vital concern which New York State has—for the proper discharge of the duties delegated to the Federal Trade Commission under our laws covering fair trade, price discrimination, combinations in restraint of trade, and unfair business practices in general. There are few subjects in which New York State has a greater interest. New York State has, I may say, a greater concentration of business and commerce than any other State in the Union. Although we have many great business concerns in our State—and some of them are indeed monopoly-minded—we also have thousands and thousands of small businesses in New York State. I would guess that we have the greatest number of small businesses in New York State of any State in the Union. So we are concerned with the work of the Federal Trade Commission—vitally concerned. We are concerned for the protection of small business, for the protection of the consumer, and for adequate defenses against monopoly and unfair business practices.

The second basis of my interest in this nomination is the fact that Jim Mead, former Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and at present a member of that Commission, is a citizen of my State; one of our most distinguished citizens. New York is proud of the service Jim Mead has performed as chairman and as a member of the Federal Trade Commission. It has been outstanding service—service always in the public interest, in behalf of small business, and in behalf of the consumers of this country.

Jim Mead's record on the Trade Commission—both as an administrator and as a representative of the public interest—have helped in a most significant way to give consumers and small business the safeguards that Congress intended they should have—and never were those safeguards more needed than they are today. We need more protection of small business and of the consumer—not less. We need more vigilance in the defense of the public interest—not less.

President Eisenhower's failure to reappoint Jim Mead is a rebuke to Jim Mead's record. It is a rebuke to the principles for which Jim Mead has stood on the Federal Trade Commission during all the years of his service.

If the Federal Trade Commission were nothing more than a branch of the executive department of Government, I would have only a political difference with the President over his failure to reappoint Jim Mead. I would not have been surprised. But the Federal Trade Commission is not just another branch of the executive department.

It is an independent agency. It has quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions.

The FTC was set up by law as a bipartisan commission to insure its immunity from passing political pressures or from dictation by the President of the United States, whoever he might be. The law states that no more than three members of the Commission may be appointed from the same political party. The other two must be members of the minority party—in this case, the Democratic Party. This provision of the law is intended to insure adequate representation for the minority political viewpoint—further to guarantee the independence and political balance of this agency.

That wasn't all the Congress did to insure the independence of this agency. The Congress also made the term of each Commissioner 7 years—another device to provide this agency with immunity from political pressures. And finally, Mr. Chairman, the Congress determined that no Commissioner could be removed except for cause. In 1935 the Supreme Court, in the celebrated Humphrey case, declared that this proviso clearly meant that no Commissioner could be removed save on the basis of specific charges as to malfeasance or improper conduct in office. The Humphrey case, it is interesting to recall, dealt directly with the FTC. In October 1933 President Roosevelt removed the then Chairman of the FTC, Mr. William E. Humphrey, and replaced him with a Mr. Matthews. Mr. Humphrey was old, and he died shortly thereafter, but his executors brought a suit against the United States Government. The Supreme Court ruled that the President did not have the power to remove a member of the FTC at will, but was required by law to present charges and to have a hearing on those charges.

A member of the FTC does not serve at the pleasure of the President. He is not an agent of the President's will. He is an agent of the Nation—carry out the national intent as reflected in the various pieces of legislation on the subject of fair trade practices and monopoly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply troubled by the tendency in this administration—a general tendency—to subvert the intentions of the law—the plain purposes of legislation enacted in past years—by appointing to positions of authority in the discharge of regulatory functions men who are out of sympathy with these functions, or at most, ready to pay only lip service to them.

Time and again during the past 2 years, tried and true defenders of the public interest have been replaced, on the regulatory agencies established by Congress, with individuals who, by background and past association, might be expected to be directly opposed to the purpose of the laws they are appointed to administer.

We have seen this happen with the National Labor Relations Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and last but by no means least, the Federal Trade Commission.

I do not charge—I have no real basis for charging—that Mr. Kern is a spokesman for, or a representative of, the business interests which the Federal Trade Commission is supposed to regulate. I strongly suggest that this committee examine Mr. Kern carefully to ascertain whether his views are entirely consistent with the spirit and purposes of the laws he has been appointed to help administer.

I do know, however, that Commissioner Mead was a man who, on the record, fought consistently and tirelessly in behalf of the public interest in the exact spirit of the laws which form the charter of the Federal Trade Commission. President Eisenhower's failure to reappoint Mr. Mead immediately raises questions and doubts.

The Federal Trade Commission is supposed to be bipartisan. It is supposed to have a membership representing a minority viewpoint. I am chairman of the Securities Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. There recently came to my subcommittee the nomination of a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The individual nominated is supposed to be a Democrat. The position in question, like the one before you, is required, by law, to be filled by a member of the minority party. Yet the individual nominated—and I have nothing against him personally—just as in the case of Mr. Kern—testified that he had been cleared for the nomination to the Securities and Exchange Commission by the Republican National Committee.

I remarked, in the course of the hearings I was conducting on this nomination, that I considered this a complete subversion of the principle of nonpartisanship. There is no nonpartisanship when a minority member has to be cleared by the national committee of the majority party.

I say this, of course, in no partisan spirit, but rather in a spirit of devotion to the law itself. I would address both Republican and Democratic Members of the Senate in the same way. I believe it would be just as wrong should a Democratic President be in office—and I hope one soon will be—to require that a position, which under the law should go to a Republican, have the clearance of the Democratic National Committee. I suggest to the Republican Members of the Senate that they beware of setting this kind of precedent.

Let us bear clearly in mind the meaning and the purpose of the legal requirement that no more than three members of the Federal Trade Commission, for instance, be members of the same party. The purpose is to insure minority representation on these Commissions. Not minority representation in theory, but minority representation in fact. It does not satisfy the spirit of the law, in my judgment, to appoint, as a minority member of such an independent agency as the Federal Trade Commission, an individual who, technically speaking, is a member of the minority party, or who is a member of a wing of the minority party which is indistinguishable in viewpoint from the majority party. That does not satisfy the spirit of this legal requirement. That is an evasion of the requirement. That does not insure the presence on these Com-

missions—and on this Commission—of a vigilant minority dedicated to the social and economic viewpoint of the minority party.

It may satisfy the letter of the law if the individual concerned is a registered member of the minority party, or even if he simply asserts, beyond power of contradiction, that he is a member of the minority party. I do not believe it satisfies the spirit of the law.

Turning now from the question of bipartisanship and minority representation to the question of what general viewpoint should be required of nominees to this all-important Commission, let me quote from an official document—from the United States Government Organization Manual for 1954–55, issued by the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration.

I am going to quote from that publication a significant excerpt, written by the Federal Trade Commission itself, representing, I assume, the composite view of the Commission. This quotation defines the nature and purpose of the Federal Trade Commission. This is not my interpretation, but the official interpretation.

"The basic objective of the Commission," says the United States Government Organization Manual, "is the maintenance of free competitive enterprise as the keystone of the American economic system. Although the duties of the Commission are many and varied * * * the foundation of public policy underlying all these duties is essentially the same: to prevent the free-enterprise system from being stifled or fettered by monopoly or corrupted by unfair or deceptive trade practices. In brief, the Commission is charged with keeping competition both free and fair. * * * As an administrative agency acting quasi-judicially and quasi-legislatively, the Commission was established to deal with trade practices on a continuing and corrective basis."

These aren't my words; they are the Commission's words—the words of the United States Government Organization Manual. The Commission describes itself as a quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative agency. What is more important than having on such agency a true minority viewpoint—a properly critical and constructive opposition to the majority?

On such a Commission, the differences in viewpoint naturally establish themselves on the basis of social and economic philosophy. Jim Mead represents as well as any man has ever represented, the social and economic philosophy of the Democratic Party as a whole, which I believe is the social and economic philosophy of the overwhelming majority of the American people—a social and economic philosophy written, in 1914, into the Federal Trade Commission Act; and subsequently into the Clayton Act and many other acts through the years, the most important and climactic of which, in recent years, was the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936.

Incidentally, I find it very interesting that the United States Government Organization Manual of 1954–55, in listing the basic statutes under which the Federal Trade Commision operates, significantly omits direct mention of the Robinson-Patman Act, although the United States Government Organization Manual of 1952–53 does indeed include reference to the Robinson-Patman Act among the basic charters of the Federal Trade Commission. I wonder whether we might have here a basis for suspecting—or at least raising the question—whether the Federal Trade Commission, under its present administration, would like to forget the existence of the Robinson-Patman Act—that basic bulwark of small business?

Jim Mead is well aware of the existence of the Robinson-Patman Act. His record as chairman and as a member of the Federal Trade Commission reflects his awareness of the necessity of enforcing the law relating to price discrimination.

All of us are well aware of the change in the tone and temper of the Federal Trade Commission since the change in national administration, and especially since the present chairman, Mr. Edward F. Howrey, took office. I would like to submit, for the record, Mr. Chairman, an article from the responsible publication Business Week, published by McGraw-Hill, issue of June 5, 1954. This article is entitled "Republicans Reshape the FTC." The highlights of the article, as printed in the heading, are as follows:

"There is a new stress on proof of injury in cases involving curbs on competition."

"They're taking a fresh look at the law on mergers and price-fixing."

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this article be read by the members of this committee before acting on this nomination, and ask that this article be incorporated in the record and be printed at the end of my remarks.

It is a fact that in the area of unfair price discriminations, the Commission has given such a broad interpretation to the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, that the whole Robinson-Patman Act is in danger of emasculation.

In recent hearings before Senator SPARKMAN's Small Business Committee, it was testified that due to this broad interpretation, the Commission now refuses even to initiate a case where the good-faith defense is asserted.

I am a cosponsor, and I am sure some of the members of this committee are cosponsors, of S. 11, a bill introduced by Senator KEFAUVER to restore to the Robinson-Patman Act the teeth that were removed by the Supreme Court "good-faith" decision in the Standard Oil case.

The Federal Trade Commission, under the chairmanship of Jim Mead, favored this legislation. It is my understanding that today, the Federal Trade Commission, under its present administration, opposes this legislation.

I believe, with all my heart, that the removal of Jim Mead from this commission, would eliminate a vital viewpoint, a viewpoint shared by at least 30 Members of the Senate, as witnessed by the number of sponsors of S. 11. That viewpoint is a minority viewpoint today on the Federal Trade Commission. To the extent that it is possible, I believe we should insist that the minority viewpoint be retained on the Commission.

Chairman Howrey, of the Federal Trade Commission, has endorsed the majority report of the Attorney-General's National Committee to Study Anti-Trust Laws. As I interpret that report, it favors weaker anti-trust enforcement in practically every part of this field. Jim Mead does not subscribe to the Attorney-General's report. He favors stronger enforcement of the anti-trust laws. He has made some recommendations pointed in this direction, recommendations which Senator HILL, of Alabama, inserted textually into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 4.

Jim Mead gained a justified reputation on the Commission as the leading champion of free enterprise and effective anti-trust legislation. Jim Mead was not a partisan. While he was chairman, attorneys were hired without regard to political affiliation, and, I am told, that many so hired were in fact Republicans.

I am not a lawyer, Mr. Chairman, nor an expert in the complexities of the work of the Federal Trade Commission. I would commend to this committee, however, a reading of the opinions of Commissioner Mead in the Pillsbury Mills case, in the General Foods case, in the Metal Lath case, the National Lead case, and the Book-of-the-Month Club case. I would ask that these opinions of Commissioner Mead be placed in the record of these hearings at the end of my remarks. As I said, I do not know all the legal implications of these cases. I have chosen them as representative of Commissioner Mead's consistent record in favor of the public interest.

In a period characterized by almost daily mergers, a growing trend toward monopoly, and a growing threat to competitive free enterprise and to small business, I think it terribly important that there be retained on the Federal Trade Commission a clear, strong voice speaking for what some of us believe to be the public interest. I think the two minority places on the Commission should be filled by men who represent the social and economic viewpoint so ably expounded by Jim Mead.

I have been told, Mr. Chairman, that since the Federal Trade Commission was reorganized by Chairman Howrey 1 year ago, the Commission has not initiated a single new action against mergers. Now I am not against all mergers—some of them may be justified. But we are facing a trend—a sweeping tide of mergers, which, compositely, in my judgment, threaten our system of free competitive enterprise and undermine our national economic health.

I feel that with this trend in full swing, we cannot safely endure the loss of even one such individual as Jim Mead from the Federal Trade Commission.

I would like to interpose at this point that Jim Mead is not the only loss we are threatened with. There is another Commission which is within the jurisdiction of this committee—the Federal Communications Commission. There is a member of that Commission who, like Jim Mead, has valiantly, tirelessly, and zealously fought for the public interest against monopoly and against undue concentration of control over our communications in the hands of any one group or class of persons. I refer to Miss Frieda Hennock. It so happens that Miss Hennock is also a constituent of mine. Just as I regret the President's failure to reappoint Jim Mead, I regret the President's failure to reappoint Frieda Hennock.

The pattern is all too clear. It is a dangerous pattern, seeking to eliminate from these independent Commissions and agencies, effective and constructive minority viewpoints. This pattern forms one of the bases of my opposition to Mr. Kern's nomination.

While I do not think that Mr. Kern has all the necessary qualifications from my point of view, he might indeed turn out eventually to be an able representative and exponent of my viewpoint. But there is no basis for any such prediction on the record. Hence, I do not think that I, as a Member of the Senate, am justified in taking a chance by voting to confirm Mr. Kern to replace Jim Mead.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is another question raised by Mr. Kern's appointment which disturbs me greatly. Let us assume, for the moment, that Mr. Kern would turn out to be a vigilant advocate of the liberal viewpoint on the Federal Trade Commission. There is still a hitch. About a year ago, Chairman Howrey promoted Mr. Kern to be Deputy Director of the Bureau of Litigation of the Federal Trade Commission.

In that position, Mr. Kern's duties included the prosecution or supervision of the prosecution of many cases initiated by the Federal Trade Commission under its basic statutes. I have been advised by competent legal counsel—as I said, I am not a lawyer—that under section 5–C of the Administrative Procedures Act, Mr. Kern would be disqualified from participating as a member of the Commission in the consideration of cases with which he had a connection as Deputy Director of the Bureau of Litigation during

the past year. Actually, I am informed all litigated cases before the Federal Trade Commission during the past year came under Mr. Kern's purview.

If my information and legal advice are correct, Mr. Kern will be disqualified from participating at all—for some years to come—on many, if not most, of the cases coming before the Federal Trade Commission.

The Federal Trade Commission already has a chairman, Mr. Howrey, who I understand has disqualified himself from sitting on many of the cases because, as a private attorney, he appeared before the Federal Trade Commission in behalf of many of the business interests which are currently involved in FTC proceedings.

Now here it is proposed to appoint another member of the Federal Trade Commission who will likewise be disqualified from participating in the decisions of the Commission. We would have, as a result, in most cases a three-member Commission.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, I am not an expert on these matters. I am not qualified to give expert testimony. I am merely repeating what I have been told. Therefore, I would strongly suggest and urge that this committee hear Mr. Stephen Spingarn, a former member of the Commission, and a qualified and expert attorney-at-law. I urge you, Mr. Chairman, to call Mr. Spingarn to testify on this point before this committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is the sum total of my testimony. I have come here before you because I feel strongly that it will be most unwise to approve Mr. Kern's nomination, and that President Eisenhower, on the basis of the record of these hearings, should be given a chance to reconsider his decision in replacing Mr. Mead.

I hope he will continue to avail himself of the services of Mr. Kern in his present position, and will send to the Senate for reappointment, the name of James M. Mead, of Buffalo.

New Comity on View in the Trade Extender Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the most important legislative acts of this year was the passage of the measure extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This measure, designed to lay down a long-range trade program for the benefit of our country, has been the subject of considerable discussion pro and con.

The Baltimore Sun of this morning carried a very well-balanced editorial on the whole issue, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW COMITY ON VIEW IN THE TRADE EXTENDER BILL

In 1948 Congress extended the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years—up to then the normal interval. In 1951 the extension was for 2 years. In 1953 it was for 1 year and for 1 year again in 1954. Now the Congress has dropped back to the older rhythm of 3 years with an extension to 1958. This in itself, with its suggestion that a period of questioning, even of doubt, of the foreign trade policy is at an end, is a good thing about the new extender act.

But there are other good things in this newest extension of the 21-year-old policy of promoting world trade. The extender act offers new suggestions of congressional trust in the President's discretion on trade matters. Look, for instance, at amendment No. 29, as passed in the Senate and accepted by the House. In this amendment Congress rejects proposals that it limit the import of a whole list of special commodities and tosses the problem to the President to work out as he and his advisers see fit.

The legislative history of amendment 29 enhances the flavor of this congressional delegation of power. During the hearings on the extended bill a variety of special interests descended on the committees. All insisted that ruination faced them from foreign competition with the commodities they manufactured. All wanted special protection. Congress swept all these protestations aside by empowering the President to exclude commodities—when in his judgment their import threatened national security.

Obviously the commodity groups will put the Executive under dreadful pressure to favor their special claims. Many a weird and tenuous argument will be urged to relate the most unlikely items to the national defense. A weak, a venal, or a high-tariff President might use amendment 29 as a charter of protectionism.

Vigilance on this point will be in order, but there is no reason to assume in advance that President Eisenhower will fall into general error. And certainly the congressional refusal to cripple the act by writing in individual commodity quotas is a defeat for protectionism. True, there are flaws elsewhere in the extender act that to some extent balance its good points. Also Executive use of discretionary power has not always been wise in the past. But amendment 29 does testify to a new comity between Congress and the Executive. And this at a time when lack of comity has been a continuing problem in operating our somewhat cumbrous Constitution.

Obligations of the College Graduate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, many industrialists are becoming greatly interested in the small colleges of our country. I ask unanimous consent that an address delivered at the commencement exercises at Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va., by Ernest T. Weir, chairman of National Steel Corp., may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBLIGATIONS OF THE COLLEGE GRADUATE

I deeply appreciate the honor that I receive here today and I appreciate it all the more because it comes from an institution so long familiar and so close to home as Bethany College.

A commencement is always a stimulating occasion. I am sure that for many of the older members of this audience it is a moment of comparison—as it is for me. We look back to the time when we were at the age of these young graduates today; remember how the world looked to us then and recall the unexpected twists and turns that life has taken since.

It is intriguing for us to speculate on the nature of the world in which you graduates will lead your future lives—a world which will shape your lives and which your lives will help to shape. And it is comforting to know that whatever its problems, each generation seems to develop the capacity to meet them and work them out.

In times past, commencement speakers felt called upon to assure the graduate that opoprtunity, although it might seem elusive at the moment, was always present and could be found if the graduate would only look for it hard and earnestly enough.

I understand there is no need for such assurance today; that the situation has been reversed. In 1955, opportunity is seeking the graduate. Throughout the country, colleges report an average of 2 to 5 positions available to each graduate. The principal emphasis, of course, is on people with technical training but there is also a developing demand for graduates with general education degrees. I am told that is the situation here at Bethany.

It is true that the present situation is a bit out of the ordinary. We are in a period of good business with high level employment and the supply of college graduates available for civilian jobs is reduced by military service requirements.

In my opinion, however, the present demand for the trained person is not a temporary thing by any means. I am sure it will be permanent and increase as time goes on. And the need for higher training and a greater degree of skill will apply not only to college graduates but to workers at all levels in all kinds of activity.

Your big problem will be not to find jobs, but to meet the obligations of the jobs you will be required to do. And America as a whole will have the same problem. There will be ups and downs in the business cycle, of course. But, as a long-range trend, the main problem is not going to be unemployment—not finding work for people to do—but finding ways which will enable the number of people available for work to supply the needs of the future pattern of American life that is now plainly indicated.

The present situation makes it seem incredible that at about the time this graduating class was in kindergarten, there was very strong support in this country for the theory of the mature economy. The advocates of this theory in the 1930's included powerful figures in Government and many influential persons outside of it. Preposterous as it sounds, they preached that America had reached the end of its economic development and that in the future national policy should be directed toward dividing on an equitable basis the limited amount of employment, goods, and services that would be available.

We do not often hear the mature economy mentioned by name any more. But this philosophy of scarcity and of doubt in the future of our country—born out of the depression is still with us. From it come pressures to reduce the scope of individual enterprise and to expand the power and activity of government. It manifests itself in gloomy predictions—based on an entirely unjustified fear—that we will have deep and recurring depressions in the United States if spending for defense purposes is ever eliminated or even substantially reduced. It reveals itself in a willingness to sacrifice progress for security. It expresses itself in the apprehension shown by some reactions to that new word, "automation," which I shall discuss presently.

For a good many years now, many of the basic things this country once took for granted have been under challenge. It is likely that the challenge will continue. Un-

der this condition, it is more vital than ever for a thinking person to have his own philosophy and to know precisely what it is and why he holds it. Your economic philosophy is an important part of your total philosophy. I strongly recommend that now—as you enter your adult life—you base your economic philosophy not on convictions growing out of negative and destructive concepts such as that of the mature economy, but on the positive and constructive conviction that America is dynamic.

I am sure that a career built on this foundation will bring you a much higher personal satisfaction and reward and be of much greater benefit to society. And it will be in harmony with the facts of life.

In order to doubt America's capacity for progress, it seems to me that an individual must ignore the entire record of our country in the past and blind himself to the plain evidence that this record not only can and will but must continue in the future.

Let us consider two of the most basic parts of that evidence. The first is growth of population. The second is increase in productivity. Present population is about 165 million. On the basis of conservative estimate, this population will grow by 1975—20 years from now—to 220 million, and by the year 2000—only 45 years from now—to at least 300 million.

Think of the implications of this. Let me illustrate by reference to my own industry. The present per capita consumption of steel is about 1,400 pounds per year. To have exactly this same amount of steel available to the American people in the year 2000, the steel industry must by that time have added 85 million tons of steelmaking capacity to the 125 million tons it has today. And, actually, in my opinion it will be at least 100 million tons—reaching a total of 225 million tons. We also must find the iron ore, coal, and other raw materials to supply those facilities.

In addition, as time goes on, the industry will have to replace all of its present facilities which, as I have said, have a total capacity of 125 million tons per year. It is estimated that these facilities have an average useful life of 35 years. In other words, between now and the year 2000, it will be necessary to replace all existing facilities about 1⅓ times.

I believe it is obvious that all of this adds up to a tremendous investment of money, tremendous employment, and a tremendous collateral economic activity. And remember that this is based only on the present per capita consumption of steel.

Now, of course, that will increase. In the steel industry, the long-term record has been one of constant increase in the per capita consumption of steel. I will not impose more figures on you. To confirm that fact for yourself, just think for a moment of all the things in and about your own home that are made of steel today which only a few years ago were not made of steel or not made at all. What applies to steel, applies to other industries. For instance, there is 5 times as much electric power generated now as there was 20 years ago. That is a significant fact in itself and becomes more significant when you think of the reasons for that increase. To take a longer view, in the past century population has increased roughly 7 times—but production—and therefore, consumption—has increased 25 times.

Is there anyone who can logically or reasonably maintain that this trend will not continue in the future? On the basis of a lifetime spent in producing for it and selling to it, I tell you that there just is no saturation point to the needs and wants of the American public. Nor can I foresee the time when there will be or should be.

The reason that production in the United States has grown at a faster rate than population is that we have had a constant increase in productivity. The explanation for that increase is contained in this simple comparison: One hundred years ago, 96 percent of the work was done by men and animals and only 6 percent by machines. Today, the situation is almost exactly reversed—machines now do 96 percent of the work. In the process, as I mentioned, production has increased by 25 times against a population growth of 7 times. And the unmatched American standard of living is due to the fact that America has not only succeeded in producing prodigiously but also in accomplishing the most widespread sharing of progress by an entire population in all history.

Now if the improvement in American standards is to continue then the rise in productivity must likewise continue. And that means that we must not only make machines do more of our work but to an even greater extent than they do today.

Why? Because all signs point to a condition in which there will be a smaller proportion of active workers in the population than there is today. At one end of the population spectrum, young people will stay in school longer than they do now; at the other end, workers will retire at an earlier age and live longer after retirement. The larger number of schools will require a larger number of teachers and other personnel who, naturally, will not be available for production. Greater emphasis on health will require more hospital and medical institutions and, therefore, more personnel. Expansion of cultural activity will have the same effect. Greater leisure will require a larger number of persons in service occupations. Again with the same effect. In short, the need will be to get a much larger volume of production in all lines of business and industry with a work force that will be smaller than now both in proportion to total population and to units of product.

How will this be done? Simply by extension of the technological progress that has been underway since the industrial revolution. In my time, I have seen machines eliminate most of the laborious, unpleasant and unsafe jobs in the steel industry while they made it possible to increase the volume of production, to improve quality, to hold down costs, to raise wages and to reduce hours of work. Now we must develop machines that require even fewer men to maintain and tend them.

This, of course, brings up that word "automation," which so many people seem to fear. Incidentally, credit for coining that word is given to Mr. Del S. Harder, of the Ford Motor Co., a close personal friend of your president, Dr. Gresham, and also, I am proud to say, of mine. Mr. Harder and others assign precise technical meanings to the word and in those meanings it represents something new. In principle, however, it is not new. The purpose of the man who first discovered and applied the wheel was to get more work done with less human time and effort. "Automation" has the selfsame purpose, and that purpose is to give the machine any job that the machine can do better and more economically than a human being.

In some cases there will be temporary difficulties to be surmounted; some shifting from job to job and from industry to industry; some need for the reeducation and retraining of workers; some other problems. But the long-range result of technological change has always been more jobs and better jobs, not fewer jobs, and more production, not less production. That is the result we can count on in the future.

And, naturally, this change is not going to come all at once. There will be no point in time in which everybody will say we have now left the age of the man-tended machine and have entered the age of "automation"—any more than we can say that, at some point in the past, we left the age of crafts and entered the age af the machine. In fact, many of the crafts are still with us and probably will continue to be.

The changes will come gradually, little by little, here and there, in various fields—just as they have come in the past. But they are now underway and they profoundly affect the working world you are about to enter and in which you will spend your future years. Be aware of this movement. See it in broad outline. Be prepared for change. Be prepared to meet the problems you will be called upon to help solve as a result of it—problems both technical and human.

So far, I have talked only about the United States. But this movement is by no means limited to the United States. It is present everywhere in the world and for the same reason as here—the pressure of rank-and-file peoples in all countries for better living conditions than they have had in the past.

This is an entirely new development and its importance cannot be overemphasized. Until recent years, many parts of the world were outside of the main stream of modern progress. Hundreds of millions of people literally knew nothing about it. They lived as their forebears had lived for generations and even centuries and were resigned to that kind of life. That is now changing. There is not a part of the world so remote that its people do not feel to some extent the effects of advanced civilization. They know now that there are better ways of living. They want them, are determined to have them and, in my opinion, will gradually get them.

This does not mean that they want to leap overnight to our kind of life or, in fact, that they want our kind of life at all. What they want is to improve their kind of life. They want improvement to accord with their history, traditions, culture, and form of society—not ours. And a degree of improvement that might seem very slight to us would appear very great to them.

Make no mistake about it. The world's people are on the march to better times. Our country must be alert to this movement and its meaning. Because of geographic location and its large degree of economic self-sufficiency, the United States has had less contact and less intimate contact with the world at large than other principal nations. As a result, our attitude has been insular. We tend to feel that all other peoples think—or at least, should think—as we do. We do not really know other peoples and in the broadest sense, do not "talk their language."

In the world that is developing, it will be of utmost importance that we understand other peoples much better and that we try to make them understand us much better. As never before, this mutual understanding is going to be vital to the position of the United States in world affairs. Its development must not be left to public officials alone. The American people must share in it. And it is something to which persons with the advantage of higher education have a special obligation to contribute. With the right attitudes and actions on the part of the more advanced nations, the universal demand of the world's peoples for better living can become one of the most potent influences in all history toward the building of a peaceful and progressive world order.

By this time, you have probably gathered the impression that I am quite optimistic about your future prospects and the future in general. And you are right. I have only one question, one reservation. They are summed up in the single word—war.

The paramount question of our time is—can we avoid war? Without doubt, it is the most fateful question that has ever confronted mankind. It is still in the balance. Certainly if the answer were left to the people of the world—and I mean all the people, Communist as well as non-Communist—there would be peace. If there is war it will result only from unnecessary and tragic

blunders of leadership in the world's principal countries.

The plain fact is that war has become completely outmoded as an instrument of international policy. And this is what the people sense. From earliest history, when nations disagreed and diplomacy failed to bring a settlement, war was the instrument of final decision—decision by force. But since the objectives of war, the machinery, and personnel of war, and the areas of conflict were usually limited, there appeared to be some rational relationship between the cost of war and its purpose.

Beginning with World War I, however, the very technological development which contributed so enormously to the purposes of peacetime life made an equally powerful but thoroughly malignant contribution to the nature of war. The limits of war were raised and widened to new dimensions. These dimensions were further expanded in World War II. Now—with the addition of nuclear energy—the dimensions of war have passed beyond the bounds of human imagination. It is an instrument in human hands so destructive that it is beyond human control. There is not a living soul who can tell you if world war III should start, when, where, or how it will end.

Wars have never been started by peoples but by leaders. And in many cases leaders have started wars for reasons of their own rather than for any true national purposes. But no leader has ever started a war unless he felt sure he would win, that he would benefit, and that the victory would be worth far more than its cost. No leader could ever feel less sure of any of those things than he can today. On the contrary, he can be sure only that—win or lose—war will bring down unthinkable destruction on his country and with it destruction of himself and anything he hoped to gain. That, in itself, is a strong deterrent to war.

By any sane standard of judgment, war is an instrument that is just no longer available to nations. The people know it, and I believe that the leaders know it, too. The difficulty is that for all time war has existed as the final means for resolving conflicts between nations. The possibility of resort to war, therefore, has been an essential part of the structure of international relations. The problem is to build a new structure with this part removed. It is a problem which will tax man's inventive power to the full. In the meantime, the leaders of government must continue to deal with each other in a world in which war has become outmoded. The trouble is that the dealing is still by methods and conventions which include war as the final instrument of decision. And these old-fashioned methods may cause somebody to blunder into the new-fashioned war that nobody wants and everybody dreads. That is the danger we live under today.

It is a real danger. But during the past year I have become more optimistic about the prospects for peace. Again the reasons stem from the universal attitude of the world's peoples. Visitors behind the Iron Curtain—objective and competent observers—report an insistent demand for better living by the people there and, coupled with it, an absolute fear and hatred of war—an active demand for peace. They find not a vestige of the war psychology without which government leaders do not dare to initiate war.

Of course, the same situation is found in Western Europe. I was in England when Winston Churchill first proposed the four-power meeting "at the summit." I saw the enormous enthusiasm with which the proposal was received. That sentiment has mounted since then. It amounts to a peace psychology—which is not merely the absence of war psychology, but an active insistence that positive steps be taken to bring peace. I believe it is because of the people's pressure that the meeting "at the summit" is finally being held. And I believe that in Europe it provides the political foundation on which the leaders of government can build peace, although the building of that edifice may prove extremely difficult and tax our patience to the utmost.

At this point I want to emphasize one thing just as strongly as I can. Whenever it is suggested that the United States meet with Russia to discuss ways and means of relaxing tension and establishing peace, there are people in our country who immediately come forward to brand any such procedure as "appeasement." These people have nothing constructive of their own to offer. Their position boils down to maintaining the same kind of repressive and antagonistic international relations that we have had—and to continue a race with Russia in the building of armament. If followed, that position would lead inevitably to war. The only sure road to peace is mutual agreement, which, if we are ably represented—and we are—definitely does not mean appeasement.

I believe it is the obligation of all thinking Americans to help develop a peace psychology in our own country which will provide here a solid political foundation on which our own leaders can work for peace. Unquestionably, it is the biggest, and most important thing that any of us can do today for it can be the pivotal point which will turn the world from the terrible danger of unimaginable desolation to a future with the brightest promise in all history.

You graduates who are here today, and your fellow graduates throughout the country, bear a very special responsibility. You are members of the minority of your generation who have had the special privilege of higher education. Of course, you are fully entitled to use that privilege to your own best advantage. But along with the privilege you bear the obligation to use the knowledge you have acquired and the ability to apply it for the larger benefit of your community, your country and humanity as a whole. Not in big and dramatic ways, but with the means at hand to all of us.

Please do not think that what you do as an individual cannot amount to much. Your hometown is made up of individuals; your country is made up of individuals; the whole world is made up of individuals. The individual is the common denominator. What happens in life is the work of the individual. And the person who knows this has the strength of 10 who do not. Be one of those who know.

I congratulate you on your graduation and wish to each of you a successful and happy life in all respects. And in conclusion, I wish to congratulate some other very important people in this audience * * * the mothers and fathers of these graduates. It is your day quite as much as it is the day of your sons and daughters. To you, the diplomas awarded here represent the happy culmination of the plans, the dreams, and perhaps the sacrifices of many years. And I know that to you, this day is its own best reward. Again, I congratulate you and I compliment you.

Guaranteed Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there was published a very informative and interesting article, written by James Marlow, and entitled "Guaranteed Wages—Relation to Unemployment Insurance Is Explained." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARANTEED WAGES—RELATION TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IS EXPLAINED

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON.—Guaranteed wages and unemployment insurance are not the same. They were pulled closer together by the auto workers' efforts to wring some kind of wage guaranty from the auto industry.

This is the main difference:

1. Unemployment insurance (hereafter called UI) is money which a State gives a worker—for a limited time and in limited amounts—when he loses his regular job.

2. The kind of guaranteed wage now in the news is money given by an employer—for a limited time and in limited amounts—when a worker is laid off.

This is what the CIO United Auto Workers' Union had in mind when it got its first guaranteed wage contract—from Ford—and went on to tackle General Motors:

That the guaranteed wage, when added to the UI which a laid-off worker would collect, would give him a figure closer to his regular pay than he would get from the UI alone.

Now it's up to the States to decide whether they'll give UI to a man collecting money from his employer. Some States don't permit that now.

Unemployment insurance—

All States, plus the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii pay UI. Where does the money come from? From a tax on employers' payrolls. In most States, workers pay nothing.

What an unemployed worker gets, and how long he get it, depends on the State where he lives. All States have minimum and maximum payments. But the amounts vary and so does the length of time each State gives these benefits.

The UI payments have been averaging around $25 a week. Some States pay for no more than 16 weeks, some for as many as 26. The payments are not intended to give a worker what he got on his old job but to help him till he gets another.

Before he can collect UI payments, a worker generally must meet requirements like these: Almost all States require him to wait a week, without pay, before he starts collecting; he must be willing to take another job if it's suitable; he may be penalized, or get no money at all, if he's been fired for misconduct.

These workers are not covered by the UI system: Farm workers, domestic servants, employees of nonprofit institutions, State employees.

Almost 36 million other workers are covered if they lose their jobs. In a few months, by recent law, all employers with four or more employees must pay the UI tax on their payroll. That tax is 3 percent. But employers who have kept their workers in steady employment year after year pay less.

The guaranteed wage—

It is of two kinds:

1. For years some companies—like Nunn-Bush, Hormel, Procter & Gamble—have had guaranteed wage plans assuring their employees steady work or income. This is not the Ford type and is not linked to unemployment insurance.

2. The Ford agreement—the first for the auto industry—and now the General Motors agreement, are tied directly in with UI payments. This is how it works:

A man is laid off for lack of work. He can get up to $25 a week—many will get less—for as much as 26 weeks. How much he gets, up to $25, and how long he gets it

depend on how long he worked for Ford and how much he earned weekly.

This company payment, when added to the UI payment he gets from the State, can, but won't necessarily, add up to 65 percent of his base take-home pay—that is, the pay he has left after Federal income tax has been deducted from it.

And that guaranty of 65 percent of take-home pay is only for 4 weeks. For the next 22 weeks the guaranty is for no more than 60 percent. So even the combined Ford-UI payment will not give a jobless worker what he had earned regularly.

As a simplified example of how it works out, take a Ford employee laid off in a State which gives UI pay for 26 weeks but a maximum of only $30:

Take-home pay, $90; 65 percent of that, $58.50; first 4 weeks, $30 from State and guaranteed maximum of $25 from Ford; total, $55, or $3.50 less than that 65 percent ($58.50) of his $90 take-home pay.

For the next 22 weeks, since he'd be entitled to no more than 60 percent ($54) of his $90 take-home pay, Smith would get $30 from State, $24 from Ford.

The Ford guaranteed-wage plan will not start before June 1, 1956, and will end altogether if States where 67 percent of Ford employees work don't agree to let laid-off workers collect unemployment insurance in addition to the pay from Ford. The deadline for State approval is June 1, 1957.

A Distinguished Lawyer's Comment on the Supreme Court School Segregation Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Supreme Court in the school segregation cases and the so-called decree which followed, do violence to our system of jurisprudence. The Court's action which ignored legal precedents in favor of sociological theories has outraged and confounded many competent legal authorities, who recognize the danger of permittng the Court to usurp the functions of the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, one of Mississippi's most brilliant and experienced lawyers, Hon. Hugh V. Wall, of Brookhaven, released a statement to the press following this action which, I am sure, reflects the thinking of a great segment of our people as well as the bar. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including the text of Mr. Wall's statement:

The order of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered yesterday, May 31, 1955, as reported in the Times-Picayune on page 8, is the only order that it could have rendered. All persons who understand the Constitution of the United States know that the only order that the Court could render was to reverse the cases with direction to the trial courts to carry out by the lower courts' orders the Supreme Court decision rendered on May 17, 1954.

The opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States is political and I think that is what the people believe and the order that was rendered yesterday, May 31, is nothing more nor less than a continuation of the psychological essay that was written by the Court on May 17, 1954. It reversed and remanded the cases before it with directions to the lower court to proceed with the trial of these cases agreeable to the Supreme Court's decision, but the Court failed to add to that opinion "if you can." It is my opinion that the Supreme Court should have said to the lower court: "Enter an order if you can," and in view of the fact that they did not do that I repeat what I have said before, no court can enter an order in these cases that can be enforced without changing the form of our Government. The Constitution will have to be amended and eliminate article X before the Supreme Court of the United States would have jurisdiction over schools. The Supreme Court of the United States has a lot to learn, especially in school matters. Schools are not run by courts under our system of Government. Schools are run by the State legislatures, and the Supreme Court of the United States has nothing on earth to do with it, and the only way that the schools in the United States can be desegregated is by an act of the State legislatures.

After careful study it is my opinion that the Supreme Court is not dumb and after rendering that political decision they have realized the people are not going to accept it, especially in the South, and they have done just as I believed from the beginning they would do and that was to alibi and shift the writing of the order to the lower courts. The Supreme Court knew it could not write an order that could be enforced and they have assigned to the lower courts that which they could not do themselves and they knew that the lower courts could not write any such order that could be enforced.

It is my opinion that none of the legislatures in the States are going to voluntarily accept the dictatorial opinion that was rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States in these cases, and it is my opinion that unless the State legislatures do voluntarily accept that opinion they cannot be made to do it and the opinion is nothing more nor less than a scrap of paper. The Communists and some innocent people have taken advantage of this asinine opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States and undertaken to create by propaganda public sentiment in an effort to force the State legislatures to adopt the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is my opinion that the people are waking up now to what is behind that decision and as time goes by the people will learn more and the State legislatures throughout the United States will resent the dictatorial interference by the Supreme Court of the United States with the powers and rights and the responsibilities of the State legislatures. We are not going to abolish article X of the Constitution of the United States without a fight. That article provides that the people reserve all of the powers not delegated to the United States Government. We did not delegate any such power to the Supreme Court of the United States as it has arrogantly assumed in these segregation cases and public officers who are expressing that they feared a worse decision than was rendered yesterday, May 31, are again misleading the Negroes and doing a disservice to the people. What we need is courage and what we need to say is that we do not fear the Supreme Court of the United States in these cases, and we do not need to say that we are not defying the decision. What we need our public officers to say is that we have no fear of that decision and we will defy it because the Supreme Court went clear out of its jurisdiction and rendered a political opinion and undertook to usurp the powers of the legislative branch of this Government. Insofar as Mississippi is concerned it is my opinion that we have already ignored that decision and we are going to continue to ignore it, and insofar as mixing the races in our public schools in Mississippi, that is not going to be done now and in my opinion it will never be done and I realize that the word "never" is a long time. I know it will not be done as long as the white people of Mississippi have the spirit of their fathers. All this sickly, sobsister stuff going the rounds about it being based on brotherly love and Christianity is hocus-pocus.

Address by Justice Carlton Mobley, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Georgia, Before the Georgia Bar Association, Augusta, Ga., May 28, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on May 28, 1955, the Georgia Bar Association was holding its annual meeting in Augusta, Ga.

The retiring president of the association was Congressman JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr., our able and popular colleague in pleted a 1-year term as president of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. Congressman FLYNT has just completed a 1-year term a president of the association, and under his able leadership it experienced a very successful year.

Congressman FLYNT was succeeded as president of the association by Hon. Henry L. Bowden, of Atlanta, an outstanding lawyer and one of the most able members of the Georgia bar.

The association heard an address on May 28, by Justice Carlton Mobley, an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Georgia. Justice Mobley is a distinguished Georgian, having served at one time as a Member of Congress from Georgia. For many years he practiced law in Macon, Ga., where he had a large and remunerative practice. Since he has been a member of our supreme court, Justice Mobley has demonstrated that he possesses rare judicial ability. He is a sound thinker, not only in the field of law, but upon public questions generally.

In his address to the Georgia Bar Association, Justice Mobley dealt with a subject of great current interest to the American people. He handled his subject, "treaty lawmaking," in a masterful manner. His address is one which deserves careful thought and study, and it is with pleasure that I insert it herewith:

The lawyers of this country have a peculiar responsibility of leadership in matters of government. Our people look to the legal profession to lead the way in preserving the Constitution and in safeguarding their freedoms thereunder. Our profession has, as a whole, from the founding of our Government, proudly shouldered and carried that responsibility and has helped make and keep this a free country. Largely through the efforts of the lawyers, was the effort of Presi-

dent Roosevelt to stack the Supreme Court of the United States a few years ago defeated.

The American Bar Association is now embarked upon an equally important mission, to wit, to amend the Constitution of the United States to prevent doing by treaty and Executive agreements with foreign governments what cannot be done under the Constitution.

Frank E. Holman of the Seattle bar, recently president of the American Bar Association, has spearheaded the drive of the American Bar Association for the adoption of the amendment. In addressing the Utah bar, he made a statement, which I want to repeat to you today, as I feel it is appropriate to this occasion. "Many of you today may have some doubt as to whether a discussion of treaty law-making is relevant to the purposes and objects of the organized bar and of interest to its members. The average practicing lawyer has assumed that domestic or local law in an American jurisdiction is made up of certain remnants of common-law principles, city charters nad ordinances, State and Federal statutes, and what has been termed 'judge-made law.' Certainly until recently, to the average lawyer, it would have seemed unthinkable that the treaty-making power of the Federal Government could to any large extent be used to make domestic or local law for the people of the various States * * * when I announced * * * that an international commission headed by Mrs. Roosevelt—all the other members of which were foreigners, including three Russians—was engaged in formulating a so-called bill-of-rights program to be ratified by the United States Senate which would affect domestic law and our basic American rights in many particulars and which would supersede any conflicting State constitutions and any State legislative enactments, and any existing Federal legislation on the same subject, this statement was received in many quarters as that of an 'alarmist.' I said then that the people and the lawyers of this country were faced with a new concept, revolutionary in character, by which our domestic law was henceforth not only to be influenced, but in many instances, controlled and overridden by international pronouncements under the treaty-making power vested in the President and Senate of the United States."

That projects the question which is one of supreme importance to the American people, for they may lose through treaties and Executive agreements made by the President of the United States with foreign governments, every right guaranteed to them by the Constitution of the United States and of their respective States. It is a legal question, which lawyers should study, and counsel with the people about. This is an instance where the bar of this Nation should provide the leadership. May I furnish you a few thoughts on the question today?

Article VI of the Constitution provides: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Thus the Constitution makes the laws of Congress the supreme law of the land only when made in pursuance of the Constitution, while treaties are the supreme law of the land when made under authority of the United States, which means when made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The first question is whether a treaty, which violates the Constitution, is the supreme law of the land? What did this provision mean in 1787 when it was put in the Constitution? Did the framers intend that the Constitution and only laws made in pursuance thereof should be the supreme law of the land, and that treaties should be the supreme law of the land, even though they might conflict with the Constitution?

Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee, both of Virginia, said of the treaty power: "Here we have set up a government with constitutional limitations, and here is the treaty power that is the supreme law of the land with no limitation on it." Jefferson, who was in France when the Constitution was adopted, wrote: "I don't agree with that argument, because, if they (Henry and Lee) were right, if the treaty power is unlimited then we don't have any Constitution." Jefferson elaborated upon his views in his manual of parliamentary practice where he said: "By the general power to make treaties, the Constitution must have intended to comprehend only those subjects which are usually regulated by treaties, and cannot be otherwise regulated. It must have meant to except all of those rights reserved to the States, for surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way."

At the time the Constitution as adopted and for approximately 133 years thereafter treaties entered into by the United States were considered compacts imposing duties and obligations upon the contracting States and not on individual citizens, and from dicta in a number of cases the Supreme Court entertained Jefferson's view that a treaty could not override provisions of the Constitution. In 1836, in *New Orleans* v. *United States* (35 U. S. 662, 735 (10 Peters)), the Supreme Court said: "The Government of the United States, as was well observed in the argument, is one of limited powers. It can exercise authority over no subjects, except those which have been delegated to it. Congress cannot, by legislation, enlarge the Federal jurisdiction, nor can it be enlarged under the treatymaking power." In 1853, in *Dee* v. *Braden* (57 U. S. 635, 656 (16 Howard)), it said: "The treaty is therefore a law made by the proper authority, and the courts of justice have no right to annul or disregard any of its provisions, unless they violate the Constitution of the United States." In 1870, in the *Cherokee Tobacco* case (78 U. S. 616, 620 (11 Wallace)), it said: "It need hardly be said that a treaty cannot change the Constitution or be held valid if it be in violation of that instrument. This results from the nature and fundamental principles of our Government." In 1890, in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* (133 U S. 258), it said: "It would not be contended that it (the treaty power) extends so far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government or in that one of the States, or a cession of any portion of the territory of the latter, without its consent."

But in the absence of a clear-cut decision from the Supreme Court that a treaty must conform to the Constitution, there was some concern over the question during this period, well expressed by Henry St. George Tucker, a distinguished legal scholar, and former president of the American Bar Association, who said in 1915 that if the Federal Government has unlimited treaty power then the incorporation of the treatymaking power into the Constitution "was the introduction into our governmental citadel of a Trojan horse," ready to unload its hidden soldiery into our midst, destroying State laws and constitutions, and wrecking the dreams of our Founding Fathers of constitutional balance between State and Federal power, and preservation of the Bill of Rights.

But then in 1920, the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416) held point blank that Congress has power under a treaty to enact legislation which would be unconstitutional in the absence of a treaty. The Congress had passed a law regulating the killing of migratory birds. The statute was attacked on the ground that the Federal Government could not constitutionally regulate the killing of birds in Missouri, since wild game within the State belonged to the State and the State alone could regulate and control same. Two Federal district courts held the act unconstitutional. The Solicitor General of the United States apparently had no faith in the case and dismissed the appeal, and advised that the Constitution be circumvented by treaty. The United States then entered into a treaty with Great Britain, acting for Canada, regulating the killing of migratory birds in the United States and Canada. Following the adoption of the treaty, Congress again passed a law regulating the killing of migratory birds in the United States. Missouri attacked the law, and the Supreme Court held it "is valid under article VI of the Constitution, as a necessary and proper means of effectuating the treaty." Thus the Supreme Court for the first time held that under the treatymaking power, the internal and domestic affairs of a State could be regulated—the 10th amendment notwithstanding—and an act of Congress which was unconstitutional without a treaty was with a treaty constitutional.

The case at the time did not attract too much attention, for it accomplished what was obviously a good purpose. It is one of those instances where the judiciary to effectuate a good result makes bad law. Unfortunately the judiciary on occasions ignores precedent and the clear intent of statutes, and finds the law to be what it thinks it should be rather than what it is. This case has pointed the way for developments in recent years toward use of the treaty power to overcome limitations of our Federal and State Constitutions.

Following *Missouri* v. *Holland* in 1920, Chief Justice Hughes in 1929 in a public address stated that the Constitution, if we take it to mean what it says, gives the United States power to make treaties; that there is no express limitation upon the power; that the Supreme Court has expressed doubt that there could be any; and that as to external concerns, international problems, there has been no disposition to imply limitations. But he points out further that "now there is, however, a new line of activity which has not been very noticeable in this country, but which may be in the future, and this may give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treaty-making power." His prophecy has certainly come true. There has been marked activity for several years to use treaties to make and to change domestic law in this county, particularly through the United Nations and its agencies. Chief Justice Hughes pointed out that the normal scope of the treaty power "is to deal with foreign nations with regard to matters of international concern," and further: "it is not a power intended to be exercised, it may be assumed, with respect to matters that have no relation to international concern * * * but if we attempted to use the treatymaking power to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the local jurisdiction of the States, then I say there might be ground for implying a limitation upon the treatymaking power that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns through the exercise of the asserted treatymaking power." The Chief Justice was reluctant to express an opinion that there is any limitation upon the treaty power, but it is clear that in his opinion the treaty power should be used solely for dealing with foreign governments upon external and not internal matters in the United States.

In 1936, the Supreme Court went further in *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304) in dealing with the validity of the delegation of unchallanged legislative power to the executive under the Constitution of the United States, to state that treaty power was not a delegated power under the Constitution but was inherent in sovereignty; not dependent upon constitutional or legislative authority, which means that there is no limitation upon the power. This case evidences the trend of the court toward the view that our internal affairs can be regulated by treaty.

Then followed the startling decision of the Court in 1942, in *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203), where the doctrine of *Missouri* v. *Holland* was extended to executive agreements made by the President without concurrence of the Senate. There a Russian insurance company had deposits in a New York bank at the time of the Russian Revolution. A New York State law provided for distribution of such funds in a certain way. When President Roosevelt recognized Soviet Russia he entered into an agreement with Litvinov, the Soviet representative, for distribution of those funds in a different way from that provided by New York law, and the agreement was never approved by the Senate or Congress of the United States. The Supreme Court held that the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement superseded the New York law. It said: "A treaty is a 'law of the land,' under the supremacy clause (art. VI, clause 2) of the Constitution. Such international compacts and agreements as the Litvinov assignment have a similar dignity," and "State law must yield when it is inconsistent with, or impairs the policy or provisions of, a treaty or of an international compact or agreement." See also *United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324).

There is no provision in the Constitution for international agreements other than treaties, yet Presidents have made them with and without the approval of Congress. The Yalta Agreements which President Roosevelt entered into with Russia and Great Britain were never approved by the Senate or the Congress. President Roosevelt apparently thought at one time that the Yalta Agreements made by him did not have the force of law, for a message by him to Congress said: "Unless you here in the Halls of the American Congress—with the support of the American people concur in the decisions reached at Yalta, and give them your active support, the meeting will not have produced lasting results * * *. I am well aware of the constitutional fact (that the political arrangements made at Yalta) must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate of the United States." This appeared in the printed message released by the White House, but was not included in that delivered to the Congress. Probably he or someone around him in the interim thought of the Pink case.

This briefly is the history of the treaty clause in the Constitution from its adoption in 1787 to the close of World War II. From the very beginning, there was some apprehension that the Constitution did not limit the treatymaking power; however, until the decision of the Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland* in 1920, the Jefferson view that the Constitution intended that the treaty power should apply only to subjects usually regulated by treaties and not to those powers reserved to the States by the 10th amendment, and the Supreme Court view as expressed in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs*, that the treaty power does not extend to permitting what the Constitution forbids, or a change in the character of the Government, or in that of one of the States, or a cession of any of the territory of a State without its consent prevailed.

Decisions of the Supreme Court in recent years and developments since the close of World War II are significant and justify the gravest concern that unless the Constitution is amended, expressly limiting the treaty-making power, the internal and domestic affairs of the people of this country may be regulated by treaty or executive agreements, that protection furnished them by the Bill of Rights may be taken away by treaty or executive agreements, and that any or all of the rights reserved to the States may be wiped out by treaty or executive agreements. The American Bar Association thinks so. Sixty-four Members of the United States Senate realized the danger in 1952 when they signed with Senator BRICKER his proposed amendment to the Constitution to prevent it. An able (then practicing) international lawyer, John Foster Dulles, thought so, when in a speech to the American Bar Association in Louisville, Ky., in April 1952, he said: "Treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given to people by their constitutional Bill of Rights."

In 1950, the State Department said: "There is no longer any real distinction between domestic and foreign affairs," which means that if there is no distinction, both can be regulated by treaty.

Chief Justice Vinson and Associate Justices Reed and Minton in their dissenting opinion in the steel-seizure case (343 U. S. 479), thought that the President of the United States could seize the steel mills of the country, because of treaty obligations of this country under the United Nations Charter, notwithstanding the provision of the fifth amendment prohibiting the taking of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The National Association of Attorneys General of the United States so regarded the dissenting opinion, as shown by this statement from them:

"Whereas adherence to this new concept of international relations and obligations of national states, directly affecting private persons and property even when not expressly required by treaty terms, has reached such a level of judicial acceptance as to be incorporated in a dissenting opinion of the Supreme Court of these United States wherein the general military obligations of the United States under the terms of the United Nations Charter and conventions and the North Atlantic Treaty were advanced as justification for the seizure of private property by the National Government and might equally well be advanced as a justification for invasion of the traditional liberties of our citizenry."

The Solicitor General of the United States thought so when in his brief in the steel-seizure cases he argued to the Court that the power to seize the steel mills was derived by implication "from an array of statutes and treaties which commit the Nation by law to a program of self-preservation which could not fail to suffer from a close of steel production."

The Supreme Court of New York thought so, when it held in *Garcia* v. *Pan American Airways* ((1945) 67 N. E. 2d 257), and *Lee* v. *Pan American Airways* ((1949) 89 N. E. 2d 258 (certiorari denied, 339 U. S. 920)) that under the Warsaw Treaty (1949) liability for a person while traveling on an international ticket injured or killed by an air carrier, was limited to 125,000 franks (about $8,200). The laws of Georgia or any other of the States, where injury occurred to one traveling on an international ticket, would be superseded by this treaty.

The district court of appeals of California in 1950 thought so when in *Fujii* v. *State* (217 p. 2d 481), it held that the "Charter of the United Nations, as a treaty is paramount to every law of every State in conflict with it." The court after noting that the California alien land law had been upheld by the California Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of the United States over a period of many years, held that the charter had become "the supreme law of the land; and the judges of every State shall be bound thereby," and that "since the charter is now the supreme law of the land it becomes necessary to examine its provisions and guarantees * * *." It then examines chapter IX, articles 55 and 56, which provide that: "The United Nations shall promote: (a) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; (b) solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems, and international cultural and educational cooperation; and (c) universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion," and that "all members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55."

The court then calls attention to the Declaration of Human Rights passed and proclaimed on December 10, 1948, by the General Assembly of the United Nations and quotes among other things as follows: "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status (art. 2). Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others." Finally, the Court held that the alien land law provision of California law was "unenforceable because contrary to letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations."

The Supreme Court of California in *Fujii* v. *State* (242 P. 2d 617) rejected the view of the district court and held that the treaty was not self-executing and did not automatically supersede local laws, but reached the same final conclusion in the case by holding that the State statute violated the 14th amendment, which finding was in direct conflict with its previous decisions and those of the Supreme Court of the United States, to wit, *Porterfield* v. *Webb* (263 U. S. 225, 44 S. Ct. 21, 68 L. Ed. 278), and others cited at page 622 of *Fujii* v. *State, supra*. Schauer, Justice, dissenting stated: "This case is remarkable and regrettable in judicial annals for this reason: A majority of the Justices of this Court join in an opinion which recognizes the law as it is but refuses to follow it."

The majority opinion made it clear that they were not following previous decisions of the United States Supreme Court, but what they thought the Supreme Court would hold the next time.

While basing its decision upon the 14th amendment and not the United Nations Charter, the Court was impressed that "the humane and enlightened objectives of the United Nations Charter are, of course, entitled to respectful consideration by the courts," and that "the Charter represents a moral commitment of foremost importance."

The importance of noting these cases (and there are numerous others) is that they indicate the extent to which courts in this country are accepting the theory that domestic law in the States may be regulated by treaties.

Since Chief Justice Hughes in 1929 mentioned the "new activity," the most noticeable line has been in connection with the United Nations. Prior to the United Nations Charter, treaties were generally regarded, as described by Chief Justice Hughes, as agreements between governments as to external or international affairs, and not affecting the individual citizen in their domestic internal affairs. The philosophy that a peaceful world requires that social, racial, economic, and industrial problems be universally regulated by international authority is the

basis for articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter, which have inspired various United Nations agencies such as the Genocide Convention, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the International Labor Organization, and others to prepare and propose some 200 treaties or agreements, many of which deal with regulating individual rights and privileges of peoples of the various member nations. The trouble is that no other nation in the world has the same high concept of liberty and freedom, nor enjoy such, as does the American citizen, and some of the nations are not willing to extend such privileges to their citizens. For instance, the draft Covenant for Human Rights, which the United Nations Commission has been working on for years did not include the right to own property because nations under the Soviets would not agree to it. Further, article 13 of the draft covenant provides for freedom of religion subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, etc. Our Constitution guarantees freedom of religion without limitation. If this covenant is adopted with that provision in it, which would prevail, the treaty provision or our Constitution? Not only could freedom of religion be destroyed, but so can every right guaranteed to us by the Constitution. Certain groups in this country have attempted to use the United Nations as a back door for getting their programs put on the American people. A typical example was the filing by the American Association for the United Nations of an amicus curiae brief in the case of *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U. S. 1), which involved restrictive racial covenants in deeds, in which they argued that enforcement of such covenants was violative of articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter; that as the supreme law of the land treaties invalidated conflicting provisions of State common law or State statutes.

Thus you see the situation existing today, which brings us to the question, Should the Constitution be amended to provide that, first: "A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect." And secondly: "A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement." That is what the Bricker amendment as it is now pending in the Senate provides. The American Bar Association is strongly urging its adoption.

Section 2 simply provides that a treaty or other international agreement shall not become effective as internal law in the United States until implemented by legislation of Congress, which act of Congress is or would be constitutional without relying upon the treaty or agreement. This would eliminate self-executing treaties and agreements, which in and of themselves impose obligations upon the United States, which our courts are required to apply. Then all would be nonself-executing, which would leave them binding upon the United States and other nations to the treaty, but would not be binding upon the individual citizens of the United States, until Congress said so. This is already the law in every other nation in the world except the United States, Cuba, Philippine Islands, and 2 or 3 other small countries.

The difference in a British treaty, for instance, and ours is that a British treaty when ratified does not of itself have the force of law. It overrides no existing British domestic law, and while binding upon the government it is not binding on the British courts or people until Parliament enacts legislation making it so. In the United States, a treaty, or executive agreement, which the Supreme Court holds is the same as a treaty, is the supreme law of the land, superior to the Constitution and the laws of the States. The framers of our Constitution never dreamed that a treaty could be used to make domestic law in the 48 States, but the Supreme Court of the United States does not always interpret the Constitution as it was intended, when written. Could there possibly be any valid objection to putting the United States in the same position as the other nations of the world by making treaties binding as domestic law, only after Congress passes an act so providing, which act must not violate the Constitution? I cannot see how there could be any valid objection to putting us on an equality with other nations, nor how merely putting us on equality with nations we are dealing with could unduly interefere with our ability to negotiate treaties.

Those opposing the amendment give as their principal objection to the first provision, that a treaty or agreement shall be of no force and effect if in conflict with the Constitution, that it is not necessary because the Supreme Court will so hold. That is not facing reality in view of what has come from the Court in recent years upon the question.

To say that the amendment is not necessary, because the power to make a treaty, which violates the Constitution, was not expressly delegated to the Federal Government, therefore, it does not exist, reminds us of the objection Alexander Hamilton made to the Bill of Rights. He said: "For why declare that things shall not be done for which there is no power to do?" How many rights would still be preserved to the American people had not they been nailed down in the Constitution?

One of my friends, an able and distinguished jurist, is not enthusiastic about the amendment. He says that the Supreme Court should decide the question, and that what is needed is for the Senate of the United States to perform its constitutional duty and concur in appointments to the Supreme Court, only where the appointee is a qualified lawyer and will recognize judicial restraint. That would be good, but in the meantime the door is open, and the court seems on its way through, why not close the door? Why let the matter come to decision when it can so easily be prevented?

Secretary Dulles now says that he has tried unsuccessfully to put into words an amendment which would accomplish the desired result without hindering the President in dealing with foreign governments at this critical time in the world's history. I submit that world leadership and national security are worthy objectives, not incompatible with the preservation of liberty at home. Secretary Dulles further says that the American Bar Association, Senator BRICKER, and other alert citizens, who became concerned over efforts to use the treaty power as a way to effectuate reforms, particularly social reforms which were alien to our traditional concepts, have aroused the American public, and that this has served as a correction of the evil; "That there has been a reversal of the trend toward trying to use the treaty-making power to effect internal social changes. This administration is committed to the exercise of the treatymaking power only within traditional limits."

Office holders are reluctant to voluntarily release any of the power of their office. As a rule they strive for more. The Secretary feels that so long as he is exercising the power on this question the country is safe. I do not question his sincerity. However his position supports a government of men rather than one of laws.

Assuming that the President could be trusted not to make a treaty or agreement that conflicted with the Constitution, that the Senate would not ratify such a treaty and that the Supreme Court would not uphold such, we are relying upon men and not laws to protect us. The very purpose of the Constitution was to put beyond the power of man to destroy the rights of the peoples and to leave in the hands of the people the governing of themselves. Let us heed the advice of Thomas Jefferson when he said: "In questions of power let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

Eisenhower's McComb Classmate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the little city of McComb, Miss., has produced many leaders in practically every field of endeavor. Like any other community in America, the people of McComb take pride in the accomplishments of their native sons, and strive to preserve the memories of those who are gone.

Recently, McComb had occasion to reflect on the services rendered this country by one of its citizens, the late Harry Harvey, a classmate of the President at the Military Academy at West Point. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial written by Hon. J. O. Emmerich of the McComb Enterprise-Journal, which appeared under date of June 8, 1955:

EISENHOWER'S MCCOMB CLASSMATE

When the local post of the American Legion was founded it was promptly named in honor of Harry Harvey, a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point with the class of 1915.

As a lad Harry Harvey lived on Louisiana Avenue in the residence now occupied by Dr. and Mrs. Thomas Purser and family. His father, a blacksmith in the Illinois Central shops, died when Harry was a lad. His mother, Mrs. Maggie Harvey, was a gentle woman, who was loved by a wide circle of friends, and who reared a large family of sons and daughters.

When Harry was a lad he decided early that he wanted to become a military man. He first got a job as a clerk with the local office of the Illinois Central and then sought an appointment at West Point. He suffered a number of reverses because of the demand over the State for such appointments. The late Henry P. Hughes, superintendent of the schools of McComb, interceded and an appointment was finally given to this young man who was then recognized as resolute, determined, studious, and brilliant.

In the June 10 issue of Collier's magazine the story of West Point's class of 1915 is related. This class is described as "the class the stars fell on." The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, was a graduate with this class. So were Gen. Omar Bradley and General Van Fleet and General McNarney. About 60 of the members of this class became generals. Among them are 26 brigadier generals, 23 major generals, 7 lieutenant generals, 2 full generals, and 2 generals of the Army, one of whom became the President of the United States.

The class of 1915 was photographed on the old battlefield of Gettysburg. This picture

was reproduced in the recent issue of Collier's. The second man in the front row is Harry Harvey, of McComb, an alert young man and as fine as any in the class. Truly this was a class of stars. The insignia of generals is the star.

It is, indeed, a sad note to strike, but in such a big class of young military men fate decreed that some casualties were inevitable: World War I came. Harry Harvey became engaged in that war. While in battle in Europe the horse he was riding was shot from under him. He was killed in that battle. That battle was about 24 months after his graduation and yet he had already attained the rank of major.

Little is to be gained in speculation of what might have been. Yet in a sense much can be said that is more than speculation. The rapid promotion of Harry Harvey indicates that he was recognized as one of the brilliant members of that class just as the people of McComb who knew young Harry recognized that he was brilliant. It is reasonable to assume that had he not paid the supreme price for his country he would have become Gen. Harry P. Harvey. It would be unreasonable to make any other deduction. Who knows but had he lived that he would have played parts similar to that of his classmates such as Eisenhower, Bradley, Van Fleet, or McNarney. The name of Harry Harvey can easily be envisioned high in national and international affairs with his hometown of McComb paying homage to him. After all he was one of the top members of that famous class of 1915.

This reminds us of the debt which all of us owe to men who go down courageously in battle. It reflects the debt which the President of the United States and the other members of this famous class owe to Harry Harvey. After all, it follows that some casualties were inevitable. Had it not been Harry Harvey it might have been Dwight Eisenhower.

We are glad that the early Legionnaires recognized the greatness of Harry Harvey and laid the foundation for the perpetuation of his memory. And know this: the McComb chapter of the American Legion is well named. It honored itself while honoring a fallen friend.

The Enterprise-Journal staff read the article in Collier's magazine and the tribute paid to the glorious living members of the famous class of 1915. Then it was resolved that least some mention must be made of the glorious dead of this same famous class. Sometimes the living move on to great things not knowing that without the sacrifice of the fallen the living would have little upon which to march in the direction of greatness.

Bananas on Pike's Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 11, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak and to approve the Seedskadee irrigation project in Wyoming.

The Seedskadee project is a part of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Seedskadee project would be $2,200 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

Public Works Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman's substitute include the amendment I offered?

Mr. BOGGS. It does, in the exact sum of $180,000.

Mr. LANHAM. I will be glad to accept the substitute.

Mr. BOGGS. This amendment covers the general subject of surveys, investigation, and planning by the Corps of Engineers. It actually affects every potential project in the entire United States. The necessity for it is quite obvious, and I hope I shall not have to take 5 minutes to convince you of it.

Under the figure adopted by the committee, the amount was increased by $405,000 for planning and investigation, but at the same time the committee specified and designated certain projects. Possibly I should read those to you. It will take only a minute. For instance, there is $1 million, which is the biggest part of it, on the hurricane project authorized by the 84th Congress. In addition, there is the Columbia River, $220,000; Pigeon Creek, Ind., $10,000; Lorain, Ohio, $20,000; Kentucky River, $20,000; Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio, $30,000; and so forth. The total is $1,355,000, which means that the committee failed by the sum of $700,000 to include sufficient funds to cover the items which it specifically designated for survey and investigation purposes.

We have checked with the proper authorities and it is estimated that this can be done with an additional $700,000. The $180,000 in the Lanham amendment bring the total increase to $880,000. That is still less than the total increase of $1,355,000 in obligations as authorized in the committee bill. I believe all of you understand the processes which must be complied with before a project can actually become a reality. Planning is step No. 1. Planning affects every area of the United States. I believe that these funds are completely necessary and that the expenditure is completely justified. If this amendment is not voted, then it means that many of these small survey projects of $10,000, $20,000, $30,000, and $40,000 must inevitably be eliminated. I trust the committee will accept the amendment.

Soil- and Water-Conservation Policy of the Kansas Livestock Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including herewith a resolution adopted by the Kansas Livestock Association recommending a complete watershed program for the State of Kansas. It is observed that the Kansas Livestock Association approves a control program for water runoff in our State and that first consideration be given to soil and water conservation and that the construction of large dams downstream be given second consideration.

The resolution follows:

The following report of soil and water conservation committee of the Kansas Livestock Association was adopted as the policy of the association in general assembly. It was presented by William Ljungdahl, Menlo, chairman.

It recognizes that the seriousness of both soil and water conservation should command the attention of our people in all parts of the State in general, and in certain localities specific consideration to the problem of flood control.

In an approach to dealing with problems of flood control which are applicable in all parts of the State, we have the State watershed district law which was enacted 2 years ago and which has for its purpose to delay the runoff of water, during heavy rains, and afford control over such runoff, to the end that it will serve the land on which it falls by way of beneficial saturation instead of losing the water, together with destructive soil erosion.

Since its enactment by the State legislature, the Congress of the United States has passed a watershed law of its own which is designed to implement watershed operations in cooperation with the several States.

If changes are needed in our present State watershed law, in order to bring it into conformity with the Federal law, this association urges that the present session of the legislature pass the necessary amendments for such purposes.

Your committee suggests that we approve a control program for the water runoff of our State, and with that the benefits that would be provided by having an adequate water supply over an entire watershed area, rather than providing a concentrated supply of water to a limited area, as would be the case if only large downstream reservoirs were provided.

It has been stated to your committee on good authority—and we believe the statement is correct—that in the construction of large dams that the entire cost is borne by the Federal Government.

This is in contrast to the policy adopted by the Federal Government in regard to small dams.

The Kansas Livestock Association recommended that in the construction of all dams that the Federal Government's participation in the matter of cost be in the same proportion to the total cost.

This association heartily endorses soil-conservation practices applicable to and best serving the different areas of our State, and thus preserving our greatest asset—the productive topsoil of Kansas.

The Kansas Livestock Association disapproves the construction of large downstream reservoirs, such as the Tuttle Creek Dam, until after all efforts to control runoff water where it falls have been exhausted.

And it is the further recommendation of the Kansas Livestock Association that Congress be petitioned to establish a national water resources development policy; provide for integrated planning of a watershed or basin area by committees of people of the area to be developed within the area; and to provide for the impartial review by a national review commission as to the feasibility, the economic justification, and priority of such projects; and to recommend to the Congress of the United States the basis for such authorization and appropriation to the various agencies which may engage in water resources programs.

WILLIAM LJUNGDAHL,
Menlo, Chairman,
J. J. MOXLEY,
Council Grove, Vice Chairman,
W. I. BOONE,
Eureka,
TAYLOR L. JONES,
Holcomb,
GEORGE HILL,
Buffalo,
STANLEY MARR,
Esbon,
FRED GERMANN,
Manhattan,
Soil and Water Conservation Committee of the Kansas Livestock Association.

Public Works Appropriation Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is one of the most important issues, probably, to be decided by this House this year. We are here asked to appropriate the money of the taxpayers of the United States for a steam-generating plant to serve domestic and industrial consumers in one section of the United States. If we elect to do that, then we must in equity and fairness be prepared to face the issue of subsidizing all of the power in the United States of America.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, 94 percent of all the people of this country get their electricity from taxpaying, investor-owned utilities. I do not think those Members of this House who serve and represent the 6 percent who get this subsidy quite realize the burden placed on the other 94 percent of the people of the country when voting the taxpayers' money for the benefit of the few.

In my State of New York, the private utility companies serving the people of New York are spending this year $50 million for extension and expansion of their facilities in that State. They are not down here asking for a dime, although last year they sent to the United States of America and to State and local agencies the sum of $185 million in taxes. Yet they are building their own program in New York.

Research and Development Progress in the Aviation Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 17, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the June 1955 issue of Aviation Age entitled "Into the Fourth Dimension." I also want to take this opportunity to bring this magazine issue to the attention of the Senate because of its excellent presentation of the research and development progress in the aviation field. The editorial is particularly significant because of the expression in this leading technical journal of the aviation industry on the future place of aviation in considering man's tomorrow. We are indeed entering new horizons in our civilization.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTO THE FOURTH DIMENSION

Man, with the airplane, is making his first flight into four-dimensional thinking. Not in theory alone, but in practice. For to the factor of space, another factor has been added—time.

To the airman, distance no longer is merely a linear measurement. Distance has become a matter of hours, even minutes, between takeoff and landing.

Militarily, one of the most significant facts is that the farthest spot on the globe is less than 24 hours from any other spot. Conventional barriers of sea, mountain, or polar waste do not exist. There are only the curved lines of a 24-hour globe.

The airplane as a result has revolutionized military methods.

As yet, the full meaning of this fact has not dawned on us. The idea of a single globe, on which all directions finally meet, and whereon geographic locations are separated—not by seas, nor mountains, nor miles—but by hours or minutes, is hard to grasp.

Thus, aeronautics is the reduction of time rather than of distance.

But not alone as a concept is the factor of time becoming important. It is being used as a practical tool. Some missile guidance procedures, for instance, are based on a measurement of time rather than of Mach number. And the factor of stability is a function of both time and speed—with the emphasis on time. Thus, Oerlikon has found it possible to couple a potentiometer to a timing device for stability control of one of its missiles.

The reduction of time is continually before both military and commercial users of aircraft. It is—for better or for worse—the main driving force behind research and development.

We have a constant need to reduce time between point of departure and point of arrival. There is ever present the requirement to shorten ground time. Flying equipment, communications, control, navaids, and airports are designed to this end—the reduction of time. Researchers press on to find ever more efficient ways to bring it about.

Aeronautics—once an art—is now a science. It has become an exacting task of precisely measuring things.

Only man remains a work—not of art—but of mystery. How he will fit into the space-time continuum that aeronautics is unfolding is a large question. He is at once the weakest and strongest link in the chain of progress. Weak, because morally and physically he is not yet well-equipped to handle or withstand the forces he is unleashing; strong, because without his imagination, ingenuity, and curiosity, all would come to a standstill.

What then of the future Only time will tell.

Public Works Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

I will speak on the project involved with which I am personally familiar. I refer to the central and southern Florida flood-control district.

This project is one of the largest of its kinds ever undertaken. The project encompasses 17 Florida counties, is concerned principally with the regulation of water to protect human life and to eliminate property damage. It involves two navigation projects, including the regulation of water from one of the largest inland fresh-water lakes in the United States. The total project area is twice the size of the State of New Jersey. It is especially significant because it includes Florida's largest city, several other large and many small cities, including 60 percent of the total population of the State of Florida. It also encom-

passes most of the fertile crop and pasture land in the State. The region is far from being a marsh nor is it always underwater. It produces 60 percent of the State's agricultural output, including sugar cane, citrus, cattle, and in some places, 3 and 4 vegetable crops per year. The State produces 13 percent of the total vegetable crop consumed in the United States.

The regulation of water in this developing region is of first importance to the safety of its citizens, the security of its farms and commercial enterprises, and to the economic well-being of the State of Florida and the United States.

The Corps of Engineers had recommended an appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 of $10 million. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $3,600,000. The bill as before this Committee, has reduced the estimate to $3 million.

The amount of money recommended by the Committee is wholly inadequate to continue the work necessary on this project. The very minimum which should be allocated to the project in order to keep the work sufficiently current so as to amortize the total cost within the foreseeable future is $6,300,000 for this coming fiscal year.

Actually, unless the appropriations are stepped up to a minimum of $20 million a year, the completion date of the project will be so extended that it will add a tremendous cost burden both to the local interests and to the Federal Government.

It has been stated by the committee that their objection to this project is that it is basically a land-reclamation project. This is not well-founded on the facts. A detailed study of the technical data will show that while there is considerable land benefit, this is incidental to the original purpose of the project itself. In 1947, there were 3 million acres of land flooded for many months. Crops were ruined. Homes were destroyed. Lives were lost. There was approximately $60 million in property damage. Almost each year since then, there has been flood damage to this area running into the hundreds of millions dollars. This damage, I respectfully submit, does not come from water which is already there. This damage comes from floods.

Another question raised by the committee was the question of the local contribution. I point out to the committee that the people of the State of Florida have met every obligation imposed upon them for their contribution to this vital project. Under the Flood Control Act of 1948, for the first phase of the project, a formula was established for local contributions which would require them to contribute approximately 39 percent of the total cost of the project. This included 15 in direct cash appropriation. All of this has been met as required, and in addition, the State has appropriated in advance $2,900,000 beyond that required to match Federal contributions to this date. The local contribution under the act further required that the local interests bear the complete cost of the acquisition of lands and of rights-of-way, and pay for all relocation work, as well as all maintenance and operation costs of the completed work.

All of this has been borne by the local interests, even though the costs of rights-of-way, have risen 400 percent, and the amounts for private and public relocations have advanced 350 percent.

The committee raised the question that the local interests should pay a greater rate of contribution because of the tremendous benefit ratio which is estimated to be 5 or 6 to 1, and because the land values of the land which is reclaimed as part of this project, has increased considerably. I respectfully point out to the members of this committee that the testimony of the engineers before the Appropriations Committee shows that at the present time, the engineers are resurveying the entire project with respect to the determination of a new formula for contributions, and that this work is being done pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1954 which authorized and approved this entire project, and required that the project be re-evaluated and appraised. The engineers report that they expect to have this completed by December 1956.

Therefore, there is no justification, either from the standpoint of the nature of the project or from the standpoint of the local contributions for in any way retarding the project by not appropriating the amount of money necessary—and which I emphasize again is the bare minimum required to do the essential work toward completing this project within a reasonable time.

I earnestly urge the members of this committee to support the amendment to the bill which would restore the appropriation to the level recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and would increase the appropriation for this project from the $3 million recommended by the committee to $6,300,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Can Italy Be Saved From Communism?—Anti-Communist Cause Sags in Italy as Reds Advance Without Opposition—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a series of five articles by Indro Montanelli, a top correspondent for one of Italy's leading newspapers, the Il Corriere Della Sera, perhaps the most influential in all of Italy. This is the first of the five articles.

Indro Montanelli has been and is a leading anti-Fascist and an anti-Communist. During World War II he was imprisoned by the Germans. In the articles which I am submitting Mr. Montanelli issues a grave warning—that the Communist threat is growing rapidly in Italy, in spite of American aid, which is advanced for the purpose of resisting this threat.

Mr. Speaker, according to Mr. Montanelli, the United States aid program plays into the hands of our Red enemies and is of little assistance to our anti-Communist friends.

The warning that is sounded should alert this Congress to the dangers that exist in a further extension of the foreign-aid legislation that is soon to be considered.

The first article bears a dateline of December 13, 1954:

ROME, December 13.—American observers seeking to evaluate the Communist danger in Italy generally set out to investigate communism itself. They discover that the party's strength rose from a 32-percent vote in the 1948 elections to 36 percent last year. And if they could catch a Christian Democratic Party Minister in a mood for sincerity (a feat seldom accomplished), they would learn that were there to be new elections today, the figure would reach 40 percent.

And they'd be alarmed.

But they would be far more alarmed still if, instead of investigating communism, they turned their searchlights on Italy's so-called anti-Communists. American readers know that the Italian Communist Party is the strongest, best-organized, best-directed in the entire west, and that it is constantly growing. But the figures, eloquent as they are, do not tell the whole story.

They do not point to the most appalling phenomenon—the progressive disintegration, as an anti-Communist force, of the remaining 60 percent of Italians who do not, as yet, vote Communist. There are no statistics on the weariness, the weakening of the will, the laxity of resistance to communism prevailing throughout Italy.

Up to 3 years ago, the whole nation stood up against the Communist menace. The Communists themselves, by their acts of violence, compelled this resistance.

The continuous strikes irritated the population. Day after day reports of arms and munitions seized in Communist headquarters filled the newspapers.

Hardly a week passed without news of some Communist mayor being indicted for embezzlement, or of other abuses, crimes, sabotage, or murder committed by the Reds.

Communists and non-Communists were separated by a sharp dividing line. And the non-Communists were, by force of circumstances, anti-Communists.

Many times, in those years, there was reason to wonder how a man as clever as Palmiro Togliatti, the Communist leader, could follow so clumsy a policy. One of his collaborators whom this correspondent had the opportunity of contacting explained that his chief did not, in fact, approve of the policy and found himself in continuous conflict with the Moscow Cominform. Whether this statement is true or not, could not be verified. The Italian Politburo is fully informed on what is being said and done in any ministry in Rome, but no ministry in Rome has the slightest idea of what is going on in the Italian Politburo. Whoever claims he knows Moscow's orders is lying.

One thing, however, is certain: Since Stalin's death in March 1953, tactics have changed considerably. Evidence was the party circular a high ranking police officer showed; one of his men had secured it in May 1953. It called on all party members to fraternize with the very people who only a few weeks before were being referred to as "hateful Fascist and capitalist enemies."

This new strategy soon bore fruit. For it proved something which Moscow probably ignored but which Togliatti knew only too well. There is only one thing non-Commu-

nist Italians hold against the Communists, and that is the latter's violences forced the Italians into a role of active anticommunism. All these Italians ask is an excuse for pretending, with a certain decency, to believe in Togliatti's peaceful aims. And these excuses are now being showered on them in generous overdoses.

Togliatti himself had always appeared in public well dressed, usually in a double-breasted blue suit of perfect tailoring. But most of his subalterns stuck to the revolutionary garb of open collars. Suddenly, from one day to the next, they received orders to get themselves impeccable "bourgeois" suits. There were no more strikes. Cell leaders who worked in factories began to send birthday cards and flowers to their bosses whenever the occasion called for it.

Togliatti declared in public that he felt deeply honored to have a visconti of Milan and a doria of Genoa—scions of the highest Italian aristocracy—in the ranks of his party. Words such a "honor" 'and "honorable," heretofore scoffed and sneered at as an outgrowth of "bourgeois" mentality and morality found their way more and more frequently into the Communist vocabulary. Likewise, the Red press has become the stanchest advocate of national pride, order, the family, of virtue and religion.

This call to fraternization was too tempting a bait for most Italians to resist. And very few did. Most Italians are only to happy to simulate belief in the Communists' peace talk, and if they do not ask for a people's government with Communist membership, it is merely because, in effect, such a government exists already, even without the Reds' official participation. Indeed, the Reds themselves couldn't do better in furthering their aims than Premier Mario Scelba's government already does for them.

The Italian Government printing office prints the Reds' papers at special prices which are never paid. The government sponsored radio and television networks are under strict orders to avoid the expression "anti-Communist" and anything that might even suggest it. These orders are enthusiastically obeyed by the staffs, made up almost entirely of Communists and fellow travelers.

When the new Russian Ambassador arrived in Italy, his train was rerouted so that the distinguished guest might appear on TV and deliver the message of friendship that the Russian brothers (not comrades, mind you) were extending to their Italian brothers. Nothing like this was done at the arrival of United States Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce who might well have been offered more attention—if only for the reason that she is a woman.

The non-Communist press flung itself on the Wilma Montesi case, enlarging that insignificant news item involving a young girl found dead on a beach into a national scandal. By a master stroke of diplomacy, the Reds didn't pick up the case directly but handed it over to the capitalist and independent organs. As to the newspapermen, it is hard to say whether it was stupidity or expediency that made them fall in line with the Red policy. Perhaps they couldn't tell themselves.

Be it as it may, it is a fact that the battle against communism rather than being lost, is not even being fought in Italy—at least not on the vital, psychological front. Ever since anticommunism has become synonymous with fascism there is not one foxhole left for self-defense.

Ninety percent of Italy's non-Communists live in the illusion that the Reds will never stage a resolution. To objections that they do not need a revolution because they are already achieving power the effortless way, the reply is that Togliatti has orders from Moscow not to win. And when told that it seems rather difficult to understand why then Togliatti should work so hard at multiplying his votes, these diehard optimists shrug their shoulders.

It doesn't really matter if he wins, they say, Italian communism could never be real communism anyway. After which there is nothing left for us to do but give up the argument and wait for this Italian version of communism which may not be communism but which will land us on the gallows just the same.

For it takes two armies to fight a battle, and Italy has but one—the Reds'. Americans must realize that the other one no longer exists. All that remain are a few dispersed patrols, lost in a lost horizon.

Can Italy Be Saved From Communism?—Italy's Capitalist Class Seen Playing Into Communists' Hands—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is the second of five articles by Mr. Indro Montanelli, a top journalist in Italy. In this one, he tells how Italian capitalists, often in league with both the Communist Party and the Italian Government, boost the Red cause and at the same time seek American aid. He says that the Italian capitalist class is a national disgrace.

His article under date of December 14, 1954, follows:

ROME, December 14.—Save for a few rare exceptions, the Italian capitalist class is a national disgrace. The northern industrialists are by no means fashioned after the American moguls. If they were, they would command our respect—if not our affection.

The sad truth, however, is that all the Italian capitalists have adopted from their American counterparts is selfishness—but not the American vitality, strength, initiative, and fighting spirit. Indeed, they are petty moguls, these Italians, no matter how sizable their fortunes.

They are too small even to stick together within their own class. Their association, which is called Confidenstria, is headed by a certain Angelo Costa from Genoa who, though held in high enough esteem by his colleagues, is unable to impose a clear-cut policy upon them.

Thus burdened by no sense of national or social responsibility and even less by class solidarity, the Italian businessman feels free to follow a personal, individual policy of his own, financing now this political figure, now that party, according to what is best for his business. Neither is he troubled by any qualms in regard to his duty, which, in his opinion, lies in not paying taxes, in securing government contracts, in establishing cartels and monopolies, in exporting his capital abroad—and in getting along as well as possible with the Communist leaders.

The Italian capitalists lack the backbone even to profess their own beliefs. They claim a leaning to the left. Their library shelves are liable to be packed with works on Karl Marx (which they do not read), their wives are crazy about Picasso. It would be unfair, however, to accuse them of mistreating their factory workers who go on strike unpunished and get away with all sorts of abuses. It is the white-collar employees, technicians, and accountants who are mistreated instead—the quiet, faithful, and patient class of officeworkers who never strike, who endure without protest.

More serious and shocking is the underground fight the so-called non-Communist government is waging against the investment of American capital in Italy, particularly in oil. The oil interests are a monopoly in the hands of a Christian Democratic Party deputy Enrico Mattei, who lacks the financial means for effective exploration of Italy's oil wells. American capital, if allowed to be brought in, would not only do much to solve Italy's financial problems, but also would increase general American interest in the country. These two possibilities being the worst evils looming on the Red horizon, the Communists are the most rabid supporters of Mattei's monopoly.

Such doings are passed by in silence both in the press and in Parliament, but they are well known to the Italian people. Yet, less they disturb the idyllic scene, the people prefer to ignore them. Everything is all right as long as the dividing line between Communists and non-Communists remains comfortably blurred just as long as "Signor Togliatti" does not choose to become, once more, "Comrade Togliatti." For this would mean they would have to turn into anti-Communists again and—what is worse—to fight.

Once in a long while does a man of courage stand up and expose Communist foul play in some branch of public administration. But soon enough it leaks through that what was done took place with the covert blessing of the Government, in exchange for a certain percentage paid into its own party funds. For everyone is familiar with the strange ways by which the Communist Party prospers in Italy. On the one hand are the big business concerns which hold monopolies on all export into the Iron Curtain countries for which they pay a fat commission into the Communist purse. On the other there is the Christian Democratic Party which—for another, just as substantial commission—sees to it that the concerns maintain their prestige of respectability by granting them the necessary export "licenses."

All this has become so much a part of national practice, that a great industrialist from Milan, taken to task by a high American Embassy official for having given 60 million lire (about $96,000) to the Reds, replied candidly, "Why it was an excellent investment." Then without wasting time, he went on to ask America for another appropriation on behalf of his industry (and probably go it, too).

Far worse still are the southern landowners—the few who are left, that is, after the thrashing which land reform has meted out to the many bad and the few good alike. The bad ones did not come up to the level even of the petty moguls. They were, and still are nothing more than parasites, and their extinction would be a blessing for the nation. But the disappearance of the good ones is no less than a catastrophe.

An example was the elections in 1948, when land reform had not even been started and southern peasants lived in miserable conditions, compared with the votes of 1953, when land reform was already in full swing. By that time the government had already spent hundreds of billions of lire though the "Cassa Del Messogiorno"—the special agency set up to provide land, housing, water, electricity, roads, schools, and hospitals for the needy peasants.

In those 5 years between elections, the Communists gained over 1,500,000 votes.

Where? In the south and exactly in the areas most benefited. While the north, the old Communist stronghold, was beginning to

crumble, the entire south passed over to the Red banner.

It is unfortunate that most American newspapermen are, though unwittingly, affected by Marxist theory in that they tend to explain all political phenomena exclusively in terms of economic and social conditions (which Marxism calls "objective causes"). They are correct when they say that the northern industrialists are, as a class, parasitic and antisocial. They are correct when they say that the bad landholders of the south do not pay their debt to society.

They are wrong only when they overrate these facts by attributing to them the only reasons for Communist success in Italy. Actually, there are far better reasons than that.

Can Italy Be Saved From Communism?—Need of Authority—Italian Government's Weakness—Propel Italy Into Communist Camp—No. 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is the third of five articles by Indro Montanelli, Italian journalist in which he points out the Red menace to Italy, and he candidly states that there is need for what he calls authority, meaning of course, the Italian Government. It is his opinion that the government by its present policies is driving the people into the Red camp and why the United States in its present cold war against communism errs in counting on what he terms the panacea of social reform.

The article under date of December 15, 1954, follows:

ROME, December 15.—Italy's statesmen of today represent the crop that was reaped by antifascism—a deadly scourge. For despite fascism's evils, it saved the quality of the state.

In fact, the Fascists retained the previous regime's best qualified executive staff (particularly in the technical and administrative branches), imposing only the uniform of black shirts. Not that there was anything exceptional about these officials. But they were, on the whole, honest, competent people, particularly in the judiciary, and they had, above all, a devotion to the state. They had a sense of authority which they saw impersonated in the King.

In the places of these people we have today strange individuals who, however full of good will, have replaced the sense of the state which they lack, with the hatred of state which they have acquired during the time in which the state was Fascist and held them in quarantine.

They are small, provincial people who have never traveled or learned any foreign language; people who have no more than a theoretical concept of democracy, which they hold to be incompatible with a police force, courts, or indeed any instrument of authority.

Most of them come from the ranks of the old Catholic parties for which the state had always been represented as the monster to be felled, the great enemy of the church to be fought. In fact, the King's Italy was Catholic, but anticlerical.

During the so-called resistance—a pitiful phenomenon in which the shameful episodes outnumbered the glorious ones—most of these people contracted a severe case of inferiority complex in regard to their Communist allies who were and still are worshipers of authority.

Eloquent proof of this was given in 1947 when Mario Scelba, then Minister of the Interior, reshuffled his police force by getting rid of the former partisans (resistance fighters) and recalling the "purged" Fascists back into service. Whether or not in good faith, the independent press hailed this action all over the nation.

Overnight Scelba had become the "reformer"—the "strong man of democracy." Actually, he did nothing exceptionally energetic or resolute. He merely let the nation believe that he was both ready and capable of doing it. That was enough to provoke immediate restitution of thousands of Communist membership cards and to undermine Red strength. The following year's elections, in fact, delivered a heavy blow for Palmiro Togliatti, the Communist leader.

Why, if it was so successful, didn't the Government pursue this policy?

The men in the Government who, incidentally, are all good friends of mine can give the answer. It is to be found, not in the words they say, but in the faint, timorous voices in which the words are uttered. I find it in their pale hands, the anemic countenances of small clerics.

Never before has Italy seen a ruling class of this sort. We have had gentlemen and thieves, adventurers and wizards, in our Government. But, in one way or the other, they were all fullblooded, hearty sinners. They were buoyant, quick-tempered, violent men—the caliber of Italians who have made Italy's history by blending wisdom with blunder, fraud with heroism.

Now, Italy is starved for authority. For nearly 10 years it has been expecting this authority from the Christian Democratic Party and its allied Liberals, Republicans, and Social Democrats. Having been let down, this nation is turning to communism, for authority is certainly no problem for the Communists. They have plenty of it and they are ready to hand it out, more generously perhaps than might be desired.

The Italian Government has made, and goes on making, the same mistake over and over again. It insists in confining its battle to the field of social reforms. It must be admitted, in all fairness, that this is a field in which Italy has achieved remarkable, if disorganized, progress—if, indeed, a situation in which a skilled laborer earns more than an army colonel, a judge, or a university professor may be called progress. True, there still are in Italy huge fortunes unscathed by taxes, thanks to their owners' power and ability of blackmailing the Government parties who need their subsidies. On the whole, however, there is a visible trend toward a better and fairer leveling off in our country's economy.

Yet the masses continue to move into the Communist lines. It is no wonder if, in seeing their efforts thus rewarded, our statesmen seem discouraged. They try to remedy this by stepping up new reforms. But the more reforms sprout up the faster the people, in search of authority, go Communist.

There, then, lies the deep-rooted psychological factor that drives Italy into Togliatti's arms. On the surface, it is a phenomenon that works two ways. As the more candid of the Red converts admit, epitomizing the average Italian's attitude, "going Communist is always a bargain, any way you look at it. If they win, we'll be with the winners; if they lose, it won't matter too much. Democracy never talks of punishment."

They are an essentially skeptical and utilitarian people, these Italians. Democracy, to them, is an unknown, foreign commodity imported from the Protestant countries where the democratic idea hinges on the local religion and is a way of life.

But in Italy not even communism is a truly strong belief. It lacks in revolutionary impact. Togliatti knows perfectly well that should he launch the famous call to the barricades hardly 50,000 of his 10 million voters would actually appear at the posts. The others would simply watch the show.

This is why Togliatti prefers the legal way to power. This is why he will not raise a finger against the present Government of which, when it comes down to facts, he is the truest ally.

Until such time as he is ready to take over, Togliatti could not, indeed, wish for a government that better serves his purposes. It is a government that, instead of devoting its energies to rehabilitating the prestige and authority of the state, concentrates all its efforts on social reforms (which the United States holds to be the panacea that will save Italy from communism). This plays right into the hands of Togliatti, for Togliatti loves social reforms. He knows that in the long run they work only for him.

Such is the situation of this country of mine. It is a country which in its frantic search for authority can find it nowhere except in the folds of the Communist Party. The temptation is great. Soon it may become irresistible.

The air we are breathing today in Italy is tainted with fear, barter, and treason. In the plain words of the man in the street, the situation boils down to this: "Since Italy is bound to become one big concentration camp, it is better to enroll with the guards than with the prisoners."

Meanwhile, Premier Scelba goes on with his social reforms paid for by the American taxpayer. And the American taxpayer goes on spending his money to speed up Togliatti's triumph.

Can Italy Be Saved From Communism?—Italy Has Faith United States Will Somehow Bar Communists From Succeeding—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of articles by Mr. Indro Montanelli, the roving reporter and top correspondent of Italy's most famous newspaper, Il Corriere Della Sera.

Mr. Speaker, in this fourth article, Mr. Montanelli examines in detail why Italy counts the United States anti-Communist efforts as a failure. His analysis of the situation will undoubtedly startle the American people and I believe Members of Congress also.

This fourth article is dated December 16, 1954:

ROME, December 16.—The few Italians who have the courage to face up to the desperation of Communist danger shrug their shoulders. "America wouldn't let it happen," they say. It is useless to ask them what the United States could do, when 40 percent of the Italian voters, if an election were held today, would turn my nation over to the

domination of Communists who have already demonstrated their "democratic" character in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the other satellites.

There are above all two basic reasons for this blind faith in the United States.

The first reason, however strange it may sound to American ears, is the conviction that the United States suffers from a guilt complex with respect to Italy, and that it is animated by the fervent desire to atone for its sins.

Concerning these sins or mistakes, Italians are not agreed whether the United States is completely or only partly to blame for the present situation. And so this article will advise Americans, who it seems to me, have never considered the matter, of the errors that all anti-Communist Italians impute to the United States.

The first is certainly that of having favored the fall of the monarchy. The king was the fatherland, the state, and the flag—the three symbols our present government lacks for combatting communism. To the king the best army officers and the best functionaries had sworn their fidelity and loyalty. They were replaced by the heroes of the so-called resistance, who were either Communists, or philo-Communists. Despite the merits or demerits of the House of Savoy, the Reds' desire to abolish monarchy demonstrated they considered it an obstacle.

The second error, in the view of these Italians, was that of having protected the partisans who from a military point of view were of no value to the Allies but who served the Communist cause extremely well. The Communists utilized the partisans to eliminate the anti-Communists, and to arm the Red squads as well. To this day the Communists have underground stores of American arms and ammunition.

Third, was the purge of the Fascists which the Americans encouraged. The Allied Military Government ignored a simple fact, that fascism had endured 23 years in Italy—a generation. All those who lived in this time were perforce part of Fascist Italy and could not pursue any profession without being somehow associated with the Fascist Party.

Therefore everybody sided with it. This brought about selection of state servants and officials along purely professional—not political—lines. The fittest were chosen. With the purge the fittest were eliminated. The purge was in effect a guillotine that amputated the head of the nation.

Certainly these were serious errors committed by Americans who have not yet learned the art of abstaining from shaping other peoples' history by redeeming them through missionary programs. Americans forget that other peoples' history is different than theirs. But the Italians who demonstrate such astuteness in evaluating American responsibilities are prone to forget some history too.

They forget that the errors would not have occurred, with such fatal consequences, if the Italians themselves had not collaborated so zealously.

The Americans favored the fall of the king—but the Italians sent him away with their votes. The Americans protected the partisans, but the partisans were Italian. The Americans solicited the purge, but the Italians were happy to execute it, because in substance the purge served as a basis for obtaining revenge by the deficient against the fittest.

The Americans, who acted in good faith, discovered their errors and called a halt. The Italians, in bad faith, continued the mistakes, creating the present situation from which they now await salvation. President Eisenhower by now has become the San Gennaro of Italy—the saint who is invoked to stop the flow of lava from Vesuvius when it erupts.

The second basic factor that the Italians rely on in their belief that the United States will not permit communism to win stems from the conviction that the men in the United States State Department are guided by the same political calculations that guide the men of Rome. America will not let it happen, they say, because geography and strategy won't permit it.

This is true, but my compatriots ignore the fact that the men of the State Department are prisoners of two things: the American electors who do not know European geography and of a handful of words which constitute for them an article of faith—words like independence, respect for the will of the people, rights, legality and so on. Just as the Americans attribute to the Italians ideals which are purely American, Italians attribute to the Americans calculations that are really Italian. This misunderstanding poisons relations, not only between America and Italy, but between America and Europe, if not between America and the world.

From the Italian point of view the misunderstanding consists in believing the United States is an empire, operating an imperial foreign policy. My compatriots have, it is true, the vague feeling that America refuses to be an empire, indeed has fears of becoming one. But they feel that this fear is only a manifestation of a puritanical hypocrisy, and that it represents only a mask, destined to fall some day, exposing the vital interests at stake.

Nevertheless there is no doubt that the unpopularity of the United States in Europe, and particularly in Italy, is derived particularly from what the Americans call respect for the rights of other people, and which the Italians call, according to circumstances, weakness, obscurity, and lack of decision and prestige.

Here is an example:

A few weeks ago, United States Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce, the first American diplomat who has understood the Italian situation fully, asked me to present to her an editor, who is also the most genial painter and writer among anti-Communist Italians. When we left her, I asked the editor what he thought about Ambassador Luce.

"Attractive," he answered, like a good Italian who, concerning women, even if Ambassadors, takes into account first of all physical attributes. "Attractive, cool, very intelligent, of supreme quality, equal to 10 men. She has only two defects—that of living at Villa Taverna, and of receiving Italians in the company of two small dogs that possess an innocent, vaguely stupid air. My dear friend, if I were the Ambassador of the United States, I would not have gone to live in the villa of a Roman prince. I would have made them build me a fortress, loaded with cannons and atomic bombs. Italian visitors I would have received in the company of two ferocious dogs, this high, ready to bite whoever entered, including the President of the Republic, the head of the Government, and editors. Otherwise, what kind of America would I represent?"

Americans do not realize the success achieved by the Communists through the menacing isolation of their Russian representatives in Rome. All Italians are finding themselves confronted not with an ideology of which they have been skeptical for centuries but an empire, determined to pursue an imperial, militaristic policy.

Italians don't vote for Karl Marx or materialism of which they know nothing. They simple vote for Russian divisions and tanks, certain in the knowledge that Georgi Malenkov, the (then) Russian leader, is determined to use them.

Americans can say the Italians are wrong, and I can say it. The average readers of Ohio and Oklahoma and the other States can be disgusted with me, rather than trying to understand what I am trying to say. Citizens of a powerful state, they ignore the hypnotic fascination that force exercises over the weak. And their reactions, and mine, will not change the situation.

The Italians lack two fundamental things—an army to defend them and a religious faith in democracy and right. The first they had; war, the republic and the purge destroyed it. The second they have never had. Italians have never fought for an abstract idea but they did fight for the fatherland, a concrete thing. Ever since patriotism and fascism become synonymous, Italians have lost the sense of the fatherland. All they are left with is speculation and opportunism.

The reasoning of Italy's common man is simple. By voting red, he runs no risk, because today nobody persecutes communism. And he buys insurance for the future.

Either Russia wins or the United States wins. If the United States wins, Americans will persecute nobody, partly because they will not distinguish friend from enemy. But there is a Russian political party which has a list of its adversaries to be hanged.

Furthermore, alliance with the Americans does not offer the Italian voter any advantages. In this line of reasoning, just as the United States ignores its enemies, it also ignores its friends, and the day I must flee, United States immigration laws will forbid me refuge, although I could comfortably go there as a prisoner of war.

The moral is that it is more convenient to be an adversary of the Americans than an ally.

Italian communism, at least 90 percent of it, is uniquely based on this calculation. To change the terms America would have to accept an imperial destiny, exercise them without false respect for the "rights of others." But can this ever be possible?

I don't believe so. History has always advanced under the force of empires. The history of young America is nothing more than a battle against other empires and in destroying them, the Americans did not even consider becoming an imperial heir.

Even today, American diplomacy, instead of following a policy to save our lives, performs missionary work to save our souls. America, with all its good intentions, is allergic to the policy which stems out of maneuvering not the good but the bad sentiments of man—hate, villainy, envy, of which the Russians are the great alchemists. This is why the political initiative is always with Russia.

In the end, I believe that the United States will triumph, saving at the same time right, justice, and soul. But I am as well convinced that our lives will have to be spent to pay for the entrance of the American soul into paradise. The Italians who vote Communist are those that try to subtract themselves from this destiny of subsidizing the American soul. They grow daily in number. In a little while they will be the majority, relative to those who obstinately think that America will not let it happen.

America will let it happen because America is good, charitable, and timid. Not only does America refuse the empire which has fallen on its shoulders, but it hesitates even to assume leadership. It does not sense the desperation that its attitude inspires in its friends, and it won't do anything to help them when they become, in their respective nations, an indefensible minority. America doesn't even know these friends of hers—it doesn't distinguish them from her enemies.

To one and the other it indifferently sends dollars and wheat and instead of making itself respected, seeks to make itself loved, certainly ignoring that love, especially among peoples of ancient history, is always mixed up with a little bit of disapprobation.

In fact, we do love America. The hearts of 90 percent of the Italians are with America. But the votes are for Russia.

Can Italy Be Saved From Communism?—Italy Needs United States Leadership in Fight Against Communism—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth and final article by Indro Montanelli, the leading Italian journalist on the Communist threat to his homeland which, as he states it, is a problem not only for Italians, but for the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those who have taken the time to read this series of articles will approach the question of aid to Italy and its effect on that country with a good deal of realism.

This fifth and final article is dated December 17, 1954, and follows:

ROME, December 17.—Six months ago a small group of Italian writers, all unquestionably anti-Communists, met in Milan to discuss the founding of a new magazine. It was to be a small weekly, aimed at divulging the truth—the full truth—about the Communist danger in Italy.

Some writers raised the doubt that, such a magazine would necessarily be pessimistic, and that pessimism would only hasten the catastrophe rather than prevent it. In the end, the opposite view prevailed, namely that truth, if administered week after week with documented facts on the corruption, vice, and misconduct that poison our Italian national life, could not fail to create a salutary shock and spark counteraction.

The new weekly was called "Il Borghese" (The Bourgeois) a word disqualified in the so-called "social" vocabulary (and not in Italy alone) as another word "proletariat" has been given pride of place instead.

In view of its high intellectual level, the magazine's circulation was estimated at 25,000 copies per issue. Today Il Borghese has already reached the 100,000 mark, and is still growing. "Borghese Clubs" are mushrooming in all major cities with memberships from all walks of life: Physicians, lawyers, judges, engineers, teachers, students, craftsmen, employees—all, or nearly all, former war veterans. These people belong to different political parties or to no party at all. But they have one thing in common: A strong sense of irritation and utter disgust at what surrounds them.

They are disgusted with the government, with the political and economic leaders, with the scandals, with immorality, with the church and its interference into the affairs of the state.

They are also disgusted by their experience with democracy—a word which, in Italy, has no "sex appeal." If Italy is a democracy today, it is merely because fascism pushed us into a war which we did not want and—worse still—which we lost.

True, these are all negative aspects. But there is a positive side to this program as well. It can be summed up in three points: socialism, nationalism, anticlericalism. These are the very concepts that directed the course of Italy's history in the last century.

The success of Il Borghese is a foolproof symptom that there exists a strong, growing public opinion which no longer considered itself represented by any of the eight political parties now vying for power in Italy. This public opinion leans toward the left in social problems, for it demands a radical and final reform of Italy's medieval economy. Politically, it tends to the right, because it wants such reforms to be carried out by a strong and authoritative state that would allow neither credit nor advantages to fall in the lap of the Communists.

Finally, this new opinion or tendency is lay or anticlerical, because it is set against a church that it considered too lenient toward all, too willing to bow to compromise.

But the fundamental point that Il Borghese has touched and that has built its great success is this:

"In Italy," the paper has pointed out, "there is no battle between communism and democracy. For, in order to talk of battle one must have two armies. Now neither communism nor democracy can be regarded as armies. The former lacks revolutionary impact, the latter has no power of resistance. Our country, like Guatemala, is a colonial country fought over by two foreign powers. Behind communism there is Russia. Behind democracy there is the United States.

"Siding with the United States, we could regain our dignity as a nation, our autonomy, our traditions. Attached to Russia, we would be no more than one of her provinces. Italians have no other choice: Either the one or the other. All else is wishful thinking."

Even such clear and straightforward language has had enormous effect, though it revealed nothing that, deep in the conscience, the Italian people did not already know. Only, no one had dared say it. Now it has been said, black on white.

There is one point only which, in my opinion, the authors of Il Borghese seem to have missed. They are correct in saying that their kind of anticommunism means America. Indeed they seem to be in doubt themselves.

Said Leo Longanesi, of Milan, the magazine's publisher, when faced with the question, "It is our duty to believe this to be so even if it isn't. Perhaps, without such faith we could fight a purely Italian communism. But if we are to fight a communism that is Russia, we must believe that we are America, or else the battle is lost."

The battle is not lost. On the contrary, the very signs that make it appear so bring us closer to a rescue which is already in the making, and which is palpable in thousands of symptoms throughout the country. Every issue of this daring magazine prints accusations, signed by plain citizens, of corruption, immorality, and abuses at the hands of mayors, judges, and high officials. None of the accused, so far, has dared to sue his accusers for slander.

Industrialists known to be selling strategic materials to Iron Curtain countries and to be financing Communist cells have been mentioned by name. And since courage is as contagious as cowardice, the number of Italians who openly revolt both against the Government and against the Communist Party is growing day by day. The position they have thus taken is not exactly comfortable. But, as most of them now realize, neither is it a particularly dangerous one.

And this, precisely, is the function of Il Borghese: to prove that in a country like ours, courage pays better than fear. Palmiro Togliatti, the leader of communism in Italy, who is accused by Il Borghese of betraying his own companions, and is constantly put up to ridicule, has not moved a finger in protest. Italian veterans are no longer ashamed of having borne arms, even though in a hapless war, but proudly display rank insignia and campaign ribbons in their lapels. The word "Fatherland" once more, is coming back into fashion.

Of course, for the time being, all this is still the doing of a minority. But then, everything worthwhile has always started with a minority. The problem, therefore, lies not in numbers. It lies in the certainty—or rather the lack of certainty—of whether or not the United States is really backing us.

Where are the Americans? We do not see them. What do they think? They do not tell us. So far, save for a certain curiosity toward the Montesi case and Gina Lollobrigida, we Italians have noticed no particular American interest in our country.

They do hand out, even if with poor criteria, a great deal of money. But nowhere have we seen any signs of American barracks set up for the recruiting of anti-Communist volunteers to fight at the given moment, not communism which we could handle alone, but Russia. For, Russia does have her barracks in Italy: The headquarters of the Communist Party.

Not communism, which in itself is negligible, but Russia is the deadly enemy to be uprooted from the Italian soil. It could be done within a year's time, if only the United States, rather than putting the problem, as she had done so far, in abstract terms such as "democracy" and "liberty" (terms which, let it be clear, enjoy no credit with the Italian people), would face it in concrete terms of power such as taught by Machiavelli, rather than as preached in the Gospel.

We Italians have the highest respect for America's Armed Forces and for her industries; but we abhor her missionaries who come to redeem us and teach us how to mend our ways. We may be wrong. But that's the way it is.

Imagine an American general rallying, with an Italian flag, Italy's war veterans and addressing them frankly, as follows:

"This is your flag. I am calling all of you who already served it in the past to serve it again with honor and integrity, without taint of treachery or political bias, in the same spirit in which once you vowed yourselves to its service. My Government may have committed some errors. If so, I now ask your forbearance, for it acted in good faith, though at times, with insufficient insight into your problems. Let bygones be bygones and look only toward the future.

"We have a mutual enemy. To fight him, America will carry the burden of technical and military leadership. At the same time, she pledges full respect to your flag. It is this Italian flag we now ask you to honor.

"You must protect it by eliminating the unworthy who have already declared their intention of betraying it. But every one of you who honorably joins this army of volunteers will be our brother and treated as such. We do not ask you to do it for America. Do it for Italy; for her civilization, for her traditions, her culture, her language, her customs. We want to know who you are, so that we may recognize you at the proper time."

The very day these words are spoken, Togliatti will have to pack his trunks and take a one-way ticket back to his real home, Russia.

Now, according to Il Borghese, such a theme has already been put forward by President Eisenhower. If we haven't heard it, the paper maintains, we must only blame our own eardrums. Fortunately, many Italians believe this to be so. God help Italy, if they stopped. But God help America, too.

I invite American citizens to have a good look at a map. They will soon realize what it would mean to the West if Italy were to disappear behind the Iron Curtain. Let's hope Americans are interested in geography and not just in gazing at La Lollobrigida.

Miracle in the Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appears in the summer issue of the Farm. The article describes a land and brush clearing project which is being carried on in the Ozark area.

The article is written by Mr. Fred Knoop, executive editor of the Farm, who has been greatly impressed by the program under which scrub forest lands are being turned into valuable pastures. The brush-killing chemicals are being applied by spray planes in a wide-spread experimental program which may well be the forerunner to a nationwide program to return to productive use worthless brush land.

I have been advised by the Public Printer that this article exceeds the limitation under which only two pages may be printed as an extension of remarks in any one instance. Notwithstanding the fact that it is estimated that this manuscript will make approximately two and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $200, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIRACLE IN THE SOUTHWEST

(By Fred Knoop)

"Anything that will kill an Ozark sprout will kill a man—for sure. And anyhow, nothing will kill an Ozard sprout." These sure words of an oldtimer ended an indignation meeting in a small Arkansas town in 1950. The meeting had been called because a chemical company was planning to run a series of brush-killing tests using hormone sprays on 2,000 acres it had just bought nearby. As the facts turned out, the farmers were wrong on both counts. Today they welcome the fliers of the lumbering spray planes as public benefactors, which they are. For they are turning brush country into grass again.

If you have ever been in Arkansas, you'll know that a sprout is anything of a woody nature—from the fat-boy scrub oak to the 40-foot shagbark hickory. All sprouts have several things in common: they are hard to kill; they put out such a dense cover of leaves that nothing will grow underneath them; they spring up when the land has been overgrazed or mistreated. In the Ozark area alone—southern Missouri, western Arkansas, northeastern Texas, and eastern Oklahoma—it is estimated that there are 30 to 40 million acres that could well be grazing land again. Much of this land was once grazing land; it is not forest land like that to the east, nor is it range land like that to west. Soil Conservation Service men have long known that portions of this area was true prairie, and that once the shade is removed, the native grasses will again grow tall enough to meet a steer's eye.

Why did this land turn into a jungle of low-grade trees? There are several causes for its downfall, soil scientists and forestry men say. First, the overgrazing; second, the removal of organic matter by the indiscriminate burning; and third, no fertilizer or nutrients of any kind have ever been put back on the land. This is the land that Coronado described in his march through the area in 1570 as "tall grass prairie country." As late as 1832, surveyors had trouble in finding trees here on which to blaze their lines.

Since 1950, this area has been the scene of the big battle with the brush, a testing ground for the chemical companies. The results that have come out of the area are just about as important to many farmers as the invention of the plow. In a nutshell, the facts are: For $8 an acre land can be sprayed with chemicals and a kill made on 75 to 95 percent of the threes and brush; about 15 months after the chemical treatment, cattle can be grazed on the native grass that springs up; land that had trouble in carrying 1 cow on 100 acres before spraying will support a cow on 8 to 12 acres after the trees are killed; the spray is selective; it knocks out the broad-leafed hardwoods, but will not kill the useful pines.

BRUSH TO GRASS IN A YEAR

L. H. King, of Clarksville, Ark., cooperating with the Johnson County Soil Conservation District, has had a chance to try out land clearing by a variety of methods over the past 20 years. His 800 acres of peaches—grown on the sunny slopes of the Ozarks—are planted on hills that were grubbed out the hard way. Nearby he has about 600 acres of land, 400 acres of which had been cleared in years past and this provided good pasture for his black Angus cattle even through the drought years. This spring he walked through the 170 acres that had been sprayed from the air in May 1954. With him was Hurlon Ray, the Soil Conservation Service range specialist from Fayetteville, Ark. As they pulled huge slabs of bark off the dead trees, King said, "I didn't think we could do it. Our kill on this brush is almost complete. I figured my total costs on this new pasture that we've got for our cattle. It cost $8.50 an acre for spraying, including the 2,4–D and the 2,4,5–T, along with the diesel oil. But I am glad that we seeded it while there was plenty of moisture in those leaves. The aerial seeding cost $3.75 an acre, $3.25 for the seed and 50 cents for the plane. We used 10 pounds each of rye grass and crimson clover. It was like finding 170 acres of pasture, for $12.75 an acre is pretty cheap. We haven't fertilized the sprayed area yet. There is going to be plenty of mold and bark as those trees rot and fall down. Right now we have 250 Angus on the 600 acres, and if we get the rain I believe it will carry all of them well into the summer."

L. H. King is pasturing the land sooner than the Soil Conservation Service recommends. On the other hand, the land he has cleared is better than the average in Arkansas, and he gave it an extra boost by seeding it. The best way to put the land back in use, the range specialists believe, is to allow the native grass 15 months' growth after the trees have been sprayed. That gives the grass a chance to seed itself twice, and recover from being suppressed by woody plants.

THE APPLICATORS

Claud Hall, of Clarksville, Ark., the Paul Bunyan of the aerial sprayers, got into the spraying business partly because he likes to fly and partly because he is a good businessman. His planes sprayed some 10,000 acres of brush last year and the tales of his effectiveness as an applicator makes good hot stove talk for the Arkansas farmers. A former Army Air Force low-level acrobatics instructor, he is one of the rare people that can bring real enthusiasm to the faces of the Osage Indians when he is operating in Oklahoma. His wheels often roll from touching the treetops and his turns at the end of a spray run are fast and precise. When he wants to give instructions to the ground crews, he puts the plane upside down and shouts his orders from the air. He is one of the few flyers that can cover 200 acres of brush with "acid" (the operator's name for the chemical spray) in an hour.

The flyer-operator like Claud Hall looks at the brush-killing business as a trucking job with disagreeable hours (the best time for spraying is from sunup until breakfast-time); he knows that he will live in a world surrounded by bad smells during the spraying season. He is well aware of the need for a high degree of skill as he skims the top of the trees in a permanent power stall to give the right kind of a "boil" to the spray to force the chemicals down into the foliage. But he takes the same professional pride in his work as a plowing champion does on the home place field alongside the State highway.

If you stop in Clarksville to see Claud Hall, he may take you on a shortcut across the Arkansas River in a fishing boat to see 600 acres of river bottom land which he sprayed for T. L. and Lewis Geren in the spring of 1954. Just a year ago it was growing some of the biggest cottonwoods, sycamores, and oaks in the Ozarks. It is easy to see where the spraying stopped, for the tangled jungle of trees is still in control beyond the Geren's property line. Lewis Geren is no windshield farmer; he has a bulldozer and he started pushing over the dead trees early in February of this year. The complete spray job had cost him $8 an acre and the bulldozing cost another $8 an acre. The trees were pushed into windrows and burned in early March. A plow went through the field easily. Even the stumps were rotten, and broke up with the kick of a boot. By May—and another $8 in plowing, disking and seeding later—the oats were waving a bright green and acting as a nurse crop for the clover underneath. Land that had cost $2 an acre was now worth $200.

Estimated acreage of land on which brush removal can improve grazing [1]

State	Number acres could be cleared	Percent of State area
Alabama	2,250,000	7
Arizona	16,000,000	22
Arkansas	10,000,000	30
California	13,000,000	13
Colorado	7,000,000	10
Connecticut	100,000	3 2
Delaware	2,000	.
Florida	8,000,000	23
Georgia	5,000,000	13
Idaho	8,000,000	15
Illinois	750,000	2
Indiana	1,000,000	4
Iowa	1,000,000	3
Kansas	1,000,000	2
Kentucky	1,400,000	6
Louisiana	5,000,000	17
Maine	950,000	5
Maryland	3,000	.05
Massachusetts	75,000	1
Michigan	3,500,000	10
Minnesota	5,000,000	10
Mississippi	1,500,000	5
Missouri	10,000,000	22
Montana	1,000,000	1
Nebraska	64,000	.1
Nevada	10,000,000	14
New Hampshire	500,000	9
New Jersey	150,000	3
New Mexico	15,000,000	21
New York	1,500,000	5
North Carolina	2,000,000	6
North Dakota	150,000	.03
Ohio	300,000	1
Oklahoma	6,500,000	16
Oregon	8,000,000	13
Pennsylvania	1,000,000	3
Rhode Island	30,000	5
South Carolina	537,000	3
South Dakota	200,000	.04
Tennessee	1,000,000	4
Texas	65,000,000	39
Utah	8,000,000	15
Vermont	150,000	3

Footnotes at end of table.

Estimated acreage of land on which brush removal can improve grazing—Continued

State	Number acres could be cleared	Percent of State area
Virginia	250,000	1
Washington	1,000,000	2
West Virginia	125,000	1
Wisconsin	5,000,000	14
Wyoming	8,000,000	13

Total acres of land that can be improved: 236,698,600. Percent of total United States area: 8.66.

[1] Based on estimates of State and Federal authorities.

BASAL BARK TREE KILLING

The methods of using the sprays have become part of the farmer's working talk in the Ozarks, and the results have been so spectacular that land prices have jumped the traces. But can the same methods be used in Michigan, in Virginia, or Iowa? Range specialists say they can, and they will go further and tell you that you don't have to use an airplane, which is best adapted to large tracts. For $17 to $40 you're in business. All that's needed is a garden or knapsack type sprayer and a gallon of 2,4,5-T. Get the type of 2,4,5-T that has 4 pounds of acid to the gallon. Then you mix the gallon of 2,4,5-T with 20 gallons of diesel oil, and put it to work on the brush that is edging into the back 40. In a year an acre or two can be added to the field with a few hours' work, using the basal bark method of spraying the trunk.

The basal bark treatment can be used at any time of the year. Wet the tree from a height of 18 inches above the ground, all around the tree, down to the ground. And spray some on any exposed roots, too. Have the sprayer adjusted so that it puts out a stream, not a mist. The chemicals and oil for basal bark tree killing will cost from $4 to $20 an acre, depending on the number of trees and how much spray chemical you apply.

A knapsack sprayer can be used to spray the foliage of a tree but this begins to get into the category of hard and slow work. A power-driven sprayer that will develop about 200 to 300 pounds pressure and has an orchard-type nozzle and 20 or 30 feet of hose is the tool that many farmers have used to work on larger areas of trees and brush. For example, the Thompson Chemicals Corp., maker of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, has developed its own type of boomless sprayer which is mounted on the back of a tractor and has been used in their test spraying plots near Branson, Mo. A number of farmers have used the inexpensive tractor-mounted pumps and spray equipment (cost $69.50) made by Continental Belton of Belton, Tex., and combined it with a 55-gallon drum. This outfit has a gear pump drive from the tractor power takeoff.

The chemical companies advise against using equipment that is to be used for spraying fruit trees or field crops. In spraying foliage the best results are obtained by doing the work in May, June, or July while the leaves are green and the plant is active. For foliage spraying, take one-half gallon of 2,4,-D and one-half gallon of 2,4,5-T and mix them with 4 gallons of Diesel oil to make 5 gallons of basic chemical mixture. Use the type of chemical that specifies on the can, "4 pounds of acid per gallon." This mixture is added to 95 gallons of water to make 100 gallons of foliage spray. For a smaller amount of spray, use one-half of the basic 5-gallon chemical mixture and mix it with water in a 55-gallon drum that is nearly full. The treatment consists of spraying the foliage, both tops and undersides of the leaves, until it is all well covered. It is best to spray early in the morning or late in the afternoon when there is little wind. These spray chemicals are extremely volatile and can drift for miles. It is embarrassing and can be downright expensive to have the 100-year old elm in your neighbor's front yard turn an ugly brown in a couple of weeks; and that is what will happen to the trees that you spray. And take care not to spray near any corn, raspberry patches, or any other growing crops. The cost of chemicals for high-pressure foliage application from the ground is about the same as for basal bark application—$4 to $20 per acre.

AIRPLANE APPLICATION

The most important part of airplane application of brush-killing spray is to do the flagging right, so the pilot can make accurate swaths over the area. The ground crew—brush apes, as they are known in the business—and the pilots must know the area and plan their spray runs carefully. Spraying up and down the narrow valleys can be tricky work and the flagmen must have their work planned. Usually the farmer is asked to supply a couple of men to work along with the two experienced flagmen who are part of the crew. The spray mixture used for most aerial work is made up on the job. Diesel oil and the acid (usually a 50–50 mixture of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T) are transported to the job in a big semitrailer and then ferried out to the landing strips, if the country is extremely rough, in a jeep. An operator wants an 1,800-foot landing strip clear of obstacles at one end from which to operate his planes. He doesn't want his strip to be more than 3 miles from the brush he is spraying, for his unproductive flying time will cut down the time he can spend in the actual spraying operation.

The area to be sprayed is first laid out to allow flight runs as long as possible. The area is then marked with permanent flags. These flags, about 24 inches square, are attached to bamboo poles, securely fastened to tree tops by a couple of the brush apes who are good climbers. The permanent flags are placed in a pattern spaced approximately every one-fourth mile along the flight path and at the boundaries. A swath width is 26.4 feet, and 10 flight swaths are flown between each permanent flag. Men on the ground with flags (36 inches square) on bamboo poles step off 26.4 feet for each swath after each pass of the plane. It is not always possible in heavy growth for the pilot to follow the men on the ground. He can, however, quite accurately follow his swath course by calculating from the permanent flags.

The swath width of 26.4 feet allows a good overlap from each swath, since the spray from the plane spreads out for 50 to 60 feet. All of the trees get hit by spray 3 or 4 times, but this is all to the good and makes for a high kill.

The ground crew, by keeping careful records of the swaths between each permanent flag, can check delivery. Flight errors are kept at a minimum in this way. The spray delivery is also checked and adjustment in the equipment or nozzles can be made if necessary to assure a proper putout of chemicals.

Ten swaths 1 mile long cover 32 acres and should consume 160 gallons of spray mixture with a limit of error of 2 to 3 percent plus or minus.

If air spraying is done carefully, it can be as efficient as any other method of application. The woody plant count in some brushy areas of Arkansas averages 240 low-grade hardwoods of 6-inch diameter and over 8,000 under 6 inches per acre. A kill of from 75 to 95 percent has been made. The materials, chemicals, and oil for aerial spraying cost about $4 an acre and the operator will charge $3 to $5 for applying them. This is the cheapest and fastest way to kill brush, but it is best adapted to large acreage.

Complete eradication of all brush is seldom accomplished by a single airplane spraying. When complete eradication is wanted, it may be necessary to make a repeat spraying in a year or two to kill undergrowth that was not killed with the first application. By then there will be the seedlings that come up from acorns, seeds, and nuts left in the ground.

After aerial or foliage spraying or basal applications in the summer, the sprayed trees will turn brown from 2 to 4 weeks following application. However, there may be a lot of green leaves left. Although they are still green, they are absorbing the chemical and the results will show up the next year. Locust, oak, elm, gum, sycamore, willow, walnut, green briar, blackberry briar, and many others will be showing the effects of the chemical first. The ash winged elm, hickory, and hard maple may not be turning brown quite as rapidly but this is due to the fact that, although they have taken in the chemical, they are much slower in showing the effects of it. They may not show any defoliation, but the cambium layer will be darkened. This is the growing layer on the outside of the tree where the cells divide.

The following spring some of the sprayed trees will put out leaves 2 to 4 weeks late. These leaves will be very abnormal in size—some very large and some very small. They will be growing out of the large limbs and trunks, not from the small lateral branches as on a normal tree. After a period of 4 to 10 weeks these leaves will begin to turn brown and die. The explanation for this is that the tree has a small amount of energy left and putting out these leaves is its last bid for life. But the root system has lost its ability to gather plant food to sustain the growth, so the leaves turn brown and die.

The chemicals proven best for brush control in the Ozarks are commonly called 2,4–D (dichlorophenoxy acetic acid) and 2,4,5–T (trichlorophenoxy acetic acid). These chemicals are made from benzene, and it was natural for such chemical companies as Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co. to get into their manufacture since benzene is an important byproduct of turning coal into coke. These hormones (2,4–D or 2,4,5–T) cause the sudden release of the stored energy in the plant and root system. This renders the plan incapable of further carrying on its life processes. The hormones are plant stimulants; they speed up growth of the plants to the point where they die because of an explosive release of energy. The hormone travels by translocation through the plant system quite rapidly.

The actual kill may come within a few minutes, a few hours, a few weeks, or in some cases it may take as much as 2 years to determine the efficiency of the kill. It is not known definitely how fast this takes place.

THE GRASS UNDERNEATH

Forestry and range specialists point out that spraying should not be done in the true forest areas where there are valuable hardwoods. Where the scrub trees have moved onto good pasture land, the brush killing pays off. Once free of the smothering shade, the native grasses will grow again. When low-grade trees are cleared with ax and saw, there are a dozen or two volunteer shoots ready to spring up where a tree is cut. And, if the top soil is disturbed in the hilly land by machinery, erosion can be a problem. That is the reason the chemical land clearing looks so good in the hilly types of land. Once the grass cover comes back, the water runoff is lowered as much as 50 percent.

The pattern of recovery taken by the native grass usually is very rapid. Grass which has grown and seeded itself for generations in a stunted form, suddenly springs to life. The heavy organic litter from the leaves, bark, and decaying trees acts like a sponge to hold the moisture and is an ideal nursery for the small grass. When the sun's rays

strike the ground, the soil flora and fauna in it spring to life, and the whole area suddenly seems to unfold a green carpet. The 50 inches of rain that the Ozarks get in a normal year keeps it that way.

The native grasses that usually spring up in the Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri areas are bluegrass, big bluestem, little bluestem, Indiangrass, switchgrass, sideoats grama, eastern gama, purpletop, sand lovegrass, and panicum. All of these are considered fine beef-makers, provided the cattle have plenty of this pasture.

Following the brush kill, the management of the grass is most important. The range should be stocked so that not more than 50 percent of the year's growth of grass is eaten. Salt mineral boxes, and watering troughs should be placed to spread out the cattle and get even grazing.

The first questions a farmer asks about chemical spraying is: "Is it dangerous? Will it hurt my cattle? How about the milk?" In the early days of brush spraying the chemical salesman often took a sip of the straight chemical to answer these questions. It doesn't taste good but has no other bad effects than to cause a case of the trots. This was all in the line of duty, though, and gradually the story was put across. The farmers realized that only the broadleaf plants were killed.

One of the long-time battles with the brush in the Southwest has been waged in the brushy areas of Oklahoma. Here developed and improved pastures are now producing 5 to 8 times more hay and beef than they did before clearing. In 1935 work was started with hand tools and since then ingenious machines and chemicals have been built for the work. Brush mowers, saws, beaters, crushers, and root rakes are all part of the arsenal. A root-cutter, consisting of a large V-shaped blade mounted ahead of a track-tractor, has been developed which will shear off trees up to 20 inches in diameter at a rate of 1 to 2 acres an hour, is the big gun in the lineup. After the brush and trees are cleared, they are left where they fall, to rot and add mulch to the thin soil. Burning is not advised, for it was found on test areas that as much as 7,598 pounds per acre of valuable mulch was present from the leaves, twigs, and stems 2 years after the clearing.

Pete Estes, of Wichita Falls, has been active in Texas range spraying and works with the new chemicals as they come out in testing them on the rough hombres of the ranches, the mesquite, post oak, blackjack oak, willow, and cactus. This year in March and April they were testing Dupont Karmex W, a new chemical which is what the trade calls a substituted urea. A fraction of a gram will kill a tree. It is a slow killer and works from the roots where it is dropped in a dry, pellet form. Since this chemical is in a pellet form there is no hazard from drift in an aerial application.

Dow-Kuron is another new chemical that is highly effective against oaks; it has been tested, and will be recommended for use this year in Texas.

Estes says the kill with 2,4,5-T has been good—using 1 pint of the acid to the acre along with 1 gallon of diesel oil and 3 gallons of water. The spraying is done from the air 6 to 12 weeks after the leaves appear in the spring. The cost is $2.95 an acre for chemicals and spraying, and one-half of this can be collected from the Agricultural Conservation Program Office.

Mesquite control was started commercially in about 1950 as a result of some aerial test plots put out by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station at Spur, Tex., headed by C. E. Fischer, and in cooperation with the Zigler System of Texas, of Stamford, Tex., the company that furnished the airplanes. As a result of these test plots the PMA Committee of Texas decided to participate in the program and recommended 2,4,5-T in an oil-emulsion solution to be sprayed on the mesquites 40 to 90 days after the first leaves appeared in the spring, provided there was sufficient moisture so that the mesquites would make a normal growth. The present recommendation is 1 pint (one-half pound acid equivalent) of a low-volatile ester formulation of 2,4,5-T in a 2 to 1 mixture applied at the rate of 4 gallons per acre.

After spraying most of the ranches prefer to leave the dead brush standing up on their ranchland since they can see their cattle through it and it does not shade the grass. In Texas the good grass will not grow in the shade.

In the early spring, the first year after the aerial spraying of his ranch, Carter McGregor, Jr., of Scotland, Tex., made these observations: "Of course, at this date it is too early to determine with any degree of accuracy the percent of root kill on the mesquite, but right now it looks as though the top kill is going to be at least 80 percent.

"However, one result that is apparent already is the growth of the native pasture grasses. In this area, we have had only a very negligible amount of rainfall in the last 6 months, but the grasses in the pastures which have been sprayed are still in excellent condition compared to the grasses in the pastures where no spraying was done. There are no weeds in the sprayed area, but the chemical apparently caused an abnormal growth of the grasses, which in our present dry state, is a most desirable situation. The cattle grazing on the sprayed area are in better flesh than the others although they are receiving less concentrates and no roughage, while I feed hay in my untreated pastures."

For sand sagebrush and skunkbrush other Texas sprayers are using 2,4-D in a butyl ester form, 1¼ pints of chemical in 3 gallons of diesel oil sprayed per acre. Some are making an emulsion, using 1¼ pints of the chemical to 1 gallon of diesel oil, plus 2 gallons of water.

HOW CATTLE GAIN

In October 1952, W. T. Thompson put 79 grade Angus and Hereford heifers on land near Branson, Mo., which had been sprayed in 1951. A fair native grass stand had developed in 1951 and seeded itself. A heavy stand grew in 1952 with a heavy seed crop. The calves were on the 320 acres until October 1, 1953, and were given no supplemental feed of any kind. It just happened to be one of the driest years in history, with half the normal rainfall, so grass and water were short. The calves were weighed 4 times during the year, and when they were sold after a year on the pasture, they had made an average gain of 354 pounds. "That figured out a gain per acre of 97.28 pounds of beef," says Thompson, "and calculated at 15 cents a pound, the gain value of beef per acre was $14.59. That was more than the land and the spraying cost. It gives you some idea what the food-producing possibilities are on the land that we are allowing to stay in brush."

The producers of the basic hormone chemicals used for brush killing are: American Chemical Paint Co., Diamond Alkali Co., Dow Chemical Co., Du Pont, Monsanto Chemical Co., Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical Co., Thompson Chemicals Corp., and Thompson Hayward.

Since the 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T hormones came out of the laboratories in 1945, the producers of the basic chemicals have spent much of their time in pushing their products in the big markets; power line rights-of-way, roadside and railroad rights-of-way, and industrial users. Now they are turning their attention to the still bigger United States farm brush-killing market where it is estimated there are nearly 250 million brushy acres in 48 States that could be put into useful production.

While much of the work with chemical land clearing has been done on large tracts in the Southwest, the methods can be used on Midwest farms just as easily. Both the basal-bark type of application and ground spraying of the foliage can be done with a small investment in equipment. The basal-bark treatment can be done at any time of the year and the foliage spraying can be fitted in between spring and summer jobs. Hot, sticky summer days when the humidity gets around 90 percent are ideal. To the farmer who has brush trees that are creeping into fields along fence lines, chemical spraying looks like a cheap and effective way to throw the rascals out.

Hurdle in Race to Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Hurdle in Race to Atomic Power," written by Dr. Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, United States Atomic Energy Commission, which appeared in the May 9, 1955, issue of Chemical and Engineering News:

HIGH TEMPERATURES: HURDLE IN RACE TO ATOMIC POWER

(By Willard F. Libby, Commissioner, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Fundamental knowledge of reactions at high temperatures is largely lacking. For the further development of atomic power, chemists and chemical engineers must turn their efforts principally to effects of elevated temperatures on materials for nuclear reactors.)

In most applications of chemistry in modern technology, the backlog of information available on performance at ordinary temperatures is adequate for preliminary estimates of the reactions which will be involved and preliminary selection of the materials and the procedures to be utilized. This is not true in atomic powerplants, because no adequate backlog of basic chemical information exists for elevated temperatures.

It is not possible to predict with any reliability the relative volatilities, thermodynamic free energies, or even the molecular formulas of the compounds which are likely to result from a given mixture of elements heated at temperatures between 500° and 1000° C. or above. Isolated portions of this great field have been mapped. In particular, geochemists in their studies of the reactions involved in the earth's crust have done a great deal. Also engineers developing jet engines, as well as several other groups in industry, have contributed sizable amounts of information. But the sweep of the whole field is so great, large areas exist where simply nothing is known. For example, problems of the solubilities at elevated temperatures of metals in salts, of gases in metals, and of gases in salts; of rates of chemical reactions proceeding at high temperatures; of relative densities, lattice structures, and the other physical properties of the various phases of almost any given compound at these temperatures—nearly all of these are without any general delineations.

In the face of this great ignorance, the chemist's and chemical engineer's role in

the design of power reactors will necessarily be a minor one, unless it be that of the gambler. He is in no position to sit down with the physicist and mechanical engineer and properly utilize his fair share of the design variables. He must guess rather blindly if asked about such matters as materials of construction or corrosion.

Early after the war we studied a pile that was to have been built with a beryllium oxide moderator and uranium oxide fuel elements. The idiosyncrasies of nature are such that this pile might have been volatilized by the coolant helium gas unless the gas had been purified to a high degree for both water vapor and air. During the course of the tests on this reactor beryllium oxide was found to be quite volatile in the presence of traces of moisture at elevated temperature, so that what appeared to be an excellent ceramic was indeed not one when small amounts of moisture were present. Similarly, it was found that small pressures of oxygen volatilize uranium oxide.

It is likely that similar unknown hazards exist for many of the power reactors now discussed. Yet chemists will be called in by the physicists and engineers to solve their corrosion problems and to cut fuel reprocessing costs after the design features have been set by nonchemical considerations. There have been many instances of failure of processes where one particular discipline has been far ahead of another. Now the underlying nuclear physical theory of reactors is so far ahead of our knowledge of the basic chemistry of processes and materials at high temperatures that it is easier to calculate with some certainty the physics of power reactors than to predict with any certainty whether reactors can be built of actual materials and can be expected to operate satisfactorily.

Aside from the reactors themselves, processing of fuels frequently would be improved by high temperature reactions, if they were known. It is likely that our ignorance of such reactions to a very considerable extent eliminates from consideration many possible fuel-processing procedures. We can expect that if we had a general foundation in chemistry and metallurgy at high temperatures comparable to the foundation we have at room temperature, we would be able to move with much more confidence in the selection of the materials of construction and even in the overall design of reactors. Thus it seems clear that atomic power needs the development of a broad-based body of fundamental chemical knowledge on systems at elevated temperatures.

AEC WILL SUPPORT ATTACK ON REACTOR CHEMISTRY PROBLEMS

It is to be hoped that adequate interest can be aroused so that the support which the Atomic Energy Commission certainly is willing to give can bear fruit soon. The chemists who have ben faced with the detailed practical problems of solving specific questions for specific reactors often long for the opportunity to make a broad attack on the particular questions at hand. Probably no one asked to study the corrosion of a given metal in a given system can do so without wondering what would have been the situation had a somewhat different metal been selected or conditions altered in various ways. Only by affording the opportunity for such variations can the best of the processes be selected and the best performance gotten out of any given process.

We urge that chemists throughout the country join in a broad program on the investigation of the chemistry and basic metallurgy of high temperature systems on an unclassified basis, the program to be pursued over a period of years with the thought in mind that in the not too distant future it will pay its way by solving some of the very critical problems of atomic power. Many people have said and many people understand that atomic power will never be at its cheapest until the best chemical processing is incorporated and utilized to the fullest extent. Homogeneous or fluidized reactors of various sorts have been proposed for the very reason that they bring chemical techniques to the fore.

Research programs of this sort are relatively inexpensive in terms of the moneys appropriated for the various reactor projects. The entire AEC program for the support of fundamental physical research, both in chemistry and physics, is less than $50 million per year. This is not a large amount compared to that spent on power reactors and the development of atomic power itself. Such a program therefore, should be economical and worth while.

How soon should dividends appear? They may be practically immediate, since many of the people involved will already have been saturated with the day-to-day problems of immediate importance. As soon as they start thinking in a more general way, they may see new solutions to their problems. The very change of attitude may in itself lead to solutions of their difficulties. However, even if this not be so, the accumulation of data and results, the meeting of minds, the cross fertilization of ideas, and the common accumulation of data to be collected and published in central places will lead to a great acceleration of the development of new materials and construction, new processes, and new procedures. There need not be any considerable delay, and within 2 years from the institution of such a program some of the first fruits may well be harvested.

FUNDAMENTAL STUDIES OF MATERIALS NEEDED FOR PRACTICAL DESIGN

To many the best way to be practicable is to be fundamental. For the practical application always requires pilot plants or confirmation by direct tests, which is always expensive and always time-consuming. If one is sure enough of the fundamentals, it sometimes is possible to eliminate pilot-plant testing and the extensive and lengthy conformatory corrosion tests which frequently are involved in atomic-power reactors.

For example, the fundamental study and understanding of the radiation decomposition of water has given us confidence that the extraordinarily favorable behavior of heavy water reactors up to the present will be the general experience in the future and that no cataclysmic new effect is likely to occur which will destroy or reduce the efficiency of operation of water moderated reactors. We understand that the radicals produced by the radiation decomposition of water have an extraordinary affinity to recombine. For this reason water is one of the most stable substances under radiation, and this is the reason—not good luck, not blind reliance on nature's good will—that we can use water moderated machines.

An example of bad luck might be gasoline moderated reactors. From all we know, they should be horrors for reasons of gumming and gassing under radiation.

Similar approaches to the problem of behavior of other materials will lead us to better interpretations of the effects of radiation on these materials. Understanding of volatilization properties of substances in various atmospheres will lead us to expect and predict such extraordinary things as the volatility of beryllia in the presence of moisture. We shall notice that this strange behavior is just another example of a broader principle. We shall understand why certain materials are corrosion-resistant and why others are not, and what the temperature coefficients of corrosion rates are likely to be. We shall not take it as an act of good fortune when we stumble upon a substance which actually can be used, nor have the disquieting feeling that one may discover tomorrow that some impurity can have a catalytic effect on the corrosion reaction which will lead to failure of the whole pile.

Imagine the difficulty of operating ordinary chemical processing plants without the great background of fundamental information which exists for ordinary temperatures. The whole of chemical industry would be impossible, and revert to the state of art of a century or more ago when developments were in the state in which modern cookery is today. One could not proceed with confidence without extensive testing and artistic examination of new situations. We must take atomic power reactors out of this darkness before we can hope that atomic power will be as competitive as it can be.

What needs to be done

These are typical of the problems posed by our present inadequate knowledge of high-temperature chemistry. They indicate the task of the chemist and chemical engineer in atomic development

Problem	Present status	Type of information needed
Solubility of gases in molten metals and diffusion of gases through solid metals.	Investigations have received considerable attention, yet knowledge is hardly adequate.	There appear to be no published studies on solubility of an unreactive gas in molten salt system.
Chemical reactions in fused salts.	Practically no single kinetic study available.	Detailed investigations of kinetics and mechanism would be desirable.
Thermochemical behavior of alkali and alkaline earth chlorides and fluorides.	Published estimates of free energy of formation of these materials show considerable lack of agreement.	Differences between estimates leave uncertain the electropotential order among such compounds.
Electrical conductivity of single molten salts.	Early investigations reported, but data are of doubtful accuracy.	Because densities often are not accurately known, reliable calculation of theoretically important equivalent conductance cannot be made. No clear understanding of behavior of complex ions exists. Data on temperature effects incomplete.
Surface effects in molten metals and salts.	Almost no recent work	Investigations of mixtures and effects of trace materials would be of importance. There are indications that considerable surface concentration of additives occurs in many molten salts, which may be significant in metal-liquid salt extraction equilibria.
Reversible electrodes for operation at high temperatures in molten salt media.	Development is possible in principle.	Such development could be used to study activities of components in molten salt mixtures and in liquid or even solid alloys.
Equilibria among molten alkali and alkaline earth metal chlorides.	Data available from various sources.	Without further information on compound formation and activities in molten salt or metallic state, these data cannot be interpreted thermochemically.

Appendix

The Public Interest in Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and as a followup to my original insertion in last Thursday's RECORD, I should like every Member of the House and the Senate to give attention to the concluding remarks of Mr. Roland V. Rodman on the natural-gas problem and the Harris bill, H. R. 6645:

THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN NATURAL GAS

(By Roland V. Rodman at the semiannual meeting of the National Petroleum Association, Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, April 15, 1955)

THE PUBLIC INTEREST

So far, I have given a résumé of the problem before us the better to enable you to see the necessity of arriving at a solution, for basically the problem is a problem that concerns every man, woman, and child in America, and the principles involved strike down our liberties as we have received them from our forebears.

It is unfortunate that some of the newspaper articles and a few of the politicians have attempted to treat this issue as a sectional division with the gas producers of the Southwest pitted against the consumers of the North and East. This is an entirely false conception. Gas is a public servant and the interest that all sections of the country have in gas must be treated as one entity. The gas producer of the Southwest is interested in getting a fair market price for his product. Only that will enable him to continue in business and to search for more gas. The consumer is interested in buying gas at a fair price and being assured of an adequate and continuous supply for the future. It is obvious that if the price is too high the consumer will turn to competing fuels and the gas producer will have no market. If the price is too low, no one will search for gas to replace our existing reserves and the consumers will soon be without a source of supply.

This danger is more real than imagined. Between 1947 and 1953, the consumption of gas doubled, yet the proven reserves increased by only one-third.

The question in this dispute is how should the price of gas be determined. Is it to be set by the free play of competition between suppliers seeking a market for their product either in interstate or intrastate sales, and where their future activities are retarded or stimulated by the natural law of supply and demand, or is a price to be set by Government agency irrespective of natural economic laws? And, if the price is to be set by a Government agency, shall it be so low as to freeze out all except the luckiest producer, or shall it be sufficiently high to give ample reward to the most inefficient producer, or is each producer to receive a different price for his gas, for if each is to be declared a public utility subject to regulation, then each is entitled to a price that will give a fair return upon his invested capital.

But if so, what is to be considered invested capital? Is it to be the fund spent in bringing in production from a producing gas well, or shall it include the delay rentals on acreage held in the hope that it will produce gas? Shall it include acres surrendered which were found to be nonproductive? Shall it include geophysical and geological expense that did not pay off? Shall it include all of the dry holes that were drilled prior to the finding of the producing well?

All of these costs vary with each individual and if individuals are to be declared public utilities, having a right to a fair return upon the investment, a hodgepodge results that would be impossible of administration.

I believe the answer is readily apparent that we cannot have the paralyzing hand of bureaucracy trying to regulate a business which is competitive, or which involves the extreme risks found in the production and gathering of natural gas.

In 1902, Russia had a thriving oil industry busily engaged in the development of the fields adjacent to the Caspian Sea, and pushing back frontiers for further exploration. They decided to protect the consumer by having the government regulate the operations of the business and have had a shortage of petroleum products ever since.

In the 1920's Mexico decided to protect the consumers' interest by having government control of oil and gas and from that date until 1952 Mexico was, on balance, an importer of petroleum products.

To you who are interested in the oil business, the effort of the Supreme Court to write social philosophy into the Phillips decision is a special danger, for the Commission already has before it in the administration of its order 174 the question of the regulation of the price of liquid products produced with gas.

Such an order would require an oil company selling casinghead gas at the wellhead to file an application for a certificate of public convience and necessity and become a natural-gas company, and to file its contracts of sale as a tariff covering its rates and charges as a natural-gas company.

Since almost two-thirds of the natural gas produced in this country is produced in connection with the production of crude oil or distillate, every oil company will find itself to be a natural-gas company.

Practically all casinghead gas contracts provide that the operator of the lease is to receive as the price of the gas at the well a percentage of the value of the products extracted from the casinghead gas, and either all or a part of the sale price of the residue gas.

Part of the liquids from a gas well may come from the field separator and be delivered in liquid form and part may come in the gaseous phase. The amount and market may vary from day to day.

For this reason the value or price at which gas is sold at the mouth of the well cannot be fixed for rate making purposes except by fixing at the same time the value or price of the liquid products, namely, gasoline, butane, and propane made from gas, and these products, especially gasoline, cannot effectively be fixed unless the price of crude oil, from which the vast preponderance of gasoline is made, is fixed. And, likewise, the value or price of one gasoline cannot be fixed unless the price of all are fixed, nor can the price of any product coming from both casinghead gas and crude oil be fixed unless the price of the remainder is fixed. Hence, a vicious chain reaction once in motion cannot be controlled without price fixing at every point.

We then find that the price of gas itself cannot be fixed unless the price of all competitive fuels are fixed for, if the price of gas be fixed too high, all use would be discontinued, and if fixed too low the value of competitive fuels would be destroyed.

However, here in Ohio where so many of the products used in the oil and gas industry are manufactured, such as steel, valves, fittings, cables, rubber products, meters, and gages, we have another problem arising. Only one-tenth of the cost of gas to the ultimate consumer is represented by the cost of gas at the wellhead. The remainder of the cost is in labor and materials necessary to deliver the gas to the burner tip. Much of this labor comes from Ohio. Many of these materials come from Ohio. The folly of trying to control one-tenth of the cost of a consumer item by price fixing is immediately apparent unless we control the factors that represent 90 percent of the cost of the gas at the burner tip. Such a result would outdistance the OPA, but the threat is nonetheless apparent. Every manufacturer in Ohio should be alerted to his peril.

The production, gathering, and supplying of gas to a public utility is no different than supplying any other basic supply to a public utility. We do not control the price of copper wire merely because the local power company uses it. We do not control the price of rails and crossties used by the railroad company. We do not control the wages in the steel mill merely because the product is to be used by a public utility and we cannot, without completely jeopardizing the future supplies of gas, make a special rule for the production and gathering of gas.

Since I am speaking to an audience of oilmen, I assume that most of you are well acquainted with this problem and share my concern about the future. Perhaps the question that interests you most is "What can we do about it." I think there is a great deal that we can do about it, particularly those of you who live in the consuming areas of this part of the country.

The most important thing that we can do is to use our natural talents of expression to clear up some of the misconceptions which have grown up around this subject. Many fallacies exist in the minds of the public, and from the questions asked at the congressional hearings on the Harris bill I think these fallacies are shared by many Members of Congress. Three of them that seem most obvious are the beliefs—

1. That the Harris bill will mean a removal of regulation;

2. That there is no competition in the production of natural gas; and

3. That it will be possible to regulate gas without regulating the fuels that compete with it.

The first of these seems to be widespread. It is amazing to me how many newspaper articles and speeches deal with this subject as though the pending legislation were an effort on the part of the producers to escape from some present regulation. The fact is, as we know, that the independent produc-

ers have not been regulated in the past and that the fair price which the consumers are enjoying today is the result of competition, not regulation.

It should be further pointed out that without regulation gas has done a better job of supplying the public than has been done by any other fuel. If we use the Bureau of Labor statistics and consider prices from 1935 to 1939 as equalling 100, we find that between 1938 and 1953 gas advanced from 94.3 to 99.6. Anthracite coal went from 99.3 to 233.4; bituminous coal from 101.8 to 212.9; No. 2 fuel oil went from 105.6 to 205.5. During this same period of time the cost of living advanced from 100.8 to 191.3, hence, it is demonstrated that competition and ingenuity within the industry has given to the public the finest and highest type of protection that could ever be obtained. Tinkering with success is not in the public interest.

The statement is frequently heard these days in Congress that the production and gathering of gas is a business which is controlled by a few producers. We are indebted to John Boatwright, Indiana Standard economist, for the painstaking analysis which he presented to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee a few weeks ago. He pointed out that two of the most important questions asked by economists to determine if competition exists within an industry are:

1. Is there freedom for others to enter the business?

2. What percentage of the total production is controlled by a few companies?

With respect to the first of these, Boatwright's study shows that there are so many producers entering the business that there is some difficulty in locating and identifying all of them. The study also shows another significant fact which is well known to most of us—there are many leaving the business who had desired to become producers, but didn't make the grade.

With respect to the concentration ratios, Boatwright's study compares the percentage of production controlled by the large producers of natural gas with the total production. His figures show that the largest 4 producers of natural gas produce only 17 percent of the total supply. The first 8 produce 28 percent, the first 20 produce 46 percent, and the first 50 produce 66 percent. He first compares with this other manufacturing industries and we find such things, for example, as the fact that in the production of cigarettes, the first 4 companies control 90.4 percent, and the first 8 control 99.7 percent. There are no figures for the first 20 because there aren't very many left after you get past the first 8. There are similar figures for a number of other manufacturing industries. A more significant comparison is the concentration ratio of natural gas as compared with other extractive industries. There we find, for example, that the first four copper producers produce 80 percent of the total supply. The first 8 produce 91 percent, and once again they have not bothered to compute the percentage of the first 20. If we can go down the line we find that even for anthracite coal, which was once the chief competitor of natural gas as a house-heating fuel, the first 4 producers control 41 percent, as compared with the 17 percent controlled by the first 4 natural gas producers. The first 8 producers of anthracite coal control 60 percent of the total as compared to 28 percent for natural gas. As a matter of fact, in all of the extractive industries we find only one with a lower concentration ratio than natural gas. This is bituminous coal, which is ordinarily regarded as an extremely widely held industry. And even in this case we find that the first 4 producers of bituminous coal control 16 percent—only 1 percent less than the first 4 producers of natural gas. The same ratio holds true all the way down the line. The first 50 producers of bituminous coal control 53 percent of the supply, not far below the first 50 producers of natural gas, who control 66 percent of the supply.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion permit me to say that the liberties that we enjoy in America are liberties that have come to us as a heritage. They must be protected and defended. These liberties were purchased by our forebears at the expense of life and blood and only vigilance will preserve them.

Our forebears wisely provided for a system of checks and balances in our Government. They wisely provided for the division of power and responsibility as between the legislative, judicial, and executive departments. It was not until the thirties that the philosophy of packing courts to procure judicial opinions to reflect new social philosophies was first advocated. Some of the members of the present Court are products of that era.

In the instant case, Congress clearly said that the Federal Power Commission should not have the power to regulate the production and gathering of gas. It was within the exclusive power of the legislative department of the Government to make such a declaration. Irrespective of the social viewpoint of the Court as to the desirability of having the Federal Power Commission regulate the production and gathering of gas, Congress had denied the right, and for 16 years all agencies of the Government had respected the wisdom of the congressional declaration. The judiciary has now seen fit to trespass upon the sphere of government exclusively reserved to the legislative branch.

Congress should now pass the Harris bill, reasserting their original legislative intent, and serving notice upon the judiciary that when new and additional powers are to be given to governmental departments they will be given by congressional action and not by judicial fiat.

We have a second principle that we should be mindful of. It is that from the days of the Children of Israel down through the Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights there has been a continuing struggle for individual liberty and freedom of enterprise, and it was only when those principles were finally established that the philosophy of mass protection or so-called mass welfare was cast aside and the rights of the individual gained ascendancy. This spirit, engrossed in the Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, continued to dominate throughout the French Revolution, our own revolution, and expanded everywhere until about the close of the First World War.

We then saw a great tendency to withdraw from individual liberty and freedom of enterprise back to the paternalistic state. We saw the Scandinavian countries go socialistic. Russia, Germany, and Italy had new central governments dedicated to the philosophy that the government could do better for the people than the people could do for themselves. We saw a socialistic government come to England and England from that day until this has been wavering as between individual liberty and freedom of enterprise, or taking one last step into so-called mass security.

We have seen liberty advance to great heights in many, many countries, but we have seen liberty pass from many, many countries, for liberty has never survived when the people of a nation reached the point of believing that the government, as such, could do better for the people than the people could do for themselves.

The step that has been taken on the natural gas question is a new innovation in a free government. It is the entering wedge of the philosophy that in a competitive, nonmonopolistic enterprise such as the production and gathering of gas the government can do better for the people than tough competitive forces from within the industry and competitive fuels from without the industry have done. This step has within it the seed that has destroyed many governments. I plead with you to protect and defend your heritage that your children and your children's children may not be deprived of the blessings of individual liberty and freedom of enterprise.

Other nations have resources in excess of ours. Other nations have populations in excess of ours. It is our form of government that has made us great. We have gained our strength through individual liberty and freedom of enterprise. Let us cherish, protect, and defend them. They have done well by us. Let us do well by them.

Strengthening the Reins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, June 17. This editorial points out the fact that Peron's aim in Argentina was not separation of church and state, but subjugation of the church to the state. It is apparent that no institution, no person, no group, will be allowed to gain enough strength in that country to present any substantial opposition, morally or physically, to this ruthless dictator.

The editorial follows:

REVOLT IN ARGENTINA

The uprising in Argentina, as this is written, appears to have been suppressed. The army and Peron's workers seem to have held against the navy and air force. Two things are clear: that President Peron deliberately provoked revolt by his treatment of the church, and that the armed forces can anticipate complete control by the Peron group if the President holds power.

Peron has made it plain that his aim was not merely separation of church and state, but subjugation of the church to the state. His deportation of two Catholic prelates (which was characteristically described as a flight by the Peronist press) was done without trial or form of law, as if to demonstrate that no churchman can exercise his functions except by the will of the government.

For the armed forces, the moral is plain. The Catholic Church had supported the Peron regime. So did the army. But like the church, the armed forces were an obstacle to complete authoritarian rule. Peron repeatedly purged his officer corps, but if the army, navy and air force should turn against him, he knew its intervention might be decisive.

Consequently, he has built up the police as a kind of private army and at the same time encouraged the formation of organized mobs among the workers. It is notable that in his recent speech, Peron urged these groups to stand ready, and to cooperate with the police. The next step would be to abolish the army as such and to rest the regime upon a workers' militia, such as has been created in Bolivia. Then there would be no strong institution in Argentina which did

not owe its existence to Juan Peron. It would be a dictatorship of the proletariat, with Peron dictating to the proletariat.

In striking back at Peron for his treatment of the church, the revolutionaries have also been fighting for self-preservation. If their failure proves complete, no one can predict where Peron's course may lead. It might well take him to Moscow.

The Case Against Natural Gas Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert a very interesting editorial from the June 16, 1955, issue of the Chicago Daily Sun-Times, which forcefully and intelligently argues the case against the control by the Federal Government of gas at the wellhead, where it is taken from the ground.

Since the Harris bill which will soon come before the Congress for consideration would remove such controls, the strong stand this newspaper has taken should be of interest to the Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

THE CASE AGAINST NATURAL GAS CONTROL

In Illinois there are more than 1,740,000 homes that use gas for cooking or heating purposes. A large number of Illinoisans should therefore be interested in a question now before Congress: Should the Federal Power Commission regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead, where it is taken from the ground?

For many years it assumed that Congress should no more set the price at which gas should be sold at the well than it should regulate the price of coal, iron, etc., at the mine. Such prices in this country always have been set by the play of supply, demand, and competition at the market place.

Last June, however, the United States Supreme Court declared that by the 1938 Natural Gas Act, Congress really intended that there be Federal regulation of independent natural-gas producers. Justices Douglas, Clark, and Burton dissented. The Federal Power Commission, which 11 times previously had ruled it had no power to fix prices at the field, thereupon reluctantly took over and froze prices and prohibited changes without Commission approval. This had never occurred before in peacetime.

Efforts were immediately undertaken to clarify the intention of Congress. A bill is now pending specifically to exempt natural-gas producers from Federal control, restoring conditions to the 1938-1954 status. It was approved 16 to 15 last week by the House Commerce Committee. Backed by President Eisenhower, Chairman Jerome K. Kuykendall of the Federal Power Commission has urged its passage.

The city of Chicago, through Special Assistant Corporation Counsel Joseph F. Grossman, has opposed the bill. Grossman claims that consumers must be protected against price increases and says the responsibility for gas price increase in Chicago in recent years must be borne primarily by unregulated producers. Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, also opposes the bill. We favor it.

The fact is that the price paid to the producer of gas is a small part of the price paid by the consumer. Out of each $1 paid on a gas bill by the Chicago consumer, only 8.6 cents goes to independent producers in the field. The rest goes for cost of transporting the gas to Chicago, for distribution to Chicago customers, and mixing in about 8 percent of manufactured gas.

Because of the great increase in gas consumption here, average cost to homeowners actually decreased by about 7 percent from 1945 to 1954, while the cost of living increased more than 50 percent.

Competition works to keep prices low at the wellhead just as competition works to keep any price low. Without controls, retail gas prices nationally went up only 8 percent from 1938 to 1953. According to Dr. Robert E. Wilson, board chairman of Standard Oil of Indiana, gas has gone up far less than any other fuel and "is the biggest bargain in this category."

"Those who favor controls," says Wilson, "have yet to prove that without them, this pattern of moderate rise will be shattered."

Wilson answers the argument of price controllers that a monopoly exists in the gas-well industry. There are 8,000 producers. The 4 top companies in each of 382 other industries have greater concentration of control of output than natural-gas production has. If natural-gas production is monopolistic, he says, then practically every other industry in the Nation is equally or more so.

Regulation of gas producers for conservation purposes long has been left up to the States. Federal regulation, besides being, as Wilson says, a step toward socialism, would substantially interfere with sound State regulatory measures covering production, pricing, etc. We believe consumers will be better off if Congress passes H. R. 6645 to restore free enterprise in the field and to exempt independent producers from control.

Iowa Leads Nation's Top 200 Counties in Cash Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman:

IOWA LEADS NATION'S TOP 200 COUNTIES IN CASH FARM INCOME

Forty-five Iowa counties dominate the ranking of 200 counties which lead the Nation in gross cash income from farming, the Iowa Development Commission announces.

The commission reports that the May 10 Survey of Buying Power, published by Sales Management magazine, shows more Iowa counties represented in the 1954 estimates than any other State.

The 45 Iowa counties listed, according to cash farm income, are:

Pottawattamie, Sioux, Plymouth, Clinton, Kossuth, Woodbury, Cherokee, Cedar, Benton, Tama, Jones, O'Brien, Crawford, Linn, Franklin, Buena Vista, Johnson, Jasper, Sac, Shelby, Hamilton, Lyon, Marshall, Washington, Clay, Hardin, Story, Black Hawk, Page, Fayette, Pocahontas, Grundy, Webster, Dallas, Wright, Ida, Hancock, Carroll, Scott, Boone, Iowa, Clayton, Dubuque, Delaware and Palo Alto.

TWENTY-TWO AND FIVE-TENTHS PERCENT

These 45 Iowa counties constitute 22.5 percent of the top 200 counties in the United States. According to Sales Management's estimates for 1954, they account for $1,359,551,000 or 16.8 percent of the total gross cash farm income produced by the leading 200 counties.

Illinois and California, States that are usually contenders for top honors in farm income, were outranked completely by Iowa in the number of counties listed for each. Illinois accounted for only 29 of the leading counties, California but 27.

Last year's Survey of Buying Power showed Iowa in the lead, also, with 35 counties listed.

Sales Management says that the measure of farm income which appears to have the greatest use in marketing is "gross dollars from farming," since this figure "measures the sum total available to the farm population for expenditures on the entire range of goods and services required for either consumption or production."

Holes in Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the warning contained in the following column by Hanson W. Baldwin, which appered in the New York Times of Friday, June 17, 1955, deserves careful consideration:

HOLES IN CIVIL DEFENSE—AN OPINION THAT TESTS MERELY POINT UP WEAKNESSES ACCENTUATED BY H-BOMBS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The current national civil defense test merely emphasizes weaknesses already known and underscored needs long apparent.

Selective evacuation of target areas, gradual dispersion and decentralization of industry and population, construction of private and public shelters, greater participation by trained military personnel in civil defense and tighter Federal-State-interstate direction and control of all activities have been the needs since civil defense activities have started.

They have not changed. Rather, they have merely become far more acute since the development of thermonuclear weapons and discernment of the problem of radioactive fallout.

The current tests may do little good if they merely serve to dramatize weaknesses long known. A mixture of public and Government apathy and ineffective leadership has handicapped civil defense planning. Neither has yet been eliminated. Nothing much will be accomplished until the majority of the public shows an energetic and active interest in serving and until vigorous and insistent leadership is given by the President.

OBSTACLES FROM THE PUBLIC

Public attitudes—certainly shared by Congress, which has persistently and insistently reduced appropriations for Federal civil defense—have been one of the biggest obstacles. On the one hand the public appears to believe that it can't happen here. On the other hand, there is a certain fatalistic philosophy that if it does happen, we can't do anything about it, so why try?

There is also, of course, the usual willingness of the average man to allow the few to worry about and to shoulder the problems that will affect the many. He tends to leave the solution to his leaders and to await orders.

These attitudes cannot be overcome except by the most vigorous type of leadership, perhaps implemented by compulsion.

But, given this leadership some of the problems that now seem insurmountable in civilian defense can be overcome and in overcoming them we strengthen the chances that "it won't happen here."

The problem of military participation in civilian defense, for instance, is one that can be solved.

Today, military participation is nominal. "Available" units would be utilized, the plans declare, to assist civilian-defense authorities. But none of these units, Regulars, Reserves, or National Guard is trained or organized, equipped, or prepared to meet the terrible problems of an atom-bombed city. Yet martial law would be the rule and not the exception if our major target areas should be bombed with atomic weapons.

TRAINING IS LIMITED

Today our military forces, active and reserve, are trained, organized, and equipped for the combat battlefield, not for civilian defense. They know little about fighting fire-storms, little about traffic control or riot action.

The field kitchens they use will feed their own units and some hundreds more but are in no sense adequate for the mass feeding of hundreds of thosands of refugees. Their equipment is field equipment. There are few fire trucks, scaling ladders, heavy mobile cranes, specialized equipment for civilian defense.

And, above all, their mobilization day assignment, the assignment for which they would be earmarked throughout the duration of all hostilities and perhaps before and after, is not civil defense. They are on call, virtually all of them, for the combat battlefield, and hence their availability for civilian defense use is entirely unpredictable.

The old and vexing problem of the dual Federal-State status of the National Guard is one aspect of the problem that has been smudged. It has been said that, since the guard is under call from the governor of a State, it would be available at his orders for civil-defense duties. But every guard unit has a Federal mobilization day assignment and once the guard is federalized, the governor no longer has control.

It is quite possible that the most serious threat of nuclear attack would come not at the start of any war, when each side because of fear of retaliation might exercise restraint, but later when one adversary was losing on the conventional battlefield. But at such a time, months or years later nearly all our National Guard and Reserve units would be federalized and in combat abroad or in training camps in the United States.

What is clearly needed is the allocating, organizing, training, and equipping of National Guard, Reserves, or State militia units for civil-defense duties only. Such units would have to include able-bodied men, possibly above the age of 35, but possibly including some draft-age personnel. Their availability at all times for civil-defense duties only is the prime requirement, their organization a necessity.

Little Blue Schoolhouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, well deserves the praise set forth on the editorial page of yesterday's New York Times. She calls to our attention a tragic situation. I cannot understand why the gentlemen in question really object. There is apparently something more than meets the eye. Mrs. ST. GEORGE is attempting to get to the heart of an incredible situation. Congratulations to her and to the New York Times for calling it to the attention of the American public.

The editorial follows:

LITTLE BLUE SCHOOLHOUSE

Representative KATHARINE PRICE COLLIER ST. GEORGE, Republican, of Tuxedo Park, N. Y., who so far as we know has never in her life been accused of radicalism, put some timorous souls of the House Appropriations Committee in their place the other day with these remarks:

"Some of us have said so often, and so loudly, that we disapproved of book burning, of censorship, and all other evils that would shackle the human mind and spirit. Now we are taking a history of our country * * * and because it is not a Pollyanna primer for backward children, because it mentions duststorms and includes an excerpt from Thoreau * * * we say it cannot be sent abroad. This would be funny, if it were not tragic. * * * That such a book should be banned is, at worst, great comfort to our enemies. * * * At best, it shows that we are not yet adult in our thinking."

The book in question, called Profile of America, is an effort to present the story of our country from the Vikings to the present day through copious illustrations and excerpts from the writings, speeches, and documents of our people. It has a foreword by Charles A. Lindbergh and an introduction by Louis Bromfield. The book was so popular in American libraries abroad that the United States Information Service asked for funds to distribute some 200,000 copies of it in translation, entirely for foreign consumption. But "No," said some members of the House Appropriations Committee, notably one JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York. Not this book. "No," said MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio. It is "objectionable * * * obnoxious * * * not representative of American life and ideals." Why not? Emily Davie, compiler of the volume (which received excellent reviews in this and many other newpapers) tried to find out.

She reports that one member of the committee thought the father-and-son scene from Ah! Wilderness and an extract from Walden might be misinterpreted overseas, the one for being obscene, the other damaging. One Congressman thought that a photograph of a little red schoolhouse, built 1750, should not have been included because the Communists might say this represents the American school system (though it was followed by pictures of a modern high school and of Harvard University). We wonder if the Congressman would have objected if the schoolhouse had been blue. Miss Davie said she was told that a graphic shot of a dust-storm in Colorado should be deleted because it was bad propaganda, though she also included pictures of beautifully cultivated fields.

What kind of puerility is this? And, furthermore, what kind of interference with the work of the Information Agency itself? Is Congress to pass on every book, to censor every publication? Sensibly, the Senate has restored practically all the funds cut by the House in the Agency's program for distribution of books overseas. We hope the restoration will be sustained in conference. It will, if Congressmen realize that our country is great enough so that the best propaganda that can be made for it is a truthful picture of America.

Strawberry Project Turns Arid Land Into Rich Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, we shall shortly be considering and voting on the Colorado River storage project, a reclamation project in my own State and our neighboring States of Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. One of the important questions in determining the value of such a project is: Do reclamation projects pay for themselves—do they produce more than they cost?

I think the best way to determine this is to look at reclamation projects already in existence. There, we have the proof right before our eyes.

I am inserting a reprint of an article recently published in a newspaper in my State. It discusses the Strawberry project, the oldest reclamation project in Utah and one of the oldest in the Nation. As you will see, the Strawberry project has benefited a great many people in a great many ways and added substantially to the economy of the State, the region, and the Nation:

STRAWBERRY PROJECT TURNS ARID LAND INTO RICH AREA

(By Edwin O. Haroldsen)

Federal reclamation projects are no pork barrel schemes to squander the taxpayers' money.

They are wealth-creating, self-liquidating investments.

The Strawberry Valley project is a fine example. It's the oldest one in Utah, one of the first in the Nation.

It cost $3,348,518.92 to build a 3.75-mile tunnel and other structures needed to divert into southern Utah County water which used to waste into the Colorado River Basin on the other side of the Wasatch Mountains.

Measured by projects built in recent years, the Strawberry isn't a huge one.

But it is extremely significant for a number of reasons.

Today more than 80 percent of its cost has been repaid by water users—farmers from Springville to Payson and beyond.

It's expected that in another 10 years every cent the United States Government spent will have been returned to the Federal Treasury.

Thanks to the Strawberry Reservoir, which can hold 270,000 acre-feet of water, 45,000 fertile acres are now safeguarded against drought. About half of them were reclaimed from the desert, the other half given a full supply of water.

"We've got 2 year's supply in the reservoir," explained R. E. Huber, secretary-treasurer of the Strawberry Water Users Association.

"The snow falling this year is going toward our 1957 supply."

Crop output and per acre farm income spiraled on lands getting supplemental water. New farms were created as water reclaimed land never before irrigated. The community of Genola sprang into existence west of Payson on what once had been desert.

Land values doubled in a year. Business boomed throughout the area. Bank deposits quadrupled in 9 years. The assessed valuation of the southern end of the county jumped from $6,271,000 in 1911 to $30,558,000 in 1920, most of the increase being attributable to the Strawberry project.

New crops like onions, string beans, tomatoes, peas, lima beans, carrots, cabbage, squash, lettuce seed, and grapes were grown.

The acreage in fruit increased from 122 acres in 1916 to 1,343 in 1945. Fruit income jumped from $6,362 to $431,435 during the same period.

Albert Swenson, 82-year-old retired Spanish Fork rancher and farmer, puts it this way:

"Before the Strawberry project was finished we used to get one crop of alfalfa on the east bench—and that was it. During a year like last year we'd have burned up."

There's another thing Strawberry Reservoir has done, too. It's created some of the finest lake fishing in the State.

The reservoir, paid for by farmers' crop and livestock sales, also serves as a Federal game bird sanctuary for waterfowl and sage hens.

Utah could use a lot more Strawberry projects.

As a matter of fact, the Strawberry story will be duplicated—only on a much larger scale—when the units of the upper Colorado River storage program are built.

More than 200,000 acres of desert or poorly watered land would benefit. The effect on the State's economy would be tremendous.

And, as in the case of the Strawberry project, Uncle Sam would get every penny of his investment back—plus interest in the form of increased national wealth and taxes, and prosperous people.

A Refugee Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky:

A REFUGEE SPEAKS

(By George Sokolsky)

Dr. Otto Nathan took refuge in the United States from the Nazis, became a professor of economics at New York University, was named by Albert Einstein as his executor, and has been fighting the State Department in the courts because it has refused to grant him a passport to travel in Europe. Thus far, he has not disclosed what he has done with Einstein's ashes and there is a suspicion among some that his current compulsion to go to Europe has something to do with the disposition of the final remains of the philosopher.

In the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail of February 10, I find a report of a speech Dr. Nathan delivered in that city. One paragraph followed almost word for word the statements of a Communist I listened to in Lewisham, outside of London, during the recent elections in England. Dr. Nathan said in Charleston:

"The United States is the leader of Western countries establishing military bases all around the U. S. S. R., and that is why the Russians consider us the chief offenders in the cold war."

He placed the United States in the category of imperialistic nations:

"We (the United States) had no business interfering in the struggle of the shoeless and economically distressed people of Guatemala—it was a popular uprising of the native people—some of which may be Communists."

Dr. Otto Nathan, as a person, is not of tremendous significance. His influence in this country has been scant. His name emerged when Einstein died. One can pass over such statements as the private opinion of an individual, an opinion to which he is entitled in a free country. Let him speak. Let him join all sorts of organization. The United States survives all this and more.

But I am often puzzled by the phenomenon that so many of those to whom we gave sanctuary in the days when Hitler was murdering his opposition, show so little gratitude for what was done for them. It must be true that thousands of refugees are grateful, but so few of them ever give expression to their emotions while such cases as these are glaring examples of ingratitude:

Oscar Lange, who became a professor at Chicago University, turned on this land of freedom, denounced it, renounced his American citizenship, became the Communist Polish representative here, was sent by Poland to the United Nations, and now has disappeared from public view.

The brothers, Hanns and Gerhardt Eisler, were admitted into this country as refugees. Gerhardt was a spy. He escaped from the United States and was set up in East Germany to conduct a violent and untruthful propaganda in Europe against the country that gave him a home when he was in physical peril.

Thomas Mann is one of the most distinguished writers in all the world. We gave him and his family sanctuary. As soon as it was safe for him, he moved to Red German territory as a respite from dwelling in America. He has not spoken well of us since.

These are but five examples of ingratitude. Many more can be cited, but they are mostly among the so-called great minds that seek a special status as superior to other men in a land where an employee of the department of sanitation is equal in the eyes of the law, and, in a manner, socially, to a professor in a university. Is that wrong?

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. One of the most important matters under consideration in this session is the question of increasing the minimum wage. I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a resolution on this vital issue which was proposed by Councilman Michael DeMartino and adopted by the City Council of Elizabeth, N. J., on June 9:

Whereas Congress enacted the national wage-hour law providing a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour in 1938 and requiring time and one-half for all hours worked in intrastate commerce over 8 hours per day and 40 hours per week; and

Whereas this was increased to 75 cents an hour in 1949, without any difficulty to industry, but with great benefit to the lowest paid workers in America; and

Whereas the 75 cents an hour minimum, which amounts to only $30 gross per 40-hour week, is now entirely inadequate to maintain a minimum American standard of living; and

Whereas since 1949 industrial wages of organized workers generally have increased by more than 40 cents an hour, making it imperative that the lowest-paid, least-protected workers in our economy receive similar increases; and

Whereas the 75 cents an hour minimum wage permits employers in the low-wage southern areas of the United States to compete unfairly with the employers in Northern States, causing plants to migrate from New Jersey to the low-wage areas, thereby causing unemployment in New Jersey and wiping out employment opportunities for thousands of workers in our State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the governing body of Elizabeth hereby urges an immediate increase in the Federal minimum wage to at least $1.25 an hour and that the coverage of that law include all workers engaged in intrastate commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That New Jersey Members of Congress be urged to sponsor and secure enactment of legislation to bring this about; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Eisenhower, Governor Meyner, Senators Smith and Case, and the 14 New Jersey Congressmen, and to Secretary of Labor James Mitchell.

Nassau County—A Banner County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be the Representative of a county that is young and vigorous, filled with life and spirit. The following article, written by our very capable treasurer, H. Bogart Seaman, which appeared in the Long Island Daily Press on June 17, 1955, gives a few facts on some of Nassau County's accomplishments:

FACTS AND FIGURES ABOUT NASSAU COUNTY

(By H. Bogart Seaman, Nassau County Treasurer)

Nassau County is the second youngest county in New York State and now has the largest population of any county outside of New York City.

Nassau's population is greater than that of 15 States and more than the combined total of Delaware, Vermont, and Wyoming.

There are more dogs licensed in Nassau (76,813) than there are people living in Atlantic City, N. J., or Galveston, Tex.

There are 2½ times as many motor vehicles registered in Nassau County (404,657) as there are people in Nevada.

County government costs the average homeowner less per day than a quart of milk, a pack of cigarettes, or a round trip on a New York City subway. Less than 18 cents per day on a home assessed at $5,000.

Total taxes on the same home are less than $1 a day in most communities. As an example, in Cedarhurst, the total is 88 cents daily—school 41 cents, county 18 cents, village 17 cents, police 6 cents, and garbage collection 6 cents.

Of the four largest towns in the State, according to the 1950 census, Hempstead was first, North Hempstead second, and Oyster Bay fourth.

The same census shows Nassau to be the home of New York's 3 largest incorporated villages, with Hempstead at the top; Valley Stream and Freeport are in the number 2 and 3 spots respectively.

Every taxpayer should appreciate the volunteer firemen. A paid countrywide fire department could easily add 15 percent to our tax bills.

Here's a stackfull of facts on growth. In 1946, school district 5 in the town of Hemp-

stead had an assessed valuation of $3 million; a school budget of $22,500, and an average daily attendance of 35 pupils. For the school year 1954–55 the assessed valuation stood at $63 million, the budget at $4,804,831.

The average attendance was 10,752—and for comparison, the assessed valuation in this 1 school district is 3 times that of all of Nassau County when it was formed in 1899, and the school attendance there equals 20 percent of Nassau's entire original population.

School, county, town, and special district taxes last year were $100,874,095. By the year end, there were no accounts receivable—every collectible item was paid and in the till.

How about this for an investment? The 820 acres originally acquired for Nassau County Park cost $190,000. Today this same property is worth over $16 million.

Needed—A Regional Air Network

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Needed—A Regional Air Network," which appeared in the March 25, 1955, issue of the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times.

The editorial follows:

NEEDED—A REGIONAL AIR NETWORK

The continuing dissatisfaction with the Civil Aeronautics Board's disposition of Route 106 through Iowa and Illinois points up the fact that the Federal authority should reexamine its pattern of regional air service.

Route 106, which extends from Sioux City through Waterloo, Dubuque and Rockford to Chicago, was broken up by a recent CAB decision. Once operated by the Mid-Continent lines, it eventually was acquired by Braniff. Now Braniff, Ozark Airlines and United Airlines all are to serve some of the stations if the Government does not reconsider the case as urged by the dissatisfied airlines operators.

The flying of such a route is a local service, and should be handled as such, not as a part of a transcontinental line which is preoccupied by larger interests. Where the route assigned wholly to a company which has developed as a local service carrier, the best interest of both the company and the passengers would be served. The operation would be more profitable for the airline, and air travelers between these regional points would find their convenience, comfort and safety were not secondary to those of transcontinental passengers.

Taking an even longer point of view, CAB should consider the benefits which would accrue from fostering well-integrated regional operations by local service carriers. Eventually, it likely would be desirable to relate the operations of Route 107 to those of Route 106. Stations on Route 107 include Des Moines, Ottumwa, Burlington, Galesburg, Peoria and Chicago.

Operations on these two routes well might mesh, too, with those of Ozark on the new Davenport-Chicago line. Then, logically, arrangements should be made to integrate service on a route extending from Davenport through Cedar Rapids, Dubuque and Rochester to Minneapolis and St. Paul.

It would be in cultivating such a net of air accommodations that the Civil Aeronautics Board would be serving its full function.

Father Walsh Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the editorial Father Walsh Retires appearing in the Washington Post of June 20, 1955, is a fitting tribute to a great priest and a great American.

There are few men in the life of our Nation who have wielded greater influence of a spiritual and constructive nature than has Father Walsh.

I am proud of the fact that Father Walsh was born in South Boston, Mass., located in my congressional district.

Many years ago, when few in America heeded him, Father Walsh saw the coming danger of atheistic communism, and on many occasions warned our people.

The wonderful life of Father Walsh is an example for all to follow.

I am pleased to include in my remarks the editorial appearing in the Washington Post:

FATHER WALSH RETIRES

The retirement of the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh from active direction of Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service marks the end of an era for this important institution. Foreseeing the increasing need for men and women specially trained for service abroad, Father Walsh founded the School of Foreign Service 35 years ago. From that time to the present he had continuously served as its regent, although he often took time out for many other activities and he has long been vice president of Georgetown University. Many of the country's able diplomats have been trained under his guidance. The School of Foreign Service now enrolls about 1,000 students a year in addition to several hundred attending its affiliate, the Institute of Languages and Linguistics.

Father Walsh's influence as an educator has also extended far beyond the training of diplomats and business administrators for overseas service. He has been an active figure in the community and a lecturer and writer whose views have been heard in many parts of the land and in foreign countries. In 1922 he headed the Papal Relief Mission to Russia, and what he saw of the man-made famine in that land left a deep impression upon him. He became an indefatigable student of the Bolshevist revolution and lectured widely on the subject years before the menace of international communism was generally recognized.

After World War II, Father Walsh served as an adviser to Justice Jackson in the prosecution of war criminals at Nuremberg. On various occasions the Holy See has given him assignments of great importance in Iraq, Japan, and other countries. His books on communism, geopolitics, and other subjects have been widely read. His learning and his persuasive manner made him a real power in the educational field. It is a matter of keen regret to his many friends that illness has now forced him to assume a relatively inactive role as regent emeritus of the School of Foreign Service. The school is fortunate to have Father Walsh's executive assistant, the Reverend Frank L. Fadner, carry on as regent.

Immigration Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by E. F. Tompkins:

IMMIGRATION POLICY—A HISTORIC NECESSITY
(By E. F. Tompkins)

This campaign to "liberalize" the immigration laws is a dangerous anachronism. It is an attempt to apply obsolete nineteenth-century ideas to inescapable twentieth-century conditions.

America had a historic task in the nineteenth century. That task was to populate 1.4 billion acres of virgin land, to found 40,000 local communities, to improve 6 million farms, to establish 200,000 factories, and to lay 200,000 miles of railroads. The task was accomplished within the century, partly by means of immigration.

The Federal census shows that immigration ranged upward from 8,385 persons in 1820, the first statistical year, to a peak of 788,993 in 1882. After 1882, with the Nation virtually physically completed, the trend was downward. In 1890, the arival figure had fallen to 455,302, and it remained far below the apex of 1882 until 1903.

WELCOMED HOMESTEADERS

In the first 62 years of recorded immigration, there were few complications.

The immigrants came mostly from north and west Europe. Either they spoke English or acquired the language readily. They understood instinctively our institutions. And they were easily assimilated into citizenship.

Moreover, there was ample room for homesteaders. During the period 1820 to 1890, thousands of Europeans joined the great American trek into the interminable territories of the Louisiana Purchase, of Texas, and of the Far West, where good land awaited them.

But the West became settled. The historian Frederick Jackson Turner fixed the year 1890 as the time when "the last frontier" was closed. The date is significant—Ellis Island was opened in 1890. And Ellis Island was a symbol: for, after 1882, both the character of immigration and its domestic consequences had radically changed.

Immigration from northeastern Europe had diminished greatly; immigration from other areas had multiplied; and the altered flow of alien peoples had introduced large differences and difficulties in language, education, social customs, and political attitudes. Many of the newcomers kept their faces turned toward the old world.

REVERSE "URBAN DRIFT"

Moreover, as the "great open spaces" which once beckoned pioneers became filled, the new immigrants congregated more and more in the cities. There they were joined by thousands of native migrants, a reverse "urban drift" of population away from the farms having set in, due to heavy industrialization and to mechanizations of agriculture. After 1882, the cities began to congest; slums began to spread; employment troubles began to appear; and labor organizations began to demand rigid exclusion acts.

The turn of the century then brought a tremendous upsurge in immigration from eastern and southern Europe. In 1 year—1905—more than a million immigrants were admitted, and that figure was exceeded in 5 other years before World War I.

The 20th century found us an inhabited country undergoing a vast influx of

immigration for which an economic basis no longer existed.

The inevitable result of 20th-century conditions was restricted and selective immigration legislation which 19th-century "liberalism" now wants repealed.

Revolt in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, June 17, concerning the most unfortunate situation in Argentina. As the Times implies, some good may come out of the chaotic events of the past week—Juan Peron may be deposed. The editorial follows:

THE ARGENTINE DRAMA

Yesterday was a day of high drama in Argentina—a military revolt and the excommunication by the Holy See of President Peron and other Government leaders.

The uprising was widespread enough to induce caution in drawing any conclusions, despite the Government claims of victory. At the same time one can see the elements of Peron's strength in this event. What is less evident, because it does not seem to have yet had a chance to manifest itself, is the profound disaffection with the regime among the Argentine people. The appearances are almost to the contrary, but one should not be misled.

When the General Confederation of Labor (CGT) called a protest strike on Tuesday against the Catholic demonstrations of last Sunday, and when the "descamisados" (the shirtless workers) were called up again to the Plaza de Mayo in Buenos Aires yesterday to defend Peron, there was, of course, a considerable turnout. This does not mean that the workers as a whole are eager to fight for Peronism. There was the same appearance of labor support in September, 1951, during the last previous military revolt, but an analysis later showed that there was serious opposition in the labor ranks. Since then, voting in factories and local organizations for trade union leaders has shown a decided trend against Peron. The leaders of the C. G. T. are Peronist stooges and they have a cadre of trained activists. It is always possible to call up a large number of workers, but many of these men are reluctant, and the great mass of them just stay away.

The loyalty—or at least the discipline—of the army yesterday was much more significant, although there, too, one must await a deeper analysis. Peron has been clever in removing officers who could threaten his position, in scattering army units and keeping them apart from their munitions and motor fuel, and generally in breaking the power of the army. However, yesterday it was the navy and air force, not the army, that rose, and these are relatively unknown quantities.

It could not have been the excommunication that sparked yesterday's event, because there was not enough time between the announcement and the revolt, but there can be no doubt that Peron's attack on the Roman Catholic Church was an ultimate cause of the uprising. There, again, we are dealing with a complex as well as confused situation. The antipathy for the regime in the armed forces and among civilians is deep. However, the only link that one can see between the military and the religious elements at the moment is that there is a deep sense of shame and anger which could have induced some military officers to act.

Argentines have a profound sense of national pride and dignity. The way Peron is dragging down the name of Argentina in the eyes of the world is a source of great bitterness, and it constitutes a bigger danger for the General than the sense of religious outrage that only a certain number of Argentines would feel. This does not mean that the Vatican's excommunication will be taken lightly. That an Argentine President should suffer this solemn condemnation is surely something that no Argentine ever believed could happen in his country, which is about 95 percent Roman Catholic.

Peron has caused many of his people to suffer the anguish of indecision by dividing their loyalties in the church and state conflict. Now the loyalties of his own supporters are being divided by Rome, for the excommunication must give members of his cabinet and other officials and diplomats a knotty problem for their consciences.

In short, Juan Domingo Peron has sowed the wind and it looks as if the whirlwind is coming along. It is too early to say yet. His position seems strong, but his methods, his policies and his character have all isolated him. He is one man, and a man alone is never truly strong.

The Commercial-Appeal Surrenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, dated Saturday, June 18, 1955:

THE COMMERCIAL-APPEAL SURRENDERS

The Tennessee State Board of Education has promulgated a plan for gradual desegregation of schools and colleges in that State.

The Memphis Commercial-Appeal calls the action "a sincere gesture of compliance with the Supreme Court ruling on segregation, a gesture both revolutionary and courageous."

We don't call it that down this way.

We call it cowardly and contemptible.

We call it abject surrender to the NAACP fight for social equality and mongrelization of the races.

We call it a flagrant violation of southern sentiment and to witness approval by a southern newspaper is downright humiliating.

Apparently the Commercial-Appeal has surrendered to its Yankee ownership.

A newspaper editor who describes any step whatsoever toward integration in southern schools and colleges as a gesture both revolutionary and courageous is flatly contradicting the best thought prevailing among southern people and arrays itself as an enemy of the South.

Now comes the irony of the situation in the Volunteer State.

Radical and strife-breeding leaders of the NAACP denounced the action of the State Board of Education as flagrantly indicative of bad faith or extreme ignorance. They demand full compliance with the Supreme Court right away, immediately, if not sooner. They will not listen to any proposal save their own.

Because of the arrogance and insolence of this demand the board of education ought to show some real courage and rescind its action, but that is not likely to happen.

Geographical lines on the map cannot be changed but Tennessee should quit calling herself a southern State.

Duplicity Apparent in Democrat Support of President's Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, by Frank R. Kent, appeared in the Sunday Star, June 19, 1955. I commend it for reading to those who claim the Democrats are such great supporters of President Eisenhower's foreign policy:

DEMOCRATS MISREPRESENTING PRESIDENT

In just a month from today the historic "at the summit" conference of the heads of the four great powers will open at Geneva on July 18. Considering the disturbed state of the world, the importance of this conference hardly can be exaggerated. It easily may be that at it the first tentative step toward a permanent world peace will be taken.

Certainly, while heeding the admonition not to be too optimistic, that is the hope of the American people as a whole, as well as of the rank and file in the other free, participating and adhering states. Under these circumstances, it would seem that regardless of party, most Americans would want to get behind their President and let it be known that at Geneva he represents and speaks for this country in its entirety.

However, if one judges from the speeches and articles recently emanating from Washington and elsewhere, such is not to be his experience. On the contrary, the Democratic politicians and journalists, dedicated to the cause of Adlai Stevenson, now recognized as an eager candidate for renomination in the Democratic convention, last week launched what seems to be a campaign of personal disparagement of the President practically on the eve of his departure.

CAMPAIGN OF DISPARAGEMENT

It is somewhat significant that Mr. Stevenson personally has seemed to join in this political strategy. Mr. Stevenson, of course, does not make direct charges. That isn't his way. Suave and subtle, he intimates and insinuates, urges "support" of the President, but expresses fear, lest he not measure up to the "great opportunity" presented and regrets that he does not seem to have the best available advice.

The line, while more openly taken, is also that of publicity agents of the Democratic National Committee who allege that while there are scores of "able, earnest, and experienced men" eager to help in this great national crisis, Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles deliberately ignore them, surround themselves by men of neither wisdom nor experience. A really terrible picture is painted of a feeble, uninformed President attended by aids who keep the facts not only from him but from the American people. This silly and slightly sinister stuff is being widely spread over the country. One group of New Deal-Fair Deal columnists calls upon Mr. Eisenhower to summon to his side a long list

of men who presumably could pull him out of the quicksands and save the Republic. It is interesting to note that only were the journalistic gentlemen, who so earnestly deplore Mr. Eisenhower's failure to call for these men, anti-Eisenhower in the 1952 campaign and are anti-Eisenhower now, but without exception the names on their list are of men who supported Mr. Stevenson in the last campaign and are anxious to support him again.

NO NEWS SUPPRESSION

If the situation confronting the country were not so serious and the coming conference so momentous, this sort of stuff might be regarded as amusing. But, as things are, it is not amusing at all and is not intended to be. Despite Mr. Stevenson's patronizing advice and pious hopes about the Geneva Conference and his routine plea for united support of the President, the politicians conducting his renomination campaign are doing their best to belittle Mr. Eisenhower at home and weaken him abroad. Another group of anti-Eisenhower commentators, containing some close personally to Mr. Stevenson, make the charge that the President is engaged in a campaign of news censorship and suppression. Aside from the fact that Mr. Eisenhower is more open, less secretive, and more expansive in his news, radio, and television conferences than either of his two predecessors, the effort to make him out as favoring news suppression just does not stand up. The instances cited are of a somewhat hysterical nature and do not involve him personally at all. Under existing conditions everybody recognizes that a certain degree of caution is essential but certainly no one who knows the character of the President would associate him with any degree of unnecessary censorship.

It also is rather absurd that those now most vocal about the Eisenhower administration's censorship should continue to be oblivious of the far more inexcusable and very real censorship of their political idols, the late Mr. Roosevelt and his successor, Mr. Truman. Certainly, it should be easy to recall the violent, denunciatory letters of the latter to the newspapermen who ventured to criticize him. It should be equally easy to recall the personal efforts of Mr. Roosevelt not only to censor the newspapers which dared differ with him but personally to damage correspondents who expressed dissent from his views. No President ever descended to lower depths of personal conduct, and it is not to the credit of his more intelligent friends that they have chosen to ignore it.

The United States Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I underwent surgery at the United States Naval Medical Center a Bethesda. I was so impressed with the quality of care and the efficiency of the Center that I feel compelled to make mention of it to my colleagues in the House.

The doctors, nurses, and corpsmen were so proficient in their work, and approached it in such good humor, that I left the hospital convinced that the United States Government is fortunate in having the services of these people.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that the men and women of the United States Navy, be they admirals or apprentice seamen, have access to such magnificent medical care.

Complexities of Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the dilemma which faces thousands of young men today because of the inequities and complexities of our selective service system is very well summarized in a letter I have received from a young constituent of mine, Mr. Robert Wimmer, of Rahway, N. J. I would like to call the attention of the Congress to this letter, since it points out the necessity of enacting legislation which would permit the young men who are eligible for military service to plan their future during this prolonged period of international tension.

The letter follows:

RAHWAY, N. J., *June 6, 1955.*

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: I have been following with interest the course of the bill which would extend the Selective Service Act for 4 years. I understand that some piece of legislation must be accepted before the present bill runs out on June 30. This Saturday I am graduating from college and like most of my fellow graduates I intend to enter the military and serve for 2 years. I am all in favor of extending this old bill for a number of years, but what puzzles me is the seeming lack of interest by our legislators in this new bill. If I recall correctly, the Selective Service Act passed the House by 232 to 0. It seems that little attempts were made to construct an entirely new bill. Simply extending this old bill for 4 years rather than creating a new bill will only add to the problems of the present-day draft eligible.

I would like to enumerate some of the problems and decisions which face me and fellows that I know. I have requested immediate induction, i. e., I asked my draft board to take me as soon as possible after graduation. I was told that a June induction, or July, or perhaps August and September would be impossible because of the large number of young men who are requesting immediate induction in order to get it over with, and because of the low draft calls. These young men are requesting to be drafted because of the difficulty in securing employment on account of being "draft-bait." If the proposal to cut the services by over 100,000 men and the Army 87,000 of this number, how much lower will the draft calls be?

I could probably sit back and not be drafted for perhaps 2 or 3 years. But having been deferred for educational purposes I am eligible for the draft until I am 35 years old. Hoping to settle down in the married state some day makes the thought of going into the Army at 30 a very unpleasant one. The problems of fellows who plan to be doctors and lawyers are even more complex.

I am grateful for having been allowed to complete my education and am anxious to pursue my choice of a state of life. At the same time I realize that I have an obligation to serve my country as many others already have. I feel that rather than put off any major decisions for 4 years, the Congress should enact an intelligent military-service bill. I cannot make definite proposals for I am not equipped to do so. I can, however, cite our problems with the hope that some sort of solution is made evident. The problem is that of serving our required time as soon as possible after graduation. This in itself is not a problem. What affects us is the cutting of manpower and at the same time the retention of the 2 years' required service. Four years ago I was afraid of not being able to finish my college education because of the draft. Today I must wait to be drafted, perhaps a long time.

I thank you sincerely for taking time to read my letter.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT W. WIMMER.

Housing Project in Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today is an important day for Cleveland. The Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority is opening a 14-story extension of the Cedar Public Housing Apartments. This building is designed to house many of our older citizens as well as the Golden Age Center of Cleveland. Every community in America should focus attention upon this effort to provide decent housing for our senior citizens so that they can live in a more dignified retirement.

The following excerpt from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 16, 1955, sets in detail the nature of this splendid project:

HOUSING PROJECT IN SKY TO OPEN—RISES 14 STORIES; MOSTLY FOR AGED; JULY 1 IS DATE

(By Eugene Segal)

The 14-story building in the new extension of the Cedar Apartments public housing project will be opened to tenants about July 1, it was learned yesterday.

Designed primarily to house aged couples, the skyscraper apartment at East 30th Street and Central Avenue SE. will be the first of its kind in American public housing history.

HAVE SEATS IN BATHTUBS

Of its 156 suites, 104 will be rented to aged persons, either married couples or pairs of widows and widowers. They contain special features for convenience of the aged. These include nonslip floors in bathrooms, seats in bathtubs and grab bars adjacent to toilets.

Thresholds are eliminated to minimize danger of tripping, and shelves are built low for easy access.

Fifty-two of the suites will be for occupancy by young persons, including couples with small babies. Their purpose is to keep the aged tenants from feeling they are isolated in an institution away from normal life.

The new-type building was conceived by Ernest J. Bohn, Metropolitan Housing Authority Director, in recognition of the problem of the growing number of older persons in the population.

GOLDEN AGE CENTER

Until now, when one person of an aged couple died, the Housing Authority has had to evict the survivor. With the new facility, it will be able to pair the survivor with another widow or widower and permit them to remain.

The first floor of the building has been turned over to the Cleveland Welfare Federation to operate as a "Golden Age Center" serving the entire city. It includes a game and meeting room, a lounge, a craft room and an office.

An open house, affording an inspection of the center and the apartments, will be held Monday for women's clubs and other interested organizations.

Geneva Will Not Be a Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the forthcoming Big Four Conference, I commend to the Members of the House of Representatives, an editorial which appeared in the June 15 issue of the Davenport, Iowa, Daily Times, entitled "Geneva Will Not Be a Yalta." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

GENEVA WILL NOT BE A YALTA

It already is plain to the Russians that the Big Four conference opening in Geneva July 18 is not going to be a Yalta and the Moscow radio is conditioning people behind the Iron Curtain not to expect it.

The West will have a different team at Geneva than the one Joe Stalin used all his wiles to cajole.

It will be a different kind of a conference than Khrushchev and Bulganin attended in Belgrade.

We can have confidence that the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Britain, and the Premier of France will engage in no vodka marathon running through the night.

Instead, the West will be in Geneva for business, for no giveaway and will feel under no compulsion to appease Russia in any manner.

Geneva is a spot where representatives of the press of the Western World will be able to function properly. It is not an out-of-the-way spot in an undeveloped country, but is well equipped with every facility for throwing the full spotlight of publicity upon the conference.

At the moment of acceptance of Geneva as the place of meeting and the dates for the conference, Russia pushed its propaganda machine into high gear for an attack upon the suggestion of the United States that the Russian satellites could be a topic for discussion. It is part of a stepped-up attack upon the United States as a warmonger.

The countries now listed as satellites were on the agenda at previous high-level conferences; why not now?

Why shouldn't consideration be given to the situation of the seized Baltic States, to Poland, to Czechoslovakia, and the others?

Western participants in previous conferences failed to recognize that Russia's aggression would enslave a great part of Europe. Russia has done it. Why not a review?

In any event, President Eisenhower and his western associates understand fully the degree of camouflage of aims of which the Russians are capable. In this conference the West will not be fooled. Moscow senses that will be the situation and the bitter propaganda campaign now on is the result.

Pan American World Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a straightforward editorial of the Miami Herald, June 8, brings to mind the story of a great competitive enterprise, Pan American World Airways, which has contributed so much to aviation throughout the world.

Since 1927, Pan American has been operating with a Florida base. It was on an historic day in October of that year that Pan American flew from Key West to Habana—a distance of 80 miles—carrying passengers and United States mail. It was historic in that the flight marked the first time that a United States airline braved the uncertainties of scheduled overseas operations to indicate to the world that American aviation initiative was ready to take on all comers in this highly competitive field.

All of Pan American's competitors in the international field also have domestic operations. Across the Atlantic, across the Pacific, through Central and South America, the United States lines with which Pan American competes have extensive and profitable domestic routes.

Forty different air carriers operate in the Caribbean and Latin American fields. Eleven different carriers operate across the Atlantic, between the United States and Europe. Pan American is a private enterprise—owned not by a government but by more than 30,000 individual stockholders.

Pan American World Airways has been a leader in aviation because it has been a strong competitor.

Its effort to get into the thriving domestic business is in the American tradition, which has welcomed competition as a road to prosperity.

The editorial follows:

PAN AM WOULD CLOSE MIAMI-NEW YORK GAP

The highly important and strategic place of Miami in international aviation is highlighted in the hearings now under way before the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington.

Pan American World Airways has made a bid to "bulwark air service between the most populous and fastest growing areas" in the country.

Should Pan American be granted the route, Miami and Florida would become the hub of a network liking Latin America, the United States and Europe for the first time by direct, one carrier route. The route between this city and Northeast United States is the busiest air trunk route in the country.

Oddly Pan American is able to fly around the world but not within its own country. The airline proposes to close the gap between its present gateway cities of Miami—to Latin America—and of New York—to Europe.

Pan American is not the only applicant. A dozen or more airlines are seeking either Boston or New York to Miami routes.

The local seers who confidently predict that greater Miami will have a population of more than 1 million by 1965 must be using the international airport as their crystal ball.

Bonded Canadians Take Jobs Away From New England Woodsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered over several stations in New England on Saturday, June 18, 1955, on the subject of "Bonded Canadians Take Jobs Away from New England Woodsmen".

This business of bringing in workers from outside the United States mainland—for employment on seasonal jobs, like the harvesting of crops—is a threat to the standards of our own people.

First came the Puerto Ricans. Then the Mexican wetbacks. And now, Canadian bonded lumberjacks to work in the woods of Maine and New Hampshire.

In the case of the Mexicans—they become "lost" in the United States, to the detriment of their own health and well-being; victims of unscrupulous employers who work them long hours on short pay.

Insofar as the Canadians are concerned, it is a situation where Americans are being crowded out of jobs in their own country by "visiting" woodsmen.

We do not blame the Canadians as much as we condemn those employers who put profit above any consideration for their fellow-Americans. We also deplore the attitude of Federal agencies that look the other way, whenever efforts are made to bring this subject to their attention.

We hear much these days about the need for promoting reciprocal trade.

But I have never heard of any proposal to permit foreign workers to come to the United States; evict American workers from their jobs; and then leave the country with their earnings.

Such a recommendation could never be supported—out in the open—except in case of war, when millions of men in the Armed Forces would create a civilian labor shortage.

These conditions do not exist now.

In fact, there are unemployed American woodsmen in New Hampshire and Maine.

Which leads us to believe that there may be a conspiracy to sidestep the laws.

The importation of Canadian bonded woodsmen has had the following harmful effects:

1. Numerous violations of wage and hour regulations.

2. Evasion of withholding tax payments with resulting loss of revenue to the United States Government. This places an extra burden on our own citizens who are already paying heavy taxes.

3. Reduction in the prevailing wage rates in the lumber industry, thereby placing American labor in a difficult position where it cannot compete with the cheap workers who come over the border.

Canadians will work for cheap wages. As long as they are going to be in the United States only a few months of each year, they are not interested in American standards. They will put up with food and lodgings that one of our workers would not tolerate.

Unfortunately, there is always the minority among employers in our country who do not understand that the equal status of labor at the collective-bargaining table is an accomplished fact. Under one pretext or another, they will try to shift progress into reverse gear.

The importation of bonded Canadian workers is one of these devices. When one company "gets away with it," other enterprises are tempted to try it.

First, they found an excuse to bring in cooks. Then came bulldozer operators, and choppers. Now they are hauling in heavy equipment, as if the United States were a backward nation that had never seen a chain saw, a crane, or a truck.

The "cheap-labor virus" is spreading. Garages, hotels, taxicab companies have been infected by it. Perhaps factories in the towns will catch the weakening fever that is coming out of the forest factories and import bonded Canadian workmen who will drive Americans out of their jobs.

If this infiltration, financed and encouraged by employers who are betraying the best American traditions, is permitted to increase, unchecked, then the northern parts of New Hampshire and Maine will become colonies of Canada.

I do not hold the Canadian Government responsible for this.

The operation was conceived, and is being carried out by certain employers who masquerade as United States citizens.

Aided and abetted by the amazing indifference of our own Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Office of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

Not to mention the Internal Revenue Department, which must be aware that income taxes are not being withheld from wages.

As of January 18, 1955, there were 5,000 of these Canadian woodsmen in the New England and the New York areas.

According to the Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Workers, American Federation of Labor, the advent of the bulldozer, the chain saw, the automobile, and mechanization in general, has changed wood operation considerably. Americans who left the woods are now anxious to go back. Americans are expert mechanics and are interested in conservation. Their roots are in the community. With good roads in and out of the woods, many of them are able to commute. They buy from the local merchants, and they pay taxes in the community. Of course, when they are compelled to remain in the woods, they require good camps and better food. The Canadians are understandably interested in going home to Canada with as much of their earnings as possible. They live in the woods during their entire stay (with occasional trips to neighboring cities or towns). They buy little or nothing in the community, and many of them do not pay their taxes.

As an official of the union has stated in part: "In the first place, it should always be borne in mind that the reason for bonded men being permitted to work in the United States of America was because of the war emergency in which we found ourselves short of certain skills. I refer specifically to the need for choppers in the woods, particularly in supplying pulp wood for our paper mills. We still recognize the fact that there is a limited need for choppers in this industry. However, with the unemployment problem as it now stands (in the North woods) the other skills can be very well supplied by American labor, and the Canadian bonded men should not, under any circumstances, be allowed to enter into competition with our own unemployed, either as to skills, or as to wage rates and working conditions. We cannot allow, nor will we permit the wage structure, which we have built up over the years through collective bargaining, to be depressed and chiseled away through the medium of competition for jobs by non-Americans, under any pretext whatsoever.

"We are now faced with the problem of garage owners and others applying for 'bonded men' to fill their alleged needs, ostensibly because there are no garage mechanics available, but actually because they do not want to pay the prevailing wage rate for garage mechanics. This condition could go on and on—store managers could ask for clerks on the pretext that no qualified labor was available for these trades. This situation could become more critical, and it is our intention to prevent it before it becomes too aggravated. * * * Manufacturers are protected by a tariff against the products of cheap labor from abroad. Our American workers should have some sort of protection, likewise, from the competition of bonded labor"—labor that is brought over the border and into our own backyard.

In case you might think this is a local, and isolated danger, let me remind you of the concern expressed by people living in the State of Iowa, which is not on any border, but is situated almost in the center of the United States. At the 1953 convention of the American Federation of Labor, the Iowa State Federation of Labor introduced a resolution objecting to the action taken by the United States Government in allowing the immigration of certain skilled nonagricultural workers. The Iowa Federation stated that these skilled workers were imported to work at substandard wages on jobs for which domestic workers were already available.

The Department of Labor has been alerted to the necessity of carefully checking all requests by employers to import workers, and of consulting with appropriate labor organizations in the United States, before approving any of these requests.

A hearing on the subject of Importation of Canadian Labor was held at the State house in Augusta, Maine, on February 28, 1955, presided over by Gov. Edmund S. Muskie.

One witness testified that: "The effect over the past 10 years following the war has been to set lumbering wage scales on a Canadian basis. The lower living costs and lower tax rates in Canada make work in Maine attractive indeed for the Canadian woodsmen. Glaring mismanagement of taxation allows bonded laborers to claim maximum dependency, and this circumvents our withholding taxes. Many persons with visas, so-called 'synthetic Americans,' have no intention of acquiring citizenship, but use this opportunity to collect employment insurance while residing in Canada. The understandable attitude of the Canadian, working in a foreign country, is one of exploitation. He works only for the weekly check to take home. He has no reason for loyalty to his employer; no particular respect for our laws or customs. He realizes he is tolerated only because of his ability to produce at the job. Usually accustomed to a somewhat lower living standard, he is content with living conditions which the average American would find intolerable."

Another stated that: "I would like to add this to what the boys have had to say. I have a crane which is not working at the present time. Why it is not is due to the fact that at the present time there are Canadian cranes in the Jackman (Maine) area, operating with jobbers. Where are the Americans? They are sitting with their cranes in the yard. They cannot work, due to the fact that they are hiring at lower prices than we can afford to work for."

Another described a Canadian outfit working in Maine: "They had a hovel, the horses in 1 end, a canvas in between, and 8 men living in that little place. All they had was logs on the floor, nothing but logs. Under these conditions Americans would not work. * * *"

In this brief broadcast I have just touched on some aspects of the problem.

I believe that there is enough prima facie evidence to warrant a thorough study of a situation that is closing the door to employment of Americans in their own country.

Because this is a problem that affects several States, and because it comes within the scope of certain Federal agencies, I think that the Congress should investigate the importation of Canadian bonded workmen.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, as the 30th of May has recently passed where we adhered to the famous General Order No. 11 issued by Gen. John A. Logan, Commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, when he proclaimed May 30 as a day to be set aside to strew flowers upon the graves and to pay tribute to all comrades of all wars who paid the supreme sacrifice that we might enjoy freedom and democracy in this great land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of going back to my district in southern Illinois on Memorial Day and speaking at several different memorial services; one being at Mound City National Cemetery, Mound City, Ill. I was happy to accept these speaking engagements because I felt what little I might do or say would not begin to pay the great debt that you and I owe to these gallant heroes who have paid the supreme sacrifice on the sacrificial altar.

Yes, we owe a debt that we can never pay because "greater love hath no man than this; than he who is willing to lay down his life for his friends." And I say to you what more could a man give than his life. So I say to every American in this country that we have an obligation to keep America free. In order to do this we must rededicate our hearts and our lives to God and country not only on the 30th of May each year but the other 364 days as well. Mr. Speaker, to keep faith with them, it must be a full-time job.

I wish to include in the RECORD two poems, one written by a good friend in my district, Mr. Ike Williford, of Eldorado, Ill., entitled "The Unknown Soldier," and the second poem I am sorry to say I do not know the author:

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

(By Ike Williford)

From the beggar's stalls in Tunis,
To the walls of Stalingrad,
Across the jungles of New Guinea,
To the green of Erin's sod.
Near the crumbling towers of Bautzen,
To the waters of the Seine,
From Korea's frozen paddies,
To the sands of El Alamein.
A silence shrouds these battlements,
And the caisson's lusty roar,
No longer calls the surging tides,
Of the mighty God of war.

Through sacrifice the soldier wins,
Some small measure of acclaim,
Yet there be men who would now pluck,
From the valor of his name.
We soon forget his dying charge,
And the cause that once seemed just,
Lie buried with the broken blade,
In the soldier's crimson dust.
When the chants of war are silenced,
And the words of praise have flown,
The soldier finds his resting place,
In a tomb that's marked unknown.
Until our Lord shall rent these tombs,
And the soldier must depart,
May his hallowed deeds of glory,
Be engraved upon our hearts.
So let us consecrate our lives,
To the peace we must attain,
Then heroes sleeping in these fields,
Shall not have died in vain.

Is it enough to think today
Of all our brave, then put away
The thought until a year has sped?
Is this full honor for our dead?
Is it enough to sing a song
And deck a grave; and all year long
Forget the brave who died that we
Might keep our great land proud and free?
Full service needs a greater toll—
That we who live give heart and soul
To keep the land they died to save,
And be ourselves, in turn, the brave.

Dr. Randolph Mas Sakada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to know Dr. Randolph Mas Sakada. In him, as in few others, I found the embodiment of the poet's great thought: "Let me live in my house by the side of the road, and be a friend to man."

In the house which is America, and which shelters the descendants of peoples of lands from all over the world, Randy Sakada was, indeed, a friend to man. His was a life devoted to achieving the great American ideal of equal justice for all. He was steadfastly dedicated toward fulfillment of the truth of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Dr. Sakada died a few days ago at age 42. His family, his friends, and his community will miss him very much, but the contribution that he made in his brief span of life will be remembered. His spirit remains—a spirit like that embodied within the definition of the spirit of liberty by Justice Learned Hand:

What, then, is the spirit of liberty? I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, nearly 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten—that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.

Tribute to North Andover, Mass.—A Famous American Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the strength of the United States is not measured by steel tonnage, millions of motor vehicles, or the mass production of cap-and-gowned June graduates.

They are the superstructure, visible to the eyes of 1955.

For the foundation, and the guiding spirit, we look back to the early settlements, where men and women were the most important facts of life.

Where courage, and character, and independence, were the pioneering virtues. That constitutes the vital life force at work on our mechanized farms and in our assembly-line cities of today; visible but dynamic.

There is something about a small town or village that gives folks elbowroom to develop to their full stature.

Before the cities summon them to leadership.

As one scans through "Who's Who"—or the pages of American history—one is impressed by the fact that our Nation is nourished by the big men who have their roots in small communities.

North Andover, in Massachusetts, which recently celebrated its 100th anniversary as a town, helped to blaze the trail that has led to greatness.

North Andover, where the first settler staked out his homestead in 1646.

Where the spinning wheels and the hand plows produced self-reliance and gave the richer yield of poets, preachers, and statesmen, to the Nation.

The Eagle-Tribune of Lawrence, Mass., has published a North Andover centennial edition to honor its next-door neighbor, dated Saturday, June 11, 1955.

The lead-off article titled "North Andover—A Town To Be Proud of," sets the stage and the mood in language that all will relish.

To give credit where credit is due, I request consent to open up a wider audience for this descriptive piece of writing, through insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Credit to be shared by the Eagle-Tribune Publishing Co., and by the very competent newspaperman who authored the preface to the centennial edition, Chief Editorial Writer Joseph A. Reynolds, of Lawrence, Mass.

The preface to the centennial edition follows:

NORTH ANDOVER—A TOWN TO BE PROUD OF—
1855–1955

Mapmakers have tedious jobs to do sometimes, as when they must measure and outline the conformations of a flat, dull region where there is nothing for the eye to exult in. Mapmakers love North Andover, upon which the great glacier exerted its vast creative pressure with surprising gentleness, and, sliding then into the sea, left North Andover all hollows and hills, and delightful.

And North Andover's spiritual topography is fully remarkable as its physical topography.

Spiritually, North Andover is bounded on the far side by such as Ann Bradstreet and her husband Simon (whom by history's caprice she now overshadows), and by such as Samuel Osgood and Phillips Brooks, all tradition makers. It is bounded on the near side by good citizens of the present day who take their lineal responsibilities as seriously as if the ancentral hand were present to beckon them to this duty. It is bounded on the east by the rising sun which symbolizes its awakening to new vistas of an almost blinding radiance. It is bounded on the west by a sunset which symbolizes the splendid fulfillment of a day of rich promise.

North Andover, observing its centennial, is, of course, taking particular note of its spiritual boundaries during these retrospective days which have been given over to celebration. It likes what it sees, as goes without saying. But, being sensible, it possibly mistrusts its own testimony as possibly having a weight of bias which possibly cants it to one side.

We therefore summon as impartial witnesses North Andover's closest friends and neighbors—Andover, Lawrence, and Methuen—and, polling them for their opinion as to whether North Andover has a right to be proud of what it has made out of its first 100 years as a town, discover that there is complete agreement that North Andover has every right to be proud.

It is a finding in which this newspaper concurs in most heartily.

Alcoholic Beverage Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a petition adopted by residents of Birmingham, Ala., concerning the advertisement of alcoholic beverages:

To our Representatives in Congress:

We, your constituents, earnestly beg you to help us bring up mentally and morally sound children, and to conquer the juvenile delinquency now in our midst by exercising the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders, of commodities which have been declared unlawful, either by their legislatures or by the people exercising the rights of local option granted them under State law.

Mrs. J. F. Brady, Mrs. Pearl B. Morris, Mrs. Walter E. Barnes, Mrs. Mary Triplett, Mrs. Bessie Phillips, Mrs. G. D. Shubert, Mrs. H. P. Waits, Mrs. L. J. Jackson, Mrs. Roy Higgins, Mrs. W. H. Savage, Mrs. B. L. Hayes, Mrs. C. P. Ingram, Mrs. Kate Boyles, Mrs. W. H. Henderson, Mrs. A. L. Whitehouse, Mrs. H. C. Riggins, Mrs. J. C. Laney, Mrs. Lois Maxwell, Mrs. R. M. Livingston, Jr., Mrs. H. W. Walker, Mrs. H. C. Landreville, and Mrs. P. M. Walton.

How Stands Our Pursuit of Happiness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. George Kennan appeared recently in the New Leader, always a most interesting and thought-provoking publication.

The title of this article is arresting, "How Stands Our Pursuit of Happiness?" I am afraid that the pursuit of happiness is, except in very unique cases, a rather frustrating and dubious pursuit. An individual has to be well poised, superbly educated and spiritually strong before he or she can purse happiness with any hope of achieving it.

Mr. Kennan is tragically right when he says in his closing paragraph:

A people in danger, at least partially, of becoming sluggish intellectually, underdeveloped emotionally, creative only where commercial interest raises its capricious demands, filled with an inner restlessness and dissatisfaction, incapable of integrating our full strength and bringing it to bear where it is most needed, dull and uninteresting to others and, what is worse, not terribly interesting to ourselves.

Are we that people?

HOW STANDS OUR PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS?

(By George F. Kennan)

Is our American civilization of the year 1955 well designed to produce the rich and meaningful life?

We have always gone on the theory that an increase in the amount of material goods and leisure time gave the individual a wider area of choice by which to make his own inner life rich; and it has been part of our traditional philosophy that the individual, confronted with this choice, would know how to use it wisely. These were the assumptions that lay, so speak, at the end of that rainbow of material progress we followed through the first century and a half of our national history.

But we are now approaching the end of this rainbow, in the sense that material plenty is really there for almost all of our citizens who are not too lazy or too improvident to seek it. We are getting enough evidence today to examine the validity of these underlying assumptions. And the results of this examination, so far as I am concerned, are not encouraging. I am not sure that the area of choice is really made wider by the conditions in which our material plenty is being achieved. I am not sure that the mass of our people know how to make good use of that choice, where it exists. And consequently, I question whether material progress alone, as we have sought it heretofore and have come to know it today, is really bringing us the results we hoped. I question whether it is making us a happier—and inwardly a richer—people.

Nothing is harder than to discuss the inner world of a great people such as ours, with all its immense variety and complexity. No scientific proof is possible. All judgments are necessarily subjective, intuitive, and imperfect. Yet these questions must be asked. I can only say, Look around you. Look at the state of our youth. Look at the faces you see behind the endless streams of windshields on our highways. Look at the state of our education, our recreational habits, and our cultural life. And then ask yourselves: Are these people as happy as they ought to be in the face of their material abundance? Are they that much happier than people elsewhere who do not have this abundance? Are they that much happier than the Americans of earlier generations, for whom this abundance did not exist?

If you can answer these questions in the affirmative, then you are yourself a happy person. But if, like myself, you find yourselves obliged to answer these questions with a decided negative, then you will have to join me in asking why all this is so, what it is that we have failed to take into account in our calculations of the past, and what this means to us for the future.

Two factors loom up in my mind as central ones in connection with this failure of material progress to bring us greater benefits. First, there is the disintegration of real community life almost everywhere, as a result of the revolutionary innovations in transportation and communications that the last half century have brought us. Secondly, there is the growing domination of cultural and recreational activity by commercial media, usually connected with the advertising profession, whose motivation has little, if anything, to do with the deeper sense of human welfare.

This last process, as you know, has a wide variety of distressing effects. By making advertising the main business of our newspapers, overshadowing physically and financially the other function, it has affected in unfortunate ways the freshness, the independence and the competitiveness of our press—once a mainstay of the vitality of our society. By its great appetite for such things as film and reprint rights and condensations, it is threatening to dominate the field of literary publishing, thus far a last refuge of genuine cultural values.

Concerned to divert rather than to develop, the commercial cultural product has led to passivity of recreation—to spectatoritis—on an appalling scale, dulling the creative faculties of millions of people, undermining the very talent for active recreation. It has invaded the home, and asserted its domain over the minds of small children, crowding the school and appropriating to itself a major role in the actual educational process. With its characteristic staccato patterns, its lack of followthrough, and its endless abrupt transitions of theme, commercial entertainment has tended everywhere to weaken the faculty of concentration and to debauch the capacity for sustained and orderly thought.

At the back of all this is usually, though not always, advertising. Thus, in ever-increasing degree, the right of monopolizing our attention, of absorbing our capacity for intellectual and emotional reaction, of shaping the habits and the imagery on which our thought depends, is being claimed by those whose primary interest in us is only the influencing of our conduct as purchasers at the shopping center.

I have no quarrel with the advertisers. I know that many of them are personally distressed about these very same things. I do not say that their business purposes are in any way evil or reprehensible. But I do say that these purposes are irrelevant to, and wholly out of accord with the importance of, those human reactions they are using as a means to their end. It seems to me preposterous that cultural and educational stimuli of such enormous importance, exercising so intimate and vital an influence on the inner world of our people—on their comprehension of life and their attitudes toward it—should be left in permanence to the conscience of an industry the nature of whose interest has so little relation to the things that are really at stake.

The effects of the other factor I mentioned—the integration of local community life—are scarcely less alarming. Here the automobile, ubiquitous and trimphant, has been the principal disintegrating agent. What we are faced with is not only a disintegration of the civic community as such but also a fragmentization of the family group to a point where the home loses its integrity and becomes a fortuitous dormitory for strangers of different age groups. There could be no more bitter blow than this at the true sources of man's security—no surer guaranty of his bad behavior.

Even if this were not at stake the deterioration of the local community would be bad enough. The meaning of citizenship begins with the neighborhood; and when this type of community begins to lose its reality for people, then I, for one, have no great confidence that they will be good citizens in the wider frameworks of State and National Government. Yet it is hard for the local community to retain its vitality when violent changes are constantly occurring in its composition and function; when the disorderly and uncontrolled development of our great urban areas is constantly rendering physical equipment obsolete and unsuited to new purposes to which commercial interests dictate that it should be put; when administrative boundaries no longer have even a remote relation to social realities; when residence is being separated from livelihood by ever-increasing distances and time intervals; when the reckless and growing dispersal of all facilities for living tends increasingly to pull people away from their homes, to fragmentize their interests, their allegiances, and their civic influence; and when, finally, it becomes increasingly impossible for the individual citizen to survey and apprehend the social context in which his life proceeds, and by which the real prospects for his happiness and that of his children are determined.

Yet these things are happening—and happending all over our country. We have been, as a Nation, extraordinarily obtuse to the importance, from the standpoint of the deeper satisfactions of those who use them, of the sheer geographic arrangement of the facilities for life and work. As in the case of our educational and recreational facilities, we have lightheartedly resigned the control of these things into the hands of people who are perfectly worthy people and doing nothing reprehensible, but whose interests, being purely commercial, do not even take into account the need for the preservation of the health and integrity of the local community itself. Today, we see all around us the chaotic and depressing effects of this failure on our part to insist on public responsibility for the control of processes that are certainly matters of public concern in their effects.

There are all facts that limit in important ways that freedom of choice which, by tradition and by the theory of our society, the individual citizen was supposed to enjoy and by virtue of which he was supposed to have been the master of his own fate and his own happiness. And it is because of them, and similar factors, that our American environment has become in certain ways a dangerous and unhealthy one—not conducive to the best development of the individual, either for his own sake or from the standpoint of his value as a citizen.

This is why I think that some day we are going to have to come to a new social philosophy, which will go deeper into the true sources of man's prosperity than does our traditional attachment to free enterprise or does, for that matter, socialism, or communism, or rationale of the European welfare state. This new philosophy will have to take into account of the fact that that the satisfying of man's material needs is only the beginning, and does not answer, but only opens up for the first time in all their real complexity and difficulty, the crucial questions as to what environmental conditions are most favorable to man's enjoyment of the experience of life and to the dignity of his relationship with other men.

These are the questions we have not yet learned to ask ourselves as a political society. We are going to have to ask them, and to find answers to them, before we will dispose of such things as personal insecurity, urban blight, civic apathy, juvenile delinquency and mass cultural vulgarity. Until we do this, we will continue to be, as we are now, not a bad people or a weak one or even a consciously unhappy one, but an endangered one—a people in danger, at least partially, of becoming sluggish intellectually, underdeveloped emotionally, creative only where commercial interest raises its capricious demands, filled with an inner restlessness and dissatisfaction, incapable of integrating our full strength and bringing it to bear where it is most needed, dull and uninteresting to others and, what is worse, not terribly interesting to ourselves.

The Constitution: A Temple of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the prize-winning speech given by Miss Olivia Pienezza, of Tallassee High School, Tallassee, Ala. With this speech, Miss Pienezza won the oratorical honors when she was judged winner of the central area oratorical contest, sponsored by the American Legion, Department of Alabama.

It is indeed very gratifying to see that the young people are aware and do esteem the cherished liberty all of us in the United States are privileged to enjoy.

The speech follows:

THE CONSTITUTION: A TEMPLE OF LIBERTY

Someone has called the United States Constitution "the greatest fundamental law that ever governed a successful people." How did this law come into existence? It is not the product of one generation that was labeled and stamped "United States of America." America cannot claim exclusive credit for this mighty temple of liberty. It took centuries of dreaming, of building, of sacrificing, and of giving to obtain the principles of freedom embodied in the Constitution of the United States of America.

Men of all races, nationalities, creeds, and religions have always possessed the dream of a temple of liberty; a temple in which there was no high priest but God, the doorway was opportunity, the windows were freedom, the cornerstone was truth and equality; a temple without the fear, the injustice, and slavery that he knew so well. This powerful necessity for freedom drove man to build this temple of liberty as nothing else could. And he worked and built, even when chains bound his feet; when he felt the sting of a whip across his back; when a power-crazed tyrant threw him into an arena of hungry lions; when blood and sweat streamed down his face; when he was persecuted and ridiculed; until finally, he stumbled and drew the last breath from his miserable body.

Centuries passed. From the lips of One who bore a rude cross to Golgotha came the most profound statement of the ages: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." History has been the record of man's struggle to find this truth, and to perpetrate the dream of a temple of liberty. The life, teachings, and death of the man called Jesus laid the foundations for this mighty temple of liberty.

The ideals of freedom and democracy were developed in ancient Rome and Greece, but they found a greater expression in the Magna Carta, that great charter of English liberty which the freedom-loving Anglo-Saxons forced a reluctant King John to sign on the fields of Runnymede in 1215. "To none will we sell, to none will we deny, or delay right or justice." These words stand as a landmark in the progress of the building of man's temple of liberty.

But it was not until a group of English colonists in the little-known country of America declared that they were entitled to "certain inalienable rights; life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and pledged their "lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to wrest those rights from a tyrannical mother country that the walls of our temple came into view.

Finally, in 1787, a man saw his dream of freedom become a reality when 55 men met in Philadelphia to write a constitution for the new republic. Certainly this was one of the great moments of history. The miracle is that so much was accomplished in such a little time with so few men, however able and brilliant they were. These circumstances force us to believe that God sat in on the meetings of the Constitutional Convention, as did Franklin, Washington, and Madison, and that He guided the pen that wrote the document which was the final manifestation of man's dream of a temple of liberty. The United States Constitution represented the hope of the world; the chance of fulfillment for the hunger that lies in every man's heart; to stand squarely with his fellow man, to share in his government, to be free to seek his own happiness.

Why is the Constitution of the United States a temple of liberty? There are three principal reasons. First: final sovereignty is in the hands of the people, not the States, the Democrats, the Republicans, the workers, the capitalists, the Catholics, the Protestants, but the people. From them flow any and all powers of government. For the first time in history, the concept of rule by the people was embodied in a national constitution. One of the most powerful weapons a citizen can wield is his right to vote. With it he exercises control over elected officials and over laws that are made. This civil liberty carries with it a tremendous responsibility for the citizen to himself and to his nation, for in America it is a free man's ballot that determines affairs of government.

Secondly, the check-and-balance system provided for by the Constitution within the framework of the Federal Government prevents the rise of an all-powerful dictator. Under this system, there are three separate branches of the National Government—the legislative, the lawmaking department; the executive, the enforcing and administering department; and the judicial department, which contains the court system. But even if their powers are distinctly separate, the three departments may not act independently of one another, thus creating a check and a balance. Set up to prevent the unjust combination of the majority, it has definitely prevented the accumulation of power in one department or person.

The third and perhaps most important reason that our Constitution is a temple of liberty lies in the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights. When the Constitution was submitted to the people for their approval, they ratified it only with the promise that a Bill of Rights be included. These men and women had not forgotten the injustices they suffered at the hands of a tyrannical monarch, and they were wary of any attempt to deprive them of their freedom.

The democratic philosophy reflected in the Bill of Rights believes that man must be free because by nature he is free, even though others have tried to enslave him; that any person may advance himself socially, politically, or economically regardless of his race, birth, his religion. That isn't a theory; it's a proven fact. Abraham Lincoln, the railsplitter, the country lawyer, rose to be President of the United States. Joe Louis, the Negro, who worked in a steel mill in Birmingham, Ala., became a world-famous boxing champ. And there is Andrew Carnegie, the Scottish immigrant, who reached the topmost rounds of success. And we could go on and on pointing out such examples. There are thousands just like these. There is your positive evidence that democracy under our constitutional system does work, that it provides the finest way of life possible to the individual and to the Nation. This is what it means to be an American.

And when the opponents of the United States Constitution and of democracy challenge you, tell them about our Abe Lincolns and our Andrew Carnegies. Show them our harbors, our factories, our railroads, our airplanes, our automobiles, or better still, show them an average American living in peace, security, and freedom; and ask these opponents of democracy: Why America? Because freedom has allowed every man equal opportunity to rise as high as his ability permits.

This American way of life is not based merely on economic considerations, but on spiritual considerations, on concepts of truth and justice, and the dignity of man. That's why America lived when Germany's blood and iron brought her defeat, when Japan's dreams of an empire failed to materialize. We must never forget that, and we must forever invoke the mercies of the God who has guided our Nation since its birth.

In addition to these freedoms of individual initiative, an American reserves the right to worship as his conscience dictates, to speak and publish his honest opinion without fear of punishment; to assemble peacefully, and to petition his Government for a redress of grievances. Government cannot demand of him his property without just compensation nor can it invade the sanctity of his home without legal warrant. Persons accused of crimes are given equal justice under the law, and are assured of a trial by jury.

Every day of your life you see these freedoms in action; when you turn on your radio for the 7 o'clock news; when you go to church on Sunday; when you go to the polls to vote; when you attend a PTA meeting, when you read your morning newspaper, you do so only because your Constitution guarantees you these privileges. These freedoms are not just high-sounding words to be used on the Fourth of July; they are essential principles of the lives of a free people that manifest themselves daily in a tangible way.

The greatest test of endurance for this temple of liberty came in 1861 when disputes over slavery and States' rights threatened imminent destruction. But the United States Constitution emerged as the final victor, and Abraham Lincoln opened a new era in constitutional development when he prophesied that "this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." As a direct result of this conflict, three amendments were added to the Constitution which strengthened the ideal and practice of democracy; the 13th, abolishing slavery; the 14th and 15th, giving the Negro full civil rights.

How has it been possible that the Constitution could survive the most revolutionary period of all history and remain unshaken while about, nations were being destroyed, kings dethroned, constitutions crumbling, and empires falling? Man's destruction did not reach the American Constitution. Formed for less than 3 million

people living in a restricted area along the coast, it now serves over 50 times that number occupying 48 States that constitute the richest, most powerful nation on earth.

Through amendment, implied powers, and liberal judicial interpretation it has been able to conform to the needs of a growing society. These features have enabled us to graft flesh and blood on the original skeleton, yet leaving its basic principles unchanged. Stagnancy is death, and when the people of this Nation cease to deliberate on the meaning of this great compact, and when they cease to adapt it, whether by popular usage, or judicial interpretation, then it will cease to be.

Will the Constitution live? Will this temple of liberty stand the test in future centuries? Our answer, thank God, is yes. The spirit of the United States Constitution will live in a mother's prayer, a father's pride, a child's faith, a son's courage, and a wife's love. It will live because of Valley Forge, Gettysburg, Pearl Harbor, Iwo Jima, and Korea. And it is your responsibility and my responsibility to perpetuate that spirit, to instill that priceless heritage of freedom into our children and their children. Anchored to God, this Nation gave birth to the dream of a temple erected to the precepts of liberty and freedom, a dream that was cherished in the hearts of men since the dawn of time. This generation will not permit that dream to die, regardless of the circumstances involved, nor will the next nor the next, for each generation must meet its own challenge. As long as men shall live and believe in the teachings of a Nazarene Carpenter who lived nearly 2,000 years ago, the Constitution of the United States of America shall live and not die.

Address by Senator Thye at Rice County Farmers Union Picnic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered yesterday at Faribault, Minn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD J. THYE, OF MINNESOTA, AT RICE COUNTY FARMERS UNION PICNIC, ON JUNE 19, 1955

I am delighted to be back in Minnesota and Rice County, and to be with you in this beautiful Alexander-Faribault Park. I have lived as a neighbor to Rice County and Faribault most of my adult life.

As you know, my farm home is just a mile from the Rice County line in Dakota County. Many of you are my neighbors. Some I have served with and have been associated with in farm and community activities over the years.

Serving you in the United States Senate, I am happy to be able to report to you that the affairs of our Nation are in good condition in almost all categories of our economy, agriculture being the weakest phase of our national economy. I will dwell more fully on this later.

Under the dynamic leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, we have seen great strides in the past year toward the hope, prayer, and objective of all freedom-loving people—the hope for permanent peace.

We have seen Austria regain its independence. We have noted that men from the Kremlin have gone to Yugoslavia to confer, instead of demanding and theratening, as they have done in the past.

We have seen the economic conditions of the countries of Western Europe improve month by month, thereby lessening the opportunities for the Communists in that area. That is the reason why Russia is today showing the conciliatory attitude it is, and opening its Iron Curtain to permit the free people to have an occasional glimpse beyond its borders.

The strength of the United States and her allies is such that the Soviet leaders know that what they prophesied—a depression and the failure of our free-enterprise system after the end of the Korean conflict—has not come to pass.

Russia had planned and laid all its strategies on the chaos such a depression would bring in the United States, but we are not in a depression.

The United States has the greatest economic strength ever in its peacetime history. The Communists had planned an infiltration into all of the countries of the world, expecting that when the depression hit there would be widespread unemployment.

It was the plan of the Russians to then take control of the different governments by getting a percentage of their people into the administrative as well as the legislative bodies of the governments.

Thus the Russian predictions and plans have failed. By strengthening the economy of countries of Western Europe and creating military strength through the Atlantic pact nations, we have destroyed Communist opportunities to work freely in the countries there. Western Germany, having become a free nation, in alining its economic as well as its future military strength with the free nations, has brought about a complete change in the tactics of the Russian leaders. Now they are endeavoring to negotiate and create friends and allies rather than to threaten nations with force.

We are rapidly gaining diplomatic control of the problems in the Pacific. But a few months ago we were threatened with what seemed to be an open conflict in the Formosa Straits. Pray God that we may continue to win, diplomatically.

We have noted a splendid reconstruction in the South Korean area and building of a good army by Syngman Rhee in Korea.

We have many problems in the Vietnam area. I was in the Hanoi region of North Vietnam, as well as other such areas, in 1953.

As precarious as the situation is in Indochina, more especially in the Veitnam area, I am confident that the patience and diplomatic understanding of President Eisenhower will lead us to a solution of the problem that will aid us in bringing to the Pacific area the opportunity for permanent peace.

Japan is confronted with an economic problem in the rebirth of its industrial activities, based upon a civilian rather than a military economy that was shattered at the conclusion of World War II. Japan has always traded with the mainland of China, and since Japan must have an industrial economy, in order to survive she must have a method of acquiring raw materials and an export market. That market must be either mainland China or the United States and Western Europe.

These are all diplomatic problems not easily resolved. I am confident that we in the United States are moving effectively in the right direction. As a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate I have participated in many long weeks of public and executive hearings. We have been getting information on all manner of military development, not only concerned with air strength but also in the atomic field—guided missiles, and so forth—and I know the dangers that would beset civilization if ever atomic warfare were set loose in a world-wide conflict.

Because everything possible must be done to maintain peace, I have done all in my power to assist in bringing about a rebirth of the economy of the nations of Western Europe, and to bring a technical assistance program to countries such as Korea and India, and to Pakistan, to help these people produce food and fiber to feed and clothe their people.

It is far cheaper to spend a few million dollars in this field than it is to spend the possible hundreds of billions for war preparations. Now, again, referring to the farm economy—What is wrong?

Why is our farm economy so weak? We have the greatest purchasing power, for food products, ever available in this Nation. Our businesses are at an extremely high and profitable level. We have the highest number of people employed that we have ever had. Wages are good and they are on the increase, as evidenced by recently negotiated wage contracts. However, farm prices are on the decline. Why are they?

Under normal conditions, present prosperity should mean good prices for the farmer. Let's examine the record. We have seen the net income of the farmer drop from nearly $17 billion down to $11.4 billion annually. We have seen the farmers' percentage of the consumers' dollar, the dollar spent for food, drop from 54 percent in the mid-forties down to 42 percent in April of this year. It is still on the downward trend and might well go to 41 percent. We have seen agricultural parity ratios drop from 115 percent of parity to 87 percent of parity. It is going lower.

The Secretary of Agriculture has just announced a drop to 76 percent in the parity price support on wheat for the coming year. Why? Why has the agricultural economy dropped in this drastic manner when our entire national economy has been expanding? I believe the attacks upon the farm support program, the denunciations of the farm support program, have brought about a fear psychology in our agricultural economy, which has depressed the farm economy more than any effect our surpluses should have had upon our markets. We need to reinstill confidence in our agricultural economy.

This fear psychology, as it weakens agricultural prices, has frightened the businessman out of the produce and commodity markets. They have not dared endeavor to revive our export markets. This fear psychology, as it has weakened the market, has caused a lowering of prices and the Commodity Credit Corporation has lost huge sums of money on its inventories. No one would deny the right of every phase of our economy to parity. In all my public service, whether it was in the Governor's office here in the State, or on a national level as your Senator, I have endeavored to maintain all segments of our national economy at parity, whether it be the Federal worker, laboring man, investor or farmer. I have endeavored at all times to maintain stability in our national economy.

We in the United States need to put forth all the ingenuity of our economists and business experts in our endeavors to resolve the problems of agriculture. If we cease to denounce the farm-support program, if we look upon it as the foundation under our produce and commodity prices, we can give a rebirth to the true American confidence in our agricultural economy and reestablish and stabilize that economy.

Surpluses of food and fiber are a blessing we should always be thankful for, and we should not permit them to become an issue to be debated on every political platform.

Inaction—A Dubious Factor in Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, June 19, it was my privilege to be the guest speaker at the Baltic States Freedom Rally held at Town Hall, New York City. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the address I delivered on Inaction—A Dubious Factor in our Foreign Policy:

I am honored to join with you today in commemorating this, the 15th anniversary of the seizure and forced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

On this occasion we are sadly mindful of those cruel events which took place on June 14, 1941, in each of the three Baltic States, resulting in the forced deportation of over 50,000 God-fearing, freedom-loving patriots to a life of slavery and for some, death in the Soviet Union.

This occasion also brings into sharper focus the tactics used by the Russians to bring about the occupation and illegal incorporation of the Baltic States. Those tactics I speak of began with the signing of the so-called mutual-assistance pacts between each of the Baltics States and the Soviet Union each of which the Russians forced upon each of the Baltic States. Those pacts gave the Russians the legal authority to establish certain military bases on the sovereign soil of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and were quickly used as an excuse for the occupying armies which flowed into the Baltic States on a prearranged timetable of conquest. You and I remember well the rigged elections, the Russians carried out in each of the Baltic States leading to the establishment of rump parliaments completely responsive to the will of the Kremlin. These acts of piracy were climaxed by petitions for the admission of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union by these same rump parliaments resulting from the same rigged elections which were directed and overseen by the Russian army of occupation. A great many events, most of them tragic in nature, have taken place in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania since those dark days of 1941. The Russians have done everything in their power to destroy those three gallant nations, to eliminate the distinctive and individual character, language, tradition, and aspiration of the people. They have attempted to substitute a new culture called Sovieticus, which you and I know to be very little different from the programs of Russification which characterized the Russian despots who preceded the present gang in the Kremlin. During most of these tragic years, we have held ceremonies such as you have organized today in the hope, that by attracting wider attention to the plight of the Baltic people, we could thereby hasten the day when the yoke of Russian slavery could be lifted from them. There was very little else we could do in those days and we therefore, in clear justice to all the people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, made widespread public protests in their behalf.

In the last several years it has become possible for us to do more than protest the enslavement of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The way has been opened for us to pursue a course of action in the United Nations which could, in my opinion, hasten the day of liberation for all the nations enslaved by communism. That hope has been made possible by the careful, thorough, fact-finding job that was done by the select committee to investigate Communist aggression and whose reports thereon have been acclaimed by all fairminded people as the most authoritative work ever done on the subject of communism. I pay tribute for this unique accomplishment to the Honorable Charles J. Kersten, whose resolution brought about that committee and who served as chairman during the past 2 years.

The third interim report of the select committee set forth all the pertinent facts concerning the occupation and illegal incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. In its conclusions that report held "that the continued military and political occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the U. S. S. R. is a major cause of the dangerous world tensions which now beset mankind and therefore constitutes a serious threat to the peace."

The committee then recommended in that report that the Secretary of State take such steps as might be necessary to cause that threat to world peace to be brought before the then current session of the general assembly of the United Nations. It also recommended that the United States sponsor a resolution in the general assembly for the full and rapid withdrawal of all the military, political and administrative personnel of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from the territories of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The select committee continued its thorough investigation of communism after the publication of such report to which I have just referred, and as a consequence it produced a total of 27 reports on the subject of Communist aggression. In its final summary report the committee recommended that the United States sponsor a resolution in the General Assembly of the United Nations naming the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against all the nations enslaved by communism. On March 22, 1955, there was introduced in the House of Representatives six identical resolutions, all of which sought to cause the Secretary of State to do the following:

1. To instruct the United States representative to the United Nations to transmit to each member nation of the United Nations copies of the summary report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression (House Rept. No. 2684, pt. 16, 83d Cong.) as well as copies of all other reports submitted to the House by such select committee.

2. To formulate a resolution, based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in such House Report No. 2684, part 16, 83d Congress, naming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism.

3. To instruct the United States representative to the United Nations to take immediate steps to place such resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

This resolution was then taken up by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and after careful study was reported out by a vote of 17 to 5. Let me make this clear, this resolution, in every sense of the word, is bipartisan in its origin and in the widespread support it has earned. House Resolution 183, which was sponsored by THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, one of the most able members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, then was submitted to the Rules Committee. This resolution was accompanied by a report which was written by Mr. DODD, and which has been acclaimed as one of the most penetrating and forthright reports to emanate from the Congress in recent years.

During the time this resolution was under consideration in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Department of State sent a letter to the committee opposing the resolution on the basis that it was untimely, counter productive, and likely to provoke the Russians with whom we are about to enter into delicate negotiations, looking forward to the easing of world tensions. The vast majority of members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee found themselves in disagreement with the views of the Department of State and consequently voted in favor of the resolution. When this resolution came before the Rules Committee, which is normal procedure for all legislation before it comes to the floor of the House, the minority position was defended by Representative JOHN VORYS, of Ohio. In advocating the defeat of this resolution he said, among other things, "The diplomatic, military implications of the action proposed by this resolution are far-reaching." He made a strong inference that this resolution was an act of war and that we as a Nation were unprepared to back up this resolution in the United Nations. Obviously, he missed the whole point of the resolution, which is to prevent war. Congressman VORYS also submitted an eleventh-hour letter from Secretary of State Dulles which urged the defeat of House Resolution 183. The underlying theme in Secretary Dulles' letter was "A clear indictment of the U. S. S. R. for its policies of aggression and subversion, is not likely to succeed and that, in the view of the Department, to attempt it would be counter-productive."

While in the past I have strongly commended Secretary Dulles when he has undertaken actions in support of the welfare and security of the United States, in this instance, I regret to say that his judgment is based on the fallacious belief that inaction in support of what is right is preferable to risking defeat in defending the just cause of human freedom. This is not the usual position of Secretary Dulles and I feel that he has become the unwitting victim of the tiptoe artists in the Department of State who have for years advocated a policy of delicate diplomacy in dealing with the Russian Communists. You and I know that the Russian bear has no appreciation whatsoever for the tactics of the ballet artist and is quick to apply the gentle strangling embrace to those who would regard him as a playful kitten. I want to make doubly sure that I am not mistaken in what I have said by repeating that the Democratic administrations were in large measure the victims of this same crowd in the Department of State.

As a consequence of what I have related to you, House Resolution 183 is now reposing in the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. In my estimation, it is likely to remain there for some time unless public demand underscores the importance of this resolution to the welfare and security of the American people, in which case I am certain it will be discharged to be tested by the popular vote of the Representatives of the American people.

In my considered judgment, House Resolution 183 provides us with the first real opportunity to strike a blow for the freedom of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania we have had since their enslavement in 1941.

I pledge to you, and the American people, a dedication of service, until this resolution is submitted to the test of public debate and voted in the Halls of Congress.

Since the administration in Washington has decided to confer with the Russians sometime during July, with a view to determining whether such negotiations can ease world tensions, I have taken the liberty to recommend to the President a number of basic considerations which should govern those discussions. I would like to present to you those basic considerations because I believe their adoption would present a forward step in reducing world tensions, and could very well lead to a restoration of national sovereignty and human free-

dom in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, as well as the other non-Russian nations now enslaved by the Russian Communists. The recommendations I have made to the President are:

First, we must regard such a conference as nothing more than an opportunity for us to spell out for the entire world what we stand for and what we stand against. In this connection, we should make it abundantly clear that we stand for the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and the natural rights of all people to the basic freedoms. We should make it equally clear that we stand unqualifiedly against any form of colonialism or imperialism and in particular, we will never acquiesce to the new Russian colonialism which is being carried out under the camouflage of Communist imperialism.

Secondly, as a logical followup to this first condition, we must demand that the Communist enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements. If we fail to do otherwise, the good people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Russia will look upon any United States participation in a conference at the so-called summit as the failure of the last great hope of mankind, and a sellout of all those moral and political principles which the United States has stood for during the 179 years of our national existence.

Thirdly, the Russians must agree to dismantling and completely removing the Iron Curtain which they have constructed from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They must remove the minefields, the barbed wire, the vicious dogs, the special squads of machinegunners, and all other unnatural barriers which the Russians have concocted in order to divide the world into separate parts. The Russians must agree, without reservation, that the Iron Curtain is the basic obstacle to true peace and freedom.

Fourthly, we must abide by the proven principle of "open covenants openly arrived at." There can be no secret understandings reached at such a conference. To insure against this possibility, the administration should avoid being party to any joint communique being issued from such a conference because the constant Russian demand for unanimity would mean that any joint communique would serve primarily the Kremlin interests. President Eisenhower would be wise to issue his own communique, on a day-to-day basis, covering developments and any successes or failures that might come out of such a conference.

As a great many of you who are gathered here today know, I have attempted to keep myself well informed, not only on the international Communist conspiracy but on all important developments within the vastly expanded empire of the Russian Communists. Many of you have been good enough to send me the most current information on developments within that empire, and to give me the practical benefit of your analysis of the tensions which beset the masters of the Kremlin. As a consequence of this stimulating and rich experience, I have come to the firm conclusion that the masters of the Kremlin have never been in a position as precarious as the one which now beleaguers them. There is no doubt in my mind but what the explosive tensions within all the non-Russian nations within the U. S. S. R., the complete failure of the Russo-Marxist economy, and the increasing demand of all mankind for peace and freedom present a most favorable situation for those who have the knowledge and the courage to stand up for those moral and political principles which form the basis of our civilization. Now, surely, is not the time for us to relax our campaign of truth or our crusade for peace and freedom. This is the most opportune time for us to press forward with a demand for the liberation of all the nations enslaved by the Russian Communists. May God give us light to understand the great opportunity that is ours and the strength to pursue it.

Evacuation Operations at Bangor, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two articles from the Bangor Daily News, a third district, Maine, newspaper.

On June 15 selected communities of the United States participated in evacuation day exercises. Bangor, Maine, was one such community, and—from a civil defense standpoint—the evacuation program was considered a success.

This was the first near-full-scale evacuation of a city in the Northeastern United States, and even the schools took part in the activities. One of the highlights of this participation was the first full-scale evacuation of patients from a hospital during a civil defense test alert.

The following accounts appearing in the Bangor Daily News present a graphic account of these evacuation operations:

FIVE THOUSAND IN DRIVE OUT, TEN PATIENTS MOVED, COSTS STORES $200,000

(By Anne Hannan)

Bangor citizens took to the roads under sunny skies Wednesday in the first full-scale evacuation of a city in the Northeastern United States, but only 5,000 of the estimated 22,000 in the area went out when the whistle blew.

The rest left town ahead of time. Those who participated did so quietly, competently, impressively, and the city for an hour seemed uninhabited.

From a civil defense standpoint, the planning, organization, and working of the evacuation was successful, City CD Director James F. White said, but he added "the people who didn't carry on normal operations today haven't helped us one bit."

BUSINESS COST

The cost of the evacuation to Bangor merchants in loss of retail and wholesale business hit $200,000, according to Norbert X. Dowd, executive secretary of the Bangor Chamber of Commerce. Stores closed at 12:30 and, for the most part, did not reopen.

The evacuation of the east side and the downtown area was not scheduled to begin until 12:30 o'clock, but many stores closed by noon and the streets were almost empty.

The actual evacuation, however, was carried off swiftly and without a hitch, "not even a scratched fender," White claimed jubilantly.

The first hospital in the country ever to be evacuated, the Bankor Osteopathic Hospital, was emptied of 10 patients and equipment in 8 minutes, and arrived in Old Town 50 minutes later.

FIRST CALL

The first call to the schools, warning them to prepare students for evacuation and send out the requests for cars, went out of the CD control center at 11 o'clock.

Almost immediately cars began to fall into the traffic pattern passing the schools, filed slowly to the buildings, stopping briefly to take in four children apiece and proceeding on to State Street and the University of Maine.

The high school was emptied in 8 minutes.

The convoys of children moved carefully and speedily into position, and fell into the traffic moving north in two lanes to Orono. At one time, just as the lead car was turning into the university gates and the last car passing into Veazie, there were two lanes of cars, 8 miles long, stretched along the road by the river.

At 12:08 the children were in Orono.

FIRST BLAST

At 12:30 o'clock the first blast of the 3-minute long wail of the sirens cut the air, and the few hundred people remaining in the business district walked hastily to their cars parked nearby, or hurried to an assembly point where they were picked up.

By the time the sirens had faded the area was deserted.

Flags flapped over empty buildings, pigeons waddled undisturbed across the sidewalks.

Government employees not tabbed for relocation went out and sat in their cars when the siren sounded.

The last car left Bangor about 1:30 o'clock; the children were back by 2:30; and the last adults were crossing the new Bangor-Brewer Bridge (toll free) shortly after that.

TOOK 1 HOUR

On an average it took 1 car a little more than an hour to travel the estimated 26 miles laid out as the routes of evacuation. The all-clear sounded at 1:35 o'clock after a KB-29 from Dow made four passes over the outskirts of the city in a simulated bombing attack.

The civil defense count showed that some 3,000 schoolchildren left the city in 602 cars, while 2,095 adults in 470 cars took off on the signal via State Street and Broadway, and 150 took a Bangor and Aroostook train to Northern Maine Junction.

The entire Operation Scram, 6 months in the planning stages, showed at least "that we can evacuate the citizens of Bangor and do it safely," White said, sizing up the problem after the cars had crossed the city lines again.

PLANNING STANDPOINT

"From a planning standpoint it was a success; we've shown we can execute the plans and organize the evacuation," White commented. "But it also proved that people just won't carry on business as usual if they know the time and date of a test."

"I think they got out of town early," he added, "because they didn't want to get involved in a situation where an accident might develop. But we've proved that accidents aren't necessarily companions of evacuation."

WEEKS OF EFFORT—NATION'S FIRST HOSPITAL EVACUATION WELL PLANNED

(By Beth Kihlmire)

The first full-scale evacuation of patients from a hospital during a civil defense test alert was carried out at the Bangor Osteopathic Hospital Wednesday morning. Ten patients, the probable number who could be evacuated in an actual red alert, were moved to Old Town High School where a complete emergency hospital was set up. The evacuation of the Bangor hospital took just 8 minutes.

At the Old Town High School, osteopathic physicians and members of the hospital's women's auxiliary moved into the school when the alert was sounded at 11 o'clock Wednesday morning. The convoy of 22 vehicles from the Bangor hospital completed the 14-mile trip without incident, and the

first patients entered the emergency hospitals as 11:57 o'clock. In 9 minutes all patients had been received, sorted, and located in the proper wards.

COMPLETE JOB

Fifteen minutes after the convoy arrived at Old Town High School, civil defense headquarters at Bangor was notified by Dr. Michael Longo, civil-defense staff chief of the hospital, that the emergency hospital could care for 235 patients immediately.

The entire evacuation was carried out after months of careful planning by the staff and Miss Lois Beane, R. N., hospital administrator.

"If it can be done here, it can be done anywhere," said Dr. Walter Hamilton, of Portland, osteopathic civilian defense head.

Fourteen members of the Bangor High School ROTC served as little bearers in the evacuation, taking 2 minutes to move a patient from hospital bed to waiting vehicle.

Twenty-two vehicles, including two trucks, carried the hospital medical and nursing staff, as well as equipment for possible emergency use enroute and for the temporary hospital to be established in Old Town.

FAST ACTION

Immediately on arrival at Old Town the entire organization went into action, setting up receiving and sorting wards, shock wards, X-ray room, operating room, first aid centers, radiation wards, cafeteria, communication center, burn wards and other vital parts of the hospital.

The emergency operating room was functioning 20 minutes after the convoy reached the new quarters and patients were being admitted "for surgery," which was carried through in all but actual fact.

Dr. Wilfred Rambo's X-ray room was in order when the ROTC litter bearers suddenly became casualties. Legs were X-rayed and put in casts in short order. Other casualties suffered burns, shock, and hysteria, the latter case needing seven husky men to control him.

Set up to run independently of outside help for 24 hours, the emergency hospital was complete, efficient, and well-staffed. As a problem for civil defense headquarters at Bangor, Dr. Longo requested via radio manned by Lt. William Tiffany of the Maine CAP Wing, Bangor Squadron "expendable hospital supplies for a 500-bed hospital for 48 hours of operation."

Civil defense headquarters also were asked to "send 220-volt generator to Old Town High School for power supply for improvised hospital," and warned that "hospital personnel and X-ray films in danger from radiation exposure. Send geiger counter to Old Town High School."

AMPLE ROOM

Since graduation was scheduled Wednesday night at the school, the gymnasium was not used for hospital purposes, but in an actual emergency it could hold 100 cots, according to Dr. Edward Ropulewis, unit director of the improvised hospital.

Sandwiches, cookies, and beverages were served to patients and hospital personnel during the emergency, the patients being comfortably established in their new quarters and under the efficient care of the medical and nursing staff.

The order to evacuate the temporary hospital and return to Bangor came at 1:21 o'clock Wednesday afternoon. Loading of patients and equipment began at 1:35 o'clock, and was completed in less than 5 minutes, due to the large number of volunteers who assisted.

On their return to the Bangor Osteopathic Hospital Wednesday afternoon the hospital and medical personnel could say "mission accomplished" with truth.

At the hospital in Bangor ambulatory patients would have been discharged in an actual alert, and those unable to leave the hospital would be taken to the lead-walled X-ray room. In the trial evacuation these patients remained in their beds at the hospital in the care of a stand-by staff.

WELL TRAINED

First-aid stations were manned along the evacuation route by medical staff members at Orono, Kenduskeag, and Levant. At the emergency hospital osteopathic Old Town physicians and volunteers, including a group of Old Town Girl Scouts under the direction of Mrs. Edward Mills, aided in receiving the patients and equipment.

The Bangor ROTC boys were well trained by Dick Wescott of the nursing staff at the hospital. Dr. Michael Longo served as chief of the civil-defense staff, with Dr. John L. Crowther as chief of medical services. Dr. James K. Mellott is chief of surgical services, and Miss Lois H. Beane, RN. is hospital administrator. Communications were handled by Dr. Frank Stager, assistant to Dr. Crowther, with the assistance of the CAP.

Acceptance of Honorary Membership in Massachusetts Department of Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the partial remarks I delivered in accepting the honorary membership in the Massachusetts Department of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., at the convention banquet, held in Fall River, Mass., on Sunday, June 19, 1955:

I deeply appreciate your thoughtfulness and your hospitality.

It came as a very pleasant surprise when I was notified that you had considered me as being worthy of honorary membership in your fine organization of veterans.

In the 14 years during which I have served in the Congress of the United States it has been my sincere endeavor to work for legislation beneficial to the 20 million men and women who have loved our country even above life itself.

To dignify the memory of those who did not come back.

To protect their widows and orphans.

To care for those in veterans hospitals.

And to perpetuate those American principles to which your organization is devoted.

It was a happy circumstance for me that I was born and brought up in the city of Lawrence, where Irish and Italian neighbors predominate.

Our two peoples are very close together in their mutual reverence for God and their passionate faith in freedom of opportunity for all men.

While our parents worked hard in factory and in home to open the way to a better life for us, we learned the lessons of American partnership.

On the empty lots where we played baseball and football, and through the years of our schooling where we developed the courage, the skill, and the friendships that make faith in freedom so strong, we created a new relationship.

The brotherhood of American citizenship.

The vital, alternating current that passes from one to another, and back again, building respect, and confidence, and fellowship.

This is the reason why our Nation is great; a reason so simple and true that tyrants can never understand it.

The people of the United States generate a human power that produces abundance in time of peace, and fighting men of unsurpassed morale in time of danger.

No king, or dictator, or palace guard could ever order the advances we are making.

Because we are doing it on our own, as human beings who believe that the making of a man is the first and foremost production of all, releasing those talents in each that enrich the whole American scene.

The number of automobiles that can be observed on every thoroughfare in the Nation—Sunset Boulevard to Scollay Square—or the list of mechanical servants in every home is not the real measure of our progress.

We do not value friends by their credit rating.

Ours is the growing nation where the extremes of poverty and wealth are being absorbed into the general prosperity that promotes good will.

Our fathers and mothers worked long and hard, cheered by the certainty of a better future for their children.

When Mrs. Clancy was sick abed and Mrs. Deluca brought over some hot food for the children, a strangeness disappeared.

And when Mr. Pappalardo approached Mr. Sullivan, hat in hand, to ask for a job on the construction crew, Mr. Sullivan said: "Put your hat on and go to work and never forget that all men are equals here," a comradeship began that brought happiness to both.

Culminated when the daughter of one and the son of the other were married a few years later.

That is what we mean by the human power of trust and affection as people learn to understand and appreciate each other in freedom.

I remember the Verdi Band on the common; the fiestas.

The hospitality and the joy of living that made one feel right at home among friends of Italian descent.

That was many, formative years ago.

Today I feel that warmth of welcome—on a larger scale—as I am adopted for honorary membership in the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States.

I humbly hope that I may be a credit to the family—living up to the patriotic ideals exemplified by my comrades in the department of Massachusetts.

For as we adopt one another—strengthening the ties of the larger American family—we are building a human power that will surely triumph over every evil and every danger that may threaten our unity.

Together we shall go on building a better America, day by day and in every way.

In liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Table of Canadian Postwar Financial Assistance Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from R. A. Farquharson, counsellor, Canadian Embassy, enclosing table of Canadian postwar financial assistance abroad.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of June 2 a few remarks of yours on Canadian foreign aid which do not seem to do full justice to the part which my country has played in the common task of postwar international reconstruction and mutual defense.

I enclose a summary table listing the assistance which Canada has made available to other countries for postwar reconstruction, mutual aid and technical assistance. You will notice that it totals more than four billion Canadian dollars since the end of the war. Inasmuch as Canada's national income is only about one-fifteenth of that of the United States, I think you will agree that Canada's contribution to our friends and allies abroad has been fairly generous.

So far as the United Kingdom is concerned, it should be noted that not only did we provide an interest-free loan of $1,185,000,000 without any security, but also that a very substantial amount of our NATO mutual aid in the form of military end items, materials and air-training has been granted to Great Britain.

I hope you will welcome this additional information on Canada's foreign-aid program.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. FARQUHARSON,
Counsellor.

COVERING NOTE FOR TABLE OF CANADIAN POST-WAR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ABROAD

The following are the full names for some of the abbreviations used on this table:

UNRRA—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

IRO—International Refugee Organization.

ICEM—Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

UNHCR—United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

UNICEF—United Nations Children's Fund.

UNKRA—United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

UNTAA—United Nations Technical Assistance Administration.

2. The figures given for the Canadian subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund are stated in Canadian dollars. These figures are given for March 31, 1954, as they appeared in the public accounts of Canada. In the case of the International Bank the figure represents the amount actually made available in accordance with the Bank's Articles of Agreement. So far as the International Monetary Fund is concerned, the Canadian commitment consists of $75 million in gold which has already been subscribed, and the Canadian dollar equivalent of $225 million United States in noninterest-bearing demand notes.

3. The figures given in the table for reconstruction loans represent the amounts actually utilized from the total which had been appropriated. No allowance has been made for subsequent repayments.

4. The figures for Canadian participation in the Colombo plan should be considered with the following points in mind:

(a) The figures generally represent the amounts appropriated (except for the deduction mentioned in footnote No. 1 of an amount which had lapsed).

(b) After 1953–54 the Colombo plan contribution has been voted in such a form that it does not lapse at the end of each fiscal year but is available until spent.

(c) From 1953–54 onward the capital and technical assistance votes were combined although a distinction continues to be maintained by the Canadian authorities between these two forms of expenditure for administrative purposes.

(d) The administrative costs for Canadian Colombo plan operations both in Ottawa and abroad are generally included in the Department of External Affairs, and Department of Trade and Commerce estimates not in the Colombo plan vote itself.

Canadian postwar financial assistance abroad

[Millions of Canadian dollars]

	Authorized or appropriated to Mar. 31, 1953	Provided in estimates 1953–54	Provided in estimates 1954–55	Estimates 1955–56	Total
1. Reconstruction loans:					
Belgium	68.8				
China	75.0				
Czechoslovakia	16.7				
France	253.4				
Netherlands	123.9				
Indonesia	15.5				
Norway	23.7				
United Kingdom	1,185.0				
U. S. S. R.	15.2				
Total	1,777.2				1,777.2
2. Military relief:					
Balkans, Belgium, Denmark, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway	105.2				105.2
3. Grants:					
(a) To U. N. agencies and programs:					
UNRRA	154.0				
Post-UNRRA relief	12.1				
Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees	.2				
IRO	18.8				
ICEM	.2	.2	.25	.2	
UNHCR	.1		.05		
UNICEF	7.9	.5	.5	.5	
UNKRA	7.3		.5		
Palestine Arab refugees	3.2	.5	.5		
UNTAA	1.7	.8	1.5	1.5	
Total	205.5	2.0	3.30	2.2	213.0
(b) Colombo plan:					
Capital assistance (India, Pakistan, Ceylon)	50.0				
Technical assistance	.7				
Total	50.7	25.4	23.4	26.4	[1] 127.9
(c) Special relief:					
Greece (wheat)	.85				
Korea (fish)			.750		
Pakistan (wheat)		5.0			
Greece (earthquake relief)		.5			
India, Pakistan, Nepal (floods)			.225		
Haiti (fish)			.025		
Japan (flood relief)		.05			
Yugoslavia (fish)	.045				
Total	.895	5.55	1.0		7.445
(d) NATO: Mutual aid (transfers from Canadian stocks, new production items, NATO aircrew training, etc.) and infrastructure	571.7	344.6	312.0	175.0	1,403.3
4. International organizations: [2]					
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (valued on Mar. 31, 1954)	70.9				
International Monetary Fund (valued on Mar. 31, 1954)	322.5				
Total	393.4				393.4
Grand total	3,104.595	377.55	341.700	203.6	4,027.445

[1] A deduction of $529,296 from the money appropriated has been made to exclude appropriated funds which lapsed before Mar. 31, 1953. Later appropriations will not lapse but will remain available until spent.
[2] Canada has also agreed to participate in the International Finance Corporation now being established.

Address by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, at American Legion Convention at Tucson, Ariz.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made last Friday before the American Legion Convention at Tucson, Ariz.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, TUCSON, ARIZ., ON FRIDAY, JUNE 17, 1955

Ever since he first walked on the face of the earth, man has been called upon to speculate on the future and his relationship with other men. War and the threat of war always seem to be an appalling prospect upon

a never-ending succession of horizons. As each horizon and crisis was approached a new one would be disclosed. As each succeeding generation improved upon the military skills of his civilization, his defensive and offensive needs became more and more complex.

Then came Hiroshima. That was the day that man finally succeeded in his efforts of finding a way of wiping himself off the face of the earth; the day when he seemed to have reached what many believe to be the final horizon for human speculation.

This awesome weapon coupled with the modern long-range aircraft suddenly made time honored and proven military concepts obsolete. Military planners and thinkers were stirred to their depths. Atomic and thermonuclear airpower became a force transcending geographical barriers.

Recently, on the floor of the Senate, I indicated that we as a people have never fully understood the complexities of modern war or this Nation's military responsibilities. Too often, and this is most unfortunate, the frightening experience of war and the means to prevent it have been for many of us a personal matter, an inconvenience, something only remotely connected with what was considered to be more pressing and personal domestic problems. That day has ceased to exist. We can no longer live in little worlds of our own.

Because power has become so important in modern international relationships it is necessary that we understand its complexion and composition. To avoid the war of the future, we must understand war.

For the past several months your Congress has been carefully evaluating the proposed military budget for the next fiscal year. All of you, I am sure, are aware of the magnitude of the amount of money that is involved. In its discussions and hearings your Congress has considered the requirements of each of the three services, not only in the light of how to insure the safety of this country against possible military aggression but also to make certain that our security will be achieved by the economic use of our resources: materiel and manpower.

Until recently our military forces could be and were designed and maintained in light of our geographical position. Our relatively isolated position on the face of this globe has always been in our favor and was a factor influencing American military thinking and planning. This isolation gave us time, and time in the past provided us with that element of security which spelled victory in our military ventures. Today, however, we can no longer afford the luxury of maintaining a position "just strong enough" in order to gain the time necessary to permit us to turn the spirit and capabilities of our people into actions in support of a war effort. With the advent of the thermonuclear air age it has now become necessary for us to have a force in being capable of forestalling or turning back any threat: a force that will determine the final outcome of a struggle the moment it begins. Mobilization drafts, and sparring for time will be neither practical nor possible. If we understand this, we need have no fear of the future.

It is axiomatic that before we can arrive at a satisfactory solution to a problem, we must first understand what the problem is. In any modern day military planning it is essential that both our military planners and civilian population understand the nature of the threat.

Since the termination of World War II, the aggressive and evil designs of world communism have become increasingly evident. The past 10 years have been a visible expression of Marxist-Lenin teachings; Communistic attempts to extend its influence over the free nations of the world have been alarmingly successful.

The military stature of the Soviets has shown a tremendous improvement. In the emergence of a truly productive aeronautical industry the Soviets have been most impressive. The Russians have developed an Air Force numerically second to none. Modern-type jet fighters and bombers are standard operating aircraft within the USSR. Even the satellite nations are expanding and modernizing their air fleets. Soviet and satellite aircraft developments not only represent a considerable technological gain for the Communists but have upset the timetable of our own military thinking. We seem to have consistently underestimated the ability of the Soviet Union to produce all types of weapons. For example, we thought they could not duplicate our B–29 in less than 6 or 7 years; the Soviets did it in 2 years. We believed they would have some difficulties in making a good copy of a jet engine. Production of a better one was launched in the Soviet Union in less than 1 year. Our best scientific analysts claimed the Reds would not develop an atomic bomb in less than 6 to 10 years. We all were dumbfounded by a surprise Soviet nuclear explosion within 3 years after they first began developing the device. Most recently they have displayed supersonic day fighters in operational quantities, and all-weather fighters also in operational numbers. Most important, however, has been their development to the production stage of a long range heavy bomber comparable to our B–52. Is it any wonder, therefore, that we have some cause for concern? Should we not then consider our military needs and structure in the light of these developments within the Soviet Union?

The margin of superiority that this Nation once held over the Communists has been narrowed and, in certain instances, has been equaled. Today the Red bloc possesses the capability of striking anywhere within the United States. There is little that we can do to prevent Soviet production of military weapons. There is no practical way to stop them from building intercontinental bombers. We can and should, however, maintain a force capable of dampening her visions of world domination. We can and must keep our guard up, for the best way to prevent a war is to be able to win it. If we falter in these efforts to hold and increase our lead then we throw away our best insurance for peace.

We have, therefore, a twofold issue before us: First, we have the problem of restraining the expansionistic desires of world communism; and, second, the all-important need of defeating Red forces should aggression be forced upon us. Since for us military power is peace power, I should like to devote consideration to the first of these tasks, namely, influencing the behavior of the Soviets in a manner satisfactory to our interests.

As I have already indicated, the extension or limitation of a nation's wills, inclinations, and desires are closely related to the military posture of that nation. Call it power diplomacy if you will, but it is, nevertheless, the fact of our times. I say this even with the full realization that superior military power is no all-embracing solution. Many factors, including spiritual and moral, are essential to the preservation of peace. Unfortunately, no reliable way—and I stress the word "reliable"—has yet been found to do away with the need for physical strength if one is to reach the minds of men such as found in the Kremlin. The futility of war can be demonstrated to these men only through a position of strength.

Many may wonder then as to whether it is necessary that we be armed to the teeth. The question also arises as to whether more money is required for our military budgets. To both of these questions my answer would be a categorical "no." It is not so much a question of making certain that more money should be provided for military expenditures. I believe that money will always be forthcoming. Rather, the issue is to make certain that the money is wisely spent and that we develop only those forces required and capable of fulfilling their required mission. This, today, more than ever before, must be understood if the money we do spend on military force is to give us a military organization tailored to fit future requirements.

We and our allies today face the full potential fury of an enemy in the early phases of any future war. Today modern aircraft and the weapons of mass destruction have telescoped both time and space. The composition, command, and structure of our military forces must be accomplished with this factor in mind.

Field Marshal Montgomery, Deputy NATO commander, vividly describes the war of the future in three phases. In the first phase he visualizes a worldwide struggle for mastery in the air. The second phase will be concerned with the destruction of enemy land forces, while the third or bargaining phase will be the period when the enemy's homeland and all it contains will be at the mercy of air power. Both in his thinking and the thinking of NATO staff, the dominant factor in a future war will be air power. Field Marshal Montgomery cautions us, however, that like in so many things we do and say, we too often only pay lip service to this great truth. Too often many military thinkers, both civilian and military, accept air power as the key weapons system but fail to apply this thinking to our military planning. Even in the NATO organization, representation of allied air forces is inadequate. It seems to me that too few Air Force officers are in command or policy positions in this defense organization.

Operating in the medium of space, unrestricted by the definitive boundaries of land or sea, air forces are inherently capable of operating anywhere and at any time. This potential exposes the entire structure of other nations—both the material and social components—to the influence of air operations.

The proper employment of air forces requires recognition of their versatility as a component of the military instrument of national policy.

Adherence to these principles will provide the maximum return for our investment, disregarding them involves a high degree of risk and possible defeat.

The medium in which air forces operate—space—is an indivisible field of activity. This medium, in combination with the characteristics of air vehicles, invests air forces with the great flexibility that is the basis of their strength. For this flexibility to be exploited fully, the air forces must be responsive at all levels of operation to employment as a single, aggregate instrument.

All command arrangements must be in accord with the precept that neither air forces nor their field of activity can be segmented and partitioned among different interests. Because air forces possess the inherent ability to concentrate effort at decisive times and places, they can be employed in a variety of tasks for the purpose of accomplishing a variety of effects. They can perform the tasks simultaneously or in rapid sequence, with all supporting a common objective. However, the versatility that makes this wide variety of employment possible has also led to demands on our Air Force of a divisive nature. The segmenting of our air power potential and the diffusion of its effort in unrelated or secondary tasks is an infeasible and an excessively costly undertaking. The full advantages of flexibility of our air power is being lost, the unity and integrity of our Air Force is being destroyed, and its strength has been dissipated in a piecemeal effort.

It is inconceivable to me that much of our military thinking still remains largely tied to

surface strategies and looks at airpower in the light of a supporting force. Military concepts, and thus military budgets, are unnecessarily restricted by tradition. These prejudices of history must be overcome if the contribution of our airpower to national policy is to be decisive.

In the past the primary medium of power of a maritime nation was seapower. Within the past few years airpower has replaced seapower as the key to national strategy. Since it is a key, it must be the dominant force.

American airpower can and does vitally affect our relationships with the Soviet Union. Its effectiveness as an instrument of national policy must not be hampered either by parceling out its elements or by assigning to it tasks that do not contribute to securing or maintaining worldwide air domination.

Airpower has given us a new meaning for such principles of war as "economy, flexibility, security, surprise, and control." The factors that influenced the course of previous conflicts have become meaningless since the nature of the medium of space gives to the Air Force a versatility never known to service forces. I certainly do not suggest that we do away with surface forces merely because we are in a nuclear air age. It is incredible to me, though, that many still consider the military budget to be a pie that should be cut into three equal or near equal slices. This competition for a part of the tax dollar is bad enough but where such competition compromises our national security the result may well be disastrous.

It is my opinion that the problem here is simply one of a definition of the meaning of airpower. The tendency exists to paraphrase our historical definition of seapower to the extent that many consider airpower as the sum of military aviation—Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine—civil aviation, civil air transport, the aircraft industry, and the aeronautical skills of the country. In other words, many hold that airpower comprises the entire portion of the national effort that expresses itself in aircraft, aircrews, and operational facilities. This is not airpower; it is air potential. Such a definition is inaccurate in that it omits the principal ingredient, namely, unity of command.

Far too many have failed to emphasize this element of unity which must be inherent in airpower. Today the administrative compartmentation of our Air Forces is creating an organization that is neither fish nor fowl. Too much thinking is in terms of either offensive atomic airpower, or air-defense measures, or tactical land support operations, or theater air operations, etc. To complicate matters, we have four Air Forces each busily engaged in or vying with each other to perform each of these tasks. Instead, we should be concerned with the unification of our entire airpower potential into a single force—an Air Force in being that can go anywhere to do what is necessary.

We have worked ourselves into the position of being so concerned with achieving a mechanical balance of force that we have ended up with an unbalanced offensive-defensive structure. Instead of balance we must be concerned with the establishment of a military force in harmony with our defense requirements.

Over the North Pole from Arctic bases of the Soviet Union, the Red Air Force has a massive bomber air fleet capable of striking at us with nuclear weapons. The defense against this attack and our ability to retaliate is completely dependent upon the power of our Air Force. If we lose the first phase, which is the struggle for mastery in the air, in this war of the future, the outcome of the last two phases as defined by Field Marshal Montgomery will not be in doubt—for the Soviet Union.

Just as in the days past, sea power was the strategy whereby nations were controlled and was the measure of the strength of nations, so too in this modern day is the strategy of airpower the only logical and genuinely acceptable avenue of approach to the problem of creating and maintaining world peace.

Russia does not have to rely on the ocean for her lines of communication and supply. Russia is essentially self-sufficient, and even the satellites that now come under her vicious wings are approached by land or, more important, they are now easily approachable by air. Hence the real power of ocean offensive—blockade and strangulation—will not affect Russia's ability to exist during war, or even to wage to a successful conclusion. On the other hand, her submarines can roam the seas, where we used to feel safe, and apply the same strategy against us which we would apply against her were sea power a factor in our retaliation potential.

By an emphasis on airpower, we utilize our technological advantages, we learn upon our great productive ability, we exploit the basic weakness of the enemy, which is now interior communication, and we do so with a minimum of manpower and a considerably reduced burden upon the economy of our country. This latter consideration is of especial importance, for the proponents of Bolshevik communism have often stated that they will destroy the Western Powers from within by destroying their economic systems; and, if we continue the policy based on the illusion that the unlimited use of money will strengthen us, then we give concrete impetus to their mode of destruction. No economy, including that of the United States, can stand forever the pressures of maintaining full war production and full war manpower in periods of peace. We can, however, look carefully at our hole card, and then proceed in an intelligent and forceful manner to strengthen it.

Agricultural Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Let's Face Some Facts," delivered by O. B. Jesness, the head of the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Minnesota, at the annual meeting of the American Seed Trade Association, in Minneapolis, on June 17.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S FACE SOME FACTS

(O. B. Jesness, head, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Minnesota)

The topic "Let's Face Some Facts" implies that we may not now be doing this to the extent we should. This, I believe, is true with respect to some aspects of the current agricultural situation and the programs dealing with it. A look at some apparent misapprehensions may help us see some of the facts which need facing.

While the talk of depression is somewhat less prevalent and emphatic than it was last year when we were in a mild recession, voice is still given to the idea that farmers once again are experiencing depression woes. Some may contend that what is important is that many farmers are feeling the pinch between lower prices and relatively fixed costs and that what we call it is not particularly significant. This overlooks the fact that it is important to know the causes in deciding on what we should do about it.

No one will deny that in comparison with the peaks of early postwar years the bloom is off the boom as far as the farmer is concerned. But it does not follow from this that the cause is depression. That can hardly be the case with industry, business and employment at present high levels. Surely no one can find in this picture any adequate explanation for the weakened economic position of agriculture. It, consequently, is not a situation appropriately described as depression. The explanation clearly lies on the side of abundance in supply rather than in a depressed market. This is one fact which we should recognize.

There may be those who will come back with the suggestion that while this may be true of the domestic market, it does not explain the drop off in farm exports. Here again one finds a high level of activity in most of the developed areas of the world. For instance, Western Europe is not robed in sackcloth of depression. Activity is at a high level. True, their takings of some American farm products are well below those of the postwar peak. What needs to be kept in mind, however, is that large exports of such commodities as wheat in early postwar years were unusual. They helped fill a gap until agriculture in Western Europe could recover from war disruption. They also were made possible by our grants of aid to help recovery in this area. These are important considerations to bear in mind as we assay the prospects for exporting our surpluses.

It is no secret that price occupies the spotlight in agricultural programs. Prices of some commodities are supported in an endeavor to raise farm incomes. Some of the points we may not always face up to on this front include the fact that price supports apply only to a minority of farm products rather than being across the board, that if prices are supported above levels which the market otherwise would find, surpluses will arise with controls over rights to produce and sell following, that arbitrary price supports create international difficulty, that price supports provide no aid for the real low income people on the land who do not produce significantly for market, that our efforts to manipulate prices treat consequences rather than causes.

A widely held notion is that the relatively favorable farm incomes of the 1940's resulted from the support program. The facts are that it was war demand which produced a strong market. Price supports served as standby protection. Consumers who thought price supports were a major factor in cost of food during this period may need to be reminded that the cause was war rather than the support program. In pointing out some areas where we appear not to be facing up fully to the facts of life, it may be in order to include mention of the political aspects of the farm question. Let us be clear on one point. The Congress and the administration have a real function in developing our agricultural policy and in shaping programs to put that policy into operation. There can be no quarrel over this. However, there may be less agreement over whether these representatives of the public may not be too concerned at times over the immediate political appeal rather than the service of such programs to the ends of general welfare. However, criticism of the Congress on this score may be misdirected. The fault may lie with the general public for creating a situation where political appeal rather than economic consequences may be given priority.

We are coming around to facing a condition which many have overlooked up to now. Reference is had to the fact that the problems of many of the low-income people on the land have been overlooked by our concentration on price and income programs which affect primarily the cmmercial farmers who are better equipped to look after themselves.

Having noted some of the situations which are suggestive of our failure to look at the facts with sufficient care, let us take note of some of the facing up to facts in which we ought to engage.

What view should we take of the surplus accumulation which at present represents a tie-up of the tidy sum of around $7 billion? First of all, it is to be noted that this is not a universal surplus situation. The surpluses consist of a limited number of commodities under price support. Wheat constitutes the largest item among CCC holdings. Cotton, butter, cheese, dried milk and a few other commodities are in the picture to some extent. Beef cattle, hogs, poultry and eggs, fruits and vegetables are not under price supports and in most instances are not particularly well suited to a building up of stocks, so are not a part of that CCC headache.

In line with the observation made above, wheat supplies have piled up because of expanded output rather than because of a depressed market. True, exports are down from those of the later war and early postwar years. But that represented an unusual rather than a normal situation. It is expanded output which explains the fact that we are heading into a new crop year with a record carryover of more than a billion bushels of wheat.

The world was well supplied with wheat at the outbreak of war in 1939. Even at the relatively moderate level of support in the 1930's we had unusually large stocks. We found that supply useful in the war period as feed to expand livestock and as raw material for industrial alcohol for synthetic rubber and other purposes. Supplies were down by 1943 so there was encouragement for expansion. Acres devoted to wheat rose from a level of 50 to 60 million to near 80 million. Part of this came from shifting acres from other crops to wheat, but a considerable share involved plowing up of grassland, especially in the Southwest winter wheat belt. Prior to 1944 this country had produced only one crop as large at a billion bushels. For the decade 1944–53 we went above this figure every year except one when we fell below by less than 20 million bushels. This outpouring of golden grain was welcome during the period when war and postwar needs saw exports of 300 to 500 million bushels a year. However, as soon as these tapered off, supplies again strated to accumulated. Korea interrupted this buildup temporarily but it was soon resumed and became especially marked from 1952 on. Supplies made it necessary to invoke the marketing quota provisions of the law. Acres for the 1954 crop were limited to 62 million and in 1955 were cut to the lowest limit permissible under the law, 55 million acres.

Were the surplus due to a depressed market or other temporary conditions, holding acres out of wheat for the time being would be appropriate. However, barring an unforeseen war, there is no prospect for a return of a market calling for billion bushel crops in the United States. The domestic demand for food is not over half that figure and even when usual seed, feed, and industrial uses are added, 700 million bushels appear more than ample to supply the domestic market. Some may suggest that this overlooks our population growth. Wheat, however, presents an interesting case in this respect. Our domestic food use of wheat has remained approximately the same over a long period of years. Per capita consumption has declined with a shift to other foods at a rate which has offset the increase in population. Our supplies of feed grains and ability to produce them do not give much hope of greatly enlarged feed use, and certainly not at the price-support levels which have prevailed.

Recovery of agriculture in Western Europe and increased supplies in other exporting nations do not provide a basis for a hope of any decided increase in exports above the level of the past year or so. In fact, the only way we have maintained this volume is by heavy subsidy made possible by the International Wheat Agreement.

Mention might be made of the strong belief in some quarters that large quantities of wheat and other surpluses can be disposed of abroad by some two-price system. The International Wheat Agreement, in effect, involves such a plan. However, that operates only for the amount of the quota and is workable mainly because it is an agreement. Any general program of selling products abroad at lower prices than those maintained at home involves dumping. Other nations are certain to object to any extensive program of this nature on our part. There is a temptation to see only possibilities and to shut our eyes to the limitations of such a scheme. Here, again, there is need for facing the facts.

Our wheat situation focuses attention on the need for taking out more or less permanently a sizable amount of resources used for this crop. The present market quota is unsuited to this purpose. With the minor exception of durum wheat, the quota system operates on the incorrect assumption that all classes of wheat are equally in surplus. This ignores the fact that hard winter wheat represents a large bulk of the stocks and that the expansion has been relatively great in wheat in the Southwest, in red winter in the central States and in the soft white wheat of the Pacific Northwest. It also fails to make a distinction between the farmer for whom wheat has been a longtime enterprise and one who jumped in to share in war prices. It treats the farmer who has adapted his acreage to conservation farming in the same way as the one who has gone "hog-wild" in wheat. It treats the farmer who grows wheat for feed in the same way as the one who grows for market. However, it does not affect the very small grower so over a period of time could increase his importance, a doubtful way of improving production efficiency.

Area controls, if employed for any length of time, lead to a situation not contemplated by their backers. Rights to produce take on values of their own and when tied to the land raise land prices. Tobacco provides an excellent illustration of this. When this happens, the gains go to the seller rather than to remain with the land.

But a shrink in wheat producing capacity is called for. Moderation in wheat supports may help induce a shift where farmers have alternatives, such as in the red winter wheat in the central States and the eastern parts of the hard winter area. Such shifts are less likely farther West. The situation suggests that instead of placing all of our faith in price supports we should undertake a program which will provide incentives to turn back to grass some of the land in wheat, particularly in parts of the Southwest.

Cotton stocks, while large, are less a problem. Here the foreign market has more promise and the domestic market is expected to expand unless prices are held so high that exports are discouraged and synthetics are encouraged. The resource which may be overabundant in cotton is labor; in wheat, it is largely land. Cotton production may be destined to decline further in the old Cotton Belt of the Southeast. If so, the problem will be simplified if there is a continued expansion of nonagricultural work opportunities in that area. This provides an illustration of how part of a farm problem may be solved by developments in other lines.

Dairy products, especially fluid milk, cheese, and dried milk, had markets expanded by war requirements. Butter had to give up milk supply to other uses so its consumption was cut by rationing. The expected recovery in per capita consumption after the war has not occurred. Instead, the postwar years have seen a continuation of a marked replacement of butter by other products, especially margarine, with a total consumption of table spreads remaining below prewar levels—partly a result of the decline in bread consumption.

Population growth and some increase in per capita consumption suggest that the problem of surpluses in dairy products may be overcome within a few years. This does not rule out the need for some adjustments. Our dairy industry clearly must continue to concentrate on cost reductions and quality improvement. It must avoid unrealistic pricing which places obstacles in the way of retaining markets. Some restrictive barriers play an important role in milk markets and some of these merit careful scrutiny. Areas of higher costs and lesser production advantages should carry the major share of readjustment and this includes some parts of market milk sheds.

Considerable emphasis is being placed on demand expansion by the dairy industry. Without in any way intending to belittle such efforts, a word of caution may be in place. It is unrealistic to believe that we Americans will eat our way out of farm surpluses if only enough money is spent on advertising. There is a good reason why the total per capita intake of food is relatively fixed. That reason is the limited stretch in the human stomach. In a well-fed country, an increase in the consumption of some foods tends to be balanced by decreases in others. However, a larger overall market for agriculture is provided if a larger share of the diet consists of animal products rather than being made up of cereals and potatoes. Over a period of time the market for farm products may be expanded by shifts with a greater reliance on animal products.

Cattle and hog producers are well acquainted with ups and downs because of the cycles which livestock numbers and prices display. Cattle prices broke sharply in the latter months of 1952, not because of a depressed market, but because of the buildup in numbers in response to earlier attractive prices. Hog prices are down at present for the same reason. No one likes to go through the low stage of the price cycle, but livestock farmers know that they bring these situations on by their own price responses. While there have been demands for price supports for livestock at such times, the livestock industry has chosen to carry the major responsibilities for making its own adjustments. Shifting the problem to the Government would not have made readjustments unnecessary.

One notion we must get over is that there is some simple, easy answer to a situation of surpluses now existing in some farm commodities. There is no painless or costless way. The costs of holding these stocks and of their deterioration fall on the taxpayers. Having the stocks hanging over the market certainly is not costless to farmers. Reduced incomes flow from production controls because it takes volume as well as price to produce an income. In truth, some pain is unavoidable once we have gotten into such a dilemma.

As the above indicates, we are not fully realistic in placing sole faith in price supports, whether they be rigid ones at the 90-percent level or flexible ones. We need to face up to the basic solutions and readjustments which each individual situation requires. We need to give up the idea that

someone is going to discover a universal solvent for our problems. There is none.

We blissfully go ahead and cite overall average farm income figures arrived at by dividing the total farm income by some over 5 million farms which the census credits us with having. Over a million of these are primary rural residences rather than farms producing for market. Over 600,000 additional are part-time farms operated by persons with other employment. A considerable additional number are small-scale farms. About 2 million farms produce by far the larger share of the market supply. The incomes of their operators compare rather favorably with those in other lines. These are our commercial farms and are the ones principally affected by our price-support programs.

The so-called "family farm" has been surrounded with a sentimental halo without too much care in defining what sort of a unit this is. A vast majority of our farms are individual units run by the farmer and his family. These farms are getting larger as they need to in order to make effective use of modern technology and mechanization. Instead of deploring as some seem to do the fact that farms are growing larger and the farm population is shrinking, why not recognize that this is a desirable adjustment in resource use which paves the way for better incomes and better living for farm families? Some try to frighten us by claiming that corporate farming is driving out the individual units. Were this the case the number of hired farm workers would show a decided increase. Instead, the number of hired workers on farms today is not much over half of what it was 35 years ago.

The Nation is just getting around to recognizing that the low-income people living on the land constitutes an entirely different problem than that of commercial agriculture and that this problem calls for different lines of attack rather than to be reached by price manipulation. Instead of charging the Department of Agriculture with a desire to drive people off the land, let us recognize that the most promising opportunities for some of these people lie in nonagricultural lines. Some other with appropriate help and guidance may join the ranks of commercial farmers. Still others because of age or disabilities or other limitations may be better off staying where they are, and some are candidates for public relief.

The preceding review is illustrative rather than exhaustive. It is sufficient, however, to show that we do need to do a better job of finding out what the real facts are and then facing them frankly. We do not have a farm problem. The farm problems are legion. There is no cure-all. Remedies must be adapted to each case. The attainment of this end should be our goal.

Jet Builder Optimist on United States Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a recent article from the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Jet Builder Optimist on United States Airpower."

This article by a distinguished staff reporter of that newspaper, Mr. John G. Norris, sets forth the views of a pioneer in jet engine development.

It is reassuring to note that, according to this expert, Mr. Frederick B. Rentschler, this Nation is strong in the air and moving toward greater strength. The American people greatly desire that our Air Force and our other defense arms be kept powerful and dynamic—able to ward off any attack and to visit devastating retaliation against any aggressor.

The article follows:

JET BUILDER OPTIMIST ON UNITED STATES AIRPOWER

(By John G. Norris)

Some enlightening and encouraging comment on the status of American airpower as compared to Russia's came last week from the founder and head of the Nation's biggest defense contractor. Newsmen journeyed to Hartford, Conn., Thursday, for one of the rare news conferences held by Frederick B. Rentschler, board chairman of United Aircraft Corp., leading builders of jet aircraft engines. They came away with no hot news, but a valuable and penetrating analysis of a vital technical subject that has become confused and distorted by military censorship and political debate.

Incidentally, Rentschler had something to say about the tight restrictions recently placed on release of military information. Noting that British security regulations are "considerably more lenient than our own," he talked guardedly about American air progress and made a number of points by referring to jet power data released in London. Then, replying to a question, he said bluntly: "I am perfectly sure that much of the information we can't talk about is well known all over the world except to the American people."

While these words won't endear him to administration chiefs, Rentschler's comments on where we stand in the race for world air supremacy generally will be approved in the Pentagon. The 67-year-old air pioneer, sometimes called "Mr. Jet Engine," made these points:

Starting from scratch after World War II, Russia has made great gains in developing and producing high performance jet warplanes. Their acquisition of the British Nene jet engine and of German scientists put them abreast of the world; their own technical ability, "vast resources" and "continuous absorption with military goals" carried them along.

We just don't have "first-hand, on-the-spot knowledge" of the status and performance of Red warplanes and so we don't know just where they stand.

Beyond the question of whether we are ahead or behind the Soviets in current airplanes lies the question of the relative production potential of the two countries. Here, Rentschler recalled that in 1943, the late James Forrestal, then Under Secretary of the Navy, told him that our best intelligence estimates were that Germany was building 30,000 to 40,000 planes a year and Japan 20,000 to 25,000. He said he told Forrestal that his knowledge of German and Japanese production capabilities, particularly their shortage of machine tools, made him doubt the Nazis were building more than 15,000 planes and the Japs more than 10,000 annually. Postwar information showed these latter estimates to be highly accurate. The United States, it will be recalled, reached a peak of 100,000 planes a year. Today, Russia lacks machine tools, and is just trying to become industrialized.

In any air-power comparison, our worldwide system of strategic bombing basis is an important consideration. Rentschler therefore concludes that "all in all, we have not yet relinquished military leadership in the air, and I, for one, would be unwilling to trade our position for that of any other nation."

Answering questions, the United Aircraft Corp. chief saw little prospect of speeding up the development of new warplanes, without taking the risk of going into production of new types before the bugs are all removed from prototypes.

United Aircraft's vice president for engineering, Leonard S. Hoggs, likewise had some encouraging comment on Russian vs. American air progress. He said he didn't know but estimated from photographs of the new Soviet Bison long-range jet bomber—counterpart of our B–52—that its fewer number of engineers achieved power and speed by sacrificing economy of fuel consumption and, therefore, range.

Hobbs also disclosed that the next cycle of American jet engines, like their own Pratt & Whitney J–75 and Wright J–67, will produce more speed than was earlier estimated. The J–75, now flying in test airplanes and scheduled to fly in prototype fighters by the end of next year, will enable operational airplanes to travel well over twice the speed of sound—1,500 to 2,000 miles per hour, he said.

Radio Equipment for Gary, Ind., for Civil Defense Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Z. R. Bardowski, director, Civil Defense, Gary, Ind., concerning the need for radio equipment in connection with civil defense.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF GARY,
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE,
Gary, Ind., June 17, 1955.

DEAR SIR: The city of Gary, in cooperation with Operation Alert 1955, carried out an exercise to the extent of evacuating the city hall and the county building and clearing the downtown area of all traffic and people for 10 minutes.

However, to be able to provide an adequate civil defense program for the people of Gary, we must have a tremendous amount of radio equipment. The cost to the city, even with the matching fund program, makes it almost impossible to obtain this equipment. The Armed Forces have a great amount of radio equipment which could be used or made usable for this purpose.

Again we ask you to support bills H. R. 4660 and S. 1527. I think not only the city of Gary but all critical target areas and the support areas are in the same predicament. This is our second plea for your support of these companion bills.

As a chosen leader of the people, you have sworn to defend the Constitution of the United States and to protect its people. By making this equipment and other surplus equipment available to the civil defense program, you are fulfilling your task.

Z. R. BARDOWSKI,
Director, City of Gary Civil Defense.

Bill Introduced To Prohibit Pay TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which will expressly prohibit television stations from imposing any toll, subscription, fee, or other charge on the general public for the privilege of viewing TV programs in their own homes.

In addition to its high cost, pay television (a) would reduce listening, by blacking out, for those who do not pay, channels now devoted to free programs; (b) it would siphon off the best programs which the public is now receiving free; and (c) it would divide the television audiences along economic lines.

The biggest ailment of TV today is not the lack of money, but the lack of talent. TV is suffering from a dearth of authors, performers, and so forth, who are needed to meet the continued, tremendous demand for novelty and variety in our TV performances. If telecast stations could continually supply good shows they would attract not only large audiences but also advertisers who would be willing to sponsor their shows in order to place their products before the public. Pay or gasmeter television cannot guarantee good shows.

Let no one be deceived that toll television will be inexpensive. A week's programing of subscription telecasts, in time, will cost the average family between $3 and $5. While many shows may only charge a fee of 25 cents, before long some telecasts, like baseball, will be charging 50 cents to $1. In fact, telecasts of certain prizefights, which are shown exclusively over closed circuits in movie houses, have already charged from $2 to $5.

In addition, pay TV will preempt the peak hours of the evening, between 8 and 10 p. m. Today's most popular shows, like I Love Lucy will be the first ones to be brought under the pay-as-you-see programs. Thousands of viewers recently enjoyed the delectable Peter Pan starring Mary Martin. Such a spectacular will, in the future, only be viewed after payment in a slot.

The price charged the public would not, of course, be limited by the cost of programing the show. Instead, it would be set by the pay television operator at the figure which would bring in the largest box return. Pay television contemplates no modest rate rise. The cost per home per program today is about 1 cent now borne by the advertiser. Under pay television, this could would be multiplied by 25 or 200 or more and would be borne entirely by the viewing audience. We were told that toll TV would eliminate advertising but already people like Walter O'Malley, of the Brooklyn Dodgers are openly indicating that advertising is a planned part of pay TV. Thus some of the inane, inept, if not insane TV commercials, will still be with us.

The proponents of toll TV talk about only what free television has not brought to the public. They refuse to talk about what they do not care to see or admit. Television is in its infancy and already it has brought into the American home great box-office attractions, including opera, ballet, concerts, the legitimate theater, omnibus shows, sports events, children's programs, educational programs, current and patriotic events. All it needs is time to grow. Let us not be impatient.

The television spectrum is limited. It is in the public domain and the interest of the public should therefore come first. The interests of telecasters are secondary.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to prohibit the charging of a fee to view telecasts in the home

Be it enacted, etc., That section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1082) as amended, is amended by changing the semicolon at the end of clause (b) to a colon and adding the following: *"Provided, however,* That it shall not authorize or permit any television station to impose a toll, fee, subscription or other charge, directly or indirectly, on the general public for the privilege of viewing television programs received over television sets located in the home."

SEC. 2. The Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1064) as amended, is amended by adding the following section:

"Sec. 508. Charging fees for viewing telecasts in home: Any television station, its agents, officers, or employees, who, directly or indirectly, impose or attempts to impose any toll, fee, subscription, or other charge, on the general public for the privilege of viewing television programs transmitted by it and received over television sets in the home, shall be fined not to exceed $10,000 or imprisoned for more than 5 years, or both."

Address by Hon. Barry M. Goldwater, of Arizona, Before the Michigan Christian Endeavor Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered last Saturday, June 18, before the Michigan Christian Endeavor Convention, at Grand Rapids, Mich.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GOLDWATER BEFORE MICHIGAN CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR CONVENTION, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., JUNE 18, 1955

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be here tonight and to have this opportunity of discussing with you the problems of our time.

In that great and penetrating play, Gioconda Smile, Aldous Huxley observes that confession is a convenient device by which we can unburden our conscience without the necessity of repentence or reform.

Let me confess that I am not the Senate's expert on foreign affairs.

I am not an expert on Russia, China, India, or the Middle East. I have no easy answer for the dilemma of our day.

I have no great academic achievement with which to dazzle you.

I am, I think, an ordinary citizen of the United States of America approaching middle age, constantly preoccupied with the responsibilities of an exacting job, but not quite anesthetized by the furious pace of our times.

It is flattering to be invited to speak to a group such as this, and your invitation is doubly cherished because I believe you and the people you represent are the custodians of all our hopes for a free and lasting peaceful world.

I am really not quite sure why I am here. I am not quite sure why you invited me. I am reminded somewhat of the man with the slight cold.

This man was driving to his office one morning when he realized he had a slight scratchy throat, possibly the indication of some slight illness which might interrupt his plans for the weekend.

This chap had a friend who was doctor, so he decided to stop at the doctor's office and get a shot of penicillin or some of these new antibiotics and cure his sore throat before it became serious. He entered the doctor's waiting room and was greeted by an attractive and impressive receptionist. "What is you name, please?" she asked.

The man smiled and said: "Oh, this isn't necessary. I know the doctor very well. Just tell Bill that Jim Blake is out here."

The receptionist noted his name and said: "Where do you live, Mr. Blake?" and began going through the other routing questions.

Well our friend reluctantly gave her the information she desired and was ushered into a second waiting room.

In a moment a nurse came in, jabbed a thermometer in his mouth, told him to stand on the scales and began to add her bits of information to his history.

When she removed the thermometer so that he could again speak, he said: "Look, I'm not sick. There is nothing really wrong with me. I just—well, I think maybe I am getting a sore throat. I know Bill and I thought I would stop and get a shot or a pill or something. All this isn't necessary, really."

The nurse smiled and continued writing, and then she ushered him into a third waiting room and left him.

In a moment a second nurse came in, handed him one of those ridiculous smocks they give you in some doctors' offices, pointed to a closet and said: "Put your clothes in there and put this on," and out she went.

Our friend had no opportunity to protest. He stared at the smock and he stared at the closet and finally he took off his clothes and hung them up in the closet and put on the smock. And after some delay the second nurse returned and ushered him into a third room.

Here there were three other men, all garbed in these same ridiculous short smocks and all looking somewhat embarrassed.

Our friend stood there first on one foot and then the other and finally said: "Look, fellows, I'm not sick. There is really nothing wrong with me. I—well, I've got a little scratchy throat and I know Bill and I thought I'd stop and get a shot or a pill or something and a—well, I'm kind of embarrassed to be in here with you."

One of the other men standing in the corner loked at him for a minute, smiled, and then said: "You're embarrased. I just came in to deliver a telegram."

Perhaps that's my mission tonight, to deliver a telegram, a message from the past.

I remember the story of a famous Frenchman, a general of the army, who had some difficulty, as we all do, in remembering names and faces. But he always seemed to get along very well and everywhere he met people who greeted him warmly and he returned their greetings.

One evening a friend said to him: "How do you remember all those people? How do

you know to ask the questions you ask about their welfare?"

The general smiled and said: "Do you know exactly what I say? Do you remember?"

And his friend said: "Well, not exactly."

The general said: "When I can't think of a man's name or his regiment or where I met him before, I always begin by saying, 'And how is the old complaint?' Of course, everyone has at least one complaint and they immediately conclude that I have a particular, distinct recollection of their problem."

So tonight I refer to the problem of our time in the singular form. I suppose that many of us give that problem different shapes and different names—taxes, bills, family health, job security, Democrat politics, Republican politics, communism.

There are many problems in the world. They have one thing in common. They are inescapably linked with the future.

We must, of course, add to that list the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb and the cobalt bomb, atomic war.

All of these things concern us. But our concern is, primarily, linked with the future, with our children and their children. Most of us have fulfilled our purely biological purpose in life and half or two-thirds of our years lie behind us. Our concern is for mankind in general and for our children in particular.

It may be that we have come to the end of our time, that we have lived beyond our time, that our time actually ended on August 6, 1945, at Hiroshima. Looking beyond our purely local difficulties, we must be frighteningly aware of what is euphemistically referred to as a cold war, the worldwide struggle between the disciples of communism and the advocates of freedom.

Cold or hot, this issue is joined. It can have only one ultimate outcome, final victory for one side or the other.

Since the end of World War II, in this past decade, more than 500 million people have accepted, either willingly or as the result of force, the doctrine of communism.

The problem of our time is simple: Shall men be slave or free?

To you and to me and to all of us in America it is incredible that anyone could willingly commit themselves to the brutal tyranny that is communism. We are inclined to shrug it off as a mere manifestation of an upside-down world which inevitably must right itself.

We know that less than a million hard-core Communists rule and control the destiny of the Russian people. We wishfully believe that no more than 10 percent of the Chinese population are devotedly committed to the horrible brutality of Chou En-li.

In my home State of Arizona, an imposter named Peralta Rivas once laid claim to hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile land in the central valleys of the State.

This swindler used the device of a forged Spanish land grant. And when his deception was discovered and the man who penetrated his trickery confronted him with it, Peralta Rivas said to his servant: "Oh, give the man some money."

Many of us in this Nation of ours today have adopted that attitude. And we say of the Communist menace: "Oh, give the men some money and be done with them."

Others place their reliance in superior force, in intercontinental bombers, in a great standing army. We behave something like the judge in a small midwestern town who was noted as a duck hunter.

The town's ne'er-do-well, a fellow named Dick, went out to the duck blinds one day without a dog, so Dick borrowed one from a nearby farmer. When he shot his first duck, he whistled for the dog and pointed to the bird, but the dog didn't plunge into the river. He walked out on top of the water, picked up the bird, and came back.

Dick shook his head 2 or 3 times and tried to remember how much he had had the night before. Then he went over and felt of the dog's belly and it was dry. The dog's legs were dry. So he concluded he really hadn't seen it at all.

Then Dick shot another duck and the same performance was repeated. And it was repeated again and again all through that day.

Dick returned the dog to his owner and made arrangements to borrow the same dog the next day. He knew that if he were to repeat the story in town, no one would believe it, so he invited the judge to accompany him the following day. They went out and borrowed the dog and went down to the blinds. Dick waited with ill-concealed impatience until the judge shot his first duck. And then Dick whistled for the dog and the dog walked out on top of the water, retrieved the bird, and came back. But the judge made no comment.

Dick concluded that perhaps the judge hadn't witnessed the recovery of that particular bird, so he waited until the judge shot his second bird and he called the dog and the dog walked out on the water and walked back with the bird. That went on all day, but the judge made no reference to it. They returned the dog to his owner and were on their way back to town when Dick, unable to contain himself any longer, turned to the judge and said: "Judge, didn't you notice something * * * well, unusual about that dog?"

To which the judge replied: "Well, I can tell you one thing. He can't swim a darned stroke."

So we see the Communist menace in all of its brutal manifestations and make little or no effort to understand it.

The appeal an idea has for a particular man frequently depends upon his point of departure, and there is one point of departure from which communism is most appealing, most logical. To understand this appeal, to be able to deal intelligently with it, we must explore first this point of departure. And for all its inconsistencies, the philosophy of communism does have an appeal when viewed from this perspective.

The basic premise of communism views man as an economic animal, a social animal, and a physical animal. And to all who accept this definition of man, communism speaks in different tongues.

To the millions of men, women, and children who go to bed every night of their lives hungry, who must spend every minute of every hour of every day to secure food and who, despite their devotion to this primary purpose, are never quite able to secure enough food to completely quiet the pangs of hunger, the Communist who says: "Accept my dictation and you will have all the food you can eat," is making a basic appeal, easily understood, and eagerly accepted.

To men and women in war torn areas of the world where plunder and loot and rape have been the everyday occurrence, the Communist speaks of peace. He says: "Surrender your lives to my dictation and there will be no more bandit gangs or plunder or loot."

To the intellectual who is confused, concerned about the strife and the inequity of the world, the Communist says: "The welfare of the collective is the total goal. Surrender your talents and your abilities and your resources to us and we will bring peace and happiness and equal distribution of food and shelter to all mankind."

These promises all emphasize the material aspect of man. And why shouldn't they be appealing in our 20th century when man's ability to produce material things has increased a hundredfold?

The most obvious truth of the 20th centurn is this: Man has triumphed over his material surroundings. Science, engineering, the power of gasoline, coal, electricity, and now the atom, have all been unleashed to the end that we are now sometimes more fearful of our ability to consume than we are of our ability to produce.

For 175 years in this Nation, we have consistently emphasized the amazing benefits of man's collective effort. We have almost succeeded in making collectivism the end rather than the means.

We believe in free public education, and most States make school attendance compulsory up to a certain age.

We believe in the principle of trade unionism and collective bargaining.

We believe in collective compulsory social security.

We acknowledge that in many areas of human endeavor, combined action is necessary.

Some of our outstanding examples are in private ownership, such as the telephone combines, big business, General Motors, privately owned electric light and power companies. All of these things are basically a collective action. Private capital pools its resources, management's brains are joined together, and great labor forces are recruited.

The Chinese coolie can see very little real difference between Consolidated Edison and TVA.

Indeed, in the past 30 years, the social and economic structure of our country has embraced a great many programs which are collective in nature.

We say it is our purpose to accomplish the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

The Communist will tell you that is precisely what world communism proposes. And make no mistake about this. The master minds of the Kremlin have never wavered for an instant in their basic objective, which is to conquer the entire world for communism.

This struggle must continue until one side or the other is total victor.

This is not a political contest, or a military contest or an economic contest. It is, rather, a contest to establish by force or persuasion a philosophical definition of man himself.

World communism is dedicated to the task of accomplishing by whatever means available, treachery, treason, brutality, or warfare the acceptance of Karl Marx's definition of man as a social, economic, physical animal whose existence can only be justified as he serves the all-powerful state.

What is the basic difference between their belief and ours? It is an ancient truth: That man is not merely a social, economic, and physical animal but a spiritual animal as well.

And you and I and too many of us are guilty of mere passive acquiescence to that ancient truth.

We regard freedom as the product of a political system, and nothing could be more dangerously false than that belief.

Freedom is the necessary state of man because man is the child of Almighty God with an important, immortal, individual soul, because man is a spiritual being as well as a physical being.

We have been quite willing to accept the benefits of the Judo-Christian civilization with its concept of individual freedom, with its cultural and economic advantages, and all the opportunities of the 20th century, but we have been unwilling to display that devotion, to make that passionate affirmation which is required of all of us if we are ever to solve man's basic problem.

We have more material advantages than any other people on earth. We know how to make refrigerators and ranges and automobiles and telephones.

And of all the nations of the world, we alone can produce more food than our population can possibly consume.

We are also the irreverent disbelievers, the cynical sophisticated products of a purely materialistic society.

We have made it fashionable to disbelieve, and in our business world and our professional life, and especially in our schools and our homes, we have classed faith with superstition.

Oh, we are successful all right. We have the richest nation on earth. We think we have self government. We even cherish the idea we have freedom.

We have all these things, material things.

I suggest we have everything except that one thing without which all these things we do have are valueless and transitory.

And that one thing is a universal firm faith in Almighty God, faith to define and understand this basic struggle which must inevitably occupy the minds of all the world until total victory.

We must first of all penetrate the propaganda, the economic and military and social smoke screens and define the basic difference between what you and I call Communist slavery as opposed to American freedom.

Let me read you what Karl Marx had to say. He said: "The democratic concept of man is false because it is Christian. The democratic concept holds that each man is a sovereign being. This is the illusion, dream and postulate of Christianity."

Adolph Hitler, the slave master of the Third Reich, had something to say on this subject. He said: "To the Christian doctrine of the infinite significance of the individual human soul I oppose with icy clarity the saving doctrine of the nothingness and the insignificance of the human being."

There is no room on this earth for the existence of these two diametrically opposed concepts of man.

If we are to win the cold war or the hot war, if our way of life is to endure, we can only be victorious after we have all come to a clear understanding of the basic difference between these two adversaries.

I am sure that you, and the people you represent in this gathering of the Christian Endeavor Union, have been aware of this ancient conflict. I am sure you are aware of the only path we can follow to win ultimate peace and ultimate victory for the individual. It is our commission then to make this ancient truth known to all men, both free and slave.

To reject our society's passive acquiescence and to substitute for it a militant affirmation, to reject the idea of collectivism and man's significance only as a tool of the state, and to establish instead not only in our land but throughout the world an acceptance and understanding of man himself, which can only come when we raise our voices together to repeat with passionate affirmation:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of Heaven and earth."

If we want peace and freedom for the future, if we desire the defeat of the evil brutality of the philosophy of Marx and Engels, the way is open for us and the power is present for us to use.

But we will never achieve the victory until we stop mumbling about man's creation in politics, in economics and society, until we reject the idea of collectivism's philosophical aspects which require the surrender and subjugation of the individual.

Of course man is a physical and an economic and a social animal. But he is first and eternally a spiritual creation in whom their lives the divine spark of Almighty God. And there will be peace and prosperity and progress, and there will be an end to brutality and privation and exploitation, only when men recognize and accept the truth of their creation.

All of these evils will be defeated and disappear when the world on its knees says: "Oh God, who art the author of peace and lover of concord, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, whose service is perfect freedom, defend us, Thy humble servants, from all assaults of our enemies, that we, surely trusting in thy defense, may not fear the power of any adversaries, through the might of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Mica Creek Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Louis R. Huber, of Seattle, Wash., which appeared in the March 25 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

NORTHWEST WARNS TO POWER PROJECT

(By Louis R. Huber)

SEATTLE.—With the shape of further hydroelectric development in this region still far from settled, one definite proposal soon may be launched with full approval of both private- and public-power advocates.

It is Mica Creek, a storage-dam project which would add 1,100,000 kilowatts of power at Federal dams on the Columbia River.

Mica Creek is in British Columbia, on the Columbia River, and therefore is an international project. The proposal is for the Puget Sound Utilities Council, a federation of both private- and public-power utilities serving Puget Sound and the Wenatchee area, to build a dam at Mica Creek.

This dam would hold water back when the Columbia River is high, and release it during the low-water periods. Canadians would benefits by use of generating facilities at Mica Creek and at a smaller dam just downstream—these to turn out 1,600,000 kilowatts of low-cost power north of the border.

NEW POWER LOADS LOOM

If international agreement is reached and the Mica Creek project goes through, it will rank as the No. 1 program in the Pacific Northwest for size, low-cost power, and importance in heading off of a power shortage that looms for the 1960's.

One of the strongest talking points for Mica Creek is that the power it will bring to this region will be devoted to new loads resulting from expanding population and industry. Aluminum it is understood, has no place in Mica Creek plans.

This is a very important point, according to Marple's Business Roundup, fortnightly newsletter published here. "Canada understandably has no desire to export power to the United States if that power is to be used to produce competitive aluminum," says Mr. Marple.

Canada is one of the world's major producers of aluminum, but sells 85 percent of its output as ingots—mostly to the United States.. With a new aluminum plant of its own at Kitimat, British Columbia, Canada is looking for larger ingot markets.

British Columbia might be willing to go ahead on Mica Creek, but the Ottawa Government might say no. Legislation is now pending at Ottawa that would give the dominion, rather than the provinces, clear-cut control over international streams.

The Canadian Government already has put a stop to a proposal—broached in 1952—of the Aluminum Company of America to bring Yukon River water out of Canada through mountain tunnels for a hydroelectric development on Alaska tidewater.

Mica Creek seems to be a different sort of a deal, however, with the Canadians gaining more, perhaps, than Americans.

Mr. Marple speculates that "the largest bloc of new lowcost power in North America" which British Columbia will get if Mica Creek goes through may go into a chemical industry, or perhaps titanium manufacture.

REPORT PREPARED

A report is now being prepared by a Federal committee headed by Col. William Whipple, of the Army's Corps of Engineers, on how the United States power from Mica Creek will be allocated; in effect, what the Federal Government will charge for handling the water.

The Puget Sound Utilities Council is making a market and load study to show the long-term power requirements and area growth. When this report is released, it will show just how urgently this region will need power by 1960.

The Department of the Interior is said to favor Mica Creek because it meets the "partnership" requirement as defined by President Eisenhower wherein both private and public power groups have a share in hydroelectric development.

Mr. Marple says he wonders, however, what will be the position of eastern private utility interests, such as those backing Washington Water Power Co. Washington Water Power wants to purchase Puget Sound Power & Light Co., a member of the Puget Sound Utilities Council, which is not willing to sell.

ARMY ENGINEER'S ROLE

There is still another question, too, about the position of the Corps of Army Engineers. It would like to build Libby Dam in Montana, another storage-dam project which would back water into Canada.

Will the Corps of Army Engineers want to build Mica Creek, too? Or, if the corps pushes the Libby Dam proposal too hard with the Canadians, will this put a stop to Mica Creek?

In the center of these speculations, the Puget Sound Utilities Council, combining both private and public power utilities, stands out as the greatest hope.

"If the council doesn't build Mica Creek, nobody will," declares one observer. "The Canadians cannot do it unless downstream benefits and nobody else in the Pacific Northwest ready to go ahead has markets enough to absorb such a big chunk of power."

Prohibition of Liquor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Orval Taylor, pastor, First Baptist Church, Benicia, Calif., concerning the prohibition of liquor advertising, especially on radio and television.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Benicia, Calif., June 13, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter dated May 31, 1955, concerning S. 923, de-

signed to prohibit liquor advertising, especially on radio and television. I want you to know that I am in full agreement with the motive behind this bill.

As you no doubt know, most ministers have a definite reason for desiring to eliminate this evil, since we often must try and deal with the results of liquor, either in handling funeral services or in counseling with families of alcoholics. Especially are we concerned about the invasion of the homes of Christians with the ever-present advertisements of liquor and beer via television.

Thank you, sir. We appreciate this kind of bill.

Sincerely,

Rev. ORVAL TAYLOR,
First Baptist Church, Benicia, Calif.
Mr. ROY J. CHARBONEAU,
Chairman of Board.

Folklore and Facts About Underdeveloped Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, last February it was my privilege to commend the State Department for refusing to participate in the work of the United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade. My remarks may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, at page A1032. That Commission was designed with a view to stabilizing world prices of raw materials, relative to the price of manufactured goods. Next month, the United Nations Economic and Social Council will meet at Geneva to discuss again commodity problems and to receive the first report of its Commission on International Commodity Trade.

Foreign Affairs, a review published by the Council on Foreign Relations, in its January 1955 issue, printed an article entitled "Folklore and Fact About Underdeveloped Areas," by Stacy May. Dr. May has very unusual qualifications as an international economist. He has taught at Amherst, Cornell, and Dartmouth. From 1932 to 1942, he was assistant director for the social sciences, under the Rockefeller Foundation. He has served as Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, and in the Office of Production Management. He has served as assistant to the president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; and since 1947, he has been the economist of the International Basic Economy Corp.

Dr. May shows the futility of attempting to stabilize world prices through international controls. I found the article of such great interest that I now ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make 3 pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $240.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOLKLORE AND FACT ABOUT UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

(By Stacy May)

Since the end of World War II the literature of international politics and economics in America and Western Europe has concerned itself more and more with the problems of the world's underdeveloped areas. Although the definition of what constitutes underdevelopment is far from precise, the term generally has been applied to most of the political entities of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeast Asia—with their combined populations of well over a billion people, or about two-thirds of the inhabitants of the free world.

There is little doubt that one important reason why western interests has thus focused on the problems of the undeveloped areas has been the obvious turn of Soviet strategy, which singles out the areas of relatively low industrial activity and appalling low per capita incomes as the vulnerable point of attack. The engulfment of China and successively of North Korea and northern Vietnam, conjured up for the West the specter of the possible alienation of other great areas in which there exist similar disparities between low economic standards and high national aspirations. The undercurrent of unrest in a major part of the underdeveloped areas, and the overt political upheavals in a large number of the nations or dependencies of these regions, have given such fears a reality that cannot be ignored. Although history provides no assurance that economic progress promotes political stability and international concord, there has been a growing conviction in the industrialized West that opportunity for the satisfaction of the aspirations of the peoples of the underdeveloped areas for economic growth had better be provided within the orbit of the free world. Frustration of their hopes, it is believed, strengthens the Soviet drive to alienate them.

Quite apart from such imperatives of western defensive strategy there has arisen in addition an increasing awareness that the economic dynamism of the highly industrialized nations of the free world is genuinely dependent upon the achievement of a comparable dynamism in the underdeveloped economies. In 1952, one-third of the combined exports of the United States, Western Europe, and Canada found outlets in the markets of underdeveloped countries. Something like 40 percent of their total exports of manufactured goods were also marketed in these areas. No business interest can afford to be complacent about future prospects in such an important segment of its markets.

The degree of interdependence is shown even more conclusively by the amount of supplies the industrialized nations draw from these regions. The records show (also as of 1952) that the United States, Western Europe, and Canada are dependent upon the underdeveloped areas for 50 percent of their combined imports of industrial raw materials and 48 percent of crude foodstuffs. Since these import needs of the industrialized nations have been steadily expanding, and promise to increase at an accelerated pace, growth in the underdeveloped economies is obviously to the interest of the West.

These three imperatives—the strategic considerations, the quest for access to expanding export markets, and the need to assure an increasing source of primary products—impel the industrialized West to forward the development in the backward sectors of the free world.

Clearly there are nonmaterial motivations as well—humanitarian and moral—which have an important weight in the traditional American attitude toward other peoples. One of the major impediments to the development of a coherent and effective United States policy in this field has been the tendency here and abroad to regard the various motives as necessarily in conflict with one another, so that those who are influenced by one kind must regard the others as spurious, or ignoble or "soft-minded."

In particular, programs which give weight to factors of defense or trade have been vociferously attacked by those to whom another motivation carries the greater appeal, and these criticisms seem often to be based more on folklore than fact. The resultant discord has engendered suspicions and fears in the underdeveloped areas, many of which are newly emerged from colonial status or are striving to emerge from it. And such misgivings have, of course, been skillfully abetted by those whose major aim is to convince the peoples of the underdeveloped areas that their aspirations for economic betterment can be achieved only if they detach themselves from the political procedures and the economic orbit of the western democracies. In the babel of conflicting counsel, the fundamental consideration is lost sight of. It is simply that the fulfillment of each of the different objectives, and of all of them combined, depends upon forwarding the same end—the prompt achievement of economic growth in the underdeveloped areas.

The analysis presented here will be restricted to the implications of only one of the three material motivations listed above—the necessity of promoting growth in the underdeveloped economies to assure an adequate supply of primary products for growth in the economy of the free world. The emphasis needs to be placed on that factor because the role of the underdeveloped areas as producers and exporters of crude foodstuffs and, particularly, of industrial raw materials, has been so consistently misinterpreted. The misunderstanding threatens seriously to impair the economic advancement that can take place in such areas if their potential as producers of primary products is properly used.

There has been a voluminous literature in recent years illustrating the prevailing misconceptions about the role of primary products in economic development. One quotation—and a relatively moderate one—from a recent book[1] dealing with development problems must suffice to establish the flavor of existing sentiment:

"While extractive industries provide a fine source of employment, of local expenditures, and of royalties to the Government, they cannot and do not contribute as much to overall development as do manufacturing, service and distributive industries. As the local people are very well aware, the oil and mining companies are after all primarily engaged in taking wealth out, not in bringing it in."

This observation, offered in a context that discounts the importance of the contribution to development of direct foreign investments in petroleum and mining activities, would not be entitled to serious consideration if it did not mirror a viewpoint widely prevalent in the underdeveloped areas themselves. Their understandable rejection of the role of "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the industrialized world has in a number of cases been carried to the point of actively discouraging the further expansion of primary products. At least one nation which

[1] Jonathan B. Bingham, Shirt Sleeve Diplomacy. New York: John Day, 1954, p. 149.

through agricultural exports had achieved a per capita income level comparable to that of many industrialized nations adopted a policy in the postwar period which seemed deliberately designed to make agricultural enterprise unattractive. The step was taken as a means of promoting industrialization, but the result was that a healthy growth was effectively arrested: agriculture was depressed, and sufficient industrial activity to compensate for this loss was not achieved.

The jaundiced view held by most underdeveloped areas toward the part which primary production can play in their economic development is mainly the result of outside influences. To be explicit, it is based largely on the findings of research carried out in America, in Europe, and by United Nations agencies. There are indeed huge gaps in our knowledge of the field, particularly with respect to industrial raw materials, where we have not even a reasonably accurate summation of the overall production in recent years or of how it is divided geographically. But there has been a veritable flood of analyses tending to make raw materials the whipping boy of underdevelopment. The popular folklore which has been developed as a result is held with a tenacity almost in inverse ratio to the amount of convincing supporting evidence. The preconceptions now current as "common knowledge" may be summarized as follows:

1. The so-called underdeveloped, or primary-producing areas, are the major producers and exporters of primary products, including industrial raw materials.

2. In the their exchange of primary products for the manufactures of the highly industrialized nations, the underdeveloped countries have been seriously handicapped by the exceptionally erratic demand and pattern of prices for their exports, in comparison to the comparatively stable prices and demand for manufactured goods in internation trade.

3. Because of the comparatively violent fluctuations of the foreign exchange earnings of the primary producing areas, and of doubt that future prices of primary products will hold their own with manufacturing prices, there is a strong case for the establishment of intergovernmental controls to stabilize the relationship between the prices of primary products and manufactures in international trade and to regularize the demand for the former.

4. Since manufacturing demonstrably brings higher per capita income returns than does primary production considered as a whole, and since there are other undoubted advantages in a broad rather than an overly specialized pattern of national production, underveloped areas should focus their efforts on developing manufacturing enterprise. Available domestic capital and additional foreign capital should be channeled to that purpose; foreign capital investment in further raw materials production should be discouraged since it is "exploitative" rather than "constructive" and tends to perpetuate a colonial pattern.

The stakes at issue for the entire free world are of sufficient importance to warrant a careful winnowing of these preconceptions to separate the fact from the folklore.

II

First, let us examine the common belief that the underdeveloped areas are the major producers and exporters of primary products, as the description "primary producing areas" suggests.[2] The free world production of primary products in 1950 was of the general dimension of $120 billion, of which industrial raw materials accounted for about $46 billion. The so-called industrialized areas, with about one-third of the free world's population, produced well over two-thirds of its industrial raw materials, and their industries processed more than 90 percent of the free world total. Estimates of the incidence of production and consumption of crude foodstuffs are less adequate, but from the known fact that the great bulk of this category of primary products is consumed in the areas where it is produced, and from estimates that establish per capita calory consumption in the underdeveloped areas at about two-thirds that of the industrialized countries, it may be inferred that the production of crude foodstuffs is more or less equally divided between the two.

When trade in primary products between the industrialized and the underdeveloped countries is examined on the basis of a representative sample, it is found that, through trade among themselves, the nations of the industrialized areas supplied each other with 50 percent of their combined industrial raw material imports and with a slightly higher percentage of their combined food imports. Furthermore, they exported to the underdeveloped areas primary products valued at more than one-fourth the value of the primary products they drew from these areas.

The term "primary producing nations," as applied to the underdeveloped economies, needs careful interpretation. The industrialized nations actually produce more primary products than the underdeveloped nations do, and their total exports of such products bulk somewhat larger in international trade. It is true, however, that their manufactures are overwhelmingly larger, both with respect to production and exports. The underdeveloped economies may properly be referred to as "the primary producers" only in the sense that a disproportionately large share of their total economic effort is devoted to the production of foods and industrial raw materials. And they may be called "the primary exporters" only in the sense that something like 90 percent of their foreign exchange earnings from Western Europe, the United States and Canada are derived from exports of primary products, while only 35 percent of the combined foreign exchange earnings of those industrialized countries are earned by shipments of food and industrial raw materials.

Thus, clearly, if the long-term record of international trade showed that foreign exchange earnings derived from exports of crude foodstuffs and raw materials suffered much more severe yearly declines than the export revenue from manufactures and semimanufactures, this would be evidence that the underdeveloped areas were suffering disproportionate hardship.

However, this is not the case, as becomes plain when we examine another preconception. This is the preconception, fostered by a variety of recent studies,[3] that short-term fluctuations in the pattern of demand and price of internationally traded primary products, as compared with fluctuations in the price of manufactures, have worked a particular disadvantage to exporters of primary products. The case made out for this appears formidable. But its weaknesses stem from the fact that most of the documentation is based on a limited list of selected commodities; that fluctuations upward are weighed along with downward fluctuations to establish a record of instability; and, generally, that the documentation fails to examine in detail the record of either individual manufactured articles or of the category as a whole in terms of price and volume fluctuations and foreign exchange earnings.

From another recent study, "International Trade—1952," published by GATT, a quite different picture is derived. This study has the advantage of being much more comprehensive, in that its indexes cover production, trade and prices for all primary products and manufactures. Its principal limitation is that it presents data for only 18 years; it begins with 1925 and runs to 1951, but the war and immediate postwar years 1939–47 are omitted. The chief finding from this study is that neither in the case of production nor trade was the record of values for primary products (i. e. volumes multiplied by prices) more volatile than that for manufactures. For the period 1925–38, the values of the two moved in essentially the same pattern. For the postwar years, the curves again were similar, with manufactures moving to slightly higher levels than primary products in terms of production, and primary products moving ahead somewhat in trade.

Thus, on the crucial question of the comparative exchange earnings from international trade, it may be stated flatly that for the period covered there is no evidence that the realized exchange earnings from primary product exports were characterized by greater downswings than those realized from manufactured exports. On the score of prices alone, primary products did fall off somewhat more sharply than manufactures in the first 4 years of the depression thirties, but recovered much more dramatically in the postwar years.

Fortunately, it is possible to make a comparison over a far longer period of the dollar exchange provided by the United States market through its imports of crude materials and crude foodstuffs on the one hand, and its imports of finished manufactures, semimanufactures, and manufactured foodstuffs on the other. Here the record has been examined from 1900 through 1953, which provides a 53-year experience of annual fluctuations. It is relevant to note that the U. N. studies, mentioned above, cite the United States market as a particularly flagrant contributor to exchange instability in the underdeveloped areas. The evidence is to the contrary. United States imports of primary products afforded their suppliers a greater return than was realized in the previous year in 35 years, a lesser return in 18 years. Imports of manufactured goods yielded the suppliers a greater return in 37 years, less in 15 years; in 1 year there was no measurable change. For both categories the percentage of decline in the years of lesser profits was 16 percent. In the case of primary products, the average increase in the years of advance was almost 20 percent, as against 16.5 percent for manufactures.

If crude materials alone are compared with finished manufactures alone, the former show a somewhat greater instability—19 years with an average decline of 19 percent, against 16 with an average decline of 13 percent. The difference was not very great; and the average advance in the favorable years was 23 percent for crude materials against 14 percent for manufactures.

It may be worth while, as a further check, to compare the relative stability of United States exports of manufactured goods as an earner, rather than a provider, of foreign exchange. There were increases in 37 out of 53 years, and decreases in 16, with the averages of the former 26 percent and of the latter 21 percent. For cotton manufactures alone, there were 20 years of lowered earnings, averaging 22 percent in magnitude; in the case of iron and steel mill products (from 1900 to 1952), there were 22 years in which exchange earnings fell by an average 23 percent; and in the category of machinery of all classes there were 14

[2] The conclusions summarized here are based on estimates set forth in a paper, The Outlook for Industrial Raw Materials Demand in 1980 and Its Relation to International Development, presented by the author of this article at the World Population Conference, Rome, September 1954. Other conclusions drawn in later sections of this article are documented in the same paper.

[3] See particularly the studies of the United Nations, Department of Economic Affairs: Instability in Export Markets of Underdeveloped Countries, New York, 1952, and Commodity Trade and Economic Development, New York, 1953.

years of decline also averaging 23 percent.

The conclusion from the evidence, which could be amplified, is that there has been considerable instability in foreign trade markets, but that the earnings from exports of primary products have not been subject to declines markedly more extreme than those from manufacturing exports. Contemporary scholarship has done a disservice by describing one side of the coin and neglecting an adequate examination of the other. This has had at least two unfortunate results. The first is a set of solutions which have gained wide advocacy, but which, if workable at all, would promise to benefit the major importers of primary products, rather than the underdeveloped areas in whose name the proposals were put forth. The second misfortune is that the underdeveloped nations have been encouraged to neglect their possibilities as producers and exporters of primary products—possibilities that may well hold the key to the achievement of a rounded economy and the realization of all their aspirations. These proposals, so uncritically taken up by many men of good will, need examination in some detail.

III

In 1952, the U. N. General Assembly adopted a resolution urging national governments to cooperate "in establishing multilateral as well as bilateral agreements or arrangements relating to individual primary commodities as well as groups of primary commodities and manufactured goods, for the purpose of:

(a) Insuring the stability of the prices of the said commodities in keeping with an adequate, just, and equitable relationship between these prices and those of capital goods and other manufactured articles;

(b) Safeguarding the continuity of the economic and social progress of all countries, those producing as well as those consuming raw materials."

The United States did not support this resolution, which passed by a vote of 36 to 4, with 20 nations abstaining. There is certain to be continuing agitation for programs to put this recommendation into force.

International control over commodity allocation has been practiced in times of emergency—during World War II, and again after Korea, when an International Materials Conference was organized, on a voluntary basis, to allocate scarce materials in an equitable fashion. But the control of primary products trade upon a broad scale and under other than emergency conditions presents many problems. Three variant types of procedure are generally considered possible, and there is a record of experience with at least two of them in limited application, though with less than conclusive results.

The first procedure calls for the use of restrictive quota agreements. Prices are controlled by means of agreed limitations on the production and export of a commodity on a quota basis, varied to equate supply with demand. The international sugar agreement of 1953 is of this type. The second device, the use of long-term contracts, is typified by the international wheat agreement under which exporting countries agree to supply a fixed minimum amount at a given ceiling price, and importing countries agree to purchase a fixed minimum amount at a given floor price. When the free market is functioning between the floor and ceiling prices the guaranties are inoperative. The third procedure, which calls for control over commodity markets through the operation of international buffer stocks, has never been tried. Purchases and sales from such buffer stocks would be depended upon to regulate prices.

There are cogent reasons to question the workability of any of these devices, particularly if an attempt were made to apply them to a broad list of commodities. One unsolved problem that is basic to all is that of finding a way to make them effective in modifying short-term price fluctuations of undue severity without interfering with the longer term trends that are depended upon to adjust supply to demand, eliminate inefficient producers, and allocate resources between alternate uses. Another difficulty is how to obtain managing personnel sufficiently wise and objective to operate the controls in the common interest, and as effectively as through the workings of the free market.

Each device raises a number of special problems; but there is one more general question that is fundamental. Who would benefit if any of these expedients were adopted and could be made to work? The Assembly resolution mentions the interests of both producers and consumers of raw materials; but its case was documented and supported largely as a measure to remove the alleged disabilities of the underdeveloped countries which concentrate upon primary production and trade. The same resolution suggests that the control should operate to preserve "an adequate, just, and equitable relationship" between the prices of primary and manufactured goods, presumably in international trade.

The record of price movements for various categories of goods in international trade shows that the postwar level of raw materials prices as a whole has an entirely different and much higher relationship to the prices of manufactured goods than in the prewar period. The much longer record of United States prices shows the same phenomenon. If the proposed program had been in existence over a 25-year period, would the earlier relationship have been considered "adequate, just, and equitable?" Is the relationship now existing, after a relatively deeper fall of raw materials prices in 1952 and 1953 and a subsequent movement toward rebalancing, the best that the market is likely to afford to raw materials in the years ahead? The United Nations economic studies find no persuasive evidence to suggest a further improvement in the relative prices of primary products, but other economists do. Before discussing that, however, I would like to register my own conviction that to peg prices of primary product prices to the prices of manufactured goods would be more likely to benefit the net purchasing areas for these products than the underdeveloped areas which are net exporters.

IV

The last of the preconceptions deals with the widespread conviction that underdeveloped areas should turn away from the production of raw materials in order to develop economies based on manufacturing. To keep the record straight, let us start with an unqualified endorsement of heroic efforts to broaden the base of underdeveloped economies. Certainly this calls for an expansion of domestic manufacturing, as fast as capital, equipment, labor, and managerial skills, materials and market outlets can be mobilized. It calls, too, in most underdeveloped areas, for a vast improvement in agricultural production, which means at the least a greater degree of mechanization and increased use of fertilizers and chemical weed and insect controls. It calls for improved transport and power facilities, which again means more equipment.

The "value added" to the gross national product by manufacturing is generallly greater per person employed than that in the case of agriculture (though not more than is contributed by the extractive industries). This is another reason for developing manufactures. A third reason is that a broad economic activity based on a domestic market can help to cushion the shock of declines in export demand, which, as we have shown, are of considerable dimension for primary products and manufactures alike.

But to start manufacturing activities, to mechanize agriculture, to establish transport and power facilities in underdeveloped areas—all these require equipment. Most such equipment has to come from abroad; it is necessarily the product of an established and complex industrial economy. There are only three ways in which it can be acquired in substantial quantity. It can be purchased for cash—and that requires foreign exchange as well as locally mobilized capital. It may be purchased on credit or through loans—but repayment calls for foreign exchange. It may be brought in as a capital contribution by foreign investors—but such investment will not be made unless there is prospect of both business profit and sufficient foreign exchange from some source to cover the remittance of earnings and amortization. Equipment is an essential key to industrialization, and foreign exchange is an essential key to equipment.

How can the underdeveloped countries get the requisite foreign exchange of the major industrial countries? In the past, they have earned the great bulk of their foreign exchange by exports—54 percent from exported industrial raw materials and 34 percent from exported foods. Primary products are likely to be their main source of earning power for some time, although inceased local processing of export products at least to the semi-manufactured stage is desirable and should be progressively feasible.

Since it can be stated with assurance that an increase of the tempo of industrialization calls for an increase in exports in its early stages, it is relevant to appraise the outlook of the underdeveloped countries for increased exports in the field of their greatest opportunity—industrial raw materials. Future projections are always hazardous, but development planning necessarily calls for a long view and must be based upon a reading of prospects.

Upon a reasonable estimate from past trends, we can say that the free-world consumption of industrial raw materials may increase from about $46 billion in 1950 to about $80 billion (at 1950 price levels) by 1975–80. The international trade in these commodities may increase from $27 billion to about $50 billion in the same period. Such an increase in consumption should afford presently underdeveloped areas an opportunity to increase their combined production of industrial raw materials from the $14.5 billion of 1950 to something like $31.5 billion within 25 years, and their exports in this field from $13.5 billion to about $28.5 billion. Increases of this magnitude, almost double the expected population increases, would exert a markedly stimulating effect upon the underdeveloped economies. It is quite possible that if a sufficiently vigorous and enlightened effort were made, the share of the underdeveloped areas in both the production and the export of industrial raw materials might increase by even more than the amounts indicated. To date they have made far less drastic inroads upon their known and potential stores of such resources than have the industrialized countries, especially on resources that can be produced at low costs.

The opportunities for increased exchange revenues from larger food exports are also considerable and should be fostered, though they are by no means correspondingly large. There is equal urgency for expanded agricultural output, but chiefly to improve the woefully inadequate nutritional levels that prevail in most underdeveloped countries, and to save the exchange now spent on imported foodstuffs.

In summary, there is need for a reorientation of current thinking about the role of primary products, and particularly of industrial raw materials, in the economic planning of underdeveloped areas. It is much to the advantage of the underdeveloped areas to take vigorous advantage of the opportunities

for increased production and trade in raw materials offered by an exceptionally favorable outlook in demand and price. They possess the most economic stores of supply. They should exploit these advantages to increase the initial processing stages of raw materials in their own countries, and thus promote industrial development in the field where they have the clearest competitive advantage. They should employ the need of manufacturing nations for raw materials imports as a lever to pry from them a major part of the capital funds upon which increased output depends, and thus conserve their limited local capital for developments of less appeal to foreign investors. Above all, they should use the increased foreign exchange earnings obtainable in this field to buy the equipment needed to broaden their domestic industrial base.

Finally, I think it is justifiable to suggest a thorough overhauling of the scholarship that, in recent analyses of the problems of underdevelopment, has so consistently disparaged the role that raw materials can play. The production and export of raw materials should not be regarded by underdeveloped nations as the terminus of their economic aspirations; nevertheless, it is a way station that cannot be bypassed. To seek to persuade the peoples who possess these resources that they should make less than the maximum feasible use of them is absurd in theory and disastrous in practice. If this counsel is followed, it will deprive the underdeveloped areas of their single most promising opportunity for attaining the broad, sound, and vigorous economic growth that is central to their own objectives and essential to the strength and security of the entire free world.

Design for the New Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, my office has received a number of protests concerning the design of the new Air Academy as made public by the Air Force several weeks ago. Investigation of the situation leads me to bring this matter before the House. Unless Congress calls a halt to the present plans of the executive department, it would appear that the Secretary of Air and the Air Force are about to make a serious mistake, one with which we would have to live for many years.

Establishment of a national Air Academy as the Air Force counterpart of West Point and Annapolis was the life-long dream of the late Gen. Billy Mitchell. This dream moved close to reality last year when Congress authorized an expenditure of $126 million for this purpose. Subsequently, the Air Force appointed as Air Academy architects a Chicago architectural firm which designed the Lever Brothers glass building in New York and a number of industrial structures throughout the country. The firm, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, was appointed to design the Air Academy, coordinate the engineering services, and supervise construction. On May 14, models of the design were unveiled at Colorado Springs, Colo., the site of the new Academy.

What was seen by the congressional observers and the press caused considerable consternation. A spontaneous protest by churchmen throughout the Nation caused the Air Force to withdraw almost immediately the design for the chapel. This glass-and-metal creation was described variously as an accordion lying on its side and a line of telescoped Indian tepees. Outside this tin building, hanging from a metal rack in the fashion of the ice cream wagon we see in summer, were the church bells. The whole business sat on a terrace which one architect said was Egyptian and another said originated with the Incas.

The balance of the plan has not been altered, we are told. The overall plan consists of a number of glass, aluminum, and steel buildings on stilts. When he first saw the design, Representative HARDY, of Virginia, commented that it looked like a cigarette factory. Congressman HARDY proved to be something of a prophet, because only a few days later, Frank Lloyd Wright, the famous architect, declared flatly that the Air Academy design is a violation of nature. He predicted that the Air Academy, if built as planned, would become known—not as the national shrine it should and must be—but as Talbott's aviary and a factory for birdmen. Mr. Wright said in a letter which was published in the Colorado Springs Free Press of May 27:

The Air Force Academy looks to me as if another factory had moved in where it ought not to be.

Since that time, there seems to have been considerable confusion. According to the Air Force's Public Relations Department, work on the Air Academy is to begin this summer. Yet, Secretary of Air Talbott has been quoted in the press as saying the design is not yet in its final form.

My purpose in discussing this subject today is to urge its revision—in its entirety—for two basic and most important reasons. They are quite simple: First, the design is not American in conception and is unworthy of the tradition of this Nation; second, the taxpayers should not be saddled with an initial cost of $126 million for construction of the Academy and its supporting facilities, and heaven knows how much more for maintenance over the years, to build a monument to experimental materials.

Let us take these points one at a time.

The Air Academy should be a national shrine, as are the historic buildings of West Point, and the Naval Academy in Annapolis. Like its Army and Navy counterparts, the Air Academy should reflect our Nation's origins, its culture, represent its teachings, and symbolize its humanity. It should have warmth, and beauty, and an atmosphere of American history. The Air Force has stated publicly that, besides teaching our future airmen mechanical skills, its duty is to inculcate unimpeachable character, an unflagging sense of duty, and devotion to the best interest of the Nation.

Instead, we have a design and choice of materials reminiscent of a cafeteria. A knowledge of architecture is unnecessary in sensing the faults of this plan. It is difficult to find any trace of American heritage in the cold, impersonal, and mechanical appearance of these buildings. Several leading architects who studied the drawings and photographs of the models made several interesting observations. What they said can be compressed into two sentences. The design is not American. It is based on a hodgepodge of European and Near Eastern influences, and not even the best of those. When you examine the models, you find the Egyptian or Near Eastern terraces. The senseless elevation of everything on stilts, I am told, was popular in Europe—particularly in Germany—during the 1920's, but has since been discarded as outmoded.

The cold surfaces and lack of decoration follow the fad we have seen expressed principally in New York City. Last April, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, commenting on so-called modern architecture, described the United Nations Building and the new glass and metal buildings on Park Avenue as—and I quote—"illuminated cracker boxes or elongated shoeboxes on stilts." One of the Air Academy designers stated in unveiling the models that his was a timeless design and will be good 100 years from now. He is a brave man, and a wise one, too, to look so far into the future and tell us what it holds.

I wonder if some of our so-called modern architects, back in the days of the Civil War, were not saying the same sort of thing about the jigsaw architecture which became a craze for a brief span. You may remember the jigsaw architecture—the odd-looking cutouts and scrolls of wood that cluttered up every building that was erected for a time. Today, the buildings which were victims of that architectural aberration are archaic curiosities.

Architectural styles are variable and fickle. Yet West Point and Annapolis are as in keeping with American tradition today as the day they were built. It is significant, too, that each of these great service Academies has found it desirable to tell its history—and the history of the United States—through statuary, busts of its heroes, murals, portraits, and other objects of art. Presumably, the Air Force has the same goals—to immortalize its pioneers, its leaders, and its generations of fighting men. It would seem strange, indeed, if the Air Force has not planned artistic representations of the history of aviation, murals depicting our great aerial victories, statues of Gen. Billy Mitchell, and our other heroes of the air. This is visual education. Thus is taught reverence for service and country. But how do you execute a mural on a glass wall? Where do you hang the portraits? Is there any place for tradition and a narration of the history of America amid glass walls and aluminum panels? I think not.

Now we come to the second point. The choice of materials. Glass and metal, of course, are alien to American monumental design—even to European. This is so obvious it needs no further comment. Let us then concern ourselves with the compatibility of the materials with their demands from the standpoint of structure and environment. The Weather Bureau reports that tempera-

tures in Colorado Springs area range from 27 below zero in February to 97 above in June and July. There is intense sunlight. Yet the Academy instruction building has glass walls, floor to ceiling. Any engineer can provide information on the heating and air-conditioning problems of glass buildings. The problem is difficult; the costs, enormous. I understand the glass walls of the Air Academy buildings are to be tinted to reduce some of the glare. There seems little or no justification for this. There is an interesting—not to say fantastic—rationalization of it.

I will read one sentence from the current issue of the magazine, Architectural Forum. Commenting upon the glass walls and their effect on the airmen, the Forum states:

> Some days they will squint, but the basic Air Force expression is a cowboy squint, shrewd and appraising.

It is a fascinating rationalization—to make a virtue out of a structural fault which makes you squint to protect your vision.

Let us consider another factor. An 8-inch brick wall will easily withstand a 4-hour fire test during which the temperature applied rises to 2,300 degrees. Actually, many fire clays will resist up to 3,000 degrees. This 4-hour fire rating is mandatory in many parts of the country. Glass, on the other hand, provides little or no fire protection. It shatters easily under lateral force, pressure, and/or heat. Aluminum, of which a generous amount is contemplated in the Air Academy, melts at 1,200 degrees. This temperature is reached in less than 10 minutes of the fire-rating test. These fire test specifications are established by the American Society for Testing Materials.

Now let us come back to the aluminum panels recommended for exterior wall use on several Air Academy buildings. I have a letter written by the Sibbald Mason Constructing Co. to the Structural Clay Products Institute. The contractor, discussing the aluminum and steel construction of the new Statler Hotel in Hartford, Conn., has this to say—and I quote—

> I have observed and been informed by the architect and the vice president of the Statler chain of an existing condition that has caused considerable anxiety due to several facts as, namely, (1) it is difficult to hold caulking in place to stop leakage as vibration from wind is severe. (2) Shrinkage in aluminum on an 80-foot span is 1 inch. (3) Discoloration varies in panels in less than 1 year. (4) Dirt seems to be more noticeable on aluminum panel than on the white Hanley brick used on same building.

This information hints at the maintenance problems and costs which the Nation's taxpayers would face with the Air Academy. It would be interesting to have maintenance figures on the United Nations building in New York. The United Nations building is metal and glass. It is said in building circles that the building leaks like a sieve and repairs are constantly in progress. I have been told that approximately $360,000 was spent on repairs little more than a year following completion of the United Nations building. And, while we are discussing maintenance, let us give a thought to the Lever Bros. building. This is particularly interesting since the architects who designed it are the ones who originated this concept of the Air Academy. I have been told that the Lever building had to have special scaffolding equipment installed on its roof at a cost of $250,000. The purpose of this equipment was to allow continual washing of the building exterior with the Lever Bros. products—soap. I am told further that the building owners were required by insurance costs and the risks involved to hire scaffoldmen rather than ordinary window washers for the continual scrubbing of the glass walls.

It must be remembered that glass, like metal, requires constant cleaning, else it quickly takes on a dirty, unpelasant appearance. This is not true of brick, stone, granite, or any form of masonry. Masonry grows more beautiful with age. Architects say it would detract from the beauty of the Washington Monument to clean its stone sides. Recently, the National Press Building here in Washington had its first cleaning in 28 years. The renovation process, according to the newspaper stories, cost less than $10,000. So here you have it—$250,000 just to install the scaffolding equipment on the Lever Bros. building—$10,000 for a once-in-28-years cleaning job on the Press Building.

There is still another factor—that of cost. It is true that in monumental building the question of construction cost can be considered secondary. However, this should only apply, it seems to me, when it has been established that the building material in question is the finest, most suitable, and the most beautiful available. Since we have disposed of the question of beauty and suitability, let us, then, see if there is any argument to be made in behalf of these experimental materials on the basis of cost. You may remember an article which appeared in Life magazine last year in which it was alleged that the metal walls of a new building at Park Avenue between 49th and 50th Streets in New York City, were actually built in 1 day. Actually, one of the Nation's top contractors, John A. Mulligan, established that a crew of 20 men spent 5 months getting ready for that 1 day of slapping metal panels on the building.

And at least a week before the 1-day publicity stunt, all construction trades were laid off while special crews set all the panels in the proper positions for the blitz installation. This 22-story building was constructed with two walls of metal and two of glazed brick. Mr. Mulligan states, in a letter addressed to President Harry C. Bates, of the Bricklayers Union, that all the masonry in the building, including labor and materials—and the masonry backing for the metal panels—cost less than $250,000. The metal walls cost more than $1 million.

In last January's issue of Architectural Form, there was an article on New York's new Socony-Vacuum building, a 42-story structure. I will quote but two paragraphs from the story. They state: "And what about the added cost?" asked Harrison and Horr, the architect and builder. Would not a stainless-steel skin cost half again as much as brick? But the steel industry wanted the building, and cost was not going to prevent them from getting it. To meet the competition, they were willing to write off any price differential as the cost of promoting steel. Result: New York's biggest skyscraper in 25 years will have a stainless steel skin. I will cite one other example—the Pennsylvania State Office Building in Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle.

Here, aluminum was selected as the exterior facing material. There were built 12-inch walls, 6 inches of aluminum, and 6 inches of block backup. For purposes of comparison, let us take a 10-inch cavity wall of brick and tile. This would provide a thinner wall and create more interior room. Now the 12-inch metal walls of the Pennsylvania State office building will pass a 2-hour fire test. The 10-inch brick-and-tile wall mentioned will pass a 4-hour fire test. The square-foot cost of the aluminum wall built in this Golden Triangle building was $6,73. This is a square-foot cost—in place. The square-foot cost of the brick-and-tile wall, using a glazed-face brick, is $4.31 in place, a saving of $2.42 per square foot. The time consumed in construction is the same for both materials—6 to 12 months—assuming, of course, that delivery of the metal is prompt.

I mention this because of the amusement created in building circles by the new Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co. Building in New York. There a wall of glazed brick was built between January 28, 1955, and May 11. The adjacent metal walls were started November 12, 1954. The last I heard, the date of completion was set for some time in June.

I have singled out these few examples to make the point that purely from the structural standpoint, these materials have not proved themselves. They are experimental. This is not to say that all metal buildings are bad. Many of them may be good. But the overall question of worth must be decided many years hence. For they have not yet withstood the test of time. It is significant that in the Roman Coliseum, there are bricks and stone standing today in their original positions. The bricks are 1 inch thick and 24 inches long. They are relatively unwarped and in good condition after 2,200 years of exposure.

Today we see modern applications of these materials. In San Francisco, the new Equitable Life Insurance Building exterior is Vermont marble veneer. The Prudential Life Insurance Building, Chicago's biggest skyscraper, is limestone backed by brick. In New York, I am told, there is to be built a $20 million office building at Fifth Avenue and 53d Street whose walls will be fashioned of stone. Interestingly enough, the investment group which is paying for the building has switched from metal to masonry in planning this large project.

I have attempted here to cover some of the very important points involved in the design and construction of our National Air Academy. It is my understanding that a conference on the design has been set for June 20 at Colorado Springs. At that time, I hope, earnest thought will be given to a thorough reconsidera-

tion of the plans which have been formulated thus far. American art and architecture moved a great stride forward under the urging of a capable architect who became President of the United States. Let us follow the urging of Thomas Jefferson—to challenge the world in our building as we have challenged the world in our Constitution.

Report on the Great Plains Agricultural Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in view of the recent meeting held at Denver, Colo., on May 31 to June 2, by the Secretary of Agriculture and his staff, at which the first great step was taken in an attempt to control this country's most vital resource, its soil, and to provide a plan for a long-range program for the Great Plains of the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the Great Plains Agricultural Conference, held by the Department of Agriculture at Denver, Colo., from May 31 to June 2.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON GREAT PLAINS AGRICULTURAL CONFERENCE, DENVER, COLO., MAY 31–JUNE 2, 1955

The Great Plains of the United States is a vast farm and ranch empire whose potential for continuous agricultural production depends on whether land use can be successfully adjusted to the repeated and prolonged droughts that are a normal feature of the region's climate.

A major step toward stabilizing the agriculture of this area has now been taken. Under the auspices of the Great Plains Agricultural Council—made up of directors of extension, deans of experiment stations, and United States Department of Agriculture representatives in the 10-State area—work has been started to develop a long-range agricultural program. Representatives of the council met in Denver, Colo., May 31–June 2, with a special committee from the United States Department of Agriculture. This work group submitted to Secretary Ezra Taft Benson a report entitled, "Guides to a Successful Long-Range Program in the Great Plains." On the evening of June 7, Secretary Benson met in Denver with the governors or their designated representatives from the Great Plains States. Eight of the governors were in attendance. Secretary Benson submitted the guides to a successful long-range program, and the governors made recommendations from the standpoint of conditions in their respective States.

On June 2, there was a further meeting of the work group and representatives of the governors, including the secretary or commissioner of agriculture from several of the States. This group had before it for consideration proposals and recommendations made at local, county, State and regional levels by associations, Federal and State agricultural agencies, farm organizations and other interested groups.

Out of these proposals and the discussions of them have come a set of "guides" that are now being reviewed and evaluated by State officials, farm organizations, and many other groups and individuals. Their suggestions will aid in rounding out the plans developed by the Denver conference. It is contemplated that the State and Federal agencies concerned move vigorously into an action program aimed at achieving a more stable agriculture in the Great Plains.

A substantial part of the Great Plains is adapted to crop farming, but there is need for more general use of farm-management practices that have proven to be essential to conserve soil and water resources. There is, however, a substantial acreage now in crop production that is suited only for grazing.

Although the details of the program are still being worked out, those who took part in the Denver conference reached agreement on the shape and general direction such a long-range program should take.

First must come an understanding and acceptance of responsibility by individuals on the land, groups, and governmental bodies concerned. Primary responsibility for the kind of land use that will stabilize Great Plains agriculture rests on the landowner and operator himself.

County, State, and Federal Government must also carry part of the load. Local government, including special-purpose units such as soil-conservation districts, will be responsible for such matters as carrying out provisions of land classification, for application of tax procedures that permit and encourage good land use, and for any land use ordinances which may be considered.

State governments have the opportunity and obligation of providing suitable enabling acts covering zoning and land-use ordinances. They need to provide funds for research, education, and action programs, and to relate tax procedures to land use. They must enact and administer laws controlling use of surface and underground water and should encourage sound water resource development.

The Federal Government's responsibility lies in the redirection of certain programs so as to eliminate any provisions in conflict with long-range land use requirements in the region, and to derive from them appropriate incentive and assistance in obtaining the kind of land use adjustments needed. Coordination and guidance of improved education, credit, technical, cost-sharing and similar program aids are also responsibilities the Federal Government should assume.

But to get started on a practical program of land use adjustments, the first question that arises is: "How must this particular piece of land be used so that it will best withstand the ravages of drought and wind; and produce the most over the long pull?"

The conference agreed that was the fundamental question and the answer to it depends on a locally acceptable and technically sound system of land classification. To achieve this the conference has proposed that the Department of Agriculture move immediately to complete its soil survey and subsequent land capability classification on the critical areas of the plains. Local groups of farmers and ranchers who need some sort of classification immediately will be urged to develop an interim system using the best judgment and information available locally.

Current agricultural programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture were scrutinized carefully. It was recommended that on-site technical assistance in soil and water conservation be accelerated in this problem area. Similarly, acceleration of the cost sharing program in conservation was urged, especially in behalf of those practices that tend to bring about desired land use adjustment. The conference proposed exploration of the need for new legislation to permit forward commitments in cost sharing, and to enable this and others of the economic programs of the Department to become more flexible and more closely geared to proper use of land.

Emphasizing the important role of private and cooperative lenders, the conference recommended that credit programs, public and private, be directed more specifically toward improved land use. More intermediate and long-term credit was seen as a need to enable farmers to enlarge or adapt farm units to better cope with the climatic hazards of the region.

Crop insurance should be developed and strengthened, the conference recommended, but should not be offered on land unsuited for long-time production of the insured crop.

As yet unresolved but holding promise of aid in this program are questions relating to crop-acreage allotments and price support and their effect on current as well as future land use.

Similarly, the conference outlined for consideration a variety of proposals as to mechanisms that might become necessary to obtain land-use adjustments in the more severe problem areas. These included State or Federal Government versions of lease, purchase, or similar devices to regulate the use of the most critical lands.

The conference explored dozens of subjects in which additional research is required, but agreed, first of all, to inventory and summarize research results already available that might bear on this problem.

In general, research efforts need to be directed toward better protection and production on lands suited for continuous crop production and toward improvements in revegetation and grassland management on those lands unsuited for arable farming. Special studies on climate will be sought as a means of further clarifying the weather risk.

A stepped-up level of education is one key to the successful application of a long-range program. Not only must detailed information on research results and farming methods be channeled to farmers and ranchers; there is the further job of stimulating effective cooperation of people in the towns and cities of the region.

Within these proposals, the conference agreed, lie the essentials of a program that will reduce or minimize the human hardships, the economic waste, and the soil damage that are so prevalent in the Great Plains. Success of such a program will depend on the determination with which the correct combination of these ingredients is put to work on the land.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The action program that is being further developed for the Great Plains will help achieve more dependable prosperity for the citizens and help build a stronger America.

The farm products from this vast productive agricultural empire helped win two World Wars. It can continue to be a great reservoir of productive strength if wisely managed to conserve and increase its productive capacity.

These great potentials can be fully realized by putting into effect the practices and procedures that will more completely control the effects of the weather hazards. Drought, floods, and other disasters cannot be prevented, but the damaging effects can be greatly reduced. The remedies and procedures must be agreed upon. There must then be complete teamwork in moving forward toward more prosperous farming and ranching and for the total economy.

Enlightenment About Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the manner in which taxes so rapidly increase is very well discussed in an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on Sunday, June 12. The editorial is entitled "Enlightenment About Taxes," and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENLIGHTENMENT ABOUT TAXES

Governor Leader is engaged on a mission of trying, in his own words, "to enlighten the people" about the vicious and tricky wage and income tax he proposes for Pennsylvania.

The way this educational venture is turning out, it appears that Governor Leader may be the one who receives most of the enlightenment. The people already seem to know a great deal about taxes.

For instance: One of the selling points in Mr. Leader's enlightening talks is the constantly reiterated statement that the proposed State wage tax of 1 percent is just a fraction of what the same wage earner pays under the Federal income tax.

That is true, as far as it goes. But what Mr. Leader forgets is that the Federal income tax started out, in its infancy, at just a fraction of its present huge bite.

Back in 1913—that was 5 years before Governor Leader was born—the lowest bracket of the new Federal income taxpayers got nicked for the small rate of one-half of 1 percent. And the average wage earner paid no tax at all.

Any taxpayer has only to look over his 1954 income-tax return, or the list of itemized deductions from his pay check, to determine how marvelously the Federal income tax has grown. The lowest bracket of taxpayers now pays 20 percent. And the average wage earner not only is in that bracket; he's the best customer Uncle Sam has.

What's to prevent the State from starting out at 1 percent and going up, up, and up, the way the Federal Government did? Not a thing. The State constitution prohibits a graduated income tax, but it doesn't put any limit on the rate of a flat tax.

This isn't just an idle or theoretical objectaxes to finance increased costs and ingovernment has had to collect more and more taxes, to finance increased costs and increased services. Every 2 years the pinch comes and we get a flock of new taxes.

Four years ago, the legislature beat down a determined drive to saddle us with a flat income tax. We got a batch of minor taxes instead. Two years ago, the bill was upped again and we got a sales tax.

Now Mr. Leader has presented a hugely increased State budget for the next 2 years, and he wants his pet wage and income tax to finance it. If by any mischance he should get away with this plan the consequences could be vast.

For the next biennial budget comes up 2 years hence, in 1957. Then, as now, more money will be needed for schools, teachers' salaries, health, welfare, political payrolls, and for increased expenses.

If we have a 1-percent wage tax on the books at that time, as Mr. Leader hopes, the legislature's job in raising new funds will be easy. Just up the wage tax to 1½ percent, to 2 percent, to whatever percentage it takes to fill out the budget.

And beyond 1957, there's 1959 and 1961. The pattern of taxation we set this year can determine a State tax pattern for the rest of our lives. And if it's a wage tax—look out. What started out to be "just a fraction" of the Federal income tax can turn out to be another huge bite out of the vanishing paycheck.

Statement by George J. Burger on the Nomination of William C. Kern To Be a Member of the Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, June 16, 1955, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, appeared and testified before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on the nomination of William C. Kern to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Burger's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS, WASHINGTON, D. C., BEFORE THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, JUNE 16, 1955

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

Mr. Chairman, no officer or group of officers is permitted to speak for the Federation prior to the direct nationwide vote of our entire membership. I make this statement so that I will qualify under the mandate of our nationwide membership.

In repeated national polls of our entire membership the executive officers have been instructed to use every power within our means for an all-out vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws. Our position was ably stated on this subject matter time and again before congressional committees and before the platform committees of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions in Philadelphia in 1948 and in Chicago in 1952.

We hold to the premise that vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws can only come through those agencies entrusted by the Congress with the enforcement of these major laws. We further know from actual experience in the business world that it doesn't make much difference what experience one has in his own individual business, whether at the production or distribution level, or how ably financed the independent businessman is—if there is no equal and fair competition, keeping within the framework of the laws both State and Nation, that the independent businessman will go down to defeat. In other words, a consistent, vigorous enforcement of these antitrust laws will, in our opinion, be the only major item which will keep small business in our overall economy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on April 26, 1955, Mr. Joseph E. Sheehy, Director, Bureau of Litigation, Federal Trade Commission, told a Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee that the FTC had made a sweeping probe of the rubber big three, presumably since 1947. In part, his testimony disclosed tire makers pay oil marketeers override "in consideration of cooperation and assistance in making sale of TBA (tire, batteries, and accessories) products to contract and leased stations. The override varies from 5 percent to 10 percent, depending on the product and customer classification. In an 18-month period combined sales of two tire manufacturers to filling stations of a single oil company were more than $56 million and the combined override paid was in excess of $5 million.

If the cease and desist order against the United States Rubber Co., et al., issued by the FTC in 1939 had been vigorously enforced there never would have been a repetition of the conditions on which Mr. Sheehy of FTC recently testified before the House Small Business Committee.

Is it any wonder that in a staff report to the House Small Business Committee, "U. S. Versus Concentration and Monopoly" pursuant to House Resolution 64, 79th Congress, they said: "The FTC, when questioned by the staff about their not making compliance checks, replied verbally that they do not have the staff to devote to this function. In other words, they have such a large backlog of cases that they have to spend all their time 'swatting new flies' and do not have time to find out whether they have effectively disposed of the old onres."

We in the federation have been consistently demanding of the FTC over the years an explanation of what is taking place, and up to this moment we are still in the dark.

The more serious aspect in the situation we quote above is that other factors in that industry or other industries must have come to the conclusion that no all-out action would be taken by the FTC to police its action, and consequently they have come to the conclusion nothing would be done to enforce the laws and have instituted practices all tending to eliminate or destroy small business of this Nation, both at the production and distribution level.

The members of your committee well know that the two agencies of the Government empowered by the Congress to enforce these laws are the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. We must look to these two agencies to bring about the needed protection for the people we represent, small business of this Nation.

In recent years small business looked to the constructive action of the Federal Trade Commission, through the Robinson-Patman Act, to bring adequate protection and relief for small business of this Nation through the vigorous enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act. We are of the opinion that if there had been vigorous and consistent enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act by the Federal Trade Commission from the inception of the act there would have been less need for constant appeals being made by small business to their Members of the Congress, or through the Small Business Committees for the necessary help to protect their businesses.

We in small business are concerned and alarmed at the action of the Federal Trade Commission for many years as it is our belief that agency should place more emphasis on vigorous enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act, and less emphasis on the study procedure as carried out by the FTC.

I think in justice to the committee we should be expected to qualify this statement, and here's a good example of what we are leading up to:

The record will show that the Federal Trade Commission, in a report prepared for the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1939 stated:

"The Federal Trade Commission, in a report prepared for the Temporary National Economic Committee, stated that 'investigations and complaints brought by the Federal Trade Commission have gone a long way toward eliminating the practice of tire companies of granting overriding commissions to the oil companies for permission to sell their stations tires and tubes, dealers feel that the major oil producers must still be receiving a quid pro quo for their efforts to induce their stations to handle only acceptable lines.'"

Mr. Chairman, we are appearing here today neither for nor against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Kern. It is our firm belief that no appointments should be made to the Federal Trade Commission at this time until the committee satisfies itself without a question of doubt that the FTC is enforcing the laws entrusted to it as so willed by the Congress of these United States.

In our opinion, from experience with the Commission for the past decade or more, we believe there has been no vigorous enforcement of the laws entrusted to the Commission, and particularly as it applied to what we term the "magna carta" of small business—the Robinson-Patman Act.

But to what appears to be the delaying action of the Federal Trade Commission to bring about long overdue protection to efficient independent business of this Nation, we urge your committee to take under immediate consideration a thorough investigation of the Federal Trade Commission in its administration of the laws entrusted to it.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in making this request we believe we are not alone in finding serious fault with the operation of the FTC as it is to be noted within the past few days the druggists, grocers, members of the automotive trade, etc., have also come to the same conclusion as noted in releases appearing in the Nation's press.

Without vigorous and consistent enforcement of the antitrust laws through all antitrust agencies of the Government there can be no future for independent business of this Nation.

We urge, in behalf of small business of this Nation, immediate consideration by your committee for a complete investigation of the overall actions of the FTC before any further appointments are made to that agency.

"Pay-as-You-See" Television Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by James P. Gossett, entitled "Search for Reality," published in the Gooding (Idaho) Leader of June 9, 1955, concerning "pay-as-you-see" television, and discussing the controversy with reference to that subject, which is before the Federal Communications Commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SEARCH FOR REALITY"

(By James P. Gossett)

The hottest thing to be dropped into the lap of the Federal Communications Commission in many a long year is the present bitter fight between those who want to organize a system of "pay-as-you-see" television and those who want to keep "free" television—that is, TV as it now is. As you know, TV as we have it at present is yours for the simple turning of the proper knob on your set. It is an advertising medium just like radio and the programs are paid for by the advertisers who sponsor each program.

The "pay-as-you-see" faction is composed largely of Zenith Radio Corp., Skiatron Electronics and Television Corp., and Paramount Pictures. These people would attach a "telemeter" to everybody's TV receiving set which would "scramble" the image on the picture tube into a sort of unassembled jigsaw puzzle. Anyone wishing to watch a program would insert a coin into the telemeter, causing the picture to immediately become "unscrambled" and permitting the program to be enjoyed.

Millions of words have been written for each side of the argument and as of now it seems that those favoring the new "pay-as-you-see" idea are in the majority. However, the "free TVers" contend that this majority is just a reflection of a vast program on the part of the new-idea boys to create an illusion of support for telemetering by having everyone connected with their huge distribution systems write to Washington in support of their plan.

That could all too easily be true, for if you look at the unbelievably enormous profit potential, you will see that the incentive is there for them to spend practically unlimited amounts of money and effort to gain support for their scheme. See here: about 34 million families have bought TV sets. Let us assume that half of those families want to watch any given popular program—say Ed Sullivan's Toast of the Town. We don't know exactly what the price will be; it has been estimated at from 25 cents to $1. Suppose we take a half-dollar as a pretty reasonable guess at the amount you will have to put into the telemeter to unscramble Toast of the Town.

The simplest sort of arithmetic will show that if half of the 34 million families who own TV sets put in 50 cents to see that program, the telemeters are going to take in $8½ million for 30 minutes' entertainment. That is making money pretty fast—to be exact, at the rate of about $353,000 a minute. And if on some special occasion all of the TV sets were unscrambled for a program at a cost of a dollar each, the telemeters would be taking in money at the incredible rate of a million dollars a minute.

The sticker there is that John Q. Public—you—is the one who is shelling out the cash. About three-quarters of the people who own TV sets are people with an average annual income of $5,000 or less. A big part of them bought their sets on the installment plan and all of them bought them with the idea that once the sets were paid for they would enjoy free entertainment from then on, with only the cost of maintenace and repair to worry about. They figure that it would be just like it always has been; just like radio, free for the tuning in.

Now the next thing is who is going to pay for the telemeter they will attach to your set? You will, of course, and its estimated to cost you anywhere from $75 to $100. If you bought one of the more reasonably priced sets costing around $200 or less, the telemeter is going to add 50 percent or more to the cost of your set, and, once it is installed, you are going to pay for everything you see over it. At least the air has been free in this country to date but it looks like the end of even that with pay-as-you-see TV (or toll TV, as some call it). And if this business is permitted, I can see no logical reason why they will not be allowed some means of blocking out your radio so that you will have to shove in a quarter or a dime to hear a newscast.

The amounts of money to be made at the expense of the families owning TV sets is fantastic. The figures we gave you in the "million dollars a minute" paragraph back aways is just the beginning. The TV industry has its best years ahead as far as sales are concerned and the population of this country is increasing by several million each year. Once the toll TV systems have a death grip on telecasting for pay, the staggering sums they will be milking out of American homes will make the richest of the Texas oil barons look like panhandlers.

I believe that this "exploitation" will eventually give as big an impetus to socialism in this country as anything that has ever happened. Certainly it will place as valid an argument in the hands of those who want to nationalize our industry as they have ever had. The resentment of people who are watching the very air about them pre-empted to make billions for a few will take some sort of concrete form, and the socialist elements will be unsparing in their efforts to shape that form to their own ends.

It cannot be denied that some TV programs on the air today are mediocre. However, those programs are costing the viewer nothing, and if he doesn't like what he is watching he can just switch it off and not be out anything. Once a dollar has been put into the telemeter on the toll system it doesn't make any difference whether the viewer likes the program or not. He can still cut it off its true, but: he is in the hole to the tune of the amount he put in the meter.

Competition among sponsors make certain that the best programs will be televised for you under the present free system. The big sponsors will pay the price to try and reach you with the best available. It would be against their own interests to beam entertainment at you that would be promptly turned off.

Once that meter is stuck onto your receiver (at about $100 per each) you will pay for what they send you or do without. You will either pay for what they telecast or your two to five hundred dollar investment in a Tv set (plus the $100 meter) has simply gone up the flue.

No one knows for sure to what extent the support of the proposed toll system is synthetic—organized by those who stand to make billions out of it. But one thing is sure, the things we have written here should be carefully considered before the American people relinquish control of our freeways through the air to any kind of cartel. Those millions of us who live beyond the big cities usually have only one channel that comes in clearly. Once the toll is slapped on that channel we either pay or we don't look—and we pay for whatever they choose to sling at us.

Shipbuilding on the West Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted

me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a very important and significant communication received by me as a member of the California congressional delegation, dated June 17, 1955, from the Governor's Committee for Ship Construction and Repair, said committee having been designated by Hon. Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of my native State of California. Also note copy of letter said committee has sent to me calling my attention to the fact that the same communication has been mailed to over 300 chambers of commerce in 11 Western States.

I desire to state, Mr. Speaker, that several weeks ago when the distinguished Secretary of the United States Navy appeared as a witness before the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, I asked him substantially the following question, to wit, "Why does the Navy not make allowance for the differential in favor of shipbuilding on the West Coast and construct one of the carriers and more United States Navy ships there on the West Coast?" In answer to that question, which I am sure was pertinent and proper, the distinguished Secretary of the Navy said that he was looking into it.

Mr. Speaker, as the text of the enclosed letter dated June 17 clearly and distinctly, although briefly, sets forth some of the position of the Western States in the matter, I desire to again state that to me it is clear as crystal that the best interests of our national defense demand that the United States Navy get busy forthwith and see to it that a *Forrestal*-type carrier be commenced and constructed on the West Coast and that also other Navy ships be there constructed and that there be a consistent continuing reasonable program adopted and carried through on that basis.

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR
SHIP CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
San Francisco, Calif., June 17, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DOYLE: Attached is copy of a communication which has been mailed to over 300 chambers of commerce in the 11 Western States, enlisting their aid in the program which we feel is so vital to our Nation.

The strength of the representation of these 11 Western States in Washington will, no doubt, be beneficial in bringing the construction of the fifth *Forrestal*-type carrier to the San Francisco Naval Shipyard.

We urge you to use your good influence to this end.

Respectfully,

LOUIS ETS-HOKIN,
Chairman.

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR
SHIP CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR,
San Francisco, Calif., June 17, 1955.

FELLOW WESTERNERS: As you are of course well aware, the United States Navy is about to build a fifth *Forrestal*-type carrier.

We in California, right on the Pacific, and perhaps because of that more keenly realizing the need for large carriers to operate strategically against our potential and well-organized enemies, are convinced that the next carrier should be constructed at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard.

Most authorities agree that these large-type carriers are a most effective means both in preventing attack and in carrying on an offensive. The last war proved the carrier to be absolutely necessary.

The prevailing opinion is that any war in the near future would be fought mainly in the Pacific, and in the interest of national safety and defense it is essential for the west coast to have the know-how and skilled men for overhauling and for rebuilding this type of craft.

Two eastern yards have for years been equipped to build and reconstruct the *Forrestal* type of carrier; and it is unthinkable that the principal area of any future war should not be equally equipped and ready with men, material, and executive know-how.

Such carriers, as you undoubtedly know, are too large to go through the Panama Canal; and no such vessel, damaged or sound, should have to make the long trip around Cape Horn. In any actual war the delay and the exposure could be disastrous.

Those opposed to building a large carrier on the west coast claim that the cost would be slightly higher. Any slight extra cost would be negligible compared with the benefit to the Nation's greater security.

As a matter of fact, however, the cost probably would not exceed eastern construction costs. We know that in the case of a smaller type carrier—the *Bon Homme Richard*, now being reconverted at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard, and 80 percent complete—over 100,000 man-days of cost have already been saved, in comparison with similar jobs at other yards. (Incidentally, the vessel will be completed by the scheduled date.)

The San Francisco Naval Shipyard is fully equipped and capable of building a carrier of this type. The accompanying list shows the dimensions.

We should like to enlist your support in getting the fifth *Forrestal*-type carrier built in San Francisco. Apart from national security, it will benefit the economy of all our Western States. The carrier will cost approximately $250 million, and every cent of it would benefit western labor and industry. The 4 carriers now under construction in 2 east coast yards are putting an extra $1 billion in circulation in the East. We believe that the West should share in this ship construction to maintain the knowledge and skills which would be so vitally necessary in an emergency.

The money spent on this project would reach practically every type of business in all the Western States—trucking, timber, manufacturing, mining, steel, hotels, resorts, farmers, newspapers, airlines, and so on. In fact, the entire western economy would benefit, directly or indirectly. Previous experience and records prove that all major construction in the San Francisco Bay area was shared, in one way or another, by the citizens of all the States west of the Rocky Mountains.

Our California Senators and Congressmen are alive to the vital importance, both to the Nation and the Western States, of super-carrier construction on the west coast. We urge you to give strong and immediate support to this program. Specifically, we suggest that you communicate with your Senators and Congressmen, your State legislators, and civic organizations and individuals who can help effectively.

We are sending copies of this letter to your representatives in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS ETS-HOKIN,
Chairman.

GOVERNOR'S COMMITTEE FOR SHIP CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR

The following, while not a complete picture gives some important information about construction of the first carrier of the *Forrestal* type:

Over 2,000 railway cars of material were used in constructing the first carrier of the *Forrestal* type. In addition, many truck loads of materials were handled.

Known material used, much of which can be supplied right here in the West, included: 52,500 tons of structural steel, 2 million pounds of weld metal, 2 million rivets, 180 miles of piping, 290 miles of electrical wiring.

Five thousand five hundred men were employed during the building.

Newport News Dry Dock (in Virginia) had to enlarge its accommodations to handle the carrier. San Francisco Naval Shipyard's largest drydock is: 1,092 feet long; carrier is 1,036 feet; 170 feet wide, carrier is 132 feet up to flight deck.

Results of 1955 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I mailed an opinion questionnaire to the Democrat and Republican voters in the 25th Congressional District. My purpose was to obtain the views of my constituents on some of the important issues facing our country. One questionnaire was mailed to each home in the district.

Following the procedure I established in previous years, I invited my constituents to write additional comments on the questionnaire form. The response to this invitation has been overwhelming—so overwhelming, in fact, that it is impossible to send individual replies to those who answered the questionnaire. To date, more than 27,000 answers have been received. This is a greater interest than has ever been shown before by the voters of the 25th Congressional District. I am extremely pleased at this interest in representative government because it is only through knowledge of what the people want that we as elected representatives can adequately follow their wishes.

Of particular significance was question No. 9, in which I asked for advice concerning President Eisenhower's legislative program. The fact that 84.1 percent advocated support is indicative of the high esteem in which our President is held. It is also indicative of the confidence which has been restored in the highest office of the land.

The following is the compilation of answers:

1. Should the United States use atomic weapons against the Chinese Communists if they attack Formosa? Yes, 62.6 percent; no, 25.2 percent; no opinion, 12.2 percent.

2. Should the United States continue membership in the United Nations? Yes, 80.6 percent; no, 14.4 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

3. Should every male American be required to serve in the Armed Forces under a universal military training program? Yes, 73.3 percent; no, 20.4 percent; no opinion, 6.3 percent.

4. Do you favor medical treatment at taxpayers' expense for veterans whose illnesses or injuries are not caused by military service? Yes, 20.3 percent; no, 76.9 percent; no opinion, 2.8 percent.

5. Do you favor legislation to prevent a person from losing his job if he refuses to join a labor union? Yes, 72.1 percent; no, 24.5 percent; no opinion, 3.4 percent.

6. Should the postage rates on letters be increased from 3 cents to 4 cents in order to reduce the postal deficit? Yes, 64.6 percent; no, 28.5 percent; no opinion, 6.9 percent.

7. Do you favor a pay increase for Federal employees? Yes, 58 percent; no, 20.9 percent; no opinion, 21.1 percent.

8. Which should be admitted as States? Hawaii, 12.5 percent; Alaska, 5.8 percent; both, 70 percent; neither, 11.7 percent.

9. In general, what should I, as your elected Representative, do about President Eisenhower's legislative program? Support it, 84.1 percent; oppose it, 4.6 percent; no opinion, 11.3 percent.

District of Columbia Bar Association Deserves the Nation's Thanks and Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia did honor to its own best traditions and served the country well when it created last January a special committee to provide legal counsel in security cases for Federal employees unable to obtain counsel of their own choice or to pay for legal aid. A recent report on the work of this special committee shows that in the succeeding 5 months it obtained clearances for employees in 13 of 22 cases which were set for hearings; and 9 cases are still to be decided.

This perfect record to date is a tribute to the care and conscientiousness with which the members of the special committee handled the cases assigned to them. As the Washington Post and Times Herald says editorially this morning, "They deserve the thanks of the country as well as of their individual clients for their promotion of justice—and the more so since these are nonremunerative cases. But the record is also in part a commentary on the sloppiness and emptiness of security charges. Most of these cases should never have arisen; most of the security risk charges should never have been made."

I introduced on January 20, 1955, House Joint Resolution 154, a companion measure to the resolution offered in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator JOHN STENNIS. This resolution has just been favorably reported to the Senate for its consideration.

There are increasing signs of doubt about the abrogation of the Bill of Rights by the Federal Government which effectively deprives millions of American citizens of the ancient protections of our Constitution. Hired informers and offically encouraged poison-pen letterwriters which have been the hallmarks of the totalitarian regimes of Hiter, Mussolini, and Stalin have no place in American life. Despite the reluctance of the present Administration to face up to the problem it must prepare for careful reform of the present un-American activities or be prepared to face the consequences.

I am proud to include here the editorial tribute to the Bar Asosciation of the District of Columbia for a task magnificently conceived and executed.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 20, 1955]

TAKING "RISKS"

The Bar Association of the District of Columbia did honor to its own best traditions when it created a special committee last January to provide legal counsel in security cases for Government employees unable to obtain counsel of their own choice or to pay for regular legal aid. In the succeeding 5 months it obtained clearances for employees in 13 of 22 cases which were set for hearings; 9 cases are still to be decided. It appears, therefore, that the volunteer attorneys have thus far scored a perfect record.

The record is a tribute in part, of course, to the care and conscientiousness with which the committee members handled the cases assigned to them. They deserve the thanks of the country as well as of their individual clients for their promotion of justice—and the more so since these are nonremunerative cases. But the record is also in part a commentary on the sloppiness and emptiness of security charges. Most of these cases should never have arisen; most of the security risk charges should never have been made.

The report of the committee chairman, former Assistant Attorney General James M. McInerney, discloses how little the law has been able to do toward the elimination of injustice in the security program. After remarking that when it was first established, the committee was virtually inundated with inquiries, he said:

"A large number of these employees could not be helped because they had already forfeited their rights by submitting their resignations upon request, during or after a security investigation. Others had attempted to represent themselves without counsel and had been unsuccessful."

What a travesty this makes of the Civil Service Commission's security risk figures. We hope that the bar association's experience in dealing with this sample of security risk cases will lead it to champion the speedy revision of a program which in its present form too often serves the interests neither of security nor of justice.

Baiting: Ducks and Civil Servants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, June 17, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] defended the Department of the Interior against what he called attacks "inspired by political motives and designed to impair public confidence in its activities."

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that public confidence in the Interior Department has been rudely shaken long before I chose to level my attack on Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay. If it is politics to protest what is happening to our conservation programs then I plead guilty. I consider it the proper function of a Democratic Congressman to keep a watchful eye on a Republican administration which seems bent on giving away our natural resources.

CONSERVATIONISTS HOPPING MAD

Conservationists prefer to spend their time in the out of doors. But the deterioration of this country's conservation standards has brought many of them hopping mad into congressional offices to save what is left of our timberland, our wildlife, our soil, our water, and our other natural resources.

Here is what Spencer Smith, secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, has to say on the administration's performance in the field of conservation:

JUNE 18, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REUSS: I noted with more than passing interest that Congressman MILLER cautioned conservationists to disassociate themselves from the critics of the administration. If not explicitly stated, Congressman MILLER certainly implies that you are leading us down the garden path and that we should beware. Though we are grateful for the solicitude of the Congressman, we are saddened by the thought that he apparently is oblivious of, or agrees with, the record this administration is making in the field of conservation. I hasten to add that conservationists are not oriented in any politically partisan fashion to the problems to which many of us are urging the Nation's attention.

NO POLITICAL INTRIGUE

Many of us feel our criticism is germane and warranted on the record that has been made and on the policies proclaimed by the administration. No political spokesman affected any intrigue to cause conservationists to oppose what has been called the Nation's biggest boondoggle and the unwarranted invasion of Echo Park. No duress was manifest in the overwhelming number of conservationists that opposed the grazing or multipurpose bill that sought to seriously handicap the proper management of the national forests. No political soothsayer mesmerized conservationists in supporting budgets well in excess of that requested by administration leaders for needed conservation. Unfortunately, this list could be considerably extended.

It is this record that has occasioned the criticism by conservationists. Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, renowned conservationist, and the first director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, said, in a talk before the Citizens Planning Conference on Parks and Open Spaces for the American People in Washington on May 24: "There has, however, been a growing doubt in the minds of many conservationists as to whether the welfare of the resource is now being given sufficient consideration by those responsible for the administration of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

"Former Undersecretary of Interior Ralph Tudor, following his resignation, stated in an article in the Saturday Evening Post that the waterfowl administration had been set up to please the California duck hunters, and a review of the record provides some evidence to support this statement.

"Mr. Harold Titus, editor of the Field and Stream magazine, noted in the May issue that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service was hardly exemplary in its management of wildlife resources. Titus stated that never before in his years of contact with this Federal agency did he find such a

disturbing lack of prompt and decisive response to his questions.

CANNOT BE BRUSHED ASIDE

"These men are hardly wide-eyed political partisans nor are they convenient and willing tools for those, who may view these problems solely from partisan vantage points. They cannot be brushed aside as unimportant nor can they be answered by a series of non sequiturs showing that many culprits have been caught in violation of conservation laws. Simply laying hands upon many violators does nothing to overcome other problems, which through administrative interpretation may be as great or greater than those they are so vigorously prosecuting.

Conservationists the country over are watching the management of the Nation's resources. They represent a variety of shades and differences of political faiths but their common interest is in the proper management of these resources and when, in their considered judgment, a serious lack of responsibility is evident in this management they will insist that those responsible face up to this lack—be he Republican or Democrat.

Here is what Mr. I. T. Quinn, executive director of the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries, has to say in his letter to me of June 9, 1955:

I want to express my appreciation for the speech which you delivered on the floor of the House on June 8.

WAITING FOR STATES

At the meeting in March of the American Wildlife Conference in Montreal after Mr. John L. Farley, the present Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior, had closed his address, I asked him from the floor if the United States Fish and Wildlife Service had any policy with reference to baiting waterfowl. His reply was "We do not have—we are waiting to see what the States are going to do."

Here is what Mrs. C. N. Edge, chairman of the Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York City, says in her letter to me of June 13, 1955:

Many thanks for the speech of June 8 on the waterfowl situation. You doubtless remember that this committee, in cooperation with Dr. Hornaday, put an end to the baiting of waterfowl. Mr. Irving Brant's pamphlets on this subject are the historic record of that fight.

I am greatly impressed with the numbers and spirit of the conservationists who are aroused against the anti conservation philosophy of the present administration.

Here is what Les Woerpel, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs, says in a letter to me of June 10, 1955:

We think you did a splendid job on a mess that needs to be brought out into the light so that it can dry out and lose some of the stink that has accumulated around it.

FARLEY'S WEAK ANSWER

The papers have carried John Farley's answer to your speech. However, it is a weak answer and includes material that is just as open to censure as any of the actions of the Fish and Wildlife Service or Department of Interior in other matters. That is the outright admission that local authorities have allowed baiting to divert the ducks from crops in the California rice fields.

While we sympathize with the loss these people sustain, we do not agree that State and Federal agencies have any right, or responsibility, to have to protect those producers. Concessions to those particular producers could conceivably boomerang in all other parts of the country and in many other fields of wildlife management.

It is no more right that sportsmen of California should bait the ducks away from rice fields, and incidentally into the range of the sportsmen's gun than it is for this State to allow sportsmen to put out salt licks near the muck farmer's lands to entice deer away from the vegetable crops that they love so well. Neither is it right to protect the fall crops of Californians while the winter wheat and rye farmers lose whole fields to migratory waterfowl returning to the north in the spring.

Certainly no one would suggest a spring season with baiting to entice the birds away from those fields, which would be just as sensible and justifiable. Migratory waterfowl, as well as deer and other species, are a part of the calculated risks that producers must take when entering into their field of endeavor.

The theory that the Government must protect them from wildlife or other hazards is invalid and preposterous. Concessions in this direction only make the practice more ridiculous and set precedents which may lead to unlimited destruction of species and breakdown of regulations.

Thanks again for helping us with this fight, we appreciate it a lot.

SPORTSMEN HEARTILY ENDORSE STAND

Here is what Jeff Whitehill, president of the Milwaukee Gun Club and past president of the Fin and Feather Club, says in his telegram to me of June 10, 1955:

Congratulations on your impressive fight against duck shooting over baited ponds and marshes. All sportsmen in this locality heartily endorse your stand in bringing this situation to the attention of the public at large. It is about time that the law regained some semblance of dignity by strict enforcement—too many fixers who are permitted to evade the law for their own selfish interests continue to promote disrespect for the law.

The charge I made against the Department of the Interior in this matter of duck-baiting is perfectly simple and straightforward. I charged that Ralph A. Tudor, until recently Undersecretary of Interior, announced in a national magazine, the Saturday Evening Post, that California bankers demanded a change in the Fish and Wildlife Service. These bankers told Tudor that they wanted John Farley, and Farley is now Fish and Wildlife Service Director. Albert M. Day, who had for 7 years been Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, was eased out to make way for this candidate of the California bankers.

UNDER FARLEY GOVERNMENT WINKED AT VIOLATIONS

Since Farley's ascendancy, the Federal Government has winked at flagrant violations of the Federal ban on baiting by 140 duck-hunting clubs in California, where so-called "sportsmen" had been openly shooting ducks lured by grain placed as close as 200 yards from the guns. This disregard by the Department of the Interior of its own antibaiting law has infected enforcement of the antibaiting law elsewhere. High administrative officials have taken to browbeating Fish and Wildlife Service agents who are trying to enforce the antibaiting law in such areas as Ohio and Maryland.

Following my remarks on June 8 in which I made these charges, the Department of the Interior called a press conference the next day to reply to the charge that the Department is winking at the baiting of ducks.

FLAGRANT VIOLATIONS IN CALIFORNIA

The Department's defense No. 1 was that the basic antibaiting law has not been changed. I didn't say that it had been changed. What I said was that the Fish and Wildlife Service had for two seasons, under Director Farley, done nothing about the flagrant violations of the Federal law by 140 duck clubs in California, which are openly practicing baiting. It is no answer to say that an antibaiting law is on the books if that law can be violated with impunity.

The Department's defense No. 2 had to do with my assertion that in the last hunting season, despite the flagrant violations in California of the Federal antibaiting law, not a single arrest for violation of the Federal law had been made. At the press conference, Director Farley asserted that there had been 17 such arrests last season in California by Fish and Wildlife agents.

ARRESTS FOR STATE VIOLATION ONLY

I have asked for and received a breakdown of these 17 cases, and I find that not one of them was for violation of the Federal antibaiting law. All of the 17 were for violations, not of the Federal law, but of the California regulation which, far from forbidding baiting, actually encourages it. So I am going to stand on my original statement that not a single arrest for violation of the Federal antibaiting law was made in California during the 1954 season.

ADMINISTRATION'S NUMBERS GAME

Since baiting was going on right and left, this is not a very vigorous enforcement record. This is another example of the numbers game which this administration seems to delight in playing.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], after his plea to keep politics out of conservation, went on to accuse Mr. Albert M. Day of having been "caught redhanded shooting ducks in an area which had been baited with corn a day earlier" in 1949. After I had read this charge printed in the Appendix to the RECORD on Friday, June 17, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Day:

JUNE 17, 1955.

MY DEAR MR. DAY: In yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (Appendix, A4380–4382) appears a statement by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] in which he accuses you of having been "caught red-handed shooting ducks in an area which had been baited with corn a day earlier" in 1949. This is a serious criminal charge. Indeed, it charges that you committed the very offense that the Department of the Interior has been condoning ever since you were removed as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I wish to give you an opportunity to reply to this charge if you wish to do so.

Very truly yours,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

I insert here Mr. Day's reply:

FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO DENY MALICIOUS ACCUSATIONS

JUNE 20, 1955.

DEAR MR. REUSS: I have your letter of June 17, and appreciate the opportunity to reply. It is the first opportunity that I have

had to officially deny the malicious accusations presented to the subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during the 83d Congress.

The charges against me were made in secret, closed sessions of the subcommittee by 2 or possibly 3 disgruntled former subordinate employees. I was denied the privilege of facing my accusers and, in fact, was not even given an opportunity to appear before the subcommittee, even though I requested it. Because the testimony of my accusers has been kept secret I have never had a chance to study it. Congressman MILLER's statement in the June 16 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing portions of this still secret testimony is the first time that I have actually seen anything of what transpired at the hearings.

Secretary McKay told me many months ago that the Department had a copy of the subcommittee report, and I asked him to permit me to review it and prepare a reply. That privilege was never accorded to me.

DENY LIBELOUS CHARGES

It has thus seemed evident that the allegations lack substance. Otherwise, I am certain that either the Committee or the Department would have taken appropriate action long ago.

I categorically deny the libelous charges that I was ever caught red-handed shooting over bait. It is postively untrue. Furthermore, I would have been glad to appear before any fair-minded tribunal at any time to discuss this or any other alleged misdeeds, and I stand ready to do so now.

My administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service was characterized by vigorous enforcement of all protective laws and regulations which, in turn, were based upon the best scientific data obtainable. It is a matter of record that, during my term as Director, waterfowl populations steadily rose from a dangerously low level to one of relative abundance. I have been an outdoorsman since boyhood, have dedicated my life to the cause of conservation, and violating any of the laws and regulations established to protect the fish and wildlife resources of the Nation is the last thing I would ever consciously do.

Thanks for giving me an opportunity at long last to reply to these unfair and unfounded accusations.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. DAY.

This House has quite recently expressed itself on the kind of treatment given Mr. Day by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 83d Congress headed by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

HOUSE RULES ON EXECUTIVE SESSION

By House Resolution 151, passed by this House on March 23, 1955, which amends Rule XI (25), it is provided that—

(m) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at an investigative hearing may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, it shall—

(1) receive such evidence in executive session;

(2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and

(3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

(o) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

Mr. Day was afforded no opportunity to appear and answer the criminal charges made against him.

ACCUSED IN KANGAROO COURT

Instead, he has been accused by obviously hearsay evidence in a secret session of a kangaroo court. And the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has seen fit to use the evidence taken in executive session publicly in the Appendix of the RECORD. If there are criminal charges to be made against Mr. Day, let them be made publicly, and let him have an opportunity to know the charge and to defend himself openly in a court of law.

Meanwhile, the conservationists of this country are not going to be decoyed from their mission, which is to prevent the Department of the Interior from giving away our waterfowl to the duck-baiters.

Classified Employees' Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to oppose this legislation. My position has always been for a minimum of 10 percent for all Federal employees. Our fight on the postal pay bill indicated to me and the other members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee that anything over 8 percent will have tough sledding.

The bill, as it stands, except for the percentage, is a good bill. We feel confident, at this time, that the other body which had passed a 10 percent bill will not go below the 8 percent in conference. This is the primary reason why I cannot, in spite of objections to the 7½ percent increase, oppose this legislation.

There are those who believe that the Federal Government is paying more than private industry. A file clerk in the Federal Government in grade GS–2, the classification most of the file clerks have, receives on the average of $3,230 a year.

The following article by Frederick C. Othman that appeared in the Detroit Free Press on March 16, 1955, shows what a file clerk gets at Sears, Roebuck & Co. On top of the $80 per week, which amounts to $4,160 per year, she receives stock. Of course, we do not expect the Federal Government to give its employees savings bonds, nevertheless we should pay them equitable salaries. As the article further states, the $80 a week employee become a wealthy person upon retirement.

The article follows:

JOIN SEARS AND GET RICH—WE PICKED THE WRONG JOB

(By Frederick C. Othman)

WASHINGTON.—I should have gone to work as maybe a lawn mower salesman 30 years ago for Sears, Roebuck & Co. You, too, probably. Now we'd both be rich.

"Yes, sir," said Gen. R. E. Wood, the longtime boss of the biggest mail order house, "we're quite proud of the fact that we're turning out a new batch of capitalists every year."

He was not kidding. Any veteran clerk in the firm is worth $100,000 easily. In cold cash, if he wants it.

The white-haired General Wood, who headed Sears for 26 years and who now is chairman of its pension board, was explaining this multimillion dollar retirement fund to the goggle-eyed members of the Banking and Currency Committee. Few of the lawgivers had done so well financially as the employees of Sears.

"Take for instance a little Polish girl who went to work for us 30 years ago in the filing department at $6 a week," said the General. "She's now in charge of the confidential files and she earns $80 a week."

She's also a wealthy woman.

General Wood said she put her regular contribution into the fund while the firm made its annual contribution of 10 percent of its profits before taxes.

The fund invested as much of the money as it could in Sears, Roebuck stock, which has soared in value. It invested in other stocks which also went up. It made realesate loans and bought bonds and at the moment it has assets of $633,596,766.

But let's get back to the little Polish girl:

"I call her a little girl and I feel I can do that because of my own age," he said. "She is 54 years old and she now has $120,000 credited to her pension account."

"Did you say $120,000?"

"Yes, sir, $120,000 is what she has coming to her when she retires," replied General Wood. "She can take this in any form she chooses. Usually our people elect to take half in cash and half in stock.

This struck some of the other body as probably being an unusual case. The General smiled. Anybody who has worked for Sears for 30 years has around $100,000 in his account. Hundreds of others have $50,000 and up.

"Of course," the General added, "I keep cautioning our people that they're rich on paper. If the stock market should go down and these shares lose their value they would not have so much money."

The little Polish girl, he said, again is typical. When she collects her fortune, she'll pay a capital gains tax on whatever cash she withdraws. She'll pay no tax on her stock until she sells it.

The other body is studying the stock market when they called on General Wood for testimony. When he was through they all seemed a little envious of the young lady from Poland.

Automation and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1955, I had the pleasure to attend a luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel, held in connection with the CIO Automation Conference.

The following are the remarks made by Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, at this luncheon. I am pleased to direct them to our colleagues' attention.

LABOR'S STAKE IN AUTOMATION

(By Walter P. Reuther)

We in the CIO sponsored the National Conference on Automation because we sincerely believe that there is a great need in America for free, honest, and frank public discussion and study of the problems automation has raised.

We have said many times that we welcome automation and that we are going to encourage the expeditious development of this new technology, just as we encouraged the development of other phases of our technical development. But we are going to insist, as free citizens in our great and wonderful democracy that responsible national policies be devised to insure that this newfound power will be used with a sense of moral and social responsibility in terms of the needs of the whole community.

It is within the framework of this basic philosophy that we in the CIO approach the related problems. We have been disturbed in recent months by the fact that around these problems—automation and the question of how we, as a free people, can so shape our national policies so that we might maintain full employment and full production in peacetime—too often we get a great deal more heat than light. Instead of discussing such problems intelligently and rationally and coming to grips with the facts, as free people need to do, we have found that time and time again some people raise ideological windmills to do battle with.

When the CIO began talking about the question of full employment, we were honored with the tag of prophets of doom and gloom. And when we raised the question of automation, we were called scaremongers. That was the term that Secretary of Commerce Weeks used.

We in the CIO believe that our free enterprise system has been the vehicle upon which the American people have ridden together to the highest living standards enjoyed by any peoples in the world. We believe in the free enterprise system, and we shall defend it. But given that belief, we believe also it must be made socially responsible. It must reflect the basic needs of all of the people. Because, unless it does, it cannot meet the challenge and the test, both economically and morally, that any economic system must meet in order to justify its continuation and the support of the people.

We would like to say to the self-appointed defenders of the free enterprise system that, if the greatness of this system is founded upon the idea of competition in the market place of commodities, they ought to recognize that you cannot have a free market place for commodities unless you defend the free market place of ideas in America.

If we are going to defend competition in the market place between commodities, we need to defend competition in the market place between ideas. It is in that spirit that we believe that a full, frank, and public discussion of automation can shed light in place of heat upon this pressing national problem.

Now we believe that discussion of automation ought to include respect for the other fellow's right to differ. But differences in a free society ought to reflect facts, not fancy. They ought to be based upon principles, not upon prejudices. And we ought to come to grips with the problem in the spirit of recognizing that maybe the other fellow has some claim to knowledge about the problem and has a right to pursue his claim to that knowledge within the free market place of ideas in which all of us together must find the answers to the problems. In our free society, getting that measure of social responsibility and moral responsibility within the economic equation that determines the shape and the future of our economy is essential to the survival of our free enterprise system.

It is in that spirit that we in the CIO approach the question of automation. We believe that the problems of automation must be faced not on the basis of complacency on one extreme, or panic on the other. There is a middle ground that recognizes the economic facts of life and attempts to appraise these facts in terms of human and social values.

If we do that we can meet the challenge. We can realize the almost unlimited opportunities for human betterment that lie ahead if we can bring into moral balance man's great technical movement forward, which goes forward at an ever accelerated rate, and the translation of that great technical progress into the present-day currency of the basic values that we, as free people, believe in.

Automation is the second phase of the industrial revolution that started with James Watt's simple steam engine. It is the second phase because it brings into our developing technology a new element that was completely absent from the first phase of the industrial revolution. The first crude steam engine was an effort on the part of man to substitute mechanical power for human power and human muscle. From the crude beginnings until the rise of the mass production plants that have characterized the auto industry and other great industries, we had an extension and development to an even higher plane of his simple idea of the substitution of mechanical power for human power.

Automation brings in a new element which marks the beginning of the second phase of the industrial revolution. In addition to substituting mechanical power for human power, it substitutes mechanical judgment for human judgment, except that the mechanical judgment can be made infallible and human judgment which it replaces, is not infallible. It is the combination and synchronizing of these two elements that really gives us some appreciation of the tremendous possibilities that automation opens up to the people of our country, and ultimately, to the people of the world. That is why we need to understand that automation is not just the extension of an old process. It is an extension of the old with a revolutionary new element—the element of mechanical judgment in substitution for human judgment.

It also must be recognized that the major impact of the first days of the industrial revolution—the substitution of mechanical power for human muscle—was upon the people doing manual or physical work, essentially in areas of production. The impact of automation is much broader. In terms of its economic and social implications it is much more challenging. Its opportunities are far greater because the impact of this new technology upon every phase of our complex economy will be tremendous.

Already obsolete are those auto plants that can turn out a complete engine block fully machined, in 15 minutes. They are obsolete because there are plans on the drawing board to do the same job in 10 minutes, with not a human hand touching it.

We already have in the auto industry a body stamping plant in which two fellows feed the steel in at one and and the finished parts come out the other. In the television industry, they can assemble a television set without a human hand touching it. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. can automate an office easier than you can automate a factory. This is going to have a tremendous impact upon our white collar workers. No industry is immune to the impact of automation.

This whole technological ability to capture an idea and store it in the memory of a machine and to recall that memory based upon an impulse, fed into the machine by a tape, or by some other technical process, is an idea that opens up doors that heretofore have been closed to technology. Automation now makes it possible to take a recording of Caruso, to capture the tone qualities of every note, and to store those qualities in the memory of a machine; today a songwriter can write a new hit, transfer it to a tape, put the tape through the machine, and have that machine call out of its memory, the tone qualities of Caruso. The net result is that Caruso can be made to sing a song written 20 years after he died.

James Carey points out that today 2 workers can assemble a thousand radios which required 200 workers before. Some people say that the 198 displaced fellows will be employed in making the machine that laid them off. Now that sounds good, but it isn't true.

When the General Motors Corp. has a billion-dollar expansion program, of which 98 percent is not expansion but modernization in terms of automation and the new technology, does anyone believe that this firm is going to find a way to displace workers directly involved in the production of cars and then turn around and pull them back into the production process in terms of indirect labor in making the machines?

You can say a lot of things about General Motors, but it is not known as being a great philanthropic organization. It certainly is not introducing automation just to lessen the human burden on the production line. There is a net gain to the corporation, economicwise. As the competitive struggle itensifies, so the drive for more advanced technology is stimulated in order to reduce the unit cost of production by reducing the labor cost of that unit in the production process. There is a net gain, or otherwise the economic incentives are not there. In some situations there have been net gains of 25 percent of the total labor savings.

In some situations there has been a greater gain. In other situations there has been a lesser gain. But there is a total net gain; that fact is inescapable.

Take the electronics industry, one of the key industries in the whole development of automation. In 1952 the production of this industry went up 275 percent over 1947 with only 40 percent more workers.

I am fairly familiar with the tooling end of the automobile industry. While I am not the greatest engineer in the world, I am also not the worst tool and die maker either; I know a little bit about this business. At the present time the MIT laboratories have automatic milling machines—tool room milling machines, the machines that the tool and die makers and skilled mechanics use to make the machines that do the automatic work on the production line. The highest skilled mechanic, who has served his apprenticeship and worked 25 years in the business, can put a job on a standard Cincinnati milling machine, with all sorts of compound angles and all sorts of curves; he can work 500 hours on that job machining it, and he won't make it perfect. Now the MIT laboratories have an automatic milling machine through which they put a tape punched by a girl on a mathematical formula; perfection is achieved by this machine without the help of a human hand. In short, the tool industry—the makers of the machines that will automate the production workers and automate the office workers that keep the payroll—will not be immune to the technical impact and the displacements of the new technology.

So you get a compounding of elements in the total picture. That is why we need to discuss automation, not in terms of smear words or swear words, not in an attempt to squeeze some small partisan advantage out of the situation, but rather to look at it as men and women of good will. We have here a problem that will challenge the best that

all of us have—we all stand on the same threshold.

You can be the poorest underpaid worker in the Deep South, and you can be the highest paid corporation executive on Park Avenue or in Grosse Point, and you cannot escape the impact upon the structure of the society on which you live. In a world of chaos there are no social test tubes that can be made so airtight that you can find a piece of Utopia for your own private consumption.

We need therefore to understand that together we must find the common answers to our common problems. Finding those answers will be the measure of our survival because we are at a crucial point in human history. You can put all the eloquence aside. If we, blessed as no people in the world are blessed, cannot find a way to bring into moral balance economic and material factors with moral and social and human values, then where in the world can such balance be achieved? That is why I believe we in America must of necessity lead the way in demonstrating not only the great capacity to make technical progress but an equal capacity to use it with a sense of moral and social responsibility.

Our great dilemma in America is the fact that there is a gigantic gap between the tremendous progress we have made in the physical sciences and our lack of ability to make comparable progress in the human and social sciences. For every competent technician who knows how to work with machines and material, you will search a long time to find a social scientist who knows how to work with people.

We need to find a way to develop the social and human know-why to match our technical know-how. We need to find a way quickly; the sands of time are running low in the struggle to preserve peace and freedom in the world. Unfortunately, many of the people who have the power to make decisions are so busy they don't seem to have much time to think about what they are doing. That is why we often have to rely on the people in the academic world to give us new ideas and new concepts.

I have said many times that the struggle in the world is not going to be won with guns—although I agree with the 99 percent of the American people who feel we need to be strong with guns, strong enough to have the power to stop the despicable forces of aggression wherever they may raise their ugly heads. Nevertheless, we have to recognize that the only struggle we can win is a struggle in terms of positive values. No one can win a struggle of negative values in terms of war in the day of the H-bomb.

If we can somehow find a way to shift the center of balance so that the struggle between the free world and the world of Communist tryanny will not be in terms of who can make the biggest H-bomb—nobody can win that struggle—but, rather, who can take the genius of modern science and technology and give tangible expression to that genius in terms of living standards in terms of a fuller measure of human dignity and human happiness, we can give leadership to that struggle and we can win.

For the first time in the history of human civilization we are at that point where we can begin to master man's physical environment. We can begin to use the blessings which the good Lord has bestowed upon us in such abundance to feed and clothe and house mankind, to meet man's basic economic and material needs, and, having done that we can begin to facilitate man's growth as a social and cultural and spiritual being, which is the real meaning of life.

We have to recognize that economics is not the end product: economics is the means to the end. Within the glory of his own individual personality man is the expression, the highest expression, of the Creator. What we need to do is to find a way to free mankind of the chains that have bound him to economic slavery so that he can begin to grow spiritually and intellectually and culturally.

In demonstrating our ability to reflect our great technical power and our economic resources in terms of human progress and human happiness we will create a power that will be more decisive than all of the H-bombs that we will ever make.

Now the Communists have said that because we have competing economic pressure groups between labor and management and big business and small business we as a free people cannot develop the singleness of purpose, the sense of unity, the common denominators essential to hold us together and give us the cohesion in terms of positive values that we demonstrate so well in terms of common fears and hatreds and in terms of negative pressures of war. I believe the Communists are wrong. I believe their whole conception that history is written exclusively in terms of man's struggle for material values can be proved completely wrong. We can prove it not by pious declarations, but by working together, free labor and free management, free people, free government, in a free society, finding the answers to our basic problems.

Now some people say, "Well, in the long run, everything will come out O. K., and we will all live happily together." If we could afford that kind of dangerous and unrealistic type of wishful thinking, I should be most happy to drink deeply of it. The fact is that in the world in which we live neither peace nor war is inevitable; neither is the prosperity made possible by our technology. We will get what we work for. We will get what we plan for. We will get what we have the vision to see.

That is why we of the CIO say, "Let's talk about our problems as free people. Let's work to try to find common answers to our problems." There are no simple answers. There are no magic formulas. There are no panaceas. But there are answers if we have the good sense to look for them together. No one can find any answers in a little comfortable compartment unrelated to the welfare of his neighbor. There is only one compartment and that is the compartment in which all of us live together.

Remember that America has fashioned its greatness by doing what the men of little faith said was impossible. We can meet the challenge of automation, we can translate the unlimited possibilities for betterment in the lives of people not only in America but people everywhere. But it will take some practical, down-to-earth, sensible action on the part of all of us.

First we hail and we commend the action of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, for having indicated, based upon the request of the CIO that they would study the broader impact of automation. We believe that effort is part of the broader effort of implementing the purpose and the meaning of the Employment Act of 1945. We are going to cooperate with that committee. We hope that every other segment of our free society will try to do the same so that that committee can have access to the basic knowledge now available in this important field.

Second, we would like to recommend to the committee that it perform a function which we believe no private economic group, either labor or management, can do. We recommend that the joint committee try to act as a clearing house through which we can assemble and make available to people generally the total knowledge available in this field.

The General Motors people know what they are doing and they probably know generally about what the automotive industry is doing. General Electric knows what is happening in its plants and what is happening in the electrical industry. But no one has the total picture of what is going on in the whole field of automation. A congressional committee is the logical place to begin to coordinate and pull together the sum of our knowledge in this field. Only as we have access to that total knowledge can we begin to evaluate the impact of automation upon our economy and upon the social structure of our free society.

Third, we need to get down to a retraining program for our workers. The impact of this problem will not be an even impact; it will be uneven as it affects individual workers and their families, as it affects industry, and as it affects the community in which those industries are located.

To meet the problem of the workers, we have to find some way to cushion the economic impact, even if in the long pull those workers who are directly displaced by automation are absorbed indirectly in the economic system. We have to protect them during the interim period, during which the relocation and the retraining takes place, so that the individual worker and his family, or the individual community which may have a plant which is closed down, will not carry a disproportionate share of the economic and social cost of technological progress.

If we are going to train workers, we have to know for what we are training them. You cannot have a training program in the abstract. If a worker is laid off in a radio plant because two workers can now turn out a thousand sets a day where we needed 200 workers before, 198 workers displaced by the automated line have to be retrained to do something else. Therefore, you have to know what jobs will open up for them, what skills are required to qualify them for those jobs, etc. This is not something that 1 company or 1 industry can meet.

Then you have the question of plant relocation. I think it will be accepted without challenge that on the whole it is much more economic good sense to build a new plant in which to place an automated line than to try to adapt that line to an existing facility. The experience in the auto industry shows clearly that in almost every case they try to get new plants where that is at all feasible.

Where will they locate the new plants? That is not purely an economic question. That is a question which must be answered in terms of its social effects. Unless the location of the new plant is made with a sense of moral and social responsibility, in terms of the people displaced or the community in which the people who are displaced by automation live, it can lead to a very serious problem. Permit me to cite an example. Ford built a new automatic stamping plant in Cleveland. It took place at a time when the labor force was expanding and it did not create any problem in the existing plants. If that had taken place in a time of stable employment or declining employment, it could have created some critical problems. Plant location is, then, a social question which management must meet as part of its responsibility in our free-enterprise system.

We also have, of course, the problem of plant location in terms of national security, the dispersement policy of our Government, and strategic considerations of wartime conditions.

Another item which the congressional committee ought to give recognition to, and work on, is the question of increased productivity resulting from the automated technology. In this case they have to measure two factors—the increased productivity per man-hour and the increase in the gross national product. Both are related factors affecting our economic future. We have to find a way to achieve a dynamic expanding balance between greater productive power

and greater purchasing power within the hands of people.

If we maintain that dynamic expanding balance, which is the key to the future of our free economy, then automation will not create any serious problems if there is an adjustment to take the impact off the workers and the community.

In terms of the technical progress we have made, in terms of the unrealized potential of technical progress, the present $0.75 minimum wage is exceedingly unrealistic. It should be raised to $1.25. There are no absolute economic values. All such values are relative. You cannot measure $1.25 an hour against some economic factor existing in some sort of academic vacuum. You have to measure $1.25 per hour in terms of the level of our technology, the productivity per man-hour, and the potential of our gross national product. For obvious reasons, the minimum-wage law can be an important factor in maintaining the dynamic balance between productive power and purchasing power.

We ultimately ought to get to a shorter workweek. But here again we ought to get to a shorter workweek not in an effort to escape the problems of automation and economic abundance. We ought to get a shorter workweek on the basis of a rational decision at that point in the development of our society where we have the material things we need to make a normal healthy life for people and we want more leisure. We will get more leisure by a shorter workweek.

All of us can agree that culture in most societies is the byproduct of leisure. But culture cannot be the byproduct of leisure if leisure means unemployment and enforced involuntary idleness. Leisure must mean more time to do the things that free individuals choose to do in the pursuit of those noneconomic activities that give them opportunity for growth as people, as social beings, as spiritual beings—but they have to have the opportunity to pursue these values within the framework of economic security and material well-being. Real leisure means leisure through a rational reduction in the workweek, in which we protect the economic position of workers.

Now one argument is that automation will not create any serious unemployment problems because there is going to be a tapering off in the birth rate. Therefore it is contended the growth in the labor force is not going to continue to move up as fast as before. Let us, for the moment, assume that is correct. What actually happens, of course, is they chop the labor force off at the bottom by saying there are 9 million people in the universities and schools. Then they chop it off at the top and say we are requesting earlier retirement. The net result is a reduced labor force. And then they say there is no problem.

That is all very wonderful, but how do you make it possible for more people, more youngsters in America, to have that greater education opportunity which will keep them out of the labor force? You cannot do that by wishful thinking. Right now we have a deficit of 390,000 elementary schoolrooms. By 1960, we will have a 600,000 deficit if we don't do something about it. How many young people can go to school, to the higher seats of learning, under such conditions, so that we can develop the great, untapped fountain of genius which is American youth?

I am in favor of paring the labor force on both ends, on the low end by giving American youth that degree of educational opportunity which will facilitate the maximum mental growth of every child, regardless of his race or creed or color. But you have to do things to bring about that great day. You cannot just wish for them.

I am for making it possible for people to retire earlier, on a voluntary basis, if they choose to do so, with the kind of economic security that will give them that measure of dignity and happiness in their evening years to which they are entitled. But you cannot wish for that. We had to fight hard to get even minimum pension benefits. And we had to fight hard for 12 years to get 1 penny of increase in the level of social security benefits.

In short, it's not enough to glibly say, "We will shave down the labor force by retiring more people earlier, and keep more people out of the labor force by keeping them in school longer." You had to do something about these things. They will not happen automatically.

Unemployment compensation has to be brought to realistic levels to cushion the impact of dislocations when they take place. Living standards can be raised a great deal. We have really just made a beginning. Much is possible if we gear potential abundance to the needs of the people. Right now the auto workers and the electrical workers are starting a crusade for a guaranteed annual wage. How will this affect the problems of automation? First of all, such a wage will sustain the purchasing power of workers during periods of temporary layoffs, thus avoiding a compounding of economic factors in which unemployment breeds more unemployment. Second, it will mean, when automation does displace a worker, that during the period of his guarantee, he can be retrained and go through the process of being relocated without the impact of unemployment being a burden on him and his family. And third, it will be a powerful economic incentive—and that is supposed to be the powerhouse that drives forward the great thing we call free enterprise. So when the management people decide to invest a billion dollars in new plants with automation, they will build those plants and time the flow of the new technology with a sense of responsibility, knowing that if they don't do well, in terms of their broad planning, they will have to guarantee the workers displaced an annual wage during that period. In the long pull that will have a tremendous impact upon stimulating a sense of social responsibility that must parallel in our free society the right of private economic groups to make basic economic decisions. In a free society you cannot have power without moral responsibility. For all economic power that anyone exercises, whether it be labor or management or government, there must of necessity be a corresponding moral obligation to use that power in the interest of all of the people who make up society.

We believe that automation and the abundance it makes possible ought to be used more realistically in terms of economic aid programs. We ought to all recognize that just as peace and freedom are indivisible values, just as we have to fight on the fronts where these values are challenged in order to defend peace and freedom in the world, that ultimately the world cannot defend peace and freedom if there are large cesspools of injustice anywhere because the Communists will exploit those cesspools and transform poverty into power for their own special purposes. Therefore, as a matter of enlightened self-interest in assessing our moral obligations, we need to give more to fight poverty and hunger in the world, so that more people can have the material income they need so they can begin to develop some of these other values that we believe in.

It is in the light of these overall considerations that we of the CIO called the National Conference on Automation. We stand on the threshold of a new technology. We believe that there is and there must be enough good sense, enough good will, enough competent sense of morality and social responsibility on the part of labor and management and government, of educators, and the men and clergymen—on the part of all of us put together—to be able to build a better tomorrow. We believe that the values we as a free people believe in can be made to grow and flower. We believe the American people can begin to shape the world in the image of their hopes and aspirations and dreams.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, addressed the same luncheon, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES B. CAREY, SECRETARY-TREASURER, CIO, AND PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS, CIO

The spread of automation poses for American industry one of the greatest challenges we will have to meet. If it is handled humanely, wisely, and not greedily, it can be a boon not only to industry, but to all mankind. If handled greedily, with emphasis chiefly on profits, it can be a disaster of the first magnitude.

Automation is not merely an extention of machine production. It is, instead, as great a revolution as machine production itself. While machine production displaces some workers, automation could displace most workers.

It means production without a human hand touching the goods to be processed. It means using tapes and electric eyes and relays instead of human hands and brains. It not only produces but also checks and tests the products.

My own industry, the electrical industry, is affected in two ways. In some of our plants we will build the automation equipment to be used in other plants—in steel, auto, textile, and others. To that extent it will create jobs. How many, we do not know. But, very significantly, a report from our General Mills plant in Minneapolis indicates that this IUE–CIO employer has perfected a device to produce by automation the automation equipment for making consumer goods. That's like stamping out thinking machines.

A recent report in the Wall Street Journal declared that "Autofab," as it is called, "will assemble in a little more than a minute the same number of multiple-part electronic units that it now takes a worker a full day to assemble. It requires only two workers and a supervisor and has a capacity of more than 200,000 assemblies a month."

For the radio, TV and parts industry, automation has developed the printed circuit, which does away with wiring, the use of soldering baths instead of solderers, and automatic inspection equipment.

In plants of Philco, Emerson, Motorola, Raytheon, Sylvania, RCA, Canadian Admiral, and others, automation is already far advanced.

The introduction of the "printed circuit" at the Philco plant in Sandusky, Ohio, resulted in elimination of 25 percent of employees on the soldering and wiring assembly line. GE, which makes printed circuits for other industries, boasts that these circuits will reduce a company's labor force by 50 percent. Another change in method whereby the entire bottom of a radio is now soldered all at once in a soldering bath has resulted in only three solderers being employed by Philco instead of the previous 40. In addition, further reduction in employment will result when Philco starts automatic production of complete radio and television chassis at this plant.

Motorola has announced it has a machine that can spit out complete radios when the components are fed into it. No human hands are involved.

Raytheon Manufacturing Co. has disclosed it is ready to put into operation an automatic radio assembly line geared to 1,000 sets per day—and operated by only two

workers. To maintain this same level of production by standard hand-methods would require 200 workers.

Other sections of our industry are also advancing—not by large steps but by huge leaps—in this field of automation. Almost all companies in the lamp industry, especially Westinghouse and General Electric, have developed automatic machinery. Examples are the machines which make lamp bases 4 or 5 times faster, and other machines that control 4 or 5 other machines that previously were operated by a substantial number of workers.

Automation's havoc is being spread in the office, too, among tens of thousands of so-called white collar and clerical workers. GE's "Univac" in its Louisville, Ky., plant not only works out the payroll for 10,000 employees, computes incentive earnings, schedules production, looks into market possibilities, but does a dozen other tasks formerly performed by perhaps hundreds of clerical workers. Other companies are widely adopting "Univac" or versions of it.

The magazine, Automatic Control, recently asserted that if automation could reach its maximum growth in our industry, the displacement of workers could be on the order of 100 to 1. The potentials of automation, obviously, have just been scratched.

A prominent Harvard economist has estimated that to fully automate all plants built in 1950 would require only $600 million, and that American industry may be fully automated within a decade. This means that 1 man will do at least the work now done by 5 men.

It is obvious that if other industries, such as automobiles, steel, oil, rubber, paper, textiles, and others, go ahead with automation, a vast number of workers will be displaced. The pool of unemployed could rapidly grow into a national disaster if the companies in each industry attempt to make maximum profits from this technological revolution.

The possibilities for good in automation are fabulous, with living standards for all at a higher level than ever imagined. The possibilities for tremendous damage are equally present.

Employers must realize that automation can be a Frankenstein monster unless the consuming power is generated to buy up the flood of goods resulting from automation. Automation joined with sufficiently increased purchasing power could be a blessing that could raise the average city family income of $6,393 today to more than $10,000 within 5 or 10 years.

This requires, however, that the savings from automation be shared by:

1. Cutting prices and thereby stimulating greater markets. The average home might then have 2 or 3 TV sets as it now has several radios.

2. Raising wages and increasing the purchasing power of workers.

3. Cutting hours of work without a reduction in pay.

4. Providing against layoffs through a guaranteed employment program and severance pay programs.

These are the goals organized labor must project when automation appears imminent or is initiated in our plants. In addition, there are a number of serious contractual problems that must be met. These include:

1. Obviously if a machine requires 1 man instead of 20 he will not receive the same incentive rate or get 20 times the pay he received previously. The danger is that one man will receive only the same pay as before. Companies have revised their incentive systems with the advent of automation—basing pay on so-called "machine utilization" and not production. Or else they put workers on a day-work-rate which, if anything, offers lower earnings.

Generally speaking, there is no one answer to the problem, but the best approach is to establish for workers on automatic equipment a new classification which provides substantially higher earnings than before. To insure that the whole plant shares the results of the increased productivity, production bonuses should also be negotiated.

2. Many present job classifications will become obsolete with the introduction of automatic machinery. The strict application of present job-evaluation standards may lower, not raise, wage rates, because the tests used in existing job-evaluation systems will no longer give correct results. We should, therefore, seek revisions of all such systems and job classifications taking into account the increased production and the new type of responsibilities involved.

3. Seniority provisions should be revised giving displaced workers a broader area of other work to which they may transfer. Contract clauses governing layoffs, promotions, and similar matters should also be rigorously reexamined.

4. Displaced workers should be either retrained by the company, receive severance pay and/or guaranteed pay when their jobs are ended. General programs of in-plant training should be established to fit workers for the new operations. As the new equipment will inevitably be more complex, automation can elevate many workers from the drudgery of repetitive machine operations. Care must be taken at the same time to see that this is not exploited for the purpose of undermining the status of skilled trades for profiteering objectives.

5. In multiplant companies consideration should be given to intraplant transfers with the maximum possible seniority rights.

We should request joint union-management committees to study problems arising from automation, insisting in any case that management furnish us with full information well in advance of the technological change.

The large and complex problems presented by the advent of automation—and with implications ranging far beyond the boundaries of organized labor—will constitute another historic test of the CIO's social consciousness.

The problem of old-age insecurity was met by the CIO's pioneering in noncontributory pensions.

The problem of periodic mass unemployment will be met by the CIO's pioneering in guaranteed employment programs.

And the threat of robot factories will be met—and solved—by the same kind of intellectual courage and moral militancy that the CIO has displayed in the past.

Hurrah for Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State made a speech the other day at the graduation exercises at Indiana University. From the report that appeared in the Washington Evening Star, it was a good one. I am glad to compliment the Secretary when he is right, and I ask consent to include Mr. Dulles' statements as they appeared in the Star:

DULLES CALLS ON GRADUATES TO SHOW TRUE PATRIOTISM

BLOOMINGTON, Ind., June 13.—Secretary of State Dulles made a plea for American patriotism here last night, declaring that ideals are not necessarily better merely because they bear a foreign label.

In a commencement speech at Indiana University, Mr. Dulles called on the students to respect qualties of enterprise, vision, industry and rugged independence which he said have made the United States the greatest Nation on earth in a century and a half.

At the same time he said the indispensable supports of the free American society are religion and morality, and he added:

"Indeed a society which is not religious cannot tolerate much freedom. It is dangerous to give freedom to those who do not feel under moral compulsion to exercise self-control and who are unwilling to make sacrifices for the good of others.

"It results that true patriotism, which vitalizes liberty and freedom for ourselves, can never be a purely selfish force."

Mr. Dulles said a nation begins to decay when people lose their sense of mission in the world.

It was in this context that he urged love of country upon the students, saying:

"In some quarters there has developed a tendency to scorn patriotism. Indeed, there are a few who find patriotism unfashionable and who go so far as to assume that institutions and ideas are better if only they bear the foreign label. Also there is a theory that this mood is necessary if we are to develop international institutions and maintain international peace.

"It seems to me that love of country is one of the great and indispensable virtues. • • • I am convinced that the family of nations will not be the poorer or the more fragile because the peoples who form different nations have special affection and pride for their own people and for the nation they form."

The Effect of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, to show how all of us are deceived with regard to inflation and the value of money, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "They All Had Riches," which appeared in the Washington Reporter of June 11.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY ALL HAD RICHES

There's a story about a man named Brown who wished he had $100,000. One morning he awoke and found that his wish had come true. One hundred thousand dollars in crisp new bills was stacked up in a corner of his room.

He sprang out of bed, a happy man. Bounding across the room, he threw up the window to cry out his good fortune to Smith who lived next door. To his surprise Smith said the same thing had happened to him, as well as to Jones, who lived on the other side of him. Everybody in the world had been given $100,000.

At first Brown was a little nettled. But he soon got over that. Why shouldn't everyone be as happy as he? Certainly everyone should be happy with $100,000 to spend.

Only trouble was, the sudden distribution of wealth didn't spread happiness at all. Brown switched on the radio to get the news but found the radio was dead. All the men at the broadcasting station had quit. Neither was there a morning paper at the door, nor the usual milk and rolls. The owner of the corner store hadn't opened up yet. Why should he, now that he had become a rich man?

Instead of making everybody happy, the distribution of wealth suddenly made everyone miserable. It didn't take Brown, Smith, and Jones long to find out mere money isn't wealth. All the distribution of the large sums did was throw a monkey wrench into the economy, and then the inexorable laws of economics started to operate, and Brown Smith, and Jones found out that the only result of more money was that everything cost more—labor and materials, tools, and goods. It wasn't real wealth at all, which is the capacity to produce.

In a sense this little story is the kernel of a new study, whose publication under the title "So People May Prosper," is announced by the National Association of Manufacturers.

The brochure turns an X-ray on the anatomy of the purchasing power theory. It strikes a mighty blow at the Marxist, Keynesian, Reutherish philosophy that we must dash for the bombproof of Government spending every time we have an economic hailstorm.

Refugee Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Colorado Labor Advocate, published in Denver, Colo., a publication owned by 50 Colorado labor organizations—published in its issue of June 3 a constructive editorial on the subject of refugee legislation, on which hearings are currently in progress before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION ON REFUGEES

The dismissal of Edward Corsi, fired after spending but 60 days in the State Department as special expediter of the Refugee Relief Act, may bring some beneficial results after all.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress to make 10 changes in the 1953 act to enable the 214,000 refugees authorized under the act to actually immigrate to the United States before the act expires on December 31, 1956.

In a special message to Congress last Friday the President said that substantial progress had been made under the 2-year-old law, but that more administrative and legislative improvements are needed.

Actually, only a pitiful handful of the 214,000 refugees from Communist and Nazi tyranny authorized under the law have been admitted to this country. It was his attempt to cut the red tape to bring in more that caused Corsi, long-time New York Republican leader, to fall out with Scott McLeod, State Department official in charge of the program.

Senator Herbert Lehman has also been urging changes in the act with a bill which encludes several of the provisions recommended by Eisenhower. Lehman goes further than the President, however, in recommending that the time limit on refugee immigration be extended to 1959. The proposals of the President include:

1. Allowing countries with oversubscribed quotas of immigrants to use up unused numbers allotted to other nations.
2. Knocking out the requirement that refugees and escapees have passports.
3. Eliminating need for a 2-year history of the refugee or escapee.
4. Allowing responsible voluntary welfare organizations as well as individuals to act as sponsors.
5. Permitting members of families to enter separately.
6. Relaxing health standards to permit tubercular persons to enter for treatment here.
7. Permitting refugees who have already been "firmly resettled" in Europe to be admitted to the United States.
8. Relaxing the provision that a refugee must be living away from his traditional home to be eligible.
9. Eliminating the requirement that escapees must also be refugees.
10. Permitting aliens in the United States who fear persecution if required to return abroad to stay in this country even if they cannot show "lawful entry."

If the promise to admit 214,000 refugees to the United States is to be more than a hypocritical gesture in the eyes of our democratic friends abroad, something will have to be done to change the present law.

That will not be easy with Congress thinking about adjourning in a few weeks, but now that President Eisenhower has made a series of humane recommendations we hope he will keep after Congress to act upon them.

The Late Ernest Greenwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been much saddened by the death of my friend, Ernest Greenwood, who represented the First District of New York in the 82d Congress. I am sure that my sense of loss is widely shared here, for I have never known a Member who was held in more affectionate regard by his colleagues.

Mr. Greenwood's devotion to public service was notable.

A distinguished educator, as headmaster of the Dwight School in New York City for 19 years, headmaster of the New York Evening School for Adults, chairman of the board of trustees of both schools, president of the Schoolmasters Association of New York, and a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, he made many valuable contributions to the field that claimed his lifelong interest. He often expressed the belief that the strength of our Nation depends on the proper education of our youth.

His interest in young people led Mr. Greenwood to become active in Boy and Girl Scouts' organizations. He was president of the Suffolk County Council of the Boy Scouts of America. The last time I saw him was when he brought a group of international Boy Scouts to Washington last year and I am happy that I was able to make sightseeing arrangements for them.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. Greenwood served his constituents ably and conscientiously. He was indefatigable in discharging his congressional duties and seldom missed a daily session or a committee meeting.

Ernest Greenwood will always be remembered by his friends here. He was a man of great personal charm. He was kindly, gentle, warmhearted, and generous. His integrity was never questioned. His interest in the welfare of his fellow beings was limitless.

I know that all Members will want to extend sympathy to Mr. Greenwood's daughter, Mrs. Charles Banks, of Bay Shore, Long Island.

America Is Proud of Its Cultural Achievements—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include an article by George Dixon distributed by the King Features Syndicate which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 20, 1955. This article concerns my distinguished colleague and friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD]. Also included is an article by Richard L. Coe, drama editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 19, 1955, entitled "Big Salute for France."

WASHINGTON SCENE—YANKEE DOODLE MACDONALD

(By George Dixon)

Representative TORBERT HART MACDONALD of Massachusetts has the distinction of having pitched the Democrats to their first congressional baseball defeat in 7 years. Nevertheless, he is probably the greatest all-round athlete ever elected to Congress.

He couldn't stand up to the most tatterdemalion crew ever allowed to waddle on to a diamond but he played for the New York Yankees and was captain of the 1938 Harvard football team.

Moreover, he was Harvard's star halfback and made the all-Eastern. In addition he set a track record of 21.6 seconds for the 220-yard sprint, which still stands, and is very handy with his dukes.

He extended his athletic fame abroad. He set running records with the combined Harvard-Yale-Oxford-Cambridge track team that raced victoriously across Europe.

This contradictory fellow, who couldn't strike out some of the most decrepit fugitives from a wheelchair, is now engaged in trying to make the whole world athletic. He has just introduced a bill (H. R. 6777) to

enlarge our cultural exchange program to include sports.

At present we are exchanging opera and ballet troups, arts and sciences students groups with other nations as a means of promoting better understanding. The Macdonald bill submits that inclusion of sports will give the exchange program infinitely wider effectiveness.

Representative MACDONALD is receiving great encouragement from Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The two were roommates at Harvard.

They joined the Navy together in September 1941, and both became PT boat skippers in the South Pacific. Another skipper in their squadron was Alfred Gwynn Vanderbilt.

The other day Representative MACDONALD returned to Washington from a flying trip to his home in Malden, Mass., where his wife, the former film star, Phyllis Brooks, lives with their three children. He ran into his old buddy, Vanderbilt, at the National Airport.

"Well, well," cried the young Congressman, "What are you doing in Washington?"

"Oh," responded the blue-blooded horseman, "I'm here with the Orioles."

"But you can't be. The Orioles are in Boston. I saw them play the Red Sox last night."

"The Orioles," declared Vanderbilt, "don't play baseball."

"I'll concede that," said the Democrats' losing pitcher, 'but they're supposed to."

"I don't mean the Baltimore Orioles," said Vanderbilt. "I'm here with Mme. Auriol and the former Premier of France."

I asked Representative MACDONALD why he didn't stick with the Yankees and play with a good baseball team.

"Well," he said, "The Yankees signed me in 1940 to play the outfield but they had three gentlemen named DiMaggio, Henrich and Keller in the outfield that year and there seemed no disposition to replace one of them with me. So I was sent to Newark, and a month later to Binghamton, where I finished out the season.

"They wanted me to go South that winter but I had entered Harvard Law School and decided I preferred Blackstone to Binghamton."

I asked Representative MACDONALD how he got to meet the beautiful Phyllis Brooks.

"Vanderbilt introduced us before the war when she was in Panama Hattie," he said. "When I was stationed in New Guinea she came out there with Gary Cooper and a theatrical troupe, but I was on PT duty and missed her. After the war Al Vanderbilt brought us together again. He's a cupid."

BIG SALUTE FOR FRANCE

(By Richard L. Coe)

"What," asks someone, "is this salute to France which the National's Can Can opening will benefit on the 28th?"

An apt question. Privately promoted and financed by public-spirited citizens through ANTA, this is a series of theater, music, ballet and arts events now underway in Paris designed to disprove the Communist-fostered notion that Americans have money, have power, but are uncultured barbarians.

Judith Anderson and an American company have just completed a week in Robinson Jeffers' Medea. Monday night, with the star of the film, Shirley Jones, as Laurey, Rodgers and Hammerstein will present the first French production of Oklahoma. And on the evening the National's pewholders will be settling into their expensive chairs, The Skin of Our Teeth will be opening a week's stay at Theater Sarah Bernhardt with Helen Hayes, Mary Martin and Florence Reed as American stars making their Parisian bows.

The value of such a gesture may seem elusive. But when one considers the millions spent by the Soviet dictatorship to reflect on the barbarous United States through state-sponsored tours of its own leading artists, one must think again.

President Eisenhower has taken note of Salute to France in these words: "This presentation will be of vast significance to the cause of friendship and understanding between the people of America and Western Europe. I wish to reaffirm my warm endorsement of the undertaking."

Under the untiring planning of Robert W. Dowling, Virginia Inness-Brown and Robert Schnitzer, Salute to France was timed to coincide with the second Paris International Festival of Dramatic Art, which last year had no American representation.

Americans all, the artists are working for minimum salaries or expenses which, in turn, are being paid, under Dowling's gentle blandishments, through private funds. ANTA's small international exchange program, sparked by Mrs. Inness-Brown and Schnitzer, has contributed its dynamic offices.

It should be here noted, however, that Salute to France has nothing financially to do with that $2½ million allocation of the State Department to the international exchange program. At the behest of our Ambassador to Italy, Clare Boothe Luce, Oklahoma will be having a 6-week Italian tour after Paris under that fund, which underwrites travel expenses and losses, since overseas grosses are not geared to even our minimum salaries. Next year's appropriation for IEP is now going through the congressional committees and one can only hope that Representative FRANK THOMPSON (Democrat, of New Jersey) and others working for the bill will be successful in their drive.

A further income for Salute, apart from its private donations and the Can-Can benefit, will come from Skin of Our Teeth when it returns from Paris. It will play a 2-week run at the National starting July 18, another 2 weeks in Chicago, and a short run in New York before taking to the air as an NBC "spectacular" September 11.

So, Salute has no Government subsidy and is, in the words of committee member Robert E. Sherwood, "an answer to Communist propaganda being given not by our Government but by the American people."

The program so far has presented three concerts by the Philadelphia Orchestra and, concurrently with the "Medea" performances, a week of the New York City Ballet, much admired by Parisians. On view in the Orangerie gallery is an exhibition of 19th century French paintings loaned by Americans, "David to Toulouse-Lautrec," which succeeded an earlier showing of "American Art of the 20th century."

Apart from the financial contributions he has made, Dowling has gone to almost painful trouble to decide on the fitting productions and performers and on clearing the project with some 18 unions.

Panels drawn from the theater and the public made recommendations in the fields of drama, music and art. Negotiations with the numerous unions affecting all branches resulted in some concessions without which the project could never have been achieved.

Dowling's imagination prompted a brilliantly ingenious collaboration with the International Business Machines Corp. Its translation gadget, usually in use at the United Nations, has been sent to Paris to give earphone translations for those who wish to use them.

It is, of course, sheer happenstance that Cole Porter's musical salute to France (I Love Paris is a Can Can highspot) should be arriving here just when the Dowling-ANTA project is reaching its climax on the Seine. So, fitting is the word for the flossy benefit which will reopen the National a week from Tuesday.

America Is Proud of Its Cultural Achievements—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the Christain Science Monitor of Wednesday, June 8, 1955, on the Salute to France which is now underway.

Legislation is now before the Congress to make programs such as these a permanent part of the armament of the United States in this cold war period. Sponsors of this legislation, which will be considered by the House Education and Labor Subcommittee chairmaned by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], include the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], the gentlemen from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. RUESS], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER,] the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and myself. The article from the Christian Science Monitor follows:

THE AMERICAN ARTS SEND A SALUTE TO FRANCE

(By John Allan May)

PARIS.—In front of one of those smart international bookshops stood two figures, intensely isolated from the world around them. The older was obviously American—big, wide-brimmed, new pearl-gray felt hat, recently trimmed silver hair only just visible under it; rimless spectacles; newly cleansed lightweight topcoat; newly pressed dark gray trousers; spotless light gray suede shoes. The younger was French—in his best dark clothes, but still clearly a student.

The first was bent down a little and was gesticulating. The other was standing still and silent and was looking up with something like awe in his widening eyes.

The centerpiece of the window display, among the many cover girls looking with a sirocco stare across the new books they would probably never read, was a magazine with the colored picture of a great American buffalo on the front.

"Thousands of them," the man was saying as I passed. "Yes, sir, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands. When we built the railroad across the country * * *."

His voice was glowing as if he had just come back from the pioneer West himself.

I did not want to eavesdrop or to disturb this moment of wonder, so I walked on and stood for a while at a discreet distance. The tale of the American West continued to unfold. It was still unfolding when eventually I resumed walking and turned the corner.

It was a charming scene, I thought, and most appropriate. The American may not have been aware of it, but a special presentation of Oklahoma, the classic Rogers and Hammerstein musical play, is being given by a new American cast June 20 to July 3 in the Theatre des Champs-Elysees as a part of the Salute to France of the American arts. Or maybe he did know, and, knowing, got to work.

AMERICA'S WEST

For here it is, in this gay and and beautiful piece of theater, that the America that

France knows best meets at last the United States the France has hardly known before. French children are all cowboys except during the time that they are Indians. The American West is the history they like best to play, as do so many other children in so many other countries. Even when they grow up the French cannot quite brush the dust off. This is part of their own experience. This they know. Yet of the United States they know practically nothing.

They know very little indeed of it as a culture, an individual civilization, or a center of the arts.

Americans, we know, are so practiced at chasing the dollar that they can actually catch it. But this specialization, in the traditional European view, leaves them no time to practice the truer arts of living. It is amazing, and rather disturbing, how firmly this prejudice is entrenched over there.

To get it out of the ground and on the run may be one object of the quite spontaneous artistic gesture known as the "Salut à la France." It is doubtless going to be one of the results.

The musical "Oklahoma!" only dots the "i's" and crosses the "t's" of a whole lesson in international relations. The serious theater, the cinema, the art of photography, design, sculpture, painting, architecture, music, and ballet have all been or are being represented in the Salute.

A certain objective is to make a gesture of acknowledgement from the United States to a France that has contributed so much to the cultural development of America.

This was, in fact, the main idea in the thoughts of United States Ambassador Douglas Dillon and Jacques Jaujard of the French Ministry of Education when they held their original discussions. They just dropped the idea, and it was immediately taken up as a piece of strictly private cultural enterprise.

BROAD SUPPORT

Funds have been raised from institutions, individual subscriptions, and even by passing the hat around in theaters. Leaders in almost every field of the arts have contributed their time and talent for organization. Heading the Salute are William A. M. Burden, president of the New York Museum of Modern Art, and Robert W. Dowling, chairman of the board, American National Theater and Academy. Vice chairman is Mrs. H. Alwyn Inness-Brown of the New York chapter of ANTA.

Many leading French citizens have helped. Among them have been M. Jaujard; Jacques de Bourbon-Busset, Director of Cultural Relations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Georges Salles, Director of Museums in France; and Philippe Erlanger, Director of the French Association for Artistic Action. But the French list is as long as the American, and the many others regretfully must remain unnamed in this article.

Opening salvos of the Salute came from 2 great art exhibitions and 1 great orchestra. The exhibitions were "Fifty Years of Art in the United States" and "From David to Toulouse-Lautrec," masterpieces of French 19th century art from American private and public collections. The orchestra was that of Philadelphia, directed by Eugene Ormandy.

A program of ballet is scheduled for June 8–14 by the New York City Ballet company.

"Oklahoma" is to run from June 20 to July 3.

Two dramatic bursts complete the Salute: "Medea," with Judith Anderson (June 14–18), and "The Skin of Our Teeth" (June 28–July 3), with Helen Hayes and Mary Martin. These pieces were chosen because of their originality and because of the strong impression they made in the United States when first produced.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

Attendance at the two art shows has broken all records for such exhibitions in Paris. And I was given this definition for the French idea of a successful man: one who comes home with the news, "I've got four tickets for Oklahoma."

American abstract painting came in for some fairly severe criticism from the French. And it is possible that the title gave rise to a misunderstanding, for the collection was more properly a selection from the New York Museum of Modern Art rather than a representative showing of the best of 50 years of painting in America.

But there was much more to the 50-year exhibition, which closed May 15, than even all the varied schools of painting shown. The architectural section comprised 17 buildings designed since 1946, and was received with great acclaim.

Industrial design was represented by 150 mass-produced articles, including chairs, kitchenware, tools, toys, and china, that gave thousands of French people occasion for some new thoughts about the famous—or notorious—American mass-production, standardized economy.

Graphic design, posters, advertising, packaging, street signs, and book covers were also exhibited. There was a section on photography and the movies which reminded visitors not only that the cinema is an art form but also of the American contribution to that art.

The exhibition of French masterpieces from American collections has been doing turnaway business ever since it opened at the Orangerie April 20. There is no sign of slackening in interest and the line will probably be stretching out to the gates on the Place de la Concorde until July 3.

PROUD OF COLLECTION

The French, on the whole, are proud to think that some the best works ever produced by French painters are usually on daily exhibition in places from California to Maine and North Dakota to Louisiana.

The great public interest aroused, and still to be kept at burning pitch until the eve of Independence Day, is bound to have an effect on the average Frenchman's idea of the average American, as anyone here will tell you.

But, of course, there is no such thing as an average Frenchman. No more than there is, in fact, an average American. In the past, however, while the Frenchman has been willing to admit the first proposition, he has been unwilling to admit the second. The view has become popular that a mass-produced economy mass produces people and that a high standard of living leads somehow to a low standard for the arts of living. Who can hold quite the same view now?

The Salute to France is an unusual international gesture. One hopes it will not always remain so unusual. This is undoubtedly an excellent way to win friends and influence people—even in its simplest form, as when a lone individual weaves a little romance from a colored magazine cover seen in a shop window 6,000 miles from home.

Petition To Withdraw From the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, 24 citizens of Santa Barbara, Calif., have petitioned Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, praying that the Charter of the United Nations be not revised and that the United States terminate its membership in that organization. The petition reads as follows:

PETITIONING SEPARATION FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

We, the undersigned, citizens of Santa Barbara, Calif., do hereby go on record that we are unalterably opposed to any revision of the United Nations Charter.

We also believe that the United States should terminate its membership in the United Nations, and that the United Nations should be forever removed from our shores.

We do not believe that the United Nations has kept the peace. On the contrary, we believe that it is plunging us down the road to one-world government, such a government to be held together by force, not peace.

Our forefathers, with the aid of God and His Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, carved forth a mighty land, these United States of America. Our Constitution was founded on the Holy Bible. Our inalienable rights were derived from our Creator, not from government. But now we are faced with a Godless international setup that has grown to gigantic proportions, and that is working night and day to break down our walls of national sovereignty, to steal our precious blood-bought freedom from us, and to destroy forever our way of life. This petition is an open, free expression of the views of the undersigned.

Ann Gilbert, Edith Gilbert, Dr. Edward C. Bowlen, Mrs. Charles Mattei, Mrs. D. C. Reynolds, Baker L. Adams, Elizabeth Clay, Tina Todesca, Marion B. Phillips, Barbara S. Whittaker, Florence C. Sorensen, Mary M. Coulter, Roger C. Colburn, Cornelia B. Houier, Jessie J. Wieske, M. C. Brelita, Rusk Bawley, Anne E. Kermode, Doris W. Hopwood, Doris Caswell, L. Merle Berry, Joe W. Berry, Libau B. Stevens, Mrs. Warren E. Drewe.

These patriotic people are fully aware that the real purpose behind the present activities of the United Nations is to revise its charter in order to have it sponsor a world government.

It seems to me that the United Nations has already done enough in interfering with our laws and the Constitution to convince the people that "world peace" is not its aim, but its true object is to destroy the Constitution and laws of the only country on earth where it is demonstrated that the government exists for the people, and not the reverse—of the people existing for the government.

Agawam, Mass., Celebrates Its Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th birthday as a township of Agawam, Mass. The celebration opened with a centennial ball on last Thursday and was climaxed by a spectacular parade yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, this typical American community is in my congressional district, and I know it well. I know some-

thing of its spirit, its people. It surely has passed the test of time and it has contributed immeasurably to the economic life of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I extend the greetings of the United States of America and my own personal congratulations to the people, town officials, and centennial committee on this significant occasion.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following editorials from the Springfield Daily News of June 17 and the Springfield Union of June 18:

[From the Springfield Daily News of June 17, 1955]

AGAWAM'S CENTENNIAL

Agawam has been called the child of West Springfield and the grandchild of Springfield, but yet it is part of the plantation purchased from the Indians in 1636 and bears the ancient name which once identified the whole Springfield settlement.

However, it was not until 1855 that the community won its independence from West Springfield which had been separated from the mother town of Springfield almost a century earlier. There were some who wanted to name the new township South Springfield, but it was decided instead to adopt the Indian name which had identified the Connecticut River settlement until the name was changed to Springfield in 1640 to compliment William Pynchon of Springfield, England.

Agawam, a town with more than 3 centuries of rich history, now celebrates its century as an incorporated town. Her story is part of the fabric of Springfield and West Springfield history for more than 200 years, but the last century has been her own, and it is that 100 years which it now celebrates.

Following the lead of Greenfield, Agawam decided to map its own celebration instead of hiring a professional party planner to do the work.

The 4-day program will open tonight with the centennial ball, at which the centennial queen will be crowned. Tomorrow night, there will be a band concert and dancing on the green. Saturday's schedule will include a field day, Little League baseball, historical exhibit and tea, barbecue, the Governor's address, dancing, fireworks, and bonfire.

A sunrise service and religious services in all churches will open Sunday's program which will feature a marathon race, a mammoth parade, and a drum corps competition.

Her neighbors join in congratulating and saluting Agawam, 300 years old as a settlement, 100 years young as a township.

[From the Springfield Union of June 18, 1955]

AGAWAM'S HUNDREDTH

It is a pleasure to congratulate our transpontine neighbor on the occasion of her hundredth birthday, and perhaps to many in Springfield who are not acquainted with the history of Agawam the thought will occur that they figured her to be a lot older. Originally, of course, Agawam was part of the tract on both sides of the Connecticut purchased by William Pynchon in 1636 from Indians who received for it "18 coats, 18 hoes, 18 hatchets, 18 knives, 18 fathoms of wampum."

The town's early history, therefore, is part of the early history of Springfield and the current celebration is not in observance of the first white settlement of Agawam, but of its assumption of a separate municipal identity and its incorporation, which the Great and General Court allowed on May 17, 1855. Agawam, incidentally, was the first name of the whole Springfield tract, which took the name of Springfield some 4 years after the Pynchon purchase. The section retained the name of Agawam, however, and maintained that appellation even after it became the second parish of West Springfield, when that town was incorporated at the request of Springfield in 1774. Hence, if today's friendly triangle of communities had adhered to the fundamental designation, they probably would be known as East Agawam (Springfield), North Agawan (West Springfield), and Agawam, which consistently has been Agawam.

There is no doubt about it; Agawam is a lot older than she looks on the official papers that have touched off her centennial celebration. Yet no one can deny that the town acts younger—still growing, persistently vigorous in civic enterprise, politically lively, and handsome to look at. May she live more centuries in good health. And whenever Springfield has occasion to tick off a significant milepost measured from the founding date of 1636, it is safe to say that this city always will be proud to acknowledge—nay, boast of—the town across the river as an original member of the family who left home and made good.

St. James Backs Expansion of Frozen Food Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of May 29, 1955, under the heading "St. James Backs Expansion of Frozen Food Industry" is printed an outline of what individual initiative can accomplish in this country and an example of what an average community can do to encourage the development of industry by foresight and financial assistance. The story of Tony Downs and the community of St. James I am sure will be an inspiration to many individuals and communities throughout the country.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

ST. JAMES BACKS EXPANSION OF FROZEN-FOOD INDUSTRY

ST. JAMES.—From a $12 a week job to the head of a company which will employ nearly 500 persons in its peak season.

That is the success story of Tony Downs, poultry processor extraordinary.

In the rich poultry country of southwestern Minnesota and northern Iowa the name Downs is an important one, and it's going to be more important in the future.

Twenty years ago Mr. Downs came to St. James from South Dakota and got a job with Boote's Hatchery & Packing Co. at $12 a week.

In 1937 nearly any kind of a job was a good job. But Mr. Downs wasn't satisfied just to have a job.

He worked for the company 10 years, saving his money, and in 1947 was able to buy the F. M. Priest & Sons poultry firm in St. James. The Tony Downs Foods Co. was born.

INFANT HAS GROWN

The infant has grown with amazing rapidity. Today, chickens, ducks, and turkeys, as well as shell and frozen eggs, are shipped all over the country under the O-So-Good label.

Fifteen refrigerated trucks and trailers keep produce rolling in and out of the Downs plant at all hours. A sideline is turtle soup; Downs even supplies information on how to trap snapping turtles to anyone who is interested in supplying him.

A new plant was erected in 1954 and an adjoining office building added this year. But the greatest expansion was yet to come.

Last year Mr. Downs was offered a contract to be the exclusive supplier of frozen food products to the Hines-Park Co., under the famous Duncan Hines label, if he could expand his plant to handle the great bulk of new business that would result from the contract.

ST. JAMES SUPPORT

It meant a $250,000 plant expansion. The businessmen of St. James heard about it. Through the St. James Industries Foundation, a nonprofit organization formed to help bring new industries to St. James, they advanced $100,000 to finance the new venture. They have the utmost faith in Mr. Downs and his ability.

The new plant is now going up and the production lines will start rolling in August. It will be a strictly big-business operation, with about 200 employees added to the present 300 at the peak season.

The new frozen-food plant, being constructed at the rear of the present building, will double present facilities. To meet the Duncan Hines contract it will be capable of turning out 5,000 frozen dinners an hour.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND POUNDS A DAY

Mr. Downs said his plant is one of the few in the Nation which has complete control of production from the live poultry to the finished product. When he isn't using chickens and turkeys from his own plant, he buys live chickens at the farms and they are "under his wing" as it were, from then until they reach the dinner tables of the Nation.

The present plant can process 100,000 pounds of chickens a day. Under blast freezing, 100,000 pounds of produce can be frozen to 50 degrees below zero every 24 hours.

Mr. Downs' business activities don't occupy all his time. He is active in the civic affairs of St. James and is president of the Minnesota, Poultry, Butter and Egg Association. He also has served as a director of the national association. He is married and has three children, Donald, 17; Dick, 10; and Deanna, 16.

His company is riding the top of the wave for an ever-increasing demand for frozen food which food men believe will expand greatly in the future.

What the expansion will be nobody quite knows, but everybody in this thriving town of 4,000 is glad Tony Downs got that $12-a-week job 20 years ago. His getting it has meant a lot to St. James.

Credit to a Productive Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to read to the House the following excerpts from the article written by Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 15, 1955:

CREDIT TO A PRODUCTIVE CONGRESS

This Democratic 84th Congress, in office under a Republican administration little

more than 5 months, is quietly and speedily setting two records without parallel in American political history.

It is demonstrating that divided government does not have to be stalemated government and does not have to be acutely acrimonious government.

It is, at this stage certainly, giving President Eisenhower's legislative program vastly greater support than any Congress of opposite political faith has given a President in the past half-century.

This is a far cry from the hostile Democratic Congress which carried on a running battle with President Hoover during the second 2 years of his administration and the gleeful, overconfident Republican Congress of 1947–48 which bottled up most of President Truman's domestic program and enacted little, nearly nothing, in its place.

Obviously there are special circumstances prevailing in this political year of 1955 and which contribute to the mood of cooperation between Democratic Congress and Republican President.

Despite the Democratic victory last fall, this Democratic Congress knows it is dealing with a massively popular President. In 1947–48 the Republican Congress thought it was dealing with a massively unpopular Democratic President. It was misguided. It was the Republican Congress which was unpopular, as Mr. Truman demonstrated.

While many people, press and public alike, agree with Mr. Drummond, the program to which he refers and with which the Democrats have cooperated, is not President Eisenhower's program, but the Democratic program—the same program which they adopted as part of their platform at the Democratic convention in 1952.

Mr. Drummond continues as follows:

But substantial and solid credit belongs to the Democratic leadership and the Democratic membership of this 84th Congress for making divided government work—and work efficiently. It has never been so well done before. I recall Senator Taft telling me in 1947 that the then newly elected Republican Congress was not going to pass any of President Truman's social welfare measures—or any Republican version of them; he wasn't going to have any credit shared with Mr. Truman; he was going to wait until a Republican administration was in control of the whole Government the following year.

In commenting on the above excerpt from Mr. Drummond's article let me say that during the 83d Congress, when the Republican administration was in control of the whole Government, Mr. Eisenhower did not receive the full support of his party, nor has he received it in this Congress.

Mr. Eisenhower has stood firmly for the part of his program which has had the warm support of the bankers and the big corporations, measures which could wreck the social and economic gains made since 1932.

The little fellow must continue to rely on the Democratic Party for what is best for the largest number of American citizens.

Mr. Drummond concludes with the following:

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the 1955 Democratic record is that when it has disagreed with the President or dissented from an important part of an Eisenhower-sponsored measure, it has not stalled and stalemated action by simply blocking what the White House wanted. It has altered the President's program at important points and then proceeded to enact it.

The Democrats decisively supported the administration on the all-important renewal of the reciprocal trade act and on the foreign aid bill. They have made substantial changes in the President's public housing bill, the highway program, minimum wage and postal pay raise, although, except for the postal raise now signed, the final shape of these measures remains to be determined by the House.

This 84th Congress is proving itself an efficient, productive, responsible Congress.

The Flag-Day Program in House Sets UNESCO Program Back on Its Heels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the UNESCO, a branch of the United Nations, got a well-deserved setback in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14.

It will be remembered that UNESCO means "United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization." Its principal work so far has been to try to destroy loyalty and devotion to the United States and patriotism for our country on the theory that such feelings interfere with world government, and that therefore all national devotion, loyalty and patriotism should be destroyed in all countries and the sentiment transferred to world government.

In the House of Representatives the Flag-Day program was carried out with beautiful ceremonies, as the following program will suggest:

FLAG DAY PROGRAM, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 14, 1955

1. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 9, the Speaker declares a recess.

2. United States Air Force Band (Capt. Robert L. Landers, commanding) enters door to left of Speaker and takes position in aisle to left of Speaker.

3. Doorkeeper announces "The Flag of the United States."

Members rise.

Air Force Band plays The Stars and Stripes Forever.

The flag is carried into the Chamber by Air Force colorbearer and a guard from each of the other branches of the Armed Forces (Maj. Robert L. Eaton, U. S. A., commanding).

The color guard salutes the Speaker, faces about, and salutes the House.

4. Mr. RABAUT is recognized.

5. The Official Air Force Choral Group (The Singing Sergeants), accompanied by the Air Force Band, sing the new song, The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, by Irving Caesar, ASCAP. Soloist, M. Sgt. Ivan Genuchi.

6. Mr. RABAUT is recognized.

7. Members rise and sing The National Anthem, accompanied by the Air Force Band and The Singing Sergeants.

8. Members remain standing while the Colors are retired from the Chamber, the Air Force Band playing The Stars and Stripes Forever.

9. The Air Force Band leaves the Chamber.

The applause was spontaneous and prolonged, and left no doubt that in the great legislative Chamber of the United States loyalty and devotion to our own institutions and our love of our country remains resplendent and vigorous in spite of all attacks by this sinister organization, UNESCO.

Just as long as the House of Representatives of this great Republic is composed of Members like those who today enthusiastically expressed an undivided loyalty to our own Government the people can feel that the world government being engineered by the United Nations has a rough and rugged road to travel before the citizens of the United States are willing to abandon their own form of government.

Harry S. Truman: A Defender of Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following speech was delivered by Dr. Louis B. Wright, director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, on June 3, 1955, at a dinner arranged by Mr. Cyrus Eaton, at the Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, in behalf of the Harry S. Truman Library Fund:

A DEFENDER OF LEARNING

When Mr. Eaton invited me to participate in this program, I was flattered by the honor, and pleased at the privilege of paying a tribute to a great leader who has won the admiration of millions throughout the world.

Many of the most eloquent speakers of our time, including Sir Winston Churchill, have emphasized Mr. Truman's immense contributions in preserving western civilization from disaster. So multifarious were Mr. Truman's activities as President that one of his very important contributions to the good of society may sometimes be overlooked, but it cannot escape emphasis on an occasion like this.

Mr. Truman has been one of the most notable defenders of learning in our generation. He has made some striking and exceedingly important suggestions for the perpetuation of learning. And the formation of the Truman Library, which has given occasion for this dinner, is only the culmination of a whole series of episodes in Mr. Truman's career that illustrate his interest in learning, and particularly in history.

He has not been a sitter on the sidelines, either. As President in an epoch of extraordinary significance, he has of course been a maker of history. But more than that, he has been a close student of history. He has been a reading President, and we must never underestimate the value to the Nation of a leader who can bring to bear upon the problems of the moment the knowledge that comes from seeing human events against the long perspective of history. Mr. Truman did precisely that, and the annals of our age will record the wisdom that his reading gave to the country.

Reading, of course, is a very dangerous enterprise nowadays. At least two States are seriously considering legislation to curb

both writers and readers as enemies of the people. Anybody who can read and write is likely to be described as an egghead. And an egghead, as anybody who reads certain of our newspaper columnists knows, is guilty of original cerebration, which some of our lawmakers would make a misdemeanor if not a felony.

We are witnessing a great debate over the relative virtue of eggheads versus boneheads. I am making no veiled political allusion. I am merely referring to what philosophers have called the Zeitgeist. Happily Mr. Truman has cast his lot with the eggheads. And in the long run, throughout the history of this country, the eggheads have prevailed over the boneheads.

The attack on intellectualism is not merely an effort to vilify the college professor and the doctor of philosophy as impractical braintrusters in search of utopia, but it is a vicious attack on every form of speculative thought. The reading man and therefore the speculative man may at some time find an idea that leads him to question things as they are. A brassy and noisy minority would purge library shelves of books they don't approve; they would silence writers who do not echo the conventional social and political doctrines; they would fire professors who do not conform; they would exclude from Government service all who do not hew to a party line; and they have even gone so far as to force the rewriting of the Girl Scouts' manual lest it somehow give an impression of internationalism. This attitude has nothing to distinguish it from the thought control exercised by the powers behind Pravda and other Russian organs of intellectual conformity.

Mr. Truman, happily for the Nation, has been a valiant opponent of this school of blind conformity. As a reader and thinker himself—egghead, if you prefer—he knows that enforced conformity in the realm of the mind leads to sterility. He knows that often the professor, as Carl Becker once said, is a person who thinks otherwise, and the "otherwise thoughts" of some of them, including those of Professor Einstein, have changed the shape of the world. If the United States is to remain a great nation, it must offer the best opportunity in the world for freedom of investigation, for freedom to think, for freedom to believe something that may be unpopular at the moment, for freedom to interpret the facts of history so as to reveal the truth, even if the truth is unpalatable.

That, I take it, is the essential purpose behind the creation of the Truman Library. It will become an important center of historical research. By making available a great mass of significant documents about one of the momentous periods in the history of western civilization, it will enable scholars for generations to come to make an accurate appraisal of those events. Free access to the documents will also prevent the kind of distortions possible when there are no documents to speak for themselves. As the founder of a library, Mr. Truman is making one of the most important contributions of his career, however great the others were. A library confers an extraordinary kind of immortality. It is virtually impossible to kill a book. It is also virtually impossible to destroy the influence of a great library.

From a little private inquiry in Washington, I have discovered that Mr. Truman, during all these years, has actually been a frustrated librarian. The chairman of a committee who once conferred with the President about the appointment of a Librarian of Congress told me that Mr. Truman on that occasion declared that if he were not President, he would rather be Librarian of Congress than hold any other office. He would have made an excellent Librarian. He would have known precisely the words to use when a Congressman offered a resolution to require the Librarian of Congress to read all of the 6 million books in that institution and personally eliminate those containing subversive passages. That, incidentally, in this Congressman's definition of subversive, would have cast out the works of Shakespeare and the Bible. He would also have known precisely the comment to make when another Congressman last year declared that the national library was merely the creature of Congress and should be shut up when the Congress was not in session, and the employees put at some gainful occupation.

Sitting across the street from the Library of Congress I can testify to the tremendous public service it performs in addition to serving the needs of the Congress and the executive branches of the Government. It is one of the institutions keeping alive the spirit of freedom and cultivating the art of reading, an art, incidentally, that may die if something isn't done to revive it. The founding of a new library is a good omen. There are a few other hopeful signs. The United Press recently telegraphed a story from Newport, R. I., about a new birth of literacy there. A Newport teacher told the UP that one of her English class announced that he was going to read a book. "I'm going to read a book sometime," he asserted, "because last night I saw a quiz show and the boy didn't get the jackpot because he hadn't read a book."

Because the Library of Congress already has immense tasks to perform, perhaps it is well that the new Truman Library is going to be a separate institution in Independence, Mo. Of course a few critics will complain. They would like to see everything under one roof for their own convenience. Actually there are excellent reasons for the establishment of regional libraries, and not all of them are merely for safety in an age of atomic hazards. Even if it will cause some inconvenience, it is a good thing for some of the important historical libraries to be in the Middle and Far West. They will stimulate historical studies in areas which are very important historically themselves. No one needs to tell this audience of the importance of Independence, Mo., in the days when wagon trains were setting out to conquer the West.

There's another good reason for libraries in areas outside the East. Coming from South Carolina, it has been hard for me to accept the New England interpretation of American history. You know, South Carolina has been a somewhat difficult region. James Louis Pettigru once observed during a debate on secession that South Carolina was too small for a republic and too large for an insane asylum. We South Carolinians never relished the particular provinciality of the classic New England historians. So we welcome any influence that will force historians out of New England into some other part of the country. Someone has remarked that every historian of American life should be forced to make a trip across the continent before writing a line, and if the historian comes from Harvard, he ought to be made to walk. If an historical library in Independence, Mo., is not in walking distance, let the historian get there the best way he can. He will learn something on the way.

To the innocents among us, it may seem fantastic that the creation of anything so beneficent as a library should arouse criticism in any quarter. But Americans, even before the present wave of distrust of intellectualism, have often been suspicious of learning. It was one of my fellow South Carolinians who once stated his platform as being "agin book larnin', the railroads, and the guv'mint." Happily, there has been very little criticism of the Truman Library from any quarters except those who think that Missouri is a long way from Washington or Boston.

But when Thomas Jefferson proposed that Congress should acquire his book collection as the nucleus of a national library there was bitter opposition. Mr. Truman, who is one of the authentic band of Jeffersonians, undoubtedly has read accounts of the violent attack on Jefferson, when in October 1814, he offered to the United States Congress his personal library to take the place of the library destroyed when the British burned the Capital in the previous August. Jefferson had spent years and a great deal of money bringing together a fine library of approximately 6,000 carefully selected volumes. He offered it to the Congress for $23,900, a sum much smaller than the books had cost him. The mere thought of acquiring Jefferson's books for the Congress and the Nation stirred up a hornet's nest. Representative Cyrus King, of Massachusetts, scented a plot to corrupt the elected Representatives of the people and deliver the country into the hands of aliens. "It might be inferred," King orated, "from the character of the man who collected it, and France, where the collection was made, that the library contained irreligious and immoral books, works of the French philosophers, who caused and influenced the volcano of the French Revolution which has desolated Europe and extended to this country. * * * The bill would put $23,900 into Jefferson's pocket for about 6,000 books, good, bad, and indifferent, old, new, and worthless, in languages which many cannot read, and most ought not." Congressmen railed at members of the committee who recommended the purchase of a library containing the works of Rousseau, Voltaire, and even John Locke. The acquisition of this collection would be a national disgrace, said the opposition. Daniel Webster made a speech against the purchase. When the vote was finally taken all the Harvard men in Congress voted solidly against the acquisition; all the Yale men except one voted against it too. But one lone Yale man from Vermont was not afraid of either Voltaire or Jefferson. He had learned independence with Ethan Allen. Despite the almost solid opposition of New England, the Nation acquired Jefferson's great library, which laid the foundations of the Library of Congress.

The opposition to the purchase of Jefferson's library has a familiar ring today. Although some of that opposition may be explained by the inflamed feelings of the Federalists against that man Jefferson, who was their bête noir, there is unhappily much in it that sounds modern. The attacks during the past 2 years on the great educational foundations came from bigots who made similar allegations of danger to the republic. Always we have with us a narrow-minded minority who smell a danger in anything more intellectual than a wrestling match on television. It is these prophets of ignorance who ridicule almost anybody in government, or out of it, who can read and write.

In discussing Mr. Franklin Roosevelt's reading habits, Jonathan Daniels has remarked that the President of the United States, by reason of his office, is not only the Chief of State and a guide in public opinion, but "there is also a feeling, perhaps more prevalent among Platonists than plowmen, that somehow the President ought to be also the leader and embodiment of a kind of national great books program. Perhaps Mr. Jefferson set the pattern. * * * [We all retain], Daniels continues, "the image of Lincoln reading the masterpieces with his forelock practically in the fireplace. All other great Presidents must conform."

President Truman of course conformed to that pattern, and he set an example that I hope will be emulated. The danger is grave in this country that despite technical literacy, we shall cease to read anything. We need examples set by someone as exalted as the President. For the danger of our lapsing into illiteracy is so great that even Fred Allen, the radio wit, is quoted as saying that

after another generation of television, we shall have "eyeballs as big as cantaloupes and no brain at all." Already in some quarters any acquaintance with spelled words is regarded as highbrow—and undesirable. Only recently I heard of a bride who suddenly came into a room and found her husband spelling out a comic book. "My God," she exclaimed in shocked surprise, "I've married a bookworm." The bad English that so many of our contemporaries write can be attributed to the fact that they have read nothing that feeds their minds and gives them a feeling for sentence rhythms. For one learns to write by reading, and so great a stylist as Robert Louis Stevenson said he learned his art by practicing the sedulous ape to great writers. Because so many of our leaders today have never read anything they are unable to be either persuasive or forceful in their public utterances. Of a very dull statesman someone said:

"He wrote in neither verse nor prose:
He simply laid his words in rows,
The selfsame words that Webster penned,
Not up and down, but end on end."

If some shrewd and imaginative young graduate student in history should turn his attention to the reading habits of our Presidents as an index to their success, he would find some interesting facts. What he would discover about those President who appear to have read little or nothing, I shall not attempt to predict. A tactful commentator once observed that "President Harding was interested in other things besides books." One thing this hypothetical Ph. D. will discover is that the most interesting Presidents, the Presidents that the future will want to know about, have been readers, often voracious readers.

Evidence of their reading may be found in their state papers, in the historical parallels that they drew, in their public utterances, and the allusions that they made, in their letters, and in the memoirs of their associates.

When our young Ph. D. comes to study President Truman, he will find an insatiable reader, a reader who ranged over a wide field, but one whose consuming interest was history, all sorts of history, from Biblical times to the present. If our graduate student starts with William Hillman's book, Mr. President, he will find a provocative section, nearly one-sixth of the book, entitled "Student of History."

The fact that Mr. Truman has had a vital interest in history is very significant. For ever since Elizabethan times, the reading of history has been regarded as second only to Holy Writ in the capacity to induce wisdom. "The reading of history," declared one of Shakespeare's contemporaries, "conduceth not a little to the adorning of the soul and mind of man, a study of all men commended. * * * In histories are contained infinite examples of heroical virtues to be of us followed, and horrible examples to be of us eschewed." And another Elizabethan Englishman, depressed over the Queen's inability to suppress the Irish, declared that the Irish were wild because they would not sit at home and read history. If they would only read history, he believed, the English might civilize them. I leave it to Mr. O'Connor to determine whether this would have been a good thing. At any rate, an interest in history has always been regarded as a mark of the civilized man.

From history Mr. Truman acquired some of the optimism and perhaps some of the courage that helped him in many difficult crises. He expressed the belief that in the end right, not might, prevails. "Imperialists never win in the long run," he told Mr. Hillman. He also discovered that apostles of gloom have always been predicting the worst of all possible worlds just around the corner. In the year 1000, an Anglo-Saxon bishop declared that modernists and other subversives were undermining society, and about a century later Peter the Hermit declared that the end of the world was imminent. But somehow we have managed to muddle along. It is encouraging to look back through history to the times when we have been on the verge of irretrievable disaster.

Mr. Truman has been a profound student of the office of the Presidency. I imagine that no other man who has held that office has known so much about his predecessors and has analyzed their problems so acutely. But his historical interests have been much wider than that. He has studied the battles of the Civil War as only a specialist in military science would study them. Mr. John J. McCloy reports that when he was at Potsdam with Mr. Truman he discovered in Kaiser Wilhelm II's library a beautiful copy of Poultney Bigelow's Battles and Leaders (of the Civil War). The book had been autographed to the Kaiser and had the Kaiser's marginal annotations. While he was looking at the book and contemplating whether it would be a patriotic act to "liberate" it before the Russians took over, an American Secret Service man stepped up and said, "there's no use for you to be looking at that book. The President has already seen it." I hope the volume will find its way into the Truman Library.

Mr. Truman has not confined his activities to armchair studies. One of his colleagues in Washington reports that he likes nothing better than a stiff walking tour over a Civil War battlefield with somebody who shares his interest. He also has a broad interest in the history of his native State and the westward movement, to which Missouri contributed so much. And I am informed that no professional scholar knows more about Custer's Last Stand. Indeed, Mr. Truman's claims are such that the American Historical Association is ready to make him an anointed member of the guild at sight. The distinguished editor of the Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Dr. Julian Boyd, tells me that Mr. Truman invariably acknowledges the receipt of each new volume, and unlike some of our professional colleagues, he shows that he has read them. And when Mr. Truman wrote to the Princeton Press to inform them that they could change his address for future issues from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to 219 North Delaware Street, Independence, Mo., he wrote across the bottom of the letter: "This project is one of the best."

Mr. Truman from the beginning has shown a deep interest in the Jefferson edition. Dr. Boyd declares that his interest "has been a wonderful stimulus to us in our editorial work."

But this is not all. It was Mr. Truman's personal effort and interest that set in motion the rejuvenation of the National Historical Publications Commission, an organization that has for its objective the publication of the works of many great Americans. Indeed, the revived National Commission dates from May 17, 1950, when President Truman, in a speech accepting the first volume of the Jefferson Papers, publicly declared that he wanted to see a plan for the similar publication of other great Americans. Characteristically, Mr. Truman did not let the idea die but has constantly lent encouragement to the Commission. Today, as a result, in whole or in part, of the Commission's activities, a number of important editorial projects are underway. The works of Benjamin Franklin are being edited in collaboration with the American Philosophical Society and Yale University. The great archive of the Adams Papers in the Massachusetts Historical Society has been opened by the Adams family, and Mr. Lyman Butterfield has made a brilliant start at the immense task of editing that fascinating correspondence. Among the most interesting correspondences in existence are the letters between Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. And plans are already underway for the publication of the papers of at least a dozen other significant Americans. All of this activity stems directly from Mr. Truman's personal concern and efforts in behalf of the National Commission.

But his own interest is not confined merely to American history. To Mr. Hillman he once remarked that "it is not enough to know just American history. The trouble with some specialists in history is that they write about 1 country or 1 period as if nothing else existed in the world. Imagine writing a history of the United States without reference to Europe or Asia. Who today can write or think about the United States or the American continent as isolated from the rest of the world. An American President today must take into account things that happen far beyond our frontiers." We may be grateful that Mr. Truman has made his influence felt in so many different ways in breaking down the barriers of insularity and ignorance that might prove disastrous to us in the present state of the world.

In a letter to Dr. Luther Evans, then Librarian of Congress, President Truman wrote on January 12, 1953: "I am expecting to maintain our close contact and relationship because I am going to be interested in libraries and research for the rest of my life." To the fraternity of librarians and historians, it is a pleasure to welcome such a distinguished addition to our ranks. Mr. Truman has already contributed more than most men to the advancement of learning and to the defense of learning on all fronts, and it is a cheering thought that he, and the great institution that will bear his name, will continue to be an inspiration to historians and scholars in many fields.

I think Mr. Truman ought to know what a high value scholars place on this particular achievement. We ought not be like the taciturn father from a small Massachusetts town who called in his sons when he was on his deathbed and told them that he wanted them always to remember their mother. "She was a wonderful woman," he said. "There were times when I almost told her." Let's tell Mr. Truman now what a wonderful thing it is to create the Truman Library.

The United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. During those years the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and their Chinese counterpart have made our search for an enduring peace increasingly difficult. Despite this cold war pressure, we have today arrived at a most significant juncture. The United Nations, 10 years after its formation is not only still in existence, but it is receiving increased respect and cooperation throughout the world. Nations not yet admitted clamor loudly for permission to join. The ideals for which Woodrow Wilson fought and died have survived the test of time. We can all agree too, that the United States has given up no cherished right nor turned over to the U. N. any constitutional privilege.

I hope that we will always have the courage and honesty to recognize the wisdom and greatness of President Harry Truman's decision to go into Korea after the Communist attack. That show of conviction and faith in the cause of free people and in the United Nations will prove the turning point in the history of the U. N. It marks the distinction between the success of the United Nations and the failure of the League of Nations.

We can be thankful today that because there is that U. N., we have peace and a forum in which to discuss the world's ills; we should be thankful too that we have a U. N. helping the poor and the backward of the world toward economic and social betterment. I pray that we shall continue to support the United Nations and its glowing promise of peace.

Analysis of Agricultural Appropriation Act, Public Law 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include an analysis of Public Law 40 prepared for me by Elizabeth Elward of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

Public Law 40, 84th Congress, Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1956

TITLE I. REGULAR ACTIVITIES

Agricultural Research Service:	
Salaries and expenses:	
Research	$37,800,000
Plant and animal disease and pest control	18,658,700
Meat inspection	14,325,000
Total, salaries and expenses	70,783,700
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	24,753,708
Foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry—research	1,900,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	97,437,408
Extension Service:	
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	45,475,000
Federal Extension Service:	
Administration and coordination	1,920,000
Penalty mail	1,650,000
Total, administration and coordination	3,570,000
Total, Extension Service	49,045,000
Farmers Cooperative Service	408,000
Soil Conservation Service:	
Conservation operations	$59,300,000
Watershed protection	12,000,000
Flood prevention	10,000,000
Total Soil Conservation Service	81,300,000
Agricultural conservation program	214,500,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:	
Marketing research and service:	
Marketing research and agricultural estimates	11,046,000
Marketing services	11,960,000
Total, marketing research and service	23,006,000
Payments to States, Territories, and possessions	1,000,000
School lunch program	83,236,197
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	107,242,197
Foreign Agricultural Service	3,365,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	698,000
Commodity Stabilization Service:	
Agricultural adjustment grams	39,000,000
Sugar Act program	59,600,000
Total, Commodity Stabilization Service	98,600,000
Federal crop insurance, salaries and expenses	6,000,000
Rural Electrification Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	7,680,000
Loan authorizations	(335,000,000)
Farmers' Home Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	24,500,000
Loan authorizations	(153,000,000)
Office of General Counsel	2,100,000
Office of Secretary	2,144,300
Office of Information	1,238,000
Library	659,950
Total, regular activities	696,917,855

TITLE II. CORPORATE EXPENSES

Commodity Credit Corporation:	
Restoration of capital impairment	$1,634,659
Limitation on administrative expenses	(26,000,000)

TITLE III. SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials	$300,000
Repayment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for eradication of certain contagious diseases	5,788,897
International Wheat Agreement	57,378,551
Reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for transfer of wheat to Pakistan	69,385,831
Reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for emergency feed assistance	42,100,000
Reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	$9,545,830
Total, special activities	184,499,109)

TITLE IV. FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION
(Administrative expense limitations)

Administrative expenses	($2,320,000)
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	(550,000)
Federal intermediate credit banks	(1,825,000)
Production credit corporations	(1,595,000)

TITLE V. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Authorizes the purchase of an additional 535 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for hire of such vehicles from appropriations and authorizations herein made.

Permits the employment of aliens under certain conditions.

Allows the expenditure of up to $1 for each option to purchase land.

Prohibits payment of salary to officers or employees who predict the future prices of cotton.

Prohibits the purchase of twine other than that domestically produced unless the latter is unavailable.

Provides that not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations for research and service work authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 and the act of June 29, 1935 (relating to agricultural research) be available for contracting in accordance therewith.

Contains antistrike provisions.

Prohibits the use of funds herein authorized for publicity or propaganda purposes.

Provides that appropriations hereunder available for research and service works shall be available for the expenses of advisory committees established under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946.

ELIZABETH ELWARD,
American Law Division.

JUNE 1, 1955.

Minneapolis Firms Show Forward Looking Concept by Merging Resources To Conduct Atomic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, we of the great upper Mississippi region are proud of the constant achievements in all fields of endeavor of the area we represent. Minnesota people have contributed mightily to the progress and well being of the whole country. Their steadiness, industry, and clear thinking are symbolic of the spirit which has made our country strong and great.

This spirit is exemplified in the following news story from the Minneapolis Tribune detailing plans of three of the largest industries in Minneapolis for pooling their resources in order to better

solve the problems of using the atom for the greatest benefit to mankind.

THREE CITY FIRMS TO JOIN IN ATOMIC RESEARCH—GENERAL MILLS, HONEYWELL, NSP MERGE FORCES

(By John Wickland)

Three of Minneapolis' largest corporations disclosed Tuesday they are pooling their resources and know-how in a joint venture in atomic research.

The companies, all of which are extensively engaged already in nuclear activities in their respective fields, are Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., and General Mills.

Their announcement of the project said they hope their wide experience will enable them to evaluate and further nuclear developments of interest to Minnesota and its industries.

The joint venture grew out of conferences on the relation of atomic energy to Minnesota's industrial future. Allen S. King, NSP president, initiated those discussions with the presidents of the other two companies, Paul B. Wishart of Honeywell, and C. H. Bell of General Mills.

To administer the co-operative undertaking, the three presidents have set up the Minnesota Nuclear Operations group.

This group's primary purpose will be to determine objectives and activities in the atomic energy field that will be beneficial to the State and its industry. The group will recommend to the member companies methods for achieving those objectives.

An operating committee, consisting initially of 1 member from each of the 3 companies, will be organized to carry out the group's activities.

Although the announcement was vague on what form the research project will take, it was considered likely that future plans will call for construction of an atomic reactor.

The project is one of the first in the country to emphasize atomic research that may be of benefit to a single State or region.

"Concentrated study of atomic developments in various industrial fields will be mutually beneficial to our companies and to industry throughout Minnesota," the three company presidents said.

"We are on the threshold of an age which undoubtedly will see great advances in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Each of our organizations has much that it can contribute to these advances."

All three of the firms have wide interests and are engaged in a number of activities in the atomic energy field. Northern States Power is basically concerned with atomic energy as a fuel source, General Mills with equipment and use in the food field, and Honeywell with instrumentation. They presently are engaged in individual research projects.

Northern States has been studying atomic power since about 1945 and is abreast of developments in connection with use of atomic energy as a fuel source for power production. In 1952 it joined a group of other utility and engineering firms known as the Foster Wheeler-Pioneer Service-Diamond Alkali nuclear power project. That group is studying primarily the economics of various reactor designs.

Two engineers at NSP have been cleared by the Atomic Energy Commission and have access to its information. NSP's president is a member of the atomic power committee of the Edison Electric Institute.

Honeywell built some of the controls, recorders, and instruments employed by the Manhattan project, which developed the atomic bomb in World War II.

Since then the company has developed many special controls for atomic reactors and other atomic installations, including the atomic-powered submarine Nautilus. Most of the reactors operating today are at least partially controlled by Honeywell equipment.

Honeywell also has a radioisotopes laboratory at its research center in Hopkins. A number of the laboratory's scientists are experienced workers in the nuclear energy field.

General Mills, world's largest miller of flour, also has had extensive experience in the atomic field. It is active not only in research but also in the design and production of various equipment for nuclear applications.

This includes remote handling equipment used for construction and maintenance of nuclear reactors and instruments and equipment for use in nuclear research and weapons development.

"Freedom for Man—A World Safe for Mankind"—The Theme for the Celebration of the Centennial of Woodrow Wilson, 1856–1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 24, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore so to do, I am pleased to present the text of the first two introductory pages of the announcement of the Celebration of the Centennial of Woodrow Wilson, 1856–1956. The theme thereof is "Freedom for Man—A World Safe for Mankind."

The Woodrow Wilson Foundation relates that even before his death some 200,000 Americans by their own voluntary contributions established the Woodrow Wilson Foundation in recognition of the distinguished services of this great American to the United States of America and to all mankind.

His vision and prayers for a world safe for mankind, and his tireless, dedicated mind, heart and spirit to that end during the time he was the 28th President of the United States; to-wit, 1912–20, was of worldwide significance and impact toward cooperation between freedom-loving peoples:

FREEDOM FOR MAN—A WORLD SAFE FOR MANKIND

Woodrow Wilson has stood preeminently since his death as a world figure; but up to the last decade of his life his main concern was with the life of the American Nation. A political scientist by training, an historian by avocation, an educator by profession, Wilson spent the greater part of his contemplative career in reflection upon the problems of American society and the greater part of his active career in the effort to open up new national possibilities for the American people.

Trained from youth for leadership in a democracy, Wilson stepped upon the political stage as Governor of New Jersey in 1910. Two years later he was setting forth under the banner of the New Freedom the image of a new economic society, a new social age, a new era of human relationships. The old order, he declared, was passing; the preservation—the renewal—of freedom required a government that unfettered the energies of the people, revivifying their generous impulses and restoring to them the control of their own destinies.

Such was the spirit which animated his domestic program when he was elected President in 1912. The Federal Reserve Act, the reduction of the tariff, the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission, the Clayton Antitrust Act were all designed to give back to the people a freedom which he felt had been taken from them by new forms of concentrated power. In the last article he ever wrote he returned characteristically to those benefits "which all normal men desire and must have if they are to be contented and within reach of happiness."

For us today Wilson must stand not alone as the fighter for a new ideal in international relationships. He must stand for the nobility of his vision of America—a nation vibrant in freedom, austere in integrity, limitless in opportunity, earning and vindicating its hopes and ideals for the benefit of all mankind.

Woodrow Wilson led America out onto the world stage. He saw America fail in the great enterprise of the League of Nations; but by the example of his leadership and the imperishable statement of his ideals he left a heritage which will endure as long as the desires of humanity.

He saw America's foreign policy as the extension of its domestic beliefs and ideals; and because he cherished these beliefs passionately, and had fought ardently to give them reality in the context of the new age, he could call for utmost effort in the struggle both to win the war and to shape a vital international order.

The great moment of 1918 passed, the dream of the League of Nations faded; but Woodrow Wilson's inspiration remained as an ideal to be pursued and a faith to be given life. He himself died firm in the belief that America would find its way along the path his vision had marked out. In ways that no man could have foreseen, through another great war and a period of sustained peril, many of Wilson's ideas have indeed been fulfilled.

If it had not been for Woodrow Wilson the United Nations would not now exist as successor to his League of Nations. From the habit of organized cooperation, which these world institutions foster, have come new international concerns for the betterment of the lot of underdeveloped countries and nonself-governing peoples; international participation in aid to refugees and homeless children; sharing of skills and of ideas and cultures; new conviction that prosperity is fostered more by sharing economic progress than by cut-throat trade rivalries; the attempt to harness for peaceful use the dreadful power of the atom.

Above all, Wilson's leadership reminds us that the United States must make good its own claim to liberty and justice—must purify its counsels and vindicate its purpose to make a better life for all its people—if its world role is to be sustained by the struggling masses across the globe.

Socialized Safety of Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, in attempting to justify the bungling of the polio vaccine situation, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby has called up that old specter, socialized medicine. This overworked catch phrase has paralyzed Mrs. Hobby and her Department in every important phase of its work, from narcotics, schools, vaccine distribution and the very safety of the vaccine itself. The shocking failure of our polio innocula-

tion program is highlighted by the efficient program run by Canada. The New York Herald Tribune, continuing its excellent work in this field, carried an account of the Canadian program in its June 19 edition. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the article here and would call the attention of the Members to the quotation from the Canadian Deputy Minister of Health indicating the surprise of the Candians at the lax testing methods employed under the United States plan initially and their decision not to take any more United States vaccine after this was discovered.

The article follows:

"SAFETY, SAFETY, SAFETY"—HOW CANADIANS SOLVED POLIO VACCINE PROBLEM

(By Earl Ubell)

OTTAWA, June 18.—Canada has met the problem of the Salk polio vaccine with foresight, readiness and action.

But government officials who ran the program disclaimed any special aptitudes as they talked with this correspondent this week.

"Touch wood," said Paul Martin, Minister of Health and Welfare. "Nothing happened to our 800,000 vaccinations. It might have if we weren't careful. I've pounded our scientists with safety, safety, safety."

"We were lucky," said Dr. G. D. W. Cameron, Deputy Minister for Health. We double-tested all our vaccine. We accepted some American-made stuff which, to our surprise, was not. We might have taken more."

"Please, I don't want any comparisons made between Americans and Canadians," said Dr. R. D. Defries, head of the University of Toronto's Connaught Laboratories that made all Canadian vaccine. "We did everything the Americans did, nothing more."

It developed, however, that the Canadians did do some things that the United States did not do in its vaccine program. Perhaps it is because they dealt with a total population of 15 million instead of the 165 million in the United States.

FREE TO ALL

They distributed the vaccine free to all children. They had 1 manufacturer instead of 6. They made the vaccine in small easy to control batches. They were ready to move in with polio medical teams in case of a vaccine accident. They double safety-tested every batch. They made only 26 batches.

Probably the most important factor was the government's insistence on safety testing by its new $1 million virus laboratory here headed by Dr. Fred Nagler. It caught four batches with live virus that had slipped by Connaught Laboratories' safety tests.

"We figured it out," said Dr. Nagler, "our double check increased our safety factor 24 fold over what had been suggested by American regulations." In the United States the Government accepted manufacturers safety tests and spot-check samples submitted.

The Canadian virus laboratory has a staff of 30 working full or part time on the polio testing program. The United States Laboratory of Biologics Control had 45 persons on its staff as of April 30, 1955, when the Cutter incident broke and when most of the 6 million shots had moved out of the commercial factories.

FEWER BATCHES

The Canadian service could do the laborious and expensive double-testing because the number of batches was small and it was dealing with a single manufacturer whom it knew intimately. The Canadians also improved the test-tube tissue tests by a variation known as additional subculturing.

Furthermore, Connaught made its vaccine in small batches of about 120 quarts each, compared to the 1,500-quart batches of American commercial manufacturers. The mathematical probability of finding live virus in a small batch is greater than in a large one with a single test.

It is something like trying to fish 1 of 30 guppies out of a bathtub with a small net, or trying to get 1 out of 5 out of a pail with the same net.

At present, the Canadians are undecided whether to adopt the new safety standards established by the United States Public Health Service. Mr. Martin said they are under consideration; Dr. Nagler said the present Canadian methods may be modified.

PLANS LAID EARLY

But aside from the extra scientific precautions the Canadians took, they laid their plans for manufacture and distribution 6 months before April 12, when Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., brought in his report that the vaccine was safe and up to 90 percent effective.

In October Mr. Martin and Dr. Cameron met with the 10 Provincial health ministers. They knew Connaught had been making live virus to be killed in the States by commercial manufacturers for the vaccine field trial.

Rather than let the Connaught operation lie fallow, the Governments decided to give the university laboratory $500,000 for enough vaccine for 750,000 children to be distributed free. Half the cost would be borne by the Provinces, the rest by the Central Ministry.

So Connaught (pronounced with the accent on the first syllable) tooled up and made the vaccine according to the formula set down by Dr. Jonas Salk, the developer, and followed the provisional requirements established by the United States Health Service.

With the care characteristic of a university laboratory, Connaught adhered strictly to Dr. Salk's formula. It cooked the live virus in formaldehyde an average of 9 days, although in the States, commercial manufacturers have been known to cook it for 15 days.

The United States Health Service contended recently that in the hands of the manufacturers, the vaccine does not follow the Salk mathematical equations. A Connaught scientist told me that generally the process, if carried out with precise measurement and control, did go by the formula. Dr. Nagler, however, showed me graphs in which there were slight departures.

COST IS LOW

Connaught made enough vaccine for 800,000 children at $1.25 for a series of 3 shots. The cost is expected to drop soon to 75 cents, and another laboratory at the University of Montreal will be in business by autumn.

Mr. Martin said that by the end of March 1956, 3 million Canadian children will have received either their full or primary vaccination. This is 60 percent of children under 16. All 800,000 children in Canada's first and second grades have already received 2 shots.

At present the central government and the provinces are considering whether to continue inoculations during the summer when polio is at its peak. In Canada, where there are between 2,500 and 8,500 cases a year, the disease characteristically concentrates in specific provinces.

"I don't think we'll give the first shots during the summer," Dr. Cameron said. "We'll start up again in the fall with boosters and primary vaccination"

NOT "STATE MEDICINE"

Plans for the vaccination program were made both at the October meeting and again in January. The local and Federal ministers decided to go ahead with the vaccination even if Dr. Francis reported the vaccine as having a low effectiveness but high safety. They wanted to continue the scientific work.

The ministers also decided to set up flying teams of polio specialists to follow up any accidents from vaccination. This proved to be a good move. One case that followed vaccination was shown not to be polio; another post-vaccination case was demonstrated to have begun before injection. Public hysteria was averted, Mr. Martin said.

Mr. Martin vigorously defends his free vaccine program.

"That is not state medicine," Mr. Martin, himself a recovered polio victim, said. "Polio is a communicable disease, and control of such diseases is a government responsibility. Besides, we have in this country a long tradition of supplying certain drugs and vaccines free. We give streptomycin to TB victims."

So far no public or medical opposition has developed in Canada against the vaccine program, probably because the Health and Welfare Ministry plays such a big part in Canadian life.

This ministry spends $1,200 million a year, including family allowances, and it is the biggest item next to defense in the Canadian budget. The United States spends $2,500 million a year, the sixth highest agency budget.

We and Our Western Allies Will Do Well To Follow the Hardheaded Advice and Example of Chancellor Adenauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Chalmers M. Roberts:

DEEP FEELING PROMPTS ADENAUER'S "GO SLOW"

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

NEW YORK, June 16.—West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer came to the United States to throw a polite but firmly held bucket of cold water on the "peace is bustin' out all over" idea.

The Chancellor's central theme in his talks with President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in Washington, and with Dulles and the British and French Foreign Ministers here in New York may be summarized this way:

The Soviet Union is weak internally. Hence her leaders may now be ready to make major, even enormous, concessions, if the Western pressure is not now relaxed.

The West, therefore, must not go overboard in responding to the Soviet peace gestures. It is not yet time to respond by offering concessions. The Russians thus far, in Churchill's phrase, have "only stopped doing what they shouldn't have been doing anyway."

The West must not show its hand too quickly. Certainly it would be foolish to lay out detailed plans before the Summit meeting next month in Geneva. The first real test of negotiations will come at the Foreign Ministers meeting to follow the Head-of-Government Conference. This does not exclude, however, new general statements of Western principles which must relate a German unification plan, East-West security, and armament.

Adenauer was alarmed several weeks ago at the President's casual press conference reference to the neutrality idea in Central Europe. He took it as an indication of the swing in American thinking, knowing the mercurial nature of American opinion. And he knew that Washington's policy stand will be the key to the West's position in the coming talks with Russia.

Hence he came to Washington and New York to drive home his point. He believes, as he said in Washington on Tuesday, that this is an extraordinarily important moment. Above all, the believes that the switch in Soviet tactics has been due to the West's success in putting through the Paris pacts which tie West Germany to the Atlantic alliance.

Adenauer reembers that not only the Social Democrats but many in his own coalition government felt he was going too far and was burning the bridge to Moscow. Now Moscow is calling him a statesman and inviting him to the Soviet capital. And Moscow indicates that the East German Communist regime is expendable.

If the pressure is kept on the Russians, Adenauer feels, real concessions can be won and a genuine settlement will in time be possible to the great advantage of both the West in general and Germany in particular. It was for this reason that Adenauer wanted the joint public statement with the President flatly rejecting neutrality for Germany.

And it was for this reason that Adenauer told the press on Tuesday that the free world faces "what may be a long period of negotiations, negotiations with an opponent for whom the factor of time does not exist."

The depth of this Adenauer feeling was best demonstrated by his references to Asia, references which puzzled many diplomats.

Adenauer deliberately invoked American emotion about Red China to drive home his point. In effect, he was saying: For you Americans there is an additional reason for caution. You are alarmed about the Peiping regime. Well, don't forget that the Communist enemy is indivisible—if you let up in Europe now before winning real concessions; you will only make trouble for yourselves in Asia, because Moscow can easily shift arms to China if the heat is off in Europe.

To emphasize this feeling of make-haste-slowly, Adenauer indicated he was in no hurry to go to Moscow, that full preparations must come first. Let the mountain come again to Mohammed. Meanwhile, the West should add another card to its hand by making a beginning on the German rearmament this summer and fall.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Housing in Many Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the United States Housing and Home Finance Agency, before the International Real Estate Federation in Geneva, Switzerland, on June 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ALBERT M. COLE, ADMINISTRATOR, UNITED STATES HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, TO THE INTERNATIONAL REAL ESTATE FEDERATION, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, JUNE 16, 1955.

I am happy to have this opportunity of speaking to this international gathering concerned with the provision of more and better housing for many people in many lands.

Here housing takes on a new dimension—a world dimension. Each of us, with our interest and attention largely fixed on our national problems at home, can take a new perspective in our work. We are reminded of the common purposes we seek to serve and the mutual advantage we can take by greater cooperation and understanding in the international field.

We have tried to promote such a cooperative interchange between the United States and other countries through the International Activities Staff of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which I head. We have sought to develop a free trade of knowledge and techniques—a two-way exchange of housing experience as much for our benefit as for that of other lands.

I have also had some personal introduction to the housing economies of Europe. A few years ago, when I was in the United States Congress, I was a member of a special committee that spent several weeks observing housing activities and programs in Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and France. It was an enlightening and stimulating inspection.

But I do not put myself forward as an expert in your housing and real-estate affairs. I will not presume to tell you what measures you should undertake to serve your own needs. Instead, I will talk to you about some of our problems and efforts in the United States, a field in which I can speak with some authority, in the hope that our experience will be of some value to you.

Much of what we have done and are doing in the United States has its origins in our European heritage, both in tools and ideas. Our country was settled and developed with axes and plows brought over from Europe, and refashioned to serve the requirements of the New World. And our traditions of freedom stemmed from the roots implanted by freedom-loving peoples in this part of the world.

In return for what we borrowed from you, perhaps there are now some things in our own experience that you may find suited to your modern needs and helpful in your own economies. You, of course, will be the best judge of that.

Housing is an intensively individual commodity that varies within even a narrow geographic range; and much more so on a world basis. But its individuality of form is in itself an expression of its similarity of purpose in all lands where freedom is prized, wherever the family and the individual are the all-important end to be served.

In a free world the home is the heart of freedom. Deeply rooted in our beliefs and written unmistakably into the Bill of Rights of our American Constitution is the concept, which had its origins in Europe, that a man's home must be inviolate. No arm of government, no power of police may reach into a man's home against his will, except by due process of law established and sanctioned by the people themselves.

Today we value this individual right more than ever, as we see the tyrannies of our present era turn free homes into cell-blocks of the state and the citizens into its prisoners. We do not want to have loose in this modern world the surly power that strikes terror into the hearts of the people with a knock on the door in the dark of night.

This is a peril that we understand. When the free home is invaded by the steel voice and the iron boot in any free land, we understand that our own thresholds are endangered and our own freedom is at stake. This, more than anything in the American citizen's heart, has sent him to join you in your battles for the freedom of person and home. It impels him to stand with you today against the threats and enticements of modern despotism.

It has been said that war begins in the minds of men. And it is also true that devotion to peace and liberty begins in the homes of men. A man who has a home of his own, also has a family, a community, and a nation that are his own. He has a real stake in a stable, peaceful world, in which he can work out his life's pattern to its fullest.

The freedom of a people is only the multiplied product of the free citizen in a free home. Where the door of that home may be smashed in at will by the gun butt of the police state and the family dragged off to an untold fate, freedom has been submerged.

But freedom is not just something to have—it is something to use. And the home, in our beliefs, means more than security—more than a place of refuge or a place to hide. The home is also a place to live and grow and to develop the strength and talents of the people. It is the essential basic piece out of which the mosaic of national character, culture, and progress is made.

We forbid the Government to trespass on our homes and private lives. But we expect the Government to be concerned about our opportunities to have homes, better homes, and to enable us to share in the Nation's rising standard of living. Within its clearly defined sphere of authority and responsibility, we believe the Government can and should strengthen and support the opportunities of all people to better their housing; to improve their living conditions, within the framework of free communities and free enterprise.

This is the philosophy of housing and community growth that we have established in the United States. It has been firmly secured and implemented under the new and reorganized housing policies and programs put into effect, with the approval of the Congress, by President Eisenhower.

Let me tell you about some of the principal responsibilities that our Government has in housing and related fields, and their relationship to the people and to private enterprise.

Housing in the United States has traditionally been, and still remains, the function of the private-enterprise system. This is the system that we believe in because it serves us best and is consistent with our belief that Government must be the servant and the aide of the people—not their master, nor even the benefactor to whom they must look for the blessings of life.

For the past quarter of a century, however, Government responsibility for the people's housing welfare has been recognized and accepted in various forms. Only in such an emergency as the war, however, has Government been granted the temporary power to control and direct the housing economy. And that power was quickly terminated when the war ended.

Many things have been tried, some discarded, some retained, most of them modified or revised. They have been shaped into what today is a basically consistent and well-defined set of limited aids, geared to private effort and local citizen decision.

In its supplementary role, the Government, with a few minor and special exceptions, does not build homes, does not make loans, and does not give subsidies to individuals to buy homes. Indirectly, however, through established private market channels, it helps to make adequate home financing available on terms that most people can afford. It also extends certain loans and subsidies to local governments for special needs, such as the clearance of slums and prevention of blight, and for the improvement of housing for low-income families.

In the limits of this talk, I cannot discuss all of our Government housing activities. I will, therefore, center on certain ones that I believe will be of most interest to you and of greatest value in terms of your own problems and responsibilities.

Let me first make clear, however, that while many of our Government programs developed separately over the years, they are today linked and coordinated in their administration and use, with common objectives. Nearly all of the major housing and related activities—except the GI home loan program under the Veterans' Administration—are embraced in the framework of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. As Administrator of this Agency, it is my primary task under the direction of the President, to coordinate and supervise the Agency's various programs.

The Federal Government first entered the housing field in a significant way through the financing field, and this still is the principal channel through which it undertakes to assist and maintain the housing market. Home financing through most of our history had been a kind of economic stepchild in

our economy. Its particular requirements were largely ignored or neglected in the development of our financial practices.

Because of this, investment in homes was subject to violent fluctuation and the risk was high both to the lender and the borrower. The great dream of the average American family, as it still is today, to own its own home was constantly thwarted and endangered by the lack of adequate and assured low-risk financing. The housing industry itself, for the same reason, was an uncertain, in-and-out business that failed to keep pace with our other great productive advances.

The initial need, which became an urgent one after the mortgage market was demorized following the 1929 depression, was for a stable, assured source of home mortgage financing. As a result, the Home Loan Bank System was created in 1932. It was designed to stabilize and encourage the growth of mutual savings and building groups which had existed, but often failed, for a century.

These savings and loan associations, as we call them, are local institutions. They derive their funds not in competition with other needs from the great centers of investment capital, but from the great mass of unassembled savings of the local citizens. They invest these savings in residential mortgages for the housing needs of the average citizen in the locality.

This assembling of relatively small investments from the local people has been eminently successful. It may suggest a source of mortgage capital to other countries for the financing of homes, and the encouragement of savings and thrift.

The individual investments can be and in most cases are small, even $100 or less, and the average individual account is less than $2,000.

Today, however, these institutions currently finance about 40 percent of new home construction and existing home purchase. Total investments are well over the $20 billion figure, and the number of individual investment accounts more than 8 million.

Here is what the Government, through the Home Loan Bank System, has done to make this source of mortgage capital secure and attractive both to the small investor and the average homebuyer.

Funds are made available through a reserve credit pool, independent of the commercial bank system, and extended through a system of 11 regional home loan banks under the supervision of the Home Loan Bank Board. They are advanced to members on terms up to 10 years. This provides a steady flow of capital and credit in line with mortgage market needs, and protection against sudden area or local contractions in economic and financing conditions.

In addition, through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, also operating under the Board, individual investors in these institutions are insured against loss up to $10,000.

Although the initial capital for the system was provided by the Government, this has now been largely paid off and replaced by capital from the participating institutions. The Government continues, however, to support the system by agreement to advance funds if necessary should conditions make this necessary.

No Government funds, however, are directly involved in the operations; the system is self-supporting.

Today there are 4,200 member institutions under the Home Loan Bank System. Their mortgage investments until a year ago were limited to a maximum of $20,000, but to reflect changing cost levels, this has now been increased to $35,000. Total assets of these institutions are now about $26 billion.

Up to the end of last year, cumulative advances made to members totaled $6 billion, of which more than $5 billion had been repaid. About 2,000 borrowing institutions had a balance owing to the Federal Home Loan Banks of $867 million at the end of 1954.

Some of these institutions are directly chartered by the Federal Government. Others are chartered by their respective States.

But a new, stable source of mortgage financing was only part of the need to encourage and secure the building of good homes and the opportunity for people to buy them. Mortgage financing practices in the past had been based not on long-term security, but on short-term, high-risk loans. The average mortgage in earlier days was for a short term, was not amortized, and carried a relatively high interest rate. When money became tight, forced foreclosures resulted in heavy losses both to borrowers and lenders.

To make mortgage lending for the average family sound and available and to improve housing standards and stimulate building, the Federal Housing Administration was established in 1934. This program provides Government insurance, under a mutual system, for private home loans. These include loans both for new and existing homes, as well as for rental and cooperative housing, and also short-term loans for the repair and modernization of homes.

This, too, is a self-supporting system, financed through premiums, but with Government credit behind it. Requiring a relatively small down payment, it underwrites private mortgages for terms up to 30 years at moderate interest rates. These are amortized mortgages which are paid off, both as to principal and interest, through moderate monthly payments. The FHA type of mortgage has proved so successful that it is now the standard for mortgages made for all types of home loans in the United States.

The general adoption of this type of financing has greatly stimulated home building and resulted in a rapid rise in home ownership in the country. Home ownership has now reached 56 percent of all housing compared to about 40 percent 15 years ago. The housing market demand has been greatly enlarged to embrace the great mass of American families, and the housing industry has become a large, well organized part of our economy. The handicraft methods of construction have been superseded by large-scale, mass operation in our urban centers.

Today the dominant force in mass building is the operative builder, who builds homes in large numbers, developing large tracts—sometimes entire communities—with the assurance that financing will be available for the homebuyer to buy his home and that this will be a profitable venture. Builders producing more than 100 homes a year accounted for more than one-third of the new homes built in 1949. This compares with only 11 percent for the same group 10 years earlier.

The FHA has been an important influence in this growth, both directly and indirectly. Since it started in 1934, the FHA has insured mortgages covering nearly 4 million sale and rental units, totaling nearly $23 billion. Losses have been negligible and repayments far in advance of schedule. About $13 billion of the mortgages insured are currently outstanding.

The veterans home-loan program, established in 1944, is basically similar to the FHA program. In this case, however, the Government directly guarantees private loans. It also pays administrative costs and losses, which thus far have been minor. The terms are in some respects more liberal. They permit the veterans to buy homes with no downpayment.

Under the veterans program a total of more than 3½ million home loans, amounting to nearly $26 billion, had been guaranteed through 1954. Almost $18 billion was still outstanding.

However, even though the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration are important sources of financing for moderate and lower-cost homes, they still represent only 27 percent of total outstanding home mortgages. Conventional loans, which carry no Government insurance or guarantee, provide the majority of home financing. The principal types of home-mortgage lenders are savings and loan associations, mortgage companies, commercial banks, mutual savings banks, insurance companies, and individuals.

To assure a steady long-term market for FHA and VA home loans, the Federal National Mortgage Association operates as another agency within the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The FNMA buys and sells such mortgages, according to the capacity of the private investment market to absorb them. Last year Congress reorganized this operation, to make private capital its normal source of funds. However, Government support is permitted for special needs where private financing is not adequate.

We have achieved, I believe, what for our economy is a basically sound and successful approach to the production and marketing of homes in the United States for the benefit of the great mass of our people. Since 1949 we have been building new homes in our nonfarm areas at the rate of more than a million units a year, with as many as 1,300,000 possible this year. I believe we will continue to produce homes—good homes—at approximately this rate, and even higher, for many years to come.

We haven't licked all our problems, however. We still have not found a satisfactory solution to our lowest-income housing needs. We have extended subsidies to local communities to provide about 450,000 units of locally owned housing for this purpose to date. We are continuing to do this on a restricted basis, not only because of the low-income problem but because of larger, community problems that are tied into it. We are developing, however, other means for meeting these needs through private effort. We hope that this will enable us to eventually remove Government substantially from the field of housing subsidy.

All of our efforts, however, are not concerned with the individual home and homeowner. We also have some very pressing problems involving the community of homes—the towns and the metropolitan cities which are the nerve centers of our modern economy and which create the environment in which most of our people must live.

The United States has long been a country in a hurry. You more patient people in Europe have often told us that. Like the white rabbit in Alice in Wonderland, we've been rushing along fearing that we were already late for the party, and having neither time nor patience to listen and to look behind or about us.

In recent years, however, we've been forced to stop and look around. We've been stopped by the very congestion that our rapid progress has piled up in the heart of our cities. We've been hindered by the financial dilemmas that have been saddled on our fast-growing but fast-deteriorating communities, and by the double burden of providing homes for our growing population and of correcting the blighted housing of much of our existing supply.

These are problems not unlike those in many of your European centers. In the United States they have grown too large, under our system, for local and private resources alone to deal with. We have concluded that Federal help is appropriate and

necessary to supplement these resources; to correct our urban deficiencies and to assure the health and solvency of our modern economy.

After some earlier partial starts to meet this need, we developed last year, at the urging of the President, a full-scale program of cooperative Federal help with local communities and private enterprises. Our aim is not only to clear and redevelop the rundown, slum sections of our cities, but also to restore declining areas and prevent and seal off the future spread of blight.

It is one of the most imaginative and dynamic national efforts we have ever undertaken. And it has called forth an enthusiastic and active response from American communities and American industry.

The program itself, which we now call a program for urban renewal, begins and remains with the local community and private enterprise. They initiate the plans, undertake complete analysis and proposed treatments of their problems. These may require either full-scale clearance and redevelopment of parts of the city, a rehabilitation or preventive measures in less seriously affected areas, or a combination of both.

The Federal Government, at the community's request, then is authorized to make loans and grants to local agencies for the clearing and replanning. Special assistance is also provided for overall and specific planning, both in metropolitan areas and in smaller towns.

The reconstruction or rehabilitation of these areas, however, is undertaken by private enterprise, or by local bodies, depending on the type of redevelopment. Through the Federal Housing Administration, special insurance of private loans is provided for financing the redevelopment and rehabilitation of these renewal areas by private enterprise. Special insurance is also extended to underwrite low-cost new or rehabilitated private housing for the rehousing needs of lower-income families displaced by these and related activities. Public housing subsidies also are still available, on a limited basis, for rehousing low-income families who, as yet, cannot otherwise be adequately cared for.

Nearly 300 communities, from small towns of a few thousand to great cities like New York and Chicago, are actively participating under this and preceding programs. About 7,000 acres of urban blight and slums, involving nearly 100,000 dwelling units, are or soon will be under actual clearance.

But this, large as it is, is only the beginning, only a small part of all that has to be done. The greater effort, the community-wide attack, under the full program has only just started.

I want particularly to say that in this communitywide and nationwide movement to redeem and restore our urban areas, the real estate profession—the realtor as we know him—has been, for years, in the forefront of our leadership. Many of the most active community programs now underway have been spearheaded by the realtor group.

In much of this housing and community progress in our country, the real estate profession has been a powerful generating force. It has not only carried through on the programs that have been put into effect, but in many cases has led the way and generated the strength that brought these efforts into existence.

The realtor in our country stands at a strategic focal point in our housing economy—the point at which the lender, the seller, the buyer, and also the local official are brought together and their respective interests combined into an accomplished result. Without his skills and knowledge, the housing economy we have sought to shape would be likely a finely designed train with no track to run upon.

Our thinking has also broadened to recognize that housing is more than individual shelters—it is a whole community, a soundly planned community. The urban planner was, not too long ago, regarded with something like suspicion as a man who wanted to keep us from doing what we wanted to do. Today, however, he is a sought-after specialist, as our urban communities frantically ask him to come in and disentangle them from the unplanned results of some of our past speedy growth.

I do not mean to give you the idea that we have somehow waved a wand over the United States and made all our problems disappear. Come visit us, and while you will see a great deal that is modern and well planned, you will not be able to miss some of the problems and deficiencies I have talked about. But what you will find, in nearly all our communities, is that something is being done about them—active, positive undertakings are being developed to correct these conditions and solve these problems in the foreseeable future.

There are many reasons why the people of the United States are concerned, and have undertaken comprehensive action in the housing and community field. Housing is a very vital part of our whole economy, and represents one of the major fields of economic activity, employment, and income to our people. It is also an essential determining factor in our social structure; if neglected, it aggravates our problems of crime, delinquency, sanitation, and health.

But these considerations alone would not account for the widespread popular concern and support that the measures now underway have won among the American people. More fundamental is the American citizen's deep-seated belief that the home, the free home, is the nucleus of a free country and a free people. He will defend his home against the despoilers of freedom abroad in the world today, and he is now equally determined to protect the home and his way of life against the corrosive effect of neglect and inaction.

In the end, all our housing, all our community improvement efforts have one end purpose in mind—not the house, not the city, but rather the family and the citizen and their way of life.

It has been a distinct privilege for me to give you this very condensed, but I hope useful review of some of our major efforts and problems in the housing and community field in the United States. I hope it will serve as a small, part payment of a long-standing obligation we owe to the ideas and ideals that have come to us from your lands and have become a part of our free way of life in America.

What the Asians Expect of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there is an old proverb, "When your friends speak, listen with care."

Our country has no stancher friend in Asia than Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippine Commonwealth. We would do well, I think, to heed any advice this brilliant statesman has to offer. With this preface, I present an article, What Asians Expect of Us, by Ambassador Romulo, which appeared in the New York Times magazine last Sunday:

WHAT THE ASIANS EXPECT OF US

The Bandung Conference showed in Asia and Africa a strong prodemocratic alignment and a considerable reservoir of good will toward the United States. But it also underlined a fact that Americans should know: The United States is not as popular with many of the Asians and the Africans as her friends would want her to be. Private conversations with delegates made me realize, more deeply than ever, the need of bolstering American prestige among the peoples represented at the Conference.

I

I will try to reproduce as closely and as objectively as possible what I heard from delegates who opened their hearts to me in the hope that I could answer their questions or help them out of their bafflement regarding certain American attitudes and policies they seemed unable to understand.

Criticism No. 1: Americans continually talk of freedom and human rights. But they have supported the colonial policies of France, England, Belgium, and other colonial powers. They abstain in the United Nations whenever the questions of Cyprus, Tunisia, Algiers, and Morocco come up for decision. In the U. N. Trusteeship Council they have adopted an amorphous attitude on fundamental questions affecting non-self-governing peoples. How can you believe in the sincerity of the Americans when their preachments and protestations do not jibe with their policy and actions?

Criticism No. 2: The Americans talk big. They speak of the billions they have poured into Europe. They continually mention the Marshall plan and how it saved the Europeans. They refer to the astronomical figures in their foreign-aid program. But their aid to Asia and Africa comes intermittently and in an amount that is chicken feed. What is worse, it comes with the accompaniment of senatorial lectures on how we must be grateful and how imperative it is for us to realize the advantages of the American way of life. And so on. Must Asia and Africa be content with crumbs and must we be told what a great favor is being conferred on us?

Criticism No. 3: The Americans are so obfuscated by their hatred of communism they cannot think straight. Anticommunism in the United States is a new form of national hysteria. The Americans' fear of communism is shown by the ease with which they are swayed by demagogs who rise in popular favor by exploiting communism as a national issue. How can we follow the leadership of a nation so unsure of itself?

Criticism No. 4: Can those of us whose security is linked with America's be certain that when the showdown comes the United States will not abandon us and withdraw to the American mainland? She did that in the Second World War. She pulled out of the Philippines and left her Asian ally in Bataan and Corregidor. She recently made Chiang Kai-shek give up the Tachen Islands. We always read in American newspapers statements and editorials about "Let the Asians fight the Asians." In the light of all this, is it safe for any Asian nation to anchor its national security to American pledges?

Criticism No. 5: Why do Americans constantly boast of the superiority of the American way of life? It has its advantages and its blessings no doubt, but what is good for the American people does not necessarily have to be good for us. Our way of life, which we have had for 2,000 years, may not offer the prosperity of the 200-year-old United States, but there is something in maturity that cannot be bought with dollars

or achieved with chewing gum, hot dogs, and comic strips.

Criticism No. 6: The latest expression of American materialism is not Hollywood; it is the nuclear weapon. Americans think that because they have superiority in this weapon of destruction they can stand alone and need not exert any effort to make friends or win allies. In fact, they are so ready for war they do not want to talk or enter into any negotiations. They are spoiling for a fight. This was the general reaction of most Conference delegates when the initial reply of the State Department to Chou En-lai's offer to negotiate the Formosan question was received in Bandung.

II

The Bandung Conference has served to encourage the recent tendency to consider the problems of Asia and Africa with a new sense of their urgency and importance. But the rediscovery of the importance of Asia particularly has come somewhat belatedly to America, and then only as a result of the gravest setback that the free world has suffered since the beginning of the cold war, the loss of China.

Measured in strictly material terms—in terms, that is to say, which would most impress the pragmatic Western mind—Asia and Africa are vastly important. They have more than half the population of the world and they possess a substantial portion of the world's natural resources, including certain vital raw materials of which they have a monopoly. And Asia, especially its southern and eastern regions, has now a strategic value which is highly coveted in the struggle for power.

Yet, it is precisely this habit of applying a purely material yardstick to Asia and Africa which has led to a grievous misunderstanding between the western nations and the peoples of the East. It is the root cause of the criticisms of the United States in the Asian mind and of the lowering of America's prestige in the East.

The American attitude toward Asia and Africa is still colored by the same predominantly material considerations which originally motivated the western approach toward Asia. In this view Asia is still primarily a theater of the cold war, a potentially valuable ally in a shooting war, a major factor in global military strategy, a rich and populous region that must be kept in the camp of the democracies and on the side of the free world.

Although this judgment may seem valid and sufficient for the purposes of the United States and the West, it does not seem so to the Asians and Africans themselves. The recognition and acceptance of this difference in viewpoint is a basic condition for the revaluation of the relations between the United States and its western allies and the peoples of Asia and Africa. And the revaluation must be made before those relations deteriorate beyond repair.

III

How many of the criticisms made against the United States are justified? I do not believe that in this article it will serve any useful purpose to sift the justified from the unjustified criticisms. What is really important is for America to know what are the criticisms that are leveled at the American people by the Asians and Africans and to pinpoint the causes of the lowering of American prestige in that half of the world. However, on the basis of the criticisms I heard in Bandung, it is possible to draw certain general conclusions:

There are a number of American assumptions, or myths, about Asia which must be set aside in the interest of better understanding. One of these is the assumption that democracy of the American type is, or should be, preferred and accepted by the Asian peoples. But democracy is not native to Asia. Asian society, for long ages, has rested upon a solid authoritarian base, heavily overgrown with custom, tradition, and ritual.

To describe this situation is not to defend it and—need I say—this does not apply to my own country, the Philippines. But it is important during these critical times that assumptions of this kind be avoided lest they lead to dangerous miscalculations in the dealings of the United States and Asia.

The appeal of democracy as we of the free world understand the term is not general in Asia or Africa by any means. Therefore, the missionary zeal with which the advantages of democracy are being brought to the attention of the Asian and African peoples must rest on faith plus something else. That something else is none other than actual good works.

To peoples who have known little or no freedom for centuries, who have lived for ages in a state of poverty and hunger, the high shine and polish which our propaganda has given to democracy can hold no special attractions. These peoples will judge political and economic systems only in terms that have a concrete bearing on their daily lives: first, on what they have to do with the freedom movements among the still subject peoples of Asia and Africa; second, on what they are disposed and able to do to help raise the living standards of the Asian and African peoples.

To see Asia through Asian eyes and Africa through African eyes—that is the prime requisite for American policy toward Asia and Africa. You cannot assume that a policy which works satisfactorily in Europe will work equally well in Asia and Africa. Nor, on the other hand, can you do one thing in Asia and Africa and then cancel that by promptly doing something contradictory in Europe. There must be a judicious adaptation of methods and parallel planning that will avoid discrimination, confusion, and waste.

The American tendency to brand any nationalist movements whatever in Asia and Africa as communistic rests on another of those assumptions which urgently need to be examined. There are unquestionably nationalist movements in Asia which are Communist-led or which are abetted by the Communists. But this fact does not necessarily invalidate the intrinsic quality of the genuine nationalist movements in the region.

What has often happened is that those movements, though originally sprung from a people's natural aspirations to freedom, were subsequently taken away by the politically sly and ruthless Communists from the hands of the timid and confused liberals who lacked prompt and effective support from their friends in the United States and the rest of the Western World. We lose battles this way by default, and will continue losing them until we stop condemning all those movements indiscriminately and dissociating ourselves from them.

Time has assuaged the bitterness which colonialism has bred among the Asian and Africal peoples. The Bandung Conference has shown that.

It is also true that we of Asia and Africa would rather keep our old friends than risk new ties with strangers. The peoples of Asia and Africa must be shown, however, that the old friends are friends indeed. And they must be shown this against the background of the irreversible march of nationalism in Asia and Africa and against the insistent clamor of their peoples for more decent standards of living.

IV

Specifically, then, what can the United States do now to enhance American prestige in Asia and Africa? What, in the opinion of her Asian and African friends, can be done to correct the impressions, true or false, that have gained currency in Asia and Africa about America and the American people?

(1) It is suggested that a resolution be passed by the United States Congress asserting a policy of support for other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence—this policy to be followed in the U. N. and in America's foreign programs. Such an expression of the official stand of the American people, if actually implemented, will effectively refute the charge that America is supporting colonialism. Majority Floor Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK's resolution to this effect should be passed without delay.

(2) Americans, in their prosperity, should not overlook the fact that there is poverty and misery and squalor in Asia and Africa. These nations lack capital and they have a very limited dollar exchange because of trade policies which they blame on the United States. There is a dearth of technical skill, and when such skill comes from America it should not be bestowed as a favor but as a joint effort between two partners, since Asia and Africa are potentially rich in natural resources.

(3) More restraint should be exercised in the publication of projected grandiose aid programs that seldom amount to much after they go through the congressional sieve. Such programs encourage false hopes in Asia and Africa, and when a limited aid is finally approved it is received with disappointment instead of gratitude. Moreover, the technical and economic assistance given by the United States must be administered by men who understand the needs of the recipient countries and who can work in cooperation with the native officials.

(4) There should be a new orientation in American military strategy in Asia. The Manila Treaty, with commitment of troops, is toothless. Some Asians point to NATO and say: "Why can't a similar plan, on a smaller scale, be prepared for Asia?" They know that the American forces in Asia are not sufficient to cope with the new responsibilities demanded by increasing Communist threats of aggression. The military aid being given to countries that have shown their determination and ability to fight communism should be stepped up. There is quite a gap between promised aid and deliveries and this should not be allowed to continue.

Asian allies should be taken into the confidence of their western partners. The exclusion of Asians from military talks between the United States, England, France, Australia, and New Zealand should not be repeated. Since the Manila Treaty considers infiltration and subversion as overt aggression, it is up to the United States, because of its resources and technical skill, to take the lead in conducting researches on how to counter infiltration and subversion by military as well as by other means.

(5) Unemployment continues to grow more acute in Asia. Unemployment is one of communism's best allies. Many Asian countries have strategic materials that America needs. The United States should negotiate long-term contracts to buy from such countries and thus help bolster their sagging finances. At the same time, the dumping of American surplus products in Asia, such as rice—which has done irreparable harm to surplus rice-producing countries like Thailand—must be avoided. Also in the Philippines, for example, United States agencies there should give preferences to construction and other materials manufactured in the country.

(6) There should be less publicity about nuclear tests, and more restraint and sobriety should be exercised in talking about new weapons. The impression must not be given that America is trying to frighten the world with its might.

7. There should be a growing awareness among American politicians of the fact that

the United States is today's world leader, that statements made at home for domestic consumption are read in Asia and Africa almost at the same time they are read in Kalamazoo or in Oskaloosa. When read abroad, these statements assume great importance in the eyes of foreigners, and some of them badly misrepresent the American people.

Fear of communism in the United States has certainly not assumed the proportions of a national hysteria. Yet that is the impression created abroad by the statements and attitudes of American politicians who prate and rant about communism with an eye single to garnering votes.

V

All the foregoing suggestions can be summarized in four words: America must be herself. As the child of revolution, America must seize the revolutionary initiative in Asia and Africa. America has helped the world not only with generosity but with largesse. She has fought wars beyond her borders and has sought no territories. No victor has been more generous to the vanquished foe.

And America can be humble, as exemplified by a former First Lady of the United States when she arrived in India for a visit. An Indian statesman told me the story in Bandung:

"As Mrs. Roosevelt landed at the airport in New Delhi, she was met by a group of journalists. They expected a long statement from such a distinguished visitor. When asked what she had to say, she replied: 'I came to learn.' That unusual display of American humility did more to enhance American prestige in India than anything I can remember."

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I was asked by Mrs. W. C. Harllee, president of the District of Columbia division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, to make a speech on the life and character of our beloved Jefferson Davis. I said many things regarding our great President of the Confederacy that are not in the prepared speech. As a matter of fact, there is no way to tell of all the wonderful things this great man did during his lifetime.

I wish every man in this Congress could have met the wonderful women from practically every State in the Union who attended the ceremonies in Statuary Hall, right under the dome of our Capitol, with not only Jeff Davis, but also another great hero, Robert E. Lee, standing there side by side, like the Rock of Gibraltar; and it seems to me that Stonewall Jackson's statue should be right there side by side with these other great American heroes, but, of course, there is not room in this great Statuary Hall for all of our great heroes who have gone to their rewards. The only place I know that could hold them all is heaven itself, and, of course, that is where we will all meet them sooner or later. There is so much one could say that will never be said about Jeff Davis, because you could be talking about this marvelous man and his life and character as long as you live, but even in that length of time you could never properly present it.

I do remember so vividly when I was a small boy that my father had our family of 7 boys and 3 girls, along with my precious, marvelous mother, on the steps of the capitol at Montgomery, Ala., where there is a marker showing the spot where Jeff Davis was sworn in as President of the Confederacy. Then, just across the street there is the Confederate White House—such a beautiful building that my kinsman, Mary Boykin Chestnut, helped design. Her husband, like Jeff Davis, was a United States Senator, and like Jeff Davis, resigned from the United States Senate to go and fight for the "lost cause." Senator, or General Chestnut, our kinsman's husband, lost both eyes in one of the hundreds of battles that were fought during these long, terrible 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein a part of my speech made in Statuary Hall on June 3, 1955, and the invocation and benediction by Rev. Vladimir E. Hartman:

PRAYERS GIVEN AT THE 147TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JEFFERSON DAVIS, STATUARY HALL, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, JUNE 3, 1955

INVOCATION

"Let us now praise famous men,
And our fathers that begat us."

Eternal God, our Father and our King in whom our fathers trusted and found their faith rewarded by thy gracious care, bless us today as we commemorate the valor and sacrifices of Jefferson Davis.

We thank Thee for the brave men who in time of conflict were ready to lay down their lives if need be in the cause of liberty and righteousness. We thank Thee for what they did and suffered on our behalf, in unflinching loyalty in order that popular self-government might not perish from the earth. Unite all the people of this Nation in a holy purpose to defend the principles of freedom and brotherhood for which they lived and died. And may the Nation which they helped to establish on an enduring foundation be ever true to the great ideals of the founders, and gain increasing prosperity as it offers to all beneath its flag justice and equal rights.

We thank Thee for the United Daughters of the Confederacy, for the ideals they cherish and for the values they perpetuate.

Bless us and guide us in this service. We pray in the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

Madam President and members of the District of Columbia Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, we are gathered here today to commemorate the 147th birthday anniversary of Jefferson Davis, President of the Southern Confederacy and leader of the South's beloved Lost Cause.

This man, Jefferson Davis, was a unique, gallant figure in the most spectacular era of our Nation's history. Around this soldierly, graceful man from Mississippi swirled great, impelling drama. Under his leadership the South waged a 4-year struggle for independence that will eternally be part of the magnificent heritage of every man and woman born under southern skies.

Today Jefferson Davis is the symbol of a valorous, fiery past, of broken hopes and shattered dreams, of a would-be republic whose Stars and Bars once floated from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. The cause to which he and 15 million people dedicated their hearts and souls was a failure, though it perished in such a sea of glory that its memory will evoke the world's admiration to the end of time.

Jefferson Davis was statesman, soldier, political leader, planter and, above and in all things, a gentleman. His enemies have charged him with treason. If Jefferson Davis was guilty of treason, this same guilt must rest on peerless Robert E. Lee, dauntless Stonewall Jackson and hosts of immortal leaders who wore the gray of the Confederacy. Even the Father of his Country was charged with treason because he led a ragged, starving army of Americans fighting for freedom.

Blame Jefferson Davis as they will they can never take from him the glory that he was an American citizen, who shed his blood for his country and who captained his people in a revolution founded on principles the South had held sacred and inviolate for almost a century. Nor can they deny that though abused and maligned, cast into prison and crucified with indignities, he accepted his fate unflinchingly and bore his sufferings with the fortitude of the soldier and Christian that he was. He had fought the fight and lost. Defeated, he would abide by the decision as did Lee, Beauregard, Hampton, and that amazing galaxy of Confederate chieftains who followed the Southern Cross through the smoke and thunder of a thousand battles.

Never once in the years after the fall of the Confederacy did Jefferson Davis retreat from his fundamental belief in the basic right of secession. Nor would he accept a pardon from President Johnson for something he felt in his heart was not wrong.

"As for me," he said, "our cause was so just, so sacred, that had I known all that is come to pass, had I known what was to be inflicted upon me, all that my country was to suffer, all that our posterity was to endure, I would do it all over again."

Let me recall for you the last inspiring message that fell from the lips of Jefferson Davis. Unfortunately, it is known to too few today. It was 1888, the year before he died. He was asked for a message to the youth of the South. Standing in the bright Mississippi sunshine he gave this exhortation to the young men who would carry on the new South that had arisen from the ashes of the old. And I quote, these, his wondrous words:

"I feel no regret that I stand before you this afternoon a man without a country, for my ambition lies buried in the grave of the Confederacy.

"There has been consigned not only my ambition but the dogmas on which that government was based. The faces I see before me are those of young men: had I not known this I would not have appeared before you. Men in whose hands the destinies of the southland lie: for love of her I break my silence to speak to you a few words of respectful admonition.

"The past is dead, let it bury its dead, its hopes, its aspirations; before you lies the future—a future full of golden promise; a future of expanding national glory, before which all the world shall stand amazed. Let me beseech you to lay aside all rancor, all bitter, sectional feeling and to take your places in the ranks of those who will bring about 'a consummation devoutly to be wished'—a reunited country."

There spoke in eloquent words, Jefferson Davis, the American, the southerner, the patriot though "a man without a country" as he called himself, as he summoned the young generation of the South to pledge themselves anew on the altar of American freedom.

I stand here today to offer no apology for Jefferson Davis. He needs none. Honest posterity has made up the record of his fame that grows as the years roll by. I am here on his natal day to pay tribute to the great man

that he was. He had faults, made mistakes. Greatest of them was his unquenchable love of the South and his unshakable belief in her invincibility and her destiny as a free and independent nation.

For a decade on the floor of the Senate, barely a stone's throw from his statue here in this hall, he fought the battles of the South against all comers with fire, logic, and eloquence. Few Americans realize that the war between the States began here on Capitol Hill long before the first Confederate shell broke blood red over Fort Sumter in 1861.

To Jefferson Davis, the dying John C. Calhoun tossed his political mantle when that great champion of southern rights ceased from wrangling to don the robe of immortality. There on the Senate floor, amid thunderous debates, stood Jefferson Davis, unmoved, courageous, erect, beating back every attack on the South, parrying every thrust of her enemies. Yet even in the heat and fire of debate there was in his voice and manner such charm that even his bitterest opponents found it hard to resist them.

But the gods had willed that the issues and political strife between the North and the South must come to the final arbitrament of the sword. Forty years of debate and violent clamor had done their best—and their worst. The year 1861 found Jefferson Davis still standing in the breach beside his desk in the Senate.

Now another scene rises before me: a cold January day, 1861, and the Senate galleries were crowded as never before. Hundreds were thronging these corridors to hear Senator Jefferson Davis of Mississippi say farewell to the Senate where he had served so long. Fine drama it was and he the chief actor in this, perhaps, the saddest scene ever witnessed on Capitol Hill. Amid tense silence while hundreds literally held their breath Senator Jefferson Davis rose and in calm, grief-stricken words offered his historic valedictory to a spellbound audience. There was no bravado, no threats of fire and sword in his words, only the hope of peace before the issues were handed over to the God of battles. Tears ran down the cheeks of men and women as Jefferson Davis closed his eloquent goodby, bowed to his august associates and walked slowly out of the Senate Chamber forever.

That same night his wife heard him wrestling in prayer. To his Maker he said, "May God have us in his holy keeping, and grant that before it is too late peaceful counsels will prevail." The next day he hurried south to lead his people on their ill-fated flight toward independence.

Now let me quickly highlight this man's career. He was born in a log cabin in what is now Todd County, Ky., June 3, 1808—and how strange it is that, within the same 12-month, in another log cabin nearby, was born another baby whose name was Abraham Lincoln. When he was 5 years old his parents migrated to Mississippi. At 14, Jefferson Davis entered Transylvania University, at Lexington, Ky. He was 16 when he entered West Point where he graduated in 1828, 1 year ahead of another young soldier, Robert Edward Lee, of Virginia. At heart, Jefferson Davis was a soldier. It was bred in his bone. After serving in the Black Hawk war he resigned from the army in 1835. He had already met and married and lost his first love, Sarah Taylor Davis, daughter of Gen. Zachary Taylor, of Mexican War fame. In 1845 Davis married glamorous Varina Howell, the rose of Mississippi, who was to him for the rest of his life, sweetheart, stanch companion in triumph and disaster, his very lodestar. To his home on the Mississippi, Brierfield, he brought Varina to share with him his love of camellias and roses, which became the very symbols of their affection.

With the outbreak of the Mexican War, Jefferson Davis resigned from the House of Representatives to which he had been elected in 1844, and sailed for Mexico as colonel of the first regiment of Mississippi Rifles. At Buena Vista, with the issue of the battle in doubt, Colonel Jefferson Davis and Mississippi regiment covered themselves with glory in a charge that saved the day. At the moment of victory Davis was badly wounded, crippling him for months. Offered a brigadier-generalcy he declined it only to be appointed to the United States Senate to fill out the vacancy caused by the death of Mississippi's Senator Speight. Subsequently, he was elected to the Senate in his own right, serving until 1851, when he resigned to run unsuccessfully for governor of his State.

In 1853, President Pierce appointed Jefferson Davis to his Cabinet as Secretary of War, a post he administered with distinction and ability. Davis pioneered many improvements in the Nation's military establishment. An innovation of his was the importation of camels to be used on the western deserts where so much of the country's small Army was stationed. In 1857 he was again elected to the United States Senate, serving until January 21, 1861, when he resigned to become President of the Southern Confederacy. On February 18, 1861, at Montgomery, Ala., he was inaugurated for a 6-year term. It was here at Montgomery that the eloquent William Lowndes Yancy, in introducing Jefferson Davis to the enthusiastic throngs, proclaimed, "The hour and the man have met."

Jefferson Davis' courage never faltered through all the varying fortunes of the Confederacy. When Richmond, second capital of the Confederacy, fell before Grant's hammer blows, Davis sped south to rally the broken remnants of the collapsed republic. He was captured by Federal troops in Georgia, May 10, 1865. Imprisoned at Fortress Monroe, he was shackled and kept for a long while in a casemate room with a searchlight on him that was never dimmed. Charged with treason by a Federal indictment he was never tried, though he asked many times to be given his day in court. On May 13, 1867, after nearly 2 years of inhuman treatment, he was released. His $100,000 bond was signed mostly by northern citizens, who admired his fortitude and who felt he had been treated shabbily. Among these signers were Horace Greeley, powerful editor of the New York Tribune, and arch-abolitionist Gerrit Smith.

Leaving prison Davis went to Canada but found the climate too rigorous for his constitution weakened by incarceration. Returning south he was received with warmth and affection by his own people. Going to New Orleans he found his property gone, his friends impoverished, and his plantations up the Mississippi devastated by Federal occupation armies.

A severe accident sent him to Europe, again seeking health. In England he was lionized. Under the kindly influence of new surroundings and cheerful company his health improved. In Paris Napoleon III and the Empress Eugenie invited him to court, but Davis declined. A visit to Scotland brought partial restoration of his health, but he was never again to enjoy robust health, never again to be a strong man.

In the autumn of 1869, he was offered the presidency of a life insurance company at Memphis, which he was compelled to accept to earn a livelihood for himself and family. Leaving his family in London, he went to Memphis where he remained for some months and then returned to London to bring his family back to America.

On his arrival in Memphis, the citizens there offered him for a gift a handsome residence, as an expression of their good will, but he preferred to be the recipient of no donations, and gratefully declined to accept it. He applied himself diligently, though probably unsuccessfully, to learning the science and technicalities of the life-insurance business. But, his training and experience had not been along such lines, and he later discovered that his company was not organized and conducted on a safe basis. The ultimate failure of the company, which was probably hastened by a yellow fever risk in the South, caused Davis to lose the small remainder of his meager fortune, and his troubles multiplied. The death of his brother, the litigation in connection with both the plantations at Davis Bend, the death of his little son William from diphtheria, and the failure of his insurance company, caused his health to grow worse, and he was again ordered to England.

Out of the wreckage of the hurricane and Briarfield suits, a portion of his old plantation was saved to him and from the lands where he had started life as a planter after his 8 years' service in the United States Army he had hoped to support himself and his family.

After pleasant months spent in England and in Paris, he returned home somewhat improved in physical condition. Through all these vicissitudes his courage continued dauntless and unbroken. Bountiful gifts of houses and lands and money might have been his for the acceptance, but his pride was as fine edged as his courage. After the death of his son in 1874, the people of Texas invited him to visit that State, and he was met with welcoming acclaim and was offered a tract of land and stock enough to furnish it, but again he declined the gift. Under the General Amnesty bill passed in May 1872, it was necessary that application should be made for the removal of prescribed disabilities to become a beneficiary of this bill's provisions. Davis, while accepting in good faith the results of the war, declined to ask pardon for an offense of which he denied that he was guilty. To quote Davis from the concluding chapter of his "Short History of the Confederate States," which was published in the year following that of his death:

"In asserting the right of secession it has not been my wish to incite to its exercise. I recognize the fact that the war showed it to be impracticable, but this did not prove it to be wrong; and now that it may not be again attempted, and that the Union may promote the general welfare, it is needful that the truth, the whole truth, should be known so that crimination and recrimination may forever cease; and then on the basis of fraternity and faithful regard for the rights of the States there may be written on the Arch of the Union, Esto perpetua—may it be eternal."

The last of his larger plans in life, the development of a trade between South America and the United States, through the organization of an international enterprise which might build up New Orleans and the cities of the lower South caused him to visit England, but this scheme came to naught, and he began to look about him for some quiet, though humble place where he might end his days in the peace and seclusion which had been denied him since his earliest years at Briarfield. He selected the lovely spot along the Mississippi coast, overlooking the beautiful waters of the Gulf of Mexico, halfway between New Orleans and Mobile, known as Beauvoir. In April 1878, Mrs. Davis, who had accompanied him to Europe on his last visit abroad, joined him at Beauvoir and with her assistance and that of Mrs. Dorsey, whose residence he was occupying, and the literary aid of his friend, Major Walthall, and of Judge Tenney, whom his publishers sent down to assist him, he completed his history of the Confederacy at the end of 3 years. During this time, he lost his sole surviving son, Jefferson, who died

at Memphis of yellow fever, and later Mrs. Dorsey died of the same malady. She had asked Davis sometime before her death to agree to act as her executor. He finally consented. After her death the will disclosed that she had devised Beauvoir to him during his life with reversion to his youngest daughter, Winnie, who was then a minor. After the book's completion, he and Mrs. Davis went again to Europe and remained in Paris 3 months, after which he returned to again take up his life at Beauvoir. The publication of his history of the Confederacy developed a renewed confidence in him on the part of those for whom he had borne a great burden. In 1886 he made a number of public addresses in Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia, and was met everywhere with expressions of kindness and affection such as no other speaker had ever received. His last visit to Macon, Ga., for one of these homecomings was too much for his weakened vitality. His physician forbade him further excitement, and he returned to Beauvoir to appear no more in public. In November 1889, he went to Briarfield and was taken ill there. His sickness prevented his reaching home before the end, and with his wife who had joined him on his way down the Mississippi, he could go no farther than New Orleans, where he died December 6, 1889. From all over the South representative men and women, including the Grand Army of the Republic, joined in the funeral ceremonies with the camps of Confederate veterans and the citizens of New Orleans thronged to his funeral in Metairie Cemetery. The Governors of nine States were his pallbearers and the legislatures of the Commonwealths which he had led in war held memorial sessions in his memory.

Four years after his death the people of Richmond asked that his body might be entombed in the company of many other soldiers and statesmen of the South, in Hollywood Cemetery. Jefferson Davis was borne back to the scene of his great adventure, the capital of what had once been the Confederate States of America. His body lay in state in the chief cities through which it passed, and tens of thousands came to gaze on the face that was still resolute and undaunted in death.

In reviewing the last years of Jefferson Davis' life, my admiration for this man which like all true southerners has always been high, if possible, has grown even greater. To meet with reverses of every kind and description and to still hold his head high and decline all the gifts which were offered him, and to rise above all the confusion of the times, proved this man to be one of our Nation's alltime greats, of whom we may be justly proud.

BENEDICTION

"May the God we trust as a nation,
Throw the light of his Peace and Grace,
On a flag with its stripes untarnished,
And with every star in place.
"Amen."

We Cannot Find an End to Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Janesville Gazette which points out that after 10 years of foreign aid and the spending of some $50 billion the American taxpayer is still called upon to spend more billions. It is the old story of a program once established and the extreme difficulty that Congress has in discontinuing it.

The editorial follows:

WE CANNOT FIND AN END TO FOREIGN AID

Senate action on continued foreign aid seems bound to stimulate citizen questioning about a matter which affects so closely their own pocketbooks.

Since 1945, the figures show, foreign aid has cost the United States more than $47 billion. Brought down to the personal level, this means that every man, woman and child in the country has given away the equivalent of about $300.

The new authorization calls for another $3½ billion. In the form sent to the House, it is a promise and not a money bill. The actual appropriations must still be made.

The foreign aid was first a matter of charity and of rebuilding of war-wrecked countries. In order to establish world trade and to permit nations to rehabilitate themselves, this form of aid was necessary. It was a matter of moral concern as well as economics.

Later, as Russia made menacing moves and the cold war developed, military aid required additional billions. Meanwhile the economic aid was continued also. As Europe seemed about ready to stand on its own feet, aid for South and Latin America, the Middle East and many other areas added to the expense. Japan, as a defeated nation, got help. It was not long before we more or less committed ourselves to India and to almost the whole of Asia outside of the Communist-held lands.

Commonsense would tell us to rewrite our foreign aid policies. The basis of such a policy might perhaps follow along these lines:

1. A total end of aid to those nations which have reached the state of economic independence contemplated when American aid was introduced.

2. Contributions from some of the prosperous nations of Europe, put back on their feet with American taxpayer dollars, to help lighten the loan in parts of the world where help is still needed.

3. A positive plan for tapering off and then completely terminating all foreign aid at a specific time. By serving notice that the free money will come to an end, nations which may be counting upon continued handouts will have a chance to put their houses in order.

No amount of high-sounding talk out of Washington of our world responsibilities is going to convince Americans that they must forever contribute for the chimerical results of present programs. Time was when the need was obvious, and the results of help were apparent. We are now creating the necessities for help and the results of our spending are naturally hard to detect.

When America set out to repair a measure of the losses of war, no citizen had any idea that 10 years and nearly $50 billion later they would be called upon to donate additional billions. That idea seems to persist only in Washington.

Two Among One Hundred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from the June 17 New Haven (Conn.) Evening Register with a great sense of pride that two boys from the Third District of Connecticut have been awarded 4-year General Motors scholarships.

Both high schools, Hamden and Hillhouse, from which these boys graduated, enjoy a high nationwide scholastic standing. From these halls men and women have made their noteworthy contributions to America in all walks of life.

It is indeed an accomplishment for Martin Sachs and Alden Myers to be recipients of these highly coveted awards for which thousands of applicants were considered. I extend to them my wholehearted congratulations and the wish for careers which will truly reflect their aptitude for civic leadership, brilliant scholarship, and perseverance.

The editorial follows:

TWO AMONG ONE HUNDRED

New Haven and Hamden residents may well find reflected pride and satisfaction in the awarding of 4-year General Motors scholarships to a Hillhouse High School senior and one from Hamden High School.

This is a signal honor won by Martin W. Sachs, from Hillhouse, and Alden Myers, from Hamden High. Naturally, they are straight A students. But this tells but part of the story. Both took prominent roles in the student-community life of their schools. Yet more important, these two are young men who were 2 among 100 so honored in the whole Nation. This speaks well for the boys, for their homes, their schools, and those who encouraged and taught them along the way.

Selection was made by an independent committee of 16 outstanding educators. The recipients were chosen from among some 14,000 applicants. The scholarship plan is part of this great corporation's $2 million annual program of aid to higher education. It denotes a faith in the Nation's future and the future of its youth.

Those who sponsor it do so in the conviction that cultivation of the minds and characters of our youth is as vital as conservation and development of our national resources. This is a conviction that can and should be shared. Here an investment, and a valued one, has been made in the future of America.

Employment of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Gen. Nathan F. Twining on "Employment of the Physically Handicapped":

REMARKS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AT LUNCHEON MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, HALL OF NATIONS ROOM, WASHINGTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 24, 1955.

I am very pleased to be able to meet with you today. Largely as a result of your committee's program, more than 7 million physically handicapped men and women are now employed throughout our Nation. From a moral viewpoint alone this is a significant

achievement. From a practical viewpoint your program is even more impressive. It contributes materially to the productivity of our Nation, and it sets some standards that we might profit by in other fields. Under conditions that existed 10 or 15 years ago this effort to overcome physical limitations might well have been restricted to the special problem of your committee—the physically handicapped.

This problem still exists. But today's developments and the new horizons we foresee in the tomorrow bring wider problems. For example, today's airplane flies faster and higher than ever before. This performance subjects our flyers to new difficulties: greater effects of gravitation, extreme atmosphere pressures and extreme temperatures. We fly under conditions in which no human could survive without elaborate mechanical aids. Without these aids we could not cope with high altitude, supersonic flight. Just as the handicapped are adjusted to the climate of office or industry, so we must equip and train our pilots to overcome their physical limitations in flight.

It would seem that the term "physically handicapped" has lost its former meaning. It has become a relative term. Today, the extent of handicap must be measured in light of the job to be done. This is what we have attempted to do in our Air Force program for employment of the physically handicapped. We apply this measurement to the full range of our activity—from the job of the combat pilot to tasks performed by the clerk at the desk.

I am sure that all of you are familiar with the achievements of Lt. Col. John P. Stapp in the field of aviation medicine research. In a series of recent tests he voluntarily subjected himself to stresses of abrupt deceleration. As a result, we know about human endurance at high speeds and in abrupt stops. We also know what equipment a pilot needs to survive the shock of bailing out in a parachute at speeds of more than 600 miles an hour. As you know, Colonel Stapp has received the Cheney Award for his skillful and courageous action and for his studies to overcome the physical limitations of our air crews.

There are numerous other examples of ingenious methods used to compensate for the job disability of flying personnel. One of these methods about which little has been said is the control system for high speed jet fighters. This device enables the pilot to move the controls without struggling against the pressures of 600 mile an hour airstreams. However, since the pilot has been taught to fly by the feel of his controls, the system produces artificial pressures on the stick. These pressures vary for all maneuvers and they correspond to the "feel" of slower aircraft which the pilot has learned to fly with a manual control system.

Some other examples of aids to the pilots are the G-suit, the ejection seat and the entire complex of flight instruments which override human judgment as to the speed, position and flight attitude of the plane. The principles applied to this operation are identical to those which govern the employment of the physically handicapped.

We recognize the time, effort and money involved in overcoming human disability is more than compensated by the value of human performance they make possible. The limits to which we have gone in this direction can be indicated by a brief picture of what the oxygen-fed, G-suited, pilot delivers in terms of individual performance. In the cockpit of a jet fighter a pilot has about one hundred controls to operate, 24 instruments to scan, and a dozen indicator or warning lights to watch. He uses electrical and electronic gear that are just as complex as the combined circuits of a whole city power system. From an altitude of more than 45,000 feet he has no visual reference points. The clouds are far below the horizon is an indistinct line. Overhead a dark blue sky obscures almost everything except the glint of sun on metal.

This is a general picture of pilot performance in a job environment where he could not remain conscious for more than 30 seconds without his equipment. It highlights another dividend on the same procedures you apply to the program for employment of the physically handicapped.

The satisfaction of success against odds is a strong factor behind the achievements of our aircrews. I am sure this is equally true of the thousands of Air Force employees who are performing valuable service in spite of physical impairment. Our program to give maximum employment opportunity to handicapped personnel is similar to the actions we take to overcome airerew disability. The first requirement is to select or create a job in which they can function. The second step is to give them duties that will permit the fullest application of their abilities. We began our concerted effort to recruit physically handicapped civilians in World War II. We are proud of our continuing program. We are especially proud of the public service awards made to Air Force individuals and organizations, in recognition of our work in employing handicapped personnel. We will continue our efforts to find ways of improving our program. We will strive to give this committee renewed assistance. You have our full support.

Today I issued this directive to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel of the United States Air Force:

"This week the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped meets in Washington. I am pleased with the Air Force record over the past year. Although we are not the largest service we lead the others in our program. This comparative record is commendable, but we can do better. I want you to review our program, and take steps to improve it during the next year. Our goal should be not just the best program in the armed services. Let us have the best record in the Nation."

The meeting of your Committee here in Washington has served as a reminder to us to rededicate ourselves to the task of employing the physically handicapped. You have served a greater purpose by reminding the Nation of this need, and by results that signal to the world the greatness of a free society.

In closing, let me emphasize again that it was a pleasure to be here with you today.

Thank you.

Commencement Address by Rev. Dr. William G. Ryan, at Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa., June 6, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the commencement exercises at Seton Hill College on June 6 of this year. This college is located in my hometown of Greensburg, Pa. A short address made by the president of the college, Rev. Dr. William G. Ryan, was inspiring. With a great economy of words he set forth in the following address the ideals inducted into the graduates of the college. It is well worth every American's attention because it should fit into the aspirations of every American citizen.

Your excellency, distinguished guests, members of the college corporation, members of the college faculty, graduates, students, and friends, we have come together for the 37th annual commencement. We are assembled for the conferring of degrees in course, for the conferring of the degree in honors, and for the giving of honors.

In these days when basic truths are being questioned and basic moral values debated, when radical ideologies are depriving the world of peace, and when even the people of free America are divided about the nature of their freedom and the methods of preserving it, Seton Hill College rededicates itself to the following propositions: First, no one is fully educated until he has absorbed at least some of the great tradition of culture which has molded Western civilization, and has learned to respect this tradition. Second, there its still much to be learned about man and about his social and physical environment; and the atmosphere of a college such as this should be one of freedom of inquiry and speculation about those wide and changing areas of knowledge upon which divine revelation has not enlightened us. Third, every man and every society must, in their thinking and in their action, do homage to Him who is the Lord of truth and the Ruler of the world. The college is confident that the members of the class of 1955 have derived from the education they received here, a due measure of humanistic wisdom, of ability to inquire thoroughly and judge dispassionately, and of religious conviction and reverence. For this reason the college grants degrees to these graduates today.

East Greenbush (N. Y.) Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like, on this occasion, to extend the good wishes of the House of Representatives to the town of East Greenbush, N. Y., on the occasion of its centennial celebration, which will extend from June 30 through July 4.

July 1 will be called Citizen Genet Day in honor of the town's most illustrious resident, "Citizen" Edmond Charles Genet—1765 to 1834—first minister plenipotentiary from the French Republic to the United States, whom President Washington asked to have recalled because of Government intrigues. Genet never returned to France. He lived the rest of his life in the town of what is now East Greenbush, devoting himself to scientific research and literature.

July 2 will be "Greenbush Cantonment Day" in remembrance of the large United States Army cantonment situated in the town during the War of 1812. More than 4,000 troops were quartered in several buildings, one of which still stands. It was here that the name "Uncle Sam" originated, when the soldiers, noting that the beef shipped by Samuel Wilson

of Troy, N. Y., was marked "U. S." jokingly called it Uncle Sam's beef.

The State of New York will dedicate markers to Citizen Genet and Greenbush Cantonment on these 2 days.

July 4 has been designated "Town of Clinton Day" to recall the forming of the town from the old town of Greenbush, Rensselaer County, by an act of the legislature on February 23, 1855. The town name was changed to East Greenbush by legislative act on April 14, 1858.

July 3 is to be "Day of Remembrance," with special mention of the centennial in all churches of the town and visits to the town's historic sites, of which there are 43 marked on the centennial map. They include the Greenbush Reformed Church, organized in 1787; Witbeck House, built about 1738; Greenbush and Schodack Academy, 1831; Lyman's Boarding School, 1851; Genet Gothic School, 1850; Gen. Henry Genet House and others.

Today the town has several hamlets and communities, all prosperous suburbs of Albany, the State capital, containing six churches; fine schools, homes and business places, and a nationally known chemical research laboratory.

I would that time would permit specific mention of the many fine citizens who have worked long and hard to make this celebration a success.

Mr. Speaker, I have ventured upon the patience of the House in this matter because I think East Greenbush typifies something precious in our way of life. Great bustling cities and rich farm acres are important to our Nation, but there is something very American about our towns.

They, like East Greenbush, have preserved the greatness of their yesterday and used it to season their calm approach to the problems of today and tomorrow.

By honoring the town of East Greenbush on this great occasion in its history, we are, in a sense, honoring similar towns throughout our great land.

The Uses of the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting an editorial that appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, June 20, which I believe to be quite significant as we consider the 10th anniversary of the United Nations Organization:

THE USES OF THE U. N.

The United Nations is 10 years old this week, and, by and large, the years have been pretty tough ones. Those who presided at the infant's birth in San Francisco predicted great deeds for the little fellow, not the least of which was that he would quickly make everyone in the world love one another.

It hasn't turned out that way, however. There is still a deal of international delinquency around, and the boys in the neighborhood are still batting each other about the ears now and then. And there isn't anything the U. N. can do about it, whatever the inclinations.

One trouble was that everybody expected too much of the U. N. The starry-eyed flocked to its corridors with petitions and pamphlets to do this and that; zealots for world government tried to make over the U. N. and build on what was not even a shell of government. The powerful nations in disagreement went outside the U. N. to strengthen their ramparts by international alliances.

The result was twofold. People who had looked to it as the last great hope for peace found the U. N. quite ineffective. And people who know the pitfalls of world government began to suspect the U. N. of too much meddling in the domestic affairs of member states.

There are many reasons for the disillusionment. But the basic one is that the United Nations was oversold in the beginning. It is still being oversold. A case in point is the Box Score of the U. N., issued by the Committee on International Relations of the National Education Association.

The "box score" lists some 22 fields of activity of the United Nations in its 10 years. It begins with "atoms for peace" and ends with "uniting for peace." Most of the scores listed are unimpressive. And others are enthusiastically misleading.

Take the case of Greece. The "problem" before the U. N., according to NEA's "box score," was how to handle the Greek complaint to the Security Council in 1946 that aid was given to Greek guerrillas by Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The "action" consisted in the setting up of a Commission on Investigation and a General Assembly Special Committee made on-the-spot observations and helped mediate the complaint. The "score"? NEA says "Conditions improved" and the General Assembly dissolved the Special Committee.

That's not quite the way it was. The conditions improved because the United States poured millions of dollars in aid and armaments into Greece as well as Army officers to build up Greece's resistance. But NEA gives the U. N. the credit.

Or take Iran. The "problem" in 1946 was how to handle Iran's charges that Russian troops were laggard about leaving northern Iran. The "action" was adoption of a resolution to work toward a solution. The "score"? NEA says simply: "Soviet troops left peacefull."

That's not quite the way it was in Iran. Pressure by the United States resulted in the departure of the Soviet troops. But the U. N. gets the credit.

Or take Korea. The "problem" was how to treat the surprise attack on the Republic of Korea by North Korean troops. The "action" was the request by the Security Council for aid to Korea. The "score" is well known to everyone. But NEA's "box score" says this: "First time in history that troops were used by an international organization for collective military action against aggression." What isn't said is that 90 percent of the collective security, troops, and money were supplied by the United States.

The point is that those who oversold the United Nations in the first place damaged it and they are still damaging it. Sensible people know that the United Nations hasn't done all that's claimed for it. And they know that sometimes the U. N.'s worst enemies are its friends.

We doubt seriously that the U. N. will prosper in the opinion of people by this pretense that the U. N. is what it is not, nor can be. Urging school children to "cook a U. N. lunch for teachers during U. N. week" reduces education to publicity. It would be far better for the future of the U. N. to tell of its weaknesses and its strengths, of its abilities and inabilities.

Only thus can come any real understanding of what may be expected of it. And only when people do understand its limitations can the United Nations fulfill its only useful function as a meeting place of nations and a forum for their discussions.

County Is Fastest Growing in Bay Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an article from the Burlingame (Calif.) Advance-Star which points up the rapid population growth of San Mateo County, California's Ninth District which I represent.

The article is headed "County Is Fastest Growing in Bay Area," and is documented with facts and figures obtained from the State controller's office and the State department of finance.

I wish to call to the attention of the Republican Members of the Congress that San Mateo County will be host to the Republican National Convention. The Cow Palace, site selected for the convention, is located at the northern tip of our county, and not in San Francisco.

The above-mentioned article follows:

COUNTY IS FASTEST GROWING IN BAY AREA

San Mateo County is the fastest growing county in the bay area.

Redwood City is the county's fastest growing city in actual numbers, but Belmont leads the parade in percentage increase.

These are estimates of the California State controller's office and the State department of finance released today by the Bay Area Council. They are based on the gains in population since the Federal census of April 1950.

Menlo Park has shown the second greatest percentage gain; Daly City, third; Redwood City, fourth; South San Francisco, fifth; and Atherton, sixth. All six of the top cities have added more than 50 percent to their populations since the census was taken 5 years ago last April.

In numbers of increase, San Mateo ranks second behind Redwood City, with South San Francisco third and Daly City fourth.

The controller's office estimates present population of San Mateo, the county's largest city, at 54,000, a gain of 12,218 since 1950, or 29.2 percent.

Redwood City, the second largest, is estimated at 40,000, up 14,456 or 56.6 percent.

South San Francisco is in third place in total population, with 30,000, up 10,649 for 55 percent.

Daly City ranks fourth with 23,951, up 8,750 or 57.7 percent. Both Daly City and Menlo Park have passed up Burlingame in total population within the last 5 years, according to the estimates.

One incorporated community in the county—little Colma—has actually shown a decline, dropping from 297 in 1950 to 270 today.

The county as a whole, according to estimates of the California department of finance, has increased by about 90,000 people, or 36.6 percent since 1950, to reach a present population of 321,900.

The estimated increase in other bay area counties has been 1.4 percent in San Fran-

cisco, 13.3 percent in Alameda, 12.1 percent in Contra Costa, 17.6 percent in Marin, and 21.7 percent in Napa.

The populations of San Mateo County cities, in 1950 and now, with the percentage of gain, follows:

	1950	1955	Percent
Atherton	3,630	5,500	51.5
Belmont	5,567	9,505	70.7
Burlingame	19,886	22,000	10.6
Colma	297	270	−9.1
Daly City	15,191	23,951	57.7
Hillsborough	3,552	5,225	47.1
Menlo Park	13,587	23,000	69.3
Millbrae	8,972	11,207	24.9
Redwood City	25,544	40,000	56.6
San Bruno	12,478	15,627	25.2
San Carlos	14,371	16,881	17.5
San Mateo	41,782	54,000	29.2
South San Francisco	19,351	30,000	55.0

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am privileged to insert the following article by the Honorable James A. Hoyt, a distinguished citizen of South Carolina and Washington, on the subject of Jefferson Davis:

JEFFERSON DAVIS, BORN JUNE 3, 1808, DIED DECEMBER 6, 1889

(By James A. Hoyt)

Jefferson Davis has been the object of extravagant adulation on the one hand and violent vituperation on the other. This is the tribute which contemporary judgments pay to greatness. The truth, of course, lies somewhere between the extremes, and no man would be more anxious than Mr. Davis not to have his ability and his services exaggerated.

It is as President of the Confederate States of America that Mr. Jefferson Davis is, and will be, best remembered, and that is distinction enough.

But, before the Confederacy was formed, he had carved out his fame. As a youthful soldier of the United States Army in the border warfare against the Indians; as a Member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi; as a soldier again in the volunteer army of the United States, in the war with Mexico, where along with the soldiers from other States, the volunteers from Mississippi wrote their names in letters of blood upon the imperishable scroll of history; as a representative of Mississippi in the Senate of the United States, where he sat first as the disciple of Calhoun as the defender of the Constitution; and meanwhile as Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President Franklin Pierce, in which position he displayed those great talents for organization and that capacity for industry which later were so strikingly exemplified in the organization of the Confederate Government.

That is the full record of a busy and useful life. The most ambitious could well be content with the recital of such a career.

But by reason of the historic setting, as well as by reason of the service therein, it is the administration of the presidency of the Confederacy by which Mr. Davis will be chiefly remembered in history. However, to understand both his selection for that office and his administration of it, it is essential to know something of his previous life.

judging his services as President of the Confederacy, there are two main facts which must always be borne in mind.

ALWAYS A SOLDIER

First, Jefferson Davis was educated at West Point and prepared for the career of a soldier—not only prepared for that career, but he demonstrated his ability as a tactician and strategist and as leader of men on the battlefield. He never ceased to be a soldier.

Second, he sat at the feet of Calhoun; he adopted without reservation, and amplified and applied the doctrine which Mr. Calhoun so long and so ably expounded with respect to the interpretation of the Constitution as it related to the rights of the States. His ability as a soldier, superior to that of many of the military leaders of the Confederacy, explains many of his actions which as President gave rise to the most bitter feeling against him.

It is safe to say that with the exception of General Lee, and perhaps 2 or 3 others, Mr. Davis did not have an equal in military knowledge and ability among the generals of the Confederacy. It will not do to assert that a president without such military knowledge would have served the cause to greater advantage and come nearer to achieving success; but it is doubtless true that such a president would have necessarily avoided much of the unpleasantness and criticism which arose by reason of the part which Mr. Davis took in directing the armies of the Confederacy, though Mr. Lincoln had much the same experience on the other side.

FITTED BY EXPERIENCE

On the other hand, no man without Mr. Davis' experience as a soldier and an Army officer and Secretary of War could have so readily and so quickly and so successfully put into shape and into operation the great army which within a few months was ready for the battlefield. Nor could his knowledge and experience have been supplied when it came to the duty of selecting officers for the important commands that were to be filled.

It is upon this very point that he has been so keenly criticized; the charge of "favorites" was repeatedly hurled at him during the existence of the Confederacy and after its fall. Unquestionably his personal acquaintance with the officers who had served him along with him at West Point, in the western army and in Mexico influenced his judgment in their assignments when they tendered their swords to the Confederacy, of which he was the commander in chief. That was perfectly natural and perfectly proper, and his personal acquaintance should have been, and was, a benefit rather than a disadvantage to the Confederacy.

It was with respect to General Lee that the charge of favoritism was first repeatedly and vehemently made; especially when Lee's early campaigns in northwestern Virginia had not been so successful. It required a great deal of confidence in his own judgment for President Davis to appoint Lee commanding general of the Confederate forces at the time he did so, for Lee's experience in the Confederate service, up to that time, had not fulfilled the expectations of the South. But Mr. Davis knew his man, and he had the moral courage to stand by his own judgment in the face of objections and criticisms.

LEE AND JOHNSTON

It is sufficient to say that the ablest military critics of the world, as well as historians generally, have confirmed his judgment as correct. It is superfluous to say that Lee became the idol of the South and that the hopes of a despondent people were fixed upon his ability as a general and his fidelity as a patriot.

On the other hand, President Davis repeatedly asserted his confidence in the military ability and the patriotism of Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, who has been portrayed as the main sufferer from his so-called "favoritism." When General Johnston was wounded and replaced by Lee in command of the Army of Northern Virginia, Mr. Davis testified to Johnston's ability, and when he placed him in command of the western army it was a hardly less important assignment. This brings up a military controversy which it is not timely to enter upon here, but it is sufficient to read Mr. Davis' own history of the war to understand his fair and frank appraisal of General Johnston.

From the standpoint of the technical soldier—the school in which Lee and Davis, as well as Johnston, were trained—there can be no criticism to General Johnston's campaigns. The truth of the matter is that Lee and Jackson and Albert Sidney Johnston, with men like Stewart and Early and Hampton and Pickett under them—the truth is that these men developed a new school of military science; and the differences between the new school and the old were irreconcilable.

ACCEPTED THEORY

General Johnston followed the accepted theory that a general on the defensive with a smaller army should not attack the stronger army. The Confederacy, said General Johnston, needed to save its soldiers rather than its territory. The Confederacy could, according to Johnston, spare a few hundred miles of country rather than lose several thousand men in arms. When Mr. Davis consented to the abandonment of this theory and approved the disastrous Gettysburg campaign—perhaps for its political and morale effect—the results were costly, if not fatal.

However, Lee won the Battle of the Wilderness, perhaps his greatest victory, in direct contradiction to the theory on which Johnston made his retreat to Atlanta. Stonewall Jackson frequently violated the theory. Had Albert Sidney Johnston not bled to death at Shiloh, he, too, would have followed up that day's fight and perhaps achieved a complete victory, although, according to the accepted ideas, his successor in command, General Beauregard, an officer of great distinction, was theoretically justified in deciding to rest his army.

Darkness was falling, he said, and his men were exhausted by a conflict of over 12 hours without food, and jaded by the march of the preceding day through mud and water. It was by disregarding, instead of yielding to, such conditions as these that won for the Confederate soldiers the magnificent victories which they so frequently wrested from a superior force.

In his monumental work, Lee's Lieutenants, Dr. D. S. Freeman says that the Confederate Army suffered from not having enough trained military leaders, and he points out also that many of the brigade commanders, who had come into the army from civil life without previous military experience, developed into remarkably capable generals. But it was by reason of his selecting this trained leader and not that one that the President of the Confederacy was most harshly judged.

HIS THEORIES OF GOVERNMENT

In the second aspect of his fitness for the high post to which he had been called, Mr. Davis was unquestionably hampered by his theories of government in the administration of a government at war. But this handicap was a handicap of consistency, which the government itself, from its very genesis, shared with him. He stood for the rights of the States, and when war came he was the ablest, the most eloquent expounder of that doctrine. That was a period when the Southern States did not lack for ability among its leaders, when Breckenridge, of Kentucky, afterwards a Confederate briga-

dier, was Vice President; when Clay, of Alabama; Toombs, of Georgia; Barnwell, of South Carolina; Benjamin, of Louisiana; were in the Senate, and when Howell Cobb, of Georgia; Hunter, of Virginia; and James L. Orr, of South Carolina, had each been Speaker of the House.

The selection of Mr. Davis as President upon the formation of the Confederacy seems to have been, if not unanimous in sentiment, at least without formal objection. The States voted as States, and no doubt each had its favorite son. South Carolina, first to secede, might have claimed the presidency. One of the delegates has said that the name of Mr. Rhett (R. Barnwell Rhett), of South Carolina, was probably more frequently mentioned than that of any other person next to Mr. Davis. But Mr. Davis was chosen. He was not a member of the convention which met at Montgomery, but was at his country home, and when informed of his election, and even before, he had said that he would prefer not to serve as President but as commander in chief of the army—which shows the strongly militaristic trend of his mind.

THE SOUTH UNPREPARED

Secession had not been unexpected, but the South was woefully unprepared for war. Many bold orators had proclaimed that the Yankees would not fight. Others conscientiously believed that the seceding States would be permitted to go in peace—many at the North advocated that course. Many others at the North viewed with horror the use of force.

Mr. Davis had no illusions. He had not advocated secession until he had concluded no other course was possible, politically, but he knew that secession, if it came, would mean war, and not only war, but a long and bloody war, and his experience as Secretary of War and as Senator gave him an unusual conception of the comparative preparedness of the two sections and the preponderance of the Northern States in men and resources. He set about to remedy that deficiency.

But with a loosely put together government, with the prevalent ideas of decentralization, with inadequate transportation, with a total lack of large manufacturing establishments, and with no navy at all, it was an overwhelmingly staggering undertaking. In his book he has told better than anyone else the magnitude of the task which faced him and which he faced with magnificent courage and which he accomplished with an astonishing measure of initial success.

As a matter of fact, the story of what was done in the organization of an entirely new government in a strictly agricultural country, to fight a war in which even then mechanization played its important part, demonstrated better than anything else the organization ability of Jefferson Davis. It is a phase that is not often thought of in the history of the Confederacy.

GENIUS FOR ORGANIZATION

His genius for organization is sufficiently demonstrated when we recall that it was in December that South Carolina seceded; that it was the 4th of February when a congress of the seceding States met at Montgomery, and on the 9th Mr. Davis was elected President; that the war began with the bombardment of Fort Sumter on the 12th of April, and that by the 22d of July, only 3 months later, the Union Army, formed around the nucelus of the United States Standing Army with unlimited resources, had been severely defeated in the first battle of Manassas by an army which did not even exist 6 months previously.

Speaking of the comparative strength of the two combatants on the 1st day of January 1863, President Davis, in his history, says:

"The white male population of the Northern States was then 13,690,364. The white male population of the Confederate States was 5,449,463. The number of troops which the United States had called into the field exceeded 1 million men. The number of troops which the Confederate government had then in the field was less than 400,000 men.

"The United States Government had a Navy which was only third in rank in the world. The Confederate government had a navy which at that time consisted of a single small ship on the ocean. The people of the United States had a commerce afloat all over the world. The people of the Confederate States had not a single port open to commerce. The people of the United States were the rivals of the greatest nations in all kinds of manufactures. The people of the Confederate States had few manufactures, and those were articles of inferior value.

"The Government of the United States possessed the Treasury of a Union of 80 years with its vast resources. The Confederate States had to create a treasury by the development of financial resources. The Ambassadors and representatives of the former were welcome at every court in the world. The representatives of the latter were not recognized anywhere."

Since 1938 the world has seen how effectively an absolutism can begin, plan for, and carry on a war. We have seen how slowly and inefficiently the democratic process enters into combat—even when the issue at stake is the continued existence of that democratic process itself. Consider, then, the even greater impediments which Mr. Davis had to overcome. That he was eventually denounced among his own people as a dictator should not be surprising to those of us of today who saw the same thing in Washington in 1943.

Mr. Davis was assailed, in the first place, for refusing to take drastic measure, and then when he did adopt such measures he was accused of being a tyrant. The first troops were enlisted for 6 months only, though Mr. Davis argued for a longer enlistment. When he finally succeeded in having the policy of conscription—selective service to us—adopted, he was again charged with wanting to become a dictator. How familiar it sounds.

PROBLEMS OF FINANCE

Mr. Davis must admit that in one particular he was deficient in his training for the office he held, and he did not succeed in securing an adviser who could supply that which he lacked—a thorough knowledge of finance. That lack was common to most of the southern statesmen of the day, with the exception of Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi. Mr. Hunter, of Virginia, the second Secretary of State in the Confederate Cabinet, has not only served as Speaker of the House, but as Secretary of State of the United States, and during his service as Senator from Virginia had been the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance. But he did not long remain in the Davis Cabinet, retiring to become Senator from Virginia in the new government as he had been in the old. He very soon assumed, and maintained throughout the life of the Confederacy, a position of antagonism to the administration of Mr. Davis, who thus did not have the benefit of his experience in finance.

AFTER THE WAR

In the South, the President of the Confederacy had his critics and detractors while the Confederacy lived, but, whatever his faults and his deficiencies—which his great ability and his great services—there were few in the South after the surrender to challenge his virtues. He came to be looked upon as the vicarious sacrifice for all his people, and the treatment meted out to him by the conquering government solidified sympathy in his favor and silenced those who were formerly disposed to minimize his ability and his patriotism.

There is little doubt that Mr. Lincoln did not want Mr. Davis captured. General Sherman—whose word is not acceptable on some subjects, such as arson—said that he put the question to the President during the celebrated conference at City Point, before the surrender of Johnston's army, and Mr. Lincoln replied by one of his characteristic anecdotes, indicating that officially he would be compelled to say that Mr. Davis should be captured, but that in reality he would be relieved if the Confederate President should escape. But by the time the army had surrendered, Mr. Lincoln was dead.

The Thaddeus Stevens faction was in the saddle, and their theory of punishment for the seceding States was put into effect. Mr. Davis was imprisoned on the charge of treason, on which he was never brought to trial, and for 2 years he remained in harsh confinement, a part of the time in chains. He bore it all with a dignity and resignation which became him well, and the result was that the people of the South regarded him as a martyr to the lost cause.

Living the rest of his life in retirement on his Mississippi plantation, he wrote his Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government, a scholarly work in two volumes. He kept aloof from postwar politics.

SOUTH'S FINAL TRIBUTE

When he died December 6, 1889, all over the South the people gathered in their towns and villages and held memorial services in his honor. In my boyhood town of Greenville, one of the speakers at the memorial services, in the old opera house, was my father, a crippled Confederate veteran, who, leaning on his crutch, paid an eloquent tribute to the man whom he greatly admired.

In 1893, when the remains of Mr. Davis were taken from New Orleans to Richmond for final interment, crowds gathered at every station along the route, standing for hours awaiting the train bearing his body and bringing their tributes of May flowers. All along the old Richmond & Danville Railroad, now the Southern, there were immense throngs, standing silently and reverently far into the night; and the scene at the station in Greenville is still fresh in my memory.

On May 31, 1893, the body was interred in historic and beautiful Hollywood Cemetery, in the fallen capital of the fallen Confederacy of which Jefferson Davis had been the first and only President, and of which he will always be the chief civilian figure in history.

Roll Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my congratulations to Sidney L. Yudain for conceiving the idea of publishing a Capitol Hill newspaper.

The first edition of Roll Call was well received. It had the touch of the old hometown paper. Washington editors take heed—Yudain is on the march. His Roll Call is one no Member of Congress need miss, and, like the best things in life, it's free.

Address by Rev. Dr. James A. Magner at Memorial Field Mass for the War Dead, Arlington National Cemetery, May 29, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I am including the following address delivered by the Reverend Dr. James A. Magner, procurator, the Catholic University of America, at the Arlington National Cemetery on May 29, 1955, at a memorial field Mass for the war dead:

SERMON DELIVERED AT THE 17TH ANNUAL MILITARY MEMORIAL FIELD MASS FOR THE WAR DEAD, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, MAY 29, 1955, BY REV. DR. JAMES A. MAGNER, PROCURATOR, THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

"Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends" (John 15: 13).

My dear brethren: We are assembled today in this beautiful amphitheater of the Arlington National Cemetery, to thank Almighty God for His innumerable blessings upon our beloved country and to render our prayerful tribute to those who have given their lives in its defense. The holy Mass which is being celebrated in this enclosure is offered as an act of supreme worship that God may be merciful to all our heroic dead and grant eternal peace and reward to their souls. This solemn event has been sponsored and arranged annually by the Knights of Columbus, fourth degree, Washington general assembly, as an exemplification of patriotism and civic virtue, which is the distinctive motive of this degree.

Our prayers and our tributes on the eve of Memorial Day are offered for all Americans, irrespective of religious faith, and for our loyal friends and allies whose bodies lie beneath the hallowed sod, both here and abroad. But in a particular way, we wish to honor those of the Catholic faith who have rendered their last full measure of devotion to our Nation, on the battlefield and in all branches of the armed services.

For Catholics, patriotism is a moral duty and a positive spiritual obligation. We regard the State as a natural society, endowed with rights and duties by Almighty God, the author of human nature and of the civic order. Catholics love their country as a matter of principle and stand ready to serve it in all of its righteous causes, whether in peace or legitimate war. We recognize the State as an expression of the divine will for the orderly governance of human society, with the power to make laws and to command, within the norms of natural and divine law. Patriotism, therefore, follows as a virtue of justice, love, and rational obedience, not as a matter of sheer expediency or compulsion in a given set of circumstances.

The record of Catholic participation in our Armed Forces, from the War for Independence right down to World Wars I and II and the Korean war, offers abundant proof of courage, sacrifice, and patriotism of which our country may well be proud.

During our revolutionary period, Catholics numbered only about 25,000, under discriminatory statutes remaining from the hateful penal laws of England. Nevertheless, they gave most generously and indeed decisively to the cause for independence, with their blood and their treasure. Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, Md., pledged his fortune to the Colonial Army, participated as a member of the Continental Congress and of the Board of War, and was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Daniel Carroll and Father John Carroll were dispatched by Congress to Canada to secure its neutrality during the war. Thomas FitzSimons, of Philadelphia, served as chief aid to Robert Morris and was the largest individual contributor, in financing the Revolution. A total of $55,000 was subscribed by four other Catholics of Philadelphia. Oliver Pollock, of Virginia, gave his own fortune and collected funds throughout the colonies for the cause.

It is estimated that 38 to 50 percent of the Revolutionary forces were Irish or of Irish descent; and it is reasonable to assert that a large number of these were Catholics. Gen. Stephen Moylan and Col. John Fitzgerald were aides-de-camp and secretaries to General Washington, and numerous others of the Catholic faith may be named in outstanding positions, including Commander John Barry, a founder of the American Navy. The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, including many Catholics among their membership, contributed $517,000 to aid the Army of Independence.

From other Catholic sources on many fronts came valuable aid. The Catholic Indians, of Maine, and those under Chief Orono under the guidance of Father Pierre Gibault, of Vincennes, Ind., rendered heroic service, and large credit must be given to Father Gibault for retaining the Northwest Territory for the Colonies. The Catholic nations of France, Poland, and Spain stood valiantly at our side with men, armaments on land and sea, supplies, and money when desperately needed. Even from the California missions, then under the flag of Spain in the territory of Mexico, came a contribution of $2,683.

These are historic facts so well known that we need not now amplify upon them or further review the illustrious names of those who shared in our struggle. Suffice it so say that at the conclusion of the war, Washington took public cognizance of the patriotic part which Catholics "took in the accomplishment of our Revolution and the establishment of our Government," and appealed to citizens of all denominations to assure their claim for justice and equal rights under the new laws. The American Constitution itself was signed by two Catholics, Thomas FitzSimons and Daniel Carroll.

In the wars which followed, of 1812 and the War with Mexico, Catholics were no less ready to serve our country. In the Civil War, Catholics served on both the Union and the Confederate sides, as their location and convictions indicated, both in the rank and file. The names of Gen. Philip H. Sheridan for the North comes to mind among numerous distinguished generals. In the South, Father Abram J. Ryan served as poet and chaplain. In the North, Archbishop Hughes, of New York, was sent to Europe on a mission for the Union. And on the battlefields of both the North and the South, heroic Catholic Sisterhoods nursed and aided the wounded and dying on the battlefields and in the hospitals, as commemorated by the beautiful monument in Washington, D. C., erected near St. Matthew's Cathedral by the women's auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

During the Spanish-American War, Catholics again responded generously. Over 1,000,000 Catholics served the American forces in World War I, along with many auxiliary services such as those offered by the Knights of Columbus. In World War II, it is estimated that 24 percent of all the American Armed Forces were Catholics, and 3,036 Catholic chaplains served in all branches of the service. We do not have complete reports of the Korean action under United Nations Command; but we may rest assured that Catholic service was at least in proportion to our total population. On land, sea, and air, in the enlisted and conscripted forces, GI's and commissioned officers of all rank, men and women, Catholics have given a glorious evidence of patriotism and have contributed immeasurably to our national morale and strength.

We are indeed proud to offer, even in reduced summary form, this tribute of loyalty and devotion and to join with all our fellow Americans in this act of patriotic remembrance.

In these times, however, we cannot end our grateful demonstration with remembrance of the dead. As President Lincoln stated at Gettysburg, we must implement the patriotism of the living, with a vigorous reminder of the fact that civic virtue has to be nourished with religious principles and sound morality. We cannot depend upon atomic weapons alone to keep the peace. Indeed, these instruments may result in total annihilation. We need a profound realization of our responsibility to God, and we must spread that same realization to all the peoples of the earth in the spirit of Christ.

From time to time, we are faced with campaigns to remove religious principles from public life. Sometimes this action takes the form of fomenting social discord among various religious groups. Catholics have frequently suffered from the false allegation of being anti-American.

During the Colonial Days, Catholics suffered from the discriminatory measures transmitted by the hated English penal laws. These measures were washed out in the blood of the Revolutionary War and in the guaranties of the new Bill of Rights. About the middle of the last century, Catholics were attacked as anti-American in the so-called "know-nothing" movement. This attack was washed out in the blood of the Civil War.

Toward the end of the century, the same type of accusation and campaign appeared in the so-called American Protective Association—the once active APA. This was washed out in the blood of the Spanish American War. Then came to Ku Klux Klan, with similar slogans impugning the patriotism of Catholics. This was washed out in the blood of World War I. Let us hope and pray that more wars will not be necessary for us to disprove the falseness and unfairness of such allegations.

In other cases, there is an attempt to drop an iron curtain between civic activity and religion, as if a deep antagonism existed between them. The principle of separation of church and state has been tortured by particular groups for dubious purposes. Self-styled defenders of the State have engaged in an effort to elimminate from the realm of civic activity and service any reference to or cooperation with the church, and indeed appear desirous of penalizing and destroying religion as a kind of alien and hostile body. In the Communist-dominated countries, religion has been stigmatized by the ruling oligarchy and crushed, as unscientific, an enemy to the best interests of the people, and contrary to the principles of the state.

Americans of all faiths who cherish their freedom and acknowledge God as the only true source of authority and law will stoutly resist all such tendencies. While we never intend to mingle or confuse the legitimate functions of Church and State, we believe that our country is strongest and best when it humbly professes its faith and trust in Divine Providence. What we need in these times is a strengthening of religious faith, not a weakening or flight from it, and a positive reaffirmation of the spiritual nature and destiny of man.

For this reason it is important that men and women of genuinely patriotic and religious principles exert a public influence by a spirit of service and serious participation in all phases of life—educational, cultural, civic, professional, business, and charitable. We cannot allow the leadership of society

to be seized by those who entertain a sheerly materialistic view of mankind and a chemical concept of the human soul and who regard the State as the exclusive property of the Godless. Memorial Day is a glorious challenge, not only of grateful devotion to our heroic dead, but also of living dedication to the betterment of our country and to the promotion of international peace with justice and freedom under God. To this living task, we pledge ourselves with the stirring words of Christ who gave himself for all mankind: Greater than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

In Support of Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement which I made before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on June 17, 1955:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I wish to thank the members of this committee for granting me the privilege to appear before you in support of H. R. 4744, a bill in which I am very interested, as I have introduced H. R. 5039, an identical bill. As a freshman Member of Congress, I am eager to do all that I can to assist any group of retired workers.

I represent a district where many railroad people live, and before being elected to Congress, as well as since then, I have had many opportunities to become acquainted with them and to learn their problems.

It is a pleasure for me to recommend that you give favorable consideration to H. R. 4744. This bill will eliminate the inequitable dual benefits prohibition as it applies to widows. I understand the last session of Congress eliminated this prohibition as it applied to the pensioners themselves. I feel this rectification is overdue and that the plight of widows affected by this provision can be alleviated by the passage of this bill.

This bill would also assure spouses receiving annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act a benefit that would be no less than the maximum benefit payable under the Social Security Act. The maximum benefit under social security has increased from time to time, and this provision would allow spouses under the railroad retirement system to receive similar increases in the case of maximum annuities.

I am also pleased to note that this legislation under sections 5 and 6 calls for the protection of employees of the Railroad Retirement Board who fall under civil service. I recall the attempted transfer last year of a number of positions on the Board to schedule C, making these positions subject to political whims, instead of retaining them in the respected caliber where they justly belong. To prevent the strictly politically minded from attempting a similar raid in the future, I feel it is proper to include them under the protection of law.

I have been deluged with letters from retired railroad constituents pleading for some increase in annuities. I, of course, favor as much relief for them as possible within the limitations of the railroad retirement fund. I wish to state at this point that I will be happy to support any future legislation of this kind that is actuarially sound. But for the movement, I understand H. R. 4744 is the extent to which changes in the act are desired. I am pleased to lend my support to this beneficial legislation, and urge members of the committee to approve it without delay.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear in behalf of this bill.

There Can Be No Compromise With Evil Men—Anniversary of a Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence which appears in the current issue of U. S. News & World Report. This outstanding journalist, in discussing the anniversary of the United Nations Organization, points out a fundamental truth when he says that "obedience to the code of international morality requires no written mandate. For imbedded in the minds of people everywhere is the simple truth that there can be no compromise with evil men or evil things."

The editorial follows:

ANNIVERSARY OF A HOPE
(By David Lawrence)

In the 10 years that have elapsed since the United Nations Organization was founded at San Francisco, the world has witnessed the rise and fall of a great hope.

With a tendency toward oversimplification of a historic problem, public opinion in 1945 delegated to the United Nations the task of preventing war and assumed that the words of a written charter would be self-enforcing.

We have witnessed in 10 years many instances in which the influence of the United Nations has been brought to bear on international disputes. Sometimes the very existence of the machinery of negotiation and mediation has served to give time for cooling the passions of war. Sometimes the United Nations has exercised a direct and effective intervention—but mostly in the quarrels between smaller states.

The major experience, of course, has been in Korea. Led by the United States, the forces of 12 nations, acting in the name of the United Nations, pushed back the North Korean Army which had been furnished the sinews of war by the Soviet Government. Then came intervention by the armies of Red China. The casualties were counted in the hundreds of thousands. Soviet Russia, a member of the United Nations Security Council, openly boasted of her part in supplying munitions and airplanes to carry on the conflict.

Here was an act of faithlessness which killed the United Nations as an instrument for the enforcement of peace thereafter by military measures.

The United Nations ceased to exist as a military alliance when it accepted an armistice in Korea in 1953 without having punished the aggressor and without having expelled from its ranks a traitorous member—Soviet Russia.

The United Nations, however, has continued to be and will continue as an instrument of peace in a different capacity. Instead of mobilizing military manpower, the United Nations must inevitably mobilize the moral force of mankind.

For in truth what we have discovered is that the United Nations Charter is not in itself a means of preventing war or of making peace. Rather it is the morality of the members themselves, or the lack of it, which can make or unmake the peace of the world.

As long as the United Nations can maintain a forum for debate—a means of compelling public discussion of any question which threatens the peace of the world—it will remain a useful and practical organization.

There can, of course, be no federation of governments with an organized discipline over sovereign states until international morality has reached a higher level than may be observed today.

International immorality nowadays is far more evident than international morality. Statesmen find ways to avoid passing judgment on the misbehavior of aggressor governments. There is a tendency to refrain from imposing a sentence of guilt on governments that have betrayed their pledges and have disregarded the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

The art of diplomacy today seems to be constantly one of saving face for somebody. The Red Chinese Government, for example, has committed all the crimes in the law books of nations. But, bowing to the temptations of expediency, many otherwise moral governments blind themselves to the real issue and argue for admission of the Red Chinese aggressors into the United Nations.

Granted that the war in Korea resulted in no victory for either side and that the aggression was halted at the place where it began, the United Nations fails to reflect the moral indignation that should be implicit in its Charter when its members openly advocate a step that means rewarding the same aggressor with a seat in the Security Council.

May the statesmen who are gathered this week in San Francisco take counsel of their consciences and come to understand that obedience to the code of international morality requires no written mandate.

For imbedded in the minds of people everywhere is the simple truth that there can be no compromise with evil men or evil things.

Peoples must always be able to use any force they can muster to drive tyrants from power and recover their liberties. Free governments, responsive to the will of the people, constitute the only real guarantee of peace. Charters may be revised and their provisions made crystal clear, but they become futile when autocracy is given equal status alongside freedom's representatives.

The United Nations gave hope to the world in 1945 as it welcomed all "peace-loving" nations to membership. After 10 years, during which we have failed to cast out the aggressors, we are celebrating again the anniversary of a hope.

It's a hope that moral force—the united opinion of mankind—someday can reach into all countries and make the words "peace-loving" now written in the Charter, mean exactly what they say.

Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to direct my remarks to what I consider to be the two most important phases of the highway legislation.

First, I shall attempt to show where the critical and primary need for highway improvement exists in the United States.

Secondly, how this Congress can meet that need by a proper allocation of Federal funds.

There are approximately 3⅓ million miles of roads in the United States. It is admitted that something could be done—some money could be spent to improve in varying degrees almost each and every mile of this gigantic system in order to bring all of this mileage up to a standard of highway perfection so as to meet present and future traffic demands.

The Clay committee finds that such a program would cost more than a hundred thousand million dollars. If we adopt a plan calling for the expenditure of only a fourth of this amount, it will still be by far the biggest single public-works program, not only in the history of this country but in the history of the world.

It is further admitted that a hundred thousand million dollar program cannot possibly be considered. It is beyond our capabilities at this time. It, therefore, becomes obvious that the money available—the money we are willing to spend must be applied where it will do the most good—where the critical need exists—where it will do most toward relieving the traffic snarls that are gradually but surely strangling America's transportation. The available money must be applied to a highway program that will most effectively cut the tragic accidents and slaughter on the roads of this Nation with a resulting damage to our economy. Above all, the program must meet the defense requirements of this country. We must be able to move large heavy military equipment and personnel quickly across the Nation.

The question, therefore, is which program will do the job most effectively—the one fathered originally by Senator GORE, or the President's program resulting from the Clay committee's studies and investigations.

If we are going to follow the overwhelming and almost uncontradictable evidence adduced in the 7-week hearing before the Public Works Committee—evidence from the most competent authorities in the country—we must adopt at least a modified version of the President's program. On the other hand, if we are to follow the theory of handling this problem conceived by Senator GORE in an effort to beat the gun we must ignore the mountains of evidence piled high in the record.

The President's program deals solely with the interstate system. Its very name indicates that it is the system with which the Federal Government should be primarily concerned. It is on this system that we find the large volume and extreme density of traffic between centers of population. It is on this system that we find the bottlenecks—the slowdowns, reduced to a snail's pace, just outside and in the big cities.

The reasons for these conditions can be understood when we realize that the interstate system which consists of only 37,600 miles represents approximately 1 percent of the total road mileage in this country. This 1 percent, however, carries one-seventh of all the traffic. It means, therefore, that the density of traffic on the interstate system is 14 times the average density on all other highways.

These conditions have resulted in tremendously increased automobile operating costs, such as gasoline and oil consumption waste, brake and tire wear, and, above all, an unbelievable man-hour loss. The loss to the trucking industry, which is eventually passed on to the consumer is incalculable.

The rebuilding of the interstate system to the standards required will save 1 cent a mile in operating costs or approximately 14 cents for every gallon of gasoline that is used in passenger cars.

The trucking industry will save 4 cents a mile in operating costs.

All this will result in a total savings to highway users and our economy of $1,475 million per year.

The evidence is conclusive that it is on the interstate system where we are having a disproportionate number of accidents and loss of life. The rebuilding of the interstate system will result in a reduction of monetary losses from accidents alone amounting to $725 million per year. The total savings, therefore, will reach the staggering sum of $2,100 million a year. These savings alone will offset about two-thirds of the cost of the program.

If the highway user realizes these savings he may even be willing to pay at least part of this amount in additional user charges in order to make the program a reality.

Furthermore, one of the principal advocates for the development of the interstate system is the Department of Defense. The Defense Department, like all of us, has no problem with its equipment reaching the main arteries of traffic from its installations. It points out that its difficulty, like yours and mine, begins when it attempts to transport large military equipment and personnel across the country on the interstate system. The Department of Defense without reservation recommends that the interstate system be developed as proposed by the administration and that it be given priority.

We all now know that the large industrial centers of the United States will be the frontline trenches of the next war which all of us, of course, hope and pray will never come. If war comes, however, then evacuation is the only defense against atomic attack.

Could any large city in the United States be evacuated? The answer is "No," because the main highways extending from the periphery of industrial areas cannot possibly handle mass evacuations.

All of us are familiar with traffic conditions in the city of Washington between 5 and 6 o'clock in the evening when the workers are being evacuated from the downtown area to the suburbs. We literally crawl southward to Virginia and northward on Connecticut Avenue and 16th Street to Maryland. One can well imagine what would happen if not only the workers but the entire population attempted to move from all the metropolitan area. The main or arterial highways beyond every city in the United States are not capable of handling the traffic that would be thrown into them as the result of mass evacuation. They cannot handle the congestion on an ordinary Sunday afternoon.

Now, of course, I admit that the improvement of all of the system of highways in the United States would be beneficial and would result in a reduction of accidents and some saving in operating costs. However, again the evidence is conclusive that the beneficial results from the improvement of these systems is so slight when compared with the needs of the interstate system that every cent of money available should be spent on the immediate rebuilding of the interstate system and that it should be given complete priority.

The testimony shows that the primary, secondary, and farm-to-market roads are generally capable of adequately doing the job that is demanded of them today.

I drive between Cincinnati and Washington quite often over the interstate system. In view of my service on the Subcommittee on Roads, I have made careful observation of conditions. Time and time again, I have driven in a long line of traffic, frequently crawling up steep grades with other vehicles behind big trucks. While impatiently waiting to move ahead more quickly, I have glanced down the intersecting secondary roads. Invariably they have been in good condition with little or no traffic on them. Usually vehicles, if any, on these intersecting thoroughfares would be stopped at the intersection waiting to enter the crowded arterial highway. I am certain each of you has had similar experiences. There are 100 million miles of such secondary roads in this country that carry only from 1 to 100 cars a day.

I am not saying these secondary roads are perfect—that they do not need improvement and that we should not spend any money on them. All I am trying to do is to point out the relative needs.

Last year this Congress almost doubled the amount of Federal funds allocated for these other systems. The fact is that none of this additional money has as yet been used for improvement of these roads. Some States are going to have difficulty in matching the new funds provided for in the 1954 act.

If the interstate system is improved as recommended by the President all other roads will have made available further additional funds in the nature of a hidden windfall. Because of the heavy demands on the interstate system States today are spending a large part of their own highway funds on the rebuilding and maintenance of the interstate system within their respective States. If the Federal Government takes over the cost of rebuilding these interstate roads the States then will be able to use the money they are now spending on the interstate system on their secondary highways. These roads are primarily the States responsibility anyhow.

Now in spite of what has been shown about relative needs it is now proposed to dump additional millions on these roads. The Gore bill calls for 900 million a year. Thirty States have said they will not be able to match these additional amounts. Why do we then in face of these facts and all of the evidence to the contrary and against the recommendations of 97 percent of the witnesses who appeared before our committee, insist on giving these additional Federal funds for the secondary systems. Why do we do this when the available money is limited. Why do we do this when this money could be used so much more profitably if it were used where it is actually needed. We do it because we cannot get away from "pork barrel" politics. An election year is just around the corner and roads on the secondary systems pass almost every voting booth in the country. And yet, this is not enough "pork." Some still are not satisfied. It is, therefore, proposed in the Gore bill to substitute more "pork" for a truly effective and uniform interstate system.

Let me demonstrate what I say.

A long list of highway experts and responsible organizations headed by the Association of State Highway officials proved by cogent evidence that the solution to our critical highway deficiencies was the immediate and uniform, and note I say uniform, rebuilding of our interstate system under modern scientific highway engineering standards in every State in the Union. The cost of doing this job will vary from State to State depending on the number of miles of the interstate system within the State—topography—land acquisition costs—width of highways—utility relocation costs—number of grade separations and interchanges.

Does the Gore bill propose to distribute the Federal funds for the interstate system on the basis of need? It does not. It completely ignores the evidence and the recommendations of 97 percent of the witnesses and distributes money on the basis of votes. Some States under the Gore bill will get far less than the Bureau of Public Roads finds is needed to rebuild the interstate system to proper standards. Other States for no reason except political considerations get much more money than is needed to do the job.

On the other hand, the President's bill proposes to build roads where the real and critical highway problem exists and to allocate funds necessary to accomplish the results on the basis of need.

Horizons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charles W. Mayo, the eminent physician and surgeon of Rochester, Minn., recently spoke at the 108th commencement exercises at Mount Union College, at Alliance, Ohio, in my district. He is the son of one of the famed founders of the Mayo Brother's Clinic and is now the director of its graduate school in addition to his duties as director. His address to this graduating class at Mount Union, one of Ohio's fine small colleges, was so outstanding that, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert it in the RECORD for my colleagues to enjoy:

HORIZONS

(By Charles W. Mayo)

My talk this afternoon may be called a commencement address and it may contain the pitfalls common to those end-of-school-now-you-are-entering-a-new-phase speeches, that seek to inspire graduates and probably do something less.

The human race has undergone certain developments, usually considered desirable, since ancient man stalked the earth, but the susceptibility to good advice remains at a generally low level.

Maturity is defined as "a stage of full development." By that definition, maturity has little relation to chronological age. Some persons are mature at 18; some are mature at 28; some never mature. One of the more important aspects of intellectual maturity is the ability intelligently to consider advice, accept it if it is valuable and reject it if it is not. Good advice, however, unlike some medicines, may be given repeatedly and in large doses, without ill effect. The average human animals sheds vast quantities of good advice with the imperturbability of a duck in a shower.

There is, of course, a wide and admitted difference between pure advice, which grants the recipient the right of free choice, and so-called advice backed by the power of authority, which forces adherence because of fear. What I have to offer you is pure advice. You may exercise the right of free choice with all the joys of rebellion.

I have decided to speak on what might be termed "Horizons." The implication may be that I am going to tell you about the golden opportunities awaiting you at the end of your college careers and that by these opportunities I mean financial reward and the fulfillment of material ambitions.

Such opportunities certainly exist in America for those who desire them and will conscientiously work for them; that is a foregone conclusion. But if financial reward and material fulfillment are your only goals, I would say that the easiest way to achieve them is to marry money. There are, however, a number of other horizons for you. I shall mention some this afternoon, the first of which is spiritual faith founded on conviction. Now conviction and belief are not to be confused. We can believe in many things and can change our beliefs with the passing of time. Convictions are acquired slowly and, once acquired, are as much a part of a human being as is an arm or a leg. The boldest definition of conviction is: Something we would rather die for than yield.

I think that everyone, to be successful, must have 1 or 2 things that he believes in so strongly that he would die for them, not suicidally, but because his life would not be worth living without those convictions. To acquire and hold convictions takes time. It is a soul-searching matter. The reward is faith in oneself—a reason for existence. It has been my experience that the persons who are most deeply motivated by convictions come eventually to the conclusion that there is a master plan for all of us, governed by an all-powerful being.

Another horizon that bears reiteration concerns the responsibility of serving our fellow men. We are born to assume eventual responsibilities, but the person who is born with unusual, or even above-average intelligence, has a responsibility for service greater than that of his brother who, through a combination of genes and chromosomes, is less brilliantly endowed. It is interesting to note that in the United States about 60 million people work to care for the needs of the remaining 100 million.

Service, and recognition of the need for service, are mainsprings of American life. Service can be effective only if given willingly. Our system plases this responsibility on the individual. The American, or any other individual, can lose his dignity if the strong do not continue to take up the task of serving their fellow men, and unless each bears his responsibility according to his capacity and capabilities.

Yet another horizon is the practice of tolerance and patience. Plato said, "You are young, my son, and as the years go by, time will change and even reverse many of your opinions. Refrain, therefore, a while from setting yourself up as a judge of the highest matters." Youth, it also has been said, is impatient. Intolerance and impatience fail to recognize what Thomas Mann has called "transitoriousness, the perishableness of life." Mann pointed out that transitoriousness creates time and "time is the essence—potentially, at least, time is the supreme, most useful gift."

Time, and in many cases time alone, can cure the things of which we are impatient and intolerant. Time and intelligent effort can eventually solve the problem of minority groups in America and in other localities. Minority groups, justifiably impatient with the failure of certain other groups to practice the Golden Rule, may hope to speed events—but time is the essence.

When I was serving as an alternate delegate to the United Nations, a newspaper reporter sought my views on international affairs. Time, tolerance, and understanding, together with intelligent effort, I told him, can cure many things, even the ills of the world.

Our problem is to recognize, as Thomas Mann does, that time is perishable. Like all great gifts, time must be used wisely—with the further recognition that in the problems of this present era, we face the danger of time's running out. But if we will combine time with tolerance, and try especially to give unbiased consideration to the problems of others, no matter who they are, what their race, culture, religion, native laws, economics, or way of life, I think a better understanding among all peoples of the world will result.

Another horizon for the future is the continuation of education. I should list as the prime objective of our educational institutions the instilling of curiosity in students. If many of our students, as they say, graduate, and then fail to read another book for 10 years, the responsibility rests with those who had the opportunity to open young minds to the world. Yet it is important to point out that about all a college education can hope to do is to open the mind. The student can learn how to think. He is equipped with certain tools. Then the responsibility is his. He may seek to become truly educated, or he may be another college-trained dullard, with expensive tastes and a pauper's pocketbook.

Awareness of the good things of life is a worthwhile horizon. Self-indulgence, practiced with restraint, as much all things be practiced to be successful, can do wonders for the individual. Seriousness has its place but so do fun and recreation. Make up your minds early to have fun. Nobody loves a grind. Enjoy the recreation that the world, particularly America, and your fellow men, offer. But remember that the good things and recreation must be earned. Make sure always that the fun you have is not at the expense of someone else.

Another horizon is in the meaning of solitude. Gregariousness, the belief that one cannot be happy without the constant company of others, is a fallacy. In solitude, alone with one's thoughts, a good book, music—there begins the development of personal culture.

The next horizon may sound strange; it is be a gambler, in the proper sense, of course, with reasonable odds. On leaving college, do not look for security—look for opportunity. Actually, in my opinion, insecurity and dissatisfaction have much to be said in their behalf as catalytic agents in the promotion of individual and group advancement. Self-satisfaction is a fault; and the belief that there exists in this life a state of security is an illusion. Recognize opportunity, seize upon it, work unceasingly and unswervingly for the rewards it offers and thus additional doors of opportunity will open.

There is an horizon in self-reliance, the belief—better it were a conviction—that an individual can, to a certain extent, determine his or her destiny. The principle of self-determination is peculiar to democracy. It carries with it the assumption that no one is owed a living. In other words, we are privileged people, and privilege always carries responsibilities.

The final horizon is, really, a summing-up of the others and it is this: If we possess certain qualities, faith in God, the conviction that we must serve others, tolerance, patience, curiosity, an awareness of the good things in life, and the value of occasional solitude, self-reliance—if we possess these things, the whole world is the horizon. With these qualities one may reach for the stars, and perhaps fall short, but understanding that failure and finding peace in that understanding, may have the courage to try again.

To live a lifetime and be willing to live it almost exactly the same way again may not be a true test of one's greatness, but it comes close to being a proper test, for if a person can say that he has exploited his capabilities to the utmost, then he is a success.

I appreciate the honor of participating in these commencement exercises and if I am remembered by any of you, I hope it will be for the brevity of my remarks.

Congratulations and good luck to you all.

Thirty-seventh Annual Department Convention—the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include my statement to the members of the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, at the 37th annual department convention held in Revere, Mass., on June 16, 17, and 18, 1955:

Some people think of the American Legion as an organization with a special interest; to forward the compensation, pension, medical, and hospital claims of all veterans.

While we proudly acknowledge this fact, because we know that veterans have made greater sacrifices in behalf of our Nation than any other single group, we also point to the great and comprehensive program of the Legion which is dedicated to the preservation of all that we hold dear to us—Americans.

The Legion advocates a strong Defense Establishment.

And a strong foreign policy.

The Legion is not fooled by the sudden switch to sweat talk by us somewhere and somehow.

At the moment, for various reasons, they are stalling for time.

It seems to me that this is precisely the right moment to press our advantage.

Not by military action.

Accelerating, instead, our campaign to win the minds of men.

By increasing psychological warfare, as recommended by the Legion at the Washington national convention.

The defense of the United States, including the maintenance of far-flung forces and bases overseas, is costing us over $34 billion a year. Of that sum we are only spending $88 million, or less than one-third of 1 percent, for the United States Information Agency and the Voice of America.

We must never forget that the cold war goes on, relentlessly, even when the Reds are making peaceful gestures.

We oppose the Communists with military power.

We counter with diplomatic moves.

And exert economic pressure.

In the field of public relations on a global scale, however, we are acting like scared sheep. While Communist propaganda works night and day to convince its present and future victims that Communism is invincible.

We have the best produce—freedom.

We have the best salesmen in the world.

By a strange lack of understanding, and purpose, we are unable to team them up in a concerted drive to hit the Communists where they are weakest—the latent dissatisfaction of their own people.

Consider this one fact; the Communists have never conquered a single country by direct employment of military power. They didn't have to. Subversion, infiltration, propaganda, and blackmail did the trick.

Do we need any further evidence that pschological warfare is the trump card of the Communists?

Then consider their hideous brain-washing techniques that take a victim's mind away from him, and replace it with a soulless zombie Communist model.

Or the massive efforts being made to train an army of professional Soviet athletes that will go into the next Olympics disguised as amateurs in order to defeat the United States, and thus increase the prestige of communism.

This is being done on a cold and calculated basis * * * not in the interest of clean and wholesome sport * * * but to serve the ruthless ends of the Communist propaganda machine.

Words like "peaceful coexistence" "neutralism" are used to play upon human wishes, with dangerous cleverness, and as weapons against the mind.

Think of it, one-third of the people in this world have been enslaved by the cold-war methods of communism, which are far more profitable for the Reds than a hot war could ever be.

They will not risk a large-scale war because they know this would release revolutionary forces within their own empire. Even if they felt sure they could win such a war, they know that they too would suffer nuclear devastation.

Psychological warfare is the key to victory.

Of course we must maintain our lead in all categories of military power, for this gives us the insurance, the confidence, and the opportunity to wage psychological counter-offensive.

It may come as a shock to us to realize that we are not as modern or efficient as we think.

The United States, with all of its military and economic power, is asleep at the switch.

We have not yet awakened to the fact that the Reds are far ahead of us in the successful employment of cold-war techniques.

Every American wants peace and prosperity. The Presidential election of next year may hinge upon the real or fancied existence of both. But if the American people interpret the absence of bombs and casualty lists as a sign of peace, they will be falling into a habit of thought that could be fatal.

The Communists know when to give in—a little—just to deceive us into believing that peace is just around the corner, because that is a part of their cold-war technique, intended to throw us off balance.

Getting us into the mood of wishful thinking, and back to business as usual, as if the cold war could be turned off as conveniently as we turn off the light and go to sleep.

While strengthening ourselves with nuclear weapons and maintaining a defensive posture, we are neglecting the main front which communism has already breached, with a positive campaign to capture the minds of all men.

Day by day we see how Communist-inspired fears confuse, divide, and weaken the moral fiber of nations that are apparently free when there are much greater tensions within the Communist empire that we are failing to exploit.

Even now, almost 50 years after the Bolsheviks took over Russia, they must use more of their manpower and resources to keep their own people in subjection.

In other words, they have not convinced their own people that communism is the best way of life.

In fact, they are afraid of them.

Add to this the feelings of the people in the captive countries, and we have a situation made to order for effective psychological counteraction by the free world.

This attack upon the enemy's nerves should be total and unrelenting.

Time does not give me the opportunity to spell it out in detail.

As a guideline, I would suggest the following eight points from a program for a political offensive against world communism, recommended by David Sarnoff:

"1. To keep alive through the Soviet Empire the spirit of resistance and the hope of eventual freedom and sovereignty. If we allow that hope to expire, the Kremlin will have perpetuated its dominion over its victims.

"2. To break the awful sense of isolation in which the internal enemies of the Kremlin live * * * by making them aware that, like the revolutionists in Czarist times, they have devoted friends and powerful allies beyond their frontiers.

"3. To sharpen by every device we can develop, the fear of their own people that is already chronic in the Kremlin. The less certain the Soviets are of the allegiance of their people, the more they will hesitate to provoke adventures involving the risks of a major showdown.

"4. To provide moral and material aid, including trained leadership, to oppositions, undergrounds, resistance movements in satellite nations, and China and Russia proper.

"5. To make maximum use of the fugitives from the Soviet sphere, millions in the aggregate, now living in free parts of the world.

"6. To appeal to the simple personal yearnings of those under the Communist yoke: release from police terror, ownership of small farms and homes, free trade unions to defend their rights at the job, the right to worship as they please, the right to change residence and to travel, etc.

"7. To shatter the wave of the future aura around communism, displacing the assumption that communism is inevitable with a deepening certainty that the end of communism is inevitable.

"8. To inspire millions in the free countries with a feeling of moral dedication to

the enlargement of the area of freedom, based on repugnance to slave labor, coerced atheism, purges, and the rest of the Soviet horrors."

As a legionnaire, I would like to see our organization enlist public opinion in support of its resolve that the United States should increase psychological warfare.

Here we can attack communism at its weakest point.

In this manner we can win a bloodless victory.

On this anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill we should remember the early patriots who quickly adapted themselves to the challenge of their times and devised bold and original tactics to confound and defeat the enemy.

Aided by the vigilance and resourcefulness of the American Legion * * * I believe that we can decisively win the cold war and bring about the complete and final collapse of communism.

The Grace Weller Story: Bighearted America at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my prideful boast that nowhere in this broad land will you find an area that encompasses a greater group of bighearted people than those who reside in Lancaster County, Pa. Indeed, their charity is the kind that leavens all who become exposed to it and makes us want to exclaim with the poet that "God is in his heaven and all's right with the world."

In support of this conviction I would like to relate briefly a warm and tender gesture of Christian fellowship and outstanding community service that occurred recently in my Ninth Congressional District in Pennsylvania.

Late in February a young woman from Ephrata, a small town in Lancaster County, woke up in a hospital following a horrible highway accident. Mrs. Grace Weller was told that her husband, Norman, aged 27, had been killed in the crash and that it was necessary to amputate one of her legs. She became despondent and despairing realizing that a bleak, dismal future faced her with no insurance, income, or means of a livelihood. She had little desire or spark to get well.

And then a wonderful thing happened. A group of citizens of Ephrata, led by Burgess Lloyd Gerhart and Mr. and Mrs. Henry Nissley, determined that Grace Weller deserved a better lot in life and decided to help. They organized a community drive that included parades, shows, and a tag day to try to relieve her of the tremendous burden of medical expenses that mounted daily.

Local clubs and civic groups cooperated, as did the town's weekly newspaper, the Ephrata Review. The Lancaster Intelligencer Journal and New Era, New Holland Clarion, Lititz Express, and Reading Eagle also publicized this worthy cause.

Several thousand dollars was raised, a sizable sum for this small community of only 6,000, but still not enough to meet Mrs. Weller's expenses, which had reached over $6,000.

A large metropolitan radio station learned of this tragic case and asked if it could help on this local level.

The Westinghouse-owned radio station KYW in Philadelphia reached out to thousands and thousands in its audience with the dramatic story of Mrs. Weller. Listeners from all over Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, although they had never heard of this young Ephrata woman and her misfortune, responded magnificently, and over $3,000 was received in 2 weeks.

KYW decided to take it further and passed the story on to Warren Hull, of the radio and television program, Strike It Rich. As a result, he asked two KYW performers, Bill Givens and Vince Lee, to appear on his show in behalf of Grace Weller. Their appearance, in which they spread the Grace Weller story from coast to coast, both on the NBC radio network and the CBS television network, brought more money to Grace Weller. Nearly $800 in money and gifts were realized by the young men themselves on the show.

And so I would like to offer this humble tribute and praise to the townspeople of Ephrata and its newspapers, and to the thousands of generous folks reached by KYW who volunteered time, services, and money to make it possible to assist this young woman to get a fresh new start in life.

This is the heart of America responding. This is the American people taking care of their own. This is bighearted America at its best.

Better and Safer Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the great rubber industry has been working for years to get better and safer highways. Mr. Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman of the board of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., is to be congratulated on the advertisement appearing in our newspapers throughout the country, stressing the need for a good highway program. It follows:

AMERICA'S FUTURE PROGRESS DEPENDS ON BETTER AND SAFER HIGHWAYS—LET'S BUILD THEM NOW

This is the season of the year when millions of Americans go vacationing in the family car.

Most of them are careful drivers who obey traffic regulations and the rules of the road. And yet, a large number of them will be killed or painfully injured in highway accidents.

Why?

Principally because we are trying to drive 1955 model cars over 1925 model roads.

As a result, here in a country where 1 out of every 7 workers is employed in the motor transportation industry, where about 53 million motor vehicles will, this year, travel some 525 billion miles, precious lives are being lost at the rate of 36,000 a year.

Today we, as a Nation, are facing a serious traffic situation. There is now 1 car to every 700 feet of every lane in each direction of every street and highway in the United States. According to estimates, our present obsolete highway system is costing us nearly $10 billion annually in property damage, loss of time, and higher transportation costs. And all we are getting for our money is delay, irrigation, injury, and death. Now, we must make up for our neglect of highways, and we must act quickly.

Even if you do not own an automobile, you have a vital stake in our highway system. Some 77 percent of the country's freight, including a very large percentage of the food you eat, the clothes you wear, the tools you use, and the raw materials needed by the Nation's factories is transported over the streets and roads of our country by motor vehicles. Any breakdown in this system of supply may have a serious effect on your way of living.

If you do own an automobile, you know from experience that you are seldom able to use the excellent performance that was built into your car. In the city, except on expressways, you are slowed down by stop signs, traffic lights, and speed laws, not to mention bumps in the pavement, chuckholes, and other hazards. Out in the country, where faster travel may be possible, you frequently find yourself creeping along with no room to pass, stalled at traffic bottlenecks or slowed to a walk by pitted pavements.

It will take the combined efforts of all Americans to correct this situation. Congress and the State legislatures have before them a number of bills which could help give our country and its people the road system it must have.

A most effective way to get quick action is to write your Senators and Representatives both in Congress and in your State legislature and tell them that you want them to vote to give the United States a system of streets and highways that will not merely meet today's needs but also take care of the traffic volume for years to come.

And, above all, tell them that you want action now. Better highways will save lives. And among the lives they save may be your own.

America's future progress depends on better and safer highways. Let's build them now.

HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, JR.,
Chairman, the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

Resolution Commending Congress for Legislation To Outlaw the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION 66

Whereas the Communist Party is un-American and subversive, dedicated to the violent overthrow of the Government of the United States, and takes its orders from, and owes its allegiance to, Moscow: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., May 4–6, 1955, That we commend the Congress of the United States for the passage of Public Law No. 637, the aims of which are to outlaw the Communist Party; and be it further

Resolved, That we further thank all the departments of the American Legion for their resolutions insisting upon the outlawing of the Communist Party, and for their help in aiding in the passage of this law and for their sustained efforts over the years to accomplish the objectives thereof.

Successful Troubleshooter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I was agreeably surprised to note that a publication, which has not been too complimentary to the present administration, has been particularly lavish in its praise of Mr. Pierce J. Gerety, of Fairfield, Conn., a personal friend and constituent of mine, who last week became Deputy Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

The article in the New Republic of June 20, 1955, says he has had "an extraordinary record in the Eisenhower administration," and it points out that in becoming chairman of the International Organizations Employee Loyalty Board in 1953 he accepted "one of the hottest assignments of that period" the screening of 4,100 Americans employed by the U. N. and some 40 other international organizations.

The magazine points out that Mr. Gerety directed the review and closing of 3,939 cases in 15 months "with warmest commendation from many of the civil servants who appeared with not an unkind word from the international agencies, and with highest praise from Secretary Dulles."

In his new post Mr. Gerety, who has already demonstrated his ability as a troubleshooter not only on the abovementioned board but also as the first one to serve as General Counsel of the United States Civil Service Commission, will, I am sure, carry out the refugee program in a manner that will win further approval and commendation both here and abroad.

The article in the New Republic entitled "A New Expediter of the Refugee Program" is as follows:

A NEW EXPEDITER OF THE REFUGEE PROGRAM

The State Department's politically explosive job of expediting the flow of refugee immigrants—the job from which Secretary Dulles booted his friend Edward J. Corsi last April—has now been handed to a young Connecticut lawyer who has made an extraordinary record in the Eisenhower administration.

Pierce Gerety, 41-year-old former law associate of Wendell Willkie, was recently sworn in as deputy to Scott McLeod, Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. In announcing his appointment, the State Department said Gerety would have complete authority and responsibility for the operation of the refugee program. He was not given Mr. Corsi's added title of Special Assistant to the Secretary.

The purpose of the lagging Refugee Relief Act is to bring 209,000 special immigrants, mainly from Iron Curtain countries, into the United States by the end of 1956. Half the 40-month duration of the act has already passed and only 15 percent of the visa quota has been used.

The new expediter arrived in Washington in 1953 to accept one of the hottest assignments of that period—the loyalty screening of 4,100 Americans who were employed by the United Nations and about 40 other international organizations. His official title was Chairman of the International Organizations Employee Loyalty Board, an offshoot of the Civil Service Commission.

Gerety was beset with conflicting pressures. Some Members of Congress had been charging for 8 years that the United Nation Secretariat included Americans who were Communist sympathizers and should be fired. International agencies, including the United Nations, felt that the United States was violating its pledge not to interfere with the work of international civil servants, and the American employees themselves had valid grievances. Some had been suspended from their jobs at the request of the State Department—one for almost a year—yet no hearing machinery existed to end the impasse.

Screening these 4,100 Americans was a task which required sensitivity to international obligations and feelings, and a strong will to resist political pressure. Yet within 15 months Gerety and his board had closed 3,939 of the cases, with warmest commendation from many of the civil servants who appeared before them, with not an unkind word from the international agencies, and with highest praise from Secretary Dulles. The problem of the loyalty of Americans working for international organizations has ceased to be an issue in Congress—with two lingering exceptions. A group of Americans formerly employed by UNESCO were dropped on recommendation of Mr. Gerety's board but appealed their case to a semi-judicial court on personnel matters in the United Nations. The court awarded them damages for dismissal. The other case involved William Henry Taylor of the International Monetary Fund, whose clearance is pending before the Board.

In his new job Gerety will find equal need for rapid action yet the pressures upon him will again be conflicting. The plight of the refugees themselves is demanding. Charitable organizations are pressing for the issuance of visas. The White House and the Republican National Committee are both concerned over possible critism from minority groups in the 1956 election if the refugee program does not function well. Yet against these pressures, Gerety's predecessor charged that Scott McLeod was out to wreck the program, and Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a coauthor of the Refugee Act, has already stated he will oppose changes in the law which would speed up its operation.

Veterans' Apprentice Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a letter received from John E. Deady, secretary-treasurer of the Building and Construction Trades Council of the Metropolitan District—Boston—affiliated with the Building and Construction Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, together with a copy of a resolution adopted at the 71st semiannual convention of the Massachusetts State Building and Construction Trades Council held in Boston on April 30 to May 1, 1955.

I have called this matter to the attention of the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs as the views of this reputable council are deserving of deep consideration.

The letter and resolution follow:

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT,
Boston, Mass., June 15, 1955.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The enclosure, a resolution unanimously adopted at the 71st semiannual convention of the Massachusetts State Building and Construction Trades Council, points up the hardship imposed on veteran apprentices because of an arbitrary interpretation of Public Law 550—82d Congress.

In the construction industry an employer having work may be considered able to provide opportunity to learn, practice, and acquire the skill enabling an apprentice to become a recognized qualified craftsman. The joker in this condition is that all employers do not always have work, the construction industry being a contract industry.

Experience has shown that where the apprentice be indentured to a union representing the craft of his choice he, the apprentice, can be moved from one shop temporarily out of work to another with work, thus cutting out time lost to the apprentice where an employer is slack.

The apprenticeship systems throughout the Nation statistically indicate that the union building industry craft apprentice constitutes about 60 percent of the enrollment in all recognized apprentice programs. This is particularly true in the Boston area. A recent apprentice State convention held at Wentwork Institute revealed the presence of six or eight at the most representatives of contractors, associations, and individual employers in the section set apart for building trade crafts panels.

Loose thinking and poor interpretation resulting in loss of veterans' benefits to future apprentices because of this ruling will do much to discourage the constructive work in progress since the end of World War II, which has seen many thousands of veteran apprentices indentured to our local unions today recognized as finished mechanics and with a secure place in the economy. The need of every encouragement to the apprentice, particularly the qualified veteran apprentice, is very plain to us and we hope to you.

May we have your support in seeing to it that tahe veteran apprentice be not denied his benefits because our unions have demonstrated that they are the more efficient agency to be indentured with if the ambitions of the veteran are to be realized.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. DEADY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION

To the 71st Semi-Annual Convention of the Massachusetts State Building and Construction Trades Council, Boston, Mass., April 30, May 1, 1955:

Whereas local unions of the building and construction trades have, since their incep-

tion, recognized the need for apprentice training; and

Whereas these local unions have prepared comprehensive programs for the training of apprentices; and

Whereas many veterans of World War II received their training as building tradesmen through this medium of training; and

Whereas the training of these young men have been an asset to the crafts in providing skilled and competent workmen to carry on the tradition of the trades; and

Whereas veterans of World War II were granted, under Public Law 346, certain monetary allowances to supplement their wages, for recognition of their services in World War II; and

Whereas by act of the 82nd Congress of the United States in enactment of Public Law 550, provisions were established for monetary allowances for veterans of the Korea conflict in apprentice training; and

Whereas the apprentice training programs were continued by many local unions of the building trades and apprentices who were veterans of Korea were indentured to local unions for training; and

Whereas on October 6, 1954, there was issued by the Veterans' Administration an interpretation of Public Law 550, section 201 (7) which wil not recognize a local union as a bona fide training establishment because (quote) "they are unable to exercise control over the physical training of the program and are unable to assume responsibility for compliance with Public Law 550" end of quote; and

Whereas this matter has been taken up by the Division of Apprentice Training of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with the Veterans' Administration and with the Building and Construction Trades Dept. of the A. F. of L.; and

Whereas no satisfactory adjustment of this matter has been made from the decision of the Veterans' Administration dated October 6, 1954; and

Whereas a further ultimatum was issued by the Veterans' Administration on February 7, 1955, that unless interpretation of Public Law 550 as outlined by the Veterans' Administration were met within 60 days that veterans of Korea would not be eligible for monetary assistance from the V. A. to supplement their wages while in training; and

Whereas this edict became effective on April 11, 1955, and veterans in training indentured to local unions are now being denied their subsistence allotments under Public Law 550 by this dictatorial act of the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas this is causing hardship to many veteran apprentices now in training and is denying other veterans the opportunity of learning a trade under the sponsorship of local unions; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration, by their arbitrary interpretation, have attempted to degrade local unions as incompetent and irresponsible; and

Whereas this seriously reacts to the detriment of the local unions in the building and construction trades: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Building and Construction Trades Council in their 71st semiannual convention assembled, do hereby protest the actions of the Veterans' Administration in this matter, and do call upon the Bureau of Apprenticeship of the United States Department of Labor and the Division of Apprentice Training of the Massachusetts Department of Labor and Industries to continue their efforts for correction of the grave injustices done to the veteran apprentice and the local unions of the building and construction trades; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the building and construction trades department of the A. F. of L. requesting that their good offices take all possible steps for the reestablishment of local unions of the building and construction trades as bona fide training agencies under Public Law 550 as enacted by the 82d Congress of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That a circular letter be sent to all affiliates of the Massachusetts State building and construction trades requesting that they contact their international unions and their United States Senators and Congressmen for the inclusion of local unions as training agencies under Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress.

Unanimously adopted by the convention.

Trouble With Farmers Is—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared on June 9 in the Thorp Courier, of Thorp, Wis.

The editorial summarizes some important facts about the 1954 farm situation. I recommend the article for my colleagues' study, and it follows in full:

TROUBLE WITH FARMERS IS—

(By Uncle Dudley)

Trouble with the farmer is, he hasn't got enough sporting blood to appreciate the great farm sweepstakes of 1955—will the loss in numbers of farmers forced off the farm, keep up with the decline in farm income?

The Department of Agriculture breathlessly announces that farmers weren't really worse off in 1954 than in 1953, despite the fact that farm income dropped off by $1.3 billions.

This is, they say, because some 700,000 farm folks were forced off the farm in 1954, to take their chances in the cities where there were already nearly 4 million jobless to compete with for jobs.

The Department explains that their departure from the farm was a blessing, because this means that farmers' income per remaining farmers did not go down in 1954, as against 1953.

Its official jobs' comforters also ignore the fact that the remaining farmers are being squeezed progressively tighter between fixed or rising costs, and lower income for what they produce, and the fact that the farmers' average income per person is at best only half that of the city dweller.

The first 2 months of 1955 have seen a further decline of $250 million in farmers' marketing income or at the rate of another $1.5 billion loss if this keeps up through 1955.

Will the Department of Agriculture be able to force another 700,000 farmers off the farm in 1955 to keep up with the decline in farm income?

How do you bet on the great farm sweepstakes of 1955?

The trouble with this sort of thing, including the official glossing over of ugly facts, by responsible officials, is that it can go on only so long.

The race between declining farm numbers and declining farm income reminds your Uncle Dudley of the old story about the miserly farmer who tried to save money by seeing how little feed his horse could get along on.

He had just gotten the horse down to one stalk of hay a day, when the horse died on him.

The farmer felt quite badly but cheered up and announced that at any rate he had come within a day of proving his case.

Will the Department of Agriculture experiment in plowing under farmers stop before we're down to one farmer?

How will you bet on the great farm sweepstakes of 1955, 1956, 1957, and so on ad infinitum? On Bensonism, or on the American farmer to survive? National Union Farmer.

Century Ends at Agawam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called the attention of the Congress to the 100th birthday as a town of Agawam, Mass. The success of the celebration is detailed by the news report of the Springfield (Mass.) Union dated June 20, 1955. The impressive religious ceremonies which were held in all the churches of the town are particularly noteworthy.

The tremendous success of this centennial milestone in the history of Agawam is all the more wonderful when it is realized that the program in its entirety was produced by the townsfolk themselves. This clearly demonstrates the capacity and the spirit of the community.

Mr. Speaker, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is, in a sense, the voice of the United States whose history it records. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the proceedings of Agawam's centennial be made a part of the record:

CENTURY ENDS AT AGAWAM—40,000 VIEW TOWN'S BIGGEST PARADE—CHURCHES CONDUCT SPECIAL SERVICES

The town of Agawam settles down to start its second 100 years this morning.

The first century came to official termination yesterday with a splash of noise and color provided by the biggest parade in the town's history.

An estimated 40,000 persons lined the 1.7-mile parade route, and almost 100,000 participated in the 4-day centennial celebration.

Yesterday's windup activities started solemly, with special services in all the town's churches, but concluded on a highly festive note.

The parade began promptly at the 1 o'clock gun, and the last unit, a frisky colt, skittered past the reviewing stand 3 hours and 13 minutes later.

There were 8 divisions, 232 units, and several thousand aching feet in the procession.

The parade had a little bit of everything.

Noise—ranging from the shrieking swoosh of four jet planes that buzzed the course to the Dixieland jazz of the Tailgate Six to military marches and the Whiffenpoof song.

Color—beginning with the blackest of black slaves of the Shrine's Oriental Band, continuing through the orange and brown of Agawam's school units and the blazing red of a dozen fire trucks, to the particolored plaids of the kiltie band.

Novelties—like the bicycles so small their wheels were the size of silver dollars to the bikes big enough for four and tall enough to permit the driver to whisper into an elephant's ear, and dozens of antique autos.

Specialties—like the baton twirling of Ginger Robbins and Marilyn Sarat, the snappy close-order drilling of military units, and half a dozen guys named Davy Crockett.

QUEEN HAS PLACE

There were floats and fire engines, cherubic little girls not far beyond the toddling stage who stepped the full route without a halt, clowns and tramps, military men and scouts, and dozens of pretty girls—but none more beautiful than the queen, 18-year-old Marilyn Wilson.

Bulk of the crowd was crammed onto bleachers, beach chairs, and curbstones on the northern end of the route, from the reviewing stand in front of the high school to the breakup point at the shopping center.

Even the weather cooperated in making the centennial a success. The sun shone bright and warm for the fourth straight day; it was perfect parade-watching weather.

TRAFFIC MOVES SMOOTHLY

The crowd was dispatched with a minimum of confusion. State troopers, mobile police auxiliaries, and West Springfield police, bolstered the Agawam department to keep traffic moving smoothly.

The final public event of the centennial took place at Riverside Park after the parade ended. Twelve drum corps took a brief breather from marching and proceeded to stage a 2-hour exhibition.

Dr. Charles Robbins, a psychiatrist from Middletown, Conn., won the New England 15-kilometer championship road race which finished a few minutes before the parade began.

Centennial events began with a ball Thursday night, continued Friday with a band concert and dancing on the green, and swung into 13 hours of celebrating Saturday that began with children's track and field events, included a barbecue, and wound up with fireworks and a bonfire.

The enthusiasm, town spirit, and optimism generated at the centennial seem strong enough to carry Agawam safely through another 100 years.

COUNTRY CLUB SUNRISE SERVICE STARTS SUNDAY EVENTS

AGAWAM, June 19.—Centennial Sunday in Agawam opened with a sunrise service at 6:30 this morning on the grounds of the Feeding Hills Country Club. The guest preacher, Rev. Robert E. Baggs, of Glenview, Ill., preached on the "strong, free, and imperfect."

BUILD TODAY ON PAST

"We build today on our yesterdays for the sake of a greater tomorrow," said Mr. Baggs. "The founders of Agawam can be likened to bridge builders, building a bridge from weakness to strength, from domination to freedom. Because of their perseverance, courage, and fortitude, the town and the country itself became strong and free.

"We accept this heritage. But we, too, must build for posterity, building on their foundation. Our country is strong, it is free, but it is imperfect. Therefore, it is ours to build a bridge from imperfection to perfection. We must continually strive for the highest and best."

In the various Protestant churches, the centennial theme was evidenced in sermon and song. At the First Baptist Church, Rev. Benjamin T. Lockhart, preaching on Faith of Our Fathers, said, "We should not live as though the past has no effect on us, for out of the past comes the present. To disregard it is to close our eyes to the pattern of growth, for our generation prepares the next generation, and each draws on the accumulated wisdom and faith of previous generations.

"Our town faces a new day. Its history will be written well if the people of our town keep faithful to the teachings of the God of our fathers, for unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

Preaching on the "Pioneer Spirit" at Lay Memorial Methodist Church, Rev. John A. Caswell said, "This is a time for looking to history in order to dramatize the customs and experiences of our forefathers. The past and the future meet in the present. The past is the ground of our present experience and the source of our learning.

"Ours is a heritage created from the raw stuff of life by forefathers who had the pioneering spirit. That spirit seems to have three major ingredients: awareness of what is vital to life and growth; awareness of the importance of the individual to the community and the support of the community for each individual; the courage born of faith in God and in oneself, to walk paths of truth and experience alone if need be, where man has never walked before."

Rev. Eben T. Chapman, preaching in the Agawam Congregational Church, declared the centennial "brings into sharp focus the fleeting nature of life. But people confronted by life's uncertainties reach out for something secure. Our unhappiness is in our mistaken notion as to what has real permanence. We are fooled by position, possessions, and power, but the things that really outlast the centuries are faith, hope, and love."

At St. David's Episcopal Church, Rev. Robert B. Lane commented that "We smile indulgently as we scan old family albums, things were so quaint and people so peculiar in dress 100 years ago. But then we notice people 100 years ago had eyes and ears and noses and mouths just like ours. They had the same needs that we have, the same basic tensions. Customs and habits change, but men's needs are always the same. The only answer for the next 100 years is the answer of the past 100 years, God."

At the Feeding Hills Congregational Church the guest preacher, Dr. Chester E. Jenney, took for his sermon topic, "One Hundred Years the Same." He said in part: "Time never changes the fundamental things. The universe is the same. The earth is the same, human nature is the same, love and sorrow are the same. In spite of change, the good things, the eternal things of life, remain. They are our sacred heritage and our hope for the future."

BISHOP WELDON CELEBRATES MASS; POPE PIUS' LETTER READ

Bishop Christopher J. Weldon spiritually rededicated Agawam yesterday at a Pontifical Mass commemorating the town's 110th birthday.

PICTURES SPIRIT THEN

Leafy boughs rustled in the midday breeze as 500 persons attended mass on the lawn of St. John the Evangelist Church.

The bishop also read a message from Pope Pius XII, relayed through the apostolic delegate in Washington, Amleto G. Cicognani bestowing an apostolic benediction upon all those who participated in the program.

The benediction was bestowed upon non-Catholics as well as Catholics, Bishop Weldon said.

Catholics attending the Pontifical Mass also are eligible for a plenary indulgence if they receive communion within a week.

It is easier to visualize the spiritual picture of the Agawam of 100 years ago than it is to imagine the physical situation that existed then, the bishop said.

"Even then the people of Agawam had a reverential feeling for their Divine Father," Bishop Weldon said. "They had freedom of worship, as distinguished from the persecution that existed on the other side of the ocean."

The bishop said he had offered the holy sacrifice of the Mass in the name of the people of Agawam, to let God know that "we are mindful, not only of the material blessings, so generous and so abundant, but also the spiritual blessings, bestowed with a lavish hand."

Agawam's success as a community, the bishop said, is partially because its people "not only speak of love of brethren, but exemplify it."

Assisting the bishop at the Mass were:

High priest, Rt. Rev. William Leclaire, pastor of St. Thomas Aquinas and former paster of St. Theresa's in Agawam; deacons of honor, Rev. Charles Zanetti, CPS, pastor of St. Anthony's, and Rev. John Shannon, pastor of St. Theresa's in Agawam; deacons Rev. Fernand Roy, pastor of St. Theresa's; subdeacon, Rev. Leonard Della Badia, CPS, pastor of Sacred Heart, Feeding Hills; master of ceremonies, Rev. George A. Berthiaume; assistant master of ceremonies, Rev. James Flanagan, CPS.

Rambling Roses and Flying Bricks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a very wonderful and unusual friend and constituent who owns a newspaper at Thomasville, in the First District of Alabama, and writes a column entitled "Rambling Roses and Flying Bricks."

Well, most people know that I know something about dogs, and in his column this week I find a wonderful story by this great writer on dogs. I think it is very well written, and it is true, as, of course, no newspaper writer would write anything but the truth, especially about a dog.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein this article by Senator Earl Tucker in his Rambling Roses and Flying Bricks, as I am sure every man in this Congress who represent every human in this Nation of about 165 million people will enjoy his story about the homeless girl dog:

RAMBLING ROSES AND FLYING BRICKS

Several years ago a scrawny, hungry-looking and homeless girl dog started hanging around my neighbor's house. Somehow the good Lord gave dogs the ability to make friends and influence people when they need to and pretty soon this girl dog had it made. Not knowing her name and because they already had a much larger and older dog, they called her "Sister."

JUST LIKED TO RUN

With good food and kind treatment Sister became a very respectable looking hound. It was learned later that her original owner, an ardent foxhunter, had kind of abandoned her because she persisted in running rabbits. She would run a fox all right, if she happened upon a trail, but if foxes weren't stirring she would take out after a rabbit and really put him in overdrive. Sister figured, I reckon, that she deserved a little pleasure herself, seeing as how she was doing the running, but her owner didn't look at it that way.

The first deer season after my neighbor acquired Sister we took her on a deer drive, not figuring she would especially care about running deer, but it was right down her alley and she became one of the finest deer dogs you ever saw. It just so happened that there were more deer than rabbits in this particular swamp and it also just happened that she jumped a deer first. She liked the sport and after that she would let a rabbit play around in the front yard, unless she was a little hungry.

FRIENDLY AND STUBBORN

She was a friendly dog, although as stubborn as she could be. On cold, rainy nights she would come down to my house and whine until I let her in. When bedtime came I would try to coax her out and she wouldn't pay me a bit of mind. Finally, I would have to pick her up and take her out, which she resented very much.

Because she was such a good deer dog and partly because my neighbor didn't care to feed any more dogs, we always put her up in one of my outside buildings when she got that semiannual family gleam in her eyes. We confined her a little over 2 months ago, but we went wrong somewhere. We either waited too long about putting her up or we let her out too soon. Anyway, she hadn't been out very long before she started gaining weight in the wrong place.

RABBITS RULED OUT

For a while we weren't too sure. Looking at her 1 day, my neighbor allowed as how maybe she had just eaten a rabbit. It was just hopeful thinking on his part, because as the days passed we realized she was either catching bigger rabbits or she was going to find some puppies. We ruled out the first possibility, because rabbits in this section just aren't that large.

Last Friday, underneath the very building where we thought we had kept her confined, she found seven puppies. There is a black one, a brown one, a yellow one and the others are two- and three-tone jobs. I don't believe there is a dog in our entire neighborhood but what could pass out cigars. Sister, I'm afraid, is a fickle female.

PUPS FOR GIVEAWAY

The reason I'm writing this column is because my neighbor kind of blames me, in a way, because my building wasn't "getting in" proof. The thought struck me that maybe somebody would like to have a cute little puppy in about 6 weeks. They're absolutely free, and if that's too high, we'll throw in another puppy. You'll enjoy seeing one grow up and it'll be interesting to see what kind of dog it turns out to be. It's entirely possible that you'll have a deer dog, bird dog, lap dog, or just a plain dog. There are 5 males and 2 females and you can have either brand. Of course, if it were me picking out a dog, I'm pretty certain as to what sex I would insist on.

Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of Saturday, June 18, 1955:

THE GRAY APPOINTMENT

It is generally accepted that most major posts in an administration should be held by those of the President's own party. Such a custom works toward strengthening the two-party system and enforcing party responsibility. The American system of Government benefits.

But there are areas into which partisan politics should not enter. One of these is national defense. And President Eisenhower has been under some legitimate criticism for failing where his two predecessors did not: In symbolizing through important appointments the nonpolitical nature of this truly national function.

He has now moved to rectify this situation by naming Gordon Gray as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs.

Mr. Gray is a happy choice. Emphasizing bipartisanship is the fact that Mr. Gray is not only a Democrat, he is a Democrat who, unlike Secretary Oveta Hobby, did not lead in a pro-Eisenhower movement within the party in the 1952 elections—a Democrat, moreover, who held conspicuous posts in a Democratic administration.

From the standpoint of value to the Defense Department, Mr. Gray served both as Assistant Secretary and Secretary of the Army under President Truman. And for both the incumbent and the last administrations he has headed with distinction boards of great military and international consequence.

The appointment is no mere gesture on any count. It should be welcomed.

The Bomb Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer dated Friday, June 17, 1955. It seems to me that this is about as apt a comment on last week's so-called civil-defense demonstration as you can find:

THE BOMB SHOW

Official Washington might be surprised to know how many Americans sympathize with the District of Columbia civilian defense official who described Wednesday's Operation Alert as a "fiasco," as "not a drill but a show."

It was all of that, and while his superiors probably took the proper course in discharging a man who entertained so little regard for the enterprise in which he was engaged, his sentiments nevertheless reflect those of perhaps an overwhelming percentage of the American people.

It may be a wise precaution to set up a system of scattered and secluded posts from which the Government could function in time of emergency, and to practice manning and utilizing these facilities. But when it comes to putting on a paper raid by hydrogen and atomic bombs on half a hundred strategic centers throughout the country, undertaking mass evacuations and assessing the theoretic loss of life or success or failure of these evacuations, the absurdity of the whole thing is its most striking characteristic.

If the purpose was to put on an actual demonstration of people getting out of the way of atomic- and hydrogen-bomb explosions, it was a failure. They just didn't get away, or if so to where? If the purpose was to condition the people to the acceptance of huge appropriations for civilian defense maneuvers and preparations, it was a failure. The people simply were not impressed. Most of them just don't believe they ever will be visited by atomic or hydrogen bombs, or that there is anything much they can do about it if they are. They may be very wrong as to the first, but nothing that happened on Wednesday shakes the conviction that they are quite right about the second.

One other criticism of Wednesday's performance, it seems to this newspaper, is quite valid. That is of the timing. Here we have Foreign Ministers from Germany and France and England gathering in New York to discuss plans for the forthcoming Big Four meeting at which it is hoped to work out some of the problems of international peace. We have the Foreign Minister of Russia a visitor in the land. We have representatives of nations from all over the world either here, on their way or preparing to come for next week's meeting of the United Nations. Peace and good will are in the air. Hope, whether justified or not, is high all over the world that out of these exchanges may come understandings and agreements that will lead to universal peace. So what do we do? We put on a war show.

Fake Union Claims Bring Sentences to Two in McCormick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: article from the Greenwood, S. C., Index-Journal:

FAKE UNION CLAIMS BRING SENTENCES TO TWO IN MCCORMICK

(By Ed Chaffin)

McCORMICK.—A fast-talking, far-ranging Negro posing as a labor union representative found a flock of lambs ready to be shorn in McCormick in March, it was brought out in a trial yesterday.

He came with glad tidings of two television towers to be constructed, 1 between Greenwood and Newberry, and the other near Troy. There was some variance in the details, but generally it seemed that those working on the ground would get $1.40 an hour and the pay would increase as the workers ascended the tower.

John Allen Starks, who came with the good news, found a confederate in Ralph "Preacher" Talbert, who said he had been leader of a Baptist flock in the community. They made the rounds, spreading the word, and collecting $5 "union dues" as a prerequisite for working on the job. Around 20 persons "joined."

The two Negroes were indicted yesterday for swindling and conspiracy to swindle, and conducted their own defense. As the jury was deliberating in the jury room, however, they entered pleas of guilty to conspiracy.

Starks, who had a record covering several pages of an FBI report, was given 1 year. Judge T. B. Greneker was told by the county officials that six warrants were held for Starks, and the judge advised them that if any other State, particularly Michigan,

wanted the prisoner he thought that it would be a good thing to let him go.

Talbert was given 1 year, suspended, and was placed on probation for 2 years.

"How much money do you have?" Judge Greneker asked him, and Talbert spread his hands and said, "Judge, all I've got is my overalls and my hat."

"If you fool around with Starks you won't have your overalls," he was advised.

The defense was simple. Starks said that he did not hold a pistol at anybody's head to get the money. When word spread, the Negroes of the community shoved the money at him, waking him up at night to take it.

"As near as I can make it out," he said in his plea to the jury, "the solicitor has got me charged with quick snatching and fast running with intent to steal of a high and aggravated nature."

Talbert's plea was that he was so carried away with the whole idea (he was to be the foreman on the job), that he indulged too freely of some whisky and didn't recall much of the entire affair.

"The devil just got the best of me," he told the court, but assured one and all that he had got back on the right side now.

Starks came into the community with 3 other Negroes, a woman and 2 men who he said were from Great Falls. He was taking them to Wisconsin to get a job, he said, but after the officers apprehended Starks the others seemed to have disappeared.

They were staying at the home of Rallie Walker, who went to the icehouse one day and let it be known that his boarder was talking big money.

Talbert and some others went to see him, and then they visited a number of homes, collecting $5 as they went.

After Judge Greneker had charged the jury on completion of the testimony, he posed the usual question as to whether the parties wanted anything else included in the charge.

"I wish," Talbert replied wistfully, "that you would charge the jury to bring in a verdict letting me go."

Talbert, pressed by Solicitor Hubert Long to explain why he was so drunk he didn't remember seeing the victims, and then was sober when he saw the sheriff shortly after, said, "They drove so fast in that Buick they cooled me off. They got to 75 in second gear, and the cool air flowed around me and swept all the amputations out of me."

Starks pleaded for another chance, saying he now wanted to join the church.

"Do you plan to join Preacher's church?" Judge Greneker asked, referring to Talbert.

"I don't believe I would make much progress in that," was the reply.

Included in Starks' long record was an escape from the new Abbeville County jail.

"How about that?" the judge asked.

"Yes, sir," Starks said. "I demonstrated the new Abbeville jail." And he admitted to criminal acts in Nashville while on "vacation" from Abbeville.

Starks quizzed one victim as to why he would pay $5 to a rank stranger, with these words: "If you had 10 gallons of alley bourbon, would you trust to pour it in a keg with no bottom?"

Another witness he told, "You mean you paid $5 for a doctor of philosophy degree without ever entering a college."

He told another one, "You mean to say that Preacher and me was going to build you a swimming pool and put water in it for you to swim?"

One witness he asked, "Didn't you think that a rank stranger might be clever enough to do something like stealing?"

"I did later."

"You thought too late."

Starks summed up his whole attitude in the matter after Solicitor Long had read from a crudely lettered handbill which promised free insurance, vacations with pay, hospitalization, and numerous other benefits.

"What about all this?" Judge Greneker asked.

Starks looked right at the judge and replied, "Now Judge, you know as well as I do that these niggers ought to have had more knowledge than to think I could get them a job like that."

Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many people entertain the notion that dairy farmers are a helpless lot of individuals, and that they are always running to the Federal Government for help. This idea is contrary to facts, for dairy farmers have always tried to formulate their own programs.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the June 9 issue of the Spring Valley Sun, of Spring Valley. The editorial, which follows in full, comments on one of the self-help programs initiated by dairy farmers:

SELF-HELP

The dairy farmer of the Spring Valley area is among those dairy farmers underwriting the current June dairy month promotion through the Wisconsin branch of the ADA (American Dairy Association).

In the search for a solution to the dairy industry's troubles which boil down to a basic problem for 99 percent of the residents of this community, the ADA's advertising and promotion program presents one of the most promising positive solutions to these problems.

The dairy industry lost a good share of its market through the advertising of the substitute producers. Oleo and vegetable shortenings took a sizable chunk of the dairy market by a combination of national and local promotion that has been and is a graphic demonstration of the power of advertising media on the buying habits of the American housewife.

It makes good sense to us, consequently, for the ADA to counter this loss of markets with a first rate campaign of its own to both recapture these markets and increase the consumption of dairy products in the markets it still has.

Such a promotion is the type of effort on the part of the dairy industry that deserves the recognition and applause of every taxpayer of the Nation because it is a self-help program that is more in line with our way of life in this country than the reliance on Government supports and aid to agricultural programs.

Concrete proof of this is the fact that every pound of butter or quart of milk sold through the ADA promotion program is one less than has to be picked up by Uncle Sam as surplus with the taxpayers money.

As long as consumption of all that is produced is the eventual goal of any agricultural program, the ADA represents the type of solution that is deserving of the support and recognition of all taxpayers, but more especially those taxpayers who have a direct stake in the dairy industry's day-to-day prosperity.

Another encouraging aspect of the ADA program is the fact that it represents a recognition by the dairy farmers of their need to take an active part in the marketing and promotion of what they produce.

A majority of farmers, for years, stayed completely out of the marketing and promotion of their own products. This has made them both ignorant of marketing processes and unable to judge the effectiveness and efficiency of the handling of what they produce after it left the farm.

That this has been costly ignorance and poor judgment on their part is evidenced by the problems they face today, not only in the dairy industry but in almost all branches of farm production.

In the few isolated cases where the producer has stepped into the control of marketing and promotion of his products, like the citrus growers of California and the potato growers of the Western States, remarkable and far reaching results have been obtained.

ADA represents one of the first steps by the dairy farmer in the same direction through an active, financial stake in the promotion of his product.

Such self help, lifting by their own bootstraps, programs are, we believe, a long step in the right direction by the dairy farmer. Whether it is only the first step in many by the dairy farmer to take an active part in the solution of his marketing problems remains to be seen, but it is a definite move in the direction away from reliance on Government aid that is significant and deserving of the wholehearted support of every taxpayer, especially us taxpayers who get their bread from local butter.

Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a wonderful address on good citizenship delivered by my friend, Orville F. Rush, of McLean, in my congressional district of Virginia, at a testimonial dinner for John R. Oppy, outstanding citizen of Westerly, R. I., and illustrious potentate of Palestine Temple of the Shrine, Providence, on February 26, at the Elks Club, Wakefield, R. I.

It is my hope that every American citizen might read this timely address on a most important subject. Orville F. Rush is an eminent citizen of our country and is in demand as a speaker at various civic, educational, religious, and fraternal affairs. He is an officer and director in several well-known business concerns, has been a civic leader, is a past president of numerous organizations and is a Masonic leader, being a past master of his lodge, past potentate of Kena Temple of the Shrine, and a member of important imperial council committees of the Shrine of North America:

GOOD CITIZENSHIP

(By Orville F. Rush)

It is indeed an honor to speak upon an auspicious occasion such as this. One which

marks a milestone of achievement in the career of my good friend Jack Oppy.

Every generation of Americans produces its own great men and Westerly, R. I., have seen fit to recognize one of their great men tonight, which is as it should be.

We get out of life what we put into life. We reap what we sow. It is beautifully expressed in the first verse of the 11th chapter of Ecclesiastes:

"Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days."

Jack Oppy cast his bread upon the waters many years ago and tonight the bread has come back to him in the highest form: Recognition by his fellow citizens and brothers for a job well done. What more can mortal man desire?

Tonight I'd like to talk to you for a few moments on good citizenship.

Citizenship is the state of being a citizen.

We have certain rights as citizens—but there is no right without a parallel responsibility.

We receive protection from our Government, but we also owe allegiance to our Government for that protection.

When we kneel beside our little children at night and say our prayers with them, we automatically consider they will be there the next morning and not kidnapped by some desperate criminal.

This feeling of safety comes from our knowledge that a great American in Washington, D. C., by the name of J. Edgar Hoover, heads an organization of 14,000 employees whose duty it is to protect the citizens of our great country from kidnappers and other desperate criminals. In turn, we, as citizens must support the FBI and pay our income tax to insure the continuance of this mighty protective force.

As the father of seven children I can say to you good people, it's a wonderful feeling to know I have the FBI to help me protect my children.

The Constitution of the United States has this to say on the subject of citizenship:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside" (amendment 14).

In most States Americans cannot vote until they are 21 years of age, but they are citizens from birth until death if they were born here, unless they forfeit their citizenship.

American citizenship in 1955 means more than it has ever meant before. It means freedom from the Communist yoke that has enslaved 800 million people in recent years.

There is no greater compliment you and I can pay ourselves today than to say, "I am an American." There are millions of unfortunate people scattered throughout our contemporary world who would give everything short of their very lives to be able to say what you and I say almost casually, "I am an American."

The privilege of being citizens of the world's greatest country should not be carried lightly. Naturalized citizens many times seem to appreciate the advantages America offers more than those of us who are citizens by birth, as we seem to take for granted these great advantages.

One night last year a friend of mine was speaking to a group of DeMolay boys in Arlington, Va. There was great excitement in the meeting that night, as the boys were to name their choice of the ideal American citizen. Each member had voted in secret ballot. Any one of the great men of our day was likely to be chosen. It could have been the father of any one of the boys present. It could have been President Eisenhower, General MacArthur, J. Edgar Hoover, or any one of our contemporary American heroes. It was strictly the individual expression of each boy. The great moment came, a youngster arose from his seat and made a short speech. The presentation was near at hand. The parents present and the boys of DeMolay were all sitting on the edge of their respective chairs waiting for the announcement. Suddenly the name of the man chosen was announced in this fashion: "We have selected man who, in our opinion, is the ideal American citizen. It is Mike Polychrome, better known to all of us as Pop." There was wild applause.

The speaker was amazed to say the least. He had never heard of a national figure named Mike Polychrome. He did not have long to wonder, for as soon as the announcement was made, two youngsters dashed to the kitchen, reappearing a moment later with a rather portly looking man about 45 or 50 who wore a long apron and was drying his hands. He had been washing the boys' banquet dishes at the DeMolay Hall that night. He was completely surprised. He had one of the kindest faces the speaker had ever seen. His whole face lighted up with joy and his eyes filled with tears when the youngster selected to make the award speech presented Mike with a beautiful fountain pen and pencil set. He said, "Thank you so much," sniffled again and returned to the kitchen.

Some of you might me wondering at the moment, "Who is Mike Polychrome?" At one time he owned a restaurant in Arlington which served as a meeting place for the boys. He helped them arrange their banquets, got food for them wholesale and fed them free many times. * * * That probably helped. I heard a boy described once as "a piece of skin stretched over an appetite."

These boys had not taken the opinions of their fathers and mothers, nor the opinions of the newspapers and periodicals of our time, as to the ideal American citizen. They had selected someone they personally knew was a great American. Someone who had worked with them; someone who had helped them solve their problems. They had selected a man born in Greece, a naturalized American citizen, who appreciated his citizenship so much, that he tried to be not only a good father to his own boy, but also to make up for the shortcomings of other fathers who were too busy with their personal affairs to spend enough time with their own boys. He had taken his citizenship so sincerely that these typical American boys had selected him above all others as their ideal American citizen.

Each year in the United States some 2 million young men and women reach the age of 21. Each year 2 million more potential voters are added to the American rolls. Now what are we doing to teach those boys and girls the value of good citizenship? Here is one thing we are doing. May 15, 1955, is their day. It is I Am an American Day. It is the day when adult American citizens will take it upon themselves to teach the young men and women of America that the privileges of our democracy are balanced only by a like share of responsibilities; it will be a day when adults will impress our youths with the significance of their status in our self-governing Republic.

It will be a day when newly naturalized American citizens will be given community recognition.

Official recognition of this day was made by Presidential proclamation on May 3, 1940, when the late President Franklin Roosevelt approved a joint resolution of Congress and affixed his signature to the proclamation setting aside the third Sunday in May as a public occasion for the recognition of all who, by coming of age or naturalization, have attained the status of citizenship.

There had been many previous efforts in various parts of the country to recognize new citizens each year. As early as 1915 public receptions were held for this purpose. In 1937 the San Diego chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution adopted a proposal for annual recognition of new voters. But one event which took place at Manitowoc, Wis., in 1939 proved to be of tremendous significance. It was called the Manitowoc plan, whereby all the young men and women of the county who had reached the age of 21 during the preceding year were honored guests at a public celebration where each awoved his allegiance to this country, the flag, and the Constitution in a formal, impressive and inspirational ceremony.

For months prior to the ceremony, the young people studied our political machinery, as well as National, State, and local problems. They studied the underlying principles of the American form of government.

A great throng assembled to welcome these young people into the full responsibilities of citizenship. Each young citizen was given a beautiful certificate attesting his citizenship. A fine memento of this great occasion. What a great thrill it must be for a youngster to be recognized by all his friends as a full-grown man or woman.

The Manitowoc plan spread like wildfire. In September 1939 the American Legion recommended an Annual Citizenship Day each year. The next year it was in the lap of Congress and it was passed as a joint resolution.

In this war-torn world in which we live we must never lose sight of the fact that this great heritage which is ours to enjoy was handed down to us by noble men and women at great sacrifice. Men like young Nathan Hale during the Revolution, whose last words were: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country." Men like John Paul Jones who said, "I have not yet begun to fight."

These are typical of the traditions we want to pass on to our children. Many in our generation are just as willing to sacrifice their lives for freedom as the heroes of the Revolution. Remember the answer General McAuliffe gave to the Germans' demand that he surrender at the Battle of the Bulge—"Nuts," he said. Then he and his men licked the Germans. Then there was the rather closemouthed Navy fighter pilot who radioed, "Sighted sub—sank same." Yes, we too have our heroes. But we can't all be heroes in the armed services, fighting on foreign soil. We have work to do here. We have civic, religious, and community duties to perform if we are to maintain America as a nation of people living together in harmony, decency, honor, and mutual respect.

Since October 28, 1886, the date of its dedication, millions of aliens from the four corners of the world, seeking the American haven of freedom and opportunity, have stood on the decks of ships passing the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, and with trembling lips, palpitating hearts, and tearful eyes, read those immortal words of Emma Lazarus:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to be free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Ah, yes, we live in the greatest country on earth, a country that is more prosperous today than any other country in the world, a country that can boast of 50 million savings accounts, and 200 million life insurance policies—a country that can hold up its head and state it has over 231,400 places of worship, and owns 72 percent of all the world's motor vehicles.

But you and I must fight to keep our country free.

Let's take stock of ourselves and see if we measure up for good citizenship.

Do we uphold the majesty of our laws?

Do we teach our children to tell the truth, to practice honesty, and to play fair?

Do we set good examples for our children?

Can we go down the street with our head erect, knowing we deserve all men's respect?

Do we support our law-enforcement agencies wholeheartedly?

Wo we cherish our freedom by voting regularly for men of integrity in public office?

Do we cooperate with the school authorities and the teachers? Do we know the names of our children's teachers? Do we make an effort to invite them to our homes in order to discuss mutual problems on an informal basis?

Do we pay taxes cheerfully, if not, willingly?

Do we attend church in order to inspire our youngsters to do the same?

Are we willing to take the time to serve on a jury?

Do we try to be a good and helpful neighbor when occasion demands?

Do we support our community chest? Community playgrounds? Boys' clubs? Girls' clubs? Civic groups?

Do we inculcate into our children or into our neighbors' children things that build character? Not with mere words but with examples and action. It was the great American preacher and author, Ralph Waldo Emerson who said, "Your actions speak so loudly I cannot hear your words."

Do we give our children love, sound advice, and opportunity? Or do we dole out cash to them to leave us alone? Are we giving them half a chance or full opportunity?

We hear much today about juvenile criminals, but very little about patriotic youngsters of good morals, intellect, and good character, upon whom we, as adults, must pin our hopes for a free America tomorrow. There are plenty of bad ones I admit, but there are millions of good ones also. Last March I heard a little 16-year-old girl express her love for America in an oratorical contest sponsored by Firestone. It was wonderful.

Thank you so much for your kindness in inviting me to this great occasion. Your sagacity in selecting Jack Oppy for this testimonial is to be commended and I offer him my congratulations.

Remember the words of Albert Pike, the founder of Scottish Rite Masonry:

"What a man does for himself dies with him,
But what he does for his community lives forever."

The House That Jack Built

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, not because it is about John H. Weed personally, but because his life's work has virtually paralleled the enormous growth of the egg industry in southern New Jersey, I am taking the liberty of including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the recent comment of Ben Leuchter in the Vineland, N. J., Times-Journal, entitled "The House That Jack Built":

THE HOUSE THAT JACK BUILT

Perhaps the most startling news in today's issue isn't to be found on page 1. Because of its primary interest to poultrymen, the announcement by the nominating committee of the Vineland egg auction is on the first page of the second section.

But because the handiwork of John H. Weed—the auction itself—has had such a great and good effect on thousands of businessmen in Vineland who are not members of the poultry industry, the news that Jack Weed will not be a candidate for reelection to the board of directors of the egg auction is important to the entire community.

Not too many people in Vineland remember the chaos in the poultry industry in this area 25 years ago. It wasn't just a question of egg prices versus feed costs, for the egg-feed ratio probably was never any more unfavorable than in the last 2 years. The chaos, rather, was caused by lack of organization, with the majority of poultrymen operating as individual sellers at the mercy of unscrupulous buyers from the big cities.

Foremost in the ranks of those who sought to start an egg-selling cooperative on the theory that in unity there is strength was Jack Weed, and for 22 of the 24 years since the Vineland and South Jersey Egg Auction & Poultry Association was incorporated Jack Weed has served as president.

Now Jack has decided to call it quits; the management of the auction is in capable hands and its financial condition is good. Despite the economic hardships suffered by poultrymen in the last several years, the auction bids fair to increase in size and prestige in the future, and its leadership is taking steps in that direction, as evidenced by the decision to start a candling and packaging operation.

There is no limit to the auction's size, but no matter what its future growth it will always stand as a monument to Jack Weed.

Dear Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago the magazine The Sign, published by the Passionist Fathers, presented a letter to Secretary of State Dulles from Father Ralph Gorman, C. P., editor of that publication.

The editorial letter from Father Gorman points out that the Russians "have almost taken over" the United Nations as a propaganda medium. The letter also urges that the United States offer to discuss the fate of the three Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania among other questions.

"We'd be stealing their—the Red's—propaganda fire away from them," Father Gorman maintains.

We should not be afraid to speak out, to put the Reds on the defensive for they are the ones who have created the tension, who have committed the offenses and who should be made to answer for their crimes against humanity and international justice.

I include the editorial from The Sign of January 1955 entitled "Dear Mr. Dulles":

DEAR MR. DULLES

No doubt you could call this an open letter, but I'd rather not, as I don't like the term. Usually an open letter is written by someone who has a grouch on about someone or something and puts it in the papers for everybody to read. I don't agree with everything you've done as Secretary of State, but in general I think you've done a very good job in very difficult circumstances.

I don't know how you feel about it, but you must be awfully tired of getting invitations from the Russians to have a conference. You know they're not sincere. You know they don't want to settle anything. They're just playing to the galleries. They're covering up their evil tracks. They want to sound off about how they're a great, peace-loving people, always willing to sit down at a conference table to settle all difficulties, and we're a bunch of warmongers bent on starting world war III.

You know even better than I do that, while Americans laugh off this propaganda, there are a lot of people who listen to it and believe it. Just as a few samples, there are the Bevanites in England, the neutralists in France, the left-wing Socialists in Italy, the followers of Nehru in India, some of the Social Democrats in Western Germany, and a lot of ordinary people everywhere. They swallow it crude, just as the Reds spoon it into them.

Now, I hope you won't think I'm being funny when I say you ought to go in for this conference business and in a big way. I think you ought to come out for bigger and better conferences. Instead of sitting down there in Washington waiting for an invitation from the Reds, why not send them one? In fact, why not send them one every month or so? And when you send them the invitation, send one to all other nations so they'll all know how conference-minded you are. And release it to all the papers and news agencies so all the world will know how willing you are to sit down and talk to the Reds.

Of course, you'll have to suggest something to talk about. Well, I can offer a lot of topics, and you can think up a great many more.

As a starter, why not offer to discuss what's happened to the three Baltic States—Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania? We still recognize them as independent democratic republics, but we haven't heard anything about them lately.

And here are a few questions that ought to be raised. Are the satellite States really independent? Why do the Reds talk peace and then go out and shoot down our planes without warning and without provocation? What about the Siberian slave-labor camps where upward of 10 to 15 million prisoners are worked and frozen to death? We might even ask whether the people of Russia want their present rulers—or are they all enslaved? If they want peace, why do the Russians build up such a terrific military establishment—in aggressive weapons—that the rest of the world has to leave peaceful pursuits and arm itself in self-defense?

I could go on and on, but why bother? You know the list of possible subjects better than I do.

I know the Russians won't accept your invitations. But that isn't the point. It really doesn't matter if they don't. We'll be stealing their propaganda fire away from them. We'll be putting them on the defense. We'll be showing them up before the rest of the world. We'll be getting some good out of the U. N., which the Reds have almost taken over as a propaganda medium.

And think of all the fun we'd have into the bargain. I'd just love to hear the answers they'd give to such invitations. Maybe they wouldn't even answer, but I'd get a chuckle anyway thinking of the squirming they'd do.

So I conclude, Mr. Dulles, with the suggestion that you get right to work sending out the invitations. I think it might even be well to begin by announcing your complete conversion to the Red idea of bigger and better conferences. In fact, you might even declare that the new slogan for the State Department under your administration will be "Let's Have a Conference."

Sincerely yours,

FATHER RALPH GORMAN, C. P.

Dry Cleaners and American Legion Cooperate on Flag Day, June 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore so to do, I wish to present what appears to me as a most interesting and significant fact in connection with the recent observation of Flag Day on June 14, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, it happened this way. As I delivered a couple of my suits of clothing to the Progressive Dry Cleaners at Cherrydale, Va., close to our nice little home at Arlington, Va., I noted a beautiful flag of the United States on a staff out in front thereof. As I entered the attractive front entrance of this particular establishment I noticed in the window a large sign, approximately 18 by 24 inches on which there was neatly and attractively printed the following:

IN COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN LEGION, AMERICAN FLAGS CLEANED WITHOUT CHARGE, JUNE 1–12, FOR FLAG DAY, JUNE 14

SPEAK UP FOR AMERICA—INSURE NEW GLORY FOR OLD GLORY

"So proudly stand you straighter
Lift eyes and spirits high;
See the emblem of your Freedom
See Old Glory passing by."
—*Ernest Todd.*

Flag Day, June 14, is the day set aside each year for Americans to honor their flag. At home, at sea, in far corners of the world, civilians and members of our Armed Forces will play their respects to Old Glory.

This year, it is more fitting than ever that we do so. In many parts of the world freedom today, is but a catchword, an ideal trampled under the heels of men who hate its very meaning.

But in these United States, and in those parts of the world where it flies, the Stars and Stripes still tells its own story to all men who would walk upright—in freedom.

Here, it proudly proclaims, is the symbol of a glorious ideal that founded a new Nation. It flies because oppressed men sought freedom—in the right to speak boldly without fear—to vote at the dictates of their minds—to worship in the manner of their choice—and were willing to die for their beliefs.

At Valley Forge, at Chateau-Thierry and at Iwo Jima—wherever down through the years the need has arisen—Americans have said "I die but It lives."

Small wonder, then, that we as Americans, set one day aside as Flag Day. But in the expression of our respect let us fly worthy of the ideals for which Old Glory stands.

Flag etiquette, the rules which have been formulated over the years for proper display of the flag, forbids the flying of a flag that is tattered or torn. Flags that have achieved this condition should be destroyed by burning.

Tradition also says that it is improper to fly a soiled flag—it should be restored, preferably by dry cleaning.

It is for this reason that the dry cleaners listed below have offered their services to their fellow citizens.

Help to insure new glory for Old Glory. Bring in your flag today. Speak up for America with the Stars and Stripes on Flag Day, June 14.

So, I naturally asked to see the manager and complimented him and his staff upon what I had seen and read in their shop windows. I learned he was a distinguished member of the American Legion and he cordially delivered to me for my inspection a copy of the following communication which he had received from the drycleaners of America.

IMPORTANT

(Please give to your local paper for release on or after June 1, 1955)

Drycleaners of America were asked today to join in a nationwide drive in which all American flags would be cleaned without charge in return for the owners' promise to display the colors on Flag Day, June 14.

The appeal was made jointly by Commander Seaborn Collins, of the American Legion, and the National Institute of Drycleaning.

Window posters identifying drycleaning stores as participating in the program have been provided to all such establishments by the Detrex Corporation of Detroit, a leading manufacturer of drycleaning equipment.

Post Comander _____ urges everyone in _____ (name of town) to make sure they "show their true colors—a bright and sparkling red, white, and blue."

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, and my distinguished colleagues, one and all of us desire to compliment the American Legion on this forthright and positively constructive and patriotic endeavor, and in like manner compliment the drycleaners of America who cooperated with the American Legion in this patriotic endeavor and action.

This endeavor, Mr. Speaker, is worthy of consideration by all American merchants in the forthcoming observation of Flag Day on June 14, 1956.

Resolution on Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Legislature relative to protection of consumers on natural gas prices. As the resolution points out, 95 percent of the natural gas supplied to Wisconsin consumers comes from one producer. Thus, the consumers of Wisconsin are vitally interested in some protection against monopoly practices. The resolution follows:

Joint Resolution 44, A

Joint resolution relating to the interest of the State of Wisconsin in regulation of prices of natural gas; and memorializing Congress

Whereas certain bills are now pending in the Congress of the United States to amend the Natural Gas Act to exempt sales of natural gas by the producers and suppliers thereof to pipeline companies for resale in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the great percentage of natural gas sold in interstate commerce for transportation and resale by pipeline companies is by a relatively few major companies; and

Whereas 95 percent of the natural-gas supply of the State of Wisconsin is monopolized by 1 producer; and

Whereas an adequate supply of natural gas reasonably priced to the consumer is essential to the economic stability of the citizens and industries of Wisconsin and many other States and can only be guaranteed by reasonable regulation of sales by producers and suppliers; and

Whereas producers and suppliers of natural gas have discriminated against the consumer by including in their contracts escalation and other clauses which require rate increases based on considerations other than a just and reasonable rate; and

Whereas consumers dependent upon natural gas will be left at the mercy of an unregulated monopoly if there is no Federal control over the price of natural gas as sold by the producer and supplier: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress and President of the United States to reject any proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 which will create a gap in the price regulatory chain, or otherwise weaken the the protection accorded consumers under the present act; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of Congress, to each Wisconsin Member thereof, and to the President of the United States.

W. S. KNOWLER,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
MARK CATHIN, JR.,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mining Soil, Patience, Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial from the Utica, N. Y., Observer-Dispatch urging defeat for the move to restore a rigid price-support formula, which has brought so much woe to the taxpayers, consumers, and the farmers themselves.

The editorial follows:

MINING SOIL, PATIENCE, TAXPAYERS

Give Congressman WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS a hand for voting for economic literacy and against a political shell game when he opposed the House action to lift farm price supports.

The area Representative lost out in the narrow 206–201 count to restore the 90 percent of parity price supports. However, it is forecast the Senate will defeat this misguided bill and save the Democratic-controlled Congress from inflicting economic hardship on the country, as the upper House did in puncturing that $20 tax give-away doodle.

In both cases, the tax return and the higher form price supports for a few favored western and southern crops, including peanuts and tobacco, the Democratic House was voting to spend money it hasn't got and which would require higher taxes in the future, plus interest on present borrowing.

The pitch seems to be that if Harry Truman won an election by asking Mid-West-

ern farmers who made them "prosperous" the party can work the gag again. We hope the farmers won't swallow that tricky bait, after recent experiences.

President Eisenhower in his agricultural message to Congress in January last said:

"The chief beneficiaries of our price support policies have been the two million larger, highly mechanized farming units which produce about 85 percent of our agricultural output. The individual production of the remaining farms, numbering about 3.5 million is so small that the farmer derives little benefit from price supports."

The charge, of course, is that farm income has gone down. Sure it has. And it has done so under just the 90 percent of parity law the Democratic House wants to keep alive. The Republican flexible-support plan, intended to move farm goods to real markets and benefit consumers at the same time, was passed to relieve the present situation and would take effect only with this year's harvest.

It's possible to wax warm over this economic monstrosity of high price supports, paid twice by the people, in taxes and over the counter. But let us use only a couple of quotations from the House debate.

Representative KEATING, western New York Republican, noting that the farm-price decline had taken place under the high-support program the House bill would continue, declared: "It's like saying the best way to get over a drunk is to imbibe more of the same."

Connecticut's Representative CRETELLA, also a Republican, charged that in the farm debate the interests of 142 million nonfarmers were consistently overlooked. He said city and town consumers can't be expected to remain silent when they see Uncle Sam pouring billions into a few commodities which have been selected for price support at 90 percent of parity.

And this makes one wonder why so many city Democratic Congressmen voted for this bill to raise food prices to their constituents. Surely they know some $8 billion in taxes are tied up in stored foods, that it costs a million dollars a day just for storage of foods held to make them cost the public more.

The high support scheme mines the Nation's soil by forcing big, unneeded crops. It mines the patience of those who see the political trick involved. It mines the taxpayers for billions, in tax returns and over the Nation's counters. The Senate surely must block this mistaken House action.

Los Angeles County 1953 Agriculture Production Exceeds Any State in the Union—Valued at More Than $1,400,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, southern California has become one of the most important agricultural centers in the United States, according to the latest figures released by the Agricultural Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, and is in the unique position of shipping, as a section of a State, more produce during the year 1953, than any other entire State in the United States with the exception of the whole State of California.

Los Angeles County alone, according to Mr. F. R. Wilcox, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, reached a total value for agricultural production for 1954 of $1,427,000,000, an amount almost $2 million greater than 1953.

The phenomenal growth of population, business, and industry in Los Angeles County and in all of southern California is well known, but to most people, it is not regarded as an agricultural area. Yet it has now become one of the leading agricultural communities in the whole world, and its tremendous produce added to that of the rest of the State has brought a record of 1 carlot of fresh fruits or vegetables rolling from the 58 counties of the State every 1½ minutes during 1953, the last year for which these figures were available.

The following is the press report on the agricultural record of Los Angeles County and southern California:

COUNTY'S FARM PRODUCTION IN 1954 NEAR RECORD

Agricultural production in Los Angeles County in 1954 reached the second highest peak in history, exceeded only by the record year of 1952.

F. R. Wilcox, chairman of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce Agricultural Committee, said yesterday the total value for 1954 was $1,427,000,000, or almost $2 million greater than 1953.

"The county, in addition to its great business, industrial, and population growth, thus continues to be one of the leading agricultural communities in the world," Wilcox said.

He said latest available figures, those of 1953, show that southern California shipped more produce that year than any State except California itself. One carlot of fresh fruits or vegetables rolled from the 58 counties of the State every 1½ minutes during 1953.

H. R. 6040 and H. R. 6041—Customs Simplification Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement of O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, before the House Committee on Ways and Means, registering opposition to section 2 of H. R. 6040 and H. R. 6041, offered as customs simplification measures.

Mr. Strackbein's statement follows:

The purpose of this presentation is to register our opposition to section 2 of H. R. 6040 and H. R. 6041. These identical bills are offered as customs simplification measures and owe their support to this avowed objective.

Our objection is twofold: (1) Simplification of customs procedures would not result from enactment of this bill (H. R. 6040), unless it is contemplated that the Antidumping Act of 1921 and the countervailing duty section of the Tariff Act of 1930 are to be neglected or set aside. (2) Both the antidumping and countervailing duty statutes would be put in legal jeopardy if not completely nullified by this bill.

We have a third objection which will be mentioned later. It is a fundamental objection to section 2 of the bill as representing bad legislation, a characterization that could not be made from a reading of the bill itself without consideration of its context.

Returning now to our first objection to the bill, namely, that it would not simplify customs procedures unless it involved setting made of antidumping and countervailing duty provisions of existing law, we come to the proposal to substitute "export value" for the present "foreign value" as a basis of assessing ad valorem rates of duty.

The export value proposed is itself narrowed down in the bill to the price on goods "for exportation to the United States."

Not only is this an open invitation to discriminating practices in international trade, a practice that we have officially condemned so profusely in a succession of world trade conferences; it is an invitation to use the United States as the dumping ground of the world. It is virtually an engraved invitation to cartels and to countries that engage in State trading to enter our domestic market with rigged prices, tailored to meet the domestic competitive conditions.

Cartels could readily adopt prices for "exportation to the United States." These prices might be lower than those offered to other countries but designed specifically for penetration of our market or even for driving domestic producers out of business, looking toward higher prices thereafter. Countries that engage in State trading could do the same thing.

Such lowered prices could be out of relation to the prices charged on exports to other countries. They could be lower than the prices charged for the same product at home. All this could be made possible either by selling at cost or below cost and then covering the deficiency by some form of bounty, grant, or subsidy.

Beyond the question of a doubt our acceptance of export value based on exportation to the United States would great reduced the paper work incident to the present system under which both export value and foreign value must be ascertained so that whichever of the two is higher may be used for duty assessment.

However, unless our antidumping and countervailing duty laws are to be nullified it would still be necessary to ascertain foreign value. Otherwise there would be no way of knowing whether dumping or actionable subsidization was taking place.

It has been said that our adoption of export value as defined in the bill would not prevent action against dumping and subsidization. If, however, effective surveillance of import prices is to be maintained as a means of detecting dumping and actionable subsidization, there could be no saving in man-hours of work. Any possible simplification must come from simplifying methods of obtaining the necessary price information. That could be done as readily under the present foreign value system as under the substitute proposal, if it were at all possible.

We cannot avoid the conclusion that the substitution of export value, as defined in H. R. 6040 and H. R. 6041 for foreign value and export value as now used, would not result in simplification of customs procedures unless the gathering of information that now makes possible dumping and subsidy detection were dropped.

It is not to be assumed that the latter is the intent. After all, the Treasury Department is under direction to carry out the Antidumping Act. The law is not merely permissive. It is mandatory; and unless it were repealed or superseded it is the obliga-

tion of the Secretary of the Treasury to enforce it.

This brings us to our second objection to section 2 of the two bills.

This is that passage of this legislation would in fact make a dead letter of both the Antidumping Act and section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (countervailing duty provision). Perhaps that is the intent of the Treasury Department, or, rather, of the State Department, since it is the latter that has elbowed its way into control of our foreign-trade policy.

It is most difficult to understand how, if an exporter to this country complied with our law on customs valuation, as he would do if he gave the price of his goods "for exportation to the United States," he could be in violation of another of our laws on the same subject.

In effect we would say to a foreign exporter, by passing this bill, if you set forth the price, i. e., the export price as defined in section 2 of this statute, you will be in compliance with our legal requirements with respect to valuation for duty assessment.

If such an exporter did then comply fully with our law, how could we then say to him "it just so happens that we have another law. In complying with our law on valuation you have fallen afoul of another law. You are guilty of dumping" (or "You are subject to a countervailing duty").

Since the present legislation would be subsequent to the laws already in effect, it would no doubt take precedence under such a conflict of laws.

We come now to our third objection.

Some of the complaints of other countries against our custom laws is that a considerable element of uncertainty surrounds questions of valuation, classification, etc.; and that this uncertainty is a drag on trade.

We, i. e., the executive, in proposing section 2 of the present bill, would add to uncertainty of this kind. We would be setting a trap, so to speak, for the unwarry foreign exporters to this country and, for that matter, for foreign exporters who might, in all good faith, try to comply with our valuation requirements.

Let us suppose that such a shipper were charged with dumping in our market. He could immediately reply that the price of his wares were the true export price for shipment to the United States as defined in our law; and this, let us say, were entirely true. If we then moved against him under the Anti-Dumping Act or under section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1940, he would be outraged.

It would be only a matter of time before we would need another customs simplification bill to take the snare out of our customs law. We would be accused of having a diversity of laws covering the same subject. Such protests would be well founded. It would be bad legislation to lead us into such a situation.

We cannot properly have section 2 of the present bill on the statute books alone with the antidumping act, and section 303 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the countervailing duty provision).

We turn now to section 3 of H. R. 6040. This has to do with foreign currency conversion.

We have no objection to this section unless it were interpreted to permit the establishment of multiple rates for the same foreign currency at the same time, i. e., more than one rate.

The language of the section does not seem to provide for multiple rates. However, it must be read in the light of present practice or possible procedures that might be followed in keeping with the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *John Barr* v. *United States* (C. D. 801), dated July 30, 1943.

In 1947 Representative KEAN, of New Jersey, introduced a bill (H. R. 3810) that would have provided for the ascertainment and calculation of a single rate of conversion where dual or multiple rates were used by a foreign country. The objectives of that bill should be assured before section 3 of the present bill is approved. Unless that is done we must oppose this section no less than section 2.

The cogency of this opposition to the recognition of multiple rates, particularly in a bill ostensibly designed to simplify customs procedures, may be recognized from an extract from Report No. 689, 80th Congress, 1st session, taken from a letter to the Speaker of the House sent by the then Acting Secretary of the Treasury:

"Unless the customs service is to accept unquestioningly and without satisfactory verification whatever statements the importers choose to make regarding the rates of exchange actually used in their transactions and more especially regarding the foreign currency laws, regulations, decrees, and (perhaps unpublished) individual rulings of foreign governments concerned, it becomes necessary to make exhaustive inquiries into the elaborate and constantly changing currency measures of many foreign countries, as well as, upon occasion, to investigate the details of the currency transactions with respect to particular individual importations."

Obviously unless abuses of undervaluation, concealment of subsidies or grants, and so forth, were to be winked at, the customs service, of course, could not "accept unquestioningly and without satisfactory verification whatever statements the importers" might choose to make. The only alternative would be the laborious inquiries outlined in the letter. This would not add up to customs simplification.

Multiple rates should therefore not be recognized and this bill should make it clear that such a practice would not be countenanced under it. If that were done, we could and would support section 3.

CUSTOMS BILL—AMENDMENT ADOPTED DOES NOT MEET OBJECTION

The amendment adopted by the Ways and Means Committee saying that "nothing in this act shall be considered to repeal, modify, or supersede, directly or indirectly, any provision of the Antidumping Act of 1921, as amended" does not overcome the awkwardness of having two conflicting laws on the same subject. This is one of the objections raised in the attached brief.

Also the amendment says nothing about the countervailing duty section of our tariff act which would be in a similar conflict with H. R. 6040 as reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the silt-irrigation project in Colorado.

The silt project is a part of the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the silt project would be $2,600 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

Indian Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a weekly newsletter entitled "Comments," published by the chairman of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council, Mr. F. David Blackhoop.

My colleagues in the Senate may be aware of the fact that the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation lies partly in my State of North Dakota and partly within the borders of our good neighbor, South Dakota. The problems faced by these proud people are appreciated by all my colleagues, and especially by those of us representing North Dakota and South Dakota in the United States Senate.

The writer of the newsletter, Mr. F. David Blackhoop, presents a convincing example of the need for good education for our Indian people. His native shrewdness, coupled with the advantages of a good education, make Mr. Blackhoop an influential and able leader for his people.

In this copy of his newsletter, Mr. Blackhhoop reprints an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald, commenting on remarks regarding the role of the white man and the Indian, as made by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The Sioux people of our two sister States have no stancher friend than KARL MUNDT. I feel sure he has touched on an important point when he states that we need to recognize the plight of our American Indians as an important and demanding problem, and certainly one which is as worthy of American dollars and assistance as are the nations across the seas, to which we have been sending aid during these postwar years.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR WAYWARD CHILDREN

(By F. David Blackhoop, chairman, Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council, Fort Yates, N. Dak.)

If a poor worm is dropped into the flames of a raging fire, the man who is most unmerciful and has the hardest heart shudders as he sees it writhing and rolling and twisting in pain. Likewise it curdled the blood of the coldest to hear tales of cruelty, murder, torture, and abduction in these modern days. And as we peer out into the world today through our teepee porthole we, too, shudder at the things that are happening around us.

"Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it," should be our primary interest in bringing up our children in view of the questionable conditions that surround them. All young lives are molded by some ideal, some philosophy of life, and some standard of conduct. So the parents should peer over their child's shoulder, and exert proper control over his developing habits.

Sterling North, literary editor of the Chicago Daily News, recently said: "The

shame lies largely with the parents who don't know or don't care what their children are reading, and hence fail to furnish them as an antidote the fine children's books to be found in every bookstore or library."

Unthinking parents never examine the contents of the popular comic magazines. Child addicts wander in an unreal, hero-worshipping land, a land unknown to their elders. It is a land of bone-crunching, superman, of crumpled, mangled human bodies, of disregard for true affection.

Can we trace where most of these crimes are born? I think we can. We can find many beginning in the home, where the child is stretched out on the front room rug with a comic strip under the eyes of unsuspecting parents. In many cases you will find the parents themselves indulged into these lurid publications. It is a sad state. Perhaps we can put it more effectively, they constitute a cultural slaughter of the innocents.

George Gallup, child psychologist and specialist on juvenile delinquency upon thorough investigations on this subject, says: "Parents are responsible * * * and the major indictment of parents is that they are not strict enough with their youngsters." In his survey he offered three major remedies: Provide: (a) more home supervision, (b) more recreation facilities in the community, and (c) lay down stricter rules of discipline for youngsters.

In addition to the above there are five major indictments of parents who lived in the cities: Parents (a) are not strict enough, give youngsters too much freedom, (b) to not provide proper home life, training in the home, (c) have too many outside interests, not enough interest in their youngsters, (d) are too indulgent, give youngsters too much money, (e) both work, mother needed at home. Finally the parents are held responsible for property damage caused by their children.

May we so guide our children that in the day of final judgment we can say: "Behold, I and the children who the Lord hath given me." If we don't, all our churchgoing days will be a waste of time, and we will never gain entrance to heavenly home.

THE SENTIMENT OF CONGRESS

In the editorial column, Omaha World-Herald, under date of May 16, 1955, United States Senator KARL E. MUNDT was quoted as saying:

"Correct its injustices to the American Indian and give the red man a white man's chance in present-day America."

The editor continued to say:

"Nobly said. There is no more sorrowful chapter in the history of this country than that which tells of the treatment accorded to the Indians. Conquered, despoiled of their property, held as wards of the Government, most of them have been doomed to life in the slums which are called reservations, or to other slums in industrial cities.

"The monstrous libel of 'racial inferiority' need no longer be considered. The relatively few Indians who have managed to break through the barrier, to take responsible positions in American life, have proved that they are just as smart, just as ambitious and energetic, just as decent, as any white man.

"But the barrier is a formidable one, and it is made up of more things than the mere matter of skin pigmentation.

"Perhaps of chief handicap and affliction of the American Indian is that he has lived so long under the domination and rule of the Great White Father in Washington. This rule was intended to be kindly and helpful. Its aim was to protect the Indians against the rigors of life in a competitive society. In other words, the relationship between the Indians and the Government became a sort of test tube version of the welfare state.

"With the result which might have been anticipated, Government-administered welfare led first to chronic submissiveness, and then to slums. Only the few most self-reliant Indians were able to survive the plague with head held high.

"Now that the harm has been done, it won't easily be undone. The problem of freeing the Indians—spiritually as well as legally—and integrating them into modern society as equal and self-respecting members, will take a good deal of solving.

"But it won't be solved until we other Americans get at it. And unfortunately, up to now we have scarcely made a beginning.

"As Senator MUNDT notes, we have money without limit for almost every good cause on the face of the earth. The 'under-privileged' of the Orient appeal mightily to our sympathies, and we open our purse to them almost without limit. But the Indians, whose ancestors we robbed and killed, whom as a race we have debased—for them there is no point 4.

"Men and women of good-will will join Senator MUNDT in hoping that 'at long last' a properly organized and financed effort will be made to correct the injustices to the Indians."

OUR DAKOTA PEOPLE NEED TO EXPAND ECONOMICALLY

The Indian is not a vanishing race. Right here on the Standing Rock Reservation our population is steadily on the increase and the present enrollment stands at 5,606 plus, while the original ownership of 2 million acres decreases to 950,000. With the rising birth rate we are faced with the task of surviving a white man's arena. We need to expand economically and the danger of it is, if the rate of land sales is further permitted to go on in a year or two the Indians will lose all individual ownership of lands formerly held under trusteeship, and from which source we get most of our income.

Further vista. In order to gain entrance to the white man's arena properly, we must be educated from the "buffalo days" to our modern status. And in my opinion, the only possible solution of our complex problem is education.

According to the report of the State of South Dakota, there are 30,000 Indians in that State. And there are over 150,000 in the entire country; only 15,000 are integrated in the white man's civilization. The slow upgrade of our Indians in general is due to our failure to put the same value on time and thrift as our Caucasian brothers. Our people will never become assimilated in the white man's culture unless they are willing to do so and develop a consciousness of time.

Education and acceptance of the white man's goal in life are the only way we can hope to lift ourselves from our poverty and mire and to remain on the level. With this in view, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribal Council featured education in their claim for settlement against the United States Government for the taking of our best bottomlands because of the construction of the Oahe Reservoir at Pierre, S. Dak.

Growing Glacier and Yellowstone Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, each year the inadequate facilities in our national parks are called upon to care for more tourists. It is estimated that this year, 19 million Americans will visit their national parks—parks equipped to handle less than half that many visitors.

In a recent article, the magazine U. S. News & World Report suggests that the solution is either to enlarge the parks or ration the number of visitors.

This article brought editorial comment from Editor Ken Byerly of the Lewistown (Mont.), Daily News.

I agree with Mr. Byerly that neither of the solutions in the U. S. News & World Report is the answer. Instead, he says, we should increase housing, eating, and other facilities at our parks.

The editorial follows:

GROWING GLACIER AND YELLOWSTONE PARKS

Glacier Park is growing fast in popularity. In fact, its percentage increase in visitors for the past 15 years is third highest among our 12 national parks.

This is of particular importance to Lewistown and central Montana, since we are on the shortest route between Glacier Park, and the Middle West and the East.

Growing tourist travel through here reflects the gaining popularity of Glacier.

The National Park Service gives 1940 attendance figures for our 12 national parks, and estimated for this year, as follows:

	Visitors in 1940	Expected in 1955	Change, percent increase
Great Smoky Mountains	861,000	2,678,000	211
Shenandoah (Virginia)	951,000	1,760,000	85
Rocky Mountain	628,000	1,511,000	140
Yellowstone	526,000	1,408,000	167
Grand Teton	103,000	1,063,000	932
Yosemite	507,000	1,060,000	109
Platt (Oklahoma)	310,000	876,000	180
Grand Canyon	372,000	863,000	132
Glacier	177,000	644,000	264
Mount Ranier	457,000	843,000	84
Olympic	92,000	703,000	664
Acadia (Maine)	382,000	587,000	53
Total	7,358,000	19,000,000	158

In commenting on these gains, U. S. News said that this summer 19 million Americans will visit national parks that are equipped to handle only 9 million.

The solution, the magazine suggests, is: "Enlarge the parks or ration the number of visitors."

We suggest that neither of these is the answer. Instead, we should increase the housing, eating, and other facilities at our parks. This is certainly needed at Yellowstone and Glacier, and can be done without much difficulty. And, because of the ever-increasing tourist travel, such a program will also pay off handsomely.

Taking another long and careful look at the attendance figures above, it seems that failure to enlarge such housing and other facilities will be inexcusable.

Echo Park Cannot Be Eliminated From Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the upper Colorado storage project is much like an iceberg. A little bit of it shows above the surface, but hidden under-

neath is a far more sizable and dangerous mass.

In case of the upper Colorado, not only underneath the surface are billions of dollars of hidden subsidies from the Federal Treasury and an economic misdirection of a whole region of our country, but always there is the Echo Park Dam and power project which would invade Dinosaur National Monument.

Echo Park is vitally necessary if this vast fiscal monstrosity is to have any chance at all of paying back to the Treasury even a small part of the United States taxpayers' funds proposed to be spent on it. This is because its power is needed to firm up that produced at Glen Canyon so sufficient quantities can be marketed to produce the heavy revenues needed to start overcoming even interest costs on the money borrowed to construct the project.

Echo Park was described by former Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph Tudor as being as necessary to the economics of this project as now planned as are the pistons to an engine.

No one should be misled by the strategy of the project's proponents of deleting Echo Park from the bill they hope to present to the House of Representatives. It would be sure to come back later. Deleting Echo Park from the bill can no more eliminate it from the basic project than could tearing up a page from a history book abolish the history that was recorded on it.

The following recent editorial from the New York Times is explicit on this point:

ECHO PARK DAM NOT NEEDED

The action of a House subcommittee in eliminating Echo Park Dam from the Colorado River storage project does not mean that the fight against this proposal has been won. Two major pitfalls remain: (1) the dam could be restored in conference inasmuch as the Senate has already approved it; and (2) even if it is kept out of current legislation the interests that would benefit from this dam—or think they would—will certainly continue to make every effort to secure its authorization in future years.

Echo Park Dam has no business being in the pending Colorado River storage project for the simple reason that the values it would destroy are greater, if more intangle, than the values it would create. It is too bad that more Members of Congress have not adequately viewed the magnificent canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers in Dinosaur National Monument. Then they would know that this proposal would wreck the spectacular beauty of one of America's most awe-inspiring scenic wonders. To the best of our knowledge exactly two Members of the present Congress have taken the trouble to travel down the river and see this incredible wonderland from the water level. The metamorphosis of these rivers into a lake, the covering of the cliffs to half their heights or more, the dismal scar of inevitable drawdown, would completely change the character and the quality of the area.

The man sincere advocates of the dam maintain that the United States has longstanding moral and legal commitments to the people of the upper Colorado Basin to build it. However, that is a debatable point. Without at the moment going into the merits of the storage project as a whole it is generally admitted on all sides that so far as storage to insure a guaranteed flow to the States of the lower basin is concerned Echo Park Dam is not needed now, nor will it be for many years. Not a single drop of water impounded by Echo Park will be used for irrigation purposes in the upper basin for years to come.

The truth of the matter is that Echo Park Dam is primarily a power project to help provide payment—through anticipated sale of Government-owned hydroelectric power at a profit—for some of the subsidized irrigation projects planned for the upper Colorado Basin. The real demand for the dam stems from the desire of the people of the region for immediate development of this power source of revenue, and also from their fear that if they don't do something about using Colorado River water now the much more fully developed State of California will manage to steal it from them.

These reasons may be perfectly sound to Utahans and Coloradans. But there are other dam sites, other power sources, other means of developing the area, some of which are provided for in the House committee bill authorizing expenditure of $760 million for the storage project without Echo Park. The proposal that a special committee of independent engineers be appointed to examine the pros and cons of Echo Park is a mere passing of the buck. If the canyons of the Green and Yampa are destroyed—and construction of Echo Park Dam would destroy them in their present form—the Nation will have indeed sold its birthright for a few miserable kilowatts. We are deeply sympathetic to the development of the intermountain West, but we do not believe that construction of Echo Park Dam is necessary for that purpose either now or in the foreseeable future.

The Export-Import Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Latin America—Our Best Customer," delivered before the Indiana Manufacturers Association, June 11, 1955, by Mr. Vance Brand, a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA—OUR BEST CUSTOMER

(Address by Vance Brand, Director, Export-Import Bank of Washington, before the Indiana Manufacturers Association, Mackinac Island, Mich., June 11, 1955)

Being honored three times within a period of 2 weeks by the people in Indiana is an outstanding privilege. I was recently the recipient of your hospitality as a guest of Senator CAPEHART when he brought the Latin American Ambassadors to Indiana. Secondly, I have been invited to participate in this wonderful trip with you and to address your convention, and, thirdly, in doing so you have asked me to endeavor to fill the shoes of your outstanding senior Senator from Indiana. This latter assignment I accept with humility, knowing full well that I must remain in my own shoes because no man can fill the shoes of Senator CAPEHART as well as he does.

Let us consider for the moment the stature of the man for whom I have the audacity to act as proxy. As chairman, and now ranking member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate, he has responsibility over such fundamental facets of our economy as the Federal Reserve System, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Housing Administration, Defense Production Program, Federal Home Loan Bank, Export-Import Bank, International Bank, price controls, rent controls, stockpiling, and many others.

Recently, he performed two outstanding services which reached into the homes of practically every citizen of the United States. First, his Federal Housing investigation and, secondly, his participation in the stock market investigation proved most beneficial to our economy.

As an outstanding member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, he has world-wide responsibilities. He was the first to announce Japan's acceptance—through Russia—of the American surrender terms. He was the author of the substitute for the Marshall Plan, to place foreign aid on a business basis with American principles. In some way he has found time to direct studies of shortages of critical materials, to be the author of the amendment to kill the Rent Control Act, to be an official United States observer on the International Bank and Monetary Fund, and the author of the Eximbank revision and expansion bill.

Your Senator is a close friend of President Eisenhower. The President recognizes that the Senator is no rubber stamp and will fight for the principles he believes right for his people in Indiana, but he respects him for his integrity and the manner in which he applies the principles he learned in his business life to the problems of government.

You might say I have some prejudice for Senator CAPEHART. I plead guilty—and am happy to say so to the people of his home State. I am prejudiced because I have found him to be a businessman with an eminently successful career, a statesman of proven sagacity, and a politician of known ability. Add to these qualities his years of experience in the Senate and you have all the ingredients of a successful Senator to which the great State of Indiana is justly entitled.

Senator Capehart has made many fine contributions in the domestic field, but he has likewise contributed in a major way in the international field.

He asked me to accompany him on a fact-finding mission to Latin America. During that trip we visited 17 countries, he made over a hundred speeches, and attended over 300 conferences. These conferences were with presidents, ministers, American businessmen, and the businessmen of the countries we visited. He got the facts, and the report he prepared upon his return—of over 600 pages—is said to be the most outstanding document on Latin America in existence.

It is a fact that most citizens of the United States know very little about Latin America and generally what they know is rather a misconception. It would be highly improbable to find in any one of our States one in a thousand individuals who is reasonably well informed on Inter-American trade or the economics of the other American republics.

Too many Americans still hear that Latin America is a land of revolutions, coups d'etat, disorder, and instability.

Few people are aware, on the other hand, that at the present time Latin America is the United States' best customer in this hemisphere and that American industry and agriculture were the recipients of more than $3.3 billion of business from Latin America in 1954. In fact, business from Western Europe exceeded that from Latin America by only the narrowest margin in 1954. Latin America was first in 1952 and 1953. That means that every single person in this room did about $20 worth of business with Latin

America in the last year, as did every person you saw yesterday in the buses and on the streets of Indianapolis, on the smallest byroad to the most remote farm in Indiana, in New York, in Los Angeles, and every other community in the United States. Nor is it generally known here or in Latin America that Uncle Sam is Latin America's best customer to the extent of 50 percent of our total imports.

If the average income per capita in Latin America was the same as in the United States, you would have done about $200 a person, rather than $20. Already the Latin American devotes 10 percent of his income to purchasing items made in the United States. Unfortunately, at this time Latin Americans have only an average earning of a little over $200 a year, while we have almost $2,000 a year. If the average Latin American income could be increased, the benefits to us would be obvious. We need no altruistic viewpoint—the "good doer" attitude is not the prime mover—we need only to look at the problem as sound businessmen in a similar manner as we look toward our best customer at home.

This best customer of ours has a total area of 2½ times the area of the United States, with a population of 169 million people, as compared with 163 million here at home. Latin American population has been increasing at the extraordinarily high rate of 2½ percent. This signifies that in the year 1975 the Latin American population will be one-third larger than the population of the United States and each inhabitant of Latin America is a potential customer of you people right here in Indiana.

Then the day came when I realized that these Latin Americans are located upon the same land as I am. That realization had quite an impact. Then I learned that they had many things that we must have to keep our economy on the track. I found Latin America supplies the United States market with 100 percent of its quebracho imports, 98 percent of its quartz and rock crystal, 75 percent of its bauxite, 62 percent of its antimony, 46 percent of its beryl, 43 percent of its sisal, 37 percent of its cadmium, 29 percent of its copper, 23 percent of its manganese, 20 percent of its vanadium, 18 percent of its tin, and 17 percent of its tungsten.

By the same token, Latin America needs and must have our products. We have mutual business interdependence.

A moment ago I mentioned that if the Latin Americans had our average annual income they could purchase at today's rates 10 times as much. That would mean $30 billion and that happens to be 10 percent of our entire national output. Thus, we see that we are not dealing with any trivial matters. Every man in this room knows that is a great potential—this export market in our own hemisphere. It is not something to casually lay aside while we transact our domestic business, not in this day of expanding production facilities in the United States.

Perhaps you see more clearly the road Senator CAPEHART seeks to guide us upon in a better relationship with our neighbors and that increased trade at a mutual profit to North and Latin Americans means an increase in our own prosperity.

Let us look for a moment into a mirror and see more precisely the reflection of our best customer.

First let us see what the reflection is in Indiana. I recently read in the Indianapolis Star that the sales of Indiana products in Latin America account for a good share of the State's $300 million in export trade; nearly 90,000 Hoosiers are employed in the State's 12 high-export industries; an additional $90 million a year is brought into Indiana by export of farm products and much of this goes to the south—and big and little firms are in on the business.

The oldest exporter of automobile parts in the country is believed to be the Atlas Manufacturing Co., of Indianapolis, and approximately 40 percent of their export business is done in Latin America, where they have done business for 42 years. Among others are Stokeley-Van Camp, Inc.; the Cummins Diesel Works, Columbus; and the Sargent-Gerke Co. I could go on for an hour naming products manufactured in the State of Indiana and exported to Latin America, and the export business in many of these fine companies amounts to over 20 percent of the firm's total production.

What does the mirror tell us on a national basis?

In 1954 the value of United States exports to Latin America totaled $3.357 billion, an 8 percent increase over 1953. It is a fact that the United States supplied 50 percent of all Latin American imports in 1954. Actually, Latin America took 26 percent of all United States nonmilitary exports, against its pre-World War share of 16 percent.

We find in this mirror the principal commodities comprising these total exports exceeding $3 billion, as follows:

The leading United States exports to Latin American Republics

[Millions of dollars]

1954	
Total exports	$3,357.2
PRINCIPAL COMMODITIES	
Industrial machinery	446.1
Electrical machinery	204.3
Tractors	99.7
Agricultural machinery	40.5
Motor trucks, buses, and chassis, new	197.7
Passenger cars and chassis, new	130.2
Vegetable food products	227.0
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	119.8
Chemical specialties	105.5
Industrial chemicals	51.5
Textile manufactures	194.6
Iron and steel mill products	144.1
Metal manufactures	125.5
Fats, milk, meat, and other edible animal products	125.1
Petroleum and petroleum products	119.1

In my investigation of the principal exports to Latin America in connection with determining from which States these exports originate, I find that Indiana is outstanding.

Let us take another look in this mirror and perhaps we will find some helpful charts showing the type of imports, the dollar value, and the States from which the exports originate. It probably would be helpful to use one country in Latin America as an example, as follows:

(A) Machinery totaling $150 million in 26 States.

(B) Metal manufactures totaling $70 million in 16 States.

(C) Automobiles and trucks totaling $90 million in 5 States.

(D) Foodstuffs from 24 States, amounting to $65 million.

(E) Textiles from 19 States, amounting to $41 million.

(F) Eleven States shipped chemicals worth $40 million.

(G) Dairy products went from 15 States in the amount of $21 million.

(H) Thirty-one States furnished wood and paper products worth $19 million.

(I) Minerals were exported from 17 States totaling $17 million.

Have you noticed that in all these charts Indiana stands out prominently in every one of them and, in all, 40 States benefited directly from major purchases from this one Latin American country, while all States produced one or more products used in manufactured products exported to this particular country in Latin America?

As a market for American export products, Latin America is slightly more important than Canada, for 2 of the past 3 years more important than Western Europe, and is far more important to the United States than Asia, Africa, and Oceania combined, as is demonstrated by the following chart:

United States trade with the principal world areas

[Total value in millions of dollars]

	Exports and reexports [1]			General imports		
	1954	1953	1952	1954	1953	1952
Total	12,195	11,648	12,588	10,207	10,873	10,717
Latin America	3,371	3,134	3,480	3,289	3,442	3,411
Western Europe	3,462	2,943	3,403	2,037	2,296	1,985
Canada	2,962	3,198	3,003	2,375	2,462	2,386
Asia	1,920	2,003	2,112	1,465	1,626	1,813
Africa	568	504	569	604	593	607
Oceania	239	174	227	163	201	243

[1] Excludes Mutual Security and Special category shipments.

Here is another interesting fact: From 1938 to 1954 imports to the United States from Latin America rose from $485 million to $3,289 million. Exports from the United States to Latin America kept in stride, from $564 million in 1938 to $3,371 million in 1954. Note the similarity.

When Uncle Sam goes to war, Latin America is indispensable. During the Second World War, Latin America provided 75 percent of the foodstuffs and 40 percent of the raw materials and semimanufactured articles imported by the United States. Out of a total of 77 articles in a list of strategic materials for stockpile in the United States, 30 are imported from Latin American countries.

And yet Latin American countries have been the recipients of very limited grant aid from the United States. It is to their great credit that almost without exception they have opposed grant aid and have preferred to meet their own problems with the help of generous access to sound loans in the United States.

For many years a growing partnership relation has existed between Uncle Sam and the Republics of Latin America. Private investments, technical know-how, and substantial loans on the part of Uncle Sam have been important ingredients in this partnership arrangement.

Latin American countries have received loans from the Export-Import Bank for the purchase of productive capital goods such as heavy machinery, hydroelectric equipment, communications and transportation equipment, and other material and services which assist them in their never-ending earnest search for improvement of their own economies. In turn, the bank's loans assist in the financing of exports from the United States to Latin America; but remember, these loans are made at a profit to the United States and this bank now has in reserve a total of $360 million—all from profits. Thus, we have at least one Government agency which operates in the black and not at the cost of the taxpayer.

Our bank has demonstrated its great faith in Latin America. During the past two decades the bank has loaned more than $1.7 billion in Latin America. Certainly the influx of private capital in Latin America has been a major factor, but $1.7 billion, principally in capital goods, is also an important contributing factor.

Our faith in Latin America has been fully justified. Let us examine a few comparisons:

Per capita consumption in Latin America increased 26 percent from 1945 to 1953. Telephones in use in Latin America as a whole more than doubled from 1940 to 1954, as did automobiles.

Truck and bus registrations tripled and the number of tractors on the farms rose five times.

United States cement production went from 24 million tons in 1939 to 47 million tons in 1952—an increase of 96 percent. But in the same period, cement production in just one country in Latin America increased 2,088 percent.

In the postwar period Latin America's gross product, measured in constant prices, has increased from $27.3 billion to $41.6 billion, or 52 percent. In this same period, the United States gross product increased from $263 billion to $307 billion, also measured in constant prices, or by 17 percent.

President Eisenhower, in his inaugural address on January 20, 1953, stated:

"In the Western Hemisphere, we enthusiastically join with all our neighbors in the work of perfecting a community of fraternal trust and common purpose."

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey announced at Rio that the partnership policy between the Latin Americas and the United States would be implemented by the intensification and expansion of the Export-Import Bank. Let us examine the record: In the first 6 months of 1954 this bank extended approximately $77 million in credits. During the last 6 months of 1954 the Congress of the United States reestablished the board of directors of the bank and expanded its lending authority. During the 6 months from July 1, 1954, to December 31, 1954, the credits of the bank exceeded $293 million. In the first 5 months of operations in 1955 the bank extended over $313 million in credit, and I want to point out that $160,711,000 of those credits were in Latin America. Furthermore, included in the amount of $313 million are exporter credit lines for financing capital equipment amounting to $106,185,000, which are available for financing exports to Latin America, as well as other friendly countries. Thus, during 11 months of the United States Government's fiscal year, the bank has extended credits approximating $606 million.

(Details of the bank's present lending policies to be developed in panel discussion and during question-and-answer program.)

Summing up, while we are indispensable to the well-being and progress of Latin America, we should recognize our great dependence on the other American Republics.

1. The United States is the best buyer of Latin American products in the world, presently purchasing more than 50 percent of all Latin American exports.

2. Latin America is the largest buyer of United States products in this hemisphere and on an average for the past 3 years has been the United States best customer abroad.

3. Latin America is an indispensable and irreplaceable ally and source of raw materials vital to the United States economy.

4. Latin America constitutes a very important source of supply of those raw materials essential to the United States in case of war.

5. Private investments and loans with reasonable assurance of repayment, particularly in the field of free enterprise, not only assist substantially in the expansion of our foreign trade but materially influence the rise in the level of the standard of living of the peoples of Latin America and thus increase their purchasing power for the products manufactured in the United States. Therefore, they should be encouraged.

The cold statistics which I have given you illustrate quite clearly the Latin American trade potential. While this is of great importance, the solidarity of the people of the Western Hemisphere is vastly more consequential. Certainly all of us are acquainted with Canada. In fact, we stand tonight a very short distance from the shores of Canada. But how many of you have visited Central America; the Islands of Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic; and South America, although Indiana does over $300 million a year in exports, I doubt if a single businessman in this room has visited all of Latin America. Let us have a show of hands of those who have gone a third of the way around.

For the moment, let us see if we can together experience the potential strength of Latin America. Join me on the top of the great mountain of ore at Durango, Mexico, where I stood some weeks ago above 300 million tons of iron ore. No American was in sight, only Mexicans—capable men who have, during my life span and several years more, charted the course of a great steel company, without help or hindrance of their government—free enterprise, if you please. To the north stood Texas, without separation of water. Friendship and strength manifest in every direction, and I was thankful, as the power of that iron flowed into my body, that it was owned by free enterprising friendly neighbors. Then, after visiting the Latin American islands in the Caribbean, on out over the Central American Republics, over the Panama Canal, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, on down to the majestic forest primeval of southern Chile, thence across the famous Andes hump, over the pampas of the Argentine, with top soil ranging 30 feet in depth, to Buenos Aires, then to Uruguay and Paraguay, on to the great expanses of Brazil, and then to Venezuela, where we again stood on an enormous mount of ore called Orinoco. This mountain of ore is the project of the United States Steel Co. and Bethlehem Steel Co. Thus, we started on a mountain of strength owned by our Mexican friends and ended on another mountain of iron evidencing our friendly partnership relation with Venezuela. You traveled over 20,000 miles, 6,000 of which were alongside the majestic Andes. You crossed the path of 169 million citizens of 21 republics. You passed over endless production facilities for coffee, oil, bananas, sugar, tobacco, cocoa, sisal, tin, copper, iron ore, tungsten, lead, quebracho, hardwoods, hides, cotton, zinc, silver, nitrates, sesame, wool, meat, wheat, corn, gold, emeralds, platinum, etc. But more important are the people. You have made friends of lifetime duration, and those friends are more hospitable and will do more for you than they would ever possibly expect you to do for them. They seek nothing of you or your Government which they are not perfectly willing to pay for and not to receive in aids or grants. Certainly you ran into situations of trade barriers, restrictions, quotas, and other impediments of consequence, but none beyond solution with mutual understanding.

Our friends to the south and to the north, in addition to ourselves, make a great host of almost 400 million people. How can the people of the United States discharge their responsibility of world leadership without first having an abiding faith in themselves and their neighbors? The greatness of our own hemisphere lies before us today as a veritable green valley of strength, yet hardly touched because we fail to give it sinews and blood. Here before us lies the avenue of peace. We have risen to meet the challenge on many foreign shores but not on our own soil and among our own people.

With clear-eyed, bold foresight and constant action, we have within our grasp the blueprint to lasting peace for ourselves, our children and theirs. Let us again rise and meet the challenge, but this time not with guns and bullets but with trade, sharing our tremendous financial resources on a businesslike basis, together with our know-how, with full understanding and the degree of faith in our neighbors that we have in ourselves.

Amendments to Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means began this morning to consider in executive session amendments to the Social Security Act which would lower the retirement age for women to 62 and provide cash disability payments. It is estimated that the average annual cost of these amendments would be in excess of $2 billion annually.

The nature of the proposed amendments was first announced last Friday, June 17, 1955, by our distinguished chairman, Mr. COOPER. On that same date, he transmitted a draft of the amendments to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with a letter requesting the views of the Department. The response of the Secretary to the Chairman, under today's date, was presented to our committee this morning.

The Republican members of the committee supported a motion to hold public hearings upon the proposed amendments as well as on a number of other liberalizations in the social-security system which have wide public support. This motion was turned down by the Democratic majority.

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as there will be no public hearings on this matter and no transcript and since it is vital that the membership of the House be kept acquainted with these proceedings of such tremendous significance to the American people, I am including at this point in the RECORD a copy of Chairman COOPER'S letter of June 17 to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a copy of the Secretary's reply of June 21, and a list of the subjects with respect to which the Republican members of the committee moved to hold public hearings:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1955.

Hon. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

MY DEAR MRS. SECRETARY: I am enclosing herewith copies of a confidential draft of a bill which I plan to submit to the full committee next week. This committee print would provide disability insurance benefits, lower the age for all women beneficiaries from 65 to 62, and provide for child's benefits after age 18 where they are physically or mentally disabled.

I have scheduled executive sessions on this bill for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, June 21, 22, and 23. During these sessions it may be that other members of the committe will offer proposed amendments to the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Title of the Social Security laws.

I would sincerely appreciate your having your staff review the enclosed draft and be in a position to present to our committee the position of your department on these proposed amendments by Tuesday.

I would like for your department to be in a position to give us your policy on these provisions, actuarial estimates of the cost involved, including any offsetting estimates such as those due to an increase in payroll, and any other factors and considerations relevant to sound actuarial estimates. I would also like for your actuaries to be in a position to recommend any necessary adjustments in the social security tax rates in order to keep the trust fund on an actuarially sound basis in the light of these proposed amendments, and other relevant factors.

I would also appreciate your department being in a position at the executive sessions to present to the committee for determination any policy decisions that must be made in connection with giving effect to these proposed changes. In addition, I would like for your staff to be in a position to suggest to us any technical and administrative improvements which might be made in these proposals.

In the past, your staff has been most cooperative and helpful with Mr. Ed Craft of the legislative counsel's office in drafting proposed legislation and in perfecting such legislation. This assistance of your staff has been invaluable to our committee, and is most appreciated. I would be very grateful if you would again permit your staff to render any assistance to Mr. Craft which he may desire.

With my kindest personal regards and sincere best wishes, I am

Very cordially yours,

JERE COOPER.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for your letter of June 17, 1955, enclosing copies of a confidential draft of a bill you are submitting to the full Committee on Ways and Means. Our staff has made such review as is possible in the time available and will be happy to appear before your committee today to assist in whatever manner is possible. We wish to cooperate fully with you, the committee and the legislative counsel's office in carrying out the committee's wishes.

You have asked, also, that our staff be ready to present to the committee the position of the Department on these proposed amendments. I would like to take this opportunity to set forth our views.

It is hardly necessary for us to restate the administration's basic policy with respect to the old-age and survivors insurance system. In his first state of the Union message, and even prior thereto, President Eisenhower clearly and emphatically called for broad improvements in the contributory, self-supporting system of old-age and survivors insurance. In the spring of 1953, a group of expert consultants was called together by this Department to consider the extension of the protection of the OASI system to additional groups of workers and self-employed persons. Late in the first session of the 83d Congress a bill was introduced by Congressman DANIEL A. REED embodying the recommendations of this consultant group. During the fall of 1953 an intensive study was conducted within the Department of the benefit structure of the OASI system, and in January of 1954 President Eisenhower transmitted to the Congress, in his state of the Union and special social-security messages, a series of recommendations for the expansion and improvement of the OASI system. These recommendations were translated into a new bill introduced by Congressman REED.

As you will recall, your committee and the Committee on Finance of the Senate gave that bill the most careful and thorough scrutiny. Your committee conducted weeks of public hearings during 1954, even though many of the elements of the administration bill had, at one time or another, been considered previously by the committee. This Department regards the committee's action last year as a model of careful and thorough joint legislative effort, and we particularly valued the important contributions made by you personally and by other members of the committee to perfecting the administration bill.

The result of this effort was perhaps the most sweeping and broadening improvement of the OASI system since its inception 20 years ago. The 1954 amendments made the following important changes:

1. Extended coverage to about 10 million more workers, including 3½ million self-employed farmers and many additional farm workers.

2. Increased benefit payments substantially for all present and future retired workers and for other beneficiaries.

3. Adopted a more advantageous basis for calculating benefits by (a) permitting a worker to drop as many as 5 years of low or no earnings from his wage record, and (b) by increasing to $4,200 the amount of annual earnings that can be counted toward benefits.

4. Preserved the rights of totally disabled workers to any benefits they may have earned.

5. Liberalized the retirement test by (a) permitting employed and self-employed beneficiaries to have earnings up to $1,200 in a year without loss of benefits, and (b) by reducing from 75 to 72 the age at which a beneficiary will be able to receive the payments regardless of the amount he is earning.

6. Provided benefits for the families of workers who had credit for a year and a half in social-security jobs but who died uninsured prior to September, 1950.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, the 1954 amendments, which were adopted by an overwhelming bipartisan vote in both Houses of Congress, reflect in a way even more eloquent than a statement of principles the deep concern of this administration for improving the welfare of our people by strengthening and improving the OASI system.

We come now to consider how the administration policy for strengthening the OASI system applies in the situation presented by your stated intention to conduct 3 days of closed or executive sessions on a bill based on the confidential draft you transmitted to us with your letter.

It is our firm conviction that a thoroughgoing review and inquiry into the issues raised by the confidential draft are essential. We believe that this committee could best serve the American people in this particular instance by setting up the mechanism for an intensive study—as was done by this committee in 1946 and by the Senate Finance Committee in 1948. A study commission or advisory council, particularly if given a mandate to consider certain specified problem areas, could assure that no important consideration is overlooked and the views of all are taken into account. Either this committee or the study commission could conduct full and open hearings on measures of the type in the confidential draft, with an opportunity prior thereto for all interested persons and groups to study the measures carefully, to formulate their views and to prepare testimony.

We wish to emphasize particularly the willingness and desire of this Department, as it has done in similar situations in the past, to work in close cooperation with such a commission or council.

While it is true that testimony on related proposals was received by this committee in 1949, we are convinced that a full inquiry is needed with respect to the proposals contained in the confidential draft for the following reasons:

1. The social security system is a system of the people. It represents the source of security for many millions of Americans, and it has a tremendous significance for our economy. It has reached practically universality in coverage of employment. Legislation dealing with a structure of such universal impact and significance should be considered widely by employers, employees, the self-employed and other interested groups and discussed fully and openly.

2. Although the confidential draft is similar in many respects to parts of a bill considered by your committee in 1949, there are important differences. Just for example, the provisions of the 1949 bill dealing with cash disability benefits provided that a disability benefit could be terminated if the disabled person refused without good cause to accept available rehabilitation services.

3. There are many alternative approaches to even the proposals in the draft bill. For example, as to cash disability benefits, the terms of eligibility, the administrative provisions and the appropriate review of administrative determinations are all matters of key importance with respect to which we do not purport to be able to give the Congress our best counsel at this time.

4. The OASI system has changed significantly since 1949 from a system under which about 6 out of 10 jobs were covered to one under which 9 out of 10 jobs are covered. Millions of self-employed persons have now been brought within the system—paying social security taxes at a rate of 150 percent of the rate paid by employees. Self-employed farmers will commence paying taxes for the first time on January 1, 1956. The benefit structure of the system has been completely revised since 1949. The overall costs of the system have increased substantially, and a substantially higher ultimate tax rate is projected than was the case in 1949.

5. Because the OASI system is becoming a more costly one (with an 8-percent combined employer-employee tax already projected at the end of 20 years), every additional item of cost must be considered with the greatest care. The system could lose its attractiveness, particularly for many self-employed persons, if additional cost items are added without the most careful evaluation of the benefits they confer.

6. There are many praiseworthy objectives which have taken the form of numerous proposals for amendment of the OASI system other than the 2 or 3 proposals included in the confidential draft. There should be full opportunity carefully to consider which of the many proposals have the highest priority.

7. Since 1949 there have been many developments outside the OASI system which call for a thorough consideration. For example, there has been a tremendous growth in private insurance, private pension plans and voluntary health insurance. These developments have an important bearing on the proposals contained in the confidential draft.

Within the administration, we have not had an opportunity to make a real study of the proposals contained in the confidential draft bill, and have particularly not had an opportunity to solicit the views of groups and individuals outside of government.

Furthermore, there has not been an opportunity to assess and evaluate the results of the 1954 amendments, nor will there be for some time yet. The first few State determinations of disability under the disability "freeze" provision enacted last year have just been received. We are convinced that best interests of the OASI system and the American people would be served by obtaining more experience under the "freeze" and having that experience evaluated carefully before coming to far reaching decisions which have important implica-

tions for the OASI Trust Fund. Similarly, there has been no real opportunity to evaluate the effect of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954, expanding the Federal-State program of rehabilitation for the disabled, or the effect of the referral to State rehabilitation agencies under the disability "freeze" provision mentioned above. We regard all of these as matters of crucial significance in the development of sound legislation.

We wish to reemphasize that the Department strongly endorses all efforts to strengthen and improve the OASI system which are soundly financed, in a way not unfair to any group. However, we believe that any major amendments should be adopted only after they have been presented to the public with an opportunity for full expression of views and open debate, and have been the subject of full deliberation based on experience under recent basic changes in the law.

There are many issues which a commission of inquiry might fruitfully consider. For example, the following major questions are raised by the proposals in the confidential draft bill:

CASH DISABILITY BENEFITS

1. Recognizing that self-sufficiency and independence through rehabilitation are more important goals for the individual than dependence on cash payments: What are the implications of cash disability benefits with respect to rehabilitation efforts?

(a) Has experience under veterans' programs, workmen's compensation, or other programs indicated any lessening of incentive toward rehabilitation as a result of payments of cash benefits?

(b) Do we yet know the full potential of the expanding Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program?

(c) Could greater social gain be achieved by backing rehabilitation efforts with additional funds—whether from the OASI trust fund or other sources—rather than paying the same funds in cash benefits on the condition of continued disability?

(d) Could the desired objectives be better achieved by making more liberal maintenance payments during rehabilitation?

2. What are the actuarial problems involved in cash disability benefits? What is the recent experience of insurance companies, labor union funds, and the like? What experience is there with respect to disabilities of women in middle and upper age brackets?

3. Do we need a broad health census to better ascertain the incidence and scope of permanent and total disability in this country? See for example, the recommendations in the 1955 report to the Congress entitled "Study of the Homebound."

4. Would a cash disability program be utilized by employers as a means for retiring disabled persons from the labor market, especially persons in upper age groups?

5. Is there in fact a changing concept of disability, as a result of developments which have broadened the extent to which handicapped persons may be restored to activity and gainful employment? Is it true, as stated in the 1952 report of the task force on the handicapped (Office of Defense Mobilization) that "The idea of disability itself is outmoded," and that the significance of medical and rehabilitation advances of the last 10 years have not yet been fully comprehended? How should long-range policy in our social insurance system toward disability be developed in the light of these factors, if they are found to be true?

6. What guidance to the administrative problems involved in determining disability can be derived from experience under the disability "freeze" which has just gone into effect?

7. What would be the relationship of a Federal cash disability program to—

(a) the program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, enacted in 1950;

(b) "permanent and total disability" benefits provided under workmen's compensation;

(c) unemployment compensation;

(d) temporary disability programs in the States; and

(e) private disability programs and voluntary health insurance plans?

8. Could benefits for "permanent and total disability" be handled more effectively under any of the foregoing programs at the State level rather than at the Federal level?

9. Should cash disability benefits, if adopted, be paid at any age, or only at age 55 or 60?

REDUCTION IN RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

1. What is the particular rationale for a reduction in retirement age for—

(a) wives,

(b) working women, and

(c) widows?

2. Is a reduction in age inconsistent with—

(a) the lengthening life span for the entire population,

(b) the fact that women live longer than men on the average?

3. In meeting the challenge of an aging population, much public and private research is being conducted into the social significance of "retirement age" provisions in OASI and other retirement plans. For example, the Department of Labor is planning a broad research program with respect to employment of older workers, and the administration has endorsed the bills pendings in Congress to establish a Commission on the Aging to consider, among other things, national policy with respect to employment of older persons. In view of these developments and the strong trend toward encouragement of continued employment for older workers who are physically healthy, should there be a general reduction in the retirement age for women at this time?

4. Would a reduction in age for working women make it more difficult for them to obtain and keep jobs on a fair basis with men?

5. Would a reduction of retirement age by only 3 years have any real significance in alleviating (for example) the problem of the woman who is widowed at age 45, 50 or later?

6. Would a reduction in age for women be merely a forerunner of a general reduction in retirement age for men, as well?

The foregoing questions, many of which involve issues of broad economic and social policy, are stated not to discourage action in further amending the OASI law, but rather to lend sincere encouragement to the soundest possible approach to strengthening our social insurance system. It is because of these questions, Mr. Chairman, that we are anxious that your committee should exercise its traditional prerogatives with respect to the social security system and conduct a full inquiry into these and the many other questions which might be raised.

In addition to stating these views as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I wish to express the same opinions in my capacity as a trustee of the Old-age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. The integrity of the fund cannot, in my opinion, be protected if we are to commence now to deviate from the pattern of deliberate, full and careful consideration which has marked all prior major amendments of the OASI system. The acturial status of the fund is too vital to the welfare of our people—the employed, the self-employed, and their families—to permit of even the possibility of hasty action without full understanding by all members of this committee, the Congress, and the American people of the implications of that action.

At the very minimum as a trustee of the fund, I feel compelled to call atention to the financial impact which the proposals in the confidential draft might have—as a result of their average annual cost in excess of $2 billion—and to stress the importance of full and forthright financing of any additional costs imposed.

We appreciate this opportunity to express our views, and will stand ready to cooperate with your committee in any way possible. We highly value the sipirt of cooperative endeavor which has marked all our relationships in the past.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

The following is the list of subjects with respect to which the majority rejected my motion to hold public hearings:

1. The payment of disability benefits.
2. Reduction of the retirement age for women.
3. Reduction of the retirement age for men as well as for women.
4. Liberalization of the retirement test which permits a beneficiary to earn only up to $1,200 a year without loss of benefits.
5. Reducing to 70 the age at which a beneficiary can earn any amount without loss of benefits.
6. Increasing the present minimum benefit of $30 a month to $45 a month or some other figure.
7. Consideration of the plight of millions of Americans who have passed the age of 65 but who never have had an opportunity to achieve social-security protection.
8. Extension of coverage to those individuals who are still denied social-security protection, such as lawyers, dentists, and many State and local employees.
9. Increasing a wife's benefit to more than one-half her husband's benefit.
10. Increasing a widow's benefit to the full amount of her husband's benefit.
11. Paying benefits to the dependent children of a deceased worker beyond age 18.
12. Paying benefits to widows whose husbands died prior to 1940 when survivorship benefits were first instituted.
13. Increasing the maximum family benefit above the present $200.
14. Providing an increase in benefits for those who postpone retirement until after 65.
15. Liberalizing the definition of employment to assist those who are employed by relatives.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the Smith Fork irrigation project in Colorado.

The Smith Fork project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Smith Fork project would be $1,800 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains and dairy products.

Poland's Freedom Should Be Restored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the celebration of Polish Constitution Day several weeks, ago, the Polish Allied Societies of Williamsburg, which is a part of my congressional district, sponsored a parade and a large public gathering.

I was privileged to be invited to this celebration, which took place on May 29, 1955, and to deliver an address on the occasion. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the text of my address into the RECORD:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY PARADE IN WILLIAMSBURG, MAY 29, 1955

My fellow Americans, I am very happy to be here with you on this occasion and to join with you in the celebration of Polish Constitution Day. I consider it an honor and a privilege to address this wonderful gathering sponsored by the Polish Allied Societies of Williamsburg, which is doing a swell job and is rendering patriotic services.

It is fitting and proper for you to celebrate this day on which you reaffirm your devotion to the great Polish heritage of freedom handed down by your people 164 years ago. Your celebration is part and parcel of the spirit of loyalty and devotion which you bear in your hearts to America and all that America stand for in the spheres of justice, freedom, and morality.

This great Polish national holiday, however, is also a sad day for all of us in the free world. We observe it as a day of remembrance and rededication. It is a day of renewed hope that Poland will soon be liberated from the yoke of Communist subjugation and oppression, and that it will once again join the nations of the free world as an independent and democratic nation.

The people of Polish descent are no newcomers to the struggle for liberty. The Polish Constitution of 1791 is today recognized by freedom-loving people everywhere as one of the great documents in the annals of human freedom—a document which has since become a landmark in the development of constitutional government. Poland in the 18th century was in desperate need of a strong government. Its elective king was helpless its Diet (Parliament) was impotent. Because of these weaknesses, Poland's predatory neighbors—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—were able to appropriate large areas of Polish territory in 1772.

Stirred by the democratic ferment then sweeping France and also our own 13 colonies in America, the people of Poland demanded a constitution which would strengthen the nation and guarantee certain rights to the people. Finally, after a long struggle, the constitution of 1791 was adopted enfranchising the citizens of Poland and establishing religious freedom in the country. Let me read to you just a few lines from that great document in which the following principle is set forth:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation."

This is still one of the great objects of humanity. No wonder that Edmund Burke, the great British parliamentarian and fighter for liberty, said at the time, "Humanity must rejoice and glory, when it considers the change in Poland." Unfortunately, those gains were lost later in the turbulent events of Polish history, but the constitution remained and it became an important factor in man's long fight for freedom.

The desire for human freedom and social justice, for democracy and religious toleration, is perhaps stronger today than it has ever been in the history of mankind. And yet the great paradox of history is the fact that the Polish people, the same people which has brought forth this noble document more than a century and a half ago as a charter of liberty, cannot celebrate the occasion in a free Poland today.

The Polish nation, which has lived for nine centuries in spiritual, religious, and cultural relationship with the western nations, is now cut off from the West. Its homeland is sealed off behind the Iron Curtain, where freedom is not tolerated, where human rights are trampled upon, where social justice and religious toleration are unknown, and where democracy has been perverted in its meaning and purpose.

Those of us who are familiar with the story of Poland's struggle for national independence in our time, know that the American people have always supported Poland's just cause for national survival and sovereignty—and we always will. Human liberty everywhere suffered a severe blow when Poland's independence was wiped out so ruthlessly in 1939 by the Nazi aggressor from the West. Later, Nazi oppression was replaced by Communist slavery from the East. Today, the power of the state no longer originates with the people, or belongs to the people—the real master sits in the Kremlin in Moscow. Poland is a captive country under a Communist dictatorship.

My friends, let me assure you, however, that neither Poland nor its people are friendless or forgotten. We, in this country, and others in free countries throughout the world, are constantly striving to bring them encouragement and giving them the fullest moral and spiritual support in their hours of anguish. We are hoping and praying that this nightmare of Communist tyranny and oppression, their enslavement and degradation, will soon end, and Poland will again rise to its rightful place among the free nations.

At this point, I want to stress a particular development of recent months and to express my views in the matter. For a long time we, in this country, followed a policy of liberation of the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe: Poland, the Baltic States, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the others. Of late, the Eisenhower administration is discarding this policy and is replacing it with a policy of coexistence.

I want to tell you just as clearly as I can make it, that this is a fallacious policy. In fact, I consider it a dangerous policy because it will destroy every vestige of hope which is still lingering in the hearts of your kinsmen in Poland and the other enslaved people, it will end all their dreams and aspirations ever to become liberated from their Communist oppressors. Only the hope of attaining freedom in the future encourages the people of Poland today to continue their struggle against slavery. To them, coexistence means death, the end of all hope for national rebirth. As I see it, there can be no coexistence of any kind, in any way, between the free world and the Communist-dominated world as long as entire nations are enslaved.

I make a point of this, because this summer there will take place a Big Four conference in which our country will sit down with Communist Russia at the same table to discuss certain matters. I suggest that the question of the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe be made a part of the agenda at that conference, with the idea of obtaining their freedom—something to which Russia has consented 10 years ago when the United Nations was organized in San Francisco. Russia must be asked to live up to her international agreements. The despots of the Kremlin must be given to understand that they cannot succeed forever in subjugating human dignity and justice. Theirs is a negative approach to human progress and civilization, it is contrary to basic principles of life itself.

In conclusion, let me assure you that the people of the United States follow with great sympathy the tragic plight which has befallen the people of Poland, whom we shall always regard as our stanch friends and allies. On this occasion, I extend my greetings and good wishes to all of you, friends and neighbors, all of you loyal Americans of Polish descent. I join with you in your prayers for Poland and its people. As we pray together for Poland's restoration, as we pay tribute to the bravery of the Polish people, let their struggles for liberty of yesterday and today serve as a beacon of light for tomorrow.

I urge you to do everything possible to help your people in Poland to surmount the great national crisis that confronts them. In ways that you know best, you must not only maintain hope for the future, but you must help your kinsmen in Poland to survive that crisis. They must feel confidence in your devotion to the altar of God, at which you both pray in your hearts—you in freedom here, they in slavery over there.

Rare and Useful Qualities of a Statesman From Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of June 20, 1955, which pays a deserved tribute to what the Sun describes as the "rare and useful qualities" of the senior Senator from Illinois. The editorial follows:

SENATOR DOUGLAS LOOKS AT AIRLINE SUBSIDIES

Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, has lately ben criticizing the new schedule of subsidies which the Commerce Department proposes for the commercial airlines. To cite a single instance, Pan American has a subsidiary called the Intercontinental Hotels Corp. which it operates at a loss, and Senator DOUGLAS does not see why the taxpayers should pay for airline losses incurred in operating luxury hotels.

The Sun has often had occasion to disagree with Senator DOUGLAS. But he does bring to the Senate certain rare and useful qualities. He is one of this country's most eminent economists. He has a keenly analytical mind which is perhaps at its best in dealing with fiscal matters. He has an ingrained aversion to spending the taxpayers' money uselessly.

Since the birth of commercial aviation in the United States, the airlines have enjoyed subsidies of one kind or another. Without some form of assistance, their development would have been greatly delayed, if not impossible. Subsidies were justifiable

in the beginning, in terms of both public convenience and national security. But the airlines have grown up, and that puts them in a different light. Now that Senator DOUGLAS has moved in on the question, the airlines are thrown automatically on the defensive. A bout of clear thinking on the subsidy question would probably be a good thing for the country, and for the airlines, too.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter written by Mr. H. D. Lollar, of 220 Mound Street, Lebanon, Ohio, to the editor of the Saturday Evening Post, relative to the farm problems, which I believe my colleagues will find most interesting:

CRISENBERY SERVICE, INC.,
Lebanon, Ohio, June 16, 1955.
EDITOR OF THE SATURDAY EVENING POST,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: In this week's issue, Too Much Is Our Trouble, Mr. Thruelsen asks what farmers being paid for not farming do with their time; the answer—the same thing union labor does while drawing unemployment compensation.

There is a way to whip this surplus problem—use a little judgment in the loaning of money. Instead of loaning more than the market price, loan, say, 20 percent under the market. If the market goes up by the time the loan is due, the farmer gains by his speculation and is entitled to it. If the market goes down, let him take his loss. Why expect to unload on the Government? If he refuses to pay the loss, hold it against him till next year and deduct it from his next year's loan, if he makes one. Maybe he will think twice before he plunges again.

I worked for a country elevator for years, and I saw how being able to borrow from the Government worked up the speculative fever in the wheat farmer. In those days the corn farmer had to keep his corn on the ear at least till next spring. Now, with the driers, his corn is shelled immediately and he has another chance to speculate.

One-crop farmers cause most of the surpluses. They should follow a crop rotation. I have managed a farm for 40 years, holding strictly to a rotation and feeding as much as possible to livestock. We nearly always have 1 year's crops marketed before next year's harvest.

Take the wool pool, for example, which the cotton people could well follow. The advance we get at shearing time is considerably less than the trade expects it to sell for some time during the year, but it all moves eventually. That is orderly marketing and there is nearly always some final payment coming before next year's clip. No contribution from the taxpayers there.

Another thing to consider: The farmer can get a loan for his crop production from his mutual credit agency, sponsored by the Government, but with little or no expense to the taxpayer. If one man fails to pay up, the loss comes off the other local borrowers. Why cannot farmers finance their marketing the same way? If too many borrow unwisely this year, the local association will remember the experience and loan more conservatively next year. There should be less dependence placed on Santa Claus. That goes for farmers the same as labor unions.

Yours truly,

H. D. LOLLAR,
Lebanon, Ohio.

Winning Keeps Us on Our Toes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, at the 79th annual Texas Press Association convention in Galveston, Tex., on June 11, 1955, the San Marcos Record, a weekly newspaper published at San Marcos, Tex., which is in my district, was awarded the sweepstakes trophy, the top award for weekly newspapers published in towns of more than 2,500. The San Marcos Record has captured this best all-around prize three times since 1950.

Following are a news article explaining this award and a very appropriate editorial entitled "Winning Keeps Us on Our Toes" which appeared in the June 17, 1955, issue of the San Marcos Record:

RECORD NAMED BEST TEXAS WEEKLY FOR 1955

For the third time in 5 years, the San Marcos Record has won the Texas Press Association newspaper contest sweepstakes.

Awarded annually at the association's convention, the sweepstakes goes to the newspaper scoring the most points in six individual contests—appearance, general excellence, column writing, news pictures, editorials, and newswriting.

Winner of the sweepstakes is declared best all-round newspaper in the division in which it is competing.

The Record won this year's best all-round title over the runner-up Fredericksburg Standard by a margin of 160 points. The Liberty Vindicator finished third with 180 points.

In all, the Record won the sweepstakes trophy, the first-place plaque for general excellence, a second-place ribbon for editorials, a second-place ribbon for appearance, a third-place ribbon for newswriting, and a fifth-place ribbon for column writing.

Ironically, the Record failed to capture a point in the news-pictures contest. First prize for news photography went to the Seguin Enterprise, which finished second to the Record in competition at the South Texas Press Association contest in April. The Record's entry was believed to have been lost.

Fourteen papers, by virtue of entering all six individual contests, were eligible for the sweepstakes award with the Record in division IV (weekly newspaper published in towns of 2,500 population and over).

The 2 Texas Press Association trophies brought to 4 the number of awards won by the Record this year.

Others won at the South Texas Press Association convention were for best all-round newspaper in south Texas and for best news photography.

The Record had previously won the sweepstakes in 1952, 1950, and 1934.

Donor of this year's sweepstakes award, a gold-plated trophy, was the Dallas Morning News. The general-excellence plaque was donated by the Southland Paper Mills, Inc.

Publisher and Mrs. Walter Buckner accepted the awards at the 79th annual Texas Press Association convention last weekend in Galveston.

WINNING KEEPS US ON OUR TOES

The Record was honored at the 76th annual meeting of the Texas Press Association last week by being awarded the trophy as best all-around weekly newspaper (towns of more than 2,500) in Texas. This is the fourth time the Record has received this same award, the first one coming in 1933 at a convention held in Houston.

This is the highest journalistic honor which can be bestowed on a Texas newspaper and it makes the workers on the Record very proud—and at the same time very humble.

The Record staff, including management, editorial, and mechanical, does not consciously strive to win such awards. They have no thought from week to week, as the newspaper is composed and printed, that "we must do this job well in order to win a prize."

But there is an underlying thought throughout the year that we must all keep on our toes and not let down on a single issue of the Record—because that might well be the issue which the judges call for when the dates of publication are mailed out in the early summer. We never know in advance what issues will be called for.

Winning such recognition is a great stimulus to all of us on the Record staff to maintain as high standards as we are capable of producing. The morale throughout the small organization is boosted upward each time the newspaper wins honors in the various contests it enters—and has been entering through the last 25 years.

We believe some of the pride we feel is also reflected by the many readers of the Record, hundreds of whom have said words of congratulations or praise as they meet us on the street or drop into the front office.

The Record strives to keep pace with the fine community which it serves. And we do not fool ourselves into thinking that the honors we win for ourselves in the field of journalism are by our efforts alone. Each advertiser, each loyal reader, every citizen of this community has a big part in these successes as they come to the newspaper. Without the support of everyone we could not accomplish much; certainly we could not win statewide recognition year after year unless we had the support of our readers and the patronage of our advertisers.

Now, it is up to us—the Record staff—to keep on doing a good job so as to merit your continued support and good will. This we promise to do week after week and year after year so long as we are privileged to live and work in San Marcos.

The Soo: Artery of Industrial Might

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Soo: Artery of Industrial Might," which was written by James H. Winchester and published in the Catholic Digest of June 1955. The article refers to the Soo Canal, located in Michigan, the world's busiest waterway.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOO: ARTERY OF INDUSTRIAL MIGHT

(By James H. Winchester)

The Soo Canal is the world's busiest waterway. On a peak day, 90 vessels will go through the locks. It carries more tonnage annually than the Panama, Suez, and Manchester Canals and the Rhine River all put together. Yet the Soo piles up its record in only 8 months each year, when its river is ice-free, while the others are open to traffic 12 months of the year.

It is officially the St. Mary's Fall Canal, but is better known simply as the Soo. This is its centennial year, which will be observed with a celebration. On June 18, 1855, the steamer *Illinois* passed upstream through the two locks and the dredged-out river channel linking Lakes Huron and Superior.

The Soo Canal, more than any one factor, perhaps, is responsible for the industrial growth of the United States.

Today the Soo is still the one vital link between the iron rim of Lake Superior and the blast furnaces that border the lower lakes. Some 85 percent of all iron ore produced in the United States, plus tremendous quantities of limestone, grain, oil, paper pulp, and manufactured goods, are transported through the Soo each season.

The idea for it goes far back in history. Sometime between 1615 and 1623 the French explorer Étienne Brule pushed up the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Rivers. Then he edged along the shores of Georgian Bay and on up the St. Mary's River, where 21-foot rapids blocked his way. Brule named the falls Sant de Gaston, in honor of the younger brother of Louis XIII of France.

French explorers, Jesuit priests, and others who followed Brule changed the name of the rapids to Sainte Marie du Sant, then to Sault de Ste. Marie and finally to Sault Ste. Marie, as they are known today.

A Catholic mission post, built by Father Marquette on the southern edge of the rapids in 1668, was the first permanent building on the site of what is now the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

Now bypassing the falls which first stopped Brule is the mile-long ship canal known as the Soo.

The Soo has well been called the "most important mile in America." When it was first dug, the iron-ore beds of the Eastern United States, never very extensive, were nearly played out. The United States then ranked fifth among the iron-making countries of the world. For the last three-quarters of a century, the United States has been first.

The Soo was the dominant factor in getting mountains of ore cheaply from Lake Superior ranges to the mills. It permitted the United States to make, first, good iron, and then good steel, cheap enough to speed the building of America.

In the early days, when the wilderness village of Sault Ste. Marie was one of the Northland's most important fur-trading centers, voyagers had to portage around the falls. The first actual canal and locks around the rapids was built on the Canadian side of the river by the Northwest Fur Co. in 1797–98. The lock was only 39 feet long 8 feet wide, and 9 feet deep. Oxen pulled the bateaux and canoes of the traders along its length. However, this lock was destroyed by United States troops during the War of 1812, and was never rebuilt.

By the middle of the last century, the first iron and copper mines began to flourish in upper Michigan and Minnesota. The need for a cargo-carrying canal became acute. In the 1830's such a canal was authorized by the Michigan Legislature, and work was actually started. However, the State engineers forgot to obtain permission to make their cut across Federal lands. Army troops were ordered in to stop them.

It wasn't until August 21, 1852, that Congress finally granted 750,000 acres of Federal lands to Michigan for the canal. The lands were to be given to the contractor, in payment for his work.

Into this ready-made situation stepped Charles T. Harvey, a brash imaginative young traveling salesman for the Fairbanks Scales Co., of St. Johnsbury, Vt. While visiting the Soo to recover from typhoid, he had seen rich piles of copper and iron ore piling up there because the producers had no ready nor cheap way to get them down to Ohio and Pennsylvania.

It was on Harvey's recommendation, after Congress authorized the canal, that the Fairbanks brothers organized the Saint Mary's Falls Ship Canal Co., and successfully bid for the job. Although he was no engineer and was only 24 years old, Harvey was placed in charge. It was a titanic assignment: The job had to be completed within 24 months or the builders would forfeit their fee.

Harvey faced stupendous difficulties. The weather was miserable, temperatures dropping to 35° below zero for months at a time during the winter. Labor was scarce. Immigrants were shanghaied off boats in eastern harbors.

It was all blasting, too, through solid rock. Every keg of powder had to be laboriously transported from Delaware or Connecticut. Stone to face the canal and lock walls had to be hauled and floated from Canada and Ohio. The nearest machine shop was several hundred miles away. The closest telegraph station was at Detroit. Army engineers, assigned to act as inspectors, differed with Harvey, the nonengineer, at every turn. But Harvey, working 18 to 20 hours a day himself, kept the work moving.

Once he was faced with a strike. "Go ahead and stay off the job," he told the men. "But if you don't work you don't eat." Sault Ste. Marie had no restaurants. Harvey posted guards at his own cook shacks. After missing two meals, the hungrey crews returned to work.

Again, a cholera epidemic struck in the spring of 1854. To prevent panic among his men, he would gather each night's victims early in the morning, hide them all day, and then bury them secretly after dark. He lost one-tenth of his 3,000-man working force, but a panic was averted. Not a day's work was lost.

A New York engineering firm wanted 6 months and $150,000 to remove submerged rocks from the Lake Superior entrance to the canal. Harvey built in his own crude shops a steam hammer that did the job in 5 weeks, at a cost of less than $5,000. He completed the canal and its two 300-foot long locks with 2 months to spare. The cost was just under $1 million.

Control of the canal was transferred to the Federal Government by the Michigan legislature in 1881. Under the State, tolls were charged. Today, the Army operates the facility toll free, its locks available to the ships of all nations.

Quite a few changes have been made at the Soo since Harvey's day. His original locks, good as they were, were soon inadequate. They were removed and replaced by the Poe lock in 1869. An additional lift, the Weitzer lock, was completed in 1881, and another lock was opened on the Canadian side in 1895. The Davis and Sabin locks, each with a capacity of two 600-foot-long ore boats at a time, were opened during the First World War. The 800-foot-long MacArthur lock, deepest and most modern of the 4 American lifts, was completed in 1948, replacing the outmoded Weitzel.

Although the MacArthur lock has been in operation a dozen years now, its official dedication will be a major part of this summer's centennial. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, for whom it is named, plans to take part.

During the 6 weeks of the centennial, nearly 200,000 people a week are expected to visit the Soo. They will see an operation that is amazingly swift and smooth. It averages only 15 minutes to lock a giant ore carrier up or down. The lake-boat captains, who use no pilots, make an average of two trips a week through the Soo during the April-to-November season. They know the intricacies of the lock operation as well the lock master himself, perched in a 70-foot tower.

The Army engineers, who operate the canal and locks, and the United States Coast Guard, which directs traffic in the river channels leading to the Soo, shudder to even think about accidents. Several have happened. Late in the last century, a ship sank in the river channel, tying up traffic completely for more than a week. In 1909, a ship rammed the gate of the Canadian lock, putting the chamber out of commission for months.

In 1942, a switch engine plunged off the international railroad bridge which spans the canal at its Lake Superior end, blocking the channel to 2 of the locks for 3 days. Still later, in 1948, the wind swung a giant ore carrier across the face of a lock, jamming the passage for half a day.

Despite the brief interruptions, the Soo has unspectacularly but always efficiently fulfilled the role for which it was designed. It is a busy funnel through which the iron ore and the wheat, the limestone and the copper, the lumber and the oil, which are lifeblood to America's industrial might and greatness, can flow in an unceasing stream.

Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, at the baccalaureate ceremony of the University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind., Sunday, June 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRIOTISM

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, at the baccalaureate ceremony of the University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind., June 12, 1955)

It is indeed a great privilege for me to be here and to have the opportunity of talking with you on an occasion which for me is full of sentiment. It was just 100 years ago that my grandfather, John W. Foster, was graduated from this university. It was just 50 years ago that he received from this university the honorary degree which, I understand, the university plans to confer upon me tomorrow. My grandfather, whose name I bear, exerted a great influence over my life and he had ideals and purposes which I have tried to make my own.

He was a deeply patriotic American. He belonged to the period which saw this country rapidly developing from a small Atlantic Coast group into a Nation that spread across the continent. He fought to preserve the Union; and then on diplomatic missions and as Secretary of State he helped to spread the

influence of this Nation throughout the world both in Europe and in Asia.

He deeply revered his forebears, who had been pioneers in settling this part of our Nation. He wrote a private booklet inscribed "Don't Let the Little Ones Forget," in which he told for his descendants the story of his own forebears, his grandfather, my great, great grandfather, on whose grave I laid a wreath today, and his father.

To me that story has symbolized the spirit of our Nation. I vividly recall being told of how my great grandfather, as a young boy of 17, had struck out into the West to get away from what seemed to him the overpopulated East. After a foot voyage of exploration, he had fixed upon a forest tract in southern Indiana, as a future homestead. He then brought his aged parents—his father was then 79 years old—from the East to settle here and gained a livelihood by hunting and by cutting hickory for hogshead hoops and floating them on a raft down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers to New Orleans, where hogsheads were needed for molasses. Then he would walk back through the 1,200 miles of dangerous trails from New Orleans to his log-cabin home here in Indiana. Finally, he became a farmer, a merchant, and then a judge, in the growing community he had helped to create.

That spirit of enterprise, that vision, that industry, and that rugged independence have been characteristic of our Nation. There are indeed few Americans who cannot find in their family history similar stories of those who risked much and endured much to bring a dream into reality. It is those qualities which within the short span or 150 years have brought our people from national infancy into forming the greatest nation on earth.

In some quarters there has developed a tendency to scorn patriotism. Indeed, there are a few who find patriotism unfashionable and who go so far as to assume that institutions and ideas are better if only they bear a foreign label. Also, there is a theory that this mood is necessary if we are to develop international institutions and maintain international peace.

It seems to me that love of country is one of the great and indispensable virtues. No community is weaker because the members of the families which make it up—the mother, the father, the sons, the daughters, the brothers, and sisters—are bound together by distinctive ties of love, respect, and admiration. So I am convinced that the family of nations will not be the poorer or the more fragile because the peoples who form the different nations have a special affection and pride for their own people and for the nation they form.

I recall that St. Paul took great pride, which he did not attempt to conceal, in the achievements of his own people. To me, one of the most inspiring chapters in the Bible is the 11th chapter of Hebrews where St. Paul recalls, in epic words, the great deeds which had been wrought through faith by national heroes—men and women.

Recently I was asked to open an exhibit of the oldest known print of the Bible, in the Aramaic language, and in that connection to select one of my favorite verses. I selected that portion of the epistle to the Hebrews where St. Paul, after the historical recital to which I allude, concludes by saying, "Seeing that we are compassed about by so great a cloud of witnesses, let us run with endurance the race that is set before us."

If it was appropriate for St. Paul to entertain those sentiments, I think it is equally appropriate for us. We, too, of our Nation can look back with pride to the great figures which our Nation has produced, who through faith wrought much.

Surely, we, too, can feel that we are compassed about by a great cloud of witnesses who are observing our conduct and who by their spirit seek to inspire us to carry forward the great national and international tasks to which they dedicated their lives and to which they committed our Nation by their strivings and by their faith.

Our national course has to a unique degree been shaped by religious beliefs. Our people have in the main been God-fearing people. They believed in moral principles derived from a source above us. They were dedicated to human liberty because they believed that men had been endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights. So, they provided that those rights must at all times be respected, assuring the sovereignty of the individual against the dictatorship of the state. They were confident that the human liberty they thus assured would not be exercised recklessly and in disregard of fellow men because they were confident that our citizens would obey the moral law which prescribes the Ten Commandments of the Old Testament and the two great Commandments of the New Testament, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" and "Whatsoever ye would that men would do to you, do you even so to them."

As George Washington pointed out in his Farewell Address, religion and morality are the two indispensable supports of a free society. "In vain," he said, "would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens." Indeed, a society which is not religious cannot tolerate much freedom. It is dangerous to give freedom to those who do not feel under moral compulsion to exercise self-control and who are unwilling to make sacrifices for the good of others.

It results that true patriotism, which vitalizes liberty and freedom for ourselves, can never be a purely selfish force. That has been ever evident so far as our Nation was concerned. Our people have always been endowed with a sense of mission in the world. They have believed that it was their duty to help men everywhere to get the opportunity to be and to do what God designed. They saw a great prospect and were filled with a great purpose. As said in the opening paragraph of the Federalist Papers, "It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide whether societies of men are capable of establishing good government." "Failure on their part," it continues, would be "the general misfortune of mankind."

Under the impulsion of that faith, there developed here an area of spiritual, intellectual, and economic vigor, the like of which the world had never seen. It was no exclusive preserve; indeed, sharing was the central theme. Millions were welcomed here from other lands, all to share equally the opportunities of the founders and their heirs. Through missionary activities and the establishment of schools and colleges abroad, American ideals were carried throughout the world. Our Government gave aid and comfort to those elsewhere who sought to increase human freedom.

These have been the characteristics of our Nation since its foundation and those characteristics have persisted. They today make our Nation the leader in the struggle to maintain liberty in the world. I believe we can say that in these times, when despotism menaces as never before, our Nation is playing a part worthy of our forebears and is imbued with the spirit of those who founded our Republic. We have availed of every opportunity, whether it be through the United Nations or through mutual security associations with other free nations, to make our influence felt in support of freedom. We have, as a matter of enlightened self-interest, contributed largely out of our vast productivity to others who, if left alone, could not sustain the freedom and independence for which they yearn.

All of that is in the American tradition. We can be happy that that tradition thrives and is vigorous and we can take pride in the fact that, inspired by our founders who saw a great vision, we are indeed with steadfastness pursuing the course upon which they embarked us.

There come times in the life of peoples when their work of creation ends. It is easy to diagnose the symptoms of that national decadence. It is seen when a people lose their sense of mission in the world, when they think only of themselves, when they forget the Biblical injunction that, although we have different offices, we are all members one of another and that those who are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak. No one, be he individual or nation, is truly great who does not have the will and the capacity to help others or who is without a sense of mission.

We can take pride in our Nation because since the day of its creation, and with but few lapses, its purposes have been large and its goals have been humane. We can rejoice that that spirit animates our Nation today, and makes us still young, still vital and still capable of great endeavor. Our youth, such as you who now enter into the larger world, are spirited, not selfish nor fearful. Our religious heritage and our national traditions are not forgotten. As we are faithful to their guidance, we can have the satisfaction which comes to those who, in fellowship, are embarked on the great adventure of building peacefully a Nation and a world of human liberty and justice.

Resolution of Roosevelt County (Mont.) Farmers Union Concerning Farm Price-Support Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the Roosevelt County (Mont.) Farmers Union has adopted a resolution containing a five-point program aimed at solving the farm price-support problem.

I call it to the attention of my colleagues, concerned as we all are about the farmers' worsening position in our national economy. In a few paragraphs the Roosevelt County Farmers Union has proposed a workable farm program.

The resolution follows:

Whereas many millions of words have been written and spoken about the farm produce price problem, but no solution is in sight—prices in many cases are still dropping, food processors' profits are at an all-time high, and are still rising. The farmers' crop-production cost is at an all-time high and shows no sign of coming down.

Therefore, we the members of the Roosevelt County Farmers Union submit the following, which we believe to be the simplest solution to the problem:

No. 1: Acreage controls, if continued, will break the small family farmer, and there-

fore should be eliminated from the program and in its place there should be established marketing quotas, these to consist of all home-consumption requirements plus the foreseeable export requirements. This quota to be established on a realistic family-type farm basis not to exceed in value of $25,000.

No. 2: Support loans to be made at full old parity on quota only.

No. 3: Surplus production above quota to be kept by producer on his farm or wherever he pleases. Storable crops could be kept as insurance in case of crop failure or disposed of as feed, or other uses as provided by law. It is our belief that most farm produce could be handled in this manner.

No. 4: It is our belief that parity supports should also be given on the export quota and the loss made up by the Government as at present.

No. 5: Since the usable quota only would be supported the Government should never have taken over any produce which could be fed into the market in an orderly manner.

In order to implement the above-described program we request that Congress pass the necessary legislation forthwith. (Further information as to details will be supplied by us to the best of our knowledge.)

ROOSEVELT COUNTY FARMERS UNION,
JULIUS GESS,
Legislative Committee Chairman,
Wolf Point, Mont.
ELIZABETH LAURIDSEN,
Secretary, Poplar, Mont.

The Role of Italians in American History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our country requires unquestioned loyalty from all of our citizens, and at a time when an organization having a hyphenated name may possibly be misconstrued to involve a divided Americanism, it was a great pleasure for me to hear from many of my friends upstate New York that a truly patriotic speech was delivered by Prof. Edward D. Re of St. John's University School of Law on June 11, 1955, at the State convention of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States. From my personal knowledge of many of the members of this organization, I can say that there is no hyphenated Americanism among these loyal and patriotic American veterans.

Members of this organization have asked me to insert Professor Re's remarks in the RECORD because, interestingly enough, although he relates the contribution of Italians in early American history, the speaker is himself a great American who clearly refers to the contributions of these men as a "glorious chapter of American history" that helped build the American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert into the RECORD remarks of Prof. Edward D. Re delivered before the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States in Little Falls, N. Y., on June 11, 1955:

REMARKS OF PROFESSOR EDWARD D. RE, PROFESSOR OF LAW, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, BEFORE ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, LITTLE FALLS, N. Y., JUNE 11, 1955

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a real honor and a true privilege for me to have the opportunity to address this fine patriotic organization of American Veterans of Italian extraction. May I tell you at the outset that I do not feel a stranger among you. I have had the occasion to see many of your friends in New York, and I bring the greetings of our Lieutenant-Governor, George B. De Luca, our Secretary of State, Carmine De Sapio, and your friend and Congressman from Brooklyn, VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

It is not without difficulty that any speaker chooses a topic for an inteligent audience. Lately we have all heard too many words of advice from too many people on all of the problems of the world. I'm afraid that these serious discussions are more appropriate in the Halls of Congress, the legislature and other meetings where people gather to conduct serious business. This, however, is a banquet, a happy gathering, which brings to a close a wonderful convention where the serious business has already been taken care of. My burden is consequently lightened.

Noticing the roster of names of the members of this organization, perhaps you would like to hear a few words of an historical and factual nature as to the contribution of people of similar names to the American way of life. Ladies and gentlemen, it is really remarkable the extent to which our great Nation has been able to reap the benefits of so many different cultures and heritages and in the process create a heritage of its own—a heritage of freedom, liberty, and the blessings that we describe cumulatively as the American way of life. As an American of Italian birth, I feel justifiably proud that many Americans of either Italian birth or extraction have made lasting contributions to that American way of life. Surely it would be presumptuous for me to tell you about the contribution made by Americans of Italian extraction in the Armed Forces to preserve that American way of life.

But may I remind you of the contribution of certain men whose names perhaps may not be as familiar as names such as Christopher Columbus, John and Sebastian Cabot and Amerigo Vespucci. This, I think, was a fair start. One of them discovered America. The other two sailors discovered Greenland, Newfoundland, Labrador and the East Coast of North America, while the third simply succeeded in having the entire continent named after him. Surely, as far as Christopher Columbus and Amerigo Vespucci were concerned, their publicity agents must have been quite efficient. However, I would like to say a few words on behalf of a few others who weren't as well known even though their contributions may be equally great.

First of all, let me mention Giovanni Verrazano, a Florentine navigator who discovered the harbor of New York and the mouth of the Hudson River about 100 years before Henry Hudson. In this connection may I state that there is presently a movement in New York City to name a bridge that is about to be built connecting Brooklyn with Staten Island "Verrazano Bridge" in honor of the first European ever to set eyes upon that beautiful harbor.

Then may I mention Philip Mazzei, who settled in Virginia in the period of the thirteen colonies, and although many people knew that he introduced the culture of grapes in America, few know that he was an intimate friend of Thomas Jefferson—and still fewer know that this man was a person of great political and philosophical wisdom, a true democrat, and that his letters had a tremendous influence upon Jefferson's political philosophy. Documents actually exist which indicate almost conclusively that many of the beautiful phrases of liberty and freedom that are considered to be Jeffersonian were actually borrowed by Jefferson from his good friend Philip Mazzei. In a series of ringing articles in the struggle for independence, Mazzei wrote: "All men are by nature created free and equal to each other in natural rights"—words later used by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. This man indeed can be called a true "Founding Father" of the American way of life.

There is still another great founder of our country of Italian extraction. How many know that the third governor of Maryland was a man by the name of William Paca. This American of Italian heritage was a member of the First and Second Continental Congresses and, yes, my friends, he was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. In fact, this was not merely a man of words and thoughts. He was a man of action. He contributed a great deal of money to help Washington equip and outfit American troops during the Revolutionary War.

All school children know about the George Rogers Clark Expedition into the Northwest Territory. How many, however, know that perhaps the most influential person in that expedition, who helped finance it, was a major from Piedmont by the name of Joseph Vigo. May I say that if there are Italian businessmen in our country who have done very well—and there are many—they are only following in the footsteps of Joseph Vigo who made a fortune in fur trading in New Orleans. In Indiana there is a county and a township named in honor of Joseph Vigo.

A Venetian musician and composer by the name of Philip Tragetta was a friend of Presidents James Madison and James Monroe. It was Tragetta who established the American Conservatory in Philadelphia.

The activity of these Americans was not limited to the east coast or the Mississippi Valley. The very first collegiate institution on the Pacific coast, the College of Santa Clara, was founded by Father Gregoria Mengarini, a Roman missionary and educator.

Perhaps many of you are familiar with the great valor manifested by some of these men on behalf of the American cause in the battlefield, during the Civil War period. Let me mention two military heroes. The first is Bancroft Cherardi who commanded several ships in the west gulf blockade and later became the commander in chief of the North Atlantic squadron. The second is Luigi Cesnola, a major in the 11th New York Cavalry who served with General Sheridan in the Shenandoah Valley campaign, was wounded, taken prisoner, and was later awarded the Congressional Medal or Honor and appointed a consul by President Lincoln.

Although it is generally said that the Italians in this country during the early portion of our history were small in number, this is a matter concerning which we are not entirely certain. Actually, there were Italians who settled on our shores as early as the 1630's. There is no doubt, for example, that a man by the name of Peter Caesar Alberti was officially known as Peter Caesar, the Italian. He married one of the daughters of a council member from New Amsterdam and they were given 100 acres of land which included what is now Fort Greene Park, in Brooklyn. Alberti established the first tobacco plantation in Brooklyn, and to the greater glory of our Nation raised a large family.

It should also be remembered that there were many others whose names would not necessarily indicate that they were Italian. Their names were Anglicized or made Dutch. For example, Paca became Packer, Taliaferro became Tolliver, Bressani became Bressany. Irish Catholics a century ago used to call Father Mazzuchelli Father Kelly. DeLietto became DuLhut, and so forth. Of course, we are not mentioning the confusion

of names caused by poor handwriting. One document, for example, states that Father Bressani was a native of Rouem. Actually, what must have been intended was Rome because there is no doubt that that was where he was born.

Many interesting stories can be told about the Anglicizing of Italian names. For example, in London in the 16th century you find Italians who were aliens with names such as Fox, Pickering, Gillam, Moore, Fortune, Kenny, Rise, Pitcher, and Benson. There is no doubt that they were Italians. It is unknown how many of them came to the United States. So we see the roots of Americans of Italian extraction do not go back to the turn of the century. They go back to the very founding of our country. They sustained her in time of need and offered their labors and ingenuity and their talents to help make it the land of the free and a glorious nation in the family of nations.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is a glorious chapter of American history. It is a chapter that reminds all Americans that the greatness of our country stems from the parts played in the contributions of so many peoples—peoples of all races, creeds, and national origins—who helped make this the greatest nation in the world. No one has a monopoly over Americanism. One American is not finer than another American. Americanism does not imply race, color, creed, or national origin. Americanism means an equality of opportunity, respect for your fellowman, adherence to the golden rule. In this sense we are Americans all. Hence each and every one of us should play an active part in seeing to it that these facts, historically true and morally sound, are never to be forgotten. We must see to it that laws that are un-American and discriminatory such as the national origins quota system in the Walter-McCarran Act are amended or repealed so as to eliminate the stigma upon worthy Americans.

Your organization is to be congratulated for its efforts in this direction. It helps to keep the Italian heritage alive in a wholesome and patriotic way. It is an organization that helps create the unity that we Americans need so badly at a time when godless communism would attack us from without and destroy us from within. It is an organization that reminds all America that the greatness of America is the combined strength of all the heritages and national origins that fused to create a "new nation under God with liberty and justice for all."

Address by Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives, at the Commencement Exercises at West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., May 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech given by the Honorable SAM RAYBURN at the commencement exercises at West Virginia University, Morgantown, and in the words of one of the members of the board of governors, it was one of the finest speeches ever delivered at the university and by one of America's outstanding statesmen. I recommend to every Member of the House the reading of this thought-provoking and informative message:

President Stewart, Congressman STAGGERS, members of the board, members of the graduating class, and friends, I am happy to be in West Virginia again, and especially to be at the University of West Virginia where my friend of many years, Dr. Irvin Stewart, is president.

I am also glad to meet here your very capable Congressman, HARLEY STAGGERS.

The University of West Virginia has been a great center of learning and inspiration to the youth, not only of West Virginia, but in many other parts of our country.

Before addressing myself to the subject that I have come here to discuss with you, I want to say a word about your generation, the so-called younger generation.

I have lived quite a while but I know that I shall be old, only when, some day, I find myself sitting around with others bewailing the younger generation and talking about how much better we did things in our day. Yet in every generation, some of the older people have sat around bemoaning the younger generation, and I suppose that some of you, too, in time, will do the same thing. However, I hope this blight will never descend upon you.

I have unbounded admiration for the younger generation.

Sometime before we entered the last world war, professional croakers were saying that the young men of our day were too soft to fight. They had had it too easy. I never shared these silly doubts. And we know, that when the time came, the young men of our armed services were as good as they ever had been in Andrew Jackson's day.

I am certain, if unhappily, the test on a great scale should come again, that again they will prove that no people excel us in patriotism, devotion to duty, courage, and the willingness to defend this great Nation of ours, whatever the cost.

What is true in this respect of young men is also true of our young women. Thousands of them entered the armed services and the Red Cross and saw service all over the world. Thousands of others of all ages toiled in munitions plants or did jobs of various kinds for the Government. There was no weakness among them, not even when their husbands or sons went off to war, leaving them lonely and waiting, as women are always left lonely and waiting in wartime. They did their duty; and they did it well. I admire them equally with the young men.

Since a country is, first of all, people, and no country is better than its people are, I do not tremble for the future of this country. Ever since Washington wrought, and Jefferson lead and taught, we have had moaners and groaners in this country that have been saying that our freedom is imperiled and that our Government is being changed. Some people have said that all of our leaders, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln, to now, have been incompetents. They said we couldn't possibly pay our debts. We couldn't expand any further. It was impossible to find markets for the things we produced, and since Congress was composed of incompetents, you couldn't depend upon them for anything. It didn't matter what political party was in power at any given time.

Well, the country hasn't been ruined yet, and I don't see any prospect of it being ruined. The more the croakers croaked, the more the country grew.

During the depression we were told that grass would soon be growing in the streets of our cities. That hasn't happened.

In my opinion, we're just getting underway in these United States. There is, indeed, little that Americans cannot do, if only they can imagine themselves wanting to do it. It matters not what mistakes any administration in Washington may make, I believe we can overcome them. The potentials of our resources, material and spiritual, have never yet been tapped to the utmost. We still do not know the limits of our strength. Let those beware, therefore, who think that they will find us easy prey.

Here in the United States we have grown both in bigness and greatness. This was a great country long before it became a big country.

It was a great country in the very beginning because the men who founded it breathed greatness into it. At the time of our Revolutionary War we were about 3 million people thinly scattered across the face of a huge and largely unknown continent. But small though we were, and weak, we shook 18th century Europe to the core. For at a period when absolutism prevailed nearly everywhere, and few men had rights, we announced the stupendous, earth-shaking doctrine of the rights of man, and so became the light of the world. The more so as the total darkness of communism casts its evil shadows upon larger and larger areas of the earth.

We founded upon this continent a nation without precedent in the history of man. The founders met at Philadelphia in May 1787, and in 4 short months, in September of the same year, they brought forth a document that the great English statesman, Gladstone, said was the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the hand and brain of man. This country was made up of members of all the racial stocks of the world. People of different religious and political faiths, many of them had never been able to live peacefully together in their native homes. But here the lion and the lamb lay down together. Out of unparalleled diversity we created an incomparable unity. Nor is this all. Our political-economic system has given more people more happiness and prosperity over a wider area for a longer period of time than any system ever created by men in their long history.

I do not say that it is a perfect system. I do not maintain that its blessings extend to all alike. I do not claim that it is without aberrations or inequities. But neither do I apologize for it. For this, I believe, is true. Men are not angels. It is not, therefore, criminal that inequities should exist among us. But it would be criminal if we should ignore them. This we will not do.

Farmers, for a long time, did not share in the general prosperity of the country. But by and large, some measure of prosperity has for some time been guaranteed them through various acts of the Government. Organized labor was long repressed in many sections of this Nation. But labor has now become a gigantic force of its own. Similarly, decade after decade, we have extended the boundaries of education; this great university and the splendid colleges and schools of West Virginia being proof of it in this State. We have made such strides in the field of preventive medicine that we have eradicated diseases that were a scourge but a little while ago. And the life expectancy of the average American is the highest in the world.

I could stand here all day reciting items of our progress, spiritual and material, but that is not necessary. Yet some of us are foolish enough to be put on the defensive by Communists when we have done so much for men and they have done so much evil to mankind.

There remains a great deal to do, and I believe there exists among us the will to do it. We are a highly competent people. But no American, worthy of the name, thinks that competence is enough. We are also, the Lord be praised, a humane people. And when you add humaneness to competence,

you get the unique American civilization that we have created. It is a civilization in which men, remembering God, do not forget their suffering brothers, here or elsewhere.

We have also done well in international affairs in the last twenty-odd years. We have done especially well when you remember that for the greater part of the life of this Republic, we were outside the stream of history. We came into it only in 1917 with our entry into the First World War.

In a way, we were innocent of the world because we had led a sheltered life. For the span of a dynamic century—from Waterloo in 1815 to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914—we conquered the West, imported millions of people to build America, dug mines, harnessed rivers, cleared land, built factories, schools, churches, and firmly laid the foundations of our strength. We spent little on arms because we did not need them.

We were able to do so—let us remember—because during all of that century, Great Britain, then the world's leading power, patrolled the earth and largely kept the peace.

After coming into the stream of history in the period 1914–18, we tried to escape it and return to our isolationist past. We wanted to be in the world but not of it. We overlooked the fact that our power was so great that by its mere existence, we tremendously influenced the world. We did not want to lead. Neither did we want to follow.

During the days of isolationism, we rejected the advice and counsel of that great scholar-statesman, Woodrow Wilson, and rejected the League of Nations. When the Senate of the United States rejected the League of Nations, Wilson cried out in his anguish and said that within a quarter of a century the world would be shocked and torn by another and more destructive war. His prediction came tragically true.

We found out that we could no longer wrap two oceans around us and be safe or secure. It is better to have security and not need it, than to need it and not have it.

We also found that this giant of the West, the United States of America, if civilization were to survive, must do a man's part in the world's great work. We cannot stand alone. We and other democracies of the earth, yes, civilization itself, stand in the most terrible danger that has faced the world in 2,000 years.

Many of our people were again isolationist. In August 1941—only a few months before Pearl Harbor—the House of Representatives extended the Selective Service Act by a margin of only one vote. If we had not extended selective service, we would have been taking down our Army instead of having it and building it up when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor.

I am glad to say that West Virginia has never been subject to the blindness of isolationism. Its people have always known that we could not be in the world and at the same time not of it.

A moment ago I said that we have done well in international affairs. Let me explain. We who have only recently come into the stream of history are now the leaders of the free world. It is primarily our strength, however indispensible our allies may be to us, that prevents Russian communism from enslaving the world. It is we who, through the Marshall plan, kept Western Europe from falling prey to communism after the end of the last war.

It is we, who, by accepting the heavy responsibility of Korea, have kept communism from engulfing southeast Asia. It is we who, through various military and diplomatic moves, held back the enemy in Italy, Greece, and other points throughout the world. If it is not surprising that we have made mistakes, it is surprising that we made so few and emerged so quickly from our historical isolationism. For nations tend to move slowly in great matters, sometimes taking generations to change over from the past. Yet we have moved with a speed that must seem bewildering to our enemies.

This is a creditable performance, but it must not lull us into complacence, for to be complacent in our world is to court national catastrophe. We live, and we shall continue to live through the foreseeable future, in great peril. We still have much to do. No people can beat us in a short-distance run. But our enemy is a plodder, and he will not run our kind of race.

So, too, the Russian aim to dominate the world is not new. You will find, if you look into it, that Russian writers and thinkers have long held that it is Russia's mission to dominate the world, believing as the Germans believed a little while ago, that they are superior to all other peoples. In this respect the czar and the commissar are one.

We must understand something of the nature of the enemy if we are to stand firm against him. One part of his nature is that he is infinitely patient as he is infinitely crafty.

As a people we like to tackle a job, do it, and go on to the next job. It does not make sense in international affairs.

So it was that, once the war was over in 1945, we did not even stop to bring about an orderly demobilization of the mightiest fighting force the world has ever seen. On the contrary, as General Marshall reported to the Nation, we hysterically disbanded it.

Some people have said that Western Europe expects us to fight its battles for it. This absurd charge is demonstrably false. The population of Western Europe is just about twice our population. They, therefore, must and will supply most of the troops, although we may have to supply most of the arms. But—and this is the point—the deadly seriousness of Western Europe's intentions is proved by the fact that they ask us to send American troops at all. By so doing, they demonstrate two things. The first is that they do not intend to appease Russia, for the presence of our troops in Western Europe is notice of determined resistance to communism instead of appeasement. Second—and most important—by asking us to send troops, Europeans are inviting us to make their towns and cities and homes and countryside the primary battleground of the war if it should come.

I don't think that anyone here is foolish enough to ask if these allies are worthwhile. The population of Western Europe, I repeat, is twice our own and considerably more than that of Russia proper. Its gifted people contain thousands of scientists and technicians of the highest skill. Let us remember that we have no monopoly of brains, ideals, or love of freedom. They have a workshop second only to ours. They belong to our common western civilization; their religious and political faiths are akin to our own. They are, in short, indispensable to us as we are indispensable to them.

Naturally they don't always see eye-to-eye with us about everything, and we must not expect that.

The hallmark of being adult is that a man understands he must pay a price for everything he wants. Once he understands this, he is at peace with himself and the world. No price is too high to pay for freedom. Who can put a dollar mark on the life of a single American lost in battle? What price did our forefathers pay so that they might bequeath this great country to us? What price, then, are we willing to pay so that we may pass it on, great and free. A high standard of living is a desirable thing. But more desirable—and more enduring—is a high standard of life.

You young people who are being graduated here today will shortly for the first time, so to speak, go out into life. Its primary condition is struggle. It is also a great challenge and a great opportunity to live in a land that is so free that every man, woman, and child can do what he or she wants to do, say what they want to say, write what they want to write, so long as in the doing of these things they do not deprive others of exercising the same rights and prerogatives and the same privileges. You are free to choose your own course.

You know from your studies that many groups of men and many species of animals, birds, and plants, have disappeared from the earth because they could not adapt themselves to changing circumstances. This Nation, as I said before, has only recently gone out into life as it came for the first time into the turbulent stream of history. It, too, must understand that the first law of life is struggle; the second, the necessity to adapt itself to changing circumstances.

We have been an immensely fortunate people, and I do not think that we have been unworthy of our gifts. The incidents of geography and space and the fact that others kept the peace of the world so long enabled us to grow and spread and become in time the world's mightiest power.

Founding this country in freedom, and dedicating it to freedom, we have subscribed, and continue to subscribe, to the highest ideals of western civilization. Now this civilization is in imminent peril as it faces a very real threat to its existence at the hands of ruthless totalitarians.

The threat comes at a time when we are the world's mightiest power. Far from bewailing our fate, therefore, I think we should regard it as a high privilege that we have become the great defender of the faith; the best hope on earth. I have no doubt, God willing, that we shall prevail.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include, in installments, the articles entitled "Report on Russia: Uncensored."

While in all matters I may not be in agreement with him, I take a personal interest in the career of the author of the articles, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., following in his father's footsteps.

During the period of the service of William Randolph Hearst in the 58th and 59th Congresses, 1903–07, and later, I was a member of the editorial staff of the Chicago newspaper he had founded to carry the banner for the Democratic Party and William Jennings Bryan. I was one of his editors when he was elected, and counted out, as mayor of New York, himself was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency and later founded the Independence League with Thomas Hisgen, of Indiana, as its presidential nominee.

Of the few left of that era when Hearst was revolutionizing the journalism of America, and was the dynamic leader in liberal causes, William L. Stuart is outstanding. Bill Stuart, at 80 still as live

as a keg of dynamite, and his brilliant and beloved Mary jointly write a four-page weekly that everybody in the Middle West in, approaching, or passed out of politics has to read to keep in the know. It was Bill Stuart who lined up delegates for Hearst as Democratic Presidential nominee, later for years was political editor of Hearst's Chicago American.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., inherits his journalistic talent from both his father and his mother. During the period that I was editing the Chicago Sunday Examiner and William Randolph Hearst was passing through Chicago occasionally he would be accompanied by Mrs. Hearst, the mother of William Randolph Hearst, Jr. Always on such occasions she would send to me her penciled comments on pages of Mr. Hearst's Chicago Sunday newspaper on subjects of woman interest. They were always genuinely helpful, were journalistically intelligent and reflected a keen sense of human and reader interest.

I venture to say that Bill Stuart will agree with me that what young Mr. Hearst has done in penetrating behind the Iron Curtain to get firsthand impressions and face-to-face interviews is in keeping with the old Hearst traditions when we worked on the rule that "cannot is the only word left out of Mr. Hearst's dictionary."

Here is the foreword and the first installment of William Randolph Hearst, Jr.'s Report on Russia: Uncensored:

FOREWORD

This is the story of a mission. A journalistic mission to Moscow that made headlines throughout the world and achieved such unique results it will go down in newspaper history as one of the most extraordinary feats of our time.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, flew to Moscow and became the first newspaperman to interview each of the four top leaders of Soviet Russia's new regime—Premier Bulganin, Communist Party Boss Khrushchev, Marshal Zhukov, and Foreign Minister Molotov. He was accompanied by Kingsbury Smith, European general manager of International News Service, and Frank Conniff, Mr. Hearst's editorial assistant.

Together, this task force invaded the Kremlin and scored more interviews with top Soviet officials in a short span of 3 weeks than any other journalist had been able to obtain since the Soviet regime came into being.

Mr. Hearst and his associates arrived in the Soviet capital at the very time that Premier Malenkov was being demoted and a new Communist high command was emerging to control the Kremlin. Mr. Hearst had no advance tipoff about the spectacular shakeup in the Soviet high command. He merely followed his best instincts as a newspaperman in timing his visit to Russia. He did not go at the invitation of the Soviet Government. He simply applied for his visa as any other journalist would have done and was surprised when it was granted within a week after the application was filed.

The interviews themselves were extraordinary in that for the first time a group of American newspapermen debated with the top Kremlin leaders and answered the Soviet propaganda line with forthright statements in behalf of America's viewpoint on the major problems of the present period.

Mr. Hearst and his task force thus achieved a new technique for interviewing such totalitarian personalities and prevented the interviews from becoming mere vehicles of Soviet propaganda.

It was the first time any such rebuttal statements in opposition to the Kremlin's official viewpoint were passed by the Soviet censorship as a part of authorized interviews with top Soviet officials.

The articles that follow in this booklet were written by Mr. Hearst after he left Russia. On his way home, he had a full opportunity to discuss his observations with Britain's venerable Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill, whom he visited in London. Immediately after his return to America, Mr. Hearst had a similar talk with President Eisenhower.

Thus, these articles are not only uncensored but represent a balanced perspective based on Mr. Hearst's and his associates' realistic appraisal of what they heard and saw in Russia.

In addition to the Hearst newspapers, many hundreds of other major newspapers throughout the United States and the rest of the world have published these articles prominently. They were front-paged not only in the major capitals of Europe (excluding the Iron Curtain countries where censorship prevails) but also in such faraway lands as Japan, India, Australia—and throughout the Middle East and Latin America.

The influential London Daily Mail, which has a daily circulation of 2,250,000 copies, displayed Mr. Hearst's articles on the front page and pointed out:

"No Western journalist—in fact, no Western Minister or Ambassador—has talked with so many top figures on both sides of the cold-war front in so short a time. No man has been granted such an insight into high places in both Eastern and Western policy."

This London newspaper characterized Mr. Hearst's achievement as the most remarkable mission in postwar journalistic history.

RICHARD E. BERLIN,
President, the Hearst Corp.

THE RED CARPET

(By William Randolph Hearst)

Three weeks in Russia and several long, intensive conversations with the highest Communist leaders have convinced me of the following:

1. The Eisenhower policy of firmness without provocation is the correct one and is beginning to get results.

2. The Soviet leaders mean it when they say Russia wants peace—but only because Russia needs peace and recognizes the superiority of the allied world in the essential sinews of the atomic age.

3. Recent changes in the Soviet hierarchy reflect internal disagreements over policy but will not basically alter the propaganda line of peaceful coexistence.

4. The Communist leaders are concerned over the Far Eastern crisis and are realists enough to know that Red China has absolutely no chance of taking Formosa or surviving a shooting showdown with the United States.

5. Discords among the allies—such as occurred at Geneva—and domestic political turmoil—such as occurs too often in France—are likely to smooth the path of Communist expansion more than any planned maneuver of the Communists.

6. The Western program of building armed strength, while fundamentally the right one, should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front.

7. Communism's ultimate goal remains world domination and the Russian leaders are sure they will someday achieve it.

These may seem like extreme conclusions to draw from such a visit to the Soviet Union but I am convinced they are basically sound ones despite the limitations of our trip.

They are shared by my two colleagues, Kingsbury Smith, European general manager of International News Service, and Frank Conniff, my editorial assistant, who traveled to Russia with me and participated in my interviews with the top Communist leaders.

They are shared as well by several high-level folk with whom I conferred.

We were aware we were getting the "red carpet" treatment, or rather what we chose to call the "whitewall treatment" from the tire sides of the gleaming Packard-like Zis that was made available to us every day.

We knew we were seeing only what the Soviet leaders wanted us to see and that no secret experiment or unflattering inner problem would be exposed consciously to our prying gaze.

We recognized that our concentration on the top tier of the Communist leadership for interview purposes would eat up so much time and energy that the chances of achieving close contact with the Russian masses were correspondingly reduced.

Nevertheless, what we did see of the Russian people encouraged us to believe that a strong sentiment of friendliness towards Americans exists among them.

When we were recognized as Americans in the streets, the theaters, the restaurants, and stores, we were greeted with smiles and friendly looks. Ten postwar years of anti-American propaganda seem to have had much less effect on the people of Russia than one would expect.

As for an overall impression of life in the Soviet land as seen from two of its main cities, Moscow and Leningrad, I would say that living conditions in Russia are less bad than the West generally believes but by no means as good as the Russian people are led by their Government to think they are in relation to the outside world.

A day in any Soviet city would, I am sure, convince an American shopgirl, factory, or white collar worker that in comparison with conditions in Russia, the United States is the paradise of the proletariat.

Indicative of what little influence the people have on the government that rules them was the apparent lack of popular excitement over the sensational shift in political power that occurred during our visit.

Replacement of Georgi Malenkov by Marshal Nikolai Bulganin as head of the Government was an event of far-reaching importance. It was accompanied by policy pronouncements which made it clear that the change would affect the life of every individual in the Soviet Union, since it meant less consumer goods and greater emphasis on the production of heavy industry.

Such a momentous political event would have aroused public controversy and excitement in any Western democracy. One would have overheard it being discussed in the buses, subways, and restaurants.

Yet, if there was any discussion of it among the Russian people, it was confined to the intimacy of inner family circles. No one would dare debate the right or wrong of it in public.

As far as any public comments in Moscow or Leningrad were concerned, the downfall of Malenkov might never have occurred. We tried to draw out our Intourist guide, but not a word would he say. The Western envoys likewise told us they had received no reports of any public excitement or agitation over the news.

Some of the Russian translators working with the Western newspapermen in the press gallery of the Soviet Parliament at the time Malenkov's resignation was announced could not restrain themselves from exclaiming, almost in a whisper: "It's sensational," or the equivalent of "What a development."

But, in the streets of Moscow, all was calm.

In the shops, people did not even gather around the radios as the news was broadcast. They simply went about their business as

usual. If they were listening intently, as they doubtless were, they allowed no sign of it to show.

Unusual interest in such things might be interpreted as questioning the wisdom of what the rulers were doing, and that would be deviationism—the first step to opposition.

To return to the subject of our own mission, our interviews ranged from Communist Party boss Khrushchev to Shostakovich, the composer; from Premier Bulganin to Ulanova, the ballerina; from Marshal Zhukov to Patriarch Alexei, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church, and from Foreign Minister Molotov to Svtlana Stalin, the late dictator's daughter.

In addition, we literally spent hours in discussion with the leading western ambassadors, checking our impressions and gauging our reactions against the experience of men who have viewed the Russian scene for years.

Our own Ambassador, Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen, was most helpful and considerate. We consulted him every step of the way. We made certain that no move of ours would embarrass American policy at this delicate moment in world affairs.

We turned over verbatim transcripts of our interviews with Khrushchev, Bulganin, Molotov, and Zhukov to the ambassador as soon as Kingsbury Smith could type them out following our return from the Kremlin.

Ambassador Bohlen's trained eyes scanned the Soviet officials' calculated answers to our questions for buried meanings hidden in the transcript, a task to which Smith also contributed his rich experience as a diplomatic correspondent.

I do not think I violate any confidence when I say the ambassador congratulated us on what we had obtained from the diplomatic as well as professional viewpoint. He found more than one item of interest which was promptly communicated to the State Department.

We're happy to be able to report that America has on the spot in Moscow a man whose training and background have well prepared him for the painstaking job of unscrambling the devious Russian moves and puzzling shifts in Communist policy.

It is nice to report, too, that the American Ambassador enjoys the professional respect of his fellow ambassadors. In fact, one Western envoy assured me, "you have not 1, but 2 fine representatives in Moscow."

"Avis Bohlen," he said, "does as much to promote America's interests as her husband."

The whole ambassadorial corps followed the progress of our high-level talks with deep interest. It is basic in the Russian system that the leaders seek to maintain a wall between themselves and the official spokesmen of foreign countries who, under orthodox Marxist definition, are enemies doomed to eventual penetration and conquest.

Some ambassadors spend years in Moscow without talking with the high Communist leaders, outside of Molotov, and even diplomats from the most important western countries are fortunate to establish face-to-face contact with the really influential men of Russia more than once in a long while.

Great was the interest and surprise, then, when I and my two companions flew into Moscow and proceeded to see, one after another, the four men who unquestionably dominate Russian affairs today.

Far from resenting our intrusion, the Western ambassadors welcomed us warmly. Shreds of information are so hard to come by in Moscow that they studied our every move as a possible beam of light on Russia's inscrutable plans.

One western ambassador made a daring deduction on the basis of our journalistic success. Three days before it formally occurred at the Supreme Soviet, he cabled his home office that Malenkov was going "into political eclipse."

"It was apparent that you were seeing only the important Communist leaders," he said. "And when I suddenly realized Malenkov was not going to see you, I felt he was in the shadow."

To lend some perspective to our Russian journey, I made certain that at both ends it would be sandwiched by balancing talks with the influential soldiers and statesmen of the free world.

At Paris on the way in, we talked with Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, the SHAPE commander. Al Gruenther has a keen, agile mind and a penetrating understanding of the problems we face in Europe today.

At Frankfurt in Germany, we breakfasted with retired Gen. Lucian Truscott, the hard-hitting, Patton-type leader of the Sicilian, Italian, and Southern France campaigns. (He is now chief of CIA Intelligence in Western Europe.)

And on our way home, when our party reached London after a day of flying from Moscow, (we had breakfast in Moscow, lunch at Vilnius, Lithuania, dinner at the Tempelhof Airport in Berlin, and a late supper at Claridge's in London), I experienced the sentimental climax of the whole trip as far as I was personally concerned.

The very next day I spent an hour with Sir Winston Churchill in the historic cabinet room at No. 10 Downing Street. Earlier in the day we had lunched with Minister of State Anthony Nutting and then talked informally with Sir Anthony Eden at the Foreign Office.

That hour with Sir Winston was something really special. He listened closely while I gave my impressions of the Russian leaders and ventured a few thoughts on the significance of recent Russian moves.

It is gratifying to me that this great man, this towering personality whose eventful life embraces so much of living history, heard me out with such evident interest, and volunteered his comments on current developments.

Nothing Sir Winston said can be quoted, but it is permissible to say that his observations ranged the international scene from Europe to the Far East.

It was a most inspiring experience. Added to my own observations in Russia, Sir Winston's appraisal left me with an optimistic glow concerning the eventual outcome of the "competitive coexistence" we have embarked upon with the Communist world, barring accidents.

But it is an optimism that must be severely conditioned by the knowledge that only great effort and firmness of purpose will suffice to carry us through the dangerous days which lie ahead.

The Russian leaders are dedicated men sworn to the theory that capitalism must ultimately topple before the thrusts of aggressive and subversive communism.

They count heavily on the indecision of the Western World. They base their judgments on the belief that internal discord will wreck the allied coalition.

Weighing up Korea, Indochina, and other theaters where allied resolution was not adequate to the challenge of the hour, the Communists are convinced we will never face up firmly to their relentless pressure. They think they can win the battle of coexistence. I think we can.

The Russians are apprehensive about the risky schemes of their Chinese allies. No strategist worth his salt in Europe thinks the Red Chinese can traverse those 100 miles of blue water to Formosa over the massed might of the Seventh Fleet.

In subsequent articles I will fill out further the bare outlines cited in my opening paragraphs. I expect to discuss the Russian leaders and peoples in detail.

1—Firmness without provocation; 2—Optimism without complacency—such should be the order of the day for America and its allies.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the second and third installments of Report on Russia: Uncensored, by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., as follows:

THE NEW RULERS

The strongest hope for peace that I found in my visit to the Soviet Union was the shrewdness of Russia's new rulers.

These men can be ruthless. They have been merciless. No humanitarian considerations would cause them to hesitate to wipe out with H- or A-bombs New York, Washington, Detroit, San Francisco or any other American city.

They believe the end justifies the means. And for them the end remains Communist domination of the world.

But these men are cold, calculating realists. They are not possessed by the madness that drove Hitler to bring Germany down in ruins. Nor by the recklessness that led Mussolini to tie Italy's kite to the shooting star of Nazidom's short-lived conquest.

Crafty all the time. Cruel if the occasion, in their opinion, warrants it.

Yes. Unquestionably.

But they are not paranoiacs.

They know the destructive power of nuclear weapons. Even if they possess the H-bomb—which British officials doubt—and even if they use it first, they know America enjoys superiority in these weapons and the means to deliver them.

They know that the chance of emerging victorious from a thermo-nuclear conflict with the United States would be a very slight one. They know the risk of being wiped out along with their system would be great.

Furthermore, the Soviets have now become the bourgeois—the so-called "middle class"—of the Communist world. They have established an empire extending from the heart of Germany to the borders of China. They are becoming property owners—cars, electric ice boxes, television sets, country homes. They have vested interests to protect. There is also the budding of a class society based on the aristocracy of a Red bureaucracy.

As long as they feel they are not going to be directly attacked, as long as they know they cannot themselves attack without the certainty of swift and terrible retaliation, I seriously doubt that they will deliberately precipitate a conflict with the West.

If America were to let down its guard, if the day were to come when the Soviets thought they could deliver a knockout blow that would neutralize the United States, then the temptation to strike would be so strong that I would not exclude the possibility of their doing so.

For the present, however, I think they realize they could not pull an atomic Pearl Harbor on Uncle Sam without getting back a nuclear punch that might well knock the red right out of Russia.

Those are the impressions I carried away from talks with the top 4 of the 9 bold men who comprise the allpowerful Presidum of the Central Committee of Russia's Communist Party—the governing body of the Soviet Union.

The four with whom I talked separately represented the leadership in the governmental, political, diplomatic, and military fields. They were Nikolai Bulganin, the new Soviet Premier, Nikita Khrushchev, the boss of the Communist Party, Vyacheslav Molotov, the foreign minister, and Marshal Georgi Zhukov, Defense Minister and wartime commander of the Red army in the allied defeat of Germany.

The history of Soviet Russia during the past 30 years has shown that one can never be sure what is going to happen, especially within the inner circle of the Red rierarchy. As Marshal Zhukov said to me, "Fortune tellers can go wrong."

Nevertheless, I am prepared to dare a guess about the future of the Soviet leadership. That is, if another Stalin is to emerge on the Russian political scene, it will not be the new premier.

Bulganin, with whom I talked for over an hour, did not impress me as the type who would be capable of seizing power and making himself the absolute ruler as Stalin did.

He lacked the dynamic personality and forcefulness of Khrushchev. He did not seem to possess the cunning that would be required for victory in a struggle for power with the tough ones in the Kremlin.

Bulganin struck me more as a front-man for the principle of collective leadership that I think, for the time being at least, continues to be the basis on which the Soviet system is being run.

With his wavy white hair, trim goatee, and neat moustache, Bulganin has a professorial look. He is a political general, not a professional soldier. Stalin bestowed the title of Marshal on him during the war when he was Commissar of the armed forces. He has a reputation for being an able administrator and organizer. More of an efficient bureaucrat than political crusader.

In his talk with us, Bulganin adopted a conciliatory tone. He seemed to be trying to offset the violent attacks on the United States which he and Molotov had made a few days previously in the Supreme Soviet, or parliament.

We took him to task for those attacks. We told him we did not see how he could reconcile them with the protestations for improved relations with our country. He denied that the attacks reflected any decision of the new government to pursue a more antagonistic attitude toward the United States, and insisted the Soviet leaders were sincere in their desire for the reestablishment of normal, friendly relations with America.

There is so much doubletalk in Soviet verbiage that it's difficult to know when they are speaking the truth. They practice a sort of double-entry bookkeeping line, saying things that can have different meanings. However, I do feel they think it is in their own interests to try to improve relations with us.

We thought we smoked out Bulganin on one thing. Molotov claimed in the Supreme Soviet that Russia had surpassed the United States in the production of hydrogen bombs. We called Bulganin's attention to the warnings of scientists that the continued explosion of nuclear weapons could have dangerous effects on human and animal life. We asked him whether Russia would be willing to enter an agreement with the United States and Great Britain to limit the number of these explosions for experimental purposes.

The quick and sharply negative reaction of the Soviet Premier convinced me that the Russians are far behind us in the stockpiling of these new weapons, and may not have the H-bomb at all.

Of the four top leaders we met, Khrushchev was in many ways the most impressive. If any of the four were to grab power and build himself up into a Stalin-like dictator, my guess is it would be this boss of Russia's 6 million Communist Party members.

A bullnecked, blunt, and rugged individual, this heavy-set little man with his beady blue eyes and aggressive vitality gave the impression of being the boss of the Kremlin show at the moment, and knowing it.

On the day Georgi Malenkov publicly lost his job as Premier, it was Khrushchev who dominated the scene in the Supreme Soviet. He nominated Bulganin as successor and as he did so he remarked that he was sure the deputies would accept the suggestion. There was more than an expression of hope in that remark. It was clear that the boss was speaking. No one else was nominated, and no one else spoke for or against Khrushchev's candidate. The vote was called and the hands of some 1,400 deputies sprang automatically into the air. That is how Soviet democracy operates.

During our private interview with Khrushchev, which lasted nearly 3 hours, he also spoke with the voice of authority. He did not seem to bother to weigh his words the way Belganin, Molotov, and even Marshal Zhukov did. He was fast on the comeback, and he talked with as much ease about foreign affairs as he did about internal policy.

He made no bones about the hope of the Communists to gain "the upper hand," as he described it, in the world one day. But he sought to convince us that the Soviet leadership wants to confine the global struggle between the Communist and capitalistic systems to measures short of war.

Unlike American Communists, he and most of the other leaders we met displayed a sense of humor.

Khrushchev laughed and joked and at times showed flashes of wit. He would doubtless order your throat cut without blinking an eye if he thought it would serve his ends. But he can be amiable.

He said quite frankly he could appreciate the feeling of our countrymen about Communist China's imprisonment of the American airmen, and added that he personally hoped the matter would be settled satisfactorily. That is more recognition of the wrong that has been done by the Peiping regime to our flyers than we would likely get from Communists and fellow travelers here at home.

As for Molotov, he seems to have become the elder statesman of the Soviet Government. He has been an active revolutionary for nearly 50 years, a member of the central committee of the party for 35 years and in the top echelon of the Soviet hierarchy for nearly 30.

His name means "the hammer" and he is known among the Russions as "Old Stone Pants." He was formally polite and courteous during our 1½-hour interview with him.

Always the professional diplomat, he was cautions in his statements and quick to give us the propaganda line. He talked at length about American military bases surrounding the Soviet Union and, referring to our protection of Formosa, labeled it interference in the internal affairs of China.

From time to time, Molotov offered me a Russian cigarette and while he talked or listened to our questions, he toyed with a matchbox.

He spoke with an air of self-confidence as though he was supreme in the handling of Soviet diplomacy and did not feel that he had to worry about what the other members of the Presidium might think of his handling of foreign policy.

However, I had much the same feeling about him that I did about Bulganin. I could not quite picture him as developing into another Stalin. He, too, seemed to lack the flair for lone-wolf leadership.

The western diplomats though the most important part of our conversation with Molotov concerned the question of a temporary cease-fire in the Formosan area to facilitate the evacuation of Chinese Nationalist forces from the exposed Tachen Islands under the protection of the United States Navy.

When we put the question to Molotov, he said he thought "hardly anyone would hinder such an operation. The western envoys seized on this statement as an indication that the Soviet Government would restrain Red China from attacking the American naval units protecting the evacuation.

A week later, the order was given for a powerful Navy task force to proceed to the Tachens and cover the withdrawal of the Nationalists forces. Had the Chinese Communists attacked our sailors we might today have been at war with Red China. The evacuation, however, was completed with hardly anyone interfering. Some of our diplomatic friends in Moscow expressed the view that our talk with Molotov paved the way for that operation and—who knows?—that might have been the case.

Of all the four top men with whom we talked, Marshal Zhukov was the most pleasant. He received us alone, except for our interpreter "guide," and greeted us warmly when we arrived in his office in the National Defense Ministry. Above 8 rows of ribbons were 3 stars representing the triple award of the highest military honors his nation bestows.

Here was the "old soldier" who had been on such friendly terms with General Eisenhower in the closing period of the European war and for a short time thereafter. He had stood with Ike beside him in Moscow's Red Square for the great victory parade. He had accepted an invitation from Eisenhower to visit Washington, and Ike had offered him his own plane and his son, John, as an aide. The cold war prevented Zhukov from making the trip. He told us that it was his dream to do so, though he doubted that the time was ripe for it.

This husky, forthright military man who commanded the defense of Moscow, prepared the Soviet stand at Stalingrad, and led the Red Army to victory against Germany gave me the impression of being sincere in his expressed hope for improved relations with the United States and the warm sentiments he voiced about General Eisenhower.

I felt almost a sense of relief later when I heard that he had been moved up to the post of defense minister. Not because he would hesitate to do everything within his power to defeat us in the event of war between our two countries, but because I believe that soldiers like Ike and Zhukov know all too well the horrors of war and want to avoid it. The presence of Zhukov in the high councils of the Soviet regime might be a conservative, perhaps even restraining, influence on recklessness.

With these four coldly realistic men at the top in the Soviet Union, I could not help feeling that any immediate threat to world peace is more likely to come from Red China than Russia.

Power Pyramid

There is one important factor too often neglected or not given sufficient emphasis in assessing the power of the U. S. S. R. against the backdrop of the world picture.

That factor is the enormous problem confronting Russia at home as its leaders struggle to gear the country's economy to the modern age.

We are inclined to think of Russia as a smoothly functioning state run with push-button precision by men who have fitted every piece into its proper place.

It is not that.

It is instead a nation of 200 million souls in relative degrees of backwardness, painfully seeking to mold its resources into a form where it can rival the might of an industrial giant like the United States.

This inner turbulence was clearly evident to us in our long talks with Russia's top leaders.

They are men at grips with problems of production, of food supply and of industrial expansion which would create headaches for the most gifted group of American production geniuses.

In the hands of this tight little knot of bureaucrats rests an authority reaching into every phase of Russian life. It is a power so huge that it is difficult for free-enterprising Americans to comprehend its scope.

There are 9 bold men in the Presidium—the post-Stalin version of the Politburo—and of these 9 men, it is certain that 3 and at the most 4 wield supreme influence in its councils.

They are Khrushchev, Molotov, Bulganin, and possibly Zhukov. There is power enough for all, so far reaching is the authority which funnels up to the small elite at the tip of the pyramid.

There is no adequate comparison in American life to Russia's power pyramid. Not only do these few men run the big factories, the farms, and the food shops; the buslines and the taxicabs; the schools and the subways; the railroads and the airlines; but also the ballet and, of course, the ballot box.

Superimposed on these pressing problems of everyday life—the questions which would plague Communist Russia if the cold war never existed—are the problems they have created for themselves by challenging America and the Western World to an armament race.

The men who rule Russia must be toiling over the intricacies of jet aircraft construction and production. They ride herd on platoons of scientists assigned to solve the mysteries of the atom. They lavish Russia's resources on plant expansion designed to keep Russia's war potential within reach of the West.

They must somehow find the means, amidst all the urgent claims of their own domestic needs, to supply the instruments of war to a Chinese ally who is long on boasts but short on bombs.

All this in a nation which only entered the industrial age 37 years ago and which, after more than a generation of bone-breaking privation, still lags far behind America in vital items like steel and coal and iron that are the sinews of a war economy.

In my opinion this inner insecurity played as big a part as any other factor in the shakeup which shuffled Georgi Malenkov out of the driver's seat.

True, there was a struggle for position within the little group of ruthless men at the top. That is a permanent condition in that Kremlin's competitive jungle, although almost certain party boss Khrushchev is now the dominant force of the Presidium.

But it seems to me that Malenkov's position weakened only as his administration proved unable to solve Russia's most clamoring problems. He is rated by westerners in Moscow as a man of intelligence and proven executive talent.

But the figures and facts were against him. His number was up. He had to go or seize supreme control himself, and he lacked the personal power for the latter bid.

In every field of Russian effort, dark spots were appearing.

The peasantry, always a restive element, was stirring again.

Production at one point slumped off 8 or 9 percent.

A re-armed Western Germany loomed on the horizon.

Malenkov's "soft" theories were clearly inadequate to meet the new threat.

Or so it must have looked to his associates in the Presidium. They are tough, ambitious men and more than one of them undoubtedly nourished reasons for welcoming Malenkov's downfall.

Had the Malenkov administration proved a big success—had production figures in industry and agriculture boomed under his leadership—there is at least the possibility that Malenkov would have survived.

Now they have tapped Nikolai Bulganin for top administrative responsibility. It may well be that his past success at executive levels was his chief recommendation for the post while his known talent for intrigue had probably placed him in a good position for the elevation.

Since returning to America, I have read many explanations of the Malenkov upheaval. Interpretations based on previous Communist history, character analyses of the principals involved, and evaluations of the relationship between the Communist Party, the Russian Government, and the Red army.

There may be some truth to all of them. Certainly neither I nor Kingsbury Smith nor Frank Conniff, nor all three of us pooled together, claim to be Russian experts after three crowded weeks in the Soviet Union.

But we have read and studied Russian history and we did have the advantage of being on the scene while world-shaking events were taking place. Also of talking to the four key men who emerged at the helm. Plus the Western ambassadors and their staffs in Moscow.

We could not escape the feeling that Russia is wrenched by problems of tremendous dimensions and that the men at the top are sorely tried to meet them.

Here in America we have problems of sufficient size to test the competence of some of the best administrators the world has ever known.

How much more difficult must it be in Communist Russia, far less endowed in basic equipment and whose administrative experience dates back scarcely more than a generation.

Now I know that nothing could be more dangerous to America's security at this time than to underestimate the capabilities and the potential of Soviet Russia—an enemy who is ruthless, implacable, and convinced that in the end communism is destined to dominate the world.

But if it is dangerous to sell the U. S. S. R. short, it is equally wrong, in my opinion, to overestimate its capabilities.

In our talks with the Communist brass, they pulled out all the usual propaganda stops about airbases, atom bombs, and the like. But running like a theme through their most brazen declarations was the counterpoint of peaceful coexistence.

"Look," said Khrushchev, tugging at my arm, "we're coexisting at this table. Why can't we coexist in the world?"

The Russians want peace because they need time.

They need time to solve, if possible, their problems at home, consolidate their vast empire, and perfect their devices for the possibility of an atomic showdown.

You may have been surprised to read here that many informed Europeans—and I heard this at the highest levels, so I know it wasn't idle speculation—doubt if Russia yet possesses the hydrogen bomb.

Without necessarily accepting that estimate, I can appreciate from my own experience in the Kremlin that the Russian position is not as rosy as those loud talkers in the Supreme Soviet would like the world to believe.

Timidity has sometimes shackled our actions in the past.

American policy now is to operate from positions of strength.

We are heading in the right direction—and Communist Russia knows it.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the fourth installment of William Randolph Hearst, Jr.'s Report from Russia: Uncensored, as follows:

THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Easily the most surprising aspect of my 3 weeks visit to the Soviet Union was the friendliness of the Russian people.

In view of the constant efforts of Soviet propaganda to turn the people against the United States, to frighten them with fear that America is preparing to attack them with hydrogen and atomic bombs, I had expected to be met with suspicious and hostile glances in public.

To my amazement, the attitude of the people we encountered was quite the contrary.

I am not referring to the formal politeness of the Red officialdom. I mean the common people. The man in the street. The shopgirl behind the department store counter. The old women in the market place.

The word Americanski seemed to have an almost magic effect on them. Doubtless, curiosity had a good deal to do with it. But it was more than that. Their faces brightened up. They smiled pleasantly. They seemed eager to talk—though not about their Government.

Some cynics might say it is naive to think the friendliness of these people was genuine. That they must have been "planted"—knew who we were—and told to be affable.

It would have been impossible to have arranged it in advance so that the people we just happened to encounter in the streets and elsewhere reacted as they did. We experienced the friendliness on the very first day of our arrival in Moscow, in different parts of the city, and before the Soviet press or radio had carried any information about our arrival.

I am positive that if you had been there with me, in the streets, the shops, the food markets and theaters of Moscow and Leningrad, you would agree with me that the amiable attitude of the people was spontaneous and sincere.

When I appeared with my two companions unexpectedly in the so-called "free" food markets, unaccompanied by any official guide but by Charles Klensch, our Russian-speaking American correspondent in Moscow, the men and women at the food stalls greeted us with good natured looks and eagerly showed us what little they had to offer for sale.

These markets, incidentally, were the only sign of free enterprise we saw in Russia, and they operated on a small scale. Most food is sold in Government stores at controlled prices, but there is a serious food shortage and the supply in the state shops is by no means enough to meet the public demand.

Prices at the free markets are uncontrolled. Peasants from the farmlands around Moscow bring to the free markets the little they are not compelled to sell to the Government. Carrots, potatoes. A few chickens and eggs. A bit of beef, lamb, or pork, though the meat is of poor quality and expensive.

In one shop there was a single scraggly chicken on the counter. Beside it were two eggs. The Russian peasant woman, in a soiled white apron, held it up to me to inspect.

Her eyes twinkled and she laughed. I doubt that her customers, if any, did, at the price. It was the equivalent to $24 at the official rate of exchange for the dollar. In terms of Russian purchasing power, it was about $9. Since the salary of an average Moscow white-collar worker is about $50 per week, chicken is a costly luxury.

To return to the friendliness of the people, however, we found it on every hand. When we stopped at a little corner ice cream and candy wagon to sample a bar of the rare and expensive chocolate, a score of people quickly gathered. They first gazed curiously, but when we smiled at them, they were quick to respond. Smiles would light their faces when we said Americanski. They crowded around and peered over our shoulders as we made notes about prices, giggled—coyly—if we took photos of them.

On one occasion in the market place a middle-aged, poorly dressed woman with the traditional shawl over head approached us, and upon being assured we were Americanski, proceeded to tell us how much the Russian people liked Americans.

"We like your Union," she said. "We are grateful for what you did for us during the war. We want to be friends with you. We do not want war. Let us have peace."

That reference to war and peace reflected the propaganda campaign against the United States, but the surprising thing to me was that these people did not seem to be mad at us. There was no antagonism in the woman's voice. There was more of a plea for friendship; an expression of fervent hope that there would be no more war.

The apparent failure of the "hate America" campaign which has been underway in varying degrees of intensity ever since the cold war started 10 years ago was rather astonishing. The anti-American propaganda in the press, on the radio, and in the movies seems to have had much less effect on the average Russian man and woman than one would have expected.

We could only surmise that the people automatically shut off their sense of hearing as we do sometimes when dull commercials come on the radio.

As Kingsbury Smith observed:

"An American walking through the Communist districts of Paris gets more hostile glances than anything seen here."

Perhaps the answer is that not many Russians are Communists at heart. After all, only 6 million Russians are members of the Communist Party out of a population of approximately 200 million.

In the light of the friendliness we encountered, I could not help but wonder if the Russian people may not yet prove to be America's secret psychological weapon in the cold war with Soviet communism.

That may seem a startling statement. It certainly is not intended to imply that the Russian masses think American foreign policy is right and their Government's policy wrong. The vast majority have no opportunity to know what really are the bases or objectives of American policy. They are simply told that Uncle Sam is an imperialistic beast who is preparing for war.

That they seem to take such propaganda with a whole sack of salt struck me as encouraging.

Not that they are going to revolt. We were told by the Western envoys there is not the slightest sign of anything like that; nor do I believe we could expect any humanitarian considerations from the Russian people if they were forced into a war with the United States. They are a patriotic people. They proved that during the last war when they fought with great bravery and stamina—certainly not because they wished to save the Soviet system but because they wanted to defend mother Russia.

If war should come, they would be told that Russia had been attacked, and whether they believed it or not, they would, I am convinced, fight hard.

However, as long as there is no war between Russia and the United States, I think the apparent resistance which the Russian people have shown to anti-American propaganda indicates two possibilities:

First, that they are not wholeheartedly supporting the Soviet Government's policy of attempting to make Uncle Sam the world's No. 1 villain.

Secondly, that if we can find ways of strengthening the feeling of friendship toward Americans that seems to be inherent in the character of the Russian people, we can make it more difficult for the Soviet Government to turn them against us, at least as long as there is no war.

In criticizing Russia, in vigorously opposing and condemning its policies, both domestic and foreign, I think our Government should make a point of differentiating between the people and the Soviet regime.

We should strive during the coming months through the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and all other means which we have of reaching the Russian people to get across to them our sympathies for the new hardships that will confront them.

We should do this without inciting them to revolt against their government. That would be cruel, because if they attempted to do so they would be shot down mercilessly. We should simply express our sympathies for them in connection with the Soviet Government's decision to curtail the production of consumer goods in order to concentrate on the greater development of heavy industry.

The Russian people are no fools. They know what this decision means for them. They realize it means more guns and less butter; more aid to Red China and fewer necessities of life for them.

This became clear to them when Georgi Malenkov was replaced as Premier. He favored a "softer" line. As far back as October 1953, he told the people, in effect, that there had been enough emphasis on heavy industry and the time had come to "organize the sharp development of the production of consumer goods."

During his short reign as head of the government, conditions eased considerably for the people. There was less police terrorism. More goods appeared in the shops, more suits and dresses, ties and shoes—though by no means enough to meet the demand at reasonable prices. Television sets were mass-produced for the people. We saw the aerials on the roofs of apartments and houses all over Moscow and the suburbs.

Malenkov also cut farm taxes, permitted collective farmers more leave in cultivating small private plots.

Now the trend appears headed back in the direction of the Stalinist policy of squeezing the utmost out of the people in order to develop the basic industries and strengthen Russia's war potential.

The people will be called upon to work harder and get less. Nikita Khrushchev told me during the course of my long interview with him that the production of consumer goods must henceforth take second place to the development of heavy industry.

Only 12 percent of the Government budget for 1955 will go for light industry. The balance will be applied to what the Soviet leaders described as "production of the means of production." In other words, heavy industry.

Notice has been served on the people that the 5-year economic plan, now in its last year, must be fulfilled ahead of schedule. The Government claims it has increased industrial production 71 percent since the plan was launched, 9 percentage points from its goal, which it hopes to reach before the end of this year.

No comparable increase, however, has been achieved in agriculture. A new program has been laid down which calls for an eightfold increase in the planting of corn and an overall annual production of about 160 million tons of grain by 1960; also a rise of 2 to 2½ times in the output of livestock products.

The people realize that the basis of this factory and farm program will be further forced development of heavy industry at the expense of consumer goods. It has been made clear to them that the economic might and military potentiality of the Soviet Union is to be given preference once again over their own personal needs.

Furthermore, they are being told in the Soviet press that they must work harder and increase the output per worker. Like the donkey and the carrot, the hope is being held out to them that if they pull the barge a little harder it will eventually be possible to increase once again the production of consumer goods.

That is likely to be of little comfort to the Russian people in their disappointment over the realization that in the immediate future the already difficult living conditions are going to become worse.

That is why I feel we should extend to them our sympathies and take advantage of every possible opportunity to let them know the difference between our free system and the totalitarian one under which they live.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the fifth installment of Report on Russia: Uncensored, by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., follows:

Red Ink

After more than 30 years of Communist rule the people of Russia are living today in what we would consider, by any comparison with our own way of life, a state of deep economic depression.

Living standards remain appallingly low in comparison with our own. There is a scarcity of almost everything—food, clothing, housing, and especially the little comforts of life that we have come to regard as necessities.

Most of the inhabitants of Moscow, for example, live in what we would regard as exceedingly poor to semislum conditions in overcrowded, dilapidated apartment buildings and small but quaint and crooked wooden houses.

But broadly speaking, conditions have improved for the people under the Soviet system, every Western ambassador and diplomatic expert in Moscow assured us.

That does not mean, of course, that they would not have been better off if the Czarist system had continued. Conditions for the working classes in all European countries are better than they were 30 years ago. Whether they would have been better in Russia than they are today must remain in the realm of speculation.

A lot more people undoubtedly would have been alive. Stalin starved millions in the

Ukraine to impose farm collectivization on a primitive agricultural nation.

The people were not free under the Czars and they are not really free now, but the fact is that they have more freedom and they regard themselves as much better off. They did not get to vote under the Czar and while their vote means nothing today, they really think that they have a democracy. As Marshall MacDuffie reports in his excellent book on Russian life—The Red Carpet—"It is not as bad in Russia as most people outside think it is, but it is nowhere near as good as the Russians think it is."

The comforts, happiness, spiritual welfare and personal liberties of the Russian people are still being sacrificed in the interests of increasing the industrial strength of the country and spreading sovietism throughout the world.

The basis now being laid could make Russia a strong and perhaps prosperous nation 50 years or so from now, especially if the system changes by that time, but this generation of Russians is paying a high price in drudgery and discomfort for an uncertain future.

Take the question of food, for example. The Western diplomatic experts in Moscow told us the average Russian is getting less than the 40 pounds of meat per person annually that he was able to obtain in 1928. Compare this with 155 pounds of meat per person that the average American is estimated to be eating each year.

I gathered that the shortage of livestock—6 million fewer than in 1928—is attributed to the wholesale slaughtering of cattle to which the rebellious peasants resorted when they were being forcibly collectivized by Stalin.

An ambitious new program of stock breeding is under way. Khrushchev told me that he hoped to get the Russian farmers to copy American methods of animal husbandry.

In his January 25 report to the central committee of the party, Khrushchev claimed that the new program had achieved last year an increase of nearly 2 million head of cattle. However, he took the peasants to task for incompetent handling of their livestock, especially in respect to feeding. He said that while stock breeding was increasing, the loss of live weight on the cattle totalled more than 40,000 tons.

The stock-breeding program also calls for a tremendous increase in corn acreage for livestock feeding purposes. The goal is 70 million acres by 1960, or about 15 million acres more than the normal United States corn acreage for such purposes.

American Embassy agricultural experts in Moscow will be surprised if these goals are achieved. They say there is not enough rainfall and too short a growing season for such massive corn production.

Khrushchev's plan is to develop millions of acres of virgin land in Central Asia. He is urging the youth of European Russia to "go east." They are being offered bonuses, relatively high wages, and other incentives to take a wife along with them and settle down as "pioneers" in the undeveloped Central Asian prairies.

This is also part of the government scheme to increase the population. The Soviet leaders are talking about doubling and even tripling it. While they don't mention China, the figures they mention are close to the population of their far eastern ally. This has led some of the western diplomats to wonder whether, from a long range point of view, the Russian rulers are concerned about the danger of an eventually industrialized China of 600 million people becoming the stronger partner in the Communist alliance.

Food shortage appears to be a basic weakness in the Soviet system, partly because under Stalin, attention was concentrated on the development of heavy industry. Western diplomats also say it is due to the difficulty of training Russians to cooperate, and especially to take good care of modern agricultural machinery.

Whatever the reason, the Russian housewife has a hard time getting things for the dinner table. This was evident from the queues we saw from before dawn until after dark in front of the food shops in Moscow and Leningrad. In fact, those were about the only queues we were conscious of, outside the line that waits daily to visit the tomb of Lenin and Stalin in Red Square.

The best food shops in Russia are said to be the two government grocery and meat stores in Moscow, called "Gastronoms." One is located in Gum, the big department store facing Red Square. The other is on Gorky Street, also in the center of the city.

These are the grocery "show" places of Russia. They are crowded from morning till evening. Even in these two shops they often run out of meat, though they usually have one or another of pork, beef, or mutton.

Most of the time they have eggs. Less frequently, sweet cream and butter. Oranges, lemons and other fruit are to be found irregularly.

Diplomats and foreign correspondents can phone food orders to these two stores. Mrs. Charles Klensch, wife of the I. N. S. correspondent in Moscow, put in orders at the Gum Gastronom four times in January. On January 7 and 11, she was unable to get lean beef, sour cream, sweet cream or any frozen fruit or vegetables. Five days later, she was still unable to get cream, frozen foods, or lamb. On January 21, pork as well as the other meats and the vegetables were unavailable.

This winter the price of a single fresh egg at the official rate of the dollar exchange has averaged 25 cents. In terms of the real purchasing value of the ruble, that would make it about 10 cents, which is still high when you realize that the basic wage scale for the Moscow white collar worker is about $50 per week.

First quality lean beef costs about $3 per pound. Pork is a little more expensive. Lemons are approximately 50 cents each, oranges $1.25 per pound.

The average Russian city dweller spends about 55 percent of his income on food as compared with approximately 28 percent spent by an American worker, and, of course, there is no comparison between what the Russian gets and what we get. An average American eats nearly four times more meat than a Russian, and that's not because Russians don't like meat. Their favorite dishes are based on it.

The basic Russian diet during the winter time is grain porridge, beet soup, and black bread. In the Moscow food shops, however, we saw counters loaded with good-tasting white bread. But Moscow is not Russia, any more than New York is America.

Clothing is scarce and expensive, though the people we saw in the streets appeared quite warmly clad. Many women wore fur coats and most of the men we saw wore fur-trimmed hats.

Kingsbury Smith said the people appeared better clothed than when he was in Russia in 1947. They were well, though not stylishly shod, wearing mostly boots. Military officers and the police are the best-dressed men to be seen in the streets, and they are far more numerous than in any western capital.

The civilians as a whole are drably dressed, and we saw no Russian woman in the streets, theaters, or restaurants that would, in western terms, be considered at all smartly attired.

Men's ready-made suits of very inferior quality were priced in the main department store at 1,600 rubles, or $400 at the official rate of exchange.

While there is no longer any rationing in Russia, prices are used for much the same purpose. Goods of which there is a shortage are priced high.

Cars are now for sale to the public, but delivery takes a minimum of 10 months and they cost about double the price of an American car. The Zis auto costs about 25,000 rubles, or more than $6,000.

There is considerable traffic in the center of Moscow, though nothing like New York, London, or Paris. However, the aristocracy of the Red regime does have money to spend. The problem is finding something to spend it on.

Income taxes are kept relatively low. Less than 10 percent of the Government's revenue comes from this form of taxation. Most of it come from sales and profit taxes of factories, farms, and state stores.

The basic working schedule is an 8-hour day, 6 days per week. Sunday is retained as the day off, though it is no longer officially regarded as the Sabbath.

Bonus incentives are used to speed up production. A norm, or quota, is set for industrial workers. If they exceed the quota, they get paid extra. In cases where the factory schedule permits it, they can work overtime to earn additional money, or, as it is put in Communist terminology, to "fulfill the plan ahead of schedule." Strikes are not allowed.

This incentive system is a far cry from communism. There is, in fact, no such thing as real Marxist communism in Russia today. Even the Soviet leaders say that quite frankly. The contend they are simply in the socialistic phase of the march toward communism, which is the Red utopia they hold out to the people for some unpredictable time in the future.

One of the best informed western Ambassadors we met in Moscow said to me: "There are no Communists in Russia, not on the top nor the bottom. This system is being operated on the basis of state capitalism. Any one who tried to practice real communism here would be shot as a deviationist."

From what I heard about the way things are being done in Russia, I could not help feeling that the Soviets are moving more in the direction of capitalism, while we over here have been heading more in the direction of socialism.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the sixth installment of Report on Russia: Uncensored, by William Randolph Hearst, follows:

THE SOVIET WOMEN

The Russian woman appears to be the greatest source of human vitality in the Soviet Union today.

Husky, healthy, frank, and good-natured, with a great capacity for hard work and also for childbearing, the average woman one sees in the big cities and on the farmlands certainly seems to justify the nation being called Mother Russia.

Drably dressed in comparison with Western standards, lacking most of the conveniences that make life comfortable, and granted little if any consideration over man, the Russian woman leads a burdensome life.

Because the Government wants to double the population, she is now being called upon to produce more children. She is being urged to marry young and migrate east with her bridegroom to the virgin prairie lands of central Asia, as the early American women went West with their menfolk.

If she is an industrial worker, as millions of Russian women are, and she wants to keep her job after the birth of a baby, she is expected when she returns from maternity leave—which usually lasts about 2 months—to breastfeed the child in a nursery attached to the factory. She is given time off for this purpose. After work she can take the baby home with her, or she can, if she wishes, turn it over completely to a Government nursery.

If she wishes to keep and feed the child herself, she is, during the nursing period of 1 year, transferred to light work. She also receives money grants and medical benefits during maternity and the nursing period.

While the Soviet regime at one time allowed easy divorces and did nothing to discourage free love, the policy now is to strengthen the family ties. Abortions have been prohibited. Divorce laws have been tightened up, and they reflect an attempt to protect the interests of mother and child.

To annul marriage, it is no longer enough (as it was prior to 1944) to give a one-sided, unsubstantiated application to the registrar's office.

Divorce is now effected publicly by a court of law and the plaintiff has to substantiate his or her claim for divorce. The case is heard in the presence of both parties—first, at the so-called people's court, which tries to reconcile the parties; then, if no reconciliation is possible, at a higher court. The latter either dissolves the marriage or rejects the case.

Simultaneously with granting the divorce, the court decides which of the parents is to have the children, which of them is pay alimony and how much.

Under Soviet regulations, a court of law can dissolve a marriage "only when there are serious grounds for divorce and when continuation in the married state will prove contrary to Communist morality and will interfere with the creation of normal conditions for living together and bringing up children."

The Soviet Constitution grants women "complete equality with men in economic, government, cultural, political, and other public activity."

That applies to streetcleaning, too. One of the sights that startles the Western visitor to Moscow is the women shoveling snow day and night on the icy streets.

Bundled up in padded, quilted coats, with shawls over their heads, these women really look like human beasts of burden. Some are young. Some are well beyond middle age. I must state though that they do not actually look or act unhappy.

We were told that they are peasant women from the farms on the outskirts of Moscow. They are paid the equivalent of about $2 per day, fed and sheltered. One of the Western diplomats told us that the women apparently apply for these snow cleaning jobs in big numbers, since it gives them an opportunity to earn money in the wintertime when there is not as much for them to do on the farms as during the milder seasons of the year.

Under the equal rights system for women, they are being given the same opportunities for education as men. Compulsory education starts for girls as well as boys at the age of 7. During our visit to Moscow University, one of the skyscraper sights of the city, we were told by the superintendent that young women comprise 51 percent of the student body.

We certainly saw as many of them as there were boys walking through the corridors and in some of the assembly halls although there was a winter recess while we were there.

About 6,500 students live at the university out of a total of 21,500 attending the classes. I visited the living quarters, and while the small dormitory rooms were by no means luxurious they were not uncomfortable.

Girl students, as well as boys, pay a tuition fee of 400 rubles, about $100, per year at the Moscow University. They receive from the Government, however, from 300 to 700 rubles ($75 to $175) per month to meet the costs of room and board, books, and incidental expenses.

Communist girls and boys get the best break on education. If they have good records as members of the Komsomols, the Communist youth organizations, their applications for admission to the universities are given more favorable consideration. Only students who pass entrance examinations with the top grades are admitted.

There are probably beautiful women in Russia, but we were certainly not conscious of them in Moscow. Unquestionably the lack of smart clothes has a lot to do with it. Outside the western diplomatic corps, you never see what would be considered in New York, London, or Paris a fashionably dressed woman.

The ballerinas were the best dressed Russian women we saw, but a chic American secretary, by comparison with them, would look as though she had been outfitted by Dior.

The women in Leningrad are more attractive than those in Moscow. They seem more European, more vivacious and less peasant-like. I am inclined to credit Scandinavian blood for their better builds.

Then, too, Leningrad was Russia's "window on the west" under the Czars. It was the capital of the nation for 200 years and at a time when French cultural influence was strong. There is much more grandeur about the city itself than there is about Moscow.

On one occasion when we were photographing the sights outside our hotel, a group of teen-age boys and girls walked by with skis over their shoulders. We turned our movie cameras on them and while the boys looked rather bewildered, the girls laughed gayly.

A pretty one stepped out of the group and walked into full view of the camera of Kingsbury Smith. With dancing eyes and a bright smile, that Russian girl would have been considered striking in any country.

One of the boys, or the leader of the group, came back and hustled her along. She smiled back over her shoulder at us and, sad to relate, that was the last we ever saw of her.

To give you an idea of what life is really like in Moscow for an upper middle-class, Russian workingwoman, I will set down a question and answer interview with a translator employed in one of the diplomatic missions. She earns 1,000 rubles ($250) per month. This woman is about 45 years old. We will call her Masha, since disclosure of her real name might get her into trouble for talking so freely to Americans.

Rather theatrical in appearance, with dyed hair, bright lipstick, and a gay silk scarf around her shoulders, this woman leads an easier and far more pleasant existence than the vast majority of Russian women.

She is looking forward to retirement 10 years from now when she will be eligible for old-age pension and other benefits. She will then be able to go to a sanatorium, or hotel-type rest home in the milder climate of Georgia. Meanwhile, the type of life she now leads can be seen from the following questions and answers:

Question. What time do you get up?

Answer. Between 8:30 and 9 a. m.

Question. What do you eat for breakfast?

Answer. We, I mean most Russians, nearly always eat a cooked breakfast. Eggs or sausages. Bread and butter. Coffee or tea.

Question. Where do you go for lunch?

Answer. Sometimes I bring sandwiches to work with me. All the big Government offices and the factories have buffets.

Question. When do you shop?

Answer. I do not care to shop myself for food, but when I do, I try to limit it to Sunday, when all the food shops are open, or after work.

Question. Who does your shopping when you don't do it?

Answer. I share a servant with my neighbor, who is a doctor.

Question. How many people live in the apartment you occupy?

Answer. There are five big rooms. We have a kitchen, bath, and telephone. It is all shared by eight people, all of us friends.

Question. Do you have electric gadgets in the apartment?

Answer. We have a big electric icebox. Also an electric iron and sweeper. We have three gas stoves in the kitchen.

Question. How about laundry?

Answer. I wash my own silk things but the rest goes to a laundry.

Question. How often do you go to the hairdresser?

Answer. Usually twice a month, but the young girls I know like to go every week.

Question. What is the price of a silk dress?

Answer. The pure, very fine silk dresses are about 280 rubles ($70). Rayon dresses cost from 180 to 220 rubles ($45 to $55).

Question. How many pure silk dresses do you buy a year?

Answer. About 4 or 5. In the summer there are many in the shops from which to make a selection.

Question. How much are winter coats, and how many do you have?

Answer. A plain but warm heavy coat without fur trimming costs about 550 rubles ($137.50). I have 1 fur coat and 1 cloth, but I know a woman who has 6 fur coats. (This woman, we found out, was the wife of a Soviet marine colonel.)

Question. How many pairs of shoes do you have?

Answer. Five pairs of all-the-year-round shoes, including fur boots, and two pairs of white shoes for summer.

Question. Do you ever wear an evening dress?

Answer. Very rarely. Sometimes at a New Year party or a big reception. I like my cocktail dress better.

Question. What do you eat for supper?

Answer. Like all Russians, we have soup. Then perhaps a little meat or fish, compote of canned fruit, or some cakes or cookies.

Question. How often do you eat in restaurants?

Answer. At least twice a month. More often in summer.

Question. How often do you go to the theater or ballet?

A. I go to the movies regularly twice a week and to the theater, opera, or ballet about twice a month.

Question. Do you go to many parties?

Answer. Oh, yes. Russians love to have little parties. Not big ones. Just a few friends to eat and drink—and sing. I go to three parties at least each month.

Question. How many books do you read a week?

Answer. About two each week. I can get them from the libraries in Moscow.

Question. Do you have any particular hobbies?

A. I make hats for myself and my friends. Also I am a member of a dramatic club, and

acted in Gogol's "Inspector General" a short time ago. I do not belong to any political club.

Question. Do you make any of your own clothes?

Answer. Some of them, but I have a good dressmaker. Most of the women I know have their clothes made by little dressmakers. The shops are too expensive. I have my own sewing machine. Most of my friends have them.

Question. Do you have a saving account?

Answer. Yes, but only to save enough money to buy the things I want. Then I spend it. Why should I save more? I will be taken care of by my pensions when I am old.

Question. What are you saving for now?

Answer. First for a new fur coat—a mouton. I can buy one for 1,900 rubles ($475), but they are scarce and one must queue up for days. I do not like to queue up and never join a line if I know I must stand for more than half an hour. When I have bought a coat I shall save for a television set. One of my neighbors has one, and I watch that, but I would like to have one.

Question. Did you go to high school in Moscow?

Answer. Yes, and after I finished, I took a degree in theater arts at the dramatic institute here.

Question. Are you married?

Answer. I am a widow. My husband was the director of a theater in Moscow. He was killed during the war.

Question. What did your father do?

Answer. He was a professor of science.

Question. How do you feel about the United States?

Answer. I am sure America does not want war. I do not believe what I read in the newspapers. I am sure there is a big misunderstanding somewhere. If Russians and Americans could meet a lot more, and get to know one another, I am sure things would be better.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the seventh installment of Report on Russia: Uncensored, by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., follows:

THE NEW "ELITE"

A new elite has emerged in the Soviet Union to prove the theory that under the Communist dictatorship everyone is equal—but some are more equal than others.

An aristocracy based chiefly though not completely on performance and talent reaps the fruits of Russia's sweat and toil in the form of bonuses, cars, apartments, dachas (country homes), servants, and so forth.

Old traditions of birth and privilege have long since been abandoned. Of course human nature being what it is, Soviet Russia has its share of political favoritism, bureaucratic boondoggling, and even nepotism. Relatives of ranking party leaders are not without advantages in the struggle for existence.

The loftiest echelon of the modern Soviet classless society is a managerial elite based on position in the Communist bureaucracy and production structure, topped by names from the theater, the opera, and the ballet.

Plant directors and managers, chief engineers and technicians, directors of state farms and machine tractor stations, kolkhoz (collective farm) chairmen, the literary and scientific intelligentsia—these comprise the upper crust.

High-ranking army officers and their wives also occupy prominent places in the new social hierarchy.

Russians in these categories live far better and higher than the massed ranks of workers below them, the humble factory hands and peasants who drudge along on a diet of meager rations and hard work.

Tempering any desire to live it up and flaunt their comparative wealth, however, is the knowledge that the Kremlin's high command frowns on ostentation.

Hard work and rugged competition keep the comrades toeing the line, and the regime applies the incentive motive of the capitalist system. This is contrary to true Marxist communism under which the incentive urge must neecssarily disappear as there is no reason for having incentive—everybody being equal.

But in Russia today there are so-called millionaire factories, such as the Stalin plant in Moscow, the sales revenues of which run into millions of rubles. There are also millionaire kolkhozes where superior management and production bring rewarding bonuses to directors and workers alike.

Some observers feel that the millionaire Stalin factory gets preferential treatment in materials and first-class production techniques and that some millionaire farms mostly owe their success to the good, rich earth of their particular areas.

Others think these favors of nature are taken into consideration when the Central Committee of the Communist Party—the top ruling body in Russia—sets up norms and big results are demanded from operators of the fortunate farms and factories.

How much are the top executives and managers paid? The chairman of a good Kolkhoz about 18 miles from Moscow told us he makes 2,400 rubles a month (about $600 at the official rate), plus produce amounting to double the amount received by the average worker on his farm.

He has a new small Pobeda car, a TV set, a radio, a Longines watch, and a telephone, testimony to the relative luxury available in such positions.

In cases such as these, it is hard to estimate the real value of pay because the exchange rate of the ruble in terms of dollars is artificially pegged. It is set at 4 rubles to $1 but Western economists estimate the true rate at closer to 12 rubles to the dollar.

President Eisenhower became aware of this false exchange during his postwar visit to Russia. When I saw him in the White House on my return, he recalled the answer he had given a Kolkhoz worker who asked what his opposite number in America would earn.

"I knew that the salary alone wouldn't tell the true difference," the President told me. "So I translated it into what the American worker could buy with his pay.

"I told him that his opposite number in America wolud probably own his own home, a car, have his children at a university, attend the movies and theater regularly, and, in general, possess many of the good things of life."

The President smiled at the memory.

"Marshal Zhukov was listening," he said, "and I could tell he didn't like this line of talk. So he turned on the worker and said:

" 'Stop bothering our guest with such silly questions.' "

Even the workers in Russia have their elite—the leading Stakhanovites (workers who invent labor-saving shortcuts); outstanding shock-workers (those who overfill their norms or quotas by big margins); and top brigadiers (foremen of collective farms whose squads give impressive performances).

But the cream of Russian "society" is represented by the artistic world—the performers of the opera and ballet and theater who rise to the top on the strength of natural talent.

Ballerinas, opera singers, conductors, movie producers, directors and writers get the best apartments and are among the few people in Russia to dress well, though not fashionably in Western terms.

They have big popular followings and are household idols throughout the Soviet Union. The wife of one Western ambassador with several years of experience in Russia told me that the artists have a little world of their own in which they live on a far better level than their adoring fans.

"There's a 'society' going on here that nobody sees," she said.

A stiff artistic price is exacted from these beneficiaries of Soviet favors. Composers and writers must hew to the current "line" and are soundly reprimanded in the party press for any deviation.

In an interview at the Moscow Conservatory of Music, Dmitri Shostakovich, the world famous composer who was severely reprimanded in Stalin's time for writing a deviationist symphony, stanchly defended the system which exposes creative artists to the barbs of doctrinaire critics.

"They've very helpful," the composer said. "Their criticism improves a composer's work. If I'm working in the wrong direction I should be told."

There appears to be one exception to the blanket rule that all artists must accept party discipline or face stern punishment. The performing artist—the prima donnas and the actors and actresses as opposed to the composers and writers—seem to lead a charmed life in this respect.

Westerners tell the story of Kozlovsky, a top Russian tenor who always gets paid 25 times the stipulated state rate for each performance. Kozlovsky rebelled against a proposed tour of the so-called people's democracies. He complained that the pay wasn't substantial enough and that the technical resources of some opera houses were beneath his standards.

For his show of temperament Kozlovsky drew the usual stern wigging in the party press. But nothing else happened. He was singing away as usual the next season and as popular as ever.

"The Russians are like the Westerners in that respect," said one diplomat. "They make allowance for the artistic temperament. As long as the fellow continues to perform satisfactorily, they'll let him get away with a lot of things."

To really understand the grip performing artists hold on the affection of the Russian people, one must consider the case of Ulanova, the premier ballerina of the famed Moscow Ballet and rated by many critics as the world's greatest.

I may say in passing that I saw more ballet in Russia than I had in all my previous life put together. We went five times in Moscow and then attended the Leningrad Ballet for good measure. People who are better qualified to judge than I am claim the Moscow Ballet is the best in the world and I can only say it looked good to me.

Ulanova is the unrivalled star of this aggregation. Now in her mid-forties but still slender and poised, she no longer appears as frequently as she once did. Announcement of a Ulanova performance is enough to start a mad scramble for tickets.

While we were there she appeared in Giselle for the first time in 7 years. Not one member of the western diplomatic corps could obtain a ticket to the performance.

We knew we were getting special treatment when our party was allotted six precious tickets. Incidentally, you cannot just go to the box office and buy tickets to the ballet or opera. Tickets are allocated to workers' or-

ganizations, visiting delegations and to the Intourist bureau for foreign visitors.

Ulanova earns about 5,000 or 6,000 rubles a month, plus perquisites in the form of creature comforts, a decent apartment, and a maid. In addition, her title of People's Artist of the U. S. S. R., brings in extra money as do the Stalin prizes she regularly wins. Along with her basic salary, she now receives a substantial bonus for each performance.

We talked to this pleasant, unpretentious woman at the Bolshoi theater and invited her to join a cocktail party we were giving that afternoon. I didn't entertain much hope that she would show up but promptly at 6 o'clock Ulanova appeared, accompanied by Pliseskaya, another ace ballerina, two male stars of the company, and the theater manager.

Our interviews with the Communist leaders were appearing from day to day in Pravda and we were slowly becoming well-known personages in Moscow. But we only became celebrities when Ulanova waved a greeting to us at the Bolshoi and Pliseskaya concentrated on us while taking her bows after a triumph in Shuralae, a ballet based on Tartar folk songs.

That's how the artists rate in the new Soviet society. We had to be considered VIP's to draw personal attention from such popular favorites as Pliseskaya and the legendary Ulanova.

The new elite minds its manners in public and indulges in no flashy gestures to call attention to itself. Theater doors shut promptly at curtain time and there are no late-comers swaggering down the aisle to disturb the intent audience. If late, you wait for a scene change.

Khrushchev attended the performance of Giselle, but he was subdued indeed. He entered a front box only after the overture had begun, sat out of sight of the audience and slipped away as the curtain descended. Nobody appeared to notice him except three American newspapermen. We also noticed two grim-looking gents who appeared in the otherwise empty box above him at the same time he entered the one below. Somebody said they were the bodyguards. Even the elite can't take chances in the workers' paradise.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the eighth installment of the series of articles by an American newspaper editor, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., on his observations behind the Iron Curtain, as follows:

RELIGION IN THE U. S. S. R.

"Religious feeling among the Russian people is very strong. The strength of it is surprising. The people who believe in God are very firm in their belief. Their faith cannot be shaken."

These words were spoken to me by a leading ecclesiastic of the Russian Orthodox Church. With a flowing beard that reached to his chest, long hair that fell over his shoulders, and the black robes of priesthood, this acting chief monk of the famous monastery of St. Sergei looked like a character out of a Passion play.

Named after the patron saint who founded the monastery in 1322, Father Sergei sat across a table from me in his tiny apartment in the seminary building of the walled, fortresslike headquarters of the Russian church at Zagorsk, about 50 miles northeast of Moscow.

The clear, frank, and apparently fearless eyes of this man of God in a land whose Government creed is dedicated to atheism stared at me earnestly—as if trying to convey an impression even stronger than his words.

Through the frost-lined window behind him I could see the beautiful bell tower of one of the ancient Byzantine churches that grace this holy shrine of Russia.

We had just finished a lunch that reflected the traditional hospitality of the Russians. Caviar, toast, hot meat cakes, borscht, or cabbage soup, baked chicken, rice, carrots, potatoes. Then a rich cakelike dessert, followed by oranges and apples. All washed down with vodka, red and white Georgian wine, Russian sweet champagne, and brandy.

That is certainly not the frequent fare of the average Russian. I would be inclined to doubt that Father Sergei himself eats like that very often. He had been informed in advance of our visit. Doubtlessly, he was ordered to provide a banquet.

Present at the luncheon was the civilian director of the monastery. He is the government's watchdog. He never left the side of Father Sergei during our visit through the churches, the grounds, and the seminary itself and he, not the holy man, answered most of the questions we put about religion in Russia. A heavyset, stern-featured man, he seemed to be on friendly terms with Father Sergei. I gathered they were coexisting as pleasantly as they could under the circumstances.

Our talks with Father Sergei and the director were conducted through the intourist guide, who accompanied us to the monastery.

We said we noted that most of the people we had seen in the churches were elderly women and we inquired whether the younger generation came regularly to religious services. The answer was that more young people came when there were sermons. It was difficult to estimate the percentage, but it was small.

We asked whether the church was allowed to teach religion to the young; whether there was anything like our Sunday school classes. The answer was no.

In response to our question as to how the children learned about religion, since it was not taught in the schools nor in the churches, the director said:

"Children learn about religion from their families."

We said we understood that the government discouraged belief in religion, and that those who dared to send their children to church or to have them baptised ran the risk of getting into trouble with the authorities. If that was so, how could the families teach the children about religion?

The director replied that it was only members of the Communist Party, not the populace in general, who were not supposed to show an interest in religion.

Answering our question as to what were the relations between the government and the church, the director said:

"The church is completely separate from the state. Of course, it is necessary for it to have some relations with the government. Since 1944 there has existed a committee on matters relating to the Russian Orthodox Church. All the church needs from the state are handled by this committee, which is composed of members of the church and the state."

We inquired how this committee affected the freedom of the church in religious matters. That seemed to touch a sensitive spot, and the director spoke with a slightly sharper tone in his voice.

"The church is more free than before the revolution," he said. "Under the Czars, the state ran the church, today the state does not try to run the church."

Father Sergei sat silently by looking rather pathetically wistful, I thought. He did not nod his head over this assertion.

"As a principle," the director added, "we have freedom of religion." Since the director doubtlessly noticed the skepticism in our faces, he quickly added:

"Certainly it is possible that there have been some mistakes, but they have been so rare, due to the fervor of some individuals. They are being corrected now. You may have hearhd of Comrade Khrushchev's decree."

We had heard of the recent decree, or statement. That is another story, and a rather amazing one that confirmed Father Sergei's expressed conviction that the spirit of religion is deep and strong in the soul of the Russian people. I will get to it later on.

We asked whether the state allowed new churches to be built or established. The director said that in order to open a church, 20 residents of the district in question had to sign a petition addressed to the Patriarch Alexei, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Patriarch would, if he was disposed to support the petition, bring it to the attention of the committee.

"Would the committee automatically grant the request?" we inquired. "It would be considered," was the reply.

We then directed our questions to Father Sergei and heard, in response to our inquiries concerning the attitude of the people toward religion, the encouraging statements I quoted at the beginning of this article.

"I often hear confessions," he added, "and am surprised when, in the evenings, young girls come and ask forgiveness for small sins. The souls of these girls are good, and their belief in God is firm. I think this is a result of the profound religious feeling of the people."

Before lunch, Father Sergei and the director had escorted us around the grounds of the monastery and through the ancient churches. The foundations of the main church date back to 1354, when work was started on it 32 years after St. Sergei had founded the monastery.

There were no pews or chairs inside the church, although a service was being held when we entered. It was a weekday. There were about a score of women and a few men standing on the stone floor, all facing in the direction of the tomb of a saint.

At the head of the tomb, a bearded monk was chanting prayers. We were told these services were conducted by the monks from 5 o'clock in the morning until 6 in the evening. The walls and cathedral-like columns supporting the high-domed church were covered with priceless old paintings or icons, as they call holy pictures.

One felt awed by both the beauty and the spiritual atmosphere of this house of God that had stood there in the heart of Russia for so many centuries and through so many turbulent times. And we emerged with a sense of great reverence and a strengthened conviction in the stability of Christianity.

In answer to our question, as we walked across the snow-covered courtyard. Father Sergei estimated that there are now in Russia between 60 and 80 convents and monasteries.

Later he took us through the seminary, where about 200 young students are being educated for the priesthood. We sat in an exquisitely decorated little music room that had been built for the seminary by Catherine the Great, and listened to the choir sing Russian Christmas songs for us.

We spent the entire day at this monastery of St. Sergei and returned to Moscow long after dark feeling somehow very much at peace with the world.

It was not until a few days later in Moscow that we learned the full significance of Father Sergei's assurances about the strength of religious feeling in the Russian people.

Then from a source whose word you would not doubt if I could identify him for you here, but which I must refrain from doing lest I endanger his position, we heard a truly remarkable report on how the Russian people have exerted their will to force the dictatorship that rules them to curtail persecution of those seeking to return to the church.

This source told us that back in about 1951, before Stalin died, the government had conducted an investigation to determine the attitude of the people toward religion. The check showed, according to our source, that not more than 40 percent of the population was atheistic.

As a result, Stalin ordered an intensification of the antireligious campaign. For the next few years, strong pressure was applied.

The husbands of women who had their children baptised suddenly found themselves transferred to inferior jobs. The older children whose parents attended church services were denied access to the Komsomols, the Communist youth organizations which assure the best opportunities of education. Girl students who had been going to church found they could not get into the universities.

Then this happened.

In Moscow, Leningrad, and other big cities production in the factories began to fall off. In some instances, it dropped 8 to 9 percent. At first, the government could not account for it. The secret police were instructed to find out what was happening. They reported that a deliberate slowdown in work was taking place. Absenteeism was increasing. And the reason was the resentment of the workers of religious persecution. The people of Russia were making their wishes known in the only way available to them.

There were threats, warnings, even arrests. The slow-down continued. The Government could not put the entire population of the cities in jail. For months this situation continued.

Then one day, not long ago, Khrushchev issued a policy pronouncement. He condemned persecution of the people on religious grounds. He said such pressure must end; that "scientific" education—propaganda, not persecution—must be used to further the creed of atheism. The slow-down in production ceased. The religious spirit of the people of Russia had triumphed, at least temporarily, over totalitarianism.

This does not mean, however, that the Soviet leaders have changed their basic doctrinaire opposition to belief in God. They have not. They may shift tactics from time to time, but they remain opposed to real religious freedom.

Their callous attitude in respect to Christianity was evidenced in the deplorable expulsion recently of Father Georges Bissonnette, the only American religious representative allowed in the Soviet Union.

We had the pleasure, and it was a genuine pleasure, of meeting this ardent, affable 33-year-old Roman Catholic priest during our visit to Moscow. We attended mass on Sunday in his little apartment in the residential block assigned the diplomatic corps. He was not allowed to hold services in any church, and had to confine his activities to administering the faith to the Catholic members of the American and other western diplomatic missions.

We lunched with him one day and found him a keen, intelligent, and devoted servant of God. I consider it highly improbable that he personally did anything to justify his expulsion from Russia.

It is more likely, as the State Department seems to think, that the Soviet Government's action was intended as a retaliation for the refusal of the United States to renew the visa of Archbishop Boris of the Russian Orthodox Church, who was allowed to enter this country on a 2 months' permit that expired the end of February.

Boris, who came over here ostensibly to look into the affairs of a faction of the Russian Orthodox Church, had requested permission to remain permanently. Apparently a puppet of the Soviet Government, he had, according to our officials, engaged in other than spiritual activities.

If that was the case, the State Department was certainly right in refusing to renew the visa.

Before leaving Moscow, I visited the Patriarch Alexei in his home in Moscow. It was not unlike a cardinal's residence, with religious paintings and incons on the walls. We sat around a large bare, polished drawing room-dining room table. A bejewelled cross hung in a silver chain around the neck of the patriarch. We talked for a while about my impressions of Russia, how I liked my visit, and so forth.

Suddenly I made the remark that I had been carrying in the back of my mind for some days.

"You know," I said, "it has occurred to me that one of the reasons our two countries have such difficulties in believing one another is that we believe in God, as you do, while the governing body of Russia, the Communist Party, insists on godlessness—atheism—in its ruling hierarchy.

He evaded a direct answer, asserting that there was religious freedom; that there were many religions in Russia. He said that in the eastern parts of the Soviet Union there was Mohammedanism and even Buddhism.

I said that might be so but repeated my original statement.

He looked straight into my eyes, and tapping his heart with his hand said:

"Who knows. I think perhaps there are times when they do think of God."

With that, he rose and asked if I would like to see his chapel. He led me through a door into the candlelit room with its icons. As I stood there beside him, I silently asked God for a blessing in behalf of my wife and children, and my mother. We then returned to his reception room, and as I bade him farewell, he gave me a little mother-of-pearl crucifix on a gold chain.

I say the spirit of religion is strong in Russia despite all that has been done to stamp it out.

Hearst's Report on Russia: Uncensored—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the ninth and final chapter of Report on Russia: Uncensored, by William Randolph Hearst, Jr. The article follows:

A WAY TO PEACE

In concluding this report, I would like to advance a few ideas based on our 3-week visit to Russia indicating how the West can most effectively marshal its resources in order to win the continuing battle with world communism.

The previous eight articles have catalogued many of the weaknesses of the Soviet Union. I have spoken of the dissension within the leadership, the grave problems besetting Russia at home, the shakiness of the satellites, and the drawbacks on Russia's one worthwhile ally, Communist China.

But it would be wrong to get the idea that the Russian Communist system does not possess many assets, not the least of which is the chance that domestic turbulence in the free world and old national jealousies will divide and splinter the allied coalition.

If this happens, Communist Party boss Nikita Khrushchev or his successor may well witness the achievement of the confident boast he made to me during our long interview, that communism would ultimately gain the upper hand throughout the world.

He said it confidently and matter-of-factly, although acknowledging my right to believe that our way of life would ultimately win out.

It's up to us to devise a strategy that will demolish Khrushchev's calm assurance.

First of all, let's dispose of the question whether the conflict between communism and freedom can be solved by resort to war.

The Soviet Union can't stand a war with the West within the foreseeable future and therefore won't start one. I have further predicted that Russia's realistic rulers will exert a cooling influence to keep the Chinese teapot from boiling over.

"We're glad the fire in Korea was put out," Khrushchev told us. "We don't want to see another one start up."

The democracies won't start a war with the Soviet Union, because it is against the very nature of democracy to launch an aggressive war.

The only spark that might touch off an atomic showdown, as I have repeatedly stated, would be the failure of the West to keep up its guard and encourage the Kremlin to think we were weak and defenseless.

If I am right in thinking that war is no solution to the current struggle, and that Russia will not pull the trigger for varying reasons, then we pass into the much more difficult battleground of peace.

The West is well equipped in any trial at arms. But are we prepared practically and philosophically to surpass communism in the thornier problems of peace?

I wrote in the first article of this series:

"The western program of building armed strength, while fundamentally the correct one, should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front."

Later, in a speech at the National Press Club in Washington, I recommended the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate an all-fields, all-fronts strategy for winning the battle of competitive coexistence.

This board should be scrupulously nonpartisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available. It should not bog itself down in catch phrases like "psychological warfare" or "merchandising the hell out of the American program."

Instead, it should coolly survey the whole global scene and develop plans for getting the people of the world on our side.

The idea that such a board was necessary had grown on me during our Russian visit when it became evident that the Communists were moving ahead in many fields which the present western strategy neglects.

Since making this recommendation at the Press Club, I have been pleased to learn that many other Americans, both in governmental and private levels, agree that it is an

imperative requirement if we want to win the cold war.

As I visualized this board, it should plan and coordinate a program designed to surpass the Russians in fields like sports, the theater, and educational exchanges. No area should be neglected in this competition of two diametrically different systems.

Who can doubt that America would emerge on top in any such competition?

Thus far, the efforts to oppose communism's steady pressure on nonmilitary fronts have been piecemeal and uncoordinated. Planners who are enthusiastic about our progress in one area have little knowledge of what is going on in another.

In fact, they may be enthusiastic about possibilities in their own particular bailiwick and take a dim view of the potentialities of another.

For instance, some Americans think we should stress the cultural side of American life in our presentation. These people, like as not, have little regard for sports as a weapon in the cold war. Sports people are likely to believe that only their own field can capture the imagination of uncommitted millions. They are just as likely to think that culture is old hat and of no particular consequence as an ideological persuader.

The answer to this clash of opinion is that the Russians take both into consideration. That is why we need a planning board to take the large view and see all sides of competitive coexistence.

After the National Press Club speech, I had the pleasure of a long talk with Theodore Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency. He told me of several interesting developments.

This May in Paris, several famous American artists are scheduled to appear at an American festival which should give the French a better idea of our cultural prowess. Actresses Helen Hayes and Mary Martin, and Conductor Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra have already been lined up for the festival. Oklahoma will be performed by a professional troupe.

This is a step in the right direction, it seems to me, and the French shouldn't be the only people to get a look at these distinctively American stars.

The New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra is scheduled to appear at the Edinburgh Festival during the coming year, while the Toscanini-trained "Symphony of the Air" has been booked for a tour of major Japanese cities.

Streibert was quite proud, and properly so, of the cultural projects planned for next year in this field of the cold war. Right now, I might add, the Porgy and Bess troupe is on tour through the Mediterranean countries and making friends for America everywhere it appears. I heard echoes of its triumphs as far away as Moscow.

Streibert and I disagreed on only one point during our conversation. He seemed to think that what was and is being done in this field is sufficient, whereas I believe it is only a beginning and a drop in the bucket.

Through funds made available by President Eisenhower—$2,500,000 for the year, according to Streibert—a modest program has been launched. When you compare this sum with the billions which we pour out each year to our Allies, I claim a few more dollars should be spent on unveiling the American story to interested foreigners.

As I have said before, we have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor.

But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete.

I can't stress this often enough: We should seek to convey to the world—to our Allies, to the uncommitted countries especially, and to the Russians if possible—the idea that America is not only proud of its motor cars, its bathtubs, and its television sets, but of many other achievements as well.

I am certain that any cultural exchange between the United States and Russia is bound to benefit us. Within limits, I think such exchanges should be encouraged.

We have nothing to lose by exposing young Communists to the wonders of our civilization. Their faith in communism might be destroyed by a view of America with its vastly higher standard of living, its free press, its cultural institutions, its cities and its farms, and its open-hearted give-and-take.

The second half of the 20th century will determine whether Boss Khrushchev was right when he predicted that communism would win in this continuing battle of "competitive coexistence."

The faith of the Communist leader in the eventual triumph of his cause must be matched by a conviction on our side that is just as strong and just as deep.

Time alone will tell whether the free world is equal to the sacrifice, the self-denial, and the courage required to win this epic struggle with aggressive communism.

After 3 weeks in Russia, I'm more convinced than ever that our side—the side of honor, dignity and individual freedom, and a humble belief in God—will prevail over the evil scourge of communism.

What America Expects of Its Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Mrs. J. Borden Harriman is deserving of our attention. It appeared in the July 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

WHAT AMERICA EXPECTS OF ITS YOUTH
(By Mrs. J. Borden Harriman)

America is not perfect. My generation knows that. But it is ours, and it has been for a century the dream of every European. We must keep it so. Its streets have never been paved with gold, and they never will be, but I should like to think that even for the democracies in the north, we should stand as a land of opportunity and enthusiasm and riches. By riches I mean not only raw materials, armies, navies, railroads, ships, and cities, but a whole people full of good will toward the world, loyal to its own flag and beautiful continent, ready to work to educate its whole people.

The ancient republic of Greece, the modern kingdom of Greece, the ancient empire of China, the modern and war-torn republic of Asia, the United States of America, see what we have in common. That is something every American young man should study.

To prepare yourselves for the times you live in you must look over the whole world to find your allies building a world of equality of opportunity for all classes and all races, for the greater part of mankind will be happiest in a democratic society. But do not hope to have your democracy in far places, or worth fighting for elsewhere if in your own house, own schools, own factories and shops, in your own country and city, you do not find the slogans and spirit and the daily practice of helping each other and keeping your eyes open to know and guard not only your own advantage, but the common interests of mankind in justice and peace. Remember to rejoice and be happy over your blessings. Hold fast to your ideals. Lift up your eyes to the hills and realize that "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Public-Facilities Construction

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, when the 84th Congress convened on January 5, 1955, I introduced H. R. 860, to provide for programs of public-facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes. The bill also authorizes an appropriation of $3 billion to finance the provisions of the bill.

In addition to H. R. 860, which is now pending before the House Committee on Public Works, several other bills have been introduced by other Members of Congress and are pending before the same committee.

These bills are H. R. 356, 385, 553, 820, 840, 1556, 2145, 3565, 5360, and 5885.

A study of all the bills pending before the House Committee on Public Works reveals the keen desire on the part of many of us who have unemployment in our congressional districts to alleviate conditions through a Federal program for public-facilities construction.

This program will provide for the planning and construction of useful public facilities and is designed to provide permanent capital improvements of a nature which will strengthen our national economy and increase the well-being of our citizens. The projects include bridges, dams, reservoirs, and other flood-control works.

In addition, the program provides for sewage disposal plants, water purification facilities, works of reclamation, facilities for research, and other works of public construction including post offices, schools, and hospitals which aid to the well-being of our citizens in general.

Mr. Speaker, while most of the bills pending before the Committee on Public Works provide a general facilities construction program, my bill, H. R. 860, restricts such a program to areas having a substantial surplus of labor according to standards established by the Secretary of Labor under defense manpower policy No. 4 or any similar rule, regulation, order, or policy.

In this connection, such a program of public facilities construction would not only provide permanent capital improvements which will strengthen our national economy and increase the well-being of our citizens but also provide employment so badly needed in labor surplus areas where little has been done to date by the Federal Government to solve this perplexing and distressing economic problem.

According to the Bureau of Employment Security of the United States Department of Labor, among the 249 areas

surveyed 144 are classified as being in group 4–A or 4–B which means they have either a substantial or very substantial labor surplus.

It may be of interest to state that since 1949 my congressional district has been classified as an area having a substantial labor surplus and at the present time it is in group 4–B with a very substantial labor surplus since over 18 percent of the employables are unemployed.

These labor surplus areas, sometimes referred to as blighted areas, are not beneficiaries of the general prosperity that is reported to exist in the Nation as a whole.

They are the victims of economic dislocations over which they have no control. While they are working to bolster their sagging economy they need Federal assistance, not through a handout program but through useful public projects on a matching-fund basis where the political subdivision has the ability to pay its share.

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Federal Disaster Act the President has authority to provide Federal assistance to States and local governments in areas declared by him to be major disaster areas.

To date millions of dollars have been spent in these major disaster areas where floods, snowstorms, droughts, and dust storms have brought economic ruin requiring Federal assistance.

Unfortunately, however, the provisions of the Federal Disaster Act do not permit the President to declare areas where unemployment prevails as major disaster areas and therefore no Federal assistance under the Federal Disaster Act is permissible.

These critical areas are unable to meet the economic problems they are faced with through unemployment because the Federal Disaster Act does not cover unemployment resulting from economic dislocations. Therefore, those of us who represent these labor-surplus areas must ask Congress to recognize their plight and render assistance through a public-facilities construction program.

It is for that reason that I introduced H. R. 860 and I know other Members of Congress were motivated by the same reason when they introduced bills on the subject.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works will find it possible to schedule hearings on the many bills now pending before his committee that are designed to alleviate unemployment conditions through a useful program of public-facilities construction.

The Senator From Moscow (Idaho)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article on our esteemed colleague from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], which was published in the July issue of American Mercury.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR FROM MOSCOW (IDAHO)

(By Howard Rushmore)

During the censure of JOE MCCARTHY, eggheads of the liberal press overlooked the startling fact that the Senator who led the defense of the Wisconsin anti-Communist was a graduate of a university located in Moscow.

The name's the same, but pronounced differently by the good westerners who, in 1950, sent HERMAN WELKER to Washington.

Idaho is a rugged State, a stronghold of western individualism and conservative political thinking. It is no coincidence that WELKER asked for and received the same Senate seat occupied for more than 30 years by William E. Borah. The late Senator has always been an idol of WELKER's and among his most cherished letters is a recent one from Borah's widow which reads, "Every day I am grateful that we had you to represent our Idaho."

WELKER also represents a large segment of the American people to whom nationalism isn't an ugly word. Many patriotic organizations have honored the Idaho Senator for his unequivocal fight against the Communists and their camp followers, the Socialists, New Dealers, and one-worlders. He's in constant demand as a speaker by unreconstructed Republicans from coast to coast, yet on his office wall is a photograph with the inscription, "With devoted friendship, from HARRY F. BYRD."

To WELKER, the fight for America cuts across party lines. He has only warm praise for JAMES EASTLAND, the Mississippi Senator who chairs the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which the Idaho lawmaker is a member.

"Senator EASTLAND has been a real bulwark on our committee," WELKER says. "And for the past 2 years every report was signed by all Democrats and Republicans and I hope and trust this unanimous united front against the enemies of our Nation will continue."

As an illustration of WELKER's typically western characteristic of honesty before partisanship, he was the only one of the 22 Senators who voted against MCCARTHY's censureship to criticize President Eisenhower when the latter praised Utah's ARTHUR WATKINS following the vote. "I hardly think," WELKER told the press, "it is necessary for the Chief Executive to be warmly congratulating anyone."

A few weeks later, WELKER was leading the fight in the Senate for passage of Mr. Eisenhower's Formosan resolution. Friends who know the Idaho solon well say there was nothing erratic in this. "HERMAN thought the President was wrong on MCCARTHY and said so. On Formosa, he thought Ike was right."

While praising Mr. Eisenhower in a Lincoln Day speech in San Diego, WELKER told the audience: "True, I have had my differences with the President, and I shall no doubt have them in the future. I have never advocated strict, lock-step political conformity as a principle upon which to base a democratic government."

Privately, WELKER yearns for a return "to the old GOP I grew up in. Our party of late has gone too far down the line of the New Deal trend. I'd like to see it united again and strong in the face of the Communist threat."

Unlike some bird-brain politicians and bemused commentators on the Russian scene, WELKER has never swallowed the theory of "getting along with the Communists." He says: "I would sooner pick up a rattlesnake from the Idaho sagebrush and embrace it than I would embrace the belief of coexistence with the Reds."

During his years on the Internal Security Subcommittee, WELKER has been an aggressive cross-examiner of Communist witnesses and has only contempt for the comrades who crawl behind the fifth amendment. "During my career as a lawyer, I defended many men, but I never had a client plead No. 5. Leave that to the Red rats who crawl behind the Constitution only to plan its destruction."

The Senator, whom Time magazine honored by calling "a four-square McCarthyite" is, like Joe, a farm boy who came up the hard way sans finishing schools and Harvard. One of eight children, he was born 49 years ago in Cambridge, Idaho, and worked his way through law school by herding sheep and mining during vacations. He knows the miners and, when elected in 1948 to the State legislature, introduced and fought for a bill to guard the hard-rock workers from silicosis.

At the age of 23, WELKER was appointed prosecuting attorney of Washington County and was reelected twice by the voters. He then launched his own law practice and became one of Idaho's great trial lawyers. To get around his massive State, WELKER bought a plane and learned to fly. It is still one of his hobbies and he's logged more than 3,000 hours.

"It's a quick way of getting around," he says, "and you sure get a good view of Idaho."

When World War II came, WELKER was offered a commission as an Army lawyer, but he turned it down and enlisted as an Air Corps private. A training accident sent him to the hospital for 3 months and he was honorably discharged. Then came his one term in the State Capitol and his subsequent election to the Senate.

A handsome, driving sort of guy, WELKER still demonstrates the catlike physical quickness that made him an outstanding baseball player during his youth. He still spends his spare time scouting all over Idaho. Several of his finds have wound up in major-league uniforms. "Never saw a ball player who was a Communist," says the Senator.

In Washington, he's a man who earns his pay. Usually heading one task force of the subcommittee, WELKER is also active in three other divisions of the Judiciary Committee. He's not a cocktail partygoer and lives quietly with his wife, Gladys, and his daughter, Nancy, in a home near that of Vice President NIXON.

This same home was stoned and several windows broken during WELKER's defense of MCCARTHY. "The rats did it while I was away," the Senator says. "They knew all they might hurt was my wife and my 12-year-old daughter."

WELKER's activities as an aggressive anti-Communist, long before the censure vote, stamped him as a foe of the American-last outfits. Undoubtedly Idaho will be flooded with "HERMAN must go" forces in 1956 when he comes up for reelection. WELKER ignores such threats and those who know him well realize such warning signals won't stop him. As for the Senator himself, "Whatever the results of my political career," he says, "I hope to be able to say I was an American in a country that has been wonderful to me. And I gave her my best."

Discrimination? Arab Status in the Jewish State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, written by Isaac Remba, which appeared in the June 1955 edition of the American Zionist:

DISCRIMINATION? ARAB STATUS IN THE JEWISH STATE

The enemies of Israel, who spare no efforts to malign and besmirch the young state, continue to bemoan the plight of the Arab minority in Israel.

What, in fact, is the so-called plight of the Arabs living in Israel? Are they really discriminated against and treated as second-class citizens? Is it possible that sons of the Jewish people, who for centuries have undergone so much suffering because of their minority status, should themselves accord improper and unseemly treatment to the minority in the state in which they are a majority?

The Arab population in Israel has now reached the number of 180,000, 10 percent of the general population. In 1948, after the establishment of the state, at the end of the open Arab hostilities, there were only 60,000 Arabs living in Israel. How did it happen that their number has tripled in a few years? Tens of thousands entered the land illegally, and consequently were legalized by the Israeli Government. An additional large number of Arabs returned to Israel under the government's plan for the reunion of the Arab families. Recently Mr. I. Rokach, the Israel Minister of Interior, announced in the Knesset that the policy of family reunion would be further liberalized and additional thousands of Arab refugees will enter the country. (There were 3 Arab members in the first Knesset; 8 in the second.)

Government policy, approved by the Knesset, states: "The Arab minority, as well as other minorities, will be guaranteed full and complete equality of rights and obligations in the civic, political, economic, social, cultural, and every other sphere. The Government will extend assistance to the inhabitants of villages who were uprooted from their lands as a result of the shocks of war to return to permanent settlement. Education in the Arabic language will be guaranteed for all Arab children besides the obligatory learning of Hebrew."

Let us see now how did the Israel Government fulfill its obligations toward the Arab minority, and we will also try to analyze where and why the Government failed in its duties toward this part of the population.

No doubt—and no decent man will deny it, whether he be an Arab or a friend of Arabs—the Israel Government has done its utmost in the field of Arab education. The Arabs not only are not discriminated against in this respect, but are even favored in comparison with the Jewish population. Namely, while a part of the educational budget in the Israeli schools for Jewish children is covered by the local authorities, through municipal taxes, the Arab schools are financed entirely by the Government treasury.

Prior to the establishment of the Jewish State, only 45 percent of Arab children of school age were attending school. Now over 90 percent attend school. Schools increased from 59 to 109. Nearly every village now has its own school. The task to educate the young generation in Israel is a very difficult one even in the Jewish population. It is immeasurably more difficult for the Arab children, due to many factors: the shortage of Arab teachers, the reluctance of the Arabs to send their womenfolk to school, the lack of school buildings and equipment, and many other reasons inherent in the semi-feudal way of life of the Arab population. The Israel Government has built schools, bought equipment, educated Arab teachers and induced Arab parents to send their children to school, led by Arab teachers in the Arab language. The Israel educational authorities had to resort to stronger measures in order to get them to send Arab girls to school. For the first time coeducation has now been introduced in the Arab schools, and a third of the Arab school children consists of girls.

Among the complaints of the enemies of Israel that the Arab minority is being badly treated, there is also the one that Israel is attempting to break the age-old Arab tradition to confine the females at home. This is an accusation that Israel can face with pride and dignity.

The health services in Israel have done for the Arab population no less a job than the educational. The mortality among Arab children in Israel is the lowest in comparison with all Arab States. Israel has put at the disposal of its Arab population all the benefits of a modern civilized state. The hospitals, laboratories, clinics, medical services for pregnant women, and for children—all with very high standards—are available for the benefit of the Arab population. More clinics and health centers were established in Arab villages by Israeli authorities in 1 year than in a decade of the British mandatory regime.

Spectacular progress was also achieved in the Arab rural districts, thanks to the help of Israel Ministry of Agriculture. For the first time in centuries tractors were brought in to replace the primitive plow. Money loans were granted by the Ministry to Arab farmers and workers. Instead of the obsolete methods of watering, modern irrigation schemes were introduced, and crop production improved.

Government help is not limited to agriculture alone. For the first time in their lives the salaries of Arab workers are equalized with the pay of Jewish workers. Arab Government and municipal officials enjoy the same conditions and salaries as do Jewish officials. The economic standard of the Arab population in Israel has achieved a never-before-attained height, and they are envied by their brethren in the whole Middle East. Never before have they received such high prices for their agricultural products, for their vegetables, and fruits. And because the necessities of the Arab population and their traditional living standards are lower than that of their Jewish neighbors, the Arabs in Israel have succeeded in accumulating substantial financial means in a short time. The total elimination of economic discrimination and the creation of new opportunities have created prosperity in the Arab villages such as no Jewish community in Israel—due to many social and spiritual obligations—can boast.

But is was a mistake to believe that all benefits which accrued to the Arabs from the establishment of the Jewish state, would make all of them loyal citizens of Israel. Unfortunately, despite all Israel has done for them, the Arabs have not abandoned their rancor nor lessened their hatred of the new state. The propaganda from across the frontiers, led by the Jerusalem ex-Mufti Amin El Husseini, strengthened their anti-Israeli feelings. The Israeli authorities were compelled to recognize the danger of "a fifth column" on the vulnerable borders of their country. The behavior of the Arab minority caused them to take measures for the preservation of internal security and against threats to the integrity of the borders. These measures call for a limitation of certain rights of the Arab population, undertaken in Israel's self-defense.

In the areas which border on the neighboring states, a military government has been established for security reasons. The necessity of a military administration in these border areas was particularly felt as the neighboring states intensified their adversity toward Israel and infiltration took on alarming proportions. In order to check the wave of murderous infiltrations, which take place with the help of the local Arab population, a watchful eye has to be kept on the Arab inhabitants of the border areas, and their movements over the different parts of the country must be controlled.

The leaders of the neighboring Arab states, who incite the Israel Arabs to acts of sabotage against Israel, raised a cry that the Arabs in Israel are treated as second-class citizens, under a military government, in contrast to the civilian administration all over the country. But refusing stubbornly for years on end to conclude peace with Israel, repeating incessantly their threats of a "second round" and continuing ceaselessly their hostile acts, promising their brethren that "soon they will be liberated from the Israel yoke," they force Israel to take steps for the security of its borders and the safety of its population.

In some instances, in places where the Arabs lived right on the borders of Jordan, Syria, and the Gaza strip, and so were in steady contact with the "other side," the Israeli authorities were compelled to transfer the Arab inhabitants further into Israel and to requisition their property. The Knesset passed a law which compensated them for their losses; they were given new land; new houses were built for them and adequate means of living were procured to them. Here again the Arab propagandists and other mischiefmakers raised the outcry that Israel discriminates against its Arab citizens and does not treat them on an equal footing with the Jewish citizens.

The precarious state of Israel's security made it necessary to exempt the Arabs in Israel from compulsory military service, unless they wish to enlist voluntarily, and some of them did. And again those who would wish the Israel Arabs to be given arms to use against Israel, and certainly not to help to drive away the infiltrators and to prevent their incursions, complain loudly against Israel's discriminatory laws, which do not grant the Arabs the same rights as the Jews.

It is fair to note that Israel public opinion, in large part, while it understands that all the precautionary measures are a necessary evil, regrets the state of affairs, and, under pressure in certain less-vulnerable spots, the military government was replaced by an ordinary civil administration, and in others the rules of the military governors were relaxed.

The Israel population would be more than happy if all restrictions on the Arab population could be abolished, if the 180,00 Arabs living in Israel could be integrated as loyal citizens of the state, if they were ready not only to enjoy the privileges of citizenship but also to give their share in fulfilling the obligations of citizens. Unfortunately, the day has not come yet. It will come when they realize that the hope to destroy Israel is a vain one, when the neighboring Arab states recognize the existence of the State of Israel in their midst and accept the outstretched hand of Israel for peaceful relations for the common good of the whole population of this area and the whole free world.

Baiting Duck Hunting Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 9, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent charges against Director John L. Farley, head of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter received from Mr. Ralph A. Nissen, vice chairman of the wild game and public land use committee of the California Farm Bureau Federation.

This letter gives another side of the picture and would seem to vindicate some of the charges made about luring ducks within shooting distance by baiting hunting areas with grain:

CALIFORNIA FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION,
Berkeley, Calif., June 17, 1955.

Hon. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNGER: Our attention has been called to a United Press release from Washington, D. C., quoting charges by Representative HENRY REUSS, Wisconsin, that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is allowing "wealthy game hogs" to lure ducks within shooting distance by baiting hunting areas with grain and that duck shooting over baited areas was common in California.

In order that the record may be kept straight we want to advise you of our support of Director John L. Farley's reported response—that because of the unusual problem in California, arising from growing crops during the duck-hunting season, the State requested a special feeding program to prevent crop destruction by ducks.

This statement is quite correct. The State of California did request regulations which would permit out-of-the-sack feeding on duck club areas not closer than 200 yards from any blind. A license with a $5 fee is required and regulations strictly enforced by the State department of fish and game. Violations are at a minimum.

This procedure is only a part of the crop depredation program carried on in California by our fish and game department in cooperation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, farmers, and sportsmen. The 200,000 acres of club lands located in some of the major agricultural producing areas in the California flyaway play an important part, along with State and Federal waterfowl management areas, in keeping the millions of ducks off ripening grain, rice, and legume crops at the height of the migration.

An organization has worked closely with governmental agencies, landowners, and sportsmen over a period of years to accomplish what has been done. We supported the out-of-sack feeding program as an important feature of the overall program. Cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service has been excellent.

Many people from other sections of the country do not appreciate the need and the importance of the crop-depredation program to California agriculture. The effectiveness is evidenced by the fact that crop losses running into millions of dollars 10 years ago have been reduced to a comparatively negligible amount. Nevertheless, the threat is with us each year and we cannot afford to have any phase of the program jettisoned.

Please be assured of our appreciation of your understanding of our local problem and of our continued support of effective crop-protection programs for California agriculture.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH A. NISSEN,
Vice Chairman, Wild Game and Public Land Use Committee.

Opposition to Antitrust Immunity for Business Under Defense Production Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the statement I made before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency today in opposition to S. 2163 and S. 2165:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am grateful for your kindness and cooperation in scheduling my appearance before this subcommittee. Members of the Banking and Currency Committees in both Houses deserve the thanks and commendation of the people of this country for their diligence and ability in presenting to the Congress proposed enactments dealing with our defense program which were models of legislative draftsmanship. Mandatory control legislation is complicated at best, and I believe considerable credit for the successful transition of this country from a peacetime to a mobilization economy and a subsequent return to more normal conditions is due this committee.

The success of the defense legislation drafted by this committee has been attested to by many eminent persons who have pointed out that almost all of the controls necessitated by the Korean conflict have now been removed. OPS, PAD, DPA, are now buried with their brethren wartime Government agencies, with only their records in the Archives remaining as epitaphs to their eminent success. Thus, it was that your committee was able to state—and I think with some degree of satisfaction—that as of 1953:

"Very substantial expansion in the Nation's capacity for the production of goods and services since Korea has brought supply and demand in most segments of the economy substantially into balance. That is why it has been possible to decontrol prices and wages and essentially limit the use of materials controls to military production. That is why it has been possible to discontinue the general distribution of materials throughout the civilian economy except for a few scarce and critical items essential to defense."

It is just because of the successful progress made by this Nation under the statutes previously drafted and recommended by this committee that I today strongly urge upon you to allow another section of the Defense Production Act to expire at this time according to its terms. I refer specifically to section 708.

Section 708, unfortunately, is not one of the better known and more widely discussed provisions of your Act. It is, however, in my consideration, one of the most significant and far-reaching pieces of legislation now on the statute books of the United States. I do not feel I exaggerate in this regard. Let me summarize, in brief, exactly what this portion of the act permits, so that you will see with me some of its tremendous implications.

First, it authorizes the President to consult with representatives from various sectors of the economy with the view toward approval by the President of voluntary agreements and programs to further the objectives of the act.

Second, the act provides that—

"No act or omission to act pursuant to this act * * * if requested by the President pursuant to a voluntary agreement or program approved under subsection (a) * * * shall be construed to be within the prohibition of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States."

What these and other provisions of section 708 do, in effect, is to authorize the President directly or his designate, who must secure the approval of the Attorney General after consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, to exempt conduct in violation of the antitrust laws from prosecution if such conduct is requested in the interests of the defense program. In other words, with no limitations as to the nature of the activity involved, immunity from antitrust prosecution may be granted by this statute. This may be justified in an all-out emergency. When the emergency is over, however, competition and free enterprise should be encouraged, not lessened.

I therefore believe this committee must now seriously question whether there is any longer need for abandoning our traditional antitrust policy in favor of concerted action among competitors and special treatment for monopolies.

We have, of course, recognized that in times of dire emergency, certain exceptions to our antitrust laws and free competition must be made just as during such periods, certain exceptions to the personal liberty and freedom of individuals occur. To be perfectly frank, as the price of survival, we had no choice. Wartime, unfortunately, has therefore been a catalyst which has stimulated the development of monopolies and retarded the growth of competition; it has led to procurement policies favoring a few select concerns with military and Government purchase orders while smaller firms were literally driven to the wall. When my monopoly subcommittee studied the recent mobilization program, it found that 55 percent of the total volume of prime defense contracts had gone to just 100 large corporations. A similar experience was had in World War II when, between June 1940 and September 1945, two-thirds of the prime contracts awarded by the Government had been placed with the top 100 corporations. Thus, as Donald Nelson frankly confessed, during wartime "business firms of subaverage size more often than not did get the dirty end of the stick."

Take the matter of allocation of materials which are scarce. Small companies without historical positions with large suppliers or without integrated facilities of their own are unable to obtain raw or semifabricated products and perish by the thousands. Even today, as you know, small aluminum fabricators are finding it difficult to obtain needed supplies from the large producers, such as Reynolds and Kaiser, notwithstanding the fact that these latter corporations have profited by millions of dollars through Government tax-amortization programs and other assistance.

I need go no further to emphasize the fact that the effects of monopoly are heightened and the tempering effects of competition halted during emergency periods. But gentlemen, isn't that all the more reason for

removing monopoly restrictions and preventing further restraints of trade just as rapidly as we can upon the termination of a wartime crisis?

These voluntary agreements provide a ready vehicle for serious restraints upon the country's economy. As the Attorney General himself said in a sharply critical report on the potential effects of such agreements under the act:

"The use of voluntary agreements and programs to carry out the mobilization program may result in business enterprise, vigorously competitive in normal times, evolving common courses of action to restrain production, retard technical development, limit expansion, reduce quality, and raise prices. To the extent that the mobilization program requires joint action by businessmen, opportunities are presented to work out restrictive agreements either within or without the framework of a Government-sponsored program. It is important that the public need shall not become a cloak for concerted action undertaken privately to the public detriment."

I emphasize to you again that the antitrust laws have formed the basic foundation of this country's economy since the Sherman Act was put on the books in 1890. Deviations therefrom, such as are proposed to be continued in section 708, have been permitted only under the most serious national emergencies. The provisions of section 708, for example, were enacted solely because of the grave situation confronting the Nation as a result of the Korean conflict. As the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee explained in the report he submitted on behalf of the act:

"The second fact is that in spite of these considerations we are at the moment faced with certain grim problems."

Similar considerations motivated this committee as explained in the committee report accompanying the Defense Production Act of 1950:

"The seriousness of the situation which was thrust not only upon the United States but upon the whole world as well when the forces of communism were unleashed on the Republic of South Korea has impressed upon every American the necessity and importance of taking prompt and vigorous action to meet the threat of Communist aggression."

Even in the period of crisis, however, I want to point out that no attempt was made to forsake utterly our reliance upon competition and free enterprise. As this committee so forthrightly stated in its report accompanying the Defense Production Act:

"The situation (referring to the crisis) has been the motivating factor in all the considerations of your committee in making an effort to bring out a bill broad enough to give the Executive necessary powers to cope with this critical situation, but not so broad as to regiment the economy of our Nation to the extent that the fundamenal democratic principles of free enterprise are endangered."

I submit to the committee that in view of the drastically changed conditions which have obviated the need for mandatory rationing of scarce materials, the control of prices, and vast authority for supervising agencies, there is no longer any need at all for continuing the immunity provisions accorded to businesses from prosecution under the antitrust laws. Indeed, the better argument lies on behalf of removing these immunities and encouraging more vigorous enforcement of these statutes so as to promote free and open competition. Yes; far from "encouraging the making * * * of voluntary agreements and programs * * *" as advocated in the specific language of section 708, we should devote more of our attention toward discouraging such agreements and other restrictions upon competition.

I have thus far limited my remarks to opposing the extension of section 708 for another 2 years as is provided in S. 2163. I would like to devote the remainder of my remarks to S. 2165, which would not only extend the section of the act but would make such far-reaching extensions in the voluntary agreement program as presently established by statute so as to render the antitrust laws virtually useless in this area of the economy for the next 20 years.

Section 4 of this bill, S. 2165, would add a new section to 708 as now constituted, which would enlarge the exemption provision substantially. Under the law as it now stands, exemption from the antitrust laws is given only for the period, and I quote, "while this act is in effect." In other words, all immunity will vanish should section 708 be allowed to expire at the end of June of this year. If the act is extended for a 2-year period, exemption for activities will be allowed until June 30, 1957—but no longer. If you read S. 2165, however, you will see that it empowers the President to continue any exemption already granted and approved for a period as long as 20 years. And this immunity will stand, notwithstanding the fact that Congress may have seen fit in the interim to let the act expire by its terms. In other words, the immunity and exemption may be granted for a period of time in futuro although Congress may very well believe that there no longer exists any need for the Defense Production Act or section 708.

As Dr. Flemming, ODM Administrator, testified yesterday, extension of the immunity provisions of the Defense Production Act beyond the termination date of the act was recommended by the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws. The Attorney General's national committee indicated that such extension may be needed at least with respect to programs for preserving the supply of critical and strategic materials from abroad. It indicated extension also may be needed to protect large-scale investments committed in such programs for long periods of time.

The House Antitrust Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, in connection with its recent exploratory hearings on current antitrust problems has investigated extensively the Attorney General's Committee and the recommendations made by it. You should recognize that the Attorney General's Committee did not undertake to collect statistics or to assemble a body of factual data with respect to the antitrust problems on which its recommendations were based. The Attorney General's National Committee primarily undertook to examine the existing case law in the antitrust field and attempted to enunciate a theory encompassing all past cases and statutory enactments in this field. Accordingly, this committee should realize that the recommendation of the Attorney General's Committee with respect to the advisability or necessity for extending the immunity provisions of the Defense Production Act are not based upon an examination into Government and business activities under section 708. Nor were these recommendations based upon economic studies or security considerations upon which any justification for authorizing immunities beyond the extension period of the Defense Production Act must rest.

Furthermore, in addition to having neither the information nor the qualifications for passing upon the factors involved in granting immunities, under the Defense Production Act, this Attorney General's Committee's recommendations suffered from other deficiencies. Our Antitrust Subcommittee has received considerable testimony bearing upon the objectivity of the Attorney General's Committee's recommendations. Testimony has been presented that of the 61 members of the Attorney General's Committee, 42 members were attorneys practicing in the antitrust field primarily representing corporate defendants. Further half of these practicing attorneys either personally or through their law firms represented defendants in antitrust cases instituted by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission which were pending at the time the committee prepared its report.

Witnesses before our subcommittee have claimed that lack of fair representation for divergent viewpoints on the Attorney General's Committee resulted in bias in the committee's recommendations. It may be that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, before it acts upon recommendations attributed to the Attorney General's Comany particular interests would receive special mittee, may wish to investigate into whether advantages from extension of the immunity provisions of the Defense Production Act in the manner recommended.

As you know, the Department of Justice did not and does not endorse the recommendations of the Attorney's General's Committee. The Attorney General himself has under study at the present time his committee's recommendations in order to ascertain which he wishes to endorse. It therefore seems anomalous for the Defense Mobilizer, Mr. Flemming, to base proposed legislation upon these recommendations without any other economic or policy basis therefor.

On June 14, 1955, I requested the views of the Department of Justice with respect to S. 2163 and S. 2165 concerning extensions of the immunity provisions of section 708. In Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes' response to my inquiry the Department did not adopt the Attorney General's Committee's recommendation. He emphasized that the Department of Justice takes no position at all with respect to either the necessity for extending the antitrust immunity provisions of the Defense Production Act, or for exempting from antitrust certain conduct beyond the termination of the Defense Production Act. The position of the Department of Justice seems to be that these problems rest upon national security considerations beyond the competence of the Department of Justice to evaluate. Justice is concerned that the existing procedures for granting antitrust immunity not be changed in such extension. Judge Barnes said specifically, and I quote:

"S. 2165's declaration of policy, as well as the necessity for amending its present antitrust exemption to effectuate defense aims, rests on national security considerations beyond the competence of this Department to comment upon. Accordingly, I assume Congress finds necessary extending present law. In addition, I assume Congress concludes that, to best effectuate defense policies, certain conduct be exempt from antitrust even beyond the Defense Production Act's proposed 2-year extension. My comments thus focus upon means for assuring that in administering whatever exemption Congress deems necessary, antitrust considerations are brought to bear in a forceful and timely fashion. * * * What justification is there for extending immunity under the Defense Production Act longer than the requirements of the Defense Production Act? Justification for authorizing immunity beyond extension of the Defense Production Act must rest upon national security considerations beyond the competence of this Department to evaluate."

I wish to put this letter into your record at this point.

Accordingly, it would seem to me that before determining this question, it is incumbent upon your committee to examine thoroughly into the past operations of the Government and activities of industry under section 708 programs. The answers to the following questions, among others, would afford a basis for ascertaining whether in fact further extension of the immunity provision is necessary at the present time:

1. How many programs involving international trade have been granted immunity under section 708?

2. Are there any voluntary agreements now in operation or proposed concerned with stockpiling strategic raw materials?

3. What evidence did the Attorney General's Committee have with respect to the need for extension of the immunity provisions of section 708?

4. What evidence did the Attorney General's Committee have with respect to the need for extending these provisions beyond the expiration date of the Defense Production Act?

5. Has the President requested any voluntary program which required the participants to commit large funds for long periods of time? What are they? Are any of these programs now operative? Are any now proposed?

6. Does the Department of Justice review the activities of the participants in voluntary programs in order to ascertain whether the participants adhere to the terms of the program? How current is the Department's review of existing approved programs?

7. What qualifications did the Attorney General's committee possess for evaluating national security questions which justify the authorization of immunity beyond the period of the Defense Production Act?

8. Is there any evidence available anywhere as to the need for continuing the immunity provisions of the Defense Production Act?

9. Is there any evidence available from any source indicating the need for giving 20-year immunities from antitrust prosecution?

The amendment to S. 2165 suggested jointly by the Department of Justice and the Office of Defense Mobilization, set forth on page 2 of Assistant Attorney General Barnes' letter to me, does not meet my criticisms. All that it accomplishes is to insure that the President's delegate, if one is appointed, will get the approval of the Attorney General and consult with the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. The amendment still permits the President personally to authorize voluntary programs and permits immunity to be granted for 20 years after the expiration of the act with no standards, limitation, or supervisory control.

While Judge Barnes' statute, of course, is to be preferred to the statute as now written, it nevertheless leaves unanswered the basic questions:

1. Is there any need for giving immunities?

2. Why must any 20-year exemption be given?

As I said before, I understand that the Attorney General does not feel qualified to answer these questions.

The power accorded under this new section to exempt from the antitrust laws is a blank check delivered to the President to repeal the Sherman Act for any special or influential group for as much as 2 decades. If you look carefully, you will see that the extension may be made by the President or his delegate merely upon the formality of making certain findings which cannot be challenged anywhere, either judicially, legislatively, or executively. Nor need the President obtain the approval of the Attorney General or the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. In fact, consultation with these expert agencies is not even required under the bill as presently written.

I do not wish to belabor the point, Mr. Chairman. But if you will ask yourself certain questions, I am sure you will see with me that this new section is fraught with serious implications to the very basic economic framework of this country. Who is to supervise these agreements exempted from the antitrust laws during the 20-year period? How can anyone know if the activities of the concerns involved will, with a 20-year monopoly franchise, continue to "further the objectives" of the Defense Production Act as required by statute? Who will the President select to make the formal findings required by the statute providing for 20-year exemptions?

I deplore witnesses who present a parade of horribles before a committee, Mr. Chairman. But I must confess that if this new section is enacted, it would be well to establish at the same time a new Cabinet post entitled Secretary of Monopolies who would award 20-year monopoly franchises to well deserving institutions with power, prestige, or a long history of contributions to campaign funds. The power to grant monopolies, gentlemen, was one of the evils of royalty for which revolutions were fought in Britain. I trust you will not permit those who would seek special privileges to obtain this right in the United States without even a struggle.

Gentlemen, let me make my position on this legislation clear. I believe that with the passing of the crisis that had actually involved the United States in a shooting war, we are presently in a position to accomplish virtually all of our defense requirements within the traditional framework of the antitrust laws. Free competition has provided the American people the wherewithal to resist open aggression in the past, and, certainly, will continue to do so in the future.

I want to add, nevertheless, that if you, in your wisdom, see fit to extend the immunity provisions from the antitrust laws, they should be carefully limited to terminate at the end of the Defense Production Act. We need no widespread monopoly licensing provisions which would grant a privileged few the right to violate the antitrust laws for as much as two decades with no supervision or control. Immunity, if immunity there must be, should be confined to the period in which you extend the Defense Production Act for all other purposes. And any exemptions from the act should be carefully restricted to matters coming within the aims, objectives, and purport of the basic statute.

WOC PERSONNEL

Section 5 of S. 2165 provides for the establishment of a reserve force of WOC's so that they would be ready to take over top Government positions in the event of any emergency. I believe the committee should carefully study the background and need for such a provision before enacting any such provision.

Reference was made in your hearings yesterday to our experience with these WOC's during World War II. I would therefore respectfully call to your attention in this connection the study of WOC's made by the Truman committee (S. Rept. No. 480, 77th Cong., 2d sess. (1942), pp. 7–10). In part, this is what the committee concluded—and I commend the report in full for your study:

"Although the contracts obtained by the companies loaning the service of dollar-a-year and WOC men are not passed upon by the men so loaned, such companies do obtain very substantial benefits from the practice. The dollar-a-year and WOC men so loaned spend a considerable portion of their time during office hours in familiarizing themselves with the defense program. They are, therefore, in a much better position than the ordinary man in the street to know what type of contracts the Government is about to let and how their companies may best proceed to obtain consideration. They also are in an excellent position to know what shortages are imminent and to advise their companies on how best to proceed, either to build up inventories against future shortages, or to apply for early consideration for priorities. They can even advise them as to how to phrase their requests for priorities. In addition, such men are frequently close personal friends and social intimates of the dollar-a-year and WOC men who do pass upon the contracts in which their companies are interested.

"These are only a few of the advantages which large companies have obtained from the practice, and it should be especially noted that they are the very same ones which the small and intermediate businessmen attempt to obtain by hiring people who they believe have 'inside information' and 'friends on the inside' who could assist them in obtaining favorable consideration of contracts. Therefore, in a very real sense the dollar-a-year and WOC men can be termed 'lobbyists' * * *.

"The committee is opposed to a policy of taking free services from persons with axes to grind, and the committee believes that the Government should not continue to accept the loan of dollar-a-year and WOC men by companies with so large a stake in the defense program."

Our experience with these WOC's in the recent hot-war period of Korea has been no more successful. Mr. Fleming referred to the Executive orders of the President designed to implement the WOC provisions of the Defense Production Act with respect to the use of WOC's. But these were blatantly and continue to be blatantly ignored. For example:

1. Section 102 (a) of Order 10182 provides that as far as possible "operations under the act shall be carried on by full time, salaried employees of the Government." However, Mr. Chairman, if you read the statements of officials in setting up the Business and Defense Services Administration, you will find that there is expressed a preference and an avowed policy of hiring WOC's notwithstanding the availability of Government personnel on a paid basis. This policy was expressed by Mr. Weeks in a speech describing the aim of the new Business and Defense Services Administration on June 9, 1953, as follows:

"We propose * * * (5) to establish approximately 20 main industry divisions with key advisers, recommended by various industries to represent them, and staffed for operation purposes by industrial experts from the career services, * * * the functions of the proposed business services agency will be to. * * *(6) See to it that, while private business, of course, cannot dictate Government policy and plans, it be placed in a position where it can effectively approve or disapprove of the implementation of such policy and plans from the standpoint of their practical workability in every day industrial operation."

And, of course, that is exactly what this legislation would approve of on a long-term basis.

2. Section 301 (d) of Order 10182 requires that in obtaining WOC's, the administrator or head of the hiring agency must certify that he has been unable to obtain a person with the qualifications necessary for the position on a full-time, salaried basis. Mr. Chairman, it would be interesting indeed to see in how many instances even the slightest attempt was made to find full-time Government employees before hiring a WOC. Certainly that can't be the policy now when a preference has been expressed in the Business and Defense Services Administration for hiring WOC's without thought to whether there were qualified personnel on a paid basis available.

3. Section 301 (c) requires that in appointing WOC's for the head of the department to certify "That the appointee has the outstanding experience and ability required by the position." If you examine how WOC's have been and are chosen in practice you will find that they are appointed not on the basis of individual merit but on a company rotation basis. Large companies are requested—yea, urged, to send a man to Washington to staff the agency. The agencies get what the company can spare. As a result, you will find that any number of WOC's have been nothing but salesmen, with no particular skills to contribute that

could not have been found elsewhere. A number of WOC's have been so called "Washington representatives" of large and powerful concerns. And it would make a most interesting study to learn how many WOC's once having worked in the Government thereafter remain in Washington to represent their companies in Government transactions.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to leave with you for inclusion in your record, pp. 78–91; and 97–98 of House Report No. 1217 of the 82d Congress which has some valuable information relating to the use of WOC's. This study was completed by a subcommittee of which I was chairman. The committee concluded that: "the employment of WOC's during the mobilization period should be kept at a minimum." If this conclusion was true during a period of actual hostility, how much more is it valid now during a period when there is no overt military action.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, the committee should require Secretary Weeks to furnish it a list of all WOC's with positions they have occupied in government and their corporate affiliations. I respectfully urge a full and complete examination of the WOC program before any such blanket recruitment of persons representing private interests for important government policy provisions is undertaken by statute.

Let There Be Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Howard Watson Ambruster.

Mr. Ambruster is a noted author, newspaper columnist, and lecturer.

LET THERE BE LIGHT—PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE POLIO VACCINE PROGRAM WILL NOT BE RESTORED BY DOUBLETALK AND CONTINUED MYSTERY ABOUT ITS PRODUCERS

(By Howard Watson Ambruster)

There is something rotten in Denmark in the mysterious postponements which have been demanded by the Public Health Service in the Salk polio vaccine program, pending a reappraisal of the various lots of the preparation which had been released previously as meeting all of the required tests for purity and efficiency.

Back in 1930 conditions in the crude drug and medicinal industries got so bad, and the nonenforcement of the law so flagrant, that a senatorial investigation was forced by several of the foremost medical and pharmacological authorities in the country.

After a month of hectic hearings, secret records of the Food and Drug Administration were forced into the open. These revealed astounding conditions of callous indifference to the legal standards of certain products by the largest of the nations pharmaceutical makers.

Likewise these heretofore unpublished official files proved that a deliberate policy of nonenforcement of the law had been in effect, insofar as the gigantic corporate sacred cows of the drug industry were concerned. Some housecleaning then took place.

It may well be that the official mystery and doubletalk which has so delayed the polio vaccination program will result in another drastic congressional investigation which will turn on the light on what it is which has so sadly messed up Dr. Salk's great achievement for the protection of the Nation's children.

It would now appear that some one inside of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may have called to the attention of Secretary Hobby the decidedly spotty record of the six pharmaceutical manufacturers that have been licensed to produce this vaccine.

The Cutter Laboratories of Berkeley, Calif., fell under suspicion because of the unexpected coincidence of affliction with polio, resulting in several deaths of children, almost immediately after receiving their shots of Salk vaccine which had been produced by that company.

Some publicity has already been given to the fact that the Cutter Laboratories has been in trouble with the Food and Drug Administration a few years ago, that several of its shipments of the solution of sodium chloride had been seized and condemned and that the company had paid a fine of $600 for some of these violations.

The record of this company is far worse than this casual appraisal. In addition each of the other five manufacturers of the vaccine have also been involved in court actions for adulterated or misbranded medicinals since the present Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act went into effect in 1939.

It should be added that there are so many loopholes and soft spots in that statute, as a permissive regulatory law in which the mandate for enforcement was deliberately omitted, that it would require a drastic congressional investigation to drag out into the open all the facts relating to violations which are never aired in public. Congress might well demand to see the secret records of private hearings on violations on which no action has ever been taken, save possibly an equally secret letter of warning to the offenders which is never given any publicity, and which warning, as is entirely legal under the tricky language of the law, may be repeated over and over again for the same offense by the same violators.

It should also be understood that the actual official control over production and testing of the Salk vaccine does not come under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, but is covered by the Virus, Serum, and Toxin Act of 1902. The Administration of this statute has always been under the Public Health Service. It now rests with Dr. Victor Haas, Director of the National Microbiological Institute, under the overall supervision of Surgeon General Scheele and Secretary Hobby.

During the half century of its existence the administration of this serum and vaccine control law has always been shrouded in mystery. No reports of its regulations, and of enforcement actions, appear to have been made by the Public Health Service at any time. The Food and Drug people have always adopted a hands off policy on serums and vaccines made and distributed in the United States despite the law's definition of the term "drug" to mean articles recognized in the official United States Pharmacopoeia and "articles intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment or prevention of disease in man or other animals."

The United States Pharmacopoeia, which lists each of the official USP medicinals recognized and administered by the medical profession through their Rx prescriptions, includes an official assay, or method of testing for purity, for all such preparations, except serums, toxins and vaccines. The latter are merely described briefly by name and general characteristics, with the added information that the preparations must be prepared under regulations established by the Public Health Service of the United States. These regulations are not set forth, nor are the tests stated in detail, as in other official United States patent assays. What this policy of secrecy has concealed all these years may supply the answer to the existing impasse.

Meanwhile examination of the records of Cutter Laboratories in official publications of the Food and Drug Administration reveals that during the years 1942 to 1948 some 29 different shipments of many thousands of ampules and flasks of that firm's preparations were seized, condemned by Federal court decisions, and ordered destroyed.

One of these seizures, in 1942, covered a shipment of "distilled water" to Savannah, Ga. This "safety tested" water, represented to be used "for injection," was found to be adulterated and misbranded in that it contained impurities which rendered it unsafe for this medical administration to hospital patients. This court action was published over 2 years later as: D. D. Notice of Judgment under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, No. 978.

The other 28 shipments of Cutter products involved a variety of solutions, the purity of which is vital to the physician who may make use of them in cases of serious illness among his patients. These include: Dextrose isotonic solutions of three chlorides or of sodium chloride; dextrose in lactate—Ringers solution; sodium citrate and sodium chloride solutions; or Vitadex-B in isotonic solution of sodium chloride.

The shipments went to hospitals and physicians in many States of the Nation. Each parcel was condemned and ordered destroyed by the courts on various dates over a 5-year period from 1943 to 1948. Further details are revealed in the published Notices of Judgment Nos. 1113, 1372, 1375, 1423, 1424, 1612, 1712, 1973, and 2851.

However, the real story of the Cutter Laboratories' long series of failures to properly check-test these preparations, and the consequent result of lax enforcement of the law for serious violations, were revealed in May 1948 by officials of the American Medical Association and of the Food and Drug Administration after the former had been advised by an indignant Kentucky physician that several of his patients had suffered serious injury following injections of one of the Cutter solutions.

Then later (much too late) investigation by the drug officials turned up similar cases elsewhere, including reports of at least three deaths which came in from Kentucky and Florida, of patients who were already critically ill when they received injections of Cutter solutions.

Physicians and hospitals throughout the country were then warned of what had been uncovered about these particular Cutter solutions. However, it was then discovered that subsequent shipments of one of the other Cutter products, Ringers solution, were also contaminated. All hospitals were then notified that Cutter was recalling not only these solutions but also others which had been produced in the same department of the Cutter Laboratories.

It was over a year after this debacle, and 6 years after the first seizures of Cutter solutions as contaminated, before the Food and Drug Administration felt called upon to institute a criminal prosecution, which the present law permits but does not require, against Cutter. This was not based upon the long list of defective shipments which had been condemned, but merely upon the last 5 which had been shipped in 1947 and 1948 from the Berkeley plant to hospitals and physicians in Georgia, Florida, New Jersey, Illinois, and Washington. These were dextrose and sodium chloride injection solution and Ringers solution, which were not sterile as represented.

Cutter made no defense and a California judge graciously fixed the penalty at a nominal $600—this under a law which would have permitted the fines to be $1,000 for each of the 5 shipments. Likewise should the responsible officers of the corporation have been included in the prosecution, the same

fines and a year in jail for each shipment could have been added to the penalties in this case.

Aside from the suspicion which already has been directed at the Cutter firm it may now appear that one of the reasons why the Public Health officials have postponed the Salk vaccine program, in order to make a reappraisal or personal check of the tests already made, and of the employees who made them, at the huge manufacturing plant of Parke Davis & Co., was a justifiable suspicion that all was not well inside that organization.

Some one may have examined the record of grossly illegal violations of official drug standards under the present law, as revealed in some 34 court actions in which more than 30 different drug and medicinal items, held or shipped by Parke Davis, had been found to be adulterated or misbranded, or both. This examination of the record would have revealed that despite these repetitious violations of the law no criminal prosecutions appear to have been instituted. Moreover, on all but a few instance these parcels of drugs and medicinals, after being condemned, were permitted by the courts to be returned to Parke Davis under bond, to be reconditioned, or otherwise "brought into compliance with the law."

A summary of these actions follows:

Notice of Judgment No. 560: Shipment of bonita livers, condemned on September 10, 1941, as adulterated with filth. Part destroyed and part released under bond.

Notice of Judgment No. 601: Bromo capsules and Rx capsules, condemned on August 18, 1941, as adulterated and misbranded. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 761: Shipments (two) of laxative cold tablets and Rx pills, condemned as misbranded, and shipments of epinephrine tablets for hypodermic use, condemned as both adulterated and misbranded—in four different court actions in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Ohio, during the year 1942. The cold tablets, Rx pills, and a portion of the hypodermic tablets were ordered destroyed; the balance being returned under bond to the maker "to be brought into compliance with the law."

Notice of Judgment No. 969: Shipment of pituitary solution, condemned on April 12, 1943, as adulterated and misbranded. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 1219: Shipment of chloroform, condemned on June 13, 1944, as adulterated and misbranded. Released under bond not to be sold again as an anesthetic.

Notice of Judgment No. 1289: Shipment of bandage compresses, condemned June 19, 1944, as misbranded. Released under bond to be resterilized.

Notice of Judgment No. 1470: Shipment of Digifortis (digitalis) condemned February 20, 1944, as adulterated and misbranded. Released under bond for remanufacture and relabeling.

Notice of Judgment No. 1569: Parcels of Jamaica ginger, arnica flowers, and 18 other seizures of crude medicinal drugs, in the possession of Parke Davis, condemned in 20 different court actions as adulterated because of insect infestation or containing rodent excreta; while stored in a building infested with insects and rodents. Released under bond to be brought into compliance with the law (reconditioned).

Notice of Judgment No. 1673: Several shipments of thyroid tablets condemned on August 13, 1945, as misbranded as to potency and the quality of the glands used in their manufacture. Released under bond for reprocessing.

Notice of Judgment No. 1823: Shipment of bandages condemned October 30, 1945, as adulterated and misbranded. Released under bond to be reprocessed.

Notice of Judgment No. 2166: Shipment of Theelin in oil, condemned on April 16, 1947, as adulterated. Released under bond for reprocessing.

Notice of Judgment No. 3268: Shipment of Elixir Aletis-Helonias Compound, condemned September 12, 1950, as misbranded. Ordered destroyed.

Consideration of the record may indicate that this huge corporate producer of vital medicinals, including the Salk vaccine, may have certain loose spots in its organization which the Public Health Service desired to scrutinize before giving another go-ahead signal to the program.

These court actions constitute only a relatively small part of the recent Parke Davis history which may have influenced Dr. Scheele in demanding another look at the company's procedures.

In February 1952, the name of the Nation's largest maker of medicinal preparations was given a severe jolt when the press carried front-page stories of the death of a physician's son in Los Angeles which the father claimed was due to administration of a relatively new Parke Davis product called Chloromycetin.

Then the June 28, 1952, editorial of the Journal of the American Medical Association called its readers attention to the questionable results obtained from the administration of this preparation; and in the next issue were three articles dealing with alleged fatal results from its use. The worst blow to the remedy came in an AMA press release on July 3, which warned all physicians on Chloromycetin therapy. This incident had a serious effect on the sale of antibiotics by this company and further distribution of Chloromycetin was restricted under a new label warning physicians to administer it with great caution.

The moral of this episode may appear in the lack of those precautions by its maker, when this remedy was first marketed, which later were found to be imperative.

Another of the licensees of the Salk vaccine is the old established firm, Sharp & Dohme of Baltimore, Md., which produces serums and like products at its old Mulford plant at Glen Alden, Pa. Sharp & Dohme was taken over some years ago by Merck & Co., of Rahway, N. J.

Sharp & Dohme's recorded encounters with the current drug law include eight different seizures and condemnations as follows: Notice of Judgment No. 87—Shipments (2) of tincture of digitalis and of Digitol (digitalis), condemned on December 29, 1939, the former adulterated and the latter both adulterated and misbranded. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 659: Shipment of laxative cold tablets, condemned August 6, 1941, as misbranded. Released under bond to be relabeled.

Notice of Judgment No. 1521: Shipment of ampuls of water for injection, condemned March 5, 1945, for adulteration with living mold. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment Nos. 1611 and 1170: Shipments (4) of ampuls of water for injection and of ampuls of solution of sodium citrate, condemned in May, June, and September 1945 as adulterated. Ordered destroyed.

Here again there were no criminal prosecutions. But in only one instance was the item returned to the maker to be fixed up.

The Pitman-Moore Co., of Zionsville, Ind., division of Allied Laboratories, Inc., and one of the Salk licensees, appears on the drug law records in seven court actions, as follows:

Notice of Judgment No. 1944: Shipment of Natronox (an animal medicine) condemned on May 22, 1946, for misbranding in that claims made on the label were false and misleading. Released under bond for relabeling.

Notice of Judgment No. 2369: Two shipments of sodium chloride isotonic solution, condemned in August and November 1947 for adulteration as contaminated with undissolved material. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 3513: Shipment of Estrotron (extract from the urine of pregnant mares) condemned on June 12, 1951, as adulterated and misbranded. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 3611: Shipment of Estrotron, condemned on September 5, 1951, as adulterated and misbranded. Released under bond to be brought into compliance with the law.

Notice of Judgment No. 3629: Shipment of Estrotron, condemned on October 29, 1951, as adulterated and misbranded. Released under bond to be brought into compliance with the law.

Notice of Judgment No. 3672: Shipment of Estrotron, condemned as adulterated and misbranded, ordered released under bond to be brought into compliance with the law.

Here again there have been no criminal prosecutions for repeated violations on the same product.

John Wyeth & Bro., Inc., of Philadelphia, known also as Wyeth Laboratories, and owned by American Home Products Co., is another of the makers of the Salk vaccine that has been haled into court under the new drug law on several important medicinals as follows:

Notice of Judgment No. 1421: Shipments (2) of dextrose ampoules and of sodium iodide ampoules, condemned in September and December 1944 as adulterated with undissolved material. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 1573: Shipment of ampoules of thiamine hydrochloride for intravenous injection, condemned November 15, 1944 as adulterated with undissolved material. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 2025: Shipment of epinephrine hydrochloride for hypodermic injection, condemned September 23, 1946 for adulteration as contaminated. Ordered destroyed.

No criminal prosecution for Wyeth.

Finally the second generation firm of Eli Lilly & Co., which bears a high reputation among the older drug houses, is revealed to have been involved in court actions under the current drug law covering five of the Lilly preparations, as follows:

Notice of Judgment No. 466: Shipment of tincture of digitalis, condemned June 18, 1941, as adulterated for low potency. Ordered destroyed.

Notice of Judgment No. 4021: Shipments (4) of acetylsalicylic acid tablets; ophthalmic ointment; potassium iodide tablets; and rhinitis tablets, each condemned March 21, 1953, as misbranded.

It may be remarked here that in the manufacture of any chemical or medicinal preparation which is required to meet exacting official tests or assays, the one controlling factor is that of the number and character of the factory batch tests which have been made during the compounding of the product and the final check tests when it is ready for shipment. Sloppy supervision, false economies in the personnel involved in the testing and in the number of tests made, can, and too often do, have disastrous and fatal results when the product is a medicinal the purity of which is essential to its successful administration to the patient.

This reporter, having had years of industrial experience in supervision of the production of chemical and drug products which were required to meet exacting commercial or official tests, can testify without fear of contradiction that no medicinal product could ever leave a manufacturing plant in a defective or adulterated state, provided only that sufficient check tests had been made before shipment. The official tests by which the public officials and the courts condemn medicinal preparations are precisely the same tests which should have been made before the products left the maker's plant. There is neither mystery nor difficulty attached to these controls. But they do cost money; in some instances the cost of proper test controls is an appreciable part of the cost

of the product. Hence, the temptation to cut corners and take a chance that nothing is wrong, or that even if a product is defective it may get by anyhow.

When this conditon is complicated by lax law enforcement the result is the situation which has prevailed for many years on our food and drug products, especially since the old Wiley Food and Drugs Act, which had teeth in it, was replaced in 1938 by the flabby Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with enforcement left to the whims and pleasures of the officials in charge of it.

It should be added here that several of the six licensees for the Salk vaccine were concerned not so many years ago in the senatorial investigation of lax enforcement of the old Wiley Food and Drugs Act, already mentioned. This involved the use of illegal adulterated Russian ergot of rye in preparations administered to mothers at childbirth. Adulterated digitalis, anesthetic ether, and fluid extract of Jamaica ginger also figured in these hearings which brought to light the secret records of the Food and Drug Administration proving beyond all question that the law had been grossly violated and that adulterated products uncovered by the officials were neither seized nor prosecuted.

The present Food and Drug Commissioner, Mr. George P. Larrick, then an assistant to the Deputy Commissioner, was also involved in those senatorial hearings.

But that is another story.

Canada and the Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item which appeared in the column Washington Wire, in the June 20, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine, is deserving of our attention:

WASHINGTON WIRE

(By T. R. B.)

When you cross the imaginary line that separates the United States from Canada the trees and houses look the same, but there is a difference. You are in a country where the Government governs. In Canada every child is getting the Salk vaccine without any fuss, and the Government is paying the bill. Only rarely does something like the Salk vaccine make United States citizens look north. We analyze Europe, we survey Asia, we ignore Canada.

Practically every type of social legislation which conservatives in the United States say would bankrupt the country is in vogue in Canada. The result is that Canada's dollar sells at a slight premium over the United States dollar. Her credit is better than ours. Her children also get the Salk vaccine when ours don't, and get it free.

Here are some of the horrifying socialistic things the Canadian Government does: It owns and operates a coast-to-coast broadcasting system, TV system, air-transport system, and railway system—most of these in competition with private companies. It owns and runs a worldwide shipping and cable system. Among other things, it operates huge grain-storage terminals and has scattered enterprises like hotels and uranium installations.

But this isn't all. Every Canadian at 70 automatically gets $40 a month for the rest of his life, let alone what he may also get from a provincial government. The old codgers aren't even humiliated with a means test; they get it as a matter of right and can look you in the eye after this disgraceful handout. This shocking situation has gone on for 3 years. But worse still is the family allowance law—Canada's "baby bonus"—whose 10th anniversary comes this July 1.

We hope the revelation we are about to make never comes to the attention of any true-blue United States conservative, for the shock might be too great (we are confident he won't read about it in the conservative local press). For 10 years the Canadians have been quietly paying the mother of every child born in the Dominion, whether Montreal housewife or Eskimo squaw, in cash or kind, $5 a month till the child is 6; $6 till it is 10; $7 to 13, and $8 to 16. We submit to our readers that the real danger to American institutions is not Moscow but Ottawa. Was this legislation rammed through by a bare majority of left-wing fellow-travelers? No; as we explained, the atmosphere is different in Canada. On final passage not a single vote was cast against the measure.

So let's all get together and ignore Canada. Let's give three hearty yawns if any oaf happens to mention the 10th anniversary of the revolutionary Canadian family-allowance act. Big business in the United States knows better than to approve that sort of government interference. And as a result • • • Ford has just had to sign the first guaranteed annual wage contract, because where the government doesn't underpin the family economy (as in Canada) big business is going to have to shoulder the load (as in the United States of America).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for suoscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed general Government appropriations bill as well as bills on Renegotiation Act and International Finance Corporation.

House passed bill authorizing construction of Trinity River reclamation project and 79 private bills.

Bill to simplify customs laws cleared for House debate by Rules Committee.

Conferees agreed to file report on bill extending selective service and doctors draft.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7492–7508

Bills Introduced: 11 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2277–S. 2287; S. Con. Res. 42 and 43. Pages 7493–7494, 7502–7504

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. Con. Res. 42, S. 332, 501, 578, 871, 987, 2171, H. R. 880, 935, 943, 968, 973, 977, 988, 995, 997, 998, 1028, 1047, 1083, 1157, 1158, 1205, 1299, 1300, 1337, private bills (S. Repts. 584–609, respectively);

H. R. 4221, authorizing certain officers of Federal penal institutions to administer oaths and take acknowledgments (S. Rept. 610);

H. R. 4549, S. 288, 1159, 1522, H. R. 3359, private bills (S. Repts. 611–615, respectively);

S. Con. Res. 39, recognizing on the occasion of her 75th birthday, June 27, 1955, the efforts of Miss Helen Keller in behalf of physically handicapped (S. Rept. 616);

S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, with amendments (S. Rept. 617);

H. R. 3659, increasing the criminal penalties under the Sherman Act (S. Rept. 618);

H. R. 4954, to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the U. S. to recover damages under the antitrust laws and to establish a uniform statute of limitations (S. Rept. 619);

S. 1287, to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under Foreign Service retirement and disability system (S. Rept. 620); and

S. Res. 116, favoring discussion at the coming Geneva Conference of the status of nations under Communist control, reported adversely (S. Rept. 621).

Pages 7493–7494

Bills Referred: 9 House-passed bills and 1 House-passed resolution were referred to appropriate committees.

Pages 7491–7492

Private Bill: Conference report on H. R. 1142, a private bill, was adopted. Page 7508

Authority To Report: Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to file reports during adjournment of Senate. Page 7504

General Government Appropriations: Senate passed with committee amendments H. R. 6499, general Government matters appropriation bill for fiscal 1956.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for a conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Magnuson, Hill, Ellender, Robertson, Dirksen, Saltonstall, and Knowland. Pages 7508–7509

International Finance Corporation: Senate passed with committee amendments S. 1894, to provide for the participation of the U. S. in the International Finance Corporation. Pages 7510–7514

Renegotiation: Senate passed H. R. 4904, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years, after adopting committee amendments and a modified Morse amendment providing for review of injustices resulting from application of the act. Pages 7514–7521

National Park Museums: Senate concurred in House amendment to, and cleared for President, S. 1747, to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto. Pages 7521–7522

Committee Expenditures: Senate adopted two resolutions, as follows, respecting expenditures by committees: S. Res. 106, to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and with

Appendix

Address by Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, Before Interstate Oil Compact Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on June 17, the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], delivered a very interesting and enlightening address before the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, at Denver, Colo. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Governor Stratton, members of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, ladies and gentlemen, this meeting here today affords me an opportunity to discuss with those who have responsibility for the conservation of the oil and gas resources of the United States what effect if any there will be upon your programs and policies if the atom becomes a fuel.

This Nation hears enough—sometimes, I think, too much—about the atom as a weapon. It is only 10 years since Alamogordo, 10 years since men of science lay silent behind bunkers in a cold New Mexico dawn and wondered if the monstrous thing would go off. I have talked with men who were there and know the tenseness of the moment. Then came the brilliant flash, a light that could be seen hundreds of miles, and a roar that rumbled and thundered against the mountain peaks of my home State. And then silence—very sober silence—again.

It was like the coming and going of our lives: "A little noise between two silences."

From that day on, men have talked of peace, but have experienced very little of it. Rather we have talked of our capability for war—of the 20,000-ton TNT equivalent of the bomb at Hiroshima, of improved yields from smaller devices, of a superbomb ,that might someday come, of its coming, of the measurement of its yield in megatons, and finally of how big the newest bomb might one day be built, so big that civilization itself could be its only target.

For nearly a month the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been holding hearings on the military application of the atom. Witnesses by the score have paraded their statistics before us: so many planes able to carry this or that bomb, so many storage sites, so many airfields; then the targets, the count of the possible defending force, the capabilities of his planes and bombs, and finally a war game to see how we came out.

Actually it is a relief to come away from it to the clearer air of this mile-high city and to discuss with you what role the atom may play in the future of oil.

Not that I know. But we are trying our best to find out and to pass on to the American people what the future may be.

A French writer has said, "Men prophesy, and the future makes fools of them." Yet the business of prophesy goes briskly along, and my only excuse for any excursion into the future is that I come by your invitation and I can ask you to deal gently with my shortcomings.

One thing about the future is definite: it will not suffer for a lack of statistics. The President's Materials Policy Committee published the so-called Paley Report, five volumes of excellent graphs and figures taking us up to midcentury. Palmer Putnam, under contract with the United States Atomic Energy Committee, published in 1953 a substantial volume entitled, "Energy in the Future." I could—and probably shall—draw heavily upon those works for any computations as to the future of oil in an atomic age, but I do it with assurances that I for one do not take these standard works as infallible, that I use them only to pose questions, the answers to which the joint committee is now earnestly searching.

With that, I take my first plunge: How fast and for how long will population in the United States and over the earth continue to grow?

There is some agreement among the many who have studied the past and projected the future. It comes down to something like this:

In the 700 years following the birth of Christ there was little or no gain in world population.

The first doubling of world population took 950 years after that, bringing us to 1650 A. D.

The second doubling required another 200 years, bringing us to the year 1850.

The third doubling took only 100 years—to 1950.

The next doubling should take even less—85 years—and we should reach it by the year 2035.

But Tuesday of this week, I got the latest returns. In 1940, world population was 2,170,000,000. In 1953, the United Nations placed it at 2,547,000,000—the fastest rate of increase ever experienced. Now the students of world population see the fourth doubling by 2010 and possibly by the year 2000, with a world total of 7 billion people by the year 2050.

Last Friday—a week ago—the population of the United States was 164,799,000.

The Paley Report, on a 1945 census figure, estimated United States' population by 1975 would reach between 180 million and 220 million, and used 193 million as a reasonable compromise. Already the later reports indicate that, barring a disastrous war, the upper limit was more nearly right.

I don't know, but the joint committee has appointed a special panel on the impact of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It will have to weigh and measure and come up with many answers. Maybe in a year, through the endeavors of the members of the panel, I can give you a better answer, but the figure of 220 million people in the United States of America by 1975 seems reasonable to me today.

What would such a population worldwide and in this country do to fuel requirements?

Here we go again. In current magazines there is a full page advertisement by a New York bank which is headed, "How many barrels, how many gallons * * * in 1975?" The first paragraph of that advertisement reads, "The country's great thirst for petroleum products should grow from 2,375 million barrels in 1950 to 5,000 million barrels in 1975, an increase of 110 percent * * * according to an authoritative projection." The projection was taken from the Paley Report.

That's one man not afraid to prophesy. Now we will take another, Mr. Putnam, in Energy for the Future. He adopts a unit of measurement—10 to the 18th power in British Thermal Units—equivalent to 38 billion tons of bituminous coal or 180 billion barrels of oil—and measures past burn-up of energy in order to estimate future needs. He finds:

That from the beginning of time until the year 1850, about six units were used by the entire world.

In the next century—1850 to 1950—four units were used.

In this year of 1955, we will use about one-fifth of a unit.

From that, he predicts that by the year 2000, the world will be using a full unit a year, five times as much as we are using now. To get from this year 1955 to the year 2000 the world will need total energy resources equivalent to 2,000 billion barrels of oil.

Now let me hasten to say this: I know that all the crude oil we will ever recover from the earth is already laid down. It has not all been discovered, but it is in place and no more will be made in our generation or in the lives of our children or our children's children.

Further, I believe that the proved world reserve of oil today is about 115 billion barrels of oil. I have seen estimates that there may be 500 billion barrels of oil in undiscovered oil reserves.

In addition, there may be some additional undiscovered oil reserves in the beds of the oceans that encircle the earth, but recovery from these would be economically unsound if scientifically feasible.

Therefore, I assume that some fuel other than oil and more transportable than coal will be needed by the end of this century, if not long before.

Whether the calculations of the Paley report or Mr. Putnam's study are right or wrong is not vital. Our panel will study the problem anew and may get other and more persuasive answers. But the record shows that the use of petroleum increased 2½ times between 1925 and 1950. In this period use of waterpower increased 4 times and gas 5 times. Coal remained static.

Those figures suggest the speed with which the oil industry has expanded. Waterpower has grown also, but I am certain that we all understand that if there is a ceiling on the final recovery of crude oil, there is likewise a ceiling on waterpower. In fact, within the United States the best dam sites have already either been used or are engineered for early construction, making the end of waterpower expansion more nearly in sight.

The rapid expansion in the production and use of petroleum in America since the turn of the century has paralleled and been tied to the rise of the automobile industry.

Essentially, these are but accompanying features of the same picture, since with all

the varied uses of petroleum, its use as a motor fuel has always been the dominant use and is most likely to continue in that position. The whole petroleum industry is so geared to the improved and expanded production of gasoline for automobiles, trucks, and buses that it is the center around which most of the technological developments have gravitated. The chief objective is still to secure from crude petroleum the maximum yield in motor fuels, especially in gasoline.

Today there are about 58 million motor-vehicle registrations in the United States. These cars and trucks consume 52 billion gallons of motor fuel each year. We are not able to project how rapidly motor registrations will grow, but the Bureau of Public Roads has estimated that by the year 1965 there will be 80 million motor-vehicle registrations. While no one attempts to estimate exactly how many cars we may have by 1985, the Bureau has assumed that even if the rate of growth does not keep pace with the record of the past, even if the 80-million registration figure of 1965 is taken as the top limit beyond which the number of cars in America will never go, then the Bureau still estimates that by 1985 we will be using 100 billion gallons of gasoline per year for motor-vehicle fuel—about double what we are using now.

That doubling in the requirement of motor fuel oil tells a story to the oil industry. Examination of the principal uses of petroleum from 1940 to 1954 shows that the percent of refined products coming from a barrel of crude oil has averaged about 44 percent. Early, it was as low as 19 percent. The fact that 43 or 44 percent of every barrel of crude oil, both domestic and foreign, that is processed in the United States goes into motor fuel indicates that whenever the motor fuel requirement of this country is doubled, then the supply of crude oil becoming available from domestic or foreign sources will need to be very substantially increased. That remains true even if by better cracking processes more of it is used in the shape of motor fuel than is now the case.

We should use the products of our petroleum reserves for their highest purpose. By that, I mean the purpose which they fill, in their most specialized and refined form, better than any other product. For example, during World War II, the highest form of commercial petroleum was commonly thought to be 100-octane aviation gasoline. This gave the Allies the edge over the Germans in air-to-air combat. This made petroleum as 100-octane gasoline more valuable than lower gasoline grades plus other by-products. There is a continuing need for high-octane aviation fuel today. In fact, automobiles today are using gasoline once thought suitable only for aircraft. Therefore, I say to you who are watching and attempting to conserve the oil resources of this country that it need come as no shock that there is a possibility that uranium may move in at some future date and take away the amount of petroleum used for heating homes and factories, may finally take away the market for bunker oil in the propulsion of merchant ships and submarines and finally may deprive the oil producers of this country of a market for their product in the shape of fuel for locomotives. But I am convinced from the figures at hand that as long as the automobile and the small truck remain customers of the oil industry, that industry will be as busy as it can be taking care of those demands.

I have been talking about needs for oil products which may grow faster than will the development of nuclear power. Actually, there is a big question if the atom will ever drive a passenger-type automobile. I will deal with huge trucks and transports later, but I am talking now about our private automobiles.

Fuel for them is a market of transcendent importance. We have become a Nation of two-car families and the third car is a necessity for families with several children. Right now the automobile buyer seems to desire bright colors, and even if that desire dies away we will probably continue to trade in our cars every few years. We like the new ones.

That one fact causes me to doubt if nuclear power will ever supplant or even supplement gasoline as a source of power in private cars. The nuclear plant might run forever. You would never be compelled to stop at the corner filling station to fill the gas tank or change the motor oil. Engineers might make a tiny reactor so safe that you could crash into another car and not be splashed with radioactive death from under the hood.

But is that what you really seek—steady driving without a stop for weeks, months, and years? The paint would wear off, the transmission would get loose, but most of all, the style would change. You would want something new. So you might not be willing to pay initially several thousand dollars for the nuclear power plant in your car when the cast iron one, using gasoline, would cost a few hundred.

Assume the engineers could find new ways of shielding you from radioactivity, assume they could cut the weight from 50 tons to 500 pounds, assume all the favorable factors you can. You would still face the probability that cost plus the desire for a new car every other year would work against the nuclear-powered vehicle. That's why for many generations to come, oil will find in America and around the world an expanding market.

Where, then, will oil lose out to atomic power? Our special panel will be looking for a good answer which will be available to you a year from now, but I think the series will go like this: first, electric generating stations; second, submarines and surface ships; third, central heating for apartments and factories; next, huge airplanes; and last, railroad locomotives. You make up your own list, filing in the items I have left out. My sole purpose is to say that the oil industry may lose some customers to a new fuel precisely as coal lost some customers to oil and gas; but the loss will not be fatal, and in one man's opinion, may be offset by the growing market developed by the transition from the 2-car to the 3-car family, by the steady drop in popularity of streetcar transportation, and by the increase in motor vehicle registrations in this country to eighty or a hundred million in the next 20 to 30 years.

Now for a brief look at the markets that oil may lose. There seems to be little doubt that large electric generating stations may be the first. Already five large reactors are ready for construction and another at Shippingport, Pa., is under way. Present processes are costly and the initial investment is high, possibly $250 to $500 per kilowatt of installed capacity for a nuclear reactor. Nobody has built a commercial power reactor, so these figures are only estimates. They were prepared, however, by experts in the field. This cost must be balanced against something in the neighborhood of $165 to $200 per kilowatt of installed steam plant capacity.

But the future is much more promising. It may enable us to eliminate the present steps of turning atomic reaction into steam and then using the steam to turn generators. Then the cost of fuel for power would be virtually zero.

It seems to me that the general direction of basic scientific research today is toward the elimination of this wasteful procedure—toward the direct conversion of atomic reaction to electric power. Electricity, though long used, has remained a relatively little-understood phenomenon. We will have to learn more about the atomic process before this step can be taken, but I am convinced it is on the way.

What effect would this knowledge have upon the world? We can only guess. But the guess is enough to stagger the imagination.

Throughout history engineers have based their design of machines and powerplants upon the premise that energy was expensive. Generators were built to hold costs down.

What if energy suddenly were as abundant and cheap as the air we breathe and just about as readily utilized? I think that is possible, once the direct conversion of atomic reaction to electricity is accomplished.

One of the reasons why I believe it will be accomplished lies in the history of atomic energy itself. Fifty years ago men of scientific background indulged in atomic research. If anyone had questions their formulae scrawled on blackboards and had been told, "I am going to split the atom," he probably would have dismissed the scientist as a day-dreamer of questionable intellect.

Albert Einstein indulged in just such day-dreaming and drew many a jeer. The effort he invested in such thought has resulted in the atomic age. Much money also was invested after 1900 in basic research in physics and chemistry on the so-called foolish assumption that man some day would release the tremendous energies of the sun which were bound up in a bit of matter also too small to comprehend, much less to measure.

Today we can comprehend the atom and can measure it scientifically and exactly. If you are interested, I will give you the figure, and if you doubt me, you can go home and measure it yourself. An atom is one ten-trillionth of an inch. If you would rather have it in fractions, write down 1 over 10 million millions.

Man himself is about midway in size between the atom and the solar system. He is about 10 billion times the size of an atom and the solar system is about 10 billion times bigger than man.

Man weighs about 30 billion billion billion times as much as the atom. If you want to write that down on the back of an envelope so you can remember it when you get home and tell it to your unsuspecting wife, put down the figure 3 and follow it by 28 ciphers. If she can't read it, she will at least be impressed with the size of the problems you are dealing with in this meeting.

Seriously, our investment today in basic research will result in discoveries as astonishing as those Einstein gave to the world. As our fathers invested in atomic research which came to benefit us today, our current investment will benefit our sons, their sons, and the generations to follow. It is this hope that a cheaper way will be found to generate energy that is leading some of the Nation's largest manufacturers into the atomic energy field.

We now know where to find a staggering amount of energy—inside the atom. The problem is, "How do we use it?"

We are like the men who dreamed of conquering the immense Congo River in Africa. There flows through the heart of that gigantic continent a river so incredibly vast that the energy of its onrushing waters has forever withstood the puny dreams of men who visualized dams spanning its brown waist. Men found an impossible task if they sought to dam it, much less to thrust its boiling, swirling, roaring water through turbines.

Unable to master this tremendous river—the job was just too big—engineers went 50 miles away along a tributary to build a dam. There, insignificant compared with the Congo, was a stream of the size and force that man could handle.

We may hope that the way will be found to provide power by reactors in the conven-

tional way now contemplated. By that I mean the use of radiation to generate large amounts of heat, using the heat to generate steam, and using the steam to turn turbines as in ordinary steam plants.

How soon will these model-T reactors take over the functions of oil-fired plants? I say the transition will be slow. By 1975, in the opinion of men who have studied the subject, not more than one-fourth of our plants will be nuclear. Present plants will be allowed to wear out. By the year 2000 or by 2050, 90 to 100 percent of our power will come from splitting the atom.

One of the factors which will bring this about is the cost of getting fossil fuel to steam plants. It has been necessary in the past to locate power plants close to a low-cost source of energy—falling water, coal measures, or oil or gas fields. Where this could not be done, the fuel had to be transported.

Any product which can cut the cost of transportation probably will be sought to replace fossil fuels. One of the advantages of uranium is that a single pound of the fissionable variety U–235 equals in total energy 2,600,000 pounds of coal or 260,000 gallons of oil. Hence transportation is almost no problem with nuclear fuel. That is why it threatens the use of oil in electric generating stations.

Now we should turn to the second category: submarines and surface ships. Oil now is used to propel them. Uranium reactors may some day replace the oil burners. Present technology in the use of oil may not match the theoretical performance of a nuclear reactor.

For example, a ship would have to carry 91,000 tons of oil to yield the same energy as a single pound of uranium. The turbines and other components of the propulsion unit might be roughly equivalent in weight to a reactor. But the cargo space used to carry the fuel would be available for payload with a nuclear power plant.

Yet the really startling thing about nuclear reactors is that they permit a submarine such as the *Nautilus* to cruise at top speed indefinitely. The power is many times greater than conventional at the start. Performance and endurance are virtually unlimited.

A comparison, although a poor one, might be this: Imagine yourself owner of a truck which could speed indefinitely under full load in high gear up and down the steepest grades at 80 miles per hour. Would it not add tremendously to the capabilities of the trucking firms? A single truck might do the work of several ordinary types because it could do more work faster.

Because a ship powered by uranium could operate without useful life for as long as 50 years, the high initial cost of uranium as opposed to oil would make the nuclear reactor feasible, and the extra cargo space thus made available also would help pay for the reactor. Thus oil use in submarines and surface ships seems likely to be ended in two or three more decades.

No time should be required to discuss the possibilities of the use of nuclear power for central heating in communities and its role in supplying the needs of office buildings, apartment houses, and factories. Every advantage that would flow from the use of this energy in a submarine or a merchant ship would seem to apply, of course, to its use in the office buildings where it could work through every month of the year producing a steady flow of easily regulated atmosphere not too hot or too cold, not too wet or too dry, and perpetually free from germs and dust particles. There is, however, the possibility that the nuclear-developed electric current from the generating station would be so cheap that a reactor would not be placed in each individual building, but, instead, cheap electricity would operate the devices by which we would heat and cool our homes, our offices, and our workshops. So count as a possible lost market for oil our space-heating systems.

Today both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense are speeding up design for an atomic-powered airplane. The use of the atom in a plane raises problems not encountered in the building of a submarine. We on the joint committee have talked these over with Admiral Rickover, the designer of the *Nautilus*—in fact, I did it aboard the *Nautilus* far below the surface of the sea. We have been pressing the Secretary for Air and the Secretary for Defense to ask Congress for more money to speed up this new type of transportation. The future looks good—maybe not for nuclear power in a fighter the size of the Russian MIG or our F–86, but for a huge bomber where the weight of the reactor and its shielding will not be so important and where speed in flight can be sacrificed to size of the flying fortress and to its ability to patrol the skies above the atmosphere, out of reach of fighter planes, and to its power to cruise high in the air for a month at a time.

When such a ship is achieved oil may lose one of its most prized customers; but if the experts are right, that day is still many years away.

After aircraft in the order of transition might come railroad locomotives and possibly even huge trucks and transports. Today the oil consumed by rail locomotives requires only 3 percent of the total oil production. A great deal of this business has been won by the oil industry since the war when railroads made their great conversion from steam to diesel propulsion. While oil, having won so recent a victory from coal, could almost as quickly lose it to uranium, my guess would be that it will not come soon, although the locomotive is a logical place for a uranium reactor. Weight is not a critical factor in the locomotive. In fact, a certain amount of weight is desirable.

Thus we can run through the gamut of possible market losses of the oil industry but the entries are not all on the debit side. There are some credits to be written down—gains that the oil industry may make because of the atom. That is particularly true in the field of radioactive isotopes. Our committee has published pamphlets outlining the contribution of atomic energy to agriculture and to medicine. It could with almost equal propriety present a very interesting booklet showing the contributions now being made to the oil industry. That assistance like some social-security programs that are advocated, reaches from the cradle to the grave—from the very moment that a geologist starts to map and outline a structure to the day when the refined products of the producing oil wells are sent through pipelines to the tanks of their distributors.

Allen Johnson, manager of the AEC at the Idaho Testing Station, spoke before the American Petroleum Institute at Casper, Wyo., last April. You would do far better to get a copy of his speech and read it than to listen to me, but pending the time that you do that I want to quote briefly some of the points which he made.

He told his listeners that the oil industry is today the largest industrial user of atomic energy—energy utilized in the form of radioisotopes.

"The oil industry's use of these unique materials," said he, "dates back to 1939, 6 years before the atomic bomb became a reality. Importance of radioisotopes in the oil industry is underlined by the fact that one company, Tracerlab, announced early this year that it has put into operation at Houston, Tex., what it believes to be the first laboratory specifically designed to supply radioactive materials to the oil industry."

What are some of the benefits the oil industry is enjoying from atomic energy? Let us look at a few.

Sensitive instruments which record natural radioactivity from the ground are now being used to help locate oil deposits because such deposits have less natural radiation than other parts of the earth's crust. After the atom has helped find the oil it shows up in another way to help in the drilling. (I am trying to show that these are real benefits to oil in its race for markets against its benefactor.) As the mud comes out of the drill hole it is checked for radioactivity and when you get close to your hoped-for oil deposit the gamma ray log will tell you where you are. If you missed the productive sands, the log will also tell you that.

Another technique called neutron logging is being used to help reduce uncertainty in bringing in oil wells. As the oil flow starts, sometimes the well has to be acidized—a tricky operation. Now radioactive iodine is being added to the acid to insure detection when the acid arrives at the right level in the well.

Other applications of radioactive materials are to control water flooding of oil fields, test oil well casing cement for leaks, locate precisely the level of oil or gas bed in solid domes and thus control brine recovery, and tag cement to locate its level around a well casing. In the field, the driller can tag his bit with radioactive material so it can be found if it is lost or can quickly be located if it becomes stuck.

Radioactive tracers are being used to test the wells; used also in the pipelines carrying the oil from the fields to the refineries and from the refineries to the points of consumption. Radioactive tracers permit ready location of the go-devil in case it gets stuck as it moves along in old oil lines to keep them clean. Finally radioactive tracers are put in the oil itself at the head of the various columns as they are pumped through the pipelines, thereby permitting ready identification of the interfaces and providing a tremendous reduction of the waste that used to go to the slop tank for reprocessing.

And this isn't all.

Radioactive materials are being used in dozens of ways in the petroleum laboratories and in the refineries themselves. They are even being used to insure uniformity of blending and to check on pipe leakage.

You might want to measure the contribution of atomic energy to the oil industry against any possible competition the atom may offer it. It helps keep down the cost of energy from oil. Remember that oil won many markets from coal because the cost of coal kept going steadily higher until it lost its competitive advantage. The oil industry can safeguard its own future by keeping its costs in line.

What will have become of oil? Perhaps we can find a parallel in history.

How many of you have stopped to think of the role of wood in the energy picture? When our Pilgrim forefathers landed at Plymouth Rock, the eastern third of our Nation was covered by a dense woodland. Farther west, across the Great Plains, almost endless pine forests stretched from horizon to horizon in the immense mountain ranges of the Rockies, the Sierra Nevadas and majestic Northwest.

Wood in those days was so abundant that it was the principal source of energy. When steam engines came along, they were fired with wood. River boats and railroad locomotives carried wood, not coal or not oil.

Then came the time when great areas of the American forests were cleared. The wood was burned—just to get it out of the way. It was so abundant it had almost no value.

What is the case today? Wood no longer is cheap. Virtually no one uses it as a source

of energy to generate electricity, propel river boats, or even heat homes. Lumber has become an expensive item in the building of a home. It is so valuable as wood that it is too costly to be burned as fuel.

So I would suggest that oil can take courage from what happened to wood. When many of its present markets are gone; it may be so valuable as a chemical that men will still search it out and find it in the remote corners of the earth.

The members of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission and the men and women of the oil industry as citizens should watch closely the development of peacetime uses of the atom. Representatives of this Government will join with those of other nations in a conference at Geneva next August 8, and spend 2 weeks discussing ways to share our skills and programs with any nation which seeks to help us in our search for peace.

When the establishment by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of a panel to study the impact of the peaceful atom was announced, I pointed out that the present highly industrialized nations (and therefore the most advanced and powerful) were those countries which won the 19th century industrial revolution because Providence had put them on the top of large fuel deposits. It was costly to transport fuel, more costly than to transport cotton which the mills at Manchester could spin and, therefore, the fuel-owning nations were able to compel the rest of the world to deal with them on their own terms.

The age of nuclear power will have a different characteristic. It will be often less costly to export nuclear power plants to remote sections of the world than to import the raw materials. Future processing plants will grow around centers in broad lands like Africa where raw materials are abundant rather than on the sites of fuel deposits.

We are not the only industrialized nation which is pressing for nuclear power development. We will not be the only people able to display a reactor at Geneva nor the only one competent to offer one for sale to nations, such as Switzerland, which now stand ready to buy. Russia and England are making great headway. Belgium, Germany, and Italy have ambitious plans. Around the winner of this race, underdeveloped power-hungry nations may group themselves in new satellite orbits far different from present alliances.

The atom comes not to be ministered unto but to minister, to help preserve the well being and prosperity of this Nation. It needs the partnership and cooperation of every facet of our industrial life. My closing hope, therefore, is that our thoughts will rest not on the competition which the atom may seem to present, not on the elimination of one type of fuel in a particular operation, but upon the continued growth of an entire economy to which both the oil and the atom will make continued and outstanding contributions.

Commendation of Senator Symington for the Increased Appropriation for the Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal commending the position and the work of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] in connection with the increased appropriation for the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE EXTRA MARINES BECOME A SYMBOL OF HISTORIC CHANGE

When times are quiet, the urge to economize is understandably great. It is all the greater now, with a presidential election coming in 1956, when the incumbent administration naturally would like to show new proof of money saved and taxes—maybe—lowered.

But if it impairs national defense, we think the urge ought to be squelched. We agree with Missouri's Senator SYMINGTON that fresh knowledge of recent events makes past and projected savings on our Air Force highly dangerous, that Congress ought to resist the temptation to save more money now by new cuts in military manpower.

Senator SYMINGTON has scored a resounding if incomplete victory for these views. A majority of the Senate rejected the President's military judgment for the first time by voting an extra $46 million to keep the Marine Corps at its present strength of 215,000, some 22,000 more than Ike had planned. And the Missourian dropped his demand for $200 million for increased fighter-plane production only after Air Force Secretary Talbott, pressured by the public uneasiness voiced by SYMINGTON, told the Senate that the Air Force has recommended increased production of two new supersonic fighters and that the administration has decided to speed up B–52 jet bomber production.

The Missourian didn't push his fight to save an extra 88,000 men for our standing Army. We wish he had, though the wisdom of centering his fire for an all-volunteer organization like the Marine Corps is obvious. But the two-count victory he won for those Americans increasingly critical of the administration's defense policies was a notable one nevertheless. We believe there are sound reasons for it.

The administration's big arguments for progressive reductions in our military strength have been that (1) our Air Force topped anything in the world, (2) the new military Reserve program would justify cuts in our standing forces, and (3) President Eisenhower, once our top general, ought to know better than anyone else what we need for defense.

The first argument has been shaken by the administration's own admission. Last year Defense Secretary Wilson soothingly assured us that the Russians were building "primarily a defensive air force." Last month, however, the Defense Department admitted that the Russians were already staging formation flights of intercontinental jets—the kingpin of offensive airpower—while the United States equivalent, the B–52, was yet to be delivered. This shocked and astonished Senator SYMINGTON, a former Secretary of the Air Force, as well as a good many other persons.

Then, after secret Senate hearings, Senator SYMINGTON was shocked even more. After hearing evidence denied the public, he believes that the United States today is leading in only one class of airpower while Russia is ahead in two, probably ahead in two more. We are ahead in medium-size bombers, he says, but the Russians have thousands more modern jet fighters and may be well ahead of us with the intercontinental ballistic missile—the ultimate weapon, at least in our time.

The second argument—that a greatly strengthened Reserve program would justify cutting our standing strength—has come a cropper from a combination of executive and legislative ineptitude. At the moment there is no new Reserve program, and little likelihood that even if one were adopted it could change what the administration admits to be a deplorable situation of weakness in less than 4 or 5 years.

The third argument, the old one about General Ike knowing better than anybody else about what we need for defense, has some holes in it. Congressmen who adopt it uncritically are abdicating part of their job and placing an intolerable burden on the wisdom of one man. And that one man, Senator SYMINGTON sensibly recalls, was not exactly right in 1950. As a revered and expert adviser, he was one of the chief architects of the Truman-Johnson move to whittle our military budget below the $15 billion mark—but not the man criticized for the woeful unpreparedness revealed by the Korean war just 5 years ago.

Aside from that, there is the human suspicion that any retired general, dealing at a remote distance with career militarists he last knew as vastly junior to him, would be more inclined to listen approvingly to the politically appealing moneysaving ideas of such expert businessmen as Treasury Secretary Humphrey and Defense Secretary Wilson.

The Senate, for the first time, rejected the administration's we-know-best arguments. This clears the air in a historic manner, and we hope the House concurs. Those extra 22,000 marines may be more important as a symbol of more legislative independence or truly critical analysis to come, but it will be reassuring to have them around anyway—along with that promised beefing-up of the Air Force. Better all this, surely, than to get caught short again and wish it hadn't happened.

Unveiling of Statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the 17th of June 1955, the statue of Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, a native of the State of Louisiana, was unveiled in Statuary Hall of the United States Capitol in Washington, D. C. Chief Justice White was one of Louisiana's most illustrious sons. The South gave tribute to one of its greatest men and the whole United State is taking note of a Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court whose contributions to the growth of the Nation are of the highest order.

The very facts of Edward Douglass White's life placed him in the center of our Nation's history. Within his own days he spanned three different eras of existence in our country. When he was born in 1845 in Thibodaux, La., as son of the owner of one of the largest sugar plantations in LaFourche Parish, he entered into the period of the old, rich, plantation days that existed in Louisiana before the War Between the States. His family circle was distinguished. His father had been Governor of Louisiana, and his mother was a Ringgold of Mary-

land, whose family name is among those of the heroes mentioned in My Maryland. His knowledge of the second period of our Nation's history began in 1861 when he abruptly ended his schooldays at Georgetown College and volunteered for service in the Confederate Army at the age of 16. During the war he served as an enlisted man and as a lieutenant on the staff of General Beall. In 1863 he was taken prisoner in a battle just below Vicksburg. The privations that followed his capture had a marked effect on his health. After the war he studied law in the office of one of the great civilians of Louisiana, Edward Bermudez, and in 1868 he was admitted to the Louisiana bar. Thereafter, his early political life which paralleled his rise to preeminence at the bar knew the harsh tumult of the Reconstruction, and the efforts of the citizens of Louisiana to restore orderly government to the State. He entered into the full tide of the third period, when after his appointment as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court in 1894, he aided in inaugurating the new federalism of the 20th century with his wise and profound decisions, particularly in those cases arising under the interstate commerce clause, and in his championship of unpopular issues such as the Federal income tax.

Familiar though he was with all these divergent eras, with their claim and counterclaim of State and Federal right, he himself was truly within the purest traditions of our Nation. This is readily evidenced by the fact that while half his critics complained loudly that White had turned from States right to nationalism, the other half equally strongly insisted that he was a reactionary advocate of dual federalism. Yet, if his decisions are examined closely, it will be seen that his balancing of interests between the power of the States and the power of the Federal Government paralleled that of the greatest men of the South, among whom must be reckoned in the first rank George Washington, of Virginia, who recognized that the very existence of the country required a central power and whose interest led to the Constitutional Convention. In serving his State and in serving the Federal Government, Edward Douglass White was but following in the footsteps of his grandfather, Dr. James White, a member of the Continental Congress from what is now Tennessee but was then the western frontier of North Carolina, who wrote in 1788 to Gov. Richard Caswell, of North Carolina:

> I am writing to Your Excellency at a time that all minds, and all conversations are turned toward the interesting question of changing the Federal system * * * as those who have been the most conversant with the subject appear to me to be the most convinced of the necessity of an efficient Federal Government. * * * Whatever may be our wish in theory, we find in practice, by our own example, that States in confederacy, like individuals in society, must part with some of their privileges for the preservation of the rest.

Edward Douglass White served his State well. He was elected to the Louisiana State Senate in 1874 and was appointed from there to the Louisiana Supreme Court in 1878. His tenure there was brief, due to a constitutional amendment engineered by the opposing political party which limited his term to 15 months. This bitter rivalry between opposing factions arose from the deep-seated question of the Louisiana lottery which White had always opposed. In 1888, after several years in private practice, he returned to politics as campaign manager for Governor Nicholls, who opposed the lottery. It was a fierce contest, but Nicholls and those supporting him won, and White was elected to the United States Senate by the new legislature for the term to begin on March 4, 1891. Meanwhile the United States Government had taken a hand in the lottery scandal by making it a criminal act to send lottery tickets through the mail. When White came to Washington to take his seat several criminal prosecutions were in progress under this law. The Attorney General consulted him on the dismissal of several of these suits in Louisiana and it is characteristic of him that he should feel their dismissal was the preferable thing to do, on the ground that the "struggle is terminated and ended. To press the prosecution further would not redound to the benefit of the public service." Many years later, in 1915, when he was Chief Justice, this former Confederate soldier, in construing one of the post-Civil War amendments in Guinn against United States, exhibited the same attitude. The issue had been settled so far as he was concerned, and it would be disruptive of the public good to allow the "Oklahoma grandfather clause" prohibition on voting to subvert the very essence of the supremacy of the Constitution and its amendments and thus the whole good of the United States.

White was appointed an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court by President Cleveland in 1894 and was elevated to the position of Chief Justice by President Taft in 1910. He has the unique distinction of being the first Associate Justice who attained to the eminence of Chief Justice. His career on the Supreme Court bench covered 27 years altogether, second only to Marshall's up to that time. His tenure was during a time of rapid social and economic change in the country, an era which also showed an increasing reliance on the Federal Government to solve the attendant problems.

There are three fields in which White's forward-looking thinking gave direction to American law. These are the fields of administrative law, interpretations under the antitrust acts, and the Federal income tax.

Justice White came to the Supreme Court bench during the years when administrative rulings under the Interstate Commerce Act were first coming up before the Court for interpretation. Beginning with the East Tennessee, Virginia and Georgia Railway decision in 1901, he steadfastly maintained the power of Congress to set up administrative agencies, provided proper limits to their authority were embodied in the law. One of the most notable decisions in this field was Oceanic Steam Navigation Company against Stranahan—1909—which permitted administrative officers to impose penalties set by Congress. In the child-labor and narcotics law cases which to him required the use of a power embodied in the Constitution to accomplish a regulatory effect not specifically denominated in the power, he dissented, for he did not believe the Federal Government had the right to assume the police powers of the several States for social welfare purposes.

Beginning with the dissent in the Trans-Missouri Freight Association case in 1897 and continuing through the Northern Securities Co. case in 1903 until he wrote the majority opinion in the Standard Oil and American Tobacco Co. cases in 1911, he carefully developed the "rule of reason" in determining whether contracts were in restraint of trade under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Finally, with respect to the income tax, it may be stated that Chief Justice White never permitted economic theory to dominate his views of constitutional law. In the Pollock case (1895) he stood for the historic definition of the fathers of the country as to direct taxes rather than accept the definition given by the economists in 1895.

The work he accomplished was enormous. During his incumbency on the Supreme Court bench the Court disposed of, in one way or another, more than 14,000 cases and rendered opinions in more than 7,000. Chief Justice White wrote about 700 opinions for the Court, 10 concurring opinions, and 33 dissenting opinions. During his service as the Chief Justice he also bore the burden of the administrative details of the Court. His kindness and forbearance was memorable, and he added to the quiet dignity of the Court with the introduction of a formal method of greeting each morning. When all the Justices had donned their gowns in the robing room, Chief Justice White would step to the center and greet each one in order of seniority with a firm handshake and an affable good morning.

Chief Justice White was a credit to the old civil law of Louisiana—one of whom it was said in New Orleans that he was not merely a learned civilian but a veritable jurisconsult. He was conversant in English, Spanish, French, and Latin, and knew them not only as speaking languages but had consulted their legal works in the original. During his young manhood in New Orleans, in order to prepare himself for practice before the Federal courts, he became equally learned in the common law. This accumulation of wisdom he brought to the Supreme Court. He also brought a mind unbiased by the passions of the war in which he fought, an earnest consideration of every problem that came before him, and a logic and honesty that compelled him to try to balance the extremes represented by the contending parties before him. The State of Louisiana is proud to confess its debt to Chief Justice Edward Douglass White for the luster he has shed upon it and to dedicate this statue to him.

"Mr. Sam" Serves the 4th and Country Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored this morning to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a short but excellent story about a great Texan. This story is the work of a very lovely and able journalist who hails from the wide open spaces of the Panhandle of Texas and who represents the Amarillo News and the Amarillo Globe-Times. Her outstanding journalistic ability is exemplified by the excellent manner in which she has verbally portrayed the life of one of America's all-time greats, none other than you, Mr. Speaker.

The article follows:

"MR. SAM" SERVES THE 4TH AND COUNTRY WELL

(By Louise Evans)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Fourth of Texas.

Six counties in the lush, rich blacklands of North Central Texas form the Fourth Congressional District.

It has produced a President, and "Mister Democrat"—Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN. (Before you've met all of these Texans who are carrying such a major responsibility in Washington today, you'll find others who are tied to the Fourth, or were born within a whoop and a holler of its borders.)

Forty-two years ago a young man who had proved his political abilities by serving as the Speaker of the Texas House stood for election as the Congressman from the Fourth District. He took office on the day in 1913 that Woodrow Wilson became President.

He has served more than one-fourth of the years that the United States House of Representatives has been in existence. Compacted into his services have been two World Wars, a boom that crashed into a paralyzing depression, a cold war that has had at least one costly "police action," if none will concede the Korean incident to be war, and a spiralling inflation that threatened the internal prosperity of the country.

SAM RAYBURN is the second most powerful man in the United States of America, though some, assaying those 435 Representatives of the people who stand behind him, would call him the most powerful. (For instance, there's a bill in the Congress now that would set up a budget office in the Congress to take over the job of the President's Bureau of the Budget. Instead of taking the President's budget, tailored to fit his policy, the congressional budget office would get an estimate of income from taxes and cut spending requests to fit it. In the name of a balanced budget, the plan sounds good—and proponents point out that it would not interfere with the President's constitutional power to ask congressional permission to spend money but would only change the present method of so doing. But such a minor change—apparently—could pile up a massive power in the Congress.)

As Speaker of the House, RAYBURN would become President of the country if the President and Vice President lost their lives. Traditionally, the power of succession moved down through the Cabinet. Now, by congressional action a few years ago, the Speaker's chance to be President has increased immeasurably—in these atomic times.

"He is the man for whom all executive departments must feel the tenderest of emotions—financial," pointed out Life magazine recently.

And he is "Mister Democrat." Of that, make no mistake.

The title is compounded partly of his ranking term in the Congress—the longest in the House and making Senator WALTER GEORGE, ranking Member of the Senate and a half dozen years older than RAYBURN, look like a freshman. It is underlined by the fact that he has held the speakership longer than any person in the House history. Henry Clay's record between 1811 and 1825 was outstripped by RAYBURN back in 1951. He has been either majority or minority leader of the House Democrats for even longer—18 years of continuous service.

Though an expert at "passing laws and placating politicians," thereby adding stature to his size as Speaker, RAYBURN has never budged an inch from the Democratic deadcenter.

When Lee surrendered at Appomattox, General Grant decreed that the Southern soldiers could keep their horses. RAYBURN'S father was there with Lee, and he headed back to the family home in the Tennessee hills to make a corn crop. At Knoxville, the Federals took his horse away. The elder Rayburn hated the Yankees to the day of his death 50 years later. A man that knows how much a horse means to a corn crop isn't apt to forget that sort of injustice. Neither will his son.

RAYBURN isn't fighting the War Between the States over again, but in 1948, when he is credited with much of President Truman's victory at the polls, he pulled the discouraged party leaders back together with a good fight talk. "We are the party of the common man and the American people know it," he declared. Evidently the American people stood with Mr. SAM that time.

He has been an honest, hard-working legislator. That he has become as cunning as a turkey gobbler in the Canadian River brakes does not belie the essential stanchness of his character. Several thousand Congressmen—and he has seen more than 3,000 come and go—do not so easily accede to leadership that RAYBURN can buy it with anything but the coin of ability.

He is willing to persuade Members of Congress personally to his way of thinking. In fact, he operates best in the cloakrooms and in the offices off the corridor. But when he speaks from the floor, he is heard because his words are to the point. On those occasions, the phrase "RAYBURN is up" runs through the Capitol, and both Members and gallery listeners gather.

But if he must use every parliamentary device to gain his point, that he can do, too. On August 12, 1941, the selective service bill was up for extension. Shortly before rollcall, the Speaker stepped down from rostrum to point out the blindness of believing that this Nation could release a million men from its 1,400,000 Army. The rollcall brought 203 for, 202 against extension of the act. Before any Member could waver, change his mind, ask for the right to change his vote, the Speaker's gavel fell. A scant 4 months later, on December 7 when Pearl Harbor was struck by the Japanese, the Nation had at least the beginning of a million men more under arms.

RAYBURN could have been the first President from the fourth district if he had agreed to be a vice presidential nominee on the Democratic ticket of 1944. But Mr. SAM had a reelection campaign on his hands down in the fourth, and he wanted to win it. Truman got the nomination, and in a few months the Presidency. It is not unlikely that "Mister Democrat" still thinks he made the right decision. RAYBURN'S mighty fond of the House of Representatives.

The Speaker is short—5 feet, 7 inches—and as bald-pated as an apple. There is something of the tangy firmness of a Winesap in his thinking and talk, too. However, there is enough southern gentlemanliness about him that one has a distinct sense of surprise when the sharp-eyed glance from his heavily-hooded eyes pierces outward. And he uses what he calls a principle of "a little applied Christianity" in politics to good advantage.

He headed the Stevenson campaign in Texas in 1952, and seems surprisingly kind toward some of the opposition. Yet one's instincts seem to warn that his memory is long; the deserters from the Democratic fold will not be forgotten.

As for that matter, RAYBURN campaigned for another presidential loser. In 1928 he stumped the State for Al Smith, and that was the last time he has been in Amarillo for any length of time. "Coldest day I ever saw," he remembers. "Wasn't a blade of grass between me and the North Pole."

As he spoke, he was turning over in his hands an unbelievably beautiful piece of silver. It is the gift of the Peruvian Government and embossed with llamas and horns of plenty. He was admiring it in an absent-minded sort of a way.

In 1948 he received the Collier magazine congressional award for distinguished service, plus a check for $10,000 to be used for whatever public purposes he wished. RAYBURN donated the money to start a public library back in Bonham for the home folks of the fourth district.

The fourth district, therefore, is an unbelievably beautiful piece pretty likely to see something of silver.

SAM RAYBURN is willing to assume the welfare problems of the world. He's willing to fight for American leadership as he did Truman's successful attempt to keep Greece and Turkey out of the Russian sphere—the so-called Truman Doctrine. He's willing to speak out, "God help us, God help this world, if we do not accept our responsibility to help countries that do not want to be smothered by communism."

He's willing to keep the House in order, its nose to the grindstone for the back-breaking job of keeping up a national security program, within and without the boundaries.

He's going to keep the Democrat party together, come hell or high water.

But he's a 4th District fellow—and he never forgets that he gets his mandate from the people. Fifty years he's spent in the Texas Legislature and the United States House of Representatives—elected by the 4th District people.

It's men like SAM RAYBURN who have made the dream come true of a Government "of the people, by the people, for the people" by keeping a lengthened ear to the will of those he represents.

Vice President Truman was in RAYBURN'S office in the Capitol in the late afternoon of April 12, 1945, when word was brought of the death of President Roosevelt. In the office, too, was Miss Alla Clary, who has been secretary to the Speaker for more than 35 years. Many years before, Miss Alla had been working in Washington and had come by to say goodbye to the Member of Congress from her district (4th, naturally). RAYBURN offered her a job and she has been with him ever since.

Naturally, too, the rest of the staff in the Speaker's office are from the 4th. John W. Holton of Sherman is his administrative assistant. From Sherman, too, are Mrs. Lorraine Kimbrough and Don Bradshaw. H. G. Dulaney is from Ector. Mrs. Bernice Frazier from Leonard and Miss Martha Freeman is from the best spot of all—Bonham.

Much is made of the fact that RAYBURN kept his old office in the last switch of the Speakership with JOE MARTIN of Massachu-

setts, who has the Republican Speakership staked out as firmly as does RAYBURN on the opposition side of the House.

The two men—MARTIN is 70, RAYBURN 73—are hale and hearty chaps. They may keep up the shuffle to and from the Speaker's chair for some time to come. After all, the complexion of the House can change each 2 years. RAYBURN held the gavel from 1940 to 1947. MARTIN had the Chair in 1947–48, when the Democratic forces stood at their lowest ebb (except, of course, "Mister Democrat" pulled off the coup of 1948). RAYBURN got it back in 1949 relinquished it in 1952 took it back in 1955.

But they intend to keep their own personal offices. No more of that kind of moving.

And "Mister Democrat" is going to keep that Speaker's chair under him as much as possible. Remember he's the man who said "I'd rather be Speaker of the United States House of Representatives than any 10 Senators" and he proved it by rejecting a chance at the Presidency.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the Committee on Un-American Activities held hearings in Newark, N. J. The day the committee arrived it was subjected to most disgraceful conduct on the part of demonstrators imported from New York by leaders who refused to answer the question as to whether or not the expenses of the demonstration were borne by the Communist Party on the grounds of self-incrimination. The entire atmosphere surrounding these hearings was very familiar to the committee because of its many experiences with subversives. Insolent lawyers advising the use of the same tactics employed in the Communist trials in New York were resorted to because some of the lawyers participated in those trials. However, one phase of the hearings disturb your committee, and that is the failure of the Newark school board to take action against three teachers who are Communists. At the hearing each one of the three refused to answer the question as to whether or not he or she was a Communist on the grounds that to do so might make the witness liable to criminal prosecution. One of the reasons for asking the questions was because of information furnished the committee by Dr. Bella Dodd, a former Communist, but now an ardent worker against the conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. Dr. Dodd has been made the target of attacks from every Communist lawyer in the United States and apparently the Newark School Board has been bluffed by Richard Green, the attorney for the teachers into relying on an alleged technicality in order to avoid doing an unpleasant duty. While discharging an American schoolteacher may be unpleasant, it isn't half as unpleasant as to be compelled to tolerate lack of cooperation in the fight to preserve our way of life.

To Ease Naturalization Requirements for Children Adopted by United States Citizens Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit children adopted by United States citizens to be naturalized in certain cases without satisfying the residence and physical presence requirements. A large number of Americans serving as career employees of the United States Government, International organizations, and American business firms operating overseas are required by the nature of their jobs to remain abroad for a long period of time with only short trips home. Since the services of these people overseas are essential to the United States, it is in our national interest, both in regard to the Government employees and to those of the private firms furthering our foreign trade and commerce, to help them in their efforts to establish a happy family life comparable to that which the American families at home are privileged to lead.

Some of these Americans abroad have adopted alien infants. The present law makes it practically impossible for these Americans to obtain citizenship for their children without resigning their jobs and establishing residence within the United States of America for a considerable time.

The amendment I am proposing would afford such children a means of obtaining citizenship comparable to that under which alien wives may obtain citizenship without the residence requirements within the United States.

The proposed amendment will not change the provisions of the present law which requires that before the American parents of an adopted child can apply for naturalization, the child must be lawfully admitted to the United States and must satisfy all requirements for naturalization. The proposed amendment would only waive the residence requirements for those adopted children whose parents are residing abroad for reasons of their employment.

In an overwhelming majority of cases the American parents want their adopted children to be United States citizens. These children residing abroad as a part of an American family are trained to think and feel as Americans. When the child is lawfully admitted to the United States and is otherwise eligible for naturalization, yet is unable to obtain citizenship because his adoptive father cannot say in this country for a long period of residence without losing his job, such family undergoes an undue hardship. The purpose of my amendment is to eliminate such hardships.

It is my hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will take favorable action on this matter without delay, and that it will be passed by the House and Senate.

The Railroad Retirement Act Is in Need of Immediate Amendment To Remove Inequities and To Increase Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest among the railroad population of my congressional district regarding amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. In this connection, I appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last week and delivered the following remarks:

STATEMENT BY HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, JUNE 17, 1955, IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 4744 AND SIMILAR BILLS DESIGNED TO AMEND THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you and the members of this committee for the opportunity to appear before you in support of several amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, some of which I sponsored in this and previous Congresses.

It is my understanding that this hearing is restricted to H. R. 4744 and similar bills which provide in part for the repeal of the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to widows under the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts.

Another provision specifies that the spouse of a retired railroader would in no instance receive less than the benefits he or she would be entitled to if covered by social security.

In effect this amendment would establish a new maximum of $51.80 a month for the remainder of 1955 and $54.30 beginning with January 1956 in lieu of the present $40 a month maximum spouse benefit. Further increases in the maximum would automatically take place if and when the Social Security Act is amended in the future to provide for higher benefits.

It is estimated that 82,000 wives now receiving maximum spouse benefits of $40 monthly under the Railroad Retirement Act would become eligible for an average increase of about $10.50 a month during the remainder of 1955 and that a further increase averaging between $1.50 and $2 a month would be given them starting January 1956.

It is my further understanding that while this particular hearing is restricted to H. R. 4744 and similar bills, hearings will be held on the general subject of amending the Railroad Retirement Act when the committee disposes of several other important bills being considered.

At that time those of us who have sponsored over 50 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act will have the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of them.

Mr. Chairman, before discussing the legislation now under consideration I should like to mention briefly the five amendments I introduced which are pending before this committee.

These bills introduced by me at the request of the active and retired railroad population of my congressional district include:

H. R. 859 which provides for a 25-percent across-the-board increase in railroad retirement benefits.

H. R. 856 and H. R. 858 are designed to improve the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act by permitting retirement at age 60 or after 30 or 35 years of service with the annuity to be computed based on the 5 years of highest earnings.

There is also H. R. 2443 which will remove from the Railroad Retirement Act a discriminating provision which requires a railroad employee before retiring to sever his connections with any other employer outside the railroad industry regardless of how insignificant the job is in which he may be engaged at the time of his retirement.

Finally, H. R. 857 will repeal the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to widows of deceased railroad employees who are entitled to receive both a pension as a surviving widow, in addition to any benefits she may have earned in her own right as a retired employee of an industry covered by the Social Security Act. The provisions of H. R. 857 are incorporated in H. R. 4744 now being considered by this committee.

As mentioned previously these bills were introduced by me at the request of the active and retired railroaders of my congressional district whom I join in expressing the earnest hope that these measures will receive consideration by this committee at an early date.

As many of you know over a period of years I have been directing my efforts toward repeal of the provision in the 1951 amendments prohibiting the payment of dual benefits to persons entitled to social security and railroad retirement benefits. When the 1951 amendments were approved I warned the membership of the House that the dual benefits provision was discriminatory and that sooner or later Congress would have to repeal it.

During the 83d Congress my bill H. R. 356 was enacted and is now known as Public Law 398. Under its provisions some 30,000 retired railroaders had their rights to social-security benefits restored.

As stated previously one of the provisions of H. R. 4744 now under consideration restores the rights of widows to receive social security benefits to which they are entitled in their own right.

At present there are some 5,500 widows and should this provision of H. R. 4744 became a law it is estimated that these widows will receive an average increase in their survivor annuity of about $20 monthly.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to state that while the elimination of the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to widows is meritorious legislation, if H. R. 4744 becomes a law the job of eliminating the prohibition against dual benefits is not complete. As you know there are still hundreds of spouses under the Railroad Retirement Act who are being denied social-security benefits which they earned in their own right and thus they are being penalized under the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

You will recall that last year we repealed the prohibition against dual benefits as far as the retired railroader is concerned. H. R. 4744 now under consideration will remove the prohibition against dual benefits to widows. It is my earnest hope that during the next session of Congress we can complete the job by eliminating the prohibition against the payment of dual benefits to spouses who have earned social-security benefits in their own right.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning I am grateful to this committee for the opportunity of appearing before you and while this present hearing limits consideration of those amendments specified in H. R. 4744, I wish to emphasize that there is immediate and urgent need for an across-the-board increase in railroad retirement benefits, as well as action on my other bill to permit a retired railroader in certain instances, and where the salary is insignificant, to continue an employment relationship outside the railroad industry which began before his retirement.

It is my hope that these two bills as well as my other proposed amendments will receive your consideration when the hearings on amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act are reopened at a later date.

Edward M. Reidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement and letter of Chairman Richard F. Mitchell, of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make acknowledgment of the recent resignation from the Interstate Commerce Commission of one of its most distinguished and valuable high policy officials, General Counsel Edward M. Reidy. Mr. Reidy faithfully, efficiently, and diligently served the Interstate Commerce Commission for nearly 39 years. He indeed made an enviable record for himself and he deserves the commendation and gratitude of the Nation.

He resigned from the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to accept a position with the Southern Pacific Co. here in Washington. Naturally, I wish for him every success and happiness in the future.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1955.

Mr. EDWARD M. REIDY,
General Counsel, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. REIDY: I have been authorized and directed by my colleagues on the Interstate Commerce Commision to give recognition to your past valuable service, which covers a period of better than 38 years as a member of our staff. You started as a stenography, and by your industry and ability you advanced to the position of attorney in 1920 and to head of the Bureau of Law, then known as Chief Counsel, in 1952, which title was to changed to General Counsel in June 1954.

During the period of time that you have been in the General Counsel's Office many important legal matters have confronted the Commission and you have ably and effectively protected its interests against the outstanding commerce lawyers in the country. As Assistant Chief Counsel and as General Counsel you have presented many cases in which the Commission was vitally interested to the Federal courts throughout the land. The record of your success is written in the decisions in those cases for all to study. Your record has been outstanding, the percentage of cases in which the Commission's position has been successfully defended is exceedingly high, and many times your able presentation has been publicly acknowledged by the court or the judge before whom you appeared.

Your retirement from the Commission is a voluntary one. It was your decision to leave, not the Commission's and before you retire the Commission wants to express its appreciation for your diligence and great ability in our behalf. You can be proud of the record of 38 years of continuous service which you have given to the public.

The Commission expresses its thanks for a job well done and wishes for you success in the new important position which you are undertaking.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD F. MITCHELL,
Chairman.

Senate Majority Leader Traveling Fast and Far

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently a lady of the press came to Washington from Amarillo, Tex., looking for Texans on the national scene. Being a reporter of great note and a feature story writer of the highest caliber, it was only a short time before she came forward with a basketful of Texans in high places in the Nation and enough material to fill many books. Among the top Texans in the world, she rightfully chose our good friend and able Senator, the majority leader of the Senate, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. It is with great pleasure and honor that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning this outstanding story of a great American.

The article follows:

SENATE MAJORITY LEADER TRAVELING FAST AND FAR
(By Louise Evans)

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8.—As John Snider, Amarillo's barbecue king, once remarked, "never has a man come to town so quick."

No truer words could be spoken of LYNDON B. JOHNSON, senior Senator from Texas—at the age of 46.

The phrase fits most aptly his title of majority leader of the Senate. In 1951, he became party whip while serving his first term in that most select club in the world, the United States Senate (even the English House of Lords can summon up more than 96 members—it has 26 spiritual, 224 temporal Lords.)

Last winter, LYNDON B. JOHNSON moved into the majority leadership as the Democrats took a plurality of one vote in the Senate.

And he is the first Texan to hold this powerful post.

The man is typical of the young Texans, all in their forties, who are in positions of leadership in Washington. Personable, aggressive, and not afraid of 25-hour days, they hold powerful strategic salients in this town.

The 25-hour day is not a misprint. A slow-moving, slow-talking southerner up on the Hill coined the phrase the other day. "Sure, you'll find the Texans kicking up around the top. They're all willing to work 25 hours a day," he drawled.

A quick look at JOHNSON's life would make even a Texan tired. After a rather slow start,

he caught up by taking seven-league steps. Born on a farm near Johnson City, only a couple of districts away from the famous Fourth Congressional District of Texas, he liked the idea of a trip to California better than a college education. At 15, he went off with a bunch of other Texas boys and worked up and down the west coast doing such chores as he could pick up, and eating irregularly. "None of us had ever been off the farm farther than the nearest town," the Senator recalls.

On his return to Texas after 7 months of vagabonding, he still chose to work on the highway. He drove a truck, pushed a wheelbarrow, shoveled gravel. But there was a tradition of education in his family; a great-grandfather had been president of Baylor University for 2 years. Both his father and his grandfather had served in the Texas House of Representatives. One of his ancestors had been a signer of the Texas Declaration of Independence. So eventually his father persuaded him to enter Southwest Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos, where he was graduated in 1930.

He was teaching public speaking and debating in the Sam Houston High School in Houston when the late Richard M. Kleberg chose him for secretary on Kleberg's first trip to Congress in 1931.

You might say that from that day on, JOHNSON was struck with luck (that is, if you disregard the 25-hour days). He served in Texas as national youth administrator, and he campaigned against 10 others for the 10th district vacancy created by the death of Representative James P. Buchanan. President Roosevelt was fishing off Corpus Christi during the campaign and was attracted by the young man's platform. JOHNSON rode into Washington on the Presidential train to serve his first term.

Another as canny in political craft as Roosevelt watched over the young Representative. SAM RAYBURN, even then one of the most powerful members of the southern delegation, and soon to be the Democratic leader in the House, made practically a protege of JOHNSON. The young Congressman landed on the House Naval Affairs Committee, and from that vantage worked closely with President Roosevelt.

When Senator Morris Sheppard died in 1941, some say the President encouraged JOHNSON to run for the vacant post. Probably that streak of Baptist preacher, squirrel-gun-toting ancestry of Texas leaders pleaded, too. JOHNSON chose "Pappy" O'Daniel, and got licked in the primaries, though by a close margin of 1,311 votes. Since he was only barely past the needed 30 years for Senate seating, it wasn't too big a setback in his life. It had been a special election; he still had his seat in the House, and he came to Washington to serve three terms in the House.

Six more years in the rough-and-tumble House sharpened the would-be Senator. Recently Newspaper Columnist Stewart Alsop wrote, "Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON is no doubt the most thoroughly professional congressional leader of our times. But that's just the trouble. He slips legislation through so quickly and quietly that nobody notices, or even cares very much."

Everyone in Texas knows about the famous 87 votes that gave JOHNSON his seat in 1948, and by 1952 he didn't need to campaign. In 6 short years he had sold the Senate, the Nation, and Texas on his ability.

Holding the position of the majority leader of the Senate makes him the third most powerful man in the country. Some like to point out that the Vice President ought to get in the running somewhere with Eisenhower, RAYBURN, and JOHNSON. But a musical comedy of the thirties—Of Thee I Sing (which Billy Rose brought to the old Municipal Auditorium when the tin roof rattled)—clearly defined the duties of the Vice President of the United States of America. It is to the credit of another young man, RICHARD NIXON, of California, that the post is growing in stature, but presiding over the Chambers in which LYNDON JOHNSON is operating as majority leader is no position of power.

Freshman Senator JOHNSON took another 7-league step a year after he gained his objective. With proper humility he kept quiet that first year, as freshmen are supposed to do. But after the Korean conflict started he demanded creation of a Senate committee to examine a fumbling defense effort. In a few weeks of what is now known as the Johnson whirlwind, cloakroom-and-floor attack, the Senate found itself with an Armed Services Subcommittee authorized to investigate the whole preparedness program. Freshman JOHNSON was chairman.

But who could resist the words of JOHNSON on the Senate floor, December 12, 1950, when the painful retreat was underway in Korea: "This is not World War II all over again. This is a struggle without precedence in human experience. The military concepts and the domestic policies which won World War II are not applicable to this struggle in which we are now engaged. * * * The people of America who sent us here are patient, but they are not docile. * * * The American people have not lost faith in themselves or in their country or in the democratic institutions, but the American people are tired of and they are fed up with double-talk in Washington. * * * A great American patriot once fanned the fires of democracy into such a flame as to give us America. In debate, Patrick Henry cried in tones heard throughout the years, 'Why stand we here idle?' Can I say more today?"

The new subcommittee learned something of 25-hour days. The Government's rubber, nickel, and tin stockpiling programs got a combing; high officials found themselves called on the carpet to explain why the waste in materials, construction, and manpower. By 1951, with the help of the subcommittee, JOHNSON rammed through the universal military training bill, the first ever passed by either branch of Congress.

JOHNSON personally learned something of Sherman's "war is hell." He was the first Member of the House to enter World War II, leaving on the day after Pearl Harbor to assume a lieutenant-commandership in the Navy, in whose Reserve he had served for several years. General MacArthur personally decorated him with the Silver Star after bombing missions in the South Pacific. (There's no note of this honor in his Congressional Directory biography.)

He is still bucking for some kind of a more permanent peace. At a dinner last month for David Sarnoff of radio and TV fame, he exploited the idea of forming a general staff for a cold war that would launch the greatest political offensive in history against the Russian propagandists.

"Somewhere along the line we have forgotten a fundamental. It is that power ultimately rests with the people. Unless we win them to our side, we are lost. * * * Even when cold war turns hot—on a local scale—we find the terrifying weapons of modern science almost useless. Atomic bombs did not shield the free of Republic of Korea. Hydrogen warfare did not save Northern Vietnam—and may not save the balance in Southeast Asia. And all the powers of nuclear physics will not recover for freedom the vast territory of China.

"This staff (for cold war) could direct and coordinate the weapons of cold war—diplomatic, economic, propaganda. * * * The prize is the good will of the vast multitude of people not only in Asia but throughout the world who are still uncommitted. They are the great jury who will decide the fate of this planet."

A short time later, President Eisenhower, addressing the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, underlined the same approach. "Everybody has a right to think of himself as a man bearing a great responsibility as a crusader to help do this job of education, of ourselves and of others about us."

JOHNSON gets credit for bridging the gap between the northern and southern wings of his party in Congress—and even more credit for keeping the interests of his party in the foreground without giving sabotaging opposition to the Eisenhower program.

He is certainly a young man—the youngest ever to hold the Senate majority leadership—who has come to town fast—so fast that there is talk of his nomination for President in the Democratic convention of 1956; and if not then, in that of 1960.

When JOHNSON first came to Washington, the then foremost Texan of them all—Vice President John Garner—was presiding over the Senate Chamber. Today the famous Christy portrait of Garner hangs on the wall directly opposite JOHNSON'S desk in his office just off the Senate Chamber. In the outer office hangs the portrait of another Texan who gave long time service to the United States Congress, Morris Sheppard. Naturally the Texas flag is there.

The Senator still keeps up 25-hour days—7 p. m. isn't too late to see him; neither is 8 a. m. too early. He's there on Saturdays, too, when most of the Hill activity is as dormant as a prairie dog village with a hawk overhead.

Undoubtedly, he occasionally sees his family—Mrs. Johnson, the former Lady Bird Taylor, and his daughters, Lynda Bird, 11, and Lucy Baines, 7. (The Senator notes that traveling is easy: "We all have the same initials and can use the same baggage.")

He was in the Panhandle a year or so ago, so everyone knows he is still 6 feet, 3 inches tall and weighs a trim 200 pounds. He looks a little tired—probably should cut down to 23-hour days.

The Senator has always taken the lead in the battle for water in Texas. The big coastal canal is a special project of his, but he's for catching and saving every drop of water that hits the western side of the State, too.

"I'm ready to do anything to help with the Canadian River dam as soon as you folks down there make up your mind what you want," he said.

The Late David Worth Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, both my State of Idaho and the country at large lost a fine and dedicated citizen in the untimely death this week of David Worth Clark. A Member of the House of Representatives from 1935 to 1939, and of the United States Senate from 1939 to 1945, he distinguished himself for his courage, his integrity, and his willingness to fight for the things in which he believed.

Although his life was cut short in its prime—he was only 53—the years he lived were crowded ones. He was 33 when he first came to Washington as a Member of Congress. He had already practiced law for 7 years in his hometown of Pocatello, and had served for 2 years as Idaho's assistant attorney gen-

eral. After leaving the United States Senate, he maintained law offices in both Washington, D. C., and the West, served as a management consultant, and took care of business interests scattered throughout this country and Hawaii.

D. Worth, as he was known, was a man of great personal charm. Few men have had more devoted friends. They loved him for his great heart and his understanding as well as for his keen mind and splendid judgment. I was not in Washington, of course, when he was here, but many Members have spoken to me about the deep affection and high regard in which they, his colleagues, held him.

My heart goes out to his wonderful wife, Virgil Irwin Clark, and his three lovely daughters in their loss. I hope they can find comfort in the legacy of accomplishment left by Senator Worth Clark to both his State and his Nation.

Increased United States Forest Service Appropriation Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gainesville (Ga.) Daily Times of June 16, 1955:

INCREASED UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE APPROPRIATION MAKES SENSE

It is not the purpose of any governmental function to make money. But when one does and still provides great benefits for all the people, it is a welcme change in the usual pattern of outgo exceeding income.

The United States Forest Service operates in the black. It makes a profit, a profit which which is distributed among the counties containing Forest Service land, as well as being returned to the National Treasury. The profit that can be counted in dollars and cents is a small part, however, of the real profit realized by the people from the management of forest lands by the Forest Service.

The real profits come in the form of watershed conservation, soil conservation, clear streams, fire protection, good fishing, good hunting, and a place to get away from it all.

Recently the United States Congress increased the appropriations to the United States Forest Service for the fiscal year beginning July 1 by a total of $9,528,438. The money of the people of America could not be more wisely invested.

A dramatic example of what happens to land denuded of its forests was shown this week in Gainesville in the Walt Disney film the Living Desert. This highly interesting film showed how flash floods roar down from the bare mountains without warning, engulfing everything and sweeping all in a giant, rushing wall of water. Of course, the desert conditions shown in the Disney film were created by Mother Nature herself. But it is not impossible that man could, through his lack of foresight and lust of quick cash, create conditions that are almost comparable right here in north Georgia.

If it were not for the countless millions of trees in the Chattahoochee National Forest today, the people of Gainesville might well have to take to high ground every time a thunderstorm broke over the mountains. There would be nothing to stop the tons of water in the merciless grip of gravity. Each heavy rain could spell disaster.

Well, we do have trees. The water is stopped, held and fed into the springs and streams as a cool, clear, pure, unhurried liquid—ready to serve not destroy, mankind and all his works.

The Buford Dam will be a huge and proud monument of man's ability to compound a mighty river and tame its waters. The Buford Dam would not be worth the ink it takes to spell its name if it were not for the Chattahoochee National Forest stretching across the mountainous end of Georgia.

The Echo Park Dam Threat Still Exists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle dated June 19, 1955. This editorial indicates very clearly that the upper Colorado River development bill, in its present modified form, still contains a dangerous threat to Dinosaur National Monument.

Conservationists and others who are interested in the protection of our national parks and monuments cannot afford to be misled by any deceptive statements that the Echo Park Dam proposal has been eliminated from the bill:

THE THREAT TO OUR NATIONAL PARKS STILL EXISTS

To forestall certain opposition, the House Reclamation Subcommittee has amended the upper Colorado development bill by striking out the provision for the fiercely debated dam at Echo Park in Dinosaur National Monument.

At first blush, this would appear a decisive victory for the conservationists and other groups who are denouncing the Echo Park Dam as unnecessary and destructive of the great natural beauty and scientific value of the area.

On the contrary, the Sierra Club notes, this action is a dangerous and deceptive piece of congressional maneuvering likely to mislead and lull those who are fighting this contemplated invasion of the national park system.

The Senate has already approved an upper Colorado bill which authorizes the Echo Park construction. The House bill, as now amended, would if approved go into a Senate-House conference committee where the Echo Park Dam might readily be restored.

For this reason, the Sierra Club is continuing its stern oppositon to the bill or any other bill that does not directly and finally bar construction of a dam at Echo Park.

The conservationists are not opposing development of the upper Colorado Basin's water resources. They assert that such development may be soundly effected through use of available dam sites outside the boundaries of the national monument. They are opposing the unnecessary drowning of a valuable natural heritage which would set a precedent for future raids upon the national park system. They have raised questions that demand careful examination and argue strongly against hasty action by this Congress.

Cooperation and Long-Range Plan Needed in Naval Academy Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Evening Capital, Annapolis, Md., on June 20, 1955. The editorial presents a comprehensive and sympathetic approach to a matter confronting the United States Naval Academy and the city of Annapolis. The editorial follows:

COOPERATION AND LONG-RANGE PLAN NEEDED IN NAVAL ACADEMY EXPANSION

The Naval Academy, where since 1910 the brigade of midshipment has increased by 450 percent, while the land area available for drill and recreation has increased only 22 percent, has a problem of finding more space to meet its needs.

Annapolis, which in recent years has become one of the leading yachting centers on the eastern seaboard, also has a problem of maintaining its waterfront so as to hold this position, and to increase a rapidly growing maritime industry.

Recently, these two objectives clashed when representatives of the maritime industry and others raised objections to the proposal of the Academy to extend its land area, in part, by a fill running out 600 feet from the present Farragut Field seawall. The result has been that the House Armed Services Committee struck the item to build this proposed fill from the omnibus military public works authorization bill. A 420-foot fillout from the present Dewey-Santee Basins into the Severn River still remains in the bill.

A suggestion that might aid the Academy in solving its problem, and at the same time benefit both the institution and Annapolis has been made. It is that instead of pushing for the Farragut Field fill, the Academy seek funds that would have gone into the fill to build the long-planned stadium on the Taylar Avenue site, and tear down the stands of the present Thompson Stadium on Farragut Field.

The removal of these Thompson Field stands, and a rearrangement of the road net around them, would add quite a lot of space to Farragut Field. Without the stands and with roads eliminated Farragut Field would run without break from the wall along King George Street to the road that now parallels the Severn River, and could be extended further out when the fillout from the Dewey-Santee Basins is completed.

A long, broad field of this sort will make possible a readjustment of the drill and playing space that would be more advantageous than at present.

The road now existing between the Thompson Stadium and the wall along King George Street would not be needed as motorists, and other vehicles, could turn into King George Street from the Farragut seawall road. The road on the other side of the stadium, running into the seawall road also could be eliminated.

It is true that the land at the proposed stadium site on Taylor Avenue does not belong to the National Government, but is owned by the Naval Academy Athletic Association. It should be possible for the Academy authorities to acquire title to this field for a stadium.

Construction of the stadium on the Taylor Avenue site would give the Academy another

playfield, which could be used at times, when necessary, for other purposes. In addition it would end a parking problem in, and in the vicinity of, the Academy when games and other events are held in the Thompson Stadium. The construction of the Annapolis Expressway and the new access road from Annapolis to this expressway have made a stadium on Taylor Avenue convenient of access.

Thus, not only would the long desired stadium on Taylor Avenue be secured, but the Academy would add more space at that site, and gain still more land space by removing the present Thompson Stadium stands and its adjoining roads.

It has been pointed out that during World War II the Navy built athletic plants at universities and colleges which were taking part in the Navy Reserve Officer Training Program, and since the war some of these plants have been given to the institutions where they were constructed. Certainly, if the Navy Department can do this, it can seek funds to build a needed stadium for its own Naval Academy.

This newspaper is fully aware of the problem facing the Naval Academy, and is also aware of the need of guarding and developing the more than 400 miles of waterfront in Annapolis and Anne Arundel County. This waterfront is one of the county's most valuable assets, as, aside from the maritime industry it attracts, it also furnishes the sites for many beautiful homes and housing developments. This adds to the assessable basis of the county and stimulates it economic life.

We also are aware of the tremendous economic value of the Naval Academy and other installations of the Severn River Naval Command to Annapolis, Anne Arundel County, and in fact the entire State of Maryland. Approximately 2,750 civilians are employed in the activities of the Severn River command and the yearly payroll for these civilians alone, based on latest data, is $11,612,600 annually.

In addition to this, the annual payroll of the military personnel stationed in the Severn River Naval Command is $11,700,000, including the $4,868,370, annual payroll of the midshipmen.

These 2 payrolls, civilian and military, total $23,312,600 a year which has a tremendous impact on the local economy. This is a factor that it is well to keep in mind at all times.

In addition, approximately 633 of the military personnel of the Severn River Naval Command live in private homes or apartments in and around Annapolis, including 222 in the Arundel Estates and Severn Homes projects.

From July 1, 1954 to June 1, 1955, the value of work accomplished under contract in the command area was $4,500,000, and the value of supplies and materials purchased for maintenance and operations totaled $800,000.

Altogether a total of $28,612,600 is represented in civilian and military payrolls, contract work and supplies and materials.

We have backed the efforts of the Naval Academy to secure additional facilities in the past and are glad to know at present that the long needed airport for the institution seems assured. The site now reported as considered for the airport is away from any densely populated area, and we hope that it will soon become a fact instead of a dream. It is badly needed for the training of midshipmen in these days of rapid aviation advances.

The history of airports is that when they are established they bring people and activities near them and that the value of real estate increases.

The current controversy over the Farragut fill points up a situation that needs attention. Over the years, as the population of the Nation increases, there will likely be more pressure for expansion of the Academy. We feel that this needs long-range study.

We, therefore, suggest that the chamber of commerce and the Severn River Naval Command authorities cooperate in appointing a joint committee to make a long-range study of possible expansion needs in the future, and draw up a plan designed to meet this situation. The pros and cons of such expansion could be thrashed out by this joint committee, and decisions made that would avoid controversy in the later years.

Address Delivered by Gen. Telford Taylor at ADA Convention Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some weeks ago Gen. Telford Taylor delivered an address at the eighth annual convention of the Americans for Democratic Action. Although I do not agree with all the observations made in the address, nevertheless, I believe it is a very able presentation of General Taylor's point of view. I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF TELFORD TAYLOR AT ADA CONVENTION BANQUET

I have been asked to say a few words on security and freedom. The form and substance that men give to these concepts are a deep and burning issue of our time, matched and closely interlocked with the brooding question of war and peace.

All too often, security and freedom are treated as antithetical or competing goals, and the sacrifice of a large part of one is regarded as necessary to ensure full measure of the other. Surely this is a most dangerous fallacy. The two concepts are mutually complementary rather than conflicting. Like the yin and yang of Chinese symbolism, each is equally necessary to the integrity of the whole. It would, indeed, be presumptuous of me to labor so basic a postulate before this audience, among which are numbered so many old and close friends, in the light of ADA's repeated and pointed declarations that freedom and security are interdependent.

I think that our efforts to drive home this principle have borne fruit during the past year. The press is not now so prone to treat demagogic accusations and insolent innuendos as front-page news. The public is less apt to judge a man's fitness for public office by his capacity for strident denunciation. Smear campaigns generally failed of their purpose in the last elections. The spearhead of the neo-know-nothing movement has been badly blunted.

I suggest, therefore, that today we no longer need be concerned chiefly with rearguard actions. On the contrary, the time has come when we can and must take positive and effective steps to strengthen freedom and security, suited to the hazards and prospects of 1955.

There are several compelling reasons why an affirmative program of this sort is a vital necessity. To begin with, the international cold war shows small sign of abating, and the importance of counterespionage and precautions against sabotage is undiminished. But the crude excesses and panicky convulsions of the last few years have dangerously weakened our internal security system. Without delay, it must be salvaged from the muddle of uncertainty, malice, and fear into which it has fallen.

Surely the national interest is reason enough, and in any event, political self-interest points the same road. Perhaps the great single success that the neo-know-nothings have achieved, has been in portraying the moderates of both major parties as "soft" toward communism, and in saddling the forces of freedom and democracy with the blame for Communist advances, whether in China or Czechoslovakia. There is no reason to think that these radicals of the right will abandon this style of play, particularly now that the shift in control of Congress has imposed on the Democratic Party the responsibility for legislative leadership in all matters, including internal security. Failure in the discharge of that responsibility can only strengthen the hand of the extreme right, in using the security issue as a device to smear individuals and destroy constitutional liberties.

Now, I think we can certainly congratulate ourselves on ADA's recent role in this situation. The administration of the Federal employee loyalty program is certainly a key factor in internal security. No Member of Congress has been more alert and effective in spotlighting the need for overhauling and strengthening the employee loyalty program than our distinguished vice chairman and toastmaster of the evening, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. Nothing that I know of has been a greater contribution to the solution of these problems than the tough-minded commonsense that has been brought to bear on them by ADA's founder and vice chairman, Mr. Joseph Rauh. What these men and others like them have been doing and saying in the last few days of hearings before Senator HUMPHREY's subcommittee (of the Committee on Government Operations) is in the great democratic tradition of the loyal opposition. Attorney General Brownell's reputation for competence and candor is unlikely to be enhanced by these accomplishments, but the Nation's security and freedom have both been notably strengthened thereby.

Let no one doubt that what ADA spokesmen are saying at these hearings is being listened to. The day after Mr. Rauh proposed limiting the Government security program to sensitive positions, his suggestion was echoed by no less a person than the President himself, who told his press conference that persons deemed security risks might be assigned to nonsensitive employment. But apparently the administration is wedded to the "trickle-down" theory in security as well as in the economic field, and evidently the President's new-found wisdom hasn't yet trickled down to the Civil Service Commission, for while the President was at his press conference, Chairman Philip Young was telling the Humphrey subcommittee that the loyalty program is skipping along merrily in the best of all possible worlds, and that he sees no need for a commission to study its operations. Mr. Young then proceeded to give an eloquent demonstration of how badly the study is needed, by revealing that he is more interested in effective Government than in "the welfare of Government employees." I fear that he hasn't yet learned the first requirement of his job as Civil Service Commissioner, which is to be civil. Perhaps he might learn from a study such as Senators HUMPHREY and STENNIS have proposed, that studied indifference to the welfare of Government employees is hardly the way to promote a loyal, devoted, and efficient civil service.

If there were any lingering doubts about the need for strengthening our security sys-

tem, they should have been set at rest by Secretary Dulles' most recent adventures in Foggy Bottom. Those of you who are operagoers are surely familiar with the scene—as routine in Italian operatic melodrama as the mounted chase in our westerns—in which a chorus of lusty and full-voiced cutthroats approaches the castle to abduct the soprano while the tenor's back is momentarily turned. Invariably the chorus reminds itself and the audience of the necessity of absolute quiet and stealth by a song in which silenzio figures prominently, starting pianissimo and ending with a rousing fortissimo. But somehow our hero never hears them and the soprano is carried off to await rescue when the tenor emerges from his inexplicable trance.

On the operatic stage we tolerate such absurdities only in exchange for the musical delights in which they are wrapped. Certainly they have no place in the State Department, least of all when the national security is closely touched. But how can we fitly describe the adventure of the Yalta documents other than as a staggering absurdity, revealing either abysmal ignorance of or total contempt for the elements of security? On Sunday we are told that publication of these documents would be injurious to allied interests, and that both the American and British Governments have decided to keep them confidential. On Monday we learn that the State Department, in order to insure their secrecy, has put them into galley proof and made them available at Foggy Bottom for congressional leaders to peruse. As an additional precaution messenger service is then offered to take 24 copies to the Capitol. On Tuesday Mr. Dulles announces that he plans to publish them eventually, but he doesn't know when. As a further safeguard, a copy of the galley proof is only made available to one newspaper—the New York Times. On Wednesday Mr. Dulles decides that the moment for publication has come; the documents are released, and on Thursday the New York Times is more unwieldy than ever. Prime Minister Churchill then denounces the documents as inaccurate and their publication as untimely, and in the other Allied countries there is bewildered criticism. No explanation of why documents which were secret on Tuesday can safely be published on Thursday, is vouchsafed by Mr. Dulles.

We may pass over the question whether or not this release was wise or timely; on any assumption such monumental bungling and indiscretion would be as laughable as the opera chorus if the implications were not so ominous. And all this from a Secretary of State who waggled an admonitory forefinger at the alleged indiscretions of a Davies or a Vincent, and banished them and others from the Foreign Service in discredit or disgrace. Mr. Young is not alone in his indifference to the welfare of Government employees or his ignorance of the elements of security. Indeed, our security system needs strengthening, but I fear that such flaws at such a level are beyond the power of Senator HUMPHREY'S subcommittee to rectify, and can be remedied only by an even higher authority.

Important as is the Federal employee loyalty program, it is by no means the only facet of internal security that needs constructive and imaginative scrutiny. Congressional investigatory methods, immunity for fifth-amendment pleaders, passport and visa control, the use of "informers," the efficacy of recent Federal security legislation, the proper role of the State governments in the security field, wiretapping—the list of security questions is almost endless. Many of them have been considered at this convention, and I will not presume on your attention to rehearse my views of each of them.

Some are very knotty and complicated questions on which the members of ADA do not all see eye to eye. In this there is no cause for alarm. ADA is mature and mellow enough to survive intra-mural disagreements, however sharp, without any lingering bitterness, and without dimming our admiration and affection for any of those among us who continue to render distinguished public service in line with ADA's objectives. Furthermore, ADA's disposition to face up to hard issues and to take a stand is its greatest source of strength. We can all find in the regular political parties abundant opportunity for a more expedient and noncommittal brand of politics. If ADA offered us only that, it would lose its unique character and most of its reason for existence.

It is in this spirit that I want to comment briefly on wiretapping. Some of my most valued friends insist that the hazards to freedom are so grave as to outweigh any possible benefits to security, and that it should be totally prohibited. I share their deep distaste for wiretapping, but I cannot follow them to this absolute conclusion. We have had a flat prohibition of wiretapping on the Federal statute books for 21 years (in sec. 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934), but this has not prevented such abuse and overuse of wiretapping as has made it an open scandal in my native State of New York. Furthermore, and conceding that the value of wiretapping as a police measure has frequently been exaggerated, I cannot agree that it is totally useless or that Federal agents should be prohibited from resorting to it when the national security is touched.

Finally, I am impressed that despite the statutory prohibition, wiretapping has been carried on by Federal agents, with the approval of the Department of Justice, throughout the 21-year period. During the critical wartime years, the Attorney General was at the outset, the late Robert H. Jackson, and thereafter our own former Chairman, the Honorable Francis Biddle. There is a strong strain of longevity in my family, but I despair of living to see a better Attorney General, or one more devoted to civil liberties, than either Bob Jackson or Francis Biddle. If they both found it impossible to do away with wiretapping, I suspect they may have had good reason.

It is not a good thing to have law on the books that fails to reflect the practical necessities of society. And in this case, I believe that the present prohibition is unworkable and is an obstacle to the prosecution of those who stoop to exploit wiretapping for personal or political ends, and to its elimination from use in connection with minor crimes. Would it not be wise, then, to support legislation authorizing Federal wiretapping within the field of national security, and prohibiting under severe penalty all unauthorized official or private interception, coupled with an adequate appropriation to insure enforcement of these provisions? I suggest that some such course of action might well serve to reenforce both security and freedom.

Of course, the general level of internal security will not be determined by wiretapping or any other one technique or device. Rather, we must maintain flexibility and freedom of maneuver in handling the problem. Security is, after all, a form of defensive warfare, and in its conduct commonsense and imagination count for much more than any single weapon. I think the greatest benefit of Senator HUMPHREY'S hearings has been in helping the country to recover its sense of proportion about the desirable scope of security administration.

Concentration of forces where they are most needed is an old and tested principle of tactics; nevertheless it is a fact that all taxpayers in California and all professional boxers in Indiana are now subject to security checks in one form or another. Mr. Tom Harris, counsel to the CIO, pinpointed the absurdity of this sort of thing very aptly when he told the subcommittee that: "When the Government tries to watch everyone, it can't watch anyone very well"—a nugget of wisdom reminiscent of W. S. Gilbert's observation (in The Gondoliers): "When everyone is somebody, why no one's anybody."

One final thought on security: Like other forms of warfare, it must be kept up to date. Communist tactics in 1955 are quite different from what they were in 1935 or 1945. During the thirties and forties, Communists were able to exploit many powerful currents of non-Communist opinion, such as anti-Nazism and anti-Fascism, the need for economic and social reforms, and the quest for peace. Some of these parallelisms are obsolete, and with others the Communist appeal has been worn thin and transparent by time and change. I agree with Congressman MARTIN DIES that Communist ideology no longer has a fraction of the lure for the idealist that it did 20 years ago. Today we are not so much in danger from Communist ideas as from Communist forces, whether or not in uniform. Unhappily, however, a large part of our internal security resources are still devoted to whipping dead horses. In a very real sense, our internal security administration is still fighting the last war. An up-to-date outlook and a re-evaluation of security hazards is sadly needed.

I have so far spoken chiefly about security; in conclusion I would like to turn to the medal's other side—the meaning and prospects of freedom in 1955. The events of the last few years have depressed our standards of justice and, in many quarters, have narrowed the discreet range of discussion and opinion. The episode of our military academy debating teams is a good illustration. For some people, loyalty appears to be a matter of reflex rather than reason. Mention China and the United Nations and we are all expected to cry "No!" in loud clear tones, as promptly and unreflectingly as Pavlov's dogs' mouths watered by reflex action when the bell for food rang. Whatever our views on Communist China, surely they ought to be based on something more than the judgment of the salivary glands.

But most of the colleges and universities stuck to the Chinese issue for their debates and seem none the worse for it. This is both encouraging and instructive. It is easy enough to assemble a chamber of horrors in the field of civil liberties; depressing as are the exhibits, they are part of a larger pattern in which there is much cause for encouragement. Indeed, we are now hearing emphatic demands for a return to sanity in security matters, emanating from some very unexpected quarters.

It is even more important to bear in mind that these individual injustices and stupidities are only the symptoms of underlying human trends and pressures. Liberty cannot thrive except in a favorable social climate. In the long run the reinvigoration of our freedom depends on our success in coping with such problems as the staggering educational crisis that confronts the Nation; whether we can maintain a free economy and an open door of opportunity for new business enterprise; now stanchly we persist in the search for a stable world peace under the rule of law.

What have been the bulwarks of freedom in Western civilization over the centuries? Surely the great centers of learning, fostering the free play of the human mind, have been among the strongest. And so today, when a great university refuses to yield to the clamor against a teacher who invokes a constitutional privilege, everyone's liberty is reinforced. So too, America has always placed special emphasis on the benefits of educational opportunities for all. Now this

country is bursting at the seams, and our educational resources are strained to the breaking point. Unless they can be expanded to meet our growing needs, it is futile to hope for freedom of the mind in the years to come.

Again, Americans have always laid great store by the sturdy independence of outlook that springs from broadly distributed productive resources. I have always thought that the unending debate between the partisans of bigness and littleness in economic organization overlooks the true issue. Bigness is not intrinsically bad, as should be apparent above all to the inhabitants of this land where the advantages of large scale production have been so magically exploited.

The risk is, rather, that the big trees will shut out the sunlight from the ground from which new trees must grow, and that our economy will ossify, and be frozen into a rigid pattern which excludes all newcomers. This risk is fundamental to any analysis of freedom, for conformity and timorousness will surely spread rapidly in a society where one can work only for the government or a big corporation and has no other choice. As Woodrow Wilson wrote forty-odd years ago: "When you are the servant of a corporation * * * you must obey the orders, and you have oftentimes with deep mortification to cooperate in the doing of things which you know are against the public interest." And he went on to state the impact of economics on freedom, in language as clear and apt for 1955 as for 1912 (from the New Freedom):

"There has come over the land that un-American set of conditions which enables a small number of men who control the Government to get favors from the Government; by those favors to exclude their fellows from equal business opportunity; by those favors to extend a network of control that will presently dominate every industry in the country, and so make men forget the ancient time when America lay in every hamlet, when America was to be seen in every fair valley, when America displayed her great forces on the broad prairies, ran her fine fires of enterprise up over the mountainsides and down into the bowels of the earth, and eager men were everywhere captains of industry, not employees; not looking to a distant city to find out what they might do, but looking about among their neighbors, finding credit according to their character, not according to their connections, finding credit in proportion to what was known to be in them and behind them, not in proportion to the securities they held that were approved where they were not known. In order to start an enterprise now, you have to be authenticated, in a perfectly impersonal way, not according to yourself, but according to what you own that somebody else approves of your owning. You cannot begin such an enterprise as those that have made America until you are so authenticated, until you have succeeded in obtaining the good will of large allied capitalists. Is that freedom? That is dependence, not freedom."

Finally, we must not forget that the fears that most dangerously threaten our liberty today stem from the fear of war. Atomic explosions in the western desert give us little reassurance when each may be followed by another in Siberia. Of course, Elmer Davis speaks the hard truth when he says that we must win the war if it comes. But surely freedom will pass through dark days if all the energies and aspirations of mankind must be geared to the outcome of so terrible a trial by battle. True, the Communists pay lipservice to the goal of peace, but if we value freedom, we must not let that or anything else frighten or deflect us from this difficult but greatest of modern crusades.

That word "crusade" is one on which the present administration has tried to take out a patent. But I can think of no word that better points up the administration's failure to give this Nation leadership in the pursuit of ideals. Man lives by the power of example—the word alone is not enough, it must be matched by the deed. From the White House we have had friendly, warm, and sometimes noble words. But time and time again an issue has been precipitated by events which fairly cried out for some deed—some decision—that would inspire and rededicate the Nation to its ideals. Opportunity has been generous and has knocked again and again on the administration's door, but the knock is never answered.

Only a few days ago the Secretary of the Treasury, namesake of but no kin to our toastmaster, had another such opportunity when he appeared before Senator FULBRIGHT'S committee that is studying the stock market. If ever a congressional inquiry has been conducted with caution and restraint, it is this one. Secretary HUMPHREY was presented with a wonderful opportunity to enlighten the public, and raise the national interest in a sound economy above partisan politics. But no, he could not do it. Instead, he told us that the Nation's confidence in its own future is a tender, hothouse growth, which can be easily upset or destroyed, and he suggested that the Fulbright hearings might be imperiling the value of corporate securities.

But what has been this administration's attitude toward "confidence" outside the doors of the stock exchange? Toward confidence in the patriotism and loyalty of our civil servants; confidence in the constitutional guarantees of freedom; confidence in the justice of the cause for which we fought the war? For years now, and for the last 2 under the leadership of Secretary Humphrey's Republican colleagues, blow after blow has been struck against the Nation's confidence in these things of the mind and spirit, without protest from the President, Secretary Humphrey, or any other high officer of this administration.

But let it be so much as murmured that we should even seek to understand the relation between economic values and stock market prices, and we hear howls of anguish and angry protest from the Republican high command. Indeed, it seems to be the unique genius of this administration to bring out not the best but the meanness and mediocrity in all of its spokesmen. When confronted with injustice their voice is a whisper; when touched in the pocket it rises to a whimper.

There was a phrase in Mr. Rauh's testimony that I would like to leave with you. The eventual triumph of communism or democracy, he said, would be determined not only by the strength of arms, but by "the splendor of ideals." The present administration has forgotten, I fear, that politics without ideals is not practical politics. Its lack of grasp for the splendor of ideals is matched only by its lack of sense of the ridiculous.

Indeed, the loyal opposition has rarely confronted a more challenging task, nor the country's welfare been so dependent upon its fulfillment. It is not only our plains and mountains and rivers and lakes, beautiful as they are, that we arm ourselves to defend; even more it is the traditions by which we live in and among them. The spirit of free inquiry and free enterprise; tolerance for differing beliefs within the framework of ordered government; enforcement of the law without fear or favor—these things are the stuff of freedom and security alike. It is ADA's finest mission to hold high the splendor of these ideals.

Contract Between Aluminum Company of America and New York Power Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the State of New York, through its instrumentality, the New York Power Authority, is building a great power works in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. With the consent of the Federal Government, the power authority will build, own and operate these works, which will have an annual output of 6 billion kilowatt-hours. The power authority has been negotiating contracts for the disposal of this power. Some differences of opinion have developed regarding the manner in which this power should be disposed. These differences have centered around a particular contract—a proposed contract with the Aluminum Company of America.

The proposed Alcoa contract, as all other similar contracts, must be approved by the Governor of New York. He now has the Alcoa contract before him, and has recently held public hearings with regard to it.

As one who has fought for many years for the St. Lawrence project, and as one who is deeply committed to the use of public resources for the benefit of all the people, I have disagreed with some aspects of the proposed Alcoa contract. I so advised the New York Power Authority; I have so advised the Governor of New York, having set forth my views at some length. I feel strongly that every contract for the disposal of public power must be consistent with fundamental public power principles developed in this country over the past 50 years. The decision in the matter of the Alcoa contract involves not only the policy of the State of New York but also has a direct bearing on national public power policy.

Recently, Mr. President, my old and good friend, Judge Samuel Rosenman, who is special counsel for the New York Power Authority, submitted a long statement of views justifying the Alcoa contract, to the editor of the New York Post, a newspaper which has been opposing the Alcoa contract. The New York Post asked me to write a parallel article, setting forth my views on public power policy and on the Alcoa contract.

Because I feel that this issue has a vital significance for the power policy of the entire Nation, I ask that my statement of views, and, to be perfectly fair, the statement also of views of Judge Rosenman, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two Views of the Alcoa Power Pact

(By Senator Herbert Lehman)

I shall not enter into detailed controversy with Sam Rosenman, my old friend and associate in many a good fight for the public interest. As special counsel for the New York Power Authority, he has an advocate's job; he is an eminent and effective advocate.

I want to emphasize, however, that the public power principles to which I adhere, and on which my attitude toward the proposed Alcoa contract are based, bear, even today, the clear imprint of Sam Rosenman's contribution.

As an adviser and then counsel to Franklin D. Roosevelt, Judge Rosenman helped to phrase and refine the public power principles repeatedly enunciated by Roosevelt during his terms as Governor of New York and in his campaign speeches as a candidate for that office. These views culminated finally in the New York Power Authority Act of 1931.

These public power principles did not, of course, originate with Franklin Roosevelt. An earlier Roosevelt, a Republican Roosevelt—Theodore—as President of the United States, helped to frame these principles at the turn of the century. Another Republican, Charles Evans Hughes, as Governor of New York, helped give them substance. And another Governor of New York, a Democrat, Al Smith, performed historic service in educating the people of New York and of the Nation to the importance of public power, and to the inalienable right of the people to the public development of hydroelectric power.

I sketch this background to put the public power issue in its proper historical perspective. This is not a new issue nor a radical idea spawned by the New Deal. It is a truly conservative idea which grew out of the conservation movement of the late 19th century—to conserve the people's resources and the national heritage, and to reclaim the portions of those resources which had been plundered and seized by predatory private interests.

Fight for public power has a very long history

This cause enlisted my interest as far back as I can remember. It was more than 30 years ago that I became an active advocate of the development of hydroelectric potential of the St. Lawrence, under public auspices, and a strong opponent of the move underway at that time—in the early twenties—to turn the St. Lawrence potential over to private interests.

Yet, the public power fight has a long history—and a proud tradition. I firmly believe that those today opposing various aspects of the Alco contract are trying to safeguard the public power principles established in the course of that fight, in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt, Charles Evans Hughes, Al Smith, and Franklin D. Roosevelt—Judge Rosenman to the contrary.

What are those principles? First and foremost is the principle that the hydroelectric power from the publicly owned waters of the St. Lawrence belongs to the people.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his first inaugural address as Governor of New York, put it this way:

"The waterpower of the State should belong to all the people. * * * The title to this power must vest forever in the people of this State. No commission, no, not the legislature itself has any right to give, for any consideration whatever, a single potential kilowatt in virtual perpetuity to any person or corporation whatsoever."

The second principle of public power is that its disposal, under public auspices, should be for the benefit of all the people of the State. Not just a few people, or some of the people, but all of the people.

This resource is not to be disposed of for the primary benefit of private utilities or industrial corporations, regardless of the importance of such utilities or corporations to the area in which they operate. This resource does not belong to any one area, but to all the people of the entire State. And when I say "all the people," I mean not only those now living, but also the generations still unborn.

This principle means that the power must be kept available for the disposal and use of the next generation, as well as the present one.

This is one of the chief differences between a privately owned resource and a publicly owned one: privately owned assets or resources can be freely and permanently sold or given away. A publicly owned resource must not, and cannot, be so disposed, regardless of how good a deal is offered.

A further principle of public power is that the people themselves, through their various public and nonprofit entities such as municipalities and rural electrification cooperatives—must have, if they so desire it, first access to the public power. They must have first call on it, to acquire it, as nearly as possible at cost, from the State—ahead of industries, private utilities, and other private entities organized for profit-making purposes.

Still another public-power principle is that the power should be disposed of to the consumers at the lowest possible rate so as to encourage the widest possible use of labor-saving electricity, in homes and on farms.

These public-power principles were given their most definitive legislative form, in New York State, in the New York Power Authority Act, in 1931. That law states explicitly that the power developed from the St. Lawrence should be primarily "for the benefit of the people of the State as a whole and particularly the domestic and rural consumers to whom the power can economically be made available, and accordingly * * * sale (of power) to and use by industry shall be a secondary purpose."

These principles as enunciated in New York State were further developed and refined in successive pieces of Federal legislation—the TVA Act, the Bonneville Power Act, the Flood Control Act—and many others. They continued to be developed by experience and refined, as well as tested, in actual practice.

Would Tennessee Valley want to give up TVA?

In the final analysis, it is in the practical testing of these principles that their validity must be, and has been, demonstrated.

Ask the people of the Tennessee Valley whether they are willing to abandon these principles. Ask the people of Oregon and Washington.

The Tennessee Valley, for instance, once an exhausted, rundown and poverty-stricken area, has become one of the great workshops and breadbaskets of America. The people and industries of the Tennessee Valley now pay in Federal taxes many times the amount the same area contributed before TVA.

The Northwest has been transformed from a wilderness into an industrial heartland.

No, the people who have come to know, and to live by these public-power principles, swear by them. They are deeply concerned and frightened by the concerted drive, inspired by the public utility lobby, to undermine and destroy those principles.

The Representatives of these areas in the Congress are fighting and will fight to the last ditch against any attempt to subvert these principles * * * either by a Dixon-Yates contract, or by a Niagara Power giveaway. They realize that the cause of one area is the cause of all areas.

I have described my public power principles, and the attachment which the people who have had experience with these principles feel for them.

But how do these principles work out in practice? How do the people actually benefit from them? What do these principles mean, in terms of the issues confronting us in New York State? How does all this affect the question of the Alcoa contract?

In practice, public power means "yardstick" competition. It means that municipally-owned utilities and rural co-ops are assured a chance to fill their needs for power from the State-owned supply—the St. Lawrence project power, in the present case. * * * These municipally-owned utilities and rural electric co-ops, in supplying low-cost power to the residents of the municipalities in the one case, and to the members of the co-op in the other, provide a yardstick by which rates charged by private utilities in neighboring areas can be measured.

"Yardstick" works wonders wherever it is tried

Private utilities must necessarily continue to supply the vast bulk of electric power needed by the citizens of New York State. But each private utility must know that unless it provides its customers with good service at the lowest possible rates, the municipality it serves can, if it wishes, set up its own utility system and get low-cost power from the State's hydroelectric system.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The simple fact is that this "yardstick" system has worked. It has worked wonders everywhere it has been tried. It has brought down rates on every side and flank of the Tennessee Valley area, throughout the Northwest and the Southwest. Private utilities, fearing public competition, have cut their rates, already approved as "fair" by State public service commissions. And the fact is that in every case, these same private utilities have prospered as a result of cutting rates. New industries have come in. People have vastly increased their consumption of electricity.

In the Northwest and in the Tennessee Valley, the per capita consumption of electricity is twice, three, and four times what it is in New York State. The private utilities have expanded right along with the public-power systems. Everybody has benefited.

In the present instance, in New York State, the St. Lawrence project, with a capacity of 700,000 kilowatts, is expected to produce about 6 billion kilowatt-hours of power annually. This is but a fraction of the present consumption of electric power in New York State.

If the St. Lawrence power is contracted for and disposed of entirely in the immediate vicinity of the project site, the benefit will accrue to the people, industries, utilities and individuals in that area. And it will be a small benefit. The saving to the consumers will not be significant. Some industries will benefit. There will be some trickle-down benefit to the entire State.

But that is not what is meant by a public development "primarily for the benefit of the people and the State as a whole and particularly the domestic and rural consumers." That is not making the maximum possible use of this public power, for the public benefit.

That brings me to the heart of the difference between the viewpoint on public power I espouse, and that held by the chairman of the New York Power Authority, Mr. Robert Moses.

Before going into the difference of viewpoint between Commissioner Moses, speaking, I assume, for the New York Power Authority, and myself, representing, I expect, the "fundamentalist" view of public power policy, I would like to point out the similarities in our viewpoints.

We both subscribe firmly to the principle that hydroelectric resources are an inalien-

able part of the public heritage, and must be publicly developed. We are united in our opposition to a "giveaway" of these resources to private interests, whether the resources in question be the hydroelectric potential of the St. Lawrence or of the Niagara.

Our difference lies in the concept which Commissioner Moses has evolved for the disposal of public power—a concept I deem to be unduly limited and parochial. The Moses concept would turn the clock back 50 years by reviving the practice of selling the power at the project site.

Commissioner Moses wants the customers to "come and get it."

He is convinced—and justifiably so—that this power is such an excellent "buy" that industries and private utilities would be delighted to build transmission lines to the project site and contract for all the power offered for sale, without putting the power authority to the expense of building a network of transmission lines to the power marketing centers in central New York.

ROB MOSES' CONCEPT FAILS TO PROTECT THE CONSUMER

The Moses concept certainly represents the easiest way to dispose of this power. It makes sense from the point of view of the bondholders who bought the revenue bonds issued by the power authority to finance this project. It represents a method of disposing of the power at the lowest possible expense and with the surest possible return.

But such a procedure would not satisfy the major demands of the public interest. It does not secure from the public resource the maximum public benefit—"for the people of the State as a whole." It would not insure that the benefits would flow "particularly to rural and domestic consumers."

Under the Moses concept, the primary beneficiaries would be select industries in the north country and, I assume, some private utilities * * * and, of course, the bondholders.

This is not only a violation of sound public power principle; it is also, in my judgment, violative of the New York Power Authority Act which specifies that the industrial use of the power shall be secondary.

The disposal of the St. Lawrence project power—and that from the Niagara, too—for the true public use and benefit requires that it be made available first of all to public bodies and rural co-ops for use as a yardstick.

It should not matter whether these public bodies and rural co-ops are in the immediate vicinity of the project site or at some considerable distance—as long as they are within economic transmission distance of the site.

Only if these public bodies and rural co-ops are able to get their share of the public power supply can they function as a yardstick to drive private power rates down throughout the State, with a resultant saving of many millions of dollars annually to the consumers of New York State.

Every city in New York State, including New York City, should have the right to acquire some of this power, if it has a need for some of it, or should develop a need for it in the future.

If this bloc of publicly developed hydroelectric power is disposed of constructively, in full conformity with the principles of public power policy, this public power will not displace a single kilowatt of privately developed power.

On the contrary, the result will be to increase greatly the total need and consumption of power. Private utilities, by lowering their rates, will find the demand greatly increased. They will prosper, along with the people. New industries will be attracted not only to the north country, but throughout the State.

HARRIMAN HAS THE CHANCE TO SAVE THE DAY FOR US

The public development of the hydroelectric potential of the St. Lawrence and the Niagara can usher in a new era of expansion for New York State—not only industrial expansion, but also, and even primarily, the expansion of the welfare and well being of all the people of our State.

This concept is a far cry from the narrow concept envisioned by the Moses plan.

I trust and hope that Governor Harriman will prevail upon the power authority to reject this limited concept and return to the broader, larger concept for the use of this power envisioned by Al Smith and Franklin Roosevelt.

Of course, this would be a much more difficult and complex undertaking than that envisioned by the Moses plan. It would require imagination, courage, and statesmanship. But it constitutes a real opportunity and a great challenge.

I have not had an opportunity to study all the terms of the Alcoa contract. I do know, however, that to enter into a 50-year contract for the disposal of one-fourth of the total output of the St. Lawrence project to the Aluminum Company of America is contrary to public power policy as I understand it.

The power authority does not have a right to contract away such a substantial bloc of public power for such a long term of years, regardless of what the State gets in return for this unprecedented concession.

It is, of course, desirable to keep the aluminum company in Massena. The State officials have an obligation to assist the alumium company in meeting this company's power needs. The Aluminum Company of America at Massena is an integral part of the economy of New York State. It has been so for many years. I hope Alcoa continues to thrive and prosper in New York State.

I do not believe, however, that it is necessary, in order to meet the reasonable needs of Alcoa, for public power policy to be sacrificed and violated. I do not think the Aluminum Company of America should be allowed to insist—I do not think it will insist—on contract terms which are so extravagantly at variance with the contract terms entered into by hundreds of industrial concerns, including aluminum companies, with public power authorities in other parts of the country.

In the Northwest, and in the TVA area, aluminum companies, and other great industrial concerns, have been very glad to secure publicly developed hydroelectric power on a 15-year term basis. They have invested vast amounts of money in construction and equipment to build plants in the vicinity of these power sites. I see no justification for setting, in the case of Alcoa, a precedent that would plague not only the Power Authority of New York State but other public power authorities throughout this country.

There are other terms of the contract which, according to information given me, likewise call for review and reconsideration. I am sure that Governor Harriman will give all these provisions full and thoughtful study, keeping very much in mind the necessity for preserving the principles of public power policy.

(By Judge Samuel Rosenman)

As special counsel to the New York Power Authority, I am writing you with respect to a series of articles which have appeared recently in the Post attacking the proposed contract between the authority and the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa) for the sale of power which is to be developed on the St. Lawrence River.

I have been shocked by some of the false, reckless, and misleading statements contained in these articles.

The power authority, after 24 years of frustration, failure and inaction, has at last begun to accomplish what it was set up to do in 1931. It has obtained a license from the Federal Power Commission to build, in partnership with the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario, the necessary dams, powerhouse, and other facilities to turn the waterpower of the St. Lawrence River into electricity.

Under the vigorous leadership of its new chairman, Robert Moses, it has raised the necessary $335 million for the United States half of the job. It has raised this sum not from the treasury of the State or Federal Government, not by having the State or Federal Government pledge its credit, but by selling its own bonds in the open market. These bonds have to be paid off by 1995—solely from the income the authority gets from the sale of electricity.

ALCOA LONG ON THE SCENE—AND THERE IS THE RUB

It has acquired land and let major contracts for construction. It has reduced the proposed construction period from 7 to 5 years.

The power authority, in its vigorous efforts to carry out its functions, has run into several very difficult problems. One of the most difficult was Alcoa. This was no theoretical problem. It was a very practical one. Alcoa has been engaged in business in northern New York for over 50 years.

With the consent of the State, it has been using the waters of the St. Lawrence to develop cheap electricity for its own use.

The construction of the power project by the authority will, of necessity, deprive Alcoa for all time of the waterpower it has been using for 50 years. Unless Alcoa can get an equal amount of power on terms which permit it to engage competitively in business it cannot continue to remain in the State of New York.

In this situation, the authority could have done only 1 of 2 things: (1) It could have told Alcoa that Alcoa was no longer going to get any power produced by the water of the St. Lawrence and that it would have to move out of New York, or (2) it could have negotiated with Alcoa to sell it enough electricity on terms which would enable it to stay in business.

While the authority could have taken the first alternative on its own accord, it could have adopted the second only on terms which Alcoa was ready to accept.

What would have happened if the authority had taken the first alternative?

1. Sixty-six hundred persons in northern New York now employed by Alcoa would have lost their jobs. These employees and their dependents form about 25 percent of the entire population of St. Lawrence County. Some 750 of them have worked for Alcoa for 25 years or longer. The position of Alcoa in the economy of this part of the country is highlighted by the fact that it now pays 50 percent of all the taxes in the town of Massena and about 13 percent of all the taxes of the whole county of St. Lawrence.

There are no industries in this locality which can take up any substantial number of these employees. On the contrary, as you know, northern New York is presently going through a very difficult period of unemployment. I know you will agree that this is no time to add 6,600 to the unemployed in this area, or to deprive the local government of its principal taxpayer.

2. Alcoa would have claimed a stupendous sum as compensation for the destruction of its right to take St. Lawrence water to develop the electricity which it needs to make aluminum—a right which it had exercised for 50 years. It has an investment in this

locality of over $91 million. Naturally, it would have stubbornly fought the authority through all the courts in order to save this investment and to continue its right to draw water—or to obtain vast sums of money in compensation for these rights. Although the authority was advised by counsel that Alcoa would not have been successful in such litigation, the expense of the lawsuits and, above all, the delay which they would have caused—and the bare possibility that they might be successful—were formidable considerations against adopting this alternative.

3. Alcoa owns a great amount of land in this area which will be flooded by the new dam being built by the authority. Much of this land would be very valuable as possible sites for power dams. In addition to its other claims for waterpower rights, Alcoa could have demanded large sums in compensation for these possible power sites and for other consequential damages.

All of these considerations were before the authority when it had to decide between the two alternatives. It realized that the first alternative might lead to disastrous results, not only to itself but to the economy of the northern part of New York. It therefore started negotiating with Alcoa to see on what terms it could sell Alcoa enough power to enable it to remain in business in the State of New York, continue to pay taxes, and employ people.

Over a period of 8 months these negotiations were carried on. There was give and take on both sides. No fairminded person can say that either side got more than it gave up or gave up less than it got. Every business contract is a result of this kind of negotiation.

Alcoa had been developing St. Lawrence power for itself—64,500 kilowatts of it—for only 1.56 mills per kilowatt-hour. The authority, in order to be able to pay off its bonds by 1995, had to ask all its buyers for much more than that. In fact, Alcoa will be paying approximately 4.2 mills per kilowatt-hour.

In addition, in order for Alcoa to use the alternating current, the authority will develop instead of the direct current it has been generating itself, it will have to spend another $25 million in construction and in changing equipment, etc.

Under another contemporaneous contract, Alcoa gives up all its claims to its water rights it has exercised for 50 years and its claims for consequential damages and other claims which would have run into millions of dollars. Litigation—with its expense and its delays—has been eliminated.

In view of the greatly increased price which Alcoa will have to pay for its firm power commitment until the bonds are paid off, in view of the additional expenditure of $25 million to enable it to use the power, in view of what Alcoa is giving up in the way of claims for water rights, consequential damages, etc., was Alcoa not justified in insisting on a long-term contract? Was not the authority justified in granting a long-term contract in order to keep Alcoa in the State and prevent the distress which would have resulted if it moved out?

ALCOA ASSURED OF ONLY 8 YEARS AT CHEAP RATE

It was only by a long-term contract, extending beyond the date of payment of the authority bonds, that Alcoa could ever get down to a rate which would be anywhere near the cheap rate at which it now generates electricity for itself. Although it is confidently expected that the bond issue will be paid off before 1995, under the contract Alcoa has assurance of only 8 years of this cheaper rate after paying the higher rate for the period of the bond issue.

And as additional protection to the authority, the contract now provides that if the rates are reduced by reason of pooling Niagara power with St. Lawrence power, then before reducing the rate to Alcoa the authority can change any of the terms of the present contract, including the length of it.

This was not a case of a new industry applying for a contract—as was the case where other public power developments in other parts of the country have sold their electricity to private industry. Examples of the length of contracts in other developments are therefore wholly irrelevant.

Here was a case of a company which was actually using the flow of the river, employing 6,600 people, having a great investment and certain definite fixed rights which it was being asked to relinquish.

The chairman of the authority seems to be selected by these articles for particular denunciation and abuse. Robert Moses needs no defense from me. He has done as much for the physical betterment of this State and this city as any man alive, and will be gratefully remembered for his accomplishments. He has been a fighting advocate of public development of waterpower in the interests of the people and a bitter opponent of private utility development of waterpower for over 30 years—beginning back in the days of Alfred E. Smith.

To accuse him—directly or by innuendo—of selling out to the power interests or of making a giveaway to such interests is not only shameless—it is ridiculous. And the public of the city and State who have benefited by his years of public service can only laugh at such reckless charges.

The articles in your paper have been increasingly abusive and increasingly incorrect. I take as an example one of them—dated May 9, 1955—and point out to you seriatim how patently false and absurd some of the accusations are:

FACTS NOT CONCEALED—GIVEN OUT IN RELEASE

Statement by the Post: "Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Power Authority, has negotiated a 48-year contract with the Aluminum Co. of America, the Post learned today."

Comment: There is here an insinuation of some effort of concealment, whereas the Post actually learned about the Alcoa contract on April 8 from a press release delivered to them by messenger. In addition, the authority advertised the power contracts in 15 papers scattered over New York State. (The law requires advertisement in six papers.) Six advertisements were run in the New York Post, beginning April 10.

Statement: "Power experts foresaw the possibility that the Moses-Alcoa agreement would set a precedent which would divert the cheap power to private industry rather than residential consumers in New York and other northeastern States.

"Olds noted that the New York Power Act directs the authority to give first consideration to the electric needs of domestic and rural consumers. The act says that 'sale to and use by industry shall be a secondary purpose.' "

Comment: The Authority is directed by the Power Authority Act to erect "such transmission lines as may be necessary to conduct electricity to industrial users located at or near the site" and to study the desirability and means of attracting industry to the State in order to effectuate the policy of the act.

While the Power Authority Act provides that the sale of power to industry shall be a secondary purpose, it also says that the sale of power to industry shall be utilized principally "to secure a sufficiently high-load factor and revenue returns to permit domestic and rural use at lowest possible rates." The manufacture of aluminum produces a higher load factor than practically any other industrial process. Besides, as you know, other contracts already announced show that this is no precedent at all. The Authority expects to comply fully with the policy stated in the act with respect to "domestic and rural consumers."

Statement: "He (Olds) urged that Moses develop a comprehensive 'marketing plan' so the public can get some notion of how the Authority plans to distribute the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power and opposed approval of contracts 'on a piecemeal basis.' "

Comment: The Alcoa contract had to be made now if Alcoa was to stay in business in Massena. It went there originally because it was able to produce cheap power. The Authority must charge it a much higher rate. Many matters had to be settled between the Authority and the company, several of them on one basis if the company remained and on another if it left. The construction schedule requires that both spend many millions of dollars on related construction work. Obviously Alcoa would not undertake to spend such sums or to waive claimed water rights unless it first obtained a contract for the purchase of power from the Authority. It could not wait upon the sale of the balance of the Authority's power.

Statement: "There was a possibility that a group of Pennsylvania Rural Electrification Cooperatives would protest the Moses-Alcoa deal directly to Harriman.

"Representatives of the group have said privately that power Authority representatives won't allow them to be heard at Tuesday's session (the hearing on the contract). Whether this is Moses' final decision was uncertain."

Comment: As you know, everybody who wanted to speak at the hearing was given an opportunity to do so. There was never any suggestion to the contrary, and no basis for this reckless insinuation that they would not get a hearing.

QUESTION OF THE RATES ALCOA WILL HAVE TO PAY

Statement: "The base rate for the firm power would be $1 per kilowatt and 2.67 mills per kilowatt-hour, for secondary power, totaling 65,000 kilowatts."

Comment: For firm power Alcoa must pay a so-called capacity charge of $1 per month for each kilowatt it contracts to buy, whether it uses it or not, and must also pay 2.67 mills per kilowatt-hour for all the energy it uses. There is a prescribed minimum amount of energy for which it must pay in any event.

As to secondary power, Alcoa, like other customers, will pay an energy charge only—the initial charge being 2.67 mills—but unlike the others, Alcoa must pay for all the energy it contracts to buy whether it uses it or not.

Statement: "If the Authority finds it must charge more than $1.10 per kilowatt Alcoa has the option of increasing the amount of the cheaper 'secondary' power it consumes or 'terminating the taking of power and energy under this contract in whole or in part'."

Comment: The general contract provisions adopted by the Authority, which apply to its contracts generally with all purchasers, allow a customer to cancel for any increase in rates no matter how small. The language in the Alcoa contract on this subject limits its right to terminate to an increase of 10 cents or more per kilowatt. The option given to Alcoa to take more "secondary power" by its terms is limited to situations where the Authority has the power available for sale and it is not subject to contract with others.

Statement: "Power analysts maintain that terms of the Alcoa contract are far more generous than those of the public agencies."

Comment: This is not so. Alcoa pays the same rates as everybody else, but is required to pay a higher minimum charge and is actually paying for power at a higher load factor than anybody else. See also the immediately preceding comment. Furthermore, while other customers, pursuant to the general contract provisions adopted by the Authority, are not required to pay for

any power when closed down because of a strike, lockout or labor dispute, Alcoa under such circumstances must pay for half the firm power it contracts to buy.

Statement: "The language in these contracts also reserves to the Authority rights it appears to have surrendered in the Alcoa contract. In the Plattsburg contract, the Authority 'may discontinue furnishing electrict service' if the city's operation of its power system 'interferes' with the Authority's operations."

Comment: There is no provision in the Alcoa contract for the discontinuance of service in case of conditions on the contractor's power system which interfere with the power system of the Authority for the reason that Alcoa does not have a power system.

Baccalaureate Address of Dr. Brainerd Gibbons Before the Graduating Class at Endicott Junior College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein, upon the request of Mr. Frary Von Blomberg, of Boston, the baccalaureate address of Dr. Brainerd Gibbons before the graduating class at Endicott Junior College. Dr. Gibbons is general superintendent of the Universalist Church of America.

His address follows:

THE AGELESS CHALLENGE

President Dr. George Bierkoe, Dean Eleanor Tupper, faculty, parents, friends, members of the graduating class of Endicott Junior College, congratulations.

The opportunity to share some thoughts with young women, who are about to project their influence into the adult world, is both a privilege and a sobering prospect. Cliché though it be, this is one of the happiest events of your lives and each passing year will enrich your appreciation of this day.

What a stark contrast is presented by the world scene. Never has the picture been more plain and ominous. Moral corruption contaminates society at all levels. Industrial strife disrupts our economy. Mutual distrust corrupts human hearts the world over. Under the stinging lash of fear nations slave to build pyramids of atomic weapons, draining their material and spiritual resources. The drums of war beat their destructive rhythms in fatal prelude to a ghastly sympathy of global annihilation. How applicable today is Tom Paine's appraisal of our Revolutionary period: "These are times that try men's souls."

Such is the setting of the world stage upon which you must play your several parts after these happy graduation ceremonies. What is the most essential quality for any role you may play in life?

Consider civilization. Jesus said that He came that man "might have life, and have it more abundantly." Certain it is that the abundant life has been the primary goal of all human strivings since man came upon this earth. Look at the results of this age-old struggle. Someone wisecracked that "civilization is only the advance from shoeless toes to toeless shoes," and that "man is a miserable creature who spends a great deal of time trying to get his conscience and his desires tuned to the same wavelength." And, as we know, never quite succeeding.

Seriously, though, the comparison of modern man with his primitive ancestor reveals a stupendous advance. Today the world is one vast neighborhood with mankind standing on a pinnacle of potential plenty and comfort for all.

What a glorious vision is that Promised Land of abundant living for all. Yet, like Moses, we may die before entering it—die not only individually, but as a civilization. This is deepest tragedy; to die within sight of the Promised Land, to have the prize of all our striving struck from our hands before ever we can grasp it securely.

Yes, civilization faces its gravest crisis. Even those whose mental realm is bounded by Superman comics sense the awful possibilities in the world of tomorrow when the fantastic powers of their hero may become destructive realities by the wanton use of atomic energy. Just as two-gun desperadoes of the old Wild West kept hapless victims jigging wildly to avoid lead spraying about their legs, so now atomic power keeps society in emotional jitters to escape its deadly potentialities preying upon human minds.

This gnawing fear over the uncertain future partially explains the utter demoralization of modern society. Seeing no spiritual, eternal values, people put their faith in transitory, external things. They worship before a jukebox rather than an altar. Glamour is rated above personality, and nylons for female underpinning are deemed more vital than good understanding. The perfume-promise of night of sin is more enticing than lifelong love and fidelity. We fight to get aboard a mad merry-go-round of hectic activities, shunning solitary meditation as though it were the plague. Our desires are so frivolous that someone observed that the "only reason many American families don't own an elephant is that they have never been offered an elephant for a dollar down and a dollar a week."

Looking ahead, perhaps only tomorrow, we can see the remnants of humanity living like our caveman forebears, starting all over again the long trek toward the Promised Land, a kingdom of heaven on earth. The prospect is hell, isn't it? No wonder man is thrown off his emotional, moral balance.

Nevertheless, and this I would say most emphatically, disaster is not inevitable. As Emerson observed, "this time, like all times, is a very good one, if we know what to do with it." "Aye, and there's the rub": We don't seem to know what to do with it, how to turn our great discoveries to advantage instead to do destruction. In bewildered confusion our blind guides turn to old remedies that have always failed and always will; armed might, treaties, charters, balances of power, and the like. These cures are absolutely futile because they have no effect upon the cause of all our ills—man. People seem as oblivious to the natural laws of cause and effect as a New Jersey husband who reported his wife, mother of nine children, missing. The police found her in a hospital maternity ward, plus another 8-pound baby.

Our problems are equally elemental. The evils that beset the world are but individual evils multiplied—your evils, my evils, and the other fellow's. As man is, so is society.

While it is fatally ignored by those attempting to save society, it must be clear to you that the crux of civilization's crisis is man's character. When pioneers swept across frontiers into virgin territory, they always faced a vital choice: To leave old evils behind or to bring them along. When the first stone ax was made, someone had to decide whether to use it solely to subdue nature, or, in addition, to subdue a neighbor by splitting his skull. So it has been with every new place and thing man has discovered; the choice was his to use them for good or evil. And, thus far, man has always made the wrong choice. He has never accepted the ageless challenge to be good and to do good; he has ignored the charge Jesus gave: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect."

Machines, all the creations of science, have no wills for either good or evil. They do good or evil as man wills. Atomic energy is no Frankenstein monster bent on destroying civilization, except as man wills it. The determining factor in the kind of world we shall have tomorrow is man's will, and man's will is determined by his character. If we would reform the world, we must first reform ourselves. We can't have a good society without first having good individuals.

Character is more than what you know. It's what you do with what you know. People render ardent lipservice to good, but lack the will to do it. Education alone will not strengthen the will to do good. A man may use the whole alphabet in degrees after his name and still not have a single degree of morality and remain a spiritual illiterate. Nor can people be made good by legislation or political coercion. Our wills to do good can be strengthened only as we draw upon that divine spirit which pervades the universe and dwells within each of us.

The world needs moral rearmament more than military. The only sure defense against the destructive use of atomic power is spiritual power, and that spiritual power we have within ourselves, awaiting development—the power to say "No" to evil and "Yes" to good. Your character, what you are inside, is the most vital power in the world today.

Now, as never before, we need a new pioneer spirit to explore and develop the spiritual ranges of human nature. We need young Joshuas of dynamic divinity to go in and possess the promised land of abundant living, of peace and plenty for all. We need young people daring enough to question the ethics of big business, or labor, or politics, of nations. We need young people independent enough to be different, hardy enough to bear the world's whipping for their nonconformity, which Emerson warns always follows. We need young people brave enough not only to die for their principles but—what is often harder—to live for them. We need young people of Bellamy's conviction that "nothing unjust can be eternal, and nothinng just can be impossible." Listen to these lines from the poem of William Rose Benet, American Parable:

"We feel the flood of those whose strong axehelves
And Oxen goad
Cleared a great wilderness what way they went—
And now there are the spiritual ranges
Still to be trod and broken to the plow.
For we must
Set our house in order, from the very least
And lowest room, according to some plan
Fit for the soul of man,
Meeting the needs of all,
Lest in the world's vanguard we fail our trust
And fearful writing on the wall
Flame, as of old Babylon it ran
Above Belshazzar when he sat at feast
Heave at the wheel, crack the long lash stinging,
On toward the heights with our wagon train
Toil through the trees, for the dusk is bringing
The marching stars again.
Forward still, where our wild star burning
Glitters on the peaks to lead us on.
Goad the oxen
Keep the wheels a-turning.
Through the night
To the dawn."

Such is the ageless challenge. Be good and do good. "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Reject this challenge, and die—ignominiously. Accept it, and live—gloriously.

Rural Electrification Loans to Colorado-Ute Electric Association and Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, from time to time I have invited the attention of the Senate to various matters concerning the rural electrification, and to various statements which distort and do not present a true view of developments in the Rural Electrification Administration.

At the request of some of the Colorado members of REA cooperatives—and I assure the Senate that I take this action on my own volition—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from James N. Myers, president of the Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., to Jack Smith, president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; also a letter from J. E. Smith, president of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, to James N. Myers, president of the Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc.; and also a statement on this subject by the Rural Electrification Administraiton of the United States Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the letters and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS VALLEY G. AND T., INC.,
Pueblo, Colo., June 1, 1955.

Mr. JACK SMITH,
President, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association,
Chase City, Va.

DEAR MR. SMITH: This is to direct your attention to an excerpt from a mimeographed document prepared and circulated by NRECA under date of May 6, 1955, and entitled "Weekly Statewide News Service." On page 5 of this document the following paragraph appears:

"Earlier, REA announced the approval of a $3,500,000 loan to another Colorado rural electric, the Arkansas Valley Generation and Transmission, Inc. Arkansas Valley would also lease its generating facilities to the Southern Colorado Power Co. Its generating unit, however, has been constructed by the power company and is nearly complete. It is also reliably reported that a contingency of approval for the loan was Arkansas Valley's agreement to drop its request for a Federal transmission line from the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas project. REA declined comment on the report."

As you will note upon reading the above paragraph, NRECA charges that in return for a loan from REA this co-op agreed to drop its request for a Federal transmission line. This is completely false.

The NRECA statement impugns the integrity of the members, directors, and officers of the Arkansas Valley G. and T., who were not consulted in any manner before the statement was released.

We can see no point being served by circulating this kind of vicious rumor without any attempt being made to check with the one party that has the most at stake in the deal.

There are two points we want to make for the record with respect to Government-owned or financed transmission lines. One is that our contract with the power company includes a specific provision which reserves for us the right to buy our power from the Bureau of Reclamation or any other source at any time we find it to our advantage to do so. A summary of the contract provisions is enclosed. The other is that, contrary to the untrue innuendo NRECA circulated, we received every consideration from REA as we worked to find a solution to our power-supply problem. We have been working on this problem for years, and we have made more progress in the last several months than we ever did.

This is no reflection of Mr. Nelsen's predecessors but it seems to us that it is a matter which deserves the credit which it is due.

We regret that your writer did not get in touch with us. If he had I am sure we could have avoided a lot of damage to the REA program that is sure to come as a result of the publication of an untruth.

It appears to us as though NRECA is deliberately trying to smear the Arkansas Valley generation and transmission loan and this cooperative especially since at the very time this false report was being written (it is dated May 6), some of our representatives were working with the NRECA Assistant General Manager, Charles Fain, in the preparation of testimony supporting the Federal transmission lines from the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas project. This testimony was given before the House Committee, as you probably know, the second week in May. In March, our cooperative representatives gave testimony before the Senate Committee again supporting Federal transmission lines.

In other words, NRECA must have known of our position in regard to the Federal transmission line and yet it proceeded to circulate an unfounded and, unchecked rumor that is of detriment to both this cooperative and REA.

We trust that you will see fit to cause the truth to receive widespread publication so that it will be able to catch up with and overcome the false statement. If you do not see fit to take such action, we are prepared to use the various advertising media to do so.

Very truly yours,
ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC.,
JAMES N. MYERS, *President.*
EDWARD GAITHER, *Manager.*

POINTS IN CONTRACT BETWEEN ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC., AND SOUTHERN COLORADO POWER CO., SIGNED APRIL 22, 1955

I. Generating cooperative to finance and the power company to construct and operate a 16,500-kilowatt-capacity steam-generating plant at Canon City, Colo.

II. Power company to pay rental charges at a rate sufficient to amortize the generating cooperative's REA loan ($3.5 million) over a maximum period of 35 years.

III. Company to sell and deliver from the integrated generation facilities to all the power the generating cooperative requests up to a maximum of 16,500 kilowatts, the full capacity of the plant, at rates 22 percent below the level the member cooperatives have been paying.

IV. Company will deliver power at seven initial points and later at other locations on its transmission system as the load growth demands.

V. The generating cooperative reserves the right at any time to purchase all or part of its power requirements from any other source with the supply of power from the company being curtailed or suspended without penalty.

VI. This specifically includes the Bureau of Reclamation in the event the generating cooperative desires to buy power from the Fryingpan-Arkansas project.

VII. Bureau power contracted by the generating cooperative may be transmitted over the company's system and delivered to the generating cooperative.

VIII. In the event all or any part of the Bureau power contracted for by the generating cooperative is not delivered by the Bureau, the company is obligated to make electric power available to the generating cooperative at rates stipulated for the life of the contract, which is 40 years.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1955.

JAMES N. MYERS, *President,*
EDWARD CEITHER, *Manager,*
Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc.,
Pueblo, Colo.

DEAR MR. MYERS AND MR. CAITHER: I wish to extend NRECA's apologies for whatever implications you feel that the association's weekly news service of May 6 may have contained impugning the integrity of you or any other persons connected with the Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc. Since acknowledging your letter of June 1 yesterday, I have been assured and am convinced that no such implications were intended, and that an honest error was involved in giving recognition to a report which those concerned now know had no basis of facts.

We are particularly glad to have your forthright statement that the report, and the possible implications that you feel may be drawn from such report, are completely false. It is much better to get the facts on the table and clear these matters up, once and for all.

We want to maintain the fine cooperation and close working harmony with you which, for instance, has made possible the constructive joint efforts of our organizations to support developments such as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. It is the support of those such as you and your groups which makes possible such successful efforts last year as obtaining increased REA loan funds for use this year when they were vitally necessary for purposes such as the two generating and transmission loans in Colorado. Then, too, our united effort has just resulted in the passage of the bill to liberalize the State loan allocation authority in the Rural Electrification Act.

I would like to take the opportunity to explain the circumstances under which the regrettable misunderstandings arose.

In the routine task of preparing this particular weekly news service, which was set up for statewide publications at their request several years ago, the able young reporter who wrote the story picked up the report of alleged conditions laid down for approval of Arkansas Valley's G. & T. loan contract. He included it only as an incidental and unofficial part of the background on one of the generating and transmission loans made in Colorado within a very brief period of time. The reporter, Sam Portwine, was up againt a Friday afternoon deadline and queried REA's information division on the report, but they declined to make any comment. The unfortunate and unwarranted report, which wes entirely initiated and circulated by other sources outside the association's staff and officials, and which I and other members of the board of directors also heard, in no way reflected upon anyone connected with the Arkansas Valley G. & T. The

source of the report was entirely in sympathy with your actions and your problems. Certainly the report had no endorsement on the part of the association nor from individual employees or officials.

The entire story, including the sentence to which you have principal objection, was produced as routine news coverage with the intention only of providing statewide papers with a comprehensive, objective review of the two G. & T. loans, the other one still pending at that time. I can assure you that there was absolutely no intention of "smearing" the loan or reflecting any improper motives or the integrity of you or any other persons connected with the Arkansas Valley G. & T. or its member cooperatives.

The staff has been and is sincerely endeavoring to correct any such misunderstanding or unjustified action such as that to which you have protested. You will find no reference to the matter in the most recent June issue of Rural Electrification magazine, as a result of the carbon copy of your letter of May 19 to Vance Austin which was sent to the national office. You will find that the previous May issue reported approval of the Arkansas Valley G. &. T. loan, but contained no references to the other matter. In this regard we assume that you prefer the denial not be carried in the July issue, inasmuch as magazine circulation was not given to the original weekly statewide news service report to which you objected.

We certainly want to clear up any misunderstandings and correct the error which has been made, and most of all we want to assure you that no reflection on the integrity or the motives of you or any other officials was intended. Toward this end, and in keeping with the request in the last paragraph of your letter, the attached release is being sent out as a full clarification of the sentence contained in the NRECA weekly news service of May 6. It will be given complete circulation to all recipients of that earlier news service.

I will be glad to hear from you further if you have other suggestions or comment on this handling of the matter.

Sincerely,

J. E. SMITH, *President.*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

BACKGROUND STATEMENT ON $10,155,000 LOAN TO COLORADO-UTE ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC., MONTROSE, COLO.

The Rural Electrification Administration today approved a loan of $10,155,000 to the newly formed Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Inc., of Montrose, Colo., for construction of generating and transmission facilities in southwest Colorado.

It was the second loan within a month by REA Administrator Ancher Nelsen for the purpose of improving the power supply situation in rural Colorado. On April 27 he approved a $3.5 million loan to Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., of Pueblo, Colo., also a newly organized power cooperative. Together the loans will boost generating capacity in the State by 54,450 kilowatts.

The loan approved today will assure members of four electric cooperatives an adequate supply of electric energy. An agreement between Colorado-Ute and Western Colorado Power Co. calls for the interconnected operation of the cooperative's new system and the power company's system.

In order to provide a sufficient State ceiling to permit this loan, REA drew down its reserve loan authorization of $35 million. It also earmarked $2,914,556 out of the 1956 loan authorization but this amount is under stop order until July 1.

Colorado-Ute is an association of four REA-financed distribution cooperatives with some 9,254 consumers on the western slope of southwestern Colorado. Member co-ops include: Delta-Montrose Rural Power Association, Inc., of Delta; San Miguel Power Association, Inc., of Nucla; LaPlatta Electric Power Association, Inc., of Durango, and Empire Electric Association, Inc., of Cortez.

Colorado-Ute will finance initially a 2-unit 25,300-kilowatt steam-generating plant and 164 miles of 115 kilovolt transmission line, substations and related facilities to serve the member cooperatives and to interconnect with the power company at Durango and Delta, Colo.

A third 12,650-kilowatt steam unit is provided in the loan and will be constructed when needed. The first steam units are expected to begin generating electricity by late 1956. A survey is now underway by the association's engineers to select the plant site.

Under the agreement between the Colorado-Ute Association and the utility, the generating plant will be operated and maintained by the power company for Colorado-Ute on an established kilowatt-hour fee basis. The cooperative will retain ownership of the generating plant and will also own, operate, and maintain the transmission systems and substations. If it is to the cooperative's advantage, Colorado-Ute may take over and operate the plant after 5 years.

In operating the new generating facilities, the power company agrees to furnish all the electricity needed by the four cooperatives. The combined reserve generating facilities of both systems will be available to either organization.

Summed up the joint power agreement has these significant benefits: 1. Adequate power as a result of the interchange; 2. substantially smaller investment as a result of the joint operation; 3. a savings in power costs to the member cooperatives.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

BACKGROUND STATEMENT ON $3.5 MILLION LOAN TO ARKANSAS VALLEY G. & T., INC., PUEBLO, COLO.

The Rural Electrification Administration today approved a loan of $3.5 million to the newly organized Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., of Pueblo, Colo., for a generating plant to help 3 Colorado distribution cooperatives obtain needed additional electric energy at a cost about 22 percent below existing wholesale rates.

The Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., is a federation of 3 REA-financed distribution cooperatives now serving about 9,000 rural consumers in southeastern Colorado. These are the Southeast Colorado Power Association, of La Junta, the San Isabel Electric Association, Inc., of Pueblo, and the Sangre de Cristo Electric Association, Inc., of Salida.

Directors of Arkansas Valley considered several power supply plans to meet their needs. After exhaustive studies they determined that this plan, patterned after the successful Cedar Rapids, Iowa, plan (Central Iowa Power Cooperative), resulted in the lowest cost power to the farmer.

The loan will finance the construction of a 16,500-kilowatt steam-generating plant adjacent to existing generating facilities of the Southern Colorado Power Co. at Canon City. Under a 40-year agreement between the cooperative and the company, the new plant will be constructed and lease operated by the Southern Colorado Co., as an integral part of its generating facilities.

This arrangement has several advantages for the REA borrowers. It will bring about a substantial reduction in the cost of power purchased from Southern Colorado for the three member cooperatives. The cost of power bought from Southern Colorado will be 8.45 mills per kilowatt-hour, compared to over 11 mills at present. Without this lower cost, 2 of the 3 rural electric cooperatives would face serious financial difficulties in future years, possibly endangering the security of Government loans. The co-ops will also be in better position to hold the line on present retail rates to their consumers.

The arrangement also enables the generating cooperative to assure partial firm power requirements of its 3 members for the next 15 to 20 years on a substantially smaller investment than would be required for completely independent facilities. Arkansas Valley is also protected against any possibility that construction costs might exceed $3,500,000 and will be relieved of the additional expense required for separate operation and maintenance.

The Southern Colorado Co. will bear all operating and maintenance expenses of the new plant, including repairs and replacements, and will pay Arkansas Valley a rental sufficient to amortize the loan over 35 years and meet its administrative expenses.

Threatened Commercial Invasion of National Parks and National Monuments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, although the Echo Park Dam has technically been eliminated from S. 500, the upper Colorado bill, there yet remains in the bill provision for a so-called study which still is a menace to the national park scenic values implicit in this proposal. To construct the Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument would be to threaten with commercial invasion all the other national parks and national monuments of the United States.

I believe it is pertinent for the Senate to see two recent bulletins by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, which includes some of the leading conservationists of the Nation—such men as Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson and Howard Zahniser. After all, the upper Colorado bill may again be before the Senate if it is amended in the House, and the amendments are not accepted by the conference committee.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, these bulletins by the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources concerning the crucial Echo Park issue.

There being no objection, the bulletins were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

ECHO PARK DAM ISSUE RAGES

Conservationists are indignant today over reports that the House Interior Affairs Subcommittee tried to fool the public yesterday by voting to take the Echo Park Dam out of the Colorado River bill and then voting to set up a prejudiced study of this same notorious Echo Park project, according to Howard Zahniser, vice chairman of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources and Washington representative of the Council of Conservationists.

The citizens committee urged the people throughout the country interested in national park preservation to renew their protests to their Congressmen and insist upon prompt defeat of the bill that includes such provision.

Already rushed through the Senate, the bill will have to be stopped in the House in order to prevent this threatened invasion of the national park system.

"This action establishing a board of engineers to prepare a report on the Echo Park Dam is simply putting the Echo Park Dam back into the bill after taking it out," Zahniser stated. "Conservation leaders are well aware of what this means and will oppose the entire bill all the more earnestly with this amendment in it. The facts and arguments for and against the proposed Echo Park Dam have been thoroughly developed and urged for 5 years already, and no board of engineers could do any better than the Bureau of Reclamation has done to try to make a case for Echo Park Dam. The fact is that it already has been demonstrated that this dam would be an unnecessary invasion of the national park system, and even the proponents of the upper Colorado River project now know that the protests against this are so numerous and insistent that Congress never will pass a bill that includes it. No one is going to be fooled by this new proposal. It is just another Echo Park echo."

COUNCIL OF CONSERVATIONISTS, NEW YORK

The House Interior Subcommittee passed a resolution to take Echo Park Dam out of the upper Colorado project bill, which the House of Representatives may soon vote on. But the same committee refused to pass exactly the same amendment when it was offered earlier by Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR, longtime champion of the conservationist position. It was reintroduced by another Congressman later, and passed only when supporters of the dam were ready to follow up with another amendment, introduced by the prodam forces, to put reconsideration of Echo Park Dam into the hands of a group of engineers appointed by the President. This amendment is not intended to find an alternative, as many think. It simply gives Watkins & Co. another turn at bat.

The prodam forces intimated that this action of the subcommittee would be approved by conservationist forces, but it certainly is not. Actually, taking the dam out of the bill while the House votes on it, and then paving the way to put it back in later, which is what these two time-bomb amendments do—does not have the approval of any responsible conservationist leader. This is only maneuvering to throw Echo Park Dam opponents off the scent. The Salt Lake City Tribune told about this trick even before it happened.

On June 9, almost a week before the maneuver, the paper reported: "Proponents of the legislation are saying privately that they still hope to knock out Echo Park. * * * They feel this is the only way the House would accept the upper Colorado program.

"The bill as passed by the Senate includes Echo Park Dam, so there would be a chance of getting the dam restored in conference. If unsuccessful, the proponents might settle for the President to name an impartial commission to determine that Echo Park is essential to the overall program, and should be authorized at a later date."

On June 11, the paper quoted Congressman DAWSON, of Utah, as saying: "We are going to get the bill out (of committee), and it will substantially be intact except for Echo Park Dam, which now is in a category where we feel it isn't lost by any means."

On June 12, Reclamation Commissioner Wilbur A. Dexheimer was quoted as saying: "It is very possible the Senate will restore proposed Echo Park Dam to the billion-dollar upper Colorado River storage project."

All conservation leaders who have seen what is happening know that the only way now to prevent Echo Park Dam is to kill this entire upper Colorado project. Here's why:

1. President Eisenhower, for political reasons, is committed to support Echo Park Dam. If he appoints engineers to investigate, they will be trained seals who will build a new case for Echo Park (with the same old faulty data), and say "There is no alternative to Echo Park." This is what the Salt Lake Tribune said (on June 9) the "impartial" engineers would really be commissioned to do. So the House will have voted in 1955 for the upper Colorado project ostensibly without the dam, and in 1958, when the engineers will come out with the same reclamation engineer's story we have heard before, Echo Park Dam will be in again.

2. If the House passes the bill in any form, it will have to go to a House-Senate conference. The conference will be largely under the control of the Senate's Echo Park Dam enthusiasts. They will find a way to put the dam back in, as Commissioner Dexheimer prophesies.

3. Remember this: Ardent, determined prodam enthusiasts who schemed the present maneuver, are responsible for taking Echo Park Dam out of the bill (temporarily); introducing and passing the time-bomb amendment to appoint impartial engineers to reinvestigate Echo Park, and prove it essential; voting the bill out of the subcommittee with the two trick amendments.

You will hear of other maneuvers calculated to make it seem as though Echo Park Dam is dead. It will never be dead unless the whole poorly planned, uneconomical upper Colorado River project is voted down by the House of Representatives.

What Conservation Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very interesting student essays published in the Condon (Oreg.) Globe-Times of May 27, 1955, one written by Linda Welp, and the other by Loraine Bewley, on the subject What Conservation Means to Me.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CONSERVATION MEANS TO ME

(By Linda Welp)

The meaning of conservation is the saving and protecting of our natural resources. I think of these resources as the soil, all wildlife, natural vegetation, water, and minerals. Mother Nature had everything planned out to work perfectly until man came along, damaging and destroying. The balance of nature was upset when man was careless in his ways with the land he lived on and his surroundings. Some of the wildlife became extinct, soil washed away, forests were destroyed, and streams polluted.

Many people don't care about conserving these natural resources. They give no consideration to the situation we would be in without them and how much the people of the world depend on them. There is the future to think of, too. In the years ahead, are the coming generations going to find a lifeless and barren wasteland? Not if everyone does his part in conservation. Conservation means to me the saving for these purposes.

All of the world depends directly or indirectly on the natural resources. Take for example the State of Oregon. The largest industries are lumber and agriculture with fishing being next in importance. These are all natural resources. Oregon's prosperity depends on these resources.

From our forests we get all of our lumber products. In a very few years our supply of trees would run out if we didn't practice conservation. There are forestry projects which supervise logging, protect the trees from fire, insects, and diseases, and tree farms that grow trees for harvest. Everyone should cooperate in these projects because it means the saving of our trees for ourselves and the future.

For successful agriculture, the soil must be taken care of. Without wise methods all of the good topsoil would be wasted, blown away by winds, or washed by rains and water just because the user was careless. With the help of our county agents, the farmer is saving his farm and rangeland. Conservation of soil is very important in future agricultural security.

The conserving of wildlife is important, too. Think what it would be like to never see any wild animals or fish. To help conserve these everyone should obey the hunting and fishing regulations. There would be no "sportsmen's paradise" if wild life weren't protected. It is necessary to save the wildlife to keep the balance of nature, and to me, personally, because I love the animals.

To me conservation means the preservation of all the natural resources, plants, animals, soil, water, and minerals which provide a living and relaxation for the people of the world.

WHAT CONSERVATION MEANS TO ME

(By Loraine Bewley)

The word "conservation" means to use materials and energy in a way to prevent waste and to obtain the greatest amount of usefulness.

When I hear the word conservation, the first thing I think of is soil conservation, because there is a lot of farming in this area of the country. Soil conservation is important, because if soil is maintained, food is assured. If the soil is conserved, more food can be grown, lands that were useless before can be used, and the country can prosper from them.

Conservation of the forests is important. Forests are not only a source of wood and wood products, but they are the home of many wild animals and insects. They hold back floods and are sources of pure sparkling streams, the hatcheries for fish. They are good windbreaks, and provide natural regions for outdoor recreation. If the forests are not conserved our grandchildren and generations to come will not know the beauty of the forest and the many animals that live in them. They will not be able to go out and spend happy days in the woods away from the worries of everyday life, if the forests are used without consideration and cut down or let go to waste.

The wildlife of the Nation must be preserved also if we want to go hunting for sport, or to just watch and enjoy animals in the future. Years ago our grandfathers could go out and hunt all day, shooting as many animals as they could. Now laws have been passed limiting the number that can be killed, and this way, there are more animals to be found. The National Government and many State governments have established animal refuges and sanctuaries where animals and birds can live and raise their young in safety.

There are other forms of conservation: The preservation of plant life, the use of mineral wealth to the best advantage, and the utilizing of waste products.

Among the many youth organizations actively interested in conservation are the Camp Fire Girls, Boy Scouts of America, Girl Scouts, 4–H clubs, Future Farmers of America, National Association of Audubon Societies, Izaak Walton League of America, National Wild Life Federation, and the American Nature Association.

I think conservation is a very good idea and that it should be continued on through the generations so that our country can be preserved and may remain beautiful, useful, and a fine place to live for many years to come.

Nebraska Stock Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 27, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolutions adopted at the Sixty-sixth Annual Convention of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in Lincoln, Nebr., June 9–11 of this year. I commend them to my colleagues. They are good reading and the kind of philosophy that has kept America strong:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

We, your committee on resolutions, believe it appropriate to call attention again to the policies, objectives, and beliefs of this association.

The object of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association shall be to promote unity of purpose of cattlemen; to advance, foster, and to protect the interests of all cattle breeders and producers of the State of Nebraska; to seek to improve the general merit, and extend the favorable reputation of Nebraska cattle; and do all things necessary to advance the prosperity of the industry.

This committee desires to reaffirm these purposes and objectives of this association and that it will continue to be its aim to vigorously promote the interests and welfare of Nebraska cattlemen.

It has been through the organized efforts of the members of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association that the promotion and protection of the livestock interests have been achieved.

Thus, we summon all Nebraska cattlemen to become members of the association and to be more closely united to safeguard and to further their industry, always keeping in mind the general welfare and prosperity of our State.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AND OFFICERS

Be it hereby

Resolved, That all of the acts and proceedings of the executive council and the officers of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association since the last annual meeting on June 10, 11, and 12, 1954, in Chadron, Nebr., as set forth in the respective minutes of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association in furtherance thereof, be and the same hereby are fully ratified, approved and confirmed.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK AND MEAT BOARD

Whereas the National Livestock and Meat Board is carrying on an extensive program on research for the purpose of expanding the nutritional knowledge of meat and is conducting extensive merchandising and meat cookery programs, and is performing many educational and promotional activities that place meat as the most important food in a well-balanced diet; and

Whereas the National Livestock and Meat Board is doing a very constructive service to our industry and is dependent upon voluntary contributions of livestock producers, feeders, and packers for its financial support; and

Whereas the funds now available to the National Livestock and Meat Board are entirely inadequate to meet present-day needs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association fully endorses the work of the National Livestock and Meat Board and urge that the assessment on cattle and calves be continued at the present rate of 2 cents per head on cattle, and that every effort be made to get all commission men and auction rings to make such a collection and all packers to match the assessment.

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE ADVERTISING PROGRAM

Whereas the American Meat Institute has carried on a broad advertising campaign which reaches millions of American consumers through foremost publications and national radio programs, stressing the importance of the producer in contributing to the health and economy of the Nation in meat production; and

Whereas this advertising is a benefit to every producer and feeder in the meat-animal industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association expresses its thanks and appreciation for this advertising.

PRICE SUPPORTS

Whereas the Nebraska Stock Growers Association has traditionally opposed Government controls and subsidies; and

Whereas it is economically unsound for the Government to maintain rigid support prices and restricting controls on any agricultural commodities that will guarantee the producer of that commodity a profit on a subsidy basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in order to reestablish a sound agricultural economy as a long-range program and to fairly test the present program as it relates to market prices and the problem of surplus, we recommend continued flexible price support on agricultural commodities to be determined annually by the Secretary of Agriculture before the crops are planted.

FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

Whereas the Congress of the United States is presently considering raising the present 2 cents per gallon Federal gasoline tax to 3 or 4 cents to finance an interstate network of highways; and

Whereas the overriding purpose of this greatly expanded Federal interest in highways is related to national and civil defense and should be paid for from general revenues of the broadest application; and

Whereas an increased Federal gasoline tax would further jeopardize a vital source of State highway funds, just at a time when demands on the States for highway revenue are at an alltime peak; and

Whereas gasoline is an indispensable element in ranching operations; and

Whereas the Federal gasoline tax is levied on nonhighway use of fuel used on the ranch; and

Whereas ranchers in this State would be subjected to greatly increased costs in operating gasoline-powered ranch machinery if the Federal tax is raised: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association go on record opposing any increase in the Federal tax on gasoline, and that copies of this resolution be sent to Nebraska Representatives and Senators in the United States Congress.

NATIONAL BEEF COUNCIL

Whereas the National Beef Council and the Nebraska Beef Council have done an outstanding job of promoting consumption of "beef for health" nationally, and at the State level; and

Whereas such action has been of great benefit to both the beef producer and consumer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association commend the National Beef Council and the Nebraska Beef Council for their excellent work and urge that their efforts be continued, and that steps be taken to provide the National Beef Council with adequate funds on a voluntary assessment basis.

NEBRASKA BEEF COUNCIL

Whereas the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, as one of its objectives has always promoted the general merit of Nebraska cattle, the production of which is an important segment of our State economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Beef Council be commended for their successful efforts in promoting legislation designating Nebraska motor vehicle license plates to carry the slogan—"The Beef State."

YOUTH PROGRAM

Whereas the 4–H membership and the FFA membership of boys and girls in Nebraska are doing an outstanding job in the breeding, growing, and exhibiting of Nebraska beef: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers Association heartily endorse and commend these organizations for their work.

Conditions in Refugee Camps in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Eugene Lyons entitled "They Chose Freedom—But What Are They Getting?" concerning "redefection" as a portent of free world political failure. The revelations of this article are such that I believe an immediate change of program is necessary.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY CHOSE FREEDOM—BUT WHAT ARE THEY GETTING?—"REDEFECTION," PORTENT OF FREE WORLD POLITICAL FAILURE

(By Eugene Lyons)

Inmates of a refugee camp in West Germany scrawled these words on their barracks: "We chose freedom—Come in and see what we got."

An American journalist recently accepted their wry invitation. He saw at first glance "what they got" in the free world, and he was horrified. Inside the barracks he found a crowd of wretched men, women, and children wasting their lives in squalor, stench, and disease, provided with barely enough

food for survival. In talking to them he learned that they were bitter, despairing, hopeless.

Unhappily that camp is not an exception. It is typical of about 200 in Europe and the Near East where tens of thousands who "chose freedom"—often at the risk of death—have received only misery compounded by the passing of bleak years. Some of the unfortunates have been in such camps for as long as 9 years.

Hundreds of thousands of other fugitives from communism, outside the official camps, are no better off. They live in ruined buildings, abandoned railroad cars and crates; few have the right to work, many are too old and sick to work. The hopes of a new life in freedom that led them to gamble their lives have collapsed in dreary poverty and a sense of futility.

Perhaps the most tragic among the unadjusted escapees to our side are the younger men and women, including defectors from the Red Army occupation forces. They looked forward not only to personal freedom but to a chance of active participation in a genuine movement to liberate their native lands. With few exceptions they have been deeply wounded by disillusionment. They have failed to find either a decent life for themselves or the opportunity to fight for the freedom of their country.

This wretched mass of humanity, estimated at over a million, has come from the Soviet satellite nations and from Soviet Russia proper. The self-exiled citizens of enslaved Russia make up one of the largest contingents.

It was inevitable that sooner or later the Kremlin would take advantage of this situation. It fears the fugitives as a symbol of freedom in the eyes of their subjects. It fears them even more as a possible spearhead in a liberation movement. The West's failure to understand the escapees and to treat them intelligently was an opportunity the shrewd masters of world communism could not fail to exploit.

Ever since the end of the war, Moscow has spared no energy to abuse, terrorize, and demoralize its runaway citizens. Even after the shameful American policy of forcible repatriation was called off, the Soviet fugitives were haunted by fear. There have been enough shocking instances of kidnaping, and even murder, to rob the life of the refugee of a sense of safety.

But within the last year Moscow moved to supplement terror with doses of honey. It has launched an intensive campaign of redefection, geared to lure fugitives to return home. The Soviet Government—so the story runs—has been moved to pity by the condition of its prodigal sons and daughters. Let them come home and they will be welcomed with open arms. Their sins in running away will be forgiven; they will have homes and work and personal dignity again.

In East Germany, a committee for return to the motherland has announced itself allegedly composed of refugees who had changed their minds and redefected. The committee is engaged in an intensive propaganda to persuade escapees to abandon the wicked, heartless, inhospitable West—the West that lets them starve and rot.

A newspaper put out by the committee is reaching former Soviet citizens all over the world, the United States included. "Brothers and sisters," it says, "return and the motherland will welcome you. Even those who are guilty before the motherland will be forgiven."

Many exiles have been receiving letters from relatives—self-evidently dictated by the secret police—urging them to retrace their steps. "We miss you and yearn for you," the missives declare. "Please come back quickly to those who love you." The process of softening-up by propaganda is often followed by personal visits from Soviet agents, who play on the victim's homesickness and make rosy promises.

Cynical and transparent though the redefection drive may seem, it is becoming increasingly effective. Hundreds have already returned behind the Iron Curtain, thousands seem of a mind to do the same. In the refugee camps, the aforementioned journalist estimated, about 25 percent seem prepared to go back. They still hate the Communist system and are full of forebodings as to what will happen to them. But their misery and hopelessness make them reckless and breed hopes in defiance of logic. They are easy targets for the Soviet manipulators.

Every fugitive who returns to the Soviet prison-land is a resounding moral and political victory for Communism and, by the same token, a great defeat for the free world. The growing success of the Kremlin's redefection campaign is the measure of Western bungling in this area. The free world has been politically short-sighted and humanly callous. It has not lived up to the duty and the opportunity represented by those who chose freedom, confident of our humane feelings and political common sense.

The United States has spent, and continues to spend, millions of dollars in radio broadcasts and other activities intended to widen the gap between the Soviet regimes and their subjects. The effects of this investment are being canceled out by the flow of returning and repentent fugitives. Each of the returners seems a living refutation of our claims, and the Soviets are past masters in making the most of this.

Caught between threats and blandishments, between fear and temptation, between hatred of communism and hatred of their miserable situation, the Soviet refugees are in a pathetic situation. They are being demoralized. Panic is spreading in their ranks. The news of the kidnaping or murder of an active anti-Communist is matched by authentic news that some well-known emigres have chosen to redefect. Meanwhile they look in vain for help and reassurance from the free world, which seems scarcely aware of their plight and indifferent to their tradegy.

What is in the process of building up is a tremendous triumph for communism in the cold war: a triumph handed to Moscow on a silver platter by our political ineptitude. Tens of thousands of devoted patriots of freedom who want to be our allies in the struggle against communism are being turned into enemies. One of our most formidable weapons against the Soviets is being converted into a weapon against the free world.

Even more serious is the likely effect on our friends and potential allies inside the Soviet Union. Their hope for ultimate release from the Red nightmare is inevitably tied to faith in what remains of the free world. If the Soviets can convince them that we treat their escaped fellow countrymen shabbily, that faith will be profoundly shaken. Without doubt the primary objective of the redefection program is to discredit the non-Soviet world, and America especially, in the eyes of the Soviet masses.

There have, of course, been some efforts by free governments and voluntary agencies to assist the hard-pressed fugitives from communism. But they have been inadequate, frequently niggardly, and as frequently constricted with red tape. There has been no consciousness of the urgency of the problem or the magnitude of the stakes.

It is late, but not too late, for massive countermeasures to offset the redefection campaign. Those concerned with what is called psychological warfare have no more excuse for ignoring the challenge. Voluntary agencies, like the American Friends of Russian Freedom, must be given larger means to conduct work among the escapees that, within the narrow limits as yet possible, has proved effective.

Above all, the individual American—you—must recognize the urgency of giving your moral and material aid. The American Friends of Russian Freedom has saved hundreds of the Soviet escapees from being engulfed by despair. Through its Friendship Center in Munich, its work project in Kaiserslautern, its direct financial help to needy families, and other undertakings, AFRF has done on a small scale what needs to be on a vast scale—what can be done if enough Americans help.

This is at once a call to humanity and a call to political wisdom. The Kremlin's redefection campaign must be halted and defeated.

Time Running Out for High Dam Advocates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Peter Edson column entitled "Time Running Out for High Dam Advocates," published in the Yakima Morning Herald of May 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME RUNNING OUT FOR HIGH DAM ADVOCATES

(By Peter Edson)

WASHINGTON.—The 30 United States Senators who favor Federal Government construction of a single, high, $388 million public power dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho think they have 1 last 3 months' chance to put it over.

They have been casting fishy eyes on Federal Power Commission Examiner William J. Costello's recent order which would authorize Idaho Power Co. to build a low, $90 million dam at the Brownlee site above Hells Canyon. The company's application to build two other low dams at Oxbow and Hells Canyon—to cost an additional $100 million—was denied.

Costello has recommended that opponents of his order be given 3 months in which to prepare their case before final hearing by the full Federal Power Commission.

OTHERWISE TO COURT

There are about 3 months left in the present session of Congress. If the 30 Senators—mostly Democrats led by Oregon Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER—can put over their high-dam bill in this time, they can stop the low dams. Otherwise, the public power advocates will have to take their case to court and delay action for a new try after 1956.

To their surprise and dismay, advocates of the high dam have found that Costello's provisional order contains many arguments in favor of the high dam.

At one point in his 75-page boildown of over 20,000 pages of testimony in hearings that began over 2 years ago, Costello writes: "* * * the facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake."

In spite of this, Costello recommended that the one, low, Idaho Power Co. dam be licensed for construction.

POLITICAL DECISION?

He reached this conclusion on the basis of what is being interpreted as a purely political judgment. In brief, it is that the Hells Canyon high-dam proposal has already been presented to Congress in 1950, 1951, and 1953, and has been turned down each time.

In the previous administration, Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman supported the project, originally put forward by Army Corps of Engineers in 1947. In the present administration, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay has withdrawn Government support.

On the economic aspects of the case, the Costello provisional order reports that, for the Idaho Power Co. Brownlee Dam, power cost would be 7.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

For the 3 low dams the power cost would be 6.6 mills per kilowatt-hour. On these facts Costello comments:

"When one realizes that the Bonneville Power Administration sells large amounts of firm power at about 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, it is difficult to see where in the Northwest power will be salable at triple the Bonneville rate."

FOR OWN TERRITORY

It was apparently for this reason that Costello disapproved the three-dam plan. He approved only the Brownlee project, which will produce power for sale in the Idaho Power Co.'s own territory.

"The really paradoxical aspect of the whole matter," comments Costello, "is that there is a crying need for firm-power additions in the Northwest, in view of the lagging program for development by the Federal Government and the steadily growing loads." The high dam would furnish more surplus power to the Bonneville grid.

The big obstacle which the high dam has to overcome is that it is a huge public-power project which would require a tremendous outlay of the taxpayers' money. Because of the Government's lower interest rates, lower taxes, and no need to show a profit, it freezes out private-enterprise competition.

Anniversary of the Death of Marshal Jozef Pilsudski, Father of Post World War I Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Polish-American Journal, May 28, 1955, in which Marshall Pilsudski is lauded for his foresight in warning the Western Powers of the rise of Hitler and Soviet imperialism and for intrepid spirit and bravery in fighting these sinister political philosophies:

LESSON FROM THE PAST

This month the free Poles all over the world, as well as the Americans of Polish descent commemorate the 20th anniversary of the death of Marshal Jozef Pilsudski, the father of post-World War I Poland.

As every great man, Pilsudski had many enemies during his lifetime, and there are still some who believe that he was a dictator and otherwise think ill of him.

Objective historians, however, are in agreement that Pilsudski was a great soldier and statesman who at times had to use unorthodox methods in order to attain what was best for the welfare of his country.

It is unfortunate indeed that Pilsudski's methods and objectives, and especially his prophetic warnings, were not understood or listened to by western European and American statesmen and as a result the free world had to go through the ordeal of World War II and is now engaged in a titanic struggle with the Soviet imperialism.

Foreseeing Soviet designs not only on Poland but on the whole free world, Pilsudski made an attempt in 1918–20 to crush the Soviet power in its embryonic stage. He imposed a smashing defeat on the Soviet armies in 1920 but was deprived of the fruits of his victory by shortsighted Western Powers who refused to give him the necessary aid to liquidate the Soviets once and for all.

Pilsudski also foresaw the rise of Hitler, and what would follow, if the Germans were not curbed.

This is not only the opinion of the Poles, but also of the former United States military attaché in Warsaw, Gen. Emer Yearger, who in his address during the Pilsudski memorial ceremony, held in New York City under the auspices of the Joseph Pilsudski Institute of America, said:

"He (Pilsudski) loaned me a study on the subject, made by the Polish General Staff during the winter of 1931–32, more than a year before Hitler came to the top. This foretold the rise of Hitler and what would happen, much as it did really happen. I am sure that was the reason for his plan to take action in the fall of 1932 to frustrate the German ambitions. However his Eastern and Western European allies would not go along with him. Nor would the United States take his warning seriously.

"Marshall Pilsudski was was truly one of the titans of his time. Those who have permitted the proud banner of Polish liberty, which he held so high and sustained so steadfastly, to be dragged in the mire of Soviet imperialism, have much to answer for."

Of course, the pages of history cannot be turned back. History, however, is a great teacher and therefore we should avail ourselves of its lessons in order to be wiser today than yesterday.

History proves that not only Pilsudski but the Poles in general understand the Germans and the Russians better than anyone else. Unfortunately, their knowledge in this respect is being ignored by our policymakers, who seem to prefer the illusion of coexistence with evil.

Let us hope that the awakening will occur in time, so that other great tragedies in the making can be avoided.

Father's Day Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention and meditation of my colleagues the following prayer by Mr. Chester E. Johnson. This beautiful prayer was inserted in the bulletin of the First Methodist Church in Montgomery, Ala., in commemoration of Father's Day, June 19, 1955.

I know that my colleagues, as I have, will find the prayer timely and inspirational:

FATHER'S DAY PRAYER

O Almighty God, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, and Father of all who believe in Thee through the redeeming and vicarious sacrifice of Thy Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, we approach Thee in humility and sincerity this day to offer up our plea and prayer on behalf of the fatherhood of the world in which we live, move, and have our being. We plead for the salvation of the races of men as a whole, but particularly do we pray today for those men of our time who have committed to their care and protection sons and daughters to become the men and women of the future. We pray that they may dedicate themselves anew, first to Thee and Thy service, then to their wives and children, to the end that generations which rise up after them may be richly blessed by their guidance, grace, wisdom, and piety; that they may find favor in Thy sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit; that their faith in Thee may never be weakened, that it may never falter nor fail; that their sons may become as great cornerstones of material and spiritual integrity, and their daughters "polished after the similitude of palaces." Grant, we pray, Dear God, that the fatherhood of our Nation and world, today, may be filled with the peace which can come only from Thy presence with them. We pray for joy in their lives and homes. We pray for a rich and rewarding success from the labor of their hands and abiding tranquillity within their hearts and souls, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

Aid for Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, last week my colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], introduced a bill (H. R. 6803) to provide that the Federal Government construct outright new school facilities required by school districts which are carrying out, or are ready to carry out, school integration programs. This proposal is a new and constructive approach to the problems consequent to the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, and already has stimulated much interest and support. Indicative of the clear merits of this legislation is the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Thursday, June 16:

AID FOR INTEGRATION

An Arizona Congressman has faced up to one of the real problems of ending racial segregation in the schools by proposing Federal aid during the transition.

Representative STEWART UDALL makes a persuasive case when he says that, just as the Federal Government grants funds for school construction where its defense projects create an impact on local facilities, so local districts which are put under a strain by the Supreme Court's mandate are entitled to claim some help in meeting extraordinary expenses that result.

In most States where segregation has been the rule, the myth of "separate but equal" has been exploded long since. Where separate schools fell short of equality, integrated

schools cannot be brought up to equality without an increase in expenditures. That is what many southern districts will face, and there are reasons both of justice and expediency for Federal aid at least in limited areas, such as the construction of needed new schools and raising the standards of teacher salaries.

Federal aid to education in the broader sense has been blockaded all too long by an unfortunate controversy over extending that aid to private church schools as well as public schools. There is no good reason why this controversy should enter into the consideration of the Udall bill. As the Supreme Court's opinion applied only to public schools, so by definition only public schools could be eligible for Federal aid in complying with it. Congress should lend a sympathetic ear to the proposal.

Livelihood of American Commercial Fishermen in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Eureka (Calif.) Humboldt-Standard of June 14, 1955.

I believe the editorial, entitled "Threats to Fishing Industry," is a realistic appraisal of what is happening to the commercial fishing industry because of consistent tariff reductions on imported fish products. It points out that between 1940 and 1954, total United States fish imports jumped from 47 million pounds to 350 million pounds; increasing in value during the same period from $7,270,000 to $87,349,000. In 1954, 38 countries exported fish products to the United States.

In spite of this tremendous upsurge, terrific pressures are constantly being brought to further reduce tariff rates. Canned crabmeat is but one example. The present 22½ percent tariff is so low that 60 percent of the crabmeat consumed on the domestic market comes from Japan. American fishermen cannot compete with the low-cost imports. Their catches cannot be readily disposed of and, as a result, processing plants in my district and elsewhere along the Pacific Coast have been forced to close.

But still it was announced that crabmeat would be one of the items considered for a tariff cut at trade-negotiation meetings with Japan. We fought long and hard to hold the line, and achieved a rare success. However, at the same meetings, tunafish canned in oil underwent a 10 percent tariff cut.

What is happening to the domestic industry? For the answer to that I respectfully call your attention to the following:

THREATS TO FISHING INDUSTRY

Crab fishermen and operators of California, including the Humboldt-Del Norte-Mendocino area, received some cheering news from Washington, D. C., a few days ago to the effect that the United States tariff levy on Japanese crabmeat will continue to stand at 22½ percent, despite pressure to lower the same. The announcement came from the office of Congressman HUBERT B. SCUDDER who, along with Congressmen MACK of Washington and NORBLAD of Oregon, has been carrying on a battle in behalf of the west coast fishermen against unrestricted foreign competition. Needless to say, the Congressmen are to be congratulated upon this victory.

The crab controversy, incidentally, serves to highlight the entire situation involving heavy importation of foreign fish during recent years. On that score, tuna fishermen of the west coast recently voiced the complaint that they are faced with a serious problem resulting from the flood of cheaply priced tuna pouring in from the Far East. This complaint, again, echoes similar comments from virtually all sectors of the American fishing industry.

The situation in the fishing industry, moreover, reflects a general battle that is developing over world markets, with many foreign countries coming into direct competition with American industry right here on our home grounds. This foreign competition was encouraged to a large extent following World War II as a means of helping these countries to rehabilitate their economy. Indeed, much of the new industrial challenge, particularly from Europe, stems from the furnishing of industrial machinery, techniques, and assistance to our allies and friends as a part of our foreign-aid program. Comes now the question as to whether we may have created a situation which conceivably could cause serious disruption among many of our home industries as a direct result.

As to what has been happening in the fish business, a graphic—if somewhat disconcerting—picture is provided by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, covering importations of fish over a 15-year period.

For example, according to the report, shrimp was imported from 23 foreign countries in 1954 compared to imports from only 10 countries in 1940. Ground-fish fillets came from 13 countries last year; in 1940 only 2 countries were exporting this product to the United States. In 1949, tuna was coming into this country from 12 countries; last year, it flowed in from 18 foreign countries. Swordfish came from 4 countries in 1954, compared to 2 exporting countries in 1940.

In all, according to the survey, 38 countries exported fish to the United States last year. These imports totaled 350 million pounds with a value of $87,349,000, compared to 1940 imports totaling 47 million pounds with a value of $7,270,000.

In the meantime, the commercial fishing industry here at home has been conducting a vast amount of research and promotion with the objective of boosting fish consumption. Advances in the fields of fish processing and packaging, indeed, have constituted one of the most remarkable contributions to the entire food industry. But here we may logically ask the question: Has all this promotion been conducted to the end that we have built up a great market for foreign fish, at the expense of our own fishermen and fish processors and distributors?

The fishing industry is peculiar—and significant—in that it is based largely upon the private initiative and pride of independence of the individual fisherman, who in most instances owns his boat and other gear. In no other field does free enterprise count for so much, except perhaps in the agricultural industry. The average fisherman is an independent operator and as such constitutes a highly important factor in our general economy. But unless he can operate at a profit, or at least be assured of a decent return on his investment and effort, then he must turn to other fields of employment.

Generally speaking, the average citizen takes slight interest in the tariff issue—unless it chances to strike home in a field where he is personally affected. But here, certainly, is a situation which should be of serious concern to every Californian and more particularly to residents of our own north coast region, in view of the importance of the commercial fishing industry to our State and local economy. And make no mistake about it, unless action is taken to give our American fishermen at least an even break, in meeting foreign competition, then the day may come when a great home industry will have faded from the scene.

Who Is the Villain?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court rendered its now-infamous decision of June 7, 1954, in what is now commonly known as the Phillips case, there has been a harsh and immediate reaction by a goodly number of so-called city fathers throughout this land. Backed by financial, spiritual, and moral support of the gas distributors, they have hailed this verdict as a great decision in the interest of the gas consumer.

And, inevitably, as always in such contentions, the consumer has been portrayed as a widow woman who is getting a great blessing by being able to pay what is termed "a fair price" for her gas at the burner-tip by the alleged generosity and kindness of the distributor and the Supreme Court.

In keeping with this fable, the distributor and the city fathers have painted the picture of the "rich producer" for all to see. It is always popular in our complex society to represent the so-called rich interests as the villian. Now, the producers of the Southwest—and especially in my home State of Texas—are being tagged with this big rich villian label.

It is time the people from the gas-producing States, who know the true facts, meet this challenge.

First, Mr. Speaker, may I say that there is a principle involved. As a result of the Supreme Court decision, we find the Federal Power Commission regulating the price of gas at the wellhead. Yet the hog in Iowa is fattened for the kill and shipped across the State line without any agency regulating the price it will bring. The automobile is made in the East and sold throughout the country, but there is no Federal regulation as to price on this product. Then, why is it that the Federal Power Commission regulates the commodity of gas? Is it because gas is a form of energy? No, Mr. Speaker. Wood is used for power, for fuel, for burning, yet the price of wood is not regulated simply through the fact that it is shipped across the State line.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, in any drama, and especially in that type of

theater known as the melodrama, it is popular to applaud the hero and hiss the villian. And the oil and gas producer is being tabbed the villain in this case.

Let me point out here that we do have some prima donnas in the petroleum industry. These individuals—and I assure you they constitute a very, very small minority—have been at times a source of embarrassment to our State and to the industry which has made them successful and sometimes wealthy individuals.

I speak not for these few.

I speak instead for the sincere majority of our producers who are sick and tired of the unfair and villianous role into which they have unwillingly been thrust.

The leaders in the move to allow the Federal Government to control the price of gas at the well, have climbed aboard a white charger, donned a cloak of armor and have sallied forth to slay the villian; the dragon, the "rich producer," if you will, Mr. Speaker.

And all in the fair name of the lily-white maiden that is the consumer. Shining knights in armor indeed.

Just who is the villian? Who is the true villian? Let us examine the facts. And let me say first that I am a consumer of natural gas, but from a gas-producing State and a gas-producing section of that State.

The only activity I have ever personally had in the oil fields and gas fields came while I was wearing a tin hat, steel-toed shoes, cotton gloves, and greasy coveralls.

I do not own a dime's worth of oil or gas, other than what I buy from the distributor for home consumption.

I would like to also point out that I have been consisently and uniformly opposed by the gas producers in my district.

So, to those who say I have a selfish interest, Mr. Speaker, I say, yes, my interest is selfish if a principle can so be termed.

Hiss the villian, hiss him loud and hiss him long. But first find who the villian really is. There may not be a hero in this drama but I intend to point out the facts and then, I think without a doubt, you will know whom to hiss—and possibly to cheer.

Let us consider for a moment both the transmission and distribution of gas—including the rates charged by the transmission and distribution companies—and we will see that both have been under governmental regulation for many years. As I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Power Commission regulates the interstate transmission lines, and State or local utility commissions oversee the distributing companies. May I point out that only in recent years, at their request, have the distributors requested Congress, and they concurred that they themselves be removed from Federal regulation through the FPC.

As consumer prices began to increase, consumer groups began protesting to the various regulatory bodies. They overlooked the fact that the price of natural gas by the producer at the wellhead had defied the rapidly rising trend in the cost of living for several years. They failed to realize that this same upward cost of living trend eventually was bound to have some effect on the cost of operations of the natural gas industry and that prices would have to move upward also. Each phase of the natural gas industry attempted to justify and rationalize its own price position, unfortunately inferring in doing so, that perhaps the other segments of the industry were the causative factors behind the price increases.

I am concerned that the continued Federal regulation will affect both adequate supplies and reasonable prices. In the first place, I know that regulation of natural gas production by the Federal Government cannot possibly result in lower prices over any extended period. On the contrary, I am confident that regulation will result in higher prices than would otherwise prevail. As an example, let me point out that the existence of regulation of the carriers and distributors has not prevented such firms seeking rate increases caused by increased steel, labor, and tax costs.

Actually, my concern is directed more to future supply than to prices. I am convinced that adequate supplies will be made available under continued competitive conditions. I am not convinced that such supplies will be adequate if regulatory effort deprives the producer of a proper incentive to seek out and develop new reserves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider particular cases in point and keep in mind, if you will, the fact that we are looking for the villain.

Consider, for instance, Providence, R. I. The producer is paid 10.1 cents per thousand cubic feet for his gas at the well. To transport the gas to the city gates of Providence costs 42.2 cents per thousand cubic feet. Now let us stop and do some simple addition: This is a total of 52.3 to buy the gas and deliver it to the gates of Providence, R. I., from Texas; but then the consumer is charged $3.64 for this same gas. Yes; the widow woman is paying a steep price to her protectors.

In New York City, Mr. Speaker, the consumer pays $2.76 for gas for which the producer received 7.8, and which cost only 23.5 to transport—that's from Texas to New York. And the State of New York at the same time it is yelling about "the rich Texas producer," has tagged a 3 percent tax on our Texas product for sale in New York. This tax alone represents almost the price the producer received at the well—the tax 7.2.

Elizabeth, N. J., where the city fathers are looking after the interest of that "pore ole widder women," pays the producer 7.6 cents for his gas at the well, transports it for 26.4 cents more, and sells it for $2.76.

Cambridge, Mass., pays 0.101 cent per thousand cubic feet to the producer, then 54.9 cents to transport it to the city gate. And that consumer pays $2.58 for literally 4 bits' worth of gas.

Mr. Speaker, some will allege that the natural-gas producers are few in number; that they create a monopoly; that a few of them, a mere handful, hold the industry in the palm of their hand.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the top 4 companies in this industry comprise only 17 percent of the business; the top 8, 28 percent; the top 20 a total of 46 percent. If those among us think that this is in contrast to my contention that this is not a monopoly business, then let them consider comparative figures for other industries. The top 4 companies in the copper business control 80 percent of the production, the top 4 companies in the iron-ore business make up 62 percent of that industry; the top 4 companies in the cigarette industry control 90.4 percent; and the top 4 companies engaged in automotive work and parts control 55.7 percent of the total business. In fact, more than 6,000 producers are furnishing gas to interstate transmission lines.

Therefore, it is clearly not true that a mere handful of rich producers control this vital industry.

In fact, production widely held presents an ideal ground for competitive activity. This condition gives rise to competitively economic strength.

Who really is concerned and involved is the landowner and producer. He is a man who, if you will listen, will probably tell you a story that begins with his grandfather coming to the Southwest in a covered wagon in 1850, or 1860, or 1870. He came to settle. He settled, and he perhaps fought the Indians, and without a doubt, he fought the elements. He scratched out a living out of the barren soil; then a company drilled on that land, and beneath that barren exterior, they found gas. And now the little farmer or rancher, as the case may be, found himself able to buy not only the necessary things of life, but perhaps a few luxuries. Still he was not a wealthy man. In most cases he is not wealthy today.

There are hundreds of these individuals. It is their land. They have a product to sell. Just as the man who sells sheep, corn, wood, or automobiles has a product to sell, he is trying to get a fair market price for his product. And now the FPC, with the sanction of the Supreme Court, jumps up to tell him how much he can get for his product—if it is natural gas—but not on the other products.

Mark my words, Mr. Speaker, if this is accomplished the man who states that he is "protecting" the consumer today by approval of the regulation of this commodity by the FPC, some day will find his product regulated by some Government agency. And oh, there will be weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth. He will pray—but his prayers are too late.

Mr. Speaker, I am ready to hiss the villian. Who is he? He certainly is not the consumer. He is not the producer. Then, could he be the one who pays a nickle for a thousand feet of gas and sells it for $3?

I urge the House to give favorable consideration to H. R. 6645.

The Old Army Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the other evening Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby was quoted as saying Dr. Leonard Scheele, the Surgeon General of the United States, was charged with full responsibility for the Salk polio vaccine program. This statement was variously interpreted by the press.

The consensus was that it was plain and fancy buck passing. This should come as no surprise. It has been a characteristic of the administration. Neither should this come as much of a surprise for it is what we have long referred to as the "Old Army Game," wherein the buck private at the end of the line is where the buck finally stops.

I can think of no more pertinent comment on this latest example of buck-passing than the lead editorial in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot for June 22, which I include as a part of my remarks.

I think it was quite fitting that Mrs. Hobby's remarks should have been made on a radio broadcast sponsored by Facts Forum.

The editorial follows:

THE VACCINE PROGRAM AND "DON'T BLAME ME"

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, says she has no apologies for the handling of the Salk polio vaccine program because "there is nothing I could have done differently."

Mrs. Hobby was speaking technically. She pointed out that under the law the Public Health Service, which comes under her department, is charged with the responsibility of licensing the drug firms. The Surgeon General makes the recommendations, she pointed out, and then she issues the licenses.

That puts the Federal Government's responsibility for the polio vaccine program on Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, the Surgeon General, and not me, Mrs. Hobby said. But, "I want to make clear that I am not dissatisfied with the Surgeon General."

If you are a little confused after you have read this far, and figure you need the counsel of a Philadelphia lawyer to straighten you out, just get in line.

Mrs. Hobby's tenuous answers to these new questions are typical of the confusion, the buck-passing and the quarreling which have marked the polio-vaccine program from the beginning.

Now that the vaccine program is off to a new start, with more adequate controls and a far better testing procedure—after fumbling, faltering, and breaking down—we still could use a little more demonstrated leadership, and a lot more acceptance of responsibility by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Her Department still is struggling to put back together the pieces it allowed to fall apart. And it still is not giving the moral support and the practical guidance it should be furnishing to its own people and the various State authorities whom it has asked to take over so much of the program under its "voluntary controls" policy.

Neither can they, or any Americans, look for much in the way of guidance and enlightenment from the hearings now being conducted by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Republicans on the committee are almost solely concerned with defending the administration's handling of the vaccine program and Democrats on the committee simply are going all out to develop a good political issue for 1956.

We would not be so critical of the mess or the yammering around to straighten it out, if there was not a shining example of how it should have been done and how it still could be done. We have only to look to Canada. There, the Canadian Government, proceeding quietly, surely, and scientifically, has completed the inoculation program for every one of its first and second grade children. Eight hundred thousand children have received the shots, and the Canadians are proceeding efficiently and without controversy to give the shots to hundreds of thousands more. Not one single case of polio has been reported among children who have received the inoculations, and there has been none of the off-again, on-again confusion in the production of the vaccine. Canada, too, is using the Salk vaccine, and has been able to produce it safely and distribute it satisfactorily. Our investigating Senators might well take a trip to Ottawa and consult with the Canadian Ministry of Health and Welfare.

Results of Questionnaire, First Congressional District, Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following results of my May 1955 questionnaire:

Results of the May 1955 questionnaire from Congressman Lawrence H. Smith, 1st District, Wisconsin, June 17, 1955

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Don't know
1. Should the United States help defend Formosa?	79	14	7
2. If Red China attacks Matsu and Quemoy, should the United States defend these islands?	50	38	12
3. Should we use atomic weapons, if necessary, in repelling any Red Chinese attack upon Matsu and Quemoy?	50	39	11
4. Do you favor military training for 6 months, plus 7½ years in the Reserve?	32	58	10
5. Do you approve President Eisenhower's foreign policy?	50	36	14
6. Do you favor a constitutional amendment making treaties of no force and effect if they deny or abridge any right enumerated in the United States Constitution (the Bricker amendment)?	76	20	4
7. Do you favor foreign military aid?	47	42	11
8. Do you favor foreign economic aid?	43	47	10
9. Do you approve exchange of atom secrets between the United States and our allies?	24	70	6
10. Do you favor authorizing the development and use of atomic energy by private enterprise within our own country?	90	9	1
11. Do you favor trading American butter for Russian manganese?	57	43	------
12. Do you favor support levels for agriculture if such support requires the imposition of stricter marketing allocations, acreage allotments, and price controls?	22	73	5
13. Do you favor immediate balancing of the Federal budget by increasing Federal taxes?	24	71	5
14. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget?	28	64	8
15. Do you favor immediate balancing of the Federal budget by reduction of Federal spending?	89	9	2
16. Do you approve President Eisenhower's 10-year construction program to modernize our primary roads?	66	28	6
17. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States to help build schools?	41	55	4
18. Do you approve an increase in the minimum wage?	44	51	5
19. Do you think management of money in welfare funds of labor unions should be regulated by law as insurance funds are regulated?	96	3	1
20. Do you favor reduction of Federal Government's competition with privately owned business and industry?	89	10	1
21. Do you approve extending social security old age insurance to all groups of workers not presently covered by social-security insurance or some equivalent plan?	71	25	4
22. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet Postal Department deficits?	65	30	5
23. Do you favor President Eisenhower's conducting personal talks with the heads of the Russian, British, and French Governments?	65	32	3
24. Do you approve of a questionnaire of this type as a means of helping a Congressman to know the thinking of his constituents?	98	1	1
25. Assuming the continuation of present economic conditions, do you favor an across-the-board lowering of the personal income tax?	63	35	2

More than 1,400 replies to the questionnaire have been received at this time. This represents better than a 15-percent return. Some of those who replied did not answer all the questions. I am greatly pleased with this fine response.

National Reserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present to the Congress three telegrams I have received from Maj. Gen. Albert H. Stackpole, Harrisburg, Pa., on behalf of the 79th Infantry Reserve Division; Col. Joseph J. Feuchter, president, 307th Military Government Group, chapter of Reserve Officers Association, St. Louis, Mo.; and Lt. Col. William L. Weiss, president, 307th chapter of the Military Government Association of the Reserve Officers Association, St. Louis, Mo. The telegrams are as follows:

HARRISBURG, PA., *June 22, 1955.*

HON. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Seventy-ninth Infantry Reserve Division disheartened at maneuvering over Reserve bill. It is difficult to maintain high morale among reservists when they feel congressional support lacking. As commander of this division, now in training at Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, and speaking for

all its personnel, I urge swift clarification and passage of adequate measures designed to provide Reserve manpower.

ALBERT H. STACKPOLE,
Major General, USAR.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 11, 1955.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman of Subcommittee,
House of Representatives:

Whereas the 307th Military Government Group Chapter of Reserve Officers Association in St. Louis, Mo., at its meeting June 9, 1955, unanimously adopted a motion that its legislative committee be empowered to draft a resolution urging action on the military reserve bill to get the said bill on the floor: It is

Resolved, That it is to the best interest of the national defense that the 307th Military Government Group Chapter, Reserve Officers Association, in St. Louis, Mo., endorse the support of and urge action upon the military reserve bill to effect its early adoption, setting aside amendments to said bill, with the view that there are no prejudices in the Reserve unit of which members of the association are concurrently unit members, and that no color line is drawn in the Reserve unit wherefore action upon and passage of the said bill is of primary concern.

JOSEPH J. FEUCHTER,
Lieutenant Colonel, MPC, USAR,
President.

EUGENE V. KRELL,
Captain, MPC, USAR, Chairman,
Legislative Committee.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *June 13, 1955.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the 307th Chapter of the Military Government Association is an organization of Army Reservists assigned to the 307th Military Group in St. Louis for early ready training and duty in the armed services; and

Whereas this group is composed of American citizens of various races and creeds who, as civilians, because of the professional knowledge and skills required in military government, actively participate in an unusually diversified field of civilian pursuits, and

Whereas the military and civilian leadership and accomplishments of the individuals composing this association bespeaks their studious and sincere dedication to all phases of national defense, be it therefore

Resolved, That the 307th Chapter of the Military Government Association urges the immediate passage of national security training bill, H. R. 5297.

WILLIAM L. WEISS,
Lieutenant Colonel, USAR, President.

Knowland Backs President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, June 20, 1955, which points up an excellent example of Senator KNOWLAND's support of the President's foreign policy.

The editorial follows:

KNOWLAND BACKS PRESIDENT

Folk who think they know where Senator KNOWLAND stands are always in danger of being surprised. Senator MCCARTHY is the latest to discover this. And he was not alone in his surprise when the Californian instantly seized an opportunity to dissociate himself from the Wisconsin Senator's attack on the Big Four Conference. For Mr. KNOWLAND has himself been active in emphasizing the dangers in negotiating with Communists.

The importance of this incident lies less in the KNOWLAND break with Mr. MCCARTHY than in the evidence that President Eisenhower will speak at Geneva with the support of congressional leaders. To state his support was doubtless the chief purpose of the Republican Senate leader. His statement did not withdraw his fears of negotiation, but rather affirmed his confidence in the President as a negotiator.

This newspaper is doubly gratified by the KNOWLAND course. Months ago it urged that he should not assume coexistence would inevitably result in successful Communist nibbling. His rebuke to Senator MCCARTHY for assuming that the summit meeting spells impending diplomatic disaster indicates he is now willing to let the coexistence policy prove itself, at least so far as it applies to Moscow. But most of all we are grateful that Mr. Eisenhower can go to Geneva knowing that he has behind him not only the Democratic but the Republican leadership in Congress.

Washington observers, always thinking in terms of politics, are suggesting that Mr. KNOWLAND has shifted his position with an eye to 1956. It is argued that he had to come to a parting of the ways with the extreme right wingers. His vote against the MCCARTHY censure and his vigorous differences with the administration over China had alined him with fading causes and separated him from many Republicans whose support he would need if he sought the presidential nomination next year.

In fairness to Mr. KNOWLAND it should be pointed out that he is a man of deep convictions, not the type of politician ruled by ambitious expediency. Many of those surprised by what they consider reversals of his position have not fully understood his thinking. Some apparent contradictions can be better understood if we note his preoccupation with the Far East. When he speaks of Communists he is thinking mainly of Chinese Communists. When he expresses fears of negotiation it is negotiation with Peking that primarily colors his thought.

The Californian warmly supported the Marshall plan, NATO and other American policies in Europe. He is not anti-British except in the Far East. So long as Formosa and the offshore islands can be kept on the back of the stove, so long as Peking does not become visibly aggressive, Mr. KNOWLAND might go a long way with Eisenhower foreign policy. If, however, talks with the Soviet are followed—as they might logically be followed—by moves for talks with China, he would almost certainly balk. But there, too, as on the MCCARTHY issue, he may find himself in danger of being isolated by the changing tide of opinion.

United States Trade Exhibits' Value Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here an article from the Los Angeles Examiner of June 15, 1955, together with an article by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt in the Washington Daily News. These important statements on the cultural exchange programs now going forward are included for the information of my colleagues who in committee and on the floor are considering ways to counter the Russian propaganda offensives in this cold war period.

Part of my statement in support of the President's Emergency Fund before the House Appropriations Subcommittee headed by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is included also.

Legislation is now before the Congress to make these programs a permanent part of the armament of the United States in this cold war period. Sponsors of this legislation, on which hearings will be held July 5, 6, 7, and 8 by the House Education and Labor Subcommittee, include the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES], the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and myself.

The matters follow:

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of June 15, 1955]

UNITED STATES TRADE EXHIBITS' VALUE TOLD—COLD WAR'S NEW PHASE TOLD HOUSE BY CONNIFF—HEARST AIDE WARNS OF PERILS IN COMMUNIST SHIFT

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Frank Conniff, editorial assistant to William Randolph Hearst, Jr., today told a House Appropriations Subcommittee that the world conflict with communism had entered a new phase which might be described as the "soft war."

Conniff, representing Hearst, editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, who is in Europe, warned that the impending competitive coexistence struggle with Red Russia might be more difficult to win than a shooting war.

"Soft words instead of threats are the new Communist weapons," he said, "and we must be prepared to counter these different tactics. Even the terminology of recent years has been outmoded.

CAN BE HARD

"But just as the cold war was a continuation of the hot war by other means, the soft war will be a form of a hard war by means other than actual combat.

"The shooting has stopped for a while but the Communists will intensify their drive for world dominance in every field and on every front."

The subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat, of New York, was told by the witness that Hearst, after his visit to Moscow where he interviewed the four new top Kremlin leaders, had concluded there should be a more dynamic presentation of the American way of life to the world.

Conniff, who accompanied the publisher to Russia, listed the following Hearst suggestions:

Creation of a competitive coexistence council to plan strategy and tactics in the forthcoming struggle against world communism which might last into the next generation.

Carrying to the youth of the world the story of democracy and dispelling the picture of America as a sheer materialistic power.

Having our athletes and artists abroad act as goodwill ambassadors with more direct availability to students and youth groups, thereby countering the blatant propaganda activities of touring Soviet athletes and artists.

Realization that the current Russian coexistence approach was influenced by domestic difficulties faced in the Soviet Union, including desperate problems of agriculture and transportation.

URGES FUND

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, another witness, urged the subcommittee to approve the requested $5 million appropriation for the Presidential emergency fund being used to support cultural missions and psychological cold warfare.

He pointed out that in the past 5 years, the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented.

However THOMPSON continued, the United States awakened in time to what was happening and last year put in a last-minute entry at Damascus with an official exhibit of the film Cinerama.

HOME EXHIBIT

The picture stole the entire show despite a $500,000 Red Russian exhibition, he said. And when the Communists heard this country was planning a repeat performance at Bangkok, they withdrew entirely.

At the recent Frankfurt fair, THOMPSON testified, American producers displayed over 300 products commonly used in the average American home.

He said:

"The exhibit, entitled 'America at Home,' featured a completely furnished full-scale five-room modern American home with actors impersonating an American family. Brand names that are household words in the United States were displayed.

"These fairs have given us an opportunity to refute Communist sneers at the myth of the American way of life. Communist goods exhibited at the trade fairs have often been of inferior quality but how are other peoples to know that if there are no United States exhibits to make the contrast clear?"

[From the Washington Daily News of June 17, 1955]

WE SHOULD BE FRANK ON EXCHANGE PROGRAM

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK.—Last week I received a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with a statement by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, on the appropriation for the division of the exchange of persons in the Department of State.

The House had made a cut of $10 million in the budget request but the Senate restored the full amount of $22 million when it voted on the bill last week. Now it will have to come up again in the House and I think the people should tell their Congressmen how they feel on this subject. They should be frank to say whether they are anxious to see this program carried through in its full amount of $22 million or even increased if possible.

CANCELLATION

Everyone will acknowledge that the way to better understanding is by meeting people from other countries, so it is well to consider what would happen to this program for the exchange of people if $10 million of the estimated appropriations fund were lopped off.

First of all, this change would entirely cancel the proposed expansion of the program in the Middle East, the Far East, southeast Asia, and Africa. New programs planned for Formosa and Korea also would be wiped out. These areas of the world—where we need to understand conditions and people far better than we do and where they need to understand us—would have no exchange at all except perhaps in Egypt, where we might have a small program left.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress for $40 billion for our own and foreign military defense in 1956. If we refuse to put any emphasis on our cultural exchange between people, how can we answer the charge that the Soviets make against us when they say that we rely for too much on military power for defending freedom and for increasing understanding in the world?

HEARST SPEECH

Young William Randolph Hearst, in a speech before the Press Club in February in Washington after his return from Russia, stated that in Russia and the satellite countries sports, ballet, and the theater and literature are all shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. And he added:

"Preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence. The Western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front."

This is a challenge which I think should make our people suggest to their Representatives in the House that an acceptance of the $22 million appropriation voted by the Senate on May 31 would be in the best interest of our country. It would be in the interest of peace and that is the aim of all the exchange of persons and our main objective at the present time.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FRANK THOMPSON, JR., (DEMOCRAT, NEW JERSEY), BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S EMERGENCY FUND, JUNE 14, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, with funds supplied by the President's emergency fund, the United States is fighting the cold war on two new fronts. Both are important. And on both the Communists have a head start on us.

The head start, however, need not discourage us. These are both fields in which the United States has no need to worry if we exert ourselves. The only danger is that we may let victory go to the Communists by default.

Let us take a look at the facts. In the 5 years prior to 1955, the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented. Their first shock was at Damascus, last year, where they had a $500,000 exhibition. Awakening in time to what was happening, the United States was a last minute entry, presenting as one of its official exhibits the film Cinerama. The picture was the hit of the fair. It stole the entire show. The Communists protested violently, and when they heard the United States was planning a repeat performance at Bangkok, they withdrew entirely. They couldn't take the competition.

Since that date, the U. S. S. R. has withdrawn from at least five other fairs in which it was announced that the United States would exhibit, the Lyons International Fair and the Milan Sample Fair in April of this year, the Paris International Fair and the Tokyo International Fair in May, and the Canadian International Trade Fair in Toronto this month.

Under the program made possible during the current year by the President's $5 million emergency fund, the United States will have been represented at 15 fairs by July 1, 1955.

These fairs have given us opportunity to refute Communist sneers at the "myth" of the American way of life. The Frankfurt Fair, March 6–10, is a good example. Commenting, a Frankfurt English-language newspaper said: "the exhibition marked the first time that Uncle Sam has actually raised his window shades in Europe in an attempt to dispel myths and give substantial facts about how Americans live."

At Frankfurt, United States producers displayed over 300 products commonly used in the average American home. The exhibit, entitled "America at Home," featured a completely furnished full-scale 5-room modern American home with actors impersonating an American family. Brand names that are household words in the United States were displayed—Dupont, General Electric, Singer Sewing Machine, Congoleum-Nairn, Revere Ware, and a host of others. Over 65 firms exhibited. The products told a significant story of a nation's economy dedicated to production for peace and abundance. Over 70,000 visitors saw that exhibit.

The trade information center, manned by United States industry specialists and Department of Commerce representatives, gave over 275 personal interviews and answered inquiries by the thousands. Inquiries came in so fast that three receptionists were unable to take care of them.

The major responsibility for the exhibits in these fairs rests, of course, upon the exhibitors. The United States Government contribution is only "seed" money. But without that encouragement the participation of American business would be uncertain. And, in this cold war, we cannot afford uncertainties.

No less significant have been the results achieved under the cultural presentation program and for this, too, the President's emergency fund provides the "seed" money. It does not pay all expenses, but it assures American artists going overseas against too heavy losses.

That Americans are uncultured, crass, material-minded barbarians is a favorite Communist propaganda line. On the other hand, they try to present themselves as devoted to the arts, to the better things of life. For years troupes of artists from the U. S. S. R., and more recently from Communist China, have been sent abroad by their Governments to make friends and influence people for communism. That the Russian ballet, admittedly among the best in the world, has its roots in czarist Russia is ignored. The ballet is Communist, they say. It is a potent argument for the Marxian line. Music, art, sports—all are grist for the Communist mills. They exploit their artists and sportsmen as they exploit everything else, and they have been doing it effectively, make no mistake about that.

All of the projects undertaken in this program have been planned with the specific interests in mind of the areas to which the traveling artists and athletes are sent. The projects, handled in this country by the State Department, are publicized overseas by the United States Information Agency. In all cases the events are being used by all Agency posts in the various countries as the nucleus of a public information campaign to create recognition and appreciation of the cultural achievements of the United States.

In my own opinion, trade fairs and cultural activities are areas of the cold war which the United States cannot neglect. And, as I have said, both are fields in which we can have full confidence of success. It is only a question of taking advantage of the opportunities afforded us.

Communist goods exhibited at trade fairs have often been of inferior quality—but how

are other peoples to know that if there are no United States exhibits to make the contrast clear? In the absence of first-rate Western participation, the Communists have been winning by default.

In the cultural field it is, again, only a question of giving these other peoples an opportunity to see, listen, and judge. Here, again, we have the goods. The best rebuttal of Communist charges is to produce them. In closing, may I refer once more to Mr. Hearst. In the speech from which I quoted earlier, he spoke words of great import to all of us here today: "One side or the other is going to win the battle of coexistence. It had better be our side. Everyone and everything we love and cherish is at stake."

I urge the committee to support these tremendously important activities and to grant the funds necessary to carry on and expand them during the coming fiscal year.

Adlai's Forgotten Speech of April 11—Stevenson Wrong Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Oroville (Calif.) Mercury of May 27, 1955.

This editorial very aptly describes how Mr. Adlai Stevenson has proved his ineptness once again insofar as our country's dealings with the Communists are concerned.

The editorial follows:

ADLAI'S FORGOTTEN SPEECH OF APRIL 11

Some military officials are said to be surprised how quickly the words Quemoy and Matsu disappeared from the front pages. They're not as surprised as Adlai Stevenson.

On April 11, Stevenson, spokesman in this country for those who favor appeasement, made an important policy address, laying down for his party the line it was expected to follow concerning dealings with China.

Stevenson advised Eisenhower to give up the offshore island in Formosa strait, forsake Chiang Kai-shek, our foremost ally in the Far East, and arrange to have Formosa neutralized. This would be a major retreat, second only to our loss of China to the Reds after we had sacrificed so much to save that country from the Japanese.

Stevenson's April 11 speech almost has been forgotten in the events that have occurred since then, for 11 days later Chou En-lai at Bandung foreswore war with the United States and announced that he would not attempt to take Formosa by force. Stevenson's followers have not mentioned his ill-advised speech, his advice to the President, since that day.

Thus was a crisis passed and our posture of strength justified.

In his address, Stevenson saw but two alternatives. He said:

"If we should withdraw under fire from the defense of these islands, we again act the 'paper tiger'; if we join in their defense we are at war, without major allies and with most of the public opinion in Asia and Europe against us."

Stevenson ignored entirely in his address the possibility that the Communists might yield when opposed by adequate strength and determination, yet that is the central theory of the Washington administration, the one upon which its foreign policy and its policy of defense have been based from the start.

Chou saw that he faced a superior in might and purpose. In some way, he had to eat his warlike words without losing too much face. He chose to adopt a new personality and he picked a new setting, Bandung. For a week he talked softly. Then to the amazement of the gathered diplomats, he issued his peace offer. He wanted to negotiate. His bluff had been called.

It would have been different had Eisenhower yielded to opposition party pressure and announced either that he would surrender the offshore islands or would fight to defend them. Had the former offer been made, the islands would have been taken at once by the Communists. Had he announced they would be defended, it would have been taken as a dare to capture them. In that situation Chou could not have backed down.

If we had followed the advice of Stevenson, we would have forced our ally to withdraw once more and his forces would have received a demoralizing blow. Then we would have entered into negotiations regarding Formosa in which we would have found our appeasement-minded allies all in favor of neutralizing Formosa, a further surrender. In that event the small nations of southeast Asia truly would have seen us as a "paper tiger."

"To act coolly, intelligently, and prudently in perilous circumstances is the test of a man—and a nation," went Stevenson's words of advice to the President. That is the way the President has acted.

Speaking of his country's Formosa policy, Stevenson said: "I shall not enlarge now upon the injury it has done us and the confusion it has wrought."

"We now face," he said, "the bitter consequence of our Government's Formosa policy * * * either another damaging, humiliating retreat, or else the hazard of modern war."

"At this late date," he said again, "there may be no wholly satisfactory way of resolving the dilemma we have stumbled into over the offshore islands. But we can learn something from the experience if we realize at last that we have been pursuing a dead-end policy in Asia."

He must hope now that what he said April 11 will not be recalled.

He overlooked the lesson of the past. We called the Communist bluff with the Berlin airlift and won. We did not call the Communist bluff when China entered the Korea war, and lost.

Our entire program has been based upon building sufficient strength to meet the enemy on his own terms. If, having achieved that strength, we continue to appease and back away, the treasure we spent to attain the strength will have been wasted.

We must not think that the President, having consented to negotiate a cease-fire and meet with Russia for high-level talks, has adopted an appeasement policy.

Had Stevenson been elected President in 1952, we would by now have been committed to the humilitating experience he advocated April 11. Mr. Stevenson is planning to run for President of the United States in 1956.

In Opposition to Pay TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the following letter I sent to the New York Herald Tribune as it was printed in that newspaper:

REPRESENTATIVE CELLER EXPLAINS WHY HE IS OPPOSED TO FEE TV

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Permit me to congratulate the New York Herald Tribune on its recent wide coverage of the pro and con of subscription television. This was, indeed, a public service. I have written to the heads of the three large broadcasting and television chains in New York City urging that they program debates and discussions on both media to bring before their vast audience all facets of this far-reaching proposal.

The proponents of pay TV continuously reassure that they have no designs on the present free TV programs. How can we be sure? How can we prevent it? On March 7 of this year it is reported that some 65 million people watched Peter Pan and that the reaction from the public and industry was most favorable.

It has been stated that it cost $600,000 to put this spectacular on the coaxials and it is presented as an example of the type of program that could be brought into our homes more frequently through subscription TV. You don't need to be a statistician to figure out that if this program were viewed by so many millions it cost less than 1 cent per viewer. This is a very low price to pay to reach so many people with direct advertising.

Assuming that on subscription such a program would cost less than the price of a good movie—which varies geographically—you don't have to be a mathematician to figure out the astronomical box office for the slot machines on each set. With such a jackpot, how can the purveyors of pay TV resist moving on to more territory?

It should also be forcefully brought to the attention of the public that there will not be just one company sponsoring subscription TV. Each subscriber will have to buy a gadget or a meter for his set. Present estimates of the cost of such equipment run from $10 to $50. Let's say Mr. John Q. Public buys a meter. He may then run into the unexpected problem of wanting to view a program which is not carried by his particular service. Competition in the United States being what it is, is he going to have to acquire 3, 4, or more gadgets or slot machines or billing machines?

It is rumored that the gadget may be installed free by some companies. With the present estimate of $10 to $50 for the cost thereof, how can any company afford this tremendous outlay? Based on a recent Federal Communications Commission survey, there are an estimated 36 million sets in the United States.

Other rumor has it that if the gadget is free, installation costs will be charged, and same could amount to $30 a set. Under this arrangement, the subscriber could very well pay for both gadget and installation without realizing it. Totaling this up, the figure is staggering, on the basis of 36 million sets.

It is further advocated that fee TV cannot affect free TV. How can 1 station carry 2 programs simultaneously? In the words of the currently popular song, Something's Gotta Give, my guess is that it will be free TV.

As a Federal legislator, expected to consider carefully the overall results of any innovation such as this, I am dismayed at the probable effects of fee TV on our tax structure, employment, those in low-income brackets, transportation, and other industries. Will our movie houses, theaters, sports arenas, etc., be thrown into the discard? What happens to the tremendous investments in such real estate?

Television has been doing a satisfactory job to date and under present conditions. A great variety of entertainment and programs

in the public interest have been presented, some of them of very high caliber. True, higher standards could be expected in a number of instances, but industry replies that they cater to the taste of the general public.

It should be reiterated that the American public does pay for this service now. I am confident that an analysis of the sales figures of the sponsoring companies would prove that there has been a tremendous increase in the sales of their products since the inception of TV. These huge financial outlays would have been discontinued long ago if the medium had not produced the most desirable results.

Free broadcasting and free television have been undisputed boons to the industry of this country. I shouldn't think the sponsors would be happy at the prospect of killing the goose that laid their golden eggs, but they are strangely reticent at this time on this subject.

In closing, may I say I shall continue to oppose all efforts to foist fee TV on the American public.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 14, 1955.*

How Not To Spot a Communist—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent days several newspapers across the Nation have carried stories regarding a publication issued by headquarters, First Army, entitled "How To Spot a Communist."

Recently, I have had a copy of the pamphlet brought to my attention, and at this point I can only say that the Army was well advised to withdraw it and order all copies destroyed as was done on June 14, 1955. In spite of this action, however, it disturbs me to find that such a pamphlet should have been issued in the first place. Most certainly it is important to discover Communists in our midst. It is also true that to make these discoveries we need competent personnel engaged in the hunt. This little 6-page booklet was issued by the intelligence section of First Army—men who should be cognizant of the difficulties of their task. If this document is an example of their skill and their understanding of the problem I fear that Communists will go undetected while our intelligence people spend their time chasing ill-founded rumors and arresting innocent citizens.

For the information and edification of my colleagues and with the hope that it will provide a measure of wry amusement for them I would like to include the text of this pamphlet together with an article by Murry Kempton which appeared in the New York Post and which treats this document with the attitude it deserves. The Christian Science Monitor recently told how an enterprising firm in Los Angeles brought out an individual loyalty kit offering an opportunity to demonstrate your patriotism at the price of $1, which, according to the American Civil Liberties Union, is an indication that the loyalty business is now on a do-it-yourself basis. This hot report is included here also for the information of my colleague.

An excerpt from the New York Times editorial entitled "Spotting Communists" which is both timely and pertinent is also included.

The matters follow:

HOW TO SPOT A COMMUNIST

1. INTRODUCTION

Events of recent years have made it obvious that there is no foolproof way of detecting a Communist. The Communist individual is no longer a type exemplified by the bearded and coarse revolutionary with time bomb in briefcase. United States Communists come from all walks of life, profess all faiths, and exercise all trades and professions. In addition, the Communist Party, U. S. A., has made concerted efforts to go underground for the purpose of infiltration.

If there is no foolproof system in spotting a Communist, there are, fortunately, indications that may give him away. These indications are often subtle but always present, for the Communist, by reason of his faith must act and talk along certain lines.

The following chapters contain some of these indications which may help in recognizing as such the individual who belongs to the Communist Party as well as the sympathizer and fellow traveler of all shades.

2. THE COMMUNIST LANGUAGE

In Lenin's writings, there are repeated references to the Aesopian language which he assertedly used to evade arrest and punishment as a revolutionary under the Czarist regime. The term is derived from Aesop, famed fabulist of ancient Greece, who attempted to hide the contemporary significance of his fables by satirizing animals rather than human beings. In Lenin's case, the term described the method of writing in hints in order to fool the censors. Ever since 1917, Communists in all countries have taken up and practiced the art of Aesopian language and, wherever possible, have refined it.

Through this process of refinement, Communists in the United States have developed what might be called a Communist language. It is not defined in dictionaries or taught in schools but can be of considerable help in identifying a Communist. The two distinguishing marks of this language are sentence structure and vocabulary.

The Communist's eternal preoccupation with Marxist theory appears to prod him to constant imitation of Marxist style at its most involved. This imitation is not limited to purely political discussions or writings and finds its way into the Communist's private life. Here are some sample sentences taken at random from Communist publications:

"The American go-getters counted on getting these resources into their clutches and exploiting them in the grand colonial manner, by taking advantage of the weakness of the Tsarist government and the venality of the Tsarist officials."

"If we stand at the brink of destruction, we also stand at the brink of something else, at the brink of a new dawn, in which the human race, in all of its complex and fascinating difference, will come to the conclusion that it must live in a peaceful brotherhood that will include this multitude of difference."

"It is rejection of finality, rejection of the idea of knowing the truth, rather than seeking it; it is the elasticity and experimentalism that come with this which * * * is at the heart of the finest American tradition, is the essence of true radicalism."

While a certain heaviness of style and preference for long sentences is common to most Communist writings, a distinct vocabulary provides the second and more easily recognized feature of the "Communist language."

Even a superficial reading of an article written by a Communist or a conversation with one will probably reveal the use of some of the following expressions: Integrative thinking, vanguard, comrade, hootenanny, chauvinism, book burning, syncretistic faith, bourgeois-nationalism, jingoism, colonialism, hooliganism, ruling class, progressive, demagogy, dialectical, witch hunt, reactionary, exploitation, oppressive, materialist.

This list, selected at random, could be extended almost indefinitely. While all of the above expressions are part of the English language, their use by Communists is infinitely more frequent than by the general public.

In speaking of a "Communist language" it must be clearly understood that the use of certain terms and structures can never constitute proof of a charge as serious as subversion. Nevertheless, since the distinguishing marks of that language are in fact part of the American Communist's life, they might well be considered as a danger signal.

3. THE COMMUNIST RELIGION

The proverbial devotion to the cause found in most hard-core Communists and many sympathizers is more than merely an intellectual response to an idea. The case of the Rosenberg atom spies and the appearance of numerous Communists before Federal and State committees show that most of these men will sacrifice their careers and families and some their lives if required by party discipline.

While it is generally believed that Communists are atheists as a result of their political indoctrination, it appears likely that many find in Marxist philosophy a substitute for religion in which they had previously lost faith. William R. Kimtner writes in his book The Front Is Everywhere:

"Communism has become a faith to warlike men cut adrift from certainty in an unbelieving world. The faith appeal of communism has important implications. It should lead us to reject the notion that all Communists are crackpots, although many of them may be."

Once the Communist has accepted his new faith, he rejects all others as a rule, and his attitude toward organized religion becomes one of hostility. Nevertheless, when speaking or writing for the public, he will usually pretend to be indifferent rather than hostile. William Z. Foster, national chairman of the Communist Party, United States of America, recently wrote in a Communist publication:

"I find that the dialectical materialist viewpoint fully satisfies me in meeting the everyday problems of life, as well as in confronting the perspective of eventual natural dissolution by death. In my outlook on life there is no place for religion."

The tell-tale signs of this Communist religion are not easy to detect. There is, above all, a rigidity in views insofar as they pertain to the Communist doctrine. This is not to say that the Communist lacks persuasiveness or variety of expression. It does mean, however, that he will stubbornly cling to the line even when proven wrong in debate. The Communist has implicit faith in Marxist philosophy and in the truth of the line as transmitted from Moscow. Because of this faith, he cannot and will not give ground when challenged on basic Marxist issues or political pronouncements made by his leaders. The possibility of compromising on these issues is utterly beyond his comprehension.

Frequently, the Communists's slavish adherence to Moscow edicts becomes absurd. A classic illustration is the Daily Worker edition of August 23, 1939. On this day, when the U. S. S. R. concluded a nonaggres-

sion pact with Nazi Germany, the Communist newspaper's columns were filled with denunciations of "Hitlerian barbarism." On the very next day, after receiving the news of the pact, the Daily Worker spoke glowingly of Hitler's peaceful intentions and sharply condemned those "imperialistic jackels," Great Britain and France. There is no indication in this and many other cases that the frequent changes in the line evoke any doubt or even wonder in the minds of United States Communists.

His religion, then, can give away the Communist. His naive and unquestioning acceptance of the line, his refusal to accept criticism are excellent indications. Last but not least, the Communist fools a strong compulsion to spread his faith and can frequently be spotted by his never-ceasing attempts at conversion of others.

---

rom the New York Post]

UP! SPOTTERS

(By Murray Kempton)

Various antennae of the Department of Defense have compiled and are circulating a "study" called: "How To Spot a Communist." It runs to six pages and has been passed out so far to the employees of the Watertown Arsenal in Massachusetts and has been printed in Air, the magazine of the Continental Air Command.

Up to this point, How To Spot a Communist has been confined to employees of the Department of Defense; but the First Army points out that this is "a question of vital concern to every American," so we may assume that all us good Americans are herein summoned as spotters and can expect to find our guide printed on the bar coasters in Schine Hotels.

First Army says that Communists no longer wear beards and carry time bombs in their briefcases. But they show themselves in subtle indications which are "always present, for the Communist, by reason of his 'faith,' must act and talk along certain lines."

The most telling indications are language. "A certain heaviness of style and preference for long sentences are common to most Communist writings." (Sic transit Pegler and I.)

There is also a distinct vocabulary immediately recognizable in a conversation with a Communist. It includes such words as:

"Integrative thinking; vanguard; comrade (sic transit the American Legion); hootenany; chauvinism; book-burning (sic transit the President of the United States); bourgeois nationalism; colonialism (sic transit J. Foster Dulles); materialist (sic transit the President again); dialectical (sic transit Peter Donald); oppressive (sic transit all commercials for headache remedies); progressive (there goes Mr. Eisenhower again); exploitation; and syncretic faith."

Simon Gerson, the Communist, is the only public syncretist I know; and, with the duplicity of his sort, he evaded my cross-examination by asking: "How do you spell it?" Gerson, who conceals his aims by posing as a subbrow, spotted "integrative thinking" as pure social worker, petty bourgeois.

Communists have a religion and their logic is its natural product. "It is practically impossible to win an argument with a hard-core Communist," a profound expression of confidence in the American cause if I ever heard one.

The individual party member or sympathizer—"a product of his Communist environment" may also betray himself by raising certain specific issues. They include:

"McCarthyism; violations of civil rights; racial or religious discrimination; immigration laws; antisubversive legislation; any legislation concerning labor unions; the military budget; and 'peace.'" (Sic transit the 1956 Republican platform.)

But if the prey conceal himself, the tireless spotter may still catch him relaxing. "Such hobbies as 'folk dancing' and 'folk music' have been traditionally allied with the Communist movement. Most Communists are likely to show preference for group activities rather than such bourgeois forms of recreation as ballroom dancing."

It is time certain men in high places came clean. Arthur Murray tells us that Duke Snider and Dusty Rhodes are now purging themselves, but I can't recall ever seeing a picture of the President dancing apart from the team. What is more, at the Inaugural Ball, Miss Dorothy Shay announced that the President's favorite song is, I Like Mountain Music. And where there's jug bands there's fire.

And, at the end, all spotters are reminded "to be wary of those organizations which stand for wholesale condemnation of the United States Government, a legitimate political party, or groups of individuals." Communist fronts will frequently seize on any controversial subject "to promote their nefarious schemes." Even fluoridation of drinking water. You, George Sokolsky, stand up; the game is over.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

NO NEED TO WAIT FOR LOYALTY OATH

LOS ANGELES.—An enterprising firm in Los Angeles has brought out an individual loyalty kit for those who have not been required to sign an oath but who wish to do so, anyway.

The red, white, and blue certificate suitable for framing contains pictures of Lincoln and Washington and the statement that the signer is not now and never has been a member of the Communist Party. James Casselman, president of Loyalty Enterprises, offers this "opportunity to demonstrate your patriotism" at the price of $1.

The American Civil Liberties Union, southern California branch, looks on this development as an indication that the loyalty business is now on a do-it-yourself basis.

[From the New York Times of June 14, 1955]

"SPOTTING" COMMUNISTS

One doesn't know whether to laugh or cry at the contents of a pamphlet on "how to spot a Communist," issued by the First Army for the guidance of intelligence officers in this area. If any intelligence officers are so naive as to be guided by it, we can only fear for the security of the installations they are supposed to protect.

How do you spot a Communist? One way, says the pamphlet, is to watch the language your suspect uses. That sounds pretty reasonable. If he starts spouting Marx or Lenin, why shouldn't you suspect him? But the pamphlet is more subtle than that. It offers clues to communism based simply on your suspect's use of certain words or phrases—chauvinism, book-burning, colonialism, demagogy, reactionary, progressive. The author of the pamphlet is generous enough to admit that such terms "never constitute proof of as serious a charge as subversion." But he solemnly warns that "they might well be considered as a danger signal."

He goes on to suggest that other clues may be found in certain issues that "have been part of the Communist arsenal for a long period of time." We learn that these clues to communism include such themes as McCarthyism, civil rights, racial or religious discrimination, immigration laws, and almost every other subject that conservatives and liberals may be expected to argue about.

If Army or police agencies really took seriously these so-called distinguishing marks of Communist leanings, it is perfectly obvious that any citizen who opened his mouth in protest against virtually any phase or facet of political or economic life risks being listed as a possible Communist. From President Eisenhower down there is probably not a well-informed liberal American today who has not used one or more of the cited expressions or argued about the potentially subversive issues mentioned in this fantastic pamphlet. If our Government and our society thought it communistic to talk about such matters as this pamphlet lists, then we really would be in a hopeless state.

How Not To Spot a Communist—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here the concluding portion of the First Army Headquarters pamphlet the issuance of which was recently protested by the American Civil Liberties Union.

There are increasing signs of doubt about the abrogation of the Bill of Rights by the Federal Government which effectively deprives millions of American citizens of the ancient protections of our Constitution. Hired informers, officially encouraged poison-pen letterwriters, and such ill-conceived and misbegotten plans as this issued by Headquarters, First Army, have no place in American life.

I introduced on January 20, 1955, House Joint Resolution 154, a companion measure to the resolution offered in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Senator JOHN STENNIS. This resolution has just been favorably reported to the Senate for its consideration. It is high time that some intelligent ground rules were established to deal with the problem of the Nation's security in this cold-war period. It is high time, also, that the present administration faced up to the problem of careful reform of the security system. As the New York Times said editorially on Tuesday, June 21, 1955:

INQUIRY INTO SECURITY

The Eisenhower administration's stubborn refusal to recognize that there is anything seriously wrong with the Federal security program is difficult to understand. Long before President Eisenhower appeared on the Washington scene major defects in the program were already showing up; but in the past 2 years the situation has become worse, until now the whole fabric of loyalty and security investigations within the Federal Government is crying out for reform.

With all the lofty talk in high places—Attorney General Brownell, for example, in a graduation speech only the other day, reaffirmed his devotion to the traditional American conception of fair play and due process—it is disappointing that neither the Attorney General nor the President has given any real encouragement to an independent, nonpartisan inquiry into the security program.

Now the Government Operations Committee of the Senate has unanimously reported the Humphrey-Stennis resolution to establish an independent, bipartisan commission of distinguished citizens to study the whole question on the premise that what is wanted is a program to protect the national security and preserve basic American rights. President Truman tried essentially the same

thing 4 years ago when he appointed the Nimitz Commission, which was sabotaged by the late Senator McCarran. We hope the proposed new commission will have more success and that the administration will at last recognize the desirability of such an inquiry and assist in its establishment.

The concluding portion of headquarters, First Army, pamphlet follows:

4. THE COMMUNIST'S LOGIC

The Communist's logic is a natural product of his religion which has been discussed in the preceding chapter. His peculiar logic is based on a rigid mind which serves merely as a storehouse for preconceived and predigested ideas.

This logic is diametrically opposed to our own. Thus, the Communist refers to the Iron Curtain police states as "democracies," and any defensive move on the part of the Western powers is condemned as "aggression." The Communist thus builds for himself a topsy-turvey world with a completely distorted set of values. For this reason, it is practically impossible to win an argument with a hard-core Communist. For one thing, he is trained to accept unquestioningly the readymade views disseminated through the national party organization. In addition, the Communist mind cannot and will not engage in a detached examination of ideas. Talking to a Communist about his own ideas, is like listening to a phonograph record. His answers will invariably follow a definite pattern because he can never admit, even hypothetically, that the basis for his ideas may not be sound. This attitude is typical not only for the individual but also on a national scale. Western protests against incidents provoked by Communist nations invariably meet with the same stereotype answer asserting that the complainants are completely wrong while they, the Communists, are just as completely right. This answer is final and no arguments are permitted so far as the Communists are concerned.

The Communist, then, is not really logical. The finality of his arguments and the completeness of his condemnation marks him clearly, whether as a speaker, a writer or a conversation partner.

5. THE COMMUNIST'S APPROACH TO OTHERS

The fact that the Communist has a very rigid set of values has a profound influence on his approach to others, whether as an individual or as a member of a group. For this reason, it is possible to some extent to predict and generalize Communist techniques.

In general, two aspects of Communist tactics are plainly distinguishable. Excessive condemnation is one. The Communist, when criticizing, goes all out in condemning a situation, an idea, or an individual. He will not admit to a single good aspect of anything which has been selected as a target by virtue of the line. This procedure is in sharp contrast to non-Communist critics who frequently realize that admission of good points only increases the weight of their arguments against others. The hard-core Communist, then, denounces all of the United States' foreign policy, all of a piece of legislation or all members of an organization which he dislikes.

Another general Communist principle is the customary procedure of seizing on any, even the most insignificant occurence or issue to create uncertainty and unrest. Thus, the arrest of a Negro (for perfectly legitimate reasons) has given rise to an organization against police brutality, and a case of a suspended college professor (for lawful reasons) has provoked well organized propaganda campaigns, charging suppression of academic freedom.

In addition to these very general principles common to Communist tactics, a number of specific issues have been part of the Communist arsenal for a long period of time. These issues are raised not only by Communist appeals to the public but also by the individual party member or sympathizer who is a product of his Communist environment. They include: McCarthyism, violation of civil rights, racial or religious discrimination, immigration laws, antisubversive legislation, any legislation concerning labor unions, the military budget, peace.

While showing standard opposition to certain standard issues, the United States Communist has traditionally identified himself with certain activities in the hope of furthering his ultimate purposes. Such hobbies as folk dancing and folk music have been traditionally allied with the Communist movement in the United States. Croups of Communists and sympathizers have been formed for the express purpose of following these hobbies. The reason for their choice is not altogether an attempt to hide political activities. The Communist's foundness for everything that comes from "the people" is not an entirely theoretical preference and has found expression in his everyday life. Most Communists are likely to show preference for group activities rather than such bourgeois forms of recreation as ballroom dancing.

In discussing the Communist's tactics, a mention of outright Communist propaganda is indicated. The Communist knows well that a direct approach would most likely meet with hostility among a population alert to the Communist danger. Consequently, the direct approach has largely been abandoned in favor of bringing up issues which have no direct bearing on Communist philosophy. The Communist correctly assumes that this procedure makes it extremely difficult to differentiate between Communist and non-Communist inspired arguments.

6. THE COMMUNIST'S AFFILIATIONS

Communism as a social philosophy becomes meaningful only when practiced in groups. The individual Communist, "security conscious" as he may be, will at one time or another engage in group activities. The nature of the groups with which he affiliates can then serve as a good indication of his own convictions.

The Communist Party itself has largely gone underground. Meetings therefore have definite characteristics. Only a few members, sometimes not more than 3 or 4, assemble at one time. Meeting places are street corners, automobiles, private homes, and even public places such as restaurants, department stores, and railroad terminals. In all cases, secrecy to avoid detection by law-enforcement agencies is the primary concern of all who attend the meetings.

Both CP members and sympathizers who are not party members frequently belong to one or more organizations referred to as "Communist fronts." Some of these have been declared subversive by the United States Attorney General under Executive Order 10450 or cited by congressional committees. Many others carry on their work of disseminating the CP line without that stigma. Generally speaking, it is well to be wary of those organizations which stand for wholesale condemnation of the United States Government, a legitimate political party, or groups of individuals. Communist fronts have consistently shown preference for such issues as civil rights, antisubversive legislation, and restrictions on immigration. In addition, those groups frequently seize on any controversial subject from fluoridation of drinking water to "police brutality" in order to promote their nefarious schemes.

Membership in one or more of such organizations is another danger signal. It is to be noted that many of these groups spring up spontaneously and go out of business after a comparatively short time only to make room for others.

7. CONCLUSION

A study such as this can lead to only one certain conclusion: There is no sure-fire way of spotting a Communist. Certain criteria, some of which were discussed above, provide clues in determining an individual's political leanings. They never provide proof.

It is obvious, then, that the job of spotting a Communist is a highly responsible one. The principal difficulty involved is the distinction between the person who merely dissents in the good old American tradition and the one who condemns for the purpose of abolishing that tradition.

In attempting to find the answer to the question "Is this man a Communist?" a checklist such as this can prove helpful, although in itself it cannot provide the answer:

Does the individual use unusual language? (Communist language).

Does he stubbornly cling to Marxist ideals without being willing to question them?

Does he condemn our American institutions and praise those of Communist countries?

Does he pick on any, even the most insignificant occurrences in this country for his criticism?

Is he secretive about certain of his contacts?

Does he belong to groups exploiting controversial subjects?

Above all, the approach to the problem of discovering Communists must be detached and completely free from prejudice. Using some of the clues mentioned in this study in connection with a factual approach provides the best system at present of spotting a Communist.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I addressed a mass meeting in the city of East Chicago, Ind., commemorating the 164th anniversary of Polish Independence Day. Hundreds of similar meetings are annually held not only in this country, but throughout the world, reminding the public of the valiant fight Poland has made back through generations to maintain independence, liberty, and self-government. This fight still continues and will be carried on until the freedom and independence of the Polish nation is reestablished.

The following is a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the officials and participants attending this large gathering on May 22:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE SOLEMN COMMEMORATION OF THE 164TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAY 3 CONSTITUTION, 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KATYN MASSACRE, AND THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE IMPRISONMENT OF POLAND'S UNDERGROUND LEADERS

Assembled on this, the 22d day of May 1955, at the McKinley Auditorium in East Chicago, Ind., to commemorate the 164th anniversary of the May 3 Constitution of the

Republic of Poland, the 15th anniversary of Polish martyrdom exemplified in the Katyn massacre, and the 10th anniversary of the treacherous arrest and imprisonment during World War II of Poland's underground leaders by the Soviet Union, we, the representatives and members of various veterans', fraternal, civic, and service organizations, unanimously resolve:

1. To pay tribute to our forefathers who, in an epoch of moral and political stagnation and crisis that submerged European peoples under predatory rules of tyranny and slavery, rose high above mercenary considerations and class selfishness, accepted the spiritual challenge of new social consciousness and revaluation of civic virtues, and gave the Polish nation in particular, and other peoples by example, a truly modern, democratic constitution in which the awareness of the divine dignity of man and his unalienable right to be free were courageously enunciated.

2. To pay tribute to the memory of the 15,000 martyred Polish officers who were, 15 years ago, wantonly murdered by the Soviet secret service in the Katyn Forest—and to again petition the United States Government that it submit to the United Nations General Assembly all findings and facts ascertained by the Select Committee of the 82d Congress, which committee, answering many appeals of Post 15 and Post 125, Polish Army Veterans' Association and the Indiana division of the Polish American Congress, conducted, under the able and statesmanlike chairmanship of Representative RAY J. MADDEN, a thorough, fact-finding investigation and placed the responsibility for the Katyn massacre on the Soviet Union; and, to further petition the United States Government that it pursue, through its representatives in the United Nations, a plan for creation of an International Tribunal to weigh the evidence and render judgment on the perpetrators of the Katyn massacre and of the savage treatment of American soldiers during the Korean conflict.

3. To ask the United States Government that it take strongest possible diplomatic action and, if need be, implement it with economic sanctions, against the persecution of the Catholic church in Poland, where a Red regime, directed by the Kremlin, has arrested and is oppressing thousands of priests, numerous bishops, including secret confinement of His Eminence Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, Primate of Poland, who has been arrested and sentenced to an unknown prison without due process of law; and that to the action in behalf of Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, a demand be added that the Soviet Union release and compensate the leaders of the wartime Polish underground, who were treacherously trapped and unjustly imprisoned by the Kremlin tyrants 10 years ago.

4. To ask the United States Government that it declare null and void all secret agreements made at Teheran and Yalta with the Soviet Union and without the consent and knowledge of American and Polish peoples who were directly concerned and effected by said agreements, which not only were made in violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter, but were, in later years, cynically disregarded by the Soviet Union.

5. To ask the United States Government that it sever diplomatic relations with Communist-controlled Government of Poland, and extend recognition to the legally constituted Polish Government in exile; and that, in conjunction with these positive actions, the so-called Polish Embassy in Washington be closed, for the reason that, in reality, it is not a diplomatic post, but a nest for Soviet spies and a base of operations for Communist fifth column.

6. To pledge our undying faith in God, our lives, and our wordly goods to the cause of the preservation of the American way of life.

Committee of resolution: John F. Pers, chairman; Stanley J. Bejger; William Bielski; Ratko Doyich; Marie Hoyda; Michael Koscielniak; George Lamb; Valerie Mackowiak; John C. Nowicki, Sr.; Wladyslawa Rojkowska; Anthony B. Roszkowski; Casimir Rymarowicz; Adolph Swiontek; Dr. Frank J. Wadas; John J. Ziemba; Jos. Wiewiora, secretary.

Passed and unanimously approved by all participants:

ANDREV S. KOVACIK,
Chairman
(For the National Commemoration Presiding Officers).

CONRAD B. BONIECKI,
Chairman
THADDEUS M. WACHEL,
Secretary
(For the General Organizing Committee).

BENJAMIN J. LESNIAK,
President
(For the Department of Indiana of the Polish American Congress, Inc.).

VINCENT A. BASINSKI,
State Commander
JOHN BIEDRON,
State Adjutant
(For the Department of Indiana of the Polish Army Veterans' Association, Inc.).

Judge Felix Forlenza Finds United States Immigration, Trade Policies Strengthen Communists in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct attention to the following article entitled "Judge Felix Forlenza Finds United States Immigration, Trade Policies Strengthen Communists in Italy," which appeared on the front page of the Italian Tribune, Newark, N. J., dated June 10, 1955. Judge Forlenza has had a distinguished career in his profession and in public service and is a truly high minded patriotic citizen with a deep devotion to our national traditions and principles. He is widely respected for his knowledge and ability and his views are always deserving of careful consideration.

The article follows:

JUDGE FELIX FORLENZA FINDS UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION, TRADE POLICIES STRENGTHEN COMMUNISTS IN ITALY

Judge Felix Forlenza, former judge of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court of Essex County, and president of the Cosmopolitan League, an organization of nationality group leaders, declared here that America's present trades and immigration policies are directly responsible for the increasing strength of the Communist Party in Italy.

Judge Forlenza stated that the many letters he receives from Italy, as well as personal reports of those who have visited the country, leaves no doubt that the Italian Communist Party has been gaining impetus over the last 2 years because of growing disillusionment with United States foreign policies. "Some of the stanchest supporters of friendship with America are puzzled by the actions of our present administration and are beginning to express doubts about the sincerity of America's motives," Judge Forlenz said. "For more than a century the destinies of two great nations, America and Italy, have been tied together in the world crusade of freemen against hunger and political despotism.

"Everybody remembers how, in 1948, Italian-Americans sent letters to their friends and relatives overseas, calling upon them to help defeat communism at the polls. We stressed the wonders of the democratic way of life, as we experienced it here in America.

"Now, our friends and relatives in Italy are sending us a timely warning to put the American way of democracy back to work to help them stem the new, rising tide of Red communism in Italy.

"Political doubletalk from Washington, a zigzag American foreign policy, and a string of broken promises about world trade, have left Italians who have urged their fellow countrymen to rely on America's help, looking rather foolish."

In his statement, Judge Forlenza stressed the importance of immigration and trade in the fight against communism. "Because Italy is painfully overpopulated, Italians are impatient to see us correct the injustices of the notorious McCarran-Walter act. That legislation disgraces America by writing racial discrimination into our laws; it offends the natural dignity of Italians by telling them that they are 'undesirable' immigrants.

"Italy must also be permitted to produce more goods for the American market in free trade with the United States, if she is to continue in the path of political freedom. But Italians cannot increase their production in the face of the strong antiforeign-trade amendments being written into Eisenhower's still-pending foreign trade bill.

"American protectionists scored their first high tariff triumph over Switzerland, Italy's neighbor. And Italians therefore are startled and uncertain, when they see the very same measures which were used to embargo Switzerland's watch trade with the United States, being written into the new trade bill.

"Italian industrialists, and Italian workers, know how much and how unjustly Switzerland suffered as a result of unfair treatment accorded her by the United States in the watch trade matter. The Italians are not eager to smash their heads and their hopes for American trade against the same obstacles.

Investigating Investigators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker the following article written by Joseph Alsop which appeared in his column Matter of Fact, in the New York Herald Tribune of June 20, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

MATTER OF FACT
(By Joseph Alsop)
INVESTIGATING INVESTIGATORS

WASHINGTON.—The cloud is still no bigger than a man's hand; but maybe Herbert Brownell, Scott McLeod, Lewis L. Strauss,

and a few other people had better start thinking about what happened to the Prophets of Baal when Elija's little cloud grew to be a big one.

The cloud in question is the unanimous report by the Senate Committee on Government Operations of a resolution calling for the appointment of a high-level commission to review the entire Federal security program.

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and House Speaker SAM RAYBURN mean to pass the resolution through their respective bodies. RAYBURN and JOHNSON have a highly developed knack of getting what they want. Hence the resolution has an excellent chance of becoming law before the end of the session.

Meanwhile, the circumstances in which this resolution to investigate the investigators was reported to the Senate are highly significant in themselves. In the novel style of the LYNDON JOHNSON democracy, it was cosponsored by a left-right team—Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi.

It was then studied at prolonged hearings, in the course of which Attorney General Brownell exhibited a marked lack of enthusiasm for the proposed inquiry into his own security practices. The Republican members of the subcommittee studying the resolution, Senators NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire; THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, were at first inclined to be suspicious of a measure that looked partisan. But in the end they enthusiastically joined in presenting the resolution to the full Committee on Government Operations.

The two senior Republican members of the Government Operations Committee are Senators JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, and KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. No one can suspect either MUNDT or MCCARTHY of any desire for reform in Federal security procedures. What they want, if anything, is a further debasement.

Yet even MCCARTHY and MUNDT did not record their hostility when the full committee reported the resolution to the Senate.

The signs are clear, then, that there are increasing doubts about the Federal security program. The doubts are no longer confined to leftwingers, intellectuals, and obstinately old-fashioned persons who cannot quite approve the back-door abrogation of the Bill of Rights. Grave concern is also beginning to be felt by such good, horny-handed, orthodox, Corn State Republicans as Senator MARTIN.

This shift of opinion was bound to come sooner or later. Essentially, the existing security program embodies a national reaction to the case of Alger Hiss. It was a proper and natural reaction. But the result of the reaction, the security program itself, is neither proper nor natural.

It effectively deprives millions of American citizens of the ancient protections of our Constitution. It has worked horrifying injustices. It has bred among us such novel phenomena as hired informers, officially encouraged poison-pen-letter writers and Federal flatfeet who ask people whether their neighbors' garbage includes an excessive allowance of bottles. As presently constituted and administered, in fact, the Federal security program must keep the founders of this Republic turning in their graves like so many teetotums.

The Oppenheimer case, the John Davies case and a few other episodes have already disturbed a great many people. But one can predict with confidence that this security program will eventually produce a sort of Hiss-case-in-reverse—a demonstration of injustices and malpractice so final and so dramatic that it will convulse the entire country with strong indignation and generate an irresistible demand for reform. Any one familiar with the program can already detect the stench of such cases coming up, so to speak, through the floor boards.

Whether the high-level commission proposed by the Humphrey-Stennis resolution will really do the job, may perhaps be open to question. It is to be composed of 3 groups of 4 members, chosen by the President, the Vice President and the Speaker. The congressional appointees should be well balanced, but Attorney General Brownell, who wants no serious inquiry, has a chance to pack the commission through the presidential appointees.

He will make the same mistake if he does so, however, as President Truman made when he called the Hiss case a red herring. Already, the peculiarities of the security program are being somewhat fumblingly investigated by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate, and a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee headed by Senator THOMAS HENNINGS, of Missouri, is also starting a more promising investigation. Sooner or later, the break will come and the storm of indignation will follow, unless the administration is wise enough to forestall trouble by preparing for careful reform.

Tenth Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this week in San Francisco the nations of the world are meeting to pay tribute to an organization which has the primary responsibility for maintaining world peace and has done an excellent job of fulfilling this responsibility.

News reporting today tends to emphasize the difficulties the United Nations is having and has had. This, I suppose, is inevitable, because a record of steady success is not susceptible to dramatic news coverage. However, as we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the international body, it, perhaps, would not be inappropriate to review the successes which this organization has achieved.

Perhaps the most important success appearing in the record to date lies in the steps which the United Nations took to bar aggression in Korea. When war broke out in Korea the world was faced with a clear-cut attempt to gain, through force, what could not be gained by peaceful persuasion. Had the United Nations failed to act in this instance probably it would have suffered the same fate as befell its predecessor, the League of Nations, when that body refused to act against Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia, Hitler's invasion of the Saar, and Japan's invasion of the Chinese mainland. Instead of following that bad example, the United Nations, following the initiative taken by President Truman and the United States, took prompt action to repel force in the only possible way—with force. Because there was no hesitation, the invasion was thrown back and the aggressors forced to give up their attempt at forcible seizure of land not properly theirs. The struggle was a long and a costly one, but it was both necessary and proper. The action served notice on all possible aggressor nations of the intention of this world body to block attempts at aggression by clear and decisive action. The prestige of the United Nations was greatly enhanced by this move, and the primary object of the organization—peace—was thereby made even more manifest.

Though the action in Korea was the most spectacular of all those engaged in by the United Nations, it is by no means the sole example of how this organization has promoted world peace. After the Jewish State of Israel was established with the consent of the United Nations, it was forced to fight for its very life against the attacks of the Arab nations surrounding it. This fight might well have become a great war but for the good offices of the United Nations in the person of Count Bernadotte. Instead, peace, however tenuous, was established. That peace has been maintained in spite of great provocations, by the United Nations.

In Indonesia, following World War II, a great struggle erupted between native Indonesians and the Dutch. Peace was established under the auspices of the United Nations, and there is now every prospect that this area will become once again one of the most productive regions in the world. Without the aid of the world body, it is not difficult to imagine the continuance of a great and destructive civil war, with all the attendant evils that such a situation inevitably entails.

Such are some of the vital steps the United Nations has taken to preserve world peace. This has not been its only function, however. Equally important to the peoples of the world has been the initiative taken by this organization in the fields of health, education, and welfare. We are all aware that, although poverty and sickness continue to exist in large areas of the world community, under the leadership of the United Nations, important steps have been taken to alleviate the ills of these unfortunates. Of particular consequence, and having great appeal to Americans, is the work undertaken by the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. In recent days I have had the very good fortune of seeing a movie starring that great comedian, Danny Kaye, which shows most vividly the significant work being undertaken by this organization. I recommend it both to my colleagues in the House and to all Americans. Once this movie has been seen, I think none of its viewers can fail to be grateful to the men and women who have devoted their lives to such a mission, even as it was most certainly apparent in the film how grateful were the people of other nations who were benefited by its actions.

We have all heard much in recent months about various technical-assistance programs. I hardly think it is necessary, therefore, for me to dwell on the value of such programs. The United Nations has done, and is continuing to do, much good in such fields, and the value of this work has been testified to over and over again by the spokesmen of the nations involved.

All steps taken in the fields of health, education, and welfare by the United Nations are good in and of themselves, but they also help to promote the primary aim of world peace. So long as poverty or sickness exists anywhere it is a potential threat to world peace. So long as men are ignorant they are easy prey of men bent on aggression. Thus, even those bodies within the United Nations not directly concerned with the peace of the world have great and continuing contributions to make to this end.

I think it is apparent from what I have said that we in the United States must be thankful for the existence of the United Nations, and we wish it well on this its 10th birthday.

Desegregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the precedent for desegregation handed down in last year's Supreme Court decision, plus its reaffirmation the other day, are landmarks in the history of the United States. These are the most encouraging beacons set out along the path to equality which the Negro has so long sought. Further inspiration and guidance will be given those who have made every effort to further interracial goodwill.

Recently, at Bandung, the world watched the Conference of Asiatic leaders. I am confident that the desegregation decision penetrated every echelon of the conclave there assembled, and undoubtedly left its imprint of inspiration. In Indonesia, site of the assemblage, there is the caste system. In India, presided over by Nehru and Krishna Menon, the untouchables have been liberated by law but not in fact; they have the Brahmins and the Khatriyas and many other gradations between. Similarly, in China, despite the propaganda boasts of communism, there is segregation of all sorts. Happily, in the United States, these decisions will do much to dispel the doubt and fog involving our attitudes.

Decisions of this type do not come down as manna from heaven. They do not spring from vacuums. It is not comparable to opening a box and finding a valuable jewel. It has been the result of painstaking, backbreaking, heartbreaking work of organizations such as the Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Urban League, and leaders like Rev. Thomas C. Harten. We are tremendously indebted to men like Walter White, for many years secretary of NAACP, and women like Mary McLeod Bethune, educator and civic leader, whose deaths within the past year have given the whole country a sense of loss.

I hope this will prove to be the last bend in the long road that has been beset by obstacles of prejudice, bias, and the inhumanity of man to man. In a way, this decision is as great as Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, because it implements the freedoms so gloriously set forth in those famous documents. It echoes the voice of Leviticus, whose stirring command is inscribed on the Liberty Bell: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." It reminds us of Washington's reverent greeting to the members of the Portuguese synagogue in which he quoted the prophet, Micah: "They shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid."

It is to be expected, I suppose, that some southern leaders will make every effort to balk the carrying out of this judgment and advocate interminable litigation. Certain States in the deep South have already announced their inflexible opposition to the principle and practice of desegregation in the schools. They may not openly disregard the Court's order, but they can flout and oppose it by subterfuge. The Court requires that the defendant in last year's case "make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance" with the ruling of May 17, 1954. Let us see to it that there will be no undue delay, no pettifogging of a clearly determined issue.

I like the way Alan Paton, author of Cry the Beloved Country, has said this:

> The history of the Negro * * * has been the history of hope and despair, of acceptance and rejection, of justice and terror, a story so noble and tragic that it is one of the greatest of the epics of mankind.

The American Negro is on the march. His star is rising. He is to come into his own. He must come into his own. He has a firm grip on a good beginning. He is protected by the minimum-wage law; we have a State fair employment practices act; his living standards have greatly improved. Certainly there is much more to be done; but the first few steps have been taken and there will be no retreat.

As in the fields of education, music, and medicine, so in the political world the Negro has embraced one more means of self-respect. For example, from 1940–1952, southern Negro voters have risen from 250,000 to 1,250,000 despite the decrease of Negro population in that region.

No one people in the United States has been called upon more to bear the burdens placed upon it by the immoral principle of exclusion. No one people more than the Negro has been called upon to exercise self-restraint to try to live a normal life within the cyclones of prejudice around them. No one people in the United States has moved so rapidly through such magnificent achievements to meet the responsibility and challenge its history has placed before it. The work is far from done but in the midst of this labor, it is right that we pause to rejoice in the achievements of the people who are part of this America, who have helped to make this America, and who until recently have been brutally, and I say criminally, denied the fruits thereof. The Negro people know in their hearts that bitterness cannot win for them equality of opportunity and have put white America to shame by their practice and belief in God's love and mercy.

Five years ago there were few, if any, fair employment practice laws. Today 12 States and 32 cities have such laws. Three States have fair education laws. Five States have public accommodation laws.

Five years ago there was only 1 Negro officeholder in the South, 1 Negro doctor on the staff of a general hospital, and only 1 Negro college professor appointed. Today such appointments will fill the pages of an entire book.

Today, in Washington, property segregation is gone, school segregation is gone, the theaters and motion-picture houses have been desegregated, as have been restaurants. Today some 2,000 Negro students attend integrated college classrooms in the South, and on May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court's historic decision banned segregation in the Nation's public schools.

I mention these as some of the highlights, and there are many others, in the closing of the gap of equality of opportunities between the white people and the colored. This does not call for a feeling of smugness or complacent satisfaction that all is well. I repeat there is much more to be done. We are only at the beginning, but we must remember that that beginning has been made, and that America's promise of a right to equality of opportunity for all must be fulfilled. The Negro people of the country have accepted the challenge and the responsibility and have made a record of which all of us, since we are the citizens of the land, are rightly proud.

Today there are approximately 15 million Negroes in the United States. It is important for us to know, for example, the population shifts of the Negro. The South which was more than one-third Negro in 1900, was less than one-fourth Negro in 1950, and if this migration continues, the population of the South will be only one-fifth colored in 1960.

More than 2½ million Negroes born in the South were living outside it in 1950. To put it more dramatically, let me state that the Pacific coast States had an increase in Negro population of 275 percent. In New York City, which has always had a high percentage of colored population, there was a jump of 60 percent between 1940 and 1950.

One further fact—the Negro has become a city dweller, and this is true even in the South.

These figures are important because the intermingling of the white and the colored populations has spread throughout the land, and equality of opportunity has been more completely divorced from the problem which had been mainly regional before.

The Negro people have reason to be proud. A Negro was world heavyweight champion boxer for over 10 years. None of us will ever forget Joe Louis. During the war years 3 of the 10 highest paid concert artists were Negroes. Negro athletes helped the United States win the International Olympics. A Negro has won the Nobel peace prize, Dr. Ralph Bunche. A Negro is now serving as

chairman of a powerful committee in Congress.

It is not commonly known that the greatest artist in America and abroad around the turn of the century was Harry C. Tanner. He was born here in 1859 and died in 1907. He was the greatest painter of Scriptural subjects of his age.

Among the Negro painters today we find such famous names as William Edouard Scott, painter; William M. Farrow, painter and etcher; Selma Burke, sculptress; Aaron Douglas, a New York painter; and Hale Woodruff, a painter and ceramist, also of New York. Lois Mailou Jones, the painter of Washington, D. C., is sometimes considered one of the greatest artists of the present time, as also is Richmond Barthe, a sculptor of New York, whose works are widely recognized in Washington and on the east coast. Barthe's bust of Booker T. Washington is a masterpiece which has been placed in the Hall of Fame on the campus of New York University.

One of the youngest of the outstanding artists is Jacob Lawrence, of New York City, whose works have been exhibited in the Museum of Modern Art and in the prominent museums over the country.

Dr. Russell Wilfred Brown has achieved recognition in the field of bacteriology, in addition to holding the directorship of the George Washington Carver Foundation, Tuskegee Institute. Dr. Hildrus A. Poindexter, head of the department of bacteriology at Howard University, has also made significant contributions in that field.

Dr. Ernest E. Just, a world-famed authority on marine biology, was also on the faculty of Howard University in Washington until his death in 1941.

One of the greatest scientists of modern times was George Washington Carver, famous for his work in agricultural development. The foundation which bears his name, and which was established from his own savings, stands as a living memorial to the great scientist.

Dr. Robert Percy Barnes is widely known as an organic chemist.

Dr. Lloyd A. Hall, Chief Chemist and Research Director of Griffith's Laboratories in Chicago since 1929, has made numerous contributions in the field, holding 75 patents in the United States, Canada and Great Britain, on his discoveries.

Dr. Percy L. Julian has a long-standing reputation in industrial chemistry, having held many prominent positions in major universities before becoming director of research of the Glidden Co., in Chicago, where he has developed numerous innovations in paint compounds.

In American medical circles, the name of Dr. Charles Richard Drew stands out. His great contribution to modern medicine was the preserving of blood plasma for emergency transfusions during the war. For this he was awarded the Spingarn Medal. Dr. Drew, who is staff director and chief surgeon of Freedman's Hospital in Washington, is an authority on blood plasma and the author of many articles on this subject.

The contribution of the colored people to the field of music is hailed throughout the world as unique. The names of Marian Anderson, Todd Duncan, Paul Robeson, and Roland Hayes are familiar to everyone. Among the most popular concert artists of today are William Warfield and Leontyne Price, who traveled throughout the United States and Canada with the company of Porgy and Bess.

Singers, bandleaders, and composers who have enriched our popular music number among them many Negroes: Hazel Scott, Mary Lou Williams, Duke Ellington, Fats Waller, Louis Armstrong, Nat "King" Cole, Pearl Bailey—to mention but a few. And not to be forgotten is W. C. Handy who composed the perennial favorite, St. Louis Blues.

In folksong and in spiritual, Negroes have left a mark on the musical history of our times. Harry T. Burleigh and R. Nathaniel Dett, through their arrangements of spirituals, did much to advance the popularity of the spiritual in concert repertoires.

Various Negro choirs have gone on world tours and won high praise: notably, the Tuskegee, Hampton, Howard, Fisk, and Talledega University choirs, and the Hall Johnson and Eva Jessye choirs. On the radio, the Southernaires and the Wings Over Jordan Choir have maintained prolonged popularity.

Throughout World War II, Negroes were to be found on every battlefront, and many individuals as well as units distinguished themselves in combat. The 92d Infantry alone, which engaged in combat in the Mediterranean theater, received 12,096 decorations. The famed 99th Pursuit Squadron won its reputation in Italy. Outstanding records were made by the 332d Fighter Group, the 477th Composite Group and the 553d Pursuit Squadron—all Negro units.

In August, 1954, more than 880,000 Negroes were enlisted in the armed services of this country.

Booker T. Washington was primarily responsible for introducing industrial arts into public secondary and higher education curricula. The establishment of Tuskegee Institute was a big step in educational progress.

Dr. Mordecai W. Johnson, president of Howard University, and Dr. Charles S. Johnson of Fisk, have done much to further progress of higher education among Negroes.

Other well-known names in the field of education are Dr. Ambrose Caliver of the United States Office of Education; Dr. Charles H. Thompson, editor of the Journal of Negro Education; and Dr. Carter G. Woodson, editor of Journal of Negro History.

In the field of sports we have had Joe Louis, heavyweight champion; also boxers Henry Armstrong, Ray Robinson, Ike Williams, and "Beau Jack."

In baseball we have Jackie Robinson, Roy Campanella, Dodgers, and Leroy Satchel Paige, Cleveland Indians.

In the Olympics, Ralph Metcalfe and Jesse Owens were track stars in 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin. The names of Herbert McKenley, Alice Coachman, Harrison Dillard, John Borican, Archie Harris, Barney Ewell are well known.

In football, Buddy Young, Paul Patterson, Illinois, and Kenny Washington, of the Los Angeles Rams.

From 1901 to 1931 there were no Negroes in Congress. At the present time there are three—ADAM C. POWELL, of New York; WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Chicago; and CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Detroit, Mich.

Other Negroes of achievement are William H. Hastie, Governor of the Virgin Islands; Eugene Kinckle Jones, secretary of the National Urban League; Dr. Frederick D. Patterson, president of Tuskegee Institute.

In closing I would like to quote from one of the famed books of my own religion, the Talmud, which says:

All men are equal. One man alone, Adam, was brought forth at the time of creation in order that thereafter none shall have the right to say to another, "My father was greater than yours."

The book further queries:

Why was man created a solitary human being without a companion? So that it might not be said that some races are better than others.

Trinity River Division, Central Valley Project, California

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4663) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we in the Congress once and for all have got to resolve for ourselves the question of which way we are going in connection with this proposition of the subsidization of the electric light and power industry of this country.

In 1933 we authorized the construction of the TVA. I was not here at that time. I would have voted for it had I been here. As a matter of fact, Stanley Reed, who was the Solicitor General of the United States at the time the constitutionality of TVA was argued in the Supreme Court, and now a Justice of the Supreme Court, said:

If TVA were solely a question of electric power I would not have a leg to stand on in appearing before you, but it is a matter of irrigation and reclamation which are governmental functions.

And, incidentally, as a matter of commonsense and good judgment, hydroelectric power developed from such dams should be utilized by the Government. Since that time we have seen the development of TVA to a point where only last week we were asked to appropriate $6½ million to build a steam plant to supply electric power for the southeastern part of the United States.

We are opening the door in this project to the identical situation; 85 percent practically of this entire appropriation is

for power facilities when actually there is under study by the Department of the Interior a proposition to permit the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. at their own cost to take that 85 percent out of this controversy by building the power facility.

In addition thereto they will pay to the Government a price for the falling water. Do you not see what that would mean? If we in the Congress wait for the termination of that investigation, we can come in here with a bill, a partnership bill, which would permit the Government to pay for and build the irrigation and reclamation features of this bill which would amount to only about $20 million to $25 million and permit the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to build the power facilities and pay rent for the falling water. We would then have a bill that would not cost the people anything because the power facilities will be built by the utilities and the rentals they pay would take care of the irrigation, reclamation, and navigation features and eventually we would not have to pay anything at all out of the Treasury of the United States. We can do that in the next session of this very Congress if we wait pending the study of the Department of the Interior and the proposal made by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Why get the Corps of Army Engineers into the construction of power facilities which they will commence right away, then have the Department of the Interior make recommendations. We would be then burdened with the proposition of determining how much the Corps of Army Engineers have spent, how much the Pacific Gas & Electric would have to pay for what has been spent and what has been done by the Corps of Engineers and the private contractor under contract by the utility, which will result in a lot of confusion in paying back to the Government money it has already spent, taxpayers' money. Why can we not just wait until the next session of the Congress, wait for the termination of this study, then we will have a bill that will not be a $225 million bill, it will be a $20 million bill and there will be a provision in the bill that will automatically repay the Federal Government for all the money spent. It will be then a partnership operation, it will be what the 90 towns are for in California, as I understand it.

May I ask the gentleman from California, if the Department of the Interior recommends this partnership with the utility and recommends that they pay for the power facilities and pay the Government for the falling water, will the gentleman from California be for that recommendation of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman asked that question, and I told him I did not propose to prejudge what they would come in here with. I do not know what they are coming in with.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Will the gentleman say now that if the Federal Government has spent this money he is for turning it over?

Mr. ENGLE. My personal disposition is not to favor turning over these powerhouses at federally constructed projects to private utilities.

Mr. MILLER of New York. They will not be federally constructed.

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to straighten him out on his figures. He talks about this project being 85 percent power.

Mr. MILLER of New York. The gentleman from Nebraska said it was mostly power. How are we going to pay this back?

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman forgets you have to build a reservoir anyway.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Yes.

Mr. ENGLE. There are only $50 million of this project in powerhouses.

Mr. MILLER of New York. How are you going to pay back the $225 million? You cannot pay it out of irrigation, navigation, and reclamation. Only out of power are you going to be able to pay this back.

Deterioration of National Park System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Wallace Stegner, the noted novelits, appearing in the June 13, 1955, issue of Sports Illustrated, describing vividly how our great national park system has been allowed to deteriorate and fall into neglect and disrepair.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE DESTROYING OUR NATIONAL PARKS

(By Wallace Stegner)

Yosemite Valley, a 7-mile setting for the great granite jewels of El Capitan, Half Dome and Clouds Rest, is veined with bright water and has grown to the loveliest of forests. The climate is perfect, access easy. Result: On any summer day the valley entertains between 20,000 and 32,000 people. Its population, at 3 or 4 thousand per square mile, is 3 or 4 times as dense as that of Java, one of the most densely populated countries on earth.

Here is dramatically illustrated the dilemma of the National Park Service, whose legal duty is "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife * * * and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

CROSS PURPOSES

Provide for enjoyment, but leave unimpaired. Use, but protect. Keep the parks primitive, but open them to millions (in 1954, almost 48 million people visited all the areas exclusive of the National Capital Parks System and in late years the total has grown by nearly 10 percent per year). Make scenery accessible with roads, trails, lookouts, but don't scar it up. Provide, invisibly, campsites for millions, lodge and motel accommodations for hundreds of thousands, and the facilities of whole towns to take care of them.

Guard against fire, clean up after the litterbugs. Protect and restore the wildlife, even wolves and mountain lions, in order to keep the balance of nature, but do it in a show window where millions can thrill to see it. Offer highgrade adult education to all who ask for it and many who don't. Rescue climbers trapped or injured on the cliffs, tourists wounded by the bears they have been (against the rules) feeding.

Do what you can about America's slaphappy habit of defacing signs, tearing up shrubs and wildflowers, and throwing candy wrappers, bottles, and beer cans in creeks and springs and geysers. Be patient when tourists bawl you out for something "because I pay taxes for this." Do it all on a pitifully inadequate budget, with collapsing equipment and an overworked and undermanned staff, and smile.

The picture is gruesome, but it is neither sensational nor exaggerated. If the men of the Park Service had only the vacationing hordes to contend with, maybe they would be able to cope with their problems. But there are other groups—the entrepreneurs who want to open the parks for exploitation, Federal agencies which would build dams in them, and Congress, which likes the parks but will not pay for them. Together, all four groups represent almost every living soul in America. They are at once the friends and the enemies of the system of national parks that gained its first great strength under the vigorous championship of President Theodore Roosevelt and has since stood as a model of democratic conservation for the rest of the world to copy. While most of the people of the United States love their parks, the parks might be destroyed.

A SIMPLE CHOICE

The entrepreneurs would cut timber, dig metals, graze the ranges, drill for oil and install ski lifts. Once a great threat, they are now reduced to a minor one. To Joe Smith, average citizen, reading of proposed raids on the timber of Olympic National Park or the watershed ranges of Yellowstone, the choice seems a simple one between good and bad. But the threat from private interests has been replaced by the threat posed by Government bureaus whose philosophy of land use runs counter to the strict conservation policy of the national parks. The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation both want to build dams in some of the parks and monuments. When they are well planned, such dams mean fewer water-starved areas, greater flood control, more electric power. These are obviously very good things. But are they good enough to warrant the destruction of incomparable wilderness? Joe Smith is confused; it seems to him the choice is not between good and bad but between varying degrees, varying kinds of good.

Our Mr. Smith, who has been battered by arguments from all sides, is only ordinarily informed; he may even have been misinformed. But he may suspect that the value of preserving a wilderness may outweight the value of hydroelectric power, especially when it seems likely that the same amount of power could be produced at alternate sites, or more cheaply by steam-coal plants, and when the potential of atomic power casts a big shadowy question mark on all expensive hydroelectric installations. Joe may even end up thinking that these dam-building bureaus are the worst enemies of the national parks.

He would be close to right. But let us not forget the Congress and the people of the United States.

It means little that both Congress and the people think themselves the parks' best friends. Congress has been friendly in principle and stingy with money ever since it established Yellowstone in 1872. The American people love their parks and threaten to trample them to death. The more successful the Park Service is in keeping a park wild and beautiful, the more people it will draw and the more it has to contend with a thundering herd.

Everything in a primeval park ought to be preserved just as God made it: everything except man, who is an intruder and has to be educated. That is the Park Service's job.

It is more than a cleanup job, though refuse disposal is a desperate problem in all the popular parks, and a park ranger in summer often finds himself little more than a garbage man working a 15-hour shift. Worse than dirty public habits is the public's failure to understand what a national park is.

MONUMENTAL GRAB BAG

Its failure is understandable, for too many kinds of things are included in the 24 million acres which the Park Service must administer in 38 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. There are 180 parks, monuments, battlefields, historic sites, memorials, cemeteries, parkways, National Capital Parks, and recreational areas.

The Park Service takes care of everything from F. D. R.'s Hyde Park home to the parkways through the Great Smokies and the campgrounds on some reclamation reservoirs. No wonder Joe Smith is confused; no wonder he sometimes falls for the notion that the parks ought to be "developed." There are swimming pools in Yosemite, and a bandstand from which dance music bounces off the cliffs. There are several tows for skiers at Hidden Valley in Rocky Mountain National Park, and Seattle businessmen are asking for more of the same on Mount Rainier.

None of these things ought to be there; they are contrary to the spirit and the letter of the law establishing the National Park Service. A national park is not a playground and not a resort, though it may be ideal for such activities as hiking, riding, climbing, hunting with a camera, fishing and cross-country skiing—sports which demand no installations, attract no spectators and leave no scars. The real purpose of the national parks—to preserve scenery, beauty, geology, archaeology, wildlife, for permanent use in living natural museums—is not affected by these, but it cannot be made compatible with weekend dances, ski tournaments, speedboat races and a million people a year. And if the parks are not protected against people who insist on using them as resorts, they are shortly going to look like Settembrini's Picnic Ground after the annual Lions outing.

In 1954 Yosemite had 1,008,031 visitors; Rocky Mountain 1,425,635; Great Smoky, more than 2½ million; Yellowstone, almost a million and a third; Grand Teton, more than a million. Nearly 26 million in the national parks and monuments alone, over 54 million in all the Park Service areas. The total has steadily increased by more than a million each year. By 1975, when according to demographers the population of the United States will be 200 million and that of California 20 million, visitors to the national parks may well run to more than 100 million every year.

If Yosemite looks now like the rush hour at Hollywood and Vine, how will it be in 1975? And where shall we go then for our inexpensive and restorative family vacations? Not to Sequoia or Rocky Mountain or Lassen Volcanic. Their beauty will be lost to us, as Yosemite's is already to many because of the crowds. We will have to seek quieter and wilder places where there is rest for soul and eye. Such places are scarce now. They are getting rarer, and there are no more where they came from.

Every one of them is unique and beyond price. We need not fewer such protected areas but more of them. House and Senate have not agreed on the Service's 1956 appropriation as this is written. The approximately $33 million budget for 1955, though supplemented by a little more than $10 million in contract authorization for roads and parkways and by a half million to match the same amount of donated Rockefeller money for land purchases, was only a fraction of what was needed. In presenting his budget for 1954, Director Conrad Wirth noted a long-term trend of slow starvation. What the Bureau of the Budget had allotted him would provide 15 percent fewer man-years of work than the budget of 1941, yet "in 1953 we have 8 percent more areas, 10 percent more acres, 32 percent more miles of roads, 35 percent more miles of trails, and 100 percent more visitors than we had in 1941."

LESS THAN ENOUGH

The 1955 budget, though better than 1954, provided for less than 5 percent of the backlog of construction that every year is more frantically needed as the visitor load increases. For our National Park System we dedicate only seven-tenths of 1 percent of our land area, and then we refuse to provide even 5 percent of what is needed to develop it. Many nations, all of whom learned the national-park idea from us, do better by it than we do. Even Japan, overpopulated and land-starved, has set aside 4 percent of its territory.

Our parks are like a child whose teeth have been neglected. Look at that smile, we say. See how white and pretty? Hardly any decay showing. But keep her away from the dentist another few years. Let maintenance and construction be postponed as they have been ever since the standby years of World War II. Put off renovating the museums, do without the extra rangers and naturalists. Don't bother moving the campgrounds, though they ought to be moved about as often as a turkey run, and for similar reasons. Let it all go, and pretty soon we will not ask the child to smile.

The service which Congress established in 1916 to care for its national parks has been, in spite of starvation budgets, a destructive public and persistent outside enemies, one of the best agencies of public service that any people ever had. Today there are more trees, flowers, and wildlife in Yosemite, in spite of the thundering herd, than there were a generation ago. They are there because the Park Service takes its job seriously. Park Service employees have a resilient morale, a morale that is always threatened but never caves, despite meager pay, high rent for park housing, and unpaid overtime. They are men of high ability who have sacrificed better pay and ambition to do a job they like.

FREEDOM FROM FREEDOM

Joe Smith is going to have to get used to some restrictions, even if Congress should decide in the future to deal kindly with the parks. Already most campgrounds have a 15- or 30-day limit; already concessionaires may restrict the stay of their lodge and motel guests. Admission cards to pitch a tent in campgrounds, good for the whole season, will probably have to go. And the recreation activities, spectator sports, concerts, and swimming pools and organizational picnics, maybe even ski lifts, will have to be left to the resort areas where there is little of the real wilderness left to spoil.

We can't, as has been bitterly proposed, close our national parks and thus force Congress to put up money for their proper operation. We can't close up something that 54 million people want. But we can destroy their beauty, and hence their reason for being, and perhaps we will. It would take a 10-year construction and rehabilitation program of $60 million a year to bring the parks back to what they should be, and an annual operating budget at least twice that of 1955 to keep them there.

That sounds like a lot of money, and is. But the money will produce returns of another kind: Health and sanity and the profound and personal sense of belonging to something good and beautiful that cannot be measured in dollars. A primeval park offers values that are close to the values of religion.

A sampling of the Nation's parks

Name	Park headquarters address	Gross acreage	Outstanding character	Available concessions [1]	Attendance, 1954
Acadia	Bar Harbor, Maine	41,954	Rugged coastal area and cliffs.	Meals only	553,785
Big Bend	Marathon, Tex	708,221	Mountain and desert scenery.	Horses	67,280
Bryce Canyon	Springdale, Utah	36,010	Fairyland of multicolored rock columns.	Transportation	238,157
Carlsbad Caverns	Carlsbad, N. Mex	49,448	Huge limestone caves	Meals only, nursery, curios.	444,338
Crater Lake	Medford, Oreg	160,290	Luminous blue water in mouth of once active volcano.	Ski tow, transportation.	370,554
Everglades	Homestead, Fla	1,258,361	Largest remaining subtropical wilderness in United States.	Boat service, tours, no meals or lodging.	218,044
Glacier	West Glacier, Mont.	1,013,129	Rocky Mountain peaks, glaciers, lakes.	Guides, boats, trail.	608,230
Grand Canyon	Grand Canyon, Ariz	645,809	Fantastically eroded and brilliantly colored rock gorge.	Transportation, store, medical, tours, horses.	814,130
Great Smoky Mountains.	Gatlinburg, Tenn	510,169	Loftiest range east of Black Hills.	Horses	2,526,879
Hawaii	Hawaii, T. H	246,747	Still active volcanic area	Transportation	444,551
Isle Royale	Houghton, Mich	133,838	Forested island wilderness	Boats, guides	4,292
Mesa Verde	Mesa Verde, Colo	51,334	11th century cliff dwellings	Horses	150,330
Sequoia	Three Rivers, Calif	386,560	Great groves of giant sequoias.	Transportation, medical and hospital, guides.	484,653
Yellowstone	Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho borders.	2,221,773	Wonderland of geysers, colored springs; spectacular falls.	Transportation, guides, stores.	1,328,893

[1] All parks offer meals and lodging unless otherwise noted.

The Boston Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday morning, June 22, 1955, representatives of the employees of the Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass., held a consultation with the Members of the Massachusetts delegation in connection with the conditions of the Boston Naval Shipyard and, particularly, certain orders issued by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy adversely affecting the business of, and employment at, the Boston Naval Shipyard.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include herein statements made to members of the delegation by John S. Gannon, correspondence secretary of the Boston Naval Shipyard Betterment Association; by Thomas J. Riley, vice president of the Boston Naval Shipyard Betterment Association; by Charles C. O'Donnell, president of the Boston Naval Shipyard Betterment Association, as well as introductory remarks made by Abraham Green, treasurer of the Boston Naval Shipyard Betterment Association:

Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation and invited guests, let me introduce myself. I am Abraham Green, treasurer of the Boston Naval Shipyard Betterment Association.

First of all I would like to welcome you all. We are honored to have here this morning two distinguished gentlemen long identified with the labor movement. At this time I would like each individual, as his name is called, to rise and take a bow.

Mr. James A. Campbell, national president of American Federation of Government Employees, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and

Mr. John J. P. Curran, district representative of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Fitters, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers of America, A. F. of L.

At this time I would like to present our correspondence secretary, John S. Gannon, as the first speaker. Mr. Gannon.

REMARKS OF JOHN S. GANNON, CORRESPONDENCE SECREARY OF THE BOSTON NAVAL SHIPYARD BETTERMENT ASSOCIATION

Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, invited guests, on March 30, we came before you to alert you and ask for your support to stop this disintegration of our essential components of our Navy. At that time, we reminded you that it was your responsibility to provide and maintain a Navy under article I of our Constitution. Many points were raised at this meeting on the essential components of the Navy. We requested a meeting with the President of the United States together with a committee from your delegation.

Now we are here again, with a bill of particulars that you have requested at our March meeting. The bill of particulars, drawn up by this association, concern essential components of our Navy, that have been ordered closed by order of the Secretary of the Navy, such as the "ropewalk" and "chain shop."

Every administration and Congress since 1800 has seen fit to hold these components intact as part of our Navy, and our report to you today, gentlemen, will show that it would be in the best interest of the public and taxpayers of this Nation, to hold these components—proven essential—intact as part of our Navy.

The ropewalk is a modern component of the naval defense installation, established in 1834, 121 years ago as an essential component of the United States Navy. The ropewalk is a traditional component of the Navy, and is the only activity of its kind in the Navy. The navies of foreign powers maintain ropewalks as components of naval activities. The ropewalk at Devonport and Exeter have been traditional components of the British Navy for many years.

The Boston Naval Shipyard Ropewalk, in addition to making rope for the Navy, develops artisans who inspect, rework, and test, and service ships, and supply a service like any other industrial component of the Boston Naval Shipyard.

The craftsmen are trained in a fine apprenticeship training program of the Navy, not duplicated in private industry. With this experience, hawsers have been reclaimed and reworked in considerable extent to save vital materials and money.

The ropewalk is actively engaged in research and development and evaluation testing which provides better materials and reduces cost.

Presently, there are 58 employees, 70 percent of the employees are war veterans, over 50 percent have had more than 15 years of Government service, 20 percent have had more than 25 years of service.

On the rolls are employees of the third and second generation of families—father to son, father to son, father to son—3 lifetimes of ropemakers, in the service of the Navy. These craftsmen are alert, industrious with a record of continual improvement in production to effect savings.

With respect to cost, formal studies conducted by the Department of the Navy showed that by any criteria, the ropewalk saved the taxpayers considerable sums of money. The extent of these savings is a matter of record. In the Ropewalk, even today, with morale at a low ebb because they face the loss of jobs, the employees continue to work efficiently to save money for our fellow American taxpayers. In effecting the decision of closing the Ropewalk, the employees have been informed that costs and savings to the Government are not considered. The philosophy of savings, which we have always considered consistent with the duties of good citizenship, demand the best and most economical in administration of Government.

With respect to research and development, as a component of the Boston Naval Shipyard, the Ropewalk has never duplicated the work of private enterprise, but has led the field for improvements for a better naval fighting ship. The Ropewalk is the only Government facility equipped for research, development, and evaluation studies in this field. Its performance has set a high standard resulting in material improvements instrumental in saving lives as well as dollars. Even a spokesman for the American cordage industry has expressed approval of this phase of Ropewalk operations. The decision to close the Ropewalk will discontinue this phase of operation with detriment to the defense effort. With respect to supply and logistics, formal studies by mobilization authorities point out this country's deficiencies in vital rope and cordage: Deficiencies not in equipment of tools, but in raw materials, manpower, skills. Cordage fibers are in our national stockpile of critical materials to which the Ropewalk operations have been geared.

No study can justify a stand that we will store away our tools of war and when we are in urgent need, we will man them, with skills which a sorely strained mobilizing industry will make available to us. Such untenable sentiment has been expressed as proper reason for closing the Ropewalk by responsible officials of the Navy Department. Even today, as the Navy plans to close the Ropewalk, plans are being made to utilize foreign manufacture for our defense needs to the extent that American citizens will be forced out of work by discontinuing the Ropewalk as a naval facility and there will be no nucleus for reactivation or mobilization. The basis for these actions has been declared and reiterated by the Secretary of the Navy to be based on careful study. It is obvious that these studies have not been adequate nor careful nor complete. These studies in the maelstrom of the issue of getting the Navy out of business have arbitrarily designated a component of the Boston Naval Shipyard and the Navy a manufacturing activity and ignored the other essential facets of operation intrinsically part of the operating Navy.

We, the employees of the Boston Naval Shipyard, know that our Navy management has never sought to take over that which can and should be performed by American industry. Accordingly, we do not consider the Ropewalk as a manufacturing operation in competition with industry. For 121 years, we have provided an essential service for the Navy and our fellow Americans, and are proud of our contribution. The Ropewalk we regard as a limited operation for pilot runs, evaluation tests, and improvements in an essential naval material: a focal point for the essential research and development responsibility assigned to the Navy by the Secretary of Defense. Even under existing executive instructions, such operations have not been regarded as commercial-type operations and accordingly can be maintained.

REMARKS OF THOMAS J. RILEY, VICE PRESIDENT, BOSTON NAVAL SHIPYARD BETTERMENT ASSOCIATION

Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation, the previous speaker has alerted you to the directive Closing of the Ropewalk at Boston Naval Shipyard. I would like to point my remarks to another component that has also been ordered closed by directive; namely, the Boston Naval Shipyard chain shop.

The closing of this chain shop is a very severe and drastic blow to our Navy in equipping and maintaining the fleet.

Gentlemen, established in the year 1800, this first and only chain shop of our Navy has been rated high for its inventions, and has developed 90 percent of chain used on naval vessels.

Today, the Navy has ordered these dies, that were invented by employees at the Boston Naval Shipyard, to be loaned to various chain manufacturers, to duplicate, by contract, the chains formerly made at the Boston Naval Shipyard.

Dielock anchor chain is subjected to a series of tests that guarantee the tensile strength, shock, and compressive resistance, uniformity, and safety factor, over any other types of anchor chain.

Dielock is the strongest existing chain—and let us not forget, gentlemen, that anchor chain is the lifeline of a ship. The parting of a link in the chain while moored could result in loss of life and ship.

Anchor chain is of extreme importance to naval operations. In its quest for stronger and improved anchor chain, the Boston Naval Shipyard was established as an anchor-chain source, and since 1912 has been maintained as a principal chain information center and dependable source of supply. The Navy maintains no other command control operation to furnish anchor-chain information. Because of the limited market, the high-strength anchor chain required by the Navy is not readily available.

As a component of the Navy, the skill of the employees engaged in chainmaking is used to further improvements. Our employees invented and progressively developed dielock anchor chain, the strongest and finest chain made for naval use. No other source has attempted to provide better anchor chain for the use of the United States Navy. It was this progressive experience and know-how which enabled the Navy to be determined as the sole source of supply for the anchor chain of strength and size suitable for our supercarriers, the U. S. S. *Forrestal* and the U. S. S. *Saratoga*. It was this progressive experience and know-how that enabled the employees of the Boston Naval Shipyard develop and perfect a nonmagnetic anchor chain to support the Navy's minesweeping program, a need which could not be supplied by any other source.

It is our contention that the discontinuing of chainmaking at the Boston Naval Shipyard will deprive the Navy of the skills

incidental to the development of improvements in chainmaking. With dissipation of skills, there will be no dependable mobilization base. It is noted by press reports that mobilization authorities even now are concerned with the availability of essential components of ships and that a national component deficiency program has already been established. Review of the Navy chain requirements will corroborate the validity of this contention.

Discontinuance of dielock and other chain fabrication assigned to Boston is of serious detriment to morale, and will be devastating with respect to encouragement of new ideas in methods or products. Naval vessels have obligations which demand superlative chain. Fleet operations are conducted in areas with mooring practices over and beyond commercial marine operations, and for such operations the skill of the chainmakers of the Navy must be ever directed for improvement. The instructions to discard these skills in the face of the fact that there are no others, that will be available in emergency is the sufficient reason for continuing this operational component in the Boston Naval Shipyard.

REMARKS OF CHARLES C. O'DONNELL, PRESIDENT, BOSTON NAVAL SHIPYARD BETTERMENT ASSOCIATION

In summarizing the talks of the previous speakers, it is obvious that the intention is to close the ropewalk and the chain shop.

In the President's directive, he stated that any components essential and for the public's interest would not be removed. We concur with the President on the essential components and are here today and with your indulgence we will bring out the factors placing these two components in the category of essential and in the public interest.

1. The ropewalk was established in 1834. What was the purpose of the ropewalk? Was it for the purpose of entering the cordage field in competition with private industry? The answer then, and is now, "No." The intent and purpose of the Congress of that date was to establish a component of the Navy that, through research, development of hawsers and rope might be adequately produced to best serve the requirements of the Navy on the oceans and seven seas.

It has been proven that a hawser might be adequate in the North Atlantic and inadequate in the South Pacific due to atmospheric and chemical conditions of the waters. That, gentlemen, is why research and development is a necessary function of the Navy.

The chain shop was established in 1800 by the Congress of the United States to implement the Navy in its moorings with the best and strongest chains that could be developed.

The differential between a fighting ship and a commercial-type ship, whether passenger or freighter, is that the commercial-type vessels operate in prescribed sealanes and are tied up to piers or wharves and seldom are required to drop anchor, whereas the fighting ships of the Navy on maneuvers or in an emergency might find it necessary to anchor in hazardous waters. If the Navy is forced to use chain not proven to their satisfaction by their research and development, it could very well mean the difference between proper moorage and the destruction of the ship—jeopardizing thousands of lives and a loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in such type ships as the U. S. S. *Forrestal* and U. S. S. *Saratoga*.

While these two components have been ordered discontinued, another serious threat has been added. Namely the reduction in wages to the laborers, 90 percent of whom are war veterans and have been on the job from 12 to 20 years. This will certainly mean a process of elimination of these men.

The OIR has issued a directive effective June 20 which changed the rating of laborer to laborer cleaner with a reduction in wages of between 6 and 11 cents per hour. These veteran laborers have been ordered to take a physical examination to qualify as a laborer which they have been doing for many years and for which they have been qualified since they first went to work for the Navy. How ungrateful can we be to our war veterans? Is this what might be expected for our war veterans? The Government should be the leader in these situations and should be a beacon to the rest of the country.

Gentlemen, we all know what is being done. What is the solution? The solution is this: That you gentlemen of the Massachusetts congressional delegation band together and with us appear before the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of the Navy and if necessary the President of the United States, and at which time we will ask that the ropewalk be kept as a Department of the Navy research, development, testing, and chemical analysis of rope. This will require 80 employees.

2. That the chain shop be continued as a department of research, development, testing, and chemical analysis of chain. This will require 125 men.

3. To permit the laborer to remain as laborers without sustaining a loss in pay and hold his rights as a laborer.

Upper Colorado River Projects Controversy—California Taxpayers Association Replies to Senator Watkins

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, southern California, and particularly the metropolitan area of Los Angeles which now ranks among the largest cities of our Nation and is one of our most important industrial and agricultural areas, is dependent upon its quota of Colorado River water to provide an essential water supply to the population of the area.

For this reason southern California must insist that the amount of Colorado River water guaranteed to it by the Colorado River compact be delivered, and must fight against any proposal which would divert Colorado River water to other uses to an extent that the water supply in the lower Colorado River would be reduced and southern California left without an adequate water supply for the millions who now live there.

The proposed upper Colorado River project would divert Colorado River water and dangerously decrease the supply available in the lower Colorado River. The project would also cost the taxpayers of the United States millions of dollars in subsidized lands in the project, a cost which has been estimated at $5,000 an acre to bring a water supply to land which would be worth no more than $150 with a full water supply.

The question of the upper Colorado River project is one which requires careful and serious consideration, and the facts must be honestly and accurately presented.

In the interest of keeping the record straight, Mr. Milo E. Rowell, president of the California Taxpayers' Association, recently replied to charges made by Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS in an effort to challenge the statement of facts regarding the cost and feasibility of the upper Colorado River project which had been issued by the California Taxpayers' Association.

Because of the seriousness of this issue and the importance of correct factual evidence concerning it, I want to bring the following statement by Mr. Rowell in answer to Senator WATKINS to the attention of the Members of this Congress:

CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION REPLIES TO LETTER FROM SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS

Milo E. Rowell, president of the California Taxpayers' Association, today made public a letter to Senator Arthur V. Watkins in which he took sharp issue with critical statements made by the Senator regarding the association's opposition to the proposed upper Colorado River project.

Rowell told the Senator that if anyone was guilty of making untruthful statements about the project it is its sponsors and proponents.

The Senator is one of the leading supporters of the project, and in a recent letter to Rowell he criticized an analysis of it made by the California Taxpayers' Association.

Reasserting his association's unqualified opposition to the project, Rowell told Senator WATKINS:

"I regret to say that if anyone is guilty of promulgating travesties with accuracy and truth with respect to the Colorado River storage project, it is the sponsors and proponents of the proposed development."

Rowell told the Senator it would take a crystal ball to determine what the construction cost of the project would be. Senator WATKINS had asserted that statistics used by the California Taxpayers' Association with regard to subsidies in the project were "completely erroneous and dishonest."

Figures used by the association, Rowell said, were based on official reports and testimony of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Rowell asked Senator WATKINS how the Senator could justify asking the taxpayers of the Nation to subsidize lands in the project "to the tune of $5,000 an acre." Project lands would be worth no more than $150 an acre with a full water supply, Rowell declared.

The full text of Rowell's letter to Senator WATKINS follows:

CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, June 14, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have given careful consideration to your letter of May 25 with reference to my recent statement on the Colorado storage project. I cannot agree with you that the statement issued by the California Taxpayers' Association over my signature contains any half-truths or outright misstatements as you allege.

This association is meticulous in making every effort by careful research to get the facts on any matter which it presents to its members or the public. It has done so in the statement issued on the Colorado storage project.

I have had additional research made by competent engineers and tax analysts and this letter is my conclusion after re-reviewing all the evidence available. I have re-

ceived the advice of technicians in whom I have confidence and after listening to all sides I find no reason to change my views.

However, I agree with your suggestion that it is high time to set the record straight. Accordingly, I am happy to comment in order on the particular points you raise.

1. It would take a crystal ball for anyone to determine with certainty what the construction cost of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects as proposed in S. 500 would be.

The Senate Interior Committee report (p. 16) clearly shows that the estimated cost of the projects specified for authorization in S. 500 is $1,658,460,100. It is true that the bill indicates certain conditions attached to the authorization of certain projects. But it must be concluded that the bill evidences a commitment or a clear intent of Congress to authorize all of the projects named and specified for authorization in the bill, including those to which conditions attach.

It also should be noted that the cost of the proposed storage and participating projects as presented by the Bureau at hearings on H. R. 4449 and S. 1555 last year was estimated at $1,518,096,300. But this did not include the cost of the Cross Mountain or Juniper storage units, nor of the 19 or 20 more participating projects added for authorization in S. 500, involving an additional cost of $200 to $300 million.

Considering the fact that the estimates of cost for 20 or more of the projects are based upon the barest reconnaissance surveys and the notorious record of the Bureau for grossly underestimating the cost of proposed projects, the construction cost of the projects specified for authorization in S. 500 would exceed $1.6 billion, and more probably reach $1¾ to $2 billion. Therefore, the $1.6 billion figure I used in my statement is conservative, if anything.

Your statement that "the total amount authorized in S. 500 is $1,092,999,800 as stated in the bill" is not only an attempt to minimize the cost of the project, but is also in error since the bill S. 500 names no amount, but is wide open as to authorization of funds (sec. 10).

2. The Bureau of the Budget in reporting on the Colorado River storage project and participating projects on March 18, 1954 (p. 6, Senate hearings on S. 1555), advised the Secretary of the Interior that authorization of participating projects should be subject to a "new finding of favorable economic justification" for each project, including a joint study with the Department of Agriculture of the direct agricultural benefits of each project. The Secretary of the Interior on April 1, 1954, transmitted to the Senate committee a draft of bill prepared jointly by Interior and Budget, which provided for such a joint reappraisal, as follows:

"The Secretary's supplemental report for each project shall include, (a) a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits of the project, made by the Secretary in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture."

The bill S. 500 contains a similar provision, which you quote, but with a most important and significant change, viz: instead of the words "in cooperation with," which would carry out the clear intent of the Budget Bureau report, the words used are "in consultation with." Why this change, if not in effect to bypass the Agriculture Department? In my opinion, that is the clear intent.

3. You apparently have not informed yourself, or have been poorly advised, or you would not have charged that my statistics in regard to subsidies involved in the Colorado storage project are completely erroneous and dishonest.

Evidently you are not aware of the fact that the Bureau of Reclamation has already reported (letter of March 17, 1955, to the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, p. 555, Senate hearings on S. 500) that the cost of interest to the Federal Government for the project recommended by the Secretary of the Interior would total $1,153,000,000 over the repayment period. The construction cost of the recommended project is estimated by the Bureau at $930 million, or over $700 million less than the estimated cost of the projects specified for authorization in S. 500.

The concealed subsidy of $4 billion ($5,000 per acre on the area to be served), which would have to be paid by the Nation's taxpayers, is based upon the $1.6 billion development proposed in S. 500, and is computed by equivalent methods to those used by the Bureau in arriving at the subsidy figure of over $1 billion for the $900 million recommended project. Actually, the estimate of $4 billion subsidy is conservative, since it reflects a most optimistic view of the accuracy of the cost and revenue estimates and the construction and repayment schedules, and is likely to materially exceed $4 billion for the projects specified for authorization in S. 500.

4. My statement in regard to participating projects accurately reflects data and information contained in official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation on each project with respect to land elevation, growing season, crops to be grown and value of land, which supports the conclusion that the lands are at high elevations with limited growing season, suitable for crops already in great surplus, and having an average value of $150 per acre fully developed and irrigated.

I did not state, as you imply, that the lands would grow such surplus commodities as rice, tobacco, peanuts, and cotton. But official Bureau reports show that the grain, dairy products, and sheep to produce wool would comprise a large part of the crops to be grown. All of these are in surplus and supported by the Federal Government. According to the reports, sugar beets would be grown on certain projects. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and more sugar beets would only add to the wild scramble for sugar-beet acreage among present growers.

No, Senator WATKINS, the lands in these proposed projects are not generally suitable for high-value crops, and that is the reason why the average value of irrigated lands is only $150 per acre. Much of the land would be devoted to raising hay and pasture for livestock. How can you justify an expenditure of Federal funds for construction alone of nearly $1,000 per acre to irrigate such lands and crops, and how can you ask the Nation's taxpayers to subsidize such a costly reclamation undertaking to the tune of $5,000 per acre?

5. Regarding your statement that the Colorado River storage project would pay out in 50 years, after a development period of 1 to 10 years, no studies have been presented by the Bureau of Reclamation to demonstrate that this would be possible, even for the 2 storage units and 11 participating projects recommended by the Secretary. On the contrary, the only payout schedule presented by the Bureau (p. 192, House hearings on H. R. 4449, 1954) shows that the payout period for the projects recommended by the Secretary would extend over a period of 70 to 75 years. No repayment analysis has been presented by the Bureau for the 33 projects named and specified for authorization in S. 500, but it would seem probable that the overall repayment period would exceed 75 years. Your claim that the Colorado River storage project would pay out in 50 years does not truly represent the facts as revealed by Bureau of Reclamation estimates, and is meaningless.

6. Your dogmatic statement that "S. 500 establishes no new policy" is simply not in accord with the facts. The record is clear that, under the proposed financing program as revealed by reports and testimony of the Bureau of Reclamation, the starting of repayment of about 85 percent of the irrigation construction cost would be postponed for 40 to 50 years. This is a radical departure from existing reclamation law of general application, which, as you well know, provides that the reimbursable irrigation costs of reclamation projects are to be repaid in approximately equal annual installments in 40 years beyond a maximum development period of 10 years in the case of new lands. This clearly constitutes new policy which is of most serious concern because it would greatly increase the Federal subsidy in interest cost on the Federal investment for irrigation, and the burden on the Nation's taxpayers.

I did not state, as you imply, that the bill S. 500 would "bypass the Hoover Commission." I stated our position as I believe any sensible taxpayer should that action be deferred on such legislation as proposed in S. 500 that would establish sweeping new policies, at least until the Congress has received and considered the report of the Hoover Commission it created.

In conclusion, I regret to say that if anyone is guilty of promulgating "travesties with accuracy and truth," with respect to the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, it is the sponsors and proponents of the proposed development. Certainly it is not the California Taxpayers' Association, as you allege—the facts are all to the contrary. I am now more convinced than ever that this project can only result in a tremendous unnecessary burden to all taxpayers.

Sincerely yours,

MILO E. ROWELL, *President.*

Life in the Socialist Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1955, the Cleaveland Plain Dealer carried an editorial on the subject Life in the Socialist Paradise. This editorial brings into sharp focus the realities of life under the Russian socialists which have been described over and over again to the unsuspecting as a paradise. The editorial wisely points out that despite widespread knowledge of what life is really like in the Soviet Union, there are still those who continue to believe that socialism can offer mankind a better way of life than we are blessed with here in America. With the hope that this editorial will reduce the number of gullibles who still believe in that great error, I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD:

LIFE IN THE SOCIALIST PARADISE

The Gum (pronounced Goom) is Russia's leading department store. It's situated in Red Square, and is the place where people line up to spend their rubles. But things aren't going too well at the Gum. They've been getting a lot of shoddy merchandise, a fact which is deplored in Soviet Trade, official newspaper of the ministry of trade.

Early this year, according to Soviet Trade, Gum received 500 children's coats which were defective in tailoring and lining. Gum

complained to the factory in Odessa which made the coats. What happened? Along came 400 more shoddy coats.

"Buttonholes don't fit," complained Soviet Trade. "Sleeves are off. Boys' school uniforms from Kazan are no good. The tunics don't match the trousers. The styles don't fit. The orders don't match."

Here, clothes not only fit, but a worker can place the seat of his properly tailored and perfectly matching trousers on the seat of his brand new automobile and take off for the electrical store to take a look at the electric washing machine, mangle, television set, and air-conditioning unit he intends to buy.

By comparison, it becomes more and more difficult to envision Soviet Russia as a worker's paradise.

And yet there are still people in this country—and others—who think socialism can provide a higher standard of living than capitalism. How long will it take them to learn that socialism is a fraud and a failure? Or are they just incapable of learning?

Illinois Voters Warned Against Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the vast and expensive upper Colorado storage project was expressed to the voters of Illinois by an editorial appearing in the Bloomington Pantagraph on May 1, 1955. It reads as follows:

IT'S YOUR MONEY THEY'RE SPENDING

With the support of the Eisenhower administration the western bloc of Senators has pushed through the upper Colorado River Basin project after 50 years of failure. The bill still faces the House.

The basin includes 110,000 square miles of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona. The project proposes six major dams at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Cross Mountain, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho. With the exception of Navaho, each dam would have a power plant. The Glen Canyon Dam would be second only to Hoover Dam, impounding 26 million acre-feet of water and producing 800,000 kilowatts of power. There also would be 14 lesser projects for irrigation purposes.

The entire project, it is claimed, would open 300,000 new acres to farming, enhance the agriculture value of 470,000 acres now partly irrigated, and produce 1,622,000 kilowatts of electrical energy.

This all sounds very attractive until one begins to figure the cost. While it would directly benefit only small portions of 4 or 5 States, the estimated cost ranges as high as $4 billion.

Here such a public power champion as Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, balks. He says simply that it is not worth the price. On the basis of his figures power production at these proposed dams would cost 4½ times as much as current produced on the Columbia; 3 or 4 times as much as the single unit dams in TVA and 4½ to 6 times as much as multi-purpose TVA dams.

Irrigation costs would average more than $2,000 per acre, according to Senator DOUGLAS' study of the project. That is pretty high as compared, for example, with $500–$600 per acre for the very best farm land in Illinois.

This, it appears, is not only socialism but such an expensive brand of socialism that a man like Senator DOUGLAS, who tends to favor such projects, cannot stomach it.

While the advocates of this project claim that it will be self-liquidating, it is so set up that no interest would be paid by the beneficiaries for 70 years. During all that time the Government—meaning you—will be paying interest.

The beneficiaries are to have 50 years in which to pay back the principal. Nothing is said about obsolescence, yet in 50 years much of the physical plant would have to be replaced. One estimate places the Illinois taxpayers' share of this project at nearly $300 million.

This doesn't look like a very wisely chosen demonstration of the Eisenhower "new look" in public power and conservation policy.

Embattled Engine Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Forbes magazine of June 15, 1955:

AIRCRAFT—EMBATTLED ENGINE BUILDER

A chilly noontime wind scattered hats and whipped old newspapers along New York's Seventh Avenue as a band of hard-bitten newsmen descended on the Hotel Statler one day last month. Later, after a hot roast beef dinner in the plushy Skytop Room, their host, Curtiss-Wright Corp.'s[1] white-haired boss, Roy Hurley, got down to business, directed 1 of his hustling aids to pass out copies of a cryptic 1-page press release.

Despite its brevity, Hurley's announcement was seasoned with just the kind of spice that has kept investors' appetites for aircraft equities healthy for months. On a 10-percent rise in first-quarter sales to $123 million, Hurley's brief showed Curtiss-Wright's earnings had soared no less than 114 percent to $6.8 million. At this rate, the famed $195 million (assets) New Jersey engine builder was pocketing a handsome 5½ cents on each dollar of its sales. Not since 1950 had any of the aircraft industry's big six[2] fared that well.

PARALYSIS

In windswept Wall Street, where memories are long, Hurley's performance earned instant respect. Few Wall Streeters had forgotten how Curtiss-Wright, a production champion in World War II (when its sales topped $1 billion for 3 years running), crumpled to the canvas when peace came. Military sales, backbone of its wartime business, trickled off to $72 million in 1946. Unlike other aircraft companies, Curtiss-Wright did not bounce back. What production it did maintain in the following years was sloppy, costly, and far too often behind schedule. At low point, the then Air Force boss, STUART SYMINGTON, ignominiously cut it off his list of Air Force suppliers.

AND ITS CURE

Disgruntled stockholders finally rebelled, in 1948 ousted Curtiss-Wright's wartime management, and handed the job of chairman to Paul V. Shields, investment banker and sometime first-aid man to ailing corporations. Shields, in turn, scoured the country for a topnotch production man to take over as Curtiss-Wright's president, snapped up Ford Motor Co.'s director of manufacturing engineering, Roy Hurley.

Coaxing some bread-and-butter contracts from the Pentagon, Banker Shields and Automan Hurley patched together production lines, worked out ways to cut costs to the bone. By the time the North Koreans swept across the 38th parallel and the Air Force began clamoring for planes and engines, Curtiss-Wright was back in business. Satisfied that things were going well, Paul Shields retired in 1952, leaving the chairmanship to Hurley.

Things were indeed going well. By last year Curtiss-Wright was ringing up $475 million a year in sales, $19.4 million in profits. Only once before in its history—1945—had it ever earned more than that.

SILENCE IS NOT GOLDEN

Seated comfortably in his paneled office hard by Curtiss-Wright's clanging turbo jet engine assembly lines last month, Roy Hurley candidly summed up Curtiss-Wright's comeback in just four words: "We were damned lucky." But for a desperate gamble that paid off, there might well not have been any recovery. Four years ago, Curtiss-Wright, having dropped out of the airframe business in the late 1940's, had almost dropped out of engine building as well. While such outfits as United, General Electric, and Westinghouse were already turning out jet engines by the hundreds, Curtiss-Wright's were still only in the blueprint stage. Finally Hurley decided that he couldn't wait any longer for the bugs to be ironed out, flew off to dollar-hungry Britain, checkbook in hand, and came back with the rights to build Armstrong-Siddeley's famed "Sapphire" jet engine. What made it an enormous gamble was the fact that Curtiss-Wright had neither the plant nor the tools to produce Sapphires. But when the Korean war broke out, the Air Force hurriedly solved both problems.

A lightweight (7,200–7,800 pounds thrust) alongside United's powerful (10,000 pounds thrust) J–57, the Sapphire (Air Force designation: J–65) proved the ideal power plant for a half dozen such swift fighter planes as Lockheed's new F–104, Douglas' Skyhawk, Republic's Thunderstreak, Grumman's supersonic Tiger, North American's carrier-based Fury. And the Sapphire soon had put Curtiss-Wright back into the race for production contracts.

Determined that Curtiss-Wright will never again fall into its recent plight, in just 2 years Hurley has spent close to $100 million (mostly Government money) to engineer an impressive array of even newer engines—turboprops, ramjets, rockets, and the security wrapped J–69 twin-pool jet. This year his research and development expenses will climb still higher, topping last year's $50 million.

AMBUSH

Despite Curtiss-Wright's booming production rate and a fat $860-million backlog of orders, Hurley admits to feeling neither secure nor happy. He has squeezed costs and streamlined production lines with notable vigor. Last year, for example, his cost-cutting program in Curtiss-Wright's jet engine division saved $28 million. But most of the savings accrued to the Government. Hurley has never been able to work any miracles with Curtiss-Wright's profits. Last month, in fact, he ran smack into a hostile band of Congressmen out on a little cost-cutting campaign of their own. Not only did they frown on Hurley's innate passion for higher profits, but they complained that the Nation's planebuilders were already earning far too much on their contracts with the Pentagon.

Hurley, an aggressive, tub-thumping spokesman for the save-money-to-make-money school of modern-day management,

Footnotes at end of speech.

lost no time firing back. "It's ridiculous to say we're making too much money," he snorted. Actually, he pointed out, Curtiss-Wright has averaged only 3.5 percent on sales for the past 5 years. Over that same period, United netted only 3.4 percent, Douglas and North American only 3.0 percent. Boeing and Lockheed did even worse, netting only 2.7 percent and 2.5 percent respectively. All this in a cold war buildup which—as one Congressman alleged—has propelled profits "at supersonic speeds." "Our percentage of net worth to sales," said Hurley, "was almost as high as General Motors' last year. But our profit margin was only half as large. The truth is, the aircraft companies are still not making enough."

It is hardly a secret that other planemakers say amen to Hurley's sentiments—but in private. He alone has taken the stump to air them. Other aircraft men speak softly, if at all, fearing that a raucous clamor will alienate the Pentagon's contract men, their biggest, and often their only, customers.

PRESSURE RISING

From a planemaker's point of view, there seems to be little justice in the remark made by House Appropriations Committee Chairman GEORGE MAHON last month that "the taxpayer is being taken for a merry ride." But MAHON had arrived at his conclusion by what many Congressmen did regard as compellingly sound reasoning. And he managed to suggest with uncomfortable force that the planemakers with their $8.6-billion annual sales and 790,000 employees, far from being a fundamental element in the normal United States economy as automakers are, have actually been primarily riding a huge wave of defense spending.

"Profits," MAHON argued, "should not be related to sales when the goods are being sold are produced in facilities, and with tools, owned by the purchaser—the taxpayer." Why, he continued, should the Government pay a "guaranteed profit" of 8.6 percent to Boeing (as it did in 1954), or ensure a 4 percent return to Douglas? Over the years, he claimed, these companies had plowed very little money back into their own plants. They had preferred to operate a safer, easier way, using Government-owned tools in Government-owned factories.

ON TARGET

At first blush, MAHON's argument is very persuasive. The facts are true. Bomber-building Boeing Aircraft has posted a 233 percent gain in sales since 1950, and a 242 percent increase in earnings. This remarkable production record, however, owes heavily to the Government's expenditure of millions on its plant facilities. Today 61 percent of Boeing's floorspace is federally owned, as are many of its tools. But over the same years, Boeing has increased its net worth "only" 122 percent, a percentage which congressional critics think is unjustifiably low. Result: last year Boeing earned an eye-popping 31 percent on stockholders' equity.

Douglas, another prime target of the congressmen, tallied even bigger gains in sales (605 percent) and earnings (402 percent) in the same 5 years. But, say congressmen, it increased its net worth only 50 percent. Thus last year Douglas earned a thumping 29.9 percent on stockholders' equity. Measured by this yardstick, every aircraft company, including Curtiss-Wright, appears to be making heady profits. There is now little doubt that Congress will not only reinstate the Renegotiation Act which expired last December 31, but will press for tougher enforcement, hoping to recapture the "excess" profits for the Treasury.

PROFITS AND POLITICS

Planemakers can hardly remember a period of industry prosperity when some such Damoclean sword has not hung over their heads. Ever since 1934, the Vinson-Trammell Act has restricted their pretax profit margins to 12 percent. In recent years, however, few aircraft companies have been able to bring as much as 9 percent down to taxes, largely because Air Force production contracts generally carry a 7 percent ceiling. As if these regulations were not stringent enough, planemakers operate under a continual threat that the Government's watchdog Renegotiation Board will one day find that their profits are still too high.[3]

Actually, renegotiation is a game without rules. While the Board theoretically takes into account a planemaker's productive efficiency, his ability to make cost reductions, and his economy in the use of material and manpower, it also attempts to relate profits to a planemaker's risk, or to the amount of invested capital in his business. But as Renegotiation Board Chairman Frank Lloyd Roberts said recently, "It is entirely a judgment operation. There is no fixed formula or yardstick for the determination of excessive profits." Presumably, the Board can be tough or lenient as it sees fit—or as political pressure dictates.

LOOPHOLES

In the absence of ground rules that would define once and for all a fair rate of return, planemakers now feel that the deck is being stacked against them. Hasn't the congressional economy wave, they ask, for all its good intentions, washed over other important facts? Why, for instance, this hue and cry over the disparity between gains in profits and net worth? How could an aircraft company be expected automatically to increase its net worth by anywhere near the same percentage as its profits? To do so it would have to plow every nickel of its earnings back into buildings and machinery. In that case, where would it get the money (short of costly borrowing) to finance heavy development expenses and starting-up costs? And how could it pay dividends on the capital already invested? "Let's face it," said one Wallstreeter last month, "someone down there has his finances badly garbled."

Curtiss-Wright is a case in point. For 6 straight years after World War II the becalmed engine builder never managed to earn its dividend. Even the good profits over the past 3 years have not restored the balance. Since 1946, Curtiss-Wright has earned $6.50 on each share of its common stock. Yet it has paid out $7.95 to stockholders. This explains, in part, why Curtiss-Wright has shown only a modest 13.8 percent gain in equity since 1950 (as against sales and earnings gains of 250 percent and 166 percent), and a mere 5.8 percent gain since 1945.[4]

POWERFUL PROTESTS

Many Wall Streeters these days are inclined to feel that congressional insistence upon spotlighting rapid rises in sales and earnings of the past 4 years is really a monstrous bit of quibbling. The record shows that, while the Big Six were ringing up profits totaling $525 million in the 9 postwar years, they plowed a walloping $350 million or 67 percent of it back into plants and tooling. The balance went for dividends. Whatever the Government spent on planemakers' facilities, moreover, was dictated by extraordinary urgency of the cold war, and the buildup required could never be justified by economic reasons alone.

"Sure, they bought a lot of my machine tools," said Roy Hurley. "They needed engines in a hurry. But they didn't buy good tools. They bought only what they could get. Right now I've got a factory full of junk. That's all it is—junk. They ought to take a bulldozer and clean it out."

To congressional ears, this sort of talk may sound more than a little ungrateful, a case of the planemakers biting the hand that feeds them. But to the planemakers themselves, it made perfectly good sense. Last year, for instance, Curtiss-Wright made a $360,000 investment in new tools to machine J-65 stator blades. By replacing 27 tools with 10 modern pieces of equipment, Hurley cut the price per blade from $23.40 to $15.66, saved the Government $700,000 on this one item alone. Said Hurley: "If Congress wants to save money, why don't they ask us how to do it?"

MAN WITH CREDENTIALS

Hurley is understandably proud of his production record and he has plenty of credentials to substantiate it. Born in Brooklyn 59 years ago, Hurley began as an airplane engine mechanic in 1916. He had nailed down a job as chief engineer of a company making sparkplugs for airplanes by the time he was 25. At 39 he was vice president of manufacturing for Bendix Aviation Corp., a post he held for 12 years before moving on to Ford Motors. In World War II he made a name for himself as Deputy Chief of Ordnance of the Army.

Since 1952 he has spearheaded the planemakers' pleas for higher profits. His report, "The Financing of Air Power," sent to Members of Congress in 1952, was both an extremely candid analysis of his industry's ailments and a detailed prescription for their cure.

Last month, with even more vehemence than before, Hurley was still pounding home one of the most startling recommendations ever made by an aircraft executive. "The Government," said he, "ought to get out of the business of supplying aircraft companies with their tools. With the right ground rules set up, we can handle everything ourselves."

GROWTH PLAN

Some aircraft men, Hurley candidly admits, might not agree with him. They might prefer to operate Government facilities rather than make a tremendous investment in a business which, for better or for worse, has always geared itself to the pleasant rise and sickening decline in defense spending. For them Hurley has an answer: "It's about time the aircraft industry grew up. We've been hamstrung by archaic regulations too long."

Based on a study made in Curtiss-Wright's sprawling Wood-Ridge, N. J., plant, Hurley says he would be willing—under certain circumstances—to invest $70 million of Curtiss-Wright's money in a 5-year program to buy new machine tools which would cut his production costs 30 percent. But under present contract arrangements with the Air Force, he adds, Curtiss-Wright would gain nothing. The Air Force would enjoy all the savings (over $100 million a year [5]) but Curtiss-Wright's pretax profit would be slashed 28 percent. If, however, says Hurley, Curtiss-Wright were allowed (1) to depreciate these tools in 5 years and (2) to keep a 25-percent share of the savings, the Air Force would save almost $85 million a year and Curtiss-Wright would wind up with a 33-percent boost in pretax profits. "An incentive plan like this," says Roy Hurley, "must combine accelerated depreciation with profit sharing. If we can't increase our profits there's no point in our buying the tools. And if we can't get a fast writeoff, in 5 years we're back in the junk business."

Nothing would please ex-automan Hurley more than to redeem the aircraft industry's reputation as a "kept" industry, and his plan, he claims, would do just that. It would also permit planemakers to replace their obsolete tools on a regular basis, thus be ready with modern equipment in any sudden national emergency. If Curtiss-Wright had spent $8 million a year since World War II and had been permitted to take fast amortization, he notes, it could

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

have bought tools which cost the Air Force $300 million, when the Korean war came, for only $100 million.

ACE IN THE HOLE

How long the aircraft industry will remain a subsidized arm of the Government is unforeseeable. Hurley himself has already served notice that he plans to take Curtiss-Wright out of that position just as soon as he can. He has already had some success. In 1955's first quarter, 40 percent of Curtiss-Wright's earnings came from its booming commercial business, which is more profitable than Air Force contracts. Only Lockheed and Douglas, commercial planebuilders, have come close to matching this percentage in recent years.

Perhaps the brightest feather in Roy Hurley's many-feathered cap is the wide acceptance of Curtiss-Wright's Turbo Compound piston engine, now the biggest factor in its commercial sales. As late as 2 years ago, United's Pratt & Whitney division ruled virtually unchallenged on the commercial airlines with its popular, powerful 18-cylinder Double Wasp. But Hurley's engineers quickly turned the table with the Turbo Compound, dubbed "the right engine at the right time." Double Wasps still have a strong market, go into Douglas DC–6B's and twin-engine Convair 340's. But they no longer rule unchallenged. Today each of the swift, rangy Super Constellations and DC–7's rolling off California assembly lines is fitted with more than $300,000 worth of Wright engines.

FOOTHOLD IN THE FUTURE

Hurley has no fear of the much-heralded commercial jet age. When airlines finally do decide that they want jet-powered airliners, Hurley is sure he can give any competitor a rough race for the engine business. But neither has Hurley overlooked the possibility that cost-conscious airline operators may elect to buy turboprop-powered transports instead. Already he has begun a campaign to sell a derated (60 percent of full power) version of his T–49 turboprop powerplant. The T–49, Hurley claims, will propel transports through the air at 500 m. p. h. (today's fastest commercial ship, the DC–7, cruises at 365 m. p. h.). Thus an airline could earn $1.2 million to $1.4 million annually on each plane, against $600,000 now, by scheduling two 5-hour coast-to-coast flights daily instead of the one 8-hour trip now.

BIGGER PROFITS, OTHER FIELDS

One of the most unique things about aircraft companies today is their almost total lack of diversification in other nonaviation fields. Without a steady flow of Government orders, many would have little reason for existence. Despite past experience, many plane makers hope that the Government will not let them wither and die when emergencies fade away.

Not so Roy Hurley. Ever since he came to Curtiss-Wright, he has been beating the bushes for commercial products to tide him over any lean years. Curtiss-Wright's subsidiary, Marquette Metal Products Co., for instance, now turns out a wide variety of civilian (and nonaviation) items ranging all the way from high-pressure pumps (for the petroleum industry) and textile spindles to hydraulic relay governors for diesel and gas engines. Even more striking, however, are the fistful of manufacturing rights and licenses (mostly German) Hurley has picked up over the past 3 years. Among them are a long list of specialized ultrasonic devices, including a drill for cutting holes in steel, glass and ceramics; a tooth anesthetizer for dental workers, a hops extractor for the brewery industry, a commercial chocolate oscillator. Also ready for marketing: a new mobile camera for closed-circuit industrial television, and a "black light" infrared night viewer for police surveillance. What may someday prove to be ever more lucrative, moreover, is Hurley's license (from Du Pont) to manufacture Curifoam, a tough multicellular plastic that can be turned out as soft as fleece or as hard as board.

"When I took this job 5 years ago," says Roy Hurley, "I promised that if Uncle Sam wouldn't allow me to make a decent profit, I'd make it somewhere else. Now I'm getting a 5½-percent return on sales—the best in the industry." Then, determinedly: "Within 5 years we're going to get 60 percent to 70 percent of our profits from commercial sales. If military profits ever climb to where they should be, all well and good. But we're not going to sit around and wait for that to happen."

---

[1] Traded NYSE. Price range (1955): High, 35⅜; low, 31. Dividend (1954): $1. Indicated 1955 payout: $1.40.

[2] The others: Boeing, Douglas, Lockheed, North American, United.

[3] Early this year, two smaller plane makers, Grumman and McDonnell, were billed for excessive profits rung up in 1951.

[4] Other Big Six aircraft companies rang up sales, earnings, and equity gains as follows: United—143, 97, and 23 percent; Lockheed—323, 211, and 48 percent; North American—352, 174, and 50 percent.

[5] On Air Force shipments now totaling $409 million.

Polio the Canadian Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the June 20, 1955, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

POLIO: THE CANADIAN LESSON

Canada's experience with the administration of the Salk vaccine has been so different from that of the United States that a comparison between the two methods of handling is inevitable. So far 800,000 Canadian children—the entire first and second grade school population—have been inoculated, and by the end of next year the total will have reached 3 million. Administration of the vaccine has been under the control of the Canadian Ministry of Health and Welfare, and all children have received the serum free. There has been no political dispute and no public controversy.

It may be argued, of course, that Canada, with a total population of only 15 million as against the 165 million of the United States, had a simpler and less demanding task. Yet the Canadian planning and direction were so thorough and effective that a decided impression is left that they might have achieved similar results in the United States. With little of the publicity and none of the improvisation of the American program, the Canadians went about their task in a scientific and detached manner, their paramount concern being to administer the vaccine to all who needed it as swiftly and as safely as possible.

Understandably, Canadian authorities are reluctant to become involved in the vaccine furore in the United States. But the fact remains that both in safety and distribution—the two key problems involved in the Salk vaccine—the Canadians have achieved remarkable success by dint of foresight and planning. There is still time for the lesson to be applied in the United States.

A Bill To Create the Office of Senator at Large for Former Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the following is a statement that I made before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee at 10 o'clock, Tuesday, June 21, 1955 with respect to my bill H. R. 3886, which seeks to create the office of Senator at Large in the United States Senate for former Presidents of the United States of America:

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues of the committee, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to appear before you today in the interest of H. R. 386 which seeks to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for former Presidents. In the future, under this legislation, there will always be the possibility of one or more ex-Presidents in the Senate, no matter what his political beliefs may be. Gentlemen, if there ever was a time during the history of our Nation that the combined talents, "know-how," experience, and training of our two living former Presidents were needed to help us solve the many complex problems with which we are presently confronted—this is that time. Let us make no mistake about it or lull ourselves to sleep over the international situation because, quite frankly, our relationship, at the present time, with the various countries of the world is most precarious.

At this time, our country is particularly blessed in having two splendid gentlemen who have served as Presidents of the United States of America. One of these distinguished gentlemen is a Republican, a conservative, and truly an elder statesman; while the other outstanding gentleman is a Democrat, inclined to be liberal, and is a real American.

The Honorable Herbert Hoover has had long and varied experience as a public servant. In addition to his having served as the President of the United States, he has served in various capacities throughout the years both prior to his term as President and since that time as chairman of various boards and commissions which have added additional luster to his good name. You will recall that during World War I, President Wilson designated Mr. Hoover to adequately, efficiently, and humanely distribute food, clothing, medical supplies, and other aid to stricken peoples, scarred and marked by the ravages of war. Mr. Hoover presently is serving as active chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and is, as usual, making a most valuable contribution to his Government and to his country.

No doubt, at this juncture, you are asking yourself the question—well this all may be very true, but what does Mr. Hoover think of this legislation? This is a good question. Although I wrote Mr. Hoover a letter asking for his comments, I must confess he replied that while he appreciated my sentiments and remarks, he asked that I do him the "kindness of leaving him out of the discussion." In other words, Mr. Hoover quite clearly takes the attitude that since he is involved in the legislation, he ought not to be embarrassed by being requested to make a statement. While I am unable to give you Mr. Hoover's reaction, I am informed that a similar plan, such as I propose in the House and Senator KILGORE proposes in the Senate, "received the weighty endorsement of former President

Hoover in 1949." It is my sincere belief that Mr. Truman is not averse to the plan.

The Honorable Harry S. Truman served as United States Senator from the great State of Missouri for approximately 10 years. He gained national stature and prominence by serving as chairman of the Truman Investigating Committee. In 1944, he was nominated and elected by the people of this country to serve as Vice President under President Roosevelt. He had hardly settled down into his office as Vice President when President Roosevelt was summoned to his reward by the "Master of all nations, lodges, and men" and suddenly and without warning, Mr. Truman found himself being sworn in as President of the United States.

Whether we agreed with Mr. Truman's politics, his policies, his methods, or his achievements, there is one thing that I feel that all of us will be bound to admit, he served at a most crucial time in our history.

In my opinion, no man ever was confronted with the decisions that he had to make as Commander in Chief of approximately 12 million men to successfully conclude World War II and to help lead our country and the world, for that matter, which was tottering on the brink of destruction and despair, back to a sound, sane, postwar status.

My colleagues, it was President Harry S. Truman who had to make the decision as to whether or not the atom bomb would be dropped on Hiroshima and on Nagasaki. I know and you know that this good man had to take decisions of such magnitude to the good Lord in prayer. Frankly, I do not think that any person could make such a momentous decision without calling on Almighty God for help and guidance.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very deeply about this particular situation. Down in my heart, I know full well that there are tens of thousands of our young men who are living in happiness today due to the decision made by President Truman to drop these bombs, each carrying death and destruction equivalent to 50,000 tons of TNT.

It took real courage to issue that order that acted as a certain death warrant to thousands of civilians. Nevertheless, we were at war, a horrible bloody war and it was either the Japanese or our soldiers who had to die. Had not Mr. Truman made the decision at the time, place, and manner in which he did, World War II would have continued and the million casualties in blood and the billions in gold and treasure that we lost might conceivably have been doubled.

Mr. Chairman, I know there will be some objection to this legislation but I sincerely trust that that objection will stem from an honest disagreement with the object, intent, and purpose of this bill rather than from any prejudices that any Member of Congress may have against either one of our two former Presidents. I have spoken to several of my colleagues about this legislation. I have urged their support of this bill. I am happy to report that 4 out of 5 favor it overwhelmingly because they agree with me that unless this legislation is enacted now during the time in which both former Presidents are active and alive, it will never be done.

The small amount of opposition that I have encountered to the legislation is, unfortunately, due to prejudice against one or the other of the two former Presidents. Such attitude is strictly unfair because you and I know that we cannot legislate by prejudice.

Any man who has served his country in as many capacities as these two distinguished men and, in addition, has served as President of the United States is highly qualified to serve as an ex officio Member of the United States Senate. Their advice, counsel, suggestions, and ideas on domestic and foreign policies ought to be made readily available to our legislators on Capitol Hill. As ex officio Members of the United States Senate, without a vote, our two former Presidents would have daily contact with the people through the medium of press, radio, and television and it would afford them a forum for their thinking on national and international problems.

At the present time, our former Presidents are somewhat reluctant to visit Washington, offer advice, or to speak out on matters of foreign and domestic interest unless they are invited to do so.

As a Senator at large in the Senate, the country would have the full benefit of their services, talents, and their vast experience without any embarrassment to themselves.

In addition, I think it would be a healthy thing for the country to have at least 1 or 2 Senators, or for that matter, a couple of Representatives of the House, who could sound off on any issue that might come before the Congress without having to worry about his constant campaign for reelection or any voter repercussions. Truly it would be refreshing to have these elder statesmen serving as Senators-at-large. It would be America at her best and in her finest tradition. As a democracy we either come up with new ideas occasionally or we wither on the vine of progress.

On April 15, 1955, the Louisville Courier-Journal printed an editorial entitled "A Senate Seat for Hoover and Truman." Later, on April 25, 1955, that splendid newspaper printed another editorial entitled "A Forum Is Needed, Not Just a Pension."

The editorial dated April 15, 1955, among other things, had the following to say:

"But they (Truman and Hoover) would hold positions of recognized distinction instead of being relegated to relative oblivion. They would be, in every case, men inclined by training and circumstance to think in national rather than in more local or regional terms. Freed of all thought of elective harassment, and representing the people at large, they could at their best provide the country with a continuous wealth of experienced statesmanship. It is an asset that should not go begging. Congress could make this a memorable session, indeed, by reintroducing us all to Senator Hoover and Senator Truman, and preparing us, in time, to meet Senator Eisenhower."

From the editorial dated April 25, 1955, I quote the following excerpt:

"It is politically improbable that Congress ever would pass a bill affecting former Presidents of the United States except at a time when ex-Presidents of the two political parties were alive. The 84th Congress has such an opportunity now while Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman are active and alive. * * * Bills introduced by West Virginia's HARLEY KILGORE and Kentucky's Representative FRANK CHELF, would make all ex-Presidents nonvoting Members of the Senate for life terms. * * * It seems to this newspaper that making our former Presidents' experience and wisdom officially useful in the United States is more important than method. * * * But of the two plans (the civil-service pension plan) the Kilgore-Chelf proposal appeals to us more. It imposes no inflexibility on the pattern of service. It gives official and active status to those former Presidents who desire to use it. It removes any suggestion that the old gentlemen have been pensioned off to pasture—which is quite the opposite of what is intended."

There is a great deal more that I could say with respect to the qualification of these outstanding Americans and why they ought to serve in the Senate, but since I realize I am speaking to men who understand and appreciate the accomplishments of our former Presidents, it would, therefore, waste your valuable time to go into further detail.

Once again, I want to thank you for your kindness in hearing me and I sincerely trust that you will favorably report this legislation.

Moral Values and American Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, who represents the First Congressional District of Iowa, as it was delivered on the east steps of the United States Capitol on Flag Day, June 14, 1955:

MORAL VALUES AND AMERICAN ACHIEVEMENT

The audience that made it a point to come here today must have an exalted sense of the American tradition.

Flag Day is a patriotic day and I incline to view that it is patriots who gather to celebrate it.

We stand on the steps of a Capitol of the people, therefore the greatest Capitol in the world.

It is impossible not to sense and to quicken to the aura of the greatest history of mankind that crowds in upon us in this almost holy place.

Here, almost on this spot, spoke a whole succession of presidents.

Their inaugural addresses present an insight into the history of our country.

If what they talked about and campaigned for, and the ideals that some of them died for, were wrong, or impractical, or composed of dream stuff, then this ceremony, this audience, this exalted sense of the American tradition that you feel with me, could not have happened.

There would be no United States of America.

The proof of the solid substance they builded for their own time and for the generation to follow is our survival as a great Nation at this hour in this place.

This place which has become the seat of the most important power in the world in the long and often melancholy history of the human race.

This our Government achieved its eminence in a world noted for savage rivalries, harsh racial, and national hates, and the persistent and sometimes brilliant drive of despots who want to enslave the world.

Here, on this soil we are pleased to call America, tyranny in all its forms met its first, tremendous, and enduring defeat at the hands of pure reason and moral principle.

What was created here of lasting value is the complete frustration of the philosophy of the brutal use of force for selfish ends and its replacement by a republican form or a representative government of the people.

History shows that at the very inception we put our trust in moral values. Moral values backed by valor and by sacrifice. The reward—as we can see—is without parallel in the annals of progress and prosperity of a nation.

The reward that is ours is in a clear national conscience.

It is these moral values that essentially encompass the meaning of the day we honor.

It is these moral values that is represented in the bit of color and bunting which we memorialize on this occasion.

It is this that we mean by Flag Day.

Our flag flies constantly over this spot. It is one of many shrines where that proud symbol flies continually.

Since we have had a national flag, it has been present at all the important events in

our history and if it could speak out to us today, those moments and words would be relived with an eloquence that would stir the patriotism in all of us and of all the freedom loving people everywhere.

It would amplify for us the words of Thomas Paine, the great crusader for Americanism in its early hours of desperation before we had a flag. He was among the first of America's adopted sons, to give flame, and inspiration to the ideals for which this flag is the symbol.

Paine addressed himself to the greatest source of power in nation, the people. To him, the people listened. They lent their ears and responded with a devotion that did much to give us victory when victory was so hard to come by, and cost so dearly, and looked so remote.

Among his associates were not only men of words but men who were shaping a doctrine and a system of government. They had a faith and were men of deliberate and determined action.

This doctrine of faith was remarkably geared with words and action in those days and went into battle joining knowledge and mind with muscle. For if you think of 1776 you must think of Paine's pamphlet, Common Sense, which was published that year.

Paine deplored the summertime patriots of whom there were some in 1776 just as there are some in our time.

But Valley Forge a year or so later put to the test whether George Washington had an army of real, or merely summertime, patriots.

And the times that try men's souls tried every generation of our country long after Paine coined the phrase and long after he had been gathered to his ancestors.

Can't we in this hour boast that we have proved ourselves a nation of more than Flag Day eulogists and enthusiasts, out for emotional patriotism on a fine day? I think so.

For we proved our stamina, our resilience, and our faith in the fight we put against economic panics and political upheaval of our own making.

We proved it in recessions and depressions. And we proved it in disasters and near-disasters forced upon us from the outside, whether in the sinking of the *Maine*, the German U-boat attacks before World War I, or the assault on Pearl Harbor. We proved it within the walls of our majestic Capitol and its Chambers that give voice to the will and the vision of the people through their elected representatives.

Sometimes the words the flag speaks sound hortatory to modern ears—as perhaps mine do today—but immortal words of our past have rung down through the decades and have moved and stirred our Nation to unity and to greatness. Language such as: "Liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseperable." Worn, sometimes tired, words that never lose their deep moral meaning such as: "with malice toward none, with charity toward all"—heard right from these steps. And these words follow almost as a matter of course from such phrases as "all men are created equal" and "equal justice under law."

For that is exactly what this flag is all about.

Our flag heard the words of Washington when he said in his famous farewell address, "Religion and morality lead to political prosperity." To many of the sophisticated and the cynics in his audience that day, as to perhaps a good many today, that statement must have sounded a little too pious, a little too grand and a little too absurd. Yet at this hour you and I have the facts, the figures if you like, the living reality. Did religion and morality bring about prosperity? We have the answer not only in the kind of dollars and cents that can be calculated to enormously impress brilliant folk inclined to be cynical about God and virtue, but in the real worth of freedom, liberty, and justice.

If we had eliminated religion and morality from our people this growth would not have been so phenomenal—and, speaking for myself—I doubt we would have survived at all. For us moral values represent the basis of our Government. Moreover had we not moved along the moral and religious paths of our Founding Father and progressed regularly upward to higher goals morally, from our beginnings this vastly powerful Nation that we are today would not have been. We know the mistakes we made and they were grave, mistakes by ourselves as a government, mistakes as a people, mistakes we made as individuals. But in the summation of it all, it cannot be denied that the keel upon which this ship of state was constructed was basicly morality and religion, taught originally and principally by the church. While the church is completely separate from the Government and should remain so, yet morality and religion it taught filled the mind of the Father of our Country.

They breathe in the Constitution of the United States.

They are the heart of the thinking in our state papers.

They invest the language of our presidential inaugurals.

They determine the outposts of right in our economic system, our labor and business laws, our debates over immigration laws, our bureaus and regulatory commissions.

They render lofty, noble, and practical the decisions of our courts.

We even engrave them in stone on our most hallowed buildings. Should you have occasion to go to the Supreme Court you will note the language of the pediment: "Equal justice under the law." This is the foundation of true religion which gave us high morals on which our Nation rests today and it is this that is our greatest security today.

If our flag and democracy stand for anything they stand for that.

And that is the kind of system and ideals given our resources that makes possible the growth of a nation from two-thirds of a billion dollars in income for a year to $300 billion in 165 years.

How could Washington's words have been more right? "Religion and morality lead to political prosperity."

A flag of 15 stripes and 15 stars on a blue field flew at Fort McHenry on September 13 and 14, 1814 when Francis Scott Key, seeing it in the "rockets red glare" wrote The Star-Spangled Banner. That very flag, incidentally, is now in the Smithsonian Institution here in Washington (a banner 30 feet by 40 feet). I visited there and was inspired by this historic emblem.

Up to 1912 there were some 20 changes made in the flag.

In 1918 the Congress ruled that the number of stripes remain 13 in honor of the States first ratifying the Constitution. It stipulated that also "on the admission of every State into the Union, one star be added to the Union of the Flag." President Taft, by an Executive order prescribed uniformity on the blue field. He directed 6 rows of 8 stars each. Another regulation provides that the stars must have five points, and that they must be placed with one point upward. Still another regulation calls for 7 red and 6 white stripes, with the red stripes placed on the outside edges to increase visibility as the flag flies against the sky.

This very briefly is the physical and chronological story of the flag we honor today.

To 165 million people of the United States that flag speaks the language of the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing the dignity of the individual: Freedom of speech, of worship, or assembly, trial by jury, security of the person and the home, no unusual punishment.

Yes; the Constitution has kept the faith.

It has formed a more perfect union, established justice, insured domestic tranquility, provided for the common defense, promoted the general welfare, and secured the blessing of liberty. It has given us the Bill of Rights. And up to this hour the people of the United States in all generations have met these inalienable rights with the due regard of a citizen for his responsibilities.

We must always remember that this Nation was not created to destroy the tyranny of the despot only to replace it by the tyranny of the mob and/or the mob leader. The flag as it flies, reminds that we must not condemn people until they are proved guilty, because the story of this flag is rich in the language of justice. This flag is a symbol for high and noble virtues but they have no meaning unless we translate our faith and our doctrines into results.

Of all the symbols that stir our people, there is none that denotes action quite so much as the flag we honor today. Ever since Valley Forge on through Gettysburg, the Argonne, Iwo Jima, and the Bulge, it has stood for action in a cause that is just; a cause of the people.

Tom Paine demonstrated the power of the written word when it was commonsense. In saying "give me liberty or give me death," Patrick Henry stirred the hearts of a people and started to forge the loose links of a mighty Nation. Then came the words of the Declaration of Independence which some think is the greatest of all declarations. It gave us ideals and character for which to fight. And we did fight. Then a Captain Parker made a statement some 180 years ago which came to be our war policy in the first major war and all the wars to follow: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon, but if they mean to have war, let it begin here." Always the accent is on: Let them begin it.

These and many others were calls to patriotism to save a nation yet unborn. It was followed by a whole panorama of battles for a cause, yet to be understood. The names of those battles have a revered place in the struggle for freedom—Ticonderoga, Valley Forge, Yorktown. Then came the struggle for union to preserve this Nation for a place among the world family of nations. And in the battles that followed we struggled to keep freedom and justice alive and meaningful in that family of nations, and above all, to have for all time on this continent, "one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

We are not, and must never be, a Nation of merely Flag Day enthusiasts and summertime patriots. This Government has given us so much and has so much coming from us. In the past, we have responded with heroism in battle and with legislation to meet crisis after crisis in the domestic disasters of this country.

If need be we can prove our mettle again, staking for this flag what our forebearers staked for it—our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Let us then as we commenorate this Flag Day promise to live each day so as to honor its rich heritage and thereby add to its greatness.

Let us, too, as we see it flying atop this Capitol and all the 48 State capitols of our Nation remind ourselves often of the dedication and sacrifice of our forebears that brought our Nation into being and then rededicate ourselves to the ever unfinished task of maintaining a good Government that is truly of, by, and for all of the people.

Let us too keep it flying above or in the area of all our institutions of learning—private and public. There to be to us ever a reminder that without true and free education an enlightened people cannot grow or continue long as a republican form of government.

And wherever we see this our flag flying let us remember that it is becoming to each of us to be better citizens in peace as well as in war.

To religious leaders it looks with confidence to help and to lead in keeping and strengthening the spiritual and moral values upon which our whole system rests.

To the elected and appointed leaders in government it is calling for the Nation to Give Us Men:

"God, give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking
Tall men, suncrowned, who live above the fog."

To the world our flag is a constant invitation to adopt our way of life and join with us to hasten the day when we shall have peace on earth and good will toward all men everywhere.

And to all mankind everywhere it is reminding us of words of a great seer when he said: "No doctrine, faith or knowledge is of value to man except as it bears fruit in action."

Let us then harken onto these things and to all of the true patriots of old and conduct ourselves according to the great fundamental truths expounded by them. Then we will be blessed by Him from on high and all together we can sing with greater devotion: God Bless America.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the Emery irrigation project in Utah.

The Emery project is a part of the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Emery project would be $2,200 an acre.

The project would produce agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*--
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2737 Devonshire Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*--------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----7304 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*--------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buchanan, Vera, *Pa*--------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*-------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*--------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*------1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*------The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*--2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*--------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*---------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*---------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*-------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*-------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*-----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*---
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*---------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*------The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y*------
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*--3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------
Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*----
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*-----
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*-------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*------The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*---------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*----------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*------104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--125 Marthas Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*-----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--2108 Suitland Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*----------
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*--------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------The Washington House
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*---------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*------2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----The Coronet

Appendix

Address of the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, Before Young Republican Biennial National Convention, Detroit, Mich., June 17, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Vice President of the United States:

This could be the most significant convention in the history of the Young Republican Federation. Because I believe this is the year when we can and must launch a winning campaign to make the Republican Party the majority party of America and of America's youth.

I want to tell you why I think this is true, and how we can do the job.

First, we aren't going to do it by kidding ourselves. Too often speeches at party gatherings like this indulge in too much self-glorification and not enough self-examination.

I propose that we begin by examining our liabilities.

The Democrats won control of the House and Senate in 1954.

They won 27 governorships against 21 for Republicans, which in the terms of electoral votes is 347 to 184.

They won over 500 State legislature seats from Republicans—we won only 5 from them.

They have won a majority of city elections held since 1952.

The polls show that a majority of the people consider themselves Democrats; and this majority among younger voters is 2 to 1.

In the light of these dismal statistics, how can we be optimistic? Because we have a Republican President who has consistently maintained the highest level of popularity of any President in our history. I have traveled to all parts of the country and I say without qualification that President Eisenhower would defeat Mr. Stevenson by a bigger vote in 1956 than he did in 1952.

The answer to our problem then is to find the secret to this popularity. I believe these are the reasons for it.

People like him personally.

People trust him. They have confidence in his honesty and integrity.

But these two reasons alone do not account for his popularity because even though people liked and trusted a man he wouldn't continue to have their support unless they liked what he did. The major reason for the President's popularity is that the people like his program, what he stands for and what he has done.

In that single fact we can see the surefire formula for increasing the strength of the Republican Party.

The Republican Party may not be the party of a majority of the American people.

But the Republican President and his Republican program is favored by a majority of the people.

Therefore, if we are to build a stronger party, Republican candidates, Republican leaders and Republican workers should associate themselves with and support wholeheartedly the leadership and program of our Republican President.

I submit that the Eisenhower Republican program is favored by a majority of all voters. But there is no segment of the population among whom it has greater appeal than America's youth.

What kind of government do young people want?

First, and above all, they want a Government which can keep the peace. Young people, even more than others, want peace because war would hit them the hardest.

On this question, there is no doubt but that the inspired leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles which got the United States out of one war and kept it out of others has the overwhelming support of the American people as being best qualified to keep the peace without surrender in the future.

Second, young people are idealists. They want and expect their government to be honest, loyal and efficient. Let us consider the issue of honesty.

The great fault of the previous Administration was not that dishonesty existed, but that it was excused, condoned and defended by men in high places.

That kind of administrative laxity stopped the day President Eisenhower was inaugurated.

Not only have we cleaned up the mess we inherited, we aren't allowing a new one to be made.

We can say without qualification that the Eisenhower Republican leadership has restored honesty, integrity, and decency to government in Washington.

Let us consider the issue of loyalty.

Here again the fault of the previous administration was not that disloyalty existed, but that in case after case warnings of the FBI and congressional committee were covered up and ignored.

In this administration we have:

Enforced existing laws as they were not enforced before.

Obtained passage of new laws to deal more effectively with the conspirators.

Removed the security risks we inherited from the previous administration.

And we are making as sure as we can that we do not put them on the payroll in the first place.

With pride and confidence we can say that the Brownell-Hoover program of this administration is maintaining the essential balance between security and freedom, and is destroying the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

Let us consider the issue of efficiency.

This administration believes the object of government should be to spend as little rather than as much of the people's money as possible.

How well we have succeeded is shown by the fact that in 3 years the Eisenhower Republican administration will spend $36 billion less than would have been spent had the Truman spending policies been continued. That is a saving of $1,000 for every family of four in the United States.

I say that if a poll were taken on the issues of peace, honesty, loyalty, and efficiency, a solid majority of American voters, young and old, would approve the policies of the Eisenhower administration.

What else do America's young people want from Government? Young people are practical; they want to be able to make a good living.

If we are to be honest we must recognize that this has been one of our weakest issues. Since 1932 polls have shown consistently that a majority of Americans believe that a Democratic administration does a better job on the pocketbook issue than a Republican administration.

But the most significant political development of the past 2½ years has been that what was our weakest issue has become our strongest. The phony idea that Republican economic policies were not good for the average man has been blasted to bits by the record of this administration.

Here is the record.

America's workers have more jobs than at any time in history.

Those jobs are paying the highest wages in America's history.

And those wages are buying more goods than at any time in history.

And here are some more comparisons which prove beyond doubt that America's wage earners today are better off than they have ever been at any time in war or peace.

"There were fewer strikes and less time lost through strikes in 1954 than at any time since World War II."

"Wage increases in 1954 provided more of a gain in real wages than any other postwar year for they were almost entirely over the amount needed to compensate for the rise in the cost of living."

The two statements I just made are direct quotes from the monthly research report of the American Federation of Labor for February 1955.

What does all this add up to?

In 1948 Harry Truman was elected on the issue "You never had it so good."

In 1948 the average weekly wages for factory workers with 3 dependents was $52. In 1955 the same factory worker is earning $70 a week. This is an increase of 35 percent or $72 a month.

If the people "never had it so good" with Truman in 1948, our slogan in '56 should be "With Eisenhower, we have it better. Let's keep it that way."

In addition to good jobs for the present, our young people want security for the future. What a great record we have to present to them on this issue.

We can point with pride to our extension of social security and unemployment compensation to millions of people not previously covered.

But what is even more important, the Eisenhower Republican's administration fiscal policies guarantee full value security rather than cut-rate security to the millions of Americans trying to plan for the future.

What this means can be seen when we realize that a man who saved a dollar and put it into social security, life insurance, or Government bonds in 1942 received only 61 cents back when he retired in 1952.

During the 2½ years of the Eisenhower administration, the value of the dollar has varied less than one-half of 1 cent.

To the 90 million Americans who have life insurance, the 55 million who have social se-

curity, and the over 40 million who have Government savings bonds this means that the dollars they save today will be worth a dollar 5, 10, and 15 years from now, provided the fiscal policies of the Eisenhower Republican administration are continued.

And now America's wage earners are getting new protection against unemployment through the contracts just negotiated by Ford and General Motors which will be followed in other industries.

These contracts amounting to approximately 20 cents an hour increase in wages could be negotiated only because of the unprecedented prosperity of the Eisenhower Republican era.

The payments under the contract can be made only if that prosperity continues.

And that prosperity will continue if the Eisenhower Republican economic policies which have given the American productive machine a chance to work remain in effect.

Finally, young people want government that is progressive and dynamic—not reactionary and static. Here, too, we must recognize that in the past our appeal has been weak.

Our New Deal and Fair Deal opponents recognize the desire of a great majority of the American people for more housing, more schools, more roads, better medical care, and more development of our water and power resources.

They offered the people a simple means to meet those ends—the Federal Government would do it.

They identified the means with the end.

We opposed the means without offering an alternative and the people assumed that we were opposed to the end as well.

Those days are gone.

The Eisenhower Republican administration has offered to the American people a progressive, dynamic program under which we will build more roads, schools and houses, enjoy better medical care, develop more water and power resources than our predecessors ever dreamed of during their period in office.

Our program differs from theirs in that it is based on these fundamental American principles:

The way to real progress and prosperity is through programs which rely primarily on private rather than Government enterprise.

The Federal Government should step in only where the job cannot be done more effectively by individuals, or by State and local government.

The way to get the most and best houses, schools, roads, medical care and, power development is not to rely on Federal Government action alone, but to develop programs in which the combined resources of private enterprise and local, State and Federal Government are pooled in the way best designed to do the job.

We oppose the programs of our predecessors not because their goals were too high, but because they were too low.

Our aim is a gross national product of $500 billion by 1965. This will mean additional income of $3,000 for every family of four in America.

To sum it up—the Eisenhower Republican program is based on the sound principle that you can be progressive and humanitarian without being socialistic, and we believe that is the kind of a program the young people of America want.

There is our case as I see it. Whatever the issue is, peace, honesty, loyalty, efficiency, prosperity, security, progress—the Eisenhower Republican record is one we can be proud of. It is one a majority of Americans approve and it is a record and a program that has magnificent appeal to the young people of America.

What do our opponents offer?

It is difficult to tell. They have made some sporadic attacks on the Eisenhower program, but each one has backfired.

They said our foreign policy would lead us into war. It has brought peace.

They said we were weakening our national defense. By spending less money more wisely, the United States is stronger today than at any time in history and we are able to meet and defeat attack by any aggressor in the world.

They said our economic policies were leading to a depression. America today is enjoying its greatest prosperity in history.

They said we didn't have an adequate housing program. This administration's objective is homes, not just housing. Fifty-five percent of the American people own homes today—the highest percentage in the history of the United States. Thousands of others are buying homes everyday of the year.

They said we weren't sufficiently interested in Civil Rights. More progress has been made in reducing discrimination in employment in 2½ years than in any similar period since the Civil War.

Finally, they have been reduced to complaining about the squirrels on the White House lawn, Mrs. Eisenhower's health, and the President's church-going.

What it all adds up to is that they have no issue, and they know it.

They have nothing new or dynamic to offer.

They are completely bankrupt in ideas.

All they offer is a return to the policies of the Truman Administration.

What does this mean?

In my opinion, the great issue of 1956 will be—shall we continue the Eisenhower Republican economic policies, or shall we go back to the Truman economic policies.

Let us examine the difference. Mr. Truman's last state of the Union message contained the following recommendations, among others.

Programs that would nationalize and socialize farming, housing, medicine, and power.

A request that controls on the economy should be continued.

Increased spending programs that would have added $40 billion to the national debt in 4 years.

In summary, the basic theory of the New and Fair Deal was that every problem should be solved by Government action. If there was unemployment, the Government should make jobs. If there was a need for houses, the Government should build them. If there was a need for more adequate medical care, the Government should provide it.

These programs all sounded good. They were easy to sell. The only trouble with them was that they wouldn't work.

There were 10 million unemployed in the United States in 1940 after 7 years of leaf-raking and boondoggling.

There were two times as many people unemployed in 1949, Mr. Truman's last peacetime year before Korea, as there are today.

The only time during the 20 years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal that we had prosperity was during wartime.

The Eisenhower Republican theory is that the way to the greatest prosperity is to reduce Government activity and encourage private enterprise. That is why we cut taxtaxes, cut spending, took off controls, and got the Government out of businesses rather than into them. We proceeded on the basic assumption that if individual initiative is released and encouraged, private enterprise will create greater wealth and do a better job than the Government.

This policy is harder to explain. But the proof that it is the right policy is that it works.

In 1956 we shall have a showdown battle between those who would nationalize and socialize basic American institutions and those who would continue the American economic policies which have been put into effect by this administration and which have worked so well.

Make no mistake about it. There are millions of Democrats who believe in the economic policies of this administration, and many leaders of the Democratic Party in the Congress who oppose and fear the New Deal, Fair Deal Socialist schemes as much as we do. But we must recognize a grim political fact—nationally, the Democratic Party is controlled by its big-city, left-wing element, who honestly and sincerely—but, I think, mistakenly—believe that we should return to the economic policies of Government action which the people rejected so overwhelmingly in 1952.

Fortunately for us, this is an issue which divides our opponents right down the middle, but it is an issue on which we, as Republicans are completely united.

And so I say we have the formula for victory—all we have to do is to tell the people the facts about the Eisenhower Republican program. The program will sell itself.

I realize that there are some who may say that this program is too liberal. What we must recognize is that the choice is not between the Eisenhower program and one more conservative—but it is between the Eisenhower program and one far more radical.

I said the Democrats have no issue. But the issue they are trying to create is based on the spurious claim that Democrats support the President better than Republicans.

The claim is false, but they are able to get away with it because when a Democrat votes with a Republican President it's news, and when a Republican votes against his President, it's news.

The truth is that on the average Republican Senators and Congressmen support the President twice as often as Democrats do—and this is particularly true on domestic economic issues.

But every time a Republican criticizes the President's program or votes against him—it's grist for the opposition mill.

Let's not give them an issue.

Let us all remember that the differences we have as Republicans are infinitesimal compared with the basic gulf between the economic policies of this administration and those which would be put into effect in the kind of Democratic administration which would succeed ours if we lost the elections of 1956.

Finally, may I say a word on a subject which is very close to our hearts.

I have had a rare opportunity in the past two and a half years of serving as a member of the Eisenhower team. I have had a chance to see him preside over the councils of this Nation, and I can tell you what you already know—that no one could be more dedicated, no one could work harder, no one could believe more deeply in the principles that have made America great than he does.

I think we all ought to remind ourselves how very fortunate we are to have him not only as the President of our country, but as the leader of our party.

He brought us our first victory in 20 years.

He is the most consistently popular President America has ever had.

The program he has put into effect has brought honesty, loyalty, and efficiency to Government, and peace, prosperity, and progress to America.

It is natural that Republicans everywhere should be saying—

We want Ike.

He is the man who can win.

He is the man the party needs.

He is the man the country needs.

I agree with all these sentiments. But I say that we have a responsibility too, and that responsibility is to build a party which will be strong enough to carry on the Eisenhower program when we no longer have him to do it for us.

In California we have a saying, "Give us men to match our mountains."

Young Republicans of America, adopt as your slogan—"Let's build a party to match our President."

We have the man—we have the program—let's go out and do the job.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Rotary Celebration of 100th Anniversary of Robesonia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the Rotary anniversary and centennial night celebrating the 100th anniversary of Robesonia, Berks County, Pa., on Tuesday evening, June 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sincerely grateful for the honor and the privilege of participating in your program tonight.

The centennial celebration of Robesonia is an event of historic importance. It commemorates 100 years of progress and achievement. It represents loyalty and devotion to the splendid traditions of the past. It inspires renewed faith and confidence in the future.

In the century since Robesonia was founded generations of fine, upright, God-fearing Americans have built an outstanding community which embraces all the finest elements of the American way of life. The strength and vigor of patriotic Americanism lives in the spirit of your people. Here in Robesonia you have kept alive the will to advance through faith, work, thrift, tolerance, and self-reliance.

We point with pride to our great cities and our heavily populated metropolitan areas. It is right and proper to do so—but let me tell you that the strong, warm, vibrant heart of America is in the small towns like Robesonia, where good neighbors work together, plan together, and pray together to make a better life for all.

That is why I am so happy to be here tonight. That is why I welcome this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to the fine men and women of Robesonia on the magnificent community spirit that made your great centennial celebration possible.

This meeting has been designated as "Rotary Anniversary and Centennial Night." It therefore has double significance and I am glad to offer an overflowing measure of congratulations to my fellow Rotarians on the 50th anniversary of the world's greatest service organization.

There has never been any question about the kind of Americanism that Rotary has preached and practiced through the half century of its existence. Rotary teaches patriotism, good will, mutual helpfulness, and obedience to the laws of God and man. Rotary has grown great by loyal adherence to American ideals. It is a potent force for the economic, cultural, and spiritual progress of our State and Nation. It is international in scope and serves the cause of peace by spreading the story of American freedom and American achievement to many parts of the world.

As we celebrate 100 years of Robesonia's progress it is fitting that we honor the pioneers of an earlier day. It is a time to voice our gratitude for the blessings that have come down to us from their struggle and sacrifice.

The early German settlers came into the fertile valleys of Berks County in search of a haven from religious persecution and tyranny. The sought freedom in the new world to worship in the manner that brought them closer to God. They were willing to face the dangers and hardships of the wilderness in order to live in peace, tolerance, and good will.

They were sturdy, courageous men and women of deep religious convictions. They brought with them highly developed skills in many crafts and a capacity for hard work.

They cleared the forests and tilled the soil. They built their homes, their schools, and their churches. With their own hands and their own industry they created a new life of liberty. They helped to shape the course of the American Republic.

On that strong foundation was built the great Berks County we are so proud of today.

It is great because men of courage and vision like Henry P. Robeson poured their powerful creative energies into productive enterprise for the benefit of their fellowmen.

The iron masters of the old days made a tremendous contribution to the industrial greatness of the United States. They were bold and vigorous exponents of free enterprise and individual initiative.

They stood on their own feet and met their responsibilities in the American way. They relied on their own efforts and energy. They did not ask the Government to guarantee their economic security. They didn't dream of Government grants, loans, or subsidies. At the same time they were not hampered by an army of bureaucrats pretending to look after their interests. They did not encounter Government competition with private industry. They were not required to pay excessive taxes to support Government grown so big that it endangers the liberties of the people.

My fellow Americans, if our country is to be preserved as the greatest Nation in all history our people must stop leaning on Governing and stand once more on their own feet as our forefathers did.

I would like to direct your attention to three great dangers that threaten America.

First. Big Government and Government doing things that we should do for ourselves.

The vast expansion in the size and cost of Government at all levels is leading us away from the ideals of the Founding Fathers. The people are constantly demanding more and more services. Under that pressure Government has become involved in too many functions in which it does not properly belong. The result has always been excessive taxation and the steady flow of power from the hands of the people into centralized, bureaucratic authority and Government control.

Second. Too much private and public debt. Too many of our people do not seem to be concerned with the ever increasing burden of debt which is growing bigger and bigger at a sickening rate.

Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today. It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us that the American people now owe a total of more than $600 billion, 3 times as much as the debt of 15 years ago.

Twenty years ago, when we were fighting the worst depression we ever had, the Federal debt was less than $20 billion. Today it is $278 billion, an increase of $20 billion since the end of World War II.

The debts of State and local governments have increased 16 percent in 1 year alone, reaching a total of $38 billion on June 30, 1954.

If for any reason we should be forced into a decline—even a slight decline in business activity, jobs, and income—this staggering burden of public and private debt could prove too much for our economy to sustain and could bring us to disaster.

Please bear in mind that more Nations have been destroyed by debt and taxes than by invading armies.

The third danger is too little interest in Government. It is unfortunate that so many people have forgotten that taking part in Government is a patriotic duty. We cannot expect clean and economical Government unless we take a real part in it.

In the pages of history may be found the real meaning of these United States. Let us briefly consider the ideals of the patriots and statesmen who planned the American system of Government.

It is not necessary for me to remind this audience that the unparalleled success of the United States is the result of the system they so wisely planned.

In less than 200 years an untamed wilderness has been transformed into the richest and most powerful nation of all time.

Our material, cultural, and spiritual attainments are unequalled anywhere in the world.

Our living standards are the highest of any people on earth.

American inventive genius has revolutioned every phaze of industry and transportation. American hard work and "know-how" have created the greatest industrial empire ever known.

We have more churches, temples, and synagogues dedicated to the service of God than any other people.

More schools and colleges offer educational opportunities to youth in America than in any other country.

Our research workers are constantly revealing new miracles of science for the benefit of mankind.

All of these magnificent achievements, and many other I have not enumerated, are the envy of the world.

What made them possible?

They are ours to enjoy because the American system of government gave us freedom of the individual, strengthened by freedom of enterprise and supported by individual responsibility.

Our Nation was established on the ideals of a Republic. The Founding Fathers erected a great landmark in world progress when they proclaimed that the rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are divine endowments, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the Universe.

The adoption of the American Constitution, 178 years ago, was a turning point in the advance of civilization.

Under our form of government the people are the source of all authority. They are the masters of the Government. They are subject to no sovereign power except that granted by the Constitution.

The Founding Fathers recognized the dangers of a big, powerful, central government. Their objective was to create an atmosphere of individual freedom where men could work out their own destiny without interference from the Government so long as they respected the rights of their neighbors.

They knew from their profound study of history, that great democracies of the past had failed because the moral fiber of the people had become undermined by greed and corruption.

They knew that tyranny and dictatorship had always overwhelmed free people who ignored the sound principle that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people.

Therefore, in framing the Constitution the Founding Fathers sought to protect the rights and the personal liberty of every individual from oppression by their own government. They established a Constitutional Republic under which the people govern through their duly elected representatives. They adopted a Bill of Rights, placing defi-

nite limitations on the power of the Government.

These fundamentals of the American system are well known to you. I mention them only because I believe that the principles and precepts of the Founding Fathers should be told over and over again until every citizen, young and old, understands and appreciates what America means and the reasons for its greatness.

We must teach the glories of the American way of life and what it has accomplished. We must arouse among our people a deeper recognition of personal responsibility for good government. We must teach our young people to be self-reliant, tolerant, and unselfish.

We must develop a stronger and more willing spirit of public service, civic mindedness, and moral leadership.

We must strengthen the moral and spiritual vitality of our people. Great armies and great navies will not maintain a nation's strength if patriotism and the moral courage of its people are permitted to decay.

We must safeguard the national economy against abuses by big business, big labor, and big government.

Our people should be taught in the schoolrooms, from the lecture platform, the pulpit, the legislative halls, and the courts, the difference between our republican form of government and the Communist system of Soviet Russia.

We must emphasize that freedom of the individual, as ordained by God, is the firm foundation of our national strength.

Americans are guided by the sacred principles of their religious faith. The Communists deny God. They worship the state. There being no God in the Communist philosophy, there is no morality.

In the United States "we the people" are the government. In Soviet Russia the people are ruled by the iron hand of tyranny. They have no choice, no voice, and no vote. They have no rights, no privileges, no freedom.

Under our Republic, government is the servant of the people. Under the distorted concepts of godless communism government is the absolute master of the people—the will of the dictator is all powerful.

In closing let me recall the words of Woodrow Wilson who said and I quote:

"Freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their government."

For a better understanding of the nature of the American Government let us teach that the three great supports in the tripod upholding the American way of life are:

1. Faith in God.
2. Faith in our constitutional form of government.
3. Faith in our private enterprise plan of economy.

We can serve our country by teaching Americans what our Government really is and what American freedom means to us and to the world.

Conservation of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the necessity for the conservation of natural gas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

West Virginia has been a source of mineral fuels since the first commercial coal mines began operation in Brooke and Monongalia Counties more than a century and a half ago. Since that time West Virginia's mines have produced more than 5½ billion tons of coal—20 percent of all the bituminous coal that has come from all mines in the history of the United States.

Many years before Oklahoma, Texas, and other States destined to become famous for oil and gas production were admitted to the Union, West Virginia was supplying oil for America's spectacular progress in the transportation field. Our State had been a Mecca of activity when kerosene was the most important product of the crude. When the utility value of natural gas was finally discovered, important quantities of this invaluable fuel resource were to come from our State. West Virginia still produces at least 2 percent of America's total output of natural gas.

Mike Benedum, who has explored for oil in the Deep South, in the Southwest, in Canada, Mexico, South America, Europe, and Asia, was born and raised in West Virginia and got his start in the oilfields of our State. He was also an important figure in the development of the natural-gas industry. I am reminded of Mr. Benedum's early appreciation of the utility value of this fuel resource, as described in his biography, The Great Wildcatter. When he purchased a home in Pittsburgh in 1911, he decided that he should assure his new residence of an adequate supply of natural gas. To do so he erected a derrick in his backyard and was ready to begin operations when some of his neighbors suggested that the activity seemed inappropriate for that particular part of the city. Mr. Benedum acceded to the wishes of other citizens of the community and immediately ordered that the derrick be dismantled.

A good deal more natural gas was discovered in the ensuing years, and fortunately no homeowner has been required to drill his own well. Yet there could very easily come a time when the entire Nation will find natural gas in short supply unless steps are taken to conserve it as far as possible and practicable.

While official Government sources show that present known reserves are enough to take care of this Nation's needs for the next 22½ years, there is no reason for us to be complacent about the situation. The index of reserves dropped by 10 years between 1946 and 1954, which in itself should be cause for alarm. In 1946 we presumably had enough natural gas to last for 32 years; but unforeseen demand made a fallacy of this appraisal. Unless some action is forthcoming, there is no reason to believe that this dangerous decline will not be accelerated in the coming years.

I suggest that it is the responsibility of Congress to take the lead in encouraging the conservation of natural gas so that our children will be able to enjoy the convenience of this valuable fuel at a price within their reach. How many more generations can expect to derive like benefits is problematical. The one consoling feature from this prospective is that there is an abundance of bituminous coal in our natural resources stockpile; thus, gas manufactured from coal will be available for hundreds and hundreds of years into the future.

I have heard it said that, because of the almost unlimited supplies of manufactured gas which are assured by coal's abundance, there is no need for concern about what happens to natural gas. I do not share this opinion. I feel that it would be a misuse of our inheritance if we were no more altruistic than to assume this attitude. Certainly it is true that manufactured gas can supplant natural gas when necessary. I remind you, however, that there is a discrepancy in prices between these two products. If such were not the case, manufactured gas would be in direct competition with natural gas at the present time.

An explanation of the disparity in costs of natural gas and manufactured gas was contained in an address before the National Industrial Conference Board, in New York City, last month by Mr. James D. Francis, president of the Powelton Coal Co. at Huntington, W. Va. Mr. Francis, who holds the Charles F. Rand Memorial Medal as testimony of his record as one of the Nation's leading industrialists and outstanding citizens, later placed this statement in the record of his testimony before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and it was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14 on page A4220. I recommend it as highly elucidative for anyone who is interested in our fuels problems.

Is it fair to ask householders to take their chances on how long natural gas will last and how much they're going to pay for it? I think that our children and their progeny as well as the present generation, deserve some consideration in this respect. The time has come for Congress to let it be known that it expects the Federal Power Commission to insist that natural gas be dispensed judiciously, to demand that wasteful practices be eliminated, and to give continuing thought to conservation of this resource.

The Federal Government has fallen behind in the job of maintaining adequate fuel reserves. Extravagance in the use of timber, fish, game, and water resources has been effectively reduced over the years through Government action. Why we have failed to make some provision for the conservation of other resources that are vital to the national defense and the general welfare is a serious reflection on responsible authorities.

I ask whether any Member of this Senate could take exception to this appeal for a specific recommendation that the Federal Power Commission henceforth make conservation a guiding principle as a means of extending the life index of natural gas as far into the future as possible. Perhaps a later Congress will have to be more definitive on this subject. For the time being, however, I believe that the Federal Power Commission should be allowed the responsibility of making the determinations involved. The Commission knows the problems. It will be able to act with greater sagacity in the overall interests of the country once the intentions of Congress with respect to conservation are made known.

The Commission realizes that extravagant use of natural gas is extremely shortsighted so long as we have billions of tons of coal in the ground and thousands of miners eager to extract it. In the past the Commission has occasionally shown evidence of its concern for dwindling natural gas reserves by refusing to permit industrial use in areas where ample coal supplies are available. With a specific recommendation from Congress, the Commission will be able to carry out this policy to whatever extent the Nation's interests require.

Industrial use of natural gas in areas where ample coal supplies are available constitutes the most glaring waste of this valuable but scarce mineral resource. In view of the many studies by Federal, State, and local economic groups, it should be unnecessary to recall the heavy unemployment in the mining districts of West Virginia and other coal-producing States. The Federal Power Commission unquestionably knows of these conditions, but perhaps it is reluctant to give coal an equal opportunity to expand markets simply because Congress has failed to spell out the duties of the Commission under cur-

rent circumstances, in contrast to the fuels situation when the Natural Gas Act was passed almost two decades ago. I consider it the obligation of Congress to delay no longer in the enactment of the necessary legislation to bring the Natural Gas Act up to date.

Why the Big Four Conference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why the Big Four Conference?" which was published in the Anniston (Ala.) Star, of Sunday, June 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE BIG FOUR CONFERENCE?

This paper has accepted the contention of Sir Winston Churchill that the Big Four Conference at Geneva should meet without agenda. For one reason, that the various sayings of both Russian and western diplomats already leave public opinion without certainty as to what the issues are as between the East and West.

The public has its own conception of what at least a few of the certainties are; but as presented in interviews by various statesmen there seems to be much contradiction.

Secretary of State Dulles makes an announcement and at once revises his first statement when he has learned the reaction of the Knowland faction.

Vice President NIXON assures us that this Conference is fraught with intimations of final American destiny—influenced, no doubt, by imaginative thoughts of what may come out of the Conference for good or for evil, and particularly what may happen to the Republican Party if Dulles and Ike return from this Geneva as the Secretary returned from another Geneva Conference.

We have some sympathy for the pressure which stirs the Vice President's imagination, but his flight of fancy is no sooner sent forth on verbal wings than the White House asks that the wings be clipped.

So this paper feels that such an agenda as massive retaliations, final destinies, and secretarial comments on Russian civilization be laid aside for the present, so that the somber realities may be faced with brutal sincerity.

"Our grand business is not to see what lies dimly at a distance but to do what lies clearly at hand," said Carlyle; and what lies clearly at hand now is how to live by agreement with the Communist regimes, if we do not intend to fight it out with nuclear weapons.

How to reach such an agreement is no easy task. The difference between communism and democracy is a radical difference amounting to an antithesis, and so recognized by both the East and West.

The German philosopher, Kant, who long ago faced this same dilemma, thought that international peace was possible only when all States were ruled on something like the same internal principles. But it is difficult to detect any internal likenesses common to communism and western democracy today.

Lenin, the real philosopher of Russian communism, also said: "We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states, and the coexistence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. One or the other must triumph in the end."

These rationalisms are now confronted by nuclear weapons in the hands of both the East and the West. Hence, it is either think it out or fight it out, with the result plainly foreseen: not victory for one but death for all.

The reason for the Big Four Conference, therefore, and for its meeting without a Knowland prescription of agenda, is that they may well "explore"—to use the President's word—the possibility of coexistence as an escape from death.

"We are now again in an epoch of wars of religion," says Bertrand Russell; "but a religion is now called an ideology," and it is dangerous to feel sure that such an epoch will not demand blood as it did in the 16th and 17th centuries.

It is obvious that there is a limit to the price which even Communist fanaticism is prepared to pay to achieve its object; the atomic age has seen to that.

President Eisenhower should go to Geneva with the text provided by the great American Justice, Oliver Wendell Holmes: "When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe, even more than they believe in the very foundations of their own conduct, that ultimate good is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes can be safely carried out."

"However valuable crusaders may be, their rightful place is not in the foreign offices of Washington, Downing Street, nor in the Kremlin," says Professor Wayfer in his Political Thought. And since the West goes to Geneva as to a market place for the exchange of ideas, where those who talk will be reminded that "there is no alternative to peace," Churchill, Holmes, and other sound thinkers have a right to be heard.

Distribution of Power on the St. Lawrence River by the New York Power Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Judge Samuel Rosenman which appeared in the June 19, 1955, issue of the New York Post, setting forth the true facts in connection with distribution of power on the St. Lawrence River by the New York Power Authority.

The article follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF POWER ON THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER BY THE NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY

(By Judge Samuel Rosenman)

As special counsel to the New York Power Authority, I am writing you with respect to a series of articles which have appeared recently in the Post attacking the proposed contract between the authority and the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa) for the sale of power which is to be developed on the St. Lawrence River.

I have been shocked by some of the false, reckless, and misleading statements contained in these articles.

The power authority, after 24 years of frustration, failure, and inaction, has at last begun to accomplish what it was set up to do in 1931. It has obtained a license from the Federal Power Commission to build, in partnership with the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, the necessary dams, powerhouse, and other facilities to turn the waterpower of the St. Lawrence River into electricity.

Under the vigorous leadership of its new chairman, Robert Moses, it has raised the necessary $335 million for the United States half of the job. It has raised this sum not from the treasury of the State or Federal Government, not by having the State or Federal Government pledge its credit, but by selling its own bonds in the open market. These bonds have to be paid off by 1995—solely from the income the authority gets from the sale of electricity.

ALCOA LONG ON THE SCENE—AND THERE IS THE RUB

It has acquired land and let major contracts for construction. It has reduced the proposed construction period from 7 to 5 years.

The power authority, in its vigorous efforts to carry out its functions, has run into several very difficult problems. One of the most difficult was Alcoa. This was no theoretical problem. It was a very practical one. Alcoa has been engaged in business in northern New York for over 50 years.

With the consent of the State, it has been using the waters of the St. Lawrence to develop cheap electricity for its own use.

The construction of the power project by the authority will, of necesity, deprive Alcoa for all time of the water power it has been using for 50 years. Unless Alcoa can get an equal amount of power on terms which permit it to engage competitively in business, it cannot continue to remain in the State of New York.

In this situation, the authority could have done only one of two things: (1) It could have told Alcoa that Alcoa was no longer going to get any power produced by the water of the St. Lawrence and that it would have to move out of New York, or (2) it could have negotiated with Alcoa to sell it enough electricity on terms which would enable it to stay in business.

While the authority could have taken the first alternative on its own accord, it could have adopted the second only on terms which Alcoa was ready to accept.

What would have happened if the authority had taken the first alternative?

1. Sixty-six hundred persons in Northern New York now employed by Alcoa would have lost their jobs. These employes and their dependents form about 25 percent of the entire population of St. Lawrence County. Some 750 of them have worked for Alcoa for 25 years or longer. The position of Alcoa in the economy of this part of the country is highlighted by the fact that it now pays 50 percent of all the taxes in the town of Massena and about 13 percent of all the taxes of the whole county of St. Lawrence. There are no industries in this locality which can take up any substantial number of these employes. On the contrary, as you know, Northern New York is presently going through a very difficult period of unemployment. I know you will agree that this is no time to add 6,600 to the unemployed in this area, or to deprive the local government of its principal taxpayer.

2. Alcoa would have claimed a stupendous sum as compensation for the destruction of its right to take St. Lawrence water to develop the electricity which it needs to make aluminum—a right which it had exercised for 50 years. It has an investment in this locality of over $91 million. Naturally it would have stubbornly fought the authority through all the courts in order to save this

investment and to continue its right to draw water—or to obtain vast sums of money in compensation for these rights. Although the authority was advised by counsel that Alcoa would not have been successful in such litigation, the expense of the lawsuits and, above all, the delay which they would have caused—and the bare possibility that they might be successful—were formidable considerations against adopting this alternative.

3. Alcoa owns a great amount of land in this area which will be flooded by the new dam being built by the Authority. Much of this land would be very valuable as possible sites for power dams. In addition to its other claims for waterpower rights, Alcoa could have demanded large sums in compensation for these possible power sites and for other consequential damages.

All of these considerations were before the Authority when it had to decide between the two alternatives. It realized that the first alternative might lead to disastrous results, not only to itself but to the economy of the northern part of New York. It therefore started negotiating with Alcoa to see on what terms it could sell Alcoa enough power to enable it to remain in business in the State of New York, continue to pay taxes, and employ people.

Over a period of 8 months these negotiations were carried on. There was give-and-take on both sides. No fair-minded person can say that either side got more than it gave up or gave up less than it got. Every business contract is a result of this kind of negotiation.

Alcoa had been developing St. Lawrence power for itself—64,500 kilowatts of it—for only 1.56 mills per kilowatt-hour. The Authority, in order to be able to pay off its bonds by 1995, had to ask all its buyers for much more than that. In fact, Alcoa will be paying approximately 4.2 mills per kilowatt-hour.

In addition, in order for Alcoa to use the alternating current the Authority will develop instead of the direct current it has been generating itself, it will have to spend another $25 million in construction and in changing equipment, etc.

Under another contemporaneous contract, Alcoa gives up all its claims to its water rights it has exercised for 50 years and its claims for consequential damages and other claims which would have run into millions of dollars. Litigation—with its expense and its delays—has been eliminated.

In view of the greatly increased price which Alcoa will have to pay for its firm power commitment until the bonds are paid off, in view of the additional expenditure of $25 million to enable it to use the power, in view of what Alcoa is giving up in the way of claims for water rights, consequential damages, etc., was Alcoa not justified in insisting on a long-term contract? Was not the Authority justified in granting a long-term contract in order to keep Alcoa in the State and prevent the distress which would have resulted if it moved out?

ALCOA ASSURED OF ONLY 8 YEARS AT CHEAP RATE

It was only by a long-term contract, extending beyond the date of payment of the Authority bonds, that Alcoa could ever get down to a rate which would be anywhere near the cheap rate at which it now generates electricity for itself. Although it is confidently expected that the bond issue will be paid off before 1995, under the contract Alcoa has assurance of only 8 years of this cheaper rate after paying the higher rate for the period of the bond issue.

And as additional protection to the Authority, the contract now provides that if the rates are reduced by reason of pooling Niagara power with St. Lawrence power, then before reducing the rate to Alcoa the Authority can change any of the terms of the present contract, including the length of it.

This was not a case of a new industry applying for a contract as was the case where other public-power developments in other parts of the country have sold their electricity to private industry. Examples of the length of contracts in other developments are therefore wholly irrelevant.

Here was a case of a company which was actually using the flow of the river, employing 6,600 people, having a great investment and certain definite fixed rights which it was being asked to relinquish.

The chairman of the Authority seems to be selected by these articles for particular denunciation and abuse. Robert Moses needs no defense from me. He has done as much for the physical betterment of this State and this city as any man alive and will be gratefully remembered for his accomplishments. He has been a fighting advocate of public development of waterpower in the interests of the people and a bitter opponent of private utility development of waterpower for over 30 years, beginning back in the days of Alfred E. Smith.

To accuse him—directly or by innuendo—of selling out to the power interests or of making a giveaway to such interests is not only shameless; it is ridiculous; and the public of the city and State who have benefited by his years of public service can only laugh at such reckless charges.

The articles in your paper have been increasingly abusive and increasingly incorrect. I take as an example one of them—dated May 9, 1955—and point out to you seriatim how patently false and absurd some of the accusations are:

FACTS NOT CONCEALED—GIVEN OUT IN RELEASE

Statement by the Post: "Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Power Authority, has negotiated a 48-year contract with the Aluminum Corp. of America, the Post learned today."

Comment: "There is here an insinuation of some effort of concealment, whereas the Post actually learned about the Alcoa contract on April 8 from a press release delivered to them by messenger. In addition, the authority advertised the power contracts in 15 papers scattered over New York State. (The law requires advertisement in six papers.) Six advertisements were run in the New York Post, beginning April 10.

Statement: "Power experts foresaw the possibility that the Moses-Alcoa agreement would set a precedent which would divert the cheap power to private industry rather than residential consumers in New York and other Northeastern States.

"Olds noted that the New York Power Act 'directs' the authority to give first consideration to the electric needs of 'domestic and rural consumers.' The act says that 'sale to and use by industry shall be a secondary purpose.' "

Comment: The authority is directed by the Power Authority Act to erect "such transmission lines as may be necessary to conduct electricity to industrial users located at or near the site" and to study the desirability and means of attracting industry to the State in order to effectuate the policy of the act.

While the Power Authority Act provides that the sale of power to industry shall be a secondary purpose, it also says that the sale of power to industry shall be utilized principally "to secure a sufficiently high load factor and revenue returns to permit domestic and rural use at lowest possible rates." The manufacturer of aluminum produces a higher load factor than practically any other industrial process. Besides, as you know, other contracts already announced show that this is no precedent at all. The authority expects to comply fully with the policy stated in the act with respect to "domestic and rural consumers."

Statement: "He [Olds] urged that Moses develop a comprehensive 'marketing plan' so the public can get some notion of how the Authority plans to distribute the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power and opposed approval of contracts 'on a piecemeal basis.' "

Comment: The Alcoa contract had to be made now if Alcoa was to stay in business in Massena. It went there originally because it was able to produce cheap power. The Authority must charge it a much higher rate. Many matters had to be settled between the Authority and the company, several of them on one basis if the company remained and on another if it left. The construction schedule requires that both spend many millions of dollars on related construction work. Obviously Alcoa would not undertake to spend such sums or to waive claimed water rights unless it first obtained a contract for the purchase of power from the Authority. It could not wait upon the sale of the balance of the Authority's power.

Statement: "There was a possibility that a group of Pennsylvania Rural Electrification Cooperatives would protest the Moses-Alcoa deal directly to Harriman.

"Representatives of the group have said privately that Power Authority representatives won't allow them to be heard at Tuesday's session (the hearing on the contract). Whether this is Moses' final decision was uncertain."

Comment: As you know, everybody who wanted to speak at the hearing was given an opportunity to do so. There was never any suggestion to the contrary, and no basis for this reckless insinuation that they would not get a hearing.

QUESTION OF THE RATES ALCOA WILL HAVE TO PAY

Statement: "The base rate for the firm power would be $1 per kilowatt and 2.67 mills per kilowatt-hour, for secondary power, totaling 65,000 kilowatts."

Comment: For firm power Alcoa must pay a so-called capacity charge of $1 per month for each kilowatt it contracts to buy, whether it uses it or not, and must also pay 2.67 mills per kilowatt-hour for all the energy it uses. There is a prescribed minimum amount of energy for which it must pay in any event.

As to secondary power, Alcoa, like other customers, will pay an energy charge only—the initial charge being 2.67 mills—but unlike the others, Alcoa must pay for all the energy it contracts to buy whether it uses it or not.

Statement: "If the Authority finds it must charge more than $1.10 per kilowatt Alcoa has the option of increasing the amount of the cheaper 'secondary' power it consumes or 'terminating the taking of power and energy under this contract in whole or in part.' "

Comment: The general contract provisions adopted by the Authority, which apply to its contracts generally with all purchasers, allow a customer to cancel for any increase in rates no matter how small. The language in the Alcoa contract on this subject limits its right to terminate to an increase of 10 cents or more per kilowatt. The option given to Alcoa to take more "secondary power" by its terms is limited to situations where the Authority has the power available for sale and it is not subject to contract with others.

Statement: "Power analysts maintain that terms of the Alcoa contract are far more generous than those of the public agencies."

Comment: This is not so. Alcoa pays the same rates as everybody else, but is required to pay a higher minimum charge and is actually paying for power at a higher load factor than anybody else. See also the immediately preceding comment. Furthermore, while other customers, pursuant to the general contract provisions adopted by the

Authority, are not required to pay for any power when closed down because of a strike, lockout, or labor dispute, Alcoa under such circumstances must pay for half the firm power it contracts to buy.

Statement: "The language in these contracts also reserves to the Authority rights it appears to have surrendered in the Alcoa contract. In the Plattsburg contract, the Authority 'may discontinue furnishing electric service' if the city's operation of its power system 'interferes' with the Authority's operations."

Comment: There is no provision in the Alcoa contract for the discontinuance of service in case of conditions on the contractors' power system which interfere with the power system of the Authority for the reason that Alcoa does not have a power system.

Iowa Legislature Against Decentralizing Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by both houses of the Iowa Legislature praising the program of the Soil Conservation Service and asking that it continue to be federally administered.

Any decentralization of the soil-conservation activities from Federal to State administration would be a misconception of the fundamental belief in local voluntary effort and the preservation of individual initiative. Such an action would lead to delays and inefficiencies in the conservation of our soil and water resources, and in many places it would halt progress completely.

The federally operated action program of the Soil Conservation Service, which gives technical assistance to farmers and ranchers to help them in conserving their soil and water resources, has encouraged the most far-reaching and greatest voluntary effort in the history of American agriculture. The formation of soil-conservation districts, now numbering more than 2,650, makes it possible for the farmer and rancher to decide if he wants to conserve his soil, and when and where it is to be done. The commissioners who direct soil-conservation districts give generously of their time without pay. These men are dedicated to helping their neighbors get the best possible program on their farms by serving as a local board to channel all available help. They make inspection trips to surrounding States in order to acquaint themselves with new ideas which can be adapted in their district. They, and their 11,000 associates throughout the country, rank at the top as true Americans.

The Soil Conservation Service gives the farmer in soil-conservation districts the technical details of what he can do and how it should be done. Each of the soil-conservation districts develops its own program and requests the assistance it needs not only from Federal but from State and local sources as well. This procedure encourages local voluntary effort and preserves individual initiative. Also, it is efficient, has precision, and is coordinated.

The proposal to decentralize the Federal Soil Conservation Service to respective States would:

First. Prevent the carrying out of a coordinated flood-prevention program in watersheds that cross State boundaries. Those of you who have small watershed protection projects in your districts know how successful the Soil Conservation Service has been in helping farmers prevent flood damage. You will recall that in the 83d Congress, through the joint efforts of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CLIFFORD R. HOPE], an appropriation was made for the purpose of conserving soil and water resources, alleviating damages from floods, siltation of reservoirs, impairment of stream channels, and related problems in small watersheds. The landowners and operators of the land located in the project established under this program in my district told me last winter how happy they were with this work so far. When the work is completed about a year from now, I feel sure it will be one of the best demonstrations for the prevention of flood damage and the improvement in production and living standards ever completed in rural America. Programs of this sort are now being carried out throughout the country under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act passed last August. These small upstream watershed-protection projects complement and supplement the work of the Army engineers on downstream flood control. They are a part of agriculture and are associated with the conservation program in soil-conservation districts. Also, the proposal to decentralize the Federal Soil Conservation Service would—

Second. Prevent a coordinated approach to the Dust Bowl problem which is caused by drought and wind damage across portions of seven southern Great Plains States.

Third. Lower the quality of technical assistance which farmers and ranchers have been obtaining for the last 20 years.

Fourth. Lose qualified technical personnel now in soil and water conservation who would move to other Federal jobs quickly because of better working conditions, lack of retirement policies, and other factors and there would be a dearth of qualified technical assistance available.

The problem of soil and water conservation is important to all the people of the Nation particularly in time of war when an ample supply of food is essential. The problem is national in scope because the people of urban centers located outside States are dependent on the food and fiber produced on lands for which their political units have no jurisdiction. Therefore, the program must be coordinated nationally.

The percentage of the population engaged in production is progressively decreasing. To decentralize the soil conservation program will further weaken the efforts of the people involved and thereby make it much more difficult for them to protect their resources and produce efficiently.

The resolution above mentioned follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 26

Whereas the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, a subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, has reportedly recommended to the Commission the transfer of the function of soil-conservation technical assitance to the various States; and

Whereas the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts in the United States and the Iowa Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing 100 soil-conservation districts in this State, along with other individuals, groups, and organizations who are vitally interested in the program, are opposed to the reported recommendation; and

Whereas if the reported recommendation is approved it would place an inordinately heavy financial burden upon the State of Iowa, since the contemplated State appropriation each biennium could amount to a sum in excess of $1 million if assistance to local soil-conservation districts is to be maintained at current levels; and

Whereas such program would greatly retard, if not eventually destroy, the national program of soil and water conservation now being carried on, and since the problem is national in scope it should be dealt with accordingly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture relative to gradual transfer of soil-conservation technical-assistance functions from the national authority to the various States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Iowa in the Nation's Capital.

The Right Man at the Right Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waco News-Tribune of June 16, 1955:

THE RIGHT MAN AT THE RIGHT TIME

Whether lighting strikes and catapults LYNDON JOHNSON into the White House or not, the Nation already owes him a debt of gratitude. Each week, more observers of the Washington scene are writing and talking about Senator JOHNSON'S effective leadership in the United States Senate, among them men of keen perspicuity and long experience who have no personal interest in the senior Senator from Texas.

The theme of their observation, and the size of the Nation's debt to LYNDON JOHNSON, is that he has managed to weld the razor-thin Democratic majority of the Senate into an effective organization. Important measures which seemed headed for long debate and possible stalemate have whizzed through the Senate under JOHNSON'S skillful handling. JOHNSON is a genius at human relations and a genius at practical politics. Only a genius could take a majority of one, which is the Democratic edge, and accomplish the things that LYNDON JOHNSON has accomplished.

Naturally, this record of achievement has attracted wide attention. And it is to be expected that LYNDON JOHNSON'S contribution to an effective National Government will cause him to loom larger in the picture as the Nation goes about seeking leadership for the future. However that search turns out, the United States of America can be thankful that LYNDON JOHNSON was sent to the Senate from Texas. His ability to bring harmony and action out of potential chaos was never more needed than it is today.

Philadelphia City Wage Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 23, 1955:

EIGHT NEW JERSEY WOMEN ARE SUED BY CITY OVER WAGE TAXES—PENALTIES AT $100 A YEAR ASKED, DWARFING AMOUNTS OWED TO PHILADELPHIA

Civil suits were filed on the city's behalf in Municipal Court yesterday against eight women employees at Federal installations here, all residents of New Jersey, to collect city wage taxes and penalties ranging from $400 to $1,500.

Assistant City Solicitor Maurice Mordell entered the complaints in assumpsit against the defendants as a final recourse, since the law protects women employees from arrest in such cases.

ONE-HUNDRED-DOLLAR-A-YEAR PENALTY

Previously, the sheriff of Philadelphia had conducted raids on such Federal agencies as the Philadelphia Naval Base, the Frankford Arsenal, and the Veterans' Administration, in which a number of men employees were arrested and jailed for failure or refusal to pay the city's 1¼-percent tax on gross incomes earned in Philadelphia. The city's right to levy the tax on Federal employees here, even though they live outside the city and State, has been upheld by the courts.

In each of the suits filed yesterday, penalties of $100 for each year the defendant failed to pay the wage tax amounted to substantially more than the tax owed.

Four of those named in the suits are employees of the Quartermaster Depot, at 2800 South 20th Street; two are at the Marine Corps Depot, 1100 South Broad Street; another is at the Naval Air Supply Depot, 700 Robbins Avenue, and the eighth at the Frankford Arsenal.

DEFENDANTS LISTED

Those at the Quartermaster Depot, with taxes owed and penalties, are:

Margaret Donio, Hammonton, N. J., $426 taxes and $1,100 penalties for 11 years, total $1,526; Hazel E. Wilson, 2012 South Seventh Street, Camden, $233 and $700 penalties, total $933; Mary Geweniger, 228 South Washington Avenue, Moorestown, N. J., $244 and $700 penalties, total $944, and Mary J. Dorsey, 931 Chelten Avenue, Camden, $261 plus $1,000, total $1,261.

Those at the Marine Corps Depot:

Sophia C. Metcalfe, 8330 Holman Avenue, Delair, N. J., $375 and $1,100, total $1,475; Emma H. Wilson, 513 Lafayette Avenue, Woodbury, N. J., $241 and $700, total $941.

Others named were Beatrice Hoffman, of 270 Boyd Street, Camden, Naval Air Supply Depot, $407 and $1,100, total $1,507, and Libby E. Butler, 335 Roosevelt Avenue, Pitman, N. J., Frankford Arsenal, $133 and $300, total $433.

Rev. Edmund A. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very complimentary and deserving editorial from the Evening Star of June 21, 1955, with respect to the distinguished Rev. Edmund A. Walsh:

FATHER WALSH RETIRING

It must have been with special poignancy that thousands of Washingtonians learned of the retirement of the Rev. Edmund A. Walsh from the regency of the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. He has been so definitely the leader of that work from its inception 35 years ago that it is hard to think of him as being separated from it. Of course, the truth is that he never will be set aside from the institution which is his lengthened shadow. Father Walsh may write emeritus after his title, but it will be a mere formality. Far into the future his name and Georgetown will continue to be related.

A like observation applies to the bond between this good neighbor and the great teaching order to which he dedicated his gifts more than half a century ago. Its sponsor was a Spanish soldier who sought the conversion of infidels. Four hundred years later Father Walsh accepted a similar mission in his campaign of resistance to materialism in its political aspect of communism. To him as much as to any other individual the free world owes its understanding of the hollow and wicked Marxist indictment of religion as "an opiate of the people." Father Walsh went to the heart of that mischief in Moscow and brought home to America with him the convincing proof of the Soviet conspiracy against Christian democratic civilization. But he also sounded repeated warnings against other dictatorships and tyrannies, wherever they appeared.

Meanwhile, he taught the constructive values of freedom as a background for learning. Father Walsh's lectures and books reached multitudes outside academic walls. He has been a popularizer of knowledge in the fine scientific spirit of James Smithson and in harmony too with the ethical example of Ralph Waldo Emerson. His own country has been fortunate in having had his services, and the world at large has been benefited equally by his labors. It is a universal hope then that rises in behalf of improved health for this good and useful man.

Rebel Yells Heard Once More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the demands for change in our social patterns and the evenutal legislative and judicial mandates which require change in them are always attended by the rantings of opponents who, at length, predict dire results to and including the spilling of blood. Such a prediction has been made by those who oppose the enforcement of the antisegregation decision by the Supreme Court. But the distinguished columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, himself a southerner, reminds us very calmly that such an ominous prediction relative to the decision outlawing the so-called white primary failed to materialize. I, therefore, commend this article for deliberation to Members of Congress and to other readers of the RECORD:

REBEL YELLS HEARD ONCE MORE

How blow the winds of opinion from the South?

What is the reaction to the Supreme Court's order to carry out its decision of a year ago that held segregation of races in public schools is contrary to our Constitution? The order, we can see, is altogether patient and considerate, shifting responsibility back to the lower Federal courts in the southern community and permitting time for those courts to supervise necessary adjustments and yet insistent on eventual integration.

The Court's moderation has its echo in the tidings from the South which, though mixed, have an overtone of gratitude for the Court's gradualism, and thereby seem to express a hope that somehow the problem may be met, with time, with ingenuity, with toleration.

We have, of course, the expected chorus of rebel yells from a handful of politicians.

Such as Governor Marvin Griffin, of Georgia, who cries out, "We will continue to run our schools as we always have," and speaks cynically in terms of a thousand years before change. And such as his predecessor in office who is regarded as largely responsible for Governor Griffin's election—Herman Talmadge, who says integration in Georgia "won't be feasible for a long, long, long time."

Certainly, of course, as long as the likes of him and Governor Griffin can get votes out of it.

We may recall another Supreme Court decision and another Governor of Georgia.

Nearly 10 years ago the Supreme Court outlawed in a Georgia case the white primary by which Negroes had been disfranchised in Georgia and other Southern States. Governor Ellis Arnall of that area issued a public statement saying the Supreme Court had spoken, that its decision now was the law of the land, and appealed to the people of his State to obey it.

Which they have done.

This reporter was in Atlanta for the State election on July 19, 1946, when Negroes voted on a State-wide basis for the first time under that decision. All day long I visited polling places in company with a reporter and a photographer from the Atlanta Constitution, polls in the city and polls in nearby country districts. It wa. all most orderly, Negroes

and whites following each other in line to cast their ballots.

There were no disorders, though in some parts of the State—not in Atlanta—there was the familiar species of intimidation, not physical, of course, but the word passed around that kept some Negroes away from the polls.

But, all in all, it was a milestone that not only impressed this reporter, a native Georgian, but was inspiring and thrilling.

The disappointment came that night with the returns showing that Gene Talmadge, who had exploited racial prejudice, had been nominated for Governor in the primary, which in Georgia is tantamount to election. He did not get a majority of the popular vote, but he won over the candidate supported by retiring Governor Arnall by the ancient county unit system with which Georgia still is afflicted. Gene, the father of Herman, died before he could assume office.

The racial barriers had been broken in that election so far as the franchise was concerned.

The white primary decision, in fact, started a trend. It was followed by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court to admit Negroes to graduate and law schools in the South in Oklahoma and Texas cases.

That decision really was a forecast of the sweeping decision in May 1954, banning segregation in public schools.

It is not pretended here that admission of Negro and white children to the same schools is in the same category, so far as southern attitudes are concerned, as permitting Negroes to vote—though the Supreme Court decision killing the white primary was considered almost revolutionary 10 years ago by some southerners. They came to accept it.

Every southerner knows almost from birth those fine distinctions about what the races can and cannot do together—a code that is almost fantastic when you stand off and look back across Mason and Dixon's line at it. But there it is. Sitting together in the same schoolroom is among the dont's in the code, just as voting once was.

We are hearing predictions from the South that it will be many, many years before the Supreme Court decision goes into effect in some parts of the South. Perhaps so. The experience with granting of the franchise after the Supreme Court decision of a decade ago, and a Governor with rare courage for that day, is brought up out of memory simply to show what can happen, and to suggest that maybe the South need not forever be the land of nullification and secession.

Maybe some day or other John C. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis will be let lie peacefully in their graves.

Looking for Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Looking for Private Enterprise," which was published in a recent edition of the Florence (Ala.) Times, which reproduced the editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING FOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

In battling electric businesses financed by city governments, cooperatives and the Federal Treasury, the investor-financed electric business is battering some good words into shreds.

Managers of the investor-financed electric business confer on themselves the description of free enterprisers.

The utility tycoons would like to ease into the public mind along the side of drygoods merchants and filling station operators. By simple repretition they hope to make free enterprise and electric business seem to be companions.

Mauling these words out of shape is difficult except for the possibilities in massive propaganda, plus the possibility that those who know better will tire of contradictions.

The fact is that distribution of electricity is, except in the rarest of circumstances, a monopoly. Shoppers can choose between drygoods stores and motorists can patronize any one of many service stations, but who has a choice in where he buys electricity, what brand he buys, or what price he pays?

Competition would be against the public interest. The cost of duplicating lines of poles down the alleys and heavy circuits under the downtown streets alone would be enough to contradict the usual values of competition, as these values are set to one side for telephone service, street railway systems, and waterworks.

Electricity is a public utility. It is an essential to everyday living and working. The powers of city, State, and Federal governments are used to see there is enough of it and to attempt to hold down unreasonable profits from this monopoly in a necessity.

We have been urged many times to look at the Dixon-Yates plan for selling electricity to the Atomic Energy Commission as free enterprise. We have looked, and are still looking.

Beyond the absence of free enterprise in the standard production and distribution of electricity, this arrangement is even further from free enterprise, because it is only a deal to build a plant if the Government will sign a contract to buy the electricity to pay for it.

It is a negotiated deal, without the public bidding traditional in Government buying, or the salesmanship required of free enterprise.

When the plant is complete, this contract makes it possible for Dixon-Yates to hold the AEC to 8 years of gradual cancellation of its purchase order for highly profitable electricity. If the plant built on the AEC power purchase produces more power than AEC wants, Dixon-Yates can have it on a bargain price. There are, in addition, built-in pressures to force TVA to take any power that neither AEC nor Dixon-Yates wants to use.

It would have been as near free enterprise as the electric business can get if Edgar Dixon had ventured the capital to build a plant at West Memphis in the confidence that new people and new factories in Arkansas will need its electricity.

We hope Arkansas needs the Dixon-Yates electricity. In fact, we hope Arkansas needs the West Memphis plan and another one just like it at Helena.

But that would be very different from building a plant on a Government contract to take the electricity.

To call this free enterprise is only a new use of a very old trick in argument in which the speaker announces: "I am in favor of education. You are against me. Therefore you are against education."

This version is: TVA powerplants are financed by Federal Treasury loans. Dixon-Yates would not borrow from the Treasury. Therefore Dixon-Yates is free enterprise.

Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates have set up an arrangement for the Government to guarantee the cost of building the powerplant, plus profit, plus cheap power for their other companies, plus tax relief.

That is free enterprise?—The Commercial Appeal.

Interstate Oil Compact Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Oil Compact was originally provided for by Congress in 1935. It has been extended by Congress from time to time. The last extension was 4 years ago. The present contract expires on September 1, 1955.

The Interstate Compact authorized by Congress permits the States to work together for the purpose of conserving the vital natural resources of oil and gas. Twenty-two States are members of the compact, with 6 States as associate members, which in effect makes a total of 28 States that participate in this highly important program.

The Honorable William G. Stratton, Governor of the great State of Illinois, is presently the Chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. In a timely and most interesting address, he gave a report at the meeting of the Commission on June 17, 1955, at Denver, Colo., in which he not only explained something of the history of the compact but the significant accomplishments. In view of the importance of this program and the recommendations which are made, I ask unanimous consent that the report and address be included in the Appendix of the RECORD for the attention of the Members of Congress:

REPORT AND ADDRESS

(By Hon. William G. Stratton, Chairman, Interstate Oil Compact Commission, and Governor of the State of Illinois, Springfield, Ill.)

The wisdom of the founders of the Interstate Oil Compact is amply borne out by history. There are today many evidences of the fact that there has been, through the years, a constant and ever-increasing public understanding and support of the concepts underlying this great interstate organization.

Organized in 1935 with 6 member States, namely: Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, and Illinois, its growth has been far beyond the expectation of those farsighted men who labored long and well, under adverse industrial circumstances and the fear of some who felt that the compact might invade or destroy the sovereign rights of each State to control the problems arising within its borders. With the close of 1954, State membership in the compact had reached the total of 22 member States, with 6 associate member States.

That the chaotic conditions existing at the time of the formation of the compact have been corrected is a matter of record. That the fundamental purpose of the compact, conservation of oil and gas through prevention of physical waste from any cause, has been accomplished, is supported by available factual information.

Since the formation of the compact in 1935, our reserves of crude oil have increased

from more than 13 billion barrels to almost 30 billion barrels at the end of 1954, all during a period of constantly increasing demand for petroleum products.

In addition to crude, we now have over 5 billion barrels of other liquid hydrocarbons, making a grand total of almost 35 billion barrels. During the same period of time our reserves of natural gas have increased from 62 trillion cubic feet to 212 trillion, despite skyrocketing consumption of gas, now supplying 25 percent of the energy requirements of the United States. This is a record of conserving our natural resources of energy fuels of which every American should be proud.

And as further and more recent evidence of the phenomenal growth of the compact, and the underlying public interest, support and confidence in the compact, it is my great pleasure to publicly announce that 4 new member States have joined the compact since January 1, 1955, namely: Nevada, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Arizona.

At this time, as chairman of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, I extend to those States and their executive, administrative, and regulatory officers a most hearty welcome. We offer to the new member States all possible assistance in solving their respective problems, but, at the same time, our assurance that we will at no time attempt, either directly or indirectly, to control their determination of any problem arising within their respective State borders. To attempt to do so would be in violation of the fundamental concepts and provisions of the compact itself.

During the early years of the compact it was extended by the member States and congressional approval thereof secured, each 2 years. During the past 8 years it has been extended, with congressional approval, upon a 4-year basis. The enabling legislation of the several member States, with the exception of Kansas and Illinois, and including the four new member States, now authorizes the Governors of the respective member States to execute extension agreements of the compact without further legislative authority. The present compact expires on September 1, 1955, and all of the member States, except one, acting through their chief executive officers, have executed an extension agreement, extending the compact to September 1, 1959.

The Illinois Legislature, during its current session, has enacted enabling legislation which I approved immediately after its enactment. This enabling legislation becomes effective on July 1, 1955, and I shall then execute the extension agreement and maintain the State of Illinois in the ranks of the member States.

We must now consider the necessity of securing consent of the Congress to extend the compact to September 1, 1959. During the current session of Congress, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and Congressmen OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas; and CHARLES W. VURSELL, of Illinois, introduced like resolutions in the Senate and in the House, respectively, to grant such consent. In this regard, it is interesting to note that some 38 Senators joined with Senator DIRKSEN in sponsoring the Senate resolution.

The resolution was unanimously passed in the Senate, but unfortunately carried the following amendment:

"The Attorney General of the United States shall, within 1 year from September 1, 1955, and annually thereafter for the duration of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, make a report to the Congress as to whether or not in his opinion the activities of the States under the provisions of such compact (1) have remained with the purpose of such compact as set out in article 5 thereof, and (2) have resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation or perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production or sale of oil or gas; with the understanding that conservation and the protection of the small producer are the paramount purposes of any rules and regulations issued under the compact."

Gentlemen, we have nothing to hide. We have nothing to fear from any investigation. We may proudly stand upon our record. We are a group of sovereign States, acting under a charter which has ably demonstrated and proven its worth and benefit to the people of our Nation by its leadership in conservation of a great, irreplaceable natural resource, so necessary to meet the demands of our constantly expanding economy and the defense of our Nation.

It is obvious to those who are familiar with the purpose and conduct of the affairs of the compact that there is no foundation in fact to support the amendment just quoted. Such fact would likewise be apparent to any fair-minded person who would seek information upon this subject.

It is my understanding that the latter part of the amendment was inserted by a friend of the compact, in an effort to take some of the sting out of the investigation and report provisions of the avendment. But where in the compact, or in the bylaws adopted by the Commission, is there any provision, either direct or implied, that the Commission shall have any power to promote rules and regulations? There is no such power and I challenge those who would seek to destroy, or indirectly limit the effectiveness of the compact or embarrass it in discharging its functions and duties, to show the Compact Commission has ever issued a rule or regulation of any kind of character.

This amendment, scurrilous in nature, conceived in a desire to ever widen Federal bureaucracy and destroy the rights of the sovereign States to regulate their own affairs and based upon misinformation or lack of knowledge of the true facts, should be deleted from the resolution in question. Like proposed amendments to the resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives and a separate resolution of the same general portent introduced during the early days of the present session should be overwhelmingly defeated. We sincerely trust that this will be done and that the resolution, as originally introduced, will be enacted at an early date.

Our executive committee has held two well-attended and constructive meetings this year, the first in St. Louis, Mo., on February 11, and the second in Springfield, Ill., on May 10.

At the business session of the commission, held at the conclusion of the December 1954 meeting in Chicago, I, as incoming chairman, was directed to appoint a special committee to study past practices, policies, and administration of the Interstate Oil Compact and to make recommendations for the future in this regard.

Shortly after January 1, this committee was appointed, consisting of Mr. Hiram M. Dow, of New Mexico, as chairman, Mr. Maurice Acers, of Texas, Senator Charles E. Tooke, Jr., of Louisiana, Mr. O. C. Bailey, of Arkansas, and Mr. Clarence T. Smith, of Illinois.

This committee has devoted a tremendous amount of time and work to its assignment. These men have traveled far and given freely of their time to meet with each other, the executive officers of the Commission and with various groups, including educators, State regulatory officers, and industry representatives. The committee requested by letter suggestions and recommendations from many people throughout the country who have evidenced their interest in the compact. All of these suggestions and recommendations have been incorporated in a report which is truly outstanding and worthy of your study and consideration.

Some of the activities recommended by the committee, if adopted, will call for an increase in the budget for the operation of the compact and I am pleased to announce that Illinois will increase its annual contribution 20 percent for this biennium, as evidence of our faith in the future of this organization and the vital importance of the function of this compact in the public interest.

In closing, I would like to touch briefly upon two problems which are still causing all of us great concern.

The economy of my State—the second largest consumer of natural gas in the Nation—depends largely upon an adequate and plentiful supply of natural gas. The people of our State cannot be assured of such supply, unless the control of production, gathering and field price, as well as all questions of conservation of this vital natural resource, is left completely and exclusively within the jurisdiction of the several States. The passage of remedial legislation, now pending in the Congress, is imperative and we, as the leaders of conservation in our great country, are well within the scope of our authority and the purpose and concept of the compact, in actively supporting such remedial legislation. It behooves all of us and I urge that all actively support the present effort to return to the States the control which is rightfully theirs.

The National Petroleum Council recently endorsed a report of its special study committee relative to the importation of foreign oil and I desire to quote therefrom:

"The continued increase in imports of crude oil, coupled with a decline in exports of crude oil and its products, has damaged in varying degrees segments of the domestic oil industry.

"Further increases of imports without regard to the principle of only supplementing the domestic production of crude oil and its products will seriously damage the domestic oil industry and thus affect the domestic economy and the national security."

The above statement clearly supports my position in this matter as stated at the December 1954 meeting of the Commission held in Chicago. My position is based upon the obvious fact that excessive importation of crude oil seriously affects our conservation programs of oil and gas, causing premature abandonment of stripper wells, retardment or abandonment of secondary recovery programs and other reasons which I will not here enumerate.

We are advised through the press that the supporters of the Neely amendment to the reciprocal trade agreement legislation were assured by administration spokesmen that immediate steps would be taken at top Government levels to reduce excessive importation of crude oil. Recently a report came out of Washington that an agreement has been reached between industry and administration sources to hold oil imports to about 14 percent of domestic consumption. Naturally, I am unable to say at this early date whether this percentage factor will prove the answer to the serious problem existing at this time. However, I sincerely hope that we will now see an effective demonstration of business statesmanship.

Peron Government in Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include

the following letter I received from members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting the current reign of terror, persecution, and tyranny by the Peron government of the Republic of Argentina:

ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS,
June 17, 1955.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and ladies' auxiliary of Massachusetts, were organized in America in 1836 in order to promote friendship, unity, and Christian charity, as well as loyalty to the Government of the United States by our members, do hereby protest the current reign of terror, persecution, and tyranny by the Peron government in the Republic of Argentina against members of the Roman Catholic clergy and all freedom-loving people in that country.

Because our Government is a champion of the United Nations and cofounder of the Atlantic Charter whose principles are freedom of speech and worship, freedom from want and fear among people everywhere, we are saddened by current oppression against our brothers in the mystical body of Christ.

We earnestly protest against this diabolical persecution in the name of humanity and democracy. As champions of freedom and peace, we members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Massachusetts, cry out to you in protest against this barbarity. We are appealing to you to use your good offices to bring about an end to this persecution, even though it means the severing of diplomatic relations with the Republic of Argentina and all such dictatorial governments that are in opposition to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Very sincerely yours,

HUGH A. MORIARTY,
State President.
DR. FRANK J. FLEMING,
State Historian.
WALTER J. O'LEARY,
State Secretary.
KATHLEEN C. ROCHE,
Auxiliary President.
MARGARET WEBB,
Auxiliary Secretary.

Ford Rouge Credit Union Seizure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution passed by the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, of the State of Michigan, focuses attention upon a serious procedural matter involving the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. This resolution does not tell the whole story, and my personal experience in this case obliges me to urge a congressional inquiry into the outlined practices.

We certainly cannot afford to jeopardize the confidence of the people in credit unions, which I consider to be one of the economic bulwarks of our Nation:

RESOLUTION ON FORD ROUGE CREDIT UNION

Whereas the action of the representatives of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, in arbitrarily closing without notice and evicting officers and staff of the Ford Rouge Employees' Credit Union, is using gestapo methods and tactics; and

Whereas the great expense and inconvenience to the 15,000 members in this action were entirely unwarranted and unnecessary; and

Whereas it is clear that this action was inspired by the repressive atmosphere in Washington, created in no small part by the presence of auto magnates and bankers' representatives in the Eisenhower administration; and

Whereas this action of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions should have considered this action in terms of bank investigation procedure, i. e., banks are never closed in like circumstances; and

Whereas this action of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, if unchecked, will set a dangerous precedent to be used by power-hungry bureaucrats; and

Whereas the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor does not condone and desires to see punished any who stole or misapplied the funds of this credit union, but feels that the same might have been accomplished by more reasonable methods: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor protests to the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions its action in this case; and be it further

Resolved, That the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions report its findings to the membership of this credit union in a duly called meeting; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Members of Congress of Michigan, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and the Michigan Credit Union League.

Sugar Acreage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, sugar acreage is of much importance to farmers in portions of my district. A statement from one of my constituents merits reading. Under leave to extend remarks I include this statement by Peter W. Grant of Stephen, Minn.:

STATEMENT OF PETER W. GRANT, WESTERN BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION, STEPHEN, MINN.

1. Common sense has taught the American farmer that he must keep pace with a modern and changing world or go broke. Economical production of agricultural products, well suited to his area, is an absolute necessity. The Red River Valley, limited by climate and short seasons, has proven that sugar beets are the answer to their need for a row crop along with small grains. For years interest has remained consistently high here and has exceeded acreage quotas when other areas have dropped acreage in favor of other agricultural products.

2. Too rapidly our farm and small-town populations have decreased, due to our young people being lured away by what they feel is more gain in cities, with shorter work hours for as much gain in the long run, plus unemployment compensation not available to a farmer when things go wrong. Acreage allotments of a crop consistently more dependable than they now have would encourage these young folks to stay in the area, both on farms and in towns where fairly level prosperity would assure business growth and gain.

3. The United States Department of Agriculture, farm scientists, farm organizations, county agents, agriculture teachers, 4-H clubs—and that most valuable man—the experienced older farmers, teaches, stresses, and urges the necessity of diversification and crop rotation, but with all this information what does that leave the valley to rotate, limited as we are.

4. The feeling is general in the areas represented by the Western Beet Growers Association that it is presumptuous and unrealistic for Cuba to ever assume she was to retain her state of wartime prosperity, based on a temporary and immediate need, as much as was any product of shipyard or defense plant during war years, and it is as presumptuous for any American area or industry to have hopefully based investments for the future on what they knew and Cuba knew to be a temporary setup, under necessity of maximums due to immediate need. They all know well that the quotas they retained in 1948 were due to consideration of them then, so they could gradually return to a peacetime quota, unaffected by the abrupt cutoff that would have meant economic stress.

Domestic growers and other areas know this, and know this was necessary in many areas to prevent economic strife, but others feel now they must be given just consideration or the whole agricultural and industrial program, as pertaining to sugar, will remain out of balance with the whole thing tilted too far to the southeast.

5. "The Red River Valley is in the heart of America, and democracy begins in the heart." We cannot possibly reach out a hand to help others unless we have a good firm base from which to work. War upsets and the patience required by all Americans through past years have had our unselfish people patiently waiting for returns to normal when they could once more go ahead with plans for the future. Now, in this important issue, and the farm program already in such turmoil, if the areas requesting fair legislation become the forgotten man, it is going to be quite a jolt, and that patience will turn to anger at what we then feel would be an outright and downright lack of consideration on the part of those responsible for such an act. We are in this tough old climate, but in one of the greatest places in the world, though our opportunities for growth are limited and few. We are not going to give up what we know will eventually come, hence the present legislation is one of the greatest to the future of our valley.

The Reserves Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, ever since debate was suspended recently on the so-called Reserves bill (H. R. 5297) there has been considerable speculation regarding the likelihood of this legislation being enacted at this session of Congress. I, for one, am convinced that the country needs a stronger Reserve program, and shall do all that I can to see that appropriate legislation is enacted.

As a result of the increasing awareness on the part of the public that a stronger Reserve program is necessary, all of us have been getting mail from our constit-

uents. I am including in my remarks at this point, because of its real general interest to my colleagues, a letter which I recently received from a young veteran on this subject. The letter follows:

HIGHLAND PARK, N. J., *June 21, 1955.*

Hon. PETER J. FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FRELINGHUYSEN: As one of your constituents, I am impelled to write to you today because of the flummery that has recently been going on in the House of Representatives over the new military Reserve program. It seems to me that some of the most absurd, upside-down thinking (or lack thereof) of the current congressional session has been lavished upon this measure, and Mr. VINSON's contribution of a modified "compromise" plan, as reported in today's New York Times, is the severest blow of all to reason and logic—not to mention traditional American standards of fair play.

Now, I am an Army veteran who completed his 2-year hitch in 1953, and, as such, I will be due to follow up my active duty with several years more of Active Reserve service, regardless of whether the administration or the Vinson plan prevails. Never having been an admirer of or an enthusiast for the military, I do not look forward to the additional burden of Active Reserve duty with relish. However, I believe that I speak for many recent veterans when I say that I realize someone must assume the burden. There can be little doubt, world conditions being as they now are, that we do need a stronger Reserve than we now have; and, as a veteran, I will be glad to shoulder my share of the burden—as long as I know that everyone else is shouldering his share as well.

The trouble with the new military Reserve program, especially as "compromised" by Mr. VINSON, is that it guarantees that everyone will not be shouldering his share. Recent veterans will be subjected to the double jeopardy of both active and Reserve duty, while a large body of young American men will be totally exempted from any military service whatever. Especially with the recent cuts in military manpower on active duty, the supply of men eligible for current military service exceeds the demand. What happens to the surplus? The new military Reserve program, as it is now contemplated, insures that those shrewd or just plain lucky men who manage to become supernumeraries in the draft will be rewarded for their shrewdness (or luck) by being made supernumeraries in the Reserves as well.

Call it universal military training or any other scare-name you like; it still remains the only fair alternative to a program through which a majority of young Americans is put into double jeopardy to the benefit of a minority which is put into no jeopardy whatever. Either you make the veterans assume a double burden, unaided by nonveterans, or you lighten the veterans' extra burden by distributing it as equitably as possible among all eligible American youths. Either you take the chance of repeating the miscarriage of justice we made at the beginning of the Korean war—when we returned our World War II veteran-Reservists to combat while nonveterans stayed home for a second time—or you prepare a Reserve which contains nonveterans as well as veterans. Which alternative, I ask, is the more just?

All the blatant and phoney emotionalism that has been generated over the lofty but essentially irrelevant principle that universal military service runs counter to American traditions—all this emotionalism ignores the inescapable fact that the absence of universal military service, at least under present circumstances, violates an even more fundamental American tradition: namely, fair play and equality of sacrifice.

I do not know where you, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, stand on this matter, and my purpose in writing this letter is not to threaten you with the loss of my vote in the next election unless you share my views (democracy is not so simple as that). I am writing simply to express my indignation, and also my wish that you—or some other responsible Member of Congress—would speak up for a vital point which, so far as I know, has not yet been brought up in congressional debate on the military Reserve program. That point is that some plan—universal military training, if necessary—which distributes the burden of military service as equitably as possible must evolve out of all the present flummery if the American tradition of fair play is to prevail.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW L. PINCUS.

Library of Congress Makes First Definitive Study of Major Attempts To Modernize Copyright Law of 1909—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision.

We are living in an age when every encouragement must be given to the free interchange of ideas. The development of methods of mass communication have provided the means of bringing creative work in the fields of the cultural arts, education, and recreation to millions of people simultaneously. A constantly growing part of the population of our country is being reached via these technological advances, and a constantly growing number of people are employed by the industries that have grown up in these fields. With industries as large as those in the field of mass communications there are inevitably many complex problems of equity and justice involved.

If the arts are among those activities which make our civilization endure and flourish, as President Eisenhower declared them to be in his recent message on the state of the Union, then it is time that a study be made by an impartial, blue-ribbon Federal commission of the Copyright Laws of 1909. It should be noted that the advancement of science and the useful arts was written into the Constitution as one of the basic concerns of this Nation, and of the Federal Government.

The American Law Division of the Library of Congress at my request undertook a definitive study of the techniques employed since 1909 in efforts at major revision of the copyright law. I am proud and happy to present here excerpts from that study for the information and consideration of my colleagues.

The letter of transmittal and part I of the study follow:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1955.

To: Hon. FRANK THOMPSON
From: American Law Division
Subject: A study of techniques employed in efforts at major copyright law revision since 1909

Reference is made to your request of April 11, 1955, for a study of the several attempts to affect a major revision of the copyright laws including specifically those of 1931, 1932, 1936, and 1939 and a survey of revisions of the patent and trademark laws.

The enclosed report, a study of techniques employed in efforts at major copyright law revision since 1909, has been compiled in response to your request. Also enclosed is a copy of a report, revision of patent and trademark laws, prepared by the Copyright Office.

FREEMAN W. SHARP.

I. INTRODUCTION

Three bills, all similar to each other, have been introduced in the 84th Congress to establish a Federal Commission to examine, study, and make recommendations for the revision of the laws pertaining to both domestic and foreign copyright.[1] The Commission would be composed of 13 members, 7 appointed by the President and 3 appointed from each House of Congress by the Speaker and the Vice President, respectively. It would be authorized to employ a competent staff, hold hearings and take testimony any place in the United States or elsewhere and make the necessary expenditures therefor. The Commission would be directed to make its report and recommendations and findings to the President and Congress within 30 days after the commencement of the first regular session convened more than 1 year after enactment of the bill. Sixty days after such reports the Commission would cease to exist.

The first copyright law of the United States was enacted by the First Congress in 1790 (1 Stat. 124). Forty years later (1831) Congress revised "the several acts respecting copyrights" (4 Stat. 436); and after a like interval passed an act "To revise, consolidate, and amend the statutes relating to patents and copyrights (16 Stat. 212, sec. 85, et seq.). The last general revision, constituting basically the present law, was enacted in 1909 (35 Stat. 1075; U. S. C. title 17).

The existing system of copyright law is thus in the main nearly a half century old. A few amendments have been made here and there, but all major revision projects have failed of enactment. At the same time, large business enterprises have been built upon the basis of the present law. The Billboard (January 29, 1955, p. 65) indicates that the American public last year spent $25 million for rhythm and blues records, personal appearances, and the products of the music-publishing business. In 1953, excluding textbooks and professional and technical books, consumers spent $531 million for books and maps and an additional $1,708,000,000 for magazines, newspapers, and sheet music.[2] In addition to these business developments, great advances have been made in the science and technology of mass communications, that is, in radio, television, recordings, transcriptions, moving pictures, and many others. In the face of these conditions, the need for a new revision of the copyright law was indicated by the Librarian of Congress in 1953:

"There has been a steadily growing movement among the bar and trade groups concerned with copyright for a complete revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, in the light of present

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

conditions. The existing law is basically that enacted in 1909, and the 44 years since then have brought such developments as radio, television, and new processes of reproduction, photography, sound recording, and transmission."[3]

Any major revision of the copyright law today will be a very delicate matter, involving, as it will, the interest of large businesses, unions, performing rights societies, libraries, and, perhaps more important, the interests of the consuming public. Considering that several efforts to effect major changes in the law since 1909 have been unsuccessful, Representative THOMPSON, author of the original proposal (H. R. 2677) in the 84th Congress for a Federal Commission, asked for an examination of the techniques of these several proposals, specifically including, but not limited to, those in 1931, 1932, 1936, and 1939. The report herewith is limited to the following aspects of these attempts: (1) The "mechanics" of the revision effort, (2) the groups and individuals who testified pro and con, (3) samples of the testimony given, (4) the outcome or net result of the effort. In other words, this study is concerned, not with the substance of the copyright law or of proposed changes but with the procedures which have been tried in the several attempts at major revision since the 1909 enactment. Some of the attempts covered (for example, of 1936) were in fact revisions designed to facilitate the entry of the United States into the Berne Convention. That fact, however, is immaterial—the point here was merely to describe the mechanics of what were in fact proposals for a major change in the domestic copyright laws.

[3] S. 1254, Mr. LANGER; H. R. 2677, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey; and H. R. 5366, Mr. DIGGS.

[3] U. S. Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, National Income Supplement, 1954 edition, pp. 206–207.

[3] Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, 1953, p. 106; see also Annual Report, 1954, p. 92.

Library of Congress Makes First Definitive Study of Major Attempts To Modernize Copyright Law of 1909—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the second section of the definitive study made by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the techniques employed since 1909 in efforts at major revision of the copyright law:

II. THE FIRST ATTEMPT AT A MAJOR REVISION, 1924

The first attempt to bring the entire copyright law up to date occurred in 1924, although prior to that time several limited amendments had been enacted.[1]

In 1924 during the 68th Congress, the House Committee on Patents held hearings on H. R. 6250, a bill to amend section 1 of the copyright law, and on H. R. 9137, the Dallinger bill which provided for a major revision of the law. Of the 383 pages in the printed hearing only 96 pages seem to have been devoted to consideration of the Dallinger bill.

During the hearing Mr. Thorvald Solberg, then Register of Copyrights, was permitted to testify in behalf of the Lampert bill, H. R. 2704, also pending in the committee, as follows:

"Mr. PERKINS. Proceed.

"Mr. SOLBERG. The chairman was kind enough to give me 10 minutes to set out my views concerning H. R. 2704. Of all the bills now before the House Committee on Patents, the interest of the Copyright Office is primarily centered in H. R. 2704, entitled 'A bill to amend the copyright law in order to permit the United States to enter the International Copyright Union.' This bill may be very briefly but comprehensively explained as a bill authorizing the President to proclaim the entry of the United States into the International Copyright Union."

* * * * *

"Mr. REED of Illinois. What is it about?

"Mr. SOLBERG. Entry into the copyright union. The bill is intended to get us into the International Copyright Union with the least possible trouble and delay, and with the least possible disturbance of existing conditions. It does not propose the abrogation of any provisions of existing law, but it does necessarily exempt authors of countries within the union from compliance with our compulsory manufacturing conditions, and such formalities as notice of copyright, deposit of copies, and registration of copyright claim. This is required because article 4 of the convention creating the union, which prescribes that 'the enjoyment and the exercise of such rights as are secured under the convention, are not subject to any formality.'"[2]

Mr. Arthur W. Weil, author of Weil on Copyright, and the attorney retained to draft a copyright bill by the Will Hays organization[3] representing all the leading motion-picture producers voiced objections to the Lampert bill:

"Now, one of the difficulties with the so-called official bill is that while adhering to the Bern Convention it undertakes to set up a dual system of copyright; that is, if you are a foreigner you do not have to comply with any formalities, but if you are a citizen of the United States you have to comply with the requirements of the present law. Furthermore, under the Bern Convention you are bound to give United States copyright in unpublished works. That would mean that by virtue of our mere adherence to the convention foreigners would get United States copyright in their unpublished works, while our own citizens do not get it under the United States statutes, whatever rights they may have being in common law; or, as Mr. Swarts pointed out, we would be going through the gestures of adherence, while not complying with the requirements as to legislation in the case of countries that have become members of the union."[4]

That fundamental change in our copyright law would have ensued from our adherence to the Bern Convention is indicated by Goldman:

"Adherence to the Bern Convention required many fundamental changes in the copyright law, and some of the interests concerned felt that the revision of the law for that purpose should be extended to cover also other issues that had arisen. With this broader purpose in view, attorneys for the motion-picture industry in 1924 drafted a complete revision of the law, modeled after the British Copyright Act, designed to adopt the principles of the Bern Convention and to amend the law in other respects. Representative Dallinger introduced this draft on March 24, 1924, as H. R. 8177, and introduced a modified version on May 9, 1924, as H. R. 9137."[5]

Mr. Louis E. Swarts, chairman of the subcommittee on copyright of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America (Inc.), commonly known as the Hays organization, described the events leading up to the drafting of the Dallinger bill:

"Mr. SWARTS: This little sketch historically will help your point of view. The motion-picture industry became interested in copyright. About 3 or 4 years ago, when I personally came in contact with the Author's League and Mr. Schuler, who is here today, I found that the Author's League was interested in the revision of copyright statutes. We discussed the question of the revision of copyright statutes and we found an interesting situation, that there ought to be a rapprochement between the organized labor and authors. They seemed to be the two poles of discussion at that time. We therefore participated with the league and formed a committee consisting of myself, George Creel, Mr. Schuler, Augustus Thomas, and Albert Reid. That committee conferred with Mr. Matthew Woll, representing the Federation of Labor, that its branches concerned in copyright, the International Allied Printing Trades Association. I saw the difficulty of bringing about any rapprochement, and in deference to Mr. Schuler's activity in endeavoring to reach an agreement, the motion picture distributors withdrew from the discussion. Is that correct?

"Mr. SCHULER. That is entirely correct.

"Mr. SWARTS: The employing printers, authors, and others continued their task and attempted to reach an agreement as to legislation which they hoped to propose. We waited patiently for several years. Several bills were introduced, the Tincher bill, the Lodge-Davis bill, and numerous bills were introduced in Congress but no substantial agreement was made. Sometime early in the summer I received an invitation to come again into conference. I went and I found that the gentlemen were in substantial disagreement on the important issues which had agitated them from the beginning, and after attempting with much sincerity to compose their differences and, perhaps suggesting a slight change or two that we had in mind ourselves, questions in regard to copyrighting in the matter of films, passing through the office of Mr. Solberg in the Library of Congress, and we found that nothing could be had in that way. It was suggested at one of the meetings that I should report back to my associates that we should propose a measure to compose their differences and ask them to meet us on the subject. I so reported to our organization and they said we should engage counsel to redraft a copyright statute suited to the times, and propose it to these gentlemen for their cooperation."[6]

Mr. George H. Putnam, representing the National Association of Book Publishers summarized some of the objections to the Dallinger bill:

"A bill has been introduced by Mr. Dallinger, which has been drafted by Messrs. Swartz & Weil, counsel for the Famous Players Lasky Corp.

"The bill drafted by these counsel covers a substantially complete revision of the copyright statute. They state that they would oppose any program which did not provide for a complete revision. The register of copyrights finds ground for objecting to the Swartz-Weil measure, which had not been prepared in cooperation with the Bureau. It is his preference that the United States should enter the Berne Convention and that any plan for complete revision should be held over until this has been done.

"The authors' league finds ground for objection to the Swartz-Weil bill:

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

"(a) The provision as to ownership of motion-picture copyright is not clear.

"(b) The provisions having to do with art productions seem to increase the difficulties for a complete control by the artists.

"(c) The provision for penalties for infringement are weaker than those included in the present statute.

"The book publishers are not prepared to give their approval to the Dallinger bill. They are in accord with the register of copyrights that a complete revision of the statute ought to be made in cooperation with or under the supervision of the bureau of copyrights (of the national association). They find flaws in the wording of certain of the provisions of the Dallinger bill. The most important is that by which, in preserving for books the copyrights of which are owned by American publishers the present manufacturing requirement, while relieving English publishers from such requirement, a very decided advantage is given to the English publishers over their American competitors. The result of such a provision would leave the control of the American market for books by English authors practically in the hands of the English publishers. This would be a detriment not only to the American publisher but to the book-manufacturing interests and would be a disadvantage also to the American reader or book buyer, who would not be as well served with imported editions as he would be with American editions.

"A section in the Dallinger bill provides that if an English author assigns his American copyright to an American publisher and that publisher does not manufacture in America, the copyright is invalidated. This would be a serious matter for the English author and would cause such author to give his preference to English houses under whose management no such provision is necessary."[7]

Among the other witnesses testifying on the bill were:

1. Mr. Eric Schuler, representing the Authors' League of America, Inc., who objected to three sections.

2. Mr. Nathan Burkan, representing the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP) and the Managers Protective Association (an association of theatrical managers), who thought the bill good in some parts but objected to parts which affected the interests of his clients; and

3. Mr. E. S. Mills, representing the Music Publishers Protective Association, who testified particularly with respect to the mechanical copyright features. He took the same position as that taken by ASCAP.

The net result of this effort was that although the proponents of the bill were able to put on record a statement and explanation of its provisions and some opponents were able to record their specific objections, the congressional committee was not able to reach an agreement and therefore did not report out a bill at that session.

[1] Act of Aug. 24, 1912, 37 Stat. 488, ch. 356; act of Mar. 2, 1913, 37 Stat. 724, ch. 97; act of Mar. 28, 1914, 38 Stat. 311, ch. 47, act of Dec. 18, 1919, 41 Stat. 369, ch. 11.

[2] U. S. Congress. House Committee on Patents, Hearing on H. R. 625 and H. R. 9137, 68th Cong., pp. 306, 307.

[3] Op. cit., p. 323.

[4] Op. cit., p. 326.

[5] Goldman, A. A. Copyright Office, Library of Congress: History of Copyright Revision, 1901–54, p. 10.

[6] Hearings, op. cit., pp. 311–12.

[7] Hearings, Op. cit., p. 305. Mr. Arthur W. Weil testified (p. 323) that he had been retained by the Will Hayes organization representing all the leading motion-picture producers for the special purpose of drafting a bill.

Library of Congress Makes First Definitive Study of Major Attempts To Modernize Copyright Law of 1909—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include section 3 of the definitive study made by Freeman W. Sharp, American Law Division of the Library of Congress, of attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909:

III. THE PERKINS BILL, 1925

A second bill of the 68th Congress providing for a major revision of the copyright law was introduced in 1925 by Mr. Randolph Perkins as H. R. 11258. While the Dallinger bill essentially represented the views of the motion-picture producers and distributors, the Perkins bill represented those of the authors. Mr. Perkins stated:

"House bill 11258 represents, as I understand it, the author's idea of a copyright bill."[1]

The bill had, in fact, been drafted by Thorvald Solberg, then Register of Copyrights, in the light of his 27 years' experience as Register and his actual experience in preparing the drafts of the act which had been enacted in 1909. Mr. Solberg stated:

"Mr. SOLBERG. May I ask the indulgence of the committee for one moment to make a personal statement to clear the record?

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. SOLBERG. On the 20th of September I sailed from New York for France. I returned to New York on the 2d day of November, and on the 3d of November was at my desk in my office. I went from France to London, or to England, and in London I received from my office a copy of the Bulletin of the American Authors' League, in which it printed a statement that at a meeting of the council of the league I had been asked to prepare a copyright bill for the general revision of the copyright law and the entry of the United States into the International Copyright Union. When I returned to my desk on the 3d of November, or shortly after that, I think it was a couple of days after, I received a formal letter from the secretary of the Authors' League, submitting the formal request of the president of the league that I should undertake the task. I balanced it for a few days, and then wrote an agreement, and I immediately began the preparation of this bill, the draft of which was completed on the 1st day of December.

"Now, I do not want you to suppose that I evolved out of my head all of the provisions of this bill in that interim of time. You must remember that I have been 27 years, full years, involved in copyright questions as Register of Copyrights. The Copyright Office was a central point for all suggestions relative to copyrights. I must have received thousands of letters containing suggestions as to the amendment of the copyright law. Since the publication in the bulletin of that notice I have received not many letters, but some letters suggesting that if I undertook that task certain considerations should be given to the suggestions made by the writers.

"Mr. REID. Do you claim to be the sole parent of this bill?

"Mr. SOLBERG. I will come to that in a moment, if you will permit me. Out of the accumulation, if I may say, of knowledge in relation to questions of copyright, the bill has grown. I made the original draft for the act of 1909; I printed a number of preparations and compilations and actual drafts—tentative drafts—which were not prepared, however, as a bill to be enacted, but, as a matter of suggestion, and afterwards went to conference, and then to the committees of Congress. During this period, in November, I prepared this bill in my office, and even in the Copyright Office of 97 people, only 1 person had anything to do with it, or was aware of it, except the stenographer who took the notes. That person was my very able colleague, Mr. DeWolfe, a very competent authority on copyright, and who is having printed a very excellent book on the subject, that will have its use in its place. I will add, however, that during that time I corresponded with one person relative to the actual text of this draft; that person was Mr. R. R. Bowker, of New York, with whom I have had a personal friendship for more than 40 years, who during those 40 years has been in every copyright hearing that has taken place in Washington. Our interest in copyright is mutual, and I value very much the suggestions that have come to me from Mr. Bowker, and some of them are embodied in this bill, and those are the only suggestions that have come from any human being with reference to this bill."[2]

Once again George H. Putnam of the National Association of Book Publishers summed up the positions taken by the proponents and opponents of the bill:

"1. It has the tactical advantage of having been drafted by an unprejudiced party, a Government official.

"2. It will have the powerful and continuous backing of the Authors' League of America, who are impatient of further delays and whose members are losing just protection every day under present law.

"3. It will be backed by the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, who have able counsel. They have much to gain by the bill and little to fear from the importing clause which will handicap the book publishers.

"4. It will be favored by the American Library Association because the bill provides for unrestricted importation.

"5. It will be opposed by labor because the manufacturing clause for American books was omitted and importing is made wide open.

"6. It will be opposed by the phonograph and player-piano people, as it abolishes the fixed 2-cent fee for records and rolls and closes the open road to much European music.

"7. It will be opposed by the broadcasting interests because it confirms the control of the composer over all public performances of music and extends similar control to authors.

"8. It will be opposed by the motion-picture producers, who have a bill of their own (the Dallinger bill) which they like better and because they find in the phraseology of this bill certain legal pitfalls.

"9. It will be opposed by the motion-picture theater owners because they are fighting the control of the composers over the public use of music in their theaters.

"10. The book publishers will suggest one amendment with regard to importations because as the provision is drafted, foreign authors have not the same rights here as American authors and American publishers have dealings with both.

"11. According to the Authors' League Bulletin, January, 1925, 'the bill as drafted omitted reference to several points on which other interests might seek its amendment, and to which the Authors' League would oppose no objection, provided there was no

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

actual invasion of the creator's rights as defined in the bill'."[2]

The list of witnesses for and against the bill included:

THOSE FOR THE BILL

Thorvald Solberg, Register of Copyrights.

Augustus Thomas, New York City, Authors' League, American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, Council of the American Dramatists.

Ellis Parker Butler, New York City, ex-president of the Authors' League and member of the executive council thereof.

Will Irwin, Authors' League, author, playwright, newspaper and magazine writer.

Marc Connelly, Authors' League.

Robert Underwood Johnson, secretary, American Copyright League, ex-editor of the Century Magazine, ex-Ambassador to Italy, poet.

Alice Duer Miller, Authors' League.

Arson Lowell, President of the Artists' Guild of the Authors' League.

Walter D. Teague, former president of the Artists' Guild.

Gene Buck, member of the Council of the Artists' League, of the American Dramatists' Association and president of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers.

Harry Von Tilzer, New York City, songwriter.

Charles K. Harris, music publisher, lyric, music and scenario writer and book publisher.

Dr. M. Llewellyn Raney, American Library Association.

J. Hertley Manners, playwright.

Mrs. William A. Dupruy, League of American Penwomen.

E. C. Mills, chairman of the board, Music Publishers Protective Association, member of ASCAP.

Nathan Burkan, ASCAP, Authors' League, and the American Dramatist, New York City.

William Hamilton Osborne, Authors' League.

Eric Schuler, Authors' League.

Mrs. Ethelbert Nevin, widow of Ethelbert Nevin, composer of The Rosary, Mighty Lak' a Rose, Narcissus, etc.

THOSE AGAINST THE BILL OR CERTAIN FEATURES OF THE BILL

George Haven Putnam, chairman of the bureau of copyright, National Association of Book Publishers.

Mathew Woll, president, International Allied Printing Association; vice president, American Federation of Labor.

M. J. O'Toole, president, Motion Picture Owners of America.

John G. Paine, Victor Talking Machine Co.

Charles H. Butler, Washington, D. C., Copyright Bureau, National Association of Book Publishers.

Paul Klugh, executive chairman, National Association of Broadcasters.

F. S. Silcox, United Typothetae of America, New York Employing Printers Association.

Alfred A. Knopf, publisher.

Thomas R. Rutter, D. Appleton & Co.

Alfred L. Smith, Music Industries Chamber of Commerce.

Henry Lanahan, Thomas A. Edison Co.

Arthur E. Garmaize, the Columbia Phonograph Co.

G. W. Case, Jr., Brunswick-Balke-Collander Co.

George B. Veattys, the Aeolian Co.

H. B. Schoad, the Aeolian Co.

Gabriel L. Hess, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Arthur W. Weil, the Motion Picture Producers and Exhibitors of America, the National Publishers Association.

H. M. Richey, Detroit, Mich., Motion Picture Theater Owners of Michigan.

Esther Hunt, New York City, representing various art dealers, art publishers, and artists.

Louis E. Swarts, chairman, Copyright Committee, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, attorney for Famous Players—Lasky Corp.

The net result of the hearing was that no action was taken by the committee and the bill died with the adjournment of that Congress.

[1] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, Hearings on H. R. 11258, 68th Cong., p. 12.

[2] Hearings on H. R. 11258, *Op. cit.* pp. 126–7.

[3] Hearings on H. R. 11258, op cit. p. 194.

Library of Congress Makes First Definitive Study of Major Attempts To Modernize Copyright Law of 1909—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am including section 4 of the study made for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the various attempts which have been made to modernize the copyright law of 1909:

IV. THE ATTEMPT AT AGREEMENT WITHIN THE INDUSTRY, 1925–26

In the period between the adjournment of the 68th Congress and the convening of the 69th, a further attempt was made to design and draft a bill acceptable to the various interested factions. At the last hearing on the Perkins bill in the 68th Congress, when it became apparent that there were a number of diverse opinions, it was voted that a subcommittee should be appointed to act during the recess period. The subcommittee's mission was to arrange, if possible, for the various groups to meet in conferences in order to compose as many differences as possible before another effort at legislation was attempted. As a result of this effort, and of the suggestions of the subcommittee, various groups such as the Authors' League of America, called a meeting at the offices of the Bar Association of New York on April 22, 1925. This resulted in the informal organization of a committee on copyright revision. Numerous meetings were held and some differences were ironed out; however, as indicated by the hearing occurring in the 69th Congress, little was actually achieved. The report of the informal committee on copyright revision appears in the hearings held by the House Committee on Patents in the 69th Congress on H. R. 10434 at page 80. The report lists the conferees as follows:

The Authors' League of America, which represented its subsidiary organizations.

The Authors' Guild.

The American Dramatists.

The Artists' Guild.

The Screen Writers' Guild.

American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

The League of American Pen Women.

The National Association of Book Publishers.

The National Publishers Association (periodical publishers).

The Christian Science Committee on Publications.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association.

The Music Publishers Protective Association.

The Music Industries Chamber of Commerce.

The Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

The Motion Picture Exhibitors.

The National Association of Broadcasters including the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. and the Radio Corporation of America.

The International Theatrical Association.

The Motion Picture Theater Owners of America.

The American Hotel Association.

The Committee of Artists, Art Publishers, and Art Dealers including the American Federation of Arts, the American Art Bureau, and Picture Publishers Association.

The International Printing Trades Union.

The United Typothetae of America.

The Employing Bookbinders of America.

The American Library Association.

During the 1st session of the 69th Congress, Mr. Vestal, chairman of the House Committee on Patents, introduced the bill prepared by the informal committee as H. R. 10434, stating:

"This bill which as introduced by me at this session is the result of many conferences as I understand between the various parties interested wherein they attempted to iron out their difference as far as they could. I do not want to leave the impression that I understand them to be together on all of the propositions but some of the difficulties have been eliminated."[1]

Mr. F. A. Silcox, chairman of the informal committee on copyright-law revision, commented on the net results as follows:

"The net result of that was through all the hearings and the subcommittees of our own committee and an attempt was made to come to an agreement on all the clauses that it was possible. It developed that there were some clauses upon which there was an irreconcilable difference of opinion and in that committee it was made clear all the way through that it was a conference committee and not a confirmatory committee; that is a committee set up purely for the purpose of endeavoring to see how far it was possible to go in a reconciliation of those differences of opinion. The Authors League naturally was very vitally interested in this bill and have been conferring over this entire period of time with most of these interests with the view of trying to arrive as I say at some kind of a bill which would bring out into relief those sections in which there was an irreconcilable difference of opinion and those on which we could agree. The bill as presented represents the result of these committee deliberations. A report was sent to you, Mr. Chairman, which states "that certain groups that were named definitely made reservations in regard to this bill but on the whole it represents results of about a year's deliberations."

"Mr. BLOOM. Which bill is that?

"Mr. SILCOX. H. R. 10434. And all I want to say as chairman of that committee is that these discussions were carried on in a serious effort to see whether or not in a spirit of conference and conciliation we could not arrive at some bill that would represent as many agreements as we could get. It does not represent the agreement in total of all

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

groups that were in that hearing and several of the groups made it specifically clear during the hearings that they reserved the right to make their statement clear, whether in favor of or in opposition to the bill." [2]

During the course of the hearings on the Vestal bill, H. R. 10434, the lineup of the opposing interests was as follows:

Those in favor of the Vestal bill were:

William H. Osborne, the Authors' League.

Will Irwin, the Authors' League.

LeRoy Scott, the Authors' League.

The Honorable William N. Vaile, Representative in Congress from Colorado.

Frederick G. Melcher, R. R. Bowker Co., Publishers Association.

Mrs. Inez Hayes Haines Irwin, president, Authors' Guild of America.

John J. A. Murphy, artist, Authors' League.

Miss Leila Mechlin, secretary, the American Federation of Arts.

John D. Phillips, Houghton Mifflin & Co., Boston.

David S. Beasley, president, Subscription Book Publishers Association.

John McCrae, president, Publishers Association, president, Dutton & Co.

Gene Buck, president, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, member of the council of the Authors' League, and its copyright committee.

Karl W. Kirchwey, counsel, Hearst organization.

Eustace Seligman, the National Book Sellers' Association.

Clifford P. Smith, Christian Science Publishing Interest.

Bernard A. Kosicki, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce.

H. R. Lamb, National Association of Book Publishers.

Authur W. Weil, counsel, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

William H. Osborne, chairman, copyright committee, Authors' League of America.

Those who opposed the bill or certain features of the bill were:

George H. Putnam, chairman, National Association of Book Publishers.

Miss Esther Hunt, American Federation of Arts, American Art Bureau.

R. B. Burchard, president, the John Church Co.

M. L. Raney, the American Library Association.

Dr. William Mather Lewis, president, George Washington University, representing the Association of Urban Universities.

Harrison E. Howe, the American Chemical Society.

Prof. David M. Robinson, the American Philological Association, the Archeological Institute of America, the College Art Association.

E. N. Curtis, the Association of American Colleges.

Truman Michelson, the Linguistic Society of America.

John C. French, the Modern Language Association of America.

Dr. Henry G. Doyle, the American Association of University Professors.

Henry B. Learned, the American Historical Association.

Joy E. Morgan, the National Educational Association.

Charles R. Mann, the American Council on Education.

Victor S. Clark, editor, the Living Age.

Alfred L. Smith, secretary and general manger, Music Industry Chamber of Commerce.

Stephen L. Newman, the Association of Picture Publishers, the American Art Bureau, the Associations of Art and Art Dealers.

George C. Lucas, executive secretary, National Publishers Association.

Karl Fenning, the American Patent Law Association.

L. S. Baker, the National Association of Broadcasters.

Fulton Brylawski, the Motion Picture Theater Owners of America.

Thorvald Solberg, Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

J. G. Paine, the Victor Talking Machine Co.

E. C. Mills, New York and Washington.

George D. Beattys, the Aeolian Co.

Although this hearing was on the Vestal bill, H. R. 10434, nevertheless Lawrence B. Evans, of the Copyright Committee, American Bar Association, testified in behalf of the Perkins bill which had been reintroduced as H. R. 5841. Mr. Evans stated:

"I may say briefly, however, that the report of the committee endorses the principles which are embodied in the Perkins bill. Those principles briefly summarized and as understood by the committee are as follows: We favor the abolition of all procedural requirements such as notice, deposit of copies and registration of claims, in other words we think literary property should be treated as other property and that the rights of the owner should not be made dependent upon any procedural formalities. On the other hand if the owner desired to register his property it would seem to us wise that provision should be made for voluntary registration. In the second place, we think that the requirements for domestic manufacture should be abolished. Literary property, like other property, should receive full recognition as property, and ownership should not be made dependent upon the place of manufacture. In the third place, we think that compulsory licensing for the mechanical reproduction of any kind of literary property and any statutory regulation as to fees should be abolished. The owner should have full control of his property. He should be at liberty to negotiate with the other persons as to his right to property in any way he sees fit. It seems to us that compulsory licensing or any regulation as to fees is incompatible with full recognition of literary property. In the fourth place, as literary property is property it should be subject to assignment and the assignee or licensee should have the right to sue in his own name and to protect his interest in that property as he could protect his interest in any other kind of personal property. And in the fifth place, we favor joining the International Copyright Union." [3]

The congressional committee made no report and both bills, the Vestal bill, H. R. 10434, and the Perkins bill, H. R. 5841, died with the adjournment of the 69th Congress. More than a year of effort had been spent by the private informal committee of the industry and the congressional committee, with nothing on the statute books to show for it.

[1] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents. Hearings on H. R. 10434, 69th Cong., p. 14.

[2] Hearings on H. R. 10434, op. cit., pp. 17, 18.

[3] Hearings on H. R. 10434, Op. cit., pp. 223, 224. The full report of the American Bar Association on the Perkins bill appears in the hearings at pages 224 through 226.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The Need for a Moral "Quantum Jump"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Edward A. Conway, S. J., of Creighton University, made a remarkable speech on May 10 regarding the desirability of American leadership toward realistic revision of the United Nations Charter.

Father Conway expressed grave disappointment that our official leaders, and even such United Nations advocates as former President Truman and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt have said that now was not the time, for courageous efforts toward U. N. revision.

There were two great areas in which the original charter fell short of ideals proclaimed by Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders, Father Conway pointed out. These were the areas of disarmament and the absolute great power veto. Yet we are being told that now is not the time to correct these shortcomings.

Father Conway first remarked that the potential time of charter revision is not now, as critics suggest. The question is simply whether some time in the autumn session of the U. N. the United States might not take the lead in suggesting a revision conference in 1956 or 1957, perhaps 1 year or 2 years later.

He next suggested that those now timid about trying to revise the charter may be seriously underestimating the impact of hydrogen bombs and other nuclear weapons on the mind of mankind. He suggests that by 1956 and 1957 we shall have entered fully the period of true atomic stalemate, with two hydrogen-powered colossi "glaring malevolently at each other across a trembling world," with mankind enjoying no more than what Churchill called "the precarious peace enjoyed by two scorpions in a bottle."

"I suggest," said Father Conway, that in 1956–57 "the statesmen will be under far greater pressures from their peoples to make concessions that will bring peace through disarmament than they ever were in 1945," when the U. N. Charter was adopted.

Father Conway calls for a "quantum jump" in the field of moral and political thinking, comparable to the great physicists' breakthrough that achieved the hydrogen bomb itself.

Mr. Speaker, it may or may not be that Father Conway is correct in estimating the pressures for peace, disarmament, and full-scale U. N. Charter revision that he foresees existing in 1956 and 1957. But he is a religious leader of wisdom and good will, and he worked diligently back in 1943 and 1945 with leaders of the Protestant and Jewish faiths to proclaim principles for the statesmen that seemed to reflect the best in our religious tradition and idealism.

I believe that what he had to say on May 10 should not be lightly disregarded, that it should be very seriously considered by all those who both believe in the United Nations and want to make it a stronger, more effective instrument for preserving mankind from the ruination of nuclear war. I submit that it should be seriously considered by those who think that now is not the time and by our official spokesmen, and by those colleagues of ours in the other Chamber who bear great responsibility for giving advice and consent on our foreign policy. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the

text of Father Conway's speech be printed in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

U. N. CHARTER REVIEW: A QUESTION OF TIMING

(By Rev. Edward A. Conway)

The cause of U. N. Charter revision suffered three staggering blows on the 18th, 20th and 21st days of April. I refer to the testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Review of the United Nations Charter by former Presidents Harry Truman and Herbert Hoover, and by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Ex-Presidents Truman and Hoover left the net impression that little could be expected from any attempt to amend the charter at this time. Mrs. Roosevelt flatly opposed a review conference. She would have the United States, when the question comes up for discussion in the 10th Assembly, agree only to the establishment of a U. N. committee to consider the possibility of charter revision some time in the indefinite future.

After the testimony of these three experienced public personalities highly respected by sizable but, I might add, separate segments of the American public, the New York Times correspondent concluded that as of April 21:

"There are growing signs that the committee will propose that this country should not support any alteration because of the present tension of the world scene."

If this is an accurate forecast, it means that the State Department, confronted by this discouraging senatorial advice, may hesitate to direct the United States delegation even to vote for the holding of a review conference.

It seems safe to say that the State Department as of today still favors a conference, but not too firmly. In his testimony before the subcommittee on May 3, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., according to the New York Times report: "suggested that the United States should support the holding of a charter-review conference but should seek to confine amendments to the elimination of the veto on new members." Although Mr. Lodge insisted that his testimony "should not be regarded as representing the settled conclusions of the administration," it must represent at least the trend of the administration's thinking. It tends to confirm private advices I have received that the State Department, though still desiring a conference, is resigned to making revision proposals for propaganda purposes only. Mr. Lodge, according to the Times, "emphasized that he was opposed to any effort to open the charter to general amendment, and specifically to any changes which go toward a world government." This was Ambassador Lodge speaking, not Senator BRICKER.

This was, indeed, a far cry from the position of Mr. Dulles in 1953. In a letter to Senator WILEY, dated August 12, 1953, the Secretary of State declared that:

"The Department will favor the calling of a review conference when the question is put to the 1955 session of the United Nations General Assembly."

In his address to the American Bar Association on August 26, 1953, Mr. Dulles repeated this promise, and criticized the "serious inadequacies of the charter." Among these was the lack, because the San Francisco Conference did not know about the atomic bomb, of sufficiently emphatic and realistic provisions for disarmament, the requirement of unanimity among the great powers in all important decisions, and too little attention in the charter to "law which embodies eternal principles of justice and morality." At that time he thought that the review conference would be comparable in its importance to the original San Francisco Conference." Mr. Dulles went even further in his testimony before the Wiley subcommittee on January 18, 1954, reiterating his suggestions of the preceding August and adding three more, strengthening of collective security, achievement of universality of membership, and the introduction of weighted voting in the General Assembly.

What has happened between the letter of Mr. Dulles to Senator WILEY in 1953 and Mr. Lodge's testimony before the subcommittee on the 3d day of May? How account for what seems to be a drastic change in State Department policy? As far as I can determine, this shocking shift represents the triumph, temporary, I trust, of the antirevisionists among the supporters of the United Nations. These antirevisionists directed the preparation of studies, conducted conferences, and distributed literature, in a cleverly conceived and adroitly directed campaign to undercut Mr. Dulles. While ostensibly encouraging study of charter revision in response to the urgent invitations of the State Department, they have subtly shifted that discussion to the question of whether or not a review conference should be held at all. By raising a whole mountain range of difficulties in the way of charter revision, they have intimidated many who sincerely want a strengthened United Nations.

The main line of their attack is reflected in this quotation from Mr. Truman's testimony:

"If we go into such a conference with inflexible demands for particular changes, we can be sure that we will encounter strong Communist opposition, and there may be strong differences of opinion among the free nations, and the net result of such a clash may be concentration by the peoples of the world on the defects rather than on the virtues of the charter, and a weakening of the United Nations just when strength is most needed. This could do very great damage so far as the effectiveness of the United Nations is concerned."

This does not sound like Harry Truman. Indeed is it unworthy of him. Consider the loaded condition: "if we go into such a conference with inflexible demands." Suppose we went in with the spirit of sincere negotiation? And on what does he base his assumption that the United Nations today has any real effectiveness to damage? What disappoints me most is the un-Trumanlike timidity of this passage. It is an almost verbatim replay of the Cassandre croakings of the antirevisionists, who paint a scarifying picture of the evils that would attend any attempt to tamper with their sacrosanct charter. "You'll give aid and comfort to the enemies of the United Nations." "You'll intensify international tension." (That means that you'll antagonize the Russians.) "You'll cause disappointment and disillusionment among true seekers after peace if you don't succeed, and of course you won't succeed because the Russians have an ultimate veto."

While I am ready to admit that these arguments spring from real devotion to the charter, I consider them the expression of a fundamental fear, fear of risking any decisive action. All the elaborate arguments against even calling a revision conference strike me as being really rationalizations of this deeplying fearfulness.

Personally, I am not impressed by the warnings of the standpatters. I have heard them all before: "Let well enough alone." "Don't upset the applecart." "You'll do more harm than good." I heard them just 10 years ago in almost identical circumstances.

It was in the fall of 1944, as you will recall, that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for an international organization were published. I was deeply interested in the proposals, since I had been responsible for the compilation of the seven-point pattern for peace issued in October 1943 by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Federal Council of Churches, and the Synagogue Council of America and signed by 147 leaders of the 3 religious groups. The pattern for peace was based on a comparative study of dozens of peace plans they had published in preceding years, and was designed to make available to our policy planners the unanimous position of the major religions of the country. Let me direct your attention to the length and breadth and depth of the fifth point, the one on the need for an international organization to maintain peace. It reads:

"An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of international law; (b) guarantee the faithful fulfillment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration, and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law."

Upon publication of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, various church bodies issued analyses of the document, most of them severely critical, and none more so than that of the Catholic bishops of the United States in their annual statement of November 1944. Acting on the conviction that our policymakers should have a consensus of church criticism, I made a comparative study and found the churches substantially agreed on the need for nine improvements. In cooperation with a minister and a rabbi, who contributed to their final formulation, these suggestions were published April 5, 1945, in a leaflet known as Goals for San Francisco.

At once we were bombarded with warnings by the "leave well enough alone" school. The big powers were satisfied with Dumbarton Oaks. The plan was as much as could be hoped for. The Russians wouldn't agree to anything more. This would embarrass the State Department and do a disservice to the cause of peace. What presumption, what foolhardiness, what irresponsibility. Leave well enough alone; don't upset the applecart.

Unintimidated, we launched an intensive campaign in our respective religious presses calling on our communicants to bring these improvements to the attention of the State Department and of the members of the United States delegation. Senator Vandenberg's secretary told me he received basketsful of letters and telegrams. The rabbi and I went to San Francisco and distributed copies of the goals throughout the conference. I lectured on them 17 times in the San Francisco Bay area. Mr. Dulles, chief adviser to the United States delegation, who had helped to draft the earlier statement, the pattern for peace, and to introduce it on the air in a joint broadcast, was deeply interested in this new interfaith effort. He told me that he had personally distributed copies of the goals in the drafting committees.

There is no way of knowing, of course, just how effective the goals themselves were. Many lay organizations were making somewhat similar appeals; the smaller nations had arrived laden with proposals for amendment. I merely report that 7 of the 9 suggested improvements were actually adopted. The exceptions were limitation of the veto and provision of actual disarmament. Judging from an incident at the end of the conference, I would say the goals made some impact. Senator Tom Connally, chief of the American delegation, and Mr. Dulles had to leave a day or two early. But they held a press conference in which the Senator, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was asked if he thought the Senate would ratify the charter. He replied that he was sure the Senate would do so. Then, and I quote the New York Times story:

"Mr. Dulles predicted that the very fact that the charter measured up to the 10

points laid down April 5 by leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish Churches was the best evidence that Senator Connally was correct in predicting ratification by the Senate."

Mr. Dulles then distributed to the reporters the copies he had left of "Goals for San Francisco," and the Times printed all 10 recommendations in full. The 10th approved of the idea of forming such an organization.

I might add that in his message to the Denver convention of the National Council of Churches on December 11, 1952, Mr. Dulles acknowledged that—

"The churches, particularly in this country, performed a historic task in developing public sentiment for world organization and in influencing the character of that organization."

Even then he urged "the free people of this country" to "take the lead in making the United Nations into a more effective instrument for achieving international order and justice." On the same occasion, Henry Cabot Lodge, according to the news story, predicted that in 1955 there would undoubtedly be a meeting of the United Nations to review the charter. "We should all be thinking of the great import of that meeting," he said, "and you who rendered such valuable service in developing public interest for creating the United Nations should, I believe, renew your efforts to support its further progress and evolution."

Mr. Dulles, of course, was in error at that press conference in claiming that the charter measured up to all the 10 points of the religious leaders. It fell short in the areas of disarmament and the big power veto. Now we have another chance to work for those essential improvements; and I am as little inclined to listen to the cautionary whispers of the standpatters today as I was 10 years ago. On the contrary, I strongly believe that there will never be a better opportunity to make the charter capable of supporting a veto-free, enforceable disarmament system than in a review conference in 1956 or 1957, agreed upon, be it noted, in the fall of 1955 by the U. N. Assembly.

Not least among the rationalizations of the anti-revisionists is the one they have cast about the question of timing. A favorite argument is that "this is not the time to call a conference." "The United States should not urge the calling of a conference at this time." "The present world tensions make a review conference inadvisable and even dangerous." It is vitally important to engage this question of timing more closely. It will soon be seen that it is more than a matter of putting the time clause in its proper place in the sentence. So let's break down the problem.

Obviously, there is here no question of having a conference now, say this month. The phrase "at this time" and its variations "goes with" the verb "proposing." Actually, there are 2 times for proposing, and 2 different propositions to be made. If you think that is confusing, you are indubitably correct. Any American who proposes today that a Review Conference be held is really proposing that the United States delegation, sometime during the fall U. N. Assembly, say 6 months from this date, propose that a Review Conference be held from 1 to 2 years from then. The question at once arises as to the wisdom of deciding now, on the basis of the current world situation, considering how swiftly international events are moving and positions changing.

Mrs. Roosevelt, for example, in the only quotation given in the New York Times from her testimony said (and this is just as it appeared), "There are changes in the world situation of today that a full revision conference might be actually harmful." This seems to imply that world conditions today which are presumed without proof to be unfavorable to charter revision will be the same 6 months from now. While I do not quarrel with President Eisenhower's claim to a sixth sense in the matter of war, I would require some justification for Mrs. Roosevelt's prophecy. I am conceding for the sake of the argument that a relaxation of tensions is necessary for fruitful negotiation on charter review and especially disarmament. Actually, I believe with Mr. Grenville Clerk that all the really important political settlements will probably come only as a result flowing from an accepted disarmament plan; in other words that the current tenseness and suspicion is generated by the desperate armament race and will not be dissipated until a serious and successful effort toward disarmament has been made.

But to return to the question of timing. To be concrete, I think it would be imprudently premature for the Senate subcommittee to make any public announcement, if it should decide soon, against approving of United States support for the calling of a Review Conference. It should at least await the results of the Big Four conference at the summit approved today by the President, which, as reported will deal with disarmament.

There are further considerations. The real time of decision will come during the debate in the General Assembly this fall. It would be the solemn responsibility of the delegates to decide then whether a review conference should be held a whole year or even 2 years later. This, I submit, would call for statesmanship at once imaginative, honest, and courageous. I stress the need for imagination. The delegates will have to project themselves imaginatively into 1956 and even 1957 and try to picture the pressures perhaps not present even in late 1955, to find a solution to the ever mounting atomic-hydrogen armament race. I am convinced that those pressures will exist, and that anyone can convince himself that I am right by courageously thinking through to those coming years.

I firmly believe that in a year—two at the most—the world will find itself in the situation described by Mr. Grenville Clark 2 years ago, on April 24, 1953, at the annual dinner of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia:

"The essential point lies in the rapid and terrific increase in the destructiveness of modern weapons. This increase proceeds on a scale and at a rate hardly yet realized. It creates a threat to all mankind of so unprecedented a nature as to create unprecedented pressures to find a solution. The seriousness of that threat is so great, as to vitiate, in my view, the current talk that we may drift along for 30 or 40 years in a state of tense armed truce. The colossal power and threat of the new weapons will, I believe, bring the situation to a head within a much shorter time. The world will then choose which road it will follow—whether toward a disarmed world organized under world law, or toward new and greater destruction."

Already we are beginning to realize the dimensions of the threat. We have it on the high authority of Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary for Air, in his book, Power and Policy, published in the fall of 1954, that:

"We are moving relentlessly toward this date of absolute Russian air-atomic power, when they will have enough bombs and planes to destroy our cities, our industry and, if we are not properly prepared, our ability to hit back. We should assume for the purposes of our national policy and planning that the Russians will reach this absolute point during the year 1956."

We should make this assumption now for the "purposes of our national planning and policy" specifically with reference to the possible Charter Review Conference.

Mr. Finletter addresses himself to the same pressures described by Grenville Clark. He comments on the fact that not even the fission or atomic bomb made the United States do anything very vigorous to lead the world to enforced peace, even when "stimulus after stimulus and evidence after evidence came in, that war was becoming a mortal threat to the United States and all the rest of civilization." He thinks, however, that the hydrogen bomb will supply the needed stimulus. "It is different," he says, "and we know it is different." "We know," he continues, "that although it may have been sensible, or at least acceptable, for us not to have done any more than we did to work for an enforced peace before the hydrogen bomb in the hands of the Russians became a known fact, it is no longer sensible or acceptable. And the United States is not deterministically inclined. If it becomes obvious that a present course of action is foolish and unless changed will do great damage to the country, we will, I think, want to change it regardless of how deeply imbedded in practice, creed and tradition the present course may be."

The bitter fact we must face, however, is that our policymakers are not acting on that assumption. That seems to be the clear implication of these words of Mr. Walter Lippmann in his syndicated column for May 3:

"Our trouble, in my view, is that we have never adapted the great conceptions of our foreign policy to the revolutionary consequences which have followed from the Soviet Union's achievement of nuclear weapons. One basic conception of our foreign policy—in that it envisages a ring of anti-Communist states—is out of date. The conception was worked out under Truman and Acheson before 1949, that is to say before we knew that the Soviet Union was breaking our monopoly of the atomic bomb. Since that time, it has been the inexorable logic of atomic armaments that the borderland nations must, and that they will, seek security and survival in policies to prevent war, and to avoid being involved in war if war cannot be prevented. Since 1949, despite all the grandoise pacts floating on the surface of events [with the Bonn treaty, the United States is now in 18 of these pacts], there has been a deep and steady undertow which has been dragging the nonatomic powers—which include Japan and Germany, all the little border states and others too—into some kind of middle position where they have a hope, a chance, of not becoming involved in an atomic war.

"Our policy, which is to expect every anti-Communist nation to line up with us in a posture of defiance, is incompatible with the realities of nuclear weapons."

This argument strikes to the very heart of the basic concept of the United Nations—collective security by voluntary association. Will it not have seeped into the chancelleries of the world in the next 6 months? In the next couple of years?

As Mr. Lippman says, the reappraisal of our current ideas, however agonizing it may be, is unavoidable. Let us hope, he adds, that it will be done by lucid and candid leadership from the top.

We can help that leadership in its agonizing task by giving as wide currency as possible to what Mr. Lippmann calls the facts of life in the age of nuclear weapons. What we must develop is, in the words of Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, "a collective realization of the ugly awfulness of allout atomic warfare such as an individual possesses when faced with sudden death. To postpone the soul's parting company with the body," he continued, "a man often finds energy, will, and capabilities he never before suspected he possessed. If the

world can come to realize that this planet, which once was paradise, may soon become an annex of hell, it will find tremendous new hidden reserves to develop nondestructive solutions for the bitter problems that separate the Free World from the Soviet." I am persuaded that this realization can be achieved and that therefore Mr. Truman was unduly pessimistic in his testimony before the subcommittee. He was warning that "We ought not to underestimate the difficulties and dangers involved in trying to get improvements at this time. And we ought to be extremely careful not to lose what we already have in the United Nations, because what we have now is very essential to world peace. "We should consider," he continued, "that the circumstances were more favorable to getting agreement out of 50 different nations in 1945 than they are now." Here I must interpose the point that it is not a question of now, but a question of how favorable circumstances will be in the fall of 1955, first of all, and, which is the crucial question, a year or more from then.

Continued Mr. Truman:

"All around the world, nations were prostrate and exhausted from 4 years of conflict. In this atmosphere of suffering, uncertainty, and continued fighting, the people yearned for peace. Statesmen were under pressure from their peoples to make concessions that would bring peace to the world. Peace and an end to suffering were the universal cry, even on the part of the Russians, whose losses had been among the worst suffered by any nation." "These," he said, "were the circumstances in which the charter was drawn up and signed. I do not have to point out to you that it would be much harder to get similar agreements from national leaders in 1955 than it was in 1945. And I respectfully suggest that this is something you should always have in mind when you consider amending the charter today."

I suggest that by 1956–57 the statesmen will be under far greater pressures from their peoples to make concessions that will bring peace through disarmament than they ever were in 1945. By that time we shall have entered into the period of so-called atomic stalemate, when both Russia and the United States will have enough atomic and hydrogen bombs to wipe each other out. By that time will be fulfilled President Eisenhower's dire prophecy of two hydrogen-powered clossi glaring malevolently at each other across a trembling world. And the peoples of the world will have learned in days of watchfulness and nights of worry the pitiful flimsiness of the peace Sir Winston Churchill has popularized, the peace of mutual terror, the precarious peace enjoyed by two scorpions in a bottle. I consider it a psychological certainty that the peoples, once they do realize their predicament, will turn with a great rush in search of what Mr. Murray called nondestructive solutions if only to save themselves from an international nervous breakdown.

I submit finally that sometime in 1956 or 1957 this realization will be widespread and this search serious. People will know, likewise, the truth of Mr. Finletter's warning that "the time of absolute Russian air atomic power of and hydrogen bombs carried mainly by big manned bombers will not last long." They will know by then that intercontinental ballistic missiles, with atomic and hydrogen warheads, able to speed from Moscow to Washington in 30 minutes, will be just around the corner. Mr. Finletter, who is one of the few really imaginative statesmen I know of, contemplaitng this vision of unstoppable guided missiles, then remarked: "It does seem that we now are talking about our last chance to control these weapons, the last chance that man will be given to prevent his own science for destruction from ending his civilization and himself."

Do you wonder that I want to see a review conference in 1956 or 1957 in which these realizations may be voiced, and answer made to the demand for peaceful solutions? It is quite possible that even Soviet Russia will have achieved by then this cold realization of the literally dead-end nature of the so-called armed equilibrium—that, as AEC Commissioner Murray once phrased it, "even in the U. S. S. R., Marx should eventually give way to the commonsense element in the instinct for self-preservation."

It is in such a receptive climate in 1956 or 1957 that the proposal of what Mr. Murray calls a "quantum jump" in world politics can be made with good hope of acceptance. In layman's language, a "quantum jump" may be defined as a long leap onto a new and unfamiliar plane—something like an aircraft breaking through the sound barrier. As Stewart Alsop defined the term last Friday, "quantum jump" is scientists' shorthand for an unprecedented, situation-transforming scientific breakthrough. In a discussion of the "quantum jump" achieved in the production of the hydrogen bomb, Mr. Murray said all of 2 years ago at Duquesne University: "Now the times cry out urgently for another 'quantum jump' but of an altogether different kind. This time a 'quantum jump' is needed not in technology but in world politics, that most difficult form of the 'art of the possible'." You and I know that this "quantum jump" is enforceable disarmament under a regime of limited world law administered by a revised United Nations. I hope you agree with me by now that the time and place for such a proposal is in a Charter Review Conference in 1956 or 1957. I make bold to predict that if that conference is not held then it will never be held.

The alarming fact is that as of today the odds are against its being held. Unless the United States this fall takes the forceful initiative, showing convincing evidence of its sincere desire for meaningful amendments primarily in the area of disarmament, I doubt very much that the conference will be held. That is why I was so disturbed and disappointed by Mr. Truman's testimony. On this question he said: "If the majority of the nations desire a review conference I do not think we should oppose it. I only believe," he added, "that we should approach it with caution and with full realization that it may be impossible to get any worthwhile changes under present circumstances."

There again is that confusion over time. We should not be talking in terms of present circumstances. But what distresses me is the complete abdication of American leadership which Mr. Truman advocated. It is so grossly un-Trumanlike, that I can hardly believe he was in earnest. This advice echoes all too perfectly the timidities of the anti-revisionists. And this counsel will prevail unless strenuous efforts are made immediately to counteract it.

Therefore I would call upon all those who are still studying charter revision to stop and take stock of the situation. While they have been buried in their studies, placidly assuming that their suggestions would get an airing in a review conference, forces have been working to forestall that conference and already are well on the way to success. All those who sincerely believe that a lasting peace demands a strengthened United Nations, and who are not obsessed by a blinding solicitude for the prestige of the U. N. as now constituted, should drop their studies and concentrate on developing a demand for powerful American initiative in favor of a conference. Drop the text, I might say, and study the context, the context of the times, especially the world context of 1956 and 1957.

We must accept as true of this case Ben Franklin's observation that "the best public measures are seldom adopted from previous wisdom, but forced by the occasion." Our immediate and urgent task is to picture as vividly as we can the stark dreadfulness of the occasion in which we shall all find ourselves a year or two from now. We must bring home to our policy planners without delay, a realization of the need for strong American initiative this fall which that occasion makes imperative.

The next 3 or 4 months confront us with a supreme opportunity and a responsibility which we cannot in conscience shrug off. In these coming months we must concentrate all our efforts to rout the forces of drift and delay, of fear and defeatism in high and influential circles.

I think it would not be presumption but simple and oh so sobering truth to say that this may well be the moment in history for which, in the providence of God, we have survived as organized advocates of authentic disarmament under enforceable world law. This may well be the moment for which we have been tempered by criticism, contempt, and even contumely. This may well be the moment for which we have been preserved uninfected by the polio-like virus of paralyzing fear. Certainly our courage cannot be questioned. It remains for us speedily to give flashing evidence of our sense of responsibility for the public weal and our creativeness and persuasiveness in the sacred cause of peace. It remains for us to summon forth whatever hidden reserves we may have of energy, will and capabilities and hurl them into the fight for a strong American initiative in favor of a charter review conference.

Let me close with surprisingly appropriate words from Albert Einstein's Out of My Later Years:

"A tremendous effort is indispensable. If it fails now the supranational organization will be built later, but then it will have to be built upon the ruins of a large part of the now-existing world. Let us hope that the abolition of the existing international anarchy will not need to be brought by a self-inflicted world catastrophe, the dimensions of which none of us can possibly imagine. The time is terribly short. We must act now if we are to act at all."

Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there is no substitute for commonsense when acting in the public interest. It is becoming more and more apparent that the exercise of commonsense will be a determining factor in the ultimate decision of the Congress on authorization of Hells Canyon Dam on the Oregon-Idaho border.

No longer do the opponents of Hells Canyon Dam question the economic and engineering aspects of the multipurpose storage project. Their arguments have disintegrated under the spotlight of cold analysis. They have been reduced to sterile and vacuous quibblings.

However, there are many people in my State of Oregon who recognize that there are still diehard disputants, who—because their judgment is obscured by partisanship or warped by pressures

from special interests—continue to turn their backs on the facts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the East Oregonian, which gives a realistic appraisal of the factors involved, and a message from the Oregon State Grange, signed by its State master, Elmer McClure, who is a tireless worker in behalf of the development of Columbia River resources.

There being no objection, the editorial and the message were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the East Oregonian of June 10, 1955]

MR. COSTELLO'S FINDINGS

In the findings of William J. Costello, examiner for the Federal Power Commission, on development in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River, we find this sentence: "The facts seem to point to the inescapable conclusion that with the market and substantial advantage of the Government's credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the middle Snake."

Mr. Costello then proceeded to recommend that Idaho Power Co. be licensed to construct one of the three dams it wants to build in the middle Snake (the Brownlee Dam that would forever block construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam) because it was his opinion that the Congress would not authorize the high dam.

On Wednesday of this week a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs approved by a 3–1 vote, a bill to authorize Federal construction of a high dam. The bill will be taken up by the full committee later this month.

It would be folly to predict, on the basis of the vote of a subcommittee, that this bill will eventually get approval of House and Senate. But, if the legislators make their decisions according to the findings of Mr. Costello (not his recommendations) authorization of the high dam is certain. Senator HENRY M. JACKSON put his finger on it when he said this week, "The FPC examiner as much as told the Congress that if it wanted to save this great resource for the Nation, it had the power to do so."

In writing of this high dam versus low dams controversy we have repeatedly stressed the importance of storage provided by the high dam; the urgent need to construct storage projects on the Columbia and its tributaries. In this regard Mr. Costello wrote:

"The core of the comprehensive plan (Army engineers' famed 308 report) is the so-called main control plan. * * * The main control plan includes the Hells Canyon project, which is called the high dam project. * * *

"More than $1 billion of Federal funds have been invested in projects of the main control plan existing or under construction. * * *

"The high dam project was planned as a key upstream storage project in the main control plan; it would contribute appreciably to the objective of the main control plan. * * *

"The high dam project would contribute about 12 percent of the flood control objective still to be realized under the main control plan.* * *

"The economic feasibility of the authorized but unbuilt plants in the main control plan, especially the four lower Snake plants (Ice Harbor et al.), is dependent upon storage development in the middle Snake."

If the Congress does what is right for the region and its citizens, full development of the water resources of the Snake River, it will approve the high dam. If it does otherwise there can be only one reason. Opposition of the Eisenhower administration to Federal development of water resources will have commanded enough votes to win out over commonsense.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 15, 1955.*

Sen. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution passed by Oregon State Grange in annual session June 6 to 10 submitted for your consideration:

"Whereas Senate bill 1333 authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress; and

"Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill for the following reasons: First, that it will tie in with the Northwest power pool to insure needed power for this area and for national defense, and, second, that it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means, and, third, that it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry and make jobs for thousands and thousands of people. These added industries, this added payroll, added homes, and other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State and county governments, and, fourth, that it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction with interest, and thereafter be a source of income for governmental operations, and, fifth, that we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low cost power in the Northwest; and

"Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation is in need of home support for this measure: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Oregon State Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon Dam bill as originally outlined in Army engineers report No. 308 and that we forward copies of this resoution to all Senators and Representatives of the Northwest States requesting their undivided support of Senate bill 1333."

ELMER MCCLURE,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

Our Indian Friend—Oh Yeah?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, my upbringing taught me that one spent his hard-earned money and received value for it. As we approach another foreign-aid bill, I wonder how long we will continue to spend the American taxpayer's dollar to aid countries that appear to have no sense of appreciation and give no value in return.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the June 23, 1955, edition of the New York Daily News which gives a good case in point:

OUR INDIAN FRIEND—OH, YEAH?

Indian's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made a speech in Moscow Tuesday which we hope got plenty of attention in official Washington.

Nehru, who has been buzzing around Russia for a couple of weeks, praised the Soviet Union in purple prose, bowed low to the memory of the great Lenin, and invited Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin to visit India, but soon.

Nehru went on to say that no country should boss any other country, and that Soviet Russia approves the principles of territorial integrity and respect of sovereignty, nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs, mutual benefits, and peaceful coexistence.

We are now waiting for Mr. Nehru to get specific, and urge his Kremlin pals to act on their alleged beliefs by striking the chains off Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and all the other prisoner nations of the Red slave empire.

Nehru included another item in his Moscow speech. He loudly demanded and predicted the early admission of Red China to the United Nations.

This, of course, was a slap at the United States. The implication is that we should forget the thousands of Americans killed, wounded, tortured, or brainwashed by the Chinese Reds in the Korean war, and let these savages shoot their way into the U. N.

JUST CUT NEHRU OFF UNITED STATES RELIEF

This is the latest in a long series of raps at Uncle Sam by an impudent little squirt in a big job who keeps professing to be a friend of ours.

Seriously, how can decent Americans trust this Nehru, or do business with him; and what sense can there be in our Government's continuing to give him money, goods, and technical help?

Why not just cut India off our relief list right now, and refuse to let Nehru play us for suckers any longer?

Time Is Running Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an open letter to the United States Tariff Commission from the New Haven Clock & Watch Co. which has been manufacturing fine timepieces for 138 years.

This is a clear and tragic picture of what foreign imports are doing to the horological industry, particularly those companies engaged in the making of nonjeweled watches and clocks.

The questions raised by this letter beg explanation. Why this old and honored American industry, which contributed so selflessly to the essential war effort, is allowed to disintegrate before our eyes, is beyond wildest comprehension.

I submit the following so every Member of Congress shall be made aware of these devastating and agonizing conditions:

TIME IS RUNNING OUT

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Last evening the management and the employee union of the New Haven Clock & Watch Co. jointly sponsored a dinner honoring 227 employees who have been with the company for 25 years or more. This group represents 25 percent of our employees and has a collective record of over 8,000 years on the job.

This long and faithful service is typical of United States clockmakers whose craftsmanship has contributed so much to America during the past 150 years, not only at New Haven but throughout the member firms of the Clock Manufacturers Association of America.

Our dinner also celebrated the completion of a retooling process intended to return New Haven Clock more fully to consumer production. This is part of a development program that has seen us more than double our number of employees in less than 3 years, bringing the total to more than 1,000, about one-half of our prewar force. Yet it is a fact that this expansion would not have been projected if the company had anticipated the current trend in the importation of clocks.

In 1951 the duty rates on clocks were cut in half. Since that reduction imports have soared beyond all expectations. In the first quarter of 1954 73,374 clocks were brought into the United States. For a similar period of 1955 the figure has leaped to 294,523, a rise of over 300 percent. In the lowest priced category the increase has been 590 percent, from 35,100 last year to 207,113 in 1955's first 3 months.

The estimated number of clocks arriving in the United States during 1955, over two million, would represent a full year's production for a medium-sized clock factory in America. In a period of exceptional prosperity for the country at large, there has been a great decrease in the number of people employed in producing clocks and nonjeweled watches since before World War II. Domestic manufacturers simply cannot compete on a price basis with foreign concerns who pay wages less than 25 percent as high as ours. Eighty cents of each production dollar in the United States clock and watch industry go into wages, up 800 percent in 50 years.

This ominous threat to our industry continues a downward spiral begun 20 years ago. In 1933 nonjeweled watches produced in the United States held 67.7 percent of American watch sales compared to 15.8 percent for imported watches. Today imported watches hold 69.8 percent of the market, while domestic nonjeweled watches have fallen to 17.6 percent. While imports of all manufactured goods have increased 86.5 percent in 20 years, watch imports have risen more than 1,600 percent. Last year more than 10,500,000 watches were brought into the United States. In nearly all categories of manufactured goods the United States enjoys a very favorable trade balance, shipping considerably more products than it brings in. With timepieces it is a very different story: America imports more than 20 times as many clocks and watches as it sends abroad.

The foreign cartel which has so successfully smothered the United States market has subjected the American people and their elected representatives to a torrent of misleading publicity and advertising. One result of their activity has been to convey the impression that the United States horological industry is not really essential to national defense. This directly contradicts the testimony of the men responsible for our national safety.

A year ago Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Pike stated the official view: "I wish to reaffirm the vital essentiality of the horological industry for defense * * * and by that I mean not only the jeweled watch industry but the nonjeweled watch industry and the clockmaking industry * * * There is no question but that the skills involved in those industries are vitally essential to our defense."

Despite this unequivocal declaration of Defense Department policy, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson found it necessary, on April 27, 1955, to reiterate official opinion: "In the course of the study (by the Defense Department) it became apparent that the entire horological industry (the nonjeweled watch and clock producers as well as the jeweled watchmakers) was essential to the mobilization base."

Expressing the view of many legislators, Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, stated: "If we permit the watch and clock industry to decline further, we face the danger of crippling our national defense."

In World War II the industry proved invaluable to the defense effort, turning out a stream of bomb fuses, timing devices, and an almost limitless variety of precision parts required in modern warfare. Member companies of the Clock Manufacturers Association alone turned out 3½ billion component parts and more than 25 million complete military items for the Armed Forces.

Unfortunately the industry's 100 percent changeover to war work placed it at a grave disadvantage. The consumer market of America's wartime prosperity was wide open for foreign producers who seized the opportunity and have never relinquished it. So successful have they been in their publicity that the United States is the only major power currently permitting the decline of its horological industry.

Contrast this with the lesson absorbed by the British: during the 1930's Britain allowed its industry to wither through liberal tariff measures which virtually handed the clock and watch market over to foreign producers. When war came, shutting off its sources, the British found that they had not a single remaining company equipped to produce the precision devices obtainable only from the horological industry. At war's end the British invoked quotas and restrictive tariffs, and granted subsidies in a planned program to redevelop this vital industry.

In July 1954 the United States Government showed its belief in the essentiality of the domestic clock and watch industry by raising the duty rates on watches under paragraph 367 of the Tariff Act of 1930. While advantageous to the United States jeweled watch industry, however, the measure holds very little benefit for producers of nonjeweled watches and no benefit at all for producers of clocks. The widespread misconception on the latter point should be effectively cleared away by the 300 percent increase in clock imports in the first quarter of this year. The July rate boost was a step in the right direction but failed to recognize the need for import quotas necessary to stabilize the United States market against "boom or bust" conditions.

Among the questions yet unanswered are these:

Should the domestic industry be penalized for its defense contributions while countries that fought against the United States, or remained neutral, smother our production?

Should foreign clock industries, which have already benefited from United States Government-aid programs, be permitted to wipe out domestic production because of the differential in labor costs?

Should our industry, already at the peril point, be allowed to decline further?

The answers to these questions are of vital interest to the many thousands of American clockmakers, many of whom have been employed for more than 25 years by member firms of the Clock Manufacturers Association of America. Their skill and experience form an asset that cannot be put into a deep freeze, to be brought forth only in an emergency such as wartime. On their behalf this letter is submited to afford the Tariff Commission a better understanding of our problem.

SEYMOUR ZIFF,
President, New Haven Clock & Watch Co.

ALEX BAIL,
Executive Vice President, Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union—CIO.

Commencement Address by Hon. James A. Farley at St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind., June 5, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General, delivered the commencement address at St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind., on June 5, 1955.

I am hereby submitting for the consideration of the Members, the speech which he delivered on that occasion:

FREEDOM AND FAITH

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., commencement exercises, St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind., June 5, 1955)

I am most honored to have a part in this convocation. This is a beautiful and gentle country which kindly and dedicated men have transformed into a sacred grove of learning. Here men are prepared for best use of their lives from each commencement, with its mystic blend of joy and sorrow, so as to attain and help others attain the sublime end for which man was created. For those of you who leave here today, this is a commencement because from this day forth most of you will begin, on your very own, the generous practice of faith toward which you were guided here as the supreme standard of measurement for worldly values, and you will begin, on your very own, the tangled practice of freedom which is snarled by social and civil obligations and strange concepts of justice and charity that flourish in the outer world. You enter upon your quest for freedom in a world sorely beset by doubts and tensions, but you do not venture forth unarmed. At your side in your most need will be the great faith implanted here, which will ever serve and comfort you.

As I look about me I am moved to deep humility. All this that I see here was accomplished in my lifetime. Saint Joseph's was incorporated the year after I was born. Since 1889 it has grown, not without trials and difficulties, into this thriving and firm institution we revere. I, too, have known my share of trials and tribulations. These have made me something of the man I am. These have been my teachers because I was not privileged to attend such an inspiring well of learning at this. Although life has brought me many honors, including some 17 honorary degrees, I would gladly exchange them all for one such as many of you have earned by pleasant and profitable instruction.

It is I who learn much today from these surroundings, from the good men who have taught you, from your proud parents and friends and from you who go forth this day.

I am most humble because this day is more profitable to me than to you. I reap the benefit. Unhappily, I cannot bring as much as I take away. I do not have the answers to the problems of the world nor to those you will meet as you proceed upon your rendezvous with destiny. Where I should like to give answers, I have only observations. These I offer, in all humility, with the hope they may not be without instruction in this culminating hour of learning.

Today we are engaged in a great struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of totalitarianism. I hesitate to use the term forces of democracy, just as I hesitate to use the term liberal because both terms have been distorted by callous malice so that the most brutal of dictators claim to be the champions of democracy and the most intolerant of our fellowmen claim to be the only true liberals. Let me, then, say we seek freedom through a democratic form of government. There are disturbing trends in our democracy which some profess to see as most serious digressions from the way of freedom. Some would have us believe that our way of government is teetering on the very brink of disaster while some fiend of hell howls below after the manner of Lucifer upon his mighty fall.

Perhaps our democracy has not kept step with our material progress. It could be that in our search for creature comforts we have lost some sight of the firm faith in values and the firm faith in ideals upon which our forefathers built. It could also be that we still have to catch up on this faith and when we do we shall end the disturbances in our society and regain the step with material things that our founders enjoyed.

Truly our material blessings have been great. We have about three-quarters of the world's automobiles. We have by far the most extensive pattern of airlines. We have the finest network of highways and railroads. We have almost 60 percent of the world's telephones. We have more rooms to live in and more hot and cold running water in proportion to our population than any other nation; more in fact than most of them put together. We have the overwhelming majority of television sets, radios, and the numerous appliances by which we have added immeasurably to the dignity, comfort, and instruction of our people. We have more hospitals, more wonder drugs, and the greatest number of the best medically trained men and women. We have more schools and more colleges and the finest teachers, though some are distressed in soul and spirit.

All this has been done under our form of government with all its faults. We have been able to indulge in our daily desires beyond the dreams of those who built this Nation. Even so there are those among us who dream strange dreams of lands they do not know and leaders they have not seen. They would have us follow dancing fires so that we might be lost in the morass of socialism. This Nation was made mighty by individual initiative and enterprise. It was made great by men who went into the world as you are about to do, certain that the world is your oyster, to be opened by your own perseverance and industry. This, then, is the American way, not the way of asking what we can expect in guaranties and provisions of socialism, the system by which we rob ourselves to stultify our initiative and enterprise.

Let us take a look at the situation of our Communist enemy. It is now 37 years since the last czar of Russia was done to his death by frightened bolsheviks, with most of his family in a cellar. Leaders of this revolution have now had almost 40 years to reconstruct Russia and make its people happy. In the same initial period we made tremendous strides toward our present prosperity. From the scraps of news that come out of Russia it is evident that the Russian people are living on a very meager diet and in the barest of comfort. Even granting that the crudest Russian peasant and the poorest Russian worker in the cities is better off than he was under the czars, the advance has not been anywhere near the world of plenty and happiness the Communist leaders promised when they began making over Russia.

It is now evident that the Iron Curtain has been erected not so much to keep the rest of the world out of Russia as to keep the Russians satisfied within. The Soviet leaders do not want the truth entering with foreign visitors. For almost 40 years the leaders of the Red revolution have been educating the Russian young people, but there is no doubt that some 60 million young Russian people, whose minds have been partially awakened, are becoming more and more of a problem. These young people have been aroused to question what they are told because their tastes have been expanded and their appetites sharpened. Some have seen the Western world in their marching in war. They have seen that the Soviet promises of a better and fuller life is shockingly disappointing by way of contrast with what the poorest people enjoy in the freer outer world.

Many Russians under the age of 40 know now that they have been getting guns and ammunition instead of bread and butter. They have been getting uniforms and drill and more work at more hours instead of better homes, simple luxuries, and a peaceful life. There can be no doubt that many millions of young Russians are unhappy to say nothing of millions upon millions of peoples who have been enslaved by the violent energy the Communist leaders put into building weapons to defend their regime while professing to defend Russia.

The greatest threat to Russia as it is constituted today is not what the Communist leaders rant about day and night—the alleged imperialism of the United States or the alleged belligerency of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The great threat to the Soviet leaders lies partly in the unhappy and disgruntled millions in Communist slavery but largely in the vigorous, hungry, and ambitious young Russians. Almost four decades ago Communist leaders told the Russian people: "You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain." Today, from the trickle of information that comes out of Russia, we learn young Russians are awakening to a growing realization that they have not gained anything of the world's abundant freedom, but have merely added to the weight of their chains.

For this reason I am convinced that Soviet Russia does not want war. For this reason I am also convinced that Soviet Russia does not want peace. If Russia were to go to war, the discontented young Russians might turn on their leaders and seize the government for themselves. It is always easier to turn upon a tormenter at home than an enemy abroad. I am certain that the Russian leaders are aware that in launching any conflict they would risk their futures and lives, just as certainly as did Czar Nicholas and Kaiser Wilhelm in 1914. Wars mark the twilight of ruthless rulers. In World War I and World War II many kings and dictators departed. Communist leaders will not launch, I believe, a war that might deliver them to the sword or the firing squad. It must be remembered that when German troops entered the Ukraine they were greeted at first as deliverers by the Russian peasantry and might have continued so had not a mad dictator, Adolph Hitler, visited them with arrogance and contempt. A more kindly enemy, without territorial ambition and with a dedication to liberty might find the Russian people his greatest allies in world war III.

It must be recognized that the Russians did not attack when the strength of Western Europe was at its lowest. They do not threaten now when the North Atlantic Treaty Army is not what it hopes to be. Russian leaders may have some concern for the atom bomb, but they have more for the smoldering minds of their own people. It must be remembered that there is no force more explosive than an outraged citizenry. It is still as true as the day Abraham Lincoln uttered it that "you can fool some of the people all of the time, all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

I have said that I do not believe that the Russians will launch a war, but neither do I believe they will agree to a lasting peace. I doubt if any of the top Communist leaders are for an enduring peace. I do not believe that a solemn and binding peace treaty will be executed by the Soviet leaders at any conference between the East and West—no matter how high the summit. I would say that the Russian leaders have no intention of starting a war; in that sense, they favor peace. However, I believe that the Soviet leaders will not abandon their policy of keeping us frightened. It is good policy, from their standpoint, to keep America frightened because in fright we might make stupid mistakes. From the Russian point of view it would seem advantageous to keep the West frightened so that more money will be spent on guns and planes and superbombs. The more we spend on such things, the less the Russian people are apt to grumble against the heavy burdens they bear for the same sort of things.

Soviet leaders have a twofold purpose in promoting unrest; they divert the Russian people from their own failure to secure the more abundant life at home by blaming enemies in the West, and they have hope that they will disrupt our economic system which is utterly unlike the slave system of Russia.

I look for the Russians to churn up more Koreas and more Indochinas and more Formosas. They will seek to encourage us to spend ourselves into bankruptcy by expending our resources and dollars in various quarters of the world. Not only would such spending pile up our debt, which the Soviet leadership considers advantageous for them, but also it brings more food into Russia. It is often forgotten that the Reds do not give arms to their allies, such as the Chinese Communists, but they exact payment for every gun and every bullet in the form of food in the hope of quieting possible unrest at home, by adding to the meager diet of the average Russian. In Red China the drain of Soviet stomachs on Chinese agriculture was so great that all the white beans in China went to Russia and only black beans were left. So great was the fear of Chinese Communists that discontent among the people might bring violent visitations upon them that the Red leaders were happy to undertake prolonged negotiations that led to the conclusion of the Korean armistice.

Next month we will undertake to secure peace by sitting down at a conference table with Soviet Russia. Our President first turned down suggestions for a meeting, insisting that he wanted strong evidence of the genuineness of Red peace intentions, and warning against expecting overnight solutions of east-west conflicts at any meeting. He has been induced to accede to such a meeting but he has made it clear that any conference will be an experiment to test Soviet sincerity on easing world tensions. The President bowed to growing sentiment in the country and around the world for such a conference. He expressed himself moved by the vague feeling that "some good might come out of it." We can, with him, sincerely hope so.

The pattern for the coming conference is to be laid out at a meeting this month in

San Francisco of the foreign ministers of the four nations involved. However, as outlined by the President, the top-level conference will consist of 3 days of general discussion without agenda or plan on our part. President Eisenhower confessed that his ideas for the coming conference are "vague and generalized." Many of us will find this disturbing. In our past meetings with Soviet Russia at the top level, we went to Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam with high hopes and pretty much without plans. The Russians came with agendas. The results of these conferences, most unhappily, speak for themselves. The Soviets came with plans and left with programs that extended their territory and influence at the expense of free peoples and free territory. We came with pious hopes and left with the bitter fruits of disillusionment.

Yet we are going to try again. Perhaps we should. We are the most generous people on earth. We have given freely of our substance. We have never been deaf to want. We have never withheld pity. It is fit that we should be trusting, but not to the point of placing our heads into a Red noose or to the point of sacrificing more free lives or more free territory, lest we regret it in the near future. We should go to such a conference fully aware that if the Russian leaders truly want peace they can win it without any four-power conference at the top level. It is within the power of the Communists to win lasting peace in our time if they really want it. They can disarm; they can permit free elections in Germany; they can withdraw troops from satellite nations, and they can persuade their Chinese Communist allies to release the American airmen and American civilians now being held unlawfully.

While we watch the state of communism within Russia and debate with its leaders on means of attaining peace, we must jealously guard our freedom at home. Our form of government is vulnerable to tyranny, because totalitarianism operates under many guises, the most effective of them being socialism. Socialism is not without attraction. It would appear to be logical that the people should own and share in what apparently belongs to all. There is wide belief that a little socialism is good for an economy. Unfortunately you cannot have a little socialism without affecting the entire economy. If 10 percent of business is socialized then 90 percent must assume the taxload formerly borne by all industry. Socialism feeds on socialism so that each bite into a nation's economy brings a larger bite. In time the remaining industry cannot support the tax burden which becomes confiscatory and private enterprise dies.

The most confirmed advocates of socialism contend that the system is all right, but that men have perverted the system. Thus they attempt to explain the transformation of socialism into Red dictatorship in Russia, into blackshirted dictatorship in Italy, and into brownshirted dictatorship in Germany. We can wonder if the system hasn't corrupted the men who started out promising and wound up dictating when they failed to make good on their promises. Dictators have turned to war or to conjuring up enemies, real or fancied, in order to divert the minds of their citizenry from their own failures.

Free men are not only prey to the lures of socialism but they are peculiarly vulnerable to confusion. Often we seem to inoculate ourselves with confusion in the form of complacency about the way in which we are being governed on local, State, and National levels; with tolerance of opportunism in those who hold public office with compromise with what is right and, worst of all, with what is wrong, and finally by the tumult and shouting of group interests.

In the world of education, for example, we are beset by storms over academic freedom, as though there were some special kind of freedom peculiar to teaching. The obligation of the teacher is to point the way to truth, more especially to bring the student to arrive at the truth by his own thinking. It is not the function of the teacher to convert by suppressing any part of the truth or ridiculing any thinking he cannot refute. Academic freedom is a sacred inheritance from the wisdom of the past, tempered by the revelation of religion. In true academic freedom teachers should be dedicated, under God, to teaching truthfully and to employing their reason to the full extent of their ability. The real threat to academic freedom is disregard of God and His moral law, not such issues raised by false hysteria as legislative concern with the Communist conspiracy and loyalty oaths. I could never see anything degrading about taking a loyalty oath. In my years in public life I never felt myself a second class citizen, as some academicians contend, because I raised my right hand to pledge allegiance to the Government and people I served. I remember feeling deep pride on such occasions and enjoying peace of mind similar to that which comes in prayer.

Liberty is not something that can be distorted by the shrill cries of vocal groups no matter how literate they may be. It is constant of itself because it is part of the eternal truth. The confusions promoted by special interests may divert us from liberty. Mediocrity in our public men may harm liberty. Indifference may work even greater harm to liberty than either deliberate or unintentional confusion.

There is no denying that the flame of liberty is more difficult to keep alive today than it was in the days of the Founding Fathers. The strains of our time are being exerted on liberty and not without danger. These are coming in three directions. There is the economic trend toward industrialization with a resultingly more urban society; there is the trend toward centralization in government, even popular government, with the resulting wooing of numbers; and there is a social trend toward mass culture. These trends have all resulted in a tremendous advance for an extremely large segment of our population. In raising the standards of living, improving educational facilities, and protecting the health and general well-being of so many millions of our people, there has been no injustice; nor has there been any betrayal of any other segments of the American people. No one has been forced downward by these trends—and while I would not now attempt to assess this phenomena, liberty is still maintained.

We need not despair, however, of keeping freedom so long as it is rooted in faith. America is the outstanding example of an industrialized Government. To our production and our ideals are anchored the hopes of freedom of the free world. Some fear our mechanization and pine for the simpler and less involved lives of their fathers. At the same time they are most anxious to expand and flourish—and this desire is true of the leaders of the Kremlin—even as we do.

So long as we stand rooted in faith, so long shall we endure free. Let us recognize that progress and culture without faith are not enough to insure freedom. Let us bear in mind that this country, like the Christian religion, is a vibrant and growing entity—ever becoming more and more powerful and more influential in the face of great dangers.

For centuries the church has known persecution. The persecution visited upon America by lies of a Communist enemy is mild by comparison. Today the church shares persecution with the United States because the godless enemy realizes it must destroy both or be destroyed by its own lies. Notwithstanding three centuries of persecution by the Roman Empire the church conquered Rome as that empire collapsed. Then the church conquered the conquerors.

When the great achievement was accomplished, the church was confronted by storms of heresy within itself. At times it appeared as though the church and all religion might go down together, but this was not so. The church weathered the mismanagement and abuses of mediocre and worldly ambitious men, and the indifference of complacent and uninformed men to establish itself as the very center of stability in maintaining culture and civilization in years of darkness.

Today the church, in conjunction with those outside its ranks who fear God and stand ready to take their own part, is fighting to bolster liberty through faith. Freedom will be kept alive so long as the warmth of faith glows in a single heart, just as surely as there can be no darkness while a single candle glows.

Let us not forget, amid our concern over the tensions of our day, that in spite of all vicissitudes, religion is today stronger than it has ever been at any time in almost 2,000 years of history. The church itself and Christianity in general have more followers today in numbers and no doubt in devotion than ever before. There are more men who fear God and look forward to eternity within various faiths than the godless enemy and a few vocal but malicious souls would have us believe, even behind the Iron Curtain perhaps.

The church, you will recall began in a remote and unimportant corner of a great empire. In its earliest days the Founder was pursued by the sword so that His parents were displaced and sought refuge for a time in a foreign land. When the Founder gathered disciples about Him He numbered 12 as the evangelists of His teachings. Of these 12 one became a traitor, another perjured himself, and 9 were cowards.

Only one, John, took his place at the foot of the cross. John stood there at the risk of his life to keep the word of the Master. In the same way many Americans have risked their lives and given their lives to keep words like freedom and faith from being extinguished in a darkening world. I charge each of you to be like John, ever ready to preserve faith and freedom, ever watchful lest justice and liberty be distorted by dangerous demagogs and ever firm so that the great light of truth placed in your hands shall burn forever bright.

Statewide Meeting Seeking Permanent Fort Wood To Be Held in Waynesville Monday

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article of June 21, 1955, from the Rolla Daily News, Rolla, Mo., which concerns the continued efforts to obtain a permanent designation for Fort Leonard Wood. I heartily endorse these efforts which I hope the Department of Army will receive with a receptive ear and open mind, for there is much merit contained in the arguments given that Fort Wood should be made permanent. The article follows:

STATEWIDE MEETING SEEKING PERMANENT FORT WOOD TO BE HELD IN WAYNESVILLE MONDAY

WAYNESVILLE, Mo., June 20.—A meeting to expand the Make-Fort-Leonard-Wood-Per-

manent Committee into a statewide organization will be held here next Monday, June 27, it was announced today by Dru Pippin, chairman.

Spurred by the failure of the Department of Defense to declare the Missouri Army post a permanent installation, the committee intends to acquire active members from many communities over the State and carry on the campaign to accomplish what it feels is the proper designation for the fort.

The Make Fort Leonard Wood Permanent Committee is encouraged by the fact that although the Department of Defense declines at this time to change the fort's status from temporary to permanent it has promised to review the status late in 1955 or early in 1956. This information came from Assistant Defense Secretary McDowell in a letter to Congressman A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Elsinore, Mo. McDowell was answering an earlier request by CARNAHAN, who was acting for the entire Missouri congressional delegation seeking permanent designation for the fort.

Pippin said the meeting will get underway at 1 p. m. Monday in the new west wing of the high school building in Waynesville. Pippin, and members of his organizational committee (made up of citizens of Waynesville, Rolla, Springfield, Lebanon, and St. Robert) are urging representatives for chambers of commerce, city officials, and businessmen from all parts of the State to attend.

The organizational committee reports that already much support has been given to its objective. Resolutions were passed by the Missouri assembly and forwarded to the Department of Defense. The entire Missouri congressional delegation signed CARNAHAN'S resolution, which was then sent to Charles Wilson, Secretary of Defense. But the resolutions have failed to shake the Department from its stand to retain Fort Leonard Wood on anything more than a temporary basis. The resolutions were followed with hundreds of letters to Missouri Congressmen and Senators. More than 1,000 letters have gone out of Wayneville alone, Pippin said.

COMMITTEE BACKED BY FACTS

The letters point to the need for more and more trained engineers, a fact recognized in professional circles, in and out of the Army. They cite unexcelled facilities which Fort Leonard Wood provides for this type of training, a fact openly admitted by no less an authority than General Sturgis, chief of Army engineers. (General Sturgis is a former post commander at Fort Leonard Wood.)

The committee also stresses the military fact that Fort Leonard Wood is beyond a radius of atomic bombing of industrial areas, and not subject to thermonuclear fallout in the event that the largest nearby industrial centers—St. Louis and Kansas City—were bombed because those targets are north and east of Fort Leonard Wood, and prevailing winds are from the southwest.

It is also emphasized that the taxpayers have a $75 million capital investment in Fort Leonard Wood, that it is serviced by a railroad, air lanes, and a cross-country, 4-lane military highway (U. S. Highway 66), that it has more than adequate water and hydroelectric power and is surrounded by more than 80,000 acres of Government-owned land with perfect terrain for training troops, that it is the sixth largest "city" in the State of Missouri, and that its economic and defense value reaches into every State in the Nation.

Maintenance, costly on temporary status, would be much more economical with permanent status and nearby communities would provide better auxiliary services, the committee concludes.

Attending the meeting today from Rolla were J. Nean White, president of the chamber of commerce; Mrs. Gale Bullman, secretary; and Edward W. Sowers, publisher of the Daily News.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower Department of Labor celebrated the end of the 1953–55 recession the other day in a press release which reported that between March and May there were substantial increases in employment and sharp drops in joblessness in most of the Nation's major labor-market areas.

Good news—yes. Except that, even with the steel industry now booming at near capacity levels in all major plants, the 4-county Pittsburgh labor-market area, which includes Westmoreland County, is still a distressed area with unemployment of between 6 and 9 percent.

When the March survey figures were made public 2 months ago, showing very little improvement in the jobless situation throughout the country even though production had jumped up tremendously, I said the paradox of all of this unemployment in the midst of a near-record production level indicated some really serious and fundamental faults in our economy.

The May figures just released make the paradox even more surprising and alarming.

You have certainly seen the headlines in the newspapers all this year telling us how prosperous we are, how well we have recovered from the Eisenhower "hard money" recession, how rosy and reassuring the outlook is. All of us have been encouraged at these periodic reports of substantial improvement over last year.

But substantial improvement over last year's recession levels apparently is not nearly enough to assure full employment in this vast, rich country.

We are producing more with fewer workers. But we are not providing enough new jobs for the displaced workers or for the youngsters coming into the labor force.

Because of the introduction of so much new automatic equipment, as well as worker improvement on the job, productivity—that is, the amount each worker turned out per hour—rose probably at as fast a clip in the past year as at any time in the past many years. This is very much to the good if those productivity benefits are spread around evenly through higher pay or lower prices, or both. Either helps to increase purchasing power and thus stimulate demand and thus provide more job opportunities.

THE LONG, LONG LIST OF DISTRESSED AREAS

But our economy has not been expanding as it should. And so, consequently, even in this period of record production of goods and services, we have the following major labor market areas in the distress category:

Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Reading, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, all in Pennsylvania; San Diego, Calif.; South Bend and Terre Haute, Ind.; Portland Maine, and Portland, Oreg.; Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, all in Massachusetts; the Duluth-Superior area of Minnesota; Atlantic City and Paterson, N. J.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; the Albany-Schenectady-Troy areas and also the Utica-Rome area of New York; Asheville and Durham, N. C.; Providence, R. I.; Chattanooga and Knoxville, Tenn.; Tacoma, Wash., and Charleston, W. Va., and the Huntington-Ashland and the Wheeling-Steubenville areas.

In addition, 105 smaller production centers throughout the country are listed in the distress category with more than 6 and often more than 12 percent unemployment including these in Pennsylvania: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Butler, Clearfield-DuBois, Indiana, Kittanning-Ford City, Lewiston, Lock Haven, Meadville, New Castle, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pottsville, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville, and Williamsport.

Certainly no one could look at this long, long list of distressed production centers of America and say that we have licked recession or have restored a satisfactory economic level. I will amend that statement; only the Eisenhower administration could look with such complacency on this grim picture.

Remarks of Col. Michael Leo Looney, Given at Boston, Mass., in Connection With the Drive of the Paralyzed Veterans of America To Assist Civilian Paraplegics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the remarks of Col. Michael Leo Looney, of Washington, D. C., given at Boston, Mass., on June 16, 1955, in connection with the drive of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, to assist civilian paraplegics:

Ladies and gentlemen, I should like at this time to discuss with you one of the most remarkable and unselfish campaigns ever conducted in the history of this country. I refer to a program initiated and sponsored by the Paralyzed Veterans of America, an organization of 5,000 exservicemen who lost the use of their limbs due to spinal injuries suffered while serving their country during World War II and the Korean conflict.

Today these 5,000 veterans, confined for the rest of their lives to wheelchairs, are trying to raise $5 million. They do not want this money for themselves, but for civilians.

If this sounds unusual, it might be well to examine the history of the PVA. This group was founded shortly after World War II, for the twofold purpose of providing counsel and assistance for paraplegic veterans in their return to the community as useful citizens; and to initiate medical research programs

aimed at ultimate discovery of a method by which severed spinal nerves may be knitted so as to end paraplegia.

The efforts of PVA in behalf of its members have met with great success. Nearly all paraplegic veterans have managed to surmount incredible, heartbreaking obstacles, and once again live normal lives—as normal, that is, as possible in a wheelchair.

Nearly all civilian paraplegics are unable to afford hospitalization. A few fortunate cases have managed to obtain wheelchairs, and a negligible minority have found jobs of a sort. But the average civilian paraplegic has been condemned to a life sentence as a useless, forgotten half man who will spend the rest of his days staring at the ceiling in a back room.

The paralyzed veterans realize—probably more acutely than any of us—that it does not matter to a paraplegic whether he broke his spine in or out of uniform. There's only one difference: the veteran has been given a helping hand; for the civilian, there is nothing—no opportunity for a job, no chance for a family, and, above all, no hope of ever getting back his self-respect. To all intents and purposes, the civilian paraplegic is a living corpse.

PVA recently resolved to do something about this. It should be emphasized that the veterans are under no obligation to these civilians—beyond the obligation of their conscience. In deciding to offer assistance to civilian paraplegics, PVA said, in effect: "Nobody else seems to care what happens to these people—it looks like we'll have to step in.

They're doing just that. In organizing the National Paraplegia Foundation, PVA becomes the first group to take definite, concrete steps toward providing civilians with the same kind of assistance that has proved to be so valuable to paralyzed ex-GI's. Furthermore, PVA plans a major expansion of its medical research fellowship programs; this will greatly enhance and increase the group's efforts along these lines.

Since civilian paraplegic cases outnumber the veterans by 20 to 1, the new program requires $5 million. To raise the money, the paralyzed veterans are not resorting to a charity drive. Charity is one commodity a paraplegic neither wants nor needs. Instead, they hope to meet their financial goal through national sales of a record album which will help all of us to remember what they can never forget.

This is an album of records about our country. Entitled "Nine Days for Americans," it combines music and narration to form a stirring pageant of those days which have played such a significant role in the growth and development of American tradition and American ideals. The text was specially written for PVA by the distinguished historian, Prof. Allan Nevins, of Columbia University. It is narrated by Gen. Omar N. Bradley. Both have waived all royalties from sales of the album as his own contribution to the PVA campaign. The music and lyrics were composed by Gerald Marks.

By offering this outstanding work to Americans, the paralyzed veterans feel that they will not only be enabled to reach the goal of their fund drive, but will also perform a public service by reawakening in all of us a fresh awareness of the real meaning of our patriotic holidays.

It has sometimes erroneously been said of veterans that they are a self-seeking body, subordinating the public interest to their own immediate wants. I think that the magnificently selfless program of the Paralyzed Veterans of America not only gives the lie to this false idea, but should also inspire every one of us to a fuller realization of our own obligations as Americans. Nor do I think it is too much to say that this demonstration of man's humanity to man should make us all deeply proud and grateful to live in the same country with such fellow citizens.

Congress Scrutinizes Mergers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee investigating the monopoly question, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of June 16 pointing up the threat of monopolies to our economy.

The article follows:

CONGRESS SCRUTINIZES MERGERS—INCREASE IN BUSINESS CONSOLIDATIONS IS DIRECT THREAT TO ALL CONSUMERS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

We have in recent months been watching a dizzy procession of mergers in business. This, as we know, increases the concentration of control of industry in fewer units and fewer hands. That has its meaning for all of us as consumers, since it makes it easier and tempting to control production and markets for bigger profits and higher prices.

That is why several committees of Congress are now engaged in probing this threat of monopoly in a series of investigations that constitute, altogether, perhaps the most comprehensive examination of the important subject ever made.

As a sort of guidebook, each committee has the recent report of the Federal Trade Commission, the Government agency charged with ferreting out violations of the Sherman and Clayton antitrust laws. That report, published May 20, reveals that mergers are proceeding today at a rate three times that of 1949, and have almost reached the post-World War II peak of 1946–7, though the rate still is not equal to that of the 1920's.

As a matter of fact, it was back in that 1920 merger era that the Federal Trade Commission discovered a loophole in the Clayton Act which was contributing to the wave of consolidations in business and industry. That was in section 7 of the act which forbids mergers by purchase by one company of the stock of another if that tends to create a monopoly. To evade that, companies were acquiring control of others by purchase of assets instead.

At that time, 30 years ago, the FTC began to urge Congress to plug this loophole, and repeated the recommendation regularly in annual reports. But nothing was done until December 1950, when Congress adopted amendments to the Clayton Act also barring mergers by purchase of assets that were monopolistic in effect. The revision was sponsored by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of New York, once again chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, after long pioneering by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, who was temporarily retired from the Senate until his election again last November.

It turns out now, however, that the antimerger section still is defective. This is because the ban it carries against merger by purchase of stock or assets applies only if the company acquired is "in commerce," which means in interstate commerce, so the courts have held. Many recent mergers, particularly in the dairy and baking industries, so vital to every family, have taken the form of purchase by one big company of small companies that operate in a single State and thus are not legally in interstate commerce; but yet that sort of merger movement may tend to lessen competition and to create a monopoly, as we can easily see.

Congress' purpose, clearly recognized at the time the law was amended in 1950 by the Celler-Kefauver Act, was merely to prevent interference with what one FTC official described this week as "the purchase of one peanut vendor's stand by another," that is, operations in very small business.

But Congress was not told until this week how the limitation impedes the FTC's antimerger operations. It was clearly a surprise to Chairman CELLER when it came out during questioning of Edward F. Howrey, FTC Chairman, in public hearings before the House Judiciary Committee, though obviously the FTC had recognized the handicap for a long time. Nor had any mention of it been included in the annual FTC report to Congress, in which it is customary to make legislative recommendations; nor in Chairman Howrey's formal prepared statement for his appearance before the committee this week. He caught up with events by recommending to the committee that Congress correct the antimerger section.

As well as being critical of the FTC's omission on this matter, Chairman CELLER likewise was critical of the Commission's antimerger activity which he did not appear to consider was sufficiently aggressive. He said he judged, from the amount of funds spent on antimerger work, that this phase of FTC operations "has been treated like a stepchild." He brought out that the FTC had applied only about 3 percent of its $4,178,000 appropriation to antimerger activity, and that it had initiated no new cases since last July.

Defending his administration, Chairman Howrey explained that the Commission had felt it necessary first to make the investigation of mergers that had produced its recent reports, in order to find out exactly what was heppening and where and how and why. It couldn't take up the merger problem in a haphazard way, he said, and do the best job. Now, he said, the FTC has created a special task force of lawyers, economists, and statisticians which is devoting all its time to the merger problem. He complained that funds allotted to the Commission by Congress were not nearly sufficient to cover all the manifold activities of the Commission and had to be spread thin.

More Poisoned Liquor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, symptomatic of conditions prevailing in the country is the disclosure of the death of eight men caused by drinking liquor containing wood alcohol poison. Six men died in Harlem Hospital after drinking a concoction called King Kong. Two persons were charged with homicide for selling the poisoned liquor for 50 cents a pint in Harlem, in New York City. Apparently this area is riddled with "juice joints." Undoubtedly there is more of this type of liquor floating around this Nation, not only in New York City but in many other places. There were two deaths of a similar nature under similar circumstances in New York.

From the reports received throughout the Nation by the Alcohol Tax Unit, we

can readily see that the extent of illegal liquor operations is growing to an alarming degree. How often must the Congress, generally, and specifically the Ways and Means Committee in the House, be reeducated to the need for taking remedial steps. It is clear as spring water that the high liquor taxes provide a great incentive for these illegal operations. The seizure of stills indicates that the present illegal capacity is greater than the legal capacity for distillation of spirits. The bootleggers know you can make alcohol out of practically anything that grows and they do not limit or discriminate the type of rotgut they make. It is all poisonous, in one way or another.

The major contributing cause for this widespread evil is the internal revenue tax of $10.50 per proof gallon on legal liquor. And superimposed on this tax is State and municipal taxes. Small wonder, then, that the weight of these taxes supplies the motive for moonshining. We simply roll out the carpet or give an engraved invitation to moonshiners. My bill, H. R. 262 would reduce the present internal revenue tax of $10.50 to $6, where it was before the emergency. The passage of this bill would be a matter of common sense. The Government would not lose revenue. As a matter of fact, it would gain revenue. The loss of revenue from illegal operations would be offset, since the decrease in such taxes would contribute to the diminution of illegal operations. This business of prohibition by excessive taxes must cease.

Wisconsin Opposition to Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, solid opposition to the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado storage project is being recorded in many States of the Union. Wisconsin voters were warned against the project in the following editorials appearing in the Racine Journal-Times on May 14, 1955, and the Janesville Gazette on May 6, 1955:

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times of May 14, 1955]

REAL BOONDOGGLING IN WESTERN PLANS

Federal reclamation and conservation projects are, to most Americans, a set of phrases which look good in the quadrennial political party platforms. We in the Middle West and East note, with little interest, that politicians out West seem to get excited about them, and not 1 in 20 of us know why.

But it's high time we took a little more interest in some of these projects if for no other reason than that they are costing us billions of dollars in tax money. Unless we become actively interested, the Federal programs in the Western States are going to be determined by the triple standard of boondoggling, logrolling, and politics.

A boondoggle, as we learned during the depression, is a project undertaken principally to spend Federal money, with the cost far outstripping the present or future benefits. Many of the so-called Federal reclamation projects fall into this category. Logrolling is the practice of one Congressman voting for the project sponsored by another Congressman in order to buy the vote of the second Member for a project sponsored by the first. For example, a Wisconsin Congressman will vote for a reclamation project for a western Congressman in order to get the westerner's vote for the St. Lawrence seaway, or something else of interest to Wisconsin. Politics enters when the political parties vie with one another for the votes of a particular State or area by promising and delivering expensive Federal projects to that State or area. It's a form of bribery, with someone else paying the bribe.

Our case in point is the current upper Colorado River reclamation project recently voted by the Senate in the form of dams on the Colorado River which would be used presumably to store water for irrigation and to develop hydroelectric power. This program is a pure boondoggle, adopted by logrolling methods, and steeped in a political effort to win votes in the States of Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico.

The cost of the program from an irrigation standpoint would be fabulous. The Hoover Commission has estimated that it will cost $906 an acre to irrigate the area, and the land itself will be worth not more than $150 an acre. With items of "concealed subsidy," it has been estimated that it will cost up to $2,900 an acre to make the soil tillable. From a national standpoint, the silliest part of this program is that we do not need the land for food production, as American farmers already are producing more food than we can eat, so that we are paying to buy, store, and destroy it.

The New York Times, which has never been backward about supporting true reclamation projects, sums up the case in these words: "It would, of course, be possible to grow bananas on top of the Rockies if one wanted to spend the money; but the question is, Couldn't this money be spent more advantageously elsewhere?"

From a standpoint of hydroelectric power, the proposed dams in Echo Park, Colo., and Glen Canyon, Ariz., are equally useless. The dams will cost so much that the price of the power, for which there is practically no market in the area, will be too high for commercial use. Steam power could be produced in the same area for a fraction of the cost and atomic power will probably be practical before either of these methods could be in use for more than a few years.

This project is only 1 of 86 reclamation projects in the Western States now awaiting congressional action. The total cost of these programs would be more than $7 billion.

If the Eisenhower administration is genuinely interested in putting a stop to useless Federal spending, this would be a good place to draw the line before the House of Representatives joins the Senate in pouring more billions of dollars down some of the world's biggest ratholes.

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette of May 6, 1955]

WISCONSIN TAXPAYERS MAY PAY $88 MILLION MORE

Wisconsin taxpayers are warned that they will face an increase of $88 million more in taxes if the proposed upper Colorado River Basin project bill is passed by Congress. The Senate already has approved the bill and it is now pending in the House. This amount is equal to a raise of about one-third in Wisconsin State income taxes.

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH, known for hard hitting at taxes, is not likely to favor this bill.

The bill calls for a number of dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River and numerous irrigation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, costing the Nation's taxpayers more than $4 billion in hidden subsidies.

These States for the most part are anxious to get the taxpayers' billions for their own benefit, though the Colorado River Association, a volunteer group including some members in California, is fighting the proposal.

Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming and now Chairman of the Hoover Commission Task Group on Reclamation and Water Supply, has stated that no new farmland is needed to feed America today, and when it is, lands in humid areas can be developed at a fraction of the cost of this project.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, told the Senate this project is improvident, extravagant, and unjustifiable.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, reveals that the bill being considered does not conform with the program endorsed by the President. Figures on the project are inadequate for thorough analysis and examination before Congress approves it he said. Yet the Senate already has passed the bill.

The bare facts are: the United States of America has plenty of land available at costs much less than that proposed for irrigation; the big selling point in the project propaganda is the creation of fine fishing and recreational waters and accessibility to rugged wild mountain country.

If taxpayers do not choose to pay for the upper Colorado big dam foolishness they can write to all the Members of the House in the Wisconsin delegation, beginning with Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

This bill is likely to pass unless the people are aroused.

Public Works Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 16, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to offer this amendment because of a resolution adopted by the mayor and the Common Council of the City of Berrien Springs, a thriving city in the county of Berrien, Mich., through which meanders the beautiful St. Joseph River on its way to Lake Michigan at St. Joseph and Benton Harbor.

Where the river empties into the lake there exists a harbor which some day, our people hope, will, in tonnage and imports, rival those at Chicago and Milwaukee.

There are other reasons justifying the offering of this amendment. On my right sit Democrats who earlier today and who in the past have seemed determined to extract from the Federal Treasury millions—yes; over the years, billions—of

dollars to help their home people either to dredge and deepen rivers and harbors or reclaim land.

The effort today was to pour additional millions into TVA in the Tennessee Valley. The purpose? Give to the local people and attract industries by cheap power at the expense of the public.

Not a little success has followed their efforts.

Now listen, my dear colleagues. To date you have extracted from the Federal Treasury to give special advantages to the people of the Tennessee Valley Authority more than $1,905,000,000.

What am I asking for?

For the people of Berrien Springs and the vicinity, my original amendment called for but $1,000. Then, at the suggestion of one of the reporters, it was raised to $10,000 for this dredging job. And mark you now, that sum is not asked primarily for the benefit of the people of Berrien Springs, but for the benefit of all, and undoubtedly if the channel was dredged, the St. Joseph River not only would be used for a tourist route, for commercial purposes, but it might be used as a part of our national defense.

The committee seems to be in a generous mood today, so if the taxpayers dollars are to be broadcast, there would seem to be no reason why some should not fall upon the exceedingly fertile soil of Berrien County and in the vicinity of Berrien Springs.

Billions upon billions of dollars, and I refer not to the billions sent abroad, have been broadcast here in America. Many have fallen on rocky, stony ground, and in the mountains of the Northwest.

Some of those millions, where they brought water to thirsty deserts, have fallen upon good ground—acres which have produced abundantly, which year after year have added to our crop surpluses, which are now, for storage, costing us a million dollars a day—a million dollars each day added to the national debt.

Other millions have fallen in the area of some of our streams. They sprouted into towns and cities with industrial plants—where none grew before. All to the advantage of certain, comparatively small groups, some owning townsites, others adjacent land. Apparently, most of these created industries, villages, and cities exist and continue to grow because they have, if I may use the expression, been and now are fertilized by tax dollars—partially contributed by the people of Berrien County.

Then, there is another reason for the offering of this amendment at this time. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. RABAUT, just established a new precedent for the making of an appropriation. He accepted an amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] against which a point of order apparently might have been successfully offered. As I get it, he gave two reasons. One, the amount—$68,000—was, he said, small. The other was because accepting the amendment would avoid further discussions and make certain that the House could adjourn tonight, over Friday, thus giving the members of the Tuesday through Thursday club a 3-day respite.

Therefore, it occurred to me that this amendment, calling for but $10,000—one for $68,000 having been accepted—might also be accepted by the subcommittee chairman. His kindness, his generosity, his power as subcommittee chairman, having been exercised in favor of an appropriation of $68,000 for a district in Iowa, I just thought might be extended to cover a little $10,000 appropriation for a worthwhile project in his home State of Michigan. It is my hope that I was not mistaken.

Candor forces me to admit that the Corps of Engineers sent a representative to take a look at Berrien Springs and the St. Joseph River and he reported that, in his opinion, the expenditure of the funds necessary to dredge the river from Berrien Springs to the harbor at St. Joseph and Benton Harbor was not justified by the prospects of future profits. But since when has the Congress attempted to justify an appropriation by requiring that future taxes paid to the Government, or the profits to the Government, or the community where the Federal investment was made would liquidate the original investment—the cost of the project? Is it possible the job is too small to merit the attention of the corps?

Certainly neither the original appropriation nor subsequent appropriations to TVA have been repaid to the Federal Government, nor has that investment been profitable to the taxpayers as a whole.

Oh, no, no, the soundness of the investment by the Government has never been the criterion, the yardstick, used and adhered to when the question of an appropriation of this nature or a reclamation project was before the House.

Apparently, appropriations of this nature go through committee, and my reference now is to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and through the House in altogether too many instances because an appropriation of a somewhat similar nature has either been adopted or will be adopted by the House to benefit some other area.

Apparently, the question is not, "Will the appropriation benefit the country as a whole, promote the welfare of all of our people?" The question seems to be, "If this particular appropriation goes through to give special benefits to a certain area, then will another appropriation for a somewhat similar purpose and which will likewise benefit another comparatively small group in another section of the country be adopted by the Congress?"

Some critical people refer to that method of dealing—of deciding whether an appropriation should or should not be made—as "logrolling." Please do not misunderstand me. I am not charging that there has been any logrolling in connection with today's consideration of this bill. Oh no. There just seems to be a spirit of good fellowship, a generous disposition on the part of some Members and of some groups. Has there been a little reciprocal backscratching in dealing with the provisions of this bill and the amendments? Added to that, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] seems to feel that one of the very important things before the House at this time is to end discussion of this bill and adopt it today.

I am not asking you to vote for this very, very small appropriation to make this worthwhile improvement on this river because of any promise on my part that when some appropriation comes up which will benefit a river, a harbor, a desert, a canyon in your district, I will vote for that. I am just offering this amendment on the merit of the improvement which will be made, though realizing, as I certainly do, that merit all too often has not too much to do with the making of appropriations.

Mr. Chairman and my dear colleagues, this amendment has merit.

The appropriation sought is so small—but $10,000—and do not forget you just accepted one for $68,000 because it was small and in order to avoid debate and an adjournment over until tomorrow. It will not require the expenditure of any large sum for a survey, the preparation of specifications. The river is there, it is winding its way through Berrien Springs and on down to the lake, the sandbars are there. The banks of the river as high enough to contain the water, it flows down the channel, no levies will be required, nor is there any danger that floods will break through the banks and overflow the adjacent lowlands if a channel is dredged. No additional water will come to the river. The scenery is so beautiful, so enchanting is the river itself—fish, bass and pike, are so plentiful and so eager to cooperate, that working to improve it will be a joy and a pleasure.

While there are no paddlewheel steamboats now carrying commerce up and down the river, I am almost certain that some will be built, and certainly the obstruction to present navigation of the river is just as great as it was at Muscle Shoals when the first Federal millions of dollars were sent down there.

Our people are progressive, they are industrious, they are thrifty, they are farseeing, and if the Federal Government will give us a river on which to operate, I am sure our farsighted citizens will provide the industrial plants and the boats to use to full capacity the water highway which will be provided by the dredging of the St. Joseph.

This amendment is not like the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], who wanted an additional $18,500,000 for the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton and which, as another gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS] said, would cost $108 million and would subsidize United States Steel Corp. at the expense of all of the taxpayers of the United States by providing it with a free canal.

We do not have a United States Steel Co. at Berrien Springs, as they have at Philadelphia or farther up that river, and again do not misunderstand me, I make no claim that the St. Joseph River, as it runs through either Indiana or Berrien County, compares as a commerce-bearing channel with the Delaware River. However, it has possibilities. Surely it has a future. Why orphan it in its infancy?

We do not have plants like those of General Motors, of Chrysler, of Ford, as they have at Detroit, and we are not at this time asking for harbor improvements at St. Joseph and Benton Harbor, which might be of some help in establishing and maintaining industry at Berrien Springs. They do have industrial plants at Benton Harbor and St. Joseph—among them the largest washing-machine plant in the world. They are turning out billions of dollars' worth of excellent equipment. The employees at the plants, the most of them, are not only rendering full service for every dollar they receive, but they own their own homes, they pay their full share of the taxes which go to create and continue special benefits, not only to those who are served by TVA, but to employees of many another tax dollar created industry.

Berrien County has many an acre of fertile soil. As just indicated, the people there are the kind of people who made this country great, rich, and powerful. They are independent by nature, and if I judge their feelings aright, they are willing to earn every dollar they get, but, if their tax dollars are to be broadcast by a Federal bureaucracy or by a spending Congress, I just assume, though they have never told me so, that there is no reason why they should not share in this broadcasting. Some are tired of always being on the giving end—they would like, once at least, to be on the receiving end.

If Federal dollars are to be broadcast, then let them be sown not so often on rocky, stony ground. Let some of them be sewn, and, like the seed referred to by St. Matthew, "fall into good ground where they will bring forth a hundredfold." Berrien Springs and the St. Joseph River are there—waiting and willing.

The area where this improvement will be made, if this amendment is accepted, compares very, very favorably with the Tennessee Valley area when the first appropriation was made for Muscle Shoals and for TVA.

Berrien County is a great berry- and fruit-producing country. Washington has its Japanese cherry trees with their beautiful blossoms, but no fruit. Berrien County and southwestern Michigan—yes, the whole lakeshore area clear up to and including the district of our colleague from the 9th District, Miss THOMPSON, who is doing such a worthwhile service here—might well be characterized as the garden of Eden of the United States of America.

The blossoms of our cherry, our plum, our peach, our pear, and our apple trees, far surpass in beauty the nonproductive, scentless blossoms of Washington's cherry trees. I hope no international complications will grow out of this statement.

May I plead with you, you who live in the South, you who live in Washington, who may look and see, but never smell the fragrant breeze, go north sometime, travel through the Fourth District of Michigan and on up the west side of Michigan along the eastern shore of Lake Michigan and for once in your hard-working lives see blossoms that are beautiful, fragrant, and the advance agents of tasty, nourishing berries and fruits.

Please do not characterize me as a Pharisee. I am only endeavoring to have you see Michigan in the springtime as we who are fortunate enough to live there have seen it and to, with us, enjoy some of nature's bountiful blessings free to all who will come and look. It is a beautiful, bountiful, productive, nourishing country. Do you like cherry pie? Blueberry muffins? A tasty peach? A delicious plum? A pear that does not need to be pared, but in the hand calls for a pair? An apple that needs no peeling, but in the hand makes you want a glass of cider; apple sauce, apple pie? Come to Michigan, and all are yours for the taking.

Give the people of Berrien Springs this channel to the lake, and it just may be that they will make the land and the orchards blossom and produce so that not only the people of Indiana and Ohio, but certainly those of Chicago will get and enjoy more and better berries, fruits, and vegetables than they now are privileged to have.

If the dredging of this river is not now imperative because there is no great need for its use as a waterway, can we not be farsighted and look forward to the completion of the St. Lawrence Waterway, when vessels from across the sea, from the Old World will dock at our lake ports? Yes, perhaps some from the Far East will sail east and south around the horn, then up the Atlantic to the St. Lawrence, then through Lake Ontaria, Lake Erie, up through the St. Claire River and Lake, up Lake Huron, through the straits and down the length of Michigan, may then load at the St. Joseph-Benton Harbor port and carry some of the abundant, health-giving produce of our area to those less fortunate.

Now, laugh at this dream if you will, but how many of you know that for several years ships from the Old World, from Norway and from Sweden, have been unloading at South Haven, just a few miles north on Lake Michigan from the Benton Harbor-St. Joseph Harbor?

The Congress has given millions, yes, billions, of dollars for the development of places in the West where, before the Federal dollars were expended, there was neither people, townsite, industry, no productive land—nothing except a roaring river down through a mountain gorge. Many a thirsty desert has been made to blossom and produce because of the dollars given by taxpayers of the Midwest.

Federal dollars harnessed many a river, made possible the building of its industries and its cities; Federal dollars wired the current that is carried hundreds of miles away for the benefit of individuals and industrial enterprises, which have grown and expanded and profited because of Federal dollars so generously given by the Congress.

The Congress has given billions to create hydroelectric plants so that citizens throughout the West and Northwest might have television, radio, electrical refrigeration, electrical cooking, lights, water, only the good Lord knows what else.

And today all this amendment calls for is, by comparison, a measley little $10,000 for a beautiful river of clear water—or at least it was clear when I lived along its banks at Constantine in St. Joseph County—which has the possibility of carrying a commerce-creating, profitable resort business.

Nor is that all. With logic and reason equal to that which has put through many an appropriation for millions, if not billions, of dollars I may add that this improvement is needed in furtherance of our national defense.

Now think of that. Who knows what we may need? Will you impair the future safety, the security, and the welfare of our people by refusing the funds to dredge this river? It may be, if and when they bomb—as we read each day they may—the valley through which flows the St. Joe may be a land of refuge where we may not only seek safety, but find sustenance.

Did I hear someone in an undertone ask if I sincerely thought that the failure to adopt this amendment would actually endanger the future of our Republic or lessen the welfare of our people? If I did or if that question is in someone's mind, as perhaps it is, my reply would be that I have seen appropriations for many times the sum carried in this amendment go through the House and the other body with no more reason back of them.

Leaving this matter to your conscience and your good judgment, my hope is that this discussion has called your attention to what we have been doing here today, to the manner in which we have dealt with the taxpayers' dollars.

National Wildlife Refuges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, sports columnist Bill Leetch of the Washington Star has called attention to bills, among them H. R. 2142 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHSON], to require that not less than 40 percent of the money raised by sale of duck stamps be used for the purpose for which it was intended—acquisition of land for migratory bird rearing and feeding areas.

As Mr. Leetch says, passage of this bill would put an end to diversion of duck stamp funds away from acquisition and to maintenance and other administrative expenses.

Here is that part of Mr. Leetch's column in last night's Star which refers to this bill:

Duck hunters would do well to obtain a copy of te speech of Representative LESTER JOHNSON of Wisconsin on May 27, entitled "We Have Found What Is Happening to Your Duck Stamp Money, Mr. Duck Hunter." It is most revealing, and we wish we had space

to print all of it. The trouble seems to be that an economy-minded Congress, abetted by the Budget Bureau, has so crippled the appropriations for Fish and Wildlife Service that it in turn has been forced to dip into duck stamp funds in order to keep going. Even the Post Office Department, which prints the duck stamps, jumped on these sportsmen's funds and raised the printing ante from $32,000 in 1953 to $154,462 in 1954.

This isn't what duck hunters voluntarily asked to be taxed for. When the Duck Stamp Act was passed in 1934 it was thought that the $1 price of each stamp might be sufficient. Subsequently, in 1949, duck hunters asked that the price be raised to $2 a stamp and legislation was enacted to do so. While the money from these stamps was primarily designed to acquire refuge lands for the wild waterfowl, out of the $44 million paid into the duck stamp fund over the years, only $7.5 million, or about one-sixth of the total, has been used for this purpose. As against that, more than $25 million has been used for ordinary administrative expenses.

Mr. JOHNSON has put a bill in the hopper, H. R. 2142, which stipulates that 40 percent of duck stamp revenues must be used for the purchase of waterfowl refuges. This bill is now pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Budget Bureau and other Federal bureaus are opposed to earmarking any of these funds. It has been suggested that the amount obtained would be entirely inadequate for the purpose anyway, and that the cost of the duck stamp might be raised to say $5, or even more. Without legislation to protect this duck stamp money and insure at least a fair portion of it going for the purpose which the duck hunters intended it to be spent, this would be useless, certainly in the light of past experience.

If you want the full story, write Representative JOHNSON at 340 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and he will mail you a copy of his full report. Then let's get busy and do what we can to get this bill reported out of the committee for action on the floor of the House.

H. R. 2142 and similar bills are a long step forward. But their passage only solves one phase of the problem.

Complete protection of the duck hunters' investment in duck stamps also involves amending the law under which the Secretary of the Interior can wipe out refuges, without hearings, without notice to sportsmen and conservationists, even without discussion with interested groups.

So, even if we pass pending legislation earmarking duck stamp funds for the acquisition of refuges, we will run this risk that these funds can be diverted by administrative officials, for the Secretary of the Interior can declare the lands so acquired surplus and they can be taken over by another agency and used for any other purposes, including a military target range.

Pending legislation would prevent this. My H. R. 5306, cosponsored in the House by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and in the Senate by the junior Senator from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY, declare it to be the policy of Congress that national wildlife refuges be maintained and preserved. These bills provide that the Secretary of the Interior cannot dispose of or relinquish any of the national wildlife refuges, or parts thereof, without the approval of Congress.

New Cure for Mental Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of excerpts from hearings, held on May 17, by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, regarding the promising results of experiments with new drugs in the treatment of mental illnesses. The summary is reprinted from the U. S. News & World Report of June 17, 1955.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CURE FOR MENTAL ILLS?

(Two drugs are promising to revolutionize the treatment of mental disease.

(Just what those drugs can do is told here by leading authorities, testifying before Congress. Indicated effects are these:

(Violent patients, with little chance of recovery heretofore, often respond quickly.

(Disturbed adolescents show a large percentage discharged after a few months.

(Hospitalization for the mentally ill can be shortened, often avoided altogether.

(Treatment by drugs, in many cases, can be carried on at home, by the family doctor.

(Cost of treatment may be cut far back.)

(Following are extracts from the transcript of hearings on Labor Department and Health, Education, and Welfare Department appropriations held by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on May 17, 1955:)

Dr. KLINE (Dr. Nathan Kline, director of research, Rockland State Hospital, Orangeburg, N. Y). Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely exciting time to be in psychiatric research. There are some of us who have been working in the field for a number of years, but relatively few. I have been doing psychiatric research for some 10 years, and until very recently it was extremely difficult to find support or help to work in the field. There are some of us consumed by curiosity to know why the mind works and how it works, along with attempting to alleviate the tremendous illness.

It has been only in the past year and a half or 2 years that this renewed impetus has come along, and in part, I think, tribute should be paid to the pharmaceutical industry, to their ingenuity, luck, and also the ability to devote their resources to this field. It looked fairly hopeless until quite recently.

Then, interestingly enough, these two drugs, reserpine and chlorpromazine, burst upon the scene at the same time. Our interest is to try to evaluate them, to tell not only that they do work, but how they work, on whom, and why they work.

The original work on reserpine was reported in India. It was there used as a cure-all for high blood pressure, snakebite, toxemia, pregnancy, insomnia, practically anythink you can mention.

These practitioners were looked down upon by the so-called western scientists. Then a few years ago some of them decided to find whether the high blood pressure-reducing effects were actually as effective as reported. Lo and behold, they found they were effective. And Dr. Wilkins in Boston and others about 2 or 3 years ago demonstrated that the drug was very effective in the treatment of high blood pressure. On the basis of this, science then also claimed it would have an effect on insanity, and since we were so desperate for methods of treatment, we decided to try to evaluate it.

At that time, we used what appeared to be a very large dose, compared to the blood-pressure dose. The results of our first study showed that the drug was effective as a sedative, that is, that less restraints were needed, there were fewer assaults, and the patients were less disturbed. But no one appeared to be cured of the disease.

However, on the basis of this, we felt it was worth further investigation. About that time an intramuscular form of the drug came along, and it was with that that we have been getting the really dramatic results.

When then gave this drug to 200 acutely disturbed psychotic females, and when females are acutely psychotically disturbed, they really are.

Of this group we found that 22 percent of these patients whose prognosis was otherwise practically nil were discharged from the hospital within a period of 5 to 6 months. This was very dramatic, because normally this type of patient would not have been discharged.

I mentioned over here that from this same building, the prior year, only 4.7 percent of the patients were discharged, and here within a 6 months' period 22 percent of the group who were given the drug were discharged.

There are side effects, but none of them are serious. With reserpine, and the risk that is involved, it is relatively small considering the benefits to be derived.

We then carried out researches further, proceeding a step at a time, and we need it on the admission service to take care of patients who were awaiting electric-shock therapy, since it takes 5 or 6 weeks to work them up and get permission. Of 90 patients whom we placed on reserpine simply to keep them calm until ready for electric shock, we found two-thirds of them no longer needed electric shock when the permission had been obtained.

As a result of that, we tried to see if we could replace electric shock entirely and get even better results. Since December of last year on no patient on the female admission service have we found it necessary to employ electric shock. We are just beginning to summarize our results. Although it is too early to know definitely, the results look better than we have gotten with electric shock.

Another group of patients whom we tested are the disturbed adolescents, which constitutes a real problem. Here again we found that even with the schizophrenic children, they improved while on medication and that the nonschizophrenics out of the group of 14, 8 of them were well enough to leave the hospital after 3 or 4 months of treatment. And there is the possibility of application of these drugs even prior to admission. It may cut in on our hospital admission rate.

We are similarly testing other drugs as they come along, chlorpromazine, frenquel, and so forth. We are attempting to determine what type of patient will respond best to what type of drug. But there certainly is a need for more support for investigations of this type, and I think that the future looks entirely different than it did 2 years ago; that psychiartry is finally coming of age.

As a final comment, I think the purported arguments between those that believe in psychotherapy or psychoanalytic orientation on drug research, it is not a conflict between them. Freud himself says that behind every psychoanalyst stands the man with a syringe, and up until the present time we have had no drugs to put into the syringe. We finally are reaching such a point.

So that the drugs open a way for better therapy. They are not going to replace it, but they are going to make possible better treatment than has ever been possible in the past.

NORMAL AFTER TREATMENT?

Senator HILL (LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the subcommittee). Doctor, of the 22 percent who were discharged within 5 months, I do not suppose enough time has elapsed to give any final answer, but do you think they are pretty well on the road to what we might call a normal condition?

Dr. KLINE. Our estimate to date is that about two-thirds of these patients have been able to maintain their improvement without any further medication. About a third of them have slipped, but if they did slip, in every case when they were retreated, they were brought back to their normal level. And we now keep them on maintenance doses of the drug, and they have been able to hold their improvement.

You were right, sir, that it is too short to know what the long-term picture is. It will be another 4 or 5 years before we can write anything like a definite story. But to see patients who were formerly untreatable within a matter of weeks or months become sane, rational human beings, means that the wall has been breached. So that it is now simply a matter of improving on them.

Mr. GORMAN (Mike Gorman, executive director, National Mental Health Committee). Next we have Dr. Henry Brill, commissioner for research for the New York State Department of Mental Health. They have done as much work on the drugs in the New York State system, I believe, as any in the country.

I though that he might present to the committee both the need for the evaluation of these new drugs and just how this procedure will be followed, Dr. Brill.

Dr. BRILL. First, I would like to say "Amen" to what has been said here already. We obviously are on the threshold of a new type of procedure in psychiatry. I will review briefly where we stand in New York as a background for what might be considered as a series of needs and possibilities.

About a year ago we became interested in the use of these drugs, and after a month or two, it was quite obvious that the drugs really have the psychiatric effects which you have heard described here, that they were therapeutically active. The next step was to get them into use in a large group of patients so that we could tell something about the broad expanse of effect.

Starting in January, we had 4,200 patients on treatment. In February it rose to 5,500; the next month, 6,900; the last month it was 8,300. That is 8,300 patients on drug therapy of a total 93,000 patients in the Department of Mental Hygiene in New York State.

One fact has stood out as fairly well proved, and that is that these drugs will allow us to carry out a more humane kind of treatment. Restraint and seclusion, which is something that we try to minimize at all times, has been recorded for years, and it has stood at a fairly stable index figure. It was an irreducible minimum.

Within the last 6 months, restraint, and seclusion figures for the department as a whole have dropped about 20 percent. Where the drugs have been applied most intensively, these figures have dropped even more. In some places they have been cut in half.

It is extremely important for public relations, extremely important for morale among the employees. It is valuable for the hospital as a whole. But in spite of the fact that we have applied these drugs broadly now for about 5 months and we have applied them in a number of different settings, there are lots of questions that remain to be answered.

We have applied them, for example, in the treatment of delinquents and antisocial behavior; people who are in correctional institutions. That is one field where it should be tried.

We have applied the drugs in the treatment of epileptics who are disturbed and in hospitals because of their behavior. We have also used them in the case of mental retardation with disturbed behavior—this all in addition to the mentally ill that we have just described.

Now, the evaluation of the drugs in all these settings has given us a qualitative answer, not a quantitative answer. We know that both drugs are useful. We know that we can get certain results. But we do not know how good they are; that is, we do not know how much better the results of treatment are than the results of spontaneous evolution of illness. We do not know how these drugs compare with each other really or with other standard methods of treatment.

Mr. GORMAN. Senator, my final witness is a kind of a "sleeper."

I ran across, in the Southern Medical Journal, an article by Dr. Frank Ayd, Jr., from Baltimore. He has come through with three or four more very brilliant papers since then. Last week he delivered a talk before the American Psychiatric Association on the use of the drugs in private practice, which I think opens up a whole new frontier of treatment away from the mental hospital.

I remember at the convention the thought was that mental patients would be treated by the family doctor outside of the hospital in those cases if we developed the drugs.

REPORT ON PRIVATE PRACTICE

Dr. AYD. I would like to present the picture that we see in the private practice of psychiatry. About 18 months ago I became interested in research of these drugs for treatment of nonhospitalized patients. The objective of the research was to determine certain factors; one, was it possible by the use of these drugs to reduce admissions to our already overcrowded State hospitals to private psychiatric hospitals; secondly, we wanted to know whether or not these drugs would make it possible to treat a larger number of psychiatric patients in our hospitals, or in general nursing homes; third, we wanted to know whether or not these drugs would make it possible to shorten the period of hospitalization when that was necessary. Finally, we wanted to know whether or not these drugs would reduce the cost of psychiatric illness for the private patients, which, as all of you well know, is a very important factor.

After working with these drugs intensively last November, I made the first report on the use of these drugs in the treatment of private patients at the southern medical meeting at St. Louis. I reported that these drugs make it possible to treat many disturbed patients or ambulatory patients—that is, outside the hospital—who would otherwise require hospitalization. At the same time, I reported that this initial study indicates that these drugs are a very useful contribution to the therapeutic work carried on by different kinds of institutions. However, a long-term study of the effectiveness of this drug is definitely indicated.

At the American Psychiatric Association meeting in Atlantic City last week, I reported on the treatment of 300 more private patients, in which I pointed out some facts; one, that these drugs make it possible to treat outside of a hospital many patients who would have had to be hospitalized; in the instances where hospitalization is necessary, patients could be adequately treated in a general hospital or a regular nursing home. After a week or two of hospitalization, these patients could be discharged and their treatment continued in the office.

Only in the most seriously disturbed patients was it necessary to admit these patients to a psychiatric hospital for a few weeks.

WHAT IS DONE FOR AGED PATIENTS

One thing we have learned very quickly, which is of fundamental importance and which has not been brought out here, is that the admissions to our State hospitals of the aged patients has gone up phenomenally in the last few years. We found the geriatric patients could make satisfactory home adjustments while taking these drugs, something which was important not only from the standpoint of the patients and the patient's family, who preferred it this way, but which is of a tremendous interest and significance because it reduces the admissions to our State hospital.

Without these drugs, senile patients would have been placed in nursing homes or private psychiatric hospitals. When treated with these drugs, they were able either to remain in private nursing homes, or else return back to their family instead of entering a psychiatric hospital.

In essence, what we found can be very easily summarized as follows: These drugs are a valuable addition to the therapy of practicing psychiatry. Practically utilized, they can increase the number of patients who may be treated in the office.

Secondly, they can shorten the period of hospitalization, or make hospitalization unnecessary, thereby reducing admissions to our overcrowded State hospitals.

Thirdly, they can replace or reduce need for some of the physical methods of treatment, such as electric-shock therapy, which we cannot always employ because of physical reasons, and so forth.

Finally, and most important, these drugs can reduce the cost of psychiatric care.

At 1:30 this morning I had a brilliant demonstration of what these drugs can do, because I was called out to see a 30-year-old woman who was destroying the furniture in her home, was acutely disturbed, with acute schizophrenic psychosis. Under ordinary circumstances, that would have meant calling in the police to restrain her and take her off to a psychiatric institution. By simply administering one of these drugs to the patient at home she became quiet enough where she could be admitted to a general hospital for possibly 2 weeks, at the end of which time she could go home.

I could cite another example. We had a beautiful demonstration of what these drugs can do in the case of a pair of twins. The older sister, before these drugs became available, had a schizophrenic psychosis and she required a period of hospitalization for almost 6 months and a total of 18 months of psychiatric treatment. The total cost was slightly more than $3,200.

A few months ago the twin sister developed the same, identical illness and was brought to my office by five men who had to hold her in restraint because of her disturbed behavior. She was admitted to a general nursing home for a period of 1 week only, received no shock therapy; at the end of 3 months was completely discharged. The total cost to the family, including the foster hospitalization, was $325.

So there you see what we can do outside of a hospital.

These drugs are definitely valuable to us. There are many questions that we do not know and which we need to know if we are going to use them properly and increase their effectiveness so that we can enable normal people to remain not only out of hospitals, but also, deeply important, the majority of these patients were able to work while they received treatment, so that there was no loss of income on the part of the patient or of the family.

And these things reduce the number of people who have to seek public assistance and so forth. So that there are many things about these drugs which we should know and we can't possibly know it unless we do further research. And that, of course, is

impossible unless someone supports it. That is why we are doing it.

Thank you.

AVAILABLE FOR ALL DOCTORS

Senator HILL. Doctor, how long have you had these drugs?

Dr. AYD. I started to use the drugs before they became available to the general medical profession, since I, like Dr. Kline, was doing basic research. They have been available on the market for approximately 1 year, so that they are available to all doctors in the United States.

If it were possible for us to teach, for example, a general practitioner, particularly those out in the counties, and so forth, where psychiatric help is not immediately available, if we could get literature out to these men in circumstances like happened to me at 1:30 this morning, we would make a tremendous advance. Instead of people calling in the State police to take patients off to the State hospital, they could treat that patient themselves, before they get psychiatric help for them, without following the usual routine of rushing them off to a psychiatric hospital.

Senator HILL. You say many of these people are able, with the administration of these drugs, to carry on with their work, their occupation?

Dr. AYD. Yes, sir. I have treated now over 500 patients in my private practice with these drugs, and fully 80 percent of these people are working people, or they are housewives in their homes taking care of their children.

This twin that I just described had a family and at the end of 1 week she was discharged from the hospital and returned home and began immediately to take up her household duties. As long as she took the drugs she was perfectly all right.

House Votes 3 to 1 in Support of Defenders' Campaign Against NATO Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include a report on the House action on status of forces amendments and resolutions from the publication Task Force, an organ of the Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc., of Washington, D. C.:

HOUSE VOTES 3 TO 1 IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDERS' CAMPAIGN AGAINST NATO TREATY—HISTORY OF OUR LONG FIGHT, NOW BEGINNING TO BEAR FRUIT

(By Eugene Cowles Pomeroy, vice president, Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc.)

The defenders alone and unaided undertook to challenge the criminal betrayal of our Armed Forces, the one class of Americans singled out for denial of their rights guaranteed by the Constitution specifically set forth and carefully described in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, generally called the Bill of Rights. This gross injustice was done through a treaty known as the Status of Forces Treaty, which ignored a principle honored by civilized nations through hundreds of years, under which each nation granted complete immunity from the jurisdiction of its courts to the armed forces of other nations when such armed forces were present under invitation for the protection of such state.

This is a nonpartisan issue. A Democratic administration first negotiated the treaty through its Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in 1951 and a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, through his influence with a Republican Senate, secured its ratification, which was carried out in 1953.

The Defenders opened the fight against the treaty by filing suit on behalf of Pvt. Richard Keefe in November 1953, demanding in the United States Federal court a writ of habeas corpus for the purpose of testing the constitutionality of the NATO treaty. We promised to continue the case into the Supreme Court if necessary. This promise has been kept.

At the same time the Defenders appeared in the United States Court of Claims on behalf of Richard Keefe's wife and two baby sons, aged 2 and 3 years. This innocent and destitute family had been summarily deprived of their living by the Army arbitrarily cutting off her husband's allotment from Mrs. Keefe. The case for Mrs. Keefe and her little boys terminated by the court ruling that it had no jurisdiction in matters involving a constitutional question.

In the case of Private Keefe's conviction and imprisonment in a French jail, by a French court, the United States district court denied our plea on the grounds that it had no jurisdiction. An appeal to the United States court of appeals was promptly taken. Before the appeal was acted upon, Lt. Col. John H. Coffman, the Defenders' attorney of record mysteriously met his death. The lower court was sustained by the appellate division and we then appealed to the United States Supreme Court. That Court refused to grant a writ of certiorari but specifically called attention to the fact that it did not rule on the constitutional issue raised.

One of the Defenders' attorneys, Eugene C. Pomeroy went to France to personally confer with his client, Richard Keefe, but was effectively prevented from seeing or communicating with him through the combined machinations of the American Embassy and the United States military authorities in France in apparent collusion with the French Government.

The revelations of the Keefe case and the infamous abandonment of the protection guaranteed to American soldiers by their Constitution, as revealed through the Defenders' monthly publication, Task Force, has evidently so inflamed Americans of all groups that they have let their Representatives in Congress know in no uncertain language that this situation will no longer be tolerated. Evidence of this is reflected in a vote taken in the House of Representatives on Wednesday, May 18 of this year, when 174 voted in favor of an amendment to H. R. 5927, introduced by a sterling American patriot, Hon. FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio. The vote on Mr. Bow's amendment was ayes 174, noes 56, more than 3 to 1 in favor of the amendment. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1955, pp. 55 and 56). A press release by Mr. Bow's office, which tells the story, follows:

"WASHINGTON.—Representative FRANK T. Bow, Republican, of Ohio, today called upon President Eisenhower to modify or abrogate international agreements permitting foreign nations to exercise criminal jurisdiction over American troops stationed abroad.

"Bow introduced a resolution requiring the President to open negotiations on the NATO status of forces agreement and 'other international agreements' of similar nature.

"He submitted the proposal during debate on the national reserve training bill, and announced that he was considering an amendment to the pending bill to prohibit overseas shipment of troops until the treaties concerned had been changed.

" 'For many years it has been a principle of international law that military personnel stationed by invitation in a foreign country remain under the jurisdiction of their own military courts,' Bow said. 'Under this principle Americans stationed overseas would be assured of their constitutional rights and of trial by other Americans.'

" 'This new theory set forth in the NATO pact leaves Americans at the mercy of foreign courts, under foreign law, with none of the safeguards or privileges guaranteed by our Constitution. Since we are the only nation that has sizable numbers of troops stationed abroad, Americans are the only ones who suffer by this new concept,' he added.

"Bow discussed the individual cases of several Americans already tried and convicted in foreign nations, including an Ohio marine who is serving a 3-year sentence in Japan for joy-riding in a taxi. He said several hundred have been tried since the end of World War II. The text of Mr. Bow's resolution follows:

" 'HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION, BY BOW, OF OHIO, MAY 18, 1955

" 'Providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries.

" '*Resolved, etc.*—

" 'That (a) the President shall forthwith address to the North Atlantic Council a request for revision of article VII of the agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces (signed at London on June 19, 1951), as provided for by article VII of such agreement, for the purpose of bringing about the prompt elimination or modification of article VII of such agreement so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American military personnel stationed within their boundaries.

" '(b) Unless the revision described in subsection (a) shall have theretofore been brought about, the President shall denounce such agreement in the manner prescribed in article XIX thereof, at the earliest date permitted under such article.

" 'SEC. 2. The President shall forthwith take such further action as may be necessary, with respect to any other treaty or international agreement to which the United States is a party and which contains provisions permitting foreign countries to exercise criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries, either to bring about the elimination or modification of such provisions so that they will not apply to such personnel or to denounce and withdraw from such treaty or agreement'."

We urge all supporters of the Defenders of the American Constitution, Inc., all subscribers and readers of Task Force to write their Congressmen and their Senators asking their vigorous support for Congressman Bow's amendment to the national reserve training bill now pending before Congress.

The Constitution must be preserved and rights of our military defenders as guaranteed to them by the Constitution must be restored to them now. Congressman Bow's amendment is an important action to that end.

LEADING NEWSPAPER OPPOSES NATO TREATY

An editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of May 24, 1955, is typical of newspaper reaction to the situation first revealed in Task Force, and now highlighted by congressional debate on the Reserve training bill, which brought forth Congressman Bow's history making resolution, reprinted in this issue. The editorial follows:

"AN AMERICAN DENIED HIS RIGHTS

"Jose Montijo, a member of the Air Force from Phoenix, Ariz., sits in a French jail today in the shadow of the guillotine. He

is charged with stabbing a Frenchman to death in a street brawl.

"When Montijo is brought to trial, he will be denied most of the rights that would be his were he tried either in an American court or before an American court martial. He cannot have an American lawyer to defend him. The court will appoint a French lawyer for that duty. Such fundamental American rights as the presumption of innocence, which requires the prosecution to prove guilt beyond reasonable doubt, and protection against testifying against himself, which Communists claim so vociferously in this land, are denied him. In France the Communist press is already demanding Montijo's execution.

"Montijo's plight arises from the status of forces treaty, which our government negotiated with other members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Under its provisions an American solider, sailor, or airman stationed abroad who is charged with an offense not related to his performance of military duty is surrendered to local authorities for trial and punishment.

"Although the Senate was so foolish as to ratify this treaty, its provisions have become so obnoxious to the American public that enactment of a law setting up a 'tough' army reserve policy has been stymied in the House by an amendment forbidding the stationing of American troops in any country in which the treaty is in effect.

"The status of forces treaty is typical of the lickspittle attitude of the American State Department. One would think, from its provisions, that we are under great obligation to the French and other nations for the privilege of stationing troops on their soil, and accordingly, must placate them at every turn. In fact, our troops are in France solely because that Communist ridden nation is incapable of defending itself." (Chicago Tribune of May 24, 1955.)

The Navy as a Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the address of the distinguished Assistant Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Albert Pratt, before the NROTC unit at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., on Tuesday, June 14.

In his admirably well-expressed talk to the graduates, Secretary Pratt outlined some of the problems confronting young college men, who are entering our armed services in these trying days. I am sure that he furnished them with encouragement and inspiration.

Naturally, I have a great interest in the naval unit at my old college and have been pleased no end by the steady progress of the unit and the high standing and fine record it has achieved. The Navy Department has been very wise, in my opinion, in its selection of leadership for this unit, which has had a line of illustrious leaders and the current commanding officer, Capt. John F. Gallaher, has carried out its best traditions and has achived an outstanding record.

Secretary Pratt's able and interesting address is worthy of careful reading:

THE NAVY AS A CAREER

(Address by Albert Pratt, Assistant Secretary of the Navy)

Dean Bundy, ladies and gentlemen, future commissioned officers, it is an honor and a great personal pleasure to be your guest today. Cambridge has a hallowed lure for me in June, and added to that is the special uplift which I derive from participating in the commencement of your experiences as Naval and Marine officers.

I guess that if one looked over the alumni parade next Thursday, he would not describe me, or my contemporaries, as particularly old graduates. However, in terms of my Navy experiences, I am beginning to feel really salty. Twenty-two years ago, I received my commission as ensign, United States Naval Reserves, after completing the Naval ROTC course here at Harvard. I had always loved the sea, and looked forward to pleasant cruises, and pleasant associations. Yet, at that time, I couldn't realize how vitally my Navy life would influence my whole career.

Therefore, I share with you the excitement and the anticipation which must be yours today, as you firm your ties with the Navy, and accept your responsibilities as commissioned officers.

You are about to embark on a phase of your career which will be filled with many interesting experiences, some of them valuable, some tough ones, and some of them amusing. Mostly, you'll have interesting times and very rewarding ones, and they all add up to an opportunity for each of you.

Some of you have already decided to make the Navy your career; others probably have a job or a civilian calling which you hope to return to, and have decided not to make the Navy your career. Others of you are uncertain. This opportunity, however, applies equally to all of you.

To those of you who have decided to make the Navy your career, let me say this: I believe that the career of the naval officer in the future will be far more attractive than it has been for many years. In the first place, we are doing all we can to increase the economic attractiveness of a naval career. As you probably know, in the recent pay bill enacted by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the Defense Department, the chief increase in pay was concentrated in those ranks and periods of service which characterize the career officer or enlisted man. We hope to provide a much more extensive system for dependent medical care.

We will also introduce legislation in the near future aimed at increasing the amount of housing so that those of you who may later have wives and may later have families can have a proper place to live while you are serving. And finally, we hope that the retirement benefits can be adjusted more equitably so that any man who makes the navy his career can look forward to reasonable security at the end of his period of service.

Economic benefits, however, are only a small part of the attractiveness of a naval career. The Navy is much more than a job; much more than service to country. It is a way of life. It gets into your blood.

These are things which are hard to express, but I know from personal experience that there is a real inspiration in being part of an organization like the United States Navy and being associated with such a fine group of men. I particularly want to reassure you career people that today there is no limit whatsoever on your advancement as a naval officer. The Navy today draws no distinction in assignment to duty or responsibility given to the individual officer, whether he be a Reserve officer, Naval Academy graduate, a Regular Officer, an ROTC graduate, or a graduate of OCS.

We in the Navy learned this in World War II when Reserve officers with a brief period of training served side by side with the regular corps of more experienced regular Navy officers and did their job every bit as well.

I can remember, for instance, a situation which occurred while I was serving on the battleship *Texas* during the hard, dreary days of the North Atlantic patrol, when the commanding officer of our ship had decided that he would have only 4 officers of the deck underway. He tried to pick the people whom he thought would do the best job and carry out his ideas, whether he was on the bridge or asleep. Of those 4, 2 were Naval Academy graduates and 2 young Reserves.

A couple of months ago I was out in the Western Pacific. We spent a few days aboard one of our aircraft carriers there, the *Kearsarge*. I was up on the bridge during flight operations and noticed with interest that the officer of the deck was a young ensign, and the junior officer of the deck serving under him was a lieutenant (junior grade). I asked the captain about this, and he said, "We merely try to pick the best man for the job. The officer of the deck that you see there is a young Reserve officer who's been here for a year and is a very able fellow, and the junior grade is a Naval Academy graduate who hasn't had enough experience."

You will find the same thing wherever you go. It's what you yourself are worth and what you can do that counts, not where you were trained or what your background is. The same principle applies to the higher ranks. I think the most outstanding example of that principle was during the recent evacuation of the Tachen Islands, which you have all read about. That operation was potentially a very explosive situation. If the Communists had interfered, we might have had some extremely difficult decisions to make, and they would have had to be made instantaneously.

The man on the spot in charge of that operation was Vice Adm. Alfred M. Pride, commander of the Seventh Fleet. The decisions which he might have had to make could have had more far-reaching consequences, not only for the Navy but for the United States and the whole world, than any decision any other man has ever had to make before. Admiral Pride is a former enlisted man who came up through the ranks. He never went to the Naval Academy, yet he is recognized everywhere as an outstanding officer, as you can see from the tremendous responsibilities that were placed in his hands.

Now let me say this to the noncareer people: Some of you undoubtedly have planned your future. You may have a job waiting for you when you get through with your military obligation, or you may have some particular nonmilitary field that you have always been heading for. Let me urge you in the strongest words possible to throw yourself into this new Navy life—while you are in it—with all of the vigor and concentration at your command. Pretend that it is the only life that you are going to lead. Enter into every phase of it wholeheartedly as though you were going to be in the Navy until you retire. Only in that way can you get the most out of it.

I speak with deep personal conviction because of my own experiences. I spent 5 years on active duty before, during, and after the last war, and they were among the most rewarding five years of my life. My situation was perhaps more difficult than those of you who are undertaking your military service at the outset of your productive years. Mine came as an interruption. Yet I have no hesitancy in saying that I believe that the 5 years I spent in the Navy made a much better person of me, a better wage

earner, and a better man than if I had spent those same 5 years in civilian life.

The Navy can do the same for you, if you will do your part and enter into the service wholeheartedly without reservation and with a determination to use your capabilities to the utmost. Of course you can slide along for your required years of service, but if you do this you will not reap the potential benefits. You will get from your service in the Navy exactly what you put into it and no more.

And now a word to those of you who are uncertain as to whether or not you wish to continue a naval career. Until your period of obligated service is completed, to you I offer the same advice as I did to those who have definitely made up their minds not to stay in the Navy. Try it out, give it everything you have, pretend that it will be your career and then at the proper time make up your mind whether to stay or not.

Actually the Navy today offers a young man with your background and training an opportunity that you would find difficult to match in civilian life. Let's suppose you stay in the Navy for 20 years. Let's see what kind of situation you would face then. Most of you would be around 42, 43, or 44. You would have had an experience shared by very few young men in civilian life for the same period. You would have traveled widely. You would have had a variety of experience. You would have had responsibilities far exceeding those of the average businessman in your age group. You would be eligible to retire from the Navy at that point and receive a very substantial retirement income for the rest of your life. Assuming that you took the usual course of promotion, you would be a commander, with a retirement income of about $300 a month.

You would not have to stop working, and you probably would not want to, for your opportunities in private industry would be unbounded. I know of no sizable commercial enterprise today that is not looking for men in their early forties with technical training, with great administrative experience, and most important of all, with training in the vital field of leadership and the handling of men. These are the assets that you would have—these are the attractions that you could offer to a private employer. If you decide to make the Navy your career, you can end up the last 20 years of your life in the top levels of executive responsibility in civilian employment.

That is why I say to you young men who do not know whether or not you wish to continue your Navy career: Don't make up your minds now. Wait and see; and in the meantime give this new life everything you have.

And now if I may take a few minutes more, I would like to address a special word to the mothers, the fathers, and the sweethearts of this graduating class. To you I say that your young man today becomes one of the elite of this country. Any man you see in the Navy or Marine uniform—enlisted or commissioned—is certain to be superior. He must have superior health and physique, for the demands of a military life are hard and the physical requirements of the service are high. He must have superior mentality because the modern weapons of warfare require highly intelligent young men to operate these extraordinary complex devices. And finally, he must have superior character. Military people, and particularly Navy people, have to live close together, frequently in cramped quarters and sometimes under conditions of great hardship. Not infrequently the life of one man depends upon the man beside him. That is why we cannot have anyone in the Navy who is not of the highest character.

These young men are truly the Nation's finest—carefully selected, screened through rigorous training and engaged in an honorable profession of service to the Nation. You can be proud of them as the country is proud of them. And you can show your pride in many ways which they will appreciate more than mere words, by making this strenuous new life easier for them through your loyal backing and support. Bear with their absences cheerfully. Give them encouragement in their hardships. Share their sense of dedication to duty. In so doing, you too can truly contribute to your country's defense, by standing behind your man in uniform and adding to his strength of purpose. For the stronger our Armed Forces in peace, the less likely we shall ever have to use them in war.

To you young men who are to be commissioned, I leave this final word. The uniform and the insignia that you wear are proud ones. Their heritage goes back through generations of naval and marine heroes to John Paul Jones. You are joining a wonderful brotherhood. The band on your sleeve, or the bar on your shoulder, is the tie that binds you together, the eagle on your cap, the bright insignia of service to your country. It is a uniform which you can wear proudly and with honor.

See that in everything you do, you live up to the finest traditions of that uniform. You have had exceptional training, well-rounded education, and you have an unlimited future. If you give the Navy your best, the service will repay you many, many fold.

Federal Retirees Merit a Raise, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, adjustments due to cost-of-living increases and other factors have been made in the pay of practically every Federal employee. There remains the responsibility of the Congress to consider the plight of retired Federal civil-service employees. Let us finish our job and not overlook this fine group of former public servants who, even more than those still in active service, are confronted with the difficult task of living on lowered buying-power dollars.

I hope the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will consider legislation such as H. R. 3792 to bring necessary relief to our retired Federal employees who are suffering under inflation and reduced purchasing power of their pensions through no fault of their own.

The following editorial from the Bremerton Sun suggests that what is needed is a practical plan to gear annuity payments to living costs. That idea merits the support of Congress.

FEDERAL RETIREES MERIT A RAISE, TOO

Postal workers have been granted wage increases averaging 8 percent; Congress has assured more than 1 million other civil service workers they will get an equivalent raise, retroactive to March.

That is all to the good, for it is generally agreed the salary levels of these faithful workers have lagged behind the scales paid for comparable work in private industry.

While Congress is in the mood to strive for such payroll equalization, it would do well to consider the plight of the forgotten men of civil service, the retired employees and survivors of deceased employees.

Many of them reside among us in Kitsap County, and we have thus become personally familiar with many individual pressing situations. But current statistics bring even greater weight to bear on their collective case for a better deal, through increased payments from the Government-controlled retirement fund which they built up in their working years.

The average annuity paid to retired civil-service employees in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, was approximately $1,400, as a result of combined employee and Government contributions to the retirement fund. Those in the group retired for disability averaged less than ¢1,200 a year. Widows and dependent children averaged less than $600 a year.

Annuities have not kept pace with the cost of living. It would take approximately $2,400 of today's dollars to equal the purchasing power of a $1,200 annuity at the beginning of the inflationary cycle 15 years ago.

Annuities have been increased twice, once in 1948 by $300 or 25 percent, whichever was lesser, and again in 1952 by $324 or 21 percent. This latter increase did not apply to anyone whose annuity was in excess of $2,160.

What is needed is a practical permanent plan to gear annuity payments to living costs so annuitants will get speedy and adequate adjustments.

The $2,160 bar should be removed. It is manifestly unfair to limit relief to those whose annuities are less than that amount.

The pay of Senators and Representatives has been raised. Social-security benefits have been increased for those who have retired.

The same thing should be done for retired civil-service employees and their survivors.

The Renewal of our Spiritual Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous approval of the House, I am including an effective and inspiring address delivered by Rev. Edward L. R. Elson, D. D., Litt. D., LL. D., minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on the occasion of the graduation exercises at the College of Emporia, Kans., on May 28, 1955. This college is located in my hometown in Kansas. While attending the exercises Dr. Elson received a degree of doctor of sacred theology from the college. It is my honor to include Dr. Elson's address in the RECORD:

In this hour of history we put a date at the top of our letters but we do not know what it means. We have not yet made up our minds as to which century it is—whether it is the last century of a departing civilization or the first century of a new one. That which we are permitted to do is to live in our own time, play our own part, and attempt to guide and modify history.

Our own age is both full of promise and fraught with despair. President Eisenhower has called it the age of peril. Winston Churchill remarked that "in all history this is the most difficult century into which to be born."

As we assemble here today, we Americans are confronted with colossal obligations and magnificent opportunities. To a very great extent, the future of the race turns on what we are and what we do. We are strong, but cautious; powerful, but hesitant; mighty, but full of anxiety. We are great, but not sure we are great enough. We are good but not sure we are good enough. There is a duality to the life of our postwar world that is at once full of despair and full of hope. The potentialities for either evil or good are incalculable. On the one hand, we are both participants and spectators at a period of moral decline and cultural deterioration. And at the same time we are experiencing what appears to be the greatest moral resurgence and spiritual awakening in the history of our land. Against all the negative aspects of this age, we are confronted by this incipient renaissance of the spirit.

It is an axiom of history that every war is followed by a moral sag—the greater the war, the greater the moral deterioration. The evidence of deterioration is now very real.

There is a fatal indifference to the moral implication of money. The ambition of many people of our day is to achieve wealth and to achieve it for its own sake by whatever devices seem necessary—unmindful of the dictum of the catechism that the chief end of man is to glorify God.

Toward the institution of marriage and the home there is prevalent a destructive, non-Christian attitude. The hasty marriages of World War II produced a solemn procession from the divorce courts of this land, and today's broken homes are sad reminders of many a broken dream.

Everywhere there is renunciation of authority. Sacred vows are repudiated and infidelity is condoned. Far too many have jettisoned their idealism, walked over their ancestors' decencies, trespassed upon the solemn conventions of the past, have said "to hell with the Ten Commandments"—and then have wondered why they are going to pieces.

When morality goes down, the cultural level also sags. Since the turn of the century, we have learned how to jazz our music, to syncopate our thinking, to philosophize with boogie-woogie and to cavort esthetically with the jitterbug.

The plays which have entertained us during the past decade furnish a tragic and revealing commentary on the kind of people we have become. Judged by box office receipts, the screen dramas which have been successful since World War II have in many cases had at the center a deteriorating personality. Name them if you will: Streetcar Named Desire, Harvey, Death of a Salesman, Lady in the Dark, Seventh Veil. Each one of these—humorously, or with poignant pathos, depicts an abnormal personality.

The significance of such an observation lies not in what it reveals about the writers of the plays. They are brilliant. They understand us. The tragedy lies in what the mood and appetite say about us as a people—that we are a generation most fascinated by dramas with a "screwball" or "crackpot" as the hero. If this is true, then the implications of this observation are clear and ominous—for orthodox psychology suggests that we can only appreciate entertainment in direct relationship to our imaginative capacity to project ourselves into the hero's role.

As a generation, we dope ourselves with amateur psychology, turn wistfully to inspirational speakers, buy up all the books of the peace-of-mind cults—as though that were the chief hope in life. We follow preachers who peddle formulas for banishing worry and fear and tension, while the prophets of God, with their painful judgments requiring repentance, go unheeded. Yet we are left with a terrible emptiness and loneliness of soul and a desolation of spirit. There sweeps over us at times the haunting feeling that we have failed—failed at living. Again, as in the Garden of Eden, man is a renegade from his true nature, a fugitive from God and from spiritual authority. We have become brilliant but unhappy, clever but unstable, comfortable but comfortless.

Throughout the world, individual-man seems to be giving way to mass-man. Man, the individual, whose true nature has been revealed in the Holy Scriptures and whose free spirit was rediscovered and espoused at the time of the Reformation, is threatened by a composite man. Man, the individual—with an immortal soul, standing in solemn grandeur as a created being before the solemn majesty of his Creator, is yielding everywhere to collectivized man.

For two-thirds of the world's population, the most intimate details of every-day life are controlled by forces outside the individual. Although more subtle than in the East, this is becoming increasingly characteristic of Western civilization. The motion pictures dictate our styles, and sometimes our morals. Radio and television mold our vocabularies and invade the quiet, leisure moments of life. Book clubs select our reading. We do our business at chain stores and chain banks. We live under a dictatorship of psychological pressure and social atmosphere. Wherever we look, mass-man is encroaching on individual-man.

The progressive secularization of Western life is so evident it needs little documentation. Services to human lives, which for centuries were motivated by the religious spirit and had their inception in the church, no longer have specific relation to religion at all. Take for example, the healing of the body. Although medical services antidate the Christian era, the church has been the chief exponent of the ministry of healing for many centuries. Hospitals, originally "hostels"—were way stations or rest centers where travelers—especially pilgrims to the Holy Land, could stop for spiritual and physical rehabilitation. In earliest times the doctors were monks and the nurses were nuns. It was the love of Christ in action which made hospitals out of hostels.

From ancient times there have been learned men and in antiquity there were schools of learning, but it is a simple fact of history that education in the Christian era has been the product of the Christian church. Every time we see an academic gown and hood, we should be reminded that these were originally the costumes of learned monks. That many an institution, brought into being by men of God, have pushed the theistic ground of reference to the circumference of academic life and have become increasingly secular, cannot be disputed.

The profession of law has always had deep religious association. The objective of the lawyer was to achieve justice under a God who was the ruler of a moral universe. The bar of justice before which he pleaded was once a communion rail. Today, the lawyer bows before the judge, but probably neither he nor others present in the modern court are aware that the bowing all began because there used to be a crucifix on the wall above the judge's head before which all men would genuflect.

So it goes. Even death we have committed to a neutral individual called the mortician. And too often the last solemn rites are held in places unrelated to the habitual sanctuary where in life offices of praise and thanksgiving to Almighty God have been offered by the deceased.

Big labor and big business often go on their separate ways, unrelated to the original motive which was according to St. Paul's injunction—"Whatsoever you do, do all to the glory of God."

All the while there hangs over us the terrifying specter that man, by his own devices and his own moral choices, in one colossal incineration may reduce his civilization to a mere memory on a vast galvanized desert. But the significance of atomic and nuclear devices, as has been pointed out by an eminent psychologist, is not to be found in the threat of physical death to come but rather in the revelation of spiritual death that is already within us.

The predicament of modern man is this—that his technological and scientific developments have so far exceeded his moral and spiritual development that it is to be doubted if man can be trusted with his own devices and his own destinies. The basic problems of our age, therefore, are moral and spiritual. The issues of our time turn on the kind of men and women we are. * * *

Today there stalks across the world a militant atheism. It has evangelistic passion and crusading vitality. Its youth parade across the vast areas of the world singing:

"It's the final conflict; let each man take his place;
The International Party shall be the human race.
We are changing the world; we are changing the world."

This new force, which is a religion of "salvation" for this world, has crusading vitality and evangelistic zeal. We reject its materialistic dialectic. We repudiate its atheism and we cannot tolerate the way it attempts to refashion man; but to deny or avoid its challenge would be consummate folly. In the ongoing processes of history, the sweeping events and the collision of forces in this age make explicit God's judgment upon us.

If we are to be what we ought to be and do what God in His providence has imposed upon us as a people, there is a feeling that somehow God must invade us from the outside and we must have an encounter with Him which will make us something which we have never yet been.

But this is only one aspect of the times in which we live. The other side of the dual nature of our times is that a wistfulness deep in the human soul is uplifting man toward His creator. If the spiritual tides now running come to full flood, our age should be one of optimism. Whatever the cause of this awakening, whether it arises out of anxiety or desperation or guilt or just the natural hunger of the soul of man to be at home with God, the fact is that in America today we are in the midst of spiritual renewal of national proportions. The spirit that moved upon the men who founded this college is at work once more among our people.

As I get about in some of our colleges and universities, I discern a new earnestness and seriousness on the part of students. There is deep concern for the problems of our age and a resolute dedication to find enduring solutions. Much of the old cynicism has gone and the modern, youthful fling is increasingly a fling for God and righteousness—for peace, justice, and social amelioration. The religious spirit is laying hold upon students everywhere. Little bands cluster together, disciplined in their dedication to God.

Theology is coming back to its original place as the science of God, and we are living in one of the periods of great theologians. What is more significant, American institutions are becoming citadels of religious learning. Once Americans thought it necessary to go to great European universities for the finishing touch in religious scholarship. Today, many of the most noted Old World scholars are now on the faculties of American divinity schools. When I was a graduate student I aspired to follow my course by further study in a certain Presbyterian center of learning abroad. Recently I did go to that city, met members of the university faculty, and gave some lectures, only to discover that the doctorate at Yale, Chicago, or USC in America is a

stronger degree than that awarded at that ancient place of learning.

In 1945, I was present at the reopening of the University of Heidelburg, when its rector—a famous surgeon—declared: "The theological faculty must be the leader of all faculties."

Reflecting on that notable address later in the light of his country's shameful years under the Nazis, Dr. Herman Maas remarked:

"In recent years we have seen in a shocking way what science is without a religious man in command of it. Medicine without God destroys productivity and life and helps to find cruel practices for concentration camps. Law without God teaches that right is what is of use, pronounces awful judgments, and protects sadism. Philosophy without God falsifies history and teaches military illusions. Natural sciences without God teach erroneous ideas of race and invent the most brutal weapons to destroy life instead of to save it."

Well might we in America learn a lesson from the pages of a disillusioned Germany who saw that God must once again be put in the center of academic life if the nation were to be rebuilt on sure foundations.

It is to the development of the religious man—in the highest understanding of that term—that education in America especially is turning once more. That is surely the significance of the words which emanate from such an educator as Dr. Pusey of Harvard, where fresh emphasis is being given to the knowledge of God and His purposes.

Outside our institutions of learning, the evidence of a spiritual renaissance is even more convincing. In every major religious group we note the rise of laymen's movements which began spontaneously but now have organized the energies of the laity in dynamic programs. In everything from quiet retreats to vigorous programs of evangelism and social action, laymen are on the march. That their religious leaders seem to be of a better quality than those produced for some generations seems also a part of this new movement of the Spirit. The divinity schools of the Nation, since World War II, have been crowded—for the most part with veterans who are war-conditioned, realistic, seasoned by the times, disciplined in body and mind, and with an earnestness and depth of consecration unmatched in half a century.

Church membership has been steadily increasing so that today 6 out of every 10 Americans formally belong to some religious body—the largest ratio in our country's history. Everywhere across the land there is sustained attendance at the services of church and synagogue—not only at special seasons but as a regular practice. Moreover $2½ billion worth of religious structures have been built since 1945.

Mass evangelism, which only a few years ago was thought by many to be a bit outmoded, is now reappearing with dynamic impact. By brilliant salesmanship, moving preaching, intelligent integration of the new convert, the techniques of the hippodrome and amphitheater are once again bringing men and women to a living encounter with God through Christ. And all of this is attested by such men as Charles Templeton, Billy Graham, and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen.

The Bible has never received more attention than it is getting today. The sale of the Holy Scriptures has doubled in the last decade, and the most phenomenal publishing achievement in all history has been the sale of the new translation of the Scriptures. Reflect, also, if you will, that month after month, year after year, religious books top the list among best sellers.

Radio and television accent the great awakening. It is simply inconceivable that a radio or television station could think itself effective or up to the times without making time available for vital religious programs. Even the most secular programs are infected by the religious spirit. Add to this the use of commercial advertising, the introduction of prayer in business and industrial affairs, and you have a religious impact which cannot be ignored.

The spiritual awakening of our age is symbolized in the personality of our President. By his inaugural prayer, the validation of his church membership, his subsequent summoning of the Nation to prayer, his opening of Cabinet meetings with prayer, his habits of private and corporate worship, and his public utterances, President Eisenhower has become a focal expression of our common spiritual aspirations. He seems to have invested prayer with a fresh masculinity and religious action with a new manliness. And although Washington has always been a religious city, much of the official life of our Capital today is permeated with an obvious and emphatic religious spirit.

All of this is as it should be. For you cannot understand our history in any other way. Apart from our spiritual foundations, American life has no meaning. God in the most vivid sense has been the source of our being, and in our highest moments our guiding light. Our ideals are religious ideals; our standards, religious standards; our goals, religious goals; our motivations, religious motivations. Allow religion to languish and we begin to deteriorate. Vital religion, for Americans is not an option; it is an indispensable requisite for our very existence.

The liberty we cherish is not a personal achievement; it is the bestowal of God in His creative action. And man, being created free, must in freedom worship God.

American democracy is the logical culmination in political terms of a deeply held religious faith.

There are some superficial writers and speakers who say that America became great and strong simply because of the presence of vast natural resources secured against all enemies by wide ocean frontiers and friendly neighbors. Other nations have had richer resources and for longer periods. The American succeeded because of his spirit—the spirit of the free man, derived from his religious faith.

One becomes a little impatient at times with the itinerating foreign observer or short-time resident in this land who berate us for our materialism, lampoon Americans for their skyscrapers, motor vehicles, airplanes, and multiplied gadgets, as though these of themselves were sinful. America's vast power and wealth and prosperity—alternately envied and condemned—are the result of a great creative spirit emanating from a robust faith. In some, that faith has been intimate and personal, in others an attitude of life derived from the social climate and cultural atmosphere produced by religious faith—dominately evangelical Christian faith—faith in the dignity of man as a being created in God's image, faith in a freeman under the sovereignty of God, faith that such a man, dedicated and disciplined, can be trusted with his own destiny.

If we are to lead in this hour of history, America must become a vast bastion of spiritual power. The dominating concern is not what we possess; but to whom we are committed.

This is the crux of the matter for the class of 1955.

The determinative fact of this moment is not what you take from this place, in technical skill or in a college degree; but rather, whose spirit you convey to the world.

What is your point of reference and to whom is allegiance given?

To human slavery, or to human freedom.

To atheistic totalitarianism, or atheistic democracy.

To Karl Marx, or to Jesus Christ.

Whose spirit do you reveal?

People want to know if you have God in your life. In all the thrilling years yet to come, we can be true to the foundations and adequate for each succeeding age as our lives are incandescent with the light of God's truth.

One Million Population in North Possible Due to River Program—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ONE MILLION POPULATION IN NORTH POSSIBLE DUE TO RIVER PROGRAM

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times)

The crystal ball marked "St. Lawrence Valley" has a rosy glow.

Fabulous industrial development and population growth are on the not-too-distant horizon. Where fewer than 300,000 residents of the valley now work at trades, farm, toil in factories, and attend school close to 1 million may crowd the landscape.

Attempts to be conservative about the valley's potential are futile, and they can be dangerous.

The potential is there, just waiting to be exploited.

As New York State government officials declared in Watertown in February 1955, much depends on the vigor and determination of localities and their leaders to make the most of a can't-miss situation.

Virtually every industrial and population projection made by governmental and business groups points to an economical mushrooming through Clinton, Essex, Franklin, St. Lawrence, Jefferson, and Lewis Counties that staggers the imagination.

The sage advice to northern New York is simply:

It can happen here.

Much of the potential, of course, can be traced to St. Lawrence power. But there is power also on the Raquette River and on the Black. Other sources are cited throughout the New York-New England interagency committee report.

In addition, there is a potential, though a lesser one, arising out of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Marvin A. Rapp, consultant to the Buffalo Port Authority, said the anticipation was for industrial investment of $1 billion in the St. Lawrence Valley. Only half that would amount to a crash program of massive proportions for the area.

Whether the impact will be felt in 20 years or less or more cannot be accurately gaged now.

What can be set down is that cheap hydroelectric power, access to water transportation, and labor available at very low prices add up to a substantial lure to industry.

For any one skeptical of the area potential he need only turn to the Tennessee Valley or to the northwest sector around Bonneville Dam. Neither area could have safely predicted the boom 20 years after the start of construction.

There are four phases to a St. Lawrence Valley boom—construction of Federal and

State projects, houses, stores, and industrial plants; added value of industrialization through new plants and rising employment, trade to the area via the seaway, and an influx of tourists.

What about new industry? In similar situations a new plant or two will come in to manufacture an intermediate product. Then the maker of the final product establishes himself in the same region to be near his source of supply. Result: A chain reaction.

Communities would be wise to marshal their empty buildings to attract business, but negotiations may take as much as 20 years before they are finalized.

Richmond, Calif., was a hot shipyard construction town during World War II, but it didn't plan. At the war's end there was a strike. Ship orders didn't show up. The city fathers looked around for industrial development, but they found out they had to clean the town up, provide sites and housing before anyone would take a second look.

Eventually, the work paid off.

The best industry to look for is an expanding one, such as plastics and chemicals. Obvious possibilities are those industries that consume large amounts of power.

With each new industrial worker the area will get an employee in one of the service trades. Each will bring a family with him, and the likelihood is that for every 100 new industrial workers there will be 350 new residents in the St. Lawrence Valley.

Everyone close to the situation has predicted sensational development—Lewis G. Castle, Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; Gov. Averell Harriman, the Federal Power Commission's power industry experts, former TVA Administrator Gordon R. Clapp, Assistant Bureau of Reclamation Commissioner Ottis Peterson. State, Federal, and community studies are now underway to determine the effect the great river development will have on the valley.

These studies, however, are just beginning.

Since the St. Lawrence development is considered vital to defense, Federal funds will be waiting for work on harbors, to build and maintain schools and improve or construct airports.

Expansion of transportation facilities—rail, ship, and plane—to the area are inevitable.

For all these new workers housing will be needed, stores, restaurants and gasoline stations will do fast-increasing business, water supply, sewer, fire protection and hospital facilities will have to be greatly expanded. Wholesalers will step up demands for distribution services to retailers.

There will be more work for telephone companies, banks, and insurance firms, more haircuts for barbers, more guests to stay in hotels and motels.

Improvements on ports, such as docks, wharves, piers, warehouses, and cargo handling will be local responsibilities. Companies will have to want to invest substantial sums of money. There will have to be good market potentials. Skilled workers must be available.

Some industries will demand accessibility to raw materials that can be easily and profitably assembled at the plants.

When a firm takes an option on a tract of land it does not commit itself to build immediately. Many of the above factors will enter into the end decision.

According to one estimate, each new job will mean $500 more in local taxes. So the communities and counties won't hurt for money.

Horace Greeley is the man who once said, "Go west." Were he alive today, he would probably say, "Go north."

St. Lawrence Valley Is Likely To Have Boom Like TVA Area—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ST. LAWRENCE VALLEY IS LIKELY TO HAVE BOOM LIKE TVA AREA

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times)

In 1946 Calvert City, Ky., was a sleepy little country village located just west of the Tennessee River in Marshall County, 6 miles below Kentucky Dam.

Five years later it was one of the country's fastest-growing industrial areas and the hub of chemical expansion that flabbergasted the local folks.

The dam brought construction workers, more trade, and business than the little town had ever seen. After that construction ended there was a lake that made the area a tourist attraction, a State park, improved farming through rotation of crops and better fertilization, and a move to invite industry.

The area had electric power, rail and water facilities, available workers, and, not too far away, coal, fluorspar, and other minerals.

If that story has a familiar ring, it should. It is a mirror of what is extremely likely to happen in the St. Lawrence Valley. Power, transportation, labor, and minerals all exist in the valley. They just need to be exploited to the full.

In other TVA areas the existence of phosphates led Monsanto Chemical and Victor Chemical to set up fertilizer plants. Similar attractions brought Union Carbide to Gilbertsville, Ky., and Ashtabula, Ohio; the Crane Co. to Chattanooga; and Dupont to west Tennessee.

Cleveland—another city expecting benefits from the seaway—has recently seen Union Carbide plan a $5 million laboratory in the suburb of Parma; Thompson Products, Inc., plan a $5 million engineering research center; both 5 years in the dream stage. Other suburbs are looking for similar industrialization. And the Eisenhower administration budget calls for $3,500,000 for atomic energy research at the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory in Cleveland.

But back to Calvert City.

The town's civic and business leaders began sales talks, and in short order the Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., the Pittsburgh Metallurgical Co., and National Carbide Co. chose sites near the community to build big chemical plants.

Pennsalt put $3,500,000 into a plant employing 105 workers. It makes sulfuric and hydrofluoric acids, laundry compounds and related products. Most products were shipped to out-of-State locales to be made into finished products.

The defense program is interested in hydrofluoric acid for alkalizing high-octane gasoline, etching glass and metal, cleaning stainless steel, pickling, making freon, refining and smelting tantalum, magnesium, and other critical nonferrous metals and atomic energy.

Cleveland Lane, Pennsalt official, said the location resulted from proximity to minerals, power supplies, accessibility to water, highway and rail transportation and existence in a fast-growing industrial area. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. has a 24-inch pipeline passing through the region.

Pittsburgh Metallurgical, producing ferrosilicon for automotive and steel industries as a deoxydizer and carbon ferrochrome for armor plate and stainless steel, provided jobs for 500 persons. It imported ores from Turkey, the Philippines, and Africa to make its products.

On a nearby 1,000-acre site the Air Reduction Company of New York built a $10 million plant to be operated by the National Carbide Co., a subsidiary. It produces needed calcium carbide, which is used in acetylene. Output is exported to other areas and used "on the spot," both.

After this activity a big aluminum company started making inquiries, synthetics and plastics firms got busy, the Great Lakes Carbon Co. took an option on 600 acres of land. The boom spurred the Kentucky Utilities Co. to launch a 3-year $45,691,000 expansion program to fill demands.

The Parker Appliance Co. built a $550,000 rubber molding plant at Berea, Ky., employing 200. The Elgo Shutter Co. mapped a $300,000 plant at Owensboro to employ 150 more. Corning Glass Works from upstate New York had a $7 million plant at Danville under way to employ some 550 workers. Baxter Laboratories from Morton Grove, Ill., chose Greenville for a new pharmaceutical products plant to employ 450.

Bardstown Manufacturing Co. built a plant with $75,000 in new equipment employing 150 persons in turning out garden products. Green River Steel Corp. built a $10 million plant at Owensboro that planned to employ 3,000 persons at full capacity. The L. & N. railroad opened a new $1 million yard.

Will the St. Lawrence Valley become another boom area like Kentucky, when TVA provided such impetus? The experts say there is no reason why it shouldn't.

St. Lawrence power output, when bolstered by other available hydro sites and activities by the private utility companies like the Niagara Mohawk Power Corp., should dwarf TVA.

The same transportation facilities could be provided with ease given some rail expansion and harbor improvement.

Minerals abound in the valley. Manpower is available, although perhaps at the expense of some agricultural activity.

It only took Calvert City 5 years. It might take 20 in the St. Lawrence Valley.

But the blueprint has been drawn. Only a group of energetic contractors is needed to translate it into material benefit.

Great Industrial Potential Now in St. Lawrence Valley—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

GREAT INDUSTRIAL POTENTIAL NOW IN ST. LAWRENCE VALLEY

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times)

It does not require extraordinary vision to see a tremendous industrial potential for the St. Lawrence Valley.

Even aside from those concerns that use large amounts of power and need water transportation, the very water in the St. Lawrence River itself holds attraction for the mightiest industry of them all—atomic energy.

Representative W. STERLING COLE, Republican, Bath, last year's chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, declares it is logical to locate a nuclear reactor along the St. Lawrence to make use of its water.

Mr. COLE said he did not know of any specific plans to locate a reactor in the river valley, but he said many reactors needed water, and the St. Lawrence was a natural location to be investigated. In addition, traces of uranium have been found in the area.

Another factor to be considered is the new emphasis on dispersal of key industrial plants. The St. Lawrence in this category, too, would be "a natural."

In addition to power, water, and transportation, raw materials must be available. For several key industries they are.

When trying to guess what are the likely industries to move into the valley, the guesser would do best to spot those that are expanding rapidly.

Metals and chemicals are the first ones that come to mind. Ottis Peterson, Assistant Reclamation Commissioner, says that aluminum followed hydroelectric to Portland, Oreg., Vancouver, Spokane, and Wenatchee, Wash.

There are major aluminum installations already a Massena and Buffalo, N. Y., and Alcoa, Tenn.

Another metal that craves power is titanium. So far most of the titanium processing has been experimental, with the Federal Government underwriting most of the expenses. When costs of refining the strategic ore drop there will be more widespread uses and greater production.

A reserve of ilmenite, a vital titaniferous ore, is being exploited at Tahawus, Essex County.

Northern New York's stand of hardwood timber is also an untapped potential, though much is now protected by State conservation law. In addition to chemical processing into pulp, the wood may serve a fledgling furniture business.

Major power users in the industrial family are ozone, aluminum, pure silicon—in lubricants and plastics—and ferromanganese, which require 9 kilowatt-hours per pound of product, and manganese—which could easily be shipped in from Maine, where there are large reserves—and hydrogen peroxide, which use 8 kilowatt-hours a pound.

Others are magnesium, cement, silicon carbide, ammonia, sodium metals, chlorine, caustic soda, graphite, calcium carbide for synthetic rubber and acetylene, copper, and fertilizers.

Electrochemical production requires large amounts of power. In this group are the tetracarbons, used in plastics like vinyl, and other synthetics that require great heat and pressure. When transportation facilities are added, such as the seaway, the valley sites become even more attractive. The Calvert City story is significant here.

Rubber production is drawn to a combination of power and water transportation.

Hydro power could be the saving of northern New York's vanishing paper industry.

A big ferroenameling plant could be built, since paint spraying and drying use up considerable quantities of power.

Adirondack iron ore plus St. Lawrence River power could add up to electric steel furnaces, especially with graphite around to use in the furnaces.

Electrometallurgical plants are high on the logical list.

The availability of talc could bring in plants representing those industries that use the mineral, produced in St. Lawrence County's Edwards-Balmat region. Consumers of the 175,000 tons or so mined each year are cosmetics, paint, roofing, ceramics, rubber, paper, textiles, insecticides, floor covering, and wall plaster.

First thoughts of power in the region immediately center on the 940,000 kilowatts from the Barnhart Island plant near Massena, of which 700,000 are firm power. But that omits at least 550,000 more kilowatts are available through the 5-phase Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. project on the Raquette River and those possibilities listed by the New York-New England interagency committee report.

Niagara Mohawk's setup has a 101,250-kilowatt goal through the completed plants at Carry Falls and South Colton, those planned at Five Falls, Rainbow Falls, and Blake Falls, and the projected one at Stark Falls.

The interagency commitee report listed as worthwhile developments the Oxbow Reservoir and powerplants at Piercefield, 5,700 kilowatts; Higley Falls, 12,040; Colton, 87,400; Hannawa, 25,200; Sugar Island, 20,800, and Moosehead Rapids, 29,000, all on the Raquette River; the Clare Reservoir and 25,660-kilowatt unit, Jackson Falls, 7,860 kilowatts, and Pyrites, 14,550, all on the Grasse River, and 230,000 additional kilowatts from Black River projects, including dams at Moose River, Fowlersville, Shuetown, Lyons Falls, and Glen Park.

The committee estimated the cost of the St. Lawrence area projects, exclusive of Barnhart Island and the Niagara-Mohawk work, at $103,200,000, and the Black River projects at $53,100,000.

One Government official noted that jet airplane engines these days are being lined with ceramics.

Conceivably, northern New York could be the site of an integrated operation whereby the metals for the engine aluminum, titanium or iron—could be mined, refined electrically, and lined with ceramics manufactured from raw minerals in the area. Then the whole product could be shipped by rail or water to an aircraft factory, such as those in Buffalo.

Another possibility, considering the location of iron and steel works, is the location of an automobile factory in the area. Certainly, efficient steel plants might well decide on northern New York as a happy location. Both use the waterway to advantage.

River Valley Soon to Develop Into Major Vacation Section—Part 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RIVER VALLEY SOON TO DEVELOP INTO MAJOR VACATION SECTION

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times)

Tourist business and big business are going to become the same thing in northern New York.

Already one of the favorites of summer travelers, the St. Lawrence Valley, and a section spilling over toward the shores of Lake Ontario, will develop into one of the major vacation meccas in the United States.

Fishing is popular now, especially the black bass around Cape Vincent and Henderson Harbor, but huge expansion is on the way. New York State is talking about spending an additional $150,000 on the facilities at Cape Vincent, now a Federal operation.

Under the potentialities listed by the New York-New England Inter-Agency Committee tourist revenues could move from $6,500,000 to $8,500,000 a year in the Black River area and from $35 million to $50 million annually in the St. Lawrence River area.

This is not all strictly dreamstuff, either.

When the Tennessee Valley Authority mounted its huge program it accounted for recreational pleasures as a by-product of its power-and-irrigation development.

During World War II, of course, TVA had to concentrate on war-related activities, but after that vacation travelers flooded the region.

It brought private companies and local public agencies together in an effort to plan adequately for the tourist influx. Dam sites and reservoirs became points of recreational, as well as industrial, interest.

Between 1947 and 1953, T. V. A. says, the number of inboard pleasure craft increased 76 percent, the number of other pleasure craft an incredible 221 percent.

Overnight rental units skyrocketed in number and are now two and one-half times as plentiful. Privately owned cottages boomed a fantastic 335 percent—or 13 cottages for every 3 that had existed a bare 6 years before.

The number of private enterprises providing recreation services rose 107 percent, those operated by public agencies 62 percent.

The resultant economic impact on the localities was gratifying. The value of overnight rental units increased 240 percent, of private cottages 491 percent.

Site improvement values for recreational areas went up 264 percent, while employment in maintaining and operating the recreational facilities more than tripled.

Assistant Reclamation Commissioner Ottis Peterson says Grand Coulee Dam now draws 300,000 visitors a year, and Lake Mead, which was formed by Hoover Dam, attracts 1,500,000. This makes Mead the third most popular area in the whole national park system.

Fishing is so improved, as a result of the cold waters of the lake, that some of the best trout angling now takes place right there.

New York State Power Authority Chairman Robert Moses has painted an inviting picture of a 2,700-acre State park planned for the area near Massena, N. Y., which should prove one of the leading northeastern tourist drawing cards. It will cover 1,000 acres on Barnhart Island and 1,700 acres between the south shore of the south channel of the river and the line at which the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation will acquire land.

The fishing, boating, and swimming of the future in the St. Lawrence Valley will probably rival the projects that sprang up around TVA, Hoover Dam, the Welland Canal near Niagara Falls, and the Sault St. Marie Canal between Lakes Superior and Huron.

The St. Lawrence already holds 60 species of fish, and the cool, calm, deep waters of the new "Lake St. Lawrence" should encourage sportsmen searching fine catch of black bass, nothern pike, and muskallonge.

Lewis G. Castle, administrator of the seaway corporation, has already tabbed Massena as a future tourist haven, but this new business will undoubtedly benefit the other areas already dependent on vacationing, such as Clayton, Alexandria Bay, Cape Vincent, and Morristown.

The Canadians, rarely at a loss to capitalize on such opportunities, are already laying

extensive plans for park and other recreational facilities on their side of the river.

The New York-New England Inter-Agency report lists projects costing $3,900,000 in the valley, $1,515,000 in the Black River area and $2,395,000 in the St. Lawrence Basin itself.

The big one in the Black River area is the Turin and Old Forge resort section. Others include camping and picnicking spots at Eighth Lake, Whetstone Gulf, and the Fulton Chain of Lakes; picnicking areas along State Highways 12, 26, and 28, and the Jacob Brown mansion museum at Brownville.

In the St. Lawrence Basin the main areas to be developed recreationally, if funds are made available, are a section through Cranberry, Tupper, and Raquette Lakes, Upper and Lower Chateaugay Lakes, Titusville Mountain, Little Tupper, Raquette, and Bonaparte Lakes, the Carry Falls dam on the Raquette river, sites along U. S. Highway 11 and State Highways 3, 10, 12, 37, 56, and 58 and a St. Lawrence River museum of history.

All this will take time, but with the overall development and expansion that is coming to the area, recreation facilities cannot lag. The demand will be there, and it will be easy to fill with a minimum of effort and a modicum of expense.

From the estimated revenues and what has gone on elsewhere the St. Lawrence Valley's recreational future seems assured.

Mineral Wealth Along River Is To Aid Building Material Firms—Part 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MINERAL WEALTH ALONG RIVER IS TO AID BUILDING MATERIAL FIRMS

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times

The St. Lawrence Valley may become the home of one of the country's biggest building materials industries.

The opportunity is there for all sorts of small industries and some big ones, thanks to a vast mineral wealth that is virtually untapped.

Some of the minerals, to be sure, are expensive to refine and to extract from the ore. Others, however, may be mined readily, and even the difficult ones may find their way to use through improved methods or through greater demand.

Geological and mining experts in Washington, Albany, and Princeton, N. J., claim northern New York is mineral-rich beyond most estimates.

St. Lawrence County and parts of Jefferson and Franklin Counties have a bedrock 75 percent made up of limestone or marble and dolomite. There are almost limitless supplies of sand and gravel.

The dolomite, with impurities of less than 1½ percent, is the gem of the lot and is found 3 miles north of Gouverneur. According to a study by the State science service of the University of the State of New York, "Future increased power developments in the St. Lawrence River Basin would substantially increase the attractiveness of the white crystal dolomite as a chemical raw material." It has 8 major and 9 minor uses.

It can be used to maintain and accomplish minor repairs in refractory bottoms and linings in open-hearth steel furnaces. As basic magnesium carbonate it is used in thermal insulation of pipes and boilers, as well as in printing inks, glass, varnishes, paints, and toothpaste.

It could go into magnesium metal, into glassmaking. It is preferred in the manufacture of ferromanganese and ferrosilicon as a blast furnace flux and, when used in sulfide paper pulp, makes a softer and whiter product. Also, it may be used as a filler in paints, rubber, fungicides and asphalt, as well as substituting in many products that now use ground talc. Finally, its clean, white appearance in some respects make it suitable for building and ornamental stone.

Minor uses include antacid soil conditioner, whitening pottery and porcelain ware, magnesian lime for prepared whiting, oxychloride cement, whitewash, resins for varnish, dry-mix-sulfur lime, a fungicide; when treated with sulfuric acid, epsom salts, and lastly, in Vienna lime, a manufactured buffing compound.

Some excitement has been caused by the discovery of traces of uranium in the St. Lawrence Valley. Fuel and fertilizer plants could utilize peat, reported in the town of Colton, near Bloomingdale and Tupper Lake.

Feldspar, preferred for glassmaking, ceramics, roofing and concrete, is present in good quantity in the DeKalb area.

An abrasives industry is another potential, based on Adirondack garnet supplies. The biggest garnet mine in the world is at Gore Mountain, Essex County.

Here is a rundown on some of the other minerals, and their industrial potential:

Augite, horneblende and enstatite at Willsboro, Essex County, good for ceramics; also there is wollastonite, used as a filler in paper, paint, rubber, linoleum and asphalt tile.

Ilmenite, which contains titanium in compound, at Tahawus, Essex County. In metallic form titanium has phenomenal strength and withstands heat very well. Aircraft crave it.

Fluorite, used for hydrofluoric acid in etching light bulbs, near Rossie, Macomb and points in Jefferson County.

Anorthosite, an aluminum-type ore, in good quantity near Tupper Lake.

Barite, used as a compound in oil drilling "mud," in paint, glass and rubber, near Pillar Point.

Graphite, low-grade, at Pope Mills and other places. Though costly to refine, it might be produced in large quantities. It is used in atomic piles, crucibles, furnace linings, pencils and as a lubricating powder for electrolytic anodes.

Pyrites, for sulfur and sulfuric acid, with the residue used in blast furnaces. Some of the ore in St. Lawrence County has 35 percent sulfur.

Apatitite for phosphoric acid, used in fertilizers, near Chaumont.

Conceivably, semiprecious stones could be produced from river valley deposits of serpentine, tourmaline, and spinel, all colored rock.

Mica, for electrical products, and mineral curiosities like zirconium, strontianite, celestite, and nepholine are all available, but in what quantities and how readily and economicable usable they would be is not known.

The area's supplies of iron ore, lead, zinc, and talc are already well publicized, and a little silver has been mined along with the lead and zinc.

Almost all of these minerals find industry interested when they can be uncovered near a waterpower site. The transportation feature cannot be written off, either.

A study is now being made to determine the commercial potential of the limestone deposits of the area. Dr. John Prucha, of the New York Geological Survey, is heading the work.

Taken together, the minerals indicate the valley should be a logical site for building, concrete, cement, fertitlizer, paint, paper, and rubber plants of varying sizes, as well as a ceramics industry.

The glass and concrete business could really mushroom if substantial quantities of sand were easy to use. Sand provides silicones, and they are being used more and more all the time. Only two firms are now going into the silicone industry in a big way, but another is preparing to and there will be more.

Silicones are used to waterproof leather, as a stain resistant, and for treating fabrics to increase resistance to wear and tear and wrinkle. Heat resistant, they are used in electrical insulation and in paints for smokestacks; also in car and furniture polishes, hand creams, ointments, and defoamers.

They are produced in pan glazes to prevent sticking, in tissues to clean glasses and lenses, and for treating ironing-board covers.

There may not be gold in the St. Lawrence Valley, but the other minerals more than make up for it. They, and the river, are the valley's wealth.

Increase in Demand for Labor, Higher Wages Due Along River—Part 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR LABOR, HIGHER WAGES DUE ALONG RIVER

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times)

With the expected influx of new industry into the St. Lawrence Valley, the demand for labor will unquestionably increase.

Also, the seaway will make it possible for many of the long-delayed harbor developments of the area to become realities as international trade increases.

Industrial wage rates in the valley should prove an attraction to interested firms. They are not high, and, compared with those of highly industrialized sections of the country, they are quite low.

While it is not expected that the scale will reach that of a big city, nevertheless a logical development would be the increase in wages, payrolls, and general standard of living in the St. Lawrence Valley, with inevitably added prosperity.

The area's labor relations are calm and genial. Strikes are rare, and bitter, prolonged ones even rarer. There is a degree of unionization, which will probably increase.

A glance at the prevailing industrial wage rates and the average stipend of a worker in Detroit indicates what the possibilities are for the labor market in northern New York.

For example, a top drill-press operator in the St. Lawrence Valley makes a maximum of $1.65 an hour. The average pay for the same job in Detroit is $2.65 an hour.

Even granting that Detroit is a high-labor-cost area, the differences are significant. Here are some other comparisons, the first figure being the maximum St. Lawrence Valley wage for the job, the second, the average Detroit pay for the same job:

Drill-press operator "B," $1.47 and $2; grinder operator "A," $1.60 and $2.68; grinder operator "C," $1.47 and $1.92; milling-machine operator "A," $1.62 and $2.64;

punch-press operator "A," $1.62 and $1.86; diemaker, $2.10 and $2.97; toolmaker "A," $2.05 and $2.97; lathe operator, $1.65 and $2.05; maintenance electrician "A," $1.82 and $2.47.

How much foreign trade will make St. Lawrence River ports big business is very uncertain, but, as with everything else, the potential is there. Ships unwilling to stop while going through the canals may stop off for food, oil, and supplies. Probably only the smaller vessels could afford to, since the big ships have large daily overheads and could not take the time out.

The Buffalo, Rochester, and St. Lawrence customs districts, between them, handled more than $1,500,000,000 worth of trade with Canada alone in 1953. Once the seaway has been completed, there will be interest in the waterway route from Montreal to Lake Champlain and the State barge canal system down to New York City.

This would ease movement of Canadian ore, pulpwood, and newsprint into this country and make it possible to export United States goods from New York State to Canada.

Of more immediate interest, however, is the port-and-trade picture framed by the seaway.

Federal appropriations for harbor work generally are restricted to entrance channels, breakwater protection, and dredging ship channels, with municipal or private funds used to dredge berthing areas, build piers and wharves, and install cargo-handling equipment, warehouses, and other onshore terminal units.

The procedure is for the Army engineers to make a survey, following congressional approval, and for the community to assure cooperation so that Congress is in the right frame of mind. Usually the start of work follows 2 or 3 years after the authorization.

Among the "inactive" harbor projects that would be likely to be resurrected as a result of St. Lawrence Valley activity are those at Sackets Harbor, Cape Vincent, Waddington, Barcelona, Grand View Bay, Oak Orchard Harbor, and Port Ontario. The first three are designed for commercial traffic, the others for recreational craft. Congress has already taken the step of authorizing a $2,459,000 detached breakwater for Oswego.

Waddington may get a sufficiently deep harbor as a direct result of the Barnhart Island powerplant, which will raise the level of the St. Lawrence River.

Oswego already has two barge canal terminals, a public coal terminal, five specialized private facilities for coal, wood, pulp, cement, and fish. It hopes to boost service to the Syracuse area to offset any loss in grain transfers. Ogdensburg has a city installation for passenger traffic and 10 specialized private units for petroleum, coal, pulpwood, and sand.

Many public piers and warehouses will be needed, particularly for general nonbulk cargo.

At Richards Landing, near Massena, a private oil terminal, established in 1953, plans more expansion to accommodate ships carrying 100,000 barrels of oil instead of the present barges, which hold only 15,000 barrels. In Ogdensburg the George Hall Corp. has temporarily abandoned an expansion of its own fuel-tank capacity, but will undoubtedly revive it in the future.

There has been talk that the Aluminum Co. of America might participate in a port development to provide facilities whereby it could ship out its products from Massena by water.

At the last accounting, which has been outdated, the project costs were listed as: Waddington, $20,000; Sackets Harbor, $328,000; Port Ontario, $864,000; Ogdensburg, $40,900; Cape Vincent, $139,000.

Other area projects, such as Black River Bay and Snowshoe Cut, need new surveys before the Army engineers can seriously consider them.

Many of these have been hanging around for a long time. The St. Lawrence development will probably create enough activity to push them off the shelf, dust them off, and get them into operation.

Astounding Expansion Looms as Result of River Projects—Part 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ASTOUNDING EXPANSION LOOMS AS RESULT OF RIVER PROJECTS

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times)

In the not-too-distanct future the St. Lawrence Valley may find itself in the middle of one of the most astounding expansions in New York State history.

Marvin A. Rapp, consultant to the Buffalo port control unit, has forecast, "There will be a great industrial development in the Massena area. They are anticipating an industrial investment of $1 billion." He said this December 2, 1954.

The automobile industry has an investment of $5 billion. It employs 750,000 persons.

If northern New York were to get a comparable influx of workers, the total would be, at the very least, 100,000.

According to estimates by Federal agencies in recent years, each industrial worker brings with him a worker for service trades. The average family is estimated at 3.9 persons.

That means that if the St. Lawrence Valley receives 100,000 new industrial workers the population increase would be 780,000. The New York State Commerce Department, using Bureau of Census figures, published a booklet showing the 1953 population of Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence, Franklin, Essex, and Clinton Counties at 349,752, compared with 340,477 in 1950. The total for Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence, and Franklin alone in 1953 was about 259,000.

The likelihood for the valley, then, is a population in excess of 1 million persons.

Should the valley receive only an added 700,000 in population, it would mean—

Ten thousand new hotel rooms and 500 churches.

Ten thousand hospital beds and 120,000 theater seats—equal to about 130 new theaters—plus 50 drive-ins.

One thousand two hundred new physicians, 500 dentists, and 1,000 lawyers.

Based on current operations, 150 new banks and branches.

Of the 700,000 workers and their families, about 10 percent might come from the St. Lawrence development construction group. Another 30,000 persons might flock in from the ranks of unemployed around New York State.

The likelihood is that the employed ranks in Franklin, Jefferson, St. Lawrence, and Lewis counties would increase from around 85,000 to 285,000.

Roughly 175,000 more homes would have to be built. Another 1,400 miles of highway might have to be constructed.

Census figures show that the city of Watertown has about 10,600 dwelling units, of which 10,380 are occupied by 33,182 persons. Of Ogdensburg's 4,100 units, 4,000 are occupied by 13,047. That was the situation at the last census.

The traffic increase will be startling. Rooseveltown International bridge handles about 173,000 cars a year now and anticipates an increase to 200,000. But soon the residents of the valley will own between 107,000 and 200,000 cars themselves, entirely apart from tourists, United States and Canadian.

Annual retail trade, which at last count in the valley was $221,437,000, would reach close to half a billion dollars. Wholesale trade could shoot from $105,648,000 to more than $200 million. Service trades can expect an eventual rise from $15,500,000 to close to $30 million.

This is what Caldwell R. Walker, business trends editor of the Manufacturers Record, said 18 months ago: A new industry employing 150 men could mean a plant investment of $200,000, annual payroll of $500,000, 33 retail stores, the support of 1,000 persons, a 22-room schoolhouse and 18 teachers, public improvements, sales and service for 400 cars, $100,000 annually for railroads, opportunity for 24 professional men, taxable valuation of $2,500,000, yearly markets for $350,000 in farm products and an annual trade expenditure of $1,500,000.

Conservatively, all this could be multiplied by 600 for the valley.

Mr. Walker said retail units are not anything like completely dependent on manufacturing industry for existence. However, he pointed out, "a new factory, be it large, small or average, is the surest and quickest way to absorb surplus labor and there raise community income."

How much will stay in the valley of the new income?

Roughly 75 percent, spent at retail; 6 percent for consumer utilities, 7 percent for rent, insurance and other finance items and 10 percent for professional and personal service.

The United States Chamber of Commerce figures some items a little more conservatively than the Federal Government, some more expansively.

Projecting an addition of 100,000 new factory workers to the area, the chamber figures the valley can expect 33,000 more workers in retail trade, 25,000 in construction, 14,000 in professional and related services, 13,000 in transportation, communication, and other public utilities, 5,000 each in business and repair services, wholesale trade and public administration, 4,000 in finance, insurance, and real estate, 2,000 each in entertainment and recreation services and other industries, and 1,000 in forestry and fisheries.

Approximately 31,000 persons will drop out of agriculture and 2,000 each out of personal services and mining.

The mining opportunities in the area, however, will probably change that projection, so that mining employment would rise and some other branch of work would not increase as much.

Grocery store sales should increase roughly $70 million, those of eating and drinking places $30 million, department and variety stores $45 million, clothing and shoe stores $25 million, automobile dealers $50 million, gasoline service stations $20 million, lumber yards and building-materials dealers $15 million, and other stores $105 million—a total boost in annual retail sales of nearly $360 million.

Striking a balance between the extreme conservative guesses and the guardedly optimistic ones, the St. Lawrence Valley can expect about a 500,000 increase in population, 180,000 more households, 80,000 more schoolchildren, a rise in annual personal income of $800 million.

Also, $385 million more in bank deposits, 150,000 more passenger cars registered, 225,000

more workers employed, 7,000 more retail establishments, 60,000 more trucks and buses registered, and 120,000 more residence telephones.

It is not going too far afield to envision the valley's requiring—and getting—11,000 more schoolrooms and 9,000 more teachers, 12,000 additional professional men, an increase in taxable real estate of $1,250 million, an added plant investment of $100 million, added payrolls of $250 million, and increased railroad revenue totaling $50 million.

Industrial Development Along River Due in Next Two Decades—Part 8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ALONG RIVER DUE IN NEXT TWO DECADES

(By Alan S. Emory, Washington correspondent, Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times)

The industrial development of the St. Lawrence Valley is no mirage.

It should take place within the next two decades, but it could be before. How soon and how much depends pretty much on two things:

The community effort put out to attract new business.

The publicity given by the valley area to its advantages in the fields of raw materials, electric power, water transportation, and comparatively inexpensive labor.

From a primarily agricultural area the valley will probably change into one that rests on an economic basis of small industry, well founded and diversified.

With the expanding population, which should triple the present census figures for the area at least, northern New York agriculture might find a greater and more profitable outlet for its output, especially dairy products. A drop in farm population would be no surprise, however, with the attraction of industrial wage rates as competition.

As industry enters and develops, transportation facilities should undergo substantial improvement. Air travel and airport facilities should get a facelifting. Railroads, with an inevitable rising demand for added passenger and freight business, will no longer consider the area its "poor relation." And, of course, the seaway will make water transport available to valley business.

Both the New York State and United States Commerce Departments are beginning to stir on the St. Lawrence development. They are conducting detailed studies that may turn valued information on the potential of the valley. So far, however, no reports have gone beyond the one published by the State unit in November. That, for the time it was issued, was a valuable document, but it is already outdated.

The most likely possibility for the area is the blossoming of a building-materials industry. The new stuff is in the ground—limestone, dolomite, gravel, iron ore. Along with the building-materials plants, mining should pick up substantially.

The continuing demand for electric power at low rates makes it virtually certain that the eventual use of atomic power will not make serious inroads on plants coming to the valley to get energy from the St. Lawrence River. The first atomic power on any scale worthy of discussion may compete with energy produced from coal, but it still will not approach the low hydro rates resulting from the Barnhart Island project.

Industrial development and recreational development will go hand in hand. Even before the former reaches its potential, the tourists will make the valley a major vacation spot on their maps. A State park is already planned for the Massena, N. Y., region. A national park somewhere close by is not too remote a possibility.

What can happen in northern New York has been clearly demonstrated in the Tennessee Valley. Outstanding public officials in Congress and in the executive departments, Federal and State, agree that the area is in for expansion in a big way, with the limitation placed by the local effort, or lack of it.

Financial requirements must be shared. Federal money for port work and school and other facilities is available, but a case must be made for spending it. Much of the case will depend on the ability and willingness of local forces, public and private, to expend their own funds.

The report of the New York-New England Interagency Committee, now looked on as something visionary, will have to be taken seriously and a vigorous effort made to put the recommendations into effect.

A billion-dollar industrial investment in the St. Lawrence area strikes a long-range note, but the United States and New York are in the midst of work right now that will cost more than $400 million.

Talk of millions and billions was foreign to the valley until the past year or so. In the near future it will become commonplace.

To expect that the ports of northern New York will rival those of Buffalo, Toledo, Chicago, Milwaukee, or Duluth is not realistic.

Nor will the area's new industry put it on a plane with Detroit or Chicago or Buffalo or Cleveland.

The population will not muscle in on the ratings of Philadelphia or Los Angeles or San Francisco.

To a large extent, the natural attractions of the St. Lawrence Valley will remain.

But its isolation from big things, its complete economic reliance on dairying and the Aluminum Co., the St. Regis Paper Co., and the New York Air Brake Co., its remoteness from metropolitan life and its danger of being frozen into an outlook primarily provincial will be gradually, if not rapidly, dispelled.

The time has come for the St. Lawrence Valley to leave scoffing at the distant future, to bury pessimism and eliminate complacency.

There is a saying that "Them as has, gits."

Northern New York now realizes that it has.

"All that remains is for it to "git."

Amend and Improve Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge that Congress devote some time and attention during the present session to the question of amending and improving our social security law.

The present benefits under our social security law do not afford the protection and security which our workers and their dependents expect.

One of the reasons is that today the American dollar is worth just about half what it was when the social security system was set up some 20 years ago. A dollar today will go just about half as far toward providing the necessities of life as was expected when the social security system was set up.

I realize, as all of us do, that in working out social security legislation, we are dealing with a subject which is relatively new. I realize that as we operate the system year by year unforeseen problems will arise, and from our experience in dealing with such problems we will gain knowledge and facts which will enable us to improve this law.

One of the things which I think our experience with the social security law has taught us is that 65 years as a minimum retirement age is not working out satisfactorily. I would like to see the retirement age lowered from 65 to 60 years.

Another change which I believe should be made is to amend this law and provide that a worker who becomes totally and permanently disabled before reaching the age of 65 should be eligible for his retirement benefits regardless of age.

In many cases a retired worker finds that his social security benefits are not enough to enable him and his wife to maintain themselves and provide the actual necessities of life. Many of them find it necessary to work and earn additional money to supplement the social security benefits. Under present law a retired worker is permitted to earn only $1,200 a year and retain his social security benefits. I feel that this sum which he may earn without losing his benefits should be raised to $2,000.

Legislation has been introduced to provide these improvements in our social security law, and I am today bringing this matter to the attention of the House to urge that this legislation be given immediate attention, and that it be reported out of the Ways and Means Committee and be taken up on the floor and passed as promptly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the need for this legislation should give it a high place upon our calendar. I urge that prompt action be taken upon it.

The Great Polio Vaccine Snafu

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent and was reprinted in the Democratic Digest of July 1955, is deserving of our attention:

THE GREAT POLIO VACCINE SNAFU

Once upon a time there was abroad in the land a plague that struck and crippled without warning.

The plague had been around a long time. It was worse in the summer than in other seasons.

This plague did not discriminate between men or women, girls or boys, or station in life. The worst sufferers were little children. But it struck grown people, too. One of the land's great rulers had been stricken and was handicapped for life.

It was during his regime that people decided to do something to end the plague.

With his example and encouragement, they started marching. They marched to the tune of dimes.

Every year they would march, bringing in the dimes and the dollars that totaled millions.

These millions of dollars were used by a central foundation to pursue research into the causes of the plague and to rehabilitate those who had been stricken.

The years passed. At times it appeared to be an endless road, this thing of tracking down the cause of the plague.

The researchers did not give up hope. The people did not abandon faith. They paid and paid, with their dimes and their dollars.

Finally, in the year 1953, the researchers said they thought they had the enemy cornered.

They were not sure, but they thought that a vaccine developed by a Dr. Salk might prove the answer.

But this vaccine was itself based upon the virus of the plague and it had to be handled carefully. They wanted to be sure.

So in the summer of 1954 they held a test run and vaccinated a great many children. They also set aside groups of children as "controls."

When the results were in, they found that the vaccine was effective and that it was safe.

Everyone in the land was notified that the results would be announced on a certain day. Everyone in the land knew months ahead of time that the momentous announcement was to be made.

Every straw in the wind showed that the announcement would be that the vaccine was satisfactory, safe to use, and the foundation could begin its plan to vaccinate, free of charge, all the children in the first and second grades in our schools from coast to coast.

But there were millions of other children in different age brackets—younger than 6 and older than 7. What about them? Doctors would have the vaccine—and the demand would be terrific.

Long before the announcement, huge private laboratories had been preparing to produce the vaccine, made possible by dollars from the people's dimes, and hoping to make millions.

Then came the announcement. The foundation had done its job.

And on the next day, April 12, the United States Government licensed six of these laboratories to produce the vaccine under Federal standards.

Ten days later, the United States Government's people—Secretary Hobby, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Dr. Scheele, of the Public Health Service; and others—woke up to the fact that there would not be enough vaccine for everyone this year. They decided on a plan for voluntary, not compulsory, controls.

The next day they grabbed headlines by announcing there would be enough vaccine to immunize every child between ages of 1 and 9 by August 1.

Four days later, on April 27, they announced a temporary ban on use of vaccine from Cutter, 1 of the 6 companies licensed to produce it. The plague had struck some who had been vaccinated.

Go ahead, they said, with vaccinations with serum from the other five laboratories.

On May 6, the Government said: "Wait, we're holding up new vaccine. But it's all right to use the first batches."

On the very next day, the Government said: "Stop all vaccinations until a recheck is made."

On May 11, the vaccine from one lab was approved, on the next day that from another was endorsed as all right.

Then followed vague statements, charges, countercharges, and a wail from Secretary Hobby that she didn't know there would be "such a demand" for vaccine.

People were frightened one day.

They were reassured the next.

They were cautioned the next day.

They were reassured again.

Then they were warned.

And now all was confusion in the land, but the days were growing longer and hotter and the plague wouldn't be waiting for anybody.

In Washington, the rulers called another meeting. They promised still another decision.

At no time in the history of the land or its people had there been a muddle on such a grand scale.

It was a snafu to end all snafus.

And all the while the people wondered if anyone had dared inform the Great White Father that his regime had so woefully goofed.

If he had been told, there were no signs of it—no action, no firm decisions, no leadership in time of confusion.

And many of the people recalled the days when they had a President—the same one who had been stricken by the plague. And they said among themselves, "Would that we again had a leader who could lead—or at least one who knows even remotely what is going on."

Speaker Rayburn's Statement in Support of Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as you so well stated yesterday, there is much discussion on proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act of 1938, to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over independent producers and gatherers of natural gas.

Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported a bill, which would exempt the independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation as a utility and protect the consumers from unreasonable prices of natural gas by providing control by the Federal Power Commission over prices which could be received by the producers.

Your public statement on this problem yesterday was, in my opinion, appropriate and commendable and I ask unanimous consent that your complete statement be included herein, together with the news article, which was carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, for the information of the Members of Congress:

STATEMENT OF SPEAKER RAYBURN ON GAS BILL

There has been a great deal of talk about the gas bill that has been reported by the committee and I desire to say that my position has not changed on that type of legislation since it was up the last time.

I supported the bill that Mr. Truman vetoed and I am supporting the bill the committee has reported. I think that if the Phillips decision stands unchanged, we would have less and less gas, which in my opinion might bring about an increase in the price of gas to the consumer. The passage of the Harris bill, I think, means the production of more gas and also if you have more and more of anything the price is more likely to go down than up.

The great cost in getting the gas to the consumer is not in getting the gas to the neighborhood of the consumer but the cost of distribution after it gets there. I could name some cities, but it is not necessary to do that, where it costs less than 70 cents to get the gas out of the ground and transported to the cities where the consumer is paying more than $3 for the gas to the house.

If I could be convinced that this bill's effect would raise the price of gas to the ultimate consumer I would not be for it. I think the opposite.

I also think it is going to take the endorsement and the power of the administration to get this bill passed, and, of course, that means the President of the United States also.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 23, 1955]

RAYBURN ASKS IKE'S BACKING ON GAS BILL

Speaker SAM RAYBURN challenged President Eisenhower yesterday to throw his support to a bill to remove natural gas producers from Federal price control if he expects Congress to pass it.

RAYBURN, who announced his support of the measure for the first time, said "I think it is going to take the endorsement and power of the administration to get the bill passed. Of course, that means the President of the United States also."

A Presidential committee and the Federal Power Commission have recommended that natural gas producers be removed from the jurisdiction of the FPC. The House Commerce Committee has approved such a bill. But Mr. Eisenhower has taken no personal stand on the issue yet.

RAYBURN, veteran Texas Democrat, said continued Federal control will mean "less and less gas, which, in my opinion, will bring about increased prices to the consumer.

"Passage of the bill," he told reporters, "will bring more and more gas into production, and with more production prices are more likely to go down than up."

There is considerable opposition to RAYBURN's theory. Some big city mayors believe that prices will skyrocket if natural gas producers are removed from Federal control.

The Supreme Court has ruled that the FPC does have jurisdiction over well-head prices of natural gas. The decontrol bill is sponsored by Representative OREN HARRIS, Democrat, Arkansas.

RAYBURN also supported a Harris resolution which would call for a congressional investigation of the transmission and distribution of natural gas that costs 70 cents on the outskirts of the town.

HARRIS told the House Rules Committee, which is considering his resolution, that "the public is entitled to know why the cost of distribution is a major portion of the cost of their natural gas."

He said a 1954 survey showed that the well-head cost of gas was only about 10 percent of the price paid by the consumer.

Hard Nox at Your Friendly Gas Station

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following very interesting article by Walter Goodman which appeared in the New Republic magazine.

I am pleased also to commend our colleague, Congressman ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, for the fine work his Small Business Subcommittee did in bringing this matter to the attention of the public.

The article follows:

HARD NOX AT YOUR FRIENDLY GAS STATION

(By Walter Goodman)

Early in 1952 Mrs. Ethel Berg Powell and her husband leased a gasoline station in Fitzgerald, Ga., from the Sinclair Oil Co. The Coast Line Railroad, by which Mr. Powell had been employed, had moved its shops to Florida, and rather than leave their home, the Powells, both in their 50's, decided to go into business for themselves.

The previous operator of the Sinclair station had lost money, but the Powells were well known and well liked around town. In 2 years they tripled the stock and the number of employees—from 1 to 3—and in 1954 they won the company's award for the most gallons sold. All this was accomplished only by working 15 hours a day, but it was their business after all.

Toward the end of their third year's lease, rumors began reaching the Powells that the local Sinclair representative had been inquiring around town about getting a new operator for their station. And a few weeks later they received a formal 30-day notice that their lease would not be renewed. No further explanation was forthcoming despite repeated requests, although the reason for the ouster soon became evident: the Powells had been selling items that the Sinclair Co. did not want them to sell. The oil company refused to permit the new lessee to purchase any station equipment except that bearing the Sinclair label, and the Powells took a $5,000 loss on their investment. They sold their home and moved to Florida where Mr. Powell went back to work in a railroad machine shop.

This tale of the Georgia couple's short, happy life as go-it-alone entrepreneurs was told by Mrs. Powell to a House Small Business Subcommittee, headed by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT (Democrat, California). It is one of about 60 which the committee has heard in recent weeks from filling-station operators and former filling-station operators who have come from every section of the country to tell the Congressmen that their friendly, courteous, smiling gasoline dealers don't have much to smile about.

The big oil companies used to own their own retail outlets, but they dropped most of these in the 1930's to avoid high taxes and antitrust suits. Now the stations are leased out—generally for a year, with a 30-day cancellation clause—to ambitious young fellows, like Glen Manchester of Cheektowaga, N. Y. When Glen was discharged from the Navy in 1946, it was his ambition to run a filling station. He owned a suitable piece of land, and went to the bank for a GI loan which would enable him to purchase the necessary equipment. The bank agreed to the loan, but only on condition that Glen lease out his land to a reputable oil company—in this case, Frontier and Ashland—and then lease it back again. The banker knew that an oil company is rarely interested in dealing with a too independent enterpreneur.

In addition to the leasee stations, oil companies also operate through socalled C-stations. These either work on a commission bases—more or less as simple salesmen for the companies—or else they operate as consignees, independent except that the company retains title to the gasoline and can lawfully set the tank price. And then, too, there are still some directly owned stations around, which hold a very special position in the economics of the industry. Standard Oil of Ohio, for instance, owns about 400 stations and leases out about 4,000. As Arthur Katz of Columbus, Ohio—one of the 4,000—testified: "The overwhelming pressure of the prices posted in the company-operated stations is sufficient to bring Standard's supposedly independent retailers into line." Lee Gardner, a Greenville, Tex., Good Gulf dealer for 10½ years, quoted a Gulf vice-president as warning him: "If you all don't go down on your price in Greenville, we will have a company-operated outlet in Greenville, and we will establish the price."

For overall pricing purposes the United States has been divided into eight parts. While you are driving through New England and New York, you are under the jurisdiction of Socony-Vacuum; if you cross the George Washington Bridge and continue south, you run into Standard Oil of New Jersey territory—until you get to the deep South where Standard of Kentucky holds the line. The Atlantic Refining Company takes care of Pennsylvania and Delaware drivers. Out West, Standard Oil of California and Continental of Colorado share the responsibility; in the Midwest, Standard of Ohio and Standard of Indiana set the pace.

But despite this amiable division, prices may still vary. Perhaps bad weather has cut down on the amount of gas used in a given month; or perhaps a company's sales have been slipping in a given area; or possibly a major wants to chase out an ostentatiously prosperous independent.. The big company may wire Madison Avenue to start a big advertising campaign; it may give away free drinking glasses and balloons; or—a sure-fire tactic—it may force down prices.

In February 1954, a Shell salesman arrived at Clarence Robbins' station in Rockville, Md., with a big sign celebrating a new low price for Shell gas. He also brought along the proper applications for Robbins to fill out asking the company for a discount to meet competition. Robbins soon found that he couldn't afford the drop in income—which the discount didn't begin to cover—and removed the big sign. The salesman spoke darkly of "noncooperation." In February of this year, the salesman was back again with the same request, reminding Robbins of last year's uncooperative spirit and informing him, in Robbins' words, that "the Shell company is vitally interested in establishing prices at the respective outlets and that they could not legally fix prices under the present independent operating lease arrangements." However, they could establish the price per gallon if Robbins were to operate on a commission basis, and he was given the alternative of becoming a commission station operator or having his lease terminated.

Glen Manchester wasn't given any alternative. Frontier and Ashland allowed him a ½-cent wholesale discount on condition that he cut his retail price 3 cents. This meant operating at a loss, and Manchester was forced to shut down his station and default on his GI loan. He is currently subject to foreclosure proceedings, and no oil company will take a chance on leasing to him until he has paid off his debts.

Roger Stubbs, a former Shell lessee in Seattle, told the Representatives how he was informed by a Shell spokesman "that it would be an absolute necessity that I drop my price half a cent a gallon to meet Standard Oil competition next door * * * and if I didn't drop the price and if I wouldn't cooperate with them, they would most certainly get somebody in there that would." In April 1954, stubborn Mr. Stubbs received notice that his lease would not be renewed.

Stubbs also described a particularly neat company tactic to dispose of excess stocks without suffering a heavy loss. A major supplier sells gas to off-brand dealers at 1.5 to 3.5 cents below the norm. Then the supplier demands that regular dealers meet the competition resulting from the wholesale price preference it has allowed the independent.

In addition to keeping a sharp eye on a dealer's prices and hours of work—Shell told Stubbs in 1953 he'd have to stay open until midnight instead of his usual 10 p. m.—the companies also have rules about what lessees may and may not sell. All the oil companies maintain informal agreements with rubber firms to promote their tires. Shell performs this service for Goodyear for a 10-percent cut—as Bill Cordell, a large Cincinnati operator, was forcibly reminded when the oil company canceled his lease after 19 years for selling Lee tires. This display of the fruits of noncooperation was not lost on smaller dealers in the area.

In a single 18-month period, one oil company reportedly sold $59 million worth of tires, batteries, and accessories and turned a tidy 10 percent profit. Local salesmen, too, get a commission on their TBA sales, so the pressure is on all the way down the line for dealers to accept and plug the selected brands. Sometimes, of course, the selected brand is changed. One dealer told of stocking up obediently with company-approved Champion spark plugs, only to have the company enter into a new alliance, which meant switching to Auto-Lite or getting into the bad books of the local company representative, who can cancel one out pretty much at his own discretion.

But some dealers, like Ed Horton, have a weakness for selling what their customers want to buy. In 1952, Horton, who was then leasing a Standard Oil of Kentucky station in Manchester, Ga., displayed both the Atlas Permaguard antifreeze sponsored by Standard and Prestone antifreeze, a far more popular brand. The company salesman told him to get rid of the Prestone. He also told him to sell his Henderson tire changer and buy a Standard-sponsored Iron Coates Tireman. Every 2 weeks the salesman dropped by to urge additional stocks of Standard-approved products on Horton, who felt himself sufficiently stocked.

In January 1953 Horton was called in by the company's agents and, as he testified, told that "I had to abide by the policies of the Standard Oil Co. and that they had a quota of TBA products to meet and that my station had to meet this quota and they were going to get it one way or another." But he still declined to buy more than he thought he could sell. He held out for 2 years; in January 1955 he received a letter from the Standard district manager canceling his 30-year lease. He was paid only for his Standard equipment and lost $1,500.

In the good days, before he was canceled out, Horton earned $250 a month for a family of 4. This is a fair income for a filling-station operator. Two-thirds of the approximately 250,000 dealers throughout the country are making a bare living or actually losing money. Of the 63 stations in Amherst, N. Y., for instance, 44 have had 1 or more changes of management since 1950. Thirty-six of them have had 115 different operators in the past 5 years. The most efficient dealers in the Detroit area make about a 5.7-percent return on their cost of operation.

In some places it's positively dangerous to make too good a living. Standard Oil of

California has been known to convert a particularly profitable leased Chevron station into one of its own Red-White-Blue Standard outlets. On the other hand, if the company finds itself saddled with a unit that is losing money regularly, there's always some eager young fellow around to take it over on a lessee basis.

But the companies usually see to it that their lessees don't make a dangerous amount of money. The president of the Ohio Gas Dealers Association noted for the Roosevelt committee that while the retail price of gasoline has gone up from 16 cents a gallon in 1934 to 26.9 cents today, the dealer's margin has risen from 4 cents all the way to 4.3 cents during the same period.

Representative ROOSEVELT's investigation is not the first to be made of the oil companies' relations with the men who sell their products. In 1940 the Justice Department brought an antitrust suit against the 22 oil companies and their many affiliates who make up the American Petroleum Institute. The suit was suspended during the war and has since proved too cumbersome to handle en masse. Separate proceedings against the Sun Oil Co. in Philadelphia and Standard Oil of California are now underway. It was revealed in 1940 that the 22 companies owned or controlled 92 percent of the country's crude oil stores, 85 percent of the gasoline refineries, 90 percent of the stocks of finished gas, and 75 percent of the service stations.

The Justice Department summed up the tribulations of your happy filling-station operator in its 1940 suit against the Petroleum Institute:

"The majors have the power, through threatening to cancel the lease by exercising the short-term cancellation clause, to force the operator to handle the lessor's petroleum products exclusively and sell them at the prices dictated by the lessor; the lessor also cancels leases where the operator fails to maintain or increase the predetermined gas gallonage which forms the basis for calculating rent, or when the operator refuses to purchase supplies of automotive equipment from the lessor or persons designated by him. In addition the majors have the power to force operators to maintain or increase the predetermined gas gallonage by dictating the reduction of sales prices without making a corresponding reduction in the price at which the operator purchases the gas."

Why do men enter a field which offers all the risks of private enterprise with none of its independence, a field in which they are kept—as a Michigan operator put it—"docile, submissive, and subservient"? The oil companies encourage them with invitations to "be your own boss." The majors operate training schools which keep a supply of high-school graduates flowing to replace uncooperative operators. They offer easy financing terms to the prospective lessee. "We specially like farm boys," one candid oil company recruiting agent told a committee staff member: "They'll work 18 hours a day."

But these oil company lures only point to the real reasons why men choose to operate gas stations. Witness after witness gave the Congressmen the same answers to the question of why they had become involved and remain involved despite their hard lessons. They've always liked being around automobiles, they explain. They like working outdoors most of the day. They like being on their own. Working outdoors, puttering with cars, being on your own, perhaps sporting the smart uniforms and wildly happy faces that singing Texaco dealers used to sport on Milton Berle's TV show—American goals all of them. And some 60 men who worked hard to achieve these goals have now appeared before a congressional committee, frustrated and confused. They had all the proper dreams, but somehow things never quite worked out right, and many still don't understand where it was they went wrong.

Power Trust Source of Political Corruption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a notable editorial from this week's issue of Labor, the national weekly, of which Reuben Levin is editor, and Hon. Edward Keating, for many years a Member of this House, is editor emeritus:

POLITICAL CORRUPTION IS BIG ISSUE IN POWER FIGHT

Let's take a new look at the public versus private electric power fight which is raging on so many fronts. What does it mean to the American people when the public power cause suffers such a major defeat as the one in the Dixon-Yates deal battle this week in the House?

Most of the talk on this subject is about how such public power yardsticks as the Tennessee Valley Authority save consumers billions of dollars by holding down private power rates. That's important but there's something equally vital at stake. It is this:

The power trust long has been, and still is, the biggest source of political corruption. That's inherent in the very nature of the private power business. It can be cured only by creating more public power yardsticks.

Do those statements seem too strong? Then consider these self-evident facts:

Every utility company is a monopoly, with no competition. The only limits on what it can charge its customers are public regulation and public yardsticks. Therefore, utility magnates constantly seek to control the regulators and destroy the yardsticks. There's nothing surprising about that, and it's been proved by one investigation after another.

For example, the 8-year Federal Trade Commission probe in the late 1920's and early 1930's. It revealed every possible kind of political corruption by utility companies. A little later, the Securities and Exchange Commission held hearings which disclosed that the Union Electric Co. of Missouri was corrupting State officials with secret slush funds and "wine, women and song."

If anyone thinks such things happened only in the past, let him recall the recent hearings before a committee headed by Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota. A subsidiary of the Dixon-Yates combine was exposed as doing virtually what Union Electric did—maintaining luxury camps where expensive entertainment is provided for public officials.

Also, another story in this issue tells how the power trust lobbyists swarmed all over the Florida legislature, wining and dining the lawmakers.

Even such things, however, are the "small potatoes" of political corruption by the power trust. The main thing is to understand the situation which inevitably produces an infinite variety of corruption at all levels of government—local, State and National.

For example: Power-trust companies always seek to "own" State governors. They pour money into the campaign funds of a candidate who is on their side, and stop at nothing to defeat a governor who is on the people's side? Why?

Because the governor appoints the members of the State regulatory commission, and it has power to grant or deny a utility company's demands. The commission not only can O. K. exorbitant rate boosts, inflated capital, and excessive salaries for the company's officials, it can also do such things as allow the company to spend huge sums on deceptive private power propaganda, and tack the cost onto the light and power bills paid by consumers.

It is the same way only still bigger, on the national scale. Why did power trust magnates contribute so lavishly to Republican campaign funds in 1952? For one reason, because the President appoints the members of the Federal Power Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Atomic Energy Commission, and other government agencies which can grant or refuse what the power trust wants.

All those agencies, having been "packed" by President Eisenhower, have given the power trust nearly everything it asked. An outstanding example is the Dixon-Yates deal, which was ordered by Eisenhower.

That deal will cost the American taxpayers at least 90 million unnecessary dollars, and is designed as the entering wedge to destroy the TVA public power yardstick. The Atomic Energy Commission, which negotiated the deal and signed the Dixon-Yates contract, refused even to listen to a cheaper offer from another private power group. The FPC and SEC okayed the deal despite serious charges that it violates the Utility Holding Company Act.

Now, this week, the House voted 198 to 169 for a TVA appropriation bill amendment which, in effect, gives the "green light" to the scandalous Dixon-Yates deal. In the days before that key vote was taken, power-trust lobbyists swarmed over Capitol Hill. What do you think they were doing, if not trying to corrupt Members of Congress by political promises and threats?

All this political corruption will continue until the people get angry enough to demand and get enough public power "yardsticks" to make public power magnates decide that corruption does not pay.

Mr. Speaker, the Henry Luce publications support and cooperate with the Power Trust lobbyists.

Power Trust Lobbyists Active in State as Well as National Capitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article from the June 25, 1955, issue of Labor, the newspaper owned and published by the railroad brotherhoods:

STATE LEGISLATORS DINED, WINED BY LOBBYISTS

(By Michael Marsh)

Lobbyists have been riding high in various State legislatures this year. They've been lavish with entertainment, favors and even bribes for legislators—who are expected to

give in return their votes. That's the gist of recent newspaper reports from a number of State capitals. Here are three examples:

In Florida, the capital correspondent of the Miami Herald reported that "public utilities are winding up another 60 days of expensive lobbying in the Florida legislature—and the consumer is footing the bill for an amount he will never know."

The electric consumer pays for such expenses as "bourbon and sirloin, hotel suites and lobbyists' salaries" through his electric bill, the Herald reporter pointed out. And the utilities aren't required to itemize these expenses at all.

The reporter cited the Florida Power & Light Co. as the "most powerful" lobby around the capital. Moreover, he noted, "like other utility and bus companies, Florida Power & Light at times hires members of the legislature as its attorneys."

In Texas, the crusading Texas Observer devoted a whole special issue to Lobbists at Work in the State capital. It described the wining and dining, racetrack excursions, free visits to brothels, legal retainers and outright bribes for the legislators. "Each member," the Observer concluded, "freeloads to his own limit—free food, free passes, free beer, free whisky, free junkets, free hotel rooms, and, for those who want them, free women."

The lobbyists outnumber both houses of the Texas legislature put together, the Observer reported. The most powerful lobbies represent oil, natural gas, sulphur, railroads, beer and liquor, and buses and trucks. Apart from parties, receptions, expensive junkets, and hotel suites where free food and drink are always available, a number of lobbyists pay out cold hard cash.

Legal retainers is one way of passing money, the Observer pointed out. Members of the legislature, polled by the paper, gave the following estimates on how many of their colleagues accept such retainers: 11 percent of the house membership and 60 percent of the senate membership.

Outright bribery is also used. "You are talking about members taking bribes?" one industrial lobbyist told the paper. "Well, I'll tell you, it's a damn scandal * * * there's some going on right now. * * * They're within one vote now."

One house member said he was offered $5,000 to vote the right way on a certain bill in committee. Another told of receiving some material from a lobbyist, and with it $150 in cash. The same house member told of a colleague protesting to him, "Look, they've been paying my office expenses for years. Don't tell me how to vote." A wealthy representative said, "They've tried to entice me with tips on the oil business * * * good ones."

FOUR $100 BILLS

A State senator told of one lobbyist offering him four $100 bills to cover his filing fee for reelection, which amounted to $50. When the same senator suffered a financial reverse and returned to his office, he recalled, "there were 11 of them (lobbyists) lined up waiting for me and * * * wanting to help with expenses."

Another senator told how a colleague complained to him on one bill, "Why they only gave me $500." The same colleague told him, the senator said, that on another bill he "got $2,500, and that five members of that committee got $2,500." Still another senator recounted how a lobbyist approached him just before last Christmas and offered him "$500 now and $500 later" as Christmas money.

Lawyer Ed Clark, kingpin of the Texas business lobbyists, protested that he himself is highly ethical but told the Observer as follows about the legislators: "It's a dangerous thing for a young man to come up here."

Mr. Speaker, the Henry Luce publications support and cooperate with the Power Trust lobbyists.

Power Lobbyists Lose on REA but Win on TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including an article from Labor's Daily, carried in its issue of June 23, 1955:

RESTORATION OF POWER FUNDS HAILED BY ECI

WASHINGTON.—The labor-backed Electric Consumers Information Committee hailed as "a major victory for public power" the restoration by the House of a $6 million continuing fund for the Southwest Power Administration.

The committee also expressed optimism that the Dixon-Yates lobby could be defeated in the Senate's consideration of an appropriations bill seeking $6.5 million for Dixon-Yates.

The Southwest Power Administration fund will implement contracts between the Federal Government and five Generation and Transmission Cooperatives in the Missouri-Arkansas-Oklahoma area. The contracts are for integration and interchange of the G. and T.'s steam generated power with SPA's hydroelectric power over the co-op's lines.

The House action, if approved by the Senate, will force the Eisenhower administration to honor the contracts which they have previously repudiated.

Meanwhile, Charles J. Fain, assistant general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, told a Senate subcommittee that the $6 million Eisenhower recommended fund for Dixon-Yates represents, "A surrender by the Federal Government of the integrity of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the representatives of New York investor groups who seek to destroy the right of the American people to enjoy the fruits of their own natural resources."

Fain continued:

"This $6.5 million item would be the beginning of a 25-year period of appeasement by the Federal Government of commercial utility interests; a program which will cost the taxpayers of the United States or the rate payers of the Tennessee Valley area $100 million to $140 million during the first 25 years of operation of the Dixon-Yates contract."

Mr. Speaker, the Henry Luce publications support and cooperate with the Power Trust lobbyists.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the Hammond irrigation project in New Mexico.

The Hammond project is a part of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Hammond project would be $3,800 an acre.

The project would produce agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, beans, dairy products, and wool.

The Selection of Judges: The Independence of the Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very interesting and educational address delivered before the Judicial Conference of the Fifth Circuit by Charles J. Bloch that appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of June 1955:

THE SELECTION OF JUDGES: THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE FEDERAL COURTS

(By Charles J. Bloch)

(Mr. Bloch is disturbed about the gradually increasing influence of the Attorney General in the selection of Federal judges. During the last 20 years, he writes, the Department of Justice has become the chief litigant in Federal courts, and at the same time the Attorney General, who heads the Department, has become the President's chief adviser in appointing members of the Federal bench who will try the cases brought by the Department. Mr. Bloch proposes a constitutional amendment to change the method of selecting Federal judges so as to prevent any possible curtailment of the independence of the judiciary. This article is taken from an address delivered before the Judicial Conference of the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans last year.)

During the 1930's there arose a very gross misconception of the function of the judiciary in the American constitutional system.

That misconception was typified by the efforts then made to pack the Supreme Court, and to make radical changes in the judicial branch of the Government.

That misconception is illustrated by specimens of ideas which men in high places expressed at that time. For example, the second volume of the diary of the Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, has just been published. I have not had the chance to read it all, and I do not know that I ever will have the chance or the inclination. But I give you 1 or 2 quotations from the first 100 pages of it:

"The President read us the draft of the message that he was to deliver before the joint session of Congress the next day on the State of the Nation. * * * It raised the Supreme Court issue very clearly and very cleverly but very inoffensively. The line that he took was that there had been cordial and effective cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government during the past almost 4 years, but that there had been lacking that cooperation on the part of the judiciary that the people had a right to expect. He invited cooperation from the judiciary and he remarked in passing that the function of legislating should be left to the Congress, where the Constitution intended it to be" (p. 31).

After the message to which Secretary Ickes referred had been delivered by the President, he writes this in his diary:

"It was clearly apparent that the message was well received, which means that those who heard it * * * are in a mood to join issue on the Supreme Court on its arrogant assumption of the right to overrule both Congress and the President in matters of legislation. * * * I imagine that this was the first time in our history that a President of the United States, in addressing Congress, has sharply, even if politely, criticized the judicial branch of the Government. * * * I believe that we are on the eve of an era where the powers of the Court will be much more strictly limited than they have been in the past (p. 32)."

Then, a little later he says:

"No one can see ahead into history, but I suspect that this adroit move all along the line against the judiciary will be one of the outstanding things in American history for all time to come (p. 65)."

And in that same entry in his diary he criticized Chief Justice Hughes because he would not make the Court an instrument for social and political progress (p. 67).

Such was the germ of the ideas which became prevalent 15 or 16 years ago, and have had their effect on the judiciary of this Nation, and more important, have had their effect on the attitude of the laymen toward the courts.

And perhaps more important, they have had their effect on the ideas of conservative statesmen toward the courts, and particularly the Supreme Court.

Recently I heard a speech delivered by a distinguished Southern Senator who is well known to some of us here and whom we all admire and respect.

In that speech he said:

"The founders of our Government never intended that public questions should be decided solely on the basis of the number of people involved. They devised our system of divided powers and checks and balances to avoid any action that smacked of mob rule * * * the founders sought to insulate the Federal judiciary against any form of pressure from any source, but all of you who are members of the bar have read decisions of our highest Court which would indicate that a political formula had been applied to reach decisions on constitutional and legal questions."

And a little later he said:

"Instead of discharging its proper function as umpire, these decisions, particularly in cases where the executive branch through the Attorney General has intervened, would indicate that the Supreme Court is about to lose its identity as a coequal branch of our Government. The Court has shown much less disposition to protect the prerogatives of the legislative branch than the Congress displayed when the Supreme Court was under attack by the same executive department. Some of the briefs filed by the Attorney General would indicate that he believes that it is the mission of the Court to strike down the rights of the States and of the people reserved in the 10th amendment and to transfer them to the Central Government."

So, that seed which was so planted has so grown that conservative, reasonable, rational men are now of the opinion that the Supreme Court is about to lose its identity as a coequal branch of our Government, or in other words, about to lose its independence. And that idea is not confined to opinions of the Supreme Court, but like criticism is spreading to opinions of other courts.

It is likely that a major operation will be necessary in order to make it plain to every citizen of this Nation that the judiciary was intended to be independent; that for the most part it is independent; and that it will remain independent.

That is was intended to be independent, we all know.

Even before the Constitution, the American colonists were mindful of the problems of judicial selection and tenure. In the Declaration of Independence they declared that the King of Great Britain "has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers, and has made judges dependent upon his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries."

When the Constitution was written and ratified, one of its fundamental principles was that governmental powers should be divided among the three departments of government, the legislative, the executive and the judicial, and that each of those was separate from the others. This separation was not merely a matter of convenience or of governmental mechanism. The object was basic and vital. (*O'Donoghue* v. *United States*, 289 U. S. 516.)

The object has never been more forcibly stated than it was by Chief Justice Marshall during the course of the debates of the Virginia State Convention of 1829–30 when he said:

"The judicial department comes home in its effects to every man's fireside; it passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all. Is it not, to the last degree important, that he (sic) should be rendered perfectly and completely independent, with nothing to influence or control him but God and his conscience? * * * I have always thought; from my earliest youth until now, that the greatest scourge an angry heaven ever inflicted upon an ungrateful and a sinning people, was an ignorant, a corrupt, or a dependent judiciary" (88 A. L. R. at p. 1025).

Those who wrote the Constitution were aware of the need for and the establishment of an independent judiciary.

Down through the years, that need has been recognized.

Never has that need been more cogently stated than it was by Justice Robert H. Jackson in his address at the laying of the cornerstone of the new American Bar Center on November 2, 1953:

"We believe in a strong and independent judiciary charged with the adjusting and applying of law to conditions of our time, with balancing the values of continuity against those of improvement, certainty against adaptability, liberty against authority. By independence of the judge we mean more than freedom from subservience to other branches of Government. We mean the largest freedom humanly attainable from his own partisanship, class interest, political bias, or group pressure" (40 A. B. A. J. 21).

But, believing, as the authors of the Constitution did, in an independent judiciary, it is noteworthy that they placed the judiciary in a rather peculiar position.

The Chief Executive is chosen by the people—indirectly, of course—but nonetheless, by the people.

The Members of the legislative branch, Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, are now chosen directly by the people.

But the members of the judiciary are appointed by the Chief Executive by and with the advice and consent of a branch of the legislative department.

True it is that once appointed and confirmed, a Federal judge holds office "during good behavior" subject to being removed only by an impeachment and trial by the Senate, but his right to serve stems from the concurrent acts of the executive department and a branch of the legislative department.

Is this system conducive to the continuance of the independence of the judiciary?

If not, is there a better system? What is it?

These are questions which have excited the attention of the bar. Not only have they excited the attention of the bar, but laymen—the press—are thinking of them and discussing them.

Charles Evans Hughes once said:

"You cannot maintain democratic institutions by mere forms of words or by occasional patriotic vows. You maintain them by making the institutions of our Republic work as they are intended to work."

That is the watchword of the American Bar Association in the founding of its section of judicial administration. The function of that section in the program of the American Bar Association is "the improvement of the administration of justice." The objectives of the association are set out in detail in the recommendations of the section of judicial administration found in 63 American Bar Association Reports 522. To them has been added the subject of improvement of the methods of judicial selection.

That subject is thus stated in the handbook prepared by the section: "The importance of establishing methods of judicial selection that will be most conducive to the maintenance of a thoroughly qualified and independent judiciary and that will take the State judges out of politics as nearly as may be, is generally recognized."

Some of us—a great many of us—have wondered why the proposal was limited to the selection of State judges. We presume that the reason is that Federal judges have a life tenure and that the method of their selection is governed by the Constitution.

That does not answer the doubt, particularly if this statement of the section in its handbook is true: "Judges should not be selected for partisan or political considerations."

The method of selecting United States Senators has been changed in our lifetime by constitutional amendment.

The possible tenure, or continuance of tenure, of the President of the United States has even more recently been the subject of a constitutional change.

The method of electing the President is constantly the subject of debate and discussion, and possible constitutional change.

Is the method of selecting Federal judges any the more sacrosanct and immutable?

If to make the institutions of our Republic better work as they were intended to work, a change in the method of selecting Federal judges is desirable, the bar of the Nation, the members of the Federal judiciary should be the first to have the courage to say so and to propose such change.

Is the present system conducive to an independent judiciary?

Before passing to a brief analysis of what the present system really is, I should like to advert to a survey made by a New Jersey journalist with respect to their recent editorial comments concerning judicial appointments. He spoke regarding that survey at a meeting of the American Bar Association Committee on Cooperation with Laymen of the Section of Judicial Administration on September 19, 1951. He called attention to the fact that in recent months there had been more than 40 sharp criticisms of the Federal system of selecting judicial appointees. He quoted the following from an editorial in a Milwaukee paper:

"To the average citizen, the dispute should point up the fact that Federal judgeships shouldn't be matters of political patronage in the first place. Why should either the President or the Senator decide who should be judges on the basis of personal desire or political favor? Why should judgeships get tangled up in political feuds? Why don't we have an impartial body to nominate professionally qualified men for the President's judicial appointments?"

After so quoting, he commented:

"Perhaps the concept of extending the Missouri plan to cover the entire Federal judiciary hasn't yet been envisaged by the

American Bar Association. It does, however, have widespread support among the press."

Personally, I think this editor missed one point when he confined himself to criticizing presidential and senatorial selection.

That can be demonstrated by a brief analysis of what the present system really is.

Theoretically, the President of the United States nominates Federal judges by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The nomination is signed by the President. Who in the executive branch of the Government actually investigates the character and qualifications of aspirants for Federal judgeships? Who actually is the alter ego of the President in that particular phase of work?

If we did not judicially know the answers to these questions, the answer would be found in that book which the author denominates a "story of men, emotions, methods, and motives in that crucial zone of law and government bordering both upon the courts and the Executive"—Federal Justice by Hon. Homer Cummings, former Attorney General of the United States.

Succinctly he answers the questions posed when at pages 528–529 he says:

"In an earlier day of fewer judges, the President could handle all routine connected with appointments. Of course members of the Cabinet often advised with him on judicial appointments and all manner of judicial matters. * * * It soon became necessary for the President to delegate the routine in connection with appointments. At first this was centralized in the Department of State. So far as law officers and judges were concerned, Attorney General Cushing caused it to be transferred to the Attorney General's office in 1853. * * * Time, practice, and the necessities of the case have finally centralized in the Department of Justice the duty of investigating and recommending judicial appointments. There it is performed solely as a confidential service in aid of the President."

So we know from eminent authority, if we did not know it otherwise, that so far as the nomination by the executive is concerned, in the vast, vast majority of cases that nomination is made on behalf of the President by the Department of Justice. The phrase "Department of Justice" and the title "Attorney General" are practically and legally synonymous (U. S. C. A. title 5, sec. 291; U. S. C. A. Cumulative Supplement, title 5, sec. 291 (N)). Even prior to the reorganization plan of 1950, the Supreme Court of the United States had conceded it to be the duty of the Attorney General to "supervise the conduct of all suits brought by or against the United States and to give advice to the President and to the heads of other departments of Government" (125 U. S. at p. 278).

Another case (68 N. E. 2d 750) has stated the authority and duty of the Attorney General to extend to the "general control and supervision of all original prosecutions and all civil suits in which the United States is interested, whether such interest be the subject of attack or defense."

So, the Attorney General of the United States:

(a) Gives advice to the President and the heads of the other departments of the Govment;

(b) Supervises the conduct of all suits brought by or against the United States—in some of which the soundness of that advice may be judicially tested;

(c) As a confidential service in aid of the President he investigates and recommends judicial appointments—the appointment of judges to preside in the trial of those cases which he must defend or which he may have instituted.

He pitches; he catches; he bats; he fields; he runs bases; and—he selects, or has a great voice in selecting the umpires.

On June 30, 1953, there were pending in the district courts of the United States, 66,873 civil cases, of which 23,617 were cases in which the United States was a party. (Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts for 1953, p. 144.)

During the fiscal year 1953 there were 64,001 civil cases commenced in the United States district courts, of which 23,881 were United States cases, plaintiff in 17,751; defendant in 6,130 (ibid., p. 148).

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, there were 38,504 criminal proceedings commenced in the United States district courts (ibid., p. 171).

On June 30, 1952, there were pending in the United States courts of appeals for the 11 circuits, 1,845 cases, of which 267 were criminal cases and 492 civil cases, in which the United States was a party. In addition, there were 369 classified as administrative appeals (ibid., p. 134).

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, there were filed 603 petitions for review on writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States from the United States courts of appeals, of which 126 were in criminal cases and 170 in United States civil cases, and 57 administrative appeals.

We do not know in how many cases the Attorney General has been asked to intervene or file briefs as amicus curiae, but it takes no more figures to demonstrate that over the years the United States has become the chief litigant in the Federal courts.

In *United States* v. *Lee* (106 U. S. 196, at p. 223), Mr. Justice Miller, speaking for the Supreme Court, said: "The judicial department is inherently the weakest of them all." The enforcement and protection of judgments of courts, he pointed out, are dependent upon officers appointed and removable at the pleasure of the Executive. "With no patronage and no control of the purse or sword," he continued, "their power and influence rests solely upon the public sense of the necessity for the existence of a tribunal to which all may appeal for the assertion and protection of rights guaranteed by the Constitution and by the laws of the land, and on the confidence reposed in the soundness of their decisions and the purity of their motives."

Day by day, month by month, year by year, cases are increasing in which a citizen of the United States meets in the courts of the United States, the United States as a party litigant.

Will the citizens of the United States continue to have confidence in the soundness of the decisions of these courts and the purity of the motives of these courts when the counsel for the adversary party litigant is vested with so great a power in the selection of the judges of those courts? Will the citizens of the United States continue to regard the judiciary as an independent judiciary when its members have practically been nominated by counsel for its chief party litigant?

I have been practicing law in the same city, the same firm for over 40 years. During that time, I have tried several cases in United States courts before United States judges in which the United States was the adversary party. I have seen other such cases tried. Never have I had the slightest suspicion that the presiding judge was in any manner partial to the United States.

But the problem revolves not around what I and other trained lawyers know, but around what the litigant citizens—laymen—in this day of television, radio, and unbridled freedom of the press—may think.

Is this flaw in the nominating power cured by the provision that the Senate must advise and consent to the nomination before it becomes effective?

A consideration of this question suggests another: Does the Senate really advise?

We would shut our eyes to the facts if we pretended ignorance on the subject of senatorial courtesy in judicial appointments insofar as it affects appointments of judges of Federal district courts. So, let us steer away from that subject for the present at least, and see what is the present status of "advice and consent" insofar as appointments to the Supreme Court of the United States are concerned.

In 1893, Grover Cleveland was President of the United States. David B. Hill was a Senator from New York in the Senate of the United States. Justice Blatchford of the United States Supreme Court died. The President nominated William B. Hornblower of New York. That appointment displeased Senator Hill. So the nomination was rejected by the Senate. The President then nominated Wheeler H. Peckham. Senator Hill contested that nomination, too, and succeeded in defeating it. Three days later the President nominated United States Senator Edward Douglass White of Louisiana. The Senate promptly and unanimously accepted that nomination. For 27 years he served on the Court with distinction, during 10 of those years as Chief Justice. It is not important whether the President or the Senate won that battle of a bygone day. The importance is that President Cleveland there set a pattern which for the last 16 years has been followed by our Chief Executives, either wittingly or unwittingly, in their appointments to our highest tribunal and thus impeding and embarrassing the Senate in its constitutional power and duty of advising and consenting to the appointment of justices to the Supreme Court.

The pattern is that of appointing to the highest court either Senators or men holding offices for which they have been confirmed by the Senate.

With the exception of the present Chief Justice, every appointee (except perhaps one) to the Court since 1937 was at the time of his appointment either a United States Senator, or holding an office for which he had been confirmed by the Senate. Whether such nominations are planned to obviate or discourage controversies in the Senate over confirmation, we of course do not know. But we do know that they have had that effect. Since the Cleveland-Hill struggle of 1894, there has been only one rejection by the Senate of a Presidential appointment to the Supreme Court, and very few instances in which there was any prolonged discussion or debate over any appointment.

For the past 16 years at least, it appears that the Senate of the United States has made little use of its constitutional power to advise with and consent to appointments of Supreme Court Justices. It was not ever thus—not even when a Chief Executive sought to place members of his cabinet on the Supreme Court. There were days when the Senate considered it not only its right but its duty to participate equally with the President in choosing Justices of the Supreme Court, and thus have some voice in the selection of those who ultimately have the decision as to whether constitutional government shall prevail in this Nation.

No man sits on the Supreme Court today without the approval of a majority of the Senate, present and voting when his nomination came before the Senate. The Senators have the constitutional power, and the correlative duty to "advise and consent" as to any nomination which is placed before them. That they have not recently exercised that power and duty is one of the reasons why there is being considered and discussed the question: Under present conditions should not the constitutional method of selecting Federal judges be changed?

As was ever so in this Nation of ours, there are men and women who are willing to face the facts, and discuss them.

With respect to judges of the courts of appeals, and district judges, the pattern is not so clear as it applies to nominations and appointments. But—when it comes to "advising and consenting," let us assume that State X has two Senators of the party in power. A district judge dies or resigns. The two Senators from State X agree on his successor. The Attorney General investigates him and recommends his appointment. He is appointed and confirmed. If perchance the Attorney General investigated and refused to recommend his appointment, there would come a clash. Until someone gave in, the State of X would be without a judge.

If the State of X should have had two Senators not of the party in power, then the "advice and consent" provision of the Constitution generally ceases to have any effect, and the Attorney General investigates and recommends.

In this situation, therefore, ought we not as men, whether judges or lawyers, be willing to admit that the present system is faulty, and face the questions: What method will be most conducive to the maintenace of a thoroughly qualified and independent Federal judiciary?

Are safeguards needed to insure the permanence of an independent judiciary?

With respect to State court judges, the American Bar Association plan contemplates that the appointing power is vested in the governor. In order to secure the best choice of names the executive does not have an unlimited power of selection, but is confined to a panel of names chosen by a separate nonminating agency. The nominating agency is not composed solely of lawyers and judges but consists equally if not predominantly of laymen elected by the voters or appointed by the governor, and serving without pay. It has been suggested that there be a national judicial council composed of judges, lawyers and laymen who would make nominations of more than one for the position. From this list the President would nominate, subject to the consent of the Senate.

A few weeks ago I was discussing this subject with a group of interested lawyers. It was suggested that I draft such a proposed amendment so that the lawyers who were interested could have the benefit of it, criticize it and make suggestions with respect to it—that it would serve as something concrete to discuss and criticize rather than to have a discussion of an abstract idea.

So, I undertook the task, and the proposed amendment might read as follows:

"SEC. 1. There shall be a Judicial Council of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The Judicial Council of the United States shall be composed of 17 citizens of the United States, 11 of whom shall be attorneys at law who shall have been admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of the United States, and none of whom shall be officers or employees of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The members of the Judicial Council shall be nominated by the President of the United States, and appointed by him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"SEC. 4. The term of office of each member of the Judicial Council of the United States shall be 15 years, and no member shall be eligible to serve upon said council after the expiration of the term for which he was appointed. All vacancies on the said council shall be filled by nomination and appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such member so appointed shall hold office for a full term of 15 years from the date of his appointment.

"SEC. 5. The members of the Judicial Council shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation to be determined by law by the Congress of the United States which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

"SEC. 6. The duty of the Judicial Council of the United States shall be to recommend to the President of the United States, persons for nomination and appointment by him as Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and as such inferior courts as the Congress may have ordained and established or may hereafter ordain and establish.

"SEC. 7. No person shall be nominated or appointed by the President of the United States as a Justice of the Supreme Court, or as a judge of any inferior court unless he shall have been recommended for such nomination and appointment by a majority of the members of the Judicial Council of the United States then in office.

"SEC. 8. No member of the Judicial Council of the United States shall be eligible for appointment as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States or as a judge of an inferior court nor for a period of 3 years after he has ceased to be such member whether such cessation ensued by expiration of his term or by resignation or otherwise.

"SEC. 9. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article."

If the idea of a national judicial council should not be considered as a solution to our problem, there is another approach which might be considered.

The Constitution of the United States, in dealing with the legislative department, provides specifically: "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own Members" (art. I, sec. 5, clause 1).

Thus, the utter independence of the Congress of the United States is safeguarded. The jurisdiction to determine the right of a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives to a seat is vested exclusively in the Senate or the House respectively. The Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit has decided in the case of *Johnson* v. *Stevenson* (170 F. 2d 108) that is the constitutional right of the Senate to judge the election of a Senator in all its steps or stages.

The legislative bodies are the sole judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their members. There is no reason why the Federal judiciary should not be a sole judge of the qualification and selection of its own members, and thus to create a real independent judiciary dependent upon the whims, foibles, personal predilections of no one but upon the calm deliberate judgment of other members of the Federal judiciary.

I have some very definite ideas as to the details of a plan, but time here certainly would not permit the mention or discussion of them.

I do think it appropriate to say that in my opinion the selection should be different with respect to Justices of the Supreme Court as distinguished from judges of the courts of appeals and district judges.

So far as the Supreme Court of the United States is concerned, I venture the suggestion that no man should sit as a Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States who has not had prior experience on the Federal bench or as a justice of a State court of last resort. The selection of Justices of the Supreme Court might be confined to a selection from judges of the 11 circuit courts of appeals, and State supreme court justices.

Presently, there are 62 judges of the 11 courts of appeals. I would say that there were about 300 justices of State courts of last resort. I should like to see the passage of a constitutional amendment which would provide that in the event of a vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States, that it must be filled by a selection from these judges and justices. It could be that the selection should be made by the remaining justices of the Supreme Court selecting a panel of 3 and the Senate selecting by election, 1 from that panel, or vetoing all 3 of them. Those are matters of detail. The underlying principle of the suggestion is that no man should be permitted to serve as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States without having had prior experience as an appellate judge or justice.

So far as court of appeals judges are concerned, I suggest that in the event of a vacancy on a court of appeals, that that vacancy be filled by the remaining members of the court of appeals either from the district judges or from members of the bar. After 40 years of practice, it is my firm conviction that judges are capable of selecting the best judges.

So far as district court judges are concerned, I suggest that if a vacancy should occur, say in Louisiana, that that vacancy should be filled by a selection made by the judges of the Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit in conjunction with the remaining district judges in the State of Louisiana.

Our Constitution was intended to insure judicial independence. If it does not—if there is the slightest doubt about its doing so—it should be changed so as to assure absolute judicial independence.

Irrigation: An Investment in the U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, too often we judge by association or just by looking at the cover. If we see something good, many of us immediately accept anything that goes along with it as being good, sometimes we are fooled. Then, too, many books are excellent sellers just because they have intriguing covers, yet, how many of these are read from cover to cover.

This is much the case of irrigation and reclamation. I have been surprised time and time again when one of my colleagues registers disbelief when he is told costs for irrigation and reclamation are paid back to the Treasury by those who use them.

When we appropriate money for irrigation and reclamation, many Members immediately feel that this is a raid on the Federal Treasury. Why? Simply because they associate it with money appropriated for the operation of the hundreds of different functions of Government which is not returned to the Treasury. Perhaps we would fully realize this if the checks which are used to pay back this money were sent to the Treasurer of the United States via the Congress. Of course, I realize this is very impractical and would never work.

Reclamation has repaid over $600 million to the Federal Treasury and during the present fiscal year, another $60 million will be returned to the Government in compliance with the repayment contracts entered into by the water users.

During 1954, the new wealth created from reclamation projects amounted to $785,939,000, this wealth pays taxes, brings security, and helps to develop new industries. Reclamation helps us keep pace with our expanding population and contributes greatly to our national economy.

We must remember that more than half of Reclamation's annual appropriation is now coming from the revolving reclamation fund which was established

by the Congress by the Reclamation Act of 1902.

I ask you, are Commerce, Treasury, State, Defense, Labor, and the rest of the Departments paying half of their appropriations? Absolutely not.

You might say that the entire Nation benefits from the money appropriated for these Departments and that money which goes to the Bureau of Reclamation is used exclusively for the benefit of the 17 Western States.

Gentlemen, let me assure you that nothing could be further from the truth. Barren wastelands which once were unproductive are now producing crops, supporting thriving cities and thousands of people who represent a multi-billion-dollar market for products produced in every State of the Union.

Even if we completely disregard the amount of money which is paid back by the water users, you can readily understand how such an intelligent and rewarding investment reclamation is. In new income taxes alone the Federal Government collects millions annually.

Total appropriations for irrigation and reclamation since 1902 amount to about $2.7 billion. I want to impress you with the fact that most of this land was unproductive in either crops or taxes. Because of irrigation and reclamation, income from this land has produced over $4 billion in Federal income taxes. If we were to add the Federal gasoline, excise, excess profits, corporation, and hundreds of other taxes, the total would be fabulous.

I have checked with the Bureau of Reclamation relative to the repayment figures. They inform me that repayment of construction charges by the water users on Federal projects is more than 99 percent current.

Not only does irrigation and reclamation pay for itself, but it also pays big dividends. It is a blue-chip investment.

COST ESTIMATES

Much criticism has been leveled at the Bureau of Reclamation, and many innuendos have been passed along that the engineers from the Bureau are able to justify many of the projects by intentionally underestimating the cost of the projects.

Calling your attention to a statement inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 7, 1955, by my good friend and colleague from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], he points out that the actual cost of Federal reclamation projects has been below the cost estimates of the Bureau engineers.

The critics have pointed to some projects which have cost considerably more than the original estimates. The facts are there and on face value they cannot be disputed. However, there must be, and is, a reason for this. First and foremost, we cannot forget that the value of the dollar has dropped from 100 cents just prior to World War II to about 50 cents where it stands now.

Critics use estimates on projects made prior to World War II regardless of the fact that actual construction or the biggest share of construction was completed following the war. Certainly we are all aware of the fact that construction costs have more than doubled since 1939.

RECLAMATION AND SURPLUSES

Perhaps some of you have seen the booklet We're Being Misled About Agricultural Surplus and Reclamation, which also includes excerpts from a speech by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico who is also a former Secretary of Agriculture.

In the booklet, it is pointed out that we will soon be eating our way out of house and home. The former Secretary of Agriculture said:

> Very soon, within the next 10 years, according to a study made by the Department of Agriculture as late as 1953, we may well be speaking of farm shortages, and the need for an adequate supply of farmlands. Crop surpluses will have vanished.

And on the question of when we will reach a balance between production and demand, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico said:

> Officials in the Department of Agriculture, in testimony before congressional committees and in their various publications point out that as early as 1962—only 7 years from now—a balance of production and consumption could be reached.

We of the arid and semiarid West have realized for many, many years the importance of water. Only recently has the humid East begun to realize that the well does run dry at times. Many cities have been forced to ration water. Who of us would have realized that, 10 or 15 years ago? Very few.

Today, I want to speak specifically on the Ainsworth irrigation unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

This unit entails about 34,000 acres of irrigable land. The weather cycle in this area—north central Nebraska—shows there is enough rainfall to let the farmer realize a fair profit on his labors only 1 out of every 5 or 6 years.

Irrigation will enable the farmers of that area to realize a perfect union of land and water. It will help them to help themselves. Crops have been lost because rain was 2 or 3 days late, and crops have produced bumper yields when rains were sufficient and came at the right time.

To the farmer it will mean a diversified and excellent crop production and will stabilize the vulnerable agricultural economy of the area.

As I have pointed out, my district—Fourth Congressional of Nebraska—has more cattle than any other congressional district in the Nation. Cattle feeders come from hundreds of miles to buy calves for their feed lots. Irrigation will provide a local market for locally produced cattle.

The people who live within the boundaries of the Ainsworth unit are eager to have irrigation. The district has passed a resolution agreeing to the form of the repayment contract. They are ready and able to assume the contractual requirements of repaying the Federal Government for the benefits they will receive.

The Federal Government, over the years, has spent billions for flood control, navigation, transportation subsidies, drought relief, crop support, and crop insurance—without expectation or hope of reimbursement. These areas of disaster continue to plague us. The irrigated oases in the arid West remain solid units of stabilized agricultural production—production in specialty crops which are not always in competition with those crops which are in surplus at the present time.

Again, I want to point out that I have no quarrel with the benefits derived from these areas of Federal operation, but I want to remind you that irrigation and reclamation projects pay back their appropriations; flood control and navigation projects do not.

The Ainsworth unit has been shown to be both economically and physically feasible. This is the one requirement which the Congress has placed on this project before actual construction may be begun. I hope my colleagues will see fit to pass H. R. 5432, which I have introduced, so actual construction of this project can be started as soon as possible.

Young Republican Federation Holds National Convention in Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I was privileged to attend a few of the sessions of the national convention of the Young Republican Federation, held in Detroit, June 14 to 18.

This youthful and dynamic political group has shown amazing growth in the past 2 years. Under the cochairmanship of Sullivan Barnes, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and Marian Smith, of Little Rock, Ark., the federation has reached an estimated membership of 500,000, a 65 percent increase. With the addition last week of Alabama and Alaska, every State is now represented. They are a most vital force in Republican politics.

New officials of the Young Republican Federation elected last week for the next 2 years are: Charles K. McWhorter, a young attorney of New York; and Joyce Bovik, of Denver, Colo., cochairman. The unsolid South is again represented, with Roy Foster, of Georgia, elected as treasurer. Margaret Hoffman, of Indiana, is the new secretary.

Highlight of the convention was an outstanding address by Vice President NIXON on Friday evening. He outlined the accomplishments of the Republican administration and emphasized the realization of our party's goal of peace, prosperity, and progress.

The Young Republicans adopted several resolutions of national interest, including a unanimous endorsement of Eisenhower and NIXON for reelection next year.

A number of Republican Congressmen participated in panels and forums. All of us were impressed with the serious-minded attitude of the delegates and their enthusiasm for the Republican program. Support of these politically minded young people may very well be decisive in the next election. It is encouraging to all of us who must face election to have their wholehearted backing.

Appendix

Economic Freedom in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of Jerry Voorhis, executive director of the Cooperative League of the United States of America, before the House Judiciary Committee concerning the league's position on monopoly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, economic freedom is lingering in the United States. It is not dead by any means. But it is being gradually strangled by the cancer of sheer bigness. Unless it is revived by vigorous, farsighted, fearless people who understand the ideals on which this country has been developed, economic freedom will be killed by those who profess to be its stanchest advocates.

These are strong words. But it is time those of us who see the handwriting on the wall spoke them. It is time we said what is true—even if unpopular—that corporate bigness and bigness of concentrated control over capital is in itself a danger to continued freedom.

In recent years we have been acting like ostriches. Our heads have been buried in the bright warm sands of a great material prosperity and the enjoyment of material gadgets such as mankind in past ages never believed possible. Eminent men have written—in fact they are still writing them—books about the new economy into which we are moving wherein our economic life will be dominated by a few giant corporations. But they say this situation should be welcomed, not resisted because only the biggest of big business possesses the sheer financial power and commands research facilities to catapult us quickly into the new gilded age of bigger and better automatic gadgets.

And for some strange reason these otherwise intelligent writers seem to think that freedom and democracy and community and all the other basic ideals of our country can survive under such circumstances.

They have forgotten, or at least neglected to mention, the facts of all past history. Never—I repeat, never—in all the annals of mankind have political democracy and personal freedom survived a condition of economic oligarchy. There is no valid reason to expect them to do so in 20th century United States. It was economic oligarchy that brought on a freedom-destroying revolution of the right in Nazi Germany—to protect the oligarchy. It was economic oligarchy in Russia that was a basic cause of the freedom-destroying revolution in that country—as a means of overthrowing the oligarchy. The advance of socialization in the democratic countries of Western Europe is a sort of peaceful revolution caused, not by the writings of Karl Marx, but by the existence of cartels and monopolies which leave a people of democratic tradition with only three alternatives.

One such alternative is to give up the effort to have anything at all to say about the economic course of their nation. Another is to organize cooperative or mutual-type businesses to compete with the oligarchy. The third alternative is to attempt an assertion of the general will of the people through political measures calculated to reduce their dependence upon the established centers of overbearing economic power.

The first of these alternatives will be accepted only where traditions of freedom and democracy are already dead in a nation. The second alternative, that is the organization of cooperatives to enter the market place in competition with monopolies, has proven successful in restoring economic freedom and healthy competition in Scandinavia and in some industries in Great Britain and other countries. But where monopoly or economic oligarchy is already firmly established, where people are not inclined to go through the difficulties involved in developing strong cooperatives, but where the democratic tradition is still strong, attempts will almost certainly be made to restore democratic control over the nation's course by means of socialization. The only trouble is that this means cannot restore economic freedom. Instead it gives economic freedom a kind of burial, where that freedom has already been killed by the march of monopoly.

These observations lead to the obvious conclusion that the thing for a people to do if they value freedom is to prevent the establishment of monopoly or economic oligarchy before it is too late. This is a tremendous task. It requires wisdom, determination, and willingness to endure misunderstanding and sometimes persecution—or ostracism, which is worse. It is a task from which some who once fought well have turned away in weariness, or despair, or surrender. It is a task, however, which no one who understands the real tradition of this country can conscientiously fail to pursue with utmost vigor. Finally, it is a task which cannot possibly be accomplished unless we recognize that bigness itself—if it is big enough—is the very core and center of the danger.

I am not here to charge any lurid plots against economic freedom. I am not here to talk about wolves of Wall Street or any other street. In fact I believe the condition of concentration of economic power which we confront today is not principally due to anyone's deliberate intent. Rather I believe it is due to a weakness on the part of many, many people who worship bigness for its own sake plus a tendency for business, having passed a certain size, gained a certain amount of dominance in an industry, and accumulated a certain amount of capital, thereafter to expand and grow in power and scope through the sheer weight of its own momentum. When we come to the place where such old and honored names as Studebaker, Hudson, or Packard can only be kept alive in the automobile business by merging with other companies—when we are told, in effect, that only one company in the country is capable of manufacturing tanks for the Army, we had better stop, look, and do something about it. We are at that point now.

My principal criticism of the report of the Attorney General's committee on the antitrust law is that it has dealt with small details and largely neglected the alarming development of concentration of economic control in our economy and the corresponding threat to economic liberty which should have been its main concern. Except for certain minority views we find nothing of consequence in the report which suggests an answer to the headlong rush to merge that has taken place in the past 3 years. But the fact is that more than 3 times as many mergers have been engineered in each of the past 3 years as took place in the average year during the previous two decades. We do not find the majority of the committee even worried over the fact, revealed recently by the Federal Trade Commission, that, whereas the 200 largest corporations produced 37 percent of our manufactured goods, by value, in 1937, the 200 largest corporations in 1950 produced more than 40 percent of the value of manufactured goods.

We find in the report no note of alarm over the increasing difficulty—if not the sheer impossibility—of small business in getting a product on the market, in the face of the growing dominance of nationwide television advertising and the prohibitive cost of such advertising to any except the biggest of businesses. We do not find any great concern over the fact that effective price competition has almost disappeared in about half of our whole economy or that price and quality leadership by 1, 2, or 3 firms now dominates most of our major industries. We do not even find effective proposals to remedy the situation where in industry after industry it is now impossible for a new concern to enter the industry at all, unless, indeed, it does so at the behest of one of the established giants and with the tacit understanding that it will remain dependent upon that giant in every important phase of its business. And yet freedom of entry into business is the basic test of economic freedom.

It is serious enough that the majority report of the Attorney General's committee suggested many measures that would actually weaken the already inadequate enforcement of our antitrust laws. It is far more serious that they made no important proposal looking toward restoration of true economic freedom in the Nation.

There is contrast between the report of the majority of the committee on the one hand and the performance of the Antitrust Division on the other. The Antitrust Division has initiated, at least, certain very important actions and those who care about economic freedom should recognize this. For one thing, Assistant Attorney General Barnes recommended passage of the bill, which the House did pass, increasing the maximum fine for Sherman Act violation to $50,000. The committee was only one-fifth as concerned to have effective penalties as was the Department of Justice.

Perhaps more important is the fact that the Antitrust Division is at least studying the monopolistic effect of newspaper mergers which lead to a situation where all the people of great communities have access to current information from only one source. Again the fact that cases are pending against such giants as Radio Corporation of America and Pan American Airways serves to allay some of the concern over dismissal of the action against major oil companies some months ago over control of world markets. Most important of all would seem to be decision of the Antitrust Division to carry the case against DuPont, based largely on their

acquisition of an effective controlling interest in General Motors, to the Supreme Court.

Nonetheless it is my opinion that the antitrust laws of the United States have never in all history been really effectively enforced. Ours is the only country in the world that has on its statute books any even potentially effective antitrust laws. This is because some countries are dictatorships where they have nothing but monopolies. Other countries have surrendered to the dominance of cartels. On the other hand, still others have strong enough and certain enough competition from cooperatives so they don't need antitrust laws. Even with inadequate enforcement, the American antitrust laws are I believe responsible for the fact that in the years before, during, and just after World War II a complete control of the world chemical industry was not achieved by 1 American, 1 British, and 1 German firm. This is only one example of the salutary effect of these laws.

But to go back to the main point. One reason our antitrust laws have not succeeded in their objectives is because they never have really been tried. So little money has been appropriated and the staff has therefore had to be so small that only spot enforcement has been possible. In many years the fines collected by Antitrust have exceeded its expenses. Still both the Budget Bureau and Congress have been, as I see it, pennywise and pound foolish when it came to building an effective enforcement agency. Furthermore, spot enforcement isn't fair. It operates on the theory that if you prosecute one violator and punish him, others will automatically cease unlawful practices. Maybe for little companies this sometimes works. For the big fellows the fines have been and still are so small that violations of antitrust laws are well worth even the maximum it might cost if the company in question happened to be chosen for action. Imagine, for example, our biggest automobile company paying $11,000 in fines in seven suits brought by the Government over a period of years. We do not yet know how effective our antitrust laws, especially with the amendment respecting mergers passed in 1950 contained in them, might be if they were fully enforced.

It seems clear to me that the committee would have had a lot to say in this point had it been really concerned about the future of economic freedom in our country. Instead the committee's discussion of the problem was such that Senator KEFAUVER described it as a guide to evasion of the law. Here again I must in fairness contrast the complacency of the majority of the committee with the encouraging apparent readiness of the Antitrust Division to examine each merger in the light of the Kefauver-Celler amendment to see whether it tends toward monopoly and, if so, to bring action. I am no expert in this field, but here I expect is the crux of the problem, especially if we include the holding company method of bringing about mergers.

For the Senate Antimonopoly Committee has pointed out—quite correctly I think—the alarming degree of monopolistic control over the public utilities of this country which is now exercised by financial holding companies. From their political influences came, I am convinced, Dixon-Yates. And I am even more certain that the concentrated clever and not always honest drive on the part of the utilities to destroy the only kind of competition that exists in this industry—namely, that of publicly owned agencies and voluntary privately owned cooperatives—stems not from busy managers but from those who control the managers through financial holding companies.

In another field Assistant Attorney General Barnes has asked that banks be made subject to the provisions of the antitrust laws. It is high time this was done. When we find one great State where 88 percent of all deposits are, according to the president of the Independent Bankers Association, in the hands of just two banking companies, it is time to be alarmed. And to do something about it. Not only should the suggestion of Mr. Barnes be followed but the Spence bill to apply the same rules to bank holding companies as are applied to banks themselves ought to be passed as well.

I know the banks have an excuse for these mergers. They say they have to merge so they can make bigger loans to single borrowers, under the 10-percent limitation. In the case of one of the biggest of the mergers the excuse was that whereas previously the larger of the two banks could loan only $35 million to one borrower, the merged banks can now loan $50 million. In other words, the banks have to merge because the industrials are merging and getting to be so big that a mere $35 million loan is now too small to be considered.

As for industrial mergers the excuse is even less convincing from the point of view of preservation of economic freedom. For here we find the excuse most frequently advanced to be that the merger was necessary to provide greater diversification or to round out a line of products. What does this really mean? It means that when a company gets big enough it is no longer satisfied, nor can it keep its available capital busy in the lines of business in which it started and has grown. It must move over into other kinds of businesses, take them away from small business and locally owned businesses, and expand its empire into new realms. Bigness feeds on itself. Bigness itself is the main evil. One recalls how during the steel shortage what is probably our biggest single corporation moved within a few years into a position of complete dominance in a manufacturing line in which it had never been in business before at all. A lot of independent businesses simply ceased to exist in the face of this giant's superior access to a vital material. Was this done in the interest of efficiency? Not a bit of it. Did it increase competition? Is it, indeed, ever a decent argument for merger or entry by a giant into a new field to say that by this means competition will be increased? I don't believe it is. This argument is like saying there would be better competition in the world between the United States and Russia if each of them swallowed a number of now independent nations, because then the United States and Russia would be more diversified. And furthermore, the giant corporations control overwhelming amounts of capital—and can get unlimited amounts more, as witness the excuse just cited for bank mergers. So when one of the giants enters a line of business where there have existed independent companies, the sheer weight of its resources dooms in the course of a little time the continued existence—or at least the continued existence as independent businesses—of its smaller rivals.

Another excuse that is advanced to try to show an advantage to the Nation from giant corporations with monopolistic power is that they compete with one another in research. Or if they don't have any effective competitors they carry on a lot of research anyway. Well, I have no doubt this is true. But it again dooms even more certainly any possibility of small business—except, of course, satellite small business—surviving at all. It constitutes the worst kind of monopoly of all—monopoly of the opportunity to progress. But that kind of monopoly is certain to grow just as sure as the big companies get big enough, as many of them already are, so they have the overwhelming accumulations of ready capital I spoke of a while ago.

And let's not deceive ourselves about one fact. That fact is that the basic interest of cosumers, which is synonymous, of course, with the basis interest of the Nation, is directly dependent upon the survival—or the creation—of enough completely independent units in each line of business to make real competition possible. And that competition has to express itself in price, and in quality, and in plant expansion. This is one reason why proposals to weaken the Robinson-Patman Act are a dangerous deception of the people as to where their real interest lies. Without that law the already big buyers would be able by sheer weight of bigness, once again, to compel sellers to grant them such concessions that their smaller competitors would find it most difficult to survive. The proposal to make action in "good faith" to meet the price offered by another seller a complete defense for violation of the Robinson-Patman Act would open a loophole a mile wide and would seem to me simply an invitation to buyers able to exert coercion for favored treatment to exert pressure on more than one seller at the same time.

The importance of the existence of competing units which can and will really compete is also a main reason for the necessity of preserving the right of groups of people freely and without penalty to risk their money and organize nonprofit, mutual, and cooperative businesses. For by this means they can restore competition and economic freedom into industries and businesses even where conditions of virtual monopoly previously existed. This is in part because a mutual or cooperative business belongs to its own customers and therefore the very organization of such a business creates its own market. It should perhaps not be surprising that those who enjoy the preesnt advantages of very great bigness should try to divert attention from their own monopolistic advantages by attempting to stir up small-business men against cooperatives and mutuals by false claims that cooperatives and mutuals "don't pay their full, just share of taxes."

The Senate Small Business Committee has warned us that the threat of monopoly has today "assumed more menacing proportions" and cited the rash of mergers as the principal reason for its concern. Particularly does the committee point to the danger of giant corporations grown great in one industry entering many other industries quite unrelated to the field where they started. No argument on the ground of possible efficiencies resulting from increased size can possibly be made in such a case. It is far more likely that these huge structures sprawled all over the economy like a great blanket are less efficient precisely because of their size than a number of competing smaller units would be.

Whatever arguments may be made that big operations are more efficient than little ones in certain particular industries like steel or autos, no such argument can possibly be made when an auto company goes into the store business or a milk company goes into the chemical business or an oil company into the grocery business. The advantage of the giants in such cases lies in their command of overwhelming amounts of capital and in the consequent fact that it is virtually impossible for them to fail even if serious mistakes are made by management.

Along with the establishment of monopoly or even effective control over an industry by 3 or 4 huge aggregations goes a kind of stagnation that appears clearly only after it is too late to do anything about it. The Federal Trade Commission has found that "a rapid expansion in output, particularly if it takes the form of a marked increase in the number of plants, tends to be associated with decreasing concentration, that is, with a less rapid expansion of output by the leading firms than by the remaining firms. Failure of production to expand materially tends to be associated with increasing concentration." As long as real competition remains it will express itself in attempts by competitors to increase production. But once effective control is achieved by a handful of companies over an industry or once leadership in an industry has been achieved by a

dominant company, then there begins resistance to expansion of production and especially expansion of plant. We learned, or should have learned, a few things about this from our experience trying to get needed production in World War II.

Our economy is in part dominated by monopolistic power today. In part it is still a free economy. By economic freedom we mean a situation in which small independent businesses, locally owned in their communities can still exist and flourish. But this becomes increasingly more difficult as economic oligarchy grows and as the giants fight for still greater power. All one has to do is read the testimony of people who have been forced out of business as independent tire dealers or independent petroleum retailers by the machinations of their giant suppliers to know that this is true. Statistics on the mere number of businesses in existence at one time or another mean exactly nothing unless they are accompanied by facts about the degree of true independence enjoyed by those businesses. And in this day of nationally advertised brands, and highly expensive television advertising—in this day of extreme difficulty for any small business to effectively market its product independent of the giants who can almost monopolize the attention of consumers it becomes necessarily more and more difficult for small business to retain that true independence.

Had the Attorney General's committee been half as concerned about the danger from growing monopoly to both economic and political freedom in this country as Congressional committees and others have been, it would have proposed a battery of measures to be taken with all vigor. Among these should, in my judgment, have been the following:

1. Provision for adequate staff and adequate funds to fully and effectively enforce the antitrust laws; and provision for effective penalties for proven violations.

2. A specific exemption of perhaps the first $50,000 or $100,000 of earnings from the corporation income tax and more graduation of the tax than we now have from that point on.

3. Encouragement of cooperative research facilities to serve small business and of cooperative advertising and marketing of small business products.

4. Amendment of the antitrust laws to bring entry of a corporation operating in one line of business into other lines under antitrust scrutiny and perhaps to make possible action to require divestiture of interest in cases where competition is threatened by such action.

5. Consideration of some such proposal as that advanced by Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, to require the Federal licensing of corporations, along with which could go a declaration that when a corporation had achieved a certain degree of dominance in an industry it becomes thereby affected with the public interest and subject to having representatives of the public appointed to its board of directors.

6. Inclusion of banks under those portions of the antitrust laws recommended by the Assistant Attorney General and passage of the Spence bill affecting bank holding companies.

7. Encouragement in every proper way but not by any public subsidy or favoritism of the formation of cooperative and mutual type businesses, which by their very nature must seek to serve the interests of their patrons rather than to build economic power for themselves. Monopolistic economic power is growing rapidly in the United States today.

It is growing by means of mergers, because of the inordinate expense of television advertising, because of inadequacies in the antitrust laws, because of an American tendency to worship bigness. Above all, it is growing because of the sheer momentum of ponderous bigness once it passes a certain point of capital control.

Monopolistic economic power is a menace to economic freedom and, ultimately to political democracy and the institutions of a constitutional republic. This is true not because of deliberate nefarious design on anyone's part. It is true because the natural interest of monopolistic power is to maintain that power. This cannot be done if pricing is free or if production and productive plant expand freely. These must be controlled and a degree of scarcity maintained if monopolistic power is to be maintained. Those in control of monopolistic power are driven to exert political influence and pressure for the simple reason that they have whole empires at stake, empires far larger than mere businesses, empires that are more wealthy than a dozen whole States in some instances.

A nation is strong and the quality of its life is good just to the extent that its local communities are strong and the quality of their life vital. Communities cannot be either strong or vital or, indeed, truly communities if most of their economic institutions are absentee owned. Only local ownership by many people and effective control and participation in control by local people can keep communities strong and vital. The problem of monopoly, the problem of bigness is not an economic problem alone. It is a political and social problem as well. It is a problem that affects every basic ideal of this country.

The question our generation must decide is whether we are going to sell our American birthright of economic freedom for a mess of shiny gadgets.

The Religious Faiths of Our Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address, entitled "The Religious Faiths of Our Presidents," delivered at many colleges and civic clubs in recent months by Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, a nationally recognized authority on our Presidents.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The whole Nation regardless of its interest in religion was impressed deeply when President Eisenhower began his inaugural address with an humble prayer to God for guidance. He was the seventh of our Presidents affiliated with the Presbyterian Church, which he joined soon after his inauguration. Andrew Jackson, another military hero, was also a Presbyterian. He joined that church however long after being President, and just before his death. Our other Presbyterian Presidents were: James Buchanan, who joined the church after he left the Presidency; Abraham Lincoln, a Presbyterian who never joined the church. However, Benjamin Harrison was perhaps the most active Presbyterian, both before and after his election as President, with the exception of Woodrow Wilson. Wilson, like Grover Cleveland, another Presbyterian President, was the son of a Presbyterian minister.

Though only 1 President in more than a hundred years has been an active member of the Episcopal Church; 10 or near one-third of all our Presidents were affiliated with that church. The recent active one was Franklin D. Roosevelt, who held high position in his own church. Seven of the eight Virginia born Presidents, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Harrison (Wm. H.), Tyler, and Taylor, all were Episcopalians. Though Wilson, the eighth President to be born in Virginia was a Presbyterian, his body now rests in the Episcopal Cathedral in Washington, D. C. The other two Episcopal Presidents were Pierce, who joined after being President and Arthur, a nominal one, who was buried from that church in New York (The Church of the Heavenly Rest). Madison, a Princeton man, studied theology as part of his postgraduate course there. Jefferson was more nearly Unitarian in his faith than anything else.

The explanation for so many early Episcopal President is that in the early life of the Nation, that was the established church in Virginia, their home State.

Though the Methodist Church has had five adherents in the White House, it can have no great pride in their work as churchmen. Two of the five, Polk and Grant, joined the Methodist Church on their deathbeds. Two others, Johnson and Hayes, were never members of the church, though their families were active Methodists. William McKinley alone was active as a Methodist layman. The pew he occupied in his home church (Canton, Ohio) is now visited with reverence.

Though the Unitarian Church is most limited in its membership, four of our Presidents, John Adams, his son John Quincy Adams, Fillmore and Taft were all Unitarians. It just happens that Taft alone of all the Presidents has had the most active son in church work, Charles P. Taft, a distinguished Episcopal layman.

Two other denominations had two members of their faith to be Presidents. Martin Van Buren and Theodore Roosevelt both of Dutch background, were connected with the Dutch Reformed Church, while Harding, a Republican, and Truman, a Democrat, both were members of the Baptist Church.

It will be noted that two-thirds (or 22) of all the men who have been President were affiliated with only 3 of our many Protestant churches. That is significant when we consider the large number of such groups.

Three churches, the Disciples, the Congregationalists, and the Quakers have furnished one President each. Garfield, who belonged to the first named, was in his early years a minister of that faith. It is a tragic fact that he was slain by a man (Guiteau) who among other things called himself a theologian. Coolidge became a church member soon after his inauguration as did Eisenhower. Hoover was the son of a Quaker minister in Iowa, and has always been loyal to the faith of his childhood.

The setting apart of a place of prayer in the Capitol in recent months for the use of men of all faiths met the approval of all churchmen regardless of their faiths. As Robert G. Ingersoll the great agnostic and orator once declared, the United States will never choose as its chief executive any man who is an open enemy to our Christian faith.

Whatever may be our national leadership from a political standpoint, the genuine integrity of those seeking high place will weigh most heavily in the minds of all good citizens when they choose such officials. Truly we believe, though we may not practice it that "righteousness exalteth a nation, and that sin is a reproach to any people."

The Greatest Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, during this month of June hundreds of thousands of high school and college graduates have listened to commencement addresses. One of the finest I have ever read was delivered by Judge Boyd Leedom, of the National Labor Relations Board, at the 71st commencement exercises of the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City, S. Dak., at which Judge Leedom received an honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST LESSON

There is a most important truth, a perfectly valid message, a very simple lesson that I would like to pass on to you in such a manner that you would be impressed. Such must be the aim of most commencement speakers. And most of us fail. Rarely do I find even a recent graduate who recalls much of anything he heard at the time of his commencement; and today I have an additional difficulty.

Not only do I encounter the usual hazards which seem for some unknown reason to render commencement speakers almost wholly ineffective, but my particular topic is one that sophisticated, or at least would-be sophisticated, young technical students might be inclined to deride. Cynical youth, gaily, somewhat seriously, but mostly in fun, is apt to say these days: "What good is happiness? It won't buy money." And since I deal today with an abstract, nebulous subject, somewhat akin to happiness, I may be deemed by an intellectual audience, naive, and my subject little short of silly.

I therefore am under no delusionss that you will be much impressed with what I say. But how I wish you would be; because if I could say it well, if I could adequately frame and pass on to you the great truth which forms the substance of the message I would give you, then you would learn in this brief period the greatest lesson, the very most important truth that man can possibly learn.

If I state my premise too simply at the outset, you might reject it for its very simplicity. I, therefore, approach it somewhat obliquely.

It has been said of the life of a particular character in history that all the armies that ever marched, and all the navies that ever sailed the seas, and all the monarchs that ever reigned, all put together have not influenced the welfare of mankind upon the earth as much as this one single, solitary life. The statement, I think you may agree, is true. The secret of the great achievement of this one life, is the basis of the lesson I would have you learn. The life, of course, is that of Christ. His secret he expressed in the new commandment. A cunning lawyer hoped to get Jesus in trouble by getting him to give one of the old, established laws precedence over another. He asked which of the commandments was greatest and Christ replied with a new one:

"You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: You shall love your neighbor as yourself."

This commandment, to love, encompasses the whole of the Christian philosophy.

Love made Abraham Lincoln stand head and shoulders above most all of his contemporaries. Love dictated the matchless words of his second inaugural address:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

I still hesitate to make a direct and simple statement of my message. Let me say it in the somewhat obscure passage of Robert Browning:

"For life, with all it yields of joy or woe
And hope and fear,
Is just our chance on the prize of learning love,—
How love might be, hath been indeed, and is."

Now that really states my message in poetic fashion. Browning there has said that there is a prize for each of us—the prize of learning love—and the life of each of us is the chance each has to win the prize. Or in other words he has said, the ultimate yield of a life well lived is to learn the lesson of love.

But I should now state the message simply: The greatest lesson you or any other person can possibly learn is that everything in your life, your happiness, your prosperity, your achievements, the kind of people you meet, the kind of friends you make, depends on your capacity to love and to express love; all your circumstances will depend on the extent that your recognize and practice the principle that love is invincible, that nothing else endures, that love does and shall rule the world.

That may sound a little silly to some of you, but it isn't.

Conversely, if you leave love out and confine your life to the narrow intellectual reality that 2 and 2 make 4, or the scarcely broader sphere encompased in the truth of Einstein's theory of relativity, or the still narrow, mysterious, half revelations of the forces of nature we recognize in the chain reaction of the atom, or if you live in the wholly unrealistic fantasy that happiness and success will necessarily come along with money or with things, or position or prestige, then your life will be correspondingly inadequate, incomplete, and miserable.

How can we transpose this broad, misunderstood term of love into language that is directly related to life? What is this love that conquers all?

The greatest and most comprehensive statement on love is in Saint Paul's letter to the first century Christians at Corinth. It is now known as the 13th chapter of the book of First Corinthians, in the New Testament. From it Henry Drummond has gleaned these nine ingredients of love: Patience, kindness, generosity, humility, courtesy, unselfishness, good temper, guilelessness, sincerity.

Now these words speak for themselves. They can be understood by all. Love is not an entirely adequate word. When I said, in effect, that your chance for success depends on your capacity to love, some of you virile young men may have gained a wrong impression. I don't mean "love" as used in the old popular song:

"I love you so much, my eyes reveal it.
I love you so much, its a wonder you don't feel it."

The "love" I mean is expressed in the other song, more nearly a classic:

"Ah, sweet mystery of life at last I've found thee,
Ah, I know at last the secret of it all.
All the longing, seeking, striving, waiting, yearning,
The burning hopes, the joy, and idle tears that fall.

For 'tis love and love alone the world is seeking,
And 'tis love and love alone that can repay.
'Tis the answer, 'tis the end and all of living,
For 'tis love alone that rules for aye."

But you do not understand these words: "patience, kindness, generosity, humility, courtesy, unselfishness, good temper, guilelessness, sincerity." We need deal with them only briefly. Why aren't we all more kindly? How quickly it gets results. How well it works. How pleasant to give and to receive. Yet how unkind we are. We have but this one life to live—we come this way but once—how important it is to leave trailing behind us a long line of kindly acts performed.

Kindness evokes generosity. Generosity precludes selfishness. Yet we will not believe—with dogged determination we reject—the truth that it is more blessed to give than to receive. But any loving parent who has experienced the joy of giving to a wholly appreciative, wide-eyed child, to whom he gives in perfect love, knows there is no greater joy. And in looking back upon our acts of selfishness along with our acts of generosity, it is not difficult to find where true satisfaction lies.

Just a word on love's ingredient, good temper. We are inclined to excuse bad temper in most everyone. Strangely, it has been called the vice of the virtues. Bad temper is the outer evidence of serious disturbance underneath. Evil temper goes far to produce unhappiness, to embitter people one against the other, to destroy homes, to distort and blight the lives of children, and generally to disrupt society.

The presence of these virtuous ingredients of love determine the quality of the soul—the climate of one's life. Presumably no human can be perfect and there must be day-to-day changes in the weather of our lives, but with a genuine understanding of the love principle, and persistent practice, each of us can, if he will, create a decent climate in which to live.

Thomas A. Kempis, whose little masterpiece was written in the 15th century, said, "He is truly great who is great in love."

About 300 years ago, the words of wisdom of Brother Laurence were recorded. He said, "All things are possible to him who believes; they are less difficult to him who hopes; they are more easy to him who loves, and still more easy to him who perseveres in the practice of these three virtues."

Love proves its own power: at Christmas time it is put on exhibition and makes new people of the Scrooges of the world.

A week ago Sunday I heard Norman Vincent Peale speak in the church the President attends. He was speaking of the kind of lives many, many Americans are living. He said a friend of his had figured out that America has 7½ billion headaches a year, or 50 headaches per head. Then he asked: "Have you had your quota?" Have you? He said Americans buy 11 million pounds of aspirin per year; and that it takes 21 million sleeping tablets a night to put us asleep.

"You would think," he said, "if we didn't know anything else, we would know enough to go to sleep."

Most of us know there is something lacking in our lives and would like to change our circumstances, but the fact is we are not willing to change ourselves. And unless we do improve ourselves, we cannot improve our circumstances. Life will be one long headache for many. For our circumstances are the direct result of our thoughts and acts. Persistent thoughts create attitudes; attitudes determine acts; acts constitute lives.

Thus it becomes clear that daily reflection on the positive virtues comprising love will create positive, virtuous lives—lives filled full of good and positive circumstances. But the law of love, like the multiplicatian table, must be memorized and practiced if it is to be successfully used. Neither becomes a part of the mentality without effort. The law of love surely and without any mistake makes it possible for each man to determine the kind of life he shall live—with unlimited heights of nobleness—with unlimited depths of degradation. The circumstances of your life will be like the thoughts you think.

The Saturday Evening Post for May 7, this year, contains quite an unusual and remarkable story. I am not able to condense it well, and I'm not sure I have its full import, but because it has a direct bearing on my topic, I am going to tell it briefly to you. The impact of its message was heightened by the unusual treatment the Post gave it; and prestige was added by the prominent persons who, on its opening 2-page spread, endorsed its lesson: Bernard M. Baruch, Milton S. Eisenhower, Dr. Peale, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Carl Sandburg. The author was Philip Wylie. The title was, "The Answer." It holds a great lesson for humanity.

America was conducting a colossal nuclear experiment designed to wipe from the face of the earth a complete Pacific island. Leaders of the Nation in science and in the military and political establishments were gathered on an aircraft carrier in the tense moments leading up to the explosion. It was a great success. The island disappeared into the depths of the ocean and into invisible clouds of poison. Then a weird message was relayed to the general in charge and he, greatly puzzled, reluctantly responded to an urgent call to come and investigate a most unusual casualty on a distant island.

He found the commanding officer at the scene, and all others there, greatly distressed, pallid, shaken with fear; tough, battle-tested soldiers were obviously deeply affected like all the rest. No one would explain the casualty. He had to see for himself, they said, to understand. There in a beautiful glade, in the full sunshine, on the fringe of a profusion of exquisite purple flowers, lay the casualty. No one would identify it aloud; but the speechless general—who had been called an agnostic, and who was not a man of orthodox religion—finally heard himself hoarsely whisper, "It looks like one." And the little boy who had found it knew, along with everyone else present, that the casualty was an angel. It was motionless. A beautiful human face slept in death; unimaginable eyes were closed; the white and perfect body was relaxed. Immense white wings were folded.

A cloak of complete secrecy was immediately thrown about the whole incident for fear the enemy in the cold war would use it as effective propaganda. The general was called to Washington to report to the President. All possibility of fakery, delusion and mass hypnosis was eliminated; high public officials were mystified, unnerved; official Washington could not conceal a degree of excitement; and when the body of the casualty, being transported to Washington for scientific examination, was lost at sea, the decision was reached to make no public announcement whatever concerning it. And those who knew about it wondered how man, in his destructive ingenuity, could kill even an angel, a thing immortal.

At about the same time that the great American experiment was going on in the Pacific, the Russians, in the wastelands of northern Siberia, were conducting a similar test so large and successful that if it had been known to the free world it would have horrified the nuclear physicists of the West. And the Russians had a similar casualty. The body had been found by a peasant. Russian officials were equally shaken. They summoned the premier in Moscow who, wholly unbelieving, flew to the scene. Alarmed inside but bound to show outward contempt he kicked the body of the angel, then directed that it, along with the peasant who found it, be left at the scene of the next experiment; and both were blown to bits.

A little later, further tests took the American general back to the island where he had seen the casualty. Drawn irresistably to the spot with the same boy he became aware that there had been some incident, some phase of the casualty, that the child had never told to anyone.

Under the general's kindly guidance the lad told his secret. The angel had carried a golden book. It was in all kinds of other languages the angel, Wisdom, had said.

"Did you ever know," said the boy, "there are other people on other planets of other suns, all around? Maybe Vega, or the North Star or more likely old Sirius?"

The angel had mentioned a few names and he had forgotten. And the boy brought forth the golden book from under a stone. The incredulous, stunned general, in inexpressible amazement, turned the golden pages. They were filled—page after page—with inscriptions in strange and unrecognizable languages, but it was apparent the message in each language was short—seemingly repeated in one language after another.

Toward the end of the book he came to the recognizable languages of the earth. There was the same repetition of a very short message; and the general's stunned despair ended, as comprehension entered his brain with a note of exultation, for the short message from the golden book that the angel Wisdom had tried, too late, to deliver to the earth out "of icy space and flaring stars was this: 'Love one another'." That, in the title of the story, is "the answer" for humanity's salvation. It is the lesson I would leave with you today.

But love cannot be summoned like an army to guard our chances of survival. It cannot be bestowed like a constitutional amendment to protect the rights of a fortunate citizenry. It stems as a mighty invincible force from the very essence of being—from life. It comes to us in the aggregate only through our individual selves. A gift of the Divine, freely given, it flows like an abundant spring from the human heart if not dammed at its source. You and I must give it or we do not get it. There is no other way to have it.

And so if you would live abundantly, if you would free yourself from the shriveling, devastating effects on your own personality of envy and hate and greed—resentment, meanness, selfishness—and attain heights beyond all present dreams, beyond all present conceptions of limitation, you will learn the lesson of love; you will take with you at this commencement of this new period in your life into whatever field you go, this prize—this simple charm of love. Then you cannot fail. And thus you will also make your greatest possible contribution to humanity. For there is no hope for the mass of men unless individuals contribute enough love from their own lives to make love dominant in all of society.

This, my young friends, is the greatest lesson of all, the lesson I would have you learn.

Walter Johnson's Outstanding Service to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in the Louisville Times of May 11, 1955, recognizing Walter Johnson's work and service to the South as an outstanding journalist.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALTER JOHNSON'S OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE SOUTH

(By Tom Wallace)

Walter C. Johnson, the Chattanooga News-Free Press says, will receive from the University of Missouri School of Journalism May 26 an award for distinguished service to journalism.

Mr. Johnson was, till his recent retirement, secretary-manager of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association. The News-Free Press says he is sometimes referred to as "Mr. S. N. P. A." He had completed a half century of service in the organization when he retired.

He began his career when he was 13 years old as what was in those days called a "newsboy." When he was 15 he was a reported, copy boy, and assistant bookkeeper-cashier for the Knoxville Sentinel.

The News-Free Press chronicles outstanding events in Mr. Johnson's career as a newspaper executive, including his scoring a "world beat" for the Knoxville Sentinel when Admiral George Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay. But one great service to journalism, and to the South, and to the Nation, for which I think Mr. Johnson should receive credit is omitted.

The Southern Newspaper Publishers Association became during, and I believe as a result of, Mr. Johnson's management the only newspaper organization in the United States which, as such, has paid due attention to the enormous value of a renewable natural resource and to the importance of the survival of that resource to the economy of the section which has ignored it.

When I was chairman of the editorial affairs committee of SNPA, only a few newspaper executives in the great area that organization represents recognized the everlasting value of forests to the South, provided the South's forests were made everlasting.

Even when demonstrations proved the practicality of making newsprint (paper on which newspapers are printed) from southern pine, which grows much more rapidly than northern spruce, or middle-latitude hardwood, had been demonstrated, most SNPA papers regarded lightly, and somewhat impatiently, discussion of forest protection; thought the subject overdiscussed and wearisome.

Walter Johnson, without blowing his own horn, worked patiently to bring SNPA papers into line for perpetuation of the South's incalculably valuable forests. The result was that throughout the South propaganda in behalf of protection of forests from fire, and

in behalf of other measures which would make the forests a stable source of revenue, became a theme of serious and frequent newspaper discussion.

SNPA papers were not balked by fear of repetition.

The effect of their mood and their means was the awakening of the South to appreciation of natural wealth that had been neglected during generations.

I believe that if a historian tracing the progress of the South from the point of view of an appraiser of cause and effect were to publish a history of the South in 1975 he would credit Walter C. Johnson with enormous beneficial influence.

Mr. Johnson in that period did not figure, as far as I know, even briefly or occasionally as an agitator, a stumper, but as a reprinter (in SNPA bulletins), and as a councilor influential among his colleagues he was instrumental in making SNPA the only newspaper organization, among regional and national organizations, which became virtually a crusader for treating timber as a crop.

I have not heard of any other newspaper organization whose member papers have gone to bat for right use of land in the degree that SNPA has.

The South's welfare is in a high degree dependent upon its wise use of land. A large amount of land between the Ohio and the gulf and between the Mississippi River and the Atlantic Ocean is especially suited to profitable production of timber. The SNPA press could reasonably claim credit for having performed distinguished service for its homeland.

Mr. Johnson, modest, unassuming, has not, as I have said, attempted to put himself forward as an evangelist for right land use. He might contend that my estimate of his influence upon SNPA policy is exaggeration. Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that as a deskman he has done more to put southern pine, as a crop, on a stable base than has been done in the same period by any crusader in his territory.

I have no doubt that, for example, Mississippi's striking advance from the position of a do-nothing State, insofar as forests were concerned, to the position of a State providing machinery for protection of forests could be traced to SNPA newspapers' recognition of forests as a source of enduring wealth, and that the general awakening in SNPA territory could be traced to Walter Johnson's desk and his paper shears.

I think it improbable that those who will lay laurels upon Mr. Johnson's brow in Columbia, May 26, will be thinking of in South's "dominion over palm and pine" and of Mr. Johnson's part in making that dominion enduringly profitable to the South.

Therefore, apologies to Virgil, logs, and the man I sing.

Minnesota Polio Surveillance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Wednesday, June 22, 1955, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article covers the record of the polio surveillance program in the State to date, under direction of Dr. R. N. Barr, of the State board of health.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE CHILDREN WHO GOT SHOTS ESCAPE POLIO

No cases of paralytic polio have occurred among Minnesota children immunized last month, State board of health officials said Tuesday at the end of the third week of a polio surveillance program.

Dr. R. N. Barr, board of health official, said two immunized children who later developed mild infections "might have had polio," but the exact nature of the illness never was determined.

The legislative advisory committee (LAC) Tuesday approved an emergency appropriation of $13,340 for the surveillance program.

The complete cost of the program will be about $39,000, $26,000 of which is available from Federal funds.

All Minnesota doctors have been cooperating since June 1 in reporting data on polio cases.

Purpose of the program is to determine exactly which cases are true polio and how effective the Salk vaccine has been in preventing paralytic polio.

"We expect to be Johnny-on-the-rat-hole on every case of polio in the State," Dr. Barr said.

Dr. Barr said that if an outbreak of polio occurs in a certain area involving immunized persons, it will be possible to determine if other persons immunized with the same lot of vaccine are also contracting the disease.

The cross check will enable doctors to learn relationships between the disease and the vaccine.

Four new cases of polio were reported in Minnesota Tuesday. None of the patients had been immunized with Salk vaccine. There have been 43 cases of polio in Minnesota since January 1 with 2 deaths. A 34-year-old Le Sueur woman died in March.

Last night James Kline, 13, died of polio at Ancker hospital, St. Paul.

James, son of Mr. and Mrs. Hess Kline, was stricken last week. Health department officials said he had not received any anti-polio vaccine.

The victim's father is president of Kline Oldsmoblie, Inc.

Highways Produce New Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very significant address delivered by C. D. Curtiss, Commissioner of Public Roads, at a dinner given by the International Road Federation on June 22, 1955, in honor of a group of Latin-American officials and highway engineers, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, it is indeed a pleasure to be with you tonight and to have this further opportunity to meet and become better acquainted with you, especially those of you who are from our neighboring countries in Latin America. You are here because of the common interest of each of our countries in economic and social development, and the contribution which highway transportation can make to such development.

Fifty years ago the motor vehicle was of no significance in the transportation of goods and people. During my life it has become an integral and indispensable part of our national economy, a necessary and valuable part of the everyday life of hundreds of millions of people. The motor vehicle and the highways and roads which they require are essential if maximum advantage is to be taken of natural resources.

A former Commissioner of Public Roads, Mr. Thos. H. MacDonald, once stated, in effect, that we pay for good roads whether we have them or not, and we pay more if we do not have them.

Here in the United States we think of this statement as applying to time lost, to increased wear and tear on vehicles, to the increased consumption of gas and oil, and to the loss of life, the injury and maiming of people and the economic loss resulting from damage to physical property. There is, however, a broader, more fundamental way in which we pay more for the good roads we do not have. We pay in the stunting of economic development and in retarded utilization of the resources of nature.

Permit me to cite a few widely separated examples: Not long ago a new 25 kilometer section of road was built in the Philippines. The area served by the new road produces abaca fiber which formerly was transported, first by human carrier, then by river barge, and again by human carrier to the highway where it could be transported by truck to the city of Davao.

Since opening of the new road the cost of transportation from the area to the city of Davao has been reduced to one-sixth of what it formerly cost—from $3 per bale to 50 cents per bale.

To come closer to our own countries I would like to cite two further examples: Recently an all-weather gravel road from Cochabamba to Santa Cruz in Bolivia was opened. Cutting through extremely difficult mountainous terrain this road provides a vital link connecting the Altaplano of Bolivia with the potentially rich agricultural area of the Rio Grande and other tributaries of the Amazon River. New villages and settlements will develop, new areas will be opened up for agricultural production.

It will make a significant contribution to a more diversified, better balanced national economy for Bolivia.

A few weeks ago formal ceremonies marked the opening of a 20-kilometer section of the Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica adjacent to the boundary of Nicaragua. Completion of this road opens an important cattle producting area to expand development. It also makes possible, for the first time, travel at all times of the year, between Costa Rica and its neighbors to the north. The road is an integral part of the Inter-American Highway extending from the United States to the Panama Canal, which is a part of the Pan-American Highway System.

Throughout the world today there is an awakened realization that adequate highways are essential to the improvement of standards of living of all countries through accelerated economic development and the promotion of commerce. Between 1948 and 1954, in nine countries of Central and South America, highway expenditures increased from $95 million to nearly $245 million—more than 2½ times the 1948 total.

Last year the United States Congress enacted legislation increasing our Federal-aid highway program by 52 percent and at the present time is considering legislation which proposes to still further greatly increase it.

In conclusion let me say this to those of us directly concerned with highways—each of us is charged with the responsibility and

we are given the opportunity to make a significant contribution to the improvement of our highways and in so doing, contribute to a better economy in our countries and to a better way of life for all of our people.

Rev. Feltham S. James, of South Carolina, Preaches Sermon on National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a speech of the Reverend Feltham S. James, department commander of the American Legion in South Carolina.

Reverend James is a minister of the gospel and the following speech I believe has more gospel than any article I have read to date on national security. I commend it to the Members of this body for their careful reading.

AMERICA'S PERPETUAL DISEASE

(By Rev. Feltham S. James)

The men of many wars lie silent. Victims of a terrible disease. Their names are etched on time discolored tombstones, and are unforgetably engraved on the hearts of all posterity. The battles they fought made history, yet to many of them the glory of the victory was their's on history's pages only, for we have not stamped out the disease. In spite of the achievements of science, in spite of the development of the "wonder drugs" of our time, in spite of the discoveries that have rid mankind of deathly plagues, America is still infected with a disease that has claimed uncounted thousands. It is America's perpetual disease. The tragic results of that disease are visible in every cemetery where lie the remains of our soldier dead; in every hospital where the maimed and the sick are suffering from battle-caused inflictions; and even on our streets where the crippled and handicapped depict the casualties of war.

America's perpetual disease is the result of the failure of the supreme legislative bodies of our country to fulfill their obligation laid down in the Constitution. In the preamble of that cherished document we read: "We the people of the United States, in order * * * to provide for the common defense, * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America." To provide for this common defense Congress is given power "to raise and support armies" and "to provide and maintain a navy." Except in time of extreme emergencies Congress has not made provision for the protection of the Nation. Therein lies America's perpetual disease—failure to provide for the "common defense."

America's perpetual disease began in the time of George Washington when we fought the Revolutionary War without trained men. We did that after 10 years of warning that such a conflict was bound to come. Oh, we gained our independence, but the tragedies of our loss are buried up and down the countryside in marked and unmarked graves.

After the "shot heard around the world"—after Lexington and Concord—English General Howe shoved the colonists before him with the ease of a vessel plowing the lanes of the sea. The untrained, undisciplined, poorly equipped Colonials ran pellmell at the sight of the British Redcoats. In saying that, I am not trying to detract from the heroism of the soldiers of the Revolution. But it wasn't an army that George Washington had. It was a collection of fellows who hadn't been taught the first principles of armed conflict, did not understand discipline, who had a few togs, were poorly conditioned, and scarcely knew how to line up. Nothing, you see, had been done in preparation. It was the first onset of America's perpetual disease. We can't blame them for running. We can't blame them for deserting by the thousands. They just didn't have a chance against well-drilled and well-trained opponents. George Washington's fighting of the whole war might be likened to a football coach who is given a new squad of men every Monday morning and is expected to win all the games on Saturday against well-coached teams.

We actually never won the Revolution by either our power or our skill. Because of our failure to make preparation, we dragged through 8 years of death by exposure, disease, and the bullet. And yet we had material available in the Colonies as fine in ruggedness, character, and marksmanship as anywhere in the world. Of course, the men became discouraged by the wholesale when they realized that they had little chance against the well-trained British and when they saw themselves officered by persons as unskilled and unlettered as themselves.

But more surprising is what was done after the war. Here is the first evidence that America has become completely infected with the disease of unpreparedness. After the war we dismissed our entire staff of leaders and all the soldiers—except 80. These 80 simply worked around the quarters and received no practice or instruction. We had the idea that there would never be another war. Any attempt to set up an army was met by charges of professionalism—despotism and tyranny. Armies had been the plaything of kings and the people would have nothing that even suggested the tyrannical and despotic ways of royalty. George Washington did his dead-level best to show them how false was such a view. He begged and pleaded and advised, but to no avail. He wrote of the Revolution: "Had we formed a permanent army in the beginning—we should not have been the greatest part of the war inferior to the enemy." He also wrote: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Governor Harry Lee of Virginia, about the same time, went even further and said, "Convinced as I am that a government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field uniformed and untaught, where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and discipline for battle, I cannot withhold my denunciation of its wickedness and folly."

Yes, we were warned against the tragic disease with which we had become infected—but we paid no heed. The people refused to look at the picture. They refused to take out preventatives or insurance against the disease. Even when the United States became a nation and our Constitution was adopted, we had an Army of the magnificent size of 595 men.

The Indian raids began to take their toll. We had no Army to fight them. A thousand perished by tomahawk and arrow in Kentucky alone, with no army to protect them. A hastily recruited force of men was ambushed and annihilated in Ohio. And so goes the record of history with the Indians. Our weakness furnished the savage with new courage and we cannot even estimate the thousands who died.

There was only one bright spot in this decade of terror. Washington had selected Anthony Wayne to lead troops against the Indians. Wayne trained his men for over a year before he took them into action. At the Battle of Fallen Timber, 11 years after the Revolution, he completely spanked the Indians and they let the settlers rest in peace for a long time. Trained troops would have spared the lives of many but we were infected with a disease.

War scares came one upon another. One with France 15 years after the Revolution; one with Spain 20 years after the Revolution; one with Great Britain 25 years after the Revolution. The only thing we did about any of them was to vote huge sums of money and call out thousands of men on paper. At no time did our Armed Forces, even poorly trained, number 4,000 men. The Army never rose in time and it never stayed long enough afterwards to have any effect. So we arrived at our second war with Great Britain, 29 years after the Revolution, weaker proportionally than when we faced that conflict.

The War of 1812 would be funny were it not so tragic. Our history books, in order to make us the perfect people of the world, omit much of it. Here again we find thousands of untrained men fleeing from the fields of combat—fleeing because they were unprepared to meet a well-trained enemy. We had no management or leadership and the fine manhood of our country, for want of previous training, was held up to ridicule, suffering, casualties, and disgrace. We called out over a half million men and could not drive a maximum of 16,000 British soldiers from our shores. We spent nearly $200 million, not counting pensions, when a small percentage of that would have maintained an army of trained soldiers that could have met the situation. We sacrificed 6,000 lives in camp and on the battlefield, when it should not have been much more than a hundred. We should thank God for Napoleon and European weariness, which called off the British.

After this narrow escape of 1812, we did not do as we had done after the Revolution. We didn't do away with our preventative medicine. No, sir; we kept our Army in training—for 3 whole months. Then, we reduced it to 10,000 men on paper. Five years later, in the face of protests by such men as John C. Calhoun, we cut it to 6,000 men. Then came the Seminoles, Creeks, Black Hawks, and others with their gentle art of taking scalps. Again we had no Army to fight them. What Army we had was scattered up and down the country in lonely forts. Oh, Congress got afraid once and hastily voted for our Army to be raised back to 10,000. But they could not be trained in time and the slaughter went on. General after general on the frontier, seeing the uselessness of his struggles, asked to be relieved of his command. One hundred and seventeen of our best officers, in 1 year, resigned from the Army rather than to be a party to "American's Perpetual Disease."

By 1842 the Army was reduced to 8,613 men. A Congressman on the floor of the House stated that year: "We have no prospects of war. We have more reason to suppose that the world will grow wiser and that the humane and oft-repeated wish of the wise and good, that the sword and bayonet may be converted into scythe and ploughshare, will be realized." No prospects for war—but 4 years after that statement came the war with Mexico. It came like a bolt out of the sky. War has a way of sneaking upon us like a thug in the night.

The war with Mexico found our 17 million people with an Army of 5,300 men all told. Think of that. General Taylor had to fight with less than that. He had just 3,000 troops against a possible 50,000 Mexicans. And his command was the largest regular force we had assembled since the Revolution. His position was perilous as he went forth with his little band of trained soldiers. He won over superior numbers but it was a hard struggle and it cost dearly in lives. In the years just before this war, Congress twice tried to abolish West Point and once made no appropriation for it. The Superintendent

borrowed at his own risk $60,000 from a private individual to keep it going. That is a symptom of our perpetual disease.

But we didn't learn after three wars. After the Mexican conflict, we reduced our Army to 7,000 men. That is the same size it was after the War of 1812, 36 years before. We reduced it in spite of the fact that we had a population of 17 million and a territory of nearly a million square miles. In this vast territory our paltry 7,000 struggled against hundreds of thousands of Indians. By 1861, the entire Army numbered a little over 15,000 men.

Then came the Civil War. For 30 years the North has been trying to black the South's industrial eye, and the South had vigorously defied the threats. Oh, there were speeches—speeches that there would be no war; that brother would not fight against brother. Even when South Carolina seceded 4 months before the conflict, and six other States followed, we did nothing about it. Even when we saw the South call up 100,000 men for a year's service, we sat like spectators on the bleachers. We continued the practice of not being ready. In 1860 we even passed a bill to abolish the Navy. The North threw away 365,000 lives, not counting the thousands who died in the Southern forces. Here was the bloodiest conflict we ever fought and it could have been prevented by wisdom and foresight. "America Perpetual Disease" took its toll. We fed our manhood like babies into the burning cauldron of Moloch, all because we were infected with the disease of unpreparedness.

After the Civil War—what happened? First, we trimmed the Army down to 38,000. The day before General Grant took office as President, we reduced it, against his urgent recommendations, by 28 regiments. By 1876 we had a scant 25,000 soldiers. And there it remained, for almost a quarter of a cenutry, until the Spanish-American War. There it remained in spite of increased population and increased territory. There was a war party who wanted to keep peace and a peace party who wanted us to fall into war. A paltry 17,000 soldiers were scattered up and down the country in little groups to protect the advancing settlers against hundreds of thousands of Indians.

The American people, after 25 years of sleep, awoke one morning to find the battleship *Maine* at the bottom of Havana Harbor. And we were in war again. Amazed and confused, we rushed this way and that. And yet, we knew it was coming. Just 2 years before the *Maine* a Congressman rose and said, "I do not take much stock in an early war with Spain or England." That same day Joe Cannon said, "I want to say that I do not believe we will have a war the coming year, nor the year after. I doubt if there will be any during this century or perhaps the early years of the next century."

When the Spanish-American War blew up in our face the Army was the same size it had been 22 years before. It was scattered in little groups all over the West and on the borders. The War Department was clogged with 30 years of cobwebs. We had not learned a single lesson from a hundred years of tragic disasters of our own making. Here was unpreparedness at its worst. Oh, we called up our volunteers but they did not have time to train. "On to Havana," the people cried. What matter to them the extravagance of human life. Congressmen who had taken delight in blocking legislation for preparedness were the loudest in crying for guns and vessels to protect their districts. But we lost 7,000 lives in 2 years.

After the Spanish-American War for the first time in history we strengthened the Army. We raised our Army to 100,000 for 75 million people. We set up other service schools and made it possible for our officers to have a good military education. We formed a general staff. For several years it looked as if our Army would be a going concern. Then we lagged. Then came the old wolf in sheep's clothing. Congressman Dies, in the House of Representatives, stated in 1913: "God has placed us on this great, rich continent, separate and secure from the broils of Europe." Others propounded their propaganda of no more war. The people ate it up. They always have. It is something we like to hear. All Europe was arming but not us. By now our trained mobile force was smaller than our trained force before the Spanish-American War.

We were magnificiently unready when we jumped into war on April 6, 1917. Someone had fired another "shot heard around the world" at Sarajevo. Europe was on fire and we had done nothing to prevent the flames from reaching us. We needed 200,000 officers but didn't have 10,000 trained to instruct them and at the same time to lead our forces. We had a few out-of-date airplanes, only enough artillery ammunition for a 2-day battle, no automatic rifles and comparatively few machine guns and ordinary rifles. What equipment we had was out of date. We did not have time to adequately train the men called up in the draft. We sent men into battle who couldn't even load a gun. The people were excited. Flags waved and bands played. But that did not save a single life of a soldier sent into battle untrained and poorly equipped. Out of 2 million sent to Europe, 50,000 were killed and 65,000 more died. And I am sure many thousands of these because they were untrained for battle.

Well, after World War I we raised our Army to 280,000. Finally we were going to do something about this business of preparedness—we were going to provide for the common defense. We were at last going to obey the Constitution. But the efforts were short-lived. Congress reduced the Army to 175,000 for a hundred and twenty million people. We began to destroy our equipment. What we kept went from bad to worse with little effort on improvement. Until World War II the Army was never more than 119,000.

You know about World War II. It is the same old story over again. We had not yet learned our lesson. The same old disease had us down again. The only bright spot was Roosevelt's National Defense Act but that was too little, too late. Again thousands died because of insufficient training. Again men were sent into battle who couldn't even hold a gun. I was at the Port of Embarkation when replacements were sent in for my antiaircraft regiment, replacements who had never even seen an antiaircraft gun and who had not fired the rifle.

After World War II it is the same old story. We reduced our Army. We destroyed our equipment. The boys just had to get back home. But then came Korea and it is just about the same thing over again. In spite of our warning we didn't even have a good map of Korea when the fighting started.

Call me a militarist, if you will, but I believe that economy which cripples our national defense is nothing short of extravagance. I believe with Benjamin Franklin that the expenses required to prevent a war are much lighter than those that will, if not prevented, be absolutely necessary to maintain it.

Did you ever stop and ask how many wars we have had? "Oh, about 10," you say. That is indicative of our knowledge. Well, we have just finished fighting our 112th war. One hundred and twelve wars—great and small—an average of about 1 war every year and a half since we have been a Nation. We have fought all told more than 900 battles. The truth is—through the years we have had no military and no peace.

Once more we are coming up with a plan to provide for the common defense. Once more we are going to attempt to cure America of its perpetual disease. The National Security Training Program must come to pass. Our Nation's ability to protect itself is our best insurance. With George Washington we say, "If we desire to avoid insult we must be ready to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

As members of the American Legion we are interested in curing America of its perpetual disease. The American Legion from its birth has been the foremost champion of national security. Being veterans with battlefield experience we are conscious of America's need for a strong defense. Adequate training and adequate equipment have grim meanings for the men who have borne arms in the Nation's defense. They know from experience how important it is to go into combat with good and sufficient equipment and to know how to use modern arms and how to defend against them.

Since World War I the American Legion has kept the torch burning for peace through strength. It has been called militaristic by the pacifists and subversive elements of our country, but it has not faltered in its effort to provide for the common defense. We are proud that in all of our 36 years of championing an adequate protection for our country, we have never been wrong in any of our major recommendations. The march of events have always justified the rightness of our course. We have worked; we have pleaded; we have demanded that the common defense be provided for. We are now waiting for the Nation and for Congress to catch up with the American Legion's policy on national security. We are out in front and mean to stay there. We mean to cure America—to rid America of its perpetual disease. We mean to fight until Congress fulfills its constitutional obligation to provide for the common defense.

Proposed Increase in Quotas Under the Refugee Act of 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Raise the Quotas," which was published in the Boston Post of Tuesday, June 14.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAISE THE QUOTAS

Senator KENNEDY'S request for larger refugee quotas from Italy and Greece addressed to Senate Judiciary Subcommittee considering amendments to the Refugee Act of 1953 is a practical, reasonable and sensible means of extending to Italy and Greece the kind of aid both countries need.

Earthquake-shaken Greece, suffering from the after effects of the Communist civil war and from overpopulation, has thousands of able and decent people lacking only an opportunity to prove themselves worthy of the kind of freedom for which they fought after World War II.

Overpopulated Italy urgently needs relief from the burden of unemployment. Italians have proved to be splendid citizens. The quotas for both Italians and Greeks are very much smaller than they should be.

If percentages of the Nation's population of Greek and Italian blood, and willingness of people of those national derivation to finance, employ and encourage refugees are reckoned, the quotas would be raised instantly and we would gain thousands of new and valuable citizens.

Address by His Eminence Edward Cardinal Mooney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address delivered by His Eminence Edward Cardinal Mooney, archbishop of Detroit, at the commencement exercises of the University of Detroit, June 16, 1955.

The speech follows:

In accepting Father Steiner's kind invitation to speak here this evening I imposed one condition. It was that I would not be expected to sum up for tonight's graduates the wholesome advice they have received during their years in this university. Instead I prefer just to say a word of congratulation to them on the accomplishment this night marks in their lives and then proceed to talk on a topic of current interest and far-reaching importance which this occasion suggests.

To present this topic in its local historical perspective let me quote a sentence from the congressional ordinance setting up our Northwest Territory in 1787. This sentence is included in our Michigan constitution and is inscribed on the facade of more than one stately educational building in Michigan. The sentence runs: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall ever be encouraged."

The evident purport of that pithy sentence is to commend the kind of school which teaches religion and morality together with the elements of ordinary secular knowledge. That statement posed no great problem in 1787 when practically the only schools that existed were church schools. It does pose a serious problem today when the majority of our schools on both the lower and higher educational levels are not church related. I am not proposing a ready solution of this serious problem in all its varied aspects. Time does not permit this nor do the circumstances make it appropriate. But I am proposing that we either quit quoting that meaningful sentence or do some serious thinking about it.

To record very briefly some of my own thinking about that quotation as it refers to higher education, I would direct your attention to the traditional role of the independent university or college—and particularly the church-related university or college—in the American educational system. That role has been to give a completely integrated education in which religion, philosophy, the sciences, and literature are all given their place in a balanced view of man and his destiny in the light of human experience and divine revelation.

To take this university as an instance, I gladly give it credit for having given to this diocese thousands of Catholic graduates whose understanding of their religion is on a level with their development in secular subjects. This means much to themselves, their families, their church, their community and even to those with whom they will be associated in some business or professional career. This university has at the same time served its non-Catholic students with meticulous respect for the individual conscience but with continued insistence on cultural courses in philosophy and ethics which confirm and deepen their belief in God and their knowledge of divine law.

All the students at this university and other schools in the same class are made quickly aware of an uncompromising stand for absolutes in knowledge, in morality and in human rights. They are also directed to see in the general acceptance of spiritual absolutes our surest protection against absolutism in government.

This forthright, unequivocal devotion of church related colleges to the spiritual postulates of ordered liberty constitutes a unique contribution to their city, State and Nation. It constitutes as well a guaranty of fidelity to the authentic American tradition of law and government. It traces the origin of our rights and duties to God. These colleges, then, can follow out to the full the recommendations of the Northwest Ordinance to make progress in religion, morality and knowledge the clearly expressed objectives of their program.

The patriotic service of this type of college and university recalls the fact that the beginnings of higher education in this country were due not to any provision of government but to independent and chiefly church related effort. Harvard was the first college established in what is now the Continental United States. It was 159 years old when the doors of the first State college (North Carolina) were opened to its students. By that time, 1795, there were 24 private colleges in the United States and all except one (in Philadelphia) were church related. In 1860, of the 246 colleges in operation only 17 were State institutions.

I realize that since 1860 there has been a momentous change. Our tax-supported and Government-controlled colleges and universities have increased enormously both in number and in size. Many independent colleges and universities that were church related in their beginnings have practically ceased to be so. But as late as 1946 the private schools of the country enrolled over 50 percent of our college and university students. Today that proportion is slightly below 46 percent. In Michigan it is far below the national average and certainly does not exceed 18 percent.

I cite these statistics to bring out the fact that independent colleges and universities are an integral part of our American educational system, not only because they operate on a State charter but even more because of the part they have played in our educational history. Most of us, I think, will, given our differences, prefer a dualistic to a monolithic system of education under the complete domination of Government. Surely, it is too soon for us to forget Hitler or to be unmindful of Stalin and his postwar puppets in their manipulating of state-controlled educational institutions. In social and industrial matters, too, we have inherited a healthy fear of the monolithic state.

Some good men in the public educational system are beguiled with the thought that if we can make the young people in our schools disregard, or seem to disregard, their inherited differences we can lay the foundations for a more united nation. My own conviciton is that the success of any such effort would only lay the foundations of a more secularistic and, in the end, a weaker nation. Surely, such success would thwart ever more the purpose of the patriots who wrote the Northwest Ordinance: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary for good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall ever be encouraged." And what of the Founding Fathers who clearly had in mind to set up on this continent a republic that would be safe for differences—and particularly for religious differences. One could almost define America in these terms.

No; it seems to me that the solution to the very real difficulties which our religious differences bring into our educational system lies not in blurring realities but in facing them. I think that men with serious diffrences but with unchallengeable loyalty to God and country must rather sit down to discuss, in a positive and constructive way, those differences as they affect our higher educational system. To solve our problems to the satisfaction of all concerned, we must bring to our discussions something that pertains to the intellect—clarity—but we must also bring something that pertains to the will—charity. I cannot forget a definition of charity I learned from an old Irish priest in Rome 50 years ago. He quoted an ancient Irish catechism which said: "Charity is a virtue which disposes us to do good to all men, especially to those who differ from us in religion." Our goal, in conformity with that definition, should be not only to live together in peace but to work together in charity.

Study of Effects of Atomic Radiation on Living Organisms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning. The editorial, entitled "Evaluating Fallout," supports the proposal made by Ambassador Lodge, on last Tuesday, for an international study, through the United Nations, of the effects of radioactivity on living organisms.

The editorial also goes on to say that before the General Assembly meeting begins in September, one helpful step would be for the Congress to approve resolutions, now pending in both the Senate and House, which call for just such an international evaluation. The Senate resolution referred to is Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, submitted by me on April 13, and cosponsored by 27 other Senators. It is my hope, and I feel certain it is the hope of the administration, that the Senate will take action on the concurrent resolution before the end of the present session.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVALUATING FALLOUT

Ambassador Lodge could not have chosen a better way to relieve fears about radioactive fallout than to propose a survey through the United Nations. This is substantially the proposal made last spring by the Federation

of American Scientists. Whether the effects of radioactivity from past nuclear weapons tests are sufficient to warrant alarm this newspaper does not know. The Atomic Energy Commission has consistently minimized talk of any current threat to human life or health; some biologists, here and abroad, on the other hand, are worried about possible genetic damage to future generations. At any rate, the possible hazards of fallout from nuclear weapons tests has caused widespread concern in Europe and Asia. If it is not feasible to have a moratorium on the tests themselves, an international evaluation of data about fallout by competent scientists is the next best thing. The National Academy of Sciences has already undertaken a study of the effects of atomic radiation on living organisms. We hope the administration will press for widespread support of Ambassador Lodge's proposal before the General Assembly meets in September. One helpful step, in the meantime, would be for Congress to pass the resolutions pending in both the House and the Senate in favor of just such an international evaluation through the U. N.

Boat Tax Refunds Discussed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 31, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Tallahassee Democrat of Tallahassee, Fla., Thursday, June 2, 1955, which relates to a bill introduced by me at the request of the Florida Boatmen's Association, Inc., of Destin, Fla. It is H. R. 2879, to amend section 6415 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The bill would provide that fishing-boat owners who have been required to pay a transportation tax may obtain a refund since the courts have held that the statute did not apply to fishing boats in the first place.

The purpose of my bill is to authorize and provide equal and uniform tax treatment, as contemplated by the Constitution, to all boat owners whose fishing fare did not exceed $5.60 per person, in those cases where it has been judicially determined that the tax was unlawfully collected. This is more fully shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1955, page A2628.

I have suggested to all my friends who have been required to pay this tax that it is necessary for them to file a claim with the Director of Internal Revenue of their State for refund at once.

The news article reads as follows:

THIRTY-THOUSAND-DOLLAR TAX REFUNDS SET

United States District Judge Dozier A. DeVane yesterday said he would order refunded more than $30,000 transportation taxes illegally collected from some dozen boatowners during 1951 and preceding years.

Judgments in 10 cases in which the judge said he would find for the plaintiffs included those of W. S. Anderson, of Panama City, awarded judgment of $2,381, and W. D. Walker, of Pensacola, awarded $4,123.

Other boatowners involved in the suits are J. C. Harris, Benson Walls, J. D. Sweeney, Eugene Jones, Mary Alma Knowles, C. S., L. M., and V. B. Anderson, and Curtis E. Ware.

David W. Palmer, Destin attorney, representing the boatowners, cited a speech of Congressman BOB SIKES of April 20, in which the Representative said some $100,000 was collected illegally from Florida boatowners.

Palmer also contended some boatowners paid tax at the rate of 60 cents a person, while others were required to pay only 6 cents.

He charged that some of the tax money paid to a Panama City deputy collector failed to reach the State collector's office in Jacksonville.

Needed: A Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Needed: A Highway Program," which was published in the Lincoln Evening Journal and Nebraska State Journal of June 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Governors' Highway Conference at Denver, sponsored largely by Nebraska's Governor Anderson, has done more to answer questions and straighten out misinformation on the Federal highway plan before Congress than anything that has happened to date in the Midwest.

It can only be hoped that it, and similar gatherings planned over the Nation, have not come too late to get a long-range, workable road program out of Congress this session.

Theme of the conference was the urgency of drafting such a program at once. Underlying this was the desire of governors of both parties to come up with the right plan regardless of the political label attached.

The thorough scrutiny at Denver exposed the inadequacy of the bill passed by the Senate. It pointed out the burden on the House to come up with a plan that will do the job the American public so obviously wants done.

Observations from Federal officials, including Secretary of Commerce Weeks and his top lieutenant, from the governors and their highway engineers made it clear that the Senate bill is far short of meeting the problem. Unlike the plan endorsed almost unanimously last year by governors of both parties over the Nation, perfected by a committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay and backed by the administration, the Senate bill fails to cope with the heart of the problem—the need for a single coordinated plan that will provide highways now when they are needed.

The Clay plan calls for completing the job in 10 years. Even in that time the Nation's automobile population will have risen from the present 58 million to 81 million. At the rate called for in the Senate bill, it would take about 18 years to do the job.

Most revealing was the light thrown on the principal objection that has been voiced to the Clay plan—the provision to finance it by 30-year bonds. It is conceded that this would call for about $11 billion interest to be paid on the $21 billion bond issue.

But opponents of the bond issue have not come up with an acceptable financing alternative. Democrats backing the Senate bill clamor for a "pay-as-you-go" program. But they have offered no means of paying the extra money needed even by their modest proposal. Obviously that must come from: (1) Reduced spending elsewhere; (2) deficit financing, or (3) added taxes such as an additional cent of Federal gasoline tax.

If No. 1 could be achieved there would be no further cause for concern. It appears highly unlikely that such will be the case. So the realistic alternatives are Nos. 2 and 3 wherein lie the real shortcomings of the Senate plan.

Deficit financing and a further increase in the national debt would undoubtedly lead to greater interest payments, with less in return, than would a carefully planned bond issue. It is likely, too, that American motorists would rather have some of the Federal highway taxes they are paying now be used for interest than to have to increase those taxes just to avoid interest payments.

The crux of the Clay plan is a "pay-as-you-use" principle. On that basis, the present rate of revenue, collected over the next 30 years, will pay the bill for roads built in 10 years. That would bring the Nation's highway network up to the standard needed for the 30-year period.

While those modern roads are being paid for and used at the same time, motorists will be saving more in driving expenses than would ever be spent for interest on the bonds. Highway engineers estimate that the improved roads called for in the Clay plan would cut driving costs by as much as 10 percent. This would come from reduced mileages by straightening roads which would save time and expense, better gas mileage by making roads for steady driving, less wear and tear on automobiles, lower insurance rates, and other indirect factors.

It can be hoped that there is still time to explain the benefits of the Clay program to others over the Nation, including Nebraska's Senators CURTIS and HRUSKA, who joined in killing that plan in the Senate.

Resolutions of Georgia Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Grant Williams, executive secretary of the Georgia Bar Association, enclosing three resolutions which were adopted by the association at its meeting held in Augusta on May 26, 27, and 28, 1955.

These resolutions were offered by Hon. Reuben A. Garland, a prominent member of the Atlanta bar. Mr. Garland is a student of national and international affairs. He is devoted to American institutions, to the maintenance of our free-enterprise system, and to the preservation of our constitutional form of government.

The subject matter of these three resolutions is of paramount importance to our people in this critical stage of our country's history, and I take pleasure in inserting them herewith and commending them to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues and the American people:

Whereas the United Nations is a group of 60 nations banded together for the sole declared purpose of preserving peace in the world with definite domestic affairs of any member nation; and

Whereas there exists an organized effort to establish through the United Nations a world government; and

Whereas such a world government would destroy the sovereignty of the United States of America and endanger the cherished liberties known only to the Anglo-American system of law and government; and

Whereas the recommendations of the so-called Genocide Convention together with the covenants of Human Rights, if adopted, would deprive American citizens of the right of trial by jury and make them subject to the provisions of a world court: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Bar Association implore the Congress of the United States to reaffirm in unmistakable language the sovereignty of the United States of America, demand that the United Nations confine its activities to being a deliberating body only of sovereign nations and that all interference in the domestic affairs of the United States cease immediately and completely.

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America is the greatest document for human liberty in 2,000 years of recorded history, and originally treaties were intended to be agreements between sovereign nations concerned solely with international affairs; and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements have been and are now being drawn which admittedly endanger American rights, make domestic laws, override the Constitution, give congressional powers to the executive branch of the Government, give States rights to the Federal Government or to an international body, and cut across our Bill of Rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Bar Association urge the immediate adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will provide that no treaty or other international agreement in conflict with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect; and no treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States except by valid legislation duly enacted by the elected representatives of the American people.

Whereas the changing of the name "Constitution Day" to "Citizenship Day" in the matter of observance of September 17 as the date of the signing of our Constitution minimizes the importance of this all-important document in the minds of the American people and emphasizes the citizenship idea which tends to fall into the world citizen plan of propaganda, and in order to preserve, support, and appreciate our Federal Constitution it is essential to understand its provisions and principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Bar Association urge the United States Congress to restore the designation "Constitution Day" to the date of September 17 in order that all Americans on this anniversary may rededicate themselves to the basic principles of this great document; and be it further

Resolved, That the Georgia Bar Association sutdy and publicize the Constitution during its 168th anniversary week of September 17–23, 1955; request the Governor to proclaim Constitution Week; and sponsor school and public programs on the Constitution, especially emphasizing the primary purposes of good government as set forth in the preamble to the Constitution and the duty of citizens in our Republic to protect the Constitution and the freedoms as set forth in its Bill of Rights, so that it may continue to protect us and our posterity in "this Nation under God."

Job Opportunities for Handicapped in Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 24, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, entitled "Job Opportunities for Handicapped in Small Business," which appeared in the June issue of Performance, a monthly magazine published by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

I am particularly gratified to know of the keen interest the Small Business Administration is taking to encourage the employment in small business of the physically handicapped throughout the country. Since approximately 70 percent of the labor force of the United States is employed in small business or industry, it is highly desirable that every effort be made to encourage the smaller industrial concern to increase the number of physically handicapped persons on its payroll.

I take great pride in noting that one of the outstanding examples of how small business can properly employ the physically handicapped mentioned in the article is the case history of a Florida small-business concern. This concern is the Empire Furniture & Rattan Works of Coral Gables whose policy it is to employ physically handicapped persons. This policy was initiated by Edward Axlrod, a young man physically handicapped from birth. One of the first loans made by the Small Business Administration was to help this small firm.

Both Edward Axlrod and his father, Leo Axlrod, contributed immeasurably toward the spread of the movement to encourage the employment of the physically handicapped, not only in every important community in the United States, but to foreign countries as well. The State of Florida and the Nation owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to them for the great public service which they have rendered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR HANDICAPPED IN SMALL BUSINESS

(By Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration)

The Small Business Administration is keenly interested in the physically handicapped, and its programs are geared to help those engaged in small business. In its approach to the problems of small concerns it always tries to be humane, considerate, and sympathetic. This, of course, is the decent way. Moreover, it is good business and good for the country to utilize the productivity of the physically handicapped.

In this it is following a pattern of conduct that was established by President Eisenhower himself. In an address at Denver a year ago, the President said:

"Now this program at home can be defined best, I think, by saying this: that it has been a liberal program in all of those things that bring the Federal Government in contact with the individual; when it deals with the individual and his problems; in this field, the Government tries to be humane, considerate, and sympathetic—and that is true liberalism."

In view of this humane, considerate approach, it is not surprising that one of the first loans made by the Small Business Administration was to help a small firm which employs physically handicapped persons. This firm is the Empire Furniture and Rattan Works of Coral Gables, Fla. In 1942 this firm adopted the policy of employing physically handicapped persons. This policy was established by Edward Axlrod, a young man who was physically handicapped from birth.

The pioneering efforts of this young man, and his father, Leo Axlrod, who now carries on the business, helped spread the movement among businesses to hire physically handicapped persons to every important community in the United States and to foreign countries. The story of Edward Axlrod is, of course, familiar to the readers of Performance; there is no need to repeat it here. But it is of interest to show how our sympathetic approach to the problems of small business resulted in a business expansion loan to this enterprising firm.

It was in February 1954, that the proprietor of this firm came to the Small Business Administration. Mr. Axlrod asked the agency to share in a $20,000 bank-participation loan to help him increase production. The firm was then employing 23 persons, mostly physically handicapped, and wanted to expand, to provide employment for 17 additional handicapped persons.

Mr. Axlrod had already talked over with his banker the need for more funds to expand operations. The banker wanted to make the loan, but it was against the bank's policy to make loans for such a long term, in this case 4 years. However, the bank was willing to take half the loan, if we would take the other half. Our investigation was favorable, and a short while later the funds were disbursed to help this firm remodel and expand, and provide more jobs for physically handicapped persons.

That, very briefly, is the story of one loan we have made to help a firm that has pioneered in giving jobs to physically handicapped persons. There have been others, and I have no doubt that in the future there will be more. For it is becoming increasingly clear to all of us that providing jobs for handicapped persons is more than kindness and consideration. It is also good business. Properly placed, physically handicapped persons are good craftsmen. Consider for a moment this statement made to us in their loan application by the Empire Co.:

"While we are extremely proud of our work with the handicapped, we are most happy too, that we make such products of excellence that have given our firm root in the homefurnishing field of our area and the country. We export some furniture to Latin American countries and are attaching a catalog printed in Spanish and English to give you some idea of our line."

There is the traditional spirit of American enterprise for you: It is a spirit we are happy and eager to foster.

We are proud of the agency's record of providing financial assistance to help enterprizing small firms expand and grow. So far, we have approved more than 1,300 busi-

ness loans totaling about $70 million and two-thirds of these loans have been made in participation with private banks.

In addition, we have approved more than 1,100 disaster loans totaling $7,700,000 to individuals and firms who suffered damage in catastrophies such as floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes. This is a purely humanitarian function.

But the Small Business Administration also has other programs of which it is equally proud, and they are all geared to the central idea of helping small business grow and prosper. All of them are, of course, available to the physically handicapped and to firms employing physically handicapped.

Not so well known, perhaps, as our financial-assistance program, is our program to help small firms obtain a fair share of Government purchase orders. Here is the way it works.

The Small Business Administration has representatives stationed in principal procurement centers of the military departments across the country. Here, all individual proposed procurements valued at $10,000 or more (except those classified as "confidential" or higher) are screened jointly by the Small Business Administration representatives and military procurement officers.

Those found suitable for performance by small business, if jointly agreed to by the Small Business Administration and the military, are earmarked and reserved exclusively for competitive award to small firms. In some cases, portions of proposed procurements are also earmarked for performance by small firms under this program.

Under this one program we have been able to earmark more than $500 million in Government purchases for exclusive competitive award to small firms. This is business that these small firms would probably not have received except for this program.

Of course, the Small Business Administration also assists small firms in other ways. The Agency's 40 regional and field offices are constantly making prime contract bid referrals to small firms with suitable facilities to bid on Government contracts.

In addition, through cooperative programs, its representatives are constantly encouraging larger private firms to subcontract more of their orders with smaller firms in their area.

For many small firms, the most serious problem is not one of obtaining financing of Government contracts, but an urgent need for help in overcoming a management or technical problem or in acquiring greater management and technical skill. The Small Business Administration helps here in a number of ways.

In cooperation with the Small Business Administration, collegiate schools of business and other educational institutions offer owners of small firms courses in currently important business administration subjects. These courses, conducted in the evening, are taught by experienced business leaders and college teachers. This year more than 55 such courses were offered.

The Small Business Administration publishes three series of practical, helpful leaflets called Management, Technical and Marketers Aids for Small Business. These leaflets cover a wide range of management and production problems, telling how to recognize and deal with them. They are available free at all of our field offices. In addition to these programs, all of which are available to help physically handicapped persons who have small businesses, as well as others, the Small Business Administration also provides experienced counsel to small business concerns and individuals in locating a marketable product or new line or type of product, or in locating a market for a product.

This products assistance program is designed to assist small firms in finding solutions to research and development problems regarding product improvement and new products. As part of this agency service, field offices maintain lists of Government-owned patented products and processes which are available to small firms free or with only a nominal charge for their use.

Production specialists in the Small Business Administration offices are available to help individual small-business concerns with technical production problems.

All of the services the agency has developed to help small business are available at its field offices. In order to foster better cooperation between firms employing physically handicapped persons and this agency, each field office has been provided with a list of certified sheltered workshops and a list of competitive firms employing handicapped persons. Persons interested in this subject may check their local telephone directories or write the Small Business Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

New Jersey Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dim view taken of the upper Colorado project by the voters of New Jersey is reflected in the following editorial appearing in the Hackettstown Gazette on May 12, 1955:

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR MILLION DOLLARS FOR NEW JERSEY TO PAY

The Tax Foundation has mailed to this desk a tax map of the United States. This map shows what it will cost the various States if the upper Colorado River Basin project, now before the Congress, is approved.

New Jersey taxpayers will pay $144 million for the "reclamation" project. Colorado, the State that will benefit most, will pay a quarter as much.

Purpose of the Colorado River project is to irrigate more land. The cost per acre of similar projects has run to fantastic figures—sometimes well over a thousand dollars. In the East and Southeast are hundreds of thousands of acres of well-watered land which could be made equally productive at a fraction of the cost for "reclamation."

What is our Government doing in keeping its budget unbalanced by reclaiming more land when it is also keeping its budget unbalanced to buy surplus farm commodities? Agriculture is in enough distress because of overproduction without making it worse.

The Colorado River Basin project must have the votes of Members of Congress from Eastern States if it becomes law. It will get these votes only by swapping or logrolling. It will be interesting to see how New Jersey Congressmen vote on this one.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak." They are typical of the unfounded attacks on the Colorado River storage project, and I submit that it would have been more accurately labeled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

The gentleman from southern California, and the rest of the critics of upper Colorado River development, have made a great to-do about the so-called hidden interest in the irrigation features of the project. Because the irrigation features are non-interest-bearing—as have been, and are, all irrigation projects under reclamation law for more than 50 years—there has been a ridiculous effort to show that the so-called hidden interest will be a burden on the taxpayers of each of our 48 States.

There is no hidden interest in the Colorado River storage project.

Rather, there is a very definite hidden profit, which will benefit all the taxpayers of these United States.

A study has been made of reclamation projects over the years. To the year 1953, the new taxes returned by the new wealth created by these projects totaled 25 percent more than the total cost of all reclamation projects constructed since the beginning of the reclamation program in 1902.

Now this analysis included all reclamation projects, many of which were still in the construction stage and had not yet begun to produce and pay out. A study of 15 typical projects which are in full production disclosed that new tax revenues attributable directly to them not only exceeded in amount the so-called hidden interest, but actually totaled 4½ times the total construction cost of the projects.

This additional tax revenue goes directly into the United States Treasury, for the relief of all taxpayers. It is entirely a net benefit to the public, as it is not counted in any way toward repayment of project costs.

I hope the people who have been figuring so hard to show what the cost of the Colorado project will be to each of the States will now do a little more figuring to see what the net gain in tax relief will be to each State.

It is time we forgot about mythical bananas and fanciful applesauce, and got down to some good, solid facts on the subject of the Colorado River storage project.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the Gooseberry irrigation project in Utah.

The Gooseberry project is a part of the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Gooseberry project would be $1,900 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Address Delivered by Hon. W. Kerr Scott, of North Carolina, at a Breakfast Group Meeting of Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently I requested our colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] to lead the discussion at a breakfast group meeting of Senators. Preparation time was brief indeed, but Senator SCOTT greatly impressed all his hearers with his practical commonsense, his sound advice and sounsel, all of which served as a challenge as well as an encouragement.

I think his words of wisdom and counsel carry a splendid message to the people of America. I believe they convey a special message of inspiration and guidance to the youth of our country and I therefore ask unanimous consent that Senator SCOTT's remarks be included in the Appendix of the RECORD. Further, I wish to commend him for his noble thoughts and the practical guidance of his counsel.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T PARK HERE

Many years ago, an inspired poet wrote the immortal lines:

"Heaven is not reached at a single bound;
But we build the ladder by which we rise
From the lowly earth to the vaulted skies.
And we mount to its summit round by round."

And as we consider the words of the poet we should also recognize that it seems to be a trait of human nature to be eternally on the lookout for a place to park—not only one's automobile but one's self. As we ride through the streets of our cities today we repeatedly face the words "don't park here."

We find them in the business and residential sections and on the side streets.

They stare at us from the fire hydrants, from in front of the theaters, the bus and streetcar stops, from public buildings, and numerous other places.

As we ride along the lonely places of country highways we are constantly admonished to "keep off the shoulders" and we are told not to park on fills, curves, or highways.

In the parks we are told to "keep off the grass" and at the intersections the policeman tells us to "step lively."

Restrictions, admonitions, and exhortations are to be seen and heard on every side touching every facet of life.

"It is well that we should thus be warned," for as the German proverb runs: "If we rest, we rust."

And remember, if water rests, it stagnates; if a tree rests, it dies; if our lungs rest, we cease to breathe, and if our hearts rest, we die.

Only yesterday (June 21, 1955) Senator ALEXANDER WILEY introduced in the Senate a bill which I commend to your attention for it recognizes that many people who are forced by provisions of the Retirement Act to retire are still mentally and physically very much alert. It recognizes that these people do not want to park but rather want to continue making their contribution to society.

Yes, "don't part here's" are found in nature, science, and human life and they are designed for our own protection. Yet in spite of all such warnings and exhortations, man still continues to park in many places where he should not.

As we read in Pilgrim's Progress, Christian on his way from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City was frequently tempted to turn aside and park awhile, especially in the Town of Vanity Fair. Christian resisted the temptation and successfully reached his journey's end. This cannot be said of all, and, as a consequence, we find today that men and women too often are parked at various places along the journey of life.

To some of these places I would call your attention.

Some men and women park beside their failures.

Some youths study hard in school. Examinations come and they fail. They accuse the teacher of dishonesty and prejudice to cover their own failures, quit studying, quit school, and park idly beside the highway of intellectuality.

I recall how impressed I was as a freshman in college with the fact of how ill-prepared I was, as well as many other farm boys were, for college training. I observed that the boys who came from prep schools and highly organized city schools were much better prepared than we farm-bred boys were. I particularly recall two boys I have never seen since my college days who were well prepared for college training but who never graduated. They loafed along waiting for the rest of us to catch up, and as a result of their parking, they failed in their examinations and dropped out of school. Parking can be dangerous.

For others a broken home is the excuse for parking along the highway of life.

For others, business becomes dull, crops fail, banks burst, and all is lost. That is, all that is material at the moment and the victim gives up and parks beside his failures or disappointments.

What a tragedy it is to find a boy or girl, a man or woman parked beside some failure or handicap and thus missing the best things of life and losing the spirit to contribute to the welfare of others. At an early age, Theodore Roosevelt was an invalid and had to be carried from place to place in his father's arms. Refusing to park beside such a handicap, he took his doctor's advice and daily, enduring much pain and anguish, he exercised his body, and later became the leader of the Rough Riders and President of the United States.

Remember what happened to Brer Rabbit when he parked for awhile. Mr. Terrapin won the race.

Have you been tempted to park beside some failure or handicap? If so, then take to heart the lesson taught Robert Bruce by the spider. Robert Bruce was King of Scotland during the 13th century. He was a brave fighter, an ardent patriot, and he carried the fortunes and misfortunes of his beloved Scotland in his heart. Late in life he was defeated on the field of battle. Fleeing for his life, he came to an old cave in the mountains. Across the entrance of it a spider had woven a web. Brushing the web aside, Bruce entered to await the end. As he sat facing the entrance he noticed that the spider was again weaving her web and within a few minutes she had completed it. Just then the pursuers of Bruce came and one of them said, "Let's look in this old cave." "No," said the leader, "No one could have entered there without destroying the spider's web." So on they went.

Bruce had entered the cave defeated in battle, broken in spirit, discouraged and ready to give up. But as he sat there and watched the spider quickly adjust herself to her misfortune and begin all over again, he said, "If a spider, without an immortal soul, having the foundation knocked completely out from under her, can begin all over again, by the grace of God, Robert Bruce can come back, too." Slipping beneath the web, he went forth again and freed Scotland from her enemies.

In early January of this year I had one of my dairy barns, which housed 100 head of cattle, burn to the ground. This building had been used successfully for 35 years and I had gotten my money out of it insofar as use was concerned.

I was confronted with making the decision of whether to build a new barn or sell the cows.

My family, because of my age, urged me to sell the cattle and start restricting my activities and take it easy. I pondered long with the realization that I had been born and reared in a dairy-farm family and that most of my life's experience had been in turning worn out agricultural land into lush pastures and in producing milk, which is nature's most complete food. I was reminded of the philosophy of the Chinese which goes something like this: If an idea is good even if it takes 300 years to bring it to fruition, go ahead and do your part if you can and pass it on to others to complete.

I felt that my knowledge in this field and that handed down by my forebears for five generations who had lived on this same land justified, yes, demanded, that I pass on to my sons those things which I had gained through experience and frugal living.

I became convinced that I had no right to coast out the balance of my life and that I had no right to park but that I should go ahead and build back the barn even though I might never receive material benefit from what it would cost to rebuild it.

Oh, my friends, whatever you do, don't park beside your failures and losses.

Then there are those who park beside their successes.

Such people study hard; become the honor men of their class; become captain of the football team or the star of the basketball team; deliver the valedictory, and full of pride, finish school to rest beside past glories.

Others may park after wooing and winning, becoming happily married, having a lovely home, beautiful children, and then sit back and let the rest of the world go by in the belief that they have done their bit for society.

Others establish businesses, outstrip their competitors, become wealthy, and then contentedly pat themselves on the back and proceed to park beside their successes.

An examination of the biographies of the 400 exclusive millionaires of New York society shows that 380 began life as poor boys—boys who refused to park beside their first, second, or third, or any other success.

But of all the parking, there is none more devastating in the lives of men than the parking beside the successes and failures of a man's spiritual life.

If ever a man had justification to park beside either success or failure, the Apostle Paul did. But standing steadfast, Paul said:

"Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended—but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, I press on toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

"This one thing I do," says Paul, "I am reaching forth. I am pressing on." It is true that I have had failures, I made a mistake in Athens, I presecuted the church. I have been the chiefest of all sinners. But those things are behind. Christ has forgiven those. So I have forgotten them. And then too I have had success. Why! I have seen Christ. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. I have already won my crown. Yet I haven't time nor the inclination to park beside any of these things. But on the contrary—"This one thing I do"—"I am reaching forth." "I am pressing on." "Toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

The lesson taught here is that if we, as Christians and as church members, are to reach the mark and win the prize there can be no parking in the individual's or church's program.

Another great lesson is to be found in the history of the erection of a statue of the immortal Gen. Robert E. Lee in the city of Richmond, Va.

When the news reached Richmond that the statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee, now standing on Monument Avenue, was at the depot, someone said, "My, it will take a lot of horses to pull all those tons of metal uptown." And someone (it must have been a blessed woman) replied, "Horses, oh, don't let horses pull General Lee—let's pull him ourselves."

The idea caught like wildfire and swept the city. The newspapers were full of it. The day was set. The schools declared a holiday. Flags, bunting, popcorn, peanuts, and red lemonade were everywhere. The sidewalks, stoops, porches, and windows were filled with happy throngs.

Out there in the middle of the street were three large trucks tied together, with a drawing cable a block long. Pulling on the cable was one of the motliest crowds ever gathered together. An ex-governor was there with several millionaires. There were rich men, poor men, fat men, lean men, white men, black men, school girls chewing gum, and society ladies tripping about on their spool heels pretending that they were pulling. Amid the laughter and tears, songs and cheers, they drew the general in triumph to the place where he sits today on Traveler, looking ever toward his beloved Southland.

As soon as they reached their destination, every man drew his pocketknife and cut off a little piece of the great rope and put it in his pocket. For days after, everywhere in the city, a man would pull out his little piece of hemp, hold it up, and with great pride say to his friends, "I had hold of the rope. Did you? Did you?"

The mission of the church is to bring the throne of our Savior to its rightful place in the hearts of men. I am hoping with a mighty hope that when that task is brought to its triumphant end there will not be a singe Christian who will not be able to look up into the face of the King and say: "Master, I had hold of the rope! I had hold of the rope! I did not Park!"

The International Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] last week was interviewed on the grave international situation in which this Nation is involved by the editorial staff of the Sunday Star. The questions and answers were printed in full in yesterday's issue of the Star. The views of the Senator from Montana are so penetrating and clear that I feel they should be made available to all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore request unanimous consent that they may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANSFIELD SEES DANGER IN POLICY, SAYS SENATE LACKS NEEDED DATA

(Following is the text of an interview conducted by members of the Sunday Star editorial staff with Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, an outspoken critic of the administration's "limited nuclear war" policy. The questions and answers that follow were transcribed from a magnetic tape exposed in Senator MANSFIELD's Capitol Hill office.)

Question. You have criticized the administration for adopting a "limited nuclear war" policy which you say is dangerous. Why?

Answer. I think anything that has to do with atomic energy is potentially dangerous. I think also that we are emphasizing the destructive aspects and not paying enough attention to the beneficial ways in which atomic energy can be used.

You will recall that Secretary of State Dulles, on an occasion a few months ago, made a statement that we had "precision" atomic weapons. To the best of my knowledge, the smallest atomic weapon we have is equivalent to 3,000 tons of TNT. As you know, the largest conventional bomb we had in the Second World War amounted to about 10 tons of TNT.

Mr. Dulles seems to have the impression that with this "precision" atomic bomb you could just wipe out military installations and nothing else. But one has only to look over this country to see that there is hardly such a thing as an isolated military installation. There are always civilian installations—towns, villages, factories, and what not nearby.

Question. You don't believe, then, that Mr. Dulles' "precision" bombs are precise enough?

Answer. No. If you go back and look over the Nevada tests, you will recall that on a number of occasions there have been delays in experiments because weather conditions were not just right. And you will recall also that the effects were felt far beyond the confined area which the Atomic Energy Commission had laid out and that on one occasion, as I recall, planes were grounded. This grounding happened just last spring in Denver. For 8 hours planes were not allowed to fly because, I assume, of the possible effects of radioactivity or some related matter.

Question. Do you think the people know enough about nuclear matters?

Answer. I think the administration has not given the people the amount of truth they should have about the atomic, the hydrogen, the cobalt, and now the U-bomb. And I believe that because of this lack of knowledge, we are lulling ourselves into a false sense of security as to our position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union.

PEACEFUL ASPECTS

Question. Did you mean a moment ago, Senator, that the administration is concentrating too much on the bellicose aspects of nuclear weapons and not enough on the peaceful side of atomic energy?

Answer. By and large, yes, although I notice that in recent months, even say recent days, they have entered into bilateral agreements with some countries for a certain amount of exchange of atomic information and also on a cooperative basis for the setting up of reactor plants.

Then, too, the President came out with an idea for an atomic ship to cruise the world. I think if he would help other nations develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy (insofar as security will permit), if he would allow more use of atomic energy in the medical and scientific fields for the benefit of mankind, that would be better. In the idea of an experimental ship I don't see much value. If you're going to launch such a ship I think it should be one that will carry out regular commercial missions, not one put out for display purposes alone.

Question. Senator, do you think enough atomic energy information can be disseminated under present security rules?

Answer. No. Much of the secrecy involved in atomic matters is just secrecy for the sake of secrecy. I've noticed that many American scientists think more information should be given to the American people. There are indications that practically everything we have done in atomic science has been duplicated and perhaps surpassed by the Russians and the German scientists they captured in the course of the Second World War.

I think there is a tendency in this country to underestimate the Russians in this field.

IS LIMITED WAR POSSIBLE?

Question. Getting back to your attitude on limited nuclear war, do you think such a thing is possible?

Answer. No, I do not. Referring again to Secretary Dulles' statement about "precision atomic weapons, the idea implicit there was that in case of war on the Chinese mainland we could limit the conflict to purely military objectives. But I think, using the Chinese mainland as an illustration, that atomic weapons there would create a wave of horror and terror and distrust on the part of all the peoples of Asia.

The Asiatic would say the Americans would use the atomic bomb only against Asians. And we couldn't explain what circumstances would have been responsible for the bombings.

You must consider, also, that this kind of action would not bring the Chinese people to their knees. As a matter of fact, I think it would mean a resumption of the war in Korea. I think it would mean stepped-up activity in Indochina. I think it might mean, if the going got really tough, that the Chinese Communists would call on the Soviet Union to honor the Sino-Soviet treaty of mutual security of 1950.

If you got to this point, and war came between the Soviet Union and the United States, then I do think all weapons would be used. And they would be used on a wholesale basis, far beyond the old-style atomic bomb.

Question. Why do you think the use of atomic weapons would snowball into the use of the ultimate ones—the T, the U, and the cobalt?

Answer. Because once you start you're not going to be able to stop. I think the terror which these weapons inspire is one of the best reasons why, at the present time, we have a sort of cold peace. Certainly the

Soviet Union knows what damage would devolve on them if these bombs are used. And despite the fact that we haven't had too much information in this country, I think the American people have a pretty strong idea of what would happen to us in case of atomic war.

NONNUCLEAR WAR

Question. If the prospects in event of nuclear war are so bleak, do you think we could win a so-called convention, or nonnuclear war today?

Answer. I think that any war we go into we will go into to win, and if all possible we will win. But I want to point out that nobody wins wars any more and that many times the winner, so-called, turns out to be the loser. He has to occupy countries. He has to disburse his own wealth and material to rehabilitate the area which supposedly has been defeated.

As far as conventional arms are concerned, the Russians have 175 thoroughly modernized, mechanized divisions, comprising some 4 million men, the same strength they have had since the end of the war in 1945. In addition, there are 88 satellite divisions of undetermined quality, and the Chinese Communists have something like 4 million men under arms. In the air, it is my understanding that the Russians are ahead of us in every field except the B-47. Under the sea, I understand they have undoubted superiority as far as numbers of submarines are concerned.

The administration seems to be very happy about what we have, but I am afraid the figures won't back up their optimism because I notice that what they talk about is what we have in being, but they never mention the ability of our Air Forces to deliver what we have.

Question. Well, if we can't compete in nonatomic weapons, don't we pretty much have to rely on atomic weapons?

Answer. Oh, yes; and I'm not opposed to that. I think we'll have to keep on experimenting and doing everything possible to develop our atomic and defensive skills. But I do think we ought to tell the truth to the American people insofar as security will permit.

According to the information I get—which is purely from the public prints—it appears to me that a lot of information the American people should have hasn't been told. For example, why did it take Admiral Strauss so long to tell the people of the United States factually what the effect of Bikini-type explosions would be on an area such as from Norfolk, Va., to somewhere up in New Jersey?

Question. Would you care to take this opportunity, now, to tell the truth to the American people as you know it? You are a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. You've been around a good bit. What do you regard as the truth?

Answer. That's not for me to say because I haven't had access to the truth except as it appears in the public prints.

"IN A VACUUM"

Question. Are you implying then, that the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who have a lot to say about the foreign policy of the United States—or should have a lot to say about it—are operating in a vacuum?

Answer. Yes, but a vacuum of our own making, because we haven't requested that information.

Question. If this information is necessary in order to make a sensible evaluation of foreign policy, why hasn't it been given to you?

Answer. Well, none of us has requested it. I think if we were to request that kind of information we might be given it. But then we would get it under the veil of secrecy and wouldn't be able to do anything about it.

Question. What we are trying to get at in these questions, Senator MANSFIELD, is this: The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is charged with keeping an eye on the foreign policy of the United States. Is that correct?

Answer. That is correct.

Question. You don't make policy, but you watchdog it. Secondly then, the foreign policy of the United States is by necessity based on the possession of certain atomic weapons, it is not? In other words, if we didn't have those weapons, we'd have a different foreign policy, wouldn't we?

Answer. That is very likely true, in the details of policy, at least.

Question. So how can you evaluate the foreign policy of the United States and its effectiveness unless you know what our situation with respect to atomic energy is?

Answer. Well, what we are doing, I'm afraid, is evaluating the foreign policy of the United States—as far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned—on the basis of the old conventional methods of evaluation.

Question. So what the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is doing now is using obsolete information to arrive at modern conclusions. Is that what you're saying?

Answer. No, I wouldn't say that. But we have not, to my knowledge since I've been on the committee, had a member of the Atomic Energy Commission before us to give us his views. We assume that when the Chief of Staff or the Secretary of State or any other officials appear before us, they have had contacts with the AEC and that they supposedly have looked into the atomic implications of any field of foreign policy in which they may have interest.

Question. And you are assuming that, having this information, they have arrived at the proper conclusions?

Answer. I'm afraid that's what it amounts to.

Question. Isn't that a rather large assumption?

Answer. Well, that's true. But the point is that in Congress we've got to make large assumptions because there are so many things before us that we just haven't got the time, individually or collectively, to get all the answers to all the questions that could be raised.

Question. Do you anticipate asking a member of the Atomic Energy Commission to come before the Foreign Relations Committee?

Answer. You are presenting an idea I hadn't thought of, but I think it would be a good idea at some time in the near future, if the schedule isn't too tight, to have some of these people come before us and give us an explanation of what they think we should be told. And perhaps we could ask them some questions and draw them out a little bit further.

Thank you, Senator MANSFIELD.

Correction of Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out for the record that an error was made in the credits given to two editorials which I spoke about on June 7, 1955, and which appear on page A4001 of that day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial Inequitable Tax appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, and the second editorial, Evading a Travel Tax, appeared in the Milwaukee Journal.

Formula for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled Formula for Peace, published in the Washington Sunday Star, of June 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMULA FOR PEACE

In effect, in his address to the San Francisco meeting of the United Nations, Secretary of State Dulles has corrected Foreign Minister Molotov's upside-down version of history. At the same time, and more important, he has served blunt notice on the Kremlin—in advance of next month's projected Big Four summit conference—that our country and its Allies, refusing to buy peace at any price, have no intention of dismantling their common defenses against the threat of Red aggression.

As far as history is concerned, Mr. Dulles has effectively demolished Mr. Molotov's bland portrayal—as presented to the U. N. earlier last week—of a peace-loving Communist world busily intent upon reducing tensions everywhere. Actually, as the Secretary has declared, if that world has grown more reasonable, and if developments like the Korean Armistice and the Austrian Treaty have improved the international climate, the primary credit for the change does not belong to the Reds, who have generated trouble in every continent. It belongs instead to the resolute policy of the free nations in building up their arms and standing firmly together to preserve their way of life—a policy that has played a key role in inducing the Kremlin to shift to an ostensibly softer line.

That is why Mr. Dulles has emphasized, in answer to Mr. Molotov's call for the liquidation of the free world's most vital defensive arrangements, that the United States and its partners must continue to maintain and strengthen the collective security they have achieved with such undertakings as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (including West Germany) and other alliances in all the threatened sectors of the globe. The Kremlin, in the context of these dangerous times, asks for the moon when it asks for the breakup of these alliances. For their existence is an absolute imperative for us and our friends, and since they conform to the U. N. Charter, and since "they thwart no nation that does not covet the land and peoples" over which they stand guard, the Soviets can bring no legitimate or acceptable complaint against them.

Certainly the way to effect a further reduction of world tension, the way to promote peace at this stage, is not through insisting that the free world render itself acutely vulnerable to Communist conquest. On the contrary, as Mr. Dulles has said, "There is one extremely simple method of bringing an end to what is called the 'cold war'—observe the charter of the United Nations; refrain from the use of force or the threat of force in international relations and from the support and direction of subversion against the institutions of other countries." But obviously there still is massive reason to doubt that the Moscow-Peiping axis is willing to accept and adhere to this formula, and the doubt now has been intensified by the incident in which Soviet jet fighters have

just shot down one of our Navy patrol planes over the Bering Strait.

Indeed, unless unpremediated or the act of trigger-happy pilots, this incident, coming at the present moment, raises grave questions as to the worthwhileness of going ahead with the Big Four summit meeting. On that point, however, judgment must be held in reserve pending a careful factual determination of whether or not Russia's leaders have any valid excuse for the shooting. Meanwhile, to repeat what Mr. Dulles has indicated, the Geneva Conference—assuming that it will be held as scheduled—will make no headway against the great and dangerous problems of our time unless the Kremlin is at last willing to live up to its U. N. obligations. Without that, a true peace simply cannot be attained.

Water Problems in My Soil Conservation District and on My Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following condensation of a winning speech in the 1954 National Speaking Contest sponsored by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, by Mr. Clarence M. Rogers, of Salem, W. Va.

I find this essay most interesting and enlightening, particularly since it concerns the congressional district which I represent, and I am highly honored to pay tribute to Mr. Rogers on this outstanding speech.

The article follows:

WATER PROBLEMS IN MY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT AND ON MY FARM

(By Clarence M. Rogers, Salem, W. Va.)

The power and usefulness of water were introduced to me in an unusual way. In 1943, I left the practice of law in the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., to begin 3 very interesting years of service with the United States Navy. As ofttimes occurred, the Navy did not need the service for which I had been trained. So they placed me in the growing and vital field of aerology—the Navy's name for the study of the weather. One of the most acceptable parts of my training, provided at the University of Chicago, was the study of cloud formations. This made clear to me the tremendous part that water plays in the energy transfers which occur in the atmosphere around and above us. I still stand in awe as I look at a towering cumulous cloud rising 30,000 to 40,000 feet above me, a sheer white mountain made of water suspended in air but containing enough pent-up energy to light a dozen cities a month or more. Rain to the aerologist was not nearly so much of a problem as fog, ice, or snow, but whatever its form, water causes us great concern.

After leaving the Navy I purchased a small farm about 1 mile from the city of Salem, W. Va. It was apparent to me from the first that water was going to be just as much of a problem on the farm as it was in the Navy, and I began to investigate ways and means for handling it. In this manner I came to know of the work of the West Fork Soil Conservation District and of the related services with which it cooperates.

FEAST OR FAMINE

Our major water problems appear to be basically two in number. First, how can the small tributaries of the West Fork River in Harrison and Lewis Counties, of Middle Island Creek in Doddridge County, and of the Little Kanawha River in Gilmer County, be so controlled during periods of heavy rainfall that downstream flooding and soil erosion are avoided? Second: How can those same watersheds provide reservoirs which will supply the surface and subsurface water for periods of drought?

Since 1896 the city of Salem and lands lying along the banks of these streams have been subject to repeated floods. These floods occur more frequently in June than in any other month of the year. Seldom a year has passed during the last 58 years when we have not had a flood. Damages over that period of time have been enormous. It is estimated that the annual loss of soil material is approximately 23,000 tons from that watershed alone. Sedimentation damage caused by the deposit of silt in the hay crop and the filling of stream channels is extensive. The 1950 flood alone damaged 73 houses and 65 business places within the city of Salem and caused a total damage of approximately $233,000. A small community cannot withstand such losses and survive. It becomes a matter of concern to every citizen to seek ways to prevent such catastrophes.

A somewhat similar picture can be painted of every community within the West Fork Soil Conservation District. Clarksburg and Weston, the two most populous areas within the district have been the victims of frequent and oftentimes very damaging floods. Hundreds of acres of bottomland have suffered too, and countless tons of soil have been carried downstream.

But let us return to our illustration. When it is not too wet in Salem, it is often to dry. The shortage of water for the city of Salem has been almost as much a problem as the floods. Water for the city has in the past been obtained from deep wells, and as the demand has increased the supply of ground water has diminished. During recent years the water supply has been so low during the dry periods that the householders have not had sufficient water for everyday use and a serious fire hazard has existed within the town.

This situation, too, is not peculiar to Salem. The city of Clarksburg only last year was considering the piping of water many miles from the Buckhannon River in order to alleviate a serious shortage caused by the drying up of the small streams throughout the watershed and an insufficient flow in the West Fork River to provide for the needs of the city. Farm wells and springs which have never been known to go dry, are year after year, in increasining numbers, ceasing to produce water.

SOIL CONSERVATION IS THE ANSWER

As a result of this condition throughout the watershed area, there has been a growing conviction in the minds of farmers and city folk alike that the answer to the twin threats of flood or drought is soil conservation. The West Fork Soil Conservation District, for many years now, has been working patiently, thoroughly, and democratically to bring about the feeling and the desire within the minds of the people that these perennial problems do not have to be—they can be beaten. This beating is now being administered by the West Fork Soil Conservation District in cooperation with many public and private agencies in the area and with the active participation of many cooperators.

There are again two main attacks to the problems. One is to work directly with the cooperators in the use of soil conservation practices. The other is to provide the public with effective information on the prime and basic importance of soil conservation to our entire economy. These have been initiated, planned, and encouraged by the supervisors of our district.

The first approach brought about within the district during the year 1953 not less than 35 different types of soil conservation activities carried on by the cooperators and the district, with the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service and the help of other agencies. Contour farming, strip-cropping, tree planting, pasture improvement, building of farm ponds, digging diversion ditches, and constructing open and closed drains—these are a few of the many scientific practices undertaken. Today in the West Fork Soil Conservation District there are 4,000 active cooperators with more than 430,000 acres of land under a planned soil-conservation program. This acreage represents 46 percent of the total area in the district. Although there is much, much more to do, this is no mean accomplishment and does not yet tell the whole story.

I should pause at this point to say a word about the individual employees of the Soil Conservation Service. Time after time, I have found them out in all kinds of weather, working from early in the morning to late in the evening, assisting the farmer and landowner with his problems in soil conservation and farm planning. It seems to be characteristic of their lot that each has a cheerful disposition, a keen desire to cooperate, and a willingness to be patient with the demands and eccentricities of the individual cooperator. As a group, these men seem to have caught the spirit of a democratic society, as few Government-employed groups have done in the past. Our district supervisors meet regularly, and though unpaid, spend many valuable hours in planning and directing the work of conserving our land and water.

The second approach to our water problems is through the activities of the soil-conservation district in making known to people throughout the district the importance of soil conservation and the urgent need for constant and active endeavor to practice it wherever it is possible. This has been accomplished by planned tours of the pilot watershed project at Salem; by regular news articles in the daily and weekly newspapers covering the areas; by demonstrations made by trained Soil Conservation Service employees cooperating with the district planning committee; by the use of visual aids in schools, churches, civic clubs, and at other gatherings; by exhibits at fairs, schools, and at other public assembly areas; by use of the radio and the speaker's platform; by encouraging participation in soil-conservation contests of both local and national scope; by contact with vocational agriculture classes and other special interest groups, as the Boy Scouts, 4–H Clubs, and Future Farmers of America; by cooperation with Federal and State agencies and home demonstration and county agents; and by enlisting the interest and support of community leaders.

Conservation of natural resources can give us some helpful pointers toward conservation of human resources. Just as God has created a balance between the energy which this world receives from the sun and the energy which it discharges into the outer atmosphere, so a balance must be found in our conservation practices which will assure us that there is as much being replaced or held in the soil as is being taken out. In that accomplishment we will find that we must ourselves give out as much as we taken in; that we must repay to society those years of loving care that were provided for us by our parents by giving such care to our children and others. We must acknowledge God's gift of land and water and life by humble, sincere, and intelligent use of these resources.

The Ford Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ford Foundation Seems To Spend Lot of Dough for Pet Ideas of Left-wing," published recently in the Omaha World Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORD FOUNDATION SEEMS TO SPEND LOT OF DOUGH FOR PET IDEAS OF LEFTWING

We have commented before in these columns on some of the exotic and/or boondoggling projects which are being financed by America's various nonprofit, tax-exempt foundations.

By way of documentation, there comes now to hand the annual report for 1954 of the richest organization of its kind in the land, the Ford Foundation. This giant outfit lists assets of $493 million, including $417 million in Ford Motor Company nonvoting stock. It itemizes expenditures of $53 million for the year, of which nearly $50 million was in the form of grants.

LOTS TO INDIA

Here, chosen at random, are a few of the beneficiaries, and the amounts they received last year:

The Government of Syria, $25,000.

Trustees Society of the Lebanon College of Suk-el-Gharb, $30,000.

The Government of Nepal, a grant of $150,000, $7,787 in cash.

The Social Science Research Council, Inc. (for summer training sessions in behavorial sciences), a grant of $185,000, $20,000 in cash.

Near East Foundation (for a pilot agricultural credit program in Iran), $177,000.

International African Institute, a grant of $50,000, $3,045 in cash.

Indian Institute of Public Administration (for its general program), a grant of $350,000.

The regents of the University of California (for a "study of political life in contemporary India"), a grant of $138,500, and $50,000 in cash; and (for a "study of political financing in England"), $4,450.

The total listing covers 16 pages of a rather fat booklet. The items cited above are only a few among many, but they are enough to convey a rough idea of what has happened to these Ford millions. Rather obviously they have fallen into the hands of eggheads, one-worlders, and leaf-rakers.

Ordinarily, what a rich man does with his money, whether he hoards it or spends it, or gives it away, is his business and his alone.

But such foundations as this one are touched with the public interest because tax-dodging angles are involved.

Many owners of large businesses leave a substantial share of their holdings to foundations because in that way their heirs will not have to pay taxes on so large an estate, and will not be forced to give up control by selling stock in the open market.

In their year-to-year operations, also, the foundations are tax-exempt. Thus, in the case of the Ford Co., the government gets not one penny from the millions of dollars in dividends that go to the foundation; from the other millions which go to individual Ford heirs, Uncle Sam collects, probably, upward of 80 percent.

Which means that a large share of both the capital and the income of such foundations is derived, indirectly, from the public treasury.

NO CONTROL

But do the people have any control over it? None whatever. Directors and foundation-bureaucrats run the various shows as they please, to promote whatever ideas and ideologies may be dear to their hearts.

It should not surprise any knowledgeable American that the political lefties—who can smell a dirty, capitalistic dollar farther than JOE MCCARTHY can smell a Communist—have taken over a good many of these funds.

It should not be surprising, but it should cause the Congress to back away and take another look at this foundation business. A congressional committee started to do just that last year, but it quit under fire—a heavy, raking fire from the extreme left flank. Under the present leadership of Congress, that inquiry is not likely to be resumed.

But there's another year coming, and another election, and those who do not wish to see American capitalism destroy itself with its own dollars might do well to keep this issue in mind.

Third Marines Ex-Sergeant Recalls Battle and Rain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., June 24, 1955, regarding the experience and story of 1st Sgt. John Bugel, of the 21st Marine Regiment in World War II battles of Bougainville, Guam, and Iwo Jima:

THIRD MARINES EX-SERGEANT RECALLS BATTLE AND RAIN

Of the 3d Marine Division, a former commander has said, "There was none better."

And it's unlikely he could get an argument out of any of the 300 veterans of the division's World War II battles at Bougainville, Guam, and Iwo Jima, who assembled today at the Raleigh Hotel.

One of the men who saw all three of these fights, former 1st Sgt. John Bugel, of the 21st Marine Regiment, filled in some of the details that are often missing from the official histories.

This division was activated at Camp Elliott, San Diego, Calif., in September, 1942. After training in New Zealand and at Guadalcanal the 3d moved in to assault Empress Augusta Bay, Bougainville, in November, 1943.

For the next 2 months it fought in the steamy jungles of the island against stiff and heavy enemy resistance, according to one official history.

"I was there 63 days and it rained 60 of them. Mud was at least ankle deep all the time and on bad days it was knee deep."

Another feature of Bougainville that stands out with Mr. Bugal, who is now in the printing and publishing business in Los Angeles, is the banyan tree roots, which were so thick it was almost impossible to spot Jap snipers between them.

After Bougainville, the 3d headed for the Marianas in June, 1944. It remained on troopships as a floating reserve force during the conquest of Saipan, before going on in July to the recapture of Guam.

At Guam, the division hit the beach at Asan and after 20 days of fighting reached the northern coast of the island.

The division remained on Guam after the island was secured, helping with the mopping-up operations and training for the next move.

That came in February, 1945, with the invasion of Iwo Jima, in the Volcano Islands, when the 3d Division was in on the Marine Corps' most famous battle of World War II.

With the successful conquest of Iwo Jima the division moved back to Guam where it trained for an invasion of Kyushu—the Japanese mainland. The end of the war canceled that operation and the division remained, on Guam until disbanded in December 1945. It has since been reactivated at Camp Pendleton, Calif., in February, 1952, and is now stationed in Japan and Okinawa.

The United Nations and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the June 18, 1955, issue of the San Rafael (Calif.) Independent-Journal.

Last week world leaders assembled in San Francisco to observe the 10th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter. The editorial is appropos and timely. It poses the question of what are our hopes and expectations of the United Nations, and suggests that each of us, as individuals, take a real look at how we feel about the United Nations.

During the past 10 years the United Nations has achieved successes and failures. It has not come up with a magic formula for peace, but it is a powerful and moving force for peace and understanding among nations of the world.

The 10th anniversary conference drew to a close on a note of reaffirmation to the principles of the United Nations Charter. With the events of that week-long observance fresh in mind, it would be well for everyone to give thought to the propitious questions posed by the following editorial:

TIME TO TAKE A REAL LOOK AT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT U. N.

Ten years ago next week the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco. We have learned a lot since then. We have found weaknesses and strength in the organization. We have found flaws, some of which have disheartened earlier supporters.

Now, however, we are ready to mark this 10th anniversary with a week-long observance. President Eisenhower, in accepting an invitation to open the ceremonies on Monday, put it this way:

"I think it is well that the whole country review the record of accomplishments and failures (of the United Nations), and fix in our minds again what are our hopes and expectations for such a body."

What are our hopes and expectations for such a body? Did we believe it was the ultimate answer? Did we think the two letters U. N. would actually mean a world of united nations living at peace and in prosperity?

President Truman, when he closed the organizing conference on June 26, 1945, did not think so. With a rare burst of prophetic insight he called the U. N. Charter "only a first step to a lasting peace." It is, he said, "not a final or perfect instrument," but it is "a great instrument."

The former President, who will address the U. N. session in San Francisco next Thursday, declared 10 years ago his "faith that war is not inevitable," but warned that the world "must learn to use" the U. N. Charter in order to prevent war.

As leaders of millions of people from all over the world converge on the bay area, we individually might ask ourselves a few questions about the U. N. and world peace.

Do we believe there should be such an organization aimed at establishing world peace and freedom?

Do we really believe in world peace—or only when it suits our convenience?

Do we really believe in freedom for everyone—or only freedom for people to agree with our way of life?

Are we willing to sacrifice to make the U. N. work? Are we willing to compromise on other than basic ideals?

No one can tell in America how he should answer these questions. It is up to each of us individually.

As President Eisenhower said, now is the time to "fix in our minds again what are our hopes and expectations" for the United Nations.

First Division Marines Recall Proud History in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Friday, June 24, 1955, regarding the heroic exploits of the First Marine Division in the Pacific theater of war:

FIRST DIVISION MARINES RECALL PROUD HISTORY IN PACIFIC

The 1st Marine Division has had about as varied a career as any outfit in the corps. And no Leatherneck division has a prouder history. In Korea alone, the 1st won 41 Congressional Medals of Honor.

Veterans of the 1st are bivouacked here in the Williard Hotel. One is Lt. Col. Warren S. Sivertsen, one of the few who were in on every engagement the division had in War II and Korea.

"I guess Peleliu gave us the worst time," he said today. "But we had a pretty good socking all through the Pacific."

Colonel Sivertsen, now stationed at Little Creek, Va., founded the division association.

The 1st Marine Division was activated in 1941, the first all-marine division the Nation had. One of its regiments, the 7th, shipped from Samoa while the remainder of the division headed for New Zealand. Orders in midocean diverted it to Guadalcanal, and a half-year of some of the most vicious fighting in the history of man.

After the Guadalcanal issue was decided, the division was withdrawn to Australia for a rest of fond memory. Nine months later it headed for the combat zone again, this time to New Guinea. Three months after it landed at Cape Gloucester on western New Britain, on Christmas eve, 1943.

The next one was Peleliu, described in the division's official history as "this unpleasant little island of the Japanese Empire. For 2 months Colonel Sivertsen and the others swapped killing with the defenders before the island fell.

One more mission remained—Okinawa. The division went in alongside the 6th Marine Division and several Army divisions. The battle lasted 3 months.

In 1950, when North Korea invaded its southern neighbors, men of the 1st Marine Division went back to war. Part of the division sailed as an undersized brigade. The remainder got ready to receive the influx of recalled reservists, Colonel Sivertsen among them. By September the division was reassembled in Korea.

The division made an amphibious landing at Inchon and drove toward Seoul, helped secure that area and was shifted by seas to the east coast for another landing at Wonsan.

When Chinese entered the war in overwhelming numbers, the division was ordered away.

Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Backing Medical Research," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, June 26, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial deals with differences between the House and Senate on appropriations for fiscal year 1956 for 5 institutes of health of the Public Health Service. The institutes are cancer, heart, neurology, and blindness, arthritis and metabolic diseases, and mental health. The House voted $74,958,000 for these institutes and the Senate $96,625,000.

I earnestly hope that the House will yield to the Senate on these figures in the conference which is about to be held. The health of the whole Nation is involved and the Senate figures are necessary if we are to make a successful assault on killing and crippling diseases.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACKING MEDICAL RESEARCH

These are exciting times on the front against disease. Just as polio is being routed, promises come from research laboratories that the line may soon give against other cripplers and killers. Two new drugs now being tested and evaluated may revolutionize the treatment of mental disease. Recent developments in cancer research offer new hope in treatment of children suffering from acute leukemia. New trails are opening up in the exploration of heart diseases, arthritis and rheumatism, neurology and blindness.

How well this tactical advantage is seized and followed up will depend in part on whether the Senate appropriation for this research is allowed to stand in the Senate-House conference this week. A Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, after hearing testimony from authorities in the 5 fields of medical research, added $21.5 million to the $75 million granted by the House. The House had taken action without testimony from outside experts.

The total Senate appropriation of $96,625,000 for this research, to be directed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is little enough in view of what is at stake, both in human welfare and the future drain on the economy. Cancer and heart disease account for two-thirds of the deaths in the country. The widespread suffering and disabling from arthritis, rheumatism, and blindness are apparent. The great influx of patients into mental hospitals and the toll of delinquency and crime are mounting expenses to the Nation—yet new psychiatric drugs hold out hope for treatment. It would be shortchanging the future to fail to provide such research with the money it can prudently use.

Effects of Cut in Beet Acreage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative report on the effects of cuts in sugar-beet acreage in Washington State. This report appeared in the Columbia Basin Herald on June 9, 1955.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUTBACK IN BEET ACREAGE SEEN AS BASIN HANDICAP

Frost and wind have set back Washington's 1955 sugar-beet crop a little this spring, but the State's beetgrowers contend the weather is no trouble at all compared with the acreage cutbacks they're taking on 1955 plantings as a result of the Federal Sugar Act.

Although sugar beets are one of the few remaining crops not in surplus supply, Washington's farmers have taken an almost 14-percent acreage cut this year as compared to 1954. Last year, total acreage in the State was approximately 35,500. This year the ceiling has been set at 30,795 acres.

The 5,000-acre decrease represents more than $1½ million to the State's farmers. It also is detrimental to optimum development of the Columbia Basin by slowing good crop rotation practices and the ability to get into livestock feeding.

PARADOX NOTED

Many of the farmers in the Columbia Basin are especially critical of the paradox of the Federal Government's spending hundreds of millions of dollars to open new farming areas under irrigation and then denying the settlers on those farms the right to grow one of the best cash crops available to them—sugar beets.

Acreage restrictions and cutbacks stem from the Sugar Act of 1948, which set a rigid ceiling on the amount of sugar American farmers and processors may sell in the United States in any 1 year. The limit placed on the beet-sugar industry is 1,800,000 tons a year.

Meantime, the lion's share of the American market is reserved to Cuba, which currently is permitted to bring into this country and market more than 2¾ million tons of sugar each. In addition, as American

sugar consumption rises, along with population growth, 96 percent of each year's new demand is reserved to Cuba, the remaining 4 percent to other foreign countries. None is earmarked for Americans.

MUIR HAS 6 ACRES

Several Washington farmers interviewed on the subject recently left no doubt as to their feelings. LaRell Muir, a 26-year-old veteran who came to the basin immediately following his discharge from the Army in 1953, has 87 acres 11 miles east of Moses Lake and is farming a total of 175 acres. He said he got a sugar-beet acreage allotment of 6 acres for 1955.

"That's only a fifth, or less, of the acreage I'd like to have for several reasons. If I could get more beets, I could set a proper rotation pattern, I'd have a good cash crop to help me get established, and I'd be in a far better position to get the farming equipment needed nowadays. But the way things stand, I've got to turn to the crops I can get. Not much choice about it," he said.

A brandnew comer to the Moses Lake area, George F. Mattson on Block 42 about 8 miles east of Moses Lake, said he couldn't get any beet acreage this year, although he had wanted to start with about 35 acres on his 72 irrigable acres.

HE GREW BEETS

"I came here from the Rigby, Idaho, area where I grew beets for quite a spell. I know what sugar beets can do and I had wanted to start a four-crop rotation—beets, beans, hay, and wheat. I wanted enough beets to justify getting some machinery, but I could not get an acre. It doesn't make sense, what with beets far from being a surplus crop in this country," he explained.

Rexal F. Rodeback, who is farming 160 irrigable acres 4 miles northeast of Warden, said he would like to have 40 acres of beets, but he can get only 20.1 acres this year.

"I had 24 acres last year, but got cut this time," he said. Beets are the best cash crop we've got in this area. Besides, we need beets to get livestock feeding going. Among other things, that would enable us to get more fertilizer on this land, and this land needs it to build up the soil."

OTHER PRICES LOW

Over in the Quincy area, Earl Gregory, who farms about 2 miles east of town, claims that the inability of basin farmers to obtain reasonable beet acreages is having an adverse effect on other crop prices being received by basin farmers.

"In just 3 years, the prices I'm getting for peas and beans have fallen off about 30 percent, and it's not because that's true everywhere," Gregory said. "Down in southern Idaho, for example, the prices are holding up fine, because the farmers down there have some choice.

"But they've found out we've got to raise beans and peas and a few other things—we can't get into beets—and our prices are set accordingly. In 1953, I got $9.10 a hundredweight for beans. This year I'll get $5.85 for the same quality beans. In 1953 I was getting 7 cents a pound for the same quality peas I'm offered 5¼ cents a pound this year."

Over around Toppenish, too, the farmers are feeling the bind. Harold Clayton, who farms 160 acres on the south edge of Toppenish, said:

"I figure that with our national consumption of sugar increasing every year, we've been 'kinda took' for the last 10 years, or so. If we'd been getting some of that increase, we'd all have the acreage we want now."

Jim Nichols, of Outlook, president of the Eastern Washington Cooperative Beet Growers Association, thinks partisan politics is slowing solution of the beet farmer's problems.

"We have run into entirely too much partisan politics in this situation, which is not political at all, but one of economics," he asserted. "What we're asking in legislation now before Congress is reasonable. We are simply asking a share in the growth of this country.

"Our Washington congressional delegation should be working hard for us to assure passage of this legislation—they should be getting recruits from among eastern Congressmen to be sure that we will win this battle."

Nichols has become one of the leading beet-grower figures in efforts to obtain congressional action on the industry's problem.

Echo Park Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an interesting statement by Trustees for Conservation concerning Echo Park Dam, as follows:

ECHO PARK DAM STILL VERY MUCH ALIVE, ADAMS SAYS

Although Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument has been killed in the House version of Colorado River storage project legislation, it is still very much alive in Congress, Ansel Adams, president of Trustees for Conservation, warned here today.

Adams, an internationally famous photographer, twice holder of Guggenheim fellowships and author of many volumes of strikingly beautiful photographs of America's national parks and monuments, issued a message to conservationists everywhere, calling on them to redouble their efforts to defeat project legislation in order to save Dinosaur National Monument.

"The House subcommittee on irrigation has eliminated Echo Park Dam from the legislation but published statements by project proponents plainly indicate that this is only a stratagem to get the legislation through the House," Adams said.

"The Senate version already contains Echo Park Dam. The plan apparently is to get it back in the House version when Senate and House conference committee members meet to harmonize Senate and House bills.

"What else can this statement by Representative WILLIAM A. DAWSON of Utah mean: 'Echo Park Dam is now in a category where we feel it isn't lost by any means,' or this statement by United States Commissioner of Reclamation Wilbur A. Dexheimer: 'It is very possible that the Senate will restore Echo Park Dam to the project.'

"The national park system is actually in greater jeopardy now than ever before. Many persons, including Congressmen, will believe that Echo Park Dam has been eliminated and they will abandon their opposition to project legislation and let it go through.

"Conservationists should, instead, redouble their opposition. They should write their Congressmen again, no matter how many times they have written them, to vote against all Colorado River storage project legislation with or without Echo Park Dam. For, if the project is defeated now, as it should be, it will be returned to the Bureau of Reclamation to be revised as a complete and sound project without Echo Park Dam or any other dam invading a national park or monument.

"There is plenty of time for this revision since the upper Colorado River Basin States will not need the water storage provided by these dams for nearly 30 years."

Trustees for conservation, of which Adams is president, was organized last November expressly to fight legislative battles which old established conservation organizations, depending on tax-deductible gifts, cannot wage without imperiling their tax-free status. The trustees organization, claiming no tax-deductible status, is soliciting funds to fight these legislative battles.

Why the President Opposes TVA—His Uncompromising Position Regarding Dixon-Yates Deal Is Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and practice since being a Member of this body to send out from my office each week a weekly newsletter touching upon topics of interest to the people of the district and State which it is my privilege to represent.

In response to numerous inquiries, I took occasion in the newsletter dated June 27, 1955, to answer the question: "Why is the President against the TVA?" In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include this particular issue of our weekly newsletter in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The newsletter follows:

WHY THE PRESIDENT OPPOSES TVA

Following the recent fight in the House for funds for a needed expansion program for the TVA—a fight which failed following the personal intervention of President Eisenhower—the Representative of the Fourth District of Tennessee has received numerous letters and inquiries asking the basic question: "Why is the President against TVA?"

It is a normal question to be asked by Tennesseans and others who in the past regarded President Eisenhower's statements of friendship and approval of TVA on their face value and as statements outlining a firm and solid personal position.

The fourth district representative does not, of course, presume to intrude himself into the thinking of the Chief Executive. Over the past 2 years, however, and in the light of developments and actions emanating from the White House and elsewhere, he has, as have others, taken occasion to form a few views in this regard and submits this newsletter report as responsive to the many inquiries received on this subject.

President Eisenhower has advocated a number of measures which have been right and worthy of support, among these being his advocacy of the Cordell Hull policy of reciprocal trade agreements programs, and his course with regard to our foreign policy. On these and on other issues, I consider the position of the President sound and thus worthy of fullest possible support.

The number of issues on which President Eisenhower has exhibited accord with measures promoted and carried forward by previous administrations have, in fact, been numerous and for this reason his political advisers may have decided that opposition to some programs of the previous administration should be undertaken. The TVA would appear to be a logical target for such

opposition in view of its apparent—to some—regional nature. In other words, his advisers may have persuaded him that he cannot "stand for all things" but must be "against" some things—and the TVA would be a good "horse" to ride, and ride hard.

Still other factors would seem to have exerted a strong and irresistible influence in the President's thinking, chief of these has been former Gov. Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire, now chief administrative assistant to Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. Adams is reputed to be, in fact, the "assistant President," and through whom virtually most matters are "'filtered" or cleared at the White House. Further, former Governor Adams is a New Englander and an arch foe of public power, and as such, is a natural leader of the school of thought that New England is rapidly losing industry to the cheap-power region of the TVA. This is fallacious reasoning, but it is nevertheless a banner under which the enemies of TVA rally forcefully. As indicated, Governor Adams, President Eisenhower's No. 1 adviser, is known as a traditional enemy of TVA.

Another factor of vast importance in the President's adamant and uncomprising position against TVA and for the invasion of public power into the region, was the presence in the Bureau of the Budget of Adolf Wenzell, a former vice president of the First Boston Corporation, the financing agency looking to the working out of the so-called Dixon-Yates deal for the administration. Mr. Wenzell, as an unpaid but powerful and strategic appointee creditable to the big business and private power trust—friends of which are known to be well placed in the administration—can be credited with much of the force behind the Budget Bureau's anti-TVA position and its advocacy of the private power invasion of TVA. This anti-TVA opposition within the Bureau of the Budget and elsewhere has supported any measure to cripple the agency—whether it be cutting its appropriations, denying needed facilities, tight and restrictive financing proposals, and other slow-death maneuvers. A position which, in effect, issues the call to "get TVA at any cost."

Individuals in high positions within the administration, together with the traditonal opposition of ancient enemies of TVA, together with the determination of the administration to find an issue, together with the fact that President Eisenhower has surrounded himself with big business, financiers, and others whose knowledge of TVA is gained only through hearsay, have constituted an irresistably persuasive force at the White House.

The President himself, though he should not be excused, has not apparently been receptive to pro-TVA information and, therefore, has not received such information. His advisors, being opposed to TVA, have provided him with only one side of the story. So far as is known he has not pressed for information to give him a complete and accurate picture of this great agency.

Those of the President's party who were too clever and experienced to write their anti-TVA views into the party platform, have succeeded in making the President a captive of their unprogressive and backward philosophy with regard to public power. The pity of it is that President Eisenhower, many feel, is not fully aware of what has happened to him—captured by those with whom he has surrounded himself.

But that something has happened to him—that he has become a captive of anti-TVA influences and TVA foes—can be easily judged by a simple comparison of his campaign speeches on TVA—advocating TVA operations at maximum efficiency—with his more recent assertions against TVA as an example of creeping socialism and like statement emanating from the White House.

Marines Pay Homage to Fallen Comrades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story by Paul Sampson which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sunday, June 26, 1955 regarding the fighting men from four Marine divisions who gathered at the Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington to pay homage to their fallen comrades:

MARINES PAY HOMAGE TO FALLEN COMRADES

(By Paul Sampson)

Fighting men from four Marine divisions gathered at the Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington yesterday to pay homage to their fallen comrades.

The solemn ceremony high-lighted the 2-day reunion here of 5,000 veterans of the First, Third, Fifth and Sixth Marine Divisions.

Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, sounded the keynote of the ceremony in his brief speech when he said:

"For our departed friends we grieve that it was their fate to die in order to make victory possible. But our sadness is shared by a deep and abiding pride in their courage and their deeds. And from this pride must come our own strong resolve that the purpose of their sacrifice shall be cherished and safeguarded."

BUDDIES LOST

Many of the men in the audience had lost buddies at Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Guadalcanal, Korea and at other places where the proud corps had unfurled its battle flags.

Shepherd reminded the marines and former marines at the memorial grounds that their departed comrades "knew that those of us who lived on would not leave the battle unfinished."

More than 3,500 marines, former marines, and their families braved gray skies and a light intermittent rain that started falling just before the ceremony started. The roof and balconies of nearby Arlington Towers were lined with spectators.

The formal part of the ceremony ended with the Marine Band and a bugler playing taps. Another bugler stood alone against the dark mass of the monument, echoing the plaintive bugle call.

After the formal ceremonies, the troops passed in review to the strains of the Marine Hymn and the cheers of the crowd. An intricate silent drill by the First Platoon of the Ceremonial Battalion from the Marine Barracks and a drum and bugle corps concert ended the events.

The ceremony was the main event in a day that was packed with reunions, reminiscence, and rollicking good times.

SIXTH DIVISION

The Sixth Division—smallest group meeting here—wound up its formal activities with a luncheon at the Mayflower Hotel. The Sixth was the last division to be evacuated in World War II, and all of its members were drawn from other divisions.

It's a division dear to the heart of General Shepherd, who trained it and was its first commander. General Shepherd attended the luncheon yesterday and recalled memories of the unit's brief but action-filled history.

"It was an outstanding organization, and it carried the ball on Okinawa from the beginning to the end," he said.

Okinawa loomed large in the memories of those at the Sixth's reunion. It was just 10 years ago this week that the Okinawa campaign ended.

Stanley Galazka, of Hartford, Conn., a rifleman in the Fourth Regiment, said, "My regiment was made up mostly of Marine Raiders. I felt like a kid next to those guys, and I'm grateful to them for being alive. They really taught me the ropes. Quite a few didn't come back."

Over at the Fifth Division headquarters in the Statler the conversations centered about Iwo Jima, for the Fifth's campaign was the battle for Iwo Jima.

Draped over a table in the Statler lobby and guarded by a marine was the division's prize possession—the flag that was raised over Mount Suribachi. The Fifth also exhibited several pieces of Japanese ordnance captured on Iwo.

The First Division, largest of the four, was entrenched at the Willard Hotel. Members wound up their reunion with a gala banquet and ball. Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador, thanked the men of the division for their aid to his country in a brief speech at the dinner.

The Third Division, with headquarters at the Raleigh Hotel, held a banquet and dance at which Gen. Graves B. Erskine (Retired), who commanded the Third on Iwo, and Lt. Gen. A. H. Turnage (Retired), who headed the division on Bougainville and Guam, were honored guests.

Lt. Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, assistant commandant of the corps, spoke at the Fifth's banquet at the Statler.

Members of the First, Third, and Fifth Division Associations elected officers yesterday morning. Officers include:

First: Maj. Gen. Edward W. Snedeker, now commander of Second Marine Division, president; Reuben Sherman, New York City; Warren R. Haas, Monrovia Lake, N. J.; Col. Lewis B. Walt, Quantico, Va.; and Dr. Lester M. Lucas, Alexandria, vice presidents; Col. Joseph J. Keating, Marine Corps Headquarters, secretary; Lt. Col. David R. Griffin, headquarters, treasurer.

Third: Lt. Gen. E. A. Craig (retired), La Mesa, Calif., president; Ralph Horgan, Bethesda, Md., R. C. Torrance, Seattle, Wash., E. W. Foote, Berkeley, Calif., and George di Falco, Worcester, Mass., vice presidents; John Bugel, Los Angeles, secretary; Col. Morris Shively, San Diego, treasurer; and John Minnick, Arlington, legal officer.

Fifth: Duncan Cocke, Williamsburg, Va., president; Dr. Bernard Botsch, Detroit, Comdr. Leon Eisman, Great Lakes, Ill, Francis Murtaugh, Montpelier, Vt., and Richard O'Toole, Ayer, Mass., vice presidents; and Mickey Maguire, sergeant at arms.

Discriminatory Transportation Tax on Travel to the Caribbean and Central American Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as additional evidence of the growing interest in the repeal of the discriminatory tax on transportation to the Caribbean and Central American areas, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Miami Herald on June 20:

REPEAL WOULD BE GOOD WILL GESTURE

Holiday's news letter notes a revived move for repeal of the 10-percent travel tax as it applies in the Caribbean and Central American areas.

Repeal of the levy would increase inter-American travel and thereby contribute directly and effectively toward enhancing good will and understanding between this country and our neighbors.

Companion bills to effect the repeal are pending in Congress, one sponsored by Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, the other by Representative DANTE FASCELL.

The State and Commerce Departments are committed to testify for the bills or any similar measure.

Up to now the Treasury has said nothing to show that it would give up its opposition to any action on the travel tax at this time.

It has argued that to do so would open the door to other tax cuts. That does not follow at all.

There is no movement on the part of the travel industry at this time for the removal of the entire travel tax.

It realizes that wholesale repeal would not be possible under current administration policy before 1956. It is content with the limited repeal.

World tensions have highlighted the need for firming up hemispheric solidarity. Abolishment of the travel tax, as it affects the Caribbean and Central America, would be a practical gesture toward rapprochement that would not be lost on our neighbors to the immediate south. Repeal should be made at this session.

The National Cancer Institute—Importance of Increased Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, an editorial in the New York Times of Sunday, June 26, cites the difference between the House and the Senate appropriations for fiscal year 1956 for the National Cancer Institute, of the Public Health Service. The editorial points out the merits of the Senate figure of $26,400,000, and makes it clear the House should move up to that figure from its own level of $22,328,000. I agree with this position, and I hope that when the conference is held in the next few days, the Cancer Institute will be voted the funds it needs in order to expand the research program it is administering throughout the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANCER RESEARCH

The House Committee on Appropriations has recommended for the fiscal year 1956 the expenditure of $22,328,000 by the National Cancer Institute; the corresponding Senate committee has increased the sum to $26,400,000. The difference of $4,072,000 means little in these days of military expenditures that run into the billions but it means much in terms of cancer research. Given this difference the National Cancer Institute will be able to expand its studies of chemical means for treating cancer and to strengthen its support of basic research.

The chemical treatment of cancer is a fact today. Leukemia, a sort of cancer of the blood, and diseases like it account for about half the deaths from cancer in children. There is no surgical method of dealing with the disease, but there are chemical means of which we ought to take more advantage than we do. Indeed, such is the progress recorded in recent years that Dr. Cornelius Rhoads of the Sloan-Kettering Institute boldly declared in Washington that if our scientific and above all our chemical knowledge were more fully exploited "both the medical cure of many forms of cancer and perhaps its elimination altogether" is probable. Dr. Sidney Farber of the Children Cancer Foundation of Boston made a deep impression when he reported to the Senate committee the case of a 3-month-old boy who was doomed to death by an adrenal tumor which had spread to the liver and the skeleton. One of the chemicals given for leukemia was administered. Six years have elapsed. There is no evidence of tumor today.

The committee heard a dozen tales like this. It was manifestly impressed. We hope that when the bill goes to conference within the next few days the impression will be intensified.

Increasing Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, during the last few months, there has been much discussion relative to the importation of oil. Total imports of crude and products for the week ending June 17 were up 124,000 barrels from the average of the preceding week, and up 227,500, or 23.4 percent, above the average in the comparable week of 1954.

Domestic production in all of our oil-producing States has been reduced. For example, Texas has only 15 allowable days for the months of June and July.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Oil Daily on Thursday, June 23.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL OIL IMPORTS RISE 11.5 PERCENT FOR WEEK; WELL ABOVE YEAR AGO

An increase in imports of crude oil accounted for the total increase of 11.5 percent in imports of crude and products in the week ended June 17.

Total imports of crude and products in the week averaged 1,201,500 barrels daily, up 124,000 barrels from the average of 1,077,500 in the preceding week, and were 227,500, or 23.4 percent, above the average of 974,000 in the like year-earlier week.

Imports in the 4-week period ended June 17 averaged 1,184,700 barrels daily, 163,400, or 16 percent, above the average of 1,021,300 in the like 4-week period a year ago.

Receipts of crude for the country as a whole were up 125,900 barrels daily in the week, averaging 844,500, compared with 718,600 in the preceding week, and were 189,900 higher than the average for the like year-earlier week.

Imports of crude east of California were 33.7 percent, or 205,400 barrels daily, higher in the latest week, averaging 814,200, compared with 608,800, but receipts in California declined 79,500, from 109,800 to 30,300 barrels daily.

Receipts of residual fuel showed little change, gaining 15,300 barrels daily in the week, from 316,700 to 332,000 barrels daily, but still held 78,800, or 31.1 percent, higher than the average of 253,200 in the like year-earlier week.

Imports of all other products declined in the latest week. No receipts of distillates were reported, compared with imports of 6,700 in the preceding week; asphalt declined from an average of 19,300 to 13,400 in the latest week, with receipts of other petroleum products off from 16,200 to 11,600 barrels daily.

The Solid-Gold Reclamation Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the lead editorial of the Los Angeles Times, June 23, 1955, commenting on the report of the National Council of State Chambers of Commerce, in my judgment, merits careful and thoughtful study on the part of all those not fully informed on the proposed upper Colorado project. Bear in mind these figures are based upon estimates by the Corps of Army Engineers and, in my judgment, are irrefutable. May I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be reproduced in the RECORD?

The editorial follows:

THE SOLID GOLD RECLAMATION PLAN

The California contention that the upper Colorado project now pending in Congress is costly beyond all reason is fully upheld by a report just made to the Council of State Chambers of Commerce by its research department.

CALIFORNIA'S OPPOSITION

Opposition to the project on the part of California has been referred to in some of the upper Colorado States as purely selfish and as an attempt to grab more than our share of water from the river.

But when the self-interest of California coincides with the general welfare and the interests of taxpayers everywhere, we need have no hesitation in using our best efforts to defeat this solid gold scheme—not only solid gold but studded with jewels besides.

And the figures of the council's research department do show how absurd the scheme is from an economic standpoint. As an example, the report cites that when interest costs are added to construction costs the irrigation features of the plan work out to an average of $4,719 an acre.

ESTIMATES ARE LOW

Further, these figures are based on estimates by the Bureau of Reclamation and Army engineers, whose estimates are notoriously low. The House Public Works Committee pointed out in 1942, after an investigation, that the total costs of all Bureau of Reclamation projects, except for the Missouri River, stood at 106 percent above the original estimates, while the Missouri River projects were up 274 percent. The Corps of Engineers estimates on 182 projects were off 124 percent.

The possibility of the project ever paying for itself is thus conservatively stated by the report as "questionable." The figures look more like "impossible."

As for hydropower, this, it is figured, will have to be sold at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour at the bus bar to justify the hydroelectric features. The same basin has vast resources of coal, oil, natural gas, oil shale and uranium, capable of furnishing thermal-generated electric energy very cheaply; and the notion that anybody would pay 6 mills is regarded as "optimistic" in the report. Optimistic seems to be putting it very mildly.

The upper Colorado project as passed by the Senate was greatly expanded from the recommendations of the administration. The House committee has trimmed it down by leaving out the highly controversial Echo Park Dam and Reservoir, which would destroy the Dinosaur National Monument. But even without this project the estimated cost is close to a billion dollars which, if the estimates are off as much as they usually are, could be two or three billion dollars before the projects were completed.

Conservationists who have opposed the Echo Park project fear that it will be slipped back into the bill if and when the measure goes to conference committee.

LANDS NOT NEEDED

As to the benefits to agriculture and the Nation's need for land on which to grow food, the report also sheds some light. These lands are not currently needed, it comments; but if they were, there are at least 20 million unused acres east of the Rocky Mountains which can be reclaimed at a fraction of the cost in the upper Colorado Basin.

The effect on Californians as taxpayers of this gigantic gold brick may be judged from the fact that California taxpayers pay 9.22 percent of all Federal taxes and the share of the ultimate cost of the project that would be loaded on our shoulders is estimated, in the report of the council's research department, at more than $230 million.

If what is contemplated is also constructed this figure would rise to $468 million.

This is the largest share to be paid by any State except New York which pays 14.75 percent of Federal taxes.

Government Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to go on record as being in favor of the Government Employees' Salary Increase Act of 1955, S. 67, since I was unavoidably detained from casting my vote on this measure when it first came up on the floor. I was returning from Florida and my plane did not arrive in time to permit me to be on the floor when the vote was taken. As a matter of fact, I reached the floor only minutes after the vote was taken. I would like the RECORD to show, as I have previously stated, that I was in favor of the bill and had planned to cost my vote in full support of it when it was first brought up on the floor of the House. However, I was present and voted for the passage of the bill after it had been agreed upon by the conference committee.

It is my feeling that our Government employees are entitled to and deserve a raise in salary; certainly their salaries should be kept commensurate with salaries paid outside governmental service. I believe this group of efficient, loyal, and hard-working employees deserve this small raise.

Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, Renowned Tennessee Lecturer and Writer, Made His Start as Schoolboy Orator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in the Lebanon Democrat, Wilson County, Tenn., an account of the first speech delivered by the now-famous lecturer and writer, Dr. Frederick Taylor Wilson, a native of Wilson County, Tenn.

This account, warmly and humanly told by Dr. Wilson, may take many of us back to our schooldays and our first public declamation. From this labored and frightened beginning emerged one of the most outstanding platform speakers and writers of our day. I believe this account of Dr. Taylor's earliest efforts will be of interest and I ask consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The newspaper account follows:

It has been my good fortune over a period of years to deliver many addresses in many different States. The memory of no one of them is more vivid to me than the memory of my very first attempt at making a speech in public which was all my own.

The place was in an old log Methodist meeting house called Corinth, located in a rural section of Jackson County, Tenn., across the river called Cumberland from the little village of Granville. I was at that time yet in my teens and was employed as a clerk in the general store of my uncle, Fred Kelly, at Granville.

The occasion was the annual Children's Day at the Corinth Sunday School, and a large audience of friends and neighbors were gathered there to encourage the timid young children who took part in the program and to meet and greet each other. Poor roads, no telephones, and very infrequent public meetings made any get-together in that section a community event.

The superintendent of the Sunday School was a well-meaning but uneducated man. He was a customer in the store where I worked and was my friend. So, naturally, I was greatly flattered when he invited me to come to the annual Children's Day celebration and appear on the program. Needless to say I was most uncertain of myself as the time approached for the historic event in my own life. The program had advanced for quite a while, when the practical man presiding announced that there would be a brief intermission so that, as he expressed it, "the folks could find out how this here thing had took."

When that announcement was made I found myself retreating to the nearby woods trembling in fear. I was soon safely hidden behind a big beech tree praying God for courage. In a little while the church bell called the crowd together again. So I screwed up to the sticking point my newborn courage and returned to the lowly meeting place, ready for my act.

My introducer may have been unlettered but he was clever even if crude in introducing me. He told the story of the country boy whose mother gave him eggs to "set" under two hens, but who in his haste to finish his task put all of the eggs under "Old Spec" his favorite hen. When the mother learned of her son's shortcut action she asked him how he expected "Old Spec" to cover so many eggs. The boy quickly replied "Just spread herself, Mammy, just spread herself." Then turning to me the chairman for the day said, "Now Fred, jest spread yerself." I cannot say that I did that. But I can say that I succeeded well enough to be invited back 1 year later as the principal speaker of the day at a similar celebration.

My conclusion, after many years experience in speaking is that the acid test of success in any address made lies not in being introduced in a flattering way or in receiving much applause at the end, but in being invited back to speak for a second time.

At the period mentioned, my education was most limited. As I now recall it no dream even for a higher education had then appeared upon my mental horizon. All that was to come later when the larger opportunities which were mine opened up to me a new world.

Near the church where I spoke, in the long ago, there had long rested the remains of many of my maternal ancestors. Two of that number were among my great-great-grandparents. Perhaps the spirits of these ancestors hovered about me as I spoke. Who knows?

At any rate that was one of my red letter days.

Statement of George Meany, President of A. F. of L., on Salk Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, because the matter of distribution of the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine is still very much unsettled and a problem of great concern to the public, and because legislation on the controversial aspects of the issue is still pending before Congress, I consider it appropriate to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement released by President George Meany of the American Federation of Labor, dealing with this vital problem. Mr. Meany's statement contains much in the way of constructive thought on the basic issues involved and I commend it to all Members of Congress for that reason:

The American Federation of Labor joins in the nationwide sense of relief and happiness over the great discovery of Dr. Salk which puts in our hands an effective weapon against polio. We also share the concern of the people and our Government over the fact that the vaccine is apparently available now only in limited supply. Dr. Salk and his associates have done their part. It is now up to the people of America to develop procedures that will make this lifesaving drug available to all who need it.

We are pleased to note that in response to this need President Eisenhower has directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to organize a voluntary system for allocating the Salk vaccine. However, we are concerned that the first announcements listing the representatives who are to be invited appear to include only professional and business groups and not the people who are most concerned—the parents of the children of America. The assistance of the medical and public health professions and the manufacturers of the vaccine is, of course, necessary to provide essential technical aid in solving the problem. However, the matter of distributing the vaccine presents basic economic, social, and humanitarian problems which are not within the special competence of the medical profession and the pharmaceutical industry. The American Federation of Labor calls upon the President and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare immediately to broaden the invitations to the conference to include representatives of the religious faiths, workers, farmers, and the great women's organizations.

Furthermore, we think that the use and distribution of this vaccine is a matter in which the whole Nation is involved in behalf of all of its children. As the supply is increased to meet the full need, no American child should go without it because his parents have low income or live in a place with few doctors. While the supply is limited its use should be rationed according to priorities of medical need and under auspices which insure that children in the poorest sections of this country should have opportunity to benefit equally with those in more fortunate areas. To achieve these ends, an official national policy is necessary, and if any such policy is to be effective a substantial part of the supply of the Salk vaccine must be purchased and distributed through the public health agencies. In order that the wealthier States shall have no advantage, there must be national funds available. We call upon Congress to take up this matter immediately as a nonpartisan measure and to make available without delay whatever appropriation our governmental and other experts consider necessary to assure the people of the United States that this preventive against a dreaded disease shall be administered with fairness for all, with priviliges for none.

The discovery of a vaccine to prevent deaths and crippling from polio has been brought to mankind by physicians and other scientists working in laboratories and clinics without the lure of financial profit to themselves but with the incentives of science and of human service. The research that brought the Salk vaccine into existence has been paid for by the dimes and dollars of millions of Americans who wished their money to be used for the benefit of all. These people have now a right to share in the further task of making this great discovery available to all the children of the Nation.

A Stamp for the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Stamp for Handicapped May Yet Be Authorized," written by James Waldo Foster and published in the Sunday Star of June 26, 1955. The article refers to a commemorative stamp which it is proposed to have issued to aid in the work for the handicapped.

If ever there was a need for a stamp to commemorate any matter, certainly this stamp comes within that category.

The article refers to the excellent work of Marine Corps General Melvin J. Maas on behalf of the handicapped. It is a very timely article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAMP FOR HANDICAPPED MAY YET BE AUTHORIZED

(By James Waldo Fawcett)

Once again but perhaps not finally, the Post Office Department has turned down an appeal from the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped for a stamp in aid of its work.

The petition was submitted originally 4 years ago. It recently was renewed by Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, USMCR (retired), chairman of the body authorized by act of Congress "to enlist the cooperation of public and private groups in a year-round program to promote employment of physically handicapped workers." The Department replied that it was "unable to include a stamp" for this purpose "in this year's program."

Lack of sympathy for the campaign, however, was not the reason for the refusal. The Post Office Department is one of three Federal Government agencies which have been granted the distinguished service certificate of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. It permits the use of appropriate slogan cancellation dies in the interest of the drive, and it also allows the use of billboard space on the sides of trucks for posters intended to serve the same endeavor.

Postmaster General Summerfield personally is a member of the committee and has been one of the most effective speakers in its behalf. His predecessor, former Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson, promised the committee a stamp but never found opportunity to keep the promise.

One of the difficulties involved is that of developing an appropriate design for the desired adhesive. The Heraldic Office of the Quartermaster General, United States Army, prepared four black-and-white sketches for the consideration of the Post Office Department but none of the lot proved acceptable. A color sketch by John J. Kennelly of the Department of Labor also was rejected on ideological grounds.

William P. McCahill, executive secretary of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, commenting on the problem, told the Star last week: "We would be delighted to have ideas or drawings representing ideas submitted to us to be referred in due course to the Postmaster General. There must be scores of artists and writers in Washington and hundreds throughout the country who would be glad to help us to find a really first-class dramatization of our work in behalf of the 30 million Americans who are handicapped and yet are employable."

The committee does not want a commemorative stamp. It wishes the Post Office Department to issue a regular postal adhesive which would remain in common use for at least a year. General Maas has explained the committee's appeal in these words: "We really need such a stamp to dramatize our campaign to those Americans who have not yet heard of it."

A veteran of both World Wars, the general has been bind since 1951. He was born in Duluth, May 14, 1898, enlisted in the Marine Corps in 1917 and served with the 1st Marine Aero Company based in the Azores. Appointed a first lieutenant in the Volunteer Marine Corps Reserve in 1926 and a colonel in 1938, he won the Silver Star for gallantry in action over New Guinea in 1942. Meanwhile, he was a Representative in Congress from Minnesota from 1927 to 1933 and again from 1935 through a term ending in 1945. He received a Carnegie Hero Fund Medal for disarming a maniac in the House gallery in 1932. Wounded in combat when commander of Awase Airbase in Okinawa in 1945, he was given the Legion of Merit for outstanding services. He is a past president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association and resides in Silver Spring, Md.

General Maas and Mr. Summerfield are very close friends, and associates of both men say they speak the same language.

The proposed Employ the Handicapped stamp should be released early in October and thus launch the 1955 intensive month-long effort of the committee to find jobs for worthy and efficient though handicapped workers.

ROBERTSON AT FRANCONIA

Assistant Postmaster General Albert J. Robertson, speaking at Franconia, N. H., Tuesday, when the 3-cent Great Stone Face stamp went on first-day sale, quoted the French traveler, Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-59) as saying in 1835: "I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there; in her rich mines and her vast commerce, and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ceases to be good America will cease to be great."

This sentiment, Mr. Robertson declared, "sums up the real strength of our country. It is as true today as it was 120 years ago and will be 120 years hence. America is great through her goodness. And if we can impress that fact on our children and our children's children, then the future of this country and of freedom-loving countries in all parts of the world will be in good hands."

Proposed Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to the proposal to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy to review the operation of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, and to recommend changes in the act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

There can be little disagreement over the need to amend the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. The coauthor of the act, a House Judiciary Committee Report on its administration and those officials of the Gov-

ernment charged with administering the act have all indicated the desirability of amending certain sections. President Eisenhower, the leaders of both political parties, and representatives of major religious, labor, civic, and other groups have called for amendments. Some minor amendments have passed without most of us realizing it. Since passage of the act, 10 bills have been proposed in the Senate and about 50 in the House to revise it; and it has been involved in approximately 28,000 court cases, in many of which the courts found difficulties or conflicts in interpretation.

The difficult is in determining exactly what amendments are desirable at this time. The entire subject of immigration—which involves a legal jungle of complex and technical details that very few Members of Congress are able to comprehend in their entirety—has become further confused with issues of partisan politics and emotional and prejudicial exchanges of extravagant praise and criticism. Very little has been said about the actual operation of the act during the past 2 years, and its consequences on our economy, security, foreign policy, and social welfare. It is my hope that a bipartisan blue-ribbon commission, including representatives of the executive and legislative branches as well as the public, will take this controversial subject out of politics, impartially analyze the administration of the act, and provide a detached and dignified report on which a large part of the Congress and the public can agree. Such a study, it seems to me, would be of value to both the supporters and the critics of the act, as well as those charged with its administration and enforcement.

Although a commission appointed by President Truman in 1952 performer a valuable service in its study of the law, the McCarran Act had not yet gone into operation at the time its findings were made. Moreover its hearings were conducted in the midst of a hated political campaign; and, inasmuch as the appointment of the Commission and its report were considered by some to be partisan in nature, these finding have been largely discarded.

A new, bipartisan, high-level commission would now be able to examine actual experience under the act. Several experts in immigration law, while disagreeing on the merits of the act and the direction in which any amendments should move, have agreed that the time is ripe for a reexamination of this problem. As I recall, the sponsors of the present act urged at the time of its passage that the law be continually reexamined in the light of experience with its various provisions. Many administrative prectices under the act have been criticized by its sponsors as well as its opponents; and both groups have from time to time called for a review of the act and its operations, as has the President.

Although there are many of us on both sides of this controversy who would prefer to see immediate amendments enacted by the present session of Congress, it is apparent that such amendments are not llikely in the supercharged atmosphere that presently surrounds the act.

What America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include remarks What America Means to Me, made by Gilbert Y. Chin, president of the Boston (Mass.) Metropolitan Junior Red Cross Chapter Council, and appearing in the May 1955 issue of the American Junior Red Cross Journal:

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME
(By Gilbert Y. Chin)

My earliest conception of America dates back to the time when I was a 2-year-old. One day I asked my mother where my father was, seeing that other boys had papas as well as mamas. And my mother replied, "Your daddy is making money at the Gold Mountain, a place called America. When his pockets are full, he will come home." So ever since that time, I have always associated America with the Gold Mountain. Then, as I grew up, I learned from school that America is translated into Chinese as the "beautiful country," and the American flag as the "flower flag."

Now that 5 years have elapsed since I first took a look at the Gold Mountain, I realize that my early conceptions were not wrong. The term "Gold Mountain" is certainly no exaggeration for the riches of this country. The American flag is truly like a flower, and America itself is without question a very beautiful country. But out of all these, as I have lived in this country longer and longer, and as I have begun to understand more fully the real America, there has come to me a special meaning—a meaning which has overshadowed all my previous conceptions.

First, America is the land of freedom and of liberty. Before I came to the United States, I had never read a newspaper which printed articles criticizing the Government. I did not know what an election was, and what was meant by the term "democracy." Wasn't I greatly surprised, then, to find the degree of freedom in America? Freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom to assemble peaceably—in other words, freedom to the fullest extent without injuring that of other people. Yes, these basic freedoms have become treasures to me, and I am sure they are to you.

My mind often wanders a little bit as I come upon the Declaration of Independence or the Bill of Rights, or the long list of our Presidents, chosen by the will of the people. During the heat of the election of 1952, I was listening to my radio at 2 o'clock in the morning—partly because I was anxious to know the results, as others were, but to a greater extent I was just wondering why such a free, democratic election could not prevail in some other parts of the world.

Secondly, to me America is the land of opportunity. I came from a tiny, obscure village in southeastern China, 10,000 miles away. There the people are mostly farmers, not the kind of farmers you have in mind, with those big tractors and irrigational canals and hundreds of acres of land. Oh no. On the average each man has less than half an acre of land, and most of them do not own lands. There they were born; there they pass away. There is no outlet, no chance to rise in the social scale.

Here in America I need not tell you, things are different. In my mind's eye I can see the Polish Jew who came to this country as a DP in 1948 with $1.67 in his pocket besides a little broken English. Today he is the head of a company which makes more than $30 million a year, thanks to the American system, and thanks to the fact that he remembered a kind of sawing machine in his native Poland that in many ways excels the American make.

Each year thousands and thousands of people rise from lowly nothing to highly everything simply because there is no legal class distinction in America. The door of opportunity is open to all—to every man of every creed, of every race, and of every nationality. And the only necessary tools to attain a goal are ability and hard work and determination.

So then to me, as to millions who have sought their haven in these United States, America has become a symbol of liberty and of opportunity—and, a land beautiful. As I recall these familiar words of Katharine Lee Bates' America the Beautiful, I know they are the summary of what America means to me:

"America, America,
God shed His grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood,
From sea to shining sea."

Five Thousand Marine Veterans Wind Up 3-Day Reunion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story, which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., June 25, 1955, concerning the reunion of marine veterans of four World War II divisions in Washington, D. C.:

FIVE THOUSAND MARINE VETERANS WIND UP 3-DAY REUNION

Marine veterans of four World War II divisions prepared to bid one another goodby and head for home today after their biggest reunion since the war.

More than 5,000 former leathernecks of a dozen campaigns swapped tales, wined and dined, acted on business matters and paid solemn tribute to their war dead during the 3-day stand.

The highlight of the joint reunion of the 1st, 3d, 5th and 6th Divisions was a ceremonial parade and memorial observance at the Marine Corps War Memorial at Arlington.

Uniformed in crisp dress blues, the ceremonial battalion from the Washington Marine Barracks stood at attention before the enormous statue of the Iwo Jima flag raising. A crowd of 3,500 persons braved intermittent showers to see the parade and hear an address by Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, jr., commandant of the corps.

"No group is better fitted to understand the true meaning of this memorial or the real purpose of our ceremony this afternoon," said General Shepherd, "than the comrades-in-arms of the brave men we seek to honor."

"UNCOMMON VALOR"

All eyes focused on the monument. Above it, the flag fluttered in a steady north wind. Around its black stone base, the gold letters listing Marine battles from the Revolutionary War to Korea shone dully. A red-and-yellow floral wreath in the shape of the Marine insignia stood beside the inscription honoring the Marine heroes—"uncommon valor was a common virtue."

"If the brave men we honor knew compassion," said General Shepherd, "let us be compassionate.

"If they were tolerant—let us add to the wisdom of tolerance to our lives.

"And if duty was to them a compelling force, let us never avoid the path of duty.

"Let us all go forward in their name to serve the Nation they died to defend."

BENEDICTION PRONOUNCED

Rear Admiral Edward B. Harp, Jr., Chief of Chaplains, pronounced the benediction, and the liquid notes of "Taps" sounded from a

single bugle. Its refrain was echoed once quietly by the Marine Band and then a second time by a red-coated bugler at the base of the monument.

The audience stood for the playing of the National Anthem and then the review was on. After the battalion had passed the stand, a precision silent drill was staged by the unit's first platoon, commanded by 1st Lt. Richard F. Daley.

Among those in the reviewing stand with General Shepherd were Lt. Gen. Keller E. Rockey, who commanded the 5th Division on Iwo Jima; Gen. Graves B. Erskine, who led the 3d Division at Iwo; Maj. Gen. Merritt A. (Red Mike) Edson, leader of Edson's Raiders in World War II, and Allen Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

After the ceremony, the divisions held separate banquets and balls—the 1st at the Willard, the 3d at the Raleigh, and the 5th at the Statler. The 6th Division veterans, not yet in an association like the others, held a luncheon earlier in the day at the Mayflower.

KOREAN ENVOY ATTENDS

Among the guests at the 1st Division banquet, along with a double handful of top-ranking brass, were Korean Ambassador You Chan Yang and Brig. Gen. W. S. MacKinnon, New Zealand Military Attaché.

"We Koreans are called the Irish of the Orient," Dr. Yang said amidst laughter. "But we have a name for the Irish too—we call them the Koreans of the Occident."

In a more serious vein, the ambassador expressed the "heart-felt gratitude of all Koreans for what you Marines have done in Korea and elsewhere in the world to preserve our way of life—a democratic way of life."

General MacKinnon told the cheering group of 700 1st Division veterans and their wives that New Zealanders "have a special regard for the Corps of United States Marines.

"New Zealand's life was saved in World War II by the Navy's victory in the Coral Sea and by the Marines who checked the Japanese advance at Guadalcanal—you can see why the Marines have a special place in our hearts."

COMMANDER CHEERED

The former leathernecks rocked the Willard ballroom with cheer after cheer as their former commanders were introduced. The biggest hand of all went to Gen. Alexander A. Vandergrift, former Corps commandant who led the 1st Division on Guadalcanal. They also applauded 3 of the 4 generals who commanded the division in Korea: Lt. Gen. O. P. Smith, Lt. Gen. Gerald C. Thomas, and Lt. Gen. John Seldon, retired. Also introduced were General Edson, General Shepherd, and Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

General Shepherd, who commanded the division in its one campaign, Okinawa, spoke at the luncheon. It was attended by about 60 officers and enlisted men who had fought on the island.

He asked them to remember that Easter Sunday morning in April 1945, when the 4th and 22d Marine Regiments led the assault that seized Yontan airfield on the first day ashore, "which I had set for 2 days."

He told of the Japanese plane that landed on the strip. The pilot got out all unknowing.

"The boys of the 4th held their fire very well," the general said. "But when he started for the tower with his brief case he was cut down by machinegun fire.

"I remember how a Marine walked over and looked down at him.

" 'There's always some poor s. o. b.,' said the sergeant, 'who doesn't get the word.' "

He outlined the high points of the campaign: the 10 days of fighting at Motobu Peninsula that ended resistance at the north end of the island.

A SHORT REST PERIOD

"We thought we could take a well-deserved rest and let the XXth Corps take the rest of the island," he said. "But the rest period turned out to be a short one and we were called upon to help our fellow divisions of the Army."

The 1st Division, at a business meeting, elected Maj. Gen. E. W. Snedeker president. General Snedeker is now commanding general of the 2d Division but is in the process of being transferred to Washington for duty. As association president, he succeeds J. Wallace Scott, of Philadelphia.

Three local men were elected to office:

Dr. Lester M. Lucas, 507 Queen Street, Alexandria, a dentist, elected fourth vice president; James J. Keating, 3513 Macomb Street NW., elected secretary, and David R. Griffin, 3208 North Nineteenth Road, Arlington, elected treasurer.

General Snedeker was elected over a former corporal, now a New York City businessman, Reuben Sherman, by a six-vote margin. The vote was 72 to 66. Speakers supporting the general cited the advantage of prestige by his election and the ease with which cooperation could be gotten from Marine Corps Headquarters on some problems. Speakers for the former corporal, who served with the 11th Regiment of the 1st Division during World War II, said all presidents in the years since the association was founded, in 1949, have been ranking officers. It was time to draw on former enlisted men, they argued.

OTHERS WHO WERE CHOSEN

Others elected to office were Mr. Sherman, first vice president; Warren R. Haas, of Mountain Lakes, N. J., second vice president; Lewis B. Walt, of Quantico, third vice president; the Reverend James M. Rogers, of Boston, chaplain; Juel C. Shook, of Los Angeles, sergeant at arms; and Ralph E. Marson, of New York City, legal officer.

The association voted to transfer $5,000 from its general fund to its scholarship fund for war orphans of Marines killed in action in Pacific and in Korea. The transfer brought the fund up to $32,000.

CONVENTION SITE PICKED

The 5th Division, holding a business meeting in the Statler, chose Miami for its 1956 convention site.

The division also elected Duncan Koch, of Williamsburg, Va., as its new president.

General Rocky, retired, presided over the 5th Division session as the members heard a report on their scholarship fund. The association has $3,000 already and hopes to raise the amount to $10,000 for scholarships for sons and daughters of 5th Division Marines who lost their lives in World War II.

There were 354 fathers killed, all on Iwo Jima. They left 578 children, most of them now in their teens. The first recipient of a scholarship was Bryan Isaacs, son of Lt. Leonard Isaacs of New Orleans. He is now finishing his first year at Columbia University with high marks.

A second recipient, Miss Mary Joanne Butler, daughter of Lt. Col. John Butler, of Mobile, Ala., will start college this fall at Springhill College, Mobile. Both scholarships are being paid for out of funds donated separately and leave the scholarship fund intact.

TWO APPLICATIONS GRANTED

The scholarship committee, headed by Maj. P. L. Wilson, retired, of Mobile, Ala., approved 2 more applications during the convention. One is for Miss Ohma Clampitt of Salinas, Calif., daughter of Pfc. Omer W. Clampitt. The other is for Miss Wanda Nelson of New Plymouth, Idaho, daughter of Pfc. Luther M. Nelson.

The 3d Division Association, in its business session, voted to undertake a drive to recognize young Marines who did not serve in World War II.

The association agreed that the individual Marine now serving in the Pacific theater with the 3d Division "is every bit as good as the Marine in World War II."

Lt. Gen. E. A. Craig, retired, acting president of the association, was elected president. He commanded the first Marine troops to join the Korean fighting at the Pusan perimeter. The group also voted to hold its next convention in Chicago, at a time to be decided later.

Alaska Statehood

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 10, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2535) to enable the people of Hawaii and Alaska each to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this bill gives us an almost unequaled opportunity to demonstrate before the world whether we in the United States really believe in the things we so often talk about or whether we do not believe in them.

I am in favor of the bill for a good many reasons, and the more I study it the more I am in favor of it. I recognize that the case for Alaska is not yet as good as the case for Hawaii, but considering the total picture and with the proposed modifications of Alaskan boundaries so that the new State would not be too overburdened with certain vast areas that are already Federally owned and are important largely for national defense, I believe not only that Alaska is entitled to statehood, but that it will be of great advantage to the United States to have her as a member of our sisterhood of States.

When it comes to Hawaii, with which I have had a good deal more experience, I have an even greater conviction that we should pass the bill overwhelmingly. We need Hawaii as much as Hawaii needs us. We need her not only because of what she can contribute to our security and our overall position in the Pacific, but because of what she demonstrates to people all around the world regarding the nature of American democracy at its best.

Nobody will deny that we are living in a period of worldwide conflict between the only two basic forms of government which, I think it is correct to say, there have ever been. One is government from the top down, with final decision in the hands of the few. It is government by dictatorship—whether dictatorship by a man or a party or a class or a race or an economic bloc; government from above.

The other basic form of government, with many varieties, of course, is government from the bottom up, with final decision in the hands of the many. The

people control the government instead of the government controlling the people. It might be described as government by federation, in the broad sense of that word. It is a free association of peoples under agreements voluntarily entered into in order to achieve objectives that are in the interests of all; instead of involuntary control of a people against its will by some person or group that is stronger than they are, strong enough to impose its will, whether consented to or not.

This bill will test whether we believe in extending to these two qualified Territories the federation principle, which is the secret of our own growth and strength; or whether we believe in the dictatorship principle when it comes to these two members of our own society. Our standing with much of the world, especially Asian peoples, and their confidence in us when we denounce Communist imperialism, will go up or down according to our action today on this bill.

I cannot see a single, good reason against the admission of these two areas to full statehood, and I see many good reasons for their admission.

I have heard all the arguments against, and am fully aware of them; for instance, that these Territories are not contiguous to the United States. But, actually, my State of Minnesota was farther away from Washington and more inaccessible when she was admitted as a State than is either Alaska or Hawaii now.

I have heard the argument about communism in Hawaii. The same problem exists there as exists here. I do not deny the problem in either place; but the question is, which is the better way to handle it—with people who are kept as second-class citizens and who become sullen and resentful because our Government does not play square with them? Or with people who are full and equal citizens of this Republic?

Surely we want to handle the Communist problem in the most successful way possible. Surely the most successful way is to enable the people in Hawaii to deal with it in the same manner as we wrestle with it in our own States and cities right here at home.

I know the argument about these folks being of different national origins than most of us on the mainland. Particularly, objection is raised because many of them came from Asian races and cultures. Actually that is one of the glories of the situation—the fact that peoples from Asian backgrounds understand and dedicate themselves to American ideas and institutions as fully as do those from Europe or those who are native born.

Why do so many of us underestimate the strength of our own America? Do we imagine that people who are way back in medieval, feudalistic conditions can understand communism and be drawn to it and give themselves to it with total dedication and understanding; but that those same people cannot understand Americanism, with its ideas and practices of freedom, self-government, equality of opportunity, and will not be attracted to it and give their allegiance to it with equal enthusiasm? If that were the case, then our side would be bound to lose in this world struggle.

But it is not the case. We should not underestimate the pull, the allure, the attraction to all peoples everywhere of the philosophy of government that brought our Nation into being, and that our Nation has generally stood for before the world.

To the people behind the Iron Curtain and the peoples on the fence, those who are uncertain or trying to be neutral until they are sure which side to choose, it is we who are on trial today, not Hawaii and Alaska. What do we really believe and stand for? That is what more than half of the people of the world, not just a handful in Hawaii and Alaska, are wanting to know.

It is said that Hawaiians of Asian ancestry will vote as racial blocs. It is said that they will vote as Japanese, or as Filipinos, or as Chinese, because of their racial ancestry. There is no evidence to support that. Certainly there is no indication that they will do so in Hawaii more than Americans of European origin do here at home.

Last winter I had occasion to go to the largest of the islands, the island of Hawaii. More than half the population on that island are of Japanese ancestry. What happened in the election they had there last fall? A man, of Japanese ancestry, was a Nisei running for the legislature. The majority did not vote for him. The elected a man of Filippino ancestry, although there is only a handful of voters of Filippino ancestry in that legislative district. They voted just the way you and I do for the man they thought was the best man for the job. They are not Japanese, or Chinese, or Filippinos, or even Hawaiians any more. They are Americans.

That is one of the greatest glories of Hawaii—and, as I have said, it is the glory of America—the ability of our American philosophy of life and system of government, which is our unique contribution to the world, to be understood and welcomed by all peoples who are exposed to it, and to inspire their full allegiance and command their loyalty.

It not only attracts people of European origins and cultural backgrounds which, while differing among themselves, are basically all of the white race; but in Hawaii it has demonstrated its capacity to appeal equally to people of all races.

This is the ultimate test of universality and true Americanism can meet that test. If I did not believe that our system is the one that will be best for all peoples, then I would believe it is not the best for you and me right here in the United States of America. I wonder sometimes if we here on the mainland understand that as well as those on our front lines in the Pacific.

Let me summarize what seem to me the basic reasons why we ought to pass this bill.

The first is the moral consideration. This applies with particular cogency in the case of Hawaii, because we did not annex Hawaii by conquest. She came in as a Territory by a treaty between sovereign governments. It was a voluntary act on her part, an agreement into which she entered in the same way as Texas did when she joined the Union. It was explicitly understood by all when Hawaii became an incorporated Territory that as soon as she qualified, she would be admitted as a State. She qualified long ago.

One, she is qualified as to population. She has more people than at least four States. Two, she is qualified as to economic soundness. She has more wealth and pays more Federal taxes than several States. Three, she is qualified as to education and health standards, and the well-being of her people. In some fields, such as rural education and rural health and agricultural experimentation, we on the continent look to Hawaii for guidance. They are ahead of us in many respects.

When it comes to loyalty, they do not have to take a back seat to anybody. I do not forget this, that when Pearl Harbor came and Hawaii took the most severe blow any part of America has ever suffered from a foreign foe, there might have been, and many expected, all sorts of sabotage. But there was not a proven case of sabotage by those of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii.

Then what did we do? Because we were scared, we seized all people of Japanese ancestry, native-born Americans as well as aliens, and we tore up their rights and guaranties under our Constitution. We put them in concentration camps. We destroyed their rights under the Bill of Rights.

What would you and I have done if our Government had treated us that way? I suspect we would have brooded about it after this fashion, "What kind of government is this that takes me, a native-born American, and just because my father and mother came from a country which has attacked America, and because I am of another color, a color I cannot change, puts me in a concentration camp in violation of the very Constitution they exhort me to be loyal to?"

I suspect I would have been full of bitterness and might have turned against America.

There was a handful of Japanese who did that—some who had come from Japan itself. They said, "There is no justice in this land. Americans will not treat us on the basis of our worth or rights as individuals. We are the wrong color. We will go back to Japan."

But what did the overwhelming majority of them do? They proved themselves better Americans than those who imprisoned them. They sat in the camps and talked about it among themselves and made up their minds to petition our Government to let them go into the armed services as volunteers, to give them a chance to prove whether or not they were good Americans. After a great deal of discussion and delay their petition was finally granted.

You all know the rest of the story. Their unit made the finest record—in medals for bravery, and Purple Hearts for wounds—of all similar units in the United States Armed Forces. They proved that they understood the heart of Americanism better than many of us

here today seem to understand it, we who boast that our folks came over on the Mayflower. We who have been so accustomed to the wonderful privileges of American citizenship that we often do not appreciate the real nature of it as much as do some of those who know what it is not to have such opportunity elsewhere.

The first reason, then, to me is a moral reason. They have earned it. They deserve it. We promised it to them. I believe in the United States keeping its promises.

The second is the economic reason. America grew rich by two processes: Increasing production and increasing trade, by developing and expanding markets here at home and then abroad. Where are the undeveloped areas of the world today? Not in Europe or America. The greatest ones are in Asia. Africa and South America have great undeveloped natural resources but they do not have adequate manpower. Asia has half the manpower of the world. It has great undeveloped natural resources plus undeveloped human resources—a billion people, a billion potential soldiers, a billion potential producers, a billion potential customers. America's trade needs to grow and expand during the next half century. Does she want to have the inside track in the economic development of that part of the world with benefit to all? Or does she want to limp along behind?

The door to much of Asia is still open. All we have to do to win their confidence is to continue the role that historically we have played, and to which they look especially on the basis of what we have done in the Philippines, with great anticipation and hope.

What are we to do now with Hawaii? Hawaii is our bridge to Asia. It is our showcase, the best we have anywhere in the Pacifica area. In fact, it is the best showcase we have anywhere in the world of the real nature of the society which we hope people everywhere will choose for themselves. Justice to Hawaiians will keep it so. It will encourage all people in Asia to resist Communist blandishments and turn more in our direction for economic relations.

More important still are the political reasons, including considerations of national security. Asia is in turmoil. The old patterns are shattered. The people there cannot be put back into the old patterns. What is the new pattern to be? Ours or that of the Communists?

Well, here is this great outpost of our pattern, right in the center of the Pacific. Can anybody doubt that it will be a far more effective outpost for freedom and a more secure bastion of our security if it is a full State and its citizens are full citizens, proud members of this Nation? Is it not certain to be a less firm bastion if its people are held in a state of half-citizenship, restless and unhappy, taxed without opportunity to vote on the taxes that are levied upon them here in Washington?

The greatest urge of most peoples in Asia today is not for larger economic benefits and well-being, as much as they want thos. What they want most in Asia is equality of political status. They want their national independence. They want self-respect. They want dignity. They want to be treated as equals on the basis of their being children of God—human beings like the rest of us. Historically that is what America has stood for. Do we stand for it today?

We are at a crossroads, deciding whether we are going to be true to one of the greatest things in American history, or whether, out of fears and doubts and lack of confidence in ourselves, we are to turn our backs upon a part of that heritage.

Out in Bandung, there has just been held a conference representing a little more that half of the people of the world. Most of them are not white people. They are awakening. We ourselves for a century have done more than anyone else to awaken them. They are aware of their potential powers. Which way are they going to go? Are they going to go the way that Japan tried to take them—racism? Asia for the Asiatics or the colored people against the whites?

Do not make any mistake about this—the only reason Japan failed was because her leaders were so foolish as to treat the people of Asia worse than the white man had treated them. But because she failed does not mean her idea did not take root. If these people do not see that their hope for themselves lies in the possibility of moving along with the whites on a basis of equality, then one day out of the ranks of the Chinese or the Japanese or the Filipinos or the Indians or the Malaysians, there will rise some man, or men, with a hypnotic personality and a sense of mission, who will preach in earnest: Asia for the Asiatics. Many would go with him with a song on their lips not because they wanted it but because they saw no hope of equality of treatment from the whites. In any such race war we would be bound to lose because they outnumber us 2 to 1. They can outwork us and undereat us. They can outwait and outsuffer us and they will outbreed us.

If America chooses a course which leads to such a race struggle, then we are walking to our doom.

All these are involved in the bill today. It is not just the fate of Hawaii and Alaska. I want my own country to survive. I want her to continue to occupy a high position among the nations of the world and to prove by our actions before the world now that we deserve such a place—as we have in the greatest moments in our past.

So, for moral reasons, for economic reasons, for security reasons, and for political reasons we should admit our Hawaiian Island Territory to statehood in the Union. It is an opportunity to take a positive political step of the greatest importance at a time of the greatest importance—when the world is fluid and many peoples are undecided, watching.

We draft men and build planes and bombs and appropriate billions to protect our country. But they are not enough. Do we believe in the things we talk about—the right of peoples to governments of their own choosing and equality of opportunity?

We have today a chance to do a positive act which will be understood around the world and which will make other peoples know that America, having thought the thing over and thoroughly debated it, believes in and is going to be true to herself.

In much of the world today the trend is from the status of citizen to the status of subject. If we will take this step today, we can come as near as by any act that I can think of to reversing that alarming trend and can expand the areas where the direction is from subject to citizen.

To give statehood to people who have proved worthy and have earned the right will be a vivid demonstration of the reality of our American faith.

To have one of our great States in the center of the Pacific as a conspicuous example of our American way of life will have obvious great advantages.

It will focus attention throughout the vast Pacific Basin on the capacity of our form of government to inspire the loyalty of all racial and national strains.

Such deeds are the way to overcome Communist lies about us and restore America to her place of leadership in the half of the world that hangs in the balance.

Passage of this bill by the Congress, I believe, will have an immeasurable value in strengthening our influence and good relations with every people in that whole area. What can be more important?

Farmer Public Relations Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in news releases for the press, for radio, and for television, in speeches and magazines, thousands of words critical of American farmers have been beamed to city dwellers. With evil sounding overtones, such words as "surpluses," "subsidies," "waste," and "inefficiency," are drummed into city ears. The farmers' customers in town are told that farmers are pricing themselves out of their markets, with a hint that they are living a high life on fat Government checks. The farmer has been ridiculed from one end of the land to the other. It even is suggested that consumers revolt against farmers.

Moreover, a rather successful attempt has been made to divide farmers, to set one group or one region against another.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when those of us who are interested in the welfare of farmers—and, indeed, in the welfare of our country—must find a way to present the truth about agriculture to the people—especially to the great urban populations of the Nation.

Therefore, I take the floor to propose to the House a positive public relations program for agriculture.

More particularly, it is my purpose today to urge the passage of an integral

part of that program which is embraced in House Joint Resolutions 317 and 318 introduced respectively by myself and my distinguished colleague, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas.

These resolutions would designate the last week in October of each year as Farm-City Week, to honor America's farm families and to promote understanding between farm and city people.

I shall submit later in these remarks detailed proposals for a public relations program for farmers, along with a brief recitation of the urgent need for such a program. But, first, I want to discuss the resolutions to establish Farm-City Week. These resolutions embody the only legislative enactment that now is essential to the overall public relations program that has been conceived as an effort to tell the truth about our farmers, to encourage understanding between farm and city people, to promote the well-being of agriculture, and thereby to lay a solid foundation under the prosperity of our total economy.

Our farmers have made the United States the best fed and the best clothed Nation in the world. I think all Americans wil welcome an opportunity to honor the people who have contributed so much to our civilization and, moreover, they will want to use this Farm-City Week to gain a better understanding of the needs, problems, and opportunities of our farm people.

The resolutions authorize and request the President to issue annually a proclamation calling upon the Department of Agriculture, the land-grant colleges, the Agricultural Extension Service, and all other appropriate agencies and officials of the Government, to cooperate with farm organizations and other groups in programs observing Farm-City Week, including plans for public meetings, discussions, exhibits pageants, and press, radio, and television features.

This specially designated week would permit many civic, social, and other organizations to fit farm programs into their regular weekly meeting days, and generally would increase the opportunities for joint meetings of farm and city people.

It is especially appropriate right now that we open this broad opportunity for understanding and friendship between the people who produce our food and fiber and those who consume it. For agriculture's position in the whole economy is the most pressing domestic problem confronting our country, and the least understood.

It is essential that city people understand agriculture. It is to their own self-interest that agriculture be prosperous and not become a depressing drag upon the whole economy.

We must remind America that our great strength as a Nation has its roots in the soil and large dependence upon the people who till the soil. Farmers want to join city people, and we want them to join us, in establishing and assuring a condition of permanent prosperity in this Nation.

The resolutions to establish an annual Farm-City Week now are pending before the House Judiciary Committee. We are hopeful that these resolutions soon will be presented for a vote in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the truth about our farmers is the heart of the public relations program for agriculture I present here today.

Probably 75 percent of our people in the cities have little or no understanding of agriculture. More alarming is the fact that many of these have a poor opinion of farmers.

Jim Roe, managing editor of Successful Farming, published in Des Moines, recently wrote in that magazine:

> A rapidly growing number of our customers in the cities are being led to believe a farmer is a sort of rural racketeer. A man who is living—and living much too well—primarily on fat checks from a misled and overprotective Government. A man responsible for high food prices.
>
> That's a character sketch which adds up to a not-so-admirable character. But he makes a wonderfully handy villain. Nonfarm groups always quickly point at him when confronted by irate ladies having trouble with their budgets. He is especially amiable villain, for he seldom answers back.
>
> Small difference that the charges are monstrously false. That prices of food at the farm have gone steadily down while grocery-store prices went up—that in 1953 farmers were able to keep as net income only 36.5 percent of their gross receipts—the smallest percentage since the well-remembered year of 1932.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the future of agriculture is imperiled by the prejudices against farmers that have developed throughout this country and, unless we find some way to put across the truth, our farmers will suffer, and ultimately this whole country will pay a woeful price for the folly of these prejudices.

We cannot permit these prejudices to promote a continued deterioration of farm income and to create a condition in agriculture such as plunged the whole economy into the great depression of the 1930's.

We in agriculture are largely at fault for the poor opinion many people have of us, because we have become divided among ourselves and we have the poorest public relations of any large group in our national life—in fact, hardly any public relations program at all.

This must be changed.

We must begin by correcting some of the serious misunderstandings and misconceptions on agriculture and public policy relating to farmers. The farmers' salvation will rest on our willingness and our effort to put across the truth.

The people have not been told that our farmers, even in relatively good times, have received less than half the per capita income of the people who live in the towns and cities—that half the farm homes in the United States still are without running water.

They do not know that consumers get more and better food today with an expenditure of a smaller percentage of their total income than at any other period in history—that in 1914 the average factory employee could buy only 3.5 pounds of bread with an hour's earnings; in 1929 he could buy 6.4 pounds, but in 1954 his hour's earnings would buy over 10 pounds of bread—that the average hour's wage would buy only 1 pound of butter in 1929, compared with 2.6 pounds in January 1955; only 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 compared with 7.9 quarts now; 1.1 dozen eggs in 1929, and 3.6 now; 17.7 pounds of potatoes in 1929, and 34.7 in 1955.

Few people know that the farmer gets only about 2.7 cents for the wheat in the 17-cent loaf of bread; that there is only 25 cents worth of cotton in a $4 shirt; that, for instance, tobacco farmers receive only about $800 million for that part of their crop consumed in the United States, while Federal, State, and local taxes on the crop amount to approximately $2,100,000,000 each year.

Were the consumers in Chicago told that last June housewives there paid 25 cents a quart for milk delivered at their doors, while the farmers who supply the Chicago market received only 6.5 cents a quart for class 1 milk?

Is anyone spreading the word of the wonderful efficiency of our agriculture; that the output per farmer has increased by more than 50 percent in a few years; that in Russia half the total population work on farms, and still cannot meet the Communists' needs for food and fiber, while in America each farmworker feeds 18 persons; that the efficiency of our farmers releases over 86 percent of our population for other work in factories, in mines, in shops, in transport, in all the other pursuits which makes the United States standard of living the envy of the world?

Mr. Speaker, we must get the farmers' story before the American people.

We must suppress the prejudices against our farmers.

We must let farmers' friends in the cities know that it is because food is so cheap that American families have three-fourths of their income to invest in their homes, in their institutions, and in the comforts and conveniences that make up this American way of life.

We must remind America that in many nations of the world today the people are hungry because their farmers have been neglected and ill-treated.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a small, representative group that has been devoting its thought and efforts to the problem, I propose immediate steps to establish a positive public-relations program for farmers; a program to plant the truth about agriculture wherever it cannot now be found; a program to bring all farmers together in a common bond; a program to cultivate understanding between farmers and their customers in the cities. We propose the development and growth of this program in two parts:

First. By creation of an interim committee to (a) enlist the aid and counsel of everyone interested in improving public understanding of agriculture; (b) study the size of agriculture's public relations problem, and its possible solutions—to serve as agriculture's research laboratory for this important, untouched farm problem; and (c) try out, on a small, pilot-plant scale, a limited number of specific projects designed to improve agriculture's relations with all

other aspects of our national community of enterprise and aspirations.

Second. To use the experience and work of this interim committee for the establishment of a permanent public relations organization, adequately staffed, to create understanding of the problems of farmers and the important of agriculture to the well-being of the total economy and also to promote food—to convince America that food is the best thing that money can buy.

The program must be supported financially by all of agriculture—by individual farmers, farm organizations, and industries serving agriculture—or it should not be started at all.

It should hew to these basic principles:

First. It would be based on facts. It could never deal with half-truths or evasions. Fortunately, our self-interests and the public interests are the same. The truth about agriculture is the best public relations it could have.

Second. It would never deal with political matters.

Third. It would attempt to unite agriculture, and give all agricultural groups something to be for. If, through a public relations effort, farm organizations can find common ground for united action, we shall have rendered agriculture a very great service.

Fourth. It would explain the essentiality of agriculture. The security of abundance has never been put across to our people. Housewives are happy to have their pantry shelves filled but they have been taught there is something evil about having abundant food in our warehouses. "Surpluses" actually represent only about 5 percent more food than our people will clear from the market-places at present prices. We should see that America gives thanks for the fact that we are 5 percent over our goals, instead of 5 or 15 or 20 percent under—as is the case over most of the world.

Fifth. It would explain the efficiency of farmers and what this means in better food and reasonable prices, and it would show the science, the flavor and romance of food.

Sixth. It would show what farm products will do for people, for health, and in terms of a good life for every American family and each member of it.

To accomplish this, we have only to use a generous sampling of well-tested public relations tools. Here are some of the things we can do:

First. We should be supplying facts—the truth—to the important writers, magazines, and newspapers of the United States. We have allowed a vacuum to come into being. The result is many people seldom hear of agriculture except in connection with unpleasant, or seemingly unpleasant, events. I feel that the great newspapers of the country will be friendly to us when we are able to put the facts before their editors.

Second. We should have a speaker's bureau, with well-qualified persons ready to present, primarily for city audiences, the true story about agriculture. Moreover, farmers or local farm organization folks often are invited to speak before their fellow citizens. But farm people have little time to write speeches. We should aid these people by giving them fact sheets for use in such public discussions.

Third. We should arrange tours of food growing and processing areas by editors and other urban leaders. Much of our agricultural public-relations problem is due to the fact that most editors of large circulation city magazines and newspapers have little opportunity to see agriculture work. Thus, they have little appreciation of our problems and do not personally know anyone to whom they can turn to explain agricultural questions as they arise. Industry for many years has used the group-tour method to acquaint people with its personnel and its processes. Agriculture should do the same.

Fourth. We should be quick to capitalize on current news—to explain our operations and the importance of our products. Every major industry and trade association in the country does that. For instance, when the Soviet regime was seriously embarrassed by its failure to provide enough food for its people, we did nothing to assure American consumers as to their own supply of food and the continued ability of American farmers to produce that supply.

Fifth. We should point up agriculture's importance, its problems and its dreams, in staged events. We should have a national farm-city week. We should give more attention and more promotion to the county fair. These, by and large, have been allowed to drift away from a portrayal of the agriculture of the area and, instead, we have allowed horse races, stock-car races, and a succession of carnival acts to come in and make use of the funds which in most cases are still appropriated by the county for an agricultural fair.

Sixth. We should promote the idea of farm summer scholarships for city schoolchildren. A number of city boys and girls could be selected by their school authorities to spend a month or two actually working for pay on farms. They would more than earn their way and could go back to their city classrooms in the fall to share with fellow students an understanding of present-day farming and farm people.

Seventh. We should encourage the teaching of agriculture in grade schools, high schools, and universities.

Eighth. We should acquaint farmers with the importance of joining wholeheartedly in their local civic groups and activities. Other businessmen in our small towns and villages know it is important for them, both in a social and business way, to be acquainted with their fellow businessmen and to be identified with community improvement. We, too, are substantial businessmen in our communities, and must accept these community responsibilities.

Ninth. We should rescue food from its present "residual expense" category. By and large, Americans buy food with the money they have left over after making the payment on the mortgage, the car, the television set, the gas company, and the tax man. There may be ways to end this situation, and we should explore them.

Tenth. We should enlist the aid of industry public-relations staffs. Many huge American industries sell a substantial portion of thier products to American farmers. Yet many of those same industries do little to help the farmer with his public-relations problem. We should show these folks how they can be of aid to agriculture. After all, their customers' problem is their problem, and farmers are their customers.

Eleventh. Eventually, agriculture should find some means of financing adequate institutional advertising to tell the agricultural stories which it will not be able to tell in any other way. Too, such an operation would give agriculture one more important point of contact and liaison with America's mass media.

Twelfth. There is more than a possibility that agriculture could develop a very worthwhile continued television program, which would be of interest to farm and city people alike. One of the outstanding examples of such a program is the Johns Hopkins Science Review. Agriculture, too, has much to tell in the way of science. We would do well to investigate this method of telling it.

These are some of the things we can do in an effective public-relations program for agriculture, in an effective program to tell the farmers' story.

This is a program in which everyone interested in agriculture can join.

It is not a political proposition. It is not a 90-percent or a 75-percent of parity proposition.

It is a proposition to undo the damage that has been done. It places no blame. It will be born, if it is born, in the hope that all of us in agriculture, and whose well-being depends upon agriculture, henceforward can sit down together, resolve our differences, work ourt our problems, promote the prosperity of our pursuits, contribute to the strength and stability of our total economy, and enjoy the fruits of understanding and friendship among all our people.

The need and the demand for a program to tell the farmers' story straight from the shoulder was first impressed upon our House Committee on Agriculture 2 years ago during its grassroots tour, under the chairmanship of Mr. HOPE, of Kansas. Our committee traveled 20,000 miles to study agriculture, and everywhere it went farmers would tell the members that agriculture had the worst public relations of any segment of our economy.

Back in February a few of us got together in a little informal meeting, to discuss what could be done. Among those present were Hon. Clifford R. Hope, Hon. W. R. Poage, of Texas, Mr. Louis Wilson of the National Plant Food Institute, Mr. Jim Roe, managing editor of Successful Farming, Dana Bennett of the Foundation for American Agriculture, and Hollis Seavey, of the Clear Channel Broadcasting Service. Politics had no consideration in the situation. We explored every means of getting the farmers' story told. Then we asked Jim Roe to draw up a plan embracing the things we had discussed.

That is the positive program of public relations for agriculture I present today.

Fraudulent to Conceal Communist Past in Naturalization Proceeding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a summary of Judge Leon R. Yankwich's recent decision as it appeared in the Los Angeles Daily Journal of June 9, as well as editorials on the decision as appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Express on June 10 and the Los Angeles Examiner of June 12, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Daily Journal of June 9, 1955]

CHIEF JUDGE YANKWICH—FRAUDULENT TO CONCEAL COMMUNIST PAST IN NATURALIZATION PROCEEDING

A Rumanian-born Los Angeles businessman was stripped of his citizenship yesterday because he concealed his Communist Party membership when he applied for naturalization.

Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich held that although membership in the Communist Party was not a bar to naturalization in 1941, the concealment of his Communist membership by title was a fraud on the Government.

The ruling deprived Sam Title, 48, of citizenship acquired in 1941 when he was naturalized in the Federal court in Los Angeles.

"This doesn't mean that an American citizen can't be a Communist," the judge said. "It only applies to foreign-born who want to become citizens."

Title came to the United States from Montreal, Canada, in 1932.

Judge Yankwich ruled on two points:

1. That Title concealed his membership in the party from 1936 to 1942.

2. That the Communist Party at the time advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

He said under Federal law at the time of Title's application for naturalization, membership in the party did not prohibit a foreign-born person from becoming a citizen. The judge said, however, membership in a movement that sought to overthrow the Government did.

The case will likely be appealed because the opinion opens the way for deportation of Title, whose name was legally changed in 1941 from Titleman.

The case was tried by Judge Yankwich in May of this year. In a lengthy opinion filed yesterday, Judge Yankwich sustained the Government's contention as to both these matters and ordered Title's certificate of citizenship revoked. So doing, the opinion calls attention to the fact that the case is unusual in that the defendant did not take the stand in his own behalf, and that when called as an adverse witness, he declined to answer questions relating to his membership in the Communist Party, or to identify his signature on a card showing his membership in 1937 on the ground that the answers might incriminate him. The opinion states that, having sustained the defendant in asserting the constitutional privilege, no inference would be drawn against him from his silence:

"Having sustained the assertions of this right, I draw no unfavorable inferences from the fact of assertion, adhering to the view stated repeatedly that the contrary attitude does violence to the spirit of our constitutional guaranties. Nor shall I draw the justifiable inferences permitted from failure to produce evidence which it was in the power of the defendant to produce. However, as stated at the trial, the failure to testify leaves the record without any defensive matter except such as is contained in the cross-examination of the Government's witnesses and some documentary evidence offered by the defendant."

The opinion states that the evidence before the court shows conclusively that during the period from 1936 to 1941, Title was a member of the Communist Party or affiliate organizations. The opinion says:

"So this is not one of the cases in which the former party members or informers seek to 'pin' membership on a person who may have occasionally been seen at a Communist meeting, but as to whom there is not showing of active participation. Here, uncontradicted evidence—some of it in the defendant's own handwriting—shows activities, first in the Young Communist League and later the Communist Party, dating back to 1935 or 1936. From his brief appearance and conduct on the witness stand, from the manner in which he answered in writing questions relating to his occupation, residence, and the like, in the documents he was required to file in the naturalization proceeding and the answers given in his deposition which the court had to consider in determining the question of privilege asserted during the taking of the deposition, one gathers the impression that the defendant is a person above average intelligence and education, with good command of the English language, showing no trace of accent, such as may be found in persons to whom English is not a native tongue. This, of course, is due to his long residence in Canada and in the United States. All these lead to the inevitable conclusion that his membership in the Young Communist League and the Communist Party was not fortuitous, but a matter of deliberate choice by a person who understood its purposes and who, beginning with the task of distributing the literature of the Party, rose to trusted position of leadership at the county level. Granted that gregariousness is one of the American characteristics and that persons may join many groups without full knowledge of their object, we are not confronted in this case with such a situation. The record before the Court shows a continuous participation in the affairs of the party, distribution and sale of the literature of the party, attendance at conventions where the line of conduct was laid down—a pattern of conduct which continued to the date of naturalization."

After a detailed analysis of the literature dealing with the aims of Communism, including the first volume of Marx's "Capital" and two volumes of Lenin's writings, introduced by the defendant himself, the opinion reaches the conclusion that during that period, 1936 to 1941, the American Communist Party adhered to the program of the Russian Communist Party and the Third International and advocated force and violence as the means of achieving the aims of the Party. The opinion points to the fact that the Constitution of the American Communist Party adopted in 1938, introduced by the defendant, ties the aims of the American Communist Party to those of the Communist International. It adds:

"And in the literature it sponsored and circulated and which is before the court, the teachings of Marx and Engels are accepted only insofar as they are modified and put into practice by Lenin, Stalin, and the Communist International. And these teachings, without deviation, urge not a change of the social system by the use of democratic institutions or legal means, but a revolutionary change by force and violence."

After pointing to the fact that there is no evidence in the record to show that the defendant at any time disavowed these aims, the opinion points to Title's active participation in the affairs of the Party, which resulted in his rising from merely a distributor of literature to "organizer" in one of the assembly districts in Los Angeles County. The opinion states that a person "holding such views was not entitled to naturalization under the Nationality Act of 1940."

Judge Yankwich also expresses the view that one who approves the aims of the Communist Party and the means of their achievement as expressed in the literature circulated between 1936 and 1941 is not "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States," and that concealment of the fact is a fraud on the Government for which the citizenship may be revoked. The opinion points to the fact that this is not a case where a person who dissents from current principles is being penalized. It states "dissent from accepted governmental principles does not necessarily prove want of devotion to the Nation." But, while recognizing the rights to dissent, and then insisting that "there is richness in cultural variety," the opinion concludes that the courts cannot disregard conditions for naturalization imposed by the Congress. It states:

"Hence the concealment of facts which would have led to the discovery of the nonexistence of any of the prescribed conditions is fraud, for which naturalization once obtained must be revoked. This is especially true when the concealment relates to membership in an organization which advocates the forcible overthrow of Government.

"Heirs to the English tradition we eschew force as a means of achieving social change. The prevalence of contrary doctrines led to the legislative proscription against naturalization of one who belongs to an organization or group advocating such forcible overthrow.

"Ours is the task to apply judicially the conditions prescribed by the Congress. Because of the value of American citizenship and the severe implications of a judgment cancelling a naturalization certificate, there is imposed upon the courts the burden of requiring that proof leading to revocation be clear, unequivocal, and convincing. The burden has been met in this case. The certificate of naturalization is ordered revoked."

The Government was represented by Laughlin E. Waters, United States attorney; Max Deutz, Arline Martin, and James R. Dooley, assistant United States attorneys. Richard L. Rykoff and Robert L. Brock represented the defendant.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express of June 10, 1955]

YANKWICH'S CITIZENSHIP RULING

Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich's decision in stripping a Los Angeles businessman of his American citizenship because he was a Communist should be strongly applauded.

In depriving the Rumanian-born Angeleno of the citizenship he was granted in the local Federal Court in 1941, Judge Yankwich ruled that no member of the Communist Party could be considered loyal to the American Constitution.

Technically, the reason for revocation of citizenship, the judge said, was a fraud against the United States Government because of concealment of Communist Party membership at the time of naturalization, although being a Communist in 1941 was not a legal bar to naturalization at that time.

The judge stated that "the Communist Party has condemned liberty and democracy and all the ideals of democratic nations. It

has advocated force and violence as the only means of obtaining its objective."

It is bad enough to have native Americans turning on our country as members of the Communist Party. We certainly don't want invited guests.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of June 12, 1955]

A POINT FOR TRAITORS

In a decision that will be felt far and wide in the cabals of disloyalty and subversion, Federal Judge Leon R. Yankwich, of Los Angeles, revoked the citizenship of a naturalized alien.

The action was based on the issue of fraud.

The defendant concealed his Communist affiliation when naturalized in 1941, although Communists as such were not then excluded by naturalization laws.

But they did exclude persons who belonged to an organization advocating the forcible overthrow of Government.

The question posed to Judge Yankwich was thus simply whether being a Communist meant relief in revolutionary violence, and hence unfitness for American citizenship.

The answer was "Yes."

It was reached by the court after "a detailed analysis of the literature dealing with the aims of Communism, including the first volume of Marx's 'Capital' and two volumes of Lenin's writings, introduced by the defendant himself.

"These teachings, without deviation, urge social change not by democratic institutions or legal means but by force and violence."

Concealment of Communist Party membership, Judge Yankwich concluded, thus was "a fraud for which citizenship may be revoked."

Of interest also was the observation by the court:

"To dissent from accepted governmental principles does not necessarily prove want of devotion to the Nation, (but) because of the value of American citizenship * * * there is imposed upon the court the burden that proof leading to revocation be clear, unequivocal, and convincing.

"The burden has been met in this case. Naturalization is ordered revoked."

We'd like to make clear a point of our own:

A long time ago the overwhelming majority of Americans became convinced, and said so right out loud all over the place, that a Communist was obviously an enemy of our country and our people.

That to admit to our society a political criminal of this stripe was gross negligence and outrageous folly.

And that once recognized as a poisonous conspirator, he should be booted permanently out of our lives and land.

Our language is of a homlier sort than Judge Yankwich's, to be sure.

But whether from judicial prose, or the talk of plain folks, let the point be made clear to all traitors.

Establishing a Transportation and Public Utilities Service To Serve Agencies and Departments of the Federal Government

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter that I received from Edmund F. Mansure, Administrator, General Services Administration, advising me that he has issued necessary orders "establishing a Transportation and Public Utilities Service under the direction of a new Commissioner to serve all executive agencies and departments of the Federal Government," which is in line with a suggestion that I made to Administrator Mansure some weeks ago. This is decidedly a move in the right direction and will result in the saving each year of many millions of dollars to our taxpayers and the Federal Government.

I congratulate Administrator Mansure on this constructive action.

The letter follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1955.

Re reorganization of transportation setup in GSA

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McCORMACK: Reference is made to your recent letter concerning the reorganization setup in GSA. We have directed that transportation and public utilities be taken out of the Federal Supply Service.

Accordingly, we are establishing a Transportation and Public Utilities Service under the direction of a new Commissioner to serve all executive agencies and department of the Federal Government. This is in line with your suggection.

Our first objective is to effect the movement of Government traffic, ocean, motor and rail, consistent with the best interests of our national economy, at the lowest cost to the taxpayers.

We are aware of the inequitable distribution of Government traffic in the various ports of the country. It is our desire to remedy this situation. Mr. Hyde, who attended the meeting in Senator SALTONSTALL'S office, has been directed to coordinate the activities of those directly engaged in this work. In order to accomplish this we shall need your cooperation.

We are now ready to discuss with you the clarification or revision of Public Law 152 in connection with the present exemptions. The general counsel has been directed to make his staff available at your convenience.

Messrs. Elliott, Kennedy, Hyde and Denniston will keep in touch with you. We are hopeful that revision of the law may be accomplished during this session of the Congress. Thanks for your help and interest.

Cordially yours,

EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator.

Vesting in the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis Sufficient Quantities of Salk Vaccine to Inoculate Free All Children in the United States Under the Age of 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as I announced to the House today, I have introduced a bill which has been in preparation for more than a month which would authorize the purchase by the United States of sufficient quantities of anti-poliomyelitis vaccine to inoculate every child in the country, without charge. The actual allocation and distribution of the vaccine under my bill would be in the hands of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

I suggested this approatch on May 13, when Dr. Leonard Scheele, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, was testifying before the House Banking and Currency Committee. While he voiced no official policy on that suggestion, he said he personally could see no objection to turning the whole thing over to the Polio Foundation. I then attempted to obtain the views of the Foundation itself, but was unable to do so until just recently, when Mr. Basil O'Connor testified before the Senate Labor Committee. His testimony—in answer to persistent questioning—finally gave me the information I felt I needed before I introduced any legislation on the subject. In other words, we now have the word of the Foundation that it can do this job; we also have the information from them as to how they would prefer to handle it in case it was thrust upon them.

I think they should have the responsibility. They do not ask for it. But they can handle it. And no other organization in the country, including no Government agency, could handle it as well, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I have issued a press release which gives the full details on my bill, and I include it, and also a copy of my bill, as follows:

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN TO INTRODUCE BILL TO TURN OVER TO NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INFANTILE PARALYSIS ENOUGH SALK VACCINE TO INOCULATE FREE ALL CHILDREN UNDER 20 YEARS OF AGE

Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Democrat, of Missouri, plans tomorrow (Monday) to introduce a bill which would have the Government purchase and turn over to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis sufficient supplies of the Salk antipoliomyelitis vaccine to immunize all children in the United States under the age of 20. The inoculations would be free.

Mrs. SULLIVAN first broached this idea on May 13 during a hearing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency while she was questioning Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Dr. Scheele said that, speaking personally, he could see no objection to turning such a mass immunization program over to the National Foundation.

The Congresswoman, 3 days later, on May 16, wired Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, asking if he thought her proposal "would be a practical approach and if the foundation would be willing to undertake the burden of the work. I can think of no better way of assuring fair distribution of the vaccine. Would you give me your views?" She said she would introduce such a bill if the foundation agreed.

Mrs. SULLIVAN received no direct answer from the foundation. Mr. O'Connor asked for time to think over her suggestion. Failing in a subsequent effort to get a definite statement of views on this matter from Mr. O'Connor, Mrs. SULLIVAN waited until the foundation head testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Education when, under persistent questioning, he finally, reluctantly, acknowledged that the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis had the competency to inoculate all children in the country if the vaccine were supplied.

The National Foundation, which financed Dr. Salk's research leading to the development of the vaccine, and also the field tests involving nearly a million children in 1953 and 1954, is now in the process of providing free inoculations for all first- and second-grade children.

In his testimony before the Senate committee, Mr. O'Connor said the foundation would be reluctant to take Government money in carrying out a mass inoculation program. "We would follow the policies that the Red Cross has always followed of not accepting Government funds. If that was officially presented to us, we would prefer that the Government buy the vaccine and give us the vaccine and vest it in us as we did in foreign civilian relief in the Red Cross."

After reading this testimony, Mrs. SULLIVAN decided to go ahead with the idea she had put forward on May 13 of having the Federal Government, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, purchase the vaccine from the manufacturers, and then turn over the entire program of allocation and distribution of the vaccine for all children under 20 to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, without regard to the ability of individual families to pay for the inoculations.

The Congresswoman declared:

"The confusion which arose because of the Government's original failure to have any practical program for allocation or distribution of the vaccine, or to assure that every child in the country would receive the vaccine regardless of ability to pay started this whole thing off on the wrong foot. The administration fumbled the thing terribly. Its present proposal for the free inoculation of indigent children puts too much of a charity connotation on this program. It is not charity. All the people of the United States have paid for the development of this vaccine through their dimes and dollars to the National Foundation.

"The Foundation pioneered the vaccine. It has paid for its development. It has pledged $9 million it does not even have to carry out the school inoculation program for first and second graders. It has been engaged in this work for 20 years. It knows the priorities and the needs, both by age groups, geographically, and so on. You would have no question of blackmarketing or of anything of that nature, for no one, no matter how much money he had, could possibly corrupt the Foundation or argue with its decisions on who should get the vaccine and in what order.

"My bill provides for the inoculation of all children under 20 by the end of 1956 with vaccine supplied by the Federal Government. I understand it will take until about then to make sure we have the 160 million separate shots of the vaccine needed to immunize the 59 million children under 20, giving 3 shots to each, including a third shot for the children who have already been covered.

"Once this mass inoculation program is complete, then of course the antipolio immunization program could be carried on in routine fashion through normal channels as any other vaccination program is regularly handled. But there is nothing normal about the demand for this vaccine, and the problem it creates in assuring fair treatment for all, particularly in such an emotional area as this where the health of children is involved."

Mrs. SULLIVAN said her bill differs from the one introduced by all seven Democratic members of the Senate Labor Committee, which also provides for free inoculation of all children under 20 in that S. 2147, the Senate bill, provides for grants of money to the States to purchase and distribute the vaccine, whereas her bill has the Federal Government buying the vaccine directly, but authorizing the National Foundation, under the general supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to have complete control of allocation, distribution, and regulation of the use of the vaccine.

The Sullivan bill is attached, as follows:

"H. R. 7026

"A bill to provide for the purchase by the United States, and the distribution by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, of a sufficient supply of poliomyelitis vaccine to immunize all children in the United States under 20 years of age against paralytic poliomyelitis

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the standard of health for all children of the United States, and institute the most effective and equitable plan for the eventual elimination of the scourge of paralytic poliomyelitis among the American people through mass immunization of all children under 20 years of age on a priority basis, without regard to their ability to pay for the vaccine, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall purchase a supply of poliomyelitis vaccine sufficient to carry out such an immunization program as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 2. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, under the general supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is hereby authorized to—

"(1) develop a program for the allocation and distribution of all poliomyelitis vaccine purchased by such Secretary,

"(2) establish priorities by age group and geographical location for the allocation and distribution of such vaccine in such a manner as to make the vaccine available to all children in the United States under 20 years of age, and

"(3) regulate the use of such vaccine, under the pprovisions of this act, in such a manner that will assure its most effective and equitable use in combating the spread of paralytic poliomelitis in the United States.

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this act the term 'United States' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"SEC. 5. This act shall terminate not later than December 31, 1956."

A Great Chief Justice Pays Tribute to Role of Dissenter in Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the June 21 issue of the Capital Times of Madison, Wis. The editorial comments on the fine speech delivered by Chief Justice Earl Warren in Madison, Wis., on June 19 at the commemorative ceremonies in honor of Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues for this thoughtful study. The editorial follows in full:

A GREAT CHIEF JUSTICE PAYS TRIBUTE TO ROLE OF DISSENTER IN OUR SOCIETY

It is inspiring and reassuring to hear a Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court talk with moving eloquence of American ideals, as Chief Justice Earl Warren did here Sunday at the La Follette memorial exercises. Such an address from a man heading the most powerful court in the world rekindles and refreshes the hopes for the future of democracy.

Chief Justice Warren talked straight from the shoulder in reviewing the life of La Follette and what it means in terms of the ancient and fundamental ideals of the Nation. He stressed the vital part the dissenter plays in our national life and the progress they have made possible.

In doing so he said things that have been left unsaid by the timid politicians in the recent era of hysteria and fear in this country.

"La Follette," he said, "suffered the same treatment that courageous men of vision in all ages have suffered. He was called a radical, a disrupter, a socialist, a subverter, and perhaps the only reason he was not called a Communist was because that term had not then been popularized as a term of opprobrium."

Pointing out the reasons why La Follette was called a "radical" in his day, the Chief Justice listed the "ingredients of the Wisconsin idea" the great social reforms for which La Follette fought and wrote into the laws of the State. He listed them as follows:

1. The direct primary giving control over government to the people instead of bossism.

2. The Corrupt Practices Act preventing the pollution of the election process.

3. The registration of lobbyists act—not to prevent them from functioning but to bring them out in the open because as he said: "Evil and corruption thrive best in the dark."

4. The equalization of taxation between the individual citizen and the powerful corporate interest. "Equal and just taxation," he (La Follette) said, "is a fundamental principle of Republican government."

5. An inheritance tax and a graduated income tax based on the ability to pay.

6. The regulation of utilities to prevent indirect and unjust taxation from burdening the people.

7. The right of working men to join unions and bargain for their right. He was determined there should be no submerged class of industrial workers.

8. The health and safety of the people through pure food laws and compensation for industrial accidents.

9. The development of the University and a sound system of general education.

It is refreshing in this age to hear a man so high in public office speak out so forcefully and courageously for unpopular ideas. Not that the things that La Follette accomplished are unpopular today. Indeed, the old political elements who fought him have long since adopted those things as their own achievements.

The courage Chief Justice Warren showed was to put them into prospective from today's viewpoint when men who advocate social reform are suffering the same abuse La Follette suffered at the hands of those who fight progress. The difference, as the Chief Justice implied, is that there is a new term of opprobrium today. Those who once cried "socialist" are today crying "Communist" in an effort to discredit liberalism.

The courage Chief Justice Warren showed in the type of address he gave is one of the qualities which has made him one of the outstanding public figures of our time. He has already amply demonstrated this courage on the Court in the segregation cases and in other cases involving basic democratic values.

And though he holds one of the highest positions in this land, he is still the simple,

warm, friendly human being which made him so popular as governor of California—a popularity which resulted in his receiving both the Democratic and Republican nominations in the primary races in which he participated.

It is good to know that a man of his calibre is sitting at the head of the highest court in the Nation. Democracy takes on a new vitality with men like him in responsible public positions.

The Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of misinformation is being circulated about the cost of reclamation, particularly as it applies to the upper Colorado River project. For the information of Members of Congress, I submit the following editorial from the Walla Walla (Wash.) Union Bulletin of June 19, 1955:

DISTORTION OF FACTS

Supporters of the Colorado River storage project are beginning to run into the type of opposition that has frequently plagued Pacific Northwest development in recent years. This opposition depends upon a distortion of facts to make its point, unfortunately to frequent advantage.

In the case of the Colorado River project, for example, it is now being charged that the entire program is one big "giveaway," with the taxpayers footing the bill for the benefit of a few people in the affected area. Actually, careful studies of the project indicate that all but $8.7 million of the $1 billion cost of the facilities will be repaid over a 50-year period, more than two-thirds of it bearing 2½ percent interest. The nonreimbursable $8.7 million, only part not to be repaid, will cover costs allocated to recreation, flood control, and fish and wildlife.

These are, of course, only the direct repayments from the project itself to the Federal Treasury. They do not include the very real indirect benefits enjoyed by local, State, and Federal Governments due to increased tax yields from the developed area, both in added income and property taxes. It has been calculated that Federal reclamation projects in the West have produced for the Federal Treasury alone up to 1953 a total of $3.1 billion in new tax revenues; this is more than the entire cost of reclamation, including power facilities, and is in addition to the regular repayments which have been made on the investment in facilities.

There is, then, no possible justification for charges that soundly planned water-development projects result in outright subsidization of one area by taxpayers of the rest of the Nation. Not only are the investments repaid, mostly with interest, but the country as a whole has benefited tremendously by the creation of new wealth and new income-producing facilities for the people. And this wealth will continue to pour tax revenues into the Public Treasury long after the total cost of the projects has been repaid.

The point is an important one in view of the record of Congress in recent years on water-development programs of the West. With the sole exception of the Dalles Dam, there have been no new starts of any significance authorized in the Pacific Northwest since 1950. The House Appropriations Committee merely confirmed this trend a few days ago when it refused to recommend any funds either for a start of construction on Ice Harbor Dam or even for planning funds for John Day Dam.

Admittedly, much work is being done within the Pacific Northwest, which is looking toward non-Federal construction of power and water projects or toward partnership undertakings in which the Federal Government has a part. But the partnership concept is a new one which is yet to be proven in practice, and the unraveling of redtape on the purely non-Federal projects is taking a good deal of time. We have felt from the outset that Congress must fill the void during the interim period before non-Federal dams get underway; and there are certain projects, notably those designed for upstream storage and water regulation, which can probably never be built by any agency other than the Federal Government.

Looking back over the history of the West, it seems obvious that our present state of development could never have been achieved without help in financing from the Federal Government. And although future power needs can probably be handled largely without such assistance, reclamation growth cannot, nor is it always possible to separate the two where maximum integrated development is desirable.

Meanwhile we must never lose sight of the fact that the history of these self-liquidating water and power projects proves conclusively they are not a gift from anyone. They are an investment which repays the Nation handsomely, many times over.

The Doctor Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the time is well past due for the discriminatory draft of doctors to end. To continue conscripting physicians and dentists up to the age of 46 is not only unrealistic but contributes to a basic condition which is sadly in need of proper adjustment. The provision of an adequate career medical officer procurement program is the true solution to the problem. The extension of the doctor draft beyond June 30 can only be considered as a mechanism for replacing career medical officers who are leaving the service in great numbers. It means the Defense Department is avoiding again the establishment of an effective career medical officer procurement program and needed adjustments to make career service more attractive.

A report of the Hoover Commission reveals an enormous increase in medical care given to dependents in recent years. Much dissention centers around this feature of the Armed Forces medical program wherein civilian physicians are drafted then required to devote a large percent of their time and services while in uniform to the care of civilian dependents and civilian employees of the Federal Government. This exists largely in areas where the services of qualified civilian physicians can be readily obtained. There are nearly 3 million such dependents and retired military personnel plus in excess of 1 million civilian employees, who, under current law, are entitled to receive all or part of their medical care from the Armed Forces. If medical service is to be supplied free to dependents and other civilians, why would it not be feasible for the Defense Department to contract directly with local hospitals and doctors, or pay the premiums for health insurance to cover the costs? The extent of the dependent medical care program is reflected directly in the medical manpower requirements of the Armed Forces.

If our Nation were at war, the drafting of doctors up to the age of 46 could be better understood. Or it could be excused if there were no other ways of meeting the medical needs of our Armed Forces. Actually, there is no incentive for young doctors to enter a career service in the Armed Forces because of the salaries which are below civilian levels. Further, they are repelled from a job which requires them to spend much time in duties not connected with their profession, and which keeps most of them at work on patients who are not members of the Armed Forces.

Certainly, there is no question about the necessity for having enough physicians and dentists to care for the needs of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and the dependents of servicemen stationed in foreign countries. The point is clear that these needs could be supplied by career officers if the career service were made slightly more attractive and by the new medical school graduates who, like all other young men, are subject to conscription under the general draft law. It is hard to go along with the policy of drafting older doctors; many of whom have already had a tour of duty in the Armed Forces.

We might bear in mind that the Government does not draft plumbers or bricklayers or carpenters to work at below union pay scales in the homes of military men and their dependents, nor has it seized factories to produce free goods for dependents and civilians. The extension of the doctor draft would mark the first time any segment of our citizens have been chosen for conscription in peacetime because of their professional training and skill.

There are plenty of doctors and dentists who could do the job if some judgment was used in their placement, for instance, in 1 department of the Government, there are 850 dentists doing research work and these are all young men just graduated, and they do not have to report to the draft board. When they take this job, they are automatically deferred by the Army. There are many more—dentists who fail to pass the physical eyamination because of the loss of a finger or toe—a disability that does not prevent them from doing a good job, who could be employed instead of these young students who could be released to serve in the Armed Forces.

I expect to have a great deal more to say about this in the next session of Congress.

Sioux Indian Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of the claim of the Sioux Tribe of Indians against the United States of America, No. 74, Indian Claims Commission, the Black Hills claim. This summary has been prepared by Mr. Ralph Hoyt Case, the Washington attorney for the Sioux Tribe and their claims against the United States.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I filed a petition to the Supreme Court asking that Court to take jurisdiction and to reverse the ruling of the United States Court of Claims. That petition was denied April 19, 1943.

In the meantime, the Indian Claims Commission Act was pending, and subsequently, it passed, and I refiled the claim with that Commission on August 15, 1950, and the case is No. 74 on the docket of that Commission.

After preliminary hearings, but before all evidence had been introduced, the Indian Claims Commission dismissed the proceeding on April 5, 1954. This decision is some 40 pages long and cannot be quoted in a letter. I filed motion for a new trial in this case, which motion was denied March 11, 1955.

At this writing, I have completed my specifications of error and am filing notice of appeal from the Indian Claims Commission decision to the United States Court of Claims. The proceedings which must now follow will be for me to file a brief in support of the appeal taken and there will be further briefs by the Government, but sometime during the latter part of this year, the case will come up on this appeal before the Court of Claims, which now has jurisdiction.

I am confident that the outcome will finally be a victory for the Sioux Tribe of Indians. We are not asking for the return of the land, nor are we questioning the title of the people who now hold it by conveyance from the United States. We are insisting that the United States is the guardian and the Sioux Tribe is the ward in this case, and that the guardian must account to the ward for the property of the ward which the guardian took without adequate and just compensation.

I suggest you advise your correspondent that the Black Hills claim is not only very much alive, but it is being prosecuted on a basis that should result in a recovery for the Sioux Tribe. No one must get the impression that individual members of the tribe will get rich out of this claim. It must be remembered that there are more than 35,000 of them who are on the rolls at the 8 reservations involved. The best we can look forward to is sufficient money to provide for the rehabilitation of the old and the education of the young members of the Sioux Tribe. It may be possible to do that which the United States has failed to do during the past 100 years it has exercised guardianship over the Sioux, that is, to bring the Sioux Tribe, by rehabilitation and education up to the competitive level on which our white citizens now stand.

As this letter has developed into rather a lengthy statement, I am taking the liberty of sending copies to the eight Sioux Reservations in South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska, which tribes or bands are plaintiffs in the action, Black Hills No. 74.

Notice of appear above referred to, together with specifications of error, relied on by the plaintiff in No. 74, Indian Claims Commission, was filed June 14, 1955, with Indian Claims Commission. The entire record together with the specifications of error and the docket fee, was filed in United States Court of Claims on the same date, June 14, 1955.

The claim, which we customarily call the Black Hills claim, is for the taking of the land in the Black Hills and the area to the north of the hills and south of the hills in South Dakota and for the loss of hunting rights in lands in South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, and Nebraska. This case was originally filed in the United States Court of Claims, May 7, 1923, and has been the subject of a vast amount of work from that day to this.

The United States, as defendant, made a complete audit of the appropriations and expenditures made by the United States for the Sioux Tribe of Indians. This audit required more than 11 years to complete. Lengthy statements of fact were filed with the court of claims. Briefs were written and arguments were had before the court, and the case was decided by the court of claims, June 1, 1942.

The decision of the Court of Claims was that the court did not have the power to "go behind" the act of Congress of February 28, 1877, which act took title to the Black Hills and surrounding land from the Sioux, with nothing paid, except a promise contained in article 5 of said act of 1877 that the United States would furnish all food, clothing, educational facilities, and all other matters necessary to bring complete civilization to the Sioux Tribe.

Abuse of Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the following which I received from one of my constituents, and I am hopeful that one of our investigating committees will look into in the very near future.

Suffice to say that my constituent is incensed with the information in this article and bitterly complains that these surpluses continue to keep prices high and increase the cost of living:

In the Fulton Market Cold Storage Co. in Chicago, H. C. Burrus, plant superintendent, showed me 14 million pounds of Government butter stored in below zero rooms. Packed in 60-pound cubes, it has been there for almost 2 years.

In the same building Burrus showed me nearly 2 million pounds of surplus cheddar cheese, in 75-pound cylindrical hoops. Some of the cheese has been there since 1953. This storage plant is only one of hundreds the CCC has filled in our great milk-producing areas.

Our Government is in the rice business too. Stashed away in warehouses in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana, CCC owns 10,500,000, 100-pound bags of rice. In Crowley, western Louisiana, a town that calls itself the rice capital of the world, warehouses were bulging with rice no one wants to buy now that oriental markets have been shut off. But the farmers go right on planting. As a result, more warehouses are needed.

Education Is More Than Book Learning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 10, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, June is the month of graduations, when young men and women throughout our Nation achieve their first major goal in life.

With school behind them, they face new responsibilities as adults and citizens, and much in their future life depends upon how solid a foundation has been laid during their long years of schooling.

It is a sobering thought to realize that in many parts of the world, spiritual values have been banished from education, and all knowledge and logic is taught on a basis of cold materialism.

Here in the United States we have maintained our religious freedom and, as a Nation, hold to our motto "In God we trust."

The following editorial, which appeared in a recent edition of the Los Angeles Tidings, is an excellent commentary on June graduation 1955, what it means to young America, and the need for constant vigilance to instill in our youth the spiritual values which through the years have made our Nation great:

DAY OF PRIDE

It is pomp and circumstance time and the June harvest of graduates. The unaccustomed cap is askance, the unfamiliar gown askew. There is the prolonged strain of seriousness and splendor as the chorus is heard, the solemn word spoken.

And then the moment when time stands still and trembling fingers clutch the parchment that attests to all the world a new son or daughter in the household of alma mater. Afterward there are the shrill congratulations and the sad farewells. New horizons loom and new responsibilities.

There is pride in the ranks of Catholic America today as it gazes more intently at the towering educational edifice its sacrifice has reared. Raised are its walls for God and country. Here is a parallel system of public schools, though privately supported, dedicated to the eternal truths and the enduring wisdom with which God inspired the early architects of our national greatness. Here is the traditional American school in which spiritual and moral values have pride of place, and shed new luster on secular subjects and new meaning on worldly concerns. What a sadness that so few of our children are allowed the vision and the dream.

The joyous shouts of children in the schools of this blessed land have had sinister echo the past decade and more in the marching tread of youth marshaled in Eastern lands by those who deny God and in Western lands by those who have forgotten Him. We have hidden from our youth the full splendor of His radiant Presence. When they asked us for bread, we reached them a stone. Not with His covenants and with crusades for His cause have we inspired them, but with cynicism and sophistry, with despair and disillusion, the death-dealing dust of a hollow materialism.

This is their need in a dread day, the wisdom that is writ on the scroll of the centuries: That they may know Thee, the one true God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou

hast sent. They look to us, the spiritually orphaned youth of today, flaming hearts for whom wealth is never enough; eager minds filled with dreams of adventure and unforgettable vistas of life and truth and love; questing for the solution of glorious riddles, splendid in the challenge to high endeavor, crusaders for the right and just, eternally seeking Holy Grails in the dust and dross of this our life.

Trustfully they come in their young faith and youthful idealism, seeking the things youth has always asked for—what the world needs so desperately—something to believe in and hope for, something that alone men will freely fight and die for, something to lift life out of its dreary, dismal darkness into God's blazing and blinding light. For the young, in whose veins beats the strong, steady pulse of creation, cannot have rest until they play their proud part in His plan.

The Late Amon G. Carter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly great Americans of our time has passed from the temporal scene. Amon G. Carter died in Fort Worth last Thursday night.

His memory will endure as long as there is a Fort Worth. The city and the west Texas region it serves are stamped with the indelible imprint of his personality.

Everywhere in this kingdom of oil and cattle, booming industry and thriving culture are the monuments to his restless vision, his daring spirit and his driving energy.

For Amon Carter was one of those rare people who achieved real greatness by doing. He was a doer of deeds. Contemptuous of obstacles and impatient of delay, he walked with steady tread into the whirlwind of history and forged an empire.

His life was a true saga of the West. From an inauspicious beginning, he proved once more the boundless opportunity which exists in this free land for one with the imagination and the force of character to capture it.

He founded a great newspaper which is a part of daily living throughout a domain that spans a thousand miles. Yet his consuming ambition was not to build a newspaper but to build a region, and the newspaper served as his personal vehicle to this end.

He became wealthy, but wealth was not his passion. He seemed to amass it for the purpose of giving it away. The extent of his beneficences is probably impossible of exact calculation. It is known that Texas Christian University, the YMCA, and 3 hospital endowments have been enriched by more than $3 million through his lavish generosity.

His largess was bestowed with the unselfconscious ease of the natural host. He wanted anyone visiting Fort Worth to be at home and took personal affront if his city was slighted. Many of the world's great came to know his unstinting hospitality and to count him a friend.

Amon Carter was known as "Mr. West Texas" because he embodied in larger measure than any other person the characteristics of spectacular success, gregarious generosity, and extreme extroversion for which the region is noted. In a land of giants, he dwarfed them all.

Fort Worth was his city, and he wanted it to have the best. There was something appealingly gallant in his unashamed partisanship. There was nothing ever halfway about his fierce allegiance. He was for Fort Worth, Tex., and the United States. He wanted the world to know it, and the world did know it.

It was never my privilege to know Mr. Carter personally. But I was intensely proud as a college student to work for his newspaper. Nobody growing up in his town could fail to feel the force of his personality or the inspiration of his achievements.

His passing leaves a void which cannot be easily filled. Yet the region and the Nation he loved with his whole heart and unrestrained enthusiasm are fortunate that the forces he set in motion will continue to live. Most of the responsibilities he bore are now assumed by Amon Carter, Jr., whose qualities of unfeigned modesty and something akin to humility will in time do ample justice to the tradition of which he is the heir.

Lesser men may discuss, as I do today, the attributes of the great, dominant personalities. We may philosophize and analyze and interpret. But society's progress owes primarily to the enterprise, the resourcefulness, and courage of the very few in each generation who are the prime movers, the builders, the doers of deeds. Amon Carter was one of these. He was one of the greatest of these.

Benelux Sets the Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, with the so-called meeting at the summit only a short distance in the future, all of us are concerned with the problems of foreign policy. These problems are many, grave, and complex. Among the most important to all of us, but one which is not being considered intensively at the present time, is that of European unity. Could this great aim be achieved, many of our current problems might well be solved. How true this is may be seen quite clearly in the experience of a group of the smaller nations of Europe—the Benelux nations. This group has acted as a kind of pilot experiment in European accord and the record clearly indicates an overwhelmingly favorable experience.

Many of us are aware of these facts but they tend to become lost in the press of daily events. European unity is a goal well worth keeping in our minds and in the minds of our citizens. It, therefore, gave me a great deal of pleasure to note that one of the newest publications in my district has called these matters to the attention of my constituents in eloquent and forceful language. Because the subject is of considerable importance and, because the editorial referred to, states the issue so well, I should like to include it as a part of my remarks. It appeared in the Burlington (N. J.) Times on June 20, 1955. The editorial follows:

BENELUX SETS THE PACE

The great project for the unity of Europe is pressed more earnestly in Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg than anywhere on the Continent or in the British Isles. One might wish that the spirit shown by the Benelux lands would prove catching.

No one has any right to expect any miracles. Perhaps it is miracle enough that Europe, through such devices as the Benelux customs union, the Coal and Steel Community, and the defense collaboration of NATO, has already managed a striking start toward unity.

Certainly Americans have often been too impatient at the seeming slow progress. Encouraged by the fluid political state of many nations in the postwar era, we sometimes have assumed that unity could be achieved almost at a single stroke.

We ourselves would not readily cast aside national patterns in the manner required of Europe. And European countries, of course, are much more firmly in the grip of their national customs and traditions than are we.

Nevertheless, this is a golden opportunity, and it is fair to ask that forward-looking statesmen seize it. The economic and political pressures exerted by Russian communism provide a driving force that has not been present before. Under such a threat, men can be moved who might otherwise stand fast for long years more.

The Dutch, the Belgians, and the Luxembourgers are displaying the kind of positive approach which is best calculated to take advantage of the opportunity.

As Michael Hoffman, of the New York Times, observes, the key to their progress toward economic union is that they begin any negotiations by assuming that a commonly acceptable solution must be found. They do not start by taking a stout national position from which they will not retreat.

The same cannot be said for others, and particularly France. The first stress always seems to be on the obstacles to action.

But not with the Benelux nations. They are out to show that unified action is feasible. They believe in it, and they will not let barriers stand in the way. And, most remarkable of all, they manage a high degree of cooperation without setting up a whole host of new "supranational" agencies.

These three little countries deserve the free world's praise for grasping so eagerly and imaginatively the great chance that now exists to forward the cause of European unity.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to

approve the San Juan-Chama irrigation project in New Mexico.

The San Juan-Chama project is a part of the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the San Juan-Chama project would be $4,250 an acre.

The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

Surprising Four Trustees Voted To Sustain Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the House Un-American Activities Committee performed another great service to this Nation by holding hearings in Newark, N. J., on the subject of communism in education and labor. Three teachers hid behind the fifth amendment when quizzed about their relations with Communist conspiracy. The Newark Board of Education, after statements by Representative WALTER, voted 5 to 4 to dismiss the teachers as useless.

Thereafter, the Newark Star Ledger reports that the counsel for the teachers "planned to broaden the scope of the appeal to include two sections of the Federal Criminal Code dealing with protection of constitutional rights and privileges to citizens." This announcement is tantamount to a threat against those members of the board of education who voted to fire the teachers under investigation. I am surprised that members of the bar, who have every right to defend their clients, would go beyond matters of defense and attempt to terrorize and frighten public officials in the exercise of their duty. They say in effect, you vote for us or we will bring a criminal complaint against you. That comes dangerously close to intimidation. It should be deplored.

It has been revealed later, however, that Adrian M. Unger, counsel for 1 of the 3 dismissed teachers said they had no intention of filing criminal charges against the school board but would cite the United States Criminal Code in arguing their appeal in order to illustrate that "it is the public policy of the United States that no one's constitutional rights should be interfered with." While it is gratifying to know that complaints against the five members of the board of education who voted for dismissal are not planned, there still is the implication and warning that public officials who vote against fifth amendment lovers may be violating the Federal law. Such a position seems hardly necessary to perfect the defense of the teachers but seems more likely to be an offensive tactic to cow the board of education members. Such a position undoubtedly will be cheered in those circles where the comrades meet to discuss legal maneuvers.

The Hudson Dispatch editorial of Saturday, June 25, has pertinent comments in regard to this case which are enclosed hereafter.

The people of New Jersey owe a debt of gratitude to the House Un-American Activities Committee and in particular to Congressman WALTER who has been so outspoken in defense of America and true academic freedom.

The article follows:

SURPRISING FOUR TRUSTEES VOTED TO SUSTAIN TEACHERS

When teachers in the public schools hide behind the fifth amendment to keep from telling their connections with the Communist Party or other subversive organizations, they forfeit their right to take taxpayers' money. They also prove themselves to be unfit to teach the coming generations, in our opinion.

The most surprising part of the trial of 3 teachers, who had refused to answer questions before House of Representatives Un-American Activities Subcommittee during the probers' sessions last month in Newark, is that 4 of the 9 members of that city's board of education Thursday night voted against firing them.

Yesterday, lawyers for the teachers, who were dismissed by the five-member majority of the board, appealed the verdict to State Commissioner of Education Frederick Raubinger. Naturally, the defendants will use every legal recourse to upset the board's decision.

Industrial Attractions of Sonoma County, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the June 22, 1955, issue of the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat entitled "Sonoma County Offers Haven for Industries."

The concentration of defense industries in target areas, is a matter of considerable concern. Agencies of the Federal Government are encouraging new industries to locate outside danger zones, but still in proximity to industrial and transportation centers.

Sonoma County, Calif., completely qualifies under the criteria. It is out of blast damage range should the San Francisco area be bombed, and would be practically free from the danger of radioactive fallout.

It is within easy access to the San Francisco Bay area, and has good railroad connections for coastal and Eastern railroad shipments. It offers ideal climatic conditions and recreational facilities of almost every type.

As a further description of what the county has to offer, I respectfully call your attention to the following editorial:

SONOMA COUNTY OFFERS HAVEN FOR INDUSTRIES

Victor Roterus, chief of the Area Development Division, United States Department of Commerce, met with Representative HUBERT B. SCUDDER in Washington recently to examine Sonoma County's fitness as a possible location for defense industries.

"From the viewpoint of adequate dispersion of new defense industries, the Sonoma County area completely qualifies," Mr. Roterus said. "In view of its dispersed location and at the same time its position in the west coast market, particularly its proximity to San Francisco, it should make an attractive location to many types of industries."

The job of Mr. Roterus' division of the Department of Commerce is to encourage defense industries to locate outside vulnerable target areas.

Sonoma County is uniquely well qualified from that standpoint. It is outside both the blast area, and the "atomic ash" fallout area of any hydrogen bombs that might be dropped on the San Francisco Bay area.

Yet much of Sonoma County is less than 2 hours from San Francisco by highway truck.

Sonoma County holds more advantages than the important but passive one of being close to major distribution centers, yet completely safe from the dangers of atomic attacks.

Representative SCUDDER pointed out to Mr. Roterus that few places in the Nation offer the recreational facilities that are taken for granted in Sonoma County. Both workers and management personnel here can and do enjoy uncrowded, pleasant living conditions. The Russian River playground is in the heart of the county. So are hunting and fishing areas, the Valley of the Moon country, and other attractions.

Few sections provide the pleasant and rapid assimilation of newcomers that is furnished in Sonoma County by its wealth of clubs, organizations, and churches of all faiths.

Too, Sonoma County has a tremendous asset in its labor force. Production is higher, spoilage of work is lower, and labor relations are better here than in most areas of the Nation.

Those are cold facts, provable by the experience and production records of industries which have either moved here from elsewhere, or which have opened branch plants here.

As to why this should be the case, probably the reason is that the workers of Sonoma County have a pride of craftsmanship and performance; and employers have a pride in their workers. Part of the reason may be found in the fact that living conditions in Sonoma County are not overcrowded or overhurried. The tensions and strains of urban living simply do not exist here. The people are relaxed, confident, and efficient.

Lessons and Blessin's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Lessons And Blessin's" which appeared in the June 19, 1955, issue of the Gleaner and Journal of Henderson, Ky.

Leigh Harris, president and publisher of the Gleaner and Journal, is an outstanding Kentuckian and a newspaperman of note who believes that, under

no circumstances, should news be suppressed, but should be dispensed in line with the true facts. He is a gentleman of the old school whose integrity and high principle could never be questioned, even by those in disagreement with his theories. Mr. Harris' contribution to the city in which he resides has been outstanding, for he has, at all times, striven to make the community a better place in which to live. His influence and keen interest in public affairs is not only manifested locally, but is felt throughout the State of Kentucky. It is to such citizens that deserved tribute should be paid.

The editorial is as follows:

LESSONS AND BLESSIN'S

The fact that you are reading this column today is a tribute to a fellow we call the boss who started writing editorials for Henderson 46 years ago.

Besides being our boss, he's our dad. And today is dad's day, as good a time as any to say thanks for many blessin's and lessons.

The lessons should be included in the blessin's, for it is by the hard ways as well as the easy that we learn of life. If we had a criticism to make of the boss it would be that he tried too hard to make it too easy for us in the early days. This lesson isn't of any particular value except in its universal application.

And universal it is, for we scarce know of a dad today who doesn't grind his nose on a grindstone to make life easier for his offspring.

Some of these pops say openly: "Our kids just mustn't have it as hard as we had it." Some go about the work of making play of life by providing luxuries and advantages far beyond their ability to pay—simply because it is the pattern of the age as well.

People in business know that there are few applications for summer work these days, when the young ones have but to ask pop for money, and get it. Housewives know how few are the applications for lawn mowing, which used to be the way of the young man to earn change to spend on movies and treats during summer months.

Governmental officials know that the parents and children alike look to them to provide amusement to occupy leisure time, just as the young ones look to dad to provide the cash.

Well, that is how it is today, and that is how it was in our youth, when the boss took from our shoulders the weight of money care, and gave us the fabulous childhood of Glen Oak. It was a shared advantage, for throughout our own and the childhoods of succeeding generations the boss and his lady made of Glen Oak a hospitable recreation center for play, swimming, dancing, and supervised activity. "Uncle Leigh" and "Aunt Jane" is how they were known by hundreds. This sort of pampering of young people may have been unwise, but it was quite, quite nice for all of us.

For such we are thankful today, as we look Father's Day full in the face.

In addition, we thank the boss for the lessons learned by osmosis, which we learned about flowers and trees and birds and animals—love of nature, love of beauty, love of the land and its growing things. The boss and his partner took as great a joy in the out-of-doors as any two people we've ever known. They shared their love of beauty, as they shared their beauty.

Thanks for this, too, Boss.

And thanks for the biggest lessons of all, which have had to do with community life in the communal pattern. Ours was never a home where individual choice directed the pattern of the life. Dedicated parents beget dedicated offspring. And the boss and his Jane were truly dedicated to the cause of a better Henderson. If some of that spirit hadn't rubbed off on succeeding generations, we'd have been unnatural.

No dinner at Glen Oak ever went uninterrupted by the telephone. The community's business was our own. It is that way still. We've been told that this is not good for families, and that one should pay attention strictly and solely to one's own business.

This may be true, and it may just be that the boss and the Mrs. boss taught us lessons we shouldn't have learned.

But we go along with those—and they number hundreds—who think that the boss did a great deal for his home town in his active years. They think, and they tell us so, that they still get a great buzz out of the humorous remarks he makes these days as they pass him on the street. He is still a senior senator of his beloved community. He still lives for the paper which binds him to his communal family. He still cannot be quiet at home, for home is at the office, and on the streets which he loves to tread.

Today is pop's day. Mr. Boss. We're thinking about you, and what you have meant to your offspring and to the hundreds of children who have been associated with you in work and in play. We think you are quite a fellow, and we want to honor you today, as others honor their dads. For as we salute our own, so do we pay honor to all of the fathers of the land, who so greatly deserve this day of spiritual tribute.

Tribute to Helen Keller on the Occasion of Her 75th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, today the world celebrates the birthday of a great, noble lady. Peoples everywhere will pause on this June 27 to pay tribute to Helen Keller on her 75th birthday, to commemorate the courageous and glorious attainments of a human being who has transcended the limits of physical disabilities.

In this time of relentless world strife and increasing pressures on the capacity of man to successfully meet his daily challenges, I know of no person who serves to inspire us to greater and greater attainments in the face of seeming insurmountable obstacles as this great lady from Tuscumbia, Ala. Although her first and foremost interest has been devoted to the handicapped throughout the world, her inspiration has been claimed by millions of people in all walks of life, by those who live in a still and dark world as well as those who are sound and secure in body. She has been acclaimed far and wide by kings, ministers, and presidents in all lands for her untiring and heroic endeavor on behalf of mankind.

Harvard University recently selected Miss Keller as the first woman in the university's 313-year history to receive an honorary degree. In awarding this singular honor the Harvard University noted: "From a still dark work she has brought us light and sound; our lives are richer for her faith and her example." This tribute echoes throughout the world on many tongues and joyful faces.

Since Miss Keller graduated with honors from Radcliffe College in 1904, she has dedicated her rich life to the cause of the deaf and blind. And as she begins her 76th year she affirms her continued effort and service in every way to help provide a better chance in life for the handicapped. In a recent interview she stated that she disliked the very word "retirement," that she intended to work as long as she possibly could for those who live in a world of darkness and stillness. To know that this brave woman will continue her writing, her travels, and her every little endeavor to cheer the lives of all men everywhere surely gladdens the hearts and souls of man universal.

Miss Keller, who now resides with her companion, Miss Polly Thomson, in a rambling colonial home about 50 miles from New York City, recently returned from a 40,000-mile tour of the Orient where I am sure she instilled in those she met the finest aspects of American character. The annals of human history will certainly record this lady as one of America's most beloved and effective envoys, as the person who more than any other has reached the comman man with universal love, understanding, and hope. As a case in point, an Indian newspaper a few months ago editorialized that Miss Keller is the "finest gift which America has yet given to India." To be sure this magnificent individual has bestowed upon the human race the fruits of a devoted and selfless life, those attributes which defy measure in terms of cost and profit.

On this day, which has been proclaimed by the acting mayor of New York City as Helen Keller Day and which marks the beginning of a week which has been declared by the governor of Alabama as "Helen Keller Week," we contemplate an individual and her monumental works with the profound hope that her fellow man will overcome the obstructions to world peace and encompass the light and sound which she has found although she cannot hear or see. We must find renewed courage and hope in the example of this intrepid lady who has given so much to so many. We must take heart and use those faculties of body and mind given us by the Creator lest we return to abysmal darkness.

A voice from the darkness has shown the way.

Dr. Phelps' Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Denver Post, Thursday, July 9, 1955:

DR. PHELPS' SCHOLARSHIP

Dr. Phelps Phelps, once Governor of Samoa and later Ambassador to the Domini-

can Republic, has come up with an idea for winning the minds of the people of Latin America that is worth consideration. Dr. Phelps has already practiced what he preaches, and is obviously well satisfied with the result so far.

At the University of Santo Domingo, the Ambassador arranged to set up a scholarship which he personally endowed, and which endowment the university invested in local bonds, the income from which is used to pay the tuition of the scholarship winner. Applicants are required to write essays on topics picked by the judges. The judges are the United States Ambassador, the university rector, and the director of the Dominican-American Cultural Institute. Topics are picked that require all applicants to do some research in the United States way of life, our economic system, and the economic and military unity of our two countries.

Dr. Phelps now suggests that it would be no difficult trick, but one extremely advantageous to us in combating Communist ideology throughout Latin America, if somebody in the United States—he mentions either our Government or educational foundations and industries operating in those countries—would organize, sponsor, and supervise a similar plan throughout the Organization of American States. (Annual tuition at most of their state universities is less than $100.) Thus, he figures, we could be selling the American way of life to a lot of people who never listen to our radio broadcasts, and who at best read what the Government-controlled press wishes them to read.

The idea has the tremendous merit of simplicity. Surely it would be worth $100 a year to the United States to get 50, or maybe even only 10, young Latins in any one of the southern countries to do some serious, intelligent research into American life and institutions as related to his own country's well-being.

Dr. Phelps outlined his plan briefly in a letter last week to the New York Times. It would be too bad to let the idea just lie there unnoticed and without serious consideration by the Government, educational groups, and American industries which have in the past found their best customers in Latin America. If they hope to hold them, this looks like an economical and effective way to assist doing it.

Molotov's Spots Come Out Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown, from the Washington Star of June 24, 1955:

MOLOTOV'S SPOTS COME OUT AGAIN—NEHRU, TOO, SHOWS HIS COLORS IN JOINING KREMLIN GANG IN EXCHANGE FOR SOVIET AID

Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov consented at San Francisco to lift the corner of the rug of good intentions, but to the dismay of Secretary Dulles and his colleagues of the free countries he uncovered the same termites which have been gnawing at the world's peace foundations for the last decade.

When he spoke before the congregation of peace-loving countries at the United Nations' 10th anniversary celebration, the Soviet foreign minister's recent smiles had changed to the customary snarl.

The spokesman for Red despotism was all for peace in our time—on the Kremlin's terms. His speech was interpreted by some of the American representatives as being addressed more to the United States than its allies in the West. He told us in effect: "All right, you can have an end of the cold war whenever you like. All you must do is clear out your troops from Germany, withdraw your assistance from the Nationalist Government of China and allow the Communists to take Formosa; and join us in kicking the Nationalists out of the United Nations to make room for the Chinese Communists."

In some responsible quarters in Washington Mr. Molotov's speech is interpreted as having sounded the death knell of the Geneva Conference. Sources close to the White House, however, indicate that President Eisenhower is determined to go through with the summit parley despite the obvious intentions of the Soviet Government.

The earlier atmosphere of reserved optimism that Russia might be willing to suspend the cold war for a while and play a make-believe peace game is rapidly vanishing from Washington official quarters.

More significant than Molotov's warning that the price of a cold war truce must be the surrender of the Free Chinese and eating of crow in connection with the admission of Peiping to the U. N. is the signing of an agreement between India and the U. S. S. R. at Moscow on the very same day Comrade Molotov delivered his unofficial ultimatum.

The agreement provides for economic and industrial help to India by the Russians. In exchange Mr. Nehru has pledged himself to support all the Kremlin's demands for the establishment of Communist China as a de jure government, incorporating in its territory all the islands now held by the Free Chinese government. This agreement is interpreted by responsible officials in our Government as the setting up of a formal Moscow-Peiping-New Delhi axis much like the axis established in 1938. India's military importance is negligible, but her prestige in Asia is to be reckoned with. Much of this prestige was fostered by the policies and utterances of the American policymakers who have hidden their heads in the sand and refused to recognize Mr. Nehru's strong leanings toward the Communist bloc.

American political ambassadors, such as Chester Bowles and now Sherman Cooper, have been untiring in their efforts to induce Congress to spend lavish sums on the Indian Government. They contended that while we might not win Nehru ideologically to our side we could assure his neutrality through bonanzas from America, financed by our taxpayers.

The high-minded Nehru, the envoys admitted, was incorruptible. But by offering much needed assistance—without any political strings—he would recognize our honesty of purpose and would maintain a useful neutrality. In the long run, it was maintained by our political diplomats, Nehru will recognize that in exchange for at least a couple of billions in assistance we ask nothing but his good will.

Nehru, we were told, is a man dedicated to peace and he would never play into the hands of those who want to disturb it. These reports were mistaken. He showed his true colors at Moscow when he accepted doubtful Soviet economic aid in exchange for his complete political support of the Communist objectives.

Not only has Nehru joined the Kremlin gang in demanding that we hand over Formosa, but he also formally supports giving Free China's seat in the U. N. to Peiping immediately. This is in spite of the fact that Peiping is still branded as an aggressor by the U. N.

Hard-headed realists have always strongly doubted the ultimate intentions of the Indian Prime Minister. Some soft-minded idealists and perennial optimists in responsible positions in Washington kept hoping that while he could not be swayed to our side he could be induced to remain a friendly neutral because of his high principles and also because he needed our economic and financial support. He has now on his own initiative dispelled whatever hopes may have existed among our political leaders as to his position in the world conflict. He has sided officially with the enemies of this country.

Address at Dedication of a Monument in Honor of 90 Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 29, 1955, a monument was unveiled in my district in memory of 90 gallant young men who lost their lives during World War II. On that solemn occasion I delivered the following address:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO AT DEDICATION OF MONUMENT MAY 29, 1955

I deem it a great privilege to join with the citizens of our fine community in dedicating this monument today. This is an occasion which takes on added significance. It in our effort, in a humble way, to honor the memory of our dead heroes and the defenders of our Nation's honor. Today, we pay homage to these gallant men who have made the supreme sacrifice in the defense of our country and for the most precious heritage of the American people—our freedom and democracy.

We are gathered here today, not in a spirit of glorification of our victory in World War II but to dedicate a monument and to lay a symbolic rose on this monument in the loving memory of those 90 brave men who came from our midst who grew up to adulthood in our community, and lived among us as neighbors. We are gathered here today—families, friends, neighbors, people from all walks of life—to collectively rededicate ourselves, to reconsecrate our hearts, and to reaffirm our beliefs in the solemn purpose for which they have died.

The one great hallmark of a civilized society is that it always shows and expresses its appreciation of the sacrifices made in its defense and the services rendered for its preservation. Yet, our capacity for thanks to those who have done so much for us, is limited—a shrine, a monument, a stone-marker over a grave, an account of their heroism in a book or newspaper, a memorial gathering such as this—and that is about all.

We feel it is not enough. We know it is not enough. We know that in our hearts these men and their deeds will live forever. Of the multitude of fine virtues planted in our hearts and minds, perhaps none is so widely shared by all of us as the feeling of gratitude for good deeds performed on our behalf. We generally express that feeling by commemorating the bravery of our heroes and we speak kind words of their heroism.

The words of praise that we utter here and the monument we dedicate today in their memory is only a small way in which we can

express our feeling of gratitude. Their heroic deeds and their sacrifices must not and shall not ever be forgotten or in any way diminished, irrespective of the passing of countless years. Our words of praise and our recitation of their sacrifices can add but little to their greatness. They have erected for themselves a monument of greatness that speaks louder and more forcefully than anything we can ever say. This great monument that they and others like them have helped to erect is our own country, our beloved United States, democratic, peace-loving, powerful, and dedicated to the principles that all men are created equal, with certain inalienable rights.

This occasion is not one of brief pause when we merely recall those whose mortal remains have turned to dust. It has lasting meaning for us and for generations to come. Today we enshrine the memory of those who gave their lives in defense of certain sacred principles and beliefs, which are the very essence and which form the sinews of our spiritual lives as free men. The 90 brave youths whose memory we honor on this solemn occasion gallantly fought and sacrificed themselves for that sacred cause. They have given their lives on the battlegrounds of liberty, in order that their fellowmen in this country and all over the world might live in peace and freedom.

The fact that these 90 men represented several of the racial strains and diverse religious elements of our community is significant. Among them were Roman Catholics, Protestants and Jews, Italians, Poles, and men of other national origins which make up the people of this community and of America as a whole. Without distinction as to race or creed, they all sacrificed themselves in World War II, for they were, above all else, true, faithful, loyal, and patriotic Americans.

And so today men of all faiths honor these brave heroes—a Joe Fileccia, charitable of heart and mind and dedicated to his fellowmen; a supreme court justice, the Honorable Charles Beckinella, who as a legislator and a learned judge has always tempered mercy with justice; and still another justice of the city court, the Honorable John E. Cone, whose crusade in the fight to build a better youth will never be forgotten.

Those we all honor today were destined by fate to have their lives cut short just as they had reached maturity, but in their short lives they have taught us a lesson which we must never forget—the lesson to defend and, if necessary, to die for the ideas and ideals that are dear to us all. Having learned that lesson, it is our duty to teach it to succeeding generations.

It is an equally noble and sublime duty for us to pay homage to the memory of these gallant men who, unflinchingly and dauntlessly, fought for a sacred cause and who in that fight made the supreme sacrifice for God and country. It is for us, the living, to solemnly vow to keep faith with our immortal heroes.

The great American poet, Edwin Markham, once eulogized a friend in the following words:

"And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a kingly cedar—green with boughs—
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome space against the sky."

The young men we eulogize today also went down in a whirlwind—a whirlwind not of their own making—and they left a lonesome space, not against the sky, but right here deep in our hearts. We shall always bear this lonesome, vacant spot in our hearts for the rest of our lives.

America Alone Carries the Torch of Idealism and Morality, Molotov and Macmillan Both Proclaim Cynical Position at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of June 24, 1955:

SAN FRANCISCO, June 24.—Did Molotov torpedo the conference "at the summit"? Is there any real possibility of agreement now? For the Soviet Foreign Minister has announced an unalterable, rigid line of policy which offers no concession—in fact, admits no wrong in the Communist imperialism and aggression of the last 10 years.

There are still among the delegates some who refuse to have their ardor dampened and who profess to see in the Molotov review of world affairs a confession of weakness and a vindication of the policy of military strength as a deterrent. But many others are whistling to keep up their optimism. For the plain meaning of the Molotov address is that he wants peace—but without any price at all to the Communists.

The Molotov address was a bombshell. It aroused adverse comments in rebuttal from the Cuban, Philippine, and French spokesmen. But everybody realized that, with the speech scheduled for today by the United States Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, there could be only an implicit rather than an explicit reply because the rules of this U. N. session do not permit direct attacks by one country on another. The insults have to be carefully phrased so as to appear to be general rather than specific.

What the American delegation might have done was to schedule a speech at the Commonwealth Club here—outside the U. N. meeting—challenging the Soviet Government to let some American spokesman have time on the television and radio networks throughout Soviet Russia, so that the people there could get the other side of the story of what has been happening in the last 10 years. According to Molotov, only the western countries have been committing aggression and threatening attack.

The British Foreign Secretary, Harold Macmillan, used the device of a speech at the Commonwealth Club to get off his chest a lot of things he wanted to say about what is going on in the world. For one thing, he wished to pay his respects to those in both America and Britain who talk loosely about nationalism and colonialism. He said:

"Nationalism, like alcohol, should be taken in moderation—as a stimulant, not as a drug. Anyway, nationalism in Asia has often been the stooge and stalking horse of communism. These young countries need patriotism—but they need also to be protected from the blandishments of communism masquerading as idealism."

Then Mr. Macmillan went on to tell the real story of what's happening in Malaya—a British colony. He declared that at it is a part of the world "where subversion is being promoted by open violence—amounting to war." He explained that the Communist terrorists "have recently turned their attention to the cities; to subverting political parties, trade unions, and—most serious of all—to forming Communist cells in schools."

What a refreshing thing it is to hear a British Foreign Secretary talking about the facts of life as the Communists shape them nowadays! He added:

"It's easy to repeat old sneers about British colonialism. I sometimes hear them still—chiefly nowadays from the leftists in our two countries—the intellectual bourbons who have forgotten nothing and learned nothing, and hope that those they write for or speak to haven't either."

Mr. Macmillan talked of the elections held in Singapore recently and the elections soon to be held in the Federation of Malaya, and then remarked:

"I've not heard of any elections in Communist-controlled territories—except the ones where 99.7 percent of the people vote obediently for one party—the party of their masters. Dr. Gallup hasn't much of a look-in under communism."

Unfortunately, the British Foreign Secretary marred his speech by an oblique defense of the British policy in recognizing the Red Chinese government. He said that "the only test was that the government should really be in actual control of the territory concerned—that's why we recognized the government in Communist China and sent a mission there."

But, while arguing that this doesn't mean approval of the governments being recognized, he forgot that his own government today refuses to agree to the admission of Spain into United Nations because it dislikes Franco's government—which, of course, is in complete control of Spanish territory. Nor is the issue what Mr. Macmillan presented. Nobody quarrels with what Britain did in recognizing Red China prior to the Korean war, but the critics rightly point to Britain's expressed willingness to admit Red China into the United Nations after the Peiping government intervened in the Korean war of aggression and caused hundreds of thousands of casualties. It is British readiness to ignore that phase of the behavior of the government of Communist China that has profoundly shocked Americans, especially those who don't believe international morality is advanced by rewarding an aggressor.

Perhaps the frankest and most candid expression that has come on the subject was in Mr. Macmillan's comment about the original reason for British recognition of Red China and other governments: "We do it, to be frank, to benefit ourselves—not to please them. * * * This may be the right or wrong view of what is expedient. But it's certainly nothing to quarrel about."

But that's the crux of the whole problem of international relations today. The British cry out when their interests are damaged in Malaya, but they are evidently willing to play the game of expediency in other parts of the world. America alone carries the torch of idealism and morality. It is too bad British materialism and its concern for trade through Hong Kong, another British colony, has caused the British of both major parties in Parliament to fail to see that a shortsighted course which makes compromises with evil only compounds the felonies of international crime.

May Yet Reap Whirlwind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "May Yet Reap Whirlwind" which

appeared in the June 22, 1955, issue of The Messenger and Inquirer of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

MAY YET REAP WHIRLWIND

President Juan Peron, of Argentina, evidently was saved from political ruin this time by the loyalty of his army; a loyalty he had taken drastic measures to insure. In the view of experts, he may not fare so well in a future revolt.

It is almost axiomatic to say that a dictator who crushes a rebellion emerges stronger than ever. Some of the best judges of Argentine affairs say that possibly this will be the temporary result of Peron's successful routing of the revolutionaries who touched off the biggest uprising of his regime.

But these same judges believe that Peron has been weakened in the long run, not alone by the abortive result but by his bitter battle with the Catholic Church. They are convinced there will be another assault upon his government one day and that it will succeed.

Peron's power today rests partly on the army, partly on a strong police force, and partly on government-dominated labor unions managed by his stooges. Of these, the army is, of course, the most crucial element.

It was unlikely any revolt would succeed which did not enlist the army. This newest insurgency did not. As nearly as can be figured, navy and air force men led the assault. The navy was the principal factor, but the use of jet planes in one of the two bombing attacks on the government palace indicated the cooperation of at least some air force personnel.

To insure it, Peron has eliminated many officers who might conceivably threaten his position. He has scattered army units about the country, and kept them separated from their munitions and motor fuel.

But these are not insurmountable obstacles to revolt if a true underground movement should develop within the army. The elements of successful rebellion evist within this force and the trained activists of his labor stooges.

Peron's campaign against the Catholic church, to which the great many of Argentinians belong, may contain the seeds of his ultimate downfall. In taking on the powerful adversary, he may have bit off more than he can chew.

If time shows that he has thus overreached himself, that the people do not support this boldest bid for absolute power, then the army may take its cue and the dictator may at long last be crushed.

Men who know Argentina well believe this will happen. Free men elsewhere in the world, anxious for the strengthening of liberty in every corner of the globe, hope it will.

God and the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a well considered editorial appearing in the Pilot, official publication of the archdiocese of Boston, in its issue of June 25, 1955.

There is no question but what the United Nations should find a place for God in it and would be far more effective if it did.

The member nations of the United Nations should give quick and favorable consideration to the recognition of God and His word, and that the weakness of the United Nations is due to the fact that His word is the origin of constructive considerations and actions.

It has long seemed to me that each member nation of the General Assembly, and of the Security Council through the call of a calendar, could and should, on the day it is reached on the calendar, determine whether or not the meeting should be opened with prayer. I can see no objection to this procedure. It would give proper recognition to the feelings of those nations whose people believe in God. At the present time the policy of exclusion of God and His word is followed to either please, or not arouse, the feelings of a few member nations who are in control of regimes who not only do not believe in, but who deny God.

From any angle that one might view it, this situation is unwarranted and untenable.

It should be rectified at once. I offer a suggestion that I think is worthy of consideration and which might well be a solution of this deep and vitally important question of concern to hundreds of milloins of persons.

The editorial follows:

GOD AND THE U. N.

The 10th anniversary meeting in San Francisco this week has been the occasion for many rhetorical reviews of the accomplishments of the United Nations since its beginning in 1945. Some people have managed to express satisfaction with the record of the decade, pointing out that we cannot expect too much from the first few years and that patient labor will bring us to more impressive successes. Some others have used a quaint and expressive language of total damnation. From every point of view, however, reasonable men will believe that there is some reason to hope, since even with its present handicaps the U. N. offers the greatest possible vehicle presently available to us for the realization of our political ideals.

Our concern at this time is particularly directed toward those who with healthy and laudable instincts, feel that the spiritual values of humanity have been ignored in the U. N. through a complete preoccupation with political, economic and social questions. So many religiously minded people have remarked over and over again that they could have much more confidence in the U. N. if somehow they could "find a place for God in it." In some large percentage of people this is a genuine anxiety and, although the same sentiment is used by others to bolster an antipathy based on other grounds, it deserves to be considered seriously.

It was in answer to such universal demands, we may suppose, that the meditation room, sometimes called the chapel, was established recently at the U. N. headquarters in New York. Perhaps it was felt that this would have the dual result of providing a room for prayer for the delegates and at the same time convince observers everywhere that the reflective values of the soul of man were not being totally ignored. The complaints, however, still continue and until the U. N. manages somehow to get a mention of God into the charter there are some elements that will not be satisfied. It would, of course, be desirable to have God acknowledged in the text of the U. N. Charter but in the face of current ideological realities, it is something less than likely. What then to do?

Some of course will hold out for the day that will allow some recognition of the Creator in the revised charter—and until that time they will refuse to assist the labors of such a godless outfit as the presently constituted U. N. It is not likely that any thing will make these people abandon this role which they support with the most pious of sentiments, though their prevailing motives are often somewhat distant from their expressed religious ones. Some others, who feel just as strongly on the matter, prefer to put off pressing for the name of the deity in the charter, a merely verbal arrangement, until a more happy time and in the meantime seek to cooperate in all the good ventures which the U. N. machinery makes possible for us.

The argument of this last group makes rather good sense. If you cannot get the name of God into the text of the U. N. charter, you can at least work toward the accomplishment of those ends which are supported by religious values and which fulfill the spiritual yearnings of humanity. The U. N. is, in this sense, a machinery for peace—it has in fact demonstrated at least in a small way its ability to prevent war. It is also a forum for the pursuit of justice and it has brought truth to triumph on many complex and distorted questions. More than this it dedicates itself to the alleviation of want and poverty in underdeveloped areas and through UNESCO it seeks to enlighten minds trapped in darkness and confusion. All of these and so many other functions touch closely upon religious ideals and require spiritual nourishment for their success. If the U. N. cannot yet give official allegiance to the name of God, it can in its efforts work to accomplish His will. In this we feel that all religious-minded persons should give it their assistance.

Fresh Outer Culture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues another of the delightful stories of a gentleman who is a friend of all of us on Capitol Hill—Colonel James "Bing" Morris, manager of the Congressional Hotel. This story, reported in George Dixon's column in the Washington Post and Times Herald recently, is one to delight the hearts of all connoiseurs of either Government "gobbledegook" or Johnsonian spelling. I submit it herewith:

FRESH OUTER CULTURE

When President Eisenhower returned to his old Alma Mater he was assured that the United States Military Academy is now stressing culture as much as the art of war.

Many hard-bitten old campaigners look askance at this, but I have just received double assurance that the Army is going cultural from a retired warrior, Col. James "Bing" Morris, who runs the Congressional Hotel on Capitol Hill.

Colonel Morris, an erudite type himself, reports that he spent last weekend cruising on Chesapeake Bay. On Sunday they holed up in Rhode River to ride out a storm, but on Monday they were informed they'd have to continue beyond the second bridge to the town of Riva if they wanted beer.

When they got to the second span they saw it was a drawbridge. They tooted for the

draw to open. Then Mrs. Morris called attention to a large sign on the bridge.

They maneuvered their yacht close enough to make out that it had been placed there by the United States Army engineers, which claims proudly to be one of the more learned branches of the service. Then they spelled out the message written thereon by the military classicists. It read:

"Outer order."

United Nations Still a Symbol of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "United Nations Still a Symbol of Hope" which appeared in the June 21, 1955 issue of the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

UNITED NATIONS STILL A SYMBOL OF HOPE

In the great flush of emotion that attended the close of World War II, the United Nations, newly born, became the symbol of hope for a bright new world from which war would be banished.

After ten of the most turbulent peacetime years in modern history, the U. N. is still that symbol. But there is a more realistic understanding of its limitations.

The U. N. is above all a forum where men of many lands may discuss their problems with one another, and their differences.

Often it has been stressed that the agency gives them this chance to talk. But what is really important is not just that they can talk but that they want to talk in the U. N.

As Walter Lippmann has pointed out, no nation has resigned from the U. N. and many more would join if they could. Only Russia boycotted it briefly, returning quickly when it saw the handicap of being on the outside.

The U. N. of course, is a propaganda sounding board for many countries, most particularly the Communist lands. But it is also a unique outlet for the complaints of small nations against big. And it is the living embodiment of man's desire that nations hereafter shall get along with each other, somehow, without resort to major war.

In the U. N. negotiations never cease. They may halt for a time, but they always can be resumed. No diplomat is handed his passport and ordered home from U. N. headquarters when talks break down. Diplomats from all member nations can take part in discussions, no matter what offenses may be charged against their countries.

It is not just an association of like-minded peoples, but of peoples of many political and religious faiths. In this very basic sense it is a universal organization.

Because it has remained universal through all the titanic struggles of the cold war, it continues to symbolize men's hopes for peace. The moment it comes to represent only non-Communist lands its universality ends and it becomes in effect a mere alliance.

Astute statesmen on both sides of the Iron Curtain want to keep it universal. Especially since the great advances in nuclear weapons, they feel the insistent pressures of ordinary folk in the world over against any course that should plunge the globe into war again.

The U. N. is their meeting ground. They fear to abandon it. For to do so would be to admit failure when such an admission might spell doom for all civilization.

This is why the U. N. has endured through the tumultuous years 1945–1955. This is why it has survived the disillusionments and disappointments of those who saw it at the start as some sort of magic preserver of the peace.

It is not a peace enforcement agency, and as now constituted cannot be. For the U. N. has no enforcement army of its own, and any of five great powers may veto punitive action against itself or any lesser nation dependent upon it.

Realistically, we of the free nations do not count on the U. N. to safeguard the peace. The NATO pact and all the related defensive arrangements in the Middle and Far East serve that objective.

But we, like our adversaries in Moscow and Peiping, understand that armies and alliances are not enough today, that men yearning for peace demand that their hopes be given brighter substance.

The United Nations provides that substance.

Disneyland Readied by Mr. Magic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to announce the grand public opening of the 160-acre, $17 million out-of-this-world project near Anaheim, Calif., in the congressional district which I am proud to represent. Known for industry, agriculture, and citrus ranches, the community has now made way for a magic wonderland—the fabulous Disneyland.

The announcement of Walt Disney's plans to build his wonderful wonderland aroused the excited anticipation and sparked the enthusiasm of young and old alike. We are glad to know that Mr. Disney's dreams for a fantasyland have become a reality and would like to express our sincere gratitude to him for this additional contribution to the wholesome entertainment that he has already given to people of all ages all over the world.

After you have read the following article from the June 23, 1955 issue of the Los Angeles Times, written by Ed Ainsworth, perhaps you will want to throw your cares away and travel through this land of wonderment and adventure which Mr. Magic has given us.

DISNEYLAND READIED BY "MR. MAGIC"

(By Ed Ainsworth)

"Mr. Magic" in a pink shirt and an old straw hat got ready yesterday to roll up the curtain on the impossible.

It was costing him sweat and sleeplessness, but he was loving every minute of it.

Walt Disney, in other words, is putting the finishing touches on the incredible dream-come-true that is called Disneyland.

Right now, it all looks like king-size chaos.

But, says everybody who knows Disney, the $17 million fantasy world will open on time Monday, July 18.

GOES ON PROWL

Walt was on the prowl yesterday to make that certain.

From the brightly painted horsecar on Main Street to the steamboat *Mark Twain* and from the King Arthur castle to the space station in Tomorrowland he went padding around amid the dust and debris encouraging, inspecting, joking, and directing.

"Hi, Walt," said everybody from hod carriers to superintendents.

"Hi," grinned Walt, carrying on like Huck Finn heading for a fish fry.

HAPPY ABOUT IT

"It's the thing I've always wanted to do, so sure I'm happy about it," he confessed on the fly as he hopped into a station wagon and started barging off toward Impossible Hill, where the Casey Junior Railroad tracks are going in.

He was granting an interview and being photographed but, man, alive, he couldn't do it standing still.

Not with the future, the past, the present, and maybe even the fourth dimension all demanding attention at once.

We crawled into the station wagon and Walt took off for parts unknown. "We" included Clyde (Vic) Forsythe, the cartoonist and western painter, and Mrs. Forsythe, oldtime friends, and the Times.

Walt piloted us bravely through organized confusion.

WORKERS SWARM

On the 160 acres of Disneyland, 1,200 workers are swarming in a determined assault upon a job that should take another year, but is going to be done in 25 more days.

"We'll open on time, Monday, July 18," Walt said confidently, nimbly dodging a steamroller and barely missing 2 men carrying a 10-foot-long elephant tusk. "I hope the public will remember that is our opening day, although the big television program and preview press party will take place the day before. The television show will be Sunday, July 17, from 4:30 to 6 p. m."

ENTRY STATION

In front of the towering railroad station of turn of the century vintage, Walt stopped and got out to sweep an arm over the panorama.

The railroad station will be the entryway to Disneyland from the parking area designed for 12,175 cars.

In front of it runs Main Street.

Farther down is the concourse where the four main sections of the vast undertaking may be entered—Frontierland, Adventureland, Fantasyland, and Tomorrowland.

Shrouded under a huge canvas in the Main Street square was a bulky thing with wheels.

GETS FIRST RIDE

"Come on, Cotta, and I'll give you the first ride on the horsecar," offered Disney to Mrs. Forsythe.

He started taking off the coverings and unveiled car 4 of the Disneyland and horsecar special. No horses being around at the moment, Walt and the spectators rolled the car up the track. Then Walt got in, and with Mrs. Forsythe hanging on, he went barreling down the grade at a full 2 miles per hour, bell clanging and handbrake gripped dramatically in genuine Casey Jones style.

Then it was the big castle leading into Fantasyland.

On the way we passed down Main Street, where gas lights will flare nostalgically over down-to-earth butcher shops, pharmacies, real estate offices and dental clinics all true to the 1890–1900 motif.

Sound effects will be authentic, too. The nerve-shattering clatter of the dentist's drill will echo along with the more romantic music of the oldtime butcher's saw in the shops where they used to give away liver for dogs.

Upstairs in a window is a sign emblematic of the thing that always is in the heart of Disney. It says simply:

"Elias Disney, contractor, 1895."

LIVING MEMORIAL

That was Walt's father, now perpetuated in a living memorial.

At the King Arthur Castle, Walt and Forsythe leaned over the wall and looked across the moat.

"How many hours a day are you putting in on this thing?" Walt was asked.

"What does it matter? I'm having the time of my life."

Around a hill we sped and Walt waved a hand.

"Going to have snow up there in the wintertime," he pronounced. "Already got the ice company's promise to do it."

TIES FOR TRACKS

We passed piled-up stacks of railroad ties.

"For the trains that will run all the way around the place," Walt explained. "And don't call 'em toys or miniatures. These are scale models, just slightly reduced, of the real thing and on tracks in proportion. The locomotives weight 15 tons."

By canals and the Painted Desert where sahuaro cacti point their gaunt fingers at the sky we went until we came to a great river and there was the *Mark Twain*.

OLD RIVER BOAT

This stern-wheeler that will carry 300 people is equipped with a genuine boiler and a music room, hoity-toity as a Mississippi culture society, suh. The superstructure was built at the studios in Burbank and hauled down to be put on the keel.

Close by is a jungle river where lifelike hippos and other scary critters will bob up to give zest to the visitors' journeyings in small boats.

EXPENSIVE SCENERY

Walt said about a half a million dollars has been spent on trees and shrubbery, ranging from cold-climate pines to tropical bananas. Three gigantic palms were retained on the old Dominguez estate, which forms the nucleus of Disneyland, out of pure sentiment. Under one of them legend says Louisa May Alcott was married.

We saw where Tahitian grass shacks will lure the romantic, where adventurous youngsters and oldsters can take a round trip to the moon or inspect old mother earth from a space station. We saw the futuristic architecture of Tomorrowland and delved backward in the tides of time toward Davy Crockett and the log forts of yesteryear.

CARVER BUSY

Under a shed, a carver, Bill Washo, was showing a pretty girl, Joyce Hackett, how to fashion some of the cornices and other doodads and gimcracks for the good old days.

"Pretty soon the grass will be up and we will get the plaster out of here and get started on the final polishing for the opening," Walt commented, deftly steering around a wheelbarrow.

"Whatever gave you the idea for all this?" he was asked.

PLANS GOT BIGGER

"It was when my kids were little—Diana, now Mrs. Ron Miller, 21; and Sharon, 18—and we would talk about some such idea. Originally I intended to take 10 acres of the 50 at our Burbank studio, but the plans got bigger and bigger. So, here we are."

"The trains?"

"Oh, they were just a hobby to get my mind off my problems—they didn't actually start the Disneyland idea."

We whirled past workmen on ladders, the clanging and clatter of the machine shop, the indescribable bustle and puttering of 1,200 men in a race with time.

BECOMES REAL

From it all Disneyland is emerging, unbelievable but a reality, a dream compounded of stone and bricks and timbers and cement, born of the brain of one boyish-looking genius in a pink shirt and an old straw hat.

Facts on 50–50 Cargo Preference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the following statement which I received from the Association of American Shipowners, with reference to the 50–50 cargo preference amendment. It is vitally important to the welfare of the American merchant marine that 50 percent of American shipping go in American ships:

FACTS ON 50–50 CARGO PREFERENCE

On nine occasions since 1948, legislation covering Government-generated cargoes has provided that at least 50 percent thereof move on United States flag vessels. Last year, in Public Law 664, Congress applied this historical principle to all Government cargoes, including agricultural surpluses which are financed directly or indirectly by United States public funds.

This support for American shipping is the most practical method of implementing our basic national maritime policy of maintaining an adequate merchant marine.

The Mutual Security Act of 1955 (S. 2090), as reported by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, eliminates the 50–50 shipping clause from the shipment of agricultural commodities not only under that act but also under Public Law 480, the Surplus Agricultural Disposal Act.

This amendment was adopted without hearing and was obviously influenced by misunderstanding and misstatement of the disastrous impact of the amendment on American ships. Moreover, its proponents accepted a completely distorted picture of the effect of 50–50 on the surplus-disposal program. In this light, a few brief facts are presented to put this matter in its proper perspective:

1. A fair participation in Government-generated cargoes is the most practical support for American ships.

2. Both American agriculture and the American merchant marine are essential to a healthy American economy. They have a mutual interest in foreign trade, foreign aid, surplus disposal.

3. Even foreign maritime nations have conceded our right to apply 50–50 to aid cargoes.

4. There is absolutely no basis in fact for the contention that 50–50 has impeded the surplus agricultural program. About 70 percent of the 3-year authorization was committed in the first year, 14 nations having purchased $425 million worth of agricultural surplus.

Despite rumors that foreign nations will not purchase our agricultural surplus if 50–50 is applied, the program is evidently well ahead of schedule.

5. It has even been claimed that unavailability of American ships would slow down the program. Actually, this is impossible under the 50–50 law. Moreover, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee thoroughly exploded this contention.

6. Cargo preference (50–50) does not increase the cost to the purchasing country. All transportation is paid for by the purchasing nation at not more than the world market rates regardless of flag of carrier.

7. Eighty percent of these cargoes will move on liners, and can be transported on American ships at the same cost as on foreign flag vessels.

8. Fifty-fifty clause has increased CCC expenditures in very minor degree. Approximately 60 percent of dollar financing of ocean freight has resulted from the inability of foreign countries to carry their own purchases, or lack of adequate currency to buy ocean transportation. Dollar financing would be required under these conditions even without 50–50 legislation. The remainder of the dollar financing of ocean transportation, or that part which may be attributed to 50–50 is but 2.9 percent of the cost of the whole program to date.

9. At the present time, approximately two-thirds of the foreign currencies received by us under title I of the Agricultural Disposal Act, have been returned overseas for the account of foreign nations. Thus these transactions cannot be considered commercial transactions.

Progress in New York State Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I am extremely interested not only in farming legislation and farm progress throughout the country but most especially in my own State of New York. I follow with deepest interest all developments on the farm front in our State, and at the same time I am ever watchful for consumer interests.

Under the new State administration of Governor Harriman, considerable progress has been made in farm legislation and in introducing certain improvements in agriculture and related fields that will be of benefit likewise to the vast number of consumers in New York. The head of the New York State Department of Agriculture and Marekts is Commissioner Daniel J. Carey, who is not only a good personal friend but a very able administrator and an expert in his field. He has been instrumental in introducing many of the innovations and achievements in the short space of a few months since the Harriman administration took over the State government.

I am in receipt of a most interesting letter from Commissioner Carey outlining some of the improvements in agriculture. I believe that many agricultural leaders and many of our State governmental leaders will be interested in these achievements, and for these reasons I am inserting the text of his letter into the RECORD:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AND MARKETS,
Albany, June 23, 1955.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: During the session of the legislature this year and in the 30 days following adjournment, Governor Harriman approved considerable legislation of particular concern to farm people. I feel it would be worth our while, at this time when agriculture is into its new production season, to look at a few of the accomplishments which are now the law of our State or soon will be.

Progressive legislation was enactetd on the manufacture of cheese. Our cheesemakers

are now permitted to use a starter method which will cause their product to coagulate properly. As a health safeguard, no cheese or cheese curd can be released to the retail trade unless it has been pasteurized or made from pasteurized milk, skim or cream. Cheese cured for more than 60 days is excepted.

Until this year the law contained no definition for flavored milk. That has been corrected along with the addition of a definition for sour cream. This clarifies enforcement problems.

Another amendment to the agriculture law makes it unlawful to advertise a place of business as a farmers' market unless farm products are the principal merchandise offered for sale. We expect this will prevent unscrupulous persons from posing as operators of farmers' markets to sell nonfarm products.

I am glad to report that a year's extension was given for indemnification for rabies in domestic animals. The State reimburses counties for half of the amount spent. State participation in county costs of rabies-control programs was prolonged for 2 years.

Our outmoded law on the inspection and sale of seeds was replaced by a new version which won widespread support. It is my opinion that this completely revised law will mean greater protection for purchasers and enable us to give stricter enforcement.

I am sure that all of us approve the appropriation of $5,000 for the expenses of the New York State Horticultural Society's 100th birthday observance. The society has been of invaluable aid to the residents of this State. The Department will work with the organization in arranging the observance.

The rapidly increasing attention New York growers are giving to irrigation projects resulted in the creation this year of a temporary commission to study the needs of this means of expanding and stabilizing our agricultural economy. This sort of planning can be of inestimable value to our State.

An amendment to the education law increases from $100 to $200 the annual State aid to enlarged city school districts for each public school pupil residing in outside areas. It raises the maximum from 200 to 400 area pupils for each enlarged district. This change recognizes the study made relative to costs in city schools where it is impractical to establish centralized districts. It will help in equalizing costs among all rural residents.

Without meaning to consider these outstanding improvements in any order of importance, and realizing that you as a leader actively interested in agriculture are probably as familiar with them as I am, I appreciate this opportunity of reviewing them with you.

Very truly yours,

DANIEL J. CAREY,
Commissioner.

Writers Refuse To Oppose Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, much misinformation is being circulated about the upper Colorado River project, and most of it originates in southern California. Typical of their tactics in getting other organizations to front for them in their selfish opposition is the method described in the following Associated Press article from the El Paso (Tex.) Times:

WRITERS REFUSE TO OPPOSE COLORADO PROJECT

SANTA FE, N. MEX.—A New Mexican Thursday reported—with considerable heat—a recent unsuccessful effort to have the Western Writers' Association take a stand against the upper Colorado River project.

Fred Patton, game and fish department publicist and association member, said a southern California newsman made the effort when the association recently met at Moran, Wyo., in conjunction with a game and fish officials' convention.

"Why," said Patton indignantly, "if it had been successful, it would have hamstrung any newsman or radioman or magazine writer who happens to belong to the association. It would have blocked objective writing about the project."

He reported that after he spoke out strongly against the motion and moved to table it, a Utah representative came to his aid and spoke emotionally of the life-and-death importance of water in the arid regions of the West.

"The vote in favor of my motion to table was 29 to 6, with the 6 votes coming from California interests," Patton said.

Slovenian Observance of St. Janez Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commemorative address made by me on the occasion of St. Janez Day, a day in which Slovenians pay tribute to the memory of their countrymen who gave their lives fighting against the Ottoman Turks and the many other invaders who have plagued Slovenia through most of modern history:

Among the Slovene people the birthday of John the Baptist, St. Janez Day, as they call it, is a national holiday. As in many parts of Europe and Latin America, bonfires are lit in tribute to the great saint of Christendom who baptized Christ. But the fires that blaze up at dusk on the mountainsides of Slovene territory have acquired a special significance for the Slovene people. The flames that dot the black skyline are vivid reminders of three and a half centuries of stubborn resistance to intermittent, but persistent, Turkish invasions.

While individual Christian countries were willing to make peace and friends with the Turks for political reasons, the Slovenes resisted. While many a ruler, knight, and noble withdrew to castle strongholds, leaving the countryside wide open to Turkish assaults, the Slovenian people held their ground. To protect themselves, they built tabors, that is, they fenced in hills or fortified village churches as best they could, and barricaded themselves inside when the Turks struck. In the time of peril watchers high up in the mountains lit signal fires to allow time for the people to gather up necessities for a siege and flee to their fortified areas.

The proud people that withstood the Turks from 1396 to 1736 had behind them a long history of resistance to foreign domination. The land of the Slovenes, which lies at one of the most important crossroads of Europe, has long been coveted by one nation or another in the seemingly endless struggle for political power on the European Continent. The Germans in the ninth century tried to Germanize the area by wiping out the Slovene aristocracy and settling the land with German colonists. From the 9th to the 15th centuries the Slovenes lost about one-half their land to invaders. Under the Austrian Empire the desire to be free inspired the indomitable Slovene peasants to revolt time and again. In our own time Nazi aggressors overran Slovene territory, swallowing up 850,000 Slovenes into their war machine and handing over 330,000 to Italy and 65,000 to Hungary. As courageous as throughout their early history, they organized guerrilla bands to plague their new overlords.

Like all other Europeans liberated from the Nazi yoke, the Slovenian people witnessed the specter of Soviet imperialistic communism enveloping vast regions to the east along the borderlands dividing Eastern and Western Europe. A new plague of totalitarianism and oppression descended upon Europe, threatening the foundations of Western civilization. The place of Adolf Hitler was taken by Stalin, and as once the heavy boots of the Nazi legions brought much of Europe under Nazi control, so now the heavy boots of the Red army brought vast areas under Communist control. With these conveyors of tyranny came a new black death to Eastern Europe which in the course of the past decade has sought to crush the soul and destroy the spirit of the many freedom-loving peoples inhabiting that stricken area.

So far in this struggle against Soviet imperialism America has succeeded. To a great extent the credit for this success should go to the men who guided the American Government in thaose perilous postwar years. But, the greatest share of the credit should go to the people who make up this great Nation; for it was in the last analysis they who sacrificed so much to reconstruct Europe and make it again a bastion of strength against the menace from the East. Thus all Americans of Slovenian descent, along with their fellow Americans, played an important part in thwarting Soviet imperialism.

Such self-sacrifice fits well into the tradition of the Slovenian-Americans; for it was an American of Slovenian descent, Frederick Baraga, who in the early part of the 19th century devoted his whole life to missionary work among the Indians of the Northwest Territory. In doing so he dedicated himself to America. Recognition came to this son of Slovenia in 1855 when he was consecrated a bishop of the newly founded Marquette Diocese, and it is noteworthy that the State of Minnesota has preserved the name of Frederick Baraga by naming one of its counties in his honor.

Like Frederick Baraga other sons and daughters of Slovenia came to this country of ours and in their contribution to this Nation they have been unstinting. Our strong and proud traditions of liberty and independence they have strengthened; and in every area of American civilization they have distinguished themselves for their dedication to duty, their boundless patriotism, and their pride in citizenship.

On the eve of St. Janez Day the bonfires that once dotted the Slovenian skyline will again blaze forth in honor of the great heroes of Slovenia who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of their homeland against foreign invaders. Once again the spirit and the traditions that these men created in their struggle for Slovenian liberty will inspire a high sense of honor, respect, and admiration in the hearts of all Slovenians who recall the great and fearless deeds of their ancestors. No sacrifice can equal the giving of

one's life for his country. To those heroes of Slovenia, therefore, no honor, no respect, no admiration is too great.

Reader's Digest Article: Misinformation on Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, following these remarks, a letter and statement from Mr. Robert Clark, farmer and chairman of the board of directors of the Corning Water District, and a press wire from Mr. Marion S. Walker, publisher of the Red Bluff Daily News.

This material typifies the reaction to the recent Reader's Digest article, Dollars into Dust, that has come from areas that know firsthand the value of our reclamation program.

Mr. Clark furnished the Reader's Digest detailed facts and figures showing how completely misleading and erroneous were the figures in the article which related to the Central Valley project. In acknowledging this material from Mr. Clark, Mr. Merle Crowell, of the Reader's Digest, stated:

That there is more to be said about the difficult problem of water supply in our western States is undenied. At the present time the Reader's Digest has two writers working full time on the subject in an effort to develop articles covering its various aspects.

I would suggest that if these writers for the Reader's Digest really want to get a firsthand picture of the tremendous value of our reclamation program to our Nation's economy, they go to the areas directly involved for their information. For instance, they might very well check with the farmers who are benefiting from the Central Valley project, such as Mr. Clark. They might also visit the Salt River project in Arizona, the Yuma project in Arizona and California, the Minidoka and Boise projects in Idaho, the Yakima project in Washington, or the North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska—and ask the people in those areas what they think of our reclamation program and what these projects have contributed to their areas and to the Nation.

The letter, statement and press wire follow:

CORNING WATER DISTRICT,
Corning, Calif., May 18, 1955.

To directors of water districts and Sacramento Valley irrigation committee:

Here in the Corning district we have found our efforts to educate others in the need for forming water districts, and negotiating with the United States Bureau of Reclamation for water, has been handicapped considerably by publication in the May issue of Reader's Digest of an article by Leslie A. Miller ("Dollars Into Dust").

We have no way of knowing to what extent the charges against the Bureau of Reclamation, listed in this article, are justified elsewhere: we do know that as far as the Central Valley project is concerned, the figures are completely misleading and erroneous.

Based on published figures made available by the State of California and the Bureau, a complete breakdown has been made, in which the facts and figures absolutely refute Reader's Digest insofar as the Central Valley Project is concerned.

Naturally our only interest in all this is its effect on the Sacramento Valley Canals. It is unfair that this article, in mentioning CVP but without any attempt at accuracy or fairness, has made our job more difficult.

The enclosed statement, drawn from the breakdown just mentioned, is being sent in the hope that you may find it useful in dealing with people who have read the Digest article, and naturally have questions to ask about that before giving us the enthusiastic support we need to persuade the Interior Department to let the contract for the Red Bluff Diversion Dam—the next step, the most important step, in assuring our success in the acquisition of water for our water-starved lands on the west side of the valley, in Tehama, Glenn, Colusa, Butte and Yolo Counties.

Yours very sincerely,
ROBERT CLARK,
Chairman, Corning Water District.

STATEMENT BASED ON BREAKDOWN DRAWN FROM PUBLISHED FIGURES

(The paragraph below is quoted from a boxed summary appearing in an article by Leslie A. Miller entitled "Dollars Into Dust" and published in the May issue of Reader's Digest.)

"In 1935, Congress, relying on an estimate by the Bureau of Reclamation, authorized construction of the Central Valley of California project at a supposed cost of $170 million. The bill finally presented in 1952 to Congress by the Reclamation Bureau was for $667,934,000."

Firstly, the $170 million figure was never an estimate made by the Bureau. That cost was prepared by the State of California in its studies which started in 1921, when labor and material cost indices were many times lower than today. Also the statement in the magazine article fails to take into account that, for example, when Shasta Dam and Reservoir finally were constructed, the reservoir capacity had been increased from 3,354,000 to 5,045,000 acre-feet, and the power capacity was increased from 325,000 to 454,000 kilowatts.

Secondly, the Digest article claims that a job originally supposed to cost $170 million actually is costing $667,934,000. This is so completely in error as to verge on falsification. Actually, the Bureau's estimated figure for construction originally planned by the State, though with improved facilities and vastly higher cost indices, is $351,103,000 as of January 1, 1955, or slightly more than double the figure given by the State in the twenties when labor and materials were cheap.

The impossibly high figure of $667,934,000 cited by the article as the Bureau's bill for doing the same job originally estimated at only $170 million actually represents the Bureau's estimate of what the end cost will be when the cost of completed projects has been added to the cost of a number of other projects equally important, of which our own Sacramento Valley canals is one.

In short, the low figure of $170 million quoted in the Digest article as an original estimate does not allow for construction of the Sacramento Valley canals, and does not make allowance either for the following projects listed, all of which are represented in the Bureau's reported cost estimate of $667,934,000: Three Trinity River dams, reservoir, and tunnels; three Trinity power plants and switchyards, Sly Park Dam and conduits, Folsom power facilities, fish protection facilities, and waterfowl conservation. These are not even under construction at the present time.

The inference in the Digest article is that the cost of Bureau of Reclamation projects must ultimately be borne by the taxpayers. All of us know this is not true. Except for a small sum set aside for flood control, moneys spent by the Bureau in developing water and power are paid back through a 50-year period through sale of the same, in some cases with interest. Actually this construction work involves the creation of new dollars, rather than a spendthrift wasting of money currently in exchange. In every case on record, development projects of this kind have resulted in new industries, new prosperity, and the creation of new wealth both for the Federal Government and the construction-and-service area.

The figures repeated in the breakdown, on which this account is based, are drawn from published reports. The data from the report by the State of California on the State water plan was published in Bulletins 26 and 29, dated 1931, and the supplementary data from the United States Bureau of Reclamation was published in the annual reports of 1953 and 1954.

SACRAMENTO VALLEY IRRIGATION COMMITTEE,
Red Bluff, Calif.:

Responsibility to their readers of widely circulated, readily believed national magazines, was emphasized today with dispatch of a telegram to the editors of Reader's Digest sent by Robert L. Clark, dry-land farmer and president of the board of directors of Corning Water District.

"Now, according to Associated Press releases, Leslie A. Miller, author of the Digest article, is repeating his misinformation before the Hoover Commission," Clark said.

"My neighbors and I want water. We must get water somehow. The one chance we have is through the Sacramento Valley Canal's section of Central Valley project. How do you think we feel? My neighbors and I are good and mad."

Miller, a former Wyoming Governor, is described by AP as heading the task-force committee which worked on reclamation and irrigation for the Hoover Commission.

Clark said today: "For instance, a $600 million figure is quoted in a résumé in the Digest story as being the Bureau's bill to Congress for Central Valley projects in California, as against a $170 million figure claimed to be originally proposed by the Bureau for the same job.

"Now, that's plain untrue. Actually the Bureau's costs for original CVP features amounted to only slightly more than double the cost estimate made for the same features, not by the Bureau, as claimed in the Digest article by Miller, but by the State of California in studies completed during the twenties, when cost of labor and material was not more than one-third as high as during construction period.

"For this sum," Clark says, "the Bureau increased by nearly 50 percent water-storage capacity, and by 40 percent kilowatts of electricity over the original State plan. The project will pay for itself through sale of water and power."

In his wire to the Digest editors, Clark writes, in part, "Please receive as kindly as it is intended our comment that in a magazine of your influence and circulation, the responsibility to be fair and accurate is ununusually heavy."

In the letter to the farmers, Clark wrote:

"We have no way of knowing to what extent other charges listed against the Bureau of Reclamation, in this article, are justified. We do know that as far as the Central Valley project is concerned, the figures are misleading and inaccurate.

"Naturally our only interest in all this is its effect on the authorized Sacramento Val-

ley Canals, now under construction. It is unfair that this article, and Miller's later testimony before the Hoover Commission, has mentioned CVP but without any attempt at accuracy or fairness. It has made our job harder.

"It is unfortunate that Reader's Digest, unlike other magazines and newspapers of large circulation, has no provision for correcting the errors made by their authors. It is to be hoped the Hoover Commission will realize Miller's statements rank as mistaken is not falsified."

A complete breakdown of CVP costs and estimates, based on published figures by the State of California and by the Bureau of Reclamation, is available on request to him, Clark asserted.

MARION S. WALKER,
Publisher, Red Bluff Daily News.

Dominick Elia, an Indomitable Local GOP Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Hudson Dispatch, Union City, N. J., on the recent death of Dominick Elia. The entire 14th Congressional District of New Jersey suffered a tragic loss when Mr. Dominick Elia, the Republican leader, passed away to his reward. America is made great by the two-party system and although Mr. Elia belonged to the opposite political party than does this member, nonetheless I respected him for his devotion to duty, for his constructive criticism, for his civic consciousness and for his courageous Americanism. It would seem to be my duty to record on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his great contribution to our country. The editorial follows:

DOMINICK ELIA, AN INDOMITABLE LOCAL GOP LEADER

The late Dominick Elia for three decades was one of the outstanding Republican leaders in North Hudson. He persistently and consistently espoused the causes of his party in spite of the fact that he was operating as a leader of a minority group in an overwhelmingly heavy Democratic territory. But by his never-deviating allegiance to his party he won the admiration of friend and political foe alike.

Mr. Elia never ceased his political activities until a year ago when he was forced to curtail his participation in affairs of the party due to a heart condition he suffered, but he still retained the reins of leadership. But even though he continued to manifest his interest in the affairs of his chosen party until the very last, another attack on June 12 finally resulted in his demise on June 15 at the age of 72.

This was a man who never capitulated to the opposition in the 30 years that he spearheaded a constantly losing cause. Mr. Elia always fought for what he believed to be the right side, although his stands were always opposed by a much greater support of the other party.

Dominick Elia's record of service to his party goes back to the time when old Union Hill and old West Hoboken were separate entities. When the two municipalities were consolidated in 1925, with the Democratic Party in complete control, he wasn't stymied in his efforts to gain control of the political apparatus which guided the destinies of the city. But, over all the 30 years which have followed that consolidation, he never was able to gain control, or even seriously threaten the ruling faction. However, he never ceased trying, for which he deserves accolades.

Serving in lesser capacities for many years, Mr. Elia took over the reins of Union City's GOP in 1943 and steadily built up his forces until 1950, when many political observers forecast that a fusion ticket backed by him and his followers had the best chance ever to unseat Democratic Mayor Harry J. Thourot. However, a third ticket led by insurgent Republicans split the city's vote, with the result that his slate went down to defeat.

In May 1954 Mr. Elia again formed a fusion slate to oppose Thourot administration, but once more the incumbents won out and the GOP chieftain suffered another defeat. All through his political life, he was an unswerving organization man, never compromising with his beliefs and principles for the sake of personal or party aggrandizement, a stand which is most unusual in a practical world where horsetrading is the accepted practice.

In spite of the fact that he was a leader for so many years of the party which always ran second, Mr. Elia was honored with a number of public appointments. Early in his political career, before the consolidation which created Union City, he narrowly lost the mayorality of old West Hoboken. He was defeated by only 112 votes. When Charles Mohn, only Republican mayor in Union City's 30 year's history, was elected, he appointed Mr. Elia a commissioner of public affairs, a post he held for 2 years.

Mr. Elia once served as president of West Hoboken Board of Health and he also was a Hudson County tax commissioner, as well as a condemnation commissioner for old West Hoboken. When his brother, Frank Elia, became Union City postmaster in 1953, he became Union City Republican municipal chairman, a post he held until his death. He was a member of the Masonic order for almost a half century. His vocation was that of a pipe manufacturer. Born in Italy, he came to this country early in his life and settled in old West Hoboken.

Statement of George J. Burger, Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Before the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, June 22, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the testimony given by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee.

The home office of the National Federation of Independent Business is located in my district at Burlingame, Calif.

The testimony referred to follows:

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business. Our National headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York City, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

It must be understood by Members of Congress that no officer or group of officers is permitted to speak for the federation as to its position on any legislative or economic problems unless so directed by a nationwide poll of our members. The entire membership is polled and the results of these polls give the executive officers the authority to act in behalf of the members.

The federation has a vital stake in the successful administration of the Small Business Administration Act. It will be found from the record of the hearings before the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees in May 1953, that the feledation's position was in full support of the proposed legislation with only one exception. We recommend that full control of the agency rest with the Administrator and that he be subject only to control of the Congress of the United States. Our position today, through nationwide vote, remains the same as it was in May 1953.

The federation has in its employ approximately 200 field representatives who are calling on small-business men every day of the business week and they are in a position to get first-hand information on the success or failure of the Small Business Administration in carrying out the will of Congress. Further, the federation, through its head offices in Burlingame, Calif., and its Washington office, receives considerable numbers of requests for information from our membership as to procedure under the Small Business Administration Act as to loans. In fact it can be safely said that better than 80 percent of the inquiries as they apply to SBA from all sections of the Nation rest on the needs for financial assistance. The Washington office alone, during the life of the act, has assisted many hundreds in giving them the necessary information on procedure to follow in their contacts with SBA. At the same time, we have kept the members of Congress acquainted with information coming from their districts on such inquiries.

We have a very vital stake in the success of the Small Business Administration Act. We are not unmindful of the fact that if there are deficiencies in the administration of the act, it would act as a boomerang to the federation. Consequently, we are watching developments to bring about a successful administration of the act, and let it be understood for the record that the closest liaison and cooperation has existed between our office and the head office of SBA for a year or more.

As a result of the mail reaching our head office at Burlingame, Calif., or the mail directed to the Washington office from members of the federation—all independent businessmen, it can be said without a question of doubt that they desire this agency to stand on its own two feet—full control and management of the agency to rest with the agency itself, and not be made a part of any other agency of the Government or have any controls vested in any other agency of the Government as to the overall policy of the Small Business Administration. Control of the agency should rest with the administrator and the Congress itself.

The position the federation is taking as to the continuance of the agency is ratified and confirmed by two recent nation-

wide polls of its entire membership. The results of the two polls are as follows:

Poll No. 1: 76 percent for, 22 percent against, 2 percent, no vote.

Poll No. 2: 84 percent for, 11 percent against, 5 percent, no vote.

It is to be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the first poll was made in or around October 1954, and the more recent poll was completed in the past 60 days.

In our appearances during the present session of Congress before the House and Senate Small Business Committees and the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees, we made six specific recommendations as to the overall operation of the Small Business Administration. I would, therefore, request the privilege of making these recommendations a part of the record of this hearing.

Let it be noted for the record that it is our opinion the Hoover Commission and its members are to be complimented for the tremendous undertaking in exploring the various operations within our Federal Government. We are sure that the results of these studies, wholly nonpartisan, will go a long ways to bring about improved methods or corrective practices within the operation of the Federal Government.

With reference to the recent report of the Commission as it applied to lending agencies of the Government, and that part of the report which applies to the Small Business Administration Act, it is our belief that the present operation of the Small Business Administration does not run in conflict with, or in duplication of the operations of the Department of Commerce. Small-business people of the Nation are beginning more and more to look to the Small Business Administration, the agency whose activities are devoted exclusively to the problems of small business, which was the intent of the Congress in the creation of the act. We desire to have this agency stand by itself and at no time be made a part of the Department of Commerce.

We do agree with the Commission's recommendation where it states, page 91 of the report: "The lending activities of this agency should not be operated in a manner which will impose any burden on the general taxpayer." It can be said that small business, nationwide, would concur in these important findings, and that small business is not interested now or heretofore in any financial handouts."

On the same page of the Commission's report, section (c) of recommendation No. 39, it states: "That, in the meantime, it should charge sufficient interest to earn its operating expenses arising out of lending and to pay interest to the Treasury on Government funds equal to the cost of money to the Government." There can be no objection from small business to this recommendation. It must be understood, however, that the agency itself is in its infancy, and it might be said operating just a little over a year, and as the saying goes "Rome wasn't built in a day" and we feel certain that if the agency proceeds in its operations in conforming to the will of the Congress it will return to the Government any expense that the Government incurs.

The members of the Commission may rest assured that we in the federation are closely watching the operations of the agency and that we will be one of the first to report to the Commission or any other agency of the Government if we find an improper application of the agency's operation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before your committee, and it is our hope, for the good of the Nation, that the Commission continues its splendid operation.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes for the week of June 27. This column, which might be entitled "A Happy World for Everyone," follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

She was 9, and as she finished her nightly prayer she added a new concluding thought before the "Amen." It was: "and please make this a happy world for everyone."

Her parents were surprised, almost startled—both by the unexpectedness of the injected thought in a prayer which usually varied little, and also by its truly eloquent simplicity. In 9 words, this 9-year-old had summed up fully and accurately the hopes of all of us—the dream of mankind.

Noting the momentary surprise on the faces of her elders as she looked up, the child asked "Was that all right to say?" Instantly and emphatically assured that it was, indeed, "all right" to pray for "a happy world for everyone," the little girl settled back contentedly in her bed and soon was fast asleep.

The idea that their surprise at the child's improvisation had raised a doubt as to whether it was acceptable to pray for a happy world for everyone bothered the adults a bit. For they remembered that there have been times—or, at least so it seems in retrospect—when it appeared unacceptable either socially or politically to be concerned about the happiness of any except ourselves and our own group or countrymen.

What we prayed for in the privacy of our own meditations was, of course, our own business. But the views that we expressed publicly about world brotherhood, about the common aspirations of man, about the necessity for freedom for all if our own freedom was to be safe and secure—these were sometimes regarded by self-appointed overseers of our political morality, it seems, almost as subversive thoughts at worst, or "excessive do-goodism," at best.

To some, the formation of the United Nations just 10 years ago was a sign of such foolishness. While the U. N. has certainly not succeeded in bringing about the realization of the 9-year-old's prayer to "make this a happy world for everyone", it is a hopeful signpost and significant milestone on the road to a decent world.

The President emphasized this in his speech to the representatives of the 60 assembled U. N. nations at San Francisco last week when he said:

"For this Nation, I pay respectful tribute to you whose faith, and patience, and courage, and wisdom have brought it through 10 tumultuous, frequently discouraging, sometimes terrifying—but often rewarding—years. That there have been failures in attempts to solve international difficulties by the principles of the charter, none can deny. That there have been victories, only the willfully blind can fail to see. But clear it is that without the United Nations the failures would still have been written as failures into history. And, certainly, without this organization the victories could not have been achieved; instead, they might well have been recorded as human disasters. These, the world has been spared."

The President spoke from the vantage point of having personally just participated in the Operation Alert civil defense test which required him and all of his top officials to flee from Washington. His plea to the U. N. for a basis for a just world peace followed, therefore, his first-hand observation of the extent of America's horrible unpreparedness for hydrogen warfare as demonstrated in this rather fumbling civil defense exercise.

Significantly, just a few hours before the President spoke at San Francisco of the need for world understanding to achieve peace, the House of Representatives unanimously passed a resolution authorizing the use of a cancellation stamp in the post offices bearing the admonition "Pray for peace."

What better prayer than the simple one of the 9-year old "Please make this a happy world for everyone"? It would, if granted, certainly assure peace, would it not? It is devoutly to be wished.

Wave Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following:

WAVE OLD GLORY

(By Henry Kravetz, United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea 50, Mass.)

Wave old glory, you royal daughter of our history,
Lady independence was your majestic mother.
You are here in being, ever proudly swaying,
Thanks to Washington, our father.
Liberty or death, challenged, ridicule and scorn.
Heroes brave, their young lives gave,
For you red, white and blue,
To be born.

Wave old glory,
In every direction.
North, South,
East and West.
Wave old glory.
Under your protection,
A toiling Nation
Finds its rest.

Ring Liberty Bell, ring again.
Remind the oppressed of a free world, of individuals right.
Lift that curtain, enough of darkness.
Give them sunshine, give them light.
Come ye emissaries of democracy.
End dictation's stalling.
Let freedom's trade winds fill the air of that sphere.
Times are calling.

Sacred shall be this day.
To all—in the U. S. A.
A day of promise, a day to pray.
A time for feast and celebrations.
A day to pledge, again and again
Allegiance to the land,
To preserve our freedoms.
To safeguard its stations.

Opportunity for Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of June 22 titled "Opportunity for Labor." This editorial points up the immediate prospect of a job bonanza with passage of the John Day bill, H. R. 5789. Since the creation of new jobs is of such vital importance, under unanimous consent, I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

OPPORTUNITY FOR LABOR

The Portland Central Labor Council has been asked by metal trades workers affiliated with it to oppose by resolution the Sam Coon bill authorizing local participation in the financing of John Day Dam. The motive, of course, is to get the council formally in alinement with the Democratic Party line of opposition to the Eisenhower administration's partnership power development policy. This may be good party strategy, but is it good from the standpoint of the average Oregon workingman? We think not.

H. R. 5789, now pending in Congress, contemplates the building of the $310 million John Day Dam on the Columbia River with an outlay of but $37 million in Federal funds for its navigation and other nonreimbursable facilities. The balance, $273 million, would be put up by local interests. As defined in the bill, such interests could be States or other agencies, PUD's, REA's, municipal power systems, or private power companies. Any such group or combination of groups could participate and their sole reward would be a 50-year contract to distribute a share of John Day's 1,105,000 kilowatts in proportion to the amount of money put up for the dam project. Three private utilities—Pacific Power & Light, Portland General Electric, and Washington Water Power—have offered to put up the $273 million if other groups are not interested.

Labor's stake in this proposal is a big one. Of the total cost of the dam, an estimated $100 million would go for wages. That's enough to keep 5,000 men working at $2.50 an hour for nearly 4 years on a 40-hour week basis. Where else can be found the immediate prospect of such a job bonanza, with the secondary prosperity it would bring to suppliers and service industries in the Northwest?

Energy from the completed dam would be integrated into the Northwest power pool, with the participating groups eligible to draw from it proportionate amounts of power for sale in their own distribution areas. The parts of Oregon served by P. G. E. and P. P. & L. thus would benefit from big new blocks of power available to attract new industry and create new jobs.

Why is labor being asked to oppose this meritorious plan? Simply because it does not jibe with the aims of public-power forces and their congressional spokesmen from Oregon, Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN. They seek all-Federal financing for Columbia River Basin power projects.

Federal Government financing would produce slightly lower cost power, it is true, because the Federal Government can obtain a lesser rate of interest on money it borrows. But there is a fatal flaw in the public-power argument. Even the Domecrat-controlled Congress is not interested in putting up any more large sums of the taxpayers' money to develop Northwest hydro and lure industries away from other parts of the country to this part. The ideas of the public-power advocates make no sense to eastern Congressmen, and they never will. Messrs. MORSE and NEUBERGER and Mrs. GREEN are leading their followers down a long, long lane to eventual and inevitable disappointment.

This newspaper has not been an advocate of the partnership plan as espoused by Interior Secretary Douglas McKay. A better way to finance power projects, we think, would be through a regional corporation which would have the advantage of low-interest rates and would not be forever dependent on congressional whims. But such an agency will take time to create, and the need for more power is with us now.

Representative COON's proposal offers a sound and sensible way to acquire the dam which is the next logical step in Columbia River development, and which would be built, owned, operated by the Federal Government in the public interest. The workingman who opposes this plan really is working against his own interests.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically called "Bananas on Pike's Peak." They are typical of the unfounded exaggerations being made by that area in an attempt to defeat the upper Colorado River project, and I submit they should be more accurately called "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

Any consideration of the Colorado River storage project should at all times keep in view the real basic issue, which is this:

The water under discussion belongs to the four upper basin States of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming. The Colorado River storage project would provide the way to develop and use that water in those States, where it belongs. If the storage project is not built, that water—the most precious of all resources in the semiarid climate in which we in the West live—will be stolen from us. It is as simple as that.

The water is ours by every right, both legal and moral. More than 90 percent of the water which flows in the Colorado River system falls in the form of snow on the mountains of our four upper basin States.

We did not selfishly try to hold onto all of that water, even though it is produced on our land. By terms of the 1922 Colorado River compact, we agree to a division of water with the lower basin States, through which the river flows. Terms of that compact are more than generous to the lower basin, but we are not disputing them. We only want the right to develop the water that is ours, under the law of the land and under the laws of justice and equity.

There is no other major source of water to which our four States may turn. Without it, the final limits of our growth and development are very sharply defined. Our future is dead.

With that water—and once more let me remind you that it is our water—we can continue to grow and develop, not only for ourselves but for the benefit of the entire Nation. We can fully develop the mineral treasure chest of the Nation which lies in upper Colorado River Basin. We can, and will, contribute steadily to the wealth and to the security of these United States.

If we are not given the right to develop our resources, through construction of the Colorado River storage project, there can be no doubt of what will happen to the water—our water. Water, unchecked and uncontrolled, inevitably runs downhill. The natural course of the Colorado River takes it to Mexico and to southern California, which has already built a tremendous agricultural and industrial economy through development of its own share of Colorado River water. Development largely accomplished through the reclamation program financed by the Government.

Let us not be led astray by false issues and the red herrings with which the opponents of the Colorado project are constantly trying to confuse the people. We are only asking for our obvious and lawful right—to develop our own water for essential use and to pay for that development from the resources of our own region. Do not let this right be stolen from us.

On House Concurrent Resolution 154—Industry to the Rockies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a true land of opportunities that place is my native State of Montana. I say that for a variety of reasons, all of which will show that there is no better place in the United States for industries to establish or relocate than in the Treasure State—Montana.

From a hardy, friendly people to a wealth of natural resources, Montana is ideal for industry of all kinds. Strategically located in the Rock Mountain area, its abundance of treasure stretches from the tall timber in the Rockies down to the depths of the earth for petroleum, copper, and other as yet untapped minerals including uranium for our atomic era. Montana provides a variety since the third largest State, by area, in the Union includes both the Rocky Mountains and a portion of the Pacific Northwest and the rolling land of the Great Plains States.

These few facts are the best evidence that Montana is a land of opportunities. Opportunities always exist in new areas. Since Montana is relatively new, has not been fully developed, has a sparse population and vacant land, it is a para-

dise for those looking for opportunities.

Montana has a great base of raw materials, minerals, agricultural and forest products. These are present more generously and completely than in any other State. Coupled with these is an enormous amount of power, an intelligent and effective labor supply, adequate transportation, local and national markets, a healthy and enjoyable climate, and a people who love and have faith in their State.

These great potentialities provide a range of opportunity as great as the range of free enterprise itself from one-man businesses to complete industrial operations. Surveys already made have yielded a long and varied list. Technological advancements which are occurring with increasing rapidity, lengthen this list.

A swift backward glance reveals why Montana is what it is today. Its early history is an intermingling of the lonely trading post and settler's cabin, the roaring gold camp, Indians and trappers, the farmer's struggle against the elements, cattle industry, the fabulous war of the copper kings, lawlessness beaten by law and order. These experiences bred a hardy, and later a friendly, people.

Montana's early visitors found the vast eastern plains and the western slope laced by great river systems. Favorable passes provided natural routes through the mountains for the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the trappers, the gold seekers, the permanent settlers, and, finally, the transcontinental railroads.

From the eastern plains, at 2,000-foot altitude, Montana stretches westward over vast range, agricultural, and oil lands. Montana rises gradually from the east to the 5,000-foot level of the foothills, over the peaks of the Rocky Mountains, and then on down the Pacific slope.

The mountain yielded a clue to their fabulous wealth in 1852, and by 1863 settlements had been made, the "miner's gulch" government, a rudimentary law based mostly upon practical experience and fitted to the individual requirements of each gulch, had evolved.

Development of broader aspects of law received an historic boost in 1863 when honest men, harassed by lawlessness and murder, formed the vigilance committee—the storied vigilantes who brought order and safety to Montana in a few months of swift, frontier justice.

When Montana became a State, November 8, 1899, its government developed from the early attempts at law and from governments established in older parts of the Nation. The government was still tempered by a rugged individualistic Montana and was adapted to its needs.

Today Montana has a modern government, similar to those in other States. It is still tempered by Montana conditions but it recognizes its responsibilities toward the State's tremendous resources. It understands that development of these resources must be encouraged and that it is the duty of the government to be liberal with that encouragement. Today Montana is a modern State. Its cities and towns are clean, with modern homes, office buildings, and stores. From a business standpoint these cities compare favorably in retail sales with cities of much larger size in other sections of the country. Population figures show that Montana has experienced a 2.9 percent postwar increase in population. Last year Montana's per capita income ranked seventh in the Nation.

On June 7, 1955, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 154, calling on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to make a full and complete study and investigation of the means of obtaining dispersion and relocation of industries and facilities essential to the defense and security of the United States in case of atomic attacks. My resolution, which is identical to Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, introduced by Senator FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming, specifically refers to the possibilities in the Rocky Mountain area, including Montana, for reducing vulnerability to atomic attack by such dispersal and relocation.

It calls for Federal, State, and local government cooperation in making the study, and also proposes tax incentives and other mesaures to encourage voluntary dispersion and relocation of such industries and facilities.

The problem of dispersal has been widely recognized and support of action on it has come from a variety of sources.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, has stated he feels speedy action on dispersion of industry is needed "in view of the great threat to our Nation's survival should the great majority of its industries be knocked out in one blow due to extreme concentration along out two seaboards." For that reason a United States Senator, who is also a qualified jet pilot and knows much of the problems of our atomic age, fully supports this resolution. And here are others who have spoken out on this problem, as contained in a recent statement by Senator BARRETT:

In a press conference on April 28, 1955, Air Force Secretary Harold E. Talbott publicly advocated the dispersal of future airplane and missile factories inland from the heavily populated and overindustrialized areas of the east and west coasts as a means of reducing targets for enemy bombers.

He declared "further expansion or duplication of aircraft production should be moved probably to the Middle West, and the reason for this is twofold. One, from a strategic standpoint it is a safer picture for this country. Second, we believe that it is not wise for any locality to be dependent on a single industry such as military aircraft for too large a percentage of its economy."

Secretary Talbott emphasized that the Air Force did not want new facilities built on the west coast, and would like to have a further dispersement from the coastal areas of this type of industry.

Val Peterson, former Governor of Nebraska and now Chief of Civil Defense Administration, testified before the Senate Interior Committee on the upper Colorado River Basin project and pointed out that the upper Colorado Basin would be an ideal place for the dispersal of industry in the interests of national defense.

Urging support of the upper Colorado River Basin storage project, Peterson told the Senate Interior Committee that in the further expansion and extension of the Nation's industries "we should look to areas where it would be more difficult to attack."

"Our expanding economy requires new sites for industry. If uranium is a coming source of power, it might be profitable for industry to locate near its source. If the oil-shale developments prove out, new industries should be located near the source of this fuel. The entire basin has great coal reserves as well as other minerals and raw materials."

Donald J. Hughes, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists in a letter to President Eisenhower, May 13, 1955, pointed out that economic forces in the Nation already are causing some dispersal, but not enough in proportion to the need. He emphasized that the longer the Nation delays starting an adequate dispersal program the more drastic the program will have to be to meet the danger of intercontinental missiles. The scientists have urged the President to have a special study made of the whole program of dispersal of industry.

The Children of Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a moving and terrifying article in the June 17 issue of the Commonweal by Eileen Fantino:

THE CHILDREN OF POVERTY

(By Eileen Fantino)

Walking through East Harlem ghettos you're swallowed up by the motion and sound of blaring music, rythmic and electric, the patter of children running through empty lots piled high with ripe garbage, darting between horn-blasting cars and lemon-ice carts, sullen ragged shadows of half-dead men huddling in a doorway waiting for the dope pushers to bring a precious dose of heroin, families overflowing from the crowded dark tenements sitting on the front steps or on the fire escapes to get a breath of air and watching the never-ceasing play which life has become. Each small candy store is a world unto itself where youngsters listen to the magic pulsation of the juke box, their only touch of forgetfulness, where they watch knowingly the intrigue of a dope sale on the street outside, where slowly and inevitably escape becomes the motivation for life. Midnight finds 6-year-olds still wandering the streets like old men, with nothing waiting at home but an empty ice box, kerosene smoke-stained walls, pungent smells from the broken and flooded hall toilets and parents beaten down by years of struggle drinking up the food money in a desperate attempt to recapture an illusion of life.

This is the world unknown to the "average citizen," a world which a casual glance cannot fathom, a world which repels and frightens like a screen of dense smoke behind which mysteries are revealed. But poverty, and the disintegration which is the shore to which it flows, are not the mystery they seem. They are caused by the greed of man and the ultimate rejection of the concept of the brotherhood of man and our responsibility to each other. All the disturbed children roaming the streets, running around in wolf-pack gangs, defying the hostile world which has rejected them, abandoned them to misery, broken their spirits and planted in them a fire of hatred which leaps out to injure and destroy what

has condemned them to hunger and humiliation, which labels them as inferior beings somehow unworthy of the goods of the earth—these children are one result of the coldness, indifference and greed of society.

The children of poverty have hunger-dimmed eyes; they have ragged, dirt-encrusted clothes to wear with ripped shoes, small, and crushing their feet into weird shapes. The calm sleep of childhood it to them a nightmare of beating off vermin and rats, huddled in one damp bed with their brothers and sisters in small, overcrowded apartments, shivering in the winter and suffocating in the summer. They are exposed to violence of mind and body when the adults of their world sporadically fall under their burdens and cry out in anguish, often because they lack even the comfort of knowing they can get up in the morning and give their children something to eat.

Parents see their children crack under the daily tensions, begin to steal, and worse, fall prey to the dope-pushers who ride through the streets in sleek cars, cars which the addicts keep clean for a bit of what to them has become life's blood. These dope-pushers accumulate huge fortunes; with prison records on narcotics charges a yard long, they hire expensive lawyers, and always manage to be right back on the beat while young people they have corrupted rot in jail for lack of bail money, smart lawyers and influence. Children become involved in dope-pushing, act as middlemen for a few pennies or to get the stuff for an addicted brother or friend who is going through the tortures of the damned because he has no money to buy it and cannot turn to anyone for help. In one school over 30 girls were found to have needle marks on their arms from heroin injections. Yet the racketeers are left free to kill with their slow poison.

This is the kind of thing the outside world finds hard to believe—that dope addiction in children is encouraged by offering them free dope for kicks in order to bleed them for the rest of their lives. But it is true, and the result is a slavery that is unparalleled. Even young boys who go away for the cure, and go through months of physical and mental torture are forced for lack of jobs and follow-up guidance to go right back into the same neighborhoods where the pushers are waiting for them. Only in rare cases is such a cure more than temporary, because the individual goes back to the same problems and the temptation for escape is too strong.

The terrible prevalence of dope addiction one finds here is directly related to the intolerable conditions of poverty and slum living, the lack of stable guidance by parents, the indifference of society and social agencies to the personal torments, frustrations and neuroses which bear down on these children. Even where an adequate "youth program" exists, it cannot compensate for the conditions under which the child must live and for the feeling of despair and rejection which poverty-weakened and subjugated groups have to endure. The consciousness of society's attitude, the feeling of racial inferiority which is so ingrained from childhood, the prejudices which make children so aware of their color and origins and of the contempt in which society holds them, cause an inestimable damage which cannot easily be remedied and for which we all share guilt. This awareness, especially on the level of color, has penetrated deeply; there are strange manifestations which show how deeply. There is, for example, a custom of taking milk of magnesia during pregnancy with the idea that it will lighten the color of the baby's skin. It will take more than a little interracial education to erase the effects of racist thinking that has so long poisoned our society, even among those whose religious tenets forbid them to look upon any man as innately inferior.

The psychological effects of prejudice are closely intermingled with the economic effects. The Negro and Puerto Rican are reduced to subservience and trembling before the gods of business when they go out to earn their family's bread. They are considered for almost nothing but the jobs still associated with slavery and servitude. To see them suffer the indignities to which they are subjected is to see the image of God beaten down by the pride and arrogance of the "lily white," the moneyed and the "respectable" who are afraid to walk through Harlem after dark.

The migration of thousands of Puerto Ricans to New York City spread consternation among those who want New York to be populated by "nice people" like themselves. By virtue of the political fact of citizenship, the Puerto Ricans were able to come to the United States. They came to escape living in shacks on stilts over foul waters, with no sanitary facilities, no income, no land to till. They fled hunger, disease and death which shadow the island's warm sun. Their coming gave us an unexcelled opportunity to analyze our society and its values.

To many, the coming of the Puerto Ricans was like a great swarming of birds, darkening the streets, making alien noises which filled the subways, settling down in the dark slum areas and huddling together in the protection of crowded ghetto. Unfriendly expressions were heard all over the city: "They take our money and won't even learn the language," a loud voice says, and two women talk and laugh as the intricate rhythms of their tongue unknowingly mock their accuser. The city shivers, mans its home relief offices, and grits its teeth: "You can't stop them, they're citizens." And in the cool quiet of the rectory, "These people must learn to support the church." Or, "Lady, the parish can't give out food coupons until we know these things. Are you married?"

So it goes on. We met the challenge of their coming on the shallow level at which we found ourselves. Poverty-stricken humanity with its inescapable "hereness" was an inconvenience. We didn't want them to get too close, even those of us who did not resent the financial help given them by the welfare department, as did so many, even though the department announced that Puerto Ricans were the quickest to get off relief and were always eager for any job. Long years of poverty had given some of their faces a hollow look and they were too much like a reminder of the death which befalls the masses of starving and depressed people throughout the world. The safe white world faces the restless stirring of the poor around the globe, but we got a taste of the depressed masses right in New York and the best we could do was to dole out a few pennies, muttering under our breaths and walking quickly past.

Incident after incident points to our failure to meet the situation with justice and love. We are very used to scorning the poor or ignoring them as members of some strange breed which has nothing in common with us. One woman who went to the welfare department for aid asked for enough money in advance for carfare home. She was pregnant, suffering from a kidney disease, and had a note from the hospital about her condition. No one would give her the money. She walked 35 blocks with her young son and then collapsed on the stairs of her apartment. Another young mother who took her small daughter to the hospital because she had been bitten by a rat for the second time was accused by a social worker of neglecting her children. Every penny the city puts in their hands is measured—to the last grain of rice. The city is god; it has the power of life and death. It says eat and you eat. It says starve and you starve. The welfare check is bread that becomes a stone because of the humiliation that goes with it.

When we can get from the Puerto Ricans we take; their cheap labor is employed washing dishes and in sweatshops, often enough at less than legal minimum wages. Our landlords collect exorbitant rents for crumbling slums. We sell them cheap junk for their homes and sew them up in lifetime debts with interest rates as high as the traffic will bear. All the racketeers descend upon them.

To the Puerto Ricans, the charity of Catholics often seems as much a mockery as the charity of the state. There is little sense of shock over the exploitation of the poor, little exchange of love with them. A day's pay to Catholic charities is supposed to take care of everything, but it doesn't even scratch the surface. Except in rare instances, the really poor are completely out of reach. Expenses which are in the luxury class are considered before the needs of the hungry children in our city. Slum parishes exist as though they were in a different world, as indeed they are. But even in the slums the church is not really reaching the poor. To the average Puerto Rican, the parish rectory is a place where you knock at the door, timidly. A place where you go if you have a suit to wear and a clean shirt and shoes to put on, not where you go in your hunger, anguish, and despair. Most Catholics do not hear the cries of the poor because we are too far away, too insulated. We rest because we have our institutions to take care of the needy. But who will kiss the lepers? Who will wash the feet of the poor? Who will feed the multitudes? Who will hold back the waters of despair until they are safe?

No sense of inadequacy is keener than that of anyone who has tried to heal the breach, who has tried to break through the barrier of coldness which separates us from the poor. You become so aware of your own selfishness, love of convenience and ease, your freedom to think and move without the burdens of others on your shoulders. To enter the world of poverty is like having a layer of skin burned off, that layer which insulates against shock and says, "All is well."

The Catholic Worker movement has attempted to heal this breach by pointing out the evils in society which perpetuate poverty, by proposing solutions, and primarily by accepting personal responsibility in service to the poor not in the spirit of the "do-gooder" but in the spirit of justice, by the acceptance of voluntary poverty, and by working to change society so that the fruits of labor belong to all and not to a privileged few. When Mary Ann McCoy and I came to East Harlem and opened a children's center, the children came streaming in full of tensions, sadness and exuberance; they painted and screamed, swung on the see-saw, eventually knocked out all the store-front glass and most of the windows, ripped a piano up in one month, gave song-and-dance shows, fought, laughed, and cried. In short we had much fun, yet woven into all of our activities was the tragedy hidden behind the walls of the slum buildings where they lived. It was a world we had not really entered. But soon we became drawn into their lives. Parents came over to get clothes and occasionally food and told us of the hardships and tragedies they faced every day. We began to feel poverty, to touch it. We saw the desolation in hungry and disturbed children, heard the lamentations of the parents which were like the psalms. These were the poor who cry out throughout time for deliverance and bread.

Two years later we moved from our store front into an apartment a short distance away. We wanted to be able to feed the children when they were hungry, to give them some of the atmosphere of a home which they could feel was their own and where they could always come if they needed us. Helen Russell joined us after spending a few months working at the Catholic

Worker House of Hospitality on Chrystie Street. Scores of kids were soon banging down the door, and parents came to us in emergencies. Helen, who is a nurse, swabbed the cuts, and Mary Ann who is home during the day took the seriously sick to the clinic at Mount Sinai and made trips to the parks and nearby Ward's Island. Our living room became the playroom and although not as many children could fit, we had fewer riots and were able to get to know the children better as well as cook some eggs when someone said he had not eaten all day.

When summer came, Helen and Mary Ann took groups of about 10 children to an impromptu camp at the CW Peter Maurin Farm. They brightened with the steady diet of sun and fresh air after the dank smoky air which filled their lungs all year round. The trees and beauty of the country were like a miracle to them and they came back full of stories, and happy. Soon the world of dopepushers, hunger and dirt was around them again and they could only imagine the world of wide blue skies and clean fruitful earth they had known in the summer.

Again we were caught up in the daily tragedies. We listened to the teenagers express their feeling of alienation from the "outside world," we were called into scenes of mental breakdown which left us shaken for days; we listened, helpless, while children told us of their older brothers and sisters who were going to jail on narcotics charges. We grew to know poverty; its face, its screams, its groanings, its flashes of joy, its warmth, the warmth of those who spend their last $2 to buy you beer because you bring their children an Easter basket. We saw the steely clutch of hysteria and brought small comfort to children who in the face of tragedy sit quietly in a dark room watching bugs crawl along the floor.

The activities of the city go on—the neon lights shout the praises of the age of progress and profit while the poor are unheard. And there is little compassion, little exchange of gifts, little love, only the inevitableness of hunger—for bread that is not stone.

Resolution of the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion on the 14th anniversary of the mass deportations from the Baltic States by the Communists, and the 15th anniversary of the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union, the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit adopted a resolution of such great importance that I hereby insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The resolution follows:

The Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians of Detroit in the mass gathering on June 12, 1955, at the International Institute of Detroit, honoring the memory of the mass deported people from the respective states by Russian Communists, unanimuosly adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas in June 1940 the sovereign and independent Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were illegally occupied through treachery and deception by Soviet Russia and still carry the yoke of Russian Communists dictatorship and tyranny; and

"Whereas Russian Communists are perpetrating deportations and exterminations of whole ethnic groups, which are criminal acts of aggression and genocide, constituting manifest crimes against mankind and world peace; and

"Whereas the Russian Communists are forcing our people in their homelands against their will to commemorate the month of June as the Month of Joy: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That hereby we, who have assembled today to commemorate this tragic anniversary, express our deep gratitude to the United States Government for not recognizing the fabricated incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully recommend and urge the honorable Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to support a bill sponsored by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN condemning Soviet Russia for crimes committed in the Baltic States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we are asking all Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to support a bill sponsored by six United States Senators in which it is recommended to continue the work done by Congressman KERSTEN's investigating committee on methods and means employed by the Russians to occupy the Baltic States and the crimes committed by them in the Baltic States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States representative at the United Nations should use testimonies and documents obtained by Congressman KERSTEN's investigating committee on crimes committed in the Baltic States, he should bring this to the United Nations' attention and he should ask all freedom-loving nations to condemn Soviet Russia and demand its withdrawal from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be forwarded to the President, Secretary of State, the United States Delegate to the U. N., Senators and Congressmen from Michigan in the United States Congress, and the Governor of the State of Michigan."

Done in Detroit, Mich., this 12th day of June A. D. 1955.

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE OF DETROIT.

Resolution of Atlanta Post, No. 1, Department of Georgia, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have just been furnished a copy of a resolution adopted by Atlanta Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, on May 10, 1955.

It is obvious from the wording of this resolution that the officers and members of Atlanta Post, No. 1, of the American Legion have noticed, as Americans from one end of the country to the other have noticed, that the executive department and the judicial department have in recent years usurped authority which does not belong to them, and that this usurpation of authority is in direct violation of one of the provisions of the United States Constitution.

I have spoken on this subject myself many times, both on the floor of the House of Representatives and elsewhere. I have pointed out time and time again that the usurpation of legislative functions by the United States Supreme Court is a direct blow at our form of government—that it will destroy our Constitution and will tear down one of the bulwarks erected by our forefathers to preserve and perpetuate liberty and freedom for the individual.

I commend the officers and members of Atlanta Post, No. 1, of the American Legion for taking action in this important matter.

The resolution adopted is as follows:

Whereas article 1, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States of America reads as follows: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives"; and

Whereas in recent years the policies of the executive and judicial departments by Executive orders, administrative directives, and judicial opinions tend to violate this constitutional principle; and

Whereas while transient advantage might accrue to the public from such practice, they are the well-recognized policies by which democracies are destroyed and, in lieu thereof, dictatorships established: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Atlanta Post No. 1 of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, That the executive committee of the Department of Georgia be requested to recommend to the national executive committee of the American Legion that they petition both Houses of the Congress of the United States to take such action as they may deem necessary to curb the dangerous practice herein enumerated, advising that the American Legion, being committed to the defense of the Constitution of the United States, cannot look with favor upon any usurpation of the powers granted to the legislative department of our Government by either of the other departments thereof or any person or persons; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to both Senators from Georgia and to each Representative from Georgia in the House of Representatives.

Submitted for approval by the resolutions committee of Atlanta Post No. 1, the American Legion, Department of Georgia.

Unanimously adopted at the regular meeting of the Atlanta Post No. 1 of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, this 10th day of May 1955.

W. N. PATTERSON,
Commander, Atlanta Post No. 1.
O. B. CAWTHON,
Adjutant, Atlanta Post No. 1.

The New Look in River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is aware of the great work which has been done over the years, by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, in sponsoring the development of our rivers and harbors.

Many of our esteemed colleagues in the House and Senate have, over the years, taken a very active part in this organization.

At a recent meeting of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, a distinguished fellow townsman of mine, Everett Lay, of Gadsden, Ala., who has, for a long number of years, been president of the Coosa-Alabama Rivers Improvement Association, delivered a noteworthy address, on the subject The New Look in River Development.

Mr. Lay's speech has received wide acclaim from many people interested in the development of our rivers. I recommend that each of my colleagues read Mr. Lay's most interesting and constructive address:

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the annual meeting of this distinguished group has become an example of the most constructive long range planning in America. It is very stimulating to attend these annual meetings and see the caliber of the men who conduct the affairs of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I cannot to strongly commend the able and high ranking public officials as well as the important business men who devote their time to this constructive work. The report of President Brooks and the other officers reflects great progress during the past year and the evidence is present, for all to see, that the entire pattern of this organization is on a high plane and in the best American tradition. It is gaining in influence and increasing in value. I consider it a privilege to be with you and a much greater privilege to claim a few minutes of the time of this body to discuss the very interesting situation existing in Alabama.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message made the following statement: "This administration believes that achievement of resource development basic to the economic progress and security of the Nation requires encouragement of local public and private initiative, and where Federal participation is necessary, emphasis on the partnership aspects of essential cooperative arrangements with State and local government or with private enterprise." Secretary of Interior McKay, testifying recently before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee said: "Again in the case of the Coosa River development Congress has endorsed the partnership principle." Private capital for the first time is undertaking the comprehensive development of a river in partnership with the Federal Government thus supplying me with the subject of my speech, The New Look in River Development.

The Coosa River is formed at Rome, Ga., from sources in the Blue Ridge Mountains. From Rome it flows southwestward being joined by the Tallapoosa near Montgomery and continuing as the Alabama River to the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile. Let me explain that the words "Coosa" and "Tallapoosa" are derived from Cherokee Indian culture; an important influence in the background of this region. The word "Coosa" is the gutteral form of the Cherokee word "usa" which meant river. The Tallapoosa, winding through the eastern part of Alabama on its way to join the Coosa, forms the storied Horseshoe Bend where, you will recall, Andrew Jackson defeated the British-allied Creek Indians in 1814 in one of the important actions of the war of 1812, and which permanently broke the power of the Creeks. There is a strong movement in the Congress now to have this interesting area made into a military national park.

The Coosa-Alabama Rivers Improvement Association, which group I represent, was organized in 1890 to promote improvement of the river channel by the Federal Government for the benefit of the flourishing steamboat transportation of that period. It is interesting to note that four times during the succeeding years this Association shifted emphasis from Government to private enterprise or back again as it attempted to meet the contingencies of our shifting, political and economic climate never losing sight of the ultimate goal—development of a great natural resource.

Efforts to induce the Federal Government to develop our river have continued with the utmost persistence up to the present time. With the main objective always in mind our organization has also sought development by private capital and with much success. Between 1914 and 1930 three dams were constructed on the Coosa and three on the Tallapoosa by a private utility, the Alabama Power Co., with installed capacity of 490,000 kilowatts with provision in the dams on the Coosa for navigation locks. The 1930's ushered in a period during which private utilities could not continue development and efforts to induce the Federal Government to do it failed miserably. Climaxing a terrific struggle of 15 years an act authorizing the comprehensive development of this river, and vesting authority exclusively in the Corps of Engineers, was passed by the 77th Congress in 1945. To you I say that nowhere on earth could be found a group more responsive to the sad words, "We could not get an appropriation." This in spite of the unremitting efforts of the Alabama delegation and our friends representing many other States.

During our darkest hour, in the Fall of 1953, the Alabama Power Co. publicly announced its willingness to again undertake the development of our river if the people approved. The statement was acclaimed by press and public and immediately won the support of the Alabama delegation and practically everyone else. The Corps of Engineers with admirable spirit cooperated fully with the private interests in working out an advantageous plan. Under the wise and skillful leadership of the Alabama and Georgia delegations the Congress by legislative enactment restored to the Federal Power Commission the authority to grant licenses for dams under specific conditions. Under the act the Alabama Power Co. will by the construction of probably 5 dams create a continuous series of pools through a 280-mile reach of the river encompassing a fall of 442 feet; developing full power potential and flood-control measures deemed practicable.

Now what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government under this partnership which it has so wisely established? They have been reduced to the job of providing navigation by the installation of locks in the dams and other improvements. Is it justified? Well, this river has a minimum flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second, 3 million persons live in the watershed of the river where 3,500 manufacturing plants are located with annual production valued at 2½ billion dollars. Emphasizing the urgency of our development, one of these 3,500 plants is the great Republic Steel Co., of Gadsden, now undergoing a 25 million dollar expansion and hoping to receive by river freight 2 to 5 million tons of foreign ore annually. Its president, Mr. White, recently referred to the Coosa-Alabama River as potentially the St. Lawrence seaway of the South. The enormous plant of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. located on the banks of the Coosa is equally interested as are many of the other 1,080 new manufacturers who have commenced operations in the valley within the past 12 years.

Waterways transportation is already vitally important in the economy of Alabama. At present about 2½ million tons moves on the Warrior-Tombigbee, 8½ million tons on the Tennessee, and 17 million tons on the intracoastal canal.

I will not burden you with more dry figures on a project so eminently justified. Our objective is for money in next year's budget to meet the responsibilities of the Federal Government, but also we hope that his unique partnership provides a pattern with broad application on a national scale. Now, gentlemen, we have an important part to play in the economic forces responsible for a rising standard of living and the safety of this Nation, therefore let us rededicate ourselves to the job of developing this and other water resources for everlasting public good.

Partnership for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert herewith a summary of a 52-page report entitled Partnership for Freedom, which was recently made public by an outstanding group of Americans, all of them prominent in our political life and specialists in foreign affairs.

Sponsors of the document include: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Benjamin V. Cohen, former member of the United States delegation to the U. N.; Thomas Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force; Victor Reuther, assistant to the president of the CIO; Robert R. Nathan, consulting economist; Elmer Davis, author and radio commentator; Stanley Andrews, former Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration; Willard Thorp, former Assistant Secretary of State; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., professor of history, Harvard University; Isador Lubin, New York State Industrial Commissioner; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, dean of the Union Theological Seminary; Quincy Howe, author and radio commentator; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; Paul R. Porter, former United States special representative in Europe, Office of the Department of Economic Affairs; Michael Straight, editor of the New Republic.

The summary follows:

PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

Safeguarding freedom in the two-thirds of the world which is still outside Communist control takes more than military alliances and more than a stockpile of bombs and threats to use them. The notion that tension in the world is caused entirely by the Soviet drive for expansion and can be adequately met by a military deterrent is false and a misreading of our times.

The surge of half the peoples of the world toward freedom and material progress is a driving force in the world today. Communists have recognized this force and sought to capture its leadership by false promises of freedom and material progress. The main thrust of Communist expansion is now directed against economically underdeveloped countries. Military strength alone will not turn back the thrust. The lesson of Indochina is pertinent. The side with the greater military strength lost. The crucial margin

was the greater will to fight, sustained by promises of freedom and economic betterment.

The obvious way to blunt these Communist promises is to provide the reality of freedom and make an actual start toward economic betterment. The United States, along with other western nations, should undertake to supplement the resources of underdeveloped countries, to help them develop by democratic means and to disprove the Communist claim that the Soviet system enables a country to make a more rapid rate of progress than the democratic system.

"In a situation where military forces approach an equilibrium, economic measures become very nearly decisive." The new phase of competitive coexistence of the free world and the Soviet bloc gives the United States the advantage because "our overwhelming strength is economic." Our help should include an expanded program of technical assistance, public loans, public grants, and private investment.

Half of the world's people live in non-Communist countries that are economically underdeveloped, with incomes less than $150 per person per year. (In the United States income per person is above $1,500.) Because they are poor, they cannot save enough to invest capital for raising their agricultural and industrial production. Many of these countries are rich in resources—some of which, like tin and manganese, are indispensable to the United States—but lack the capital to develop them. They are trying to develop democratically, but if democracy does not give them hope of better lives, they will be tempted by the claims of communism.

In this respect, there are three lessons for United States policy: (1) The United States has failed to build an American-directed anti-Communist front in Asia because these nations, many of them recently liberated from colonialism, cannot accept American direction; (2) the United States objective should be to help develop self-reliant nations, not satellites; (3) the United States emphasis has been on United States objectives, not on the needs and hopes of the underdeveloped countries. Yet a successful United States policy requires that these nations, with their billion people and vast resources, be held for the free world. A program to help them develop their economies and raise their standards of living is an essential element.

"Economic development involves many simultaneous changes—new tools, new capital resources, new skills and aptitudes, new governmental competence, new business institutions. Communists bring about these changes by force. Free nations must employ persuasion."

Most of the capital needed for development must and will come from within these countries themselves, but history has shown that during the decades of transition from a static to a growing economy, outside capital is necessary to stimulate growth. European capital played an important part in the growth of the United States economy in the early stages of its development. Underdeveloped countries do have some savings with which to start but the people live so near the margin of survival that they cannot invest large sums. They have little machinery; therefore output per worker is low. Almost all the output is needed to keep people alive. Very little goes for more machines. Communist governments squeeze savings out of the economy by holding down consumption, even though millions of people starve as a consequence. Free people will not submit to this. To stimulate their economic growth, outside capital must supplement their savings. By supplying this capital, developed countries enable them to preserve their freedom and at the same time to raise their standards of living.

This outside capital takes many forms. Growing economies offer many opportunities for profitable investment from abroad, but in early stages of development, long-term loans and government-to-government grants are necessary to stimulate growth. We have already seen how this can work successfully: in Turkey, 5 years of United States grants stimulated the flow of Turkish capital many times as great as the American funds; as production rose, Turkish credit improved and made possible sound international loans; increasing expansion generated more Turkish capital and attracted American private investment and American trade. This sequence of grants, public loans, private investment and American trade, can be repeated in other countries. It must be repeated in India, where a vast and successful program of economic growth is in process but seriously handicapped by lack of enough capital.

There is no single prescription for the amounts, forms and rates of capital that will fit the needs of all underdeveloped countries. The essentials are that these must be suited to the circumstances, needs and resources of each country; that the flow of capital be assured over a period of years, so that programs of development, once started, can be carried through to productive completion; that capital be made available to free nations under conditions that will offer every reasonable assurance that it will be productively used, but "separate from our system of military alliances" and without political strings which would conflict with the national policies of free nations or contradict what they consider their best interests.

The cost need not be great; in comparison to our national income or to other expenditures for our national security. Perhaps one-third or one-half of 1 percent of our national income; or 5 percent of what we spend on our military defense; or 10 percent of the amount by which our national income increases each year.

The study concludes with 7 recommendations:

1. "The United States should announce, jointly with Great Britain and other industrialized nations, that we are prepared to assure for at least a decade the availability of a much greater flow of capital into underdeveloped countries."

(a) The United States should at the start appropriate a billion dollars a year for grants or loans repayable in local currency over and above the cost of technical assistance and direct forces support.

(b) The banks now making international loans should be pressed to double their rate of lending to underdeveloped countries.

(c) Congress should approve the proposed International Finance Corporation, to help stimulate American private investment abroad.

(d) Congress should enact tax incentives for overseas investment.

2. "The offer of greater capital flow should be safeguarded by a clear statement of purpose and a set of business-like conditions." The statement of purpose should indicate that public funds would be available, in circumstances where private investment is not doing the job, for such basic economic services as highways, railroads, ports, power plants, water supply, irrigation, reclamation, and for educational and health facilities.

3. "As the flow of capital increases, technical assistance services should be enlarged, possibly as much as 50 percent."

4. "The United States should stimulate free world growth by a number of methods in addition to export of capital and technical assistance," notably by keeping the United States economy operating at full capacity, by encouraging international trade, and by developing atomic power generation adapted to underdeveloped countries.

5. "A partnership for free world growth should be administered in part by national (United States) agencies, in part by U. N. agencies, in part by regional organizations."

6. "The principles which guide a partnership for freedom must be in keeping with the time-honored phrase in the Declaration of Independence: 'a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.' "

7. "The amount of capital which America and other leaders of the free world should be willing to invest in underdeveloped countries should be the amount which those countries can use effectively on a self-help basis—no more, no less."

Valedictory Address by James Brownie Pilcher at John Marshall Law School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and privilege to attend the graduation exercises of the John Marshall Law School in Atlanta, Ga., on June 9, 1955.

The valedictory address was delivered by Mr. James Brownie Pilcher, an outstanding member of the graduating class. He chose for the subject of his address the life and achievements of John Marshall, a great American and the most famous Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Under unanimous consent request previously granted, I insert Mr. Pilcher's splendid address herewith:

VALEDICTORY ADDRESS BY JAMES BROWNIE PILCHER, CLASS OF 1955, JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL, ATLANTA, GA.

Lawyers, it is said, are divided into two classes, those who know the law and those who know the judge. The division is not so clearly marked. To know the law it is also necessary to know the judge.

The most abstract of the exact sciences, astronomy, first discovered the need for the use of a personal equation in checking the results of observation. The very exactness of that science called attention to the failure of all men to observe the movements of the stars in precisely the same way. The traditional machinery of the law long tended to conceal a similar situation. In law, also, men make a difference. There is no inevitability in history except as men make it. That the line of precedent does grow was an observed phenomenon.

The year of our graduation from law school marks the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of an outstanding precedent maker, the greatest name in history of American law, and one of the dominant figures in the patristic period of American history.

It is fitting that we direct our thought tonight to the salient features of the life and work of this great jurist; not only because of the great formulator of constitutional principles and doctrines that he was, but because we law graduates have an affinity to this man, for it is after him that our school is named.

He was born near Germantown, Va., on September 24, 1755. His father was a former classmate and fellow surveyor of a man soon to be named President of the United States—George Washington.

It was Washington who later became a strong influence in this young man's becoming a candidate for Congress.

In 1780, after having served as a captain in the Continental Army, he attended a series of law lectures at William and Mary College for a period of less than 2 months. This was the extent of his formal legal education. A month later he was admitted to the bar of Virginia.

Unlike most young lawyers, he had not long to wait for clients. Almost from the start he entered upon a renumerative practice. His rapid advancement at the bar was favored by the conditions which existed at the close of the Revolutionary War. The unsettled state of the country was favorable to litigation, and the dockets of the courts were encumbered with law suits. His success was largely due to his sound judgment and power of vigorous and logical statement rather than to technical learning or rhetorical display. It could hardly be expected that his knowledge of the law would be either extensive or profound. Fortunately for him, the questions to be settled were of novel character which depended not upon authority or precendent but upon broad principles of justice and equity. American jurisprudence was yet to be born. It was a constructive period of the law, which called for the higher qualities of the profession. These characteristics he possessed. His increasing popularity and business soon led him to change his residence to Richmond, the new capital of the State. Here, he was brought into active competition with such leaders at the bar as Patrick Henry, Alexander Campbell, Edmund Randolph, Benjamin Botts, and James Inness. How he impresses his contemporaries at the bar we learn from the pen of William Wirt, who wrote of him as follows: "All his eloquence consists in the apparently deep self-conviction and emphatic earnestness of manner, the correspondent simplicity and energy of his style, the close and logical connection of his thoughts, and the easy gradations by which he opens his lights on the attentive minds of his hearers."

In 1782 he was elected to the House of Delegates of Virginia, commencing his political career. Nineteen years later he was appointed Chief Justice of the United States. Briefly, the positions he occupied during this interim period were: member of the council of the State of Virginia, member of the House of Delegates from Fauquier and Henrico Counties, special envoy to France, member of the United States Congress, and Secretary of State in President Adams' cabinet.

When he was appointed Chief Justice of the United States, he was 45 years of age, and he had never yet filled any judicial office.

While his great abilities were recognized by the legal, profession, and the public, he had yet to demonstrate that he possessed the qualities of a great judge.

The Supreme Court had been in existence but 12 years at this time. No case had yet called for a decision of questions which opened up the whole scheme of the Constitution and determined the rules of its interpretation. The field was absolutely new. The world had never known such a science as a law of a written constitution of government. There were no precedents, and the road had to be cut without the aid of landmarks or guides. To construct a system of jurisprudence under these conditions required a man of the highest judicial order. It was not sufficient to give decisions which were technically correct. It was necessary to combine these decisions in a manner so harmonious and consistent as to create a system of constitutional law which by universal consent should become the fundamental law of the land. To accomplish this task required a mind which combined the highest judicial faculty with great intelectual strength and scope. The qualities he possessed.

Thus the task of expounding the Constitution during the most critical period of its history was his. It was given to him to preside over the Supreme Court when it was called upon to decide four cases of vital importance: *Marbury* v. *Madison*, *M'Culloch* v. *Maryland*, *Cohens* v. *Virginia*, and *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*. In each of these cases it is he who writes the opinion of the Court. In each case the continued existence of the peculiar Federal system established by the Constitution depended on the action of the Court. In each case the Court adopted a principle which is generally perceived to be essential to the preservation of the United States as a Federal state.

The case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, the most famous case in American judicial annals, presented the question of the power of the Court to set aside an act of Congress because it was in violation of the United States Constitution. Thus arose America's unique contribution to the art of government, the doctrine of judicial review. This extraordinary legal invention has constituted that feature of the Federal Constitution which has been most admired by foreigners. In modern times, some countries have adopted written constitutions, but they have steadfastly refused to accept judicial review.

For 34 years he continued these series of judgments. At a time when all was void in constitutional law, he had but to speak and there was light—a light which cast its rays far down the corridors of future generations.

It is universally known that as Chief Justice he won his greatest fame and made an impress upon the fortunes of the Nation, which will not perish from the memory of men as long as the science of government and jurisprudence survive.

Because of his contribution to our structure of constitutional law, the class of 1955 ca be proud to have attended a school named for one of the greatest judges the world has known, John Marshall.

Reserve Bill Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Marys (Pa.) Daily Press of June 24, 1953:

RESERVE BILL NECESSARY

There is before Congress now a bill to set up a permanent military Reserve bill in the United States, something veterans' organizations have been seeking since the closing days of World War I when lack of preparedness stood out in all its shocking implications.

The first bill, backed by these organizations, was brought up for congressional consideration in 1920, and died before it had a chance to become law.

Had the measure been passed and its features adopted United States from that date on would have had a sound Reserve system, and there is no doubt had such an organization been in effect Hitler would never have started his big "Putsch" in Europe, knowing that across the sea there would be a restraining influence capable of halting his dreams of domination.

The sad tragedy of unpreparedness came to the front anew in World War II when men were put into combat units before they had bee.1 fully prepared for their tasks.

Even this lesson was lost when that conflict came to a close and the United States once again returned to the status of complacency.

When American troops were ordered into Korea 5 years ago this Nation, despite having the largest Army, Navy, and Air Force the world had ever seen but a few short years before, was weaker in a military strength than some South American countries—and that lack of strength soon became apparent on the rugged hills of Korea with all its tragic impact on the men called upon to bear arms.

Since an uneasy peace settled over Korea, attempts have been made to establish a sound Reserve program for this country so men who fought in World War II and the Korean campaign would not have to be summoned back into service in event of another outbreak of war.

One bill introduced in the present session of Congress became bogged down in red tape and was "killed" in the House.

Another is now up for voting consideration, and should be supported, if for no other reason than to begin building up a military backlog in United States to the point the Nation will, at all times, be adequately prepared for any eventuality.

The bill would give youths reaching a certain age 6 months of active military training, then have them retained on an active standby status for the next 6 or 8 years, never subject to recall unless hostilities broke out.

They would have to take an annual refresher course similar to what other Reserve units do now.

The young man going into service would have to give up but 6 months of his life instead of the 2 or more he has to serve now.

Twenty Years of Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, since the House will soon be considering S. 2126, the Housing Act of 1955, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of June 3, 1955, will be of interest. I am pleased to direct it to the attention of our colleagues:

TWENTY YEARS OF PUBLIC HOUSING

New York City occupies a unique position as a pioneer in public housing in this country. The record of accomplishment is spread over the five boroughs, but chiefly seen in Manhattan, Brooklyn and the Bronx. Now the New York City Housing Authority, in its 20th annual report, traces the history of public housing from the small, tentative, experimental beginnings of 1934.

First Houses, on the lower East Side of Manhattan, a remodeling job, was opened December 3, 1935. Now the Housing Authority is the Nation's largest landlord, with nearly 30,000 apartments completed in 71 permanent housing projects; 500 acres of slums have been cleared and redeveloped after demolition of 55,000 slum apartments; 500 acres more of substantially vacant land, mostly in outlying sections, have been developed for public housing. More building is under way and lies ahead, because in spite of the use or commitment of more than $900 million the end of the need is not in sight.

The accomplishments of these 20 years were made possible by an awakened public conscience and the help of the Federal Government, the State and the city administrations through the years. Some of the housing is cash-subsidized, to keep rents down. Some of it merely has tax-relief. The housing does pay some taxes, or the equivalent, however—in fact $22,400,000 over the years, and $3,600,000 last year.

What New York City would be today without this 20-year program of public housing can hardly be imagined. It has demonstrated what can be. But praiseworthy as the record has been, we can view the present situation and the pace of construction, public and private, in the moderate rental field only with the gravest misgivings. We simply must do better, and the hope lies in part in the reexamination of policy now under way on various levels.

Secretary Hobby and the Salk Vaccine Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the smear artists are moving out into the open again hot after a new victim. You can tell a smear artist in a very simple way. Is the attack against specific things done or against the alleged motives of the person doing the things?

I am inserting into the RECORD after my remarks a news item appearing in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Letter to Ike: ADA Urges Ouster of Mrs. Hobby." Also the letter referred to. Notice the use of adjectives and adverbs, participles and phrases. All begging the question, all stating the most general of unproven conclusions, leading toward the basic conclusions sought to be drawn, i. e. "a crude attempt to escape public disfavor," "the inefficiency is only equaled by its inhumanity," "(in Mrs. Hobby's place) the country needs someone who lives in the real world where people seek compassionate and imaginative aid in their quest for health, education, and welfare."

Now what has Mrs. Hobby done or not done which brings about their vicious attack on her personal integrity, her compassion and her humanity for her fellow beings? A very simple answer—she has not followed the particular program that these smear artists happen to be advocating. So, instead of bringing forward honest facts and honest argument in favor of the program they advocate, they seek to win the battle without even engaging in it by trying to make the public believe that Mrs. Hobby is not interested in the health, education, and welfare of our people.

Let us take a few of the issues up one by one, because the pointed attack of the ADA letter is only part of a concerted attack that has been going on for some time by these vicious people who will brook no honest differences of opinion.

First. The "fantastic fumbling of the Salk vaccine program." Well, what is the issue? Has there indeed been fumbling or has there been a deliberate attempt to make a political issue out of the uncertainties and problems attendant to the application of any new laboratory technique to a Nation of 160 million people? In my judgment the basic error committed was the Hollywood treatment given the wonderful discovery of the Salk vaccine; this publicity program created a very false and dangerous public attitude toward the scientific problems of getting a new vaccine out of the laboratory and out to the public. What errors have been committed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I think there have been some, are just the reverse of what smear artists insinuate. The basic error committed was not to immediately call to the attention of the people the scientific and other problems that still needed to be overcome to make the mass innoculation a reality. It was to be hoped that no scientific problem would arise, but the odds that some might arise was quite real to any true scientific mind. Actually, the problems that did arise would not have been so bothersome if the Hollywood presentation had not created the unhealthy atmosphere of haste and cocksureness.

Regardless of all this, the matter is not one involving partisan politics. The persons who have interjected the issue into partisan politics are the very ones who falsely accuse Mrs. Hobby of putting the matter into partisan politics. It is the old game of the thief mingling in the crowd and yelling "Catch the thief" in the loudest voice.

Second. In the education field the ADA accuses Mrs. Hobby's proposal an unworkable plan of Federal aid for school construction. What the smear artists mean is she proposed a plan which did not coincide with the one they wanted. Now let us get down to the specifics. The ADA wants, and have wanted, for some time to get the Federal Government to move more fully and completely into the field of education. Others who are just as interested as the ADA in the field of education of our people, and more so, in my opinion, because they do not falsely throw the matter into partisan politics, believe that in the long run the education of our people is best served through the local communities and the States with the Federal Government playing only an ancillary role. Now there is ample room for fair debate on this subject. But the issue is not as the ADA would have it, who is the most interested in the education of our people, but what proposals are most likely to produce the best education for our people. Once we stick to the issues and get away from attacking the motives, the public debate can be fruitful.

Third. In welfare Mr. Rauh, the chairman of ADA, said Mrs. Hobby "vigorously opposed" adequate increases in social-security benefits. Now, this particular accusation approaches outright lying—the only word in that statement which saves it from such a charge is the adjective "adequate." Indeed, the adjective "adequate" is the entire issue. But let Mr. Rauh come forward to state what he believes are "adequate" increases in social-security benefits and why. Of course, he cannot do this in public hearings because his partisan allies have voted to hold no public hearings on the proposed increases in social-security benefits. Having the votes 15 to 10, these illiberal procedures are being followed right now in the House Ways and Means Committee deliberations on social-security extension. On this point again, let Mr. Rauh and his partisans direct their attention to discussing the issue rather than accusing their opponents of being in favor of sin and opposed to Christian humanity.

Finally, I would say to Mr. Rauh and his partisans, if they would seek to deserve the adjective "liberal" which they so loosely apply to themselves and their endeavors, let them at least eschew procedures and techniques of debate that are illiberal. I am satisfied if once the debate gets on the issues and away from the motives of opponents, we will find that the results of Mr. Rauh's and the ADA's proposals in the field of health, education, and welfare would actually produce less health, education, and welfare and certainly would shackle rather than free our people in reaching these ends. But that, of course, is the issue—what proposals are indeed most likely to get the maximum of health, education and welfare for our people.

Now, a word about Mrs. Hobby's resignation. I hope Mrs. Hobby will not resign. I think she has been doing an excellent job overall, in very trying circumstances. Whoever is the head of HEW is apt to be subjected to the same kind of attacks that Mrs. Hobby has been subjected to. It is in the HEW field that the socialists are the most active, and I regard most of the proposals of the ADA in this field as socialistic. Incidentally, I am using the term "socialistic" not as an epithet, but as a definitive term set forth in any English dictionary. I believe that more direct Federal governmental action in these fields will produce, over all, less, not more, adequate health, education, and welfare for the American people. I believe the Federal Government has an important role to play. Much needs to be done, but what is primarily needed at this time is to get the matter back to honest public discussion of the issues of how we are to get the job done. I am certain there will be plenty of room for political differences as to how to do it without accusing one another of not being interested in the health, education, and welfare of our people.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 27, 1955]

ADA URGES OUSTER OF MRS. HOBBY

Americans for Democratic Action called on President Eisenhower yesterday to "reverse the do-nothing course" of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and dismiss Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as Secretary.

ADA Chairman Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., said in a letter to the President that Mrs. Hobby's "fantastic fumbling of the Salk vaccine program has ended her usefulness as a public servant."

"More important, it has dramatized beyond doubt the extent to which Mrs. Hobby's new Department has abdicated responsibility

for public health, education, and welfare," he said.

"The inefficiency of Mrs. Hobby's administration is equaled only by its inhumanity," Rauh told the President. "Surely it is time for a change."

Mrs. Hobby's first "failure" in the vaccine program was "in failure to take responsibility," Rauh said. Then, he said Mrs. Hobby made a "crude attempt to escape public disfavor" by a "buckpassing" denial that the responsibility was hers in the first place.

In the education field, he said, Mrs. Hobby proposed an "unworkable" plan of Federal aid for school construction. In welfare, he said, Mrs. Hobby "vigorously opposed" adequate increases in social-security benefits.

Rauh urged Mr. Eisenhower "to replace Mrs. Hobby." In her place, Rauh said, "the country needs someone who lives in the real world where people seek compassionate and imaginative aid in their quest for health, education, and welfare."

JUNE 25, 1955.

To the PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Secretary Hobby's fantastic fumbling of the Salk vaccine program has ended her usefulness as a public servant. More important, it has dramatized beyond doubt the extent to which Mrs. Hobby's new Department has abdicated responsibility for public health, education, and welfare.

In your message to Congress of March 12, 1953, you staked out the new Department's purpose: "To improve the administration of the vital health, education, and social-security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental rank. Such action is demanded by the importance in magnitude of these functions which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens."

But you also said, "* * * good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their success upon efficient, responsible administration." We heartily concur.

Mrs. Hobby's regime is bare of either responsibility or efficiency. In fact her self-righteous refusal to recognize government's responsibility for the health or welfare or education of the American people appears to be a matter of private principle; in so doing she professes to be resisting what she calls "back door socialism."

The consequent chaos and confusion in the United States vaccine distribution program is especially shocking when compared to the success of the Canadian program directed by a government which even Mrs. Hobby could hardly accuse of having succumbed to state socialism.

Even more appalling is Mrs. Hobby's crude attempt to escape public disfavor by indulging in the ordinary barracks variety of buckpassing. Her first failure was in failure to take responsibility. Equally incredible is her serene denial that the responsibility and the failure were hers in the first place.

Mrs. Hobby's negligence in the Salk vaccine program is typical of a 2-year record of evasion of the tasks for which her Department was charged with responsibility.

One has only to look at the record:

Most administration proposals in the field of health, as devised or presented by Mrs. Hobby's Department, have been transparent public relations gimmicks.

The proposal for reinsurance of private health plans suggested a $25 million solution to a $9 billion problem; it proposed applying relatively untried economic backstops for programs already working well for people who could afford them; it would give no aid at all to those for whom private health plans are economically out of reach.

The proposal to revise the Hill-Burton Act to encourage the construction of homes for the chronically ill was submitted to Congress at the same time that the administration was requesting less than half of the annual appropriations already authorized under this act for hospital construction. When it was pointed out to Mrs. Hobby's Department that the Hill-Burton Act was broad enough to construct the kind of facilities sought, the Department failed to forward a request for funds to construct the very nursing homes originally proposed.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department has reluctantly requested aid to States and local communities for school construction, a request which only came after the administration had been in office for more than 2 years, and after the Democratic controlled Labor Committee began hearings on a Democratic proposal of direct Federal grants to States and local communities on a matching basis, and suggested instead an elaborate system of Federal guaranties for local and State bonds permitting local authorities to borrow money for school construction. The Hobby proposal, as presented to Congress, would undoubtedly have required a majority of States to amend their constitutions in order to benefit from it. Further, many State and local communities which are already unable to bear the burden of their school problems would be encouraged to overextend themselves further. It is hard to see how States which cannot now build schools for lack of money would be able to afford to pay the interest and service charges on the bond proposed by Mrs. Hobby.

Mrs. Hobby's Department has done nothing about the teachers' salary problem.

While the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare favored modest increases in social security benefits, it vigorously opposed increases to make social security benefits provide a really adequate standard of living. The Department opposed legislation which would have given immediate benefits to workers who have been permanently and totally disabled after they had worked long enough to gain coverage under the law.

Americans for Democratic Action respectfully urges you, as the person who must assume ultimate responsibility for the policies of your administration, to reverse the do-nothing course of your Health, Education, and Welfare Department and recognize in deeds as well as in words "the importance and magnitude" of its functions. The first step, we suggest, would be to replace Mrs. Hobby.

In her stead, the country needs someone who lives in the real world where people seek compassionate and imaginative aid in their quest for health, education, and welfare.

The inefficiency of Mrs. Hobby's administration is equaled only by its inhumanity. Surely it is time for a change.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, Jr.,
National Chairman, ADA.

New Techniques and Therapeutic Agents in the Treatment of Moist Eczema

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years numerous Congressmen and Senators have called to the attention of the American people a miracle solution of extract of mung-bean sprouts which has been used so successfully for treatment of burns and skin dermatitis by doctors who have requested manufacturers' samples. As yet this medicine is not available for public sale as the subcommittee on trauma of the National Research Council has not allowed the Surgeon General of the United States or any of the surgeons general of the branches of the Armed Forces to conduct or sponsor any research, as the solution's discovering company did not have the proper pharmaceutical background at the time of the discovery. The subcommittee on trauma also has refused to accept hospital or clinical data which confirms the effectiveness of the medicine.

The Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation is at present conducting tests as to the safety of this product in animal burn cases, and its report is expected in the near future. I understand that there are other schools of medicine which desire to conduct further research with this medicine in the burn field.

Mr. Speaker, my interest in this matter stems from the fact that over 90 percent of the mung beans in the United States is grown in my district and when this product becomes available to the public it will be of great benefit to the Oklahoma farmer as well as to the suffering and afflicted.

Recently two outstanding Chicago veterinarians conducted experiments in which moist eczema of small animals was treated with this extract. At the veterinarians' association convention of last May these doctors were asked to report on these experiments. This report has been reprinted in the June issue of the North American Veterinarian, which is recognized as the veterinarian's journal in the small-animal field. The findings therein open up an entire new area in which the mung-bean extract has been used successfully.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD this article by Martin A. Sweeney, D. V. M., and John J. Sweeney, entitled "New Techniques and Therapeutic Agents in the Treatment of Moist Eczema":

NEW TECHNIQUES AND THERAPEUTIC AGENTS IN THE TREATMENT OF MOIST ECZEMA

(By Martin A. Sweeney, D. V. M., and John J. Sweeney, Chicago, Ill.)

The skin inflammations to which small animals, especially dogs and cats, are susceptible vary according to their intensity, character, and location. One of the more common of these inflammations and the most difficult to treat is moist eczema, which may be more specifically termed dermatitis rubrum mandidans or eczematoid dermatitis. This type of dermal disturbance reputedly may be of infectious or noninfectious origin and, consequently, is diagnosed practically by the physical manifestations of the disease rather than from an etiological viewpoint.

In the progressive stage of this disease, at which it is presented most often to the veterinarian, the epithelial and endothelial tissue layers have been destroyed and the wound is laid open to the adipose, and sometimes to the muscular tissue. The denuded tissue usually is overlaid by a moist exudate of either a serous of purulent nature. In some instances the disease may be complicated by a form of sapremia and, as a consequence,

the surviving epithelium is cut off from the normal supply of nutrients and undergoes progressive atrophy and degeneration. Furthermore, the loss of normal blood supply from the diseased site adds impetus to the progression of necrosis and precludes counteraction upon the inflammatory processes by the disease-combating biological functions.

Hitherto it has been the practice to correct these eczematoid conditions by applying oleaginous substances to the diseased site in order to minimize the formation of cicatricial elements deposited from the exudate; also, to employ antiseptic agents to control infectious organisms, if present, and to induce proliferation of new skin tissue. In relatively recent years, the antibiotics have been utilized in the control of pathogenic organisms associated with the disease. In addition, radical excision of encrusted materials and necrotic tissue frequently has been found desirable, permitting the biological processes of the animal to regenerate granulation tissue in the wound. A newer technic, involving the use of proteolytic enzymes to produce sloughing of this putrefied tissue, has been developed, but has not attained widespread practice.

Recently we have employed, in our hospital, a therapeutic agent which has exhibited surprising properties in inducing proliferation of new skin in acute and moist eczema and related dermatological disorders. This medicinal agent is characterized as being an enzyme extract of mung-bean sprouts, grown under hydroponic conditions. This material is furnished in liquid form, containing 0.02 percent of thimersol as a preservative. This medicinal substance has been employed in the successful treatment of burns, diabetic lesions, contact dermatitis, and other conditions in humans.

It is the purpose of this report to describe certain cases of moist eczema treated with this medicament in our hospital, and the clinical results obtained therewith.

CASE HISTORIES

Case 1. An 8-month male dog, of the terrier-dachshund variety, was presented for examination and found to have a lesion of the skin in the upper cervical region, of a generally oval shape, approximately 4 by 6 inches in size. This dermatitic condition was diagnosed as moist eczema and the dog, after conventional dermal therapy, was released from the hospital as an outpatient. On the following day, the dog was returned for reexamination and it was seen that the lesion on the upper cervical region had increased in size, and that a new lesion had developed in the lower cervical region, in the vicinity of the larynx, approximately 1 by 1½ inches in size, ovoid in shape, and in the initial stages of necrosis. In addition, a third lesion was seen on the right shoulder, extending from the lower cervical region to the shoulder and from the shoulder forward to the sternum. The epithelial tissue in this last-named lesion was undergoing exceptionally rapid degeneration, and the periphery of the lesion was regressing constantly. The dermatitis was complicated by a rhythmical chorea-like condition.

After 5 days of conventional dermal therapy, wherein no apparent control of the disease was obtained, it was decided to perform euthanasia. At that time, a revised diagnosis of moist eczema, complicated by sapremia of undetermined origin, was made. However, euthanasia was not performed, due to our inability to inform the owner of the patient's condition and to obtain the owner's consent. In view of these circumstances, it was decided to attempt the treatment of this disease with the mung bean sprout extract.

On the following day, and for the next succeeding 3 days, wet packs were applied to the lesions, and these packs were moistened liberally 4 to 6 times daily with the mung bean sprout extract. In addition, dihydrostreptomycin sulfate, in the amount of 0.5 cc., was administered intramuscularly twice daily on alternate days of treatment. After omitting a single day, the course of therapy was reinstituted for the next succeeding 4 days.

After the first day of treatment it was observed that the lesions on the upper and lower neck were of slightly increasing severity, while the progressive degeneration of peripheral epithelium in the shoulder lesion seemed to have been arrested.

On the third day of treatment it was observed that the spread of necrosis in all lesions had been arrested. By the fifth day of therapy healthy granulation tissue in the shoulder lesion and a proliferation of new epithelium at the periphery were observed. Also, the size of the lesion appearing on the upper cervical region had decreased considerably, and the texture and coloration of the tissue therein had improved noticeably. However, it was observed at this time that a portion of the upper left quadrant of the shoulder lesion was increasing in size and severity. It is believed that this anomaly can be attributed to an inflammatory condition associated with prolonged hospitalization, known as decubitus chronicus. Decubital lesions were observed also on the opposite shoulder and on both hips. This complication of the eczematoid condition was seen to progress to intensity in spite of the continued application of the mung bean sprout extract, even though the dermatitis rubrum madidans showed continuous improvement.

On the 7th day of treatment, although the eczematoid lesions were practically devoid of necrotic tissue, and the proliferation of new tissue at the periphery was proceeding at a rapid rate, the general condition of the dog worsened, and for the first time a loss in weight was observed. In addition, the condition analogous to chorea also worsened, and the subjective symptoms of a systematically malfunctioning organism became apparent. In spite of these complications, it was observed that the lesion on the lower cervical region had healed, and all traces of scab formation had disappeared. The lesion on the upper cervical region also had been reduced drastically in size.

On the 9th day of therapy, the lesion in the upper cervical region also had healed, and the only remaining exposed lesion was that of the shoulder area. The appearance of the tissue in the exposed lesion was that of healthy muscle, and the restoration of skin was proceeding at an unexpectedly rapid rate. On the other hand, the choreic condition remained unimproved. The animal showed signs of physiological weakness and refused food and drink. It was believed that the systemic condition of the dog was futile and euthanasia was performed.

Case 2: A 2-year-old, male boxer was presented for examination and found to be suffering from deep lesions over the entire dorsal midline from the neck to the tail. The owner reported that about 6 days previously the dog, having been fastened by a lead to a centerpost in the backyard of his home, so wound the lead around the centerpost as to restrict his movement to within a few feet. In this position the dog had been exposed to an extremely hot sun for approximately 2 hours. Within 4 days, a slight inflammation appeared, and a lesion developed in the upper cervical region, progressing ultimately along the entire dorsal midline. The condition was diagnosed as moist eczema of an extremely severe type.

The patient was treated with the mung bean sprout extract in the following manner: For the first 3 days of therapy, wet packs were applied to the back of the animal, and these packs were moistened liberally, 2 or 3 times daily, with the extract. At the end of this period, new granulation tissue had been generated in the lesions, and the proliferation of new skin tissue on the periphery thereof had commenced. Thereafter, for a period of about 2 weeks, topical application of the extract directly to the diseased portions of the body surface was made, 2 to 3 times daily. Dihydrostreptomycin sulfate, in the amount of 0.8 cubic centimeter, was administered intramuscularly to the dog every third day during the entire course of treatment.

At the end of 17 days of treatment, improvement in the pathological condition was evident. The presence of granulation tissue was apparent, and the proliferation of new skin and hair along the entire dorsal midline, with practically complete disappearance of the lesions proximate to the neck and tail, was observed.

At this time, treatment was discontinued and, within a short time, it was observed that the healing process had been arrested. Additional proliferation of new skin tissue was very slow, and scar tissue became prominent over the diseased area. Complete closure with new epithelium was not obtained. A lack of hair growth upon the more newly restored skin was noted.

SUMMARY

In two cases of moist eczema in dogs, a mung bean sprout extract was applied topically to the lesions, with apparently good success. In each instance restoration of the exposed muscle and regeneration of new epithelium were obtained, although in one case it was necessary to perform euthanasia, due to the development of an intractable nervous involvement analogous to chorea. Also, in one of these cases, the animal developed decubitus chronicus, which was not amenable to therapeusis with the mung bean sprout extract.

In both cases, dihydrostreptomycin sulfate was administered intramuscularly as adjunct therapy in the control of infection. The exposed muscle in the lesions developed a blackish hue, which may be associated with the chemical action of tyrosinase, reportedly contained in bean sprout extracts of this type.

CONCLUSION

The utilization of mung bean sprout extract in the topical treatment of moist eczema presents a novel approach to the management of dermatological disorders. The proliferation of new epithelium and restoration of necrotized tissue in this technique have wide application in small-animal hospitals for the treatment of a variety of dermatoses. Its properties indicate decided advantages over therapeutic agents presently available, particularly in its apparent action to regenerate healthy muscle granulation tissue, thereby effecting healing in a relatively short time.

The Salk Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting editorial which appeared in the June 1955 issue of the United Automobile Worker:

THE SALK REPORT

Perhaps the biggest medical discovery of the decade has been followed by the biggest public health bungle.

The Nation still doesn't know where it stands on polio protection. The accompany-

ing story, based on the latest official Government report on Salk vaccine, does not give parents the assurances they should have.

The story is inconclusive because the report itself is inconclusive. It tells of past mistakes in controlling the quality of the vaccine and some improvements in the controls.

The summary of the report says only this: "The modifications (in controls on production) provide greater assurance of safety." The technical section says, "The application * * * of the recommendations (on controls) to the production of poliomyelitis vaccine should result in a product essentially free of live virus."

But one expert who prepared the report says that until further study, no more vaccine should be released.

Most newspapers have carried little if anything about the Salk report. The Auto Worker, appreciating the dilemma of parents with children in the most vulnerable age groups, is trying to bring out all the information available.

It should be noted that the report indicates a considerable slowing up of vaccine manufacture at the present time. Presumably this reflects the adoption of more careful methods of manufacturing and testing.

Dr. Salk, who developed the vaccine, reports that the one shot received by many children is enough to provide protection for some months. But permanent protection requires two shots.

By contrast with the American developments, the Canadian polio program is going along fine. Children in the age group needing the greatest protection either have had their second shots already or will have them shortly. All the vaccine used in Canada is being manufactured in the University of Toronto laboratories under strict controls.

Distribution has been strictly controlled. The shots have been bought and paid for by the government and the provinces so that all children are sure of the chance for protection.

The American Medical Association recently blasted the faint controls imposed by the United States. AMA claimed that the doctors could have handled the program better with no controls at all. AMA claimed doctors would do no price gouging despite the many reports of doctors giving shots to people out of the critical age levels at high prices.

AMA, in the face of a tremendous medical fiasco, gives no leadership. Instead it merely repeats its ancient creed that its members, solely by virtue of their being doctors, are devoid of human frailties.

Review of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Just Give Us the Facts," written by George Sokolsky, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. The article deals with the proposed review of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST GIVE US THE FACTS
(By George Sokolsky)

Violent excitement is being generated over the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act with a view to having it "humanized," which is a word of emotional rather than reasoned content. The realistic questions that seem not to be asked these days are:

(1) Do we want or need any more immigrants?

(2) If yes, how many?

(3) If we do need immigrants, what kind do we need? Shall we select them according to vocations, approximation to the American culture, or haphazard?

Those who oppose the current restrictions upon immigration adopt the view that suffering humanity must have a place to go and that the United States is as good a place as any for them to come to. Personally, I can have no private objection to such a position as both my parents were immigrants. But the public position is different. We now have a population of 165 million. First, it is a matter for scientific appraisal, not for political agitation, to determine how much of a population our 3 million square miles can maintain on an American standard of living.

Secondly, it is a matter of sociological study to provide data on the assimilability of varieties of peoples in our culture. Perhaps there are those who do not regard this as important, who believe that a conflict of cultures within the United States will serve us better than the preservation of our traditions. As all Americans, with the exception of the native Indians, are the descendants of immigrants, a vast and well-documented experience has been provided to guide our judgments.

Immigration cannot be an afterthought. Each newcomer becomes the progenitor of an increasing part of the population. The question ought to be whether it is more beneficial to include diverse cultures or to favor northern and western Europeans, who are of identical basic stock to the early American settlers.

Actually, none of these questions are realistic in the present political climate. Pressure organizations exist among each former immigrant group which favor their own kind. These groups are very powerful, particularly in large cities and in politically crucial states. Also, there are those who believe that human suffering should be dealt with urgently and that a theoretical discussion of immigration problems is today academic and of no value.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is a codification of some 200 laws on the subject of immigration and naturalization. It took 4½ years of investigations and hearings to bring the bill before Congress. It was passed in July 1952 over President Truman's veto.

The quota system was in existence when the bill was passed and was included in it. This quota system provides that each country outside the Western Hemisphere may send immigrants to this country each year equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of such nationals who had reached the United States by 1920. By this method, immigration is established on a cultural rather than a vocational basis. Communist, Nazis, Fascists, are not to be admitted.

One of the most serious problems that faces the United States is the illegal entry of immigrants who come across our borders without the exercise of any jurisdiction. It has been variously estimated that between 3 million and 5 million illegal aliens live in the United States. If such entry becomes legitimate by a sort of squatter's right, why have any immigration laws at all?

In a word, this is not a question for shouting and shrieking on one side or the other. It remains a problem for scientific investigation and for decision on the basis of facts.

Let's Get the Facts About Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 15, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, action has been taken in committee on both sides of the Capitol to set up a bipartisan 12-member commission to make a new study of the Government's employee security program and all the other security programs that have filtered up and down the line.

The objective, as I understand it, is simple: There is a bipartisan effort, at last, to lift the whole issue of security out of politics—to end forever the evil pretense that any one party has a monoply on patriotism or that any party opposes a proper security program with safeguards of individual justice.

The administration has not lifted a finger to encourage this effort; the Justice Department has frankly been opposed. The Attorney General has pretended to think that everything is all right with our present security programs, despite the obvious injustices and confusion it has produced, despite widespread criticism of the program from highly respected newspapers that supported the present administration for office.

In this connection, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the following pertinent editorial from the New York Times—which has some suggestions that Mr. Brownell and the administration would do well to heed:

INQUIRY INTO SECURITY

The Eisenhower administration's stubborn refusal to recognize that there is anything seriously wrong with the Federal security program is difficult to understand. Long before President Eisenhower appeared on the Washington scene major defects in the program were already showing up; but in the past 2 years the situation has become worse, until now the whole fabric of loyalty and security investigations within the Federal Government is crying out for reform.

With all the lofty talk in high places—Attorney General Brownell, for example, in a graduation speech only the other day reaffirmed his devotion to "the traditional American conception of fair play and due process"—it is disappointing that neither the Attorney General nor the President has given any real encouragement to an independent, nonpartisan inquiry into the security program.

Now the Government Operations Committee of the Senate has unanimously reported the Humphrey-Stennis resolution to establish an independent, bipartisan Commission of distinguished citizens to study the whole question on the premise that what is wanted is a program to "protect the national security and preserve basic American rights." President Truman tried essentially the same thing 4 years ago when he appointed the Nimitz Commission, which was sabotaged by the

late Senator McCarran. We hope the proposed new Commission will have more success and that the administration will at last recognize the desirability of such an inquiry and assist in its establishment.

Helen Keller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the birth of Helen Keller. I join in paying my respects to this great woman on her 75th birthday. I include herewith, Mr. Speaker, a tribute paid to her in an editorial in today's Washington Post and Times Herald:

HELEN KELLER

Seventy-five years ago today at Tuscumbia, Ala., one of the most remarkable lives in human history began. The daughter born to the wife of Capt. Arthur H. Keller on June 27, 1880, was a normal baby until she was 19 months old. Then a mysterious illness, diagnosed as brain fever, left her blind, deaf, and mute. Relief for the stricken infant came when Dr. John J. Chisholm, of Baltimore, advised that she be taken to Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, a teacher of the hard of hearing long before he invented the telephone. The meeting between the famous scientist and the helpless child took place in Washington in the summer of 1886. A quarter century later, Helen Keller, then world famous, wrote of this interview: "I did not dream that (it) would be the door through which I should pass from darkness into light."

What followed has been told many times and is being retold again just now with special emphasis. The little blind deaf mute for whom Dr. Bell opened the gates of liberation was destined to set an inspiring example for thousands of other handicapped children and still other thousands of handicapped adults. With the help of generous friends she was placed under the instruction of Anne Sullivan, subsequently Mrs. John A. Macy, trained at the Perkins Institution in Boston. This gifted and devoted woman was Helen's companion until she died in 1936. She revealed to the isolated child committed to her care the fact that everything has identity and that things are related to each other through the miracle of language.

Helen was liberated by the development of her sense of feeling, her capacity to understand what her tactile powers could reach. Miss Sullivan educated her to comprehend the meaning of touch. She spelled words into Helen's hand, and each word became an opening door. In 1904 the blind deaf mute was graduated with honors from Radcliffe College. Since then she has been tireless in her service not only to the handicapped but also to those who are not so limited. She has written important books, lectured before innumerable audiences, played on the stage and in the movies, been an adviser and counselor of many governments, exemplified the values of faith and courage in the highest degree. Aided since 1914 by her "sister" Polly Thomson, she has been the leader of the American Foundation for the Blind. Recently she completed a tour of the world in aid of the blind overseas. Her 75th birthday finds her still bravely laboring that life may be more abundant, free, and happy for humanity everywhere.

The Withdrawal of Soviet Troops From the Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the attention and the hopes of the world are focusing on the forthcoming Big Four meeting in Geneva. Our people, and the people of many other nations, are hopeful that the meeting will serve to ease world tensions, and further the attainment of lasting and just peace.

These expectations will be greatly strengthened if the Big Four meeting will lead to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the Communist-dominated nations of Central and Eastern Europe—from the Baltic States, from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania.

Unless such steps are taken, and a full degree of independence is restored to those nations, the Soviets may attempt to place the present division of Europe on a permanent basis. This is something which the free world could never tolerate. A permanent division of Europe into the free half and the enslaved half can lead to disaster if not finally to world war III.

The forthcoming Big Four meeting will offer an opportune occasion for the discussion of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the nations presently behind the Iron Curtain. I hope and trust that the western powers, and our Chief Executive, will press such representations in every way possible. Freedom from foreign Communist domination, and the freedom to hold unfettered elections—guaranteed, for instance, for Poland in the Yalta agreements—must be restored to those captive nations.

In this regard, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body a letter which I received today from the pastor and the members of the Hungarian Evangelical and Reformed Church of Milwaukee, Wis.

The Reverend Kalman Csia, and the other signers of the letter, urge that our Government—our Chief Executive—press for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary. These recommendations merit careful consideration, and I trust that the President will continue to strive for the restoration of complete independence and of the right to self-determination, to all of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain:

HUNGARIAN EVANGELICAL AND
REFORMED CHURCH,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 19, 1955.

Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Milwaukee, Wis.:

On the eve of the coming conference between the heads of the leading nations of the world we, the undersigned citizens of the United States of America of Hungarian origin, take the liberty to remind the Government of the United States of America of the pledges made by the Western Powers concerning Hungary in connection with the Austrian State Treaty.

The Austrian State Treaty declares that the Soviet troops will leave Austria at a certain date. As far as we know, the pledge was made by the Western Powers at the peace treaty with Hungary in Paris that after removal of the Soviet Army from Austria the Soviet troops should leave Hungarian soil, too.

We sincerely hope that the pledge will not be forgotten at the coming conference, because the withdrawal of the Soviet Army from Hungary is the basic necessity for enabling the Hungarian nation to have a new and really free election.

Today the Hungarian nation is enslaved and oppressed by Soviet bayonets. The nation is not able to speak for itself; therefore, it is our duty and privilege to raise our voices in the behalf of our suffering homeland.

In our judgment, the coming conference will be the best and may be the last chance to achieve freedom for our native country by peaceful means. Therefore, we hope that the President of the United States of America will not hesitate to enforce the given pledges.

Sir, we send our memorandum to you, representing our point of view recorded here, because your activities and your principles encourage us to do so.

Very sincerely yours,

Rev. Kalman Csia, Leslie Varga, Charle Pallagi, Stefan Bartok Paes, Joseph Ekes, Steve Huszti, Zoltan Highy, Michael Pallagi, Steven Boros, Steve Reves, Michael Nagy, Csire Sanidor, Laszlo Mihas, Paul Karizs, Steve Marki, Allan Stange.

The Connecticut Mock Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Education in Government—the Connecticut Mock Legislature," written by Dr. David Mars of the University of Connecticut, and published in the June 1955 issue of State Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN GOVERNMENT—THE CONNECTICUT MOCK LEGISLATURE

(By David Mars)

Although the General Assembly of Connecticut meets only once every 2 years, 3 legislative sessions are held in the capitol at Hartford every biennium. The additional two are those of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature, popularly known as the Mock Legislature. It represents every one of the State's 17 senior colleges and universities and it occupies the capitol every spring for 3 days.

The Mock Legislature is now in its eighth year. It held its first session in April 1952, with 15 colleges participating. Edwin Stevens, of Teachers College (New Britain)—influenced by the example of a similar body in Pennsylvania—was its father, and he continues to serve as its honorary chairman. Cooperating with him in helping to organize the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature, was Mrs. Malcolm J. Edgerton and Mr. Searles Dearington, who also play important continuing roles, serving the organi-

tion as adviser and technical adviser, respectively.[1]

The purposes of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature, as set forth in its handbook, are "* * * to stimulate among college students a further interest in government, and to offer the experience necessary for a practical understanding of the political activities of the General Assembly concerning contemporary State affairs." The pages that follow will demonstrate that these purposes are admirably served both in mock legislatures at each campus and in the annual sessions at Hartford.

I. THE CAMPUS LEGISLATURES

At the Connecticut colleges and universities the mock legislature is usually one section of a larger student political organization. At Yale University, for example, it is part of the Political Union; at Hillyer and Trinity Colleges, of the Political Science Clubs; at Saint Joseph College, of a political group known as the Cloak Room Club. The officers usually are chosen by the members of the parent political organizations. Occasionally, as at Teachers College, one encounters campuswide elections for the mock legislature. And at a few schools, including the University of Connecticut, the "mock" is a self-contained group, its officers elected only by its own members.

The local legislative groups usually meet two times a month, from October until the campus mock session, which ordinarily comes in March. Meetings tend to become more frequent and activity intensifies, as session time approaches, so that in February weekly meetings are the pattern.

The most important business facing the local groups is the authorship, study and preparation of the defense of bills to be sponsored by members of the campus "mock." However, since the aims of the organization include practical understanding of politics and government in a broader sense, other business occupies the local meetings, especially those toward the beginning of the season. For example, speakers from around the State are invited to address meetings on legislative procedure, bill drafting, etc. One or more meetings are given over to lectures on parliamentary procedure. The State chairman and vice chairman usually pay an annual visit to each local group, and other chapters occasionally are entertained at meetings. After the middle of December, when the candidates for the four major positions of the Hartford session (senate president and majority leader, and house speaker and majority leader) have been nominated by the State board of selectors, the candidates visit local "mocks," seeking support for their candidates.

On or about December 1, each campus group is required to send to the chairman of the bills committee of the State organization the titles of five bills, as well as "prospecti" setting forth their purposes. These bills are to be marked according to the preferences of the transmitting group; insofar as possible, the bills committee heeds these preferences. Some time in December, the bills committee selects two bill titles for each school from the lists and notifies the campus groups of the selections.

At this time, the original sponsors of the bills ordinarily become the authors, although frequently other members of the local group, or even a committee, may be assigned to aid in the research which goes into each bill and to assist in final drafting. The authors have only a few weeks to prepare their bills, for, during the first week in January, 350 copies of each must go to the bills committee. It then distributes twenty copies of each to each of the colleges and universities in the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature.

After the bill drafting, activity in the local organizations begins in earnest. Several meetings must be devoted to discussion of the bills, so that each member of the delegation to Hartford will know the contents thoroughly and be able to speak intelligently about them, should the occasion arise, either in committee hearings or on the floor of one of the legislative houses.

Ordinarily, to prepare for Hartford, two local "Mock Mocks" are held. The first deals with bills. Where a city contains several colleges, their groups often meet jointly. These meetings help to educate the newer members in the operations of the Mock Legislature; they also help to discover possible weak points in the bills, thereby forearming their authors for committee hearings and floor debates at the capitol. The second "Mock Mock" illustrates the way in which the committees at the legislative session will operate.

Among the final items of business of each chapter is selection of delegates to the Hartford session. Each college and university, regardless of size, is entitled to 2 senators and 18 representatives as well as a number of alternates. The delegates are chosen by the chairman and vice chairman of the campus organization or by a committee consisting of its officers and a faculty advisor. Criteria for selection include experience, interest, knowledge of parliamentary procedure, attendance at meetings, etc. The same criteria apply in selecting committee representation. Nine committees operate throughout the Hartford session, and each school is entitled to one seat on each of these committees. All delegates not designated as senators or committee members sit in the house of representatives as delegates-at-large.

II. THE STATE ORGANIZATION

The governing body of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature on the the State level is an executive council consisting of 2 students and 1 faculty member from each participating school. The students on it are the senior delegates and junior delegates from the local campus groups. The council maintains 5 standing committees: banquet, bills, capitol, publicity, and registration. (The capitol committee has the important function of arranging for rooms to be used by the mock legislature at Hartford.) Temporary committees also may be utilized.

The executive council meets at least once a month during the school year before the big legislative session. When it is not in session an executive committee, comprising the officers of the executive council, and the advisors, handles the business of the mock legislature.

At the last meeting of the academic year following the legislative session, the executive council selects a temporary committee, which holds office only until the first meeting of the executive council the following fall. This committee guarantees that the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature will be a continuing body, avoiding a demise every spring and a reincarnation every fall.

III. THE CAPITOL SESSION

A date on or near the second Thursday in March sees the State capitol in Hartford seething with the beginnings of the annual 3-day session of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature. The first day's activities combine business with pleasure. After registration late in the afternoon, a banquet is held, attended by all the delegates and alternates. This banquet always features a guest speaker—at the 1955 session Karl A. Bosworth, associate professor of government at the University of Connecticut. Following the banquet is a ball. That same night, after the ball, much unofficial business is transacted, often into the wee hours of morning. The individual delegations caucus, decide on strategy for the next 2 days, and may again interview some of the candidates for elective positions. Votes are taken on whether the delegations will stand by the unit rule or whether delegates will act on the floor according to individual preference.

Informal groupings among the delegations constantly occur, for the purpose of supporting certain candidates and measures. However, the makeup of these blocs perpetually changes. Bases of affiliation and bloc loyalty may vary from session to session—involving such diverse factors as geographical location of schools, private versus State-supported institutions, boys' schools and girls' schools versus coeducational institutions, secular versus nonsecular schools, etc. As a result, although much politicking goes on at each session, nothing resembling a formal partisan arrangement or structure has emerged. And, since the delegates have a very limited number of college years during which they can serve, it is impossible for any individual to build up a personal following of any considerable duration.

Friday at 10 a. m., the two houses meet separately for transaction of business. This includes prayer, a rollcall of the colleges, election of a president and a majority leader in the senate, and a speaker and majority leader in the house. (The person with the second highest number of votes as speaker automatically becomes minority leader of the house.) Each house adopts a set of rules, and both houses joint rules. The bills, which have been numbered by the bills committee, are introduced in their respective houses, their titles are read by the clerks, and they are referred to the proper committees by the president and speaker, respectively.

After this business is completed, the houses notify each other that they are organized and ready to meet in joint session. The senate adjourns and proceeds to the house chamber. Here, with the entire CISI in session, and with a good crowd of spectators in the gallery, the Governor of Connecticut delivers an address. Flashbulbs explode and moviecameras grind as the Governor speaks, for, as far as the public in concerned, this is the session's high spot. After the Governor has retired, the senators withdraw to their own chamber and each house adjourns until 10 a. m. the following morning.

Friday afternoon is given over to committee hearings. There are nine committees—agriculture and elections; constitutional amendments; education; finance and appropriations; judiciary; labor, public works, and public utilities; motor vehicles and liquor control; public health and safety; public welfare and humane institutions. All are joint committees, consisting of senators and representatives; this parallels the practice of the General Assembly of Connecticut, which makes wider and more exclusive use of joint committees than any other legislature in the United States. The committees consist of 1 person from the delegation of each college plus 1 chairman from the senate and 1 from the house. All delegates who have not been designated to serve on any committee, and

[1] These 3 individuals, together with the Governor of Connecticut, the commissioner of education, and the presidents of all 17 of the State's institutions of higher learning are regarded as sponsors of the organization. Member colleges of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature, are Albertus Magnus College, Annhurst College, Connecticut College, Danbury State Teachers College, Fairfield University, Hartford College, Hillyer College, New Haven State Teachers College, Quinnipiac College, St. Joseph College, Teachers College of Connecticut, Trinity College, University of Bridgeport, University of Connecticut, Wesleyan University, Willimantic State Teachers College, and Yale University.

all alternates, attend committee hearings as the public. Sitting with each committee in an advisory capacity is a member of the corresponding committee of the real general assembly. The presence of these legislators is a constant reminder of the interest the state takes in its mock legislature.

Committee procedure follows a definite pattern. The chairman invites any senators or representatives present to comment on any bills pending. He then recites the number and title of each bill assigned for hearing before his committee and takes them up for consideration one by one. "The public" is invited to comment on bills as they are being considered. Ordinarily, authors of the bills are present and may be questioned by members of the committee, but not by "the public," which is limited to simple pro and con statements on the bills.

After each assigned bill has been considered, the chairman announces that the public hearing is ended and that the committee will go into executive session. During this session "the public" may remain in the room but must refrain from attempting to participate in the deliberations.

Any bill changes voted upon favorably are written in by the committee clerk. The entire bill is then voted upon, marked by the clerk as "favorable" or "unfavorable," and dispatched immediately to the revision committee, which has the job of preparing the legislative calendars for the proceedings on the following day. This committee is a group of assigned and volunteer workers, who carry out their responsibilities under the supervision of the bills and the capitol committees.

At 10 on Saturday morning, the two Houses reconvene in their respective chambers. Until 12:30 each House debates the bills as they are presented from their respective calendars and votes upon them. After adjournment for lunch each House again debates and votes on bills. As soon as a bill is passed in one House, it is rushed across the capitol to the other House, where it is placed on the calendar for debate and action.

An important figure in government or politics usually addresses the Saturday morning session. In the 1955 session the speaker was Mrs. Edward N. Allen, Secretary of State of Connecticut, who addressed the senate and the house separately.

Late Saturday afternoon the senators again appear in the house chamber, where all hear an address by the adviser of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature, Mrs. Edgerton. After this, the president of the senate says to the chairman of the executive council, "Mr. Chairman, will you now adjourn the assembly?" To this the chairman replies, "Oyes, Oyes, Oyes, by His Excellency's command, I now declare the general assembly adjourned without date; God save the State of Connecticut." With these words, the annual session of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature is brought to a close.

All bills which pass both houses are signed by the president and the speaker, and transmitted to the historian to be placed in the files of the Connecticut Intercollegiate Student Legislature. Passed bills, accompanied by stenographic notes of the proceedings of both houses, are also sent to the office of the Governor.

The scope of the measures considered by the mock legsilature parallels those dealt with by the general assembly itself. They range far and wide over many areas of social and economic policy. Among measures considered by recent sessions and passed by at least one house have been bills to provide:

Compulsory vaccination for pre-school age children.

Addition of a course in public high schools dealing with democracy, communism, and socialism on a comparative basis.

Repeal of the Sunday blue laws.

Absentee ballots for college students.

Making parents responsible for property and personal damage caused by their minor children.

Standardization of signals by auto drivers.

Compulsory pasteurization of all milk sold in Connecticut for public consumption.

Severer penalties for illegal handling of narcotics.

Establishment of a State narcotic hospital.

Compulsory liability insurance for motor vehicle owners.

Fluoridation of public water supplies.

Extension of public housing for persons in moderate-income brackets.

Abolition of capital punishment.

Establishment of a State income tax.

Repeal of the State sales tax.

Establishment of an educational television network.

Strengthening the veto power of the Governor.

Better facilities for treating the mentally deficient.

Establishment of a State farm for alcoholics.

Establishment of a port authority for Connecticut.

Establishment of State schools of medicine and dentistry.

Creation of a juvenile delinquency commissioner.

Increasing the State minimum wage.

Resoluting urging repeal of the Internal Security Act.

Some bills recur perennially and go down to defeat every session. Many of these are of a nature that conflicts with traditional attitudes of the general assembly toward the subjects in question. They ordinarily get no further than a committee room, where they are dealt the coup de grace.

One of the outstanding reasons for the success of Connecticut's mock legislature is the friendly and cooperative attitude maintained toward it by the executive and legislative branches of the State government. Physical possession of the State Capitol for the session is one of the factors here. Nothing gives a mock legislator a greater feeling of reality than rising from a seat on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives and addressing a group of colleagues occupying similar seats.

Without question, the Connecticut intercollegiate student legislature fulfills an excellent educational purpose. Its participants learn a great deal about the inner workings of a legislative body. They learn to formulate public policies and to defend them on the basis of careful thought and research. They learn to think and speak on their feet. They learn the meaning of compromise and its necessity in a democracy, and the desirability of getting along with other individuals. In short, the Connecticut mock legislature is not only an educational workshop in government, but a slice of life as it is lived in 20th-century America.

The Late Ernest Greenwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I learned of the death of our former colleague, Ernest Greenwood, who represented the First Congregational District of New York in the 82d Congress. Mr. Greenwood was a native of Yorkshire, England, and came to the United States in 1910. He was a teacher in vocational education and for 19 years was headmaster of the Dwight School in New York. He was also a director of the First National Bank of Islip, former president of the Bay Shore-Brightwaters Civic Association, and president of the Suffolk County Boy Scout Council. Mr. Greenwood served diligently in the House of Representatives. He was an able Congressman, and his State and his country benefited as a result of his efforts. He was a kind and gentle man, loved and respected by who knew him, devoted in the duties of his office and dedicated to public service. I am happy to have had the privilege of serving in this House with Ernest Greenwood and to his daughter, Mrs. Dorothy Banks, I extend my sincere sympathy in her loss.

Remarks of Hon. Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, on the Program Youth Wants To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 15, 1955, I participated in the program entitled "Youth Wants To Know." I ask unanimous consent that the questions asked and my responses thereto be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ANNOUNCER. Youth Wants To Know. The unrehearsed, spontaneous questions of today's young people.

And here is your moderator, Stephen McCormick.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Hello, I am Stephen McCormick welcoming you to another session of Youth Wants To Know, founded and produced by Theodore Granik.

Our guest today on Youth Wants To Know is Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, the chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. Senator ANDERSON is a former Secretary of Agriculture and is also a member of the Senate Committees on Agriculture and Forestry and Interior and Insular Affairs.

Senator ANDERSON, it is a pleasure to have you with us as our guest on Youth Wants To Know today.

Senator ANDERSON. I am glad to be here, Steve. I like this program.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Good.

Well, the youngsters participating in the program under the auspices of the American Legion have many questions for you.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think there should be a Secretary for Atomic Energy in the President's Cabinet?

Senator ANDERSON. No, I don't believe there should be. The atomic energy work cuts across many departments.

The Secretary of Defense is very much interested, for one, and the Secretary of Commerce, and all the various Government

agencies have a part in it. I think it is better to have the program administered by a separate, independent Commission than by a Cabinet officer.

Question. According to the May 13, United States News & World Report, the recent atomic blast had been postponed for several days until the winds that had blown radioactive clouds over areas that had just about all the atomic radiation that the Atomic Energy Commission would allow, had shifted themselves. Is this true?

Senator ANDERSON. I don't blame the AEC for being cautious. It was a little more cautious than I would have been.

Question. Is that radiation reaching the danger level or is this talk we hear about the effects just Communist propaganda to slow down our weapons program?

Senator ANDERSON. It is not Communist propaganda, but it is sometimes a little overcautious. For example, I live at Albuquerque, N. Mex., and the radiation there is five times what it is in Phoenix, because we have certain industries close at hand.

Radiation is higher in Denver, which is a mile high, than at the seacoast, but the people in Denver bear up very well under it.

Mr. MCCORMICK. It isn't particularly harmful to them, is it, Senator?

Senator ANDERSON. No, not unless it is higher than it has become.

I don't blame the AEC for being careful. I believe it was unduly careful in laying out a pattern that enabled them to shoot about once every 20 days, if you followed that policy exactly. I think we can afford to be a little more liberal, because the danger isn't that great.

Question. Do you think that the Federal civil-defense laws need changing, at the present time?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I don't know. I think we need to worry a lot more about civil defense than we are now doing, and I think we need to try to find out if we have come to some conclusions on civil defense that are valid. For example, I don't know whether you can evacuate a great city like New York and if that is the only type of civil defense we have, then it isn't very good.

I think there are other things we might do, probably by law, maybe better by practice.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think universal disarmament is possible in the face of the H-bomb?

Senator ANDERSON. I am afraid I don't, David. I think until we have reached a position where we are able not only to have disarmament, but able to have inspection so we can go in and see what another country is doing in the manufacture of bombs, then and only then can we have any sort of disarmament.

Now this Government made a proposal at one time to Russia. Russia wouldn't accept it because it wouldn't grant the principle of inspection. We have to know, just as Youth Wants To Know, and our Government wants to know.

Question. Is the United States in such a position now that we cannot stop developing atomic weapons without defaulting to the Russians?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I don't know how to answer that. We must not stop. That is the best answer I can give you, because we know that the Russians are pressing rapidly ahead and for the present, at least, the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb are the one great deterrent to war. Therefore we can't afford to be in a position where we can't deter a war, we can't stop somebody else from striking us. Therefore, we must keep our weapons program going.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Senator, should one conclude from your answer that possibly a Big Four meeting or a meeting in the summer would be unwise, then?

Senator ANDERSON. Oh, no, I think a meeting is wise and I think it is fine to talk about it, but until Russia will change her position and say, "We are willing not only to say we will disarm, but we will also permit constant inspection to see that we are not again building bombs," then we can't safely give up our weapons, because Russia does have a manpower that might be able to overrun Europe without something like the atomic weapon, and the atomic weapon, however, balances out this difference in manpower. Therefore, we must keep it, as long as we have that great difference in manpower.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think it is wise to sacrifice a large mass land Army in favor of an atomic-backed Air Force?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I think we have to sacrifice a large land mass army, because the fighting might take place in Europe or might take place in Asia, and we don't have an Army there, and they can't train an army in Asia very quickly and they aren't able to raise a large enough army in Europe to stand up against the present strength of the Russian Army, and therefore our atomic weapons are very, very essential.

Question. United States Intelligence recently disclosed that we have fallen behind Russia in air superiority. Do you feel this is really a desperate problem, or is there something we can do to remedy the situation?

Senator ANDERSON. I have heard the story that we have fallen behind. I don't believe our military people believe we have fallen behind and I would rather take their judgment than my own.

I think the Russians are moving ahead very rapidly in the development of aircraft and atomic weapons, and while that is true we simply cannot afford to take it easy.

Question. How are we with regard to the atomic stockpile, or the atomic element? Are we ahead of the Russians there, too?

Senator ANDERSON. The stockpile question is very, very much classified material and we don't know the score on Russia's stockpile but let me say this: We believe we are in very good shape and I have seen some figures that persuade me we are in pretty good shape. I just hope we stay in that good shape.

Question. Do you think that the present restrictions on the exchange of atomic information with our allies is hampering our atomic research program?

Senator ANDERSON. I think not. There are restrictions that have to be placed. We are developing our own research in excellent fashion. I do hope that as a result of the Geneva Conference, we will find it possible greatly to increase the scope of information being exchanged with our allies. I think it can safely be done now, but I think it has required a great deal of caution in the past and may require a substantial amount of caution in the future.

You can't tell exactly what someone else is going to do with the information once it reaches him and it's going to take a little trial and error testing before we know how safe it is to turn our secrets over to someone else.

I think we have many allies such as the Canadians with whom we can exchange any type of information without any danger whatever. How much farther it should go depends, really, upon those individuals in the State Department who are able to judge the reliability of foreign governments.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, why has the United States lagged so far behind England in using atomic energy for industrial purposes?

Senator ANDERSON. Now, let me tell you, you must not believe all read in the papers about how far ahead of us Britain is. While Britain has done a fine job and is making a great show, I am one of those who believe we are still ahead of most of the rest of the world in the practical application of atomic energy.

I do think we need to turn our great industrial giants loose. I want to turn Westinghouse and Western Electric and General Dynamics loose in this field and let them run with the ball, and I think they will do a magnificent job.

I don't admit we are behind Britain in the slightest. We are just lacking a little in opportunity for our people to make practical application of what they already know.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You feel industry rather than Government, Senator, should take the full charge ahead?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, and they want to. We have been a little slow.

Question. Will you cooperate with them in the future?

Senator ANDERSON. I will, but it requires something more than one individual. I believe we need a policy that presses ahead in that field. I believe we are coming to it, and the recent announcement that we would allow many different firms to build reactors and start in this field was a very encouraging one. These five who are now underway will do a lot toward proving how sound our theories are, and once they are completed I think it will be pretty well established that we are not behind the rest of the world. At least, I hope so.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, Mr. Hopkins, the head of General Dynamics, said that Britain and France are almost ready to put reactors into use for electricity, today, while the United States was just beginning. Do you have any comment on this?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, I heard Mr. Hopkins on that program, and I think I might agree with him, but remember that out of his own yard has come the *Nautilus*—the atomic-powered submarine. We are making some practical use of it.

The difference, I think, between Britain and the United States is that Britain has to depend upon a rather expensive coal supply for the generation of electricity. We have an enormous quantity of hydroelectric power. We have a lot of natural gas that generates electricity very cheaply. We have a lower generating cost, and therefore it is more desirable to develop energy in the high-cost areas such as Britain than in the low-cost areas like the United States. Even if atomic energy should 11 mills or 12 mills per kilowatt to generate in Britain, it is still very desirable because they want to keep their coal for another purpose. But we don't want to generate 11-mill electricity here. We want 3- and 4-mill electricity and therefore we approach it from a different economic standpoint.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, what will the U. N.'s Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva accomplish?

Senator ANDERSON. If it accomplishes nothing more than forcing the Russians to show their hand while we show ours, I think it will be a good thing, because it will tend to show how far along we are in the development of atomic energy for peacetime purposes, and they will compete with us, and maybe out of that mutual competition there will come some emphasis on what is the real purpose of atomic energy.

In the long run, the peaceful uses of atomic energy will far outweigh in importance the military applications, and we want to start moving in that direction.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You feel, then, that the peaceful application might be that one element that might bring us together?

Senator ANDERSON. It could be. It isn't indicated yet, but I say the showing at Geneva could put such an emphasis on the peacetime uses of atomic energy that we might say, "Well, let's for a while be able to see if we can agree to put wartime applications in the background and see who can lead in this new field."

I hope that might be the result.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, at the recent conference between the United States and our allies and Russia in Vienna, do you think that the Russians are really sincere there?

Senator ANDERSON. I don't believe the Russians have been very sincere in international affairs for a long time.

Question. Then what is the use of even trying to make a treaty with them if they aren't going to keep it?

Senator ANDERSON. That is why I said we have to have inspection. We don't upon their written word if we have that sort of agreement. We don't depend upon their promises to disarm and never to build another bomb. We want to be able to go in and see whether they are building them or not. That is what broke up the other conference. That is why I like this program, Youth Wants To Know. I want to know and the United States Government wants to know whether Russia is living up to its agreements.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, don't you feel we should spend more money on guided-missile research in addition to atomic-energy research?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, you don't know how much we are spending on guided-missile research, and it might be quite a little.

I do feel we should spend a great deal, I think we are spending quite a good deal. I think that satisfactory progress is being made, but it is one of those things you can't discuss until it is all over. Once we have developed a good guided missile then someone will say, "Well, they were making wonderful headway all the time." We didn't have too much to say about the possibility that the atomic submarine would be a success, although we had tried out all the essential theories before it was built and we could almost predict it would be a success. It proved to be. When our guided missiles come along, I think they will prove that we are farther along than we probably now know.

Question. Are you in favor of the President's proposed atom-powered merchant ship which would cruise the world?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, maybe I'd better say I would like to see us devote that same energy to developing a merchant ship that would be useable, rather than one that would be used for a demonstration. I am not very much interested in using atomic power to show off, and I am afraid that is how this might be construed. I say that not in a partisan fashion, because Congressman COLE who is my precedecessor or chairman of the Joint Committee is also critical of it. We would like to see a demonstration, I believe, of a merchant ship carrying useable cargo and demonstrating the useful applications of atomic energy and not as a display.

Question. Do you think the $30 million it would take to build it and the $600,000 each year it would take to run it could be used better in other propaganda endeavors, in food and so on?

Senator ANDERSON. Yes, I do believe so. Otherwise, I wouldn't have said I would like to try some other type of merchant ship.

I think, for example, if we could get an ocean liner that was carrying merchandise to other parts of the world—perhaps carrying part of our surplus food—that they would like to see atomic energy used for that more useful purpose than just for a demonstration. After all, being tied up at a dock, the people can't see what is unusual about it, because we are not going to take them down and let them see the power plant, anymore than you can come down and see the power plant of the *Nautilus*. We can show them what a nice deck we have. I would prefer that the deck would be carrying some useful goods to another part of the world. I am not against trying to demonstrate how well we are doing our job. And the President's proposal may come down to that, eventually. He didn't amplify it. I want to believe that he has in mind only the finest demonstration of our atomic energy development, and let's see what it proves to be.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Now, Senator, before taking the next question, it is time to announce the winner of this week's 30-volume set of the Encyclopedia Americana, America's first and oldest encyclopedia. The winner this week is Marie Morrison, 1605 W. Allegheny Avenue in Philadelphia, Pa. The station of the week, WPTZ in Philadelphia. For details of the contest, listen to the announcement at the end of the program. Now let's hear the winning question. Will you read it please.

Question. Will the continued development of atomic energy result in a gradual elimination of coal and gas in the electrical industry?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, that is a very interesting question. I think my answer to it would be a flat "No." For example, I think the fossil fuels will have a place in our whole economic life until they are perhaps exhausted. We use the waterpower plants we have now built. They will not be put out of existence by atomic energy. They will go on for 40 or 50 or 60 years, because our energy requirements are building up very rapidly and the atomic energy that is developed will just supplement what we now have. It may gradually supplant it, but not until the useful life of the present plants is well wornout and as far as gas and oil are concerned, they may be required for many other things. Our coal may be wanted for a great petro-chemical industry, but certainly for the present there is no possibility that atomic energy will supplant it.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, what do you think will be the main election issues in 1956?

Senator ANDERSON. I think they will have to develop when we have finished this session and the next session of Congress. Primarily, I think people will want to know how well the Republican Party has kept its promises. They will want to know that about the Democrats, and I assume they will want to know the same thing about the Republicans. They will want to know how well we have balanced the budget. They will want to know how well we have gone about the principal business of the world, which is the preservation of peace.

Question. Senator NEUBERGER said he thought it would be conservation. Would you like to comment on this?

Senator ANDERSON. I think that will be an issue in many States and may result in the election of Senators and Congressmen and it may change some of those States, but Senator NEUBERGER is from an area that is very conscious of conservation and waterpower. That is not so much an issue in New York State, or Maine, or Vermont. Therefore, I think, across the country, it will not be quite as important as, perhaps, how well we have gone about the business of peace.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, do you think that Governor Shivers, along with other prominent Democrats who bolted against Stevenson in 1952, surely should not be treated as delegates to the convention in 1956?

Senator ANDERSON. I think that will depend a lot on the attitude of the Democratic convention and how it is getting along on its program of trying to bring about unification.

There is an obvious indication that the present chairman of the party, Chairman Butler, wants to bring these Democrats back into the party.

I was one of those in the Chicago convention 2½ years ago, who tried to keep the Texas delegates in the convention and Governor Shivers and I talked there many times about it. And therefore I believe that perhaps by the time we get to the 1956 convention, we will be wanting to make sure that all the Democrats are inside the Democratic Party.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, should Mrs. Hobby resign from her position, who do you think will, or should replace her?

Senator ANDERSON. That is purely the prerogative of the President of the United States, and until he asks me for some advice I am not going to give him any.

Mr. MCCORMICK. You don't think that is likely for the moment, sir?

Senator ANDERSON. No, I don't think that is likely for the moment.

Question. Senator, would you say that the United States Government under President Eisenhower has mishandled the use of the Salk vaccine, the distribution and so on?

Senator ANDERSON. I have always found it a pretty wise thing not to comment on things I know very little about. I have not been one of those in close touch with the distribution of the Salk vaccine, and I don't know. It is a pretty easy thing, after the event, to criticize. If everything had worked out very well, we would have said "Isn't it fine we didn't put any controls on?" I don't know.

Mr. MCCORMICK. One thing you do know a great deal about is nuclear power, and I have been fascinated by that little yellow rock there. I wonder if you would tell us what it is.

Senator ANDERSON. That happens to be a piece of good uranium ore. I thought these young people, impressed by success stories of prospectors, wanting to go out and look around for some, might want to know what they are looking for.

This is just a little piece of yellow stone that proves to be very valuable. It is out on the Colorado Plateau, which is a very worthwhile part of the world these days, as a source for uranium and it's indicative of the fact that we have found inside this United States, a very wonderful supply of ore.

Mr. MCCORMICK. We will keep our eyes out for rocks that look like that.

Question. Are we developing another Dust Bowl in the West?

Senator ANDERSON. Well, we aren't, but somebody is. I am afraid that the weatherman is doing a bad job out there.

Yes; a Dust Bowl seems to be developing again. I was very familiar with the Dust Bowl that we had there in 1934, because I had the responsibility of moving some of those families out of the Dust Bowl when conditions got to a point where they couldn't live there. And now, again, we seem to be developing a very dry situation, and a great deal of dust. I hope it is not going to finally develop, but at the present time it is an extremely interesting prospect and could happen to us.

Question. Senator ANDERSON, we have been talking quite extensively about the use of atomic energy in industry. How about the use of atomic energy in agriculture?

Senator ANDERSON. It is a very interesting field. I brought along a package that I think is interesting. You know when I was Secretary of Agriculture, the toughtest problem we had was what to do with all the potatoes that were thrust upon us.

Here is a potato that has been irradiated and it's smooth and firm and good and will stay that way for a couple of years without undue problems. Here is a potato that was not irradiated and in 2 weeks it starts to sprout.

We have some potatoes that have been going a month or two and they look like a hairy ape.

Now, this is a sample of the fact that agriculture may change completely. It not only applies to potatoes, it applies to meat, it applies to a great many things. Not only that, but we are finding out how fertilizer is best used. We are finding out that new substances can be fed to animals that benefit

them. I would like to give you a whole lecture.

Question. How would that potato taste after you cooked it after a year or so?

Senator ANDERSON. Just the same. If potatoes are fattening to you before, they are fattening to you after they are irradiated.

Question. Why does that potato stay good by being irradiated? What is the difference between its condition and the condition of the potato on the right?

Senator ANDERSON. The processes that start the development of these sprouts are killed by the irradiation. In other words, it becomes sterile.

Question. Do you think there is any chance for Hawaii or Alaska getting into the Union in the coming months?

Senator ANDERSON. I thought once that both of them would be in and I hope that both of them do come in. I think the prospect is a little less forbidding than it once was.

Question. Are Senators and Representatives playing politics with these two areas? That looks like what is happening.

Senator ANDERSON. Well, politics has something to do with how they get elected and it is not unusual that it continues to influence their lives to some degree.

I don't think it is just that. Many of us feel Alaska should be in the Union, along with Hawaii, that if Alaska is left out, it may never get in and we would rather insist it be brought in at the present time. I don't think you can change the reactions that human beings have to that. I have supported the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii. I do today and I will when I leave the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MCCORMICK. We certainly thank you, Senator ANDERSON, for helping to provide the answers that Youth Wants To Know.

And, now, I'd like you to meet a special guest, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. WATERMAN. The United States has always been and still is the country's pioneers. Today the great unexplored areas are in the field of science. The country needs young men and women with trained minds and a sense of adventure to pioneer those fields.

Our industrial democracy depends very greatly upon basic research which seeks out the secrets of nature.

In their search for the unknown, scientists accumulate the fundamental knowledge that is applied to the needs of daily living. Scientists and engineers are essential to industry, to agriculture, to the creation of weapons for defense, to the Armed Services, to the war on disease, to the education of others. Unless an increasing number of gifted young people choose science as a career, there may be grave shortages of these essential skills in the years immediately ahead.

I do not mean, of course, that science should have more than a reasonable share of able people. For those whose aptitudes are along scientific lines, however, the career opportunities are many and the rewards great.

Scholarships and fellowships are available from many sources, for those who need assistance in acquiring an education.

The Federal Government is playing an important part through the support of research and education in the sciences. A career in science is an apportunity to serve your country.

When American young people realize there is a great need all along the frontiers of knowledge, I know that their spirit of adventure will respond.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Thank you very much, Dr. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation.

Tito Backs Peron, Rips United States, But Wants Our Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article by Victor Riesel which appeared in the New York Mirror on June 24, 1955. Mr. Riesel has informed me that when he was in Vienna, just a few weeks ago, he learned from very good contacts in Yugoslovia of Tito's friendship to the Soviets, despite outward appearances.

United States assistance abroad rests upon two factors—the economic prosperity we enjoy attained under the principle of private enterprise and the moral concept upon which the United States was founded. I have supported aid to all peoples for these reasons, believing as I do, that it is our duty to help those less fortunate.

I do not subscribe to assistance to Yugoslavia due to many factors: First, the failure of Marshal Tito to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act which require continuous observation and review of the use made of equipment supplied by the United States. Can we guarantee in which direction the guns—supplied by us—will be turned? Second, I believe fundamentally Marshal Tito is with the East. His tolerance of the West is based upon opportunity and motivated by the exigencies of the moment.

The article follows:

TITO BACKS PERON, RIPS UNITED STATES, BUT WANTS OUR AID

(By Victor Riesel)

There are in the files of the Central Intelligence Agency full reports on Marshal Tito's recent radio and newspaper blasts against the United States, the Catholic Church in general and Cardinal Spellman in particular.

Whether these files have been consulted, only a few close to CIA Director Allen Dulles can say. But there is no doubt that the dossiers reveal that even as we are considering giving Communist Yugoslavia $40,500,000, its radio and press has accused the United States, the Catholic Church, and "American trusts" of inspiring the revolt against Juan Peron.

Certainly there is no shame in any effort to oust a government which specialized in terror, blackmail, unadorned shakedowns, and the totalitarianizing of labor. I would have liked to have been in on that fight.

But the Tito-controlled radio and press makes the anti-Peron revolt out to be "American capitalist intrigue"—real Yankee-dollar stuff. This line is intended to prepare the working people of Yugoslavia for a gradual turn against us.

Tito's propaganda experts also were ordered to attack us through their internal media because the Argentine Communists have been allied with Peron for years. In turn, the Latin American comrades have helped Peron control the Argentine Fascist labor unions, while anti-Communist union chiefs were jailed and tortured.

It was the Ljubljana (Yugoslavia) Radio which early this week linked the Argentine revolt to American industrialists. Then the broadcasts went on to malign Cardinal Spellman by reporting that some commentators had alleged that he was the intermediary between the Argentine Roman Catholic Church and the American trusts.

This radio also revealed that Borba, the official mouthpiece of Tito and his foreign office, charged the Vatican with promoting the uprising. The words used were vicious and revilling and need not be repeated here.

All this followed the Moscow line. Russian radio propagandists linked the anti-Peron naval forces with our Army and the "United States Office of Naval Intelligence." This verbal caressing of Peron goes far beyond any Soviet hatred of Catholicism. The Soviet-Yugoslav position pivots on the fact that Peron has been doing business with communism—and that the so-called Argentine workers' groups were in the dictator's corner.

It's not generally known in the United States, but Peron would have been ripped to pieces if the Argentine Confederation of Labor hadn't rallied thousands into the streets and to his buildings during the attack. The so-called labor chiefs, closely linked to the Communist underground in Argentina, took to the air and ordered their people to rush into the center of Buenos Aires.

The words were to commandeer all vehicles—buses, cars, trucks, even wagons—and "kill any driver who resists."

They followed orders. And on Saturday, June 18, even while sporadic fighting still ripped the country, Peron made a special trip to the labor headquarters. There he delivered one of the few speeches he was able to get off his chest, thanking his listeners for preventing chaos.

By "chaos" the dictator meant a successful revolt against his government.

The Zwicky Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by Joseph Alsop, which appeared in his column, Matter of Fact, in the June 26, 1955, edition of the New York Herald Tribune, is deserving of our attention:

THE ZWICKY CASE

The Department of Defense has now suspended the security clearance of Dr. Fritz Zwicky, professor of astrophysics at the California Institute of Technolcgy.

The security of the United States has been triumphantly safeguarded by depriving the United States of the services of one of the world leaders in the vital fields of astrophysics and rocket propulsion. Thus Dr. Zwicky's suspension again raises the question whether the so-called security program is not really an insecurity program.

This is not a new question, of course; but it is a much more acute question than most people suppose. To name one other really lurid example, the eager flatfeet came within

a hairsbreadth of lifting the security clearance of the President's personal scientific adviser, the great president of Caltech, Dr. Lee DuBridge. The decision to deprive Dr. DuBridge of clearance was, in fact, tentatively made in the Pentagon some months ago.

The charges against Dr. DuBridge were the usual insubstantial, unsupported, poison-pen letter stuff. But the flatfeet might have had their way if the Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of Research and Development, Donald Quarles, had not grimly warned that every other scientist would automatically leave the Government service along with Dr. DuBridge.

The idiotic harassment of Dr. DuBridge, the shocking injustice done to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the suspension of Dr. Zwicky, form what the flatfeet like to call a pattern.

In the case of Dr. Zwicky, his Swiss citizenship seems to be the main charge against him. In giving notice of the suspension of Dr. Zwicky's clearance, the Defense Department flatfeet indicated that the case would be instantly reopened if the astrophysicist would just take out his American first papers. Dr. Zwicky, meanwhile, has an extremely cogent reason for not requesting American citizenship, which he expressed to this reporter with some vigor by telephone from the west coast.

"I would apply for American citizenship tomorrow," he said, "if you did not now have two classes of citizens. If you are a naturalized citizen, you are a second-class citizen. My friend, Prof. Herman Weyl, the great mathematician, became an American citizen without sutdying the class rules. So his citizenship was taken away because he went to Zurich to lecture, and stayed abroad too long. If I am more free as a Swiss than as an American, I stay Swiss."

Such, then, is the nature of the deadlock between the American Government and Dr. Zwicky. From the viewpoint of the national interest, this deadlock is a rather serious matter.

A deadly, unseen race is now going on between this country and the Soviet Union to get there first with the best guided missiles. In winning this race, and especially in the development of the crucial missiles of intercontinental range, no fields of knowledge are more important than astrophysics and rocket propulsion. And Dr. Zwicky is not only one of the tiny group of world leaders in these abstruse fields; he has also proved his value to the Government by important services already rendered.

His contributions to defense projects began in 1943, when he organized the research department of the Aerojet Corp., the largest American company exclusively engaged in rocket development and manufacture. Most rocket projects are still classified, so that no results of Dr. Zwicky's work can be pointed to except the jet-assisted takeoff device that was so important to our carrier aviation in the last war.

But Aerojet officials state that Dr. Zwicky's contributions have been very great, and he was formally classified as an essential scientist until his clearance was suspended.

But, of course, Adm. Lewis W. Strauss established the rule in the Oppenheimer case that neither past services nor present usefulness are to be considered in weighing the "security" of our public servants.

Of course, the dangerous old American habit of welcoming men of learning to these shores has been properly abandoned. Of course, Gen. Leslie Groves and the other leaders of the Manhattan District project, who used scores of foreign scientists to make the atomic bomb, were nothing but a lot of pinkos who were definitely soft on the great security issue.

To be sure, as General Groves has testified, America would never have been first with the atomic bomb if Dr. Niels Bohr and all the other foreigners had not joined the project. To be sure, the research and development chiefs of the Defense Department are now engaged in a rather desperate effort to recruit foreign scientists for work in this country.

But practical considerations must be forgotten, and America's proudest traditions must naturally be trampled upon when the thing at stake is this wonderful new security of ours.

Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address made by Max Abelman, known as Brooklyn's Ambassador of Goodwill, which he delivered to the medical board of the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn on September 30, 1954. Mr. Abelman stresses the need for more medical colleges throughout the country and to this I subscribe:

Mr. Toastmaster, Dr. Irving Pallin, chairman of the dinner committee, Judge Maximilian Moss, Dr. Louis J. Morse, president of the medical board, and toastmaster, Doctor L. H. Baretz, and all my dear friends present, I was asked whether I am a Democrat, a Republican, or what else. This is rather amusing. I am a man friend of the people.

Now, let me say, for the information of all those gathered here, I came to Brooklyn when I was a young man in 1909, and I then met Nathan S. Jonas, my mentor, at the Unity Club on Franklin Avenue.

I am most happy to be present here tonight and to finish my so-called 50 years of communal service at the Unity Club here.

But before I say anything else, I must pay my deep respect to my former teacher, that great humanitarian and leader, Nathan S. Jonas. I have respected him, I have revered him, through my entire life, and whatever I have accomplished, I owe to him a deep debt of gratitude. In all the years of our association, never did we have words between us, and not only was he my mentor but he was my friend. I thought so well of him that when my son was born after 16 years I named him after Mr. Jonas.

I want to give you just a trifle of the background of my work. In October 1909 when I came to Brooklyn at once I was introduced to the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn when I went out to collect dues for it, and I became very closely attached to the institution.

In October 1909 I became affiliated with the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities as a clerk and later became its executive director, which position I held for 14 years.

In 1912, I advocated an affiliation between our hospital and the Long Island College of Medicine. The first conferences were held between Dr. John O. Polak, Dr. Leon Louria, and Dean Adam Miller.

In 1917 I advocated a United Jewry in Brooklyn and worked for kashruth for our institution and became the secretary of the Committee of One Hundred, of which Judge Edward Lazansky was the chairman.

On June 3, 1923, I became affiliated with the Manufacturers Trust Co., as one of its officers in charge of new business and public relations work.

In 1923 I planned the dedication of the Abraham Abraham building.

In 1926 I planned and directed the dinner to Nathan S. Jonas at the Hotel Biltmore.

On January 5, 1928, I planned the dinner to Mr. Joseph J. Baker, later Nathan S. Jonas, then Alvin S. Rosenson, Isador Leviton, and Justice Emil N. Baar.

The Jewish Hospital has attained naional prominence, largely due to the important personages and national visitors that came to autograph the murals, the first of their kind at our hospital, which were the kind gift of Mr. and Mrs. Louis M. Rabinowitz.

In 1939, I urged Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to name a room for the murals which Albert Cugat was painting, and she suggested Wind of the Willows, and when the room was completed she came to our hospital to dedicate it.

In 1941 I prepared a booklet, A Hospital With a Heart, and I hope that that name will continue for a great many years to come.

I want to touch on something in connection with our hospital, and I hope that I may be permitted to make this observation. I don't mind saying that we have some noted and excellent doctors and scientists at our hospital, and I have always hoped that our hospital should be one of the outstanding institutions in the country. Under the leadership that we now have, I am quite certain that this will be accomplished and attained.

By way of outside activity, I am a great believer in practicing tolerance and not talking about it. It was in 1941 that an idea came to my mind, and I went to Dr. Frank Kingdon to discuss it with him. He said, "Max, you have a brainstorm, and if you can accomplish this, it will be terrific." He said, "Why not go see your friend Charlie Michaelson in Washington and discuss it with him?"

I did speak to Charlie Michaelson about it, and when I did he turned to me and said, "Max, you really have a brainstorm. Frank Kingdon is right. I would go to the utmost because this is a terrific bit of public relations not only of local character but of national and international character." The idea was to give a dinner to the Bishop of Brooklyn, His Excellency Thomas E. Molloy, on his 20th anniversary and to present a portrait of His Holiness Pope Pius XII.

The anniversary dinner was held, and the portrait was presented, and Mr. Louis M. Rabinowitz was the host on that occasion. It was a memorable event.

In 1942 I planned a dinner to Justice Edward Lazansky at the Waldorf-Astoria when Maurice Rosenfeld was the host. In that same year I planned a dinner to Maj. Alvin S. Rosenman at the Waldorf on the occasion of his going into the Army.

In 1943, on January 19, a reception was tendered to Lord Halifax, to which Wendell Willkie came also, to autograph the mural at the hospital which was dedicated in memory of his son who died in action.

We have at the hospital a room known as Children of Many Nations, and it was my hope that that room at some time would be dedicated in honor of Franklin D. Roosevelt. As a matter of fact, he at one time mentioned that he hoped to come and autograph it.

Now, going back to what I wanted to say about the hospital, firstly, I would be remiss if I did not thank the medical board for their faith in me and also thank them for their kindness and generosity.

Nowadays no institution of the magnitude of our hospital can afford to dispense with the modern method of community public relations publicity, to keep the public informed of its discoveries in medicine and other sciences, fund raising for specific purposes, and to create permanent, active committees for wills, legacies, and the formation

of a men's and women's junior auxiliary to build for future leadership.

After my retirmeent I do hope that our hospital will establish a secretarial department for the records which in years to come will be a vital and historical part of the hospital. I have prepared a partial memorandum which I shall present to the medical board after this dinner for their record.

I hope that for the balance of my years I will be permitted to visit your board and take part in the discussions of the institutions which have been so close and dear to my heart.

Those trustees, doctors, and friends who have visited my office at the hospital have noticed autographed photos given me by various important and prominent people. Yale University, Brooklyn College, and other kindred institutions have requested that I give them these autographed pictures. However, the Alumni Society of the Jewish Hospital which has honored me by making me its first honorary member—for which I thank them at this time again—has requested that I give them these pictures to hang in the alumni room of the new building. In the meantime, I shall exhibit them in the very near future at Brooklyn College where I think they belong and where I did most of my work.

To Abe Stark I want to give thanks for his kind words about me and what he has told you of my work with Middlesex, but he didn't tell you what he has done, together with Victor Ridder, Dr. Frank Kingdon, Judge A. David Benjamin, and many others who have worked night and day and traveled throughout the country to obtain for nearly 600 student recognition. But, to our surprise, no one who is now practicing successfully has ever written a note either to Abe or myself saying anything in appreciation or thanking us for what we did for them. Actually, this was a labor of love without hope of reward, but as I look back upon it, it would have been a nice gesture if they had thanked us. However, we are satisfied in a job well done.

I am going to touch on something now that is very close to Abe's heart and to mine as well as many others. I want especially to speak about the shortage of doctors and the need for more medical schools throughout the country. This is a most important and vital thing today. We need more medical schools and also if possible the creation of a Jewish medical center, and I hope this will come about at some future time with the cooperation of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropic Societies, so that we can get more physicians, and we need more physicians and more modern methods of training of our men.

In 1943 I brought to the hospital the Chinese Ambassador, Wei-to-Ming; in 1944, Jan Masaryk; later Gen. George C. Marshall, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Gen. George E. Armstrong, Surgeon General of the United States Army, and the Surgeon General of the Navy, Lamont Pugh, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Ambassador to the United States from the Philippines, Dr. Ralph Bunch, of the United Nations, and last but not least, the Duke and Duchess of Windsor.

Before I close my remarks, I must pay particular tribute to those who have been an inspiration during my lifetime. By that I mean Dr. Leon Louria, Dr. William Linder, Justice Edward Lazansky, Victor Ridder, Matthew Woll, Charlie Michaelson, Dr. Frank Kingdon, the Honorable James J. McDonald, the Honorable James Farley, and the Honorable Henry Wallace; and I have always worked very closely with his Eminence Cardinal Spellman, Rabbi Judah L. Magnus, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Rabbi Sidney S. Tedesche, and my dear friend last but not least, my dear and close friend, his Excellency Archbishop Thomas E. Molloy.

In conclusion may I say that I have made my motto the following, "Do something kind for somebody every day," and "I shall pass through this world but once. Any good therefore that I can do, or any kindness that I can show to any human being, let me do it now. Let me not defer or neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

On behalf of my dear, sick wife, to whom I owe everything for having permitted me to do all these things, I wish also to thank you one and all.

On October 6 I will celebrate my 47th anniversary, and this dinner tonight has indeed made me happy—both myself and my dear wife.

Oregon Opposition to Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, editorial opposition to the unsound upper Colorado storage project has been voiced in strong language in the State of Oregon. Samples are the two following editorials from the Oregon City Enterprise-Courier and the Grants Pass Courier, respectively, printed during the month of May 1955:

[From the Oregon City (Oreg.) Enterprise-Courier of May 15, 1955]

MORE LAND UNDER IRRIGATION NOT NEEDED

Putting more raw land under irrigation when farms currently cropped can produce more food than we can use or export profitably is not good business. Bureau of Reclamation projects that cost great amounts more than the value of land improved by irrigation are especially poor business.

The bureau isn't good at business, anyway, as its past record shows. It invariably under-estimates costs, perhaps for the purpose of selling a project to Congress and obligating public money so that additional expenses must be accepted rather than lose the original investment.

Farmers of the Nation certainly do not want more competition. They are having trouble enough selling profitably what they can produce and resent having to help pay for fancy irrigation projects that will increase competition.

No new farmland is needed in America, and none will be needed for many years to come. Technological advances will increase production of existing farmlands sufficiently to meet increased food demands of the country. Exhaustive studies of future food needs were made by the President's material policy commission. Its findings show no need for significant additions of farmlands up to 1975, at least.

Aside from the loss of national monument wonders in Echo Park, we oppose development of the upper Colorado River Basin on the grounds the cost to all taxpayers is not justified by possible returns in food-producing areas. The cost per acre, to bring water from Echo Park, would be $906. With irrigation, the cropland would be valued at not more than $150 per acre. The Hoover Commission said hidden subsidies in this reclamation project would bring the ultimate cost per acre to $2,900.

The central Arizona project would cost $10,991 per acre. Yet the Bureau of Reclamation is quite serious in urging congressional approval of this project. More fantastic than the high cost per acre, is the fact that 55 percent of the irrigable land is in 420 large farms, that would have a subsidy financed by every taxpayer in the Nation in the amount of $2,720,000 each.

Right here in Oregon, the Bureau dreamers actually plan to wreck several Cascade Mountain lakes and the upper Deschutes River in order to irrigate a few hundred acres of sage-brush land near Madras.

This project would divert water from Willamette River sources. By damming lake outlets and raising levels, these natural reservoirs would be made to spill over on the east slope and run into the Deschutes River. A dam at Benham Falls on that river would flood out most of the Deschutes County's livestock meadows, submerge miles of the finest recreation and angling area south of Bend and dry up miles of the river bed north of the dam.

At astounding expense, the Bureau would ruin natural wonders and summer playgrounds for millions of persons who would enjoy them in future years. The only benefit would be a few acres of sagebrush placed into agricultural crops production that is not needed and never will be.

In nearly every project the Bureau has wheedled out of Congress, the taxpayer has taken a costly rap. And, he not only pays dearly for these fancy irrigation systems, but loses great areas of his outdoor heritage at the same time.

[From the Grants Pass (Oreg.) Courier of May 13, 1955]

OREGON EDITORS SPEAK

(Oregon Statesman, Salem)

Editor Bob Ruhl of the Medford Mail-Tribune is puzzled over the endorsement of the upper Colorado River project by the Eisenhower administration. He writes:

"How the administration can favor this gigantic "boondoggling" venture and oppose Hells Canyon, is something beyond the comprehension of this department and anyone else, as far as the record has divulged thus far."

The answer to that question is easy. Private capital is eager now to build dams in Snake River, but not in the upper Colorado system. So the administration backs out of the Hells Canyon development but says it is willing to take on this immensely costly project in the upper Colorado basin. One explanation may be that there are some very powerful Republican Senators in that part of the country: WATKINS, of Utah, MILLIKIN, of Colorado; though prominent Democrats are supporting it, too; ANDERSON, of New Mexico, O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming.

The power that would be generated at the dams on the upper Colorado project will be high cost power; and the reclamation end of it will never pay out. The reason for the tremendous drive back of it is fear that unless it is built the water will be put to use on its lower reaches, particularly in southern California. Since it is their water the habitants of the upper reaches of the Colorado demand that it be put to use even though it means draining off a big chunk of money from the United States Treasury.

The bill for authorization has passed the Senate as it did last year, but is sure to run into rough waters in the House.

The Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to direct the Mem-

bers' attention briefly to the recent records of achievement of the Federal Trade Commission.

Under the leadership of Chairman Edward F. Howrey, of Virginia, an outstanding lawyer, this small but active organization has since 1953 become one of the most important agencies in Washington. Life and vitality have been breathed into a heretofore almost moribund body. All of us who believe in fair, vigorous, and effective law enforcement should commend the present FTC.

The administrative structure of the Commission has been reorganized, its procedures have been modernized and strengthened, and, perhaps best of all, the element of delay in its work has been eliminated. Those who follow the Commission's work closely feel that its activities reflect—now as never before—the basic principles intended by Congress in 1914 when it had before it the original FTC legislation, proposed earlier by the Republican Party and later agreed to by President Wilson.

As Chairman Howrey has pointed out, the new FTC no longer believes in wasting its energies on peripheral test cases of doubtful validity that in years past consumed a substantial share of the agency's appropriations and which often required years to reach the Supreme Court; rather, FTC is giving timely attention to the predatory and fraudulent practices that do damage to the fabric of our free enterprise system, and it has been effective in doing so. During the present fiscal year, the Commission has instituted more legal proceedings than for many years. In the field of false advertising and related deceptive practices well over 100 complaints have been filed, a number not exceeded in 10 years. This year also will be one of the greatest in history in the field of antimonopoly actions instituted.

FTC has entered cease and desist orders in an equally large number of cases this year, including more antimonopoly orders than in any 1 of the 4 preceding years. In addition, more civil penalty actions—for violation of existing orders—are now pending trial in the Federal courts than ever before.

Where inadvertent violations of law occur, the Commission has also secured widespread compliance. For example, in the fiscal year 1955 FTC has already approved 13 new or revised sets of trade practice rules, each embracing an entire industry on a voluntary basis, a record unsurpassed in more than 20 years.

The people of my State have shared the benefits of this outstanding record; it has taken on a real meaning to us. Businessmen of California have long been plagued by the out-of-State poacher who manufactures goods elsewhere and falsely labels them as being "made in California" or deceptively marks styles or designs as having come from within the State. So effective has the Commission been recently in stopping this unlawful practice that the California Legislature passed a resolution, which was filed with the California secretary of state on May 2, 1955, as resolution chapter No. 135, congratulating the Federal Trade Commission on its activities. The resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 21

Joint resolution relative to the use of the word "California" on labels of garments manufactured by out-of-State garment manufacturers

Whereas the Legislature of the State of California, in 1953, by assembly joint resolution 5, requested that the Federal Trade Commission investigate all instances of the use of the word "California" on labels by firms in the apparel industry other than those who actually manufactured such apparel in California, and in the proper cases, issue cease and desist orders; and

Whereas the Commission is to be commended for its prompt and vigorous action in this regard; and

Whereas in the interest of a better informed public the Commission should publish a report on such activities; and

Whereas since, however, there are still some firms that are mislabeling their products in an attempt to capitalize on the sales value of the word "California," the Commission should not relax its vigil: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California does hereby congratulate the Federal Trade Commission on its activities to date, urges it to publish a report of such activities, and finally, to continue unabated its good work; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Federal Trade Commission.

I feel the Congress of the United States agrees with these sentiments of the legislature of my State.

It should not be overlooked that two former Members of this body have recently joined Chairman Howrey as Federal Trade Commissioners. All of us remember with pride John Gwynne, of Iowa, and Robert Secrest, of Ohio. Greater competence and integrity could not be found, and President Eisenhower is to be commended for his choice in each instance.

Latest Cold War Weapon Widely Supported by United States Press and Democratic Members of Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, with funds supplied by the President's emergency fund, the United States is fighting the cold war on two new fronts. Both are important. And on both the Communists have a head start on us.

In the 5 years prior to 1955 the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented. Their first shock was at Damascus last year, where they had a $500,000 exhibition. Awakening in time to what was happening, the United States was a last minute entry, presenting as one of its official exhibits the film Cinerama. The picture was the hit of the fair. It stole the entire show. The Communists protested violently, and when they heard the United States was planning a repeat performance at Bangkok they withdrew entirely. They could not take the competition.

Since that date the U. S. S. R. has withdrawn from at least five other fairs in which it was announced that the United States would exhibit, the Lyons International Fair and the Milan Sample Fair in April of this year, the Paris International Fair and the Tokyo International Fair in May, and the Canadian International Trade Fair in Toronto this month.

Under the program made possible during the current year by the President's $5 million emergency fund, the United States will have been represented at 15 fairs by July 1, 1955.

Bills to make the President's emergency fund a permanent part of the program of the United States in this cold-war period have been introduced by eight Democratic Members of the Congress. Hearings will begin on this legislation on July 5 before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. So far, this legislation does not have the sponsorship of a single Republican Member of the Congress. Yet it has the support of the Hearst newspapers and has been widely supported in other publications from coast to coast. Included here is an article from the July 1, 1955, issue of U. S. News & World Report as well as an article of mine which appears in the July–August issue of the Music Journal.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of July 1, 1955]

ART AND ENTERTAINMENT: LATEST COLD WAR WEAPON FOR UNITED STATES

People around the world are beginning to find the cold war entertaining—at least in one of its latest phases.

America and the Communist bloc are sending their finest talent—musicians, ballet dancers, actors—everywhere to build prestige among intellectuals.

Europeans and Asians are eating it up. In big cities such as Paris, hardly a week goes by without a United States or Communist show on the platform, sometimes both at the same time. It is almost like an old-fashioned band contest, with the trumpets of one side trying to drown out the horns of another.

Even places as remote as Iceland or the town of Peshawar, at the foot of the Khyber Pass in northern Pakistan, see talent from both sides as the artistic warfare warms up.

It was Russia that launched its big cultural drive first, right after Joseph Stalin's death. In the last 8 months, 500 Soviet and other Communist performers have visited France alone. And they lose no chance to build up the old idea among intellectuals abroad that America is a barbaric nation, with little or no real culture.

CAN THE UNITED STATES CATCH UP?

The United States, getting started only recently, is making up for lost time.

Congress, last autumn, gave the State Department $2.25 million to help United States artists and athletes—selected by the American National Theater and Academy and the Amateur Athletic Union—make foreign tours that could not hope to meet expenses by commercial bookings.

That program, on top of the libraries, art exhibits, and lecturers sponsored by the United States Information Agency, now gives foreigners a look at American talent of all kinds—not just the gangsters, jive artists,

and millionaires they see in Hollywood films and hear about from Communists.

The musical comedy Oklahoma swept French critics off their feet in Paris. It is booked for Italy, also, and may be sent around the world.

That show is just one feature of an American cultural display in Paris, Salute to France, which is helped by the United States Government. An American art exhibit drew heavy crowds. Actress Judith Anderson, in Medea, was praised by one critic as giving one of the most remarkable performances of our generation.

UNITED STATES MUSICAL TRIUMPH

Europeans are still talking about another musical from America, Porgy and Bess, now being sent to Latin America after a triumphal tour of seven countries in Europe and the Middle East.

In Milan, stronghold of traditional European opera, Porgy and Bess sold out 4 days before it opened, and it won thunderous ovations for 8 consecutive nights at La Scala. Even the Communist press called this folk opera about life on Catfish Row one of the masterpieces of the lyric stage.

In Tel Aviv, two-thirds of those wanting to see Porgy and Bess were turned away. At one showing, a crowd of 200 Israelis crashed through a window and squatted in the aisles.

Everywhere, United States diplomats report, Porgy and Bess did much to dispel the idea of foreigners that America has little culture. And many Europeans commented that its all-Negro cast, on this official tour, was an effective reply to widespread stories of racial tension in the United States.

"RAVE" NOTICES

In Europe, too, United States art exhibits draw people by the thousands—in Germany, Spain, Britain, and other nations. The New York City Ballet, at its Paris debut, was cheered by an overflow audience long after auditorium lights went on. The 102-man Philadelphia Symphony, on tour, got packed houses and "rave" reviews.

American officials now are trying to send more performers to Asia and Africa. In that part of the world, few American artists can get commercial bookings—and anti-American feeling among Asian artists and intellectuals is especially strong.

The United States, this year, is helping send a tennis team to the all-Asian tennis tournament in India. The Martha Graham dance troupe is to make a tour of Asia. Exhibits of American paintings, arranged by the United States Information Agency, prove popular in India and elsewhere.

Big United States cultural showpiece in Asia, right now, is the Symphony of the Air. This orchestra, trained and conducted for years by Arturo Toscanini, is touring the Far East with the help of a $200,000 Government grant. It stirs even wilder enthusiasm among Asians than Porgy and Bess did in Europe.

GIFTS AND FAN MAIL

In Tokyo, people stood in line 24 hours just to get standing-room tickets to Symphony of the Air. Musicians were besieged for autographs.

Latin America, too, is getting a slice of officially backed United States ballet and art exhibits, in addition to Porgy and Bess.

These cultural missions by no means answer all the criticism of the United States abroad. Anti-Americans in Tokyo and elsewhere point out that the Symphony of the Air seemed to find very little American music worth playing. And there are complaints that United States artists have to attend too many high official receptions, unlike Russian artists who seek out students.

Generally, however, American performers are found to be making a good impression—and causing many foreigners to revise their idea of America as backward in the arts.

American performers occasionally show up their Communist rivals. A Soviet art exhibit in Ceylon was termed inferior to a showing of United States water colors there a few weeks earlier. Japanese comment was far more favorable to the Symphony of the Air than to the recent visit of a Soviet ballet troupe.

Communists, too, suffered a propaganda reverse when three of their performers deserted to the West while touring France in the past year.

SPEEDUP FOR REDS

These setbacks are forcing the Communists—old hands in official show business—to step up their efforts.

Russia, with a full-fledged Ministry of Culture that spends tens of millions of dollars annually, has concert artists performing throughout Europe and has even sent a ballet troupe to Canada. A Soviet company of 30 entertainers, including circus performers, toured India for 6 weeks, with Prime Minister Jawaharial Nehru's government picking up the tab. And the London appearance of Russia's leading violinist, David Oistrakh, was a big event of the musical season.

Communist China is busy, too. A Chinese entertainment troupe made a big hit in New Delhi. And the Peiping Opera Co., turning up in far-off Paris, drew huge crowds and enthusiastic reviews from critics.

United States and Communist cultural competition, already warm, is to get warmer. The Administration now is asking Congress for funds to continue officially backed overseas tours by American artists next year.

America's cultural drive, officials point out, has to overcome a big head start by the Communists. But United States, judging by audience reaction, is doing very well in the world-wide battle developing between American and Communist artists.

[From The Music Journal for July-August, 1955]

ARE THE COMMUNISTS RIGHT IN CALLING US CULTURAL BARBARIANS?

(By FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.)

Making Washington the cultural center of the world would be one of the very best and most effective ways to answer the Russian lies and defeat their heavily financed effort to have communism take over the world. As my friend Jacob K. Javits put it, "if we do not want to fight the Russians with the atom bomb, then we have got to defeat their effort with two other weapons, economic and cultural, but in the cultural field we have not even touched it."

I have introduced several bills in Congress which are designed to enhance the cultural and artistic prestige of our country, for I am convinced that this is as important as any of the "guns and butter" programs which we support. One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy military allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture.

It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a Nation for our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contribution which we have to give to the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cue from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist parties in various countries and the U. S. S. R. find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

I, for one, do not, propose to make it easy for the U. S. S. R. to win the minds, the hearts, and the loyalty of men and women throughout the world. I believe the time has come, and indeed is long overdue, for the United States of America to mount an important counteroffensive against the huge Soviet cultural drive which includes everything from violinists and ballerinas to athletes and chess players, and on which they are spending enormous sums. The fine arts are a unifying force, as Washington and Jefferson knew, and they are especially important to us now, when our country is assailed from within and without by divisive and undemocratic forces from the right and from the left. At no time in our history, perhaps, has it been more important than it is today for the dynamic and liberal forces to rally around the effort to place our National Capital in the vanguard of our country's cultural and artistic development, in order that the healing influence of the fine arts may become both practical and effective.

It has given me a great deal of pleasure to note that the administration has now begun to realize the importance of these matters as they were brought out last year in hearings before a committee of the House of Representatives.

In his state of the Union speech to the Congress last January, President Eisenhower said: "In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

When the Secretary of that Department, Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, presented the proposal for such a Commission to the House of Representatives, her message included the following statements: "Encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny. Throughout the great epochs of history, civilization has been importantly exemplified by masterworks of art and architecture, music and the dance, drama and literature. Achievements in these fields represent, of course, one of the enduring criteria by which history appraises any nation.

"The United States, despite its relative youth, is rich in artistic achievement. We have contributed new power of design in architecture, created new rhythms in music and developed a literature which commands worldwide attention. In the theater and film, and in the ancient form of the dance, we show a creative vitality. Our great museums, art galleries and orchestras are a source of pride for our people. Yet there are many respects in which we lag behind other nations in the general position we accord to the arts in our society. * * * There are in our Nation many persons of talent and genius, whose gifts need the encouragement and recognition which persons in other comparable fields enjoy. * * * Our National Government has not lent its encouragement and prestige to the arts to the extent that is desirable."

The sentiments expressed by President Eisenhower and Mrs. Hobby have been given legislative expression in a bill introduced by Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, Republican, New York, which would provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. While this bill does not envision as complete a program in the cultural field as those which I have introduced, it is an important step in the right direction. At the moment, details are not too important. They may be worked out during the hearings on these bills and a program established which will satisfy the

groups and individuals with a direct interest in these proposals. Nor is it necessary to dig up the old clichés about mixing politics in art. Federal recognition is an absolute must in this matter and the bills I have introduced provide the necessary safeguards since all programs will be in the hands of experts and not politicians. This should insure the realization of our esthetic ideals without favoritism and with no strings attached.

It is my hope that all music lovers and culturally minded people in general will do everything possible in support of these bills, most particularly by letting their own Congressman know how they feel. In this way we will be able to prove to the rest of the world that we are sincerely concerned with the ultimate realities of truth and beauty and that we are by no means a Nation of mere "cultural barbarians."

Secrecy Versus Security in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Carroll Binder, on Secrecy Versus Security in a Free Society, which appeared in the Harvard Alumni Bulletin of June 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRECY VERSUS SECURITY IN A FREE SOCIETY

(By Carroll Binder)

No loyal American wants to give a potential enemy military secrets which might help him to destroy American lives or impair this Nation's ability to survive in freedom. Every loyal American wishes to preserve the free institutions, including the freedom to know, speak, and publish, to which we owe so much of our well-being. How to keep secret the military information which could seriously harm us if it should fall into hostile hands, while giving citizens the information they require to exercise wisely their civic responsibilities and conduct their affairs, is one of the most difficult problems of this Republic.

The determination of what it is in the national interest to keep secret and what it is in the national interest to make known is one of the most delicate responsibilities of a free society. In the opinion of many newspapermen and scientists who have some knowledge of the situation, neither the present national administration nor its predecessor has devised a system for successfully coping with the problem of what to withhold and what to make known. Newspapermen and scientists have found fault with both the Truman administration's and the Eisenhower administration's handling of information about a wide variety of matters, including what may properly be regarded as secret projects. Both national administrations have found fault with the media of information, which includes scientific and technical publications read by specialists as well as newspapers and magazines, radio, and TV.

President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Wilson complain that information of value to a potential enemy is being published, and President Truman made the same complaint. On April 8 President Eisenhower said "technical military secrets" of value to Russia or any other potential enemy have been made public by United States Government sources. Secretary Wilson said on April 12 that this country is giving away military secrets to Russia that would be worth hundreds of millions to us if we could get similar leaks through the Iron Curtain.

On October 4, 1951, President Truman justified an order to nonmilitary agencies to tighten security information by charging that "95 percent of our secret information has been published by newspapers and slick magazines." Mr. Truman said that newsmen should withhold even some information made available to them by authorized Government sources.

On February 14, 1952, Mr. Truman criticized newspapers for publishing the fact that 12,000 maps showing the exact location of our major atomic plants at Hanford, Wash.; Los Alamos, N. Mex.; and Oak Ridge, Tenn., had been printed and given away by the United States Government. The preceding October he had criticized Fortune magazine for publishing a map showing where atomic plants and research are being carried on in the United States. The Fortune map had been given out by a military agency. The 12,000 maps printed after Mr. Truman's criticism of Fortune were given out by the Civil Aeronautics and the Atomic Energy Commission to keep private and commercial pilots from flying over the installations. The maps were posted in many airports.

Wilson is particularly troubled about publication of information concerning how high, how fast, and how far the Nike-guided antiaircraft missiles are capable of traveling. Some of the information about performance of the Nike missiles became known through publication of contractor advertising, required by law.

It is generally assumed that the newspapers are the chief divulgers of information which those who seek security through secrecy think should be withheld from publication. Some information potentially damaging to our military security undoubtedly finds its way into the columns of newspapers.

Such things happen in a free society. They also happen at times in totalitarian societies. For the most rigorous censorship in the most rigorous police state is bound to overlook information which tells an astute reader in another country things the secrecy-minded police states wish to withhold. Our intelligence learned vital Nazi and Japanese secrets through careful combing of their publications during World War II, and our intelligence is less good than it should be if it is not constantly gleaning valuable information from Soviet publications despite all that the Soviet apparatus can do to prevent such information from finding its way into print.

The most significant disclosures of this sort are found, however, in scientific and technical publications rather than in newspapers or popular magazines. Russia bought $200,000 worth of books and periodicals published in this country last year for the obvious purpose of trying to penetrate our secrets, along with keeping posted on the general state of our knowledge.

The President and Secretary Wilson think we make it too easy for Russia and other potential enemies to learn our secrets by too extensive publication. This view is shared by other officials and many citizens. Some people with less understanding of such matters than the President has, thanks to his wide experience, have come to identify secrecy with national security.

These are the people who object to publication of anything that would be of value to a potential enemy. If one attempted to act on that principle there would be no publication of weekly carloading reports, daily Treasury statements, petroleum production reports. A potential enemy can learn something of value from our long-range weather forecasts, the day the ice breaks in the Great Lakes, unemployment statistics, and a number of other things that probably wouldn't occur to most of us as possible matters for withholding from publication.

The functioning of our productive apparatus would be seriously impaired by withholding publication of such information. We prefer to take the risk of its being put to harmful use by a potential enemy in order to enjoy the benefits of its availability to our own people. The President is not objecting to publication of such types of information. He wants technical military information that could be of help to a potential enemy to be withheld.

Secretary Wilson shares the President's view, but hasn't been consistent in his efforts to carry out that view. Wilson and R. Karl Honaman, newly appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, are trying to bottle up information that does not make a "constructive contribution to the primary mission of the Defense Department." They are trying to get newspapers and technical journals to withhold from publication much of the material which now finds its way into print in connection with letting of contracts, publication of papers read at scientific meetings, and reports of addresses made by Members of Congress or the Armed Forces.

Honaman also has the curious idea that compilations of published information should be suppressed. He gave as an example, recently, the case of an engineer without intelligence experience who undertook to see what he could learn about our guided-missile program while waiting for security clearance to go to work for a defense contractor.

This man, Honaman said, went to a public library and read the daily newspapers, technical magazines, and Government publications on its shelves for 3 months. He then wrote a 45-page report including 15 pages of charts which gave very accurate information on the characteristics of our weapons. He included detailed information which gave for each its name, model designation, manufacturer, guidance system, method of propulsion, length, diameter, range, and altitude. He also included certain reasonable deductions concerning the high-level plans and policies of our whole guided-missile program.

The report was so accurate and complete, Honaman said, that it was necessary to classify it. Honaman saw no absurdity in classifying this compilation, though he admitted that all of the information that went into it was gathered from information readily available from the newspaper stand and magazine counter.

Some of the information Honaman's engineer culled from publications on the library shelf should presumably have been classified by those who controlled it, and thus kept from publication. That, as Honaman admits, is hard to do when a model goes into production, and practically impossible to do when the weapon is made available for service. The manufacturer needs hundreds of drawings to produce the weapon. The service people need hundreds of manuals at widely scattered places to operate the equipment.

But what is gained by classifying the compilation of published material? Surely any foreign intelligence agent is capable of making the same compilation an intelligent American engineer can make. The most that such a compilation can do is save the foreign intelligence agent several months of work. But how much delay may its classification cost our own defense effort by perhaps requiring many Americans each to make his own time-consuming compilation?

Honaman's is not an isolated example. During the war, when extraordinary efforts

were made to prevent publication of anything about radar and public use of the word was frowned upon, the editors of a national publication compiled a detailed account of what made radar possible and how radar operated, out of textbooks to be found on the shelves of every good library.

Lloyd Berkner, president of the Associated Universities, thinks that technological delays resulting from secrey deprived us of many of the benefits we should have had from the discovery of radar, which was made about 1930. Berkner thinks that had we made known our radar protection of Pearl Harbor, it is doubtful if the Japanese would have attempted a surprise.

Secretiveness about radar permitted dilatoriness in development of airborne-radar applications. Thus at the beginning of World War II we had no antisubmarine radar, no night fighters, no means for extensive sea search.

Berkner thinks that had airborne radar been developed and advertised openly, the consequent great progress in these developments might have so weakened the German confidence in the submarine supremacy, or in their capabilities for strategic air attack, that the war might have been prevented altogether.

The only way we can get full good out of technological advances, according to Dr. Malcolm Henderson, one of the designers of the long-range detection system that warns of Soviet atomic tests, is to have them widely known.

Suppression of classified material, while necessary, is bad enough, but the suppression of nonclassified material—strategic information as we call it now—is much worse.

"What will happen is that suppression in the newspapers must, of course, be accompanied by suppression in all media, and in particular in the technical journals, trade papers, house organs, proceedings of learned societies, and everywhere that technical material of general interest is published.

"Now, when the technical journal is censored for unclassified material as well as classified, the technician, engineer, and scientist will really have blinders and earmuffs put upon him. It is just this sort of information that keeps him active, interested, and productive, and it is to the wide dissemination of such information that American technology owes a large measure of its success."

In these days all the important areas of science have military implications, and, if those who seek security through secrecy have their way, must inevitably fall under the cloak of military secrecy.

The stultifying effect of secrecy upon scientific progress was brilliantly stated by Berkner at Ann Arbor last June. He asked whether scientists could not demonstrate that "in suppressing seemingly isolated scientific bits of information of direct military value, we at the same time prevent the germination of scientific ideas of much greater scientific, social, and military significance. Can we not show that such really great concepts, injected into our industrial complex, can provide far greater security through technological supremacy than we could ever hope to achieve through the secrecy of technological information?"

The trouble with secrecy, Robert Oppenheimer told Edward R. Murrow, is that it denies to the Government itself the wisdom and resources of the whole community. The only way the Government can have the benefit of collective wisdom and experience is to let almost anyone say what he thinks. There must be encouragement to try to "give the best synopses, the best popularizations, the best mediations of technical things that you can. To let men deny what they think is false you have to have a free and uncorrupted communication."

Society is now forced, Berkner reminds us, to depend wholly upon the judgment of a few men "who have been selected by the idiosyncrasies of politics, for decisions of the most far-reaching social importance. The judgment of those men is no longer rendered under the guidance of public experience and debate. Are we not justified," he asks, "in then expecting some really colossal blunders whose adverse effect on our lives and well-being will completely overshadow any minor advantage that we might hope to acquire from the restriction of technical information?"

There are undeniable weaknesses in the democratic process, including freedom of information and discussion. These weaknesses, real and apparent, are particularly conspicuous at the present time when the free societies are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with Communist police states—the antithesis of freedom. But there are even greater weaknesses in totalitarian regimes which tend to be overlooked by those who are familiar only with the shortcomings of freedom.

I have seen at firsthand nearly all contemporary forms of totalitarianism except Communist China. I have been a reporter in Fascist Italy, Communist Russia, Nazi Germany, Militarist Japan, Peronist Argentina, and in various adaptations of those types of police states. Observations over a period of nearly 30 years give me a strong conviction that there are greater dangers in the sort of secrecy practiced in those regimes—and upon which some of our officials, less well acquainted with their actual operations, look with envy—then in the freedom of information practiced here.

When you bottle up information about what the Government is doing, including what it is doing in most phases of national defense, you place a protective curtain of secrecy over incompetence, neglect, corruption, and lack of initiative. All of these things have happened under totalitarian regimes in greater proportions than would have been the case had the press, an independent legislative body, and the public been free to know, speak, and publish.

Details as to the manufacture and performance of weapons which our experts in such fields believe are unknown to the Soviet power need not and should not be made public. Anything which an expert who knows the whole picture things should be kept secret because the release of information would help a potential enemy more than release of information would help us should be kept secret.

But it is extremely difficult to confine secrecy to that relatively small area. There is constant pressure from a great variety of officials at all levels, civilian and military, to extend the area of secrecy. These efforts must be combatted constantly, for if the devotees of secrecy have their way, our free institutions will be scuttled by misguided efforts to save them.

There is a strong temptation to overlook the harm that may be done to our people by withholding information essential to the conduct of their affairs and suppress information for fear it may in some way be useful to a potential enemy.

This Nation's decisions are made not only by the President and Congress but by the 60 million citizens who vote in national elections. Unless those voters have a strong sense of participation they cannot be expected to give the Government adequate support. Unless they have an adequate flow of information about what the Government is doing and why, including the state of our military defenses and the nature of our relations with other nations, they may make dangerously wrong decisions.

If there should be hostilities with the Soviet power, it would be a miracle if the enemy did not succeed in dropping some of his superweapons on large centers of population just as we would endeavor to drop our superweapons on enemy industrial concentrations. Many millions of Americans might be exposed to the effects of radioactive dust from the fallout of a Soviet H-bomb in addition to large numbers directly hit by a superweapon.

The problems presented by radioactive fallout are of the most far-reaching sort. Among the questions presented by nuclear warfare are: When it would be safe to move about in an area possibly subject to fallout, when it would be safe to eat food grown on soil exposed to fallout, and how best to treat persons injured by radiation, flash burns, and radioactive fallout.

The questions are among the most vital problems of civil defense. Yet under the policy of secrecy pursued by the Atomic Energy Commission our civil defense authorities know less about the effects of H-bomb damage than the Russians know. The AEC waited almost a year before it released information about the fall-out of the H-bomb explosion at Bikini Island on March 1, 1954, and then it released less than physicians need to know to treat H-bomb injuries or civil defense officials need to know to make wise plans for coping with such a possible attack.

The AEC is the largest enterprise in the United States. Billions of dollars of taxpayers' money have been invested in the search for ways to put atomic energy to constructive peaceful uses as well as in the development of super-weapons. It is conceivable that the production and distribution of power may be revolutionized in this and other countries within a relatively short time by atomic energy developments. The question of what role the government shall play in the production and distribution of such power may be one of the most important decisions taken in this country.

These phases of the atomic energy program are shrouded in secrecy. The taxpayers are not told what percentage of the vast funds made available to AEC go for power and other non-military purposes. The policy of secrecy on technological developments keeps the public in ignorance of adjustments it may have to make in the face of technological change. The officials, in and out of uniform, who have it in their power to decide how much information the citizens shall have, are under strong compulsions to play safe, and stamp documents under their supervision top secret, secret, or confidential.

There is a penalty for releasing information which ought not to be released. There is no penalty for withholding information which ought to be released. Former Senator William Benton proposed safeguarding the public interest by appointment of a people's advocate on the National Security Council to "fight" for the release of information to the public just as secrecy-minded officials fight for the withholding of information. He proposed that each agency have a team of four departmental officers "under the leadership of an outstanding man drawn from the newspaper field" to make the argument for disclosure, thus "forcing clarification of the reasons for nondisclosure, and with the right of appeal to the secretary."

The proposal got nowhere. Thus there is no one to check up on the custodians, no one to take care of the caretaker's daughter when the caretaker's away, except the press, Members of Congress, and interested citizens who sustain the people's right to know by an unceasing fight against secrecy where secrecy is dangerous to survival in freedom and security.

Only through constant information about actual conditions can citizens be counted upon to support the heavy expenditures and undertake the difficult tasks incident to successful conduct of the Nation's affairs in these troubled times. Secrecy may deny a

potential enemy knowledge of our defense potential that, if known to him, would deter him from irresponsible adventures leading to war. Excessive secrecy about our own defenses may lead a potential enemy to believe that we are more vulnerable to attack than we really are.

Secretary Dulles Tells Kremlin All It Has To Do To Get Peace and Relaxation of Tensions Is To Observe Faithfully the Charter of the United Nations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address given by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles at the 10th anniversary meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco on June 24, 1955. If the people of our own country and those allied with us will read and heed his penetrating analysis and sound counsel, we will continue steadfastly on the course which is beginning to get results, and not be tricked by the guile and wiles of our enemies into abandoning the sound policies of firmness and strength which give hope at last of forcing the Kremlin to abandon its program of world conquest:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN FOSTER DULLES, SECRETARY OF STATE, AT THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE UNITED NATIONS, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 24, 1955

Anniversaries can be both pleasant and useful occasions. This meeting is of that kind. We look backward and see much that was good. We look forward and see much of promise.

I

The United Nations has already shown that it is here to stay. One proof is the presence here of 37 foreign ministers who have come from all parts of the earth. Another proof is the fact that, since its founding, no member nation has sought to withdraw; and there is a long, too long, waiting list of qualified nations which want to become members.

This esteem for the United Nations is based on solid accomplishments.

In the political field, there have been moments of triumph, as when the United Nations enabled Iran to bring about withdrawal of foreign troops from its soil. And when it helped Greece to overcome the threat of Communist subversion. And above all when it saved the Republic of Korea by organizing collective defense.

In the field of non-self-governing territories, the United Nations, working through the Trusteeship Council and otherwise, improves the lot of many dependent peoples and brings them nearer the goal of self-government or independence.

Through its Declaration of Human Rights, the United Nations holds aloft a standard which will lead increasingly to respect for the individual human being and his sacred God-given rights.

Through the Economic and Social Council, much is being done to improve the economic and social conditions of the less-developed areas of the world.

We live in the atomic age. And members of the United Nations, responding to President Eisenhower's stirring proposal, are joining together to create an international agency which will harness for human welfare what was only a weapon of war.

Above and beyond concrete actions is the all-pervading moral influence which the United Nations exerts. In fulfillment of the words of Arthur H. Vandenberg—a name never to be forgotten here—our General Assembly has become a "town meeting of the world," exercising a guiding and enlightening influence on the conduct of all nations.

These achievements explain why, throughout the world, the United Nations is held in high respect. As President Eisenhower said in his opening greeting to you, the United States takes pride in its loyal support of the United Nations in all these manifold activities which benefit mankind.

II

The vision of the founders was indeed a lofty one. They met, while war still raged, determined to save mankind from the scourge of future war. But the charter they wrote does not call for peace at any price. The peace of the charter is a peace of justice; it is a peace which will assure to all nations great and small the right to be genuinely independent; it is a peace which will enable all individuals, however humble, to enjoy their God-given right to freedom.

To attain these high goals, the charter calls upon the nations to work together. Fellowship is indeed the essence of the charter. No solidarity effort could win for any nation the charter's goals. Collective effort is needed to preserve freedom. Without collective strength despotism would have free rein; the rights of nations would be trampled under foot, and human beings would be made slaves.

The founders of the United Nations endowed the charter with the flexibility needed to keep alive this concept of collective effort that these unpredictable times demand. A secure peace still eludes us. But that spirit of collective effort implicit in the charter, if practiced in good faith and with creative will, can guide us toward the ultimate goal of man—peace with freedom.

III

We all know that certain of the activities of the United Nations have been gravely hampered by the use—abuse—of veto power in the Security Council. This has prevented the Security Coucil from discharging many of its intended functions. Also, the Security Council has never brought into being the security force which it was supposed to command. The reason is that the members have not sufficiently trusted each other to make it practicable for them to unite their forces.

Happily, the framers of the charter realized the limitations under which the Security Council might operate. They did not require the members to risk their future on a rigid all-or-nothing proposition. They provided alternatives. Article 51 permits like-minded nations with common problems of defense to join together under the charter for their collective protection against aggression. This has been widely availed of by nations which trusted each other and which felt bound together by a sense of common destiny.

The first so to act were the 21 American Republics. They had been closely associated for a century and a half. They knew each other, and they trusted each other. So, in 1947, they made their Rio pact. It recognized that an armed attack against any American state was an attack against them all.

Others followed in that way. There was the Brussels Pact of 1948; the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949; and the Manila Pact of 1954. Now, there are the London and Paris Accords of 1954, which bring about the beginning of Western European Union, a union long dreamed of by men of vision and goodwill, but which, until now, has eluded human grasp.

Every one of these collective security arrangements embodies the basic principle of the United Nations Charter, a principle which in turn derives from the teachings of all the great religions, that people have the right and the duty to help each other.

Every one of these arrangements also gives added security even to the nonparticipants. There is less armament, because multiplication of armament is avoided when the force that protects one is equally at the service of many. Also, the military power and facilities of a coalition tend to become distributed and not within the control of any single nation.

In international affairs, as in domestic affairs, the sharing of power is the best safeguard against abuse.

Power which is shared among a group of independent sovereign nations cannot be used effectively unless the participating countries are in accord. Such accord would be totally unattainable except for collective self-defense.

Because collective security responds to the needs and highest aspirations of mankind, it has been invoked by many nations.

The United States, which in 1914 and again in 1939, sought safety in neutrality, has now learned by that hard experience that security lies in collective action. We believe that the power which we possess ought to be made available for the protection of others, just as we desire the help of others for our own defense. So, the United States is today a party to mutual security treaties which bind us collectively with the defense of no less than 44 countries. We are proud to have these multiple ties of trust and confidence.

These systems conform to the Charter of the United Nations. They carry into effect the charter ideal of fellowship. They operate under the principles of the charter, and they are subject to the influence of this organization. They have attacked no nation; they have threatened no nation; and they thwart no nation that does not covet the land and peoples over which collective security stands guard.

IV

Out of the evolutionary process I describe, much good has come. Speakers who preceded me have referred to encouraging international developments, particularly some of recent months. Wars have been ended in Korea and Indochina; the Austrian State Treaty has been signed; relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have improved; the Soviet Union seeks diplomatic and trade relations with the German Federal Republic; and peace talks have begun between the Soviet Union and Japan.

These are indeed significant developments. But in our rejoicing, let us not forget why they have occurred, or the sequence of events that have brought us where we are. If we forget that, we will have lost the key to a future of peace and prosperity.

What has happened is because certain nations backed steadfastly the principles of the United Nations and backed them with a resolve that, if need be, carried with it blood and treasure.

Today there is no longer fighting in Korea. But why? The reason is that 16 members responded to the call of the United Nations and fought the aggressor who had struck from the Communist North and almost immediately overran South Korea. After 3 years of bitter fighting, the aggressors were back at, or behind, their point of beginning. The aggression had failed. Then, and only then, did the aggressor accept an armistice and end the killing. It is indeed strange to hear this triumph of collective security now hailed as proof of the peace-loving character of the aggressor and its supporters. If they had had their way we would today

be commemorating the fifth anniversary of the demise of the United Nations.

Today there is an armistice in Indochina. It was negotiated a year ago at Geneva. But shortly prior to the Geneva meeting several members of the United Nations made clear that continuance of the fighting would carry a threat to all of Southeast Asia and require consideration of collective defense within the framework of the United Nations Charter.

Today there is an Austrian Treaty. It is a treaty which could, and should, have been signed years ago. For nearly a decade Austria was deprived of its freedom and its economy was exploited by one of the occupying powers. During this period of travail Austria's courage was sustained by the moral and material succor of friendly powers and by the backing of its hopes by the United Nations. In the long run, that combination prevailed to win a victory for justice.

Today, Yugoslavia is no longer the target of abuse. An orchestrated threat began in 1948, when Yugoslavia asserted its national independence and broke away from an alien yoke. During the next 7 years Yugoslavia was helped militarily and economically by nations which differed from its government in almost every respect except for one, namely, the right of Yugoslavia to be a truly independent, sovereign nation.

Today, the Soviet Union seeks diplomatic and economic relations with the German Federal Republic. That development comes after many years of hostility, during which the Federal Republic was given security and economic support by those who believe in the right of the Germans to have an independent existence under a government of their own choosing.

Today, there is a possibility of peace between the Soviet Union and Japan. Four years ago, in this same room, 49 nations signed the Japanese Peace Treaty, a treaty of reconciliation. I recall how, from this very platform, that peace was bitterly assailed and rejected by some. But now, as a result of the treaty of San Francisco, Japan has resumed a place of honor and dignity in the community of nations, so that some nations now seek peaceful relations which 4 years ago they spurned.

Throughout all of these events, there runs a common theme, the theme of fellowship. Those who believed in the principles of our charter have helped each other, and in so doing, they have helped themselves.

Some say that what has happened marks the beginning of an era. I believe that can be. Certainly, the United States, I pledge you, will do all that lies within its power to make it so. But we do not forget, we dare not forget, that some of those who now hail the recent developments are precisely those who sought for years to stop them.

It is not unprecedented to see men make a virtue of necessity. Today, the necessity for virtue has been created by a stalwart thwarting of efforts to subvert our charter. If we want to see that virtue continue, I suggest that it may be prudent to continue what has produced it.

Steadfastness to principle and sacrifice for principle are the proven price of the good that we have won. It would be reckless to expect further good at any lesser price. To achieve peace with justice, peace with sovereignty for nations great and small, peace with respect for human beings without regard to class, will require sustaining the effort, the sacrifice, the solidarity which has brought us where we are today. Much has been accomplished, but more, much more, remains.

There exists the problem of German unification. For 10 years, part of Germany has been severed from the rest. That unnatural division of a great people constitutes a grave injustice. It is an evil which cannot be indefinitely prolonged without breeding more evil to plague the world.

In Eastern Europe are nations, many with long and proud record of national existence, which are in servitude. They were liberated from one despotism only to be subjected to another, in violation of solemn international undertakings.

In Asia, there is a Chinese Communist regime which became an aggressor in Korea, for which it stands condemned by the United Nations. It promoted aggression in Indochina, and has used force and the threat of force to support its ambitions in the Taiwan area. Recent developments, including the influence of the Bandung Conference, suggest that the immediate threat of war may have receded. Let us pray that this is so. But the situation in Asia remains one that cannot be regarded with equanimity.

Also, we cannot forget the existence of that apparatus known as international communism. It constitutes a world-wide conspiracy to bring into power a form of government which never in any country, at any time, was freely chosen by the people, and which destroys the reality of independence. At Caracas last year the Organization of American States found that the activities of international communism constituted alien intervention in the internal affairs of nations, and were a threat to international peace ad security. This threat should end.

Finally, there is the urgent problem of limiting the crushing burden of armaments. For many years the United States and its friends have sought to find ways to carry out the mandate of the charter to reduce the diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. Nearly a decade ago, the United States made a proposal to internationalize atomic energy. This, if accepted, would have prevented the present competitive production of these weapons of awesome destructive power.

This unprecedented proposal was made at a time when the United States was sole possessor of this weapon. It was rejected.

This proposal was subsequently followed up by new proposals for the control and regulation of armaments and the establishment of an international organ to supervise an honest disarmament program. These proposals too were spurned. But the Soviet Union recently indicated that it might be prepared seriously to consider the initiative which had been taken months before by other members of the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee. Let us hope that these indications can be translated into concrete action making possible limitations of armament which are, in fact, dependable and not a fraud.

These are some of the problems that confront us as we face the future. They are problems which cannot be met if we shut our eyes to them, or if we are weak, confused, or divided. They are problems that can be met if we are faithful to the principles of our Charter, if we work collectively to achieve their application, and if we are prepared to labor and sacrifice for the future as we have in the past.

The United States asks no nation to do what it is not prepared to do itself. Any nation that bases its actions and attitudes in international affairs on the principles of the Charter will receive the wholehearted cooperation of the United States.

Admittedly, the problems we face are not easy to solve, and they will not be quickly solved. There is room for many honest differences of opinion. But the existence of hard, unsolved problems need not itself be a source of danger and hostility if the nations will bring to the common task the spirit of our Charter.

There is one extremely simple method of bringing an end to what is called the "cold war"—observe the Charter of the United Nations; refrain from the use of force or the threat of force in international relations and from the support and direction of subversion against the institutions of other countries.

To bring the cold war to an end, seven points are not needed; this one is sufficient.

It is in that spirit that we go to Geneva, and we hope to find that spirit shared.

If so, we can find there new procedures, or at least develop a new impetus, which will help to solve some of these vast and stubborn problems that still confront us.

We shall not, at Geneva, assume to act as a world directorate with the right to determine the destinies of others. Good solutions do not come from such a mood. We shall seek to find procedures such that all nations directly concerned can fully assert whatever rights and views they have.

In other words, we shall try to carry into the Geneva Conference the spirit which has been generated by this commemorative gathering of 60 nations. The sentiments which have been here expressed can inspire new strength, new determination, and a new spirit of fidelity to the principles of the United Nations founders.

In conclusion, I can do no better than to cite the pledge made here last Monday by the President of the United States:

"We, with the rest of the world, know that a nation's vision of peace cannot be attained through any race in armaments. The munitions of peace are justice, honesty, mutual understanding, and respect for others.

"So believing and so motivated, the United States will leave no stone unturned to work for peace. We shall reject no method however novel, that holds out any hope however faint, for a just and lasting peace."

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky.*—
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*—The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*—
Bender, George H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah.*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*—
Bricker, John W., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*—
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*—
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*—
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky.*—2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*—
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*—
Daniel, Price, *Tex.*—
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*—
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*—
Duff, James H., *Pa.*—
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho.*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*—
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*—
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*—
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*—
George, Walter F., *Ga.*—The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*—
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*—
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*—
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*—
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*—
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*—
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*—
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*—
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*—
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*—
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va.*—3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*—
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y.*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La.*—
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis.*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*—
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*—
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev.*—The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*—
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*—
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa.*—
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo.*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*—
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va.*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*—
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*—
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine.*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*—
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*—
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C.*—
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*—
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*—
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*—
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*—
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*—
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah.*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho.*—4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*—
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

America and the International Atom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able address delivered by the Honorable Gordon Dean, former Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, at a dinner forum on atoms for peace, on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of the National, Sunday evening, June 19, 1955, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sixteen years ago several scientists including the late Dr. Enrico Fermi approached Albert Einstein and advised him that certain experiments with nuclear fission had approached a point where they felt the highest authority should know it. They asked the professor to go to Washington to see the President. But the modest professor said, "I really don't feel that I could disturb so busy a man." He was induced, however, to write a letter to the President. A friend sat down at a portable typewriter on the back porch of a home where Einstein was visiting. He might have used a better typewriter ribbon for one of the most important documents in human history. However, the simplicity and lucidity of Einstein's style were so effective that upon receiving the letter the President, on a little memorandum to General Watson wrote, "See that this is done." With that authorization $5,000 was appropriated and the atomic energy program of this country was begun.

Sixteen years after this event the United States had spent in excess of $10 billion on its atomic energy program; huge stockpiles of bombs had been accumulated; atomic energy programs had developed in a score of countries around the world; a submarine called the *Nautilus* was sailing the Atlantic, propelled by a nuclear reactor; another submarine, also nuclear propelled but of quite different design, was soon to be on its way; large public utilities both in this country and abroad are designing reactors to produce electricity from the heat produced by the fission of uranium atoms; industry, medicine, and agriculture are examining the effects of radiation to understand its dangers and to harness it to useful purposes. Reactors, that is nuclear furnaces, exist today in the United Kingdom, Canada, Sweden, Norway, and France and will soon be building in many other countries including Holland, Denmark, Belgium, Australia, Italy, Turkey, Switzerland, India, and Brazil. Much has happened.

I have been asked this evening to talk briefly on the capacity of the United States to revolutionize the world through the fullest development of peacetime uses of atomic energy. That the atom has already had a terrific impact on the world is quite obvious; that its impact to date is only a fraction of its potential is equally clear. That the world will be revolutionized is clear. That the United States has the capacity to bring about this revolution is also clear. But that the United States will play the leading part it could have played, is today a very serious question.

The United States had remained, except in public pronouncements and speeches, significantly aloof from the world atomic picture. At the same time countries all over the globe are probing the nucleus of the atom.

We forget sometimes that the atom is international; that it knows no nationality, race, or ideology. It will go about its sometimes productive, sometimes destructive work just as loyally for a Russian, a Pole, or a Chinese as it will for an American, a Briton, or a Frenchman.

The atom obeys only one set of laws—the laws of physics. And man's mastery over the atom is directly proportional to his comprehension of these laws. The real top secrets in atomic energy are those that are still held by nature. Those which nature has released are generally known. Every now and then the scientists of one nation or another wrest a new secret from nature, either by accident or by dint of great effort. When this occurs, the nation that discovers the new information may lock it in a safe and disclose it only to those it considers to be loyal and trustworthy. But nature herself remains a security risk that cannot be controlled. The secret that has been learned by one may be and usually is quickly learned by another. It takes brains, knowledge, experience, skill, and resources, but these are not the exclusive possession of any one nation or any one group of nations.

The blunt fact is that while the United States has the capacity to revolutionize the world through the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy, in all probability the United States will play but a part in this revolutionary process. We have no monopoly.

A little history is perhaps in order at this point.

Until a year ago the Atomic Energy Act of the United States prohibited interchange of information with other countries dealing with commercial applications of nuclear energy except in the field of radioactive isotopes. One reason for this legislative prohibition was that if any country which should build a reactor for the generation of heat—it would be manufacturing in the course of the process plutonium; that plutonium being fissionable or explodable could readily be fashioned into bombs. The reasoning was just that simple—and, I might add that up to a certain point of time quite valid. Seventy percent of the United States effort goes into making fissionable material. This is therefore the largest single effort of the United States program. Fashioning a bomb out of this material is comparatively simple and today the general theory is well known. Consequently we did not interchange information on the making of fissionable material because we did not wish to hasten the day when other countries could secure a bomb.

But many things have happened since the act was written. Canada has built reactors. England has built reactors and bombs. France has built reactors. All therefore produce plutonium. And within the past several years other countries have built them—not, I should add, to get bomb material but to find a way to get heat and eventually electricity from these reactors.

Furthermore in 1949 something very significant happened, something we sometimes forget when we make security policy. Russia exploded an atomic bomb and has since exploded many others. It followed that Russia had built reactors, and separated out plutonium. Since that date she has accumulated an imposing stockpile of bombs to which she has more recently added the much more destructive hydrogen bomb.

Almost a year ago Congress, fully aware of these developments, amended the Atomic Energy Act to permit transfer of information touching upon peaceful uses of atomic energy to friendly countries and set up a machinery for bilateral agreements whereby any atomic information could be interchanged except information dealing with the fabrication of atomic weapons.

Even prior to this the President had spoken eloquently for a sharing of the blessings of the atom. He painted a picture of the tremendous strides which mankind could make if all the scientists and engineers of the world could turn their inventiveness to exploiting the peaceful atom. The message stirred the people's imagination particularly in those countries which saw in the peaceful atom a new fuel, a new source of power.

Both before the President's speech of 1953 and since we have taken some steps which have been highly useful. Actually the Atoms for Peace program of the United States Atomic Energy Commission goes back to September 1947 when we first began the international distribution of radioisotopes. Such distribution was permitted even under the original Atomic Energy Act. Since then 46 countries have received in all many thousands of shipments from the United States. Nearly 5,000 individuals and organizations today throughout the world are employing radioisotopes in the fields of medicine, agriculture, and in their industrial processes.

In the more recent past we have made other notable strides in the field of international cooperation. A conference has been called under the aegis of the United Nations for this summer in Geneva where over 1,000 technical papers will be presented by various countries around the world, over 100 by the U. S. S. R. This is the first time at which the atom will literally be placed on an international stage. I hope the results will be significant.

In recent months, the United States has negotiated agreements with Turkey, Colombia, and Brazil and some 10 other countries whereby these countries will receive enough nuclear fuel and the necessary design material to build a research reactor. We can expect that many such agreements will be signed in the months ahead. There is, however, remaining one great area in which the United States has been deficient and that is in the field of making available, information concerning power reactors. It was to this area and this great need that the President against addressed himself last week at Pennsylvania State College.

Again let me say that his proposal deservices quick implementation by the people in the Atomic Energy Commission, State, and Defense Departments.

Today in many parts of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the western Hemisphere the lack

of power is holding back economic and social developments. As one high placed observer recently said of Europe, "Next to peace, electric power is the primary interest of many governments. Unless something is done about it, the lights will grow dim over much of Europe."

People everywhere want cheap power. The atom gives great promise of supplying it. And the United States has many times in the past 2 years promised assistance in this field but we are not delivering on our promises. Our Government is still not quite willing to give the information necessary to friendly foreign countries to build modern power reactors, and we are not yet even willing to permit an American industrial concern to sell a power reactor to a foreign country—at least to countries which don't have them. This is not the fault of Congress, for Congress last year amended the Atomic Power Act and set up simple procedures to accomplish the result. What then is holding us back? I very much fear that we are still operating on the theory that someday the Russians will be able to build a reactor, make plutonium, and fabricate a bomb.

Let me illustrate:

We are today building in this country two reactors optimized so as to produce power. One is a large central station powerplant being designed by Westinghouse and which will be operated by the Duquesne Power & Light Co. We are also building at the request of the Army a smaller so-called package powerplant. But both bear the secret label. The design of neither is available to other countries nor for that matter to American industry except under security conditions. Today, foreign countries may have, as for years they have had, all the information they wish on the uses of radioactive isotopes. They may have the design of a research reactor and the unclassified literature and know-how necessary to build and operate a research reactor. But let's face it—what they want is atomic power, and American industry would like to supply the reactors to produce it.

We are simply not implementing the President's "atoms for peace" proposal. I submit that if we do not soon change our policy and take the secrecy wraps completely off these power reactors, our pretention that we are spreading blessings will have a very hollow ring.

The most significant and most dramatic item which America has to sell to the underdeveloped areas of the world is its latest knowledge on power reactors.

If we do not move soon, our friendly competitor, England, will surely do so. American abstinence from this area is even today causing many of the European countries to turn not to us but to other countries for assistance in solving their power crisis. Let me illustrate:

Sweden, intent upon building a research reactor and later a power reactor, knew that it would be useless to come to the United States. She therefore extracted uranium from her own shales, turned to France to bring the uranium oxide to the metal stage, to the United Kingdom for help in fuel fabrication, and to Norway for heavy water. Sweden built her research reactor and is building her power reactor. Less well developed countries such as India and Brazil have turned to France. In fact, practically every country in Europe has turned for atomic assistance to England or France and received it—assistance frequently refused by the United States.

Argentina recently perfected a process for producing pure uranium metal but she did this with the assistance of a German company. Illustrations of this are legion.

If we do not move soon, our unfriendly competitor—the U. S. S. R.—might even beat us to the golden opportunity. She has promised to supply information on her own power reactor at the Geneva Conference.

But the policy of secrecy on nonweapons uses has other effects which will soon be felt.

American industrial concerns which today are anxious to supply this potentially tremendous demand for equipment for reactors are not free to develop the market. At the same time England has a sharp eye on this attractive market and is today placing her know-how and machinery where her eye now is.

How does one engage in a full interchange of information and materials dealing with power reactors? There are two ways.

The first is to keep the secrecy label on these reactors and pick very carefully only those countries for interchange which we trust to keep the secrecy label on them by setting up security procedures satisfactory to this country.

I submit that this is completely unrealistic and that we are both tying our own hands and making for ourselves a few enemies rather than friends if we adopt this course. For every country we approve we will make an enemy of countries we turn down. Foreign countries are interested ultimately in the best and latest information on reactor design; certainly they will not secure cheap power if they do not have the best and the latest. But I am sure it will be completely unworkable if we try to police the security systems of all the countries with which to deal. I can visualize someone in a foreign country, friendly to the United States, expressing a point of view in a public speech which would make him suspect by our security standards, this followed with congressional investigations here into the arrangements made with that country, and finally charges, countercharges, and much ill will. And there is no reason for all of this if we face up to a few facts of life. One of those facts is that the only reason we have a security system is that we do not want to add to the Russian stockpile. Another fact is that the Russians have a stockpile, a sizable one; and within a matter of a few years will have enough of a stockpile perhaps to cancel out, for all practical purposes, the much larger United States stockpile.

Since it would take the Russians about 3 years to take the latest reactor information and with it build a modern reactor; and since perhaps the most they could expect to add to their stockpile because of it would be a small increase in the amount of plutonium manufactured; and since this would be but a drop in the bucket compared to what they have already produced, and could have no effect on "the cancelling out" situation, I submit that if we operate on the assumption that there are real security considerations in the reactor field, we are tying our hands and the hands of the other countries of the West.

The notion that we can share atomic blessings with one and all and at the same time place the secrecy label upon them does violence to all concepts of security. Not security, but the appearance of security is all that will be achieved. This much is quite clear to me. But the point I really wish to leave with you is that in the field of peacetime uses there is no need and no room for secret labels.

An "atoms for peace" ship plastered with secret labels had best not leave port.

The second way to implement power reactor interchange is for the Atomic Energy Commission to declassify with one bold stroke all power reactor technology, face up to the fact that the Russians long long ago perfected the bomb, face up to the fact that without such action we will make enemies out of three-quarters of the Western World whose security systems don't match ours, face up to the fact that what we are talking about here is nothing more than a new source of heat for power and that the world wants what comes from cheap power.

This is what is needed.

If we take this step—and it must be soon—in 1955 (and remember we need no new laws to do it) America can again assume her leadership position in the atomic field.

American industrial concerns will be freed to compete in the world markets. They will be able to sell power reactors to mining countries in the far north, the high Andes, and the jungles of Africa. They will be able to install large central station powerplants in countries which now desperately need them. They will be able to supply the power to convert salt water to fresh, irrigate the deserts and alter the entire face of the globe. They will be able to make good friends and good will for America.

News Blackouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on April 30, in an address to the United High School Press Banquet at Huntington, W. Va., I quoted warnings by leading newspaper editors that proposals for so-called voluntary curbs on information advanced by R. Karl Honaman, then newly appointed Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary in charge of public affairs, "could interfere with the right of the American people to learn what their Government was doing."

In the same speech I also declared that "the newspapermen of the Nation have not only the right, but the duty to examine carefully any new proposals made by Government officials, which, in their opinion, would prevent legitimate news from reaching the public."

Now that Mr. Honaman has presented his questionable ideas to the American press, our newspapers are making public their own critical reactions.

The Washington Daily News, in a leading editorial on June 24, published a number of caustic comments on Mr. Honaman's proposals. The Washington Post and Times Herald, on June 27, printed an Associated Press article by reporter Ed Creagh questioning the administration's defense news policy, under the headline "Reporters Still Fight News Blackout."

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News of June 24, 1955]

CONGRATULATIONS, MEN

Correspondents should ask officials only those questions that are interesting and useful to readers. Pentagon officials are mighty busy and haven't time to waste.

Thus spake, in effect, R. Karl Honaman, Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary in charge of public affairs, when the freedom of information committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors protested that something akin to censorship, or a news brownout or blackout, had developed in the Department of Defense.

Deputy Honaman was well qualified by experience before he entered public service to answer, "What is news?" or define what is interesting and useful to newspaper readers. He was director of publications for the Bell Telephone Co.

What could the outstanding newspaper publishers of the country and their veteran reporters possibly know about the sacred obligation to the public, that is newspapering, that a compiler of Bell Telephone literature didn't?

Deputy Honaman, who was brought from the Commerce Department to the Pentagon to do a job for Secretary Charles E. Wilson, is an affable gent, a veritable newspaperman's newspaperman's newspaperman's newspaperman, so long as nosy Washington correspondents don't ask questions that fall without the narrow area of what Ma Bell's gift to fourth estate and the Eisenhower administration says constitutes news.

Mr. Honaman, charged with carrying out the tough policy of Secretary Wilson of withholding strategic information, which could or could not cover a multitude of official miscues, now places editors and Washington correspondents on their honor.

In asking editors to refrain voluntarily from publishing news that, although not secret, still may be useful to Russia, Deputy Honaman even gives the editors credit for being friendly to the United States and having a measure of discretion.

Well, that's mighty white of Deputy Honaman. May we not congratulate editors and their Washington correspondents for the high esteem in which they are held by one in the higher echelons of Pentagon officialdom?

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 27, 1955]

REPORTERS STILL FIGHT NEWS BLACKOUT

(By Ed Creagh)

Are the American people getting all the information to which they are entitled about the activities of their Government?

Generally, officials of the Eisenhower administration say "Yes"—that nothing is withheld except data which would help a potential enemy. Generally, newsmen covering the Washington scene say "No"—that all sorts of information is withheld and without valid reason.

This is an old argument, but it has taken on new significance in recent months because of several developments:

A partial blackout of news from the Pentagon. Officials say this involves nothing but technical military secrets whose release could hurt the United States. Reporters covering the news say the curtain has been lowered on other, far-from-secret information.

A growing belief by many correspondents that officials are following "out the window" two directives of President Eisenhower. One, a 1953 Executive order, lets 17 Federal agencies restrict information on security grounds. The other, issued during last year's McCarthy-Army row, shields conversations and communications and communications between Government officials from public disclosure.

Congressional uneasiness over the information picture. Representative FRANK E. SMITH, Democrat, Mississippi, said recently there is rising concern lest secrecy be used to cover up mistakes and shortcomings of government. A special House subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Jr., Democrat, California, has started an investigation to see whether pertinent and timely information is being withheld.

The focus currently is on the Pentagon.

Last March, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson began issuing tighter security directives which have had the effect of choking off much information normally available to the public and of slowing the release of much other information.

At first the Navy, in particular, "clammed up" so thoroughly that reporters had trouble getting a biographical sketch of an admiral, while a district naval office refused to give details of a destroyer-freighter collision until the news had been cleared with Washington.

Wilson said he never intended to cut off information of this kind, and he urged all hands to use commonsense in interpreting his directives. Since then there's been a relaxation, but Pentagon newsmen report the directives still are a barrier between them and the news.

As part of his new policy, Wilson told the services March 29 to get rid of their military chiefs of information and turn the jobs over to civilians. So far, none of the services have done so.

Wilson, himself, installed a new Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs and the appointee, R. Carl Honaman, has spent a good deal of time denying he is in effect a supercensor.

Honaman formerly headed the Commerce Department's controversial Office of Strategic Information, set up late last year to foster voluntary efforts to prevent classified strategic data from falling into unfriendly foreign hands.

At the Pentagon, Honaman says his chief concern is to restrict the publication of technical data which will help the enemy more than it will help us. He said at one point that the Government alone couldn't always judge what information fell into this category, adding he hoped writers and editors would vountarily refrain from publishing such material.

Here he came into conflict with J. R. Wiggins, managing editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald and chairman of the American Society of Newspaper Editors' Freedom of Information Committee. Wiggins wrote him that newspapers aren't going to set themselves up as censors of material the Government itself gives out.

The White House stands behind Wilson's announced general policy. President Eisenhower has backed it at news conferences. His press secretary, James C. Hagerty, has summed it up this way:

"The President never has believed in censorship of legitimate news. However, he has also always believed there is no reason to make available to the enemy technical military secrets which by their issuance could do nothing but hurt the interests of the United States.

"To that extent, and only to that extent, would we ask that that sort of information be withheld from general circulation."

What, then, is legitimate news in the opinion of the administration?

The first week in June, as it developed later, Robert T. Stevens submitted his resignation to Secretary of Defense Wilson.

Last Tuesday the Washington Star reported Stevens had resigned. Newsmen asked Hagerty about the report. He said the White House had received no resignation. Newsmen asked if a resignation was expected. "I know of none," Hagerty replied.

The next morning he announced Stevens' resignation.

The McCarthy Resolution and the Big Four Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald-Tribune of June 25, 1

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MCCARTHY'S STAN.

There has been no doubt that the President would go to Geneva with the full bipartisan backing of the American Congress. Just how massive and well-nigh unanimous is that support has been established by the Senate test on Senator MCCARTHY's resolution. This would have limited the President's freedom to negotiate and would in effect have been a vote of no confidence.

The resolution might have died or been withdrawn, but the Senate Democratic leadership decided to push it to the ultimate test. The results of the decision have been highly useful. The Republican Party has been given a chance to express its fundamental unity and its loyalty to the President. The tiny group which at the end stood with MCCARTHY—Senators MALONE and JENNER and the unpredictable and erratic Senator LANGER—revealed how little of this kind of thinking there is left today.

Senator MCCARTHY fought to avoid the showdown. He tried maneuvers and substitutes; the bitterness of his attacks on the President grew in proportion to his desperation. He ended by charging his opponents, as he has so often done before, of doing a service to communism. But the irony had never been so great; for MCCARTHY was confessing that he saw service to communism in pushing through to a vote the very resolution which he had introduced.

The little incident will be remembered by Europeans, we hope, when they are misled into talking about Senator MCCARTHY as one who represents something vital or meaningful in the present American scene.

Ninth District Ohioans Answer Poll On National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of the answers I have received in response to my questionnaire on current national issues published last month in the Toledo Blade. Replies were returned by 1,152 persons, all but 30 of them residents of my district, which includes the city of Toledo and the rest of Lucas County, Ohio.

The purpose of the poll was simply to provide me with a cross section of opinion from our district on matters of importance to the entire country. I think most people agree that their Representatives should be guided by the facts available to him, rather than by public opinion alone. However, people are entitled to know why their Representative votes as he does, particularly if it appears to be contrary to the majority views.

Results of the poll are as follows:

1. Do you favor direct Federal grants to States to help build schools? Yes, 722; No, 408; no answer, 22.

2. Do you favor extension of the low-rent public housing program which would provide 35,000 public-housing units during each of the next 2 years? Yes, 696; no, 427, no answer 29.

3. Do you approve of universal military training as a means of meeting the defense needs of the Nation? Yes, 691; no, 415; no answer, 46.

4. Do you favor an Armed Forces Reserve program as a means of building a civilian-military reserve? Yes, 880; no, 190; no answer, 82.

5. Do you believe the present minimum wage should be raised to: 90 cents an hour, 214; $1 an hour, 290; $1.25 an hour, 523; no answer, 82; no raise, 38.

6. Do you favor continued United States support of the health, educational, and technical assistance program of the United States? Yes, 799; no, 302; no answer, 51.

7. Do you favor continued United States economic assistance to Europe? Yes, 602; no, 454; no answer, 96. To Asia? Yes, 559; no, 449; no answer, 144.

8. Are you in favor of granting statehood to Alaska? Yes, 850; no, 254; no answer, 48. To Hawaii? Yes, 831; no, 266; no answer, 55.

9. Do you favor amending our present immigration law to allow more equal entry of immigrants to the United States from the various geographical areas of the world? Yes, 538; no, 571; no answer, 43.

10. Do you feel that top Government sources are keeping the American people accurately informed on the conduct of the United States foreign policy? Yes, 341; no, 744; no answer, 67.

I am frankly disturbed that so many people indicated that they do not feel that the present administration is keeping the American people adequately informed on the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States. However, I am pleased with the healthy response to the questionnaire as a whole and I hope again to use this method of giving my constituents an opportunity to express their views.

Radioactive Fallout and United States Proposal for International Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials on radioactive fallout and the United States proposal for an international study of this problem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

One editorial is from the New York Times of June 27, 1955, and the other is from the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1955.

Both editorials express strong support for the international study, as proposed by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge while he was in San Francisco last week—a study similar to the one proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, submitted by me, and cosponsored by 27 other Senators, which currently is pending in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 27, 1955]

RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., delegate of the United States, suggested at San Francisco that all the information at present available on the effects of atomic radiation be collected and disseminated. The suggestion deserves the serious consideration of the General Assembly of the United Nations. There is no question that the Atomic Energy Commission would do all in its power to aid an international study.

The last issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists contains several articles on this problem. Dr. Ralph E. Lapp emphasizes the persistence of radioactive fallout and estimates the radiation danger in a world war waged with H-bombs. What alarms the people of all countries are possible hereditary effects. Dr. H. J. Muller, a distinguished geneticist, believes that we have no reason to fear a significant undermining of the hereditary constitution of the population as a whole.

For the Atomic Energy Commission it must be said that it has never ignored the possible dangers of fallout. Last May its Advisory Committee for Biology and Medicine studied the question and reached the conclusion that genetic effects would be manifest only in hundreds of years at the current rate of irradiation. The Japanese seem to be of a different mind, exposed as they are to the fallout of both Russian and American H-bombs.

Mr. Lodge is evidently looking ahead. The need of his international commission is already recognized. Aided by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, the National Academy of Sciences is to investigate the effects of fallout. The Medical Research Council of Britain has already embarked on a similar enterprise. Why not consolidate these separate studies and invite the participation of other nations, particularly of Japan? Such a consolidation would give us just what Mr. Lodge has in mind.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1955]

ATOMS, GENES, AND THE U. N.

Our Government has acted wisely in proposing that the United Nations undertake a special cooperative study to evaluate the degrees of genetic danger inherent in radiation unleashed by test detonations of atomic-hydrogen weapons.

The proposal—which has been presented by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., our chief delegate to the U. N.—is in line with the suggestion made last March by the Federation of American Scientists. Unquestionably, given favorable international action on it, it can do much to place the whole subject in proper perspective and eliminate many of the wild misconceptions and unjustified fears that have been voiced in recent months in connection with the experimental explosions.

These misconceptions and fears have revolved around the idea that the reproductive health of the human race has been and continues to be gravely menaced by the A and H tests. Actually, on the basis of exhaustive studies, the medical and biological experts of our Atomic Energy Commission have flatly declared (1) that all the detonations to date—ours, Russia's and Britain's combined—have caused only an insignificant increase in worldwide radioactivity and (2) that the prospective rate of future experimentation and peacetime nuclear development does not constitute a truly serious genetic hazard. But these assurances, which almost certainly will be confirmed by the thorough investigation now being carried out by our National Academy of Sciences, have come from wholly American sources, and they have received scant attention abroad where there has been much Communist propaganda to the contrary.

So it will be a good thing if the U. N., with Russia cooperating, embarks upon the kind of study that has been proposed. The findings then will be widely publicized, and they will be stamped with such international impartiality that nobody will be able to misrepresent them as being merely a lot of self-serving talk by the United States. Certainly, in the words of the Federation of American Scientists, "When radiological information from all sources is assembled, the world will be in a better position to answer the questions which have been raised in many countries about the possible harmful effects of nuclear tests." And very probably, as Mr. Lodge has said, the data thus gathered and evaluated will convincingly show that every nation "can be satisfied that humanity is not endangered by these tests" when they are subject to proper safeguards by the powers staging them.

Moreover, apart from dealing with the current rate of experimentation, the U. N. study could determine whether or not there is justification for the warning that future accelerated H-bomb tests by several powers will ultimately be a major menace to the genetic health of all mankind. Investigation conceivably may support the warning, and in that case, as the FAS has suggested, international machinery might be established to keep the number of such tests from going beyond a certain agreed-upon safety limit or danger threshold.

Accordingly, looked at from any angle, our Government's proposal to the U. N. is at once timely and to the point. The men of the Kremlin, for reasons of their own, may take a dim view of it, but they can hardly oppose it without seeming to vote for darkness where light is needed.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial written by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, reveals facts and circumstances connected with the United Nations which the American people and the people of the free world should always keep foremost in their minds. A world organization like the United Nations, although not perfect, is the only hope of civilization.

The editorial follows:

TEN YEARS OF THE U. N.

The diplomats gathered in San Francisco this week are speaking in more sober and realistic terms than did the world leaders who met there a decade ago to complete formation of the United Nations.

After 10 years, we know that many of our supreme hopes for the U. N. have not been realized. It has not prevented wars, nor removed the threat of wars. It has not accomplished the great things too many of us expected from it.

That is not at all to say it has been a failure. Far from it. As President Eisenhower told the opening session in San Francisco this week, "That there have been victories, only the willfully blind can fail to see."

The American people frequently have been critical of the U. N. They have been irked by the stalemates in the Security Council, by the Soviet vetoes. But polls show they

still support the U. N. overwhelmingly. They do not want the United States to get out—they would have us stay in even though Red China should be admitted.

For we do know the United Nations has achievements to its credit. And we do know that, even more than in the days of the League of Nations, some sort of world organization is vital.

The U. N. is more than an association of the world's diplomats. Many of its achievements have been outside the ordinary field of diplomacy. They are important in diminishing the long-range threat of war. For diplomats basically do not cause wars, they only give the signal for them. The various side agencies of the U. N. have been striking at the underlying causes for strife. They have been treating with all manner of problems which cause human frictions.

The United Nations has not become the world government some feared of it. Indeed, one valid criticism is that the U. N. has not gone far enough on that road. Eventually, if there is to be enforced world peace, there must be a world organization that can speak with authority.

But there are moves in that direction. Both in the economic and political fields, Western Europe is aiming at unity. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is laying the foundation for possibly increased federation of its members. There are other signs that the idea is gaining in popular support.

The League of Nations was a first step. The United Nations is a second step in man's modern efforts to banish the threat of war. It may be replaced, as was the league, or it may develop into the instrument man has hoped for. As Harry S. Truman said in San Francisco 10 years ago, it is not a "final or perfect instrument."

The thing to remember is that the U. N. is an instrument, not a sovereign organization. It is a tool used by the associated nations, thus far with varying degrees of success. But it is a tool that none of them has proposed discarding, for which no better substitute is now available. And it may be that, in the U. N.'s second decade, we may be able to use it to even better advantage.

The President's Emergency Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, clear cut evidence of the support President Eisenhower's program has obtained from the Democratic Members of the Congress and a corresponding exhibition of lack of interest and support for this program among the members of his own party has been pointed up once again by the reception accorded the President's emergency fund.

With funds supplied by the President's emergency fund, the United States is fighting the cold war on two important new fronts. On both of which the Communists have a head start. Under the program made possible during the current year by this fund the United States will be represented at 15 international trade fairs by July 1. These fairs have given us opportunity to refute Communist sneers at the myth of the American way of life. No less significant have been the results achieved under the cultural presentation program for which the President's fund provides the seed money. It does not pay all expenses of participation in either the business or cultural fields, but it assures American programs going overseas against killing heavy losses.

This program is being carried on by the relatively small sum of $5 million. The program has provided results out of all proportion to the amounts involved.

So far, eight bills have been introduced by Democratic Members of the House to make this program a permanent part of the armament of the United States in this cold war period.

Hearings will be held on these bills beginning July 5 by a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague and friend the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who has, himself, introduced 1 of the 8 bills to make the President's emergency fund a permanent program.

In view of this interest and support of a worthy program it is highly interesting to note that the President's emergency fund so far has been without any notable support from members of the President's own party in the Congress.

Included herewith are some letters and a news article from the Catholic Standard in support of the fund, which were sent to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], who has filed a bill in support of H. R. 6777, filed by me which would include within the President's fund provision for assisting the athletic program of the United States and especially with a view to aiding our athletes to a successful participation in the 1956 Olympics.

The letters and news article follow:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, June 20, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I was glad to have an opportunity to chat with you on the telephone today and will look forward to meeting you in person.

As I told you, I want to express our appreciation to you for your help in connection with the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs.

Sincerely,

CLIVE L. DUVAL 2d,
General Counsel.

THE AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE,
New York, N. Y., June 22, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I was happy to receive your note and the clipped pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dealing with your support of an appropriation from the President's Emergency Fund to aid American participation in the 1956 Olympics. We trust that your efforts will meet with success.

Naturally, we were pleased that you saw fit to insert the article from the June issue of the American Legion Magazine by Arthur Daley titled "Will the Soviet Union Sweep the Olympics?" in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and refer to it in your Extension of Remarks dealing with the upcoming Olympics.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. O'NEIL,
Publisher.

[From the Catholic Standard of June 24, 1955]

CAPITAL SPORTS

(By Bill Ring)

Seeing sort of "red" from a down-under point of view, a freshman legislator has taken to beating the tom-toms up on Capitol Hill in an avowed effort to snap the Nation out of its apathy over the 1956 Olympic games which will be held in the down-under land of Melbourne, Australia.

This young Paul Revere without a horse is 36-year-old Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, a product of Trenton's parochial and public schools and an alumnus of Wake Forest College and law school. He was a naval officer in World War II, saw service at Iwo Jima and Okinawa and has been an avid sports fan since he was a toddler. He tried hard in high school and college to make the varsity swimming and basketball teams, but had to be content with intramural competition.

"In baseball, I'm a red-hot New York fan. I root for both the Yankees and Giants," Mr. THOMPSON said. "If the two teams wind up again in a world series, I guess I'll turn out to be my own worst enemy."

More than once of late, Mr. THOMPSON has sounded the alarm in the halls of Congress that the United States is in danger of losing its world supremacy in the field of athletics to the Soviets in the coming Melbourne games. Not only that, but the young legislator has been doing something highly commendable—filling the usually staid and dry CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with some highly interesting articles concerning the threat poised by the Russians against the United States in the coming Olympics.

One such article is the work of that superlative sports columnist, Arthur Daley. It ran in the American Legion magazine and it starts off with this ominous note:

"The Russians will knock the ears off the Americans in the 1956 Olympic games. It isn't a pretty fact, but it's virtually an inescapable one. The worst of it is we can't borrow the light-hearted English approach and give it the jolly-well-done-old-boy treatment. The Red brothers will scream to the world that this is merely one more proof of how decadent the capitalistic system really is."

The Daley article points out that the Soviets will present a mighty team, handpicked all the way, from an athletic farm system built up in recent years by the Soviets along the lines of the baseball farm systems built by Branch Rickey for the St. Louis Cardinals and the Brooklyn Dodgers and now being built for the Pittsburgh Pirates. What's more the Russians will take their hand-picked Olympic team to Afghanistan where the weather resembles that of Australia for special conditioning a month before the Olympics.

Mr. Thompson backed up the dark Daley forecast with a warning from Avery Brundage of Chicago, president of the United States Olympic Committee, to the effect that "Russia is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known" in preparation for the Melbourne games.

The legislator has pointed out that the 1956 Olympic games could not be held at a worst time from the United States standpoint. In down-under Australia, he points out, the weather also is upside-down for the Olympic dates in late November and early December are in Australian spring, while here in the United States, our athletes will be conditioning themselves in winter weather. The dates also will run smack-dab into mid-term college examinations and United States college athletes are the backbone of United States Olympic teams.

Mr. Thompson also has reminded of the warnings sounded by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., following his visit to Russia and

his interviews with all the Soviet big shots. Mr. Hearst said sports are a front on which the commissars are moving full speed ahead. The publisher advocated a permanent planning board to formulate a strategy on all fronts to meet Communist competition.

That's more or less right down Mr. Thompson's alley. He says it is tremendously important that America become alert to the fact that communism must be fought in other ways than in a hot or cold war. It must be fought along cultural as well as military and diplomatic lines, he said, and America must show the world its high cultural attainments by sending out dramatic groups, orchestras and such bands of goodwill ambassadors all over the world to compete with anything and everything Russia has to offer.

Mr. Thompson said he's convinced the best way of doing this is by substantially building up the President's Emergency Fund to cover appropriations for such cultural ventures. The fund, he said, also could be used in assisting the Nation to prepare its athletes for the gruelling competition they are sure to encounter in the 1956 Olympic games.

New Red Tactic Menaces Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Julius Epstein that appeared in the Tablet on June 18, 1955.

Mr. Epstein's article brings to us another case where the Soviet Union is doing all in its power to give the impression it is outsmarting us in its propaganda program that is such a vital part of the cold war:

NEW RED TACTIC MENACES PEACE—REDEFECTION APPEAL IS BASED ON BUNGLING OF ADMINISTRATION

(By Julius Epstein)

A complete change of attitude toward Soviet defectors has taken place in Moscow. Soviet defectors who were considered not long ago as the "scum of the earth," "traitors of their fatherland," "spies," "warmongers," and "lackeys of Wall Street," to quote just a few of the more colorful epithets used by the Kremlin to describe them, are right now being wooed back to the Soviet Union where everything will be forgotten and forgiven.

The new Soviet policy can be seen all over Europe, especially in Germany, where the largest number of refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain are either living of passing through.

How seriously the Soviets are going about their business to woo back the greatest possible number of defectors can be learned by the fact that they just created a "Committee for Return to the Homeland" whose headquarters are in Berlin's Soviet sector and that this committee is already printing and distributing a newspaper, called "For Return to the Homeland."

CITES ACTUAL CASES

The latest issues of that newspaper clearly show how the new scheme works. The following quotations may illustrate the new technique in the cold war:

Under the headline "It Is Impossible To Go on Living Like That" we find the following questions:

"Why should Nikolai Grigorievich Ruban, a former agronomist, sweep streets in Regensburg?"

"What forces an intellectual like A. Bukhanzev, living in Augsburg, to subsist by picking over garbage before daylight, set out before houses occupied by Americans?"

"Is it possible that Vishniakov, living in the same city of Augsburg, can be satisfied by his semistarving existence there, where he has nothing except a miserable unemployment dole?"

In a leading editorial, "Reject Your Absurd Fears," we can read the following:

"The statements of Prof. V. P. Vasilaki (a prominent Ukrainian refugee who recently returned to the Soviet Union) have once again confirmed the dark work that is being accomplished among displaced persons by certain emigre leaders bought by the American Intelligence.

"These political speculators are selling their fellow countrymen wholesale and retail; they are pushing them on the dishonorable and destructive path of spying and sabotage against our homeland, and are preparing them to become cannon-fodder for the imperialistic adventures.

"We know that the great majority of our fellow-countrymen have kept their love for their country intact and long to return. But they are hesitating to do so only because they are frightened by lies about the Soviet Union, and inventions of punishments always awaiting them upon their return.

REDS LAUD HEARST PAMPHLET

"Fellow countrymen, reject these absurd fears. Do not believe the political speculators who earn their living on your blood and sweat. To break with them and to return is the only right path, which must be chosen by all our fellow countrymen who value their conscience, their honor, and their human dignity."

Other articles feature the wonderful life redefectors found in the Soviet Union. To alleviate the fears of war and to stress the validity of the new coexistence appeasement policy, the Hearst interviews with Bulganin, Khrushchev, and Zhukov are being distributed in pamphlet form.

(Those interviews have also been published by the Communist Party in the United States. The Daily Worker of May 23, 1955, greeted the appearance of the pamphlet containing the Hearst interviews and selling for 15 cents with the following words: "Here is a clear exposition of the Soviet attitude toward the United States and to the question of peaceful coexistence.")

What are we going to do about it?

Up to now, obviously nothing. Neither our Voice of America nor Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberation have been able to counter effectively the new Soviet propaganda, aimed at the creation of redefectors.

As some experts employed by these agencies explained to this writer, it is almost impossible to do anything against the new Soviet tactics. As one of these experts put it:

"How can we counter Soviet propaganda, when it is true that Nikolai Grigorievich Ruban is still sweeping the streets in Regensburg and A. Bukhanzev is really collecting garbage from cans in front of American dwellings?"

And he added:

"What can we do about it, when the Soviet propaganda approaches individually those defectors who escaped to the West 3, 4, 5, and even 6 years ago and who are still rotting in DP camps without any hope to establish a new life in the West?"

There are no answers to these questions. As long as our administration is completely bungling the refugee and displaced persons issue as it has done so far, the new Soviet tactic cannot be met successfully. This tragic bungling is mainly due to the complete lack of imagination, vision, and courage to open new and adequate approaches to the problem.

TIME TO ACT IS TODAY

A few weeks ago, David Sarnoff released his memorandum to the President, a "program for a political offensive against world communism."

As this writer was told in Washington a few days ago, it is not at all sure that the President will take any action, in spite of his favorable comments about Sarnoff's memorandum. And even if he does, it will take about a year until a new program could be implemented.

But time is running out. If we don't act within the next month, another most crucial battle in the cold war will be lost.

Therefore, the time to act is today, not tomorrow.

Prophet Cometh to the Desert Tribes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post of May 27, 1955, contains an interesting account of the visit of the Secretary of Agriculture. I think the Members of the House will be interested in this local interpretation of his words:

THE WORD OF EZRA: PROPHET COMETH TO DESERT TRIBES

(By Roscoe Fleming)

One alighted in Denver from the big metal bird that flies through the clouds, saying: Let the chieftains of the tribes that live in this desert draw near and attend, for I bring to them the word of Ezra, who is the prophet of the Great White Father in Washington.

The Prophet Ezra biddeth me say that he, yes, even he himself, will shortly cast the light of his countenance upon the chieftains of all the 10 tribes that inhabit this desert; yea, even the chieftains of the heathen tribes that acknowledge not Ezra nor the Great White Father. For Ezra suffers long, yet is kind, and will deal in mercy even with those chieftains.

But those who attend those chieftains will he not hear; nay, he will not even admit such to his presence, lest they should fractiously dispute the word and the wisdom of Ezra, who is the prophet of the Great White Father in Washington.

Let no chiftain therefore presume to bring his henchmen, lest all alike be turned away from the light of the presence of Ezra, and cast into outer darkness. And there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

Blessed only are those who acknowledge Ezra's dicta as their law; only their acres shall be fruitful, and their lives long in the land.

Hear therefore the word of Ezra as he has commanded me to bring it to all who dwell in darkness in this desert land:

You are not so badly off as you may seem. In your blindness you have sinned, yet now you call upon Ezra to save you from the consequences of your sin.

You have plowed and planted for the wind to reap, even though you were told of old time that this is wicked. And you heeded not the word of Ezra, bidding you to rise and go forth from this desert, and seek your sustenance elsewhere.

Now your miseries have therefore come upon you redoubled in drougth; and being anguished and hungered from your folly, and afraid, you yet call out for succor that you may be sustained and continue in sin.

The ways of Ezra and his commands may seem harsh to you in your blindness. Yet are they just. Does he command that you pay more for the money that you need to tide you over? This is because you might otherwise unjustly deprive the money-lender of his profit.

Does Ezra command that he who hath nothing left but his crop insurance, be deprived even of that which he hath? This is lest it arouse false hopes, and cause those to linger on the acres of their fathers who should have gone hence long ago.

Say not that these things are harsh, for woe unto you who have perversely gone your own way and listened not to the dicta of Ezra, and of the wise and kindly men whom he hath appointed to rule over you.

Therefore you deserve only to be removed from the face of the land forever, and to tramp the city's stony ways to earn your bread. Yet Ezra suffers long and is kind, and decrees hope even for you.

Hearken to the words of the prophet Ezra: You are not so badly off as in your blindness you may think. For did not Ezra when he previously cast the light of his countenance upon you, bid you to pray for rain? And did it not rain?

The Shrine, the DeMolay, and Dr. Frank S. Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a digest of remarks made by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., West Orange, N. J., before the Pacific Northwest Shrine Association's annual meeting in Spokane, Wash., on June 11, 1955. In his talk Mr. Stringfellow, who is the imperial high priest and prophet of the shrine, pays high tribute to Dr. Frank S. Land, founder of the Order of DeMolay, and presently the imperial potentate of the shrine.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PURPOSE OF THE SHRINE

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, imperial high priest and prophet, AAONMS, before the 23d annual meeting of the Pacific Northwest Shrine Association, at the Davenport Hotel, Spokane, Wash., June 11, 1955)

Illustrious President, officers, past officers, distinguished guests, and members of the Pacific Northwest Shrine Association:

It is a pleasure to participate in the activities of your 23d annual meeting and a privilege to again be the recipient of your gracious and generous hospitality.

Shrine associations render a great service to our fraternity and I am sure that yours, in common with the other 15 associations, has the respect, and the wholehearted and enthusiastic support of your Imperial Divan.

One of the most distinguished members of that Divan, Mr. Justice Marshall M. Porter, Imperial Second Ceremonial Master, of Calgary, Alberta, Canada, and his delightful lady, grace the dais tonight with their presence and therefore add greatly to the importance of this gathering. Imperial Sir Porter will, in my opinion, render one of the most outstanding administrations our fraternity has ever had when he becomes Imperial Potentate a few years hence. It is a privilege to be associated on the Divan with such a fine, clear-thinking, liberty-loving, distinguished citizen.

May I now say a few words about our fraternity—its origin and purpose, and especially about our reigning Imperial Potentate.

BIRTH OF AAONMS

Eighty-six years ago this month, a distinguished American actor named William J. Florence and an eminent American physician named Walter M. Fleming, presented to 11 other master Masons a proposal for the formation of a new fraternal order. That proposal was enthusiastically approved. Thus was born the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine.

Starting 86 years ago with 13 members and 1 temple, our fraternity has grown to 740,000 members and 166 temples. It has 17 hospitals for crippled children in operation, in which more than a quarter of a million crippled children have been rehabilitated.

PURPOSE

Since its inception the Shrine has been a humanizing agency, seeking to keep alive in men the spirit of youth. We Shriners know that pleasure is something we can take out of life, or put into it, but happiness is something we must share. The purpose of the Shrine is something more than pleasure—its purpose is to teach the broad principles of toleration, charity, benevolence and unselfish friendship.

Out of such thoughts and ideals as are embodied in the Shrine, came the idea of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children. With such a fine objective, there is no wonder that our fraternity has grown so great.

GET MORE OUT OF LIFE

Shriners as a group get more out of life than those who have not experienced the philosophy of our fraternity. Their hearts are big and their dispositions are mellow. Their loyalty to and love of country is deep rooted. They realize that good will is more precious than a gold nugget and often harder to find. They know that good will, to a large extent, determines one's usefulness to society and they are particularly careful to radiate it at all times. True Shriners, therefore, cherish no jealousies and entertain no hatred of their fellow men. Shriners who reflect in their daily lives the philsophy of our fraternity, are happy to proclaim to the world "It's great to be a Shriner."

DR. FRANK S. LAND

Some wise man has said there are three kinds of minds in the world:

1. Great minds that think in terms of principles;

2. Medium minds that think in terms of current events;

3. Small minds that think in terms of personalities.

Dr. Frank S. Land, our imperial potentate, is a man of principles. He was elected to the helm of our fraternity at our imperial council session in Atlantic City, N. J., on July 1, 1954, when a person of his stature was needed.

For more than a quarter of a century, Dr. Land, as founder of the order of DeMolay and its secretary general, has specialized in building the character of the youth of our Republic. As imperial potentate, he has used his ability to reinforce the character of the membership of our fraternity.

Dr. Land is, in every sense a nobleman. He is justly and widely known as "the man of good will" and high intellectual integrity. He possesses the enthusiasm of youth and the wisdom of maturity. His constructive administration will long command a devotion rooted deeply in the hearts of Shriners throughout North America.

SUCCESS

A wise philosopher years ago penned the following: "He has achieved much who has lived well, laughed often, and loved much; who has gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children; who has filled his niche and accomplished his task, whether by an improved poppy, or a perfect poem, or a rescued soul; who has never lacked appreciation of earth's beauty or failed to express it; who has always looked for the best in others and given the best he had; whose life is an inspiration and whose memory is a benediction." Such a man is Dr. Land and such is the measure of his success.

Dr. Land has employed his talents, his philosophy and his sterling character to elevate our fraternity to a higher pedestal than that on which he found it.

FAITHFUL SERVANT

This brings to mind the parable of the faithful servant, related by the Gentle Carpenter of Nazareth. You have read the story in St. Matthew's gospel, how the Master, before going to a faraway country, called His servants to Him. To one He gave 5 talents, to another 2, and to another 1. You will recall that one servant buried his talent in the ground, that he who had two gained still another 2, and he who had 5 gained still another 5. Therefore, when their Master returned, He was pleased with the stewardship of the two servants who had made the most of their gifts, and because they had been faithful over a few things, He set them over many.

Shriners are indeed faithful servants. They are endowed with a philosophy and a spirit that helps to make this a better world. They are men of talent and by the wise use of talents committeed to their care, they are by their conduct enriching the world and when they render an accounting of their stewardship, they will deserve to hear the Grand Master of the Universe say, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Censorship of News About Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the running of the Government of the United States is clearly the business of the public, and the public should have access to all information regarding the Government except that which is classified for national security purposes. There has lately been continued evidence of increasing censorship of news about the Government—evidence which is highly disturbing. I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a column on this subject by Joseph and Stewart Alsop which was published on June 8 and to an editorial in the June 21 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1955]

CENSORSHIP WARNING

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

For a great many years, American correspondents in Moscow have wisely warned that their own dispatches are slanted, be-

cause of the Soviet censorship. In the opinion of these reporters, it is now time for Washington correspondents to send out a similar warning.

This being peacetime, the Eisenhower administration is not yet using the conventional blue pencils. Yet this administration is practicing a widespread censorship, which is no less effective in slanting the news because it is insidiously indirect.

The censor's pressure is felt by every Washington reporter who still bothers to wear out his shoe leather to do his real job—which is to transmit facts of vital national meaning to the American public.

Facts of really vital meaning are precisely the facts that are now under interdict. And the stage has now been reached where honest reporters really have a duty to confess this novel pressure.

As an example of the sort of thing that is now a matter of course, consider the curious episode that led these reporters to the rather grave decision to give a censorship warning. It happened not very long ago, when one of us had just returned from a 6-months' trip in Asia.

After this long absence, two of these reporters' best and oldest friends in Washington proposed a happy family reunion. The ladies of the three families laid agreeable plans. The logistics of the party, although somewhat elaborate, were smoothly completed. And then, on the very eve of the reunion, there was a somewhat embarrassed telephone call.

Messrs. A and B, as we may call our two old friends, both hold high posts in the same Government agency. They had been bluntly told that their official positions would be compromised if the party were held as planned.

Behind this extraordinary episode, there was another no less extraordinary. During that week, we had published a report on the problem of an American satellite. The Soviets have already announced their intention to build an earth-satellite, and have placed their leading physicist, Peter Kapitza, in charge of the project. For this and other obvious reasons, the satellite problem seemed to us reasonably fateful, and therefore we felt it was in the public domain.

This view was not held, however, by the National Security Council. That Thursday's NSC's meeting turned apparently, into a prolonged outburst of righteous indignation. Here, once again, the American people were being told facts of the utmost national importance—but facts which the NSC wanted to cover up.

It did not matter, of course, that these reporters had had no access whatever to classified information. That point was not even tested. The chief of the agency that employs Messrs. A and B had been at the NSC meeting. Without further ado, he returned to his office and issued the edict that led, in turn, to the embarrassed telephone call already noted. He did this, moreover, with a full understanding of the rules that have always governed our friendship with Messrs. A and B.

We have never talked to these friends of ours about their work in their agency, or, indeed, about any sensitive matters. This has always been understood between us. In present-day Washington, which is more zoo than metropolis, wise men keep business and friendship strictly separated. If any official is your friend, and you feel you must discuss public questions with him, you ask formally for an appointment, and you go formally to his office.

You do not talk business at family reunions. And you do not talk business, either, with very old and valued friends whose official duties are genuinely not in the public domain.

The agency chief knew of these rules. He told Messrs. A and B, and he later told these reporters, that he was confident the rules had always been and would always be strictly enforced. He did not fear any improper disclosure. But he greatly feared the attack that would develop on his agency, if it became known that important subordinates of his dared to continue an old friendship with persons who dared to write about facts of the highest national importance.

No doubt he was right. He had observed the scene at the NSC meeting. He is one of the finest men in Washington. He and Messrs. A and B had no course open to them, in the circumstances, except to put the welfare of their agency first.

What is not right, however, is the mephitic, the almost psychotic atmosphere that forces this kind of invasion of private life, to carry out reprisals against reporters who are doing what they conceive to be their public duty. What is not right, either, is this indirect censorship by reprisal which is now being carried so far that reporters who still do their jobs must expect any kind of harassment, from old-fashioned security investigations to separation from their oldest friends and quite probably wiretapping and bug planting.

What is involved here, in fact, is a radical change in the American political system, and very nearly an amendment to the American Constitution, that is being shoved through behind the backs of the American people. And this is so serious a matter that it will be the subject of several subsequent reports.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 21, 1955]

SECRECY A LA MODE

Censorship is a horrid word, and you won't catch anyone in the administration endorsing such a repugnant concept. Publicly, that is. The fact remains that despite the sanctimonious denials something very akin to censorship—call it gray censorship or suppression of information—is fast spreading through the Government.

The latest example comes again from the Defense Department, which recently instituted a rule whereby the release of information was to be judged by whether it made a constructive contribution to the Department's mission. R. Karl Honaman, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, has devised a balance sheet for strategic information to aid field commanders in deciding what nonclassified information should be released. Mr. Honaman was lately Director of the misnamed Office of Strategic Information in the Department of Commerce, where he attempted to transfer to the press the responsibility for withholding information which the Government was unwilling to classify.

Among the criteria listed on the new balance sheet are effect on military power, effect on industrial power, and effect on morale. These are to be used in weighing the release of information which bears no military-security classification. If they are to be applied literally, it is hard to see how anything but the most innocuous information will be given out. Take, for example, a scandal in Defense procurement. Would news of this make a constructive contribution to the Defense Department? Would it not have a bad effect on morale? The safe thing would be to suppress it.

Put this together with other tendencies in the administration. Cabinet members, with several conspicuous exceptions, seem to be holding progressively fewer press conferences. Not infrequently there is an air of hostility toward the press, and sometimes there are reprisals against reporters who manage to get information anyhow. The hush-hush over the problems of nuclear fallout is an example of suppression. The much-advertised Operation Alert of last week could just as well have been Operation Asleep so far as the public was concerned. Not only did it seemingly ignore fallout, but there are no standards by which the public can judge the operation's success or failure except what the administration may choose to tell.

Robert Cutler, former executive secretary of the National Security Council, and now a consultant to the President, enunciated in a speech last month a philosophy toward information that may be described as a sort of creeping aunty-knows-bestism. That is, information, even nonclassified information, is not something that belongs to the people for judgment of public affairs; it is a commodity to be manipulated to the Government's advantage. Undoubtedly the men who hold this view are sincere and patriotic. But their philosophy, even in a period of cold war, is a dangerous one for a country in which the successful operation of government depends upon public enlightenment. For the idea that information is something that belongs to the Government to use as it sees fit comes perilously close to the concept of government for government's sake.

Reply to a Telegram of the American Farm Bureau Regarding the 50-50 Shipping Provisions of the Existing Mutual Security Act

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Farm Bureau Federation is sending telegrams to all Congressmen, reading substantially as follows:

Urge your support Burleson amendment, Mutual Security Act. Cargo preference clause now in effect forces farmers subsidize United States shipping industry and places them at competitive disadvantage farmers others countries having advantage lower rates.

The above contains the incorrect statements:

First. The 50–50 "forces farmers subsidize United States shipping industry."

Second. That 50–50 places United States farmers "at competitive disadvantage [to] farmers [in] other countries."

Third. That foreign farmers have "advantage lower [shipping] rates."

First. United States farmers of course do not subsidize United States shipping when the United States Government places a portion of cargoes generated by and paid for by the Government, in American ships. Indeed, in the case of cargo liners where there is no differential between foreign-flag and American-flag rates, not even the United States Government absorbs any difference in cost as between foreign-flag and American-flag transportation. In the case of United States tramp ships, where a differential generally does exist in favor of the low-cost foreign tramp ships, the Government, not American farmers, absorbs a differential which generally does not exceed 10 to 15 percent. In no case does the United States farmer bear any part of this differential, which prevails only in the case of tramp shipping.

Tramp ships carry only from 20 to 30 percent of agricultural cargoes as a whole.

Second. The 50–50 shipping provision cannot place United States farmers at a competitive disadvantage to foreign farmers because it is applicable only to Government, not private, shipments. Under the agriculture disposal program American farmers make no sales. The sales are all made by our Government pursuant to Government-to-Government arrangements. Although the Government uses private channels of trade, the sales in all cases are for the account of the Government, that is, American taxpayers. It is true the United States Government sells the commodities, but not below world market prices, and even then it sells the agricultural products only for foreign currencies, not dollars. Since the agricultural surplus disposal programs are solely Government, not private, transactions, the United States farmer cannot be placed at any disadvantage by reason of the 50/50 shipping provision.

Third. Foreign farmers do not have the advantage of lower shipping rates insofar as surplus agricultural products are concerned. This is because under the programs the importing country is not required to deposit foreign currency in any amount above world foreign-flag shipping rates. Thus, even the purchasing country itself is at no disadvantage because of the 50–50 shipping provision since, under the programs, it never pays more than the world foreign-flag shipping rates. Whatever differential may exist as between foreign-flag tramp rates and United States-flag tramp rates, is absorbed not by the importing country but by the American farmer, but only by the United States Government. Furthermore, the importing countries, under the shipping arrangements of the Department of Agriculture, do not pay dollars where, as is true in most cases, dollar freights are charged by foreign-flag lines—as well as American lines—on all movements outbound from the United States. Instead, the United States Government pays United States dollars to the foreign-flag lines concerned, and accepts reimbursement from the importing country in its own foreign currency. Therefore, the shipping arrangements under the surplus agriculture disposal programs are, in effect, a dollar subsidy payable to foreign-flag liners to the extent that they charge dollar freights payable to the importing country. Accordingly, there is no basis whatsoever for the statement or implication by the Farm Bureau Federation that foreign farmers have any advantage of lower shipping rates, since in all cases and under all circumstances the importing country pays no more than the prevailing worldwide foreign-flag shipping rates.

The net effect of the so-called Burleson amendments would be to make the United States Government pay a substantially increased dollar subsidy to foreign-flag lines. This is because in the absence of the 50–50 shipping provision, foreign-flag lines would carry substantially all of the exported commodities—instead of only 50 percent—would charge dollar freights for most of such commodities, and would be paid dollar freights by the United States Government for such shipments. The Burleson amendments would therefore amount to a further American subsidy of competing foreign-flag steamship lines and at the same time would effectively deprive our own American industry of the opportunity of carrying a fair and reasonable proportion of these cargoes, generated and paid for by American taxpayers.

End the Doctor Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune of June 21, under the title, "End the Doctor Draft":

The Senate has approved another 2-year extension of the doctor draft and similar action is expected to be taken shortly by the House. The measure is part of the legislation prolonging the general draft law for another 4 years.

Further extension of the practice of conscripting physicians and dentists up to the age of 51 would be excusable if the Nation were at war, or if it could be clearly shown that there is no other way to meet the medical needs of Armed Forces. Neither of these conditions exists.

The real reason for the extension of the doctor draft is disgraceful. Nearly half of the authorized positions for career medical officers are unfilled. Young doctors are repelled from a job which offers salaries below civilian levels, which requires them to waste much time in duties not connected with their profession, and which keeps most of them at work on patients who are not members of the Armed Forces.

Continuation of the doctor draft means that every 2 years there will be a huge turnover of medical officers, an obviously wasteful process. It means also that the Defense Department again is postponing solution of the basic problem of getting and keeping an adequate corps of career men.

There is no argument about the necessity for having enough physicians and dentists to care for the needs of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and the dependents of servicemen stationed in foreign countries. These needs, however, could be supplied by career officers if the career service were made slightly more attractive and by the new medical school graduates who, like all other young men, are subject to conscription under the general draft law.

The need for drafting older doctors, including some who have already had a tour of duty in the Armed Forces, arises from the policy of providing free medical service to nearly 3 million dependents of servicemen and more than a million civilian employees of the Defense Department. Most of these nonservice patients are in areas well supplied with civilian physicians. If medical service must be supplied free to dependents and other civilians, why can't the Defense Department contract directly with local hospitals and doctors, or pay the premiums for health insurance to cover the costs?

The Government is not drafting plumbers to work at subunion pay scales in the homes of military men and their dependents, nor has it seized factories to make free clothing for dependents and civilians. The doctor draft is unjust. Its extension would mark the first time in our history that any group of citizens has been singled out for conscription in peacetime because of their professional skill.

The Myth That Dies Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the myth that public power is cheap power is a myth that dies hard. In western New York, however, it is slowly but surely succumbing to a lethal dose of facts.

The nub of the controversy is the great unused power potential at Niagara Falls. Both public and private entities want to develop it. The Citizens Public Expenditures Survey of New York has made an analysis of the merits of these proposals and pinpointed the fallacies of the cheap-public-power myth. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Buffalo Courier Express of June 27, 1955, which sets forth succinctly the pertinent facts, both for the Niagara area and for New York State as a whole:

PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION ASPECT OF FALLS POWER

Some rather startling figures concerning loss of local tax revenues in New York State by reason of exemption of real property from taxation were presented by a representative of the Citizens Public Expenditure Survey at a hearing in Washington recently. The organization is composed of taxpayers of this State. James E. Finke, its research director, furnished the figures at a hearing on electric power development on the Niagara River.

Noting that a Government-owned power plant would not pay taxes, Mr. Finke pointed out this tax exemption would not reduce the total tax load; exemption merely redistributes the taxes over a narrower tax base.

"From 1930 to 1954," he said, "the valuation of taxable property in New York State increased $3,400,000,000, or 11.5 percent, from $29,500,000,000 to $32,900,000,000. Tax-exempt property during the same period increased $3,800,000,000 or 56.7 percent, from $6,700,000,000 to $10,500,000,000. Nearly one-quarter of all real property in the State is now exempt from taxation."

Since real estate is the chief source of tax revenue for local purposes—including school construction, operation, and maintenance—it is evident that exemption of so much property from real estate taxes is a matter of concern to payers of city, county, school, town, and village taxes.

"Are we now to have business enterprises kept off the local property tax rolls through Government ownership and operation?" asked Mr. Finke with reference to the Niagara power development. "Where, then, will our localities get the money for support of schools and local government services? They cannot continue indefinitely to increase tax rates on the remaining taxable property."

Revenue requirements of municipalities and school districts seem bound to increase. Mr. Finke's disclosure that nearly one-quarter of real property in the State is exempt from taxation should be somewhat alarming to those who must bear the burden of the increasing costs.

Vidovdan: A Tribute to Serbians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commemorative statement made by me on the occasion of Vidovdan, or feast day of St. Vitus, a day on which Serbians pay homage and rededicate themselves to their great national traditions and rich history:

Among Serbians, Vidovdan is a day of national dedication. It is a day on which all Serbs commemorate not a victory but a defeat for their nation. More than that, it is a day on which all the great national traditions of the Serbian people are commemorated with all the honor and respect they so richly deserve.

Centuries ago an empire of the first order emerged in the Balkans, and at the head of this Serbian Empire was Stephen Dushan. In the past disunity had plagued Serbia, and with the decline of the Byzantine Empire, the Balkan Peninsula was further exposed to the Turkish invaders. Realizing this menace to Serbia, Dushan, a name of endearment among Serbians meaning "the soul," tried to counterbalance Turkish power by replacing the declining Byzantine empire with a Serbo-Greek empire. Gradually Dushan extended his domain throughout the Balkan Peninsula until 1345 at which time he proclaimed himself "emperor of the Serbs and the Greeks." On Easter of the following year he was crowned.

Furthermore, Dushan began the codification of all Serbian laws which were finally published in 1345. Historically, Dushan's codification was a clear indication of the substantial advancement of Serbia among the nations of Europe.

However, Dushan met an untimely death in the campaign of 1355 to strengthen the unity of his empire as a defensive measure against the Turks. Subsequently Serbian princes carried on the general foreign policies laid down by the former Serbian ruler, but with limited success. At Maritza in 1371 the Serbs were badly defeated by the Turks, a somber foreboding of the great and tragic defeat that was to come at Kosovo. Serbia's political position was substantially weakened by this defeat. Moreover, the lack of unity that prevailed in the empire after Dushan was an added factor contributing to the weakness of the Serbian empire.

Serbia was, however, fortunate in having Lazar Hrebelyanovich elected as its ruler in 1374. To prevent the further disruption of the empire and to organize a Christian League against the Turks were the primary objectives of the new Serbian rulers. The Turkish Sultan could not, however, permit these Serbian policies to succeed, and thus in 1389 the Turks launched a campaign which ultimately led not only to the subjugation of the Bulgarians but the defeat of the Serbs as well.

It was on the plains of Kosovo on Vidovdan, the feast day of St. Vitus, on June 28, 1389, when the armies of the Turkish Sultan Murad I and the Serbian Lazar met in mortal conflict. Serbs, Bulgars, Albanians, Croats, and even Roumanians fought with the armies of Lazar, while the Sultan in addition to his Turkish forces even had Christian vassals under his command.

The Serbian defeat at Kosovo was an important event in Serbian history. Indeed, it was a decisive battle in European history because the defeat of the Serbs prepared the way for the Turkish conquests of the Balkan Peninsula, a conquest that was to last until the 19th century. The Serbian forces fought with great courage and resourcefulness to stop the onrushing Turks, but victory was not to be theirs. Both commanders of the contending forces were killed; the Turks won the battle, and with that victory the hope of continued Serbian independence and empire vanished. For the Serbian people Vidovdan—June 28, 1389—was a day of national mourning and sorrow.

The consequences of the Serbian defeat at Kosovo were far-reaching. Nearly all the Serbian princes and noblemen, including the heroic Lazar, who had fought in that battle, were killed in combat or afterwards beheaded. Thus, the flower of Serbian aristocracy, the nation's leadership, was destroyed beneath the sword of the Turkish warrior. Vidovdan meant also that the Turkish Crescent fell across Serbia. Disunity and anarchy increased, and in 1459 the Serbs fell under complete Turkish domination. Subsequently, the Serbian language and all political, cultural, religious, and national traditions of the Serbian people were compelled to succumb to the despot who brought to Serbia tyranny, oppression, sorrow, and a decadent civilization which were destined to remain for the next 345 years.

Among the Serbs, Vidovdan calls to mind a day of great national humiliation; but, it also calls to mind a day when Serbian courage and heroism reached a peak seldom achieved by any nation. Vidovdan is to the Serbs a time of national dedication. It has long been the custom of Serbians to go on an annual pilgrimage to the tomb of Lazar, the fallen hero of Kosovo, resting in the monastery at New Ravanitza. That Lazar was more than a military and national hero to the Serbs is indicated by his canonization by the Serbian Orthodox Church. In poetry, literature, and in music this great battle of Kosovo became for Serbians a theme of great national importance. Even Goethe, the great German poet, compared many of the Serbian epic poems depicting the tragedy of Kosovo with the Iliad and the Odyssey.

Thus, among the Serbian people Vidovdan is a day of national dedication—dedication to the joy and sorrow of a great historic event. Vidovdan has taken on a broader meaning, however, than originally conceived. To Serbs the world over Vidovdan is a day of prayer and commemoration of all the glorious traditions of the Serbian past. In a sense Vidovdan, a religious feast day and a national holiday, represents the spiritual and historic fusion of all the ideals and traditions of the Serbian people.

On this occasion, therefore, commemorating Vidovdan all America takes cognizance of the great national traditions of Serbia, and to Serbians everywhere may this Vidovdan serve as a source of renewed inspiration for the future.

Moses Cleveland Grabs a Whale by the Tail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 the German freighter *Nady* came into the Cleveland Stevedore Co. docks with the first boatload of crude sperm oil ever imported into Port Cleveland.

On hand for this historic occasion were representatives of the city of Cleveland, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, the Cleveland Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Cleveland Port Authority, and the Werner G. Smith, Inc., of Cleveland, who were responsible for bringing the cargo, and, of course, scores of onlookers anxious to see this epic event which brought ocean shipping to this Lake Erie metropolis.

The sperm oil was produced in the Antarctic on board giant floating factory whaling ships and rendered from hundreds of whales caught this spring. The shipment then moved from the Antarctic through the St. Lawrence seaway directly to Port Cleveland as an experiment to learn the advantages of through-shipload delivery to Great Lakes ports.

The experiment worked, Mr. Speaker, and this historic boatload will be the forerunner of other boatloads of sperm oil unloading this summer in Cleveland.

Through-ocean shipping has proved its value, and this industrial event in Cleveland heralds a new era of progress and prosperity in the Great Lakes area, for with the advent of St. Lawrence seaway, ocean-lake shipping will open even greater worldwide channels for peaceful commerce.

Werner G. Smith, Inc., is to be lauded as a pioneer in Great Lakes progress. Their courage and foresight is in the true American tradition.

Regulating the Price of Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent letter sent to the editor of the Washington Post by my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MACDONALD. This letter clearly sets forth why the Harris compromise proposal to amend the Natural Gas Act does not given adequate protection to gas consumers. I am happy to endorse the position set forth in this letter and to commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

The letter follows:

REGULATING THE PRICE OF GAS

I feel that your editorial endorsement of June 14 of the Harris compromise proposal to amend the Natural Gas Act, which cleared the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by a 16 to 15 vote, requires further analysis. You infer that the compromise bill affords a substantial measure of consumer protection, but this demonstrably is not so. The powers attributed in the editorial to the Federal Power Commission to "set maximum prices in the various fields" and to "invalidate rate increases under escalator clauses" do not exist under the compromise in such form as to provide any effective consumer protection.

The issue before the Congress is whether the producers of natural gas should be subject to Federal regulation with respect to their sales in interstate commerce. The Supreme Court a year ago, in the now famous Phillips case, expressly held that the inter-

state sales by producers are subject to regulation under the Natural Gas Act. Thus comprehensive regulation of the natural gas industry presently exists. The Federal Government has the power through the Federal Power Commission to regulate the interstate aspects of the industry and the States have the power to regulate local distribution at retail.

The objective of the Harris bill is to exempt producers from Federal regulation, and, in effect, overturn the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case. Having encountered strong opposition to the bill as originally drafted, the proponents of exemption have in the compromise proposal altered the form, but not the substance, of the objective. The definitions of "transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce" and "sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale" clearly reverse the Phillips decision.

The real vice in the compromise proposal is that it affords no greater measure of consumer protection against the continuing sharp increases in the field price of gas than did the original Harris bill. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the bill does not give the Federal Power Commission power to "set maximum prices in the various fields." The bill does not expressly or inferentially provide power for such a purpose.

One alleged consumer protection of the compromise is based on the theory that the Federal Power Commission can lawfully deny pipeline companies the recovery through rates of any payments made to producers under new or renegotiated contracts which exceed the "reasonable market price" of the gas. Aside from the dubious constitutionality of such form of indirect regulation, the "reasonable market price" standard in and of itself would make any regulatory effort an exercise in futility. This high-sounding phrase is entirely misleading because it gives the impression that there is a balanced market which, in the absence of regulation, will provide stability in prices.

Market prices depend upon the supply-demand relationship. Natural gas has been in short supply for several years and no evidence is at hand that this situation will improve in the future. The resource is exhaustible and the only feasible means of transportation is by pipeline. Producers are, naturally, taking advantage of the seller's market they presently enjoy and are charging whatever the traffic will bear.

Thus, if the Commission is compelled to use the market price standard, no relief from higher gas rates can be expected. Moreover, the pipeline companies owning natural-gas reserves would receive tremendous increases in their profits above a fair return, as the Commission would be compelled to use the same standard in regulating pipeline company rates. In this respect, the compromise is simply the Moore-Rizley bill of the 80th Congress in a new dress.

The reasonable market price standard is misleading for still another reason. The words of limitation on this standard set forth in the compromise proposal are designed to make certain that the reasonable market prices will continually advance to higher levels. The bill expressly provides that the determinants of reasonable market price are (1) "whether such price has been competitively arrived at," (2) "the effect of the contract upon the assurance of supply," and (3) "the reasonableness of the provisions of the contract as they relate to existing or future prices."

As thus restricted, reasonable market price does not afford any restraint on the upward trend of field gas prices, but actually gives legislative sanction to the acceleration of the rate of increase which currently characterizes the industry.

Your editorial endorsement also was based on the conclusion that the compromise bill empowers the Federal Power Commission to invalidate rate increases under escalator clauses. However, it is quite clear from a mere reading of section 3 (d) of the compromise bill that no effective control is provided for escalator and favored nation clauses, since the prices brought about by the operation of such clauses only need meet the reasonable market price standard set forth above.

Another legal boobytrap is concealed in section 3 (e) of the bill which purportedly relieves a pipeline company of its obligation to pay a producer the contract price if the Federal Power Commission finds such price to exceed the reasonable market price. However, the very sales transaction referred to is defined in section 2 of the bill as not being in interstate commerce. Thus Congress would be subjecting to regulation under the commerce clause a transaction which it has defined as not being in interstate commerce.

The editorial recognizes the importance of the actual cost of production as an element in determining reasonable price, but fails to recognize, in my opinion, that under the reasonable market price standard as defined in the bill neither the producer's cost of production nor his profits can be taken into account. Thereby, the regulatory standard set up in the bill is contrary to the whole philosophy of utility regulation as developed in this country which is opposed to the use of market price as a regulatory standard.

I am confident that the 15 members of the committee who voted against the compromise are not in favor of regulation of natural gas producers unless it is absolutely necessary in the public interest. I know I am of that mind. We feel some regulation of producers' prices is in the public interest. We feel, I am sure, that the Harris compromise does not afford adequate protection to gas consumers.

The questions which Mr. HARRIS asks concerning the large spread between the price of gas in the field and the rate at the consumer's meter have already been answered in the testimony of witnesses before both the House and Senate committees. The makeup of the cost of transmission and distribution of natural gas are contained in the published reports of these utilities and in sworn reports to regulatory commissions. I would not hesitate to predict that the investigation, if ever made, will not disclose the existence of exorbitant profits derived from the transmission and distribution of natural gas at the present time.

The increasing cost of gas in the field and at the city gate in thet last few years has squeezed out most of such profits. Undoubtedly a few companies have earned excessive returns in recent years, but many more will be found that are distributing natural gas at rates which yield the utility less than what is normally considered a fair return.

I trust that after the majority and minority reports of the House committee are available the Washington Post and Times Herald will reappraise the Harris compromise bill and will reconsider its present endorsement of that measure.

TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Member of Congress from Massachusetts.

Progress of Soviet Union in Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on June 27, yesterday, I directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense relating to the progress the Soviet Union is making in the field of airpower. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 27, 1955.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have been sorely troubled by the massive and growing evidence of the extraordinarily rapid progress the Soviet Union is making in the field of airpower.

Six years ago, American air-atomic might was incontestable. In addition to our atomic monopoly, we possessed the B–36, the world's only true intercontinental bomber and we had already flown the B–47, the world's first strategic jet bomber. Yet the Soviets broke our atomic monopoly in 1949—years before the expected date. Their first hydrogen explosion occurred in the summer of 1953—only 9 months after our own first full-scale hydrogen test.

Coupled with this, the Soviet Union has made ominous—and unexpected—strides in the development of delivery vehicles. It is no exaggeration to say that their May Day demonstration of 1954—when they first exhibited jet bombers comparable to our own medium-range B–47 and long-range B–52—caught our defense planners by surprise. Our responsible officials were likewise caught by surprise by the Moscow fly-overs of 2 months ago, when the Soviets flew both their medium- and long-range jet bombers in operational numbers, and when they also flew large numbers of a new day fighter and a new all-weather interceptor.

In the wake of these recent fly-overs, our only comfort today lies in the fact that—in certain types of planes, such as our B–47—we still appear to be ahead of the Soviets. In 1949, in short, our airpower lead was incontestable. Today, 6 years later, we find ourselves trying to keep up with Soviet progress in delivery vehicles—rather than being decisively ahead.

What concerns me even more than the existing precarious balance of airpower is my fear that if present trends continue, the Soviets will be demonstrably ahead of us in airpower—both quantitatively and qualitatively—5 years from now. We must assume that what is past is prologue. The Soviets have been narrowing the technological gap between our two nations with awesome speed. In all honesty, the ineluctable logic of present trends impels me to fear that the Soviets will be our unquestionable superiors in airpower a few short years hence, unless we do something about it now.

I am thinking not only of Russian progress in the development of manned aircraft, but—still more important—their effort in the field of ballistic missiles of intercontinental or continental range. I believe it is a simple statement of fact to say that Soviet victory in this race for discovery could turn the balance of world military power upside down.

On this score, one point particularly troubles me. If the Soviets build a ballistic missile of merely continental range—that is, 1,500 to 2,000 miles—at an early date, all of free Europe might feel itself at the mercy of Moscow, since such a weapon could blanket all the capitals, industries, and military installations of Western Europe. If this occurs, it could well cause the breakup of the free world's alliance system.

Our entire defensive effort has been predicated upon offsetting Communist superiority in conventional forces with American superiority in airpower and anvanced weapons

systems. As you know, in fact, the administration has gone on record as favoring a cutback in American ground forces—which I have opposed. We have always conceded to the Communists superiority in manpower and conventional forces, and we have sought to cancel out such superiority with our trump card of technological supremacy—particularly in the air-atomic field. What troubles me now is that the Soviets may be setting the stage to take this trump card out of our hands. Should this happen, military disaster could well result.

Accordingly, I would greatly appreciate receiving from you, in written form, your personal answers to the following questions. Permit me to express the hope that your reply will be as explicit and categorical as possible, since the very survival of our Nation may hinge upon remaining decisively and unquestionably ahead of the Soviets in this field.

1. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets may now be quantitatively equal to us in the production of long-range jet bombers?

2. Is it accurate to say that, even with the proposed 35 percent accelertation in B–52's, the Soviets may have more long-range jet bombers in their air force by 1958 than we will?

3. Is it accurate to say that the new day fighter and all-weather interceptors recently unveiled over Moscow in operational numbers are better planes, performance-wise, than any comparable aircraft we now have in squadron service?

4. Is it accurate to say that, in terms of numbers of advanced fighters in operational service, the Soviets are now overwhelmingly ahead of us?

5. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets have produced and flown jet engines with greater thrust than we ourselves have?

6. Is it accurate to say that our defense planners underestimated the date on which the first Soviet long-range jet bomber was flown?

7. Is it accurate to say that our defense planners underestimated, by a very considerable margin, the date on which the Soviets would fly operational numbers of their long-range jet bombers?

8. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets have been able to tool up for mass production of aircraft more quickly than we have—in other words, that their lead time from the design of prototype aircraft to mass production models is shorter than ours?

9. Is it accurate to say that, by 1960, the Soviets will probably have more scientists and engineers working in the airpower field than we ourselves will have?

10. Is it accurate to say that, if present trends continue, the Soviets may be ahead of us in airpower—both quantitatively and qualitatively—by 1960?

11. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets may achieve a continental ballistic missile—one with a 1,500 to 2,000 mile range—before we will? If so, what degree of likelihood do you attach to this possibility?

12. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets may achieve an intercontinental ballistic missile before we do? If so, what degree of likelihood do you attach to this possibility?

Since I am sure that the members of the Military Applications Subcommittee will wish to study your answers to these questions before the adjournment of the Congress, I would greatly appreciate receiving a reply by the earliest possible date.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee.

Defeat Upper Colorado Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from the Minneapolis Star of Wednesday, June 22, 1955, by Mr. George M. Laing, president of the Minneapolis, Minn., division of the Izaak Walton League, entitled "Defeat Upper Colorado Bill."

Mr. Laing's article follows:

DEFEAT UPPER COLORADO BILL

To the EDITOR:

Joseph Penfold, western representative of the Izaak Walton League and acknowledged leader in the battle for a sensible upper Colorado River bill, excluding Echo Park Dam, has just issued the following statement which I know your readers will find of interest:

"Because the Senate has passed a bill including Echo Park Dam, and any bill on the upper Colorado project passed by the House will differ from the Senate bill, both would be referred to a conference committee of Senate and House Members. The conference committee undoubtedly would be loaded with members committed to Echo Park Dam. This fact would make it almost certain that the conference committee would place Echo Park Dam back in the bill, if the House eliminates it in its bill. A conference bill is almost certain to pass both House and Senate without difficulty.

"This means, then, that a bill passed by the House which excludes Echo Park Dam is no guaranty whatsoever that Echo Park Dam has been defeated. It might well be the strategy of Echo Park proponents to eliminate Echo Park from the House bill, so as to assure passage of some upper Colorado project bill, knowing that the conference committee is almost certain to add Echo Park Dam to the conference committee bill.

"This brings us to the inescapable conclusion that the only sure way now to defeat Echo Park Dam is to defeat the whole upper Colorado River project in the House.

"The league has never, in the long 6-year battle over Echo Park, opposed sound development of the upper Colorado River. To the contrary, it has specifically urged authorization of Glen Canyon Dam which is the keystone to that development. We have not changed our position. Had the project proponents been willing to defer Echo Park Dam even temporarily, it seems certain that a sound initial phase of the project would have been authorized and construction been 2 or 3 years along at this point. If the project is defeated in the House now, it is certain that next session there will be substantial agreement among all concerned on a project which we can all support."

The Star is to be greatly commended for its series of articles on the upper Colorado. The league has reprinted them and has issued several thousand copies. Taxpayers and conservationists alike should urge defeat of the entire bill in this session and ask that plans be made to authorize Glen Canyon Dam only. This is the only course left if we are to eliminate unsound and extravagant dams from the upper Colorado project and still provide for a legitimate need.

GEORGE M. LAING,
President, Minneapolis, Minn., Division, IWLA.

Former Shamrock Man Leaves Congress for Judicial Robes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splended account of the life and accomplishments of a former Member of this House. He is presently serving with distinction as a judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. His great service as a Member of this legislative body is evidenced by the many splendid programs that he advocated and supported during his tenure of service as Representative from the 18th Congressional District of Texas. His many friends in the Congress who had the pleasure of serving with him will no doubt feel deeply indebted to the able staff writer of the Amarillo, Tex., Globe-Times, to wit, Miss Louise Evans, concerning the splendid story she has written about Judge Eugene Worley:

FORMER SHAMROCK MAN LEAVES CONGRESS FOR JUDICIAL ROBES

(By Louise Evans, Amarillo Globe-Times staff writer)

The second man to represent the 18th district in Congress also is still in Washington. He is Judge Eugene (Gene) Worley, one-time Shamrock boy who was elected to the 77th Congress when Judge Marvin Jones left to set on the United States Court of Claims.

Worley served in Congress from 1941 through the winter of 1950, when he, too, resigned to take a judicial position—on the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

His oath of office was administered by Judge Jones.

There can be no greater contrast that that between the busy congressional offices and the somewhat austere quarters in which the judge works in the Internal Revenue Building, which houses the court on the seventh floor. The courtroom and the judges' chambers are closed off by vast double doors midway through the building, so that it is virtually a building within a building.

And the work of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals sounds mighty dull. It is an appellate court that studies the cases sent up from the United States Court of Customs in New York and the United States Patent Office. But Judge Worley loves it: "I'm getting back into the interpretation of the law instead of the legislative action of making law," he notes.

How a man could love the kind of work that brings forth the following paragraph, taken from one of Judge Worley's opinions, is mysterious:

"A gas-turbine engine comprising a compressor having a rotor and a stator casing enclosing the rotor, a turbine having a rotor coaxial with and axially spaced from the compressor rotor and a stator casing enclosing the rotor, a driving shaft connecting the compressor rotor to the turbine rotor, a plurality of combustion chambers disposed in a ring around the said shaft to extend from the compressor toward the turbine, an exhaust unit supported from the turbine casing on the side thereof remote

from the compressor, an intermediate casing surrounding the shaft within the ring of combustion chambers * * *"

It doesn't really matter where you pause in the paragraph, which concerns itself with a patent on a jet engine. In fact, it doesn't matter where you pause in the sentence, which continues for some 20 lines more. Only the patentee could be interested.

Judge Worley is at present working on the first of the atomic device suits to reach the court. A European refugee claims that his device deserves a patent. In this particular case, even the words are unintelligible to anyone with less than a doctor's degree in nuclear physics.

Yet Judge Worley says it widens one's vocabulary to study the cases, and stretches one's mind considerably to arrive at a decision that will be fair to present patent holders and yet not impede the progress on which American technology has been built.

Judge Worley missed being born in Texas by a few miles. The family moved from Lone Wolf, Okla., where he was born in 1908, to Shamrock while he was still a boy.

Like all youths who grew up in the depression years, he worked his way through school. He attended Texas A. and M. College, but while there decided against a career in agriculture. He even toyed with journalism for a time, and worked at the Shamrock Texan. But when he decided that the law was his love, he went on to the University of Texas Law School and served for 3 terms in the Texas Legislature, starting before his degree was completed.

While there he met and married Miss Ann Spivy, of Bonham (of SAM RAYBURN'S Fourth District home town), and they have 3 children, Gene, 13 (who was born while Judge Worley was serving with the U. S. Navy at Pearl Harbor), Morgan, 8, and Sam Rayburn, 6.

They have bought a home with as pretty a back yard as you will find in Washington at 4745 32d North, Arlington—and it is in this quiet yard that Judge Worley does a great deal of the hard digging for facts that his work requires. He finds that very early in the morning before the city is astir, with a pot of coffee beside his books on a table under a big tree, is a time when he can accomplish much.

Judge Worley kept a campaign promise when he entered the Navy shortly after the United States entered World War II. He had told the 18th District that if he voted for war, he would enlist immediately. On Dec. 8, 1941, the day after Pearl Harbor, he tried. The Army didn't want anyone past 27 years of age. He and another young congressman friend had a hard time before they talked the Navy into taking them.

The judge served on the carrier *Saratoga*, in some of the bitter battles of the Pacific—and he bade the great ship a sad farewell in 1947 when he was with the congressional delegation attending the celebration of the Philippines Independence Day. The plane flew over Bikini, and there anchored in the lagoon as a "guinea pig" for the atomic underwater test was the old *Saratoga*.

He saw the Bikini explosion from about 12 miles away. Like all those who viewed the awesome demonstration, he has no words with which to describe the upthrusting mushroom.

Judge Worley did not run for office in 1942—in fact, he was in New Guinea when he received the cable that he had been reelected by an overwhelming majority. Shortly thereafter President Roosevelt called the Congressman back from the armed services.

Judge Worley still has the affable charm which made him one of the most-liked Members of the Congress. By far the youngest man on the court, he takes off his coat, loosens his tie and wades into the work piled on his desk with the same zest he had in Congress. But in the judicial robes, it becomes apparent that he made a final trade from the law-making to the law-interpreting branch of the Government.

There is another well known Texas in the judicial division of the United States Government.

He is Judge Luther A. Johnson of the Tax Court of the United States, which deals exclusively in matters of taxes and redetermination of amounts of excessive profits realized by war contracts.

Judge Johnson is a long-time Democratic leader in Texas. Born in 1875 and educated in Tennessee, he went to Corsicana in 1896. In 1916 he was delegate to the National Democratic Convention in St. Louis, and was chairman of the State Convention in Fort Worth, in 1920.

He was elected to Congress from the 6th district in 1922 and served until his appointment to the tax court in 1946.

Resolution of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Concerning Mutual Security Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES CONCERNING MUTUAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS, S. 2090

Whereas Public Law 664 (83d Cong., 2d sess.), the Cargo Preference Act was enacted after full hearings and most careful consideration by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and

Whereas the Cargo Preference Act amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to adopt as permanent legislation the principle that at least 50 percent of all Government-generated cargoes, including agricultural surpluses which are financed directly or indirectly by the public funds of the United States Government, shall move on United States-flag vessels to the extent that they are available at fair and reasonable rates; and

Whereas in February 1955 the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held extensive hearings on the administration of the Cargo Preference Act, finding among other things that there is no basis in fact for charges that shipments to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities are being, or can be, delayed by reason of the provisions of the act; and

Whereas the Mutual Security Act of 1955, S. 2090, has been reported to the House with amendments which would eliminate the 50–50 shipping requirement from the transport of agricultural commodities not only under the Mutual Security Act, but also under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, thus in effect repealing in large part the Cargo Preference Act; and

Whereas members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee were not invited nor given opportunity to testify on the amendments in question and in fact the indications are that no testimony was taken on this subject from persons understanding merchant marine matters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that the following provisions of S. 2090 should be stricken from the bill when it is considered in the House:

On page 17, lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "insert '(except surplus agricultural commodities)' after 'commodities', and."

On page 19, strike out lines 7 through 16, inclusive.

Public Favors Easing McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I was quite heartened to read in a recent news report that a Gallup poll survey substantiates the position that the public favors liberalization of the McCarran-Walter Act. The results of the survey showed that 53 percent of approximately 14 million persons in the total population who are familiar with the act feel that changes should be made and of that 53 percent, 68 percent feel that the act should be liberalized.

Among the many citizens who oppose the provisions of this act and have made their viewpoint known to my office is the prominent minister, Dr. Henry Hitt Crane of the Central Methodist Church of Detroit, Michigan, which is located in my district. As requested by Dr. Crane and because I believe in the intrinsic value of its contents and have already expressed those convictions in the introduction of House bill 4797 to amend the present immigration and nationality law, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD an open letter which he forwarded to me:

OPEN LETTER TO THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. HARLEY KILGORE,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, D. C.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, Washington, D. C.

We are sure that you are aware of the aroused public sentiment which exists in the country today in opposition to the provisions of the Walter-McCarran Law. Ever since its enactment in 1952, over President Truman's veto, there has been widespread opinion that this law is racist, discriminatory and inhuman and that it must be repealed or drastically amended if we are to maintain basic democratic principles.

In his State of the Union message this year, President Eisenhower declared that "certain provisions of the law * * * should be corrected in this session of Congress."

Since the convening of the 84th Congress a number of bills have been introduced proposing numerous changes in the Walter-McCarran law.

We believe that the American people should have an opportunity to express themselves on these bills through public hearings.

We urge, therefore, that public hearings be held immediately on all bills pending before the 84th Congress in relation to the

immigration and naturalization laws of the United States.

Rabbi Morris Adler, Detroit; Walter Allmendinger, Royal Oak; Rev. Paul Johnson Allured, Lansing; Rev. Walter H. Amos, Detroit; Prof. Robert C. Angell, Ann Arbor; Irving Antell, Flint; Laura Ault, Detroit; Prof. Kenneth E. Boulding, Ann Arbor; Dr. Margaret Hague Bradley, South Haven; Prof. Russel H. Broadhead, Detroit; Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, Detroit; Harold A. Cranefield, Detroit; George W. Crockett, Jr., Detroit; Max Dean, Flint; Arthur Dunham, Ann Arbor; Esther S. Dunham, Ann Arbor; Morton A. Eden, Detroit; G. Leslie Field, Detroit; Rabbi Leon Fram, Detroit; Hon. William Friedman, Detroit; Lila E. Fyan, Detroit; Dr. Nicola Gigante, Detroit; Rev. John W. Gilbert, Detroit; Rev. Charles A. Hill, Detroit; Mrs. Moritz Kahn, Detroit; Leonard Kasle, Detroit; Rev. Albert W. Kauffman, Lakeview; W. K. Kelsey, Detroit; Rev. Werner Kuntz, Detroit; Virgil Lacey, Dearborn; Morton Leitson, Flint; Rev. Henry Lewis, Ann Arbor; Kathleen Lowrie, Birmingham; William Lowrie, Birmingham; John E. Marvin, Adrian; Ernest Mazey, Detroit; Mrs. Dorothy S. McAllister, Grand Rapids; Wallace D. McLay, Detroit; Mrs. C. L. Meader, Ann Arbor; Lloyd F. Merrel, Morrice; Rev. F. Ricksford Meyers, Detroit; James Montante, Detroit; Joe Morgan, Dearborn; Arthur W. Munk, Albion; Ben Nathanson, Detroit; Walter M. Nelson, Detroit; Guy T. Nunn, Detroit; Prof. Theodore M. Newcomb, Ann Arbor; Rev. J. Douglas Parker, Detroit; A. C. Perlman, Detroit; Dr. Verne C. Piazza, Detroit; Dr. B. G. Pinx, Detroit; Rev. Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit; Nathan Rosenshine, Detroit; Mrs. Emil D. Rothman, Detroit; Prof. Philip L. Schenk, Ann Arbor; Prof. John F. Shepard, Ann Arbor; Prof. Jay J. Sherman, Detroit; Mathew Smith, Detroit; Rev. E. H. Soderberg, Hamtramck; Patricia Soderberg, Hamtramck; F. K. Sparrow, Ann Arbor; I. R. Starr, Detroit; Dr. M. J. Steinhardt, Detroit; Rev. Carlyle F. Stewart, Detroit; Rev. Paul B. Studebaker, Detroit; Maurice Sugar, Detroit; Rev. I. Paul Taylor, Detroit; Rev. Harley V. Townsend, Battle Creek; Rev. Edgar M. Wahlberg, Dearborn; Prof. Leroy Waterman, Ann Arbor; Alice M. Woodruff, Northville.

Delaware Valley Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Valley Firms' Expansion To Cost $4 Billion." The article contains a compilation of new business concerns in the Delaware Valley, as assembled by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia. The article was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALLEY FIRM'S EXPANSION TO COST $4 BILLION—EIGHTY-TWO BUSINESSES PLAN USE OF FUNDS IN 15-YEAR PERIOD

By 1960, a 15-year wave of industrial expansion that began in Delaware Valley, United States of America, at the war's end will have produced an expenditure of nearly $4 billion for new plants and equipment alone by 82 of the biggest companies and 3 large Federal installations in the area.

That is the finding of a survey just completed by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, first survey of its kind to cover the entire 11-county district.

Counting in an estimate of outlays by smaller companies and commercial establishments and by governmental units for public improvements—none of which was computed in the 1945–60 roundup of the major developers—the total expenditures for building up the productive potential of the metropolitan sector probably would run to well over $6 billion, said Walter P. Miller, Jr., chamber president.

NEW SURGE EXPERIENCED

The survey, he pointed out, covered only industrial expenditures for new plants and equipment of $5 million or more.

This sweeping summary of the area's accomplishments and future plans, Miller said, "is graphic illustration of the dynamic advancements being made in the world's fastest growing industrial region.

"Our region is experiencing a new surge in population, industry, and commerce," said the chamber president. "The reasons are basically the same as those which originally made the Quaker City great; an ideal location, a vigorous climate, and people with know-how and the will to develop 'acres of diamonds.'

"Let us never stop preaching and teaching that industrial development provides the very lifeblood of our great and growing metropolis. New industry means greater employment opportunities. Fuller employment is the key to prosperity."

TWO-THIRDS IN EXPANSION

Of the $3,923,300,000 outlay covered by the survey, $2,810,900,000, or nearly two-thirds, already has gone into expansion; projects costing $196 million are construction; and $916 million is earmarked for others to be completed by 1960. This last figure, Miller said, represents a conservative forecast of actual expansion during the next 5 years, since many companies set up their programs only 1 or 2 years ahead of actual work.

Philadelphia, largest in population of the 11 counties, leads the list in expenditures with $1,116,500,000, followed by Bucks County, with $595,600,000, largely accounted for by the big Fairless Works of United States Steel Corp.

FIRMS LISTED

Firms and governmental units spending $5 million or more for new plants and equipment in the 15-year period include:

Philadelphia Electric Co., $765 million.
United States Steel Corp., $400 million.
Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania, $340 million
Atlantic Refining Co., $172 million.
Delaware Power & Light Co. (northern division), $103 million.
Gulf Oil Co., $100 million plus.
National Tube Co., division of United States Steel, $100 million.
Tide Water Associated Oil Co., $100 million.
United States Naval Air Development and Materials Center, $96 million.
Sun Oil Co., $88 million.
Philadelphia Gas Works Division of U. G. I., $76 million.
Budd Co., $65 million.
Philadelphia Naval Base, $63 million.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., $60 million plus.
The Texas Co., Eagle Point Works, $60 million plus.
Rohm & Haas Co., $60 million.
Alan Wood Steel Co., $60 million.
Pennsylvania Railroad, $59 million.
Radio Corporation of America, $51 million.
Chysler Corp., Delaware Tank Plant, $50 million.
Frankford Arsenal, $48 million.
Public Service Electric & Gas Co. (N. J.), $47 million.
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., $45 million.
Publicker Industries, Inc., $44 million.
John A. Roebling's Sons Corp., $36 million.
Diamond State Telephone Co., $34 million.
Curtis Publishing Co., $33,800,000.
Triangle Publications, Inc., $33,300,000.
Westinghouse Electric Corp., $33 million.
Lukens Steel Co., $31 million.
Atlantic City Electric Co., $30 million.
Philco Corp., $27,500,000.
General Electric Co., $26 million.
Sinclair Refining Co., $26 million.
Heintz Manufacturing Co., $25,600,000.
Scott Paper Co., $25 million.
Sharp & Dohme division of Merck & Co., $21 million.
National Biscuit Co., $20 million.
Reading Co., $20 million.
The B. F. Goodrich Co., $19 million.
Atlas Powder Co., $18 million.
Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co., $18 million.
Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, $17 million.
Bulletin Co., $15 million-plus.
Standard Pressed Steel Co., $15 million.
C. Schmidt & Sons, Inc., $15 million.
Hercules Powder Co., $15 million.
Piasecki Helicopter Corp., $15 million.
I–T–E Circuit Breaker Co., $15 million.
Barrett division, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., $14 million.
Phoenix Iron & Steel Co., $12 million.
Midvale Co., $12 million.
Doehler-Jarvis division of National Lead Co., $12 million.
Crown Can Co., division of Crown Cork & Seal Co., $12 million.
Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., $11,100,000.
Air Reduction Sales Co., $10 million.
Philadelphia Transportation Co., $10 million.
Cuneo Eastern Press, Inc., $9,800,000.
Electric Storage Battery Co., $9 million.
Leeds & Northrup Co., $9 million.
SKF Industries, Inc., $9 million.
Lee Rubber & Tire Corp., $9 million.
Wyeth Laboratories, $9 million.
Container Corporation of America, $8,600,000.
General Steel Castings Corp., $8,500,000.
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., $8,500,000.
Henry Disston & Sons, Inc., $8 million.
Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., $7,300,000.
Hoeganaes Sponge Iron Corp., $7 million-plus.
E. J. Lavino & Co., $7 million.
Warner Co., $7 million.
James Lees & Sons Co., $6,500,000.
Pennsylvania Salt Manufacturing Co., $6,200,000.
R. M. Hollingshead Corp., $6 million.
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., $6 million.
Burroughs Corp., $5,500,000.
J. S. Thorn Co., $5,300,000.
General Motors Corp., $5 million-plus.
Kaiser Metal Products, Inc., $5 million-plus.
Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., $5 million-plus.
American Stores Co., $5 million-plus.
General Refractories Co., $5 million.
W. C. Hamilton & Sons, $5 million.
Chase Aircraft Co., $5 million.
Name of company withheld, $6,800,000.
Total, $3,923,300,000-plus.

Monsignor of the Shoeshine Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Eve of 1944 an Irish priest walked through the war-damaged streets of Naples and saw the thousands of homeless youngsters who were sleeping out on that bitterly cold night.

When he returned to Rome, Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing asked Pope Pius XII to relieve him of some of his duties in the Vatican service so that he could dedicate his life to the cause of these homeless youngsters.

He rapidly became known as the Monsignor of the Shoeshine Boys because of the centers that he set up to give a home and a chance in life to these poor vagrants whom many people already called "juvenile delinquents." Monsignor Carroll had faith in these boys.

Today, Monsignor Carroll is in the United States trying to spread the wonderful story of his Boys' Towns of Italy. Ten years ago he had 1 bombed-out villa, $20, and 2 sacks of flour. Today he has built 8 beautiful Boys' Towns equipped with their own farms, their schools, their factories, and trade centers. He has also founded a home for emotionally disturbed boys and, only a few weeks ago, opened his first Girls' Town. In addition to these imposing institutions, he has erected 27 day-care centers in the poverty-stricken areas of southern Italy, where communism has been taking advantage of the great misery in order to win over the people. The Boys' Towns of Italy have been called bulwarks of American democracy overseas, not only because they were made possible because of the contributions of men and women in the United States, but also because they have trained thousands of young boys in social living and in democracy in action. Thousands of young men, who have now left the Boys' Towns, look to America as the country that gave them a chance in life. Monsignor Carroll, who told the wonderful story of Italy's lost children of the war in his book, A Chance in Life, has now written a second book, a novel, Journey to Somewhere.

It is easy to imagine what the story is: It tells of one of the thousands of Italy's war orphans who experienced every hardship, but eventully began his Journey to Somewhere when he was given a chance.

Americans of every national origin and of every creed are proud of the Boys' Towns in Italy. They are the outstanding examples of what a voluntary foreign-aid program should be. They are direct manifestations of good will from the people of the United States to the people—and particularly the children—of Italy; the effort is nationwide in America, the results are nationwide in Italy; the contributors have seen the immediate and easily identifiable results of their own personal gift or the gift of their community. In New Jersey we are all very happy to be sharing in this great work.

In a world where so much of the news makes men pessimistic regarding the future of the human race, the message of the Italian Boys' Towns is like a ray of light and of hope shining in the darkness and indicating the way to a better world, one which is built on brotherhood and kindness.

On Saturday, May 14 of this year, I was privileged to attend the Union County, N. J., committee's benefit dinner and dance for the Boys' Towns of Italy. It was truly an inspiring occasion and I want to commend the president of the committee, Mr. Arthur Venneri, and all the committee members for their outstanding contribution to this most worthwhile cause.

In recognition of their great compaign, I ask that Mr. Venneri's greeting to the friends of Boys' Towns of Italy be included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

We are tonight again assembled in unity to express our enthusiasm and continuing confidence in the youth of Italy. We are earnestly carrying the torch handed to us by our inspirational leader, Monsignor John Patrick Carroll-Abbing.

Because of your traditional and sympathetic understanding, Boys' Towns in Italy today abound in good, wholesome living for hundreds of otherwise homeless boys.

This year, Monsignor Carroll has inaugurated the first Girls' Town of Italy—certainly a necessary and worthy development to our project.

The child centers and nurseries multiply in ever-increasing numbers—fulfilling a need among those in need.

This great humanitarian work continues largely because of your wholehearted support and loyalty evidenced in many cases by your willingness to defer a luxury to give a child a necessity.

May I thank you personally, and in behalf of the little ones we are privileged to help, and may God continue to bless you for your fine efforts.

Fostering an Interest in Sports To Combat Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, much concern is directed toward the growing problem of juvenile deliquency in the United States. This is a very real problem in the city of New York.

I am proud to represent a part of the Borough of Queens, New York City, in this House. I am also proud of the work that is being done in Queens to combat juvenile deliquency.

In my opinion, we can go a long way toward eliminating delinquency by fostering an interest in sports among our young people. This we are atempting to do in Queens and I believe that we are succeeding.

The Eintracht Sport Club, Astoria, Queens County, N. Y., is now considered the ranking soccer team in the United States. It has won the National Challenge Cup—DeWar Trophy—tournament.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Long Island Star-Journal with regard to this recent competition:

MILT MILLER'S SOCCER SHOTS

It is difficult to get the full impact on the community made by the fact that the Eintracht Sport Club of Astoria is now considered the ranking soccer team of the country as a result of winning the National Challenge Cup (DeWar Trophy) tournament.

But it is high time that the local chambers of commerce, civic, and service clubs as well as the borough president and the normally blase public decided to pay public tribute to the Astoria kickers who traveled clear across the Nation to bring fame to the borough that must be considered the booting hub of the country.

The Eintracht club, headed by John Vollrath, sets an excellent example for sport and civic groups in the borough—not because it won the title so much as the fact its sports activities personify a well-organized program catering to the needs of youth and adult alike. In addition to its first team, its sponsors, a host of other senior and junior sides. It also has an active women's group that provides excellent assistance.

Eintracht Oval in Astoria is a memorable tribute to the many hours of skill and diligence countless Eintracht members have contributed to erect a suitable showplace for the club. Even that effort is not completed for work is still going on to improve the spot.

Therefore, I think it would be only fitting if the borough president and civic groups decided it was time to pay tribute to the club and its achievements capped by copping the national title. National soccer crowns don't come easy to Queens, so why not celebrate the honors while the silverware is on hand?

Let's go, Queens.

Amarillo Man Served in All Branches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning a story by Miss Louise Evans, staff writer of the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times, which concerns a man who is loved by all who know him and who has done an able and outstanding job in all three branches of our Government. He is a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives and the present chief judge of the United States Court of Claims. He served with great distinction in the executive branch of the Government during World War II. His great contributions to our beloved country are well portrayed in the splendid article written by Miss Evans which I here insert:

AMARILLO MAN SERVED IN ALL BRANCHES

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 16.—The 18th Congressional District of Texas has had only four Representatives. All are in the Nation's Capital now.

Two—Marvin Jones, chief judge of the United States Court of Claims, and Gene Worley, judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals—are in the judiciary. One—Ben Guill, member of the Federal Maritime Commission, is in the administration. The other, of course, is our present Representative, the Honorable WALTER ROGERS, Member of Congress.

Chief Judge Jones is one of the few men in United States history who has served—and outstandingly, too—in all three branches of the Government.

For 24 years he was a member of Congress, heading for a decade the powerful House Committee on Agriculture.

For 2½ years during World War II he served in the administrative branch of the Government as adviser and assistant to James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, and later as War Food Administrator. He left the bench of the United States Court of Claims, to which he had been appointed in 1940, on draft by President Roosevelt, for the administrative service.

Washington being what Washington is, Judge Jones is still a well-known and useful figure to the administrative and legislative branches of the Government, although naturally his interest is centered in the court. Such varied experience is not lightly tossed away, and his advice and counsel is still sought by legislators and administrators.

The United States Court of Claims is on Pennsylvania Avenue, catewampus from the White House grounds and next door to the Blair House, which is the official residence for visiting dignitaries from foreign countries. President Truman lived there, too, while the White House was undergoing reconstruction. It was here that the Puerto Ricans attempted assassination in 1951, and bullets richocheted close to the venerable court building.

Once an art gallery, the old red brick building bristles with cupolas and fancy facade features. The old-fashioned dignity of the interior arrangements gives considerably more of the feeling of the calm continuity of the law than do most of the Federal courts in Washington, which are housed in the long corridors of executive buildings or the United States Courthouse—or in the case of the Supreme Court, in what appears to be a marble mausoleum.

Long before the modern theory of "gouge the corporations since they ain't people," there was a tendency to gouge the Government, which, too, was big and impersonal. A democratic government is peculiarly susceptible to unfair claims and must be even more fair in dealing with the people who support it by choice.

Until 1855, a citizen or a foreigner could obtain satisfaction for a claim only by presenting his case to the Congress. In that year, the United States Court of Claims was set up to assure that an impartial judgment could be passed on such claims—assuring the Government protection against unfair and unjust claims and protecting the individual against oppression, economically speaking, by the Government.

President Abraham Lincoln was one of the founders of the court, and now it grants millions of dollars to those who have been wronged (and also quashes the claims of those who would fradulently gouge the Government). After World War I, the claims amounted to more than $2 billion.

The largest single award ever made was in the Ute Indian case, where $32 million were allowed for 4½ million acres taken by the Government.

In 1952, the court allowed $14 million in 1,600 cases involving $100 million dollars in claims on taxes and Government contracts.

If no other court in the world deals in such staggering figures, neither does any other court listen so patiently to absurdly small claims. Once the court allowed $1.50 lunch money to a Department of Agriculture employee who sued the Government for this sum which he thought legally should be refunded.

The claims range from sheer fraudulence to knotty problems of the law. For instance, the court found that a farmer whose chickens had been scared eggless by planes from a nearby airbase had a legitimate claim. It was not so kind to the wife of an American diplomat who felt she was entitled to extra expense money when shipment of her pet dogs was delayed during wartime. It had no patience with a man who deliberately threw himself in the path of an Army truck, then sued for damages.

The chief judge of this unique court is fitted by temperament, education, and experience for its work. A quiet man, who has made his influence felt by sheer ability and a friendly attitude toward the aspirations of the other fellow, Marvin Jones might never have taken his first step toward national priminence, if it hadn't been for a merry-go-round on a Matador fairgrounds.

The judge was running for Congressman in the old 13th District of Texas which stopped just a few miles short of Dallas and included all of the northwest area of Texas (now the 13th, 18th, and 19th). He was campaigning against John H. Stephens who has held the post for many years.

"Only a young man steeped in ignorance would have attempted the race. I actually spoke at one rally 35 miles from Dallas and covered the whole district by any means available, from railroad, to horseback, to foot," he recalls.

At the Matador picnic, his opponent's speech was drowned out by the music from a mule-drawn merry-go-round. Jones studied a minute, slipped $2 to Jeff Morris, the merry-go-round owner, with the advice that he rest the mules a moment. Jeff was glad to oblige. The crowd gathered at the rostrum and heard every word Judge Jones said.

That ability to quietly study a situation and find a practical solution stood the judge well in years to come. He is the father of most of the emergency legislation that saved the farmers in the thirties. The Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 still forms the framework of the Government's agriculture program. Jones fathered the AAA, the soil-conservation bill, and the bill creating the five-State wind erosion district. (Just recently, the chief judge reminded Secretary of Agriculture Benson that a reinstatement of that district again might be the salvation of the Great Plains area in this period of drought and blowing dust.)

The Farm Credit Administration policies of low interest rates and long time loans are largely his handiwork.

On display at the Panhandle-Plains Historical Museum in Canyon may be seen 13 presidential pens with which were signed important pieces of legislation sponsored by Judge Jones.

His firm foundation in law was received at the University of Texas and in the courtrooms of the Panhandle, since he practiced law in Amarillo after his admission to the bar in 1908. He also served as chairman of the board of legal examiners for the Seventh Supreme Judicial District of Texas.

Judge Jones was born near Valley View, Tex., just inside the old 13th District—and a stone's throw from the Fourth District, where his longtime friend and congressional teammate, Speaker of the House RAYBURN, lives.

In fact, Judge Jones was only 3 years behind RAYBURN, now dean of the House of Representatives (with 42 years of service), in entering the House. The judge was elected in 1916, represented the 13th until 1919 when the 18th was split off, leaving the area from north of Wichita Falls to Dallas in the 13th. Then in 1934, his district was further reduced as Texas was assigned another congressional Representative because of growth of population, and George Mahon, of Lubbock, was elected as first Representative from the 19th District.

Judge Jones resigned from Congress in November, 1940, staying until the calendar of the session was cleared, although he was appointed to the United States Court of Claims bench by Franklin Delano Roosevelt on April 9 and approved by the Senate on April 10. In less than 7 years he became chief justice of the court.

Of course, during that period he was on leave of absence to help the administration of the war effort. No one in Washington knew so much about the problems of the producers of food, nor was so able to rally the farmers for the all-out production needed for the armed services and the starving areas of our allies.

During this period, he also served as president of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, which was composed of 600 delegates representing 44 nations.

The 18th district still claims the judge for its own; everyone who comes to Washington drops in to see him. And the judge still knows his district like a man knows his own backyard.

During the recent national spelling bee when he visited with the John D. Glenns, of Canadian (whose son, John D. Glenn, Jr., was the Globe-News champion for the national event), he recalled the families of two elder Glenns—and "people I had almost forgotten," said Mrs. Glenn.

The judge will be in Amarillo soon to visit with his mother, Mrs. Docia Hawkins Jones, Talmadge Place, and his sister, Mrs. Jeff Neely. He always tries to spend July 6 in Amarillo when his mother celebrates her birthday—the 99th one this summer.

The United States Court of Claims is just, fair—and has a heart as big as the country it serves.

Realizing that everyone cannot afford to travel to Washington to make his claim against the Government, it goes to the people who cannot come to it.

Eleven Commissioners assume this job of traveling—all over the world, if necessity demands. They have gone to the bedsides of dying men, to jails and poorhouses, to riverside shacks, and crossroads general stores.

One of these Commissioners also is from the 18th district. Wilson Cowen, once judge of Dallam County, has served the United States Court of Claims since 1942.

He will go to Europe this summer to hear several cases, one of which is a claim by the opera singer, Maria Jeritza, whose home near Salzburg, Austria, was used by American occupation forces during World War II. It was filled with priceless antiques and china gathered from all over the world, the singer claims, and much of it was destroyed during the occupation. However, the Germans earlier occupied the castle. Commissioner Cowen will attempt to find which occupying force destroyed Jeritza's possessions.

Cowen has served as vice president of the Texas State Society, a fluorishing organization. Under its banner, Texans in the Capital get together for practically any reason, ranging from a barbecue to honoring a native son. He also has been president of the ex-students of the University of Texas Law School, of whom there are many in the Capital.

Wilson is one of the most respected of the faithful corps of Texas workers in the Government. Since 1938, when he became State director of the old Farm Security Administration with headquarters in Amarillo, he has served in several capacities. For a time during 1939 and 1940, he was in Washington with the Department of Agriculture and then returned to Amarillo to head the FSA regional office. Later the Dallas and Amarillo offices were merged and for a time Wilson ran the affairs of both. In 1942 he came

to Washington as Commissioner for the United States Court of Claims.

One of those ageless persons, Wilson looks exactly as he did 20 years ago in the Panhandle—boyish.

He is married to the former Florence Walker, daughter of the late George E. Walker, pioneer Rock Island railroad man. In fact, Walker was one of the first men to settle in Dalhart.

They have two sons—Walker, who is a junior at Harvard, where he was honored with a scholarship this year, and John, 13.

Wilson was born down in Bosque County in 1905 and moved to the Panhandle in 1928, shortly after his graduation from Texas U. in 1928. He was associated with the firm of Tatum & Strong until his election as county judge in 1934.

There is another west Texas Commissioner at the court. He is Col. Paul H. McMurray, formerly of Floydada, although he has served in Washington for many years on the board of veteran appeals for the Veterans' Administration.

He was appointed as commissioner to the United States Court of Claims about a year ago.

Colonel McMurray's parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. H. McMurray, live in Canyon now, and his oldest son, Paul H. McMurray, Jr., will enter West Texas State College next fall.

Last week his other son, Donald, was named the outstanding athlete at Woodrow Wilson High School in the District of Columbia.

The McMurrays also have a daughter, Marilyn, who is the wife of Capt. C. L. Rishell. The Rishells have just returned to Washington from Frankfurt, Germany, and will be stationed here.

Colonel McMurray came to Washington shortly after World War I and worked at a civil-service job while he attended George Washington University, where he obtained his law degree. He served for 5 years in the Army during World War II.

At the court, too, is Mrs. Lotus Allen Van Huss, who has been Judge Jones' secretary since 1924.

She was secretary to the late Judge S. H. Madden when she resigned to take the Washington position.

Her acquaintanceship through the 18th district is almost as wide as that of Judge Jones. It's the congressional secretaries on whom falls the work of getting the answers to most of the thousands of questions for information and for running the errands that we constituents demand.

William R. George and the George Junior Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the best brains of the country are seeking to find ways to deal with juvenile delinquents, it is appropriate to consider the miracles wrought at the George Junior Republic. Founded by William R. George, and with sustained moral and financial help from public-spirited citizens such as George Eastman and the Sibleys of Rochester, the Republic has rehabilitated scores of boys and girls through the use of a very old, relatively simple formula: Give them love; give them responsibility; give them useful work to do, in a clean environment.

A. B. Genung, who lives in Freeville, N. Y., where the George Junior Republic is located, took occasion to review the success of this undertaking in an article in the Times-Union of Rochester on June 18. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it, herewith:

HOW IT LOOKS IN FREEVILLE—DADDY GEORGE—NO BOY WAS "BAD"

(By A. B. Genung)

Father's Day brings to my mind a man who was daddy to hundreds of boys and girls when they really needed one.

The man was William R. George, known all over the United States as Daddy George. He founded the George Junior Republic, a school in our village of Freeville.

I knew Daddy George intimately. I lived close to his junior republic from its beginning and saw many of the transformations it wrought in teen-agers.

This place was and is just what its name implies, a little republic, modeled after the larger one in which we all live. It is a village by itself in the midst of broad farm acres, looks like any other American village.

The youngsters govern their own community, make their own laws, elect their officials from president down, have their own money, earn their living, learn trades, and generally face the same problems and conduct their lives as do you and I.

Daddy George had much early experience among the tough-gang boys of New York. His idea in founding his junior republic was to create an environment wherein the "bad" boy would come up against, not a system run by the police and other pillars of an adult society whom the boy classed as all enemy, but against the laws and usages of his own young peers.

The theory was that when the errant youngster ran afoul of public sentiment represented by others of his own age and kind, the impact eventually would straighten him out.

The theory worked. Crime and lawlessness just didn't pay, when one's own fellows punished it instead of applauding it.

So the school grew. To it came bad boys and girls, often sent by the courts, others who were homeless, problem teenagers from wealthy homes; finally the school accepted almost any boy or girl of sound mind and body. Many of them were good and tough when they arrived. But after a few weeks of trial and error generally the toughest settled down to honest work and decent conduct.

I recall the case of the "redhead" brought there in handcuffs by a county sheriff. Five years later he married one of the teachers at the Republic and went out to a notable career in YMCA work.

There was the boy who stayed crooked underneath and even after having been elected president stole some Government funds. In the end he was found out, impeached, jailed—all done by his own young peers. But he had a streak of character somewhere inside. He finally straightened up, was sent through Harvard by a friend of the Republic, and wound up a business executive of note.

Hundreds of these cases could be recited. And into most of them were woven the dynamic personality, kindliness, and insight of "Daddy" George.

No boy or girl, whatever their unhappy deeds, ever found the refuge of that warm heart closed to them.

None was bad, just misguided. He was a great man, certainly a man worthy to be recalled on Father's Day.

Incidentally, much money and friendly support have come to the Junior Republic over the years, from George Eastman, the Sibleys, and other generous Rochester families.

Library of Congress Requests Authorization for 3-Year Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision.

On June 7, 1955, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyrights, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, described the Copyright Act of 1909 as "archaic" and requested the creation of a number of new positions in the Copyright Office to undertake a 3-year study looking toward revision of the domestic law. Excerpts from that important testimony are presented here:

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Mr. NORRELL. We will go on to the next item which is the "Copyright Office" on page 90 of the bill. The estimate for 1956 is $1,195,284 and in 1955 you had $1,100,000. An increase is desired this coming year of $95,284. We will insert page 26 of the justifications in the record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Salaries and expenses, Copyright Office

1955 regular bill	$1,100,000
1956 estimate	1,195,284
Net increase	+95,284

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES REQUESTED

1. Federal employees group life insurance	+$3,386

The cost of Federal employees group life insurance, which is being absorbed during 1955, is specifically requested for 1956 as an item of increased cost. The estimate is based on experience during 1955 which indicates a cost of about ⅓ of 1 percent of the total requirement for personal services.

2. Ingrade increases	+16,818

Increases in salary costs of staff subject to such increases in 1956 over 1955 due to periodic ingrade increases.

3. New positions requested	+75,080

The annual cost of 21 new positions requested as follows:

Studies relating to the revision of the copyright law:	
7 GS-7	$29,435
3 GS-4	9,525
Workload—Increased volume of business:	
7 GS-5	23,870
1 GS-4	3,175
2 GS-3	5,900
Compliance activity:	
1 GS-4	3,175
Total positions (21)	75,080
Total increase	+95,284

Mr. NORRELL. Will you give us a short statement regarding your item for the Copyright Office? Will you describe especially the need for the 21 new positions which are proposed in 1956?

Dr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir. May I mention that in the case of the first two items, "Federal employees group life insurance," and the "ingrade increases," the same principle prevails here as mentioned in respect to the other appropriation.

REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW

Then, proceeding to the "New positions," the request for the 10 new positions is for the revision of the copyright law for a special 3-year program. This is intended to provide 7 attorneys to participate in studies relating to revising and redrafting the copyright law or to relieve experienced attorneys on the Copyright Office staff to do this work, and 3 clerk-stenographers to perform clerical duties in connection with this work.

The present copyright law of the United States, title 17 of the United States Code, as codified and enacted into positive law by the act of July 30, 1947, and amended by subsequent acts is basically and substantively the act of March 4, 1909.

Now, Mr. Fisher, the Register of Copyrights is here, and I would be glad to have him elaborate upon the need for this assistance for the proposed revision of the copyright law.

Mr. NORRELL. I think we would be glad to hear him for a few minutes. State your name and how long you have been in this kind of work.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Arthur Fisher. I have been either Register, Acting Register, or Associate Register of Copyrights for about 7 years.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to explain the problems and the needs of the Copyright Office.

REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW

Now, the third item is for the revision of the law, the item under discussion as I came in.

May I say just a word about the general problem of the revision of the law. As the Librarian just said, the act we operate under is really the act of 1909. There have been minor revisions, and the codification of the act brought about just as I came to the Office, but there have been no revisions of the fundamental provisions of the law.

Since the law of 1909 was enacted there have been tremendous technical and organizational changes, which can even be said to be revolutionary. For example, there was no radio or television industry at that time. The motion-picture industry was just a fragment. The recording industry had not developed. Many modern methods of mass reproduction were still unknown.

So the copyright law of 1909, under which we operate in the United States, is out of date, archaic, and this is generally so recognized. The several committees of the American Bar Association and the other associations concerned with copyrights have urged a general revision of the law for many years. In the past three American Bar administrations I have dealt directly with personnel of those committees.

We have taken the position for the last 6 years that we were engaged in a very difficult international problem of securing better protection for American works abroad. I might say parenthetically that the motion-picture industry, for example, out of a total annual business of that industry running about $1½ billion, with something less than half of that dollar volume in the producing companies, 42 percent of that production company business is overseas. That is a very large amount of business, and is very important in the representation of American interests abroad.

We gave the foreign situation a priority. After 6 years of work we have secured the adoption of the Universal Copyright Convention, which required certain changes in domestic law and is going into effect in the next few weeks. A short waiting period is provided for.

We heard yesterday that Germany has completed its ratification and the United States has also, so we now have ratification of 11 countries out of the 12 necessary.

We took the position over these last 6 or 7 years that we should not deal with the domestic revision of the law beyond the minimum extent necessary in connection with the universal convention and the foreign situation. We were successful in doing that. If we had taken on the general revision, we never would have gotten through with the universal convention.

That leaves us with the problem of the proposals made with respect to the domestic American law, both on the west coast and New York. We have persuaded people submitting such amendments to postpone them until there could be a comprehensive revision. We have now come to the point where we should deal with that.

We have had a number of detailed changes. In talking to the members of the Judiciary Committee, who have worked very closely on all amendments to the copyright law, I have noted that some of them express the view that we should not do this piecemeal, as an uncoordinated revision, but that we need to accomplish a fundamental revision.

We feel that for this task the Copyright Office has the staff and the experience. It is very difficult to find impartial people competent both in these industries and in copyright problems. What we should do in the domestic field is the same as was done in the foreign field, namely, do the spade work on the facts, analyze these very complicated problems, present alternatives, and follow procedures where the Congress itself can decide policy questions.

We will have to use our most experienced examiners and attorneys in order to do this. However, in order to release them and still keep current, we need to recruit a small group of new examiners. Our requirements are very small, compared either to our total staff or the Patent Office. We estimate we should have 7 additional juniors to do the current examining work, the current routine technical work, plus 3 clerical people; with these we can keep up to date in our normal work and really do a good job on this long-overdue revision of the law.

In summary, we are only asking for $95,000 increase. In comparison with this sum the total of cash turned over to the Treasury, plus the value of deposits, is very much in excess of the amount I come before you to request.

SUMMARY OF NEEDS AND PROBLEMS OF COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a brief summary of what I have said. Could that be given to you for inclusion in the record?

Mr. NORRELL. All right. We will place this in the record.

(The statement is as follows:)

"As Register of Copyrights, I appreciate the opportunity to summarize the needs and problems of the Copyright Office.

"Piecemeal revision expensive and undesirable

"Many individual administrative and other changes have been found necessary in the law. To accomplish these piecemeal is an expensive and unsatisfactory procedure. For the past several years subcommittees of the American Bar Association and other associations concerned with copyright have been established to seek a general revision of our copyright law.

"Domestic law revision postponed for 6 years

"In view of the effort to draft and secure United States adherence to the Universal Copyright Convention, now successfully achieved, these efforts for a general revision of the domestic copyright law were discouraged during the past 6 years. It was felt necessary, if the universal convention was to be completed on schedule, that changes in the domestic law should be limited to those essential to the approval of that convention.

"Assurances, however, were given to those who urged the importance of revision of the domestic law that such a revision in the domestic law would be undertaken as soon as the changes related to the international convention were accomplished.

"The matters of domestic revision, therefore, is overdue and should now be promptly undertaken. The first step, if the same success is to be achieved in the domestic field as in the foreign, is to make factual studies, careful analyses of existing law, with presentation of alternative solutions.

"Copyright Office to make factual and analytical studies, final policy decisions by Congress

"The final determination of policy will, of course, rest with the appropriate committees of Congress. No matter what form any bill takes or the detailed procedure adopted, the Copyright Office will be looked to, to do the impartial spadework and analyze the alternatives.

"Fundamental revision of domestic law now needed

"The matter is not merely one of codification but of fundamental revision. Several of the most competent personnel and attorneys experienced in the work of the Office and the administration of the law would devote themselves to this task. They cannot be spared from current activities unless replaced at least temporarily by other examiners. A minimum of 7 attorneys and 3 supporting clerical staff is estimated as needed for this purpose."

Dr. MUMFORD. Finally, I should like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman that the proposal for the revision of the law is for only a 3-year project.

Mr. NORRELL. All right.

Library of Congress Requests Authorization for 3-year Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, great interest has been expressed in a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909. Among those expressing interest in this study have been representatives of the National Broadcasting Co., the firm of Covington & Burling, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, and the Government of Switzerland. An excerpt from this historic study is included here:

V. RESPITE

In the 70th Congress the bill for the general revision of the copyright laws was again introduced by Mr. Vestal as H. R. 8912. This bill was the same as H. R. 10434 of the 69th Congress. No hearings were held by the committee on H. R. 8912, and no action was taken with respect to a major revision throughout the entire Congress.

VI. THE VESTAL BILL OF 1930

The Vestal bill was again introduced in the 71st Congress as H. R. 6990. Hearings

were held by the Committee on Patents on April 3, 4, and 11, 1930. At the beginning of the hearings, the chairman, Mr. Vestal stated with respect to design copyrights and mechanical reproductions that separate hearings had been held upon bills dealing with those subjects and that therefore the witnesses should touch lightly upon them, but with respect to the rest of the bill the committee would like to have a thorough discussion.[1]

Those in favor of the bill were:

Will Irwin, Authors League, American Center of the P. E. N. Club.

Marc Connelly, dramatist, Authors League.

Elmer Davis, writer, Authors League.

Miss Thyra Samter Winslow, Authors' League.

Chester Crowell, Authors League.

John Paine, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Frederick Melcher, editor of Publishers' Weekly, the National Association of Book Publishers.

Frederick A. Stokes, chairman, Copyright Committee, the National Association of Book Publishers.

John Benbow, Longman's, Green & Co.

J. W. Lippincott, publisher.

Cass Canfield, executive vice president, Harper Bros.

Lynham B. Sturgis, the Century Co.

George P. Brett, Jr., treasurer and general manager, the Macmillan Publishing Co.

Edward H. Hart, husband of Mrs. Hart, writer.

Hon. Sol Bloom, Representative in Congress from New York.

Mrs. William Atherton Dupuy, the League of American Pen Women, Dramatist Guild, the Authors' League.

Austin Strong, dramatist.

Joseph P. Bickerton, Jr., representing various theatrical producing managers, dramatists, and magazines.

John Golden, the John Golden Theater, New York.

Arthur McKeough, editor, Good Housekeeping.

Lyman Beecher Stowe, grandson of Harriett Beecher Stowe, author of Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Fred G. Cooper, illustrator.

John J. A. Murphy, Guild of Free Lance Artists.

Charles Scribner, Jr., Charles Scribner's son.

John Macrae, president, E. P. Dutton & Co.

Carl Cannon, the American Library Association.

Arthur Guiterman, poet.

Miss Marguerite Widdemer, poet.

Karl W. Kirchwey, the Hurst Organization.

Mrs. Mateel Howe Farnhan, novelist.

Mrs. Gladys Shaw Erskine, novelist and poet.

Mrs. Elizabeth Newport Hepburn, the Pen and Brush Club of New York.

William H. Osborne, the Authors' League.

William O. Tufts, the map publishers.

C. Augustus Norwood, the Christian Science publishing interest.

Arthur W. Weil, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Louis Swarts, Paramount Famous, Lasky Corp.

W. D. Wiechmann.

Louise M. Sillcox.

R. R. Bowker, president, R. R. Bowker Co., magazine publishers.

Those who testified against the bill or certain features of the bill were:

Prof. Henry G. Doyle, George Washington University, the American Association of University Professors.

George C. Lucas, executive secretary, National Publishers' Association.

William B. Warner, National Publishers' Association.

Elisha Hanson, American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

William Klein, attorney, the Shubert Theater Corp.

Lee Shubert.

Al H. Woods.

William L. Brown, Assistant Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

John W. Ziegler, vice president, the John C. Winston Co.

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, United States State Department.

Jean Monk, manager, National Fellowship Club, Inc., Washington, D. C.

M. L. Raney, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

O. R. Barnett, attorney.

After all the testimony was in, a new committee bill, H. R. 12549 was introduced by Mr. Vestal, the chairman. In reporting the committee bill the House committee on patents stated:

"H. R. 6990, introduced in the House of Representatives during the first session of the 71st Congress, is in general revision of the national copyright law. A similar bill was introduced in the year 1926 and has been before the patents committee ever since its introduction in that year; and there have been many hearings upon it before the committee, a large amount of testimony taken and a multitude of conferences between various interests held. The committee has successfully reconciled the differences. The context of the bill has been changed in various particulars from time to time to meet valid suggestions on the part of one interest or another and the present bill, H. R. 12549, combines the results of all hearings and all conferences.

"It has been found that practically all the industries and all the authors have united in support of this revision. The authors, playwrights, screen writers, composers, and artists support it. The book publishers, the motion-picture producers, the newspapers and magazines, the allied printing trades unions, the librarians, the majority of the theatrical managers, all of these have appeared at the hearings and have supported the principles of the bill.

"This general revision of the copyright law provides for—

"(1) Automatic copyright by which the copyright is conferred upon the author upon creation of his work, a right so limited by various provisions of the bill as to be made a privilege;

"(2) Divisible copyright, which permits the assignee, grantee, or licensee to protect and enforce any right which he acquires from an author without the complications incident to the old law;

"(3) International copyright, which enables American authors merely by complying with the provisions of this act, to secure copyright throughout all the important countries of the world without further formalities."[2]

[1] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings on H. R. 6990, pp. 14–15.

[2] House Rept. No. 1689, 71st Cong., 2d sess.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Library of Congress Requests Authorization for 3-Year Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am including the concluding portion of section 5 of the study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909. I do this because of the great interest which has been expressed in this study:

However, things did not go as smoothly as the committee report seemed to indicate. The report itself contained a minority report which was an attack upon the bill with respect to divisibility of copyrights.

The bill was recommitted twice before it was debated.[3] The first recommittal was for compliance with the Ramseyer rule, House rule XII, section II (a). Thereafter the bill was again reported out (H. Rept. 1898, 71st Cong.). The second recommittal was on request of the committee chairman due to the discovery of an irregularity in the adoption of the report (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, p. 11994). The bill was reported out the third and last time as House Report No. 2016, 71st Congress.

After being debated the bill passed the House[4] on January 5, 1931, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Patents. This committee also held hearings. At the hearings it was evident that opposition was developing. The chairman, in opening the hearings, stated:

"I may say to those assembled here at this hearing that today and tomorrow have been set aside by the committee to have a hearing upon this bill, H. R. 12549. This hearing was called at the instance of opponents of the bill as a whole or as opponents to some specific portion of the bill. It is the purpose of the committee today to allow all of today, if necessary, to those opposing the bill either as a whole or in part. If there are people here who have had their day before the House committee we do not care to spend time in hearing them repeat what they said before the House committee. We can read that. However, if they spoke before the House committee and they have some new proposition that reaches beyond what they said at the House hearing, of course we shall be glad to hear them."

"After the opponents of the bill or parts of it have been heard, we will then listen to those first who approve the bill in its present form and, second, those who approve the bill generally, who have some minor amendments to suggest. We desire those who oppose this bill or who will direct their energies to opposition to specific portions of it, to arrange this hearing in their own way and to select their own speaker or speakers, giving to the committee the name and address of the person or persons who are to address the committee. We do not want people called here to talk to us over the same matters that have been talked of in the House and I think we will discover pretty soon whether or not the speaker is keeping within that limitation or whether he is not. We want to get through with this bill. We want to give you a full hearing, as full as is necessary, but we do want you to pin your statements right down to the specific things that appear in the bill as it is before the Senate, and we want your statements to go to the things that you object to. We want to know in a concise way why you object, and, if you have an amendment which you propose on the general theory that some legislation is to pass, we request that you have your amendment prepared and put it up to us in order that we can have the benefit of it. In other words, you cannot be too concise, too direct, in your criticism, nor too specific."[5]

The lineup at these hearings was as follows. Those in favor of the bill were:

William H. Osborne, Council of the Authors' League.

Chester T. Crowell, the Authors' League.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Gene Buck, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Otto C. Wierum, the Bar Association of the City of New York.

Frederick G. Melcher, vice president, R. R. Bowker Co., National Association of Book Publishers.

Louis D. Fraelich, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, United States State Department.

M. J. Flynn, America's Wage Earners Protective Conference.

George C. Lucas, executive secretary, National Publishers' Association.

McDonald De Witt, attorney, Conde Nast Publishing Co.

Carl Cannon, American Library Association.

Arthur W. Weil, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Louis E. Swarts, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Walter G. Wiechmann, National Association of Book Publishers.

Those opposed to the bill or certain features of the bill were:

Karl Fenning, attorney, Washington, D. C.

Oswald F. Schuette, Radio Protective Association.

Eugene C. Brokmeyer, National Association of Retail Druggists.

H. E. Capehart, representing Manufacturers of Slot Machines and Automatic Phonographs.

William S. Hedges, National Association of Broadcasters.

Louis G. Caldwell, National Association of Broadcasters.

William A. Brady, theatrical producer.

Thorvald Solberg, Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

William L. Brown, Assistant Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

J. H. McCracken, The American Council of Education.

Herman H. B. Meyer, Library of Congress.

M. L. Raney, representing 21 national organizations such as the American Chemical Society, the American Council of Learned Societies, etc.

Frank D. Scott.

John W. Ziegler, vice president, John C. Winston Co., publishers.

A. Julian Brylawski, the Motion Picture Theater Owners of America.

F. J. Rembusch.

Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico.

William Neidel, secretary, Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Hearings on the bill closed on January 29, 1931. The committee, however, did not report the bill until February 23. In its report it stated:

"Bills not unlike the one under consideration have been before the House of Representatives since the year 1926. Many hearings have been had and a large volume of testimony adduced before members of the Committee on Patents of that body, as well as to your committee during its consideration of the measure now under review. It will be noted that notwithstanding the extended consideration given to this and other measures by committees of the House of Representatives, your committee has seen fit to modify the bill as it came from the House of Representatives in many respects. The bill as now presented to the Senate is the result of all this extensive study and consideration. It is safe to say that practically all of the industries and all of the authors and composers have united in support of this measure. The authors, playwrights, composers, and artists are in favor of its enactment. The book publishers, the motion-picture producers, the publishers of newspapers and magazines, the allied printing-trade unions, the librarians, a majority of the theater managers—all of these have appeared at one or another of the several hearings and have expressed their approval of the principles of the bill, as well as most of its provisions.

"MAJOR AMENDMENTS PROVIDED BY H. R. 12549

"What might be called the major amendments to the existing copyright law that are provided in this bill may be summarized under three heads as follows:

"(1) Automatic copyright, by which a copyright is conferred upon the author immediately he creates a work.

"(2) Divisible copyright, which permits the author to dispose of his several rights which he has in his creation and to enable his assignee, grantee, or licensee to protect any such right which he acquires, and this without the many complications arising under existing law.

"(3) International copyright, which guarantees to American authors the copyright of their works throughout all the important countries of the world without compliance with any formalities." [6]

Intermittent debate in the Senate started on February 26 and continued until the early morning hours of March 2, 1931. From a reading of the debate [7] it is evident that strong opposition had developed. As a matter of fact the situation in the dying hours of this Congress was such to cause Senator Reed to state: [8]

"If it has taken 6 hours to do 9 pages, it is going to take about 40 hours to do the remaining 40 pages. There are only about 34½ hours left of this Congress."

After numerous efforts to recess, the hour then being later than 1 o'clock in the morning (a. m.), the Senate finally recessed with no vote on final passage of the bill. Thereafter, the bill was never taken up again and, of course, died with the adjournment of the 71st Congress.

---

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, pp. 10595, 11549.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, pp. 11994, 11996, 12018, 12473, 12474; vol. 74, pp. 2006, 2019, 2022, 2037, 2080, 2081.

[5] U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Patents. 71st Cong., hearings on H. R. 12549, pp. 1–2.

[6] S. Rept. No. 1732, 71st Cong., pp. 19–20.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 74, pp. 6102, 6234, 6237, 6244, 6449, 6458, 6463, 6470, 6474, 6480, 6486, 6640, 6654, 6706, 6709, 6712, 6717, 6721, 6722, 6727, 6906 (Mr. Jones).

[8] Op. cit., p. 6719.

Social Security for Lawyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the rising demand of lawyers throughout the country to be included in the social security system should not and cannot longer be ignored.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include, as evidence of this rising demand, the following messages which have reached my desk within the past week: First, a resolution of the Philadelphia Bar Association; second, a message with respect to the views of the National Association of Bar Presidents; and third, a message from the Bar Associations of Genesee and Wyoming Counties and other bar associations of New York. Without exception, they express overwhelming sentiment in favor of social security coverage. When are we going to heed these pleas and take action?

The resolution and messages follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE PHILADELPHIA BAR ASSOCIATION, JUNE 7, 1955

Resolved, That the Philadelphia Bar Association endorses in principle the inclusion of self-employed members of the legal profession in social-security coverage on a compulsory basis;

Further resolved, That the committee on lawyers' retirement benefits be authorized to adopt such measures as may be reasonably appropriate in its opinion to promote the enactment of such legislation by the Congress of the United States, including cooperation with the American Bar Association and other interested organizations, and to take such other appropriate steps as may be feasible within the limits of personnel and resources at their disposal.

TELEGRAM FROM GARNER PETRIE, OF LOUISVILLE, KY., JUNE 14, 1955

Representative OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a lawyer I am very much interested in extending social security to lawyers. A poll taken of lawyers by National Association of Bar Presidents shows an overwhelming majority of lawyers favor social security for themselves.

GARNER PETRIE,
Louisville, Ky.

LETTER FROM GENESEE COUNTY, N. Y.

BATAVIA, N. Y., *June 14, 1955.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
United States Congressman, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. OSTERTAG: As a member of the Genesee County Bar Association, I wish to inform you that we have passed a resolution favoring extension of social-security coverage to lawyers. This resolution was passed and approved without dissent.

Most respectfully yours,

VINCENT J. GULLO,
Attorney at Law.

WYOMING COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TREASURER,
Arcade, N. Y., June 21, 1955.

Congressman HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OSTERTAG: I wish to advise you that the Wyoming County Bar Association has gone on record in favor of legislation to place a lawyer within the category of self-employed persons under the Social Security Act.

I understand the following associations have also gone on record in favor of such legislation: Albany County Bar Association, Allegany County Bar Association, Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Bar Association of Erie County, Inc., Bronx County Bar Association, Brooklyn Women's Bar Association, Chemung County Bar Association, Chenango County Bar Association, Cortland County Bar Association, Delaware County Bar Association, Fulton County Bar Association, Livingston County Bar Association, Madison County Bar Association, New York County Lawyers Association, New York Women's Bar Association, Oneida County Bar Association, Onondaga County Bar Association, Otsego County Bar Association, Peekskill Bar Association, Rochester Bar Association, Rockland County Bar Association, Schenectady County Bar Association, South Nassau Lawyers Association, Suffolk County Bar Association, Sullivan County Bar Association, Ulster County Bar Association,

Washington County Bar Association, Wyoming County Bar Association, Yates County Bar Association.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT BENTLEY.

Tidelands Champion Seen as Texas Gubernatorial Material

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and honor that I rise this morning to place in the RECORD an excellent article by Miss Louise Evans, of the Amarillo, Tex., Globe-Times. This article concerns a man who has served his State with great distinction and honor for a number of years. A few short years ago he came to Washington as the junior United States Senator from Texas. His splendid work and great progress is exemplified by the deep respect in which he is held by his colleagues in the United States Senate. I refer to my good friend, Senator PRICE DANIEL, Democrat, of Texas.

The article follows:

TIDELANDS CHAMPION SEEN AS TEXAS GUBERNATORIAL MATERIAL

(By Louise Evans, Amarillo Globe-Times staff writer)

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 21.—Will Senator PRICE DANIEL be a candidate for governor of Texas?

In the early summer of 1955, DANIEL holds the same position he took in the fall of 1954 when he visited in the Panhandle: "* * * Under certain conditions."

The Senator is not yet ready to publicly define those conditions. Although the recent announcement of a bona fide candidate—Reuben Senterfitt, of San Saba—may speed up his decision.

There are two other Texans in Washington who are mentioned as Texas gubernatorial material—Deputy Defense Secretary Bob Anderson, of Vernon, and Representative MARTIN DIES, of Lufkin, who is back as Congressman at large in the House from which he voluntarily resigned in 1945, after serving for 14 years. During some of those years, DIES headed the highly unpopular, at the time, but prophetic Un-American Affairs Committee that first jousted with Communists in America.

Back in Texas there are double-handfuls of potential candidates. Attorney General John Ben Shepperd is one—and the post of attorney general has always been a popular springboard for gubernatorial candidates. In fact, Daniel gave long and brilliant service in that position. Lt. Gov. Ben Ramsey is known to cherish some ambitions, as do Mayor Roy Hofheinz, of Houston, State Senator Jimmy Phillips, Agriculture Commissioner John White, and Representative Jerry Sadler. Ralph Yarbrough, wtice defeated by Gov. Allan Shivers, traveled with National Democratic Chairman Paul Butler on his swing through the State. And there are others whose friends, at least, are promoting as gubernatorial material.

Without attempting any analysis of the stay-at-home Texans, it appears likely here that only 1 of the 3 Texan-in-Washington candidates will announce for the governor's chair. If it is DANIEL, then the senatorial post might become available to one of the others. DANIEL does not have to resign from the Senate to make the gubernatorial race, but if elected, the post would become open and either of the other two could be appointed for the interim and elected later.

DANIEL has made no bones about the fact that he prefers to live in Texas. "I'd rather that my children received their education in Texas," he has said. And it must be difficult for a man to concentrate on national affairs who has spearheaded such home-State projects as the tidelands fight, the policy of patience in the desegregation moves, and even the battle to keep gas and oil producers from being named as interstate distributors.

Not that the freshman Senator has shown himself incapable of this growth to national-mindedness. He forgets sectionalism in his service as a Senator. In little more than 2 years he has captured an important committee chairmanship—that of a special investigation of the narcotics enforcement laws. He is serving on the Judicial Committee through which move about half of the bills considered by the Senate. His speech on the Supreme Court May 1954 decision for virtual forced desegregation was such a model of legal thoroughness and dispassionate policy that the veteran Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia distributed copies throughout his home State.

There are certain indications in that speech of fundamental character traits in PRICE DANIEL. Translated, they give sturdy guideposts to the manner in which the DANIEL mind and personality operate.

First, the approach is factual. DANIEL points out that desegregation was first practiced in Boston and as early as 1849, long before the War Between the States, the right for such schools was upheld in the courts. Time after time, he enumerates earlier opinions of the Supreme Court which clearly defined the right for separate but equal schools. And he trumpeted "to show * * * the good faith of the States in past, to show where they got the doctrine * * * the States have acted in absolute good faith in believing that they were obeying the Constitution and the opinions of the Supreme Court."

Secondly, he gets to the heart of the matter by good spadework into history—for instance, the theory made much of—that the Congress which submitted the 14th amendment to the States for ratification really wanted desegregated schools. As Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, interrupted to say, "The very Congress which provided the 14th amendment provided for the adoption of a separate school system for the races in the District of Columbia. My own State at the time had a legislature that was largely carpetbagger or scallawag. The same legislature which ratified the 14th amendment proposed by the Congress, wrote a constitution for the State of Georgia which contained a provision for separate schools."

The Senator from Georgia was a little more brutal than DANIEL when he referred to the present Justices on the Supreme Court. He had this to say: "For the first time, the Court admittedly substituted psychology (trying to analyze the thinking of the Congress of 1866) for law and precedents when it came to construing the Constitution of the United States. It is my opinion that if the Supreme Court is to abandon law and precedents in favor of psychology * * * we should either add trained pyschologists of recognized ability to the Court, or else we should provide that a Court psychologist of high standing shall attend the sessions of the Court and assist the Attorney General of the United States in bringing the Court to its conclusions."

Thirdly, Senator DANIEL shows himself a practical man—one who does something about a problem, as well as defining it, and seeks substitution of a law for action. When he was attorney general of Texas, he prepared the bill that established a university of Negroes "second to no university in the State or in the South (Texas Southern University in Houston) * * * although the Supreme Court held several years ago that Negro citizens are entitled to attend, on the graduate level, the University of Texas—the great majority—about 6 to 1—of the students have elected to remain in their separate university." He also cited the fact that various reports by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have shown that Northern Negroes, with free choice, have elected to go to separate schools for Negroes in the South, rather than to schools in the North where they could be with members of other races if they desired. According to the latest edition of Encyclopedia Britannica, 85 percent of all the United States Negro citizens with college degrees received them at Southern, separate schools.

Fourthly, DANIEL proved himself a man of good will. "I know of no one who had ever defended the doctrine of separate but equal schools because of prejudice or a desire to discriminate against either the white or colored race, or because of hatred, or a feeling of superiority. I have not lived among people who have that feeling. That has not been my feeling. The only defense and justification for the doctrine have been that in certain localities it has been impossible to maintain peace, order, and harmony among the people, and to have support of the public-school system by the taxpayers, when people are forced to mingle together against the will of the majority of each race."

DANIEL, in his defense of the basic good will of the South, also noted that "not too long ago in the District of Columbia, swimming pools had to be closed because of fights which occurred when there was comingling of the races. The same thing was true in Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, and New York."

Right now Senator DANIEL is most interested in the coming narcotics probe. He thinks that out of it may grow some knowledge that will be helpful in solving the widespread juvenile delinquency.

He also is keeping a weather eye on two areas that are important to Texas. One is the recent decision by the Supreme Court, which overrode the Federal Power Commission decision to allow a division between the producer and the distributor of natural gas.

"The men whom this decision will affect are not utilities. They are not natural-gas companies. They are searchers, developers, and producers of oil and gas who cannot operate under utility-type rate fixing," he says.

The other area is one in which DANIEL has won a decision, but feels that eternal vigilance, as expounded in Curran's speech on the Right of Election in 1790, is the price Texas is to pay for the right to keep its tidelands. Attorney General Brownell is asking the Supreme Court to declare the seaward boundary of Louisiana to be 3 geographic miles (6,076.1 feet per mile) instead of the claimed 3 leagues (10½ miles). The Submerged Lands Act of 1953, which set aside the Supreme Court decision that the Gulf States had no right to their tidelands, clearly stated that the coastal States were to hold the lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries—which was to be 3 geographic miles seaward from the coast, or to boundaries existing when the States entered the Union. Louisiana claims that the enabling act which allowed it to enter the Union, contained a clause which included within the boundaries of the State "all islands within 3 leagues of the coast."

As DANIEL points out, no one is now questioning the right of Texas to its tidelands since the Republic of Texas entered the Union by treaty. Still, it never pays to relax that eternal vigilance. What happens in Louisiana can be made into a yardstick for Texas, if one closes the vigilant eye.

One of DANIEL's appointments within the Senate Judiciary Committee is to the subcommittee that considers proposed constitutional amendments. For instance, here are the Bricker amendment (which would limit treaty making powers of the President) and the Gossett-Lodge proposal to abolish the electoral college and elect presidents directly on the vote of the people.

There is another amendment which has a note of expediency about it in these atomic times. It would allow the governor of a State to appoint Congressmen for unexpired terms, if more than half of the Congressmen or the Nation are wiped out in one blast.

Generally Texans know the history of PRICE DANIEL. Only 44, he has packed into a few years a variety of experience. He has been a newspaper man, a Texas legislator (and speaker of the house), an attorney general in the State administrative setup, and has had a sizeable amount of experience in the Army (from PFC to captain) and in Security Intelligence during World War II. He waived immunity and resigned from the Texas House to enlist in the armed services. He has been author of learned treatises—that famous Texas Election Laws is one.

He was born in Dayton, Tex., on October 10, 1910, and took 3 degrees at Baylor University—1 in journalism, 1 in law and a doctor's in law. On June 29, 1940, he married Jean Houston Baldwin, a great-granddaughter of Sam Houston. She is one of those pretty, alert, competent girls that Texas turns out, whose youthful appearance belies the four children—Price Jr., Jean, Houston, and John.

His Texas residence is Liberty, where he is coowner and publisher of the Liberty Vindicator and Anahuac Progress.

He has always been a popular campaigner in Texas. In 1948, on his reelection as attorney general, he polled 1,231,881 votes, the highest number ever garnered by a candidate in the Democratic primaries. In 1952, when he was elected to the Senate, he polled 72 percent of the votes in the primary, and of course was elected without opposition in the general election.

DANIEL's administrative assistant is Jake Jacobson, of Austin, who attended law school at the University of Texas, served with the Texas Supreme Court as briefing attorney for 1 year and worked as executive assistant to Senator DANIEL when he was attorney general.

John Goldsum, Jr., of Victoria, is legislative assistant. He served as a reporter on the Victoria Advocate and will graduate from law school at American University this year.

The Senator's personal secretary is Mrs. Emma M. Ward of Austin who has been with him since 1943 except during the time Senator DANIEL was in the Army, at which time she was secretary to Speaker of the House of Representatives CLAUD GILMER.

Mrs. Margaret Behrens of Uvalde has been with Senator DANIEL 3 years, while he was attorney general, and was secretary to the campaign manager during the senatorial campaign in 1952.

Mrs. Mary Folk, of Houston, who is, in charge of the file room, is the widow of a prominent Houston attorney and formerly was active in the Texas League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Maydell McDarment of San Antonio joined the staff in Washington. She worked for many years as secretary to the late Gen. Billy Mitchell.

Harry McAdams of Austin was a page in the Texas House of Representatives when Senator DANIEL was speaker.

Mrs. Cecil Morgan, Jr., of Fort Worth, who is receptionist, is the wife of a former University of Texas basketball player presently serving in the Army near Washington.

Miss Martha Fulbright, of Waco, a recent graduate of Baylor University, joined the staff this year and works in the file room.

Mrs. Marjorie Amidon, who lives in Washington, was formerly with Representative Hatton Summers of Dallas for many years.

Ex-Lincolnite McKenna Heads National Jaycees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor has come to Nebraska with the selection of Hugh McKenna, of Omaha, Nebr., as national president of the junior chamber of commerce. Those who are still to know him will respect and like him. Along with his youth and ability is a friendliness and sincerity that typifies so many of our young leaders today who actively enter into a cause and give it the effort and attention it deserves.

Appropriate recognition has also come to Charles Thone of Lincoln, Nebr. As 1 of 5 State junior chamber of commerce presidents, he was recognized for outstanding service to that organization and presented the Clayton Frost Memorial Award.

I am happy to join with other Nebraskans in paying my respects to these young men for the recognition which they have so justly earned.

And in connection with the recognition accorded these Nebraskans, I ask leave to insert and have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item from the Lincoln Journal of June 24, 1955:

EX-LINCOLNITE MCKENNA HEADS NATIONAL JAYCEES—CLAYTON FROST MEMORIAL AWARD PRESENTED TO THONE

ATLANTA, GA.—Hugh McKenna, 33-year-old Omaha insurance executive, won a 1-year term as president of the U. S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, sweeping from behind in a dramatic third ballot turnabout.

Charles Thone of Lincoln, president of the Nebraska Junior Chamber of Commerce, received the Clayton Frost Memorial Award.

McKenna, a former Lincolnite, trailed Edwin H. May, Jr., 30, of Hartford, Conn., by a vote of 1,204 to 794 on the first ballot. May fell short of a majority by 169 votes when Van Richardson, 34, of Greenwood, Miss., polled 748 votes.

After the second ballot went about the same way, Richardson's support broke away to McKenna. Texas and Alabama led the way as Southern States swung to the Nebraskan.

May had gone into the balloting as a heavy favorite.

The final third ballot count was 1,450 for McKenna, 1,197 for May, and 72 for Richardson, who had released his delegates. Howard E. Norris of Madison, Wis., who had been expected to enter the race, withdrew his possible candidacy as nominations were being made.

McKenna, like the other candidates, a national vice president, served as an Air Corps captain during World War II.

He is married to the former Margaret Koupal, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. R. V. Koupal of Lincoln. They have two children.

The new president is an administrative assistant to the president of Mutual Benefit Insurance Co. in Omaha and was a lobbyist to the Nebraska Legislature during the 1953 and 1955 sessions, representing insurance firms.

McKenna's junior chamber activities first began in Lincoln, where he was a member in 1946. He became a member of the Omaha Jaycees in 1947.

He is a graduate of the University of Nebraska.

Testimony on H. R. 377, Garmatz Public Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Committee on Banking and Currency reported out a bill which provided for only 35,000 public housing units a year. I had introduced H. R. 377 which would have restored the program to the one that was adopted in 1949, for 135,000 units per year average and a maximum of 200,000 per year. The bill approved by the Senate carried out the recommendations made in my bill, H. R. 377, in this respect. However, when the housing bill comes before the House, I certainly will support any amendment to substitute the Senate bill's provisions on public housing, or otherwise increase the number of units authorized from this very inadequate figure of 35,000.

My reasons are contained in the following statement which I gave to the Banking and Currency Committee on my bill, H. R. 377:

TESTIMONY BY HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON HOUSING LEGISLATION

Chairman SPENCE and members of the committee, I am appearing here today primarily as the sponsor of H. R. 377, which I introduced on the opening day of this session of the Congress, to repeal the various restrictions adopted in recent years to cripple public housing. The evidence before this committee is clear that public housing construction has come to a standstill, and to all intents and purposes is dead and buried as a program of Government.

While my testimony will be devoted largely to my own bill on this one phase of housing—that is, the public housing program—I want to say at the start that I am very much in accord with other measures before you to expand and accelerate the urban redevelopment work which has been so successful in the larger cities of the country. Baltimore has been one of the leaders in urban renewal as well as in public housing and in the rehabilitation of existing housing, and so we are naturally very much interested in seeing the basic authority for all of these programs continually kept up to date with current needs.

Before going into the details of H. R. 377, I will tell you first what it is I would like to see accomplished. It is this: I would like to see this committee restore the public housing program—that is, the legislative authority for public housing—to the dimensions provided for in the Housing Act of 1949. This act, which the late Senator Taft helped to write—and I mention that to show that

we Democrats are not the only ones to favor an effective public housing program—the 1949 act, I repeat, provided a standard of 135,000 public housing units a year. It permitted as many as 200,000 in any 1 year.

That is what I would like to see it go back to. If this committee and the Congress should adopt that objective of H. R. 377, it would not mean, of course, that the Government would have to build that many units each year. The President would have a wide amount of discretion—in fact he would have complete discretion—in putting the program into effect each year at the levels he thought commensurable with the need and with the economic situation generally.

That is a very important point that is often lost sight of. When President Eisenhower says he is willing to settle for 35,000 units a year for just a few years, my bill would not force him to construct more than that during his term. It would allow him, however, to look at the whole problem of public housing not from the standpoint of what he thought he might be able to wheedle out of a reluctant Congress in any one year but rather from the standpoint of what the country needed.

I think it is pretty clear that even the limited authority which now rests in the administration to build public housing has not been used in the past year or two with any degree of effectiveness or even interest. If you go through the construction statistics you find public construction of residential building hitting what appears to be new lows, with public housing starts during 1954 and half of those of 1953, which, in turn, were only about half of the number in 1951. Instead of a monthly average of 3,000 or more public-housing units which we were still reaching in 1953 on the basis of previous commitments, the record since the adoption of the Housing Act of 1954 shows monthly totals of 200 units, 300 units, 700 units, 900, and so on, with few months showing more than 1,000. So obviously we are not making any kind of production record on public housing; we are not even holding our own—not coming anywhere near building the number of units authorized by the restrictive legislation now in effect.

Nevertheless, I think we can now acknowledge the mistakes of last year, admit that they have resulted in the virtual death of public housing, and go on from there.

The bill which I have introduced attempts not only to correct the mistakes and restrictions of last year's bill but to do back to other legislative roadblocks beginning with the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953.

Thus H. R. 377 would repeal this language of the 1953 Appropriation Act:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 * * * (2) after the date of approval of this Act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 35,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress."

Now this, of course, was, at the time, a serious blow for public housing and was one of the first big victories since 1949 for the group which has been opposing public housing so vigorously. As the members of this Committee know, President Truman's budget provided for only 75,000 public housing units a year while the Korean war was in progress, but when this rider to the appropriation bill for the 1952–53 year reduced that further to 35,000 units, the program kept going, and it kept going to the full limit of that authorization.

The following year, however, the 83d Congress, in the first Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the 1953 fiscal year starting July 1, 1953 contained this further restriction:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 * * * (2) after the date of approval of this Act, enter into any new agreements, contracts, or other arrangements, preliminary or otherwise, which will ultimately bind the Public Housing Administration during fiscal year 1954 or for any future years with respect to loans or annual contributions for any additional dwelling units or projects unless hereafter authorized by the Congress to do so."

Now this, of course, completed the hatchet job on public housing through riders on appropriation bills. From 35,000 units a year—a cut in half from the Truman budget—we then went down to no units—no new units—as the law of the land.

H. R. 377, therefore, repeals the continuing prohibitions on public housing from both the 1953 and 1954 appropriation acts.

The third legislative provision on public housing which H. R. 377 would repeal is section 401 (I), Housing Act of 1954:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Public Housing Administration may, with respect to low-rent housing projects initiated after March 1, 1949, enter into new contracts, agreements, or other arrangements during the fiscal year 1955 for loans and annual contributions pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, with respect to not exceeding 35,000 additional units: *Provided*, That no such new contract, agreement, or other arrangement shall be made except with respect to low-rent housing projects to be undertaken in a community in which there is being carried out a slum clearance and urban redevelopment project, or a slum clearance and urban renewal project, assisted under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and the local governing body of the community undertaking such slum clearance and urban redevelopment project, or slum clearance and urban renewal project, certifies that such low-rent housing project is necessary to assist in meeting the relocation requirements of section 105 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *And provided further*, That the total number of dwelling units in low-rent housing projects covered by such new contracts, agreements, or other arrangements shall not exceed the total number of such dwelling units which the Administrator determines to be needed for the relocation of families to be displaced as a result of Federal, State, or local governmental action in such community."

This provision gives the impression that we have a public-housing program but as a practical matter we know that virtually none of the 35,000 units it purports to authorize has actually been approved for construction. Many of us warned last year that it would build no housing and, of course, it has built no housing. It should be repealed in toto.

And rather than settle for this very inadequate number of 35,000 units a year recommended by the President, I urge you to go back to the 1949 act, as my bill would do, and let us have once again a public housing program that builds public housing, that builds enough public housing to make at least a dent in the serious needs of our cities. As the spokesman for the American Municipal Association, Mayor Clark, of Philadelphia, told you earlier in these hearings, Philadelphia alone needed 70,000 new units all by itself as of 1950. In the case of Baltimore we have been working steadily at the problem of expanding our housing facilities and our housing authority, which is one of the best, has had a number of projects waiting in line for authorizations and for construction commitments, projects which have been held up because of the restrictions in the 1954 act.

The red tape, the statistical analyses, the studies and surveys required under the 1954 act before a community could get any part of the 35,000 units which were supposed to have been authorized by the act have made a frightful and chaotic situation out of public housing everywhere. Even a city like Baltimore which has been on top of this whole problem over a period of years and which has had certainly one of the best "workable programs" in the country has been put to tremendous work tied up in the most elaborate kind of red tape.

For these and other reasons well known to this committee, I urge you with all the emphasis I can command to repeal these bad mistakes which Congress has made on public housing in the last 2 years and, as I said, give us a real program, a workable program, and effective program which will help get people out of slums and into decent accommodations at rents they can afford. Bring sunlight into the lives of people living in dark alleys.

Senator Kennedy's Proposal for Bipartisan, High-Level Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Should Be Supported

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for some time the Immigration and Naturalization Acts have been the center of controversy. Almost everyone interested in the subject has admitted that changes are desirable and necessary. For example, on May 27, 1955, the President submitted certain recommendations to the Congress which he said were vital to the administration of the acts. At that time he pointed out that "the purposes of the act—the Refugee Relief Act—are not being achieved as swiftly as we had all hoped." Numerous bills have been introduced to affect changes in our laws relating to this subject both in the Senate and the House. I, myself, have introduced 2 bills which, if passed, would clarify many of the more confused sections of the law on this subject and would bring the immigration policy of the United States into line once more with the traditional attitudes of the American people on this matter.

I am introducing today a companion measure to Senate Joint Resolution 84, introduced in the Senate yesterday by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. Because the subject is both controversial and vitally important to our Nation, the creation of a blue-ribbon investigative body seems to me to be the most workable approach to the problem. We are a Nation dedicated to the idea of

providing a land of opportunity for the oppressed of other lands. This has been one of the cornerstones of our democracy and it has helped to make us the great Nation that we are. Today, however, because of the Communist conspiracy, we must examine our immigration policies in the light of a serious security problem. The conflict between our traditional desires and security has created the legislative impasse which now exists. A nonpolitical commission composed of men of unimpeachable reputation should find it possible to take both sides of this controversy into account and report legislation designed to establish a workable policy in both respects. Without such a balanced study our security complex is likely to destroy both our traditions and the high esteem in which we are held by the peoples of other nations because of our traditions. I sincerely hope the Congress will see fit to pass this resolution promptly. The text of my proposal follows:

Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy

Resolved, etc.,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to maintain a program of sound and orderly immigration and naturalization of desirable immigrants on a basis consistent with the best interests of our national security and national economy, and consistent with basic American ideals; to promote effective, vigorous, and efficient administration and enforcement of such a program; and to provide for a reexamination periodically of such a program and its actual operation in order to achieve these ends.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four members appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government, and two from private life;

(2) Four members appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life; and

(3) Four members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(c) Of the members appointed to the Commission not more than two shall be appointed by the President of the United States, or the President of the Senate, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the same political party.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but such vacancy shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4 (a) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(b) All employees of the Commission shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to character, associations, and loyalty and a report of each such investigation shall be furnished to the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall study and investigate—

(1) the administration of the existing immigration and naturalization laws and their effect on the national security, the foreign policy, the economy, and the social welfare of the United States; and

(2) such conditions within or without the United States which, in the opinion of the Commission, might have any bearing on the immigration and naturalization policy of the United States.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

REPORTS

SEC. 8. The Commission shall submit interim reports to the Congress and the President at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the Congress and the President not later than April 30, 1956. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Ninety days after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 8 of this act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

Will the Voices of the Baltic Peoples Be Heard at the Summit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, with prayerful expectation the world awaits the much-heralded meeting at the summit, that nether, nether land habitated by the titular heads of powerful states—some the elected representatives of their peoples, others the self-appointed managers of their people's fates. Whatever their sovereign status the fact still remains that the lives of countless millions will weigh heavily in the balance of their decisions. But what of the great multitude of people who will not have voice or representation on this hallowed summit? Who is to decide their case? Who is to give voice to their feeble cries for freedom? Their erstwhile protectors will see to it that the embarrassing questions about inhumane and criminal treatment that is foisted upon them will never appear before this world forum.

The freedom-hungry peoples that I refer to are the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians; sometimes referred to as the Baltic States. Their incorporation into the Soviet Union was itself a miscarriage of national justice, if there be such a legal entity; but the mass deportation of these peoples to the mining and slave-labor camps of Russia will take its place among the irremovable blights upon the conscience of all humanity. I ask my colleagues to take cognizance of these inhumanities and to join me in denouncing the inhuman acts of its perpetrators.

I should like to include with my remarks a letter which accompanied the resolution that was drawn by the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit on the occasion of their commemoration of the mass deportations that took place in their countries on June 12, 1941. My Michigan colleague, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, previously published the resolution which appears in the July 27 RECORD. The letter follows:

THE BALTIC NATIONS
COMMITTEE OF DETROIT,
Highland Park, Mich., June 12, 1955.

The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: On the occasion of the 14th anniversary of mass deportations from Baltic States by the Communists and on the 15th anniversary of the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union, commemorated by Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in Detroit area on June 12, 1955, the enclosed resolution was adopted which we would respectfully call to your attention.

Since national freedom and independence are dear to all freedom-loving people, our nations look to the leaders of the free world for help in restoring freedom to the enslaved people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Any assistance that you, as honorable Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, could give to restore the freedom of our beloved countries will be forever appreciated by the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Very truly yours,
THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE OF DETROIT,
SIGURDS RUDZITIS,
Chairman; President of the Latvian Association in Detroit.

We Pay Cost Anyway, Why Not Directly?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to take prompt action to bring out a bill to increase postal rates. It is difficult for me to see any justification in Government subsidies for users of the mail. The Post Office Department should be self-supporting, and I believe that it is up to us as Members of Congress to pass legislation which will make this condition possible.

I am introducing into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Ventura County (Calif.) Star-Free Press on January 25, 1955. The writer has headed his comments "We Pay Cost Anyway, Why Not Directly?" He makes an excellent case to the effect that the users of the mail, rather than the general taxpayers, should pay the cost of running the Post Office Department. I am in complete agreement with the views as expressed in this editorial:

WE PAY THE COST ANYWAY, WHY NOT DIRECTLY?

We suspect that a terrific hubbub will be raised by the request of Postmaster General Summerfield for an increase in mail rates. Howls of anguish will arise from various groups of heavy mailers and these will be echoed by numerous Members of Congress.

Yet, when you come right down to it, why not? We're paying the full cost of carrying the mail now, paying part of it through postage stamps, the rest through taxation. If we can get around to a basis where the mail rates balance the Department's budget, then there will be that much less to be taken out of our hides by the Internal Revenue Service. The total amount will remain the same.

Trouble is, for a long while the country has been subsidizing magazines, newspapers, distributors of advertising matter, and small merchandise packages, and others by granting them mail rates far less than the cost of the service. Still, all of those groups have to help pay, through taxation, for the benefits they receive.

Originally, this policy was based on the belief that it was in the national interest to promote the "dissemination of information" by this means. Well, it seems to us that the country has grown up to the point where it might well let such business stand on its own feet. People who subscribe to magazines, for instance, surely can afford to pay the costs of having them delivered; can afford to do it directly as well as they now do indirectly.

It would be a very refreshing change, it occurs to us, to have a self-supporting Post Office Department.

Socialism Does Not Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot about socialism and there are those who hold the opinion that a little of it might be a good thing. I do not agree.

Right next door our good neighbor to the south has been floundering with it for many years, and the result has been shown in the article in the U. S. News & World Report on June 17, 1955, which, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD:

WHY THE BOOM BYPASSES MEXICO

Question. Is Mexico having a business boom anything like that to be found to the north, in the United States and Canada?

Answer. No. There has been some economic expansion in Mexico, but mostly it is seen in relatively small-scale business and industrial projects—nothing like the big capital investment and production gains in the other countries.

Question. What is holding back Mexico's economic development?

Answer. There are many factors that slow it up. However, one of the most important factors is the attitude of Mexico's Government toward foreign investment—in fact, toward private capital in any form.

For instance, if a foreigner wants to set up a corporation to do business in Mexico, he finds that there is a law that requires majority ownership by Mexican nationals in that corporation, unless the Government grants him a special exemption.

And the Government, except in special cases, requires that at least 90 percent of the technical and unskilled workers of any company must be Mexican nationals.

On top of that, private capital—Mexican as well as foreign—is slow to invest in a country where the Government is getting deeper and deeper into business on its own account.

Question. Is Mexico, then, a socialistic country?

Answer. Not wholly. But there is much socialism mixed in with its economy. The petroleum industry that it took over from United States oil companies in 1938 is only a small part of the Government's operations.

The Government runs almost every railway. It has a monopoly on grain purchasing, and owns Mexico's biggest food-distributing firm. It owns many other companies—for instance, an aviation firm, powerplants, mines, a food-freezing plant, and so on.

Altogether, it is estimated that the Government now runs about 40 percent of Mexico's business operations.

Question. What has been the effect of that situation on Mexico's economy?

Answer. One result is continuing inflation.

When American companies were producing oil, Mexico had lots of foreign currency. Mexico, in the 1920's, was the world's second largest petroleum producer. The peso, then, was worth about 50 cents American.

Now Mexico has an unfavorable trade balance. The state petroleum industry exports little oil, and the peso, today, is worth about 8 cents.

That is one of the big reasons why the cost-of-living index in Mexico is about five times as high as it was in 1939. Workers get wage raises from time to time. For instance, they got a 10-percent raise after last year's devaluation of the peso. But their wages, if anything, buy them less now than before.

Question. Do the various Government industries bring in any revenues?

Answer. On the contrary, the Government has to put money into its enterprises. In past years, there have been sums in the Government's annual budget amounting to five hundred or six hundred million pesos for investments. In American dollars, at the old rate of exchange, that would amount to about $60 million. And the Government gets no taxation revenues from its companies.

Are the federally owned industries run efficiently?

Answer. Take the railroads, as an example. The biggest rail system was nationalized back in the early part of this century—during the time of the dictator Porfirio Diaz. Other systems were nationalized from time to time after that.

During the 1930's, the Government decided on an experiment. It turned the operation of the railroads over to the labor union of railroad workers. And the railroads became such an awful problem that, in 6 weeks, they went right back into the hands of the Government. They have been operated by the Government ever since. And the cost of operating them is 120 percent of their receipts—which means that the Government takes a loss.

A very powerful union has a big voice in railroad operations. The men in the field often pay little attention to management. They pay attention to what the union officials tell them. If you go around, you see the railroads operating with nearly twice as many people as they need. Officials go by and see people loafing, and do nothing about it—the union members cannot be fired.

Question. How long has nationalization been going on in Mexico?

Answer. It really started on a large scale when Lázaro Cárdenas was President of Mexico—that means from about 1932 on.

Actually, there are not many cases of expropriation like that of the oil industry, in 1938. What happens more often is that the Government has to step in and take over a company that's in financial trouble—a

company in which the Government already has a considerable interest.

This is the way it generally comes about:

A Mexican politician decides that some day he may retire from politics. Therefore he wants to start a business, just in case. Because of his political influence he can borrow a lot of the necessary capital—even all of it—from the Government investment bank, called the Nacional Financiera.

If that business does not turn out to be profitable—which is often the case—the Government bank has to take over the business to protect its loan. That, in effect, puts the business in Government hands. Then the bank puts somebody in charge. That person is supposed to pull the business out of the red. But that never happens, because usually he is a political appointee and not really qualified for the job.

Question. Does the Mexican Government ever start any business or industry of its own?

Answer. That happens, too. For instance, there is the food-distributing agency called CEIMSA—the export and import company. It buys all the grains from Mexico's farms, and handles all the grain imports from abroad.

CEIMSA sells staple foods at retail through its own 560 local stores—it is the largest retail merchant in Mexico. And it supplies grain at wholesale to private dealers. It also imports lard and eggs, and things of that sort.

Farmers are required to sell their grain produce to this company. They have no choice. You cannot get a truck or freight car to ship any grain in Mexico except through CEIMSA. If a farmer gets out in his own truck on the highway, he can be stopped by police because only certain groups are permitted to do trucking on the highways.

Question. What about the petroleum industry that the Mexican Government took over from United States companies? Is the Government doing a good job on oil production?

Answer. There is an answer to that question, right across the Rio Grande—in the State of Texas.

Both Mexico and Texas have an abundance of the same subsoil structures that produce oil. So you have a basis for comparison in their oil production.

That comparison shows that Texas—just 1 State—is producing 10 times as much petroleum as all of Mexico.

For many years, PEMEX—that is the Government's oil subsidiary, Petróleos Mexicanos—put little into new properties and drillings. Then, in 1949, it announced a huge development program that was to cost $470 million over a 5-year period. Oil officials promised to raise production to 132 million barrels of crude by 1953.

Far from doing that, they managed to produce only 83 million barrels of crude by 1954. They claim this figure to be almost double the amount produced by United States companies in Mexico in 1937, just before expropriation. What they do not point out is that production, last year, was less than half what it was in the early 1920's before the United States oil industries began to be hampered by Government interference.

Question. What is the real trouble with Mexico's oil industry?

Answer. Much of the Government's investment has gone into private pockets—graft. That was especially true before the present head of PEMEX, Antonio Bermúdez, took over. He is a former businessman himself, a successful one. But he can do only so much before he runs into political opposition.

There are a few good men like Bermúdez in the petroleum industry. But, ever since the Americans were kicked out, the industry has lost ground technologically. In Mexico today, you can see 8 to 10 men handling a drilling rig that 3 or 4 men handle in Texas.

Oilmen say the industry could trim its force by at least 10 percent without reducing the output of petroleum. But that would be politically dangerous in a socialistic enterprise. The unions would fight any such reduction, and politicians with friends and relatives holding down jobs in PEMEX would also make trouble.

As a result, there is not much money left, after wastage, for capital improvements—for drillings, and so on.

And the Government's investment in its oil industry does not begin to compare, in volume, with the hundreds of millions of dollars in private capital that are invested in the Texas oilfields.

Another difference shows up. Texas oilmen drill many dry holes—they have a saying that "gushers begin with dry holes." In Mexico, the Government is reluctant to take a chance on new areas. Many of the "new fields" announced by PEMEX turn out to be no more than extensions of existing oil fields.

Question. Is it true that the Mexican Government is letting United States oil companies come back into the country again?

Answer. American companies are going back in, but only to a very limited extent. There are strings tied to the Government's bid for foreign capital. The private operator takes the risk of drilling for oil. If he finds it, he gets 15 percent of the production for the life of his 25-year contract with the Government in that new area. In addition, he gets 50 percent more of the production until all of the exploration costs have been repaid.

Question. Do these companies have any assurance against expropriation?

Answer. Yes, everybody has more security today. Businessmen say it is because 30 years of socialistic experiments has finally convinced even the politicians that they need to make concessions to get oil in the large quantities that Mexico needs.

Question. Does that point to a definite change of Government policy, away from Federal ownership?

Answer. Not yet. The Government is still taking on other activities. For instance, it is starting up a factory to make 10-ton diesel trucks—heavy machines for which there is no real market in Mexico.

Question. How strong is the Communist Party—is it a danger in Mexico?

Answer. In Mexico, Vicente Lombardo Toledano, the labor leader, makes annual trips to Moscow. He is believed to come back with large funds that the Russians give him to carry on extensive propaganda in Mexico.

The Soviet Embassy has the biggest building of any embassy in Mexico, and is said to have the largest number of employees. It has a whole printing plant, too. There is a magazine called Cultura Sovietica—"Soviet Culture"—telling of the trips of prominent Mexican politicians to Russia, how they are feted there and appear in public with Soviet officials.

The Communist Party of Mexico, itself, gets only a small vote, but it is extremely active. It has a newspaper, and for many years there has been a university called La Universidad Obrera—The Labor University—where Marxist doctrines are taught.

Question. Mexico's President, Adolfo Ruiz Cortines, is described as a "conservative" who is trying to encourage private enterprise. Is that impression correct?

Answer. He is regarded as a good and honest man. But businessmen say he is influenced by many left-wingers in government, and by his 30 years of contact with the left. He has said that free enterprise can pull Mexico out of its economic troubles. But little has been done so far.

The Bulganin-Nehru Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following thought-provoking editorial from the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass.

The article follows:

BULGANIN'S BOGUS BENEVOLENCE

In the Sunday Sun editorial column of June 5, following the release of four captive American airmen by the Chinese Reds, it was stated that the liberation of those prisoners, plus a diminishing of Red sword-rattling over Matsu, Quemoy, and Formosa, indicated that, in effect, there was a good deal of horse-trading going on behind the scenes, with the Chinese doing the bidding.

What happened last Wednesday proves the point brought out here on June 5.

The Chinese Reds, using Soviet Premier Bulganin as a mouthpiece and India's Prime Minister Nehru as a stooge, put some more cards on the table and made a grand and phony overture to the world for peace and amicable coexistence of the Communist world with the democratic world.

In exchange for a number of grandiloquent promises by the Communists, we are expected to be permissive of the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and allow Formosa to be turned over to Red China.

If there had not been provisions and qualifications attached to the Red proposals, we might be inclined to give some thought to the possibility that, at long last, the Communists were making an effort at being sincere.

The Chinese Nationalist Government under Kai-shek is still, in fact, a government. It operates principally on Formosa, but it is still doing business. It is recognized in the United Nations. It is a dagger pointed at the heart of Red China and is a thorn in the side of all communism.

But the Communists now ask the world to believe that they want to be brothers-under-the-skin to everyone. How completely phony their latest gesture is can be readily seen.

For example, they want Formosa surrendered peacefully to Red China. Yet, in the same breath, the Communists assert, as point No. 1 of last Wednesday's formula for world peace, that all nations cultivate "mutual respect for others' territorial integrity and sovereignty."

The "others" apparently do not include the Chinese Nationalist Government and the real estate it still owns.

Point No. 2 of the formula calls for nonaggression. Let us now ask just where the Communists can become aggressive today and get away with it. They were aggressive over Formosa until it was made clear that the United States, with or without allies, would send its battle-ready Pacific fleets into action if Red invasion were attempted. They were aggressive until certain major magazines published in the United States—and which are read carefully by the Communists—printed maps showing just how many aeronautical installations we have throughout the world, on 24-hour alert and primed to shower nuclear and thermonuclear missiles on the U. S. S. R.

Point No. 3 of the Bulganin-Nehru formula calls for noninterference in others internal

affairs for any reason of an economic, political, or ideological character.

Communism itself is an ideology—an applied science of ideas on how to overthrow every other government in the world and enslave their people.

Do the Communists, in making point No. 3, intend to convey the impression that the Communist fatherland (or we should say cesspool) will disown every one of its branch parties in every other nation and refrain forthwith and henceforth from all attempts to undermine and overthrow every other government on the globe? Are they trying to tell us that they are no longer Communists, per se, and that they have decided to call off their crusade against capitalism and democracy?

Silly, isn't it?

Point No. 4 of the Bulganin-Nehru formula wants everybody to agree to equality and mutual benefits. The equality includes admission of Red China into the United Nations as a state of importance equal to any other. The mutual benefits opens up great and fantastic vistas. Inasmuch as the Soviet Union is having trouble feeding itself, is getting less and less food and machinery from its enslaved puppets, and doesn't know what to do next, it could be presumed that both Russia and Red China want to climb aboard the gravy train and get some whopping handouts from Uncle Sam, such as we have been giving to our friends for years. Communism now begs for the benefits of the capitalistic system which it is determined to destroy.

Peaceful coexistence is point 5 in the formula for world tranquillity. This would be attained by everybody stopping the production of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons of war—everyone but the Reds, that is. The whole formula is a sham. The only way to keep the Reds peaceful is to keep a gun at their head.

Alcoholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following petition which has been signed by a number of very substantial constituents of my congressional district:

JUNE 13, 1955.

We, the undersigned, are heartily in favor of prohibiting liquor advertising over the air.

We ask your support of the Siler bill (H. R. 4627) or any other similar bill.

We feel that our right to liberty includes the right to train our children in our own homes in principles of our own choosing. This may not be possible when opposite views are constantly and insidiously invading our private homes at frequent intervals while listening to news, sports, and other broadcasts.

The liquor industry spends millions of dollars in advertising each year. By their own admission, they aim to present drinking in the most alluring form to attract young people, and even small children, and they succeed only too well. At the same time, they are keenly aware that their own advice to drink in moderation leads many to begin drinking, and leads the drinker to drink more.

The attached statement by Dr. Fosdick, taken from the June 1955 issue of New York Temperance Work, aptly expresses the feelings of thoughtful people in all parts of the United States:

"ALCOHOL INVASION OF OUR HOMES—INSUFFERABLE

"Every ingenious device that money can buy is being used to persuade our children to become addicted to alcohol. In homes where the use of liquor is discouraged by family tradition and parental choice, the solicitation of television is continually urging the children and young people to become drinkers. This invasion of our families by urgent appeals to acquire a habit which is ruining millions of our people is insufferable."

Will you please enter this petition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Edith Van Wagner, Elizabeth E. Lown, Rhinebeck, N. Y.; Eunice Browning, Hyde Park, N. Y.; Mrs. Jennie Lloyd, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Ella S. Haight, Stanfordville, N. Y.; Virginia A. Sargent, Ursula Dresser, Eva Van Benschoten, Bessie H. Payne, Poughkeepsie, N. Y; Florence M. Post, Clinton Corners, N. Y.; Mildred Browning, Hyde Park, N. Y.; Anna M. Griffin, Mary C. Spafford, Laura B. Hall, Martha G. Morey, Mrs. Mary Seitz, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Clara Masterson, Staatsburg, N. Y.; Mrs. Verna Mingey, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Mrs. Viola Van Wagner, Percy Masten, Ernest Van Wagner, Hyde Park, N. Y.; Sara A. Cookingham, Harlow C. Cookingham, Florence Baker, Ethel P. Rymph, Staatsburg, N. Y.

Nixon States the Case for the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an article by Mr. Kyle Palmer, political editor of the Los Angeles Times, which was printed in that newspaper on Sunday, June 26, 1955. The article follows:

NIXON STATES THE CASE FOR THE GOP

(By Kyle Palmer, political editor)

For one reason or another the propaganda of the Democratic Party has ordinarily seemed a little more appealing and plausible than the Republican variety of the same.

One of those reasons has been the Democratic Party's tendency to speak in such moving terms of its abiding love for the common man and to shout thunderously of the Republican Party's affection for big business and the wealthy classes.

Another Democratic gimmick for garnering votes has been a consistent claim—not justified by facts—that only under Democratic management has the country been prosperous, safe, and progressive.

Republican fulminations in the face of such tactics haven't always been smart.

In recent months Republicans have made the mistake of stressing the personal popularity of their President over the accomplishments and principles of their party.

Thus actually handing the Democrats another campaign argument.

All of which is very disconcerning to Republican well-wishers who have faith not only in their leaders but in their party and its healthy contribution to public welfare.

Some part of this general state of mind in the GOP apparently made a sufficiently deep impression on Vice President NIXON to cause him to take a good look at the party's plight. And he has come forward with some exceedingly impressive answers. If the Republican National Committee would take his viewpoint as a cue to its own opportunities the fortunes of the GOP might take an early and active upward trend.

The NIXON approach is realistic not only from the standpoint of Republican assets but also that of the party's liabilities.

In a blunt talk to young Republicans in Detroit a few days ago he mentioned the liabilities first and in several categories.

Democrats, he said, not only won control of the United States Senate and House in 1954 but captured 27 of the 48 governorship contests.

In terms of electoral votes, he explained, the gubernatorial results gave the Democrats a showing over Republicans of 347 to 184.

Moreover, Democrats captured 500 State legislative seats from Republicans while GOP candidates wrested only 5 seats formerly held by Democrats.

To such doleful statistics NIXON added further that Democrats have won a majority of city elections held throughout the country since 1952.

And he wound up this recitation of GOP reverses by drawing attention first to the national polls that show a majority of the people is registered with the Democratic Party, and second, that this majority among younger citizens is about 2 to 1.

In the face of such a situation the young Republican Vice President insisted his party has no basic reason for being downhearted. He believes the way is open to the GOP to make itself the majority party.

Despite the dismal statistics he recited, NIXON said, a repeat in 1956 of the Eisenhower-Stevenson battle of 1952 will wind up in an even bigger victory for Eisenhower.

There is considerably more to the Eisenhower popularity, as the Vice President sees it, than liking and trust.

The Nixon analysis holds that President Eisenhower has been able to maintain a consistently high place in public esteem principally because the American people approve the Republican administration's program and accomplishments.

Thus, while "the Republican Party may not be the party of a majority of the American people, the Republican President and the Republican program are favored by a majority."

Particularly, NIXON believes, the GOP and its President appeal to the ideals and the interests of the younger generation of Americans—to those who not only must labor in the future to keep the Nation prosperous but also, if need arises, must fight to make it secure.

Under a Republican administration the NIXON facts show that the country has been extricated from one war and protected, without surrender or appeasement, from involvement in other conflicts.

On the score of honesty in Government, NIXON argues that "the great fault of the previous administration was not that dishonesty existed, but that it was excused, condoned, and defended by men in high places."

Such laxity ended with the Republican victory in 1952, and, in NIXON's words:

"Not only have we cleaned up the mess we inherited, we aren't allowing a new one to be made."

On the loyalty issue: "This administration has enforced exicting laws as they were not enforced before, and has obtained passage of new laws dealing more effectively with conspirators."

As a national administration that believes "the object of government should be to spend as little rather than as much of the people's money as possible," the Republican administration will spent $36 billion less than would have been spent under continu-

ation of the Truman policies—a saving of $1,000 for every family of 4 in the United States.

Answering the Democratic-union labor contention that workers fare better under Democratic Patry policies, the Nixon summarization is persuasive: More jobs than at any time in the Nation's history, and at the highest record of wages paid. More goods being sold and produced, and the factory worker who, with 3 dependents, had an average weekly wage of $52 in 1948, now receives $72.

Even the research report of the American Federation of Labor noted that "wage increases in 1954 provided more of a gain in real wages than any other postwar year, for they were almost entirely over the amount needed to compensate for the rise in the cost of living."

That in itself represents quite an admission or, at least, a concession from an organization so consistently and frequently vocal in pining for the good old days of the Roosevelt-Truman regime.

Essentially, the Republican philosophy as enunciated by the Vice President holds that "the way to real progress and prosperity is through programs which rely primarily on private rather than Government enterprise."

By intelligent application of this program the country has been made prosperous. By introduction of a foreign policy based on firmness, friendliness, and wise preparedness, we have been led away from war and closer to the attainment of peace.

Civil liberties have been upheld and strengthened, more progress made in eliminating discrimination in employment than at any time since 1865.

To sum it up, in NIXON's words: "The Eisenhower Republican program is based on the sound principle that you can be progressive and humanitarian without being socialistic."

A pretty good summarization.

Mutual Security Act of 1955—Some Observations on the United States Technical Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a statement by Dr. John H. Reisner, executive secretary for Agricultural Missions, Inc., New York City, on certain portions of the Mutual Security Act which is now under consideration.

Dr. John Reisner is an authority on this question of technical assistance and he has been abroad and viewed the aspects of our program. His conclusions are important and should be considered by the House before it passes S. 2090.

The statement follows:

No recent foreign policy of the United States has elicited greater public approval and support than the decision of the Government to undertake a program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries and peoples. It appealed to the imagination and generosity of the American people and still does. During the fiscal years 1951–54, the technical assistance program was closely tied in with the military aspects of our mutual security program. This detracted from the high-mindedness and service motive of the original legislation and decreased public and international confidence in it. In the Mutual Security Act of 1954, Congress wisely restored the conditions in the original act for international aid (June 1950), under which technical assistance could be extended to other countries.

In the 5 years since the Act for International Aid was approved by Congress—June 1950—there have been 3 Administrators and 1 Acting Administrator. For about 2 years, it has been under the Foreign Operations Administration. After June 30, technical assistance, or technical cooperation as it is now officially referred to, will, according to present administration plans, be in the International Cooperation Administration, a semiautonomous body within the Department of State.

In the President's message of June 23, 1954, to Congress, he said:

"Our country's participation in technical cooperation programs must be vigorously advanced. Certain fundamentals are essential to their success. First, they should provide experts and know-how rather than large amounts of funds or goods, although they should not be allowed to fail due to lack of necessary teaching and demonstration equipment. Second, they should be tightly adjusted to the needs of the host countries. Third, they should be so administered as to reach as many people, helping them raise their own standards of living and solve their own problems. Technical cooperation's programs now before the Congress are based on these fundamentals. These programs are out most effective countermeasure to Soviet propaganda and the best method by which to create the political and social stability essential to lasting peace."

To what extent has our technical-assistance program achieved the goals set for it in our public laws and in statements by high administration spokesmen? The following observations in partial answer to the question are based on the convictions: (1) That technical cooperation must and will continue as an important phase of the foreign policy of the United States; (2) that in spite of some real accomplishments, its success has been definitely limited; (3) that important lessons have been learned, both from its successes and failures; (4) that much careful consideration must still be given to developing more pertinent programs and to devising more effective machinery of administration.

This statement refers only to technical assistance as envisaged in the Act for International Development (1950) and is not to be confused with economic development which has to do with large scale economic and industrial programs. Technical assistance is here considered as a long-term undertaking.

II. ADJUSTING OUR PROGRAMS TO THE NEEDS OF THE HOST COUNTRIES

One of the great weaknesses of the whole technical-assistance operation is that we didn't take enough time to find out just how we could be most helpful. Moreover, we seem to have thought it necessary to make a mass impact on the country concerned. To succeed in this mass impact, it seemed desirable to put in as many people and as much money as Congress would provide. On the Asian continent with one exception we operate the programs uniformly. The exception is the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction originally operating on the mainland of China and now operating in Formosa as part of the FOA program. Most of these countries vary so greatly that each needs individual consideration. The problems presented in evolving a suitable program for India and Jordan are quite different for self-evident reasons. Granted that needs are varied, great, and pressing, the fundamental problem has always been and still is, how we can help build services and institutions and organizations that will be related to the needs of the people and that can be transfered to the governments as quickly as possible. For example, it does only limited good to spray a whole country once with DDT at our expense, unless the host country can then take over.

A major difficulty is one imposed by fiscal procedures. It is evidently incumbent on any country mission to spend or pledge all the money that the administration has allocated to it in any fiscal year. Not to do so I believe is recognized as a sign of incompetency. There ought to be some way to reward country directors for not pledging funds if in their judgment available funds should not be spent for questionable undertakings because there had not been time to develop more solid plans. The program since its initiation has too many of the earmarks of a July 1 to June 30 operation.

The Special Study Mission (of the House Foreign Affairs Committee) to Southeast Asia and the Pacific (autumn of 1953) recommended as follows: "Technical-assistance programs and projects should be curtailed in number and in people. A smaller number of better projects do more good than a larger number of poorer projects."

III. BENEFITING THE MASSES OF PEOPLE

It has always been the popular understanding that our technical assistance would be closely related to the needs of the masses of underprivileged people. These masses are largely village people. The only country in Asia where this is not true is Japan where we have a relatively small program. On the Asian continent our contribution to village development is spotty, at best. In some countries we have barely scratched the surface of the problem of getting help to the villages. In some countries like India, we have, to our detriment, claimed much more credit than we deserve. The JCRR in Formosa has done an excellent job in getting help to the village people. In one country in Asia a high USOM official said that conditions in the village were so bad, an American couldn't be expected to live there and so nothing had been done. Incidentally, it is a country in which there is considerable Communist strength.

Admittedly the problem is extremely difficult. More could have been done and should have been done and must be done. The point here is that our technical assistance hasn't, in any large way in a number of countries, been reaching the people who need it most.

IV. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AS A COUNTERMEASURE TO COMMUNISM

This is a touchy matter and again we need to be sure. Where communism is being held down or its influence lessened is in those countries where the governments are themselves deeply concerned and are promoting programs for the general welfare. Such is Egypt, India, Formosa, and the Philippine Islands. The heads of these governments have instituted constructive measures to help the common people—generally villagers among whom the plagues of poverty, ill health, illiteracy, landlordism, etc., weigh most heavily. In some of these countries our technical assistance has been of great help. In none of them has it been a decisive factor. Technical assistance, as a deterring factor in the spread of communism, is effective only if the host government is sincerely and actively concerned. For example, Burma has made solid progress in her anti-Communist drive after requesting the United States to withdraw its technical-assistance program in that country. Nor have our programs always been consistent.

In 1 country we are helping in 2 rural community improvement schemes and at the same time investing $700,000 to demonstrate the mechanization of agriculture. The only possible beneficiaries are the landlords. The end social results will be landless villages and broken homes, the wage earners going off to the city in the hope of finding jobs as unskilled laborers.

As I see it, the answer to communism in many of these countries is not so much in increasing production (though this is eminently desirable for many good reasons) but in giving the people hope, removing their frustrations by helping them to help themselves—an overworked term but still very pertinent. Unless the governments concerned take this problem seriously, it is difficult for a technical assistance or any other program to make a significant contribution. The immediate value of a technical-assistance program must not be overweighted in terms of anticommunism. We are prone to such an unbalanced and perhaps unrealistic judgment. The Communist menace in many countries of Asia is a very real one. One can only hope that our Government is not depending to heavily on its technical-assistance program to tip the scales toward democracy.

V. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AS A MEANS TO GAIN FRIENDS

When Congress voted in 1951 that the purposes of the Mutual Security Act and the conditions under which assistance would be made available were to apply to the Act for International Aid (originally passed in 1950), we lost much of the good will and confidence that the program might have produced. In the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (Public Law 665), Congress wisely reversed its action of 1951, but a great deal of harm had already been done. The popular reaction after 1951 was that we were trading technical assistance for our greater military security.

Surely the United States is strong enough and Christian enough to extend a helping hand to the underdeveloped areas of the world and to their underprivileged people without demanding a quid pro quo. That we might be able to help in mutually acceptable ways should surely be sufficient satisfaction for a great nation. Nor to demand recognition and appreciation of our help would not seem to be the best way to make friends. Yet in Public Law 665, noted above, a condition for technical assistance is that the nation being assisted "provides all necessary information concerning such program and gives the program full publicity." It is a self-defeating condition. Further, our enemies are working overtime to discredit us before the world. The right kind of a technical-assistance program ought to provide us with a demonstration of disinterested service that would represent the best in American life. Such a demonstration would more nearly provide the good will we desire.

VI. THE PROBLEMS OF PERSONNEL

Much of this section will appear overly critical. Therefore, at the outset, I want to acknowledge the devotion and success of many technical assistance experts. In considering the problems of technical assistance there has been unanimous judgment that personnel is of major, if not, first importance. How extremely important the factor of personnel is may be illustrated by a remark made by an American resident of many years in the country concerned. He stated that the nationals, in looking back over the work of the United States operations mission would refer to it in terms of the name of a member of the technical assistance team. He had not only done a good technical job but he had identified himself with and was genuinely accepted by the people with whom he worked.

Nevertheless, our technical-assistance program has suffered unnecessarily because we haven't sent enough of the right kind of people. Our fiscal regulations are partly to blame. We have also made too many appointments on the basis of technical competency without sufficient regard to personal qualifications.

More than one highly placed Government official said: "Send us fewer and better men." One Government official complained rather bitterly that the early technical-assistance personnel had been third rate. He considered it an insult that such men should have been sent to them. He also said that the more recent arrivals were much better but the hurt remained. Are technical-assistance personnel different in a foreign country than they are at home? Several said this was so. This point was discussed by some who had been to America for study and were friendly to the United States. They said, "We don't recognize them for the same kind of Americans who came to know and admire."

The importance of personnel has always been recognized by the Government. The fact is, however, that Government policies governing appointments on the basis of classification, salaries, etc., have worked against the goal set. Here is an example given me by a country director. Two men were appointed for the same kind of work. One came from a State paying high salaries. The other came from a State paying a considerably less salary. Both were engaged in the same kind of work in both States. They arrived on the field. The lower paid man who had received a lower salary rating felt that he had been treated unjustly. It affected his whole term of service and the quality of it.

An Asian friend who travels widely over south and southeast Asia and the Pacific told me that technical-assistance personnel were roughly put into four groups. In the first group were the older, often retired people. They were well liked and doing a good job. The next group included those who wanted to travel and see the world. They were of very little use. The third group included misfits, those who weren't making good on their own jobs, and it was easy for their employers to give them leave. The fourth group included those who were fairly well trained and were anxious to do a good job.

The problem of personnel for overseas technical service will be with us as long as we have such a program. It would certainly help the administration if Congress were to go on record more clearly that technical assistance is based on fairly long time bipartisan commitment. The program needs personnel who see in technical assistance more than a 2-year contract. The process of screening applicants for both personal and technical qualifications must be tightened. The orientation courses must be adequate. A good look at the wives of candidates would, in many cases, be a good move if it could be done. It will always be well to remember that the most important factor in this program is personnel.

VII. LOOKING AHEAD

As already noted, in 5 years of technical assistance, there have been 3 administrators and 1 acting-administrator. As of July 1, 1955, the technical cooperation program will be under the International Cooperation Administration with semi-autonomous status in the Department of State. The problem facing the new administration will not be one of purposes and objectives so far as the American people are concerned. It will be one of organization and administration that will demonstrate, to the greatest extent possible, the concern of the American people that the program be one of disinterested service, closely geared to the needs of the cooperating countries and adjusted to bring help and hope to those who need it most. The Administrator must have both responsibility and authority for all phases of the program, especially: (1) The organization of administrative machinery; (2) the appointment of administrative and operational personnel; (3) program planning and execution through all stages from the United States of America to the fields of operation; (4) budget building; (5) relations with other United States Government agencies; (6) cooperative arrangements with educational institutions, business and industrial organizations, private agencies and international agencies, such as FAO, WHO, and UNESCO.

There is developing a body of opinion that our technical assistance should be operated by a Government corporation, established by Congress, and freed as largely as possible, from political and military considerations. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs was so established to carry out a technical assistance program in Latin America. At a hearing of the House Foreign Affairs Committee 2 years ago, and reiterated in 1954, the Board of Consultants to the Director, Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resources Staff, of Technical Cooperation Administration, testified as follows:

1. The United States, in view of worldwide suspicion of her power and motives and the organized hate campaigns made against us, needs at least one demonstration of disinterested service.

2. We heartily support the suggestion made by the Honorable Lawrence H. Smith, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to set up a Government corporation to administer a worldwide technical assistance program. We believe that this would demand public confidence. Public opinion is now generally opposed to any program of technical assistance that is tied to our national military and political objectives.

3. We believe such a corporation would greatly facilitate the cooperation and participation of United States private and semipublic and business agencies, particularly the many United States colleges and universities related to agriculture, engineering, and medicine. Such an organization would also facilitate the use of international organizations.

4. Such an organization would provide a sound financial basis for long-term planning.

5. Such an organization could contract with Government agencies for specific programs.

6. It would streamline operations and provide a degree of efficiency not always associated with Government bureaus no matter how good they are.

7. The organization could be held easily accountable for a limited and agreed upon program of technical assistance.

8. It could operate independently of military requirements and politics and still contribute to our overall foreign policy. Indeed we believe a technical assistance program thus operated independently, would contribute more by way of creating mutual understanding and good will than if operated within any Government department.

A writer to a midwestern religious journal last March put into words the thoughts of many Americans who want our technical assistance to succeed. He wrote: "So long as we adhere to our present policy of resort to the threat of quick retaliation with atomic weapons, and so long as we make political weapons of our food, our economic aid, and our technical assistance, we shall run the risk of losing the very things we seek."

Technical assistance can be made to work. The United States cannot afford to let it fail. The idea of technical assistance represents a long step forward in international understanding and cooperation. It is here to stay. But we need to do a better job than we have done to date.

Prosperity in the Eisenhower Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of Sunday, June 26, 1955. The editorial follows:

PROSPERITY IN THE EISENHOWER ERA

The influence of political action on the national economy is often overstated, sometimes because of partisanship and sometimes because people like to arrange simple patterns of cause and effect.

A CURB ON INFLATION

Once in a while pattern expresses a true state of affairs, showing an effect neatly related to an uncomplicated cause. The present state of prosperity, as reported by Secretary of Labor Mitchell, presents such a case. Prosperity can be described for the present purpose as an increase in consumer income in comparison with the price of consumer goods and services; in other words, by the curbing of inflation.

General Eisenhower when campaigning in 1952 promised to do something about inflation, which he attributed in part to price and wage controls. Among his first acts as President in 1953 was the removal of the controls; by March 17 of that year the country had a free economy again. (It had been suspended in January 1951 on account of the Korean war.) Joseph H. Freehill, the Price Administrator held over from the Truman administration, said President Eisenhower's action would cost the economy of this country $3 billion annually in higher prices.

ONLY SLIGHT RISE

But this is what happened: In January 1953, before the President removed the controls, the Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics stood at 113.9. That meant that under the control system the cost of living had increased 13.9 percent over the cost of 1947–49. The last monthly Consumer Price Index is for May 1955—in 2 years and 4 months it had risen to 114.2. Mr. Mitchell said it hasn't varied more than 0.1 percent in the last 6 months; it was the same in April and May. This means that without controls the cost of living has increased 0.0026 percent in 2 years and 4 months—26 cents for every $100 worth of goods a consumer buys.

But that's not all that has happened since the President freed the economy: While the cost of living has stood still for more than 2 years, wages have been going up. Since President Eisenhower was inaugurated the bottom fifth of the Nation's families have shown a gain of 14 percent in real earnings, which means a gain in relation to prices and taxes. The top fifth of United States families gained 3 percent. Mr. Mitchell's figures show an average gain of 6 percent for factory workers from May 1954 to May 1955.

With the arrest of inflation and the stabilization of taxation (a reduction in Federal taxes is expected next year), every wage and salary increase is a real increase, and this is a marked change from the war and postwar years when wages raced with the cost of living.

THE FREEST ECONOMY

In the midthirties the New Dealers dreamed of a minimum annual income of $2,500 for every family, and to the realists that seemed, indeed, to be a dream. But in the midfifties it seems like a small-bore dream. The New Dealers expected to achieve their $2,500 a year through Government manipulation, by an everwidening system of controls. The achievement of 1955 has not come that way, however; it has come by removing controls. The prosperity we are enjoying is coincident with the freest economy we have had in 25 years.

In terms of purchasing power based on the value of the dollar in 1935–36, only 8,300,000 persons or families have less than $2,000 a year in 1955. In 1935 about 16,500,000 persons or families had less than $2,000. The number of persons or families with incomes of $5,000 or more has increased four times—in terms of purchaing power—from 5,300,000 persons or families to 21,100,000. There are 62,600,000 income-earning families or persons in 1955; that means that a third of the total have between $5,000 and $10,000 a year. But 3,800,000 persons or families have incomes of $10,000 or more a year. That means that 40 percent of all the income-receiving units in the United States either single persons or families, have $5,000 or more a year by 1935 standards—and in 1935 the dollar was worth twice as much as it is now.

Inflation was not thrown back, but it was stopped while income overtook it and passed it. That at this point seems to be the significant domestic achievement of the Eisenhower administration.

Slum Clearance Projects: Building a New City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very appropriate article especially at this time, written by Dr. Laurence Phalan, Ph. D., a former teacher at Boston College, for the Pilot.

This is one of the series of articles on social questions written by Dr. Phalan with the hope that an objective study of conditions may prepare for effective action to improve them.

The article follows:

Sprawling areas of blight are found in every big city in the Nation. Reclaiming these areas is one of the biggest tasks facing our governments and private enterprise. Some progress has been made, however, which gives encouragement to the belief that ways are being found, or will be found to stop the spread of blight and to give decent housing to all the people of this, the most prosperous Nation in the world.

The Federal Government has long recognized the need for its aid to the community in the area of housing and urban redevelopment, and there has been a steady stream of legislation pointed in that direction; the most recent and comprehensive of which is the Housing Act of 1954.

In the Federal Housing Act of 1954, the approach to the elimination of substandard housing and decadent areas is spelled out in terms of what is known as urban renewal, under which the cities and towns develop workable programs to prevent the spread of slums and urban blight. Subsequent to the approval of a workable program for urban renewal, the Federal Government will enter into agreements with communities to provide them with new financial aid.

The workable program is a comprehensive plan developed by the community based upon the following—

1. Adoption by the community of a comprehensive system of codes or ordinances prescribing adequate minimum standards of health, sanitation, and safety under which dwellings may be lawfully occupied.

2. The formulation of a comprehensive general plan for the community as a whole.

3. The establishment and preservation of sound healthy neighborhoods of decent homes and suitable living environment for adequate family life.

4. Establishment of administrative responsibility for effective enforcement of codes and ordinances and the carrying out of planned renewal programs and projects.

5. The recognition of the financial obligations involved in completing the desired program.

6. The adequate rehousing of families displaced by governmental action in decent safe and sanitary accommodations.

7. The obtaining of communitywide participation in the program to insure the understnding and support necessary to guarantee success.

FEDERAL AID

The Federal Government now gives new aid to the community in the fields of urban redevelopment, public housing and special Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for rehabilitation of dwellings only when the above-noted workable program for the community has been developed and approved. For some years back, financial aid by the Federal Government, particularly in the areas of public housing and urban redevelopment has been furnished without requiring an overall plan.

Notable assistance has been contributed through the Federal Housing Act of 1949 under which approximately 6,800 units of public low-rent housing were constructed in 14 cities in the Boston archdiocese, and under which 10 cities have embarked on urban redevelopment programs. The public housing program was discussed in the May 15, 1954, issue of the Pilot and it is well here to confine discussion to the urban redevelopment program.

Urban redevelopment activity, as provided for under the Housing Act of 1949, authorized the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make loans and capital grants to assist communities in eliminating their slums and blighted areas through the assembly, clearance, preparation and sale or lease of land for redevelopment at its fair value for the uses specified in local plans. Losses on a project growing out of differences between cost of clearance and development of the project land and returns on the sale of it to private parties are borne in a ratio of two-thirds by the Federal Government and one-third by the local community. Since it is expected that property assessments on a site will be greatly increased by redevelopment, the immediate cost to the community will be offset in the long run by increased taxes.

NEW YORK STREETS

Urban redevelopment projects in various stages of progress are found in Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Chelsea, Lawrence, Lowell, Medford, Revere, Somerville, and Woburn. Projects are furthest developed in Somerville and Boston. An examination of the New York Streets project in the latter city may serve to illustrate the purposes of the program.

The New York Street project, located in the South End of Boston, is so called because a number of the streets in the area bear names of New York cities. The streets in the section are narrow and inadequate. The majority of the homes are over 75 years old and are obsolete and dilapidated. The lots are very small and there is excessive coverage of the land, with residential parcels covering 90

percent of the lots, thereby preventing adequate light and air.

Few houses have baths or inside toilets. Cellars consist mostly of crawl space only, with dirt bases. Hot water and central heating are a rarity. Property values in the area have declined at a rate of one-half million dollars per decade since 1940 in assessed valuation. The incidence in the area of tuberculosis, infant mortality, fire, juvenile delinquency and crime are well above the citywide averages. In addition to this, there has been considerable encroachment in the area of industrial uses of the objectionable types which are inharmonious with residential use.

Everything in the area will be demolished except for seven nonresidential structures which, by virtue of their condition, use, and location, will not interfere with effective redevelopment of the section.

After clearance, the site will be prepared with a new street layout and new utilities and will be sold to private enterprise for redevelopment for light industrial use at the fair value of the cleared land.

At the present time, there is $2,200,000 in taxable property in the area to be redeveloped. After redevelopment, the tax values will be increased and stabilized and it is expected that the assessed values will be at least double, thereby liquidating the city's costs in a few years. Savings will also accrue to the city in the reduction of fire and police protection, street maintenance and garbage and trash disposal.

As noted, the land is to be redeveloped for industrial use and will provide centrally located prime industrial land with excellent identity value in close proximity to the heart of the city.

Land may also be redeveloped for residential use as well, as in the case of a project to be located in the west end of Boston.

There are areas in all of the larger cities of the archdiocese where blight has not reached a state requiring complete redevelopment, but where extensive rehabilitation and conservation is necessary to restore a section to be an attractive part of the city. The Housing Act of 1954 has as one purpose the furnishing to private enterprise financial means whereby dwellings in such areas may be rehabilitated as part of an overall community plan.

Historically, property located in a rundown area has been considered a poor mortgage risk because of its environment and the usual continued fall of the area toward decadency. Now, under a workable program of urban renewal, it is hoped that areas planned for renewal can be restored and property to be rehabilitated in them can be considered for mortgage purposes not as the area currently stands but as it will be subsequent to redevelopment.

Facts Forum Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Facts Forum news release showing the results of a poll which was taken on questions of public interest.

Mr. President, Facts Forum was created and developed by Mr. H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex., as a public service.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Percent Yes
Should we let the Chinese fight the Reds?	86
Do United States servicemen lose United States protection when fighting under the U. N.?	65
Is a raise in pay for our Congressmen justifiable?	61
Will our decision to defend Formosa be tempered by coexistence policies?	75
Are our Supreme Court Justices keeping faith with our Constitution?	29
Is every increase in Government authority a step toward socialism?	75
Should Congress establish a medical insurance plan?	19
If China was represented in the U. N., would it promote peace in Asia?	7
Can petitions to our Government help in the deciding of important issues?	76
Is reciprocal trade really reciprocal?	15
With today's missiles, do you favor construction of super air carriers?	59
Should American history be a compulsory course in all of our colleges?	90
Will United States lose Japan to Communists in economic trade war?	57
Would a nationwide curfew curb juvenile delinquency?	46

Nomination of Former Representative John B. Hollister To Be Head of International Cooperation Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Emphasis on Concern for United States Needed in Handling Foreign Aid," published in the Ohio State Journal of Friday, June 17, 1955.

The editorial comments on the appointment of former Representative John B. Hollister, of Cincinnati, to be the head of the International Cooperation Administration. Mr. Hollister, who is one of Ohio's outstanding citizens, was for many years a law partner of the late beloved Senator Robert A. Taft.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPHASIS ON CONCERN FOR UNITED STATES NEEDED IN HANDLING FOREIGN AID

It takes an encyclopedic mind to keep up with changes in our governmental agencies. For example, the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) will expire by Executive order of the President on June 30. This farflung operation of the Government will not disappear, however, its functions being transferred to the State Department, where it will emerge as the International Cooperation Administration (ICA).

ALPHABETICAL SWITCHEROO

Under the general classification of foreign-aid programs, we first had the Marshall plan, although that was never the name of a Government bureau. Then there was ECA (Economic Cooperation Administration), and next something called ERP (we forget what the letters stood for), and next the Mutual Security Administration (MSA), and more recently FOA, which now is to become ICA.

The changes have been made as different conceptions of the purpose and scope of United States aid to foreign countries have arisen and become the official policy of the Government. Sometimes the changes have involved abandonment, expansion or regrouping of various phases of the aid program. No doubt the various administrators, rolling with the changes, have felt that a new name would get their reorganized department off to a better start, psychologically.

CHANGES IN HEADS

Besides the changes in names there have been frequent changes in administrators. The latest change has been confirmed by the Senate this week—that of former Congressman John B. Hollister, of Cincinnati, to head ICA, replacing Harold E. Stassen, who headed FOA, and who has become the President's adviser on disarmament with Cabinet rank.

The designation of Mr. Hollister, a law partner of the late Senator Robert A. Taft, to head ICA to succeed Mr. Stassen is interesting to Ohioans from an historical standpoint. On two occasions, Mr. Stassen, seeking the Republican Presidential nomination, came into Ohio to challenge Senator Taft, the State's favorite son, in the contest for pledged delegates. On these occasions, Mr. Hollister was a stanch supporter of Mr. Taft and therefore a political opponent of Mr. Stassen, whom he now succeeds.

SKEPTICISM IN CAPITAL

There has been skepticsm in Washington as to Mr. Hollister's suitability for his new post, based on doubt as to the degree of his internationalist feeling. The opposition, which has been under cover, apparently is based on the premise that in order to administer a program dispensing United States funds to aid foreign countries, one must be an internationalist to a high degree.

Mr. Hollister assured the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which passed on the nomination prior to the Senate's confirming vote, that he would not have accepted the President's assignment if he had not regarded the program as necessary.

A former Congressman, Mr. Hollister has had some experience in the Washington environment, and as an almost lifelong active politician he has exhibited considerable determination and steadfastness of purpose.

WHAT'S GOOD FOR U. S. A.

The internationalists to the contrary, it might be a good thing both for the country, and for the foreign-aid program as well, if the program were administered with a little more consideration for the American people who are footing the bill and from the standpoint of what is good for the U. S. A. Mr. Hollister might be the man to just that.

New Hampshire Industry Aided by Bridges' Vigilance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article which appeared in the Manchester Union Leader of June 25. The

article was written by Herman Lowe, Washington correspondent for the Union Leader, and is entitled "New Hampshire Industry Aided by Bridges' Vigilance."

It is a well deserved tribute to the diligence, skill, and ability of my senior colleague, and I take pleasure in inserting it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE INDUSTRY AIDED BY BRIDGES' VIGILANCE

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON.—The constant vigilance of Senator BRIDGES over proposed legislation which might affect New Hampshire industry is demonstrated on the Senate floor, in committee hearings, and in conferences with government officials.

Another example of the first of these bobbed up, the other day, on the Senate floor, during debate over the Department of Commerce appropriation bill. The House had declined any funds for the 2-year-old Area Development Division of the department, but the Senate Appropriations committee had inserted $150,000 for the agency. Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota—a State which has little industry but would like more—offered an amendment to increase the figure to $250,000.

MUNDT had scarcely concluded explaining his amendment when BRIDGES was on his feet, asserting:

"The Senator from South Dakota well knows that when the Federal Government participates in the matter of relocating businesses, unless new businesses are created, they are bound to be taken from older areas and put into new ones. So far as we in New England are concerned, we are sick and tired of having other areas raid our industries and relocate them in other sections of the country."

BRIDGES said he had agreed to the $150,000 in committee because he didn't want to be unfair, but that he was unwilling to increase the amount without assurance that the Area Development Division would not seek to relocate existing industry, especially New England industry.

"In no sense," MUNDT asserted, "does my amendment move in the direction of moving industries from one section of the country to another."

"I wish I could be sure of that but I am not," replied BRIDGES, who normally is on the same side of issues as MUNDT. "When the Federal Government begins to move in the direction of the relocation of industries, I am suspicious, because we in New England have already suffered too much from movements of that kind."

A little later on the floor, MUNDT said, "I have been checking into that matter since the Senator from New Hampshire has raised the objection. I have the definite word of the Area Development Commission that they have neither the desire nor the authority to relocate industries. They simply provide an advisory service for all communitites."

"Naturally they may not require the relocation of industries," retorted BRIDGES, "but they can do a good deal in an informal way. Having heard all the testimony and evidence, it seems to me that if we were to allow the entire budget request, we would be approving everything the Area Development Division might do."

"No," answered MUNDT, "because the legislative history will clearly indicate that the powerful Senator from New Hampshire, with his great influence in our committee, will certainly crack the whip on the Area Development Division if it makes a single move toward taking an essential worker out of New Hampshire and transferring him to some other area. I hope, with the typical generosity which is characteristic of the great Senator from New Hampshire, he will allow the Area Development Division to operate for 1 year at full speed ahead. Then I shall be happy to join him in making certain that they have not moved in, in an effort to disrupt existing industries."

BRIDGES commented that "we must put the brakes on a little," and asserted that at the end of the next fiscal year, "I should like to see a summary of exactly what has been done, what States have been involved, what new industries they got, and where they were settled."

MUNDT promised to cooperate in this, and Bridges finally agreed to a $75,000 addition to the $150,000 okayed by the committee.

There was another definite purpose in BRIDGES' action. Sometimes, when Congress votes money for an agency, it uses the debate to make clear its views on how the money should and should not be used. While debate is not law, it provides an informal guide, with the implied warning that, unless the agency takes heed, it is liable to find the cupboard bare when it returns for added funds the following year.

Report on Questions Raised by Mrs. Jan Howard, East Palo Alto, Calif., Regarding Radioactive Fallout From Weapons Tests Prepared by Division of Biology and Medicine, United States Atomic Energy Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recent series of nuclear tests conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, honest concern was expressed by a number of thoughtful Americans regarding the radiological effects of these tests upon our population and upon future generations. One particularly good set of questions was submitted by Mrs. Jan Howard, a resident of East Palo Alto, Calif. In order to obtain authoritative answers, I submitted her questions to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Last week, the Commission sent me its report. Since the answers as formulated by the Division of Biology and Medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission are of vital interest to all Americans, I wish to include them in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks. At the same time, I wish to commend the Atomic Energy Commission for the most excellent manner in which these replies were prepared. As I have written to the General Manager of the Commission, this way of handling an inquiry cannot fail to enhance the prestige of the Commission among our people, and further increase their trust in our Government.

The report follows:

"1. What does the Commission mean by no immediate danger? Is there a danger from future tests?"

The radioactive materials released from the detonation of nuclear weapons, whether in tests or in actual warfare, can be harmful or dangerous to human life. The probability of detectable harm, or of any other degree of injury to any individual, either living or unborn, depends upon many factors including the quantities of materials (i. e., the size or energy yield of the bomb) so released. This probability varies from vanishingly small (practically zero) values for the case of single weapons tests as conducted by the United States Atomic Energy Commission to quite large values anticipated from the general use of nuclear weapons in global warfare. The hazards to human life from weapons tests which have been conducted or which may be conducted by the United States in the immediate (or foreseeable) future are insignificant in comparison with the normal hazards of life.

"2. As close as we are to Yucca Flat, are Californians average Americans?"

For purposes of this question, Californians may be considered to be comparable to average Americans, since, while they are nearer to Yucca Flat than is the average American, prevailing winds are from west to east. The total fallout per square mile in California from both Pacific and continental tests has been less, for example, than in the State of New York.

"3. Is it true that radioactivity cumulates in the atmosphere—that it does not totally dissipate for years after the blasts? In other words, are these chest X-rays cumulative? (Note R. Lapp's article, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, February 1955)."

It is true that some of the radioactivity disseminated in the atmosphere from a weapons test is contained in particles so small that they are retained in the atmosphere, in continuously diminishing amounts, over periods of many years. During retention, the total amount of radioactivity per particle is also constantly diminishing as the result of radioactive decay. This material is not more hazardous as a result of its retention in the atmosphere; it is less hazardous than if it were deposited on the surface of the earth soon after its formation.

"4. Is it true as the January 1955 Bulletin of Atomic Scientists suggests that a debate is taking place in high Government circles on the advisability of testing a more powerful hydrogen bomb, the real trouble being that no one really knows what the radiation hazard would be? A wide variation in the estimates of the danger allegedly exists between the Defense Department and the AEC, the AEC's conclusions being less frightening than the Pentagon's."

We are not aware of the alleged debate referred to in the above quotation. It is not true, however, that "no one really knows what the radiation hazard would be." The Commission's statement of February 15, 1955, a copy of which is attached, is a report to the American people in which the radiation hazards from a thermonuclear weapon are described frankly.

The question implies, however, that debate in high Government circles is undesirable. It is, of course, redundant to point out that debate over important issues is often healthy and the opportunity to express an opinion and to disagree is an important asset of our form of government.

"5. Is it true that Winston Churchill told Commons in November that 'an undue number of atomic and hydrogen bomb explosions might have serious effects on the earth's atmosphere for 5,000 years'?"

The Atomic Energy Commission is not in a position to verify the accuracy of the quotation attributed to Winston Churchill. If he did make the statement, he may have referred to either of two possible effects on the atmosphere of the detonation of a very large number of nuclear weapons:

(a) Neutrons from such weapons interact with the atmosphere to produce carbon 14, a radioactive isotope of carbon. A considerable fraction of the carbon 14 so formed would be found in the atmosphere for many

thousands of years. Since the radioactive half-life of carbon 14 is 5,000 years, the number used in the quotation, while incorrectly applied, suggests that this was the effect to which the quotation refers.

(b) A second effect on the atmosphere resulting from the detonation of a large number of bombs at or near the surface of earth would be the dissemination of large quantities of dust into the atmosphere. This would reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the earth and affect the average temperature.

The maximum quantity of carbon 14 which could result from a nuclear detonation of a given yield if all free neutrons were utilized for the production of carbon 14 is easily computed and found to be of negligible biological effect compared to other radioactive materials liberated. "Other radioactive materials liberated" refers to both the highly radioactive, short-lived isotopes of concern in heavy, close-in fallout, and the longer lived isotopes such as Strontium 90 with a half-life of 20 years. The answer to Question No. 1 above briefly evaluates this type of hazard. Also, the Commission's statement of February 15, 1955, deals more completely with the immediate hazards of large-scale detonations.

It should be noted that in the same statement before the House of Commons Sir Winston, in elaborating on the reference to an "undue number," reportedly went on to say that "On the most cautious assessment it would be, so I am advised, considerably greater than the number which could be conceivably employed in any tests likely to be made by the powers in possession of these weapons."

Some guide as to the possible effects of dust thrown into the air by such a bomb is provided by comparison with the eruption of the volcano Krakatoa in 1883, from which several cubic miles of dust were widely disseminated in the earth's atmosphere for several years.

While it would probably be possible to detonate a sufficiently large number of nuclear weapons near the surface of the earth to produce "serious" effects on the atmosphere (i. e., serious to the inhabitants of the earth), there is every reason to believe that more serious effects would be produced directly on the earth's inhabitants by much smaller numbers of nuclear weapons. In any event, serious effects are to be anticipated from the use of nuclear weapons in warfare, not from tests on the scale at which they are presently performed.

"6. Is it true that 'apart from the immediate danger of injuries caused by fallout, there is a much less understood, but potentially fateful danger of long-range damage due to the heriditary endowment of the human race caused by exposure of whole nations or continents to a weak, but widely persistent radioactivity'? (Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, December, 1954). 'That perhaps even the minute rise in the rate of mutations produced by atomic bomb tests (let alone war) may throw a monkey wrench into the delicately adjusted mechanism of the preservation of the species'?"

It is true that rates of genetic mutation in all experimental plants and animals can be increased by exposure to radiation. While no experiments are performed on humans, on the basis of experimental observation on other animals, various geneticists have estimated that from 3 percent to 25 percent of the present rate of genetic mutation in man is due to "natural radiation"—cosmic radiation and radiations from radioactive materials which have always existed in our environment—from which we cannot escape. If this value were 10 percent, for example, doubling the present average level of radiation in the environment, would make the average rate of genetic mutation about 1.1 times as high as it has been in past generation; or, to double the average rate of mutation would require adding 10 times as much radiation as is now in the environment. It is generally believed that increases in genetic mutation in humans would be undesirable, but there is little basis for estimating by what factor the present average rate would have to be increased for the effects to become serious.

"7. Is it possible that the question is no longer which nation can blast the other off the face of the earth, but will mankind be radiated off the face of the earth?"

In the event of full-scale warfare, protection of personnel from the effects of radiation will be a major problem. Whether blast effects or radiation effects will be of greater importance will depend upon several factors, including methods of use of weapons and the relative degree to which populations have taken measures to protect themselves against blast and against the radiation from "radioactive fallout." Among the many answers which the AEC is trying to obtain from our own weapons tests is the answer to the question, "What can the population of a country such as ours do to protect itself from both blast and radiation?"

In considering the questions raised by Mrs. Howard, there appears to be preoccupation with the hazards of weapons tests rather than with the catastrophic results to be anticipated if nuclear weapons were to be fully employed in global warfare. Assuming that the weapons which can be fabricated within the next few years would be deliverable at will, it would be possible for warring nations to practically destroy each other. It is imperative that the human race find a positive means to avert such a war Until such a means is operative, it appears equally imperative for the United States to assure itself that an enemy nation cannot hope to "win" such a war and, consequently, will not engage in such a war. The "undesirable" aspects of weapons tests appear very minor indeed against the background of these urgent considerations.

The Jet Airpower Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a statement by Frederick B. Rentschler, chairman of the United Aircraft Corp. Mr. Rentschler is a pioneer in the field of aviation and an authority on the subject of United States airpower. His observations deserve our careful reading:

To the stockholders, employees, and suppliers of United Aircraft Corp.:

The American people are justifiably confused and concerned about relative progress throughout the world with respect to both military airpower and, to a lesser degree, commercial aviation. This nuclear-turbine age provides far graver implications than history has ever recorded before. The caliber of our national air defense against aggression could mean our very survival. At this critical time, there is no place either for boastful optimism or undue pessimism. It is a time to analyze and coldly appraise the facts as we can best interpret them.

LACK CONCRETE INFORMATION ON RUSSIA

Aviation, since its inception, has been beset by periodic alarms stemming from the human tendency to arrive at a dogmatic conclusion based largely on the sketchiest of information or outright rumor. Some of the current discussion has resulted from statements by men with no direct knowledge of Russian aeronautical developments and often with little regard for known developments both in this country and among its Western Allies. There has been a wide variation in assessing "the facts," which occasionally were not the facts at all. Some are sure that Russia has now taken over leadership in combat types of aircraft. Some are sure that American military types are definitely superior. Others believe that Russia and the United States are now on a parity. It is little wonder that the public is confused and concerned.

Actually, little is known about the exact status and performance of Russian combat types; that is, concrete, first-hand, on-the-spot knowledge. Our experience in Korea proved that the Russian Mig–15 fighter was good, but not as good as our own North American F–86 Sabre, and the combat records proved this. Yet there was a hue and cry over the Mig's superiority as intense as that which has taken place in the current situation, and this continued even while the Sabre was winning in a preponderant manner. Korea further proved that no other allied nation's jet fighters, including those then operational in England, were capable of successfully meeting the Mig in combat.

BOTH COUNTRIES HAVE NEW TYPES OPERATIONAL

Both the Migs and Sabres used over Korea were from designs of the late 1940s that were in quantity production in the early 1950s. A new cycle of experimental aircraft, both in Russia and the United States, came into being in the early 1950s; these aircraft are now in production and becoming operational. This new equipment is vastly superior to the Korean vintage, and no one today definitely knows the exact relative performance of the new Russian and American types. It is known that Russia has fighters superior to the Mig-15 and also that it now has both medium and heavy turbine-powered bombers. All three of these Russian types have been seen singly and in numbers.

Our own Air Force has not just been marking time. The Century series of new Air Force fighters are all vastly superior in power and in performance to our Korean Sabre. The Boeing B–47 medium bomber, powered by six jets, is a fully developed type, has been in production for some years, and is operational in relatively large quantities. The Boeing B–52 heavy bomber, powered by eight jet turbines, has undergone several years of flight testing and development, is in quantity production, and is fast becoming operational. The B–52 is a direct heir of the B–47, which means that it has a wealth of real experience and operational knowledge behind it.

ADDITIONAL AIRPOWER OF NAVY AND ARMY

Moreover, our naval air arm is an extremely important phase of our total airpower as was effectively demonstrated in World War II. In this field Russia has virtually no experience and, to our knowledge, not even a single modern carrier afloat. We have been steadily increasing our aircraft carriers in size and effectiveness and equipping them with jet-powered aircraft capable of carrying and delivering the nuclear bomb.

Aviation has also become an important factor in modifying and modernizing the tactics of both our Army and marine ground troops. Not only has the mobility of the field troops been revolutionized through the use of large, long-range troop and logistics air carriers, in the development of which our country obviously leads the world, but the vertical envelopment theory of attack through use of helicopters has given our troops another important tool with which to work. In helicopters, too, the United States is well in advance of the international com-

petition both from design and production standpoints.

These, then, are the principal factual deductions which are available for analysis. It means simply that turbine powerplants are sufficiently developed, both in Russia and the United States, so that all important combat aircraft are now turbine-powered in both countries. The efficiency of the powerplant determines and dominates the relative excellence of the aircraft.

RUSSIA'S AVIATION POSITION PRIOR TO 1945

The Russians came out of World War II with comparatively little knowledge of the design and production of aircraft, aircraft engines, or of military or transport operations other than in a tactical sense. To the best of our knowledge, they knew little or nothing about turbine powerplants at that time. Two important factors unquestionably helped to bring them somewhat abreast of turbine developments at the end of the war. The first was the acquisition, by purchase, of a quantity of British Rolls-Royce Nene centrifugal-flow jet turbine engines. The second was the acquisition, at World War II's close, of certain German laboratories and a large number of scientists in East Germany.

At the end of World War II, the British Rolls-Royce Nene was perhaps the best developed and most powerful jet turbine in existence. The acquisition of this design by the Russians was, therefore, obviously most helpful and important to them. We know they then had nothing of their own in gas turbines which could have been made available on their own account except after a period of years. The Nene, first largely in its original form and later with improvements the Russians succeeded in making powered the Migs in the Korean war.

If the Russians have made rapid progress in the art of turbine powerplants since World War II, and we believe they have, then it is reasonable to conclude that they have derived very substantial aid from the captive German engineers and scientists, particularly during the 1945–50 period.

Quite apart from these outside gains, however, the Russians steadily have demonstrated a high capability in research and engineering on their own account. Their successes in the fields of artillery and tanks serve as two ready examples. In aviation, where the appearance of the gas turbine leveled the dominant world position the United States and the West had held for a generation, Russia's acquisition of the Nene and its conscription of the German scientists who had pioneered some phases of gas-turbine developments, merely served to speed up Russia's potential.

JET ENGINE REQUIRES 5-YEAR DEVELOPMENT

The time requirement from start of design to the period when an experimental engine has been proved and put in production consists of a cycle of about 5 years. Since the war there has been the opportunity to fulfill two distinct cycles of turbine powerplants from the standpoint of research, engineering, and development. These could be roughly indicated as 1945 to 1950, and 1950 to 1955. With the help of the British Nene and German scientists, Russia was able to more or less match our American progress during this first cycle of 1945 to 1950. Both the Russian Nene and the General Electric J–47, which powered our Sabre fighters, were in the 5,000 to 6,000-pound-thrust category and reasonably comparable. The Sabre was more rugged and was a superior gun platform. It had more firepower, a better gunsight, and greater range. It was fought by better trained and finer pilots, which combined to give the Sabre unquestioned combat superiority over the Mig–15.

NEW FAMILY OF JETS

A new cycle of engines became available in the 1950–55 period in Russia, in England, and in the United States. We have no exact knowledge of these advanced Russian developments. In England, two typical experimental turbines became available, the Rolls-Royce Avon and the Armstrong Siddeley Sapphire, both with approximately 7,000 pounds of thrust. In the United States, the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft J–57 was put into production in this period. Its indicated thrust at that time was 10,000 pounds. This powerplant also employed an entirely new configuration, which resulted in fuel savings of about 25 to 30 percent over any other type of turbine engine then in service. While Russia's powerplant progress remained hidden, we at least knew in 1950 that this country had definitely caught up with the very latest British turbine developments. This important fact has many times been overlooked in estimating the comparable status of British and American turbine progress. Since 1950, both the British Avon and Sapphire and the American J–57 have been placed in production. All are now operational in combat aircraft. Throughout this cycle it is important to note that the J–57 led the way into the 10,000-pound-thrust class. This was the goal of all competitors, and its achievement in this country gave factual proof that we were more than abreast in the turbine field.

We next come to the experimental phase of the 1950–55 cycle, leading to the present moment. During that period new turbine types have again emerged in England, in this country, and quite likely in Russia. Again we cannot be at all sure of Russian developments, but we do have general knowledge of developments in both England and the United States.

Military restrictions preclude our dealing factually with this particular American experimental progress. The Air Force has announced only that new, highly advanced, experimental engines are in being mentioning by name only the General Electric J–79, the Wright J–67, and the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft J–75. Without violation of secrecy, I can at least state that some of these engines are in a higher power class than the J–57. They are not paper engines, either; they are all heading for production.

EXPERIMENTAL VERSUS OPERATIONAL TYPES

British security regulations seem to be considerably more lenient than our own. The British Air Ministry has permitted announcement of its experimental engines of this cycle, indicating their thrust and other basic characteristics. Several analysts have seized upon these widely circulated British announcements and, ignoring our 1950–55 cycle of developments, they have dogmatically elevated the British to a position well ahead of turbine developments in this country. The only comment I feel I can safely make, in the absence of being able to state the facts, is that I believe we have again surpassed Great Britain's best efforts of the 1950–55 cycle, and that we are not on the way to relinquishing that leadership at the present time.

If these facts are reviewed realistically, it becomes preposterous to believe certain public statements that argue British turbine technique is vastly superior to ours, and that we are largely or completely dependent upon British research and engineering for existence in this turbine age. Such conclusions and the natural confusion they cause result from the basic error of comparing British experimental or prototype engines to American gas turbines that are developed and operational. To be specific, the North American F–100 is a developed, operational fighter in quantity production. The B–47 medium bomber has been in production for years and is operational in very large quantities. The B–52 is a heavy intercontinental jet bomber with several years of development behind it, and is in quantity production. There are no British counterparts of these important types in heavy production or operational at this time.

COMMERCIAL NEED FOR MILITARY JET EXPERIENCE

In any survey of international airpower, the field of commercial aviation is always important. In the first place, transport aircraft are a vital element in any war operation. In the second place, leadership in air transport types almost always is a definite yardstick of military supremacy. Since the late 1920's, American-designed-and-produced transport equipment has predominated on the world's airways. It has been stated that our present transport leadership came about because the British were unable to participate in transport development during the World War II period. This oft-repeated legend is false. Our position of leadership was established in the late 1920's, continued through the 1930's and World War II and immediately thereafter, and has never been relinquished.

Shortly after the war, British announcements were made, foreseeing that British turbine-powered transports would be flying between New York and London by 1950. We questioned that statement then and said it was our judgment that piston-equipped aircraft would dominate the world's airways until at least 1955. Then, in 1951 we stated our belief that turbine-powered aircraft of the proper size and efficiency for fleet replacement would not be sufficiently developed for widespread commercial application until 1960. We see no reason today to revise that forecast.

It has been our firm belief that before being ready to meet hard, grueling, transport service conditions, heavy military multijet equipment must be operated in quantity over a period of years to pave the way and accumulate the necessary background of experience. Only then will commercial turbine-powered aircraft replace the proven piston transports.

AMERICAN JET TRANSPORTS IN SERVICE IN 1960

At this time we do have sufficient experience and knowledge to design the heavier types of commercial transports which should be suitable for operations. It is doubtful if it can be truthfully said that jet transports have been unduly delayed, having in mind the necessity for military background of experience. Fleet replacement by turbine-powered equipment should be possible by 1960.

In making this statement, I am excluding the relatively small type of short-haul propeller-turbine transports, which are now in limited service. The propeller is well proved in powers up to nearly 4,000 horsepower. There is little or no service proof beyond that power range. These smaller turbine transports, of which at least one type already is operational, will undoubtedly prove useful in certain fields.

As to the future of the race for larger commercial jet transports, I believe it is reasonable to point out that our major airframe companies, who have been engaged in this field since the middle 1920's, have a wealth of background and experience. Already one American prototype jet transport, the Boeing 707, capable of transoceanic service, has been undergoing extremely successful test flights for more than a year. Lockheed has formally announced its "Electra" development, a medium-size transport to be powered by propeller-turbine engines. A substantial order for "Electras" has been placed by American Airlines. Douglas has just announced its DC–8, the design of which has been underway for some time. The DC–8 is a large, long-range transport of 80 to 125 passenger capacity for nonstop transcontinental and transoceanic service. Both the Boeing 707 and the Douglas DC–8 are equipped with Pratt & Whitney Aircraft J–57 jet turbines. The J–57 will continue to

undergo very extensive military operational service in the next several years preceding the two transports' regular commercial service, which is scheduled to begin about 1960. In my judgment, America's future leadership in air transport types is in good hands, and in the end their designs will continue to predominate on the world's airways.

THE FACTOR OF PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

Certain general conclusions can be drawn from the facts I have set forth here. We can be reasonably sure, I believe, that turbine powerplant developments in this country are definitely abreast of those of any other nation. We not only are not dependent upon British research and development, but we very clearly surpassed them beginning in 1950. We have lost no ground to them in the intervening years. Acknowledging their technical ability and their vast resources and aware of their continuous absorption with military goals, we find it possible to say that the Russians may have proceeded with turbine developments as far and as fast as we have in America. However, the short-term experience and background of Russia in the art of aviation, in my opinion, makes this fact somewhat unlikely and illogical. It is nevertheless much better to err in the direction of viewing Russian developments as having attained the optimum possible progress than to underestimate them.

Quantity production facilities are only important if there are on hand proved designs of aircraft and powerplants of the first rank. At this point, then, production potential can be the final winning factor. World War II gave a clear demonstration of the unparalleled productive capacity of this country with respect to aircraft as well as to all other essential war products.

GERMANY COULD NOT MATCH MACHINE TOOLS

Today our country's potential facilities for aircraft production are far greater than they were during World War II. A prime factor embodied in the facilities is machine tools, tooling, and other special equipment. To me, it seems both illogical and unreasonable to believe that now or in the near future Russia, or Russia combined with her satellites, including East Germany, could possibly provide machine tools and equipment capable of challenging our potential production. Both Germany and Japan, when put under pressure in World War II, soon found that machinery and equipment were their most limiting factors in the production race with this country. Many of us will recall the statements made by experts during the early part of World War II that the Germans were producing aircraft at the rate of 30,000 to 40,000 yearly. Some of us immediately rejected that possibility, and the rejection was based solidly upon our knowledge of machine tools and equipment possibilities within the German empire. Actual German production never exceeded a third of the amount originally claimed. In contrast, during World War II the American aviation industry, with its versatile assistant production sources, reached a peak of annual output of almost 100,000 aircraft.

BELIEVES UNITED STATES STILL HOLDS LEADERSHIP

In conclusion, no one knows better than our American aviation industry that we have a job on our hands to meet, and continue to meet, the design and production competition in combat aircraft on an international basis. In spite of adverse predictions, this same American aviation industry measured up fully to the requirements of World War II. At the end of the war, the American Air Forces both in quality and in quantity, were greatly superior to the combined air forces of all the rest of the world, including those of our allies.

The gas turbine's appearance as an aviation powerplant served almost overnight to equalize the aircraft engine position of all nations and bring about a temporary parity in the air. From the standpoint of research and engineering, the 10 years that have elapsed since the war are insufficient to expect any nation to achieve an overwhelming advantage from airpower alone. The American public has a right to expect that we are not being outstripped. In our judgment, we are somewhat more than abreast of any world developments at this time. We must additionally take into account our superior production potential and, very importantly, too, our overall planning with particular reference to strategically placed air bases in order to make our operations more effective. Tremendous effort has gone into all these factors steadily throughout the years of the cold war. All in all, we have not yet relinquished military leadership in the air, and I, for one, would be unwilling to trade our position for that of any other nation.

FREDERICK B. RENTSCHLER,
Chairman, United Aircraft Corp.

Statement of Former Congressman Jerry Voorhis Urging Further Efforts in Support of Universal Enforcible Disarmament

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the four points contained in the statement issued at the conclusion of the anniversary meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco is as follows:

All nations agree to press forward in the search for agreement on a disarmament plan which would provide a greater measure of security to the world and remove the threat of atomic destruction. They are determined to use their resources, once freed from the burden of armaments, for the improvement of the lives of people everywhere.

In light of this development, a statement of our former beloved colleague Jerry Voorhis which was issued on January 25, takes on added significance. It is a thoughtful, well-considered statement and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Voorhis' observations on this vital subject.

The main business of the people of our generation is to give their children a chance to live.

Shortly after the end of World War II, a newspaper in a big American city published an editorial about the atomic bomb. It said:

"We are face to face with the moral question whether our Nation or any other nation has the right to possess the power to banish life on earth."

The editorial proceeded to appeal for a relentless drive, carried forward in a spirit of desperate necessity, for a system of universal enforcible disarmament and peace in the world.

A few short years later—in 1952 to be exact—this same newspaper published an editorial about the hydrogen bomb. It said:

"As horrifying as the new weapon may be, its development was inevitable. It was in our own enlightened self-interest that we were the first to devise and explode the weapon. But we must realize, too, that it has increased our burdens of responsibility."

The "moral question" was not mentioned. The editorial simply concluded by saying that mankind's hope of survival must rest on the achievement of peace through "skillful negotiation." The prospect of being responsible, along with the Russians, for the probable destruction of most of mankind had, by 1952, ceased to move us so deeply. We were getting used to having the power to banish life on earth.

Now in 1955 this same newspaper has just finished publishing, with great courage, a series of very frank—and deeply terrifying—articles about the probable effects of atomic radiation on the human race. Even if most of humanity should by some miracle escape being fried in the fires of the bomb, future generations would consist of an increasing number of monsters, a decreasing number of normal human beings. So warned the articles. Then the paper commented editorially:

"While viewing the radiation hazard with realism, we must not be talked into an unrealistic curtailment of our nuclear weapons program. As peace insurance for America and the free world, this country must continue atomic- and hydrogen-bomb tests—with traditional caution. In the words of Gordon Dean, former Atomic Energy Commission Chairman, 'We must hold tests to make weapons that are more deliverable, bigger, and better.'"

So now, not only is the moral question forgotten, but so also is any attempt to find a way to end the ultimate and total danger which our generation has brought upon mankind. All we know how to do now is to make weapons that are more deliverable, bigger, and (God forgive us) better. Better, that is, than the hydrogen bomb which can destroy three to five million human beings at 1 blast and which killed a Japanese fisherman 200 miles from the scene of the blast.

We pause here to ask our readers to go back and read slowly and thoughtfully the 3 quotations from the 3 editorials.

Now we'd like to simply ask a few questions.

1. Is there any doubt that, if a war is fought with atomic and hydrogen weapons, it will destroy over half the population of the United States, lay waste all our great cities, and put an end to all the freedoms we now cherish?

2. Is there any doubt that this would happen whatever devastation was wrought upon other countries?

3. Were all the moral laws, and all the laws of the Creator of human life and atomic energy and of the universe itself suddenly repealed when this generation became smart enough to explode an atomic bomb?

4. If these laws were not repealed, then is it not true that moral right is still the mightiest force on earth?

5. Is there any doubt that a nation which came forward with a bold, fearless proposal, (containing the necessary elements of risk and sacrifice to make it a great proposal) for the universal, enforceable disarmament of all nations would immediately gain the moral leadership of all mankind?

6. If such a nation possesses also great military power, is there any reason why such power could not be used as well to persuade others to accept a plan for the relief of mankind from tragic suicide as to frighten other nations into a stalemate of triggered bombs?

7. Is there any one thing that could more certainly turn the peoples of the world away from communism than for the United States, the archfoe of communism, to assume relentless, single-purposed leadership for a plan of enforceable peace? And is there any more certain way for us to feed the fires of Communist propaganda than for us to abandon the great peace proposals our country has already advanced—the Baruch plan for world

control of atomic energy, President Eisenhower's proposal for universal foolproof disarmament, and a number of others, and appear to rely solely on bigger and better bombs to protect freedom?

8. Can freedom and decency and democracy and the lives of our children really be protected by hydrogen bombs?

A better way has got to be found before it is too late. It will be hard to find it, hard to get our own Nation to accept it, hard to get the Russians to accept it, hard maybe to live with it. But, unless we do find that other way, we shall have been guilty, not alone, of course, but guilty, just the same, of condemning the human race to self-destruction.

A nation like ours may find excuse and reason for doing a thing that is wrong in itself, like the making of these total weapons. The excuse and reason, of course, is self-defense, because another nation, Russia, is making such weapons and threatens the values we most cherish.

But never can excuse or reason be found for failing to do an act that is eternally right and, in God's right, necessary. That act is to commit ourselves, without reservation or thought of discouragement or failure, to the relentless pursuit of the means of preventing the atomic-hydrogen war from ever taking place.

The main business of the people of our generation is to have enough simple decency toward our children to give them a chance to live. What are we going to do about it?

North Carolina Opposition to Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the objectionable nature of the upper Colorado project and its unwisdom have not gone unnoticed in North Carolina, as evidenced by the following editorial carried by the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer on May 13, 1955:

FIVE BILLION DOLLARS HEADED DOWN THE DRAIN

One of the biggest pork-barrel bills of modern times, if not the very biggest, will soon come up in the House of Representatives. It has already been passed by the Senate.

It is the upper Colorado River project, which is intended to develop some of the most sparsely settled land in the country. Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, said it was, without exception, the poorest agricultural land in the United States. The estimated first cost of the project is $1.6 billion, but with 75 years of interest and carrying charges, it is estimated that the ultimate cost will be between $5 billion and $7 billion.

The Eisenhower administration which was going to cut Federal expenses, is asking that this enormous sum be spent to irrigate marginal land that can grow hardly anything but alfalfa, hay, and corn.

By the time it is paid out—if it ever is—it will cost more than $5,000 an acre to put this land in production. If this country were starving, that outlay for marginal crops might be justified. But we are not starving. On the contrary, we have $8 billion worth of surplus farm products in storage and don't know what to do with them.

The spectacle of a nation with that kind of surplus on hand preparing to spend $5 billion to $7 billion to provide water for a mere handful of farmers on poor land is so absurd that it cannot be explained even on the ground of pork-barrel politics.

If and when we need more farm production—which will be a long time from now—we have plenty of unused land in the South and in Texas and Oklahoma that can be put in production at no cost except for clearing, terracing, and plowing. And it will produce far more with natural rainfall than those desert lands of the upper Colorado that will not grow anything unless a river is diverted to cover them. It will be the most expensive use of water imaginable, because the same amount of water it takes to support one person by irrigation will support 60 persons in industry.

Members of Congress ought to be told emphatically that the great majority of the people do not want their money thrown away in this manner. Unless they are told, they may vote away $5 billion to $7 billion of our money before we know it.

Platform of the Young Republican National Federation Adopted at Detroit, Mich., June 18, 1955—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD the platform of the Young Republican National Federation adopted at Detroit, Mich., June 18, 1955. The platform follows:

PLATFORM OF THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FEDERATION ADOPTED AT DETROIT, MICH., JUNE 18, 1955

PREAMBLE

We believe that God created man as a distinctive individual personality, having a free will, a desire to live, and a desire to improve his way of life.

Man, of his own free will, has created a society in which he has consented to be governed in the interest of orderly process and the general welfare, but without relinquishing his inalienable rights of opportunity, justice, and individual dignity.

We believe that our progress in this country is the result of individual initiative in a climate of freedom.

Believing these truths to be fundamental to the creation and establishment of our United States, we further believe:

That government should govern only when it is necessary for orderly process and to improve the general welfare; and

That government should act to retain incentive and to provide new incentives which will encourage man to develop his God-given individual personality, to foster the exercise of his free will, and to guarantee his opportunity to labor for personal security.

We young Americans attach more importance to opportunity and free enterprise than security and the surrendering of individual rights.

We believe these fundamental principles of government are challenged on two fronts:

The first challenge would seek to destroy man's dignity of freedom with subservience to an all powerful federal bureaucracy, artificial controls and hand-out security; and

The second challenge would seek to collectivize man, destroy his individual faith in God, and deprive man of his self-expression under a form of government called Communism.

We believe these challenges, from either front, from within, as well as from without, can best be met with a reverent rededication to those fundamental principles upon which our Nation was founded.

Our faith in the Republican Party is predicated upon these principles to which we subscribe.

AGRICULTURE

This American Free Enterprise Society is experiencing an era of food abundance, which is the fruit of, and complicated by, an industrial society the like of which the world has never seen. History shows that every nation at some stage reaches a high point in food supply and, if once lost, seldom reoccurs. This food abundance therefore is an estate which not only the American farmer, but everyone in this Nation, should hope to preserve. It follows that the American farmer should not be penalized for furnishing this estate for our Nation.

We, therefore, as a generation of young people resolve that we will, with the help of God, preserve for posterity this Nation's ability to produce.

For agriculture to remain strong, the American farmer must receive a price for his products that will cover the cost of production, and give a fair return for his labor and capital risk.

We, therefore, condemn as a fraud on all posterity the leadership of any generation which acts to subsidize inefficiency in agriculture. We charge the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations with placing deeply and dangerously into debt all future generations just for the sake of political advantage in their day. Shame on that leadership.

We hold these following National policies fundamental to the welfare of agriculture:

High employment, rising productivity, and a good distribution of income after taxes.

Monetary and fiscal policies which will contribute to the maintenance of a stable general price level.

The prevention of restraint of trade or the exercise of monopolistic power by any group—Government, industry, labor, or agriculture.

The encouragement and creation of private capital, used properly throughout the world.

The encouragement of foreign trade and investment.

Demonstrate our humanitarian concern for other peoples, by using our abundance to alleviate suffering throughout the world.

We hold these farm policies essential to a strong agricultural economy:

The maintenance of consistency between our foreign policy objectives and domestic price support programs.

An expanded program of research and education with current emphasis on projects to improve marketing and reduce its cost to the farmer, to encourage new uses and increase the utilization of farm products, and the adoption of improved techniques and increased efficiency in the processing and distribution of farm products.

Adequate farm credit at a reasonable rate of interest.

Adequate rural electric power and communication service at a reasonable cost.

Assistance and encouragement for farmers to maintain and improve land resources.

Special assistance to help the operators of low-income, uneconomic farm units make necessary adjustments. By improving the living standard of this group of people, the entire National economy will benefit.

Continuing efforts to improve diets, through education and promotional work, as well as special programs such as the school lunch program.

Improvement of crop and market news reports and outlook information.

Improvement of agricultural weather forecasting.

Improvement in certain types of Government grading, inspection and regulatory work, so that our products will be more competitive on a domestic and international market. These should be in keeping with the welfare of the people of this Nation and yet not unduly burdensome to the American farmer.

Reasonable price protection, through price supports, production, adjustment, storage programs and the use of marketing agreements, and orders where producers develop feasible programs.

We commend the Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress for its courageous action in stopping the trend toward socialization in Agriculture.

We commend the administration for its stand on revising the Sugar Act, to give domestic producers their proportionate share of the increased domestic consumption, created by our increasing population.

We realize, however, there is much left to be desired in the way of good farm legislation.

We deplore the fact that Agriculture is at the present time receiving a declining proportionate share of the national income. Immediate action should be taken to remedy this fault for the benefit of our entire economy.

We would like to recommend a serious study of the following programs which, used separately, or together, may well be the answer to an equitable farm program.

1. The land-bank system of production control.

2. Two-price system for certain commodities.

3. "Quality" differentiation between various grades of the same commodity.

ANTITRUST

We commend the Republican administration, and the attorney general's office for its enforcement of our antitrust laws.

We believe in establishing safeguards against improper concentration of economic power to cover all situations which result in restraining or disrupting trade on a widespread basis.

We also believe that enforcement of antitrust laws should be supplemented by educational programs whose purpose would be to prevent or restrain violations where possible, without the necessity of litigation.

We believe that our Republican Administration should continue to give close and urgent attention to the present rapid rate of corporate consolidation, and that special study be given to the relationship between current tax laws and corporate consolidation.

AVIATION

We endorse the Republican administration's program of Federal aid for airport improvements, and the advancement in safety and efficiency in air travel that it will bring.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We commend the administration for its whole-hearted effort toward the complete alleviation of the injustices to the minority peoples of the United States, and on the positive action in the abolishment of segregation and discrimination on the economic, educational, and social levels. We urge the continuation of the present steadfast positive, progressive policies on civil rights.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

We favor self government and national suffrage rights for the residents of the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

We believe that policy-making, policy-executing, and executive positions in the Federal Government should be filled with persons who are loyal to, and sympathetic with, the principles and program of the administration in power.

FISCAL POLICY

We commend the Republican administration for its enlightened economic policies which have arrested the inflation of the dollar, and produced a prosperous peacetime economy. The welfare of the country obviously calls for a continuation of the policies.

Our goals are a balanced budget, economy of administration, and a further reduction in taxes. We believe in combating inflation by encouraging full production and eliminating restrictions.

To attain these goals, we advocate the following policies:

1. A further reduction of Federal expenditures through a continued elimination of waste and extravagance. We recommend that special attention be given to the Hoover Commission Report for savings through Government reorganization.

2. We urge the further study of the Federal tax structure, for the purpose of eliminating hardships and inequalities, and removing barriers to economic development; the result of which would be a lightening of the Federal tax burden.

3. We commend the Republican administration's management of the public debt in keeping with its objective of making certain that Government financing activities stimulate neither inflation nor deflation, cause a minimum of interference with the normal functioning of the Nation's economic life, and help preserve a sound and honest dollar. Particularly to be commended are the changes in the United States savings bond program, which contribute significantly to wider debt ownership, and the gradual lengthening, as conditions permit, of the debt maturities so as to render the debt more manageable.

4. We think it essential that the Federal Reserve System be permitted to continue exercising its authorized powers of giving sound guidance to monetary action without political interference or other hindrance.

5. We believe that present discriminations existing under the tax structure against self-employed persons should be rectified by the establishment of deductions for individual pension funds properly safeguarded to prevent abuse.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We commend the Republican administration led by President Eisenhower for its patient, flexible, and unremitting policy directed toward establishing for the world a just and lasting peace and a more widely shared prosperity.

We pledge our continued support of such a policy which must rest on both military and economic support of Asian nations having and maintaining democratic institutions. We believe that regional agreements within the framework of the United Nations such as ANZUS, SEATO, and NATO, together with our continued support of the Colombo plan and similar economic programs, will most effectively enable the free people of Asia to resist the ruthless aggression of Communists which seek to impose on Asia a new and deadly colonialism. Insofar as economic aid is concerned, we favor greater emphasis on aid to Asia rather than Europe and preferable in the form of technical assistance, and loans.

Communism

We commend the Republican administration for showing highly exemplary leadership in the conclusion of an honorable peace in Korea and the prevention of Communist aggression against Formosa, arranging the Iranian oil settlement, assisting in the settlement of the Trieste dispute, restoring German sovereignty and bringing about the withdrawal of Russian forces in Austria. We believe this is clear evidence that Americans will not compromise principle for expediency and will defend the right of free people everywhere to remain free.

United Nations

Recognizing peace cannot be achieved in isolation, we highly approve of the administration policy of giving full cooperation to the United Nations. We commend the President for using the United Nations facility for presenting his Atoms for Peace plan. We continue to oppose the admission of Red China in the United Nations. We urge increased efforts toward the settlement of the Arab-Israel dispute by the United Nations.

Trade

We support a continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements, together with progressive reduction of tariffs over a period of years except in those industries where national security is jeopardized. We believe the Federal Government should, through existing agencies, make every effort to assist persons adversely affected by tariff reductions.

Platform of the Young Republican National Federation Adopted at Detroit, Mich., June 18, 1955—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD the second part of the platform of the Young Republican National Federation adopted at Detroit, Mich., June 18, 1955. The platform follows:

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH BUSINESS

An essential criterion of the definition of socialism is the nationalization of industries and farms. In January 1952 the capital assets of the Federal Government, including those of a business nature, totaled over $146 billion, by reason of which the Federal Government is, among other things, the largest electric power producer in the country, the largest insurer, the largest lender, the largest landlord, the largest tenant, the largest holder of grazing land and timberland, the largest owner of grain, the largest warehouse operator, the largest shipowner, and the largest fleet truck operator.

Our American democracy is based on the fundamental economic law of the free enterprise and we commend the administration for its policy to take Government out of competition with private enterprise as exemplified by the sale of the Inland Waterways Corporation, the closing of laundries, bakeries, nurseries, ice-cream plants, paint factories, coffee roasting projects, rope factories, sawmills, and other business projects operated by and in the Military Establishment; the sale of 24 synthetic-rubber plants and the liquidation of other agencies and projects concerned with purely business-type activities, many of which were operating at a deficit financed by the taxpayers and all of which were operating in competition with private enterprise.

We encourage the continuing and implementation of this policy, to the end that in all areas where the national security is not involved, Government shall not compete with its citizens in business-type activities.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

We endorse the President's highway program as the best means yet presented: (a) To solve the dangerous and economically crippling highway problem; (b) to provide the essential defense needs in time of national emergency; (c) to release State funds to help solve the local road problems; and (d) to provide a long-range program to solve not only the problems of today but also those of the future.

IMMIGRATION

In furtherance of President Eisenhower's desire for a change in the present laws in respect to refugees, we urge the humanization of the Emergency Refugee Act of 1953, by such steps as broadening the sponsoring of refugees to include group sponsorship, and eliminating the requirement of a residence in this country.

We also favor simplification of the administrative procedure to achieve the purpose of the act.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

We urge that the Congress increase the number of Federal judgeships and assistant United States district attorneys, so that due process of law may be expedited.

LABOR

We commend the Eisenhower Republican administration for, and urge the continuation of, its policies and philosophies that have created for more than 2 years the most prosperous period for the people who work, and the most peaceful period of labor-management relations in any period of free collective bargaining.

We recommend that business-management and labor-management regulations for the protection of the respective members be on an equal basis.

We believe that no organization or person should be compelled, directly or indirectly, to contribute to a political campaign or a political candidate, as a condition of employment, or pursuit of an occupation, or of any business transaction. We believe that management of labor and business should be subject to strict financial responsibility requirements.

We favor the continuation of the Eisenhower Republican administration policy in urging and cooperating with State governors and legislatures, to secure, or improve, fair labor standards laws in areas where necessary, such as workmen's compensation laws, minimum-wage laws, and unemployment compensation laws, such as Michigan recently enacted in their legislation.

We further urge the Eisenhower Republican administration to continue its efforts to revise and improve the Taft-Hartley Act, in accord with its present policies and philosophies.

We respect the dignity of the individuals who work and we urge their participation in political activity in a party of their own choice. In the case of a union member, we urge him to actively participate in the affairs of his union.

All to the end of providing a framework within which employers, and people who work, can continue to bargain and work out their differences with a minimum of Government interference.

MERCHANT MARINE

Last year, after a thoroughgoing study of national maritime policy, Congress and the administration launched a record peacetime merchant-ship construction program. It is designed to expand and modernize the United States Merchant Marine to meet the needs of the Nation's foreign commerce, maintain defense-vital jobs in the shipbuilding industry, and strengthen the national security. At the same time, it places maximum reliance on private financing. We urge that this program be continued without crippling reductions.

We heartily endorse President Eisenhower's plan for construction of the first nuclear-powered merchant ship as a floating showcase to exhibit to the world the potentialities in atomic energy for mankind's betterment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We commend the Republican administration for the establishment and maintenance of our Armed Forces in a state of high preparedness, and instant readiness to meet aggression anywhere.

We believe that our national defense should rely primarily in strategic and tactical striking power supported by well-trained and adequate ground forces in uniform, as well as a defense in depth resting on a sound reserve program.

We believe also that national defense resting on such a policy of massive, measured retaliation, not only lessens the burden of defense spending, but reduces the risk of an all-out atomic conflict.

The great progress made in establishing an efficient Department of Defense, through the 1953 reorganization, and through the Republican shift in emphasis toward the utilization of technological resources of Americans, has made substantial savings in money while increasing the effectiveness of our armed services.

NATURAL RESOURCES

We support the sound development and wise use of our Nation's resources through the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government, State and local agencies, and free enterprise. We endorse specifically:

1. The positive actions taken by the Interior Department under its multiple-use land policy, which permit full economic use of the public domain, by encouraging grazing, mining and mineral development, homesteading, recreation, and other uses to proceed in the same area.

2. The enlightened program to provide fuller opportunities to Indian citizens by expanding educational facilities; withdrawing economic restrictions, which retard Indian progress, and encouraging and helping Indians to find employment and better living conditions, away from their reservations.

3. The intensive research efforts of the Bureau of Mines, in cooperation with land-grant colleges, to develop efficient, low-cost methods of processing secondary mineral deposits and reclaiming wasted sources, as well as to find new materials and substitutes to fill the gap as our better mineral sources are exhausted. The Bureau should investigate the producing of liquid fuel from oil shale and investigate alternate uses of coal.

4. The dramatic progress of the Department of Interior in spurring the development, by private enterprise, of the vast oil resources of the outer continental shelf, in a manner which has added a tremendous potential supply to the Nation's oil reserves, and promises to add revenues to the Federal Treasury of more than $6 billion.

PATENTS

Patent protection is vital to the retention and advancement of America's industrial position and, consequently, the system must be protected and strengthened, particularly by increased appropriation directed to the development of efficient procedures and equipment in the Patent Office.

POLL TAX

We oppose the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting and we favor its elimination by the States as soon as possible.

POST OFFICE

We commend this administration for the progress made by the Post Office Department in giving the American people better mail service at lower cost. We endorse the efforts to place the Post Office Department on a self-supporting basis through a long-range fiscal program that would provide new postal revenue, separate subsidies from operating expenses, and establish a Postal Rate Commission under congressional guidance.

PUBLIC WELFARE

We favor the stand of the Eisenhower administration to furnish aid in school construction to those districts unable to properly provide their own construction because of lack of local revenues. We are unalterably opposed to any degree of Federal control of education.

We endorse the constructive steps taken in vocational rehabilitation and the efforts being expended in the expansion of vocational education for the physically handicapped.

We favor the encouragement of private pension programs, including incentives to supplement old-age and survivors insurance programs.

We recognize the primary responsibility of the individual for his own personal security; however, we fully endorse and encourage the improvement of existing insurance-type programs, such as social security and unemployment insurance, to prevent undue hardship on any individual or his family.

We recommend that the Federal Government gather information on juvenile delinquency and disseminate it to the proper local authorities for aid in combating this national problem.

We favor the development of programs for the aged, specifically in the field of medical care and old-age assistance.

We share the concern of all citizens for the health of each member of our population. We favor the development of those voluntary health programs which will insure adequate health protection to all our people.

We hail the discovery of the Salk polio vaccine, under a voluntary scientific research program, independent of Government sponsorship or control. We are proud of President Eisenhower's statement that no child shall be omitted from the vaccination program because of insufficient finances.

SMALL BUSINESS

We recognize that small business is a vital phase of our national economy and does have problems and interests which are inherent to it by virtue of its relative size, function, and relations with big business.

We do not believe that small business, because it is small, should be financed by public funds, subsidized, or sustained by any special treatment detrimental to the buying public.

We do believe that small business has its special problems and that these problems merit the same measure of recognition and consideration as any other phase of our economy, business or social.

We recognize that numerically small business represents about 92 percent of the individual business establishments, employs a large proportion of labor, and is an important part of the business and civil life of the community, therefore:

The small-business men of America should have equal representation with other groups on Government boards, commissions, bureaus, and agencies affecting the American economy.

We recommend careful study of the problems surrounding new enterprise ventures, with a view to development of a program which will aid young businessmen desiring to establish themselves in business. We favor extension of the Small Business Administration, which expires June 30, 1955.

We strongly recommend that the administration of the SBA be streamlined, and that the forms used by the SBA be reduced in number and complexity, and that the loan procedure be simplified and speeded up.

STATEHOOD

We, the National Young Republican Federation, favor and urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska under an equitable enabling act.

TRANSPORTATION

We urge the Congress to give prompt and thorough consideration to the recommendations in the unanimous report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization, and that the report be supported substantially as presented.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

One of our primary concerns is the welfare of the men who have honorably served our country.

We point with pride to the long record of the Republican Party in the sympathetic treatment of our Nation's veterans, and their dependents, and emphasize particularly the outstanding record of veteran legislation adopted by the Republican-controlled Congresses.

We believe that:

1. The controversy resulting from the denial of veterans' claims, caused from inadequate medical records of the Armed Forces, should be studied by the President's Commission, with a view of correcting any injustices.

2. Efforts should be continued by the Veterans' Administration to improve systems which will bring about prompt and equitable determinations of veterans' claims, and will expedite action on real estate loans.

3. The President's study take into consideration the problem of providing adequate benefits for veterans being drafted, and for those who served in the Armed Forces, subsequent to January 13, 1955.

4. There is a major problem of adequately staffing facilities which should be under continuous study, in order that adequate hospital facilities will be available to disabled veterans, especially those suffering from service-incurred disabilities.

5. That the country is composed in large measure of veterans and their families, and we should not confuse patriotism with the necessity for handouts and governmental paternalism. Most veterans prefer a minimum of benefits, since payment of such results in an increase in taxes, which they must ultimately pay.

It is gratifying to veterans of the Korean war that, under a Republican administration, hostilities have ceased, and under the President's proclamation, rehabilitation, education, loans, pensions, wartime rates of compensation, and burial benefits are authorized for such veterans of service, between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955, as recommended in our 1953 platform at the national convention of the Young Republican National Federation.

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Recognizing the importance of the cooperation of the Federal Government with local initiative in carrying forward the urgent task of providing the needed development of the Nation's water resources, we give full support to the partnership-power policy of the administration.

We commend the Department of Interior for reawakening industrial initiative to undertake with private capital the development of waterpower resources which has resulted in vast savings to the Federal Government.

YOUTH IN GOVERNMENT

We commend the administration for appointing qualified young Republicans to Federal administrative positions, and we urge that this be expanded to encourage the youth of the country to take a more active part in the work of our party, and to become more familiar with the operation of the Federal Government.

Natural Gas Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a letter I received from the Americans for Democratic Action, on the subject of the Natural Gas Act:

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: In a few days you will be called on to vote on a bill affecting, literally, millions of people and billions of dollars: H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. Seldom have the issues on a bill been so beclouded as on this one. In case you have not had time to follow these issues through the hearings, I am taking the liberty of summarizing them, as we see them.

Every one of the statements that follow is documented in authoritative sources:

1. The bill does not provide effective regulation of producers' prices of natural gas; on the contrary, it legalizes effective removal of such regulation. (The Wall Street Journal said of it: "The House Commerce Committee approved legislation to exempt independent natural-gas producers from direct Federal rate regulation.")

2. The direct regulation proposed in the bill is of doubtful legality and would be completely ineffective in practice. Moreover, the bill provides a standard of "reasonable market price" to replace the established "fair return on rate base" formula which has long been the standard in utility regulation.

3. Spokesmen for the gas producers have been quite frank about "reasonable market price." They think they should be allowed to charge what they can get in competition with other higher priced fuels. They themselves have estimated that this would increase the prices by 5, 10, or 15 cents (various estimates) per 1,000 cubic feet.

4. Every 5-cent increase in the price of gas at the well adds about one-quarter billion dollars a year to the gas bill of 60 million consumers, and adds about $10 billion to the value of producers' gas reserves.

5. Much is said about competition holding down the prices; but competition in the natural gas industry is among buyers, not sellers, and in the absence of regulation, this competition will drive prices up. Wellhead prices have already doubled since 1947. More than $28 million of producer rate increases have been filed with the Federal Power Commission since last July.

6. Commerce in gas is a monopoly utility. The pipeline company, the distributors, and the consumer are tied together by large fixed investments in pipeline facilities and gas appliances. Consequently, the normal competitive forces found in a free market are completely absent. Regulation of pipelines and gas utilities in your State is meaningless if the producers' price is unregulated.

7. More than 90 percent of natural gas is produced by fewer than 200 of the 4,500 producers. The rest could be exempt from regulation without harm to the industry or the consumers. (Ask the bill's proponents why they will not vote to exempt small producers.)

8. The most important owners and producers of gas are the big oil companies: 29 companies produce about two-thirds of all gas, and 20 of these are the great oil companies. No one has alleged that their profits from gas are inadequate. Every increase in price is a windfall for them, at the consumers' expense.

We will be glad to document these statements and to provide additional facts. This is one of the most important bills in years, and much that is being said in its behalf is calculated to confuse and mislead. It is held out as a "reasonable compromise," but it is a compromise in form only. In substance it gives the oil companies just about what they have been demanding since 1947.

We respectfully suggest that you question the sponsors of the bill when it comes to the floor and find out who is behind the bill, what its real purposes are and what its effects will be, why it is necessary, whom it will help, and whom it will hurt. We think if you can get clear, factual answers to these questions, you will vote against it.

Respectfully yours,
EDWARD D. HOLLANDER,
National Director, ADA.

College Decides To Educate Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel recently carried an editorial with respect to Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich. I think this is an interesting and timely presentation and, with unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

COLLEGE DECIDES TO EDUCATE YOUTH

We took occasion the other day to lament the shocking ignorance of high school and college students of the fundamentals of the American economic system, and the obvious indifference of many high school teachers and college professors toward this shameful condition.

We had commented on the results of two independent surveys covering more than 5,000 high school seniors which showed that most of these students were appallingly ignorant of even the rudimentary principles of our American free-enterprise system. We deplored the fact that the seniors interviewed had evidenced a general instinctive loathing of the word "profit," which many of them frankly said had only evil connotations.

Also that 75 percent "thought" almost all the gains resulting from installation of modern machinery went to the "companies," and that benefits accruing to employees and the public were negligible. Also that 60 percent "thought" "owners" of companies get "far too much" of the "profits" and their employees "way too little." And that not a single one of them could give any tangible constructive figures to back up their conclusion.

We opined that it was a serious reflection on the schools, when, while students are heavily indoctrinated on such things as the United Nations, One World, and UNESCO (and all in a most favorable light, without pointing out any of the evils such as that UNESCO proposes that treaty law supersede our domestic law and Constitution), they are not given even the rudimentary principles of our economic system in any sort of factual or favorable light.

However, we are now very greatly pleased to report that at least one of our midwestern colleges, not only is not by any means indifferent to this shocking condition, but is

going to do something very definite and constructive about it.

This institution is Hillsdale College, of Hillsdale, Mich. It is not a large college (it has only some 600 students), but it does have more than 100 years of fine traditions of supporting the inherent principles of Americanism.

After studying the results of a survey which interviewed some 3,000 high-school seniors in Michigan, the faculty of Hillsdale were astounded and arrived at the conclusion that students generally know practically nothing about what makes our free competitive system tick.

The President of Hillsdale College decided to do something about this startling revelation—not merely by inveighing against the indifference of the high schools, but also by instituting some serious self-examination of his own institution, to be sure that every member of the faculty realizes the preeminent importance of really educating our youth by teaching the preeminently important facts of life about our American economic system.

As a result, it will henceforth be mandatory that all freshmen at Hillsdale be taught a complete comprehensive understanding in practical detail, of the theory and practice of our American free enterprise system. This, he has decreed, shall be a must and first order of business on the logical theory that no matter what kind of a career in life the student is to be trained for, it is a most vital prerequisite that he first gain a thorough grounding in the details of just how our economic system works. And of how, incidentally, the billions which make the physical properties of our American schools and colleges the finest in the world, inevitably come from the much-maligned American profit motive.

The Hillsdale example, of course, should be followed by schools and colleges generally, to help assure the perpetuation of our American economic system which has brought more well-being to more people than any other the world has ever known.

Address of Bernard M. Baruch on Freedom for Man: A World Safe for Mankind, at Meeting To Announce Plans for Woodrow Wilson Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on May 25 one of America's great men, Bernard M. Baruch, delivered a significant address on the life and the service of Woodrow Wilson. The occasion was a meeting at Woodrow Wilson House for the announcement of plans to observe the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Anniversary in 1956. In view of the interest in this observance I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the text of Mr. Baruch's splendid statement:

As one of the dwindling group who knew Woodrow Wilson, who worked with him and who were privileged to call him friend, I am pleased at this opportunity to pay tribute to him. No more fitting theme could have been chosen for the centennial anniversary of his birth next year than the one proposed by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation: Freedom for Man—A World Safe for Mankind. That theme sums up not only the ideals of Woodrow Wilson and the goals for which he labored but the deepest yearning of mankind and the crucial question of our time.

I have never known a man more richly endowed in mind and spirit—a man with character more noble than Woodrow Wilson. He was a rare human being and a complex one, this aristocratic man of the people, scholar-statesman, practical idealist, religious-humanist. In him there was a purity of purpose which power could not corrpt. He stands in the forefront of those who have struggled to introduce ethical considerations into the conduct of world affairs. Confronted by a choice between the right as he saw it and the expedient, he invariably chose the right.

It is not easy to understand men such as he. They appear too infrequently. Perhaps we may say of him what he said of Lincoln, that "natures deep as his and various almost to the point of contradiction can be sounded only by the judgment of like sort, if such there be." But whether or not we can grasp the complexity of the man, the world recognizes in him one of the giants, not only of his time, but of all time. The years have neither tarnished his ideals nor invalidated his principles. They never will.

Woodrow Wilson came to the world of politics from the quite different world of scholarship. These academic years were years of preparation for leadership. His studies were devoted not to the theory but to the practice of government, not to doctrine but to affairs. He came to know the meaning of freedom—its privileges and responsibilities, the nature of democracy, its potentialities and problems, and the real working of the American political system with all its strength and weaknesses. And it should be added he understood human nature, now wise, now foolish, now noble, now base.

He was a natural leader who could "capture public opinion as by wireless." His own words on the gift of leadership sum up his capacity for it. "A great nation," he wrote, "is led by a man who speaks not the rumors of the street, but a new principle of a new age; a man in whose ears the voices of the nation do not sound like the accidental and discordant notes that come from the voice of the mob but concurrent and concordant, like the united voices of a chorus, whose many meanings unite in his understanding in a single meaning and reveal to him a single vision, so that he can speak what no man else knows, the common meaning of the common voice. Such is the man who leads a great, free democratic nation." Such a man was Wilson.

He led America and the world toward the goal of international peace and freedom. If we are ever to attain that goal, if we are to make the world safe for mankind, we would do well to learn from Wilson. If we are to preserve liberty against the ruthless challenge which confronts it today, we must understand it as he did.

Most men cherish liberty. Few understand it. Wilson did.

Liberty he knew was the source of America's greatness and its most priceless possession. "This is not America because it is rich," he said. "This is not America because it has set up for a great population great opportunities of material prosperity. America is a name which sounds in the ears of men everywhere as a synonym with individual opportunity because it is a synonym of individual liberty." Individual liberty—the words are inseparable. The individual is "the first fact of liberty." There can be "no corporate liberty," Wilson insisted. "Liberty belongs to the individual or it does not exist."

Yet liberty, indispensable as it is, is not the only ingredient of democratic government. Democracy requires not only a free citizenry, free to dissent, but an enlightened and self-disciplined one, which explains why it is the most difficult of all forms of government, as nations newly independent are discovering. "Liberty," Wilson wrote, "is not itself government. In the wrong hands—in hands unpracticed, undisciplined, it is incompatible with government." Democracy, he was saying, is organized self-restraint. In these days when it is under seige, self-discipline is the first imperative of its defense. In the last analysis, our only freedom in these times is the freedom to discipline ourselves. If we fail we shall be compelled to submit to the discipline which others will impose upon us.

Liberty is never secure. The threat to it may come in many forms—in naked aggression, in stealthy subversion, in the slogans and blandishments with which tyrants mask their designs on people hungry for a better life. It would be bitterly ironic if those nations of the world which have recently gained their independence and those struggling for it should be seduced by the false promises of an oppressor worse than any they have ever known. It is a tribute to many of them that they are alive to the danger and that they are not deceived by the empty promise of neutralism.

Liberty requires not only unceasing vigilance, but unceasing work. "Liberty," as Wilson said, "is not something to be laid away in a document, a completed work. It is an organic principle of life—renewing and being renewed. Democratic institutions are never done—they are, like the living tissue, always amaking."

He knew that democratic institutions require periodic reform. He also knew that the world could not be remade in one sitting, that progress comes in slow states. His vision was as broad, his idealism as pure as any man's. But he had no patience with Utopians. He once remarked that it would be a sad day for society when sentimentalists attempted to cure all the ills of their fellow men. And as for the new order of the Communists, he said of its prophet, Karl Marx, "I know of no man who has more corrupted the thinking of the world. * * *"

In the years between the Civil War and Wilson's emergence as a political leader, great forces had been let loose in America and great changes had taken place. We had grown rich and powerful—and careless. Injustice and inequity were permitted to mar the face of America. Under Wilson's New Freedom, America returned to the task of perfecting democracy. A vigorous attack was launched against special privilege, monopoly, the mastery of the many by the few. The door of economic opportunity was opened wide again, social wrongs redressed, political abuses corrected. A new wave of energy and confidence swept across America—a wave of energy and confidence which, with the outbreak of the war, was diverted from the task of improving democracy to the infinitely more difficult task of defending it.

No man abhorred war more than Woodrow Wilson. Yet when he was compelled at last to lead America into the conflict he was prepared to fight without stint. His administration of the war was expert and businesslike. And yet it was not for military victory alone that he fought. He fought for a just and lasting peace, which we have come to learn is something quite apart from the triumph of arms. On that fateful day when America assumed the leadership of the world, it was to make the world safe for democracy—which is to say, safe for mankind. That has remained our only purpose.

That the task remains to be done is not Wilson's fault. He expressed the common meaning of the common voice in his peace proposals. But that voice was drowned in the discordant chorus of vengeance, ignorance, and selfishness. In his insistence on international cooperation in a world in which nations could no longer live apart, he spoke

a new principle for a new age. In the League he offered men an instrument of good will. The failure of the League lay in that he could not provide the good will.

Wilson's critics have contended that his refusal to compromise in the fight over the League permitted its enemies to defeat it. This characterization of Wilson as uncompromising is inaccurate and unjust. He was willing to accept reservations to the treaty of peace provided they did not impair article X. On it he stood fast, for it was the heart of the League. It bound the signatories to the treaty to respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of all members of the League. To compromise on it would have been to surrender the cardinal principle he sought to establish. The League was the indispensable instrumentality of peace. It was necessary to guarantee the peace. Article X was the guaranty.

As Wilson stood fast in his determination to provide a guaranty for peace, so must we now. Attention is presently being directed to discussions of disarmament and to peace proposals. It is the hope of the world, of course, that the threat of war will be lifted, that the fear of atomic devastation will be dispelled, that the burden of armament will be lightened. But we must not be beguiled by wishful thinking. Every plan for disarmament deserves careful consideration but none can be adopted which fails to provide direct, effective, and certain guaranties for enforcement of its terms. International disarmament of both conventional and atomic weapons requires an international authority with power to inspect, control, and impose punishment, swift, sure, and condign, against any transgressor. Any agreement which does not establish the authority to enforce its would be incalculably dangerous. To permit any nation the right to veto the decisions of the control agency, or actions taken against violators would be to make the plan meaningless. As Woodrow Wilson refused to compromise on the heart of the League, we must refuse to compromise on the heart of effective disarmament.

One may read in Wilson's life a story of personal triumphs and tragedy. But his is not the story of one man but of mankind. His victories were victories for all men. His defeat was defeat for all humanity. That defeat doomed the world—as Wilson predicted it would—to a generation of sorrow and pain unequaled in history. And the end is not yet. Freedom today stands in greater jeopardy than it has even known. And men now have the power not only to extinguish liberty from the earth, but life itself.

Tragic as has been the history of the world since the death of Wilson, and menacing as are the times in which we live, the world's doom is not foreordained. In the strength of America and her allies we have the means for preventing war. In the United Nations and in other agencies of international cooperation imperfect as they may be, we have the means for reconciling differences between nations amicably and fairly. We have it in our power to preserve freedom, to attain peace. We need only the will, the courage, the self-discipline to do what the task requires.

It is great to have the strength of a giant, Wilson said, paraphrasing Shakespeare. It is tyrannous to use it like a giant. We must muster the strength of America—physical and spiritual—and use it wisely, generously, firmly in the cause of peace and freedom. We must make of the centennial occasion not one which marks the passage of a hundred years since the birth of a great man, but one which marks the beginning of a new effort to attain freedom for all men in a world safe for mankind.

Missouri Cotton Producers Association Makes Observation and Gives Recommendations on Acreage, Price Supports, Exports, Minimum Wage, and Social-Security Programs, Rules, and Regulations as They Pertain to Cotton Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege over the weekend to travel with a representative delegation from the House Committee on Agriculture, as we visited one of the larger rice-producing areas, and a part of the old Cotton Belt in the great State of Texas, and on the return stopped at Jonesboro, Ark., where my colleague, the Honorable E. C. (TOOK) GATHINGS, presided at a hearing conducted by the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Prior to entering the State of Arkansas, our committee traveled through a large portion of the district so ably represented by our colleague from Texas, the Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, where we were shown every courtesy and were permitted to enjoy the hospitality of those folks so representative of the rural areas of the Lone Star State. Our committee gained much valuable information on this trip which will be of great value in helping us to act sympathetically, as well as intelligently, on legislation which we hope will solve in a measure some of the problems of the rice farmers, as well as those of the small cotton farmers of that area.

At the Jonesboro meeting, attended by several hundred farmers from many of the counties of northeast Arkansas, there was also a representative delegation from the 10th Congressional District in Missouri. While statements were made by many of those present whose views will be included in the printed testimony of this hearing which will not be available for some time, I think the statement made by Mr. Hilton L. Bracey, the executive vice president of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, is of tremendous importance since it contains many observations and makes some specific recommendations which are particularly apropos at this time, and for that reason I have asked that his entire statement be reproduced herewith.

Following is the statement of Mr. Bracey, which I know will be read with interest, not only by those who represent cotton districts, but by all Members of Congress who have the responsibility of solving some of the vexatious problems now confronting the farmers of America.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

The cotton industry in general and cotton farmers in particular are faced with the hard fact that nothing less than the production of 14 million bales of cotton annually will allow the industry to maintain its rightful place in the national economy.

Production at this level must be established and maintained in order to (1) allow cotton farmers and the entire industry to acquire a reasonable degree of production stability, (2) to discourage expansion of foreign growths, (3) to discourage production of synthetics, (4) to insure employment for the domestic labor force, and (5) to bring a reasonable return on the huge investments in land, tools, handling and processing equipment.

EXPORT KEY

As producers, we recognize that the key to the reestablishment of a realistic production program in this country is in the expansion of foreign markets for American cotton and the products made therefrom. In addition to a positive export program of not less than 5½ million bales per year, it will be necessary to dispose of current surplus CCC stocks.

We specifically recommend that the Government immediately program 4 million bales of CCC owned stocks for sale in the export market during the next 2-year period. These stocks to be in addition tof the annual exportation of 5½ million bales. All of these stocks to be offered and moved through whatever competitive pricing devices that may prove necessary.

During the last 3 years we have talked about reciprocal trade agreements, currency adjustments, creation of revolving funds, and credit extensions. In spite of the employment of all of these devices, we have seen our export market for cotton drop from a level of 5½ million bales in 1952 to a level of 3 million bales in 1953 and 3½ million bales in 1954. It is now clear to everyone that nothing short of competitive pricing will reestablish the export market for cotton.

USDA RELUCTANT

\$t is recognized, of course, that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority and the responsibility to move cotton into export channels. It has become apparent, however, that the current Secretary of Agriculture is not willing to use this authority, and, as a result, acreage allotments in this country are becoming more and more stringent while world production of cotton is on the increase.

While no substantial reason has been advanced by the Secretary for his failure to move cotton into export channels, it is assumed that his actions have been influenced to a large degree by American cotton mills and large speculators who have off-shore cotton interests.

PROTECT AMERICAN MILLS

Cotton producers recognize American cotton mills as their best customers; and in no case have producers recommended sale of American cotton on a competitive price basis without reasonable protection for American mills. Producers chave repeatedly recommended that American mills should be protected in the domestic-goods market. We believe that they should be afforded means to produce the necessary raw cotton at the export price for their export tarde in textiles. There does not seem to be any serious objection to this recommendation from American mills. Apparently, however, they are reluctant to endorse such a program while it is still in the planning stage. The principal objection up to now has come from the offshore speculators who seem to have a disportionately strong voice in the affairs of the cotton industry.

EXPORT TEXTILES

Another proposal that has been advanced, and which seems to have merit, is to allow American mills to produce textiles from the surplus raw cotton and export the textiles under some sort of governmental pricing arrangement with interested foreign customers.

COSTS OF PROGRAM

It seems feasible to assume that any loss to the Government in a competitive pricing program would be offset by a decrease in storage and handling charges. It is rather difficult, however, to compare costs on the basis of funds expended through a competitive pricing program. It is more realistic to figure anticipated costs in relation to the loss of income to producers, resulting from excessive cutbacks in production.

Comparing the current 10-million-bale allotment to the proposed 14-million-bale allotment for 1956 and future years, we find a difference of no less than $600 million. This figure, of course, reflects the loss in farm income and to the cotton community.

SUPPLEMENTAL AIDS

There are several other related recommendations which we advance as being supplemental to the competitive pricing program. They are:

1. Expedite actions under Public Law 480 by—

(a) Centralize administration of program in the USDA.

(b) Eliminate provision relating to the movement of United States agricultural products as it relates to cargo space in United States ships.

We wish to commend the 84th Congress for repealing that part of Public Law 480 requiring shippers to replenish stocks from CCC.

2. Discontinue under the technical assistance program promotion of cotton and other commodities that are in excess supply in the United States.

3. That actions be initiated to fully utilize lines of credit of the Export-Import Bank.

4. That Public Law 480 funds be increased to a level consistent with the potential effectiveness of this authority to move surplus American commodities, and that no restrictions be placed on the amount to be spent in any one year.

SMALL-FARM RESERVE

In addition to a minimum national allotment sufficient to produce 14 million bales of cotton per year, we recommend a national reserve of not to exceed 1 percent of the national allotment to be established, and to be in addition to the national allotment, and allocated to States on the basis of need for adjustments in small-farm allotments. Such a reserve would relieve a difficult situation in those States and counties having a high percentage of small farms. The matter of small-farm allotments is a national problem and we strongly recommend that it should be handled as such.

PRICE SUPPORTS

It is becoming increasingly popular for individuals and groups in certain circles to recommend cuts in price supports and increases in cotton acreages. These recommendations have a certain amount of producer appeal, as the individuals advocating such proposals make it appear that the price of cotton is too high and that a cut is necessary in order to increase production. At no time, however, have we heard any answers to the following questions: (1) How much would a cut in price increase domestic consumption? (2) How much would a cut in price, to producers, increase export sales? (3) How much would a cut in price discourage production of synthetics?

NO BENEFITS FROM CUTS

Actually, when the questions are analyzed, we find general agreement among qualified economists, and others who are well acquainted with the cotton price situation, to the effect that raw cotton itself is not too high and that a cut in price up to a nickel a pound to producers would have no substantial effect on domestic consumption, exports, or production of synthetics.

Cotton producers themselves are somewhat confused about the situation. All producers want more cotton acreage; they must have more acreage. At the same time producers who have made a study of the situation are not willing to buy a "pig in a poke" or sacrifice price for intangible promises. There does not appear to be any good reason why the support price should be reduced on quality cotton.

APPEASE SECRETARY

It is reported that the Secretary has proposed to undertake to move from 4 to 5 million bales of cotton in the world trade at competitive prices if farmers will agree to accept a cut in price supports. The conclusion reached by most producers is that the Secretary has always had the legal right, the responsibility, and duty to manage the affairs of his office for the good of the people. It is a little difficult to understand just why a public official should be bribed to do a job that he is legally and morally required to do.

Unless the reasoning of most producers is incorrect, the Secretary is striving to prove that 90 percent of parity will not work, and is using the export bottleneck to demonstrate his contentions even though price to the producer has no effect at all on the movement of cotton into export channels.

ADJUSTMENT NEEDED

The only area of the loan program that needs attention is the short-staple cotton that now makes up the bulk of the CCC holdings. Proposals have been advanced for changing the loan base from Middling ⅞ inch to Middling 1 inch—the argument being that it would discourage production of undesirable staple lengths. It would have the effect, however, of reducing the loan price about 245 points. In other words, it would severely penalize producers of quality cotton, and it is highly doubtful that such a change in the loan base would stop the production of undesirable staples.

It appears that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to make this ruling under existing legislation. However, for sake of expediency, it would probably be better for specific legislation to be drafted to cover this point. The loan program is not available to other commodities that do not meet desirable quality levels. There is no reason why a similar ruling should not apply to cotton. It is interesting to note that the production of this undesirable quality cotton is restricted to a relatively small area, yet its presence in the loan is costing producers of quality cotton untold millions of dollars and will no doubt cause heavy losses to the CCC.

To summarize our recommendations of acreage, price, and exports, we reiterate our position in support of the following:

1. Program 4 million bales of CCC stock for sale in export market during next 2-year period.

2. Minimum exports of 5 to 5½ bales annually. (Annual exports to be in addition to disposal of current stocks.)

3. Sale of cotton for export at competitive world prices to achieve these goals.

4. Increase in acreage for 1956 to 21,500,000 acres.

5. Price supports for cotton at 90 percent of parity with recognition of the shift in the parity formula to a more modern basis.

6. A national cotton acreage reserve over and above the national allotment to prevent undue hardships for small farms

7. Authorization for United States mills to purchase raw cotton equivalent of textiles exported at the export price.

8. Protection for United States mills on the domestic goods market.

MINIMUM WAGE

In addition to dwindling markets and falling prices, farmers are beset with many other complications. The cost of production steadily increases; the proposed minimum wage increase certainly will have its effect on the agricultural industry.

While it is rather a foregone conclusion that an increase in the minimum wage will be granted, we cannot emphasize too strongly the adverse effects of extending the minimum wage to farm labor and the initial processors of agricultural commodities. The farmer has no way of passing on increased production costs. It will be the farmer who pays if an increase is granted in a minimum wage. We are rapidly approaching the point where farm operators will be unable to obtain either the labor or the financial support to operate cotton farms. The farmer has already lost control of 2 of the 3 profit elements—"volume, price, and production cost"—and only by a constant increase in efficiency, and the consequent reduction of unit cost, has he been able to remain in his present semisolvent position.

FARM SOCIAL SECURITY

Amendments to the Social Security Act, which became effective last January 1, made two major changes pertaining to agriculture. (1) Practically all farmers who make as much as $400 profit in a year now come under old-age and survivors insurance. (2) Farm employees have already been covered by the law if they work regularly for one employer. This includes tractor drivers, farm machine operators and other farm employees who make up the regular farm force. In addition, the new law extends coverage to all farmworkers who are paid as much as $100 cash in a year from any one farmer whether employed on a regular basis or not.

A review of congressional hearings indicates that the Congress did not intend to burden farmers with the tremendous and almost impossible job of recordkeeping now required for temporary farmworkers. It is also evident that the Congress did not intend to classify sharecroppers, and in some cases tenants, as employees.

There is much confusion between the governmental agencies charged with the responsibility of administering the Social Security Act. Interpretations of the Social Security Administration differ with those of the Department of Internal Revenue. Rulings and regulations differ between area and State offices. As a result of this confusion, farmers in general are ignoring their responsibility under the act. We fear, however, that the farmer will eventually pay the price for the confusion that now exists. There is no possible way for the farmer to comply with the act as it is now written and interpreted.

Bills have already been introduced to amend the law. Representative FRANK E. SMITH, of Mississippi, introduced H. R. 4177 which provides that any wages paid to a farmworker who is employed for less than 90 days shall not be taxable. In addition, Representative SMITH has introduced H. R. 4179, to establish clearly that it is the intention of Congress that sharecroppers and tenants shall be considered as self-employed persons rather than employees for purposes of social-security legislation.

As farmers we must look to our Representatives on the House Committee on Agriculture for leadership necessary to obtain the required revisions in the Social Security Act. We feel that the 90-day period and clarification of tenant-sharecropper-landlord relationship would make the program workable.

To summarize, our recommendations on minimum wage and social security are as follows:

1. Oppose any extension of minimum-wage legislation to farm labor and initial processors of agricultural commodities.

2. Amend minimum-wage law to define area of production as any county where agri-

cultural commodities are grown in commercial quantities.

3. Provide first 90 days of farm labor shall not be taxable under Social Security Act.

4. Clearly establish that sharecroppers and tenants are self-employed persons for purpose of social-security legislation.

The 50-50 Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the Cargo Preference Act of 1954 is under attack by foreign nations, and by some of our own people who do not understand the law or who have been subjected to false propaganda by foreign interests. An excellent article by Edward P. Tastrom which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on May 20, 1955, gives a good explanation of the legislation. I have placed it in the RECORD for the information of Members who are interested:

THE 50–50 LAW

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

Discrimination is a dangerous word to bandy about at any time unles you happen to be talking about the finer things in life, like art or music, when it assumes a certain majesty.

We find it necessary, however, to discuss discrimination today—flag discrimination particularly—and how it is being applied specifically to the United States ever since the Butler-Tollefson so-called 50–50 law was enacted last year.

The criticism that has been leveled against this measure abroad during recent months has mounted steadily. It reached a new peak this week when Sir Colin Anderson, president of the International Chamber of Shipping, told delegates from 35 nations representing some 17 million tons of shipping, who attended the Baltic and International Maritime Conference at Copenhagen, that "one of our biggest problems today is United States flag discrimination."

Since this use of the word in a depreciatory sense before such an important group can only result in a false and misleading statement coming to be accepted as genuine by many, unless challenged, it is time to state a few facts.

First, this law does not provide that American-flag ships are to get 50 percent of certain types of cargo to which it applies. The American-flag ship "must be available" and at "reasonable rates." Otherwise, the shipment can move on a foreign ship, as many of them have been handled. Last year, for example, 82 percent of this country's tramp-borne commerce moved in foreign ships, because the 50 tramps still under the United States flag were not able to handle the allowed percentage.

Second, the law applies only to overseas cargo paid for or guaranteed as to payment by the United States Government, including American surplus commodities that are sold for local currency and hence must be covered by dollar appropriations out of the United States Treasury. This local currency is either spent by the United States in that foreign country or allowed to stay there as a grant or long-term loan. Regardless of the final disposition, it is a tab that the American taxpayer must meet.

Third, cargo preference of the type just mentioned has been applicable in one form or another over several years, or ever since this country engaged on its policy of helping friendly nations at the end of the war. American ships had a priority up to 50 percent of all aid cargo. We do not recall any great furor being raised abroad during this period though the surrounding circumstances, basically, were little different than they are today.

Yet despite this effort to assist United States shipping, the percentage of our dry-cargo trade handled by American bottoms has steadily dropped. In 1946, for example, American ships handled 60.9 percent of our exports and 56.3 percent of our imports. The figures for November 1954, the latest available, show American ships handling 24.4 percent of dry-cargo exports and 29.1 percent of imports.

This is rather ironic in view of another observation by Sir Colin at the Copenhagen Conference that world trade is 20 percent greater than in 1950 and 50 percent greater than prewar.

United States flag shipping certainly hasn't been doing too well in this expanding market.

So we have a situation in this 50–50 law where United States flag shipping is not guaranteed any percentage of cargo but must meet certain conditions: Where the cargo involved is directly tied to the taxpayer's dollar; where the so-called preference has been in effect for years; and where, despite this misnamed discrimnation, the fleets of every leading maritime nation have expanded while that of this country has declined.

Surely this has not resulted in any restraint of trade. Competitive forces have been freely at work around the world outside this country as the statistics covering the handling of our waterborne commerce indicate.

Overlooked in all this hullabaloo is the fact that whatever flag a vessel flies, it is placed at no disadvantage with American ships in normal trading with this country. We do not have any special port dues, consular fees, berthing preferences, and other dodges to aid our shipping.

This is discrimination in the proper meaning of the word as we see it, for these gimmicks are aimed to divert all cargo to a particular nation's shipping, not 50 percent of taxpayer-financed cargo which, in turn, is a small percentage of all cargo moving in and out of our ports.

Our friends abroad have every right, of course, to criticize this statute, but we believe that in labeling it "flag discrimination" they are putting on a handle that does not fit. In so doing they are letting loose impressions that are not warranted by the simple truth.

Overworked Smear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the A. F. of L. News Reporter:

OVERWORKED SMEAR

The people of this country are becoming more than a little fed up with the repeated outcries of "socialism" from the Tories every time a constructive proposal is suggested to meet urgent needs.

The use of this scare word has been overworked—both by the standpatters of the Republican Party and the Dixiecrats.

When social security was first advanced, it was denounced as "socialism"—but the American people have found from experience that it fits in perfectly with our free enterprise system, has helped to wipe out the menace of the poorhouse for the indigent old aged and has permitted working people to make decent provision for their years of retirement.

Similarly, the smear of "socialism" was daubed on Government bank deposit insurance, but the banking business is flourishing nonetheless and depositors enjoy the assurance that their savings are protected from being wiped out overnight by faulty management.

Today the reactionaries are still screaming "socialism" against an adequate public housing program intended to eradicate slum evils from American cities; against a proposal to provide free antipolio vaccine to all American children and against proposals, now being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee, to institute disability insurance to provide immediate Social Security benefits to those who become permanently disabled instead of making them wait until they are 65, if they can survive that long.

Such measures are designed to promote the general welfare, as the Constitution of the United States itself provides. They are good, solid Americanism, rather than socialism.

You don't see the tories branding as socialistic government subsidies to railroads, airlines, or the merchant marine. Any such governmental actions for the private welfare of business are, in fact, applauded by the conservatives. It is only when public funds are to be spent for the general welfare of all the people that the GOP elephant sees pink and the Dixiecrat donkey starts bucking.

The great majority of the American people are no longer going to be taken in by the smear technique on important national issues. They realize that name calling is the refuge of politicians when they can't find logical argument to defeat a proposal on the merits.

Another heartening development is the emergence of a more intelligent and hard-headed approach on the part of the younger element in both parties who understand that our free enterprise system, to survive, must provide a minimum standard of social justice to all rather than permit a policy of the devil take the hindmost.

GOVERNOR HALL SPEAKS

An encouraging sign of progress within the Republican Party came from the speech delivered by Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, to the Young Republican Federation in Detroit.

This GOP governor, who had the courage to veto a "right-to-work" law, took after the stick-in-the-muds of his political party and urged the younger element to make it known as the Grand New Party, instead of old.

He said Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby's "socialistic" tag on free antipolio vaccine for all American children was just plain silly and that the National Association of Manufacturers was also talking through its hat when it pinned the same label on the guaranteed annual wage.

We hope the young Republicans will realize that the survival of their party requires more liberal leaders like Governor Hall.

AND SO DOES HENRY FORD

Reply to charges by big business critics that guaranteed wage plans constitute creeping socialism, Henry Ford, 2d told the Detroit News:

"A lot of people call everything we do creeping socialism. They called social security that and they called pensions that. I don't really know what creeping socialism

is. If the critics will define the term I'll tell them whether I think this is creeping socialism.

"We have to keep up with the times. Every time that we do something new, people cry that it's either communism or socialism."

Kamp and Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement made by our colleague, Mr. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, with regard to Joseph P. Kamp.

I personally think the most effective way to handle a rabble-rouser such as this individual would be to disregard him completely. The only possible way to explain this character and others of his ilk is to assume that the venom which they spew is the result of a psychotic personality. However, some of my colleagues who have met up with him feel that his activities should be exposed.

I am happy to insert Representative EBERHARTER'S remarks and emphasize that I agree with him wholeheartedly:

KAMP AND AMERICANISM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to speak out in opposition to what I consider one of the most vicious and unpatriotic attacks I have ever heard on leading Jewish organizations. I refer to the recent April issue of a pamphlet circulated under the title of "Headlines." This scurrilous sheet is dominated and disseminated by one Joseph P. Kamp, a leading hate monger in the United States. In an article entitled "Cowards in the United States Congress," he not only attacks the House Un-American Activities Committee in such a manner as to put him in contempt of Congress, but he also scurriously attacks the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, an organization which all of us know has a long and meritorious record in the fight against communism and other dictatorships.

Although Mr. Kamp denies that he is anti-Semitic, I would like to quote a statement by him attacking the great Jewish organization, B'nai B'rith:

"Pro-Communists professionals have been in control of the Anti-Defamation League for many years. It has sponsored Communist-line speakers, its literature has been authored by Communist-fronters, and its spy and smear network has continually harassed and persecuted anti-Communists, while maintaining a 'phony' pose of anticommunism."

It think it might be interesting to Members of the House for me to briefly review the record of this man, Joseph Kamp, who apparently believes he is qualified to judge the patriotism of an organization such as B'nai B'rith, and so blatantly proclaims his judgments. This is a man, Mr. Speaker, who has for years tried by various means to engender bigotry, hate, and intolerance in this country—all the characteristics which are prevalent in totalitarian countries and so abhorrent to all real Americans.

In the fall of 1933, he organized a pro-Fascist newspaper entitled "The Awakener." Until 1937, he was listed as the editor of this sheet, and on his staff was the known Fascist propagandist, Harold Lord Barney, and also the notorious Lawrence Dennis, who authored The Coming American Fascism. When The Awakener suspended publication, Joe Kamp wrote to a follower: "The work will be carried on by the Constitutional Educational League." Of Kamp and the Constitutional Educational League the American Legion has this to say: "The Constitutional Educational League's main activity is pamphleteering. Pamphlets issued by the group try to create religious hostility. In its accusations of Communist infiltration, it make malicious and irresponsible charges against responsible and respected groups and individuals who are working to strengthen and improve our democracy. The league is a personal vehicle of Kamp's which sells its pamphlets at profiteering prices in order to insure a good living for him." (Sunday Herald, Bridgeport, Conn., April 22, 1951.)

While head of the Constitutional Educational League, Mr. Kamp published a pamphlet entitled "The Fifth Column in Washington," a copy of which was sent to every Member of the House and Senate. This publication seems to have enjoyed brisk sale at meetings held under the auspices of the German-American Bund and the Christian Front. According to Kamp, the real fifth column apparently was an insidious band of Government employees, ranging from Attorney General Jackson (later United States Supreme Court Justice) and Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes to a charwoman employed in the Capitol Building, all of whom Mr. Kamp designated as Communists or practically Communists.

In the spring of 1933, while on a so-called lecture tour and in the course of one of Kamp's speeches, he made statements about our Government that were apparently even too un-American for the Constitutional League. As a result he was told he could not talk politics under the auspices of the league. Thereupon connections with the league were discontinued, but this severance only lasted until 1937.

Some of the titles of publications by Mr. Kamp are an indication of his views, such as "Join the CIO and Help Built a Soviet America" (1937), "Vote CIO and Get a Soviet America" (1944), "To Hell With GI Joe" (1944).

He has twice been cited for contempt of Congress—first in 1944 for his refusal to answer questions of the House Campaign Expenditures Committee. He faced further possible contempt proceedings for having refused to name his financial backers when he appeared before the Special House Lobby Investigating Committee in June 1950. After he first refused to testify voluntarily, he appeared after being subpenaed. On August 30, 1950, Congress voted to cite Mr. Kamp for defying the House Lobby Activities Committee in refusing to produce records, and on November 27, 1950, a Federal grand jury in Washington, D. C., indicted him for contempt of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, here is a man who for years has been agitating and advocating what most of us think are undemocratic and totalitarian ideas, and who is still continuing unwarranted and disgraceful attacks on organizations and groups which stand for the very principles upon which America was builded and has become great.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pike's Peak." They are typical of the unfounded attacks on the Colorado River storage project, and I submit that they would have been more accurately entitled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

The States of the upper Colorado River Basin—the States of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming—are all public land States. In this entire area, more than half of the land is in Federal ownership. This imposes a real hardship on these States.

Under terms of the United States reclamation law, 52½ percent of the revenue on these public lands from oil, gas, mineral, and other leases, and 95 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands, is put into a reclamation fund, for the construction of reclamation projects.

In 1954, this revenue from our four States amounted to $21,525,000.

The average balance on the construction costs over the 50-year repayment period of all the reclamation features of the Colorado River storage project would be $144,796,000. Opponents of the projest have made much af the fact that money used for the reclamation features of the project is—under standard United States law—interest free. They talk about a hidden interest subsidy which the taxpayers must pay.

At the standard rate of 2½ percent, annual interest on this investment would be $3,619,000. From these figures, it is clear that the revenue put into the reclamation fund each year by our own 4 States is nearly 7 times the total of theoretical interest charges on the reclamation features of the Colorado River storage project.

Let us have no more applesauce on Capitol Hill about the nonexistent hidden interest burden. Let us rather look to the immense values of a sound investment in the future of our Nation.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the Florida irrigation project in Colorado.

The Florida project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the Florida project would be $2,200 an acre.

The project would produce agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains and dairy products.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

High Honors Well Bestowed—Former Representative Thatcher Receives Tributes and Awards at Testimonial Luncheon of Society of Mayflower Descendants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in the roster of patriotic and genealogical societies of the Nation no one of them is more loyal to American ideals and institutions than the General Society of Mayflower Descendants and its constituent State societies. Among the latter none is more prominent than the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia. In the general society, and in that of the District of Columbia, no member has been more effective in the effort to uphold the aims and purposes of the societies than former Representative Maurice Hudson Thatcher, of Kentucky and Washington; and no one has more effectively labored to oppose communism and communistic influence in our midst and to promote sound Americanism, than himself. As governor of the District of Columbia society, and as deputy governor general and counselor general of the general society, he has distinguished himself in these and other important fields and connections.

In recognition of these outstanding services, and also because of his splendid labors in various roles of his public and private career, the District society, on June 11, 1955, gave for him, at the Shoreham Hotel in this city, a testimonial luncheon. He and Mrs. Thatcher—who also received a full measure of tributes during the program—were the special guests of honor. Between 150 and 200 members and friends of the Thatchers were in attendance—among them a number of members of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the Commonwealth of Virginia, which was organized by him. The two Houses of Congress were represented by Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN of Iowa; Representatives JOHN M. ROBSION, JR., and EUGENE SILER, of Kentucky; and myself. Presiding was the District society's present governor, Mr. Charles T. Macdonald, of the Federal Trade Commission staff. The chairman of the committee on arrangements was Mr. Leigh L. Nettleton, former governor of the society, and member of the Board of Immigration Appeals. A splendid program was provided, the printed motto of which was, "While yet we live let's honor those yet living." At the conclusion of the addresses, Chairman Nettleton presented to Governor Thatcher the District society's certificate of merit and accompanying citation—the first ever bestowed by the society. The formal addresses were delivered by Representative ROBSION and Capt. Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, retired, the former dealing with the general background and public activities of Governor Thatcher, excepting those of isthmian character which were presented by the latter, a well-known historian of Panama Canal and isthmian subjects. Following the formal addresses, Miss Mattie Richards Tyler, of Louisville, Ky., and Washington, herself a poet and writer of distinction, read a number of poems written by Governor Thatcher.

The occasion was notable and outstanding in character. It is believed that an account of the proceedings merit a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to constitute an enduring record of the high honors thus paid a former and highly esteemed member of this body, and a greatly beloved member and officer of the Societies of Mayflower Descendants. Accordingly, under leave granted, I am including, as a part of these remarks, the pertinent features of the program, together with the testimonial addresses.

The program began with an appropriate invocative service by Mrs. Fletcher Quillian, the society's elder. Then came the pledge of allegiance to the flag, led by Clarence I. Peckham, captain of the society. Next came the Pilgrim Pledge, composed by Governor Thatcher, as follows:

THE PILGRIM PLEDGE
(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

In the name of God, Amen.

I pledge myself to help hold aloft the lamps of civil and religious liberty lighted by the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock; to recall and cherish the sacrifices and struggles made by them for the common good; to study their lives, deeds, faith, courage, and character, and to draw inspiration therefrom; to emulate their spirit; to be loyal to the flag and institutions of the country whose founding was so greatly aided by their work and wisdom; to do everything within my power to deserve the heritage; and in all things, and in all ways, to profit by the Pilgrim example.

The other more important features of the program follow in sequence.

Governor Macdonald read a number of wires and letters from distinguished personages, unable to be in attendance, with congratulations for the occasion, and paying tribute to Governor Thatcher.

Called on by Governor Macdonald, Senator MARTIN, Representative SILER, and myself made brief remarks, now given:

Senator MARTIN. My good friends, Mrs. Martin and I are delighted to meet with you on this memorable occasion to do honor to an outstanding American leader, Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher.

Throughout my 17 years of service in Congress I have found the wise and kindly counsel of Governor Thatcher most useful and inspiring. He is, indeed, one of the best informed and soundest thinkers of our time, and he is noted for his friendly encouragement and guidance.

To Mrs. Thatcher belongs a real share of the credit for their outstanding record. No one is more deserving of the honors accorded today than Governor Thatcher.

More power to both of them, and best wishes for many more years of their fine and genial leadership.

Representative SILER. I am quite happy to be here and enjoy this occasion with a group that is seeking to honor one to whom honor is due. Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, my fellow Kentuckian, has had a long and distinguished career of good service that is in every way worthy of memorialization at this time. We all trust and hope that he will have many additional years in which to continue to shed the radiance of the great and worthy light of that service among his fellow men.

Representative CANNON. It is a much-appreciated privilege to have the opportunity of being here and breaking bread with the society, and especially to be permitted to say a word in grateful appreciation of the distinguished service of Dr. Thatcher on this very happy occasion.

Kentucky has produced many great men. Champ Clark once said that the State of Kentucky had contributed so many governors, Senators, Congressmen, judges, generals, and other distinguished citizens to surrounding States that he often wondered what would have happened had they all stayed at home together. Whether they were permitted to contribute to the upbuilding of other States of the Union, or whether they remained at home, Dr. Thatcher would still rank as one of the greatest living Kentuckians.

He is a great statesman, a great diplomat, a great Isthmian governor, a great lawyer, a great American; and especially great in his friendships.

A nation, a people, who do not appreciate and honor their great men will not long produce men worthy of honor and appreciation. So it behooves us to extend honor to those to whom honor is due, and certainly that would include Dr. Thatcher.

And how appropriate it is that we take advantage of the opportunity to pay this honor and this testimony to him, and to his great service to the society, and to the Nation, and to humanity in general.

"If with pleasure you are viewing any work a man is doing;
If you like him; if you love him—tell him now.
Don't withhold your approbration till the parson makes oration,
And he lies with snowy lillies on his brow.
If he earns your praise—bestow it; if you like him—let him know it;
Let the words of true encouragement be said; do not wait
Till life is over, and he's underneath the clover—
For he cannot read his tombstone when he's dead."

"If you love him, if you like him, tell him now." Dr. Thatcher, we do like you. We do love you, and we are grateful for this opportunity to tell you how much we appreciate you and how much we and the rest of the world owe you.

May you live forever.

INTRODUCTION OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBSION

Governor MACDONALD. The next speaker today is a distinguished Kentuckian. He attended the George Washington, Georgetown, and National Universities; was admitted to the bar in 1926; and in 1929 became Chief of the Law Division of the United States Bureau of Pensions. In 1935 he entered upon the practice of law in Louisville, Ky., where he has since made his home. In Louisville he became prominent in civic and political affairs, and in World War II served with distinction overseas, part of the time on the staff of Gen. Mark Clark.

He is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Military Order of the World Wars. In 1952 he was elected to represent the Louisville and Jefferson County, Ky., district in the United States House of Representatives—the same district formerly represented by him whom we are today honoring; and he was reelected for a second term in 1954. He is a member of the important Judiciary Committee of the House, and last year he was the author of a greatly needed enactment on the subject of subversives.

It is my privilege—indeed, my great pleasure—to present Hon. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR., who will tell us something about the career of his friend, and now, also, his constituent, Governor Thatcher.

Representative JOHN M. ROBSION, JR. Governor Macdonald, Senator Martin, Congressman Siler, Congressman Cannon, and Mrs. Thatcher, distinguished guests, at the outset I must express by deep appreciation for the honor accorded in placing me on this program to speak somewhat of the life and deeds of the man to whom you pay tribute today. Your own society and your national organization are doing much in these difficult and troubled times to keep alive in the hearts and minds of our people the sentiments and practices of Christian virtue, loyalty to the ideals of civil and religious liberty and practical idealism, which so greatly distinguished your Pilgrim ancestors. They gave a great impetus to the splendid principles which they held, and this Nation of free men and women owe them a debt which can never be paid except in following their example.

In the time permitted I can only touch upon certain of the more prominent features of a career so filled with worth as that of Maurice H. Thatcher, and it is very gratifying to me that I am now representing, in Congress, the identical district which, for a good many years, was so ably represented by him; that is to say the district made up of Jefferson County, Ky., including the city of Louisville.

Maurice Hudson Thatcher grew up in western Kentucky in the Green River section of the State. His paternal line runs back to the very beginning of New England history, and his earliest American ancestor was Elder William Brewster, one of the Mayflower passengers, the spiritual leader of the Plymouth colony. His father was born in Connecticut, and his mother in Tennessee. He obtained his education in public and private schools and through broad personal experience. In his earlier life he lived on a Butler County, Ky., farm. In his teens he was employed in the county offices, and he learned the printer's art in the composing room of the county newspaper. In these years he acquired the habits of close application to his tasks and of industry and integrity which have always characterized him. Not long after he reached his majority he was elected clerk of the Circuit Court of Butler County, and discharged the duties of the office so well that he soon came to be known as one of the most efficient circuit court clerks in the State of Kentucky. After several years of service as circuit clerk he went to Frankfort, the State capital, to serve on the State auditor's staff, meanwhile continuing his legal studies. Later he became a licensed attorney and received an appointment as assistant attorney general of the State. In this post he met his duties and responsibilities in the most praiseworthy manner. Upon the conclusion of this particular service he removed to Louisville and entered into the private practice of law.

In 1901 he was appointed assistant United States district attorney for Kentucky and served until 1906, most of the time for the western district, making a fine record as an able and fearless prosecutor. In 1908 Mr. Thatcher was chosen as State inspector and examiner for Kentucky, and during the ensuing 2 years he made an outstanding record. He collected more revenue from delinquent officials throughout the State than had been collected by all his predecessors. In addition he conducted the most exhaustive investigations of the State's charitable and penal institutions and brought about substantial reforms. Also in 1908 he was selected to be chairman of the campaign of former Gov. William O. Bradley for United States Senator, and contributed in very large degree to Governor Bradley's election.

In April 1910, Maurice Thatcher was appointed by President Taft as member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which was charged with the supervision and performance of the work of building the Panama Canal. As regards his labors and achievements in that unique and highly important post, and touching his subsequent accomplishments growing out of his isthmian service, I shall leave to another speaker who is eminently qualified to speak of them.

After returning from Panama he again engaged in the practice of law in Louisville and again became effectively active in politics. In the Louisville-Jefferson County campaign for city and county offices in 1917 he rendered important party service; and his labors constituted a substantial contribution to his party's complete success at the polls. Following that election he was chosen as a member of the board of public safety of the city and made an excellent record in that position during the ensuing 2 years. In 1919 he became department counsel of Louisville and served in that capacity for 4 years, and in that responsible post performed his duties with outstanding ability.

The year 1922 brought Maurice Thatcher the Republican nomination for Congress from the Louisville district, and in November of that year he was elected to the House of Representatives. Four times he was reelected to Congress, serving altogether 10 years—March 1923 to March 1933. As a Member of the House he strove always to act for the best interests of his district and his constituents, and in addition, did much for the State and the Isthmus of Panama. While in Congress he sought to serve the people of his district and State regardless of party or partisan considerations. In consequence of which he became very popular in his district, and always in his congressional races received a substantial number of Democratic votes and the bulk of the independent vote. This popularity was well attested by the fact that in 1926 he was elected without opposition, and by the further fact that in 1928 he was reelected over a distinguished opponent by more than 32,000 majority—a result which I believe has never been equaled in the district by any candidate for a major office in a contested campaign. As a Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman Thatcher's interests and efforts were varied. Throughout his congressional tenure he was a member of the powerful House Committee on Appropriations, and in that connection rendered important national service. In addition to his regard for Panama Canal, Isthmian, and Latin American affairs, he was especially active—and successful—in his efforts in behalf of national parks, public highways, public buildings, aviation and airmails, benefits for the blind, and other matters of general import. Thus, in Congress, he was the author of various enactments dealing with these subjects, as, for, instance, the following:

Act for the establishment of the Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky; act for permanent improvement and maintenance of the Lincoln birthplace farm in Kentucky; act creating the Zachary Taylor National Cemetery in Kentucky; act authorizing the construction of the municipal bridge across the Ohio River at Louisville (formally named the George Rogers Clark Memorial Bridge)—a pioneer piece of legislation obviating the necessity of bond vote issues, with financing processes resulting in ultimate freedom from bridge tolls; act (joint author) for the same type of bridge financing for the State of Kentucky; legislation and appropriations for the construction in Louisville of a new Federal post office, customs, and courthouse building, a new marine hospital at Louisville, a veterans' hospital at Lexington, Ky.; an act increasing appropriations for the making of braille books and apparatus for the blind children of America; and an act for the benefit of the "underdogs" of the Treasury, the storekeeper-gagers of the Nation. In Congress he was one of the leaders responsible for the building up of our systems of domestic and foreign airmails.

In addition his efforts contributed greatly to the conversion of Camp Knox, in Kentucky, into the permanent military post of Fort Knox. Also he led the successful effort for the naming of the United States Battle Cruiser *Louisville* for his home city, and made the dedicatory address at Bremerton Navy Yard when the vessel was launched, Mrs. Thatcher acting as formal hostess for the occasion. Then he was also author and sponsor of the creation of the Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway project linking together the great national parks east of the Mississippi, Tidewater Virginia, and the National Capital over established roadway systems; and is yet serving as president of the Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway Association, organized by him in 1931. Other enactments of an isthmian character will be mentioned by a later speaker. Since he left Congress he has continued his interest and labors in behalf of the more important of the subjects which engaged his interest during his congressional period.

Congressman Thatcher's record of public service is, indeed, one of outstanding and distinguished character. In the typically American way he has moved from farm boy to posts of honor and distinction without the aids of wealth and extraneous influence. He has fairly earned and fully deserved the honors which have come to him. By loyalty to duty, through high purpose and untiring effort, he has accomplished much; and his life, character, and deeds are truly inspirational. His interests have been wide and varied, and his labors have well served his district, his State, and his country; and, I would add, his loyal wife, Anne Bell Thatcher, has materially aided him in his achievements.

Much more might be said of this man and the labors of his life; but this, and what may come hereafter, may suffice. Your society has done well to pay him formal honor—not only for what he has done in your behalf, but, as well, for his services to his country and international causes. We are all very happy that he and Mrs. Thatcher are yet in health and strength, and are con-

tinuing in their appointed tasks. I join you in the hope that they may be long spared for further usefulness.

In conclusion, permit me to say that it is a real pleasure to meet the officers and members of this unique and patriotic organization and its distinguished guests. And thanks again for the opportunity given me to participate in this program and to speak somewhat of the life and deeds of one of your most highly esteemed and deserving members—my fellow-Kentuckian, Maurice Hudson Thatcher.

INTRODUCTION OF CAPTAIN DUVAL

Governor MACDONALD. Our next speaker is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, class of 1919. He has had a distinguished naval career, both ashore and afloat, including combat command in World War II. While on duty in Washington he took post graduate work in Foreign Service at Georgetown University. He chose as the subject for a term paper, the diplomatic history of the Panama Canal. This was expanded into a book published in 1940 by the Stanford University under the title, "Cadiz to Cathay." Eventually, it led to his detail, 1941–44, to duty in the Canal Zone, where he was in charge of marine operations in the Pacific sector of the Panama Canal during the most critical period of its history.

While on that assignment he wrote a second volume, And the Mountains Will Move, Stanford Press, 1947. He is now nearing completion of a third volume dealing with the Isthmian problems. He is accounted the outstanding historian on the subject.

Thus, in our next speaker, we have one whose experiences in the Canal Zone and intensive studies of Isthmian history combine to qualify him eminently to address us on this occasion. I am very glad to present Captain Miles P. DuVal, United States Navy, retired.

Capt. MILES P. DUVAL. Mr. Governor, members of the Society of Mayflower Descendants, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to address this splendid sector of American life. Descended, as you are, from illustrious Pilgrim pioneers who came to America seeking freedom, yours is a heritage that appeals strongly to all sons and daughters of Virginia, of whom I am proud to be one. They, like you, are bred in the great tradition of constitutional liberty.

Your member to whom we do homage today, the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, as a *Mayflower* descendant and also as a product of the great State that was once a county of Virginia, carries both of these magnificent streams of American culture and life.

My first introduction to this distinguished name was in 1936–38, while I was on duty in the Navy Department as Secretary of the Shore Station Development Board. The function of that body was to formulate programs for the evolution of our naval stations to meet future needs. When studying plans for stations in the Canal Zone, the board always had two important facilities to consider: the Thatcher Highway and the Thatcher Ferry. Thus, by that time the name of Thatcher had already become a fine tradition on the isthmus and a symbol in the United States for matters related to the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama. As a student of these subjects, I am particularly pleased to address you on the Isthmian aspects of Governor Thatcher's career.

What led this leader to become such a figure in Isthmian life and how did he attain such stature?

The explanation traces back to the start of his career in the earlier part of the century, when Governor Thatcher, like many other young Americans who must make their own way in the world, began his upward climb through the law and politics. That time was a significant period of United States history, ushered in by the war with Spain. In its course, young Thatcher lived through important phases in the evolution of the Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States, which, as a keen student of public affairs, he followed closely.

These momentous events included the negotiation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 with Great Britain; the great Congressional debate of 1902 over the location of the Isthmian canal known as the "battle of the routes," ending in decision for Panama in preference to Nicaragua; the Panama Revolution of November 3, 1903, resulting in the creation of the Republic of Panama and acquisition by the United States in 1904 of the Canal Zone; and a notable legislative struggle in 1906 as to the type of canal, known as the battle of the levels, producing the great decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level lake and lock plan for the Panama Canal.

During that period, as so well described by Congressman ROBSION, Mr. Thatcher had a most useful public experience that was to be of great value in the days to come. He never seriously thought of associating himself with the building of the Panama Canal. Following the resignation of former Senator J. C. S. Blackburn, of Kentucky, as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, President Taft began a search for a well-qualified man to fill the vacancy. On April 12, 1910, he appointed Mr. Thatcher as a member of the Commission, with assignment as head of the Department of Civil Administration of the Canal Zone. This action received general acclaim, particularly in Kentucky.

On May 6, Governor Thatcher sailed for the isthmus with his bride of 2 days, the former Miss Anne Bell Chinn of Frankfort, Ky., who is with us today.

For more than 3 years, Governor Thatcher served as a member of the Commission and head of the Department of Civil Administration, and functioned as Governor of the Canal Zone. Thus, he had unique opportunities at an inspiring time to participate in the official and social life of the isthmus, and took full advantage of them.

Because of his function as governor, his home, ably supervised by Mrs. Thatcher, who made it into a bower of tropical bloom and beauty, became an important social center in the Canal Zone. His office and that of Col. William Crawford Gorgas, a fellow commissioner and widely famed sanitarian of the isthmus, were in the old Administration Building in Ancon, adjacent to the city of Panama. His duties included liaison work with the Republic of Panama and diplomatic representatives of other countries accredited to Panama. These factors together served to establish for him a closer relationship with Panama than that enjoyed by any other canal official.

One element that contributed much toward this result was that Mrs. Thatcher, upon her arrival on the isthmus, undertook to master the Spanish language. In this endeavor, in which she was remarkably successful, she was assisted by everyone she met in Panama, from the President in the palace to the coach driver in the street. Her efforts are still recalled by Panamanians of that period with admiring approval.

With canal building then at its height, Governor Thatcher was on the scene during the great period of isthmian history when the vast construction program was being rushed toward completion. Making frequent inspection trips along the line of the canal he saw the Atlantic and Pacific locks take shape; observed Gatun and Pacific dams slowly form; arranged for needed lands in the Republic of Panama for lake purposes; saw Gatun Lake start from a body of water no larger than a mill pond; and watched it gradually rise, transforming mountains into islands and becoming what was at that time the largest artificial lake in the world. All of this together served to give him a deep insight into the meaning of the canal as an avenue of marine transportation serving vessels of all nations on terms of equality as provided by treaty.

The work of civil administration was not spectacular. If operating properly, it was quiet and efficient. Nevertheless, it was an indispensable prerequisite for successful engineering and sanitation. It included such activities as police, fire and schools; posts, customs, immigration and revenue; municipal engineering and roads; in fact, most all the customary functions performed by State, municipal and county governments in the United States. In addition to its work in the Canal Zone, the Department of Civil Administration was then charged with the construction, maintenance, and operation of street, sewer, and water systems in the terminal cities of the Republic of Panama.

Governor Thatcher's isthmian achievements, which reflected his previous public experience, include a number of items of historical interest in the Canal Zone. Among these, he was the—

1. First to recognize the evils of flogging convicts and to abolish it.

2. First to institute a system of rewards and denials to prisoners as an instrument for enforcing discipline—a program that reduced infractions by 50 percent in 6 months.

3. First to use prison labor in the Canal Zone for the construction of highways, which became models for other countries of Latin America and some of which are still in use.

4. First to introduce the teaching of Spanish in Canal Zone high schools.

5. First to enforce the Mann Act in the Canal Zone and, by such enforcement, to send a number of notorious criminals to prison.

6. First to draft a comprehensive vehicular traffic code for the Canal Zone, which was enacted into law by the Isthmian Canal Commission.

7. First to supervise taking an adequate census of the Canal Zone, which showed a population of approximately 75,000, made up of many races and nationalities.

Of the many close relationships in his Isthmian career, one of the most gratifying was that with Colonel Gorgas in connection with health and sanitation in the terminal cities, Colon and Panama, which matters were the responsibilities of the Isthmian Canal Commission. Under the system then in effect all requests for health and sanitary cooperation on the part of the Panamanian Government were handled by the head of the department of civil administration. In these and other relations, Governor Thatcher, as always recognized by the people and press of Panama, was among the first to exemplify, in adequate manner, the principles of the good-neighbor policy. This practice produced positive results, for no request of his to Panamanian authorities was ever refused.

Another significant event in Governor Thatcher's Canal Zone career was witnessing the first nonstop transcontinental airplane flight—a seaplane piloted by Robert G. Fowler from the Bay of Panama to the Atlantic entrance of the canal on April 27, 1913. His observation of this flight was to bear important fruit in the future.

Following a change in the national administration in Washington, Governor Thatcher, on August 18, 1913, resigned his position after more than 3 years' effective performance, for which he was warmly commended by Secretary of War Lindley M. Garrison, and resumed his life in Kentucky. At the time he did not realize what an impact his Isthmian experiences had made on him, or what would ultimately unfold from them.

Years later, in the Congress as a Representative from Kentucky and a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, 1923–33, new opportunities opened. Lessons learned at Panama qualified him to play im-

portant parts as a leading congressional authority in handling Isthmian and Latin American problems.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, he was a principal leader in the fight for establishing the first air mail routes in Latin America. One line extended from the United States down the west coast to Chile, and thence to the Argentine; and another, from the United States along the eastern seaboard of South America to Buenos Aires. These developments trace back to his observation in 1913 of the first trans-Isthmian flight when he visualized the need for mail service by aircraft.

In 1928 he was the author of legislation providing for the establishment, and the maintenance and operation with Federal appropriations, of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama City, for which the Republic of Panama donated the necessary land and buildings.

During the years that have followed, the laboratory developed much basic knowledge of the transmission of yellow fever and other deadly tropical ailments, including those of veterinary character. The reports of its investigations, which are available in all centers of medical learning, contributed greatly toward the success of our Armed Forces operating from tropical islands of the Pacific in World War II.

In connection with the recrudescence of yellow fever in tropical America, evidence of which has been found as far north as southern Mexico, studies by the capable staff of the laboratory have shown that the monkey and certain other animals are the reservoirs of this disease; and newly discovered species of mosquitoes, the conveyors.

The work of the laboratory thus constitutes not only a potent defense against the ravages of yellow fever in the Canal Zone and the isthmus but also a bulwark against its extension into the United States. The last is particularly pertinent since the indigenous opossum has been shown to be one of the animal reservoirs.

Another significant contribution by Governor Thatcher in the Congress concerned the operation of the Panama Canal. In this, because of his special knowledge of canal problems, he materially aided in securing legislation in 1929 for construction of a dam at Alhajuela. Named in honor of the able chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations who died in 1928, the Madden Dam and power project was the first major step toward increasing the capacity of the Panama Canal.

Completed in 1935 this project has supplied more water for lockages, generated additional power, controlled floods, and improved navigation. It still remains a monument to all who contributed to its success.

A fourth notable achievement in the Congress on the part of Governor Thatcher was securing legislation authorizing construction of a ferry, free in character, across the Panama Canal at its Pacific entrance and of a highway in the Canal Zone connecting the ferry with the road system of Panama. Opened to traffic in 1932 this ferry has transported tens of millions of passengers and hundreds of thousands of vehicles, thus rendering indispensable services in both peace and war. Both the highway and ferry, officially named in his honor, constitute links in the projected Inter-American Highway, which, with the exception of certain uncompleted sections in Central America, already extends southwardly beyond the Canal Zone.

Following as a consequence of his effective labors for pan-Americanism, President Hoover, in 1930, appointed him a member of a special mission to present, at Caracas, a statue of Henry Clay to the Republic of Venezuela. For this and his other services in fostering better relations between the United States and Latin American nations he has been decorated by the Governments of Ecuador, Panama, and Venezuela; and, most appropriately, awarded an honorary doctorate in law by the University of Alabama, an institution long associated with the Gorgas family.

After leaving the Congress in 1933, Governor Thatcher was chosen vice president and general counsel of the Gorgas Memorial Institute of Tropical and Preventive Medicine, which supervises the operations of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory. These nonsalaried positions he yet holds. Aided by his wise and experienced counsel, and his activities, this research organization has continued to grow in fame, and is known throughout the world for its invaluable services to all mankind.

When the time approached for the name of General Gorgas to be proposed for the Hall of Fame, it was natural that Governor Thatcher should play an important part in the campaign to secure that signal honor for the celebrated sanitarian.

No one who attended the graveside of General Gorgas in Arlington Cemetery on the afternoon of July 4, 1950, can ever forget the simple, yet dramatic, commemorative exercises of that beautiful summer day. Arranged and eloquently presided over by Governor Thatcher, in his capacity as a vice chairman of the Gorgas Hall of Fame Committee, they portrayed the notable contributions of General Gorgas to worldwide health and sanitation, and his position in history. This and other related services of Governor Thatcher materially aided in winning for his former friend and collaborator this new and significant recognition in a field of eminent competitors.

Since the close of World War II, the problems of modernizing the Panama Canal and of interoceanic canals generally have been topics of extensive debate. Featured by sharp differences of opinion as to what should be done, the evolving situation has confronted the Congress and the President with difficult questions of policy determination. Understanding these matters in the broadest sense, through his many years of close association and study, Governor Thatcher recognized the pattern of events as repeating the canal struggles in the earlier part of the century, saw their implications for the welfare of the United States, and has urged an Isthmian Canal policy based on a reasoned line of thought. To this end he has been a long and continuing advocate for the creation of an independent and broadly based Interoceanic Canals Commission as the best means for the adequate resolution of these grave and intricate problems. Published to the world in considered statements, his views have gained wide acceptance.

Though the activities of Governor Thatcher have brought him in close touch with men of high position and great fame, he has never overlooked those of lesser stature. In and out of the Congress, he has been effective in securing beneficial legislation, decisions, and rulings for civilian builders and operators of the Panama Canal. This assistance he has always freely extended because of his sympathetic understanding of their contributions to the success of the canal enterprise and an earnest desire to see justice done for all.

On the occasion of the dedication, on March 31, 1954, of the Goethals Memorial in the Canal Zone, Governor Thatcher and Mrs. Thatcher attended as guests of the Canal Zone Government.

In stirring remarks, he expressed high praise for all builders of the interoceanic waterway. As the surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, whose interest in Isthmian problems has never abated and whose views are well known, he symbolized the connecting link between the builders and the future.

Governor Thatcher's contributions, however, have not been limited to material achievements. He has served the canal enterprise and the Isthmian land with impressive writings in prose and verse, which will be read for generations to come.

The path of him whom we now honor has not been easy. It has been often beset with difficulties and trials. Yet under the influence of his Pilgrim-Virginia-Kentucky heritage and a wealth of useful experience, he has been always prepared for crucial tests and has built a record unique for its constructive achievements. It can well be stated that of all the eminent men who have contributed to the welfare of the Canal Zone and the Republic of Panama subsequent to leaving Canal service, Governor Thatcher ranks highest. He is now revered as an outstanding benefactor of the Isthmus.

INTRODUCTION OF MISS MATTIE RICHARDS TYLER

Governor MACDONALD. This program, without a lady, would be incomplete. Fortunately we have with us a lady of talent and distinction, a native of Louisville, Ky., who has lived for a number of years in the National Capital. She is a gifted poet, and now president of the District of Columbia branch of the National League of Pen Women. She is also the poet laureate of the Beta Sigma Omicron National Sorority; and the winner of many prizes and awards in poetry contests, including those of patriotic character. In addition, she is associate editor of the Blue Moon Poetry magazine, which, as you may know, is one of the outstanding poetry publications of the Nation.

With respect to another facet of the character and labors of the man whom we today honor, some of the many fine poems he has written, will be read by Miss Mattie Richards Tyler.

Miss TYLER. The poems I shall read—as well as many others written by Governor Thatcher—have been published in various magazines and newspapers in the United States and Panama, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; as well as in certain anthologies of verse.

I shall first read excerpts from a poem of considerable length, which is descriptive of his beloved State—and my own—and which was originally published in the Kentucky Historical Register, and afterwards in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is entitled "What is Kentucky?"

"Beloved Kentucky! the Land of Yesterday
And tomorrow; erstwhile the enchanted realm
Of Foster and My Old Kentucky Home;
Demesne of sunshine and shadow; of joy
And sorrow; of song and revelry; of
Laughter and tears; of travail and sacrifice,
With Gethsemanes sprinkled here and there;
The haunt of pleasure and the thorobred;
The stage of eloquence, valor, and zeal;
The rare product of a freedom-loving folk;
A mother whose children, at home and abroad,
Love her in strength and manner unsurpassed!

"What is Kentucky? A bloom and fragrance;
A name, a song, an idea and symbol;
A prayer, a vision, and a revelation;
An appeal, a torch in time of darkness;
A lode-star, and a pillar and a cloud;
A fount of faith and hope, and a rainbow;
A prophecy and a benediction!

"What is Kentucky? Ah, let the answer be:
A strange and proud, intangible spirit,
Born of the soul and soil, and all that went
Before; a brave and hospitable people,
Tolerant in all things save politics,
Whose hot and gusty breath oft blows away
Discretion's light, and leaves the State awry;
A breed whose members find that their mutual

Regards, affections, and esteems increase
With the proportioned distance from their homes!

"Indeed, what is Kentucky, but a rich
Composite of all of these?
Her past is sure,
Her present all-worthy, and her future
As great as her own may will it to be!"

Next, I shall read two stanzas from Governor Thatcher's lovely poem entitled, "Builders of the Panama Canal." It is a tribute to all who were engaged in the construction of the great Isthmian link, and was written in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of its formal opening, on August 15, 1914. The poem was published in the anniversary issue of the Star and Herald, of Panama. The lines I give you were recently carried in the Blue Moon.

"The mountains moved, and the waters rose;
And faith, at last, fulfilled her dream:
Lake, lock, and channel—the whole world knows—
Attest the worth of a hope supreme!
The ships now shuttle from shore to shore:
Up, up, and up—and thence straight on;
Then three times downward—and on, once more,—
Into the sunset or the dawn!

"All were as one; and they strove and wrought
To shape the passage to the Ind.
In terms of life it was dearly bought;
In money, cheap. The ranks are thinned
By time and death; but the deed they did
Excels all others of like and kind;
Its strength and virtue cannot be hid:
It lives—all tongues and lands to bind!"

In a gathering of this character it seems especially appropriate to include the sonnet tribute to the frail craft that brought the Pilgrims to the New World.

THE MAYFLOWER

"O little ship of troubled yestertime,
What precious burthens you were called to bear,
From Old World wrongs, unto a virgin clime
Within the West, ordained to be the heir
For all the ages, of the dream and hope
For freedom of man's conscience, thought and deed;
For all that widens spirit and its scope,
And yields largess for vital human need!
O sacred ark, you were divinely sent,
To bring across the stormy wastes of sea,
The humble group which was the instrument
To found a new concept of Liberty!
In voyage, compact, Plymouth, there was wrought
The goal itself which man, through God, had sought!"

Now, some poems of general character, which further illustrate versatility and gifts of expression. First, some sonnets:

GOD'S MERCY

"Ere yet the sun shall pale today, and die;
Ere yet the dusk descends, and then the dark;
Ere yet the moon shall climb the eastern sky,
And ride in midnight beauty, lone and stark;
Ere yet the heralds of the dawn shall sound
Their shrilly trumps; ere yet the light shall break:
Ere yet all this be seen, or heard, or found—
The Lord of Grace a fresh resolve will make.
E'en as the old day fades into the past.
And man's account is debited anew
With countless sins; as angels stand aghast
At what man's done, or what he's failed to do,
The Lord of Grace wills that another day
Be lent to man, somewhat his debt to pay."

YOUTH AND AGE

"How may one keep his youth, despite the years?
Or face the East, although his sun be setting?
Or stay Time's pen, naught aiding or abetting
Its cruel graph which, in ripe age, appears?
How shall dear Hope supplant the doubts and fears,
The sense of loss, the racks of sighing, fretting,
Which aging breasts are constantly begetting?
And what shall stanch the flow of senile tears?
None may reply; but Faith and Hope suggest
That never does life end; it but begins
With each new hour, whate'er the past may be.
The spirit's ev'rything; by it we're blest.
Or cursed; its force, unquenched, true vict'ry wins
O'er Time's advance and Death's dread regency."

MY FRIENDS

"I love my friends, whate'er their faults may be,
Because their faults of me, seem like a part—
Thought of my thought, and heart of mine own heart—
No less than those which all the world may see.
And know, as mine—in truth a part of me.
Likewise the sorrows of my friends besmart
And wound me, as if mine: I must needs chart
My course of joy with theirs, my own to free.
My friends, I'm sure, all due allowance make
For these, my faults, of which I have a-many;
Their sympathy and love I need, no less
Than mine they crave; thus, all for friendship's sake.
Except for friendship there could not be any
Of life's rich balms to comfort and to bless."

In conclusion, permit me to present the following quatrains:

BE NOT AFRAID

"Be not afraid that wisdom, friend, may die
When you shall quit this mortal round.
O try
To think the fount from which you drink so deep,
May have a little left for earth's supply."

FAULTS

I

"My fault, if yours, would surely seem to me
As large and sad as any fault could be:
But, being mine, strangely it doth appear
Almost too small for human eyes to see.

II

"Within myself what optic ills combine
To make my sight distraught: ah, I opine,
The telescope I use in strict reverse—
To swell my brother's fault, and shrivel mine."

THE GATE

I

"Swiftly our friends evanish through the gate
Which opens into dark; and, soon or late,
We who remain, shall follow, one by one,
And none may give an inkling of his fate.

II

"Someday shall death appear, and tap his drum,
And say to you, 'I need you; quick, O come.'
And you must go, however ill-prepared;
But, of the end, death always shall be dumb."

EFFORT

"Cease not to strive: It's better, far, to try,
Upward to rise, than fold our wings and sigh;
'Tis so ordained that distant paradise
Takes off and flies to meet us—as we fly."

MEMORY

"Old friends, olden remembrances, and old dreams,
Make up the heart of life; all else but seems
A rack of moonbeams. Memory is life,
And through time's waste carves its eternal streams."

Then, in highly commendatory terms, Governor Macdonald presented Chairman Nettleton.

REMARKS OF LEIGH L. NETTLETON, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

We descendants of those brave souls who comprised the passengers on the good *Mayflower* have a wonderful heritage of which we are justly proud, a pride manifested by our associating ourselves together in this society.

We are here today to honor one of our more distinguished members, the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher; and in doing so it seems appropriate to mention that our numbers have included other famous and distinguished Americans. Among those of eminence who have served us as Governor, in addition to Governor Thatcher, are Henry Billings Brown, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, Governor of Cuba and Governor General of the Philippine Islands; Maj. Gen. Adolphus W. Greely, Arctic explorer; and Senator Carroll S. Page, of Vermont.

Time forbids mention of the many distinguished persons who have been members, but mention should be made of President and Chief Justice William Howard Taft, the only person who ever occupied those two high offices.

On one, however, has been more assiduous than has Governor Thatcher, in his constant and vigorous effort to promote and advocate American principles and to hunt down and defeat movements inconsistent therewith.

It is appropriate, therefore, that the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher be the first to receive recognition under our newly adopted bylaw, and I deem it an honor and privilege to move that the Mayflower Society in the District of Columbia award to him a certificate of merit for distinguished service.

I suggest a rising vote on the motion.

CITATION RE ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF MERIT TO MAURICE H. THATCHER BY THE SOCIETY OF MAYFLOWER DESCENDANTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This citation and the accompanying certificate of merit evidence the high esteem in which Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher is held by the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia and its membership. Reasons for the bestowal of these honors follow:

1. He has performed distinctive service in behalf of the Mayflower Society over many years, the doing of which has added vigor to our organization and credit and prestige to our good name.

2. For 7 years he served as our governor, being an unequalled record in the society's history. During his governorship the society continued and augmented its excellent record as a well-administered and patriotic organization.

3. He has served as chairman of our legislative committee and his been ever viligilant in his support of or opposition to proposed legislation of interest and concern to patriotic organizations generally.

4. For several years he served as assistant general of the General Society of Mayflower

Descendants, relinquishing that office in 1951 when he was elected deputy governor general in which capacity he is now serving.

5. In 1954 the general society unanimously elected him counselor general for a 3-year term.

6. In 1951 he served as chairman of the committee on resolutions in the 19th congress of the general society, and he served in the same capacity during the succeeding congress in 1954. As chairman of a special committee, he drafted an amendment of the Mayflower constitution, which amendment was recently adopted, barring from eligibility for admission, and requiring the expulsion from membership, any one "who is pledged to or advocates the overthrow, by force or violence, of the Government of the United States or that of any State or Territory, or who has been guilty of other treasonable practices."

7. Through his zeal and tireless efforts the organization of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the Commonwealth of Virginia was effected, and he is now an honorary member of that society.

8. For many years he has participated in radio programs on compact day, which participation included his reading of the Mayflower compact.

9. Due in large part to his efforts, the Mayflower compact was included among the exhibits of historic documents carried on the Freedom Train which traveled back and forth across the country and was visited by untold thousands of our inhabitants.

10. In numerous other ways he has contributed to the name and fame of our pilgrim fathers and to the promotion and advancement of those laudable objects and high principles which all American patriotic organizations and loyal citizens sponsor and seek for the public good.

For his many and varied achievements he merits the highest honor which lies in our power to confer as evidence of our great appreciation.

Therefore, in token of the appreciation and gratitude of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, the citation and certificate of merit are now presented to him.

Done in the city of Washington, D. C., this the 11th day of June A. D., 1955.

CHAS. T. MACDONALD, *Governor.*
ZEPHEREINE TOWNE SHAFFER,
Secretary.
LEIGH L. NETTLETON,
Chairman, Committee on Arrangements, Testimonial Luncheon.

The citation and the certificate of merit, beautifully engrossed and framed, were then formally delivered to Governor Thatcher by Chairman Nettleton, followed by the response of the former:

RESPONSE OF MAURICE H. THATCHER

Unless one should be as unimpressionable as Mr. Peepers he could not fail, as the beneficiary of an occasion such as this, to experience the deepest emotions. For what this society has done to pay me the great honor involved; for the very generous words that have been spoken by our distinguished speakers—Congressman Robsion, Captain DuVal, Miss Tyler, and others—including Congressmen Cannon and Siler, and Senator Martin; and for what Governor Macdonald and the officers of the society, and the luncheon committee, headed by Brother Nettleton, have done to make this a successful event: for all of this I am deeply grateful; and to all these—and for the presence of so many friends and members of the society—I am also under never-ending obligation. And in this expression of appreciation and gratitude I include, of course, Mrs. Thatcher, both on my account and her own. We are, indeed, greatly touched and humbly grateful; and our heartfelt thanks go out to each and every one of you.

For the trust and confidence you have given me through the years, and for the many honors you have accorded me—crowned by this day's event—I can never make repayment, but must be, and forever remain, your debtor. Through all of life which may yet be ours all these things shall remain firmly enshrined in the inmost hearts of my wife and myself.

The overall honor accorded by the society, together with the citation and certificate of merit, and the attendance of so many friends in proof of their sympathetic interest, constitute a rounded event truly rich and precious.

I can only hope that in some measure I may be worthy of all this. You have taught me the value of adjectives, but I find it quite impossible to find and use those which are sufficiently apt and adequate.

When the proposal for all this was given by our fine new governor I was taken very much by surprise, and I felt embarrassed. First, I was not sure that I merited such consideration; and second, I recalled the famous legendary story of Croesus, the fabulously rich king of Lydia—whose name throughout the succeeding ages has been the synonym for great wealth—and his captor, Cyrus the Great, king of the Medes and Persians. During the period of his independence and glory Croesus was exceedingly proud of his great treasures and practiced, in marked degree, the exhibition of his splendor; and accounted himself the happiest of men. Sardis, his capital, became the brilliant center of the arts. Thus vain of his wealth and fame, it is said that he asked the philosopher, Solon, what the latter thought of the good fortune of himself, Croesus. The answer of the sage was: "I pronounce no man fortunate until his death." Later Croesus became the war prisoner of Cyrus, and was condemned to death. When seated on the funeral pyre and about to be burned alive, he called to mind the words of Solon and thrice repeated his name. Cyrus demanded an explanation. Croesus gave it, with the result that Cyrus not only spared his life, but also took him into royal favor and protection; and Cyrus, at his death, commended Croesus to the like consideration of Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus.

On or about the 19th of May 1925, shortly after my second term in Congress began, I became a member of this society; and in November 1939 I was elected as its governor, and was reelected 6 times, thus serving in that capacity 7 terms. Throughout the years of my membership—and especially ever since 1939 when it became necessary for me to become active in the affairs of the society, I have greatly enjoyed the resulting contacts and associations; and I believe that I am well qualified to bear witness with respect to the very high integrity and character of citizenship of these members. I have never been associated with a finer, saner, more congenial, and patriotic group of men and women than those making up this membership.

THE PILGRIMS

The Pilgrims—as I am able to gather from the facts of history—were, in their general makeup, high-class middle-class people, earnestly and in practice devout Christians, but independent in their outlook. In their labors, sacrifices, and achievements for the cause of civil and religious liberty and the establishment of the Christian home in the New World, and in their adoption of the Mayflower compact, the first formal document of the Western Hemisphere that provided for free and independent government and which contained the seeds of the American Constitution—they performed a service for the human race that has never been excelled. They were, indeed, men and women of great courage and faith, but of modest mien and deportment.

It is unfortunate that in the Nation at large genealogical records could not have been kept as carefully as those of New England; but outside of that region the processes of pioneering in vast wildernesses and moving across the continent to establish new settlements, coupled with the devastations of war, have rendered the genealogical tasks greatly more difficult, and in all too many cases altogether impossible of execution. By those quite competent to judge, it is estimated that today—335 years after the establishment of the Plymouth Colony—there should be something like 1 million descendants of those who came to New England shores on the Mayflower. Scattered throughout the country these descendants—most of them—it would appear, are unaware of their Pilgrim ancestry. Yet, there are only about 8,500 members of the Societies of Mayflower Descendants.

COMMUNISM

And may I inject—for a moment—a more serious note. Communism, organized and enthroned and maintained by perfidy, infiltration, intrigue, tyranny, and methods utterly ruthless and sanguinary in vast regions, and over countless millions of our fellow men, throws across the world the greatest shadow it has ever known. To lift that shadow requires the united, realistic, and unabated will and effort of freedom-loving men and women everywhere. To this end, and in this urgent hour, let us hope that the spirit of liberty, as it motivated the Pilgrims and their fellow colonists, may inspire, direct, and preserve—not only our own people—but, as well those of every land and clime who prefer freedom to slavery.

IN CONCLUSION

Now for a few concluding thoughts.

Those who have spoken here have been—as I must believe—overgenerous in their appraisals and commendations. If I have been able to accomplish any things of worth, they have been of modest character; but, withal, needed, just, and useful—and achieved, I assure you, only through persistent aim and sustained effort. And, I must add, any measure of success which has been mine in these connections has largely resulted from the fine and efficient aid and assistance of others associated with me in my labors. Therefore whatever of honor or recognition which may come to me should be shared by them.

Also, it is my pleasing duty to acknowledge the fullest portion of credit and gratitude that is due my wife for her unfailingly faithful and effective service and labors through the years. In times of good fortune, and bad, she has been unchanged and steadfast in her helpfulness, courage, wise counsel, and good spirit: All of which has been inspirational in the highest degree.

Again, for both of us, I thank you, one and all, and trust that Heaven may vouchsafe unto each of you peace and good will, and that the lights divine may shine round about you.

The Jewish Community Center: Hub of Good Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, throughout the Nation, social workers

and people in the field of psychology are finding that wholesome and happy recreation is one of the safeguards of American democracy.

Furthermore, this recreation is one of the most effective means for preventing the juvenile delinquency which is such a source of alarm to so many parents in the United States. In many of the great communities of America, Jewish community centers are doing their part to assist in these worthwhile efforts.

The lecture platforms in Jewish community centers also are open to various points of view on political and economic questions, thus helping to encourage that freedom of discussion and thought which is indispensable to a democratic society, founded on individual liberty. As a speaker at some of these forms, I have been profoundly impressed with the keen interest shown by audiences in the forward progress of our great country.

So that the Senate may be more fully informed on the contributions of the Jewish community centers, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the National Jewish Welfare Board on June 24, 1955, for release to the press of the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER: HUB OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

One of the bedrock elements that add up to the greatness of the United States is our unique system of voluntary groups of citizens organized to work together toward the achievement of common objectives. In no other country is this phenomenon apparent to the degree that it exists here. Some people call this adult education, but by whatever name you describe it, it is one of the fundamental bases of the American democratic concept.

The Jewish community center sponsors civil forums open to the whole community on matters which have concerned the interests of the public. These center forums are one of the more overt and dramatic aspects of the broad adult educational activities fostered by the Jewish community center which is one of the major voluntary groups so uniquely characteristic of American life. One of the principal objectives of Jewish community centers and of the National Jewish Welfare Board's lecture bureau is to develop a deep interest and participation in civic affairs.

The wide range of personalities and scope of interests represented on Jewish community center platforms is an example of adult education at its best. The center platform is hospitable to varied points of view. The Jewish community center does not shy away from political iconoclasm. It is not parochial in presenting conflicting ideas and personalities in American life any more than it is in making its platform available to similar dissenting or minority views in Jewish life.

Jewish community center audiences are a channel for reaching large numbers of alert, articulate, thinking Americans of all races and creeds who are deeply concerned with basic traditions and concepts of American democracy. The kinds of public forums to which the Jewish community center is committed and which the JWB lecture bureau encourages are a means for whetting the appetite of intelligent Americans for further exploration into the problems that concern us all and for opening new vistas of thought and action. Audience reaction at these forums is often a kind of minuscule public opinion poll that may have more validity than the popular pollsters.

This deep and abiding concern with public service and public affairs makes the Jewish Community Center and the National Jewish Welfare Board a healthy element in the totality of American life. The word "community" in the name of the Jewish Community Center emphasizes the constant seeking for new ways to serve the entire community. The word "welfare" in the name National Jewish Welfare Board underscores a concern with the welfare of the Nation.

Center-sponsored forums are valuable in producing clear-headed thinking, sound leadership, progressive action, and the ability and willingness to keep up with the times. In an era when an informed and alert public opinion is essential to the maintenance of freedom, the Jewish community center provides free access to and use of knowledge.

For more than a century the center has been one of the key institutions in American life. In most communities it is as well known as the public library and the post office. Organizations of every description, Jewish and non-Jewish, use its platform which is open to every constructive community cause and idea.

The founders of the Jewish community center movement had little leisure to enjoy freedom that was their birthright but their heirs have acquired not only increasingly more free time but have also developed a keen sense of the responsibilities that go with leisure. The wholesome and creative use to which the Jewish community centers and the National Jewish Welfare Board are putting this leisure is one of the valued achievements of our free society and a great bulwark of our free way of life.

In the Jewish community center we have a lively and essential hub of good citizenship.

Mutual Security Bill for 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to express my regret for not carrying my part of the load when the hearings were in progress in our committee. Members of the committee, however, are aware of the reasons for my failure to attend many of the hearings. I know that the committee has worked diligently. I know that the chairman has been under pressure—I think too much pressure. Not sufficient time was allowed so the committee could consider all phases of this program. I think this is a program that requires thorough attention every time it comes before us; it should have minute scrutiny. I, for one, would express the hope that the time will come when we can consider the basic philosophy, of this kind of legislation and thus have sufficient time to thresh out some of the differences in committee of those of us in the minority. We believe it was our duty to file minority views on this bill.

In that connection I want to say that printed minority views are to be found on the desk where the majority report is on file. It was signed by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

I want to agree with one of the best witnesses I listened to when I was at the hearings, and that was Mr. Hensel. So far as my experience on the committee is concerned, the presentation that he made was outstanding. He pulled no punches. He was honest with the committee. When he concluded his presentation I believe we had a better understanding of what was involved in the military phases of this program than from any witness who has ever appeared before us. He very frankly said that this is one of the programs we should take a look at. I want to quote some short excerpts from his testimony which Members may find in our minority views. He said:

I spoke to you about the fact that although these programs had been made up, had been approved by the military authorities and by the Congress, we had certain skepticism about them, at least enough to require a review, because they had been made up on the basis of criteria, some of which were now open to question.

He also said:

It is not too difficult just to spend money. It is much more difficult to spend it intelligently.

Also he said in conclusion on that particular phase of his testimony:

I think Congress ought to examine very carefully into the manner in which the money is administered, because you cannot run it from here, expressing your opinion in a rigid statute, that executes itself. It just will not work.

From this, Mr. Chairman, the committee is justified in making a detailed study of the military requests covered by this bill. If Secretary Hensel and his Department have some doubts about the criteria heretofore considered as a basis for these requests certainly the Foreign Affairs Committee should carefully examine the requests that are before us.

That brings me to the position I have taken on this legislation heretofore, and I may say that this is the phase that I object to most strenuously. It is the question of these large carryovers and I think the majority members of the committee have brushed aside consideration of this important matter.

I had rather anticipated that the majority report would include a statement as to just how large a carryover we would have in this program. It did not, so we on the minority thought that we ought to set it up, we should indicate to members of this committee the balance that is expected to be carried over, at least, unexpended as of the 30th of June. There will be $8,717,000,000 as a carryover and yet the bill before us would authorize $3½ billion. This is incredible.

I know that my very good and able friend, the chairman of the committee, will say that this is necessary because we have this long pipeline to keep filled up. I call your attention to the fact that in all of the history of this legislation those who are administering this program have never been able to spend more than $6 billion, yet there is an an-

ticipated unexpended balance as of the 30th of June of $8,817,000,000, I repeat we are authorizing by this legislation $3.5 billion more, and there are available in counterpart funds in other countries of the world over $900 million, almost another billion.

I say that we ought to stop and look. We ought to consider ourselves members of a board of directors. We are called upon to administer this program and to conserve wherever we can the taxpayers' money.

In view of the spending ability of the administrative departments, or lack of it, I say to you that so far as the present authorization is concerned we need not authorize a dime and yet the program would not be affected in any way.

If we were sitting as a board of directors, we would say to the general manager of the plant, "How much can you spend?" I say to the administrators of this program, "How much can you spend?" It is an open record that $6 billion has been the top. It takes a lot of programing and good management to spend $5 billion a year.

I call your attention to our minority views again. You will note the table. It is interesting to observe that the carryovers this program has had every year since it was set up. In 1950 we had a carryover of $3,521,000,000; 1951, $7,145,000,000; 1952, $9,895,000,000; 1953, $10,000,000,000; 1954, $9,914,000,000; and for this year, 1955, $8,717,000,000.

If you take what we are going to have as of the 30th of June and add to it the request in this authorization, you will have close to $12 billion again. This is gross mismanagement. Has not the Congress lost control of this program? It seems to me it has. If your constituents came to you today and asked you how you justify appropriating $3½ billion when you have almost $9 billion on hand—how could you answer? I think in suggesting a review of this whole program that this carryover situation is one that commands attention.

The Hoover report speaks in very strong language of these carryovers and points out again, as I have, that by going along with our present policy the Congress has lost complete control of the financial phases of the program. We are defeating our very objectives.

The chamber of commerce in a very interesting report said, "This fund should be held to the lowest possible level to insure retention of firm congressional control over the program. Furthermore, the carryover funds should be reviewed annually by the Congress regardless of whether they have been committed."

The answers to the arguments that I am making in part is this: First, is the one of the pipeline, keeping it full, and then, secondly, the answer that this money while unexpended, yet is obligated under valid contracts. I would like to know whether or not the presentation teams presented, or are able to present signed contracts in justification for the money that is being requested? I would like to have an answer to my question. I am sure it would be a very, very interesting answer.

United States Military Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the survival of our country, our way of life, and of western civilization may well depend upon the decisions made in this Chamber with regard to military policy.

There is no more important debate, no more important study, no more important soul searching than that accompanying the quest of free America for an effective means of perpetuating internal democracy and discouraging external aggression.

In connection with this great task, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent signpost that has recently appeared along this difficult path. Brig. Gen. Dale O. Smith, USAF, has recently written a book entitled "United States Military Doctrine." General Smith is one of the United States Air Force's outstanding educational leaders and strategists. Formerly Director of Education at the Air University, he is currently assigned to the staff of the Operations Coordinating Board in Washington. In the few weeks it has been in print critics have already acclaimed his work saying it may become the military classic of the atomic age.

It is not because General Smith is a fellow Nevadan, that I am so anxious to extend his sphere of influence. It is because his book is the first study published in many years which analyzes the development of military thought in the United States and presents a reasonable philosophy for the future in a manner anybody can understand.

His is a volume which should reside permanently on every congressional desk, and which should rapidly become dogeared from frequent and fruitful reference.

Let me quote from a recent review which appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

> General Smith stresses that few Americans appreciate the tremendous influence military doctrine has on their lives and fortunes. He points out that the great debate in the United States today revolves around the tactics and strategy this Nation should employ to preserve its sovereignty and the American way of life. Fundamental to tactics and strategy are the deep beliefs held by military people with respect to the ways of conducting a successful war.
>
> The book traces the evolution of these beliefs from the time of George Washington and analyzes the adaptability of various military philosophies to the times when they were in effect. General Smith, an Air Force officer with wide combat experience, pulls no punches in evaluating these beliefs. He expresses profound knowledge of his topic and it is quite possible his book not only will rank with the writings of Admiral Mahan, but it may well become the military classic of the atomic age. It is a book to be read by every person in uniform from the GI on upward, and by all civilian Government men who deal with national security matters.

A Food Stamp Plan for the Distribution of Surplus Commodities to All Americans in Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I was given an opportunity by the House Committee on Agriculture to appear before that committee and testify in behalf of my bill, H. R. 5105, to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States. The bill which I have introduced this year is in many respects similar to my bill of the 83d Congress, H. R. 7870, which has been reintroduced this year by a number of other Members. However, as a result of my further studies into the problem. I made some changes in my original bill which I consider quite important, particularly in bringing into the program the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor. Under my new bill, these two cabinet officials are to join with the Secretary of Agriculture in the determination of all basic policy matters involving the distribution of the food to needy persons.

I was very pleased by the interest in this whole matter shown by Chairman COOLEY and other members of the Committee on Agriculture. They were most gracious to me and demonstrated sincere sympathy for the objectives of my bill. I am hopeful that we will see some action by the committee and by the Congress in the very near future to put a program of this kind into effect.

To me, and I think to all Members of Congress, it is a tragic thing that we have many citizens in the United States not receiving an adequate diet, and not able to buy butter and other dairy products, and in many cases not even getting enough to eat, when we have these simply huge stocks of food accumulating in Government warehouses. We do not have a practical and efficient system of nationwide distribution of surplus foods to needy people in this country. The present plan of distribution administered by the Department of Agriculture is a very cumbersome and ineffective one; large quantities of the food are going into just a few States, whereas elsewhere in the country needy families receive none of it.

Because of the widespread interest among the Members of Congress in this problem, as evidenced by the many Members who have discussed it with me and by those who have introduced my bill of last year, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent my testimony of June 17 before the House Committee on Agriculture on H. R. 5105, as follows:

A Food Stamp Plan for the Distribution of Surplus Commodities to All Americans in Need

(Testimony by Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan, Democrat, of Missouri, before the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives on H. R. 5105, a bill by Mrs. Sullivan "to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States," June 17, 1955)

Chairman Cooley and members of the committee, I am so appreciative to the committee for final scheduling hearings on my food stamp bill and on similar bills to get some of our surplus food distributed on a much more effective basis to Americans in need. I know the committee has been very busy, and I am very grateful that you are all putting your very considerable talents in the field of agricultural legislation to this problem of maintaining decent standards of nutrition for all of our people.

Let me say first that I am aware of the fact that there are now several programs for distribution of surplus food. The school-lunch program is and has been a very important means for using surplus food in a way to help the schoolchildren of the country. You have also provided for distribution of surplus food to many types of public institutions, including hospitals, prisons, and so on. Some of this food goes abroad through either donation or purchase at very reasonable rates. And then you have a very substantial program in operation in a few States like Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and others where you are now distributing butter, cheese, dried milk, oil, rice, and beans to a great number of people in what would be a modification of the kind of program suggested in my bill.

I don't think this program now in effect is a good enough program. Many States are not participating in it because of the cumbersome and expensive obligations placed upon them not only for certification of the eligibles but for collection and distribution of the food. The present program as I understand it has been of a hit-and-miss nature with no uniform national standards assuring equal treatment for all. The present program has been charged with slipshod operation at the State or local level permitting or encouraging chiseling and the gift of food to people who perhaps may not need it, while others might go hungry.

I cannot document all of these charges, but the members of this committee all know that these charges have been made by responsible observers of this present food distribution system. The fact that you know the present system is not adequate is clear from your actions over the past year in seeking to find ways and means of improving the present system of distribution of surplus food to needy persons. I would point out, however, that what you have been doing has been to patch up some of the deficiencies in the program when actually a new approach is needed.

This committee recently proposed expanded donations of food to needy persons in the group IV labor market areas, the so-called distressed areas of high unemployment. That is fine, but a person with insufficient income, or a family on relief, can be just as hungry here in Washington, D. C., or in Hartford, Conn., or Atlanta Ga., or Tulsa, Okla., or any other of the cities with a balanced labor supply where there is very little unemployment as they can be in the distress areas of West Virginia or Tennessee or Alabama or wherever you have lots of unemployment.

In other words, throughout the country today there are millions of Americans living on the edge of economic disaster. In periods of high unemployment the number increases. But even in good times there are a substantial number of very low income families. (The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress periodically has been making studies of this paradox in rich America.)

Many of these people do not get enough to eat—certainly not enough of the proper, nourishing foods. At the same time, here we are as a Nation building up these vast billions of dollars worth of agricultural surpluses. As of May 18 the approximate total cost of these commodities held in Government inventory was $4.7 billion. The approximate dollar cost of the 6 items being distributed to the needy at the present time—the cost of stock of these 6 items now on hand—is $382 million. We have more than a quarter billion pounds of butter, nearly a half billion pounds of cheese and dry milk, a hundred million pounds of beans, two hundred million pounds of rice, and so on.

What I am asking this committee to help me to do, what I am asking the Congress to do, is to provide a practical, effective means for getting some of this food—and other food items which we buy to help the farmers maintain fair prices—to get it into the stomachs of hungry people everywhere in this country. My bill provides for a food-stamp plan. The stamps would be issued by the Department of Agriculture, based on the quantities and varieties of surplus food items available for distribution. The Secretary of Agriculture would decide how the food was to be distributed—whether through central depots or through normal food retailing channels. The Secretary of Agriculture would be in charge of the packaging of the food. In other words, when it comes to moving the food, handling it, packaging it, distributing it—the physical process of distribution, that is—these are all jobs of the Department of Agriculture under my bill. But he does not have to decide who is to get the food.

Now I stress that because I know that this committee and the Department of Agriculture itself are reluctant to have the functions of the Department dealing with price support mixed up in any way with welfare work. Throughout your hearings on the bill we recently passed on the processing of corn and wheat for distribution to those now receiving surplus food there was emphasis on this note that feeding the hungry is not the job of the Department of Agriculture.

The bill I introduced last year and which has been reintroduced by several Members this year would, therefore, under the reasoning you people expressed, be guilty of making something of a humanitarian or at least a social worker out of the Secretary of Agriculture. I am being facetious, of course, for I know he is a fine gentleman and in private life very much of a humanitarian if my information is correct. But my bill last year did give him almost sole responsibility in this food-distribution program.

I have modified the bill this year to take some of this responsibility off the shoulders of the Secretary of Agriculture and put it where it should probably more properly belong, and that is with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In this respect my bill, H. R. 5105, introduced in March, appears to have anticipated the reasoning you people adopted in H. R. 2851, the Jennings bill, which was passed by the House on May 25. Whether the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare wants this responsibility or not is a question which apparently did not bother you at the time that matter was up before, and I trust it will not bother you now in connection with my bill. Of course, I think the Department should be consulted, but as this committee made clear earlier this year, the reluctance of a Government agency to take over a function the Congress thinks it should have is no reason not to go through with a worthwhile program.

Thus, I suggest, in H. R. 5105, that the Secretary shall consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor "in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act."

Those goals are "to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities."

The bill authorizes the distribution of up to $1 billion worth of this food a year, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling the food.

The food stamps themselves—redeemable for surplus commodities at such places and in such quantity as the Secretary of Agriculture shall decide—are to be issued to the appropriate agencies of the States or their subdivisions for distribution by them to people on public assistance or in need of public assistance but ineligible for it because of technical provisions of law. This is the main group I am trying to help get some of this food—people on public assistance or old-age assistance, families receiving aid to dependent children, families which are destitute, families which we know, because of the pitifully small relief grants, are not getting proper diets.

This is the main point of departure between the kind of program envisioned under my bill and the kind of program now in effect. The Department of Agriculture now ships bulk quantities of these surplus-food items to distress areas in certain States participating in the program; it is then distributed through local authority or local surplus-food boards to people who register in advance and are provided with a card or other means of identification. The registration procedures are determined on the local or State level and so, I understand, are eligibility standards. Thus you have a situation where in some States people who virtually have to prove they are starving to death can eventually get a pound of butter and some cheese and rice; in another adjacent State families with incomes of as much as $5,000 could qualify—that is, of course, a family of 10. There are sliding scales in effect—it is only fair to point out.

I am not arguing that we take away surplus food from people now receiving it because I am sure not very many people would sign up for this kind of thing unless they are in need. Most Americans are not chiselers. Most Americans have no desire to receive charity. But may I emphasize this: Millions of Americans who need this food are not getting any of it. I want to see them get some of it on a planned, intelligent, practical, smooth-running, regularly operating program of government.

The Committee on Agriculture may feel, as the Department of Agriculture seems to feel, that the problem of feeding hungry people in the United States should not be mixed up with and cluttered up with the price-support program. The Department of Agriculture says in effect not to bother them with this problem of feeding the hungry—that they now have a system for getting some surplus food out to some people in need and that is as much as they think they should do. And I know that the members of this committee are concerned—and properly so—that relief operations of this kind not be charged dollarwise and appropriationwise against the price-support program. I can sympathize with you on that.

I don't care what amendment you adopt to make clear that any funds appropriated for the operation of a food-stamp program not be charged against the price-support program as such and not be counted in as part of the cost of "helping the farmer." Let us agree among ourselves that (1) since we have the food, and (2) since the price-support program and related activities of the Department of Agriculture intended to maintain fair prices for farm commodities do bring into storage additional quantities of surplus food, and (3) since we have people who are not getting enough to eat because of low income here in the United States, that we get the food to the hungry. If you want to charge it to welfare, that's all right with me. Let us not quibble over how the item is going to look in the budget, or under what heading.

I would like to call your attention to one additional provision in my bill which is different from the original food-stamp bill I introduced last year and which is now before you in the form of measures introduced by other Members. While my bill limits the food-stamp program to those on some form of assistance or in need of public assistance, it provides for a joint study and a report to Congress within 6 months—a joint study by the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture, and Labor on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in extending the scope of this food-stamp plan to include additional groups.

Among those listed are persons receiving unemployment compensation, persons receiving social-security pensions (as differentiated from those receiving assistance payments under the Social Security Act and who would therefore be eligible for food stamps), and "other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of" the limitation in section 7 restricting its immediate operation to those defined as needy.

I can see a program of this kind filling a very important role in this country—lifting up nutritional standards of those families who are, as I said earlier, right on the edge of hunger and certainly not getting proper nutrition. And I see it being done under a program of this kind in a way which would certainly appeal to this committee of the House, for it would be a strong supporting activity to the price-support program and would make the price-support program itself a little more understandable to city folks. There is nothing, I believe, which is more harmful to the programs for the farmer developed in this committee, than the spectacle of these vast surpluses building up while people in every part of this country—perhaps a few here or there, but some in every part of the country—go without sufficient food.

There is no reason for anyone in America to go hungry. I ask you in effect to outlaw hunger in the United States by approving my bill.

I again thank the committee for giving me this time to explain the purpose of my bill.

Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUTH THOMPSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS observed her 30th anniversary as a Member of this great Congress. During those many years she has observed the coming and going of many Members, but the service she has rendered to her constituents, to the veterans of America, and to the country at large, has continued her in that great body. Thirty years is a long time and her many accomplishments will fill volumes.

I am personally deeply grateful to Mrs. ROGERS for the help and encouragement she has given to me during the time I have known her. She is a great lady.

Davy Crockett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution offered by the Tennessee delegation and unanimously adopted by the Young Republican National Convention at Detroit, Mich., June 18, 1955, in reference to Davy Crockett:

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY TENNESSEE DELEGATION TO YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION AT DETROIT, MICH., JUNE 15–18, 1955, AND ADOPTED BY A UNANIMOUS VOTE

Whereas it has lately come to the light of day, after being hidden from history by the Democrats for many years, that one of the founders of the Democratic Party, Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, did engage in dastardly acts of political chicanery in the Tennessee congressional elections of 1830, when one of our greatest citizens, Davy Crockett, was a candidate for Congress, opposed by a Mr. Fitzgerald, whom history has long forgotten.

These acts included in the very words of our immortal son, "Over all I should have been elected, if it hadn't been that but a few weeks before the election, the little four pence-ha'penny limbs of the law fell on a plan to defeat me, which had the desired effect. They agreed to spread out over the district and make appointments for me to speak almost everywhere to clear up the Jackson question. They would give me no notice of these appointments, and the people would meet in great crowds to hear what excuse Crockett had to make for quitting Jackson. But instead of Crockett being there, this smallfry of lawyers would be there, with their saddle bags full of the little newspapers and their journals of Congress, and would tell the people I was afraid to contend. The people of my district were induced, by these tricks, to take a stay on me at that time, but they have since found out that they were imposed upon."

Whereas this defeat, no doubt, caused Davy to decide to go to Texas and all of us know the disastrous results of that adventure.

Whereas had Davy remained in Tennessee instead of seeking solace in the quiet hills of distant lands to the west, there is no doubt that he would have attained a position of preeminence much greater than that which he today enjoys solely through the machinations of Walt Disney and his crack publicity experts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Young Republican National Federation, That we express our censure of Andrew Jackson for the dirty tricks he caused to be played upon the hero of the Alamo. "His land is biggest and his land is best."

The Christening of the Capital Airlines Viscount Heralds the Entry of Air Transportation Into a New Age of Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, under unanimous consent, to quote from the talks given during the impressive ceremonies at the christening of Capital Airlines' Viscount airplane on June 23.

More than 2,500 civic, business, and Government leaders attended the program and reception at the Washington National Airport. Mrs. Richard Nixon, wife of the Vice President of the United States, formally christened the beautiful aircraft, first of a fleet of 60 to be used over Capital's expanding system of important American cities.

Vice President NIXON extended greetings. The Alexandria Gazette, in reporting his comment, said:

The plane, christened "Capital Viscount of Washington," is a symbol of a new age in aviation as far as the United States is concerned in that it brings the jet age to American airlines.

The Washington Post and Times Herald quoted the Vice President as saying that the Viscount, representing a $67.5 million plane order, "was symbolic also of the close and friendly relations between the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations."

This memorable event opened with the playing of the British National Anthem and the Star-Spangled Banner.

Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate, in his invocation, prayed:

From the childhood of the race, as under all skies man has gazed with envy at the emancipated birds of the air winging their way through the ethereal blue, he has yearned to be able to rise up and greet the clouds, longing for wings. Yet ever has he kept his face to the sky, while always there was ringing in his soul the promise of that coming coronation: "Have domination." And so, as there has been granted in our day the great boon of wings, written in giant letters across this glittering century, and as among its wonders we see

> "The heavens filled with commerce,
> Argosies of magic sails,
> Pilots of the purple twilight
> Dropping down with costly bales,"

and transporting its human passengers above all barriers of earth and sea, may there be woven over all the earth a tapestry of brotherhood and fellowship.

President J. H. Carmichael, whose recognized leadership of this growing airline is an outstanding industry achievement, declared:

This is a great and historic moment and one in which we take a real, personal pride. It symbolizes the attainment of a goal toward which we of Capital have been long working and it marks the opening of a new

era of flight in the history of air transportation in America.

Lt. Gen. Sir Ronald Weeks, chairman, Vickers Ltd., in his remarks, said:

The purchase of the Viscount by Capital Airlines is a true expression of international trade at its very finest. To break into the American airplane market required an advanced aircraft which could stand up to the outstanding products of the United States.

Sir Ronald praised the good relationship which exists between the two companies, Vickers Ltd., and Capital Airlines.

I also would be remiss were I to fail to mention the splendid cooperation we received from the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the certification of the airplane—

he continued.

Sir Roger Makins, British Ambassador to the United States, stated:

It is a matter of the greatest satisfaction to me, both officially and personally, to know that the negotiations for the purchase of these Viscounts have been carried to the successful outcome we can see in a spirit of the friendliest cooperation on all sides. Close and cordial relations have been established between makers and operator; and both they and Her Majesty's government owe a debt of gratitude to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for its help and cooperation over the introduction into service in the United States of a completely new type of aircraft. I congratulate Mr. Carmichael and Capital Airlines on their enterprise, their foresight, and their business sagacity. I can only conclude with the hope that so much virtue on so many sides will be doubly rewarded.

Members of the Congress, members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce officials, representatives of the various armed services of the United States as well as other countries, joined with hundreds of the guests in personally inspecting the four-engine turbo-prop plane which will begin its regularly scheduled flights on July 26.

Reserve Bill Passage Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of June 23, 1955:

TOO MANY SHENANIGANS—RESERVE BILL PASSAGE OVERDUE

Various technicalities have been used by Congress to delay full consideration of a badly needed military Reserve bill. The failures of Congress in this respect add up to only one thing—irresponsible politics.

Despite debate and hearings, the Reserve bill today is back where it started, in a subcommittee of the House. The history of this measure reflects badly on Democratic leadership.

After lengthy hearings, which followed intensive studies by the Defense Department, the House Armed Services Committee finally brought an acceptable Reserve bill to the floor in May. The proposal was sent back to committee without a vote on the full measure.

An antisegregation amendment introduced by Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York, caused the defeat of the Reserve program at that juncture.

While this amendment stated a principle with merit, it was extraneous and should not have been allowed to defeat the bill. Actually the Armed Forces, which function without such an amendment, have followed commendable desegregation practices in the last few years.

President Eisenhower summed up this situation well: "It is entirely erroneous to try to get legislation of this character through tacking it onto something that is so vital to the security of the United States."

Following considerable urging by the President, an attempt was made to convince the Senate it should consider the Reserve bill. This proposal was defeated in committee when Senators placed protocol above national defense.

After more prodding, Representative VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, attempted to push a new Reserve bill through the House Armed Services Committee this week. For his efforts he received the temporary rebuff of having the measure again sent to a subcommittee—where it started in the first place. From here it may eventually work its way back to the floor.

Encouragement has been given to the stalling tactics by politically minded Congressmen who sought to revise the President's proposal to cut active military manpower. Without an adequate Reserve there was more reason for leaving the standing Army at its present size. This rebellion now appears dead.

Without question, a stronger Reserve is vital to the Nation's security. We will not have a strong Reserve until the present laws are given more enforceable provisions. Political shenanigans are intolerable. Passage of a strong Reserve bill is long overdue.

Lake Mead Revisited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, recently addressed the House of Representatives in an eloquent speech, which, in its reprinted (not at Government expense) form, was entitled "Lake Mead."

When a copy of the gentleman's speech was placed before me, I swelled with justifiable pride as I caught a glimpse of this title—Lake Mead.

Lake Mead. I basked in the visions and memories conjured up by those two brief, but beautiful words—technicolor visions of the rugged beauty of lower Colorado River canyons—contented memories of this year-round rendezvous of boaters, fishermen, and vacationers.

The title to Mr. SAYLOR's speech brought to mind strings of plump, succulent bass taken from this outstanding fishing center. I thought of the more than 2,300,000 people who came from near and far to enjoy Lake Mead's delightful and easy-to-reach recreational facilities last year.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was a proud moment for Nevada's lone Representative and I was pleased to think that the busy gentleman from Pennsylvania, himself a great lover of the outdoors, had thought so much of this area and had taken the time not only to mention it in his widely-distributed remarks, but to use its name in the title—and its name alone. I turned reluctantly from the happy visions of life on Lake Mead to pleasantly contemplate the spotlight of national and, yes, even international publicity turned briefly on this proud portion of my district. In all frankness, I must admit I then experienced waves of extremely warm and cordial and grateful feeling toward my good Cambria County friend. Mr. Speaker, it was a true highlight of this legislative year.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I began to read the happily titled speech and found a statement which brought me up with a start—a statement which must have stunned those listening on the floor almost as much as the unfortunate shooting episode which occurred here some 16 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you remember those very words when the gentleman from Pennsylvania commenced his vigorous remarks by saying "whereas Lake Mead has nothing whatsoever to offer visitors."

It was some time before I could recover. It was some time before my constituents could recover. Those remarks have had a far more forceful social and economic impact upon Southern Nevada than all of the nuclear devices which have exploded there thus far. I have heard it said the pen is mightier than the sword, and after assessing local reaction to the gentleman's remarks I am convinced that here are nine words mightier than the atom.

"Lake Mead has nothing whatsoever to offer." It is easier perhaps, Mr. Speaker, to understand the discomfiture, the consternation, the tragedy that attended the solemn pronouncement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania when you realize that for lo! these many years the residents of southern Nevada and most other places—I dare say even Cambria County, Pa.—have been operating under an almost diametrically opposed assumption.

For some time the residents of both Arizona and Nevada in the vicinity of Lake Mead have been smugly complacent in the thought that there was in this lake one of the finest recreation areas in the country. The long summer season attracted many visitors from all over the country for swimming, boating, surf boarding and fishing. The lake was well supplied with large-mouth bass, bluegill, black crappie, channel catfish and other pleasure-producing underwater species. There was no closed season and recent estimates of fishing showed an annual use in excess of 90,000 fisherman days, with a total catch of some 135,000 pounds of bass alone.

Until the gentleman from Cambria County, Pa., made his startling and earth-shaking disclosure that "Lake Mead has nothing whatesover to offer visitors," there had been rather substantial investment in tourist industry fa-

cilities by those not so well informed, or at least not having access to the same sources of information as the distinguished Pennsylvania gentleman. Motels, hotels, restaurants, and cafes sprang up. Service stations, curio shops, and gift stores were erected. Trailer courts, boating facilities, and campgrounds were made available. An information bureau for tourists was put in readiness. Now those people are beginning to wonder what they can do. Will they have to tell the nearly 3 million visitors expected at Lake Mead this year, "We have nothing whatsoever to offer"?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, even the Federal Government itself has been thrown into more than customary confusion. The Bureau of Reclamation has a guide service at the dam above Lake Mead. The National Park Service has contracts with concessioneers to provide boating, camping, and dining facilities. It has been working diligently to meet the ever-increasing demands attendant upon the ever-increasing number of visitors to the area.

What happens now? Does the National Park Service tell the American public, "It's all a mistake, we've just had word from Pennsylvania that the Lake Mead recreational area is not really the third greatest attraction in the national park system; please go home, we have nothing whatsoever to offer"?

Mr. Speaker, as we know, it was the intent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his recent speech to make a sincere and impassioned plea to protect the sanctity of Dinosaur National Monument from the alleged ravages of reclamation. I have no intention of injecting myself into the dispute that the gentleman has with those who are intent on building a reservoir at Echo Park site in Dinosaur National Monument. I, too, have expressed my opposition to Echo Park Dam at this time, although in general I favor the bill now pending to commence development of the upper Colorado River.

I am, however, seriously concerned with the statement regarding Lake Mead. The remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania do this area a great injustice. We in Nevada feel that Lake Mead is a tremendous asset; that it has not impaired the scenic values of this part of the Colorado River, and, if anything, it has improved them—and has improved the opportunities of millions of Americans to enjoy more fully part of the outdoor storehouse of the resources of the West.

To contend seriously, Mr. Speaker, that "Lake Mead has nothing whatsoever to offer" is to ignore the millions of visitors who have flocked to its shores; it is to overlook the unsurpassed fishing that has attracted tens of thousands to participate; it is to blind oneself to the thriving campgrounds and the inability to keep pace with the ever-increasing demands; it is to be unable to see the hundreds of boats that sail on its waters and the myraid of persons who enjoy them.

To say that Lake Mead has nothing whatsoever to offer is like saying that Nevada has no sagebrush; that Las Vegas has no games of chance; that Mount Charleston has no breathtaking sunsets; that the West has no inspiring mountains or melancholy deserts; that Marilyn Monroe has no feminine charms; and Cambria County, Pa. has nothing to offer.

And, Mr. Speaker, you and I know that Cambria County has a great deal to offer.

It has just about everything to offer except good advice about Lake Mead.

Baer's Almanac: Compendium of Wit and Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial the Agricultural Almanac, as originally published by John Baer's Sons of Lancaster, Pa.—price, 25 cents—has held an honored place in the homes of my constituents about midway between the Holy Bible and the Sears, Roebuck catalog and has been deferred to as an authority almost as immutable as the laws of the Medes and the Persians.

An advance copy of the 1956 issue of this informative publication carries such diverse information as the use of gum boots as an insulator against lightning, the best time to dehorn calves, and the complete recipe for making Mrs. Leader's—she is the lovely wife of Pennsylvania's Governor—potato salad. Also set forth is the recipe for making the famous Pennsylvania Dutch dish of Snitz and Knepp as it appears in the Mennonite Community Cookbook—$3.50, John Baer's Sons, box 328, Lancaster, Pa.

Baer's Almanac, however, has undoubtedly earned its greatest acclaim from the accuracy of its weather prognostications, and it has accordingly been with some amazement that I have discovered an admission by the publisher that perhaps the United States Weather Bureau may reasonably be expected to also render some service in that field. Under the title of "Help the Weather Bureau" the almanac presses the cause of a weather reporting station for Lancaster County, which I have been actively promoting; and I am pleased to set forth the editor's views on the subject as follows:

HELP THE WEATHER BUREAU

This may come as a surprise to some of our readers, but we hereby go on record solidly in favor of greater appropriations for the United States Weather Bureau. We feel this is the least we can do to help improve the quality of the Weather Bureau's forecasts.

Since this almanac was published long before the Weather Bureau came into existence, and even though we get a quizzical stare from some of our contemporaries in the Bureau, we have a paternal interest in its betterment. By the nature of our long-range and long-distance predicting, providing our prognostications as much as a year and a half in advance for the large areas of the Nation, we cannot always pinpoint our information to a given locality at a given moment. This, we feel, is one province in which the Weather Bureau can be of aid.

It is our definite opinion that the United States Government should allocate increasing amounts of money to the Weather Bureau, so that it may move in two great directions—a broader and vaster operation to obtain more knowledge about the many factors that make our weather, and greater ability to forecast accurately the big storms that wreak havoc as well as the little rains that wreck picnics.

We are fascinated, for instance, by ideas on the jet steam, a "river" of wind flowing up to 8 miles above the earth's surface, and its possible shifts which could cause changes in weather patterns and the paths of hurricanes. We are also fascinated by days when the Bureau forecasts rain and the sun shines brightly, or when no snow is forecast and we end up digging snow that's shin-deep.

As a private enterprise, we do what we can. We try to tell what the weather will be like for folks that are planning picnics, outdoor weddings, hay rides, public sales, festivals, summer chicken corn soup suppers, and winter dances. But we feel it is a matter of national price for our Government to do more than it is doing now.

A copy of our 1956 almanac is being forwarded to our Congressman, PAUL B. DAGUE, so that—if he wishes—he may inform his colleagues for the benefit of the national health, welfare, and defense.

World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from a recent address by G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan. The address was made before the Georgia Bar Association at its annual banquet in Augusta, Ga., on May 27, 1955:

As Americans, we are united in our desire for peace. It makes little difference whether we are Republicans or Democrats, or hail from the South, North, East, or West—we all want world peace.

But that doesn't mean we are all united on how we should go about achieving peace. Some of us think we should do one thing; others think we should do something else; and some of us are just not thinking about it at all.

Those of us who are thinking about this problem of world peace have arrived at several axioms of national policy upon which there is fairly general agreement.

The first of these generally agreed principles is that peace depends upon the existence of armed strength.

This principle was not always a part of our American habits of thought. There was a time not so many years ago when it was thought that war somehow resulted from the spontaneous combustion of armaments—and that the way to peace was through military weakness. The possession of arms was thought to be a bad thing because, if we or our friends had weapons, there would always be the temptation to use them.

This reasoning bore a specious appearance of truth, because of accidental circumstances then existing. The United States was then defended by wide oceans, across which nobody had yet been able to fly a fleet of hostile bombers or a guided missile. And on those oceans rode the British Navy, intent on making sure that Britannia would always rule the seas—but also constituting a shield for the American people against foreign aggression.

Two world wars, the disappearance of British imperial power, the perfection of intercontinental weapons, and the emergence of the Communist imperialism have changed all that. Today, for the first time in our history, we stand open to a possible enemy attack, and it is abundantly manifest that the best deterrent against such attack is our capacity to counterattack with necessary force.

We no longer quarrel about this principle. Military power helps preserve the peace. But many of us feel that not enough care has been taken to maintain our peace-preserving military power in terms of weapons other than the atomic explosives.

"Massive retaliation," or complete dependence upon the atomic bomb, is not a dependable deterrent to aggressors. Anyone can envision circumstances under which this policy could serve not to preserve the peace, but to ensure that any war becomes a catastrophe. A police department which was armed only with heavy artillery would have a hard time coping with a hold-up gang—unless it was prepared to wipe out in the process those whom it was constituted to protect.

We must have and maintain superiority in atomic weapons, yes. To fail in that would be to invite annihiliation. But we must also maintain the capacity to fight lesser wars with lesser weapons, if that should be necessary. Otherwise we limit ourselves to the hard choice between atomic war and capitulation to Communist piecemeal aggression.

Another axiom of our thinking on the subject of peace is that we must have allies. This concept is also comparatively new. The idea of American isolation, and the avoidance of entangling alliances, was a valid idea generations ago. But again, conditions have changed. The Communist imperialism moves with arms or ideas, according to the circumstances.

We cannot resist armed aggression effectively unless we have strong, armed allies to stand beside us and to deny the aggressor the positions of military power and the sources of industrial power.

We cannot resist the aggression of ideas successfully unless we ally ourselves with the aspirations of the common people everywhere, and help them to find their own way to prosperity, stability, and national integrity.

Probably because of their historic aversion to alliances, the American people have shown an inclination to doubt that loyal and steadfast allies can be raised up to stand beside us when the going is tough. There is really no evidence upon which to base such doubts. The American nation is entirely capable of forming with other peoples strong and fast friendships which will be immensely effective in defense by ideas as well as defense by arms.

There is no better example of this than the Near East. I had the privilege to visit that part of the world recently and I came away with a new feeling of confidence in our allies there, and in the job which has been done, through the Marshall plan, the Truman plan, and our other such programs, to make firm allies in that vital area.

Greece and Turkey guard a most important rampart. They stand athwart imperial communism's spread to Near East oil, the eastern Mediterranean, and Africa. They happen to be a most successful demonstration of America's effort to build allies and bastions of freedom against communism.

The Turks in many ways speak our own language. The Prime Minister of Turkey said to me: "We picked the United States as an ally because they are the most powerful force in the world for peace, and because they are interested in the same causes."

In casual conversation I asked one of my Turkish friends what would you do if the U. S. S. R. attacked? He answered without hesitation: "We would drive them out or die."

We saw Turkish troops stand and die beside our forces in Korea, and we have ample evidence that the feelings expressed by my Turkish friend were an accurate statement of his nation's intentions.

In my opinion, Turkey is a real and solid ally.

"If it comes to a hot war," a Turkish official said to me, "we would be a sword against the soft underbelly of Russia."

In a cold war they conceive it their function to help diplomatically in the Balkans to the north and west, and among the Arab countries to the south and east. The Turkish-Iraqi pact is, of course, an example of that.

How did we win such allies? We won them by making common cause with the aspirations of the Turkish and Greek people to build for themselves a life of national integrity, national prosperity, and freedom.

We won that ally by giving them the barest minimum of financial aid, mostly in the field of military subsidy.

What has this aid cost us? Let's look for a moment at some of the figures gleaned from the defense budgets of the two nations and the number of men under arms.

Turkey is fielding about 450,000 men, or better than 2 percent of her population (our figure is less than 2 percent), at a total defense cost for everything averaging out to about $1,200 per man.

The United States is providing support amounting to a little less than half of this cost, or about $600 for each Turkish soldier under arms. Actually, this includes the whole defense cost, as well as food, clothing, etc.

The average cost for transport, equipment, training, food, and clothing for each enlisted man worldwide in the United States Army runs around $5,200 to $5,800. This includes indirect cost of maintenance and operations attributable on a per capita basis, but not capital costs or costs of major construction and equipment.

Now these figures would indicate that, for an expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars, we are getting defensive forces in Turkey which would cost us between two and two and a half billion dollars if we were to muster in their stead equal forces of American troops.

To put it another way, it would cost us 8 to 10 times as much to guard against a Communist eruption in the eastern Mediterranean, if we did not have our Turkish allies. Who can justly quarrel with the cost of the aid we have sent to Turkey if it saves us not only American dollars but American soldiers?

The question quite naturally comes up—is Turkey doing all she can? I think the answer is yes.

Turkey devotes 35 percent of her national budget to defense. It must be understood that this represents almost 35 percent of all public spending in Turkey, since they have no appreciable local budgets. The United States spends 39 percent of its total budget, including Federal, State, and local expenditures, for its Military Establishment. Turkey, however, lives so close to a minimum subsistence that her sacrifice is particularly meaningful. Ninety percent of our people are in nonagricultural pursuits. Only 20 percent of Turkey's are. Turkey's average per capita income for 1949, the latest available figure, was $125. For the same year, ours was about $1,350.

The Greek situation is quite similar. Greece's population is about one-third of Turkey's, as is her army. In the last year for which complete figures are available, Greece's military budget was $80 million. We matched this with another $80 million.

Greece, with $160 million for defense, maintained aforce of 140,000 men. This averaged about $1,100 per man. We provided half of that cost, so our expense ran about $550 for every Greek soldier.

Again, when compared to the cost of training and equipping an American soldier, we saved 8 to 10 times the cost.

Our friendship with Greece is traditional and of long standing. Much of our culture comes from there.

Greece and democracy are synonymous in most men's minds. And on many occasions the Hellenes have demonstrated that their liberty and bravery are equally a part of the Greek makeup.

In the recent past the Greeks fought a bloody war with the Communists and drove them beyond their borders. Today they stand on guard against further Communist aggression.

In the long run, it's going to be a lot better for us, and certainly for Turkey, if our help is aimed at enabling Turkey to build their economy and pay for their own armed forces in toto, instead of about 50 percent as now.

Fortunately, Turkey has most necessary resources such as iron, coal, copper, petroleum, and chrome. But they are now largely inaccessible, due mainly to capital equipment. Turkey needs heavy machinery of all kinds, but she particularly needs machinery to mine the coal and iron, etc., to make the heavy machinery she needs. The only place Turkey can get machinery in the immediate future is from abroad. That means foreign exchange.

Today we Americans have no idea of what this means. We now have a favorable trade balance so a dollar is good anywhere and much sought after. But that wasn't always so. If it had not been for British and other investments in America, we would have grown much more slowly. Turkey has all the resources to develop and pay back foreign investment. America, the country with money to invest, however, is a newcomer in foreign investments. Our capital is slow to move into many areas of foreign investment.

To encourage foreign investment, our country should develop (as has been suggested in Congress) some form of insurance for our foreign investors. In the long run the advantages will be enormous. Prudent capital investments in Turkey, I am advised, have been repaid in remarkably short time.

While I think private investment is the most desirable form of capital encouragement in countries like Turkey, our point 4 programs have much to offer. These are not only investments in good will, but in building our allies and building customers for ourselves.

The wisdom of helping Turkey help herself applies equally strongly to Greece.

We have been talking here about the economic and military predicates of peace. Let me turn now, in conclusion, to an equally important phase of the conflict between communism and democracy—the spiritual phase of that conflict.

It is a truism to say that this is not a war of guns, primarly, but of ideas. But neglect of that aspect of the world situation can lead to defeat for our way of life as surely, if not as swiftly, as military conquest.

This point was brought forcibly to my attention by an Israeli displomat who had traveled to the troubled countries of Asia.

"The United States," he said, "is neglecting tomorrow's rulers of most of the world."

He then pointed out that the young people in the schools of higher education all over the world are eager to read history, economics, politics, and literature. They are able to buy, in all major cities of the globe, cheap books which tell the Communist side. These books, he said, are not necessarily the standard Communist propaganda works, but much more subtle versions of the viewpoints which are not the viewpoints of democracy.

These young people, he said, cannot afford to buy America books because there is no agency which brings to them cheap editions of the literature of western civilization. They can even buy American authors printed in Russia much more cheaply than those printed in America. You can imagine what type of American writers find a ready publication in cheap editions in the U. S. S. R.

This Israeli gentleman wondered why our great and resourceful Nation has found no way to make available standard American documents and authors in cheap editions, in the bookstalls of the world. And as he made this point it occurred to me that our neglect in that matter is typical of our neglect to export the ideas of democracy.

Wouldn't any of us stack the Declaration of Independence, the Federalist papers, Lincoln's speeches, or the commentaries of De Toqueville and Bryce against Das Kapital, and the works of Lenin and Stalin in the marketplace of ideas?

But these works which explain and expound the American way of life are not readily available to the world's young people who hunger for answers to the problems of the day.

If we are to win the struggle of ideas, we must go on the offensive, ideologically. This phase of the conflict between communism and democracy will go on, regardless of the changes which may occur in formal Soviet policy. Even if, as we all hope, the cold war gives way to a period of so-called peaceful co-existence the agression of the fundamentally hostile ideas of communism will not cease.

Indeed, a period of peaceful coexistence may prove to be the most dangerous period of all, in terms of the penetration of Communist ideas among the peoples of the world.

In the long run the future of the world will be decided on the battleground of ideas. And therefore it behooves us, if we love our country and our way of life, to be as alert to win the minds and hearts of our neighbors to democracy as we are to maintain superiority of atomic weapons.

A whole great new American program in the field of ideas is needed—a program comparable to point IV in the economic field, and to our military alliances in the field of armed power. Missionaries of democracy—not generals and diplomats, but teachers and young workers and students and technicians, labor leaders and production managers must be sent to foreign lands to show our neighbors of other races and nations how the American idea works.

American books, radio programs, newspapers, and so forth must be made available all over the world. The youth of other nations should be brought to the United States in much greater numbers to study at our American institutions of learning, and to see at first hand how prosperity, national independence, and human dignity have resulted from the practice of democracy.

And so, to sum up, it seems to me that the preservation of peace in the world involves three things: First, the maintenance of the western world's military strength to deter aggression; secondly, the formation and maintenance of stronger alliances, military and economic, with the other free nations of the world; and third, the launching of a grand offensive in the struggle of ideas, to carry the ideology of freedom to every part of the earth.

If we are prepared to do these things, I have no doubt that our chances are good to avoid military conflict, and to gradually slow down and overcome the Communist dynamic, with the spread of a dynamic democracy all over the world.

Storage Basin Perils State, Hosmer Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of June 21, 1955:

STORAGE BASIN PERILS STATE, HOSMER SAYS

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER, 18th Congressional District)

A football field is slightly more than an acre of ground. Cover it a foot deep with water and you would have about an acre-foot of water.

Cover it with a tower of water 11,000 miles high, and you have an idea of the amount of water parched southern California will lose if the upper Colorado Basin storage project is built as now planned.

Imagine a canal wide enough and deep enough to float the world's biggest ship, the Navy's new aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Imagine that canal stretching from New York City to Los Angeles. During just one year, enough of the Colorado River's water to fill it could be stopped from flowing downstream at the project's gigantic Glen Canyon Dam.

COULD BE WITHHELD

That is water that could not be used by southern California, Arizona, and Nevada because it would be withheld upstream and never reach them.

The multibillion dollar project would put approximately 48 million acre-feet of water in storage behind dams in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico. Another 10 million acre-feet would be lost by evaporation during storage.

Yet so vital is this water in the lower basin that even today arid Arizona and California are before the United States Supreme Court litigating their rights to it.

California agrees that the upper basin is entitled to use some of the disputed water but contends that most of it must be left flowing down to the lower basin under provisions of a 7-State contract known as the Colorado River compact, completed in 1929.

BASIC POSITION TOLD

California's basic position is that she conforms to the compact and must insist that the States of the upper basin and the Federal Government do likewise. California thus is fighting only to preserve rights to water she already has and not for any new and additional water rights.

Relying on these rights, California invested between $500 million and $750 million of local money, not Federal money, for water projects calculated to make maximum use of her share of the Colorado River. Thereby, southern California was transformed from a semidesert into an oasis constituting one of the Nation's key economic and agricultural regions, supporting millions who migrated to her borders from less hospitable climates.

As southern California continues to grow, her need for water becomes greater, not less. Should the bleak day ever come when her Colorado River water supply is cut off, on that day the jobs of the millions she supports will vanish and the value of everything they own that cannot be transported to another part of the country will be lost completely and forever.

Californians in Congress are fighting to prevent spending billions in a program which would impose financial ruin on almost 6 million constituents. The upper basin States can plan their projects without this disastrous result and California demands that they do so.

To understand the reason they have not done so requires some knowledge of the Colorado River Compact and the situation that produced it.

Early in this century southern California men of vision foresaw water needs beyond those satiable from the available resources and began plans which resulted in such great works as Hoover Dam, Davis and Parker Dams, the All-American Canal, and the metropolitan water district's vast Colorado River acqueduct with its extensions reaching even as far as San Diego.

RULE LAID DOWN

Meanwhile, the upper basin States were experiencing little growth or progress. A Supreme Court decision had laid down a rule of law respecting use of river waters which said that whoever first begins using them obtains a right to continued use that cannot be taken away by someone who later wants to use the same water. The upper States, foreseeing burgeoning southern California acquiring first rights to almost all the river's water before they were able to appropriate uses themselves, began stalling action.

The Boulder Canyon Project Act, authorizing Hoover Dam, was stalled in Congress for almost 10 years by the obstructive tactics of upper basin Senators and Congressmen. It was passed only after tribute had been extracted from California and the lower basin in the following manner:

First, imposing the Colorado River compact which removed at least 7½ million acre-feet of water from appropriation by the lower basin.

Second, requiring the California Legislature to pass a law further limiting the amount of water to which the State could acquire first rights.

LIMITED CALIFORNIA

This limited California to slightly less than 5½ million acre-feet of water a year that she could use. California tailored her developments on the river strictly to the limitations and to the intent and meaning of the Colorado River compact. Even with only a portion of her great dreamed-of projecs built, no place in time or history has experienced developments of water resources comparable in scope and magnificence to those of southern California.

It is the water rights which underlie those developments that Californians seek to protect when they oppose the upper Colorado River storage project and charge that it tramples these rights.

Gas Price Decontrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times:

GAS PRICE DECONTROL

The pernicious effects of Federal control of wellhead gas prices will show up eventually, but it might take 2 or 3 years to reveal them to the point of public revulsion. These effects are inevitable, but meantime they might prove irretrievable if this session of Congress fails to pass the Federal decontrol legislation.

There is no law on the statute books which specifically and unmistakably vests wellhead price control in the Federal Power Commission. There is only a Supreme Court decision to that effect. FPC never sought this power, yet must administer it under the Court decision.

The only remedy lies in new legislation removing Federal control. It was thought at the beginning of this Congress that while the vote might be close, decontrol would win in the showdown, over the opposition of big city members and that the advocates of Federal control over everything.

But lack of time threatens this legislation now, and Speaker RAYBURN has asked President Eisenhower to intercede in behalf of this legislation, as part of his State's rights pronouncements. While a President has to be cautious in urging action upon the Congress, his support of the legislation at even this late day might save the day. Anyway it is worth trying.

Aside from the clear invasion of State's rights in the high court's decision, one of the most pernicious effects of Federal price control will be to reduce or kill off the continuous development of new gas production to offset fading fields. This effect will not be a result of private enterprise's dissatisfaction with Federal control, but the consequence of the redtape and trammeling Federal regulations which will make the pursuit of new developments unprofitable and economically impossible. That means less gas, which in turn means higher prices to consumers—and particularly those in the large cities where the demand for Federal control is strongest.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and the foreign ministers of many other states, members of the United Nations, met in San Francisco to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

The United Nations Organization provides a forum for the discussion of basic economic philosophies. Our Government can suggest to other countries that they follow the economic concepts which have contributed so greatly to our strength and the high standards of living which our people enjoy; or we can join the forces of socialism and repudiate those principles which will insure their rejection by the so-called underdeveloped countries.

Prior to the inauguaration of President Eisenhower, I find that our State Department had done very little to sell American free-enterprise economic concepts to the rest of the world in the debates and discussions which took place in the Economic and Social Council. Mr. Speaker, it is a great satisfaction to me to be able to commend the State Department for the positions which it has taken during the last few years. It has repudiated alien concepts, some of which we ourselves proposed under earlier administrations, and we have taken an aggressive stand in advocating free-enterprise concepts.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion over the years about the necessity of a bipartisan foreign policy. Such a policy imposes responsibilities on both the majority and minority parties to so conduct their debates and their discussion of domestic issues that neither party will jeopardize our national objectives through demagogic appeals, exaggerations, and misstatements in order to win votes at home.

Last year, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle took exception to investigations by certain congressional committees. They stated that the work of these committees was misunderstood abroad and placed our foreign-policy objectives in an unfavorable light.

Adlai Stevenson's remarks at Oberlin, Ohio, where he received an honorary degree, were reported by the Washington Post and Times Herald on Tuesday, June 14, as follows:

Stevenson also attacked the used of "ugly labels" and the putting of "the Red brand on every unpopular idea."

He said, "No one knows how seriously this has impaired the quality of Government service and the quality of public debate. Whatever the price, it is too high."

Mr. Speaker, if there is any validity to these statements supported by my friends on the other side of the aisle, it behooves us to be equally careful in our castigation of the administration and its supporters as agents of Wall Street, supporters of big business, opponents of little business, supporters of trickle-down tax theory, and advocates of give-aways. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Digest is distributed all over the world. It has impugned the character of our great President. It has suggested that this administration gave away our natural resources as campaign pay-offs and that the Dixon-Yates contract was made so that Bobby Jones, one of the President's golfing partners, could receive a pay-off. Those who wish to destroy us and support communism take great satisfaction in such statements which all of us know are untrue. We are all politicians and understand what campaign oratory means. Those who read our remarks abroad do not.

On Friday, June 17, I exposed the philosophy of Mr. T. K. Quinn—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 16, 1955, No. 101, pages A4333 through A4341—who has frequently appeared before congressional committees, so that Members of the Congress would not be misled and endorse his views. They support attacks upon our business system which has contributed so much to our strength. It is this system which the State Department is now persuading other countries to adopt so that they too may enjoy the freedoms and prosperity which we have in this country.

Our Government, like all governments, members of the United Nations, was asked by the Secretariat to submit a report last winter on the current legal developments in the field of restrictive business practices. The State Department, last December, started its report to the United Nations with the following statements:

PRINCIPAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FIELD OF RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE JANUARY 1, 1953

1. GENERAL POLICY

The antitrust policy of the administration was initially set forth by the Attorney General of the United States in a speech delivered on June 26, 1953.[1] After quoting the 1952 Platform Pledge of the Republican Party on the subject, he stated as follows:

"This plank emphasizes certain fundamental aspects of antitrust law enforcement policy in which this administration, from the President on down, thoroughly believes: the equality of its enforcement; the simplification of its administration, assistance to the businessman acting in good faith in his attempts to follow the law, but with all, an uncompromising determination that there shall be no slackening of effort to protect free enterprise against monopoly and unfair competition; and most certainly, no winking at violations of the law and no wholesale dismissal of pending suits."

2. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ANTITRUST LAWS

The Attorney General further stated in the speech cited above: "It is essential * * * that there be established adequate enactments or interpretations to give clarity, to produce uniformity, and to ensure a commonsense approach to enforcement."

To this end, he announced the establishment of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. This Committee consists of some 60 members largely from private life including teachers of law and economics and practicing lawyers.

In the words of one of the two cochairmen, Professor Oppenheim, of the University of Michigan:

"The Committee's task is to analyze and evaluate the fundamentals of our national antitrust policy in its substantive and procedural aspects. From this it follows that our goal must be to arrive at conclusions and recommendations as guides to future antitrust policy * * *.

"The committee adopts two major premises. One is that a fair and effective antitrust policy is an indispensible nonpartisan article of faith of our political and economic democracy. The other is that private competitive enterprise is that form of economic organization we choose as our own. We are not concerned with alternatives either to antitrust policy or the competitive process it is designed to maintain.

"No restriction upon the committee's freedom of thought is suggested in saying we are in harmony with the goal specified by the Attorney General, namely, an 'uncompromising determination that there shall be no slackening of effort to protect free enterprise against monopoly or unfair competition.'

"* * * We will seek to determine what is sound as well as what is unsound, and to resolve ambiguities and conflicts, not only in the statutes, but in administrative interpretations, court decisions, and enforcement policies."[2]

[1] Before the Judicial Conference of the Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

[2] Speech delivered before the New York State Bar Association, January 28, 1954, copy enclosed.

According to Professor Oppenheim, the committee is directing its attention to six basic aspects of antitrust policy and administration. These are a study of the application of the antitrust laws to United States foreign commerce, the relations between legal and economic concepts of competition and monopoly, the application of antitrust laws to the field of distribution, the relationship between antitrust policy and the United States patent laws, exemptions of certain groups from the antitrust laws such as labor, agriculture, and regulated industries, and administration and enforcement of the antitrust laws including problems of Department of Justice-Federal Trade Commission jurisdiction.

The report is expected to be completed before the end of 1954. It will be submitted to the Attorney General upon completion.

The importance of the work of the committee was emphasized by President Eisenhower, who said in part:

"I believe that the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws will provide an important instrument to prepare the way for modernizing and strengthening our laws to preserve American free enterprise against monopoly and unfair competition."

Mr. Speaker, what do our friends abroad think when they read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and hear the report of the Attorney General's Committee characterized as the work of a group of private individuals in no way responsible to any branch of the Government, "mostly big corporation lawyers who are 4-time losers in antitrust prosecutions." The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD advises that some Members of Congress regarded the report of this group as recommendations which "would change the antitrust laws in such a way that the law firms, who represent the big corporations in antitrust matters, could never lose a suit brought by the Government, but they would be getting a perpetual fee for defending one of these suits. The suit would be never-ending." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 31, 1955, No. 58, page 3478.

Some of my colleagues may think that I exaggerate when I state that everything we say on the floor of this House and everything which is published downtown is carefully screened by our opponents in the psychological war which has been going on for many years.

I want to offer tangible proof to show how material thoroughly understood here is used to embarrass us by the Iron-Curtain countries in the debates within the United Nations.

At the thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council held in Geneva, September 1951, the United States representative explained the philosophy behind our antitrust laws. He reviewed the 60-year-old tradition which has been basically bipartisan and is dedicated toward the preservation of a competitive free-enterprise system. Mr. Speaker, let me read from the official record of the United Nations Economic and Social Council debates the reply to our representative by Mr. Birecki, the Polish delegate to the Economic and Social Council:

Mr. Birecki (Poland) recalled that the representative of the United States of America, a country whose Government had a 60-year-old tradition in combating monopolies, had referred at the 546th meeting to the 600 officials dealing with restrictive business practices in the United States and to the many cases dealt with by the United States courts. Poland's claim to fame in that direction was decidedly more modest. All that the Polish Government had done was to liquidate the prewar Polish monopolies and the Polish branches of a number of international monopolies. Mr. Harriman, as ones of the biggest monopolists in prewar Poland, could give the United States representative information about the restrictive practices which had reduced Poland to poverty before the war.

In face of the positively farcial nature of the United States delegation's proposal, it might be well to recall the more cynical way in which young people in the United States universities were being trained to take over the leading positions from the older men. In an article in the periodical Economic Foreign Policy of the United States, Mr. Williams had stated that, in social and political matters, American businessmen had acquired an unprecedented influence, and that State Department officials were capable of so handling that situation as to forestall criticism by stressing, not the wishes of certain groups of citizens, but national defense, the will to peace, maintenance of public order, and the granting of economic assistance to the smaller States.

The United States draft resolution was another attempt by United States leaders to pose as apostles of the abolition of cartels. Actually, American big business was opposed to any cartels over which it had no control, but inspired and fostered the creation of groups which it knew it could dominate. Thus, in the Schuman plan, the principle of cartels was condemned, while at the same time the supreme authority was entitled to authorize such practices when it regarded them as timely and rational. That meant that the practices of cartels would be condoned, provided they corresponded to the interests of United States capital.

In view of the effrontery of the United States maneuver, there was no alternative but to point to the practices of United States monopolists, who let nothing stand in their way when there was a chance of increasing their profits. That was why they fought those European cartels which resisted infiltration by United States capital. But, having defeated them, the United States monopolies did not hesitate to conclude new agreements with the vanquished, dividing up markets and fixing prices, and thus impoverishing the working masses.

United States foreign trade was concentrated in the hands of a small number of monopolies; a few companies were powerful enough to earn immense profits from the underdeveloped countries, to defeat, or even to get a stranglehold on the European trusts, and to influence the political life of other countries through economic control.

According to the census of American-owned assets in foreign countries in 1943, 100 corporations and their branches had owned 70 percent of all the assets of foreign enterprises controlled by the United States, while, according to the United States National Resources Committee, by 1947, over 75 percent of the capital exported had been provided by 10 corporations alone. The interests of those corporations had formed the mainspring of the whole of United States foreign policy since the end of the Second World War.

The dividing up of the capitalist world among the big trusts was clearly manifest in the field of primary industrial commodities, such as petroleum and metals. Seven big oil trusts, 5 of them American, 1 British, and 1 Anglo-Dutch, had price agreements with one another. About one-fifth of all the oil produced in the capitalist world was handled by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, which in its annual report for 1949 had illustrated its domination with a map on which its empire was shown as extending over an area whose inhabitants represented 72 percent of the world's population.

The dividing up of the market and intertrust agreements were accompanied by a merciless struggle to obtain a larger share of the spoils. During the last decade, United States trusts had noticeable improved their position vis-a-vis their European rivals; they had invested million of dollars abroad, doubled their oil production in Venezuela, and considerably increased their share of production in the Middle East. Far from being satisfied with those successes, they were seeking completely to subjugate the British trusts, as recent events had clearly shown, and were making every effort to extend their control over the sale and production of oil throughout the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, the next two paragraphs show how cleverly reports prepared by the Federal Trade Commission and other Government agencies are used to embarrass us in our international relations. It is another reason why we must be meticulous in our use of languge and avoid exaggeration and overstatement:

Turning to base metals, he pointed out that, in the capitalist world, copper production was shared amongst three American companies and several British or Belgian companies. The 1947 report of the Federal Trade Commission on the Copper Industry stated in so many words that, directly or indirectly, 6 men were in a position to fix production and price policy for copper throughout the world. He could supply the United States representative with the names of 5 of those gentlemen, who were United States citizens.

Five-sixths of the nickel produced in the capitalist world came under a single trust, the International Nickel Co.; on its executive board, Americans had in 1949 held the chairmanship and 7 of the 9 seats. Mr. Foster Dulles, who was cooperating in the State Department's antitrust crusade, had, since the end of the Second World War, been chairman of the executive board of the International Nickel Co., in which, to paraphrase the terms of the United States draft resolution, different groups combined to restrict competition.

The Aluminium Corporation of America, which had the lion's share of aluminium production in the capitalist world, was in the hands of the Mellon group.

Numerous other United States monopolies could be memtioned, such as, for example, the United Fruit Co. Their rapacity lowered the standard of living of the working masses in many countries of the capitalist world.

United States monopolies controlled not only the output of raw materials, but also the production of manufactured goods. The trusts belonging to the Morgan group were extending their domination over the world electrical industry in all its branches. The General Electric Corp., in particular, had a large interest in the various electrical equipment manufacturing cartels in the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, France, Italy, and Morocco.

In speaking of his country's traditions, the United States representative had simply glossed over the fact that it was not the United States Government, but the American people who had a long record of antitrust activities. The public authorities in the United States of America were obliged from time to time to stage an antitrust farce, such as the promulgation of the Sherman and Clayton Acts, in order to allay public indignation.

One of the first international cartels had been organized in 1896 by the Aluminum Corporation of America and the German-

Swiss Aluminum Trust. Between the two wars, the big United States trusts had played an important part in international cartels in the chemical, oil, iron and copper industries. The collaboration between the Standard Oil Co. and Hitler's mainstay, the IG-Farben, was a matter of common knowledge.

History showed that the United States Government had encouraged trusts. The United States representative had not referred to the Webb-Pomerone Act, which permitted joint action in the case of exports. By a decision of the Federal Trade Commission in 1927, associations of exporters were authorized to join international cartels. After the Second World War, the United States Government had never ceased to protect the interests of its monopolies. Shortly before the second session at Geneva in 1947 of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, the International Chamber of Commerce had clearly stated that, despite strong resistance on the part of certain circles, the United States Government would not hesitate to provide immediate aid to Europe if the consent of the other powers could be counted upon; but that such consent would obviously require the abandonment of an over-narrow concept of national sovereignty.

It could be seen today that the Marshall plan, the European Payments Union and the Schuman plan were but stages in the execution of United States plans to open Europe to the expansion of their monopolies, regardless of national sovereignty.

Further, discrimination was being practised by United States monopolies against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, out of hatred for countries which had thrown off their domination once and for all, and which were a living example of a world, freed from the exploitation of man by man. Such discrimination also aimed at further weakening the European partners of the United States Government, by obstructing the normal flow of their international trade.

In the bilateral agreements concluded under the Marshall plan, the United States Government had constrained the beneficiary countries to cut off certain exports to Eastern Europe. Recently, too, it had obliged Chile to accept a discriminatory measure in a trade agreement.

Thus the United States monopolies had managed to create an unhealthy atmosphere in international trade, with the sole aim of suppressing any resistance by their partners to preparation for fresh acts of aggression.

After the farcical performance of the United States representative, the Iranian representative had brought the Council back to reality by his reference to the practices of foreign monopolies in his country.

As had already been demonstrated during the present session, international monopolies were steadily lowering the standard of living of millions of human beings in Asia, Africa, Europe and elsewhere. The working masses of the capitalist countries, who were living under the yoke of the monopolies, would not allow themselves to be duped by the demagogic schemes of the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, my only reason for reading this diatribe is to bring to the attention of the House the way words such as monopoly, Wall Street, international bankers and similar terms, which have been used in the heat of debate by some of our own Members, can do damage to national programs in which, regardless of party, we are vitally concerned.

Mr. Birecki's attacks referred to both Mr. Harriman, a Democrat, and the present Governor of New York, and to Mr. John Foster Dulles, a Republican, the present Secretary of State. So this is not a question of partisan politics. It is a question of protecting the good name of this country. We must be as scrupulous in dealing with economic matters as Mr. Stevenson and our friends on the other side of the aisle advocate be our practice when investigations of subversion in Government are under discussion.

Mr. Speaker, at the recent meeting of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, which concluded in New York the latter part of May, our delegation was embarrassed by an impassioned speech by a very capable but misguided United States citizen, Miss Elinor Kahn, who represents the World Federation of Trade Unions. This organization has been repudiated by both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations as a Communist-dominated group. I have secured her statement. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed immediately after my remarks.

The similarity in Miss Kahn's statement with statements which some of us have made at times in the heat of debate should make us all doubly careful that no word or action we take can embarrass our represenatives in the United Nations or in any other international forum in which we may participate.

Miss Kahn's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS

The Council is this year embarking upon a review of the comments of governments, specialized agencies, and nongovernmental organizations on the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices. The item, which has now been before the Council for more than 4 years, should in the opinion of the World Federation of Trade Unions, continue to figure as an important part of the Council's work and should be the subject of further study and recommendation by the Secretariat.

The Council has recently demonstrated, in one important field, its desire to examine the act upon problems of international trade. Its action in establishing the Commission on International Commodity Trade was a forward step which was officially welcomed by the WFTU. The effect of restrictive business practices on international trade is another facet of the same problem, as is the effect upon international trade of politically dictated restrictions impeding free expansion of trade itself. The question of trade is in turn of vital concern to both developed and lesser developed countries.

If the Council's work is to be of value it must encompass restrictive business practices in their broadest sense. It cannot be limited to the operations of formally established cartels which reflect only one aspect of restrictive practices. It must encompass monopolistic practices in general, which, in turn, requires examination of the role of the monopolies themselves as well as the broad range of their economic, financial, political, and social influence and domination.

The WFTU has previously set forth its position in communications to the Secretariat (May 3, 1952) and in its statement to the 16th session of the Economic and Social Council. It is based upon the daily experiences of workers in the capitalist and colonial countries who know that the activities of monopolies, trusts, and cartels motivated only by the desire for maximum profits, have had disastrous consequences primarily upon the lives of the masses of workers, but also in a most serious manner on economic and social development in general.

The situation has not changed materially in the past 2 years. Thus, the final communique of the 29 Asian-African nations meeting at Bandung, Indonesia, in April 1955, took specific note, as part of a broad economic policy statement, of various aspects of monopoly. It recommended that "Asian-African countries should diversify their export trade by processing their raw materials whenever economically feasible before export." Yet, it is in this field, among others, that the monopolies—particularly in metals, oil, and fibers—have been most active, pursuing their pattern intended to keep newly independent lands in economic subjection. More specifically, the Bandung conference also took note of discriminatory freight rates which result from monopolistic practices and recommended a study of the problem and "collective action thereafter to put pressure on the shipping lines to adopt a more reasonable attitude."

In the financial field the Asian-African conference implicitly took note of monopolistic policies by agreeing that "encouragement should be given to the establishment of national and regional banks and insurance companies." This is not surprising in the light of ECAFE's 1951 study on "Mobilization of Domestic Capital in Certain Countries of Asia and the Far East," which said, in part:

"A few large banks which operate on a global basis and are mostly foreign owned and controlled, operate in most countries of the region * * * they hold a virtual monopoly of foreign trade finance in the region."

The effect of monopoly practices in highly developed areas of the world has recently been the subject of much discussion, following publication by the Economic Commission for Europe of its study, the Price of Oil in Western Europe, which says, in part:

"Although the trade links between the two hemispheres are weak, and likely to become weaker, the corporate links are very strong. Specifically, the lion's share of crude oil production and refining throughout the world is in the hands of 8 major companies—5 American and 3 European—most of which have interests in each of the main producing and refining centers."

ECE pointed out that "the high degree of concentration of ownership has been an important determinant of the industry's economic behavior."

The recent period has been marked by two divergent trends—on the one hand a desperate struggle of the monopolies to strengthen their hold on the economy of the capitalist and colonial countries, and on the other a vigorous political campaign of the underdeveloped countries and colonial areas to realize economic as well as political independence. In this struggle the monopolies have, to date, managed to protect and fortify their position of strength. The degree to which this runs counter to the interests of the United Nations and of world peace and stability warrants the continued scrutiny and action of the Council.

Indications of the extent of these trends are easily found. The United States magazine, Business Week, published on April 23, 1955, a list of the 32 members of the 1954 Billion Dollar Club—the nonfinancial corporations with assets of more than $1 billion at the end of 1954. Among the top 16 corporations on the list are to be found 5 American oil corporations referred to in the ECE study. Their assets had increased since the end of 1946 by anywhere from 98.8 percent in the case of the company with the smallest increase to 172.7 percent in the case of the company with the highest increase. The unweighted average increase in assets of the five major oil companies over this 8-year period was 129.4 percent. Foreign operations were a decisive factor in this growth.

This trend is not limited to the United States. Between 1949 and 1953 gross trad-

ing profits of all British companies other than those in finance and agriculture increased by approximately 28 percent. During this same period the trading profits of Royal Dutch Shell increased 84 percent, of Unilevers increased 79 percent, and Imperial Chemical Industries increased by 104 percent. These three corporations, together with Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., as it was then known, earned in 1949 one-seventh of all British company trading profits; their share had increased to one-sixth by 1953. It is obvious that these gains were the result of the monopolistic role played by these companies in the world economy. A notably example is the role of Unilevers in West Africa.

A classic example of the effect of monopolies on international trade is seen in the experience of Latin American countries with the United Fruit Co. The annual report of that company for the year ending December 31, 1953, revealed that it had assets of $579.3 million. In the same year, as figures in the United Nation's Statistical Yearbook (1953) disclose, seven of the countries in which United Fruit operates—namely Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, Columbia, and Ecuador—had total government expenditures of only $523 million, or considerably less than the total assets of the United Fruit Co. Yet no formalistic study limited to the classical definition of "cartels" would disclose the restrictive effect upon international trade of the operations of this one monopoly.

The problem of restrictive business practices is not something that can be debated briefly and then ignored. The problems will not vanish unless the United Nations continues to maintain vigilance and initiate action. Yet such action is indispensable if the objectives of economic development, broader trade between all nations, and maintenance of peace are to be achieved. It is these objectives together with the objective of national independence and sovereignty which the unbridled rule of the monopolies continues to imperil.

The World Federation of Trade Unions therefore considers the role of the United Nations to be extremely important. Monopolies tend to keep their affairs secret. They do not, as the ad hoc committee pointed out, "voluntarily furnish data concerning their restrictive business practices."

While the documentation already available is impressive and provides conclusive evidence of the vast scale and dire effects of the activities of monopolies, it is certain that deeper and more thorough studies by the United Nations would show that so far only a corner of the veil of secrecy has been lifted. Preparation and publication of such studies would be a powerful aid in combating restrictive practices.

At the same time the approach to these studies must be based upon recognition that the power of the monopolies themselves and the whole complex of their activities has now swollen to formidable proportions. No limited approach is possible. The effect of the monopolies upon society and the economy as a whole must be examined in concrete terms, and not in the inadequate concepts of "restriction of competition" found in much existing antitrust legislation.

Workers are not the only group who suffer—as employees and as consumers—from the activities of the monopolies. The experience of all the lesser developed countries and colonial areas shows the effect of the domination of foreign monopolies. In the underdeveloped areas large and small businessmen are unable to develop national enterprises in the face of monopolistic practices; in the developed areas small-business men are forced out of operations by the monopolies or dominated by them. The recent trend of armaments production has led to intensification of monopoly control in a number of countries such as the United States. In the lesser developed countries small farmers and peasants suffer from the buying, selling, and operating practices of foreign monopolies.

It is thus impossible for the United Nations to consider problems of trade and economic development without continuing to give serious attention to the problem of restrictive business practices. The studies must have as their objective aiding all groups injured by monopolies to protect themselves; they cannot be designed to protect one group of monopolists or would-be monopolists against another.

This approach will inevitably pose problems. But these problems should not deter the council and the secretariat from pursuing their activities in this important field. The problem is of extreme gravity and must be faced seriously and constructively. The World Federation of Trade Unions will welcome intensification of the activities of the United Nations in this direction.

Trademarks—America's Good Will Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by the Honorable James A. Farley before the United States Trademark Association in New York City on June 23, 1955, and an excerpt from an editorial in the Holyoke (Mass.) Daily Transcript of June 24:

TRADEMARKS—AMERICA'S GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR

(By James A. Farley)

A dynamic symbol cloaks this gathering in special distinction. That symbol—the most glorious of all trademarks—is in this room.

I refer to our flag.

Under it, we are privileged to enjoy the dignity of honest labor and reward according to achievement.

Shackled millions in curtained lands cannot live under its benevolence and opportunities. But wherever free breath is drawn its glories are known, its invincibility respected.

The real meaning of this occasion is inherent in the words of Franklin K. Lane, a member of President Wilson's Cabinet. Giving voice to our national emblem, he said, "I swing before your eyes as a bright gleam of color, a symbol of yourself, the pictured suggestion of the big things which make this Nation. My stars and my stripes are your dream and your labors. They are bright with cheer, brilliant with courage, firm with faith, because you have made them so out of your hearts."

Yes, through your skills and perseverance has come the mighty Nation for which our flag stands and the greatest tide of products and services in the history of mankind—each carrying proud trademarks guaranteeing workmanship and integrity.

You are the ones who have given seed and being to this wondrous commercial and industrial miracle. You are the leaders who send forth throughout the world a myriad of things which create enduring good will.

Wherever there are people and needs, wherever there are open markets and free enterprise, the results of your labor remain as America's most impressive ambassadors—appreciated and remembered over and above even the greatest of our statesmen.

You as owners, and representatives of trademark owners, as men who are the basic architects of world trade unity, are deserving of all the acclaim this Nation can bestow.

And to the United States Trademark Association, to its guiding lights, to all who have made it a powerful beacon searching out and fostering the highest ethics in international trade and commerce, must go the gratitude of our Government, our businessmen, our workers, our consumers.

It is no wonder that the great majority of important trademark holders are members of the United States Trademark Association. Its efforts to obtain useful legislation and treaties and to give encouragement to the advancement of trademark rights are recorded in the pages of American progress.

I see in the United States Trademark Association, as it is constituted and operated today, an important spearhead of industry's part in the strengthening and advancement of America. I am proud, indeed, that the company which I represent, and I, personally, can share in that mission.

Today the political and trading sphere of this Nation extends beyond its borders to all corners of the earth. No place is too remote to experience the enjoyment and benefits of American brands. So the theme of this meeting, International Aspects of Trademarks, is timely and proper.

If I have any qualifications at all to talk before a meeting of this nature, it can be justified by the globe-trotting aspects of my job. It has taken me to faraway lands and has placed me in proximity to all manner of people. And in these countries of varying degrees of civilization and culture, I have come face to face with the great glory of this Nation's ingenuity and its far-reaching contribution to global progress.

If you will forgive the mention of a favorite brand of mine, I would like to paint a graphic picture of American enterprise and the wonder of trademarked products.

In my travels, I believe one of the things that has given me the most gratification about my own product and what it can do has been in the provincial towns of the Philippines. Here one gets on a plane in the modern, up-to-date city of Manila and rides 400 or 500 miles to Cebu or Ba cō lod, or any one of five or six other provincial towns of some 200,000 Filipinos.

Way back in these islands, the provincial cities consist mostly of nipa huts which are homes on stilts, constructed of bamboo and grass. Living space in each hut is at a premium. The natives are shabbily dressed. The children mostly wear no clothes at all. The settlements usually have streets of mud and 1-story shacks.

But you turn a corner in all this poverty and suddenly you catch sight of a beautiful Coca-Cola bottling plant. These plants to me are amazing. Well built and freshly painted in sparkling white, they are equipped with the latest and most modern bottle fillers, bottle cleaners, and water-treating equipment, and all the things that go to make up a modern Coca-Cola manufacturing plant.

The floors o fthe boilerrooms are meticulously clean. All the personnel, even the fellows who work in the boilerroom and those who feed the soakers with used bottles, are clothed in garments that are not only clean but also freshly laundered and pressed at regular intervals.

At every plant there is a doctor's office with a doctor and a nurse to meet any emergency.

Shower baths in our plants are mandatory for the employees. In the beginning it was hard to get workers because showers were required. But today, the natives come and inquire at this plant for work, giving as a reason the fact that they can take a shower.

Certainly these plants are the standard of cleanliness, purity and modern, up-to-date manufacturing methods, and have raised the standard of living in each of these islands where they are located.

A public health official in the Near East told one of our pepole that the influence of Coke on sanitation would be one of the most effective factors in promoting health that had ever reached his country. To use his own words, "Coca-Cola is worth its weight in gold as education in cleanliness."

This influence goes far beyond the physical. For example, in Egypt, the Coke man wears a uniform. At first the employees were skeptical. Today they wear it as a badge of honor because it represents to them and to the people whom they deal with the whole idea of fair treatment and compatability between employer and employee.

One of our salesmen, incidentally, is one of the wealthiest people in his community. He sells Coca-Cola, not because he needs to make a living but because it gives him prestige.

Here I wish to ask you please to forgive the frequent reference to the trademark I represent. I do this because, naturally, it is what I know most about. I am sure your product has a similar influence on similar communities, but I do not know as much aobut it as I do my own product.

However, I do know that in traveling through India, in the filth and squalor of such places as Delhi, Bombay, and Calcutta, you suddenly turn a corner and find a Caltex filling station that might have been lifted from the corner of Independence and Highland Avenues in Kansas City, Mo. The modern, up-to-date cleanliness and sanitation and merchandising methods have been transported 12,000 miles, right from the heart of America to the heart of this Indian city.

Speaking of India, I would say that, to the average Indian mind, there are 3 major products which represent America to them—more than all of the political talk of Nehru or Bulganin or even our own Mr. Dulles. To them America is prepresented primarily by American automobiles—Buick, Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors, by American oil companies—predominantly, I think, Caltex, and by Coca Cola which is on sale in some 10,000 or more outlets in Bombay, Delhi, and Calcutta.

About the time that the Mau Mau trouble was beginning in Kenya, but while it was still comparatively safe to travel, I was in that part of the world. One of the boys I was traveling with took a trip from Nairobi 100 miles inland to the treetop hut over the famous water hole where nightly hundreds of wild animals come for water. This hut is well known because—the night that her father died—Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh were in that hut and it took many hours to locate them.

To reach the treetop hut from Nairobi, my companion traveled over a cordury dirt road in a Coca-Cola panel truck for some 80 miles without seeing any kind of real civilization. There were no towns and no civilized settlements other than some native huts scattered along the road. Suddenly he came upon a small trading post that looked like a second-rate general merchandise store at some crossroads in deep Alabama.

He was amazed to find there, some 80 miles from anywhere, a Coca-Cola cooler; and, as he stopped for a refreshing pause, he casually looked around the shelves of the trading post. He was particularly impressed by the sight of four American trademarked products on sale—the Coca-Cola he held in his hand, a large box of Gillette razor blades, a dozen cans of Heinz' soup, and, to his utter amazement, four boxes of Toni.

It is apparent how unique is the position of the trademark system and how effective it is in influencing attitudes toward this Nation. It can be said truly that on the trademark we base our greatest hope of expanding world trade—of embracing nations in a brotherhood of peace and progress.

The trademark is often the only thing that cuts across national and ideological barriers. And how heartening it is for a world traveler to see the widespread distribution of American products. It may be an International Harvester combine at work in the wheat fields of Argentina. It may be a GMC truck along the dikes in Holland. Or perhaps it is Singer sewing machine, humming busily away in a little Italian tailor shop.

Maybe it is a pack of Luckies, jealously hoarded by a Nile boatman at Cairo, or a Hershey bar held in the tight fist of a hungry little child in West Germany. In Brisbane, in Calcutta—in Rio, Rome, or Paris—American trademarks are making friends for America.

The things we manufacture are perhaps the best proof of what we are and the best ambassadors of our country.

When traveling, you are impressed by another startling thing. The world is tired of words. Everywhere the meaning of words is tending to break down. They are used by too many people in too many untruthful ways. The finest words have been used to make so many promises that have not been kept that people have become skeptical. Everywhere in the world people have been driven by abuse of language to judge you not so much by what you say as by what you do.

It is a well-known fact that people understand things much better than they understand ideas. When we speak to a man in another country about democracy, he may or may not understand us. The idea may be beyond his comprehension; or perhaps a poor brand of democracy has been sold to him by somebody else before. But when you give him a ride in your Buick, Ford, or Chrysler, or offer him a Chesterfield, Lucky Strike, Camel, or Old Gold, or a package of Chiclets or Beechnut gum, this is something he can easily judge for himself.

Let us consider for a few minutes what trademarks stand for. First, they symbolize America's products. Then they symbolize the maker of the products. Then the reputation of the maker. Then, and even more important, they vouch for the responsibility of the maker.

Eevry one of the great galaxy of American trademarks implies a unity of responsibility. It suggests the individual's responsibility for his acts, the corporation's responsibility for the quality and value of its products. It expresses the seller's responsibility for his service. Each one in the chain stands responsible and accountable.

Sometimes we hear those who would like to tear down our system claim that trademarks are monopolistic. But we know that is untrue. They are the very opposite of monopoly. For, in addition to the freedom of choice, which they make possible, trademarks create competition. And that competition expresses, in a very positive way, our belief in progress and in our basic American optimism.

It shows that we are never satisfied to rest on our laurels. We believe that no product, no act, no plan, represents the ultimate achievement. We see it as just a step on the path toward better products, better acts, or better plans.

No matter how good we make the better mousetrap, we know that some day we will make it still better. Or if we do not, we know some bright competitor will come along and do it for us. This philosophy is implied in every ad you run, every sales talk you make, and every transaction you ring up.

In offering competitive products we express also our deep respect for the individual and our belief in his ability to exercise his own good judgment. We offer him our goods and provide him with information and suggestions to buy. But he makes the decision. He chooses or rejects whatever we offer. And in that selection he is governed not by any form of compulsion, but solely by his own individual taste or requirement.

You imaginative men and women, who by your daily acts foster and promote our trademark system, are making a great contribution. You are helping to keep these principles alive in the thought and action of our public. And in that way you are helping greatly to bind together all sections and segments of our Nation.

It is easy to appreciate the great value of the trademark system. It can serve to keep alive the concepts of responsibility and integrity—not only here in America but throughout the world.

No force in whatever guise should be permitted to gnaw at the principles for which trademarks stand. We must be constantly alert to the dangers which continue to beset the system.

Sometimes the dangers come from the inside. Sometimes they come from the outside. Some of them arise in the legislative halls of our country and some of them arise from practices we permit in the conduct of our own business.

Fortunately—and largely due to your efforts—the situation is better today than for many years. But in nearly every Congress, thinly disguised socialistic measures are introduced which would damage our system beyond repair.

They ask for mandatory standardization, mandatory grade labeling and other restrictions on the development of trademarks. On the surface, these measures always seem to promote and protect the public interest. That is the way they get their support. That is the way they carry along with them so many intelligent but over-trusting people. But the benefits are only superficial.

The proponents of these measures hold out the bait of total security. They profess to eliminate all risk from purchasing, all risk from the supply and exchange of goods. But what they would really do is to take away from our public the right to pick and choose, the right of a man to give his patronage to the product he likes best, based on his own good judgment. And for his judgment they would substitute the judgment of government bureaucracy.

Many of the supporters of these measures are well meaning, but they are being taken in by clever schemers who would substitute government regulation for all public decision.

Let us watch out for all total security measures, either in trade or other phases of American life.

Time and experience have taught us that total security is the forerunner of regimentation. For every benefit, some price must be paid. Let us look at the price and scrutinize it closely before we buy the social measure.

Let us keep our eyes on basic principles. Let us be particularly wary of any proposal or plan which would limit or subordinate the influence of a trademark on our economic system. For that kind of proposal makes the best kind of example of a price that is too high for the merchandise.

Let us protect what courage and enterprise has made possible—the miracle of American industry!

In His infinite wisdom, God has given this Nation limitless capacities and a great stewardship in a world that must find peaceful ways or face destruction.

The warm handclasp of trade—American products that feed, nourish, warm, protect, cure, cool, and beautify—all the wonderful benefits and joys that skilled manufacture can provide—these are the effective weapons to stop global calamity.

Yes, the trademarks you represent are in reality the hope of the world—stronger than guns, or bombs, or planes, or battleships. And you, my friends, are the soldiers in this

fight for international sanity and understanding.

Fight we must when our liberties are threatened. And destroy we must in self-preservation. But the United States of America stands at the helm of today's civilization because of unparalleled scientific and industrial know-how, because it has stimulated world markets, shipped a myriad of goods, built outposts of progress in every corner of the globe.

We are faced with the greatest challenge ever to American industrial genius and resourcefulness, to the kind of initiative represented by men such as yourselves and organizations such as the United States Trademark Association.

Highly geared production will need new sales outlets. Successful competition in world trade will depend on progressive industrial overseas expansion.

Yes, I say to you, the hope in a more normal world, in a busy, bustling, buying, consuming world, rests with organizations such as this.

Outstretched, friendly hands across the seas, not mailed fists, skilled, knowing, courageous hands of American industry, pouring the good things of life onto distant shores which sorely need our output—these are the dynamics which will build the greatest possible kind of national and global prosperity.

The more people we expose to American products and American ways of business, the better they will understand the kind of people we are. The more who experience our merchandise, the better off both they and we will be, and the greater the mutual understanding between us.

Who knows, history may yet record that we won the peace and kept more friends with American trademarked products than we did with all the billions and billions of dollars we have poured into wars and efforts at world rehabilitation.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Daily Transcript of June 24, 1955]

JAMES A. FARLEY'S NEW ROLE

Who would have expected, let's say, back in 1940 that the time would come when James A. Farley, one of the political immortals of the Franklin D. Roosevelt era in American life, would, 15 years later appear in the news as one of the dominant minds in an entirely different field and that a news story of the day would fail to suggest his political career in any way? He is now James A. Farley, chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., and as such listened to with attention as he stands up to define his position on a great variety of nonpolitical developments and promises. A few weeks ago he gave an address at Des Moines on juvenile delinquency which was a classic expression of the problem and its potentials.

Yesterday he was a speaker at the annual gathering for the United States Trademark Association at New York and his theme was the International Aspects of Trademarks. His main point was that an American trademark, displayed on a quality product, was an American ambassador of good will in foreign lands and one not given proper credit in the public mind.

Molotov and Romulo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I include an editorial of commendation of our former colleague, Gen. Carlos Romulo, appearing in the Boston Traveler of June 27, 1955, entitled Molotov and Romulo.

MOLOTOV AND ROMULO

We are indebted to Gen. Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines for canceling out the cynical speech made at the U. N. anniversary meeting in San Francisco last week by Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov.

The best that can be said for Molotov's speech is that it was a little less vitriolic than usual. Behind the sweet talk could be found the same charges of United States warmongering that he has made repeatedly. The only peace-loving nations are the Communist nations. Western alliances are for offensive purposes only, etc., etc.

General Romulo, on the other hand, made a speech that was sensible and constructive. He put the U. N. and its problems in the proper perspective, and he set a future course which we would like to see the U. N. follow.

"The function of the United Nations," he said, "is not to eliminate diversity, but to make the world safe for diversity. Either we eliminate war or we expose the face of man to such hammer blows as have never before been recorded.

"In the final analysis, it is not what the West will do for the East, or what the East will do for the West that will make the better and safer world we seek. It is what all of us here do in behalf of mankind as a whole that counts."

If the U. N. is ever to succed in its task of safeguarding the peace, it must do so in the ways suggested by General Romulo rather than by adopting any such peace plan as that proposed by Molotov at San Francisco.

Molotov spoke of relieving tensions. He gave lip service to the ideals and aims of the U. N. But the details amounted to nothing more than the old Soviet plan of getting concessions from the West while conceding nothing in return.

A lot of oratory came out of the U. N. anniversary meeting. Taken as a whole, it served to remind the world, and the U. N. members, that the U. N. is still a useful forum for the exchange of ideas in the search for lasting peace. It was a constructive meeting.

Light on Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I attach an editorial from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of June 27, 1955:

LIGHT ON NATURAL GAS

The deceptive propaganda campaign about natural gas regulation which is flooding the country is illuminated with the facts by Senator Douglas of Illinois in an article in Sunday's Post-Dispatch.

The big oil companies that stand to reap the most in unregulated profits contend competition will keep the price of natural gas down without any Federal regulation. Senator DOUGLAS shows that, to the contrary, the unregulated price of natural gas at the wellhead has gone up 120 percent in the last 9 years. Pipelines are now buying natural gas in the Southwest at prices 400 to 500 percent of 1946 prices, he reports. He describes the nature of the industry which not only gives the pipelines no opportunity to shop for competitive prices but no incentive for trying.

Senator DOUGLAS estimates that the no-regulation bills which Representative HARRIS and Senator FULBRIGHT, both of Arkansas, have introduced, could be expected to cost consumers about $600 million a year every year from now on. Missouri's inflated bill is estimated at $8 million to $25 million a year; Illinois' at $14 million to $44 million.

With such large sums at stake, is it any wonder that the oil, gas and pipeline companies are reported by the Wall Street Journal to have raised a war chest of $1,500,000 for "public relations" to push this price-gouging legislation?

The propaganda claim that risk capital would not venture to develop new sources of oil and gas if regulation were applied at the well-head is demolished by Senator DOUGLAS' facts: The natural-gas transporters, which are also extensively engaged in exploration, development, and production of natural gas, have prospered under regulation for the last 16 years although during that time the Federal Power Commission has ordered rate reductions totaling $43 million a year.

It was Senator DOUGLAS who almost single-handedly alerted Congress and the country 5 years ago when a bill sponsored by Senator KERR, an Oklahoma oilman, sought to do substantially what the Harris-Fulbright bills seek to do now. That earlier bill was courageously vetoed by President Truman.

Senator DOUGLAS believes "there is a good chance to beat the exemption drive if the people understand the issues." There are only about 175 big producers that produce 90 percent of the natural gas sold in interstate commerce in the United States—but there are more than 300,000 consumers of natural gas in St. Louis and St. Louis County alone.

Those Representatives and Senators who think they can do a multi-million-dollar favor for the producers without the knowledge of the consumers who would be footing the bill may find themselves standing corrected at the polls. The appeals at Washington by mayors and legal officers who have come from many of the Nation's biggest cities indicate the deep public concern over this issue.

But no one who buys or may be buying natural gas—or electric power produced with natural gas in steam generating plants—can afford to sit back and let the other fellow fight for him.

This is his battle, too. If he loses it, he will pay as long as it takes to reverse the defeat.

There can be little doubt of the outcome if enough consumers will demand that their Representatives and Senators require the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead as the Supreme Court of the United States ruled last year the law requires.

Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following address delivered by Mr. Durward L. Allen, department of conservation, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., is an enlightening address on reclamation, dams, and other problems involving our natural resources:

DAMS, RECLAMATION, AND SOME FACTS OF LIFE

(By Durward L. Allen)

(With a bitter fight raging in Congress over the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project and Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument, Professor Allen here tells why the proposed vast Reclamation Bureau programs are visionary and foolhardy and a tax levy on naturally productive areas. A resource ecologist at Purdue University, Professor Allen is former research chief of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. He is the author of Our Wildlife Legacy, published by Funk & Wagnalls.)

The huge increase of the taxpayer's burden since World War II has been little cause for satisfaction, other than the measure of national security we have purchased. But one attendant benefit may be a public awakening on the need to reexamine major items in the Federal budget.

In particular, we have perhaps grown too accustomed to expenditures in hundreds of millions for great reclamation plans to open up new lands for agriculture and industry. The demands of these costly ventures have become so obviously insatiable that there is increased questioning of their propriety and ultimate worth. They are presented to us as the inspired vision of bold and progressive men. It could be prudence to suspect that when the cost of failure is a public charge, men of vision may become visionary and the bold foolhardy.

In essence, the vast reclamation programs are a tax levy on naturally productive areas and efficiently operating business for a hazardous speculation in regions submarginal for both farming and commercial enterprise. This is nothing today's public can afford to accept without careful scrutiny, since the debt will be incurred by people far removed from the sites of reservoirs, power stations, and watered lands. Citizens of the entire Nation are being asked to contribute during their own lifetimes and to place a lien on the incomes of their grandchildren.

The spending of billions in a limited region naturally enlists a solid front of local support. Inevitably, it will bring a local, if temporary, prosperity. But what is given is also taken away, and people of eastern States must weigh the value of more dams on western rivers against their own needs for better schools and other services to their increasing populations.

The question of reclaiming new lands is commonly represented as a need for business opportunity. It is a part of the expanding economy that a steadily building population of Americans has come to look upon as a permanent feature of our way of life. The time is now close upon us when we will have occupied our naturally productive lands and when, in terms of area, there will be an end to further expansion at reasonable cost. To insist on going ahead by adding unreasonable costs to the public debt is no permanent solution to anything, since this, too, must reach an ultimate limit.

The resources of this continent are the base on which our population will expand and survive. The development and use of this natural wealth should involve some consideration of the biology of man himself. The population biologist knows well that nothing grows from nothing. It is true of animals in natural environments, and it is true of human beings as well, that maximum numbers bring reduced comfort and welfare for the individual. Even in our industrial society, after an optimum level is attained, increased numbers mean more competition, which requires that more things be divided more ways.

We are in the midst of a population increase, and no one can predict with certainty where it will end. There is little question that we have reached the level where additions to our numbers are more of a problem than an undiluted benefit. Since this date a year ago, we have acquired 2.8 million more Americans, and this upward trend may well continue beyond the ultimate point of national strength and welfare.

In the interest of a high living standard, it would seem reasonable to allow our numbers to seek their level on the basis of habitable land we now have. Considering the population pressures which are likely to be with us, even before the end of this century, we probably would be wise to preserve our living space and retain an undeveloped reserve, rather than pay a large premium in public money to reclaim marginal lands. Eventually, these areas will be chiefly significant in adding to the total number of people within continental United States.

These concepts are contrary to our habits of thought, because population biology is no part of our usual training. We are conditioned otherwise, in being for several centuries a few people in a vast continent which we have been in the process of occupying and filling up.

At present, we are in a tension period when it must be decided whether we will go on demanding expansion at any and all cost. We must decide also what our open spaces are worth to us and whether all their assets must be commercialized for quick liquidation to the detriment of long-term public values. Parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and other lands belonging to the entire Nation are feeling the pressure of those who conceive that land not overrun with people is idle and worthless.

That concept is refuted by the 88 million recreational visits paid by American citizens to their national parks and forests last year. These visits have doubled in 9 years and they bespeak the need for more such public properties, rather than less. The value of our idle wet lands is attested by the 14 million hunters who bought licenses in 1954 and to whom the marshes are yielding the annual harvest of waterfowl that has fostered one of our great sporting traditions.

The pursuit of our development complex would allocate billions to the irrigation of a few hundred thousand acres of desert and pay public tax money for the destruction of our remaining marshes—while tolerating the ruination of millions of productive acres through misuse.

Farms are being washed away for want of provident farming, and plowed-up grasslands are blowing away under the stimulus of a subsidy on wheat. Overgrazed watersheds are sliding into the valleys in flash floods, and western topsoil is building up steadily in the reservoirs we already have.

There is a reclamation frontier, and its demands are imperative. But it is a technological frontier in the husbandry of land. A few millions wisely spent, could mean annual progress and the steady building of solid value in all parts of the Nation. It would be less spectacular than concrete monuments to engineering genius, but it would bring into being a social maturity which we now seem to lack, and it would be our best insurance for the future.

What's So New About the Red Airpower Threat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Air Force magazine for July, printed by the Air Force Association, carries a most timely article written by Mr. John F. Loosbrock, the managing editor for this excellent periodical. It is entitled "What's So New About the Red Airpower Threat?"

I wish to commend this article to the careful reading and consideration of the membership, for Mr. Loosbrock points out a chronology of events that spells a moral for us all:

WHAT'S SO NEW ABOUT THE RED AIRPOWER THREAT?

(By John F. Loosbrock)

The shocking thing about the recent parade of Soviet airpower over Red Square is that it should come as a shock to anyone—even to Mr. Average Citizen, much less our national planners and policymakers. To be sure, the flyovers of 10 4-jet intercontinental bombers, of 50 supersonic day fighters, and 30 all-weather fighters marked the first visual confirmation of a conclusion that our intelligence experts had arrived at some time ago by deduction and extrapolation. But the basic facts of Red capabilities in the area of aircraft technology have been a matter of record for many years. Exactly how the Russians might have intended to use this capability could not be documented until now. But we have known enough over the years that the current furor and gear-shifting of our production effort could have been avoided.

Lord knows we had plenty of warnings. The Spaatzes, the Doolittles, the Vandenbergs, the Symingtons, the Finletters, the Twinings, the Talbotts, all have gone on record time after time over the years in outlining the nature of the Soviet threat. Air Force magazine has done its share. But, as a friend of ours is found of saying, "none of this has any meaning unless it shows up somewhere in the budget."

On this point of concrete reaction to the threat, our national record is a consistent one. We have not failed to underrate Soviet technological competence on every major military development since the end of World War II. This current episode is but the latest in a long series of wishful thinking, ostrich-like planning, and downright ignoring of the facts of life. Let's take a look at this consistent record of ours.

We pooh-poohed the fact that the Soviets had obtained a B–29 and told ourselves that these technologically primitive people could not possibly duplicate it in less than 6 or 7 years. It took them exactly 2 years to get a copy into the air.

Jets were quite another thing, we told ourselves. We knew the Reds were working on a copy of the British Nene engine but we predicted production problems. Yet within a year they were not only producing the Nene on their own assembly lines but had considerably improved its thrust output.

When the MIG–15 appeared in the skies over Korea we did our usual double-take. But it didn't take us long to settle back in the easy chair. After all, it wasn't as good as the F–86. Weren't we shooting them down at a ratio of 14 to 1? Those louts in the baggy pants had only succeeded in producing 13,000 first-class fighters in a few short years, hadn't they? Obviously an ox-cart economy.

We took great comfort in our post-World War II monopoly in nuclear weapons. In this field we had a 6- to 10-year lead, many experts said, even if the Reds could solve the secret of the atomic bomb manufacture at all. Yet the first Soviet A-bomb was exploded in 1949, just 3 years after they began work on it. It had taken us about the same length of time to build our first nuclear weapon.

One would think that the Red A-bomb would have shattered our complacency. It didn't. Within a comparatively short time we had retired behind the shield of the superbomb, the thermonuclear device which

would catapult us back into a position of military supremacy. But in this field the Russians caught up even quicker than they did in atomic-bomb production.

Ah, we said, but we have so many more bombs than they, ignoring the fact that counting stockpiles becomes merely mathematical gymnastics once the Soviets have a quantity sufficient to deal with our target system.

Even while our seismographs and other detection instruments were confirming Soviet accomplishments in the field of weapons technology we were busily erecting another strawman—not to knock down but to hide behind. What good were Red bombs if they couldn't deliver them on United States targets? We had the B–36 for intercontinental delivery, the B–47 was in quantity production, and the B–52 was coming along nicely. All the U. S. S. R. had was a fleet of now obsolete TU-4s, the B–29s we said they couldn't build. Deliverability. That was a nice, mouth-filling word. You know what happened to that one.

Surely by this time the lessons are beginning to soak in. The Soviets may not be 8 feet tall but they aren't all thumbs either. They are tough-minded, resourceful, industrious people who know exactly what they want to do and are doing it as fast as they can. We have been told time and again that we cannot hope to match them in numbers—either of aircraft or of men under arms. This is true. But we have also been told that we are so superior technologically that they can never match us in quality. This conclusion now proves debatable, to say the least.

There appear to be two basic reasons for our inability to face the unpalatable facts of our military position vis-a-vis that of Russia. The first is psychological. We are conditioned to a belief that Americans can do anything better than anybody else, especially when it comes to making things, machines in particular. We hate to admit the possibility that we can be outproduced, outresearched, or outstripped in any way—particularly by a system of government and economics that is diametrically opposed to our own.

The second reason is less complex. We just plain don't want to spend the kind of money that it takes to stay even with the Soviet Union in an age of incredibly expensive and complex weapons. This attitude cuts across political party lines, even though the Democrats historically have been kinder budgetwise to our armed services than have been the Republicans. They have been kinder likewise to almost every facet of governmental spending and their defense budget attitude probably reflects a traditionally freer hand with the public dollar more than a deeper understanding of the issues involved.

This dollar business has plagued our airpower buildup from the very beginning of the Air Force as a separate service. When the Finletter Commission and the Brewster-Hinshaw committee told President Truman and the Congress, respectively, that our minimum need was for 70 wings as of 1948, their reports proved little more than a warning and a mental exercise. For the money needed to achieve this goal was never even asked for, let alone voted.

Then the combination of the Russian atomic bomb and the Korean war led to a belated reexamination of the situation. The Air Force need, as determined by the Joint Chiefs and confirmed in a national security council decision on October 1, 1951, was placed at 143 wings, to be achieved by June 30, 1954. The money for this program was not forthcoming. It was never requested. The fiscal year 1953 budget of the Truman administration kept the 143-wing goal but stretched out the date of achievement to 1955.

The Truman lame-duck budget for fiscal year 1954 stretched the stretchout—this time to 1956. But the new Eisenhower budget for the same period went further. It knocked the 143-wing program into a cocked hat by slicing $5 billion from the Air Force funds, et an interim goal of 120 wings, and told the new Joint Chiefs to take a new look at the program. Obviously acting under a combined ceiling of dollars and personnel, the new Chiefs came up with what is the current program—137 wings by June 30, 1957.

Observe what this sequence of stopping, starting, stretching out and cutting back has done to our airpower program. Research, development, procurement, production, manpower, base construction—all have been subjected to an accordion action that, in plain language, raises all kinds of hell in terms of efficiency, morale, and combat effectiveness.

Thus, over the years we have been consistent only in our inconsistency. We have been blind to the Russian threat and by deliberately blinding ourselves to the threat we have played fast and loose with the programs that have been designed to meet it—programs that were not lavish but which were acknowledged to be minimal and austere. We have even acted logically, it can be argued, based on the facts as officially acknowledged and presented. But the most pitiful sight in the world is a man acting coldly and logically from a false premise, especially when those actions are a matter of life and death.

What effect the new documentation of Red airpower capability will have on the fiscal year 1956 budget are not completely clear at this writing. Our B–52 production has been stepped up some 35 percent. The Air Force has asked for $300 million more for this purpose. A similar speedup in fighter production is in the mill. This will cost more money. No general acceleration in aircraft programing, which has ramifications all along the line in base construction, personnel procurement, and a hundred other items, will come cheaply.

What is more important at this juncture is what is going to happen to the budget for fiscal year 1957. It's getting about the time of year when the important fiscal spadework is being done in the Pentagon caverns. And it's the worst kept secret in Washington that the administration hopes desperately to balance the budget next year. There have been many signs of officially fostered complacency pointed in that direction.

Surely, now that the facts about Red air strength can no longer be hidden from the public there can be no more wishful thinking about balancing the budget. Certainly not with the intercontinental ballistic missile, both ours and theirs, coming into the picture more rapidly than anyone cares to think about.

The situation demands bold and forthright leadership from the top down. The Congress has a history of voting substantially the money an administration requests for defense. And the American taxpayer has never shown an aversion to footing bills he thought were essential to his survival. We have already lost valuable time we can never buy back. However, this is no reason for compounding the error.

Nehru in the Russian Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Nehru has gone completely over to the Russian camp, as a great many Members of Congress thought he would. During the sessions of the United Nations he has never once voted with the United States. Yet, through our foreign-aid program, we have put $267,500,000 into coddling Nehru to get his good will; but like Tito, once a Communist, always a Communist. The reason why Nehru is so determined to accept Red China in the United Nations is that Red China and India, under Nehru, are the same breed of cats. If a world government, which many of our own citizens advocate, is set up you can get a clearer idea of what the situation will be. Russia, with 200 million people, India with 450 million, Red China with 500 million make a total of over a billion people—and in the whole world there are only 2½ billion.

It will mean more Reds in the organization than that, for Yugoslavia and many other satellite countries will jump at the chance to get into this world government, and even before it is ready to function it will have a representation in numbers of people equal to two-thirds of the population of the entire world. Members of the World Congress will be elected on a population basis, hence it doesn't take a mathematician to realize that our power and influence will be close to the zero point if we enter this combination. Likewise, this majority will control the whole one-world government.

Do not Americans stop to think that a government such as this could not possibly give to the people of this country those spiritual things guaranteed by the Constitution, nor could it guarantee what we most cherish and believe in. Our theory of government is that it exists for the people—the people are the government—while the Asiatic view is that the people exist for the government. What will become of our minority ideas and ideals? We believe in Jesus Christ as our Master, and while we have a great multitude of church denominations, they are all agreed on that one fundamental. Can we enter into a unified government with others whose concept of religion differs so violently from ours? We left Europe and came here and braved the wilderness for the one and only purpose of finding or establishing a place where it would be possible to worship God in our own way. Are we willing to give up that spirit of independence and the security which were denied us in Europe? Are we willing to give up our individual liberty and the right to govern ourselves?

While we know we are a minority as fas as population goes, why should we be willing to hazard this minority against a great majority of the population of the world on the illogical theory that people must be united in one government before world peace can be established? Suppose we entered and accepted this plan of world government, would that be a guaranty against revolutions in that government? Not at all. Just as soon as one party openly advocated a principle of freedom in any of the institutions of society that differed with that of another powerful group there would be a conflict just as easily as there might be among independent nations.

We here in the United States want to live in peace and enjoy the blessings of liberty and freedom and the right to

govern ourselves; and we hope that other nations can do likewise. But to run the risk of scuttling what we have for something which others tell us we should have is a dangerous risk which I do not believe the American people are ready to sanction. Russia, Red China, and India can well afford to further this one-world government for, first of all, it could not possibly be any worse than the governments they have, and secondly, they are in a position to control that supergovernment, which in turn will govern the United States.

We have not many friends among the nations of the earth. I know of none that could, or would want to if they could, come to our rescue if attacked; but we need have no fear of any nation or combination of nations provided our own people are not gullible enough to embrace this vitiating foreign doctrine. If the people of the United States stand firm for our Government, change it themselves when they think it necessary, and allow no outside force to alter it under any circumstances, freedom and liberty will remain on this Western Hemisphere. Private enterprise will continue as it has since we formed this Government. Capitalism, and not communism, will operate to the great advantage of the country, as it has operated since 1789. We gladly welcome people from other countries to these shores, just as we have for over 160 years, but we want them to leave behind them when they come here the century-old prejudices that have been fostered by the constant turmoil that has been generated by the policies and disagreements of foreign countries. This constant turmoil, born of conflicting ideologies, desire for power, and acquisition of territory, has produced some major armed conflict every 2 years in the recorded history of the human race. Is this Republic, as a minority, great as it is, able to line up the foreign countries and stop what centuries have built up? No one here pays any attention to crowded populations—that seems meaningless to us as we are not crowded yet. But should the population of Japan or any other country increase to the saturation point, there will be an explosion somewhere. Overpopulation inevitably flows out to find relief—it will not stay put and die; hence, wars must be continuous in the future as they have in the past.

Our job is to protect the United States and its institutions and aid as far as we can to bring freedom and liberty to people everywhere by our Christian example, our trade, and by our commerce and noninterference with the governments of other countries. All people born on the earth's surface are entitled to live, work, and have food. There is always enough food. There never has been too much food, and there isn't now. The reason people are hungry in some countries, including our own, is not that we do not have the food, but the difficulty lies in getting that food to the spots where it is needed. The objection that it will cost us too much to feed others cannot be raised, for we can give away food just as easily as we have given away money. If we did this we would have no unnecessary surplus in any food product. Of the $267,500,000 we have given India to obtain her friendship we will never collect anything, and now she has taken her stand with Russia. Could we not have given food instead of money, and thus served our own interests as well as hers?

But of all things, we should exercise our vigilance to zealously protect our national integrity and remain alert to make sure that here on these shores shall be maintained a citadel of freedom and liberty, where the distressed of the world can come and enjoy the protection of blessings guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The example of our own progress will do more to bring peace to the world than all the armies we can maintain throughout the world.

Capital Times Editor Lauds Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a eulogy delivered by William Evjue, editor of the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., at the site of the birthplace of Robert M. La Follette, Sr., in the town of Primrose. I was not able to secure the text of Mr. Evjue's speech until today, and that explains its late insertion in the RECORD.

My colleagues will undoubtedly recall that on June 14 a number of Members of the House paid tribute to Wisconsin's most distinguished citizen, Robert M. La Follette, Sr., on the 100th anniversary of his birth. I commend Mr. Evjue's eulogy to Old Bob to my colleagues. The text of his address follows:

Pausing here today on the spot where once stood the humble birthplace of the man whose memory we honor, we are bound to reflect on the lasting heritage left to us by the frontier as it moved westward. Out of its spirit came the dreams of a La Follette as in our sister State to the south a young man by the name of Lincoln caught its spirit and moved the Nation to fit its ideals.

It was the restless urge of the pioneers for freedom and independence that gave Lincoln to Illinois and La Follette to Wisconsin. They had much in common in their backgrounds. Their families moved with the frontier. Belle Case La Follette and Fola, have told us in their comprehensive and finely written biography that for a while the paths of the La Follette and Lincoln families crossed. La Follette's father was born in a log cabin on a farm in Kentucky that adjoined the farm of Thomas Lincoln, the father of Abraham. There is a legend that when one of Thomas Lincoln's neighbors called upon President Lincoln in the White House, that he was asked about "Uncle Jesse La Follette" the grandfather of the man in whose memory we gather here today. It is recorded too that the La Follette family moved West from Kentucky to Indiana, because they wanted to raise their children in a free State.

BOYHOOD DAYS IN PRIMROSE

Josiah La Follette, the father of Robert M. La Follette, came to this spot with Bob's mother, Mary Ferguson La Follette, in 1850, accompanied by five of his brothers. He brought with him his household goods, two or three horses, a cow and $100 in cash. On this ground was built the log cabin in which LaFollette was born.

LaFollette's boyhood days were probably spent in much the same way as Lincoln spent his, perhaps less rugged because of the difference in time. All of us have seen the picture of the young Lincoln lying before the fireplace reading the family Bible or a borrowed copy of Shakespeare. It is not hard to imagine that it was in this way that La Follette acquired his great gift for putting dreams and aspirations into words. One of his father's most proud possessions, as it was with so many of the pioneers, was the collection of books which he brought westward with the frontier. In the collection were Lives of the Presidents of the United States and A practical System of Modern Geography; or A View of the Present State of the World Simplified and Adapted to the Capacity of Youth.

Through his early years here he had time to read and to think about what he read in his walks over these hills. On the way out here this morning I think we came by the spot where he attended school. Behind the school was a big stone boulder, which he used as a back-drop for his outdoor stage and where he showed the first signs of his great gifts in oratory. He read Henry George, he watched the gathering storm of the Granger movement which rose in rebellion against the encroachment of monopoly. In the spring of 1873 he went to Madison to make preparations for his entrance into the university the following fall.

SPIRIT OF THE FRONTIER

It was while in Madison that he underwent an experience that was to have a profound effect on his life. You will be interested to know Mr. Chief Justice, that it was a great chief justice of the Wisconsin Supreme Court, who uttered a warning that had a profound effect on a future career of the young man born here in the town of Primrose. In the speech delivered by Chief Justice Edward Ryan of the Wisconsin Supreme Court of 1873 he said:

"There is looming up a new and dark power. I cannot dwell upon the signs and shocking omens of its advent. The accumulation of individual wealth seems to be greater than it ever has been since the downfall of the Roman Empire * * * The question will arise and arise in your day, though perhaps not fully in mine, which shall rule—wealth or man; which shall lead—money or intellect; who shall fill public stations—educated and patriotic free men, or the feudal serfs of corporate capital?"

It was natural that this young man, imbued with the spirit of freedom and independence that brought his forebears westward with the frontier should be deeply moved by the words of the chief justice. He said many times in later life that he never forgot those words.

We who are here today to honor his memory know that he never forgot them, for his life's work was dedicated to preventing what Chief Justice Ryan warned about. Because he dared to live the dreams he dreamed here as a boy he made an immeasurable contribution to saving what was best in the spirit of the frontier. Our thought today in honoring him should be of those frontier values and whether today they are not slipping away into our past as the frontier itself has disappeared.

Doctor of Laws Degree to Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1955, St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind., conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws upon the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States.

The Reverend Edward A. Maziarz, dean of St. Joseph's College, conferring this honor in behalf of the college to this distinguished gentleman, made the following remarks:

St. Joseph's College is proud to confer the degree of doctor of laws upon its distinguished commencement speaker, James Aloysius Farley. The title of doctor of laws is richly deserved by the noble public servant who has taught us all the lesson of the primacy of character and moral principle. His example is a parable for every American youth who asks himself, How shall I live my life as a true Christian and a true American? As a businessman who attained to success in the world's commerce and industry, as a statesman who has been a leading figure in our political life, as a layman for whom faith and virtue were his only pattern, as a gentleman of true refinement and dignity, he has shown the way truthfully and without faltering. He has followed St. Paul, who suggests that one must first "rule well his own household" before he may be placed in a position of public trust. His modesty and abstemiousness, his simple devotion to wife and family, his sense of the value of Christian virtues, old-fashioned but never out of date, his spontaneous practice of his Catholic faith, are only a part of the Farley lesson to our youth. Through decades of the most varied political activity, he has walked with dignity and wisdom and, we might add, with something of the charismatic touch of prophecy. In the atmosphere of temptation and corruption, he has remained unsullied. Though loyal to his own great party and its lofty traditions of service, he never descended to factionalism or fanaticism, because of his deep respect for the rights of others and the higher allegiance to God and country. More than any other man in our time, he has restored the term politics to its ancient meaning as the science and art to promote the social good. Faithful to friends, a man of his word, he inspired confidence in all and even affection in countless American hearts.

To the generation that sought the ultimate good in man or in human achievement or in material and mechanical progress, James Farley presented the full and integral moral life of dedicated service. He did more for others than for himself. If he advanced the cause of others, it was always with the conviction that duty was greater than honor or privilege. Always he taught the lesson that character and virtue are the supreme accomplishment of man and that ultimately they rest in the Eternal Law which is God. The teacher of this fundamental lesson in word and deed is indeed worthy of the title, doctor of laws.

The life of James Aloysius Farley is well known to all of us. He was born at Grassy Point, N. Y., on May 30, 1888. After completion of his common school education, he attended Packard Commercial School in New York City, from which he graduated in 1906. From the humble position of bookkeeper for the Merlin Heilholz Paper Co. in 1908, he rose to positions of importance in the world of business and industry. In 1926 he organized the James A. Farley Co., which soon merged with five other companies to form the General Builders Supply Co., of which he was for a long time president-director. In 1940 he was appointed chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., a position he still holds.

His political activity also had humble beginnings. In 1912 he was chosen town clerk at Stony Point, N. Y. He was elected to the State Assembly in 1923. For a time he was a member of the State athletic commission, as well as its chairman. He served on the Rockland County and the State Democratic committee from 1919 to 1944. He was chairman of the Democratic National Committee from 1932 to 1940. He was delegate to all the Democratic National Conventions from 1924 to 1948. Though he never became the President of our country, his influence in the choice of the candidates for President and Vice President and his power of organization for their election has never been equaled in American political history.

He was Postmaster General from 1933 to 1940. He has been honored in a singular way by the Republic of Venezuela which conferred upon him the Order of Francisco de Miranda, and by the Government of Spain which this year bestowed upon him the Cross of Isabella Catolica. The Captain Robert Dollar memorial award was given him for distinguished contribution to the advancement of foreign trade. He is the member of many clubs, societies, and fraternal organizations. He has received honorary degrees from no less than 15 colleges and universities. He is the author of two significant books, Behind the Ballots (1938), and Jim Farley's Story: The Roosevelt Years (1948).

In recognition of his great service to our country and our faith, we are happy today to welcome among our list of illustrious men who have accepted the title of doctor of laws, the Honorable James Aloysius Farley.

Given at Collegeville, Ind., on this 5th day of June, in the year of our Lord 1955.

Reserve Bill Flaws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the Washington Post of June 27, 1955:

RESERVE BILL FLAWS

Permit me to point out a few of the flaws in the proposed compulsory Reserve bill which the usually acute and clear-thinking editors of the Washington Post and Times Herald have seemed determined to overlook or to discount as of little significance.

1. It is unjust. It changes the terms of service after induction. This provision has a sort of ex-post facto character which should be clear to anyone, and it is only common sense that a man should know in advance of his induction how many years of military service his country would require of him in peacetime.

2. It is inequitable. It will place additional burden on some while permitting others to avoid military duty altogether. This is one of the points the Post has glossed over so smoothly in its editorials.

3. It is inconsistent. If the need for reserves is not urgent enough to require everyone to do his share, then certainly it is not so urgent as to require a few to do extra.

4. It is impractical. Has the Army made public any concrete plans for improving the Reserve training program so that it might be worth the reservists' time to attend and the taxpayers' money to support? Is the Army prepared to receive, starting in July, tens of thousands of men per month into the Reserves, and will it be able to absorb them at this rate for 3 years or until the Reserves have reached full strength?

5. It is outdated. We all realize (or we ought to by this time) that if war comes it will be fought with the very latest and most destructive weapons. That is this country's stated policy. When a single U-bomb can render tens, even hundreds, of thousands of square miles lethally radioactive for days and weeks, is it not completely unrealistic to be thinking and planning in terms of conventional reserve training regiments, as the President has been doing?

If the President and his military advisers, working with the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, would propose the bold and imaginative new program for a coordinated military-civil defense that is indispensable if this country is to face up to the realities of the atomic age, then undoubtedly he would find less delay in Congress and far more of the grass-roots support he so ardently desires. It is hard to understand why the Post has not taken the lead in urging such a course of action.

OBSERVER,
Bladensburg, Md.

My Plans for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, not long ago a young student, Jerry Josties, a senior of Sterling High School, Sterling, Colo., won first prize in a national contest on My Plans for the Future.

While a sophomore Jerry was student council representative, president of the class, and president of the National Junior Honor Society, vice president student body in his junior year, and president student body when a senior.

His extracurricular activities were: Hi-Y, DeMolay, Letterman Club, Presbyterian Youth Group, and in addition to this was employed at the newspaper office in Sterling during the summers. He was also active in sports all through high school, having obtained letters in tennis and golf and was on the "A" squad in basketball. In other words, he was an all-around student.

This short essay by Jerry Josties is worth careful reading, and I enclose it as part of my remarks:

MY PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

Who can plan with certainty for tomorrow? My goals are definite. Yet I know that the accomplishment of them will be subject to interruptions arising from financial limitations and undetermined military obligations.

The plans that I have made are, necessarily, the direct result of my activities and achievements heretofore. My chief interests

in high school have been mathematics, chemistry, physics, and philosophy. Since I expect to become a research scientist, I shall continue to study these subjects in college. However, because all knowledge interests me, I plan to study in many other fields as well. In this way I hope to widen my outlook on life and its problems. Many times in the past our engineering and science students excluded liberal arts subjects from their course of study. As a result, one of the great dangers in today's world is that we are developing our technological science faster than our ability to control and use it properly. This trend violates the basic American philosophy that science should serve man rather than contribute to his destruction. Therefore, I believe that a liberal arts college will provide the background desirable for graduate work leading to scientific research.

I realize that knowledge is progressively infinite; nevertheless, I hope to "help push back the frontiers of the unknown toward those of the unknowable." I ask this question: "If man used his mental abilities to the limit of his capacities, what would be unknowable?"

I shall, then, pursue truth with my mind open and alert in order to evaluate correctly each new idea that suggests itself. In pledging myself to this purpose, I am too sincere to be either vain or humble.

Observance of Baltic States Day in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, this year the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Councils of Baltimore again observed Baltic States Day, to commemorate the invasion of these countries by the Russians on June 16 and 17, 1941, and their enslavement. Both the Governor of Maryland and the mayor of Baltimore issued proclamations designating June 15 as Baltic States Day.

The Baltimore groups held their observance at Lithuanian Hall on June 18. At the meeting, verses were read and talks were made by displaced persons, reflecting the deep feeling and concern they have for their relatives and friends behind the Iron Curtain. A resolution was also adopted at this meeting which I believe will be of interest to all Members of Congress, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert it at this point:

RESOLUTION

At a meeting held June 18, 1955, at the Lithuanian Hall, 851 Hollins Street, Baltimore, Md., protesting the illegal annexation of the Baltic States and the genocide of its inhabitants by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, representatives of the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian Councils unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas as a result of the expansion of Soviet communism the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were invaded by the Red Army on June 16 and 17, 1941, thereby destroying the economic, social, and political structure and freedom of these nations; and

"Whereas to insure the perpetration of the imperialistic aims of the Soviet regime, the extermination of the people of the said Baltic Republics was started in June 1941, when within a few days more than 100,000 inhabitants were arrested, tortured, slain, or deported to Siberian slave labor camps, and this practice of genocide has continued not only in the Baltic States but has spread to other Soviet-dominated countries; and

"Whereas the United States of America is the stronghold of the free world, and together with other freedom-loving nations is engaged in a cold war, defending the liberty of peaceful people against Communist aggressors: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the United States of America be respectfully requested to continue to maintain its world leadership in its efforts to achieve international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice, and we urge the President and the Secretary of State to adopt appropriate measures in order to accomplish the following:

"1. To expose and condemn this practice of genocide by the Soviet Union in order to strengthen the hopes of the people behind the Iron Curtain;

"2. To bring up the matter of the liberation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania at all future conferences to be held between the United States of America and the Soviet Union;

"3. To demand the release of all political prisoners now in concentration camps and under forced labor in the Soviet Union; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That copies of the resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, Maryland Members of both Houses of Congress, the Governor of the State of Maryland, the United States representatives in the United Nations, the mayor of Baltimore, the diplomatic and consular representatives of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, in the United States, and the press.

"RUDOLF T. ISE,
"Chairman, Estonian Committee.
"IGORS BLOSFELDS,
"Chairman, Latvian Committee.
"THOMAS G. GRAY,
"Chairman, Lithuanian Committee."

Increased Domestic Sugar Quota Urgently Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting a copy of a letter from Mr. Grant Trenbeath, of Neche, N. Dak., pointing up the predicament of our sugar-beet growers in the Red River Valley area in North Dakota.

Even though sugar consumption has increased in the United States, our growers have had to take a cutback in acreage, which means a further decline in our overall agricultural income.

It seems unfair to our growers of both beet and cane sugar that they cannot share in this increased demand here in our own country. We are not asking for all of the increased consumption, but rather a share based on the ratio prior to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Mr. Trenbeath's letter reads as follows:

NECHE, N. DAK., *June 16, 1953.*

I would like to relate a hardship that has been placed upon us 2- and 3-year growers that seems very unjustified because of concessions to Cuba.

In 1950 our processor in the Red River Valley planned and began building a new $10 million sugar plant to be completed in 1954. In 1953 they began contracting acres to new growers anticipating an increase for them in 1954. Very many of us growers started with an acreage of 90 and 100 acres in 1953 contemplating an acreage of 120 to 130 acres for 1954. On this strength we bought 2-row equipment in 1953 which will handle 120 to 130 acres of sugar beets at an initial cost of from four to six thousand dollars over single-row equipment, which will handle 60 to 80 acres. Not only were we held to the 100 acres in 1954, but we have been curtailed to an acreage ranging from 70 to 75 acres in 1955. We are now saddled with a four to six thousand dollar investment over the required equipment to handle our present acreage allotment and no chance of selling or trading it because every sugar-beet grower has taken a big cut.

Both the growers and the processor here have made a large investment with no way of working it out. This at a sacrifice to Cuban interests.

We believe here that some immediate relief should be given to reduce United States surpluses of domestic production immediately, and the growth formula should begin at 8,200,000 tons.

Hoping you and those coming to Washington from the Red River Valley are successful in making our present plight clear to those that can effect some relief.

Sincerely yours,

GRANT TRENBEATH.

When Mrs. Hobby Found Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the June 22, 1955, edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

WHEN MRS. HOBBY FOUND OUT

Secretary Hobby's discovery that she was not legally responsible for the Government's actions on Salk polio vaccine comes very late, indeed.

Back in mid-April, when plans for distribution of the vaccine were being made, nary a word was said about the responsibility being Surgeon General Scheele's instead of Mrs. Hobby's.

It was Mrs. Hobby, in those days, who posed for photographers signing the official orders licensing production and distribution of the vaccine. It was Mrs. Hobby who spoke a few well-chosen words for press and newsreels. And not one of those words, as we recall, suggested that Dr. Scheele rather than Mrs. Hobby was officially in charge.

During that first rosy week, when excitement ran high and the headlines were forecasting vaccination of 57 million Americans before midsummer, the name of Dr. Scheele was still relatively unknown. When the White House announced that President Eisenhower had ordered a survey to assure fair supplies of vaccine for all sections of

the country, it was Mrs. Hobby and not Dr. Scheele who was directed to make the survey.

So far as we know, Mrs. Hobby first announced that Dr. Scheele was legally responsible for the vaccine enterprise on June 20, when she was asked in a radio interview whether she had any apologies for the way the enterprise had been handled.

By that date, the project had become a fiasco. By that date, difficulties had turned up and the results of Government indecision and lack of advance planning had become plain for all to see. By that date, it was evident that relatively few children, instead of the millions so hopefully talked about in April, would get Salk protection against polio this year.

It was at this point that Mrs. Hobby, adding another remarkable episode to a remarkable record of polio vaccine, decided that the responsibility belonged on Dr. Scheele's shoulders.

Public Power Wail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on Sunday, June 26, 1955:

PUBLIC POWER WAIL

The gusty uproar over the Dixon-Yates contract is largely the stentorian outcry of public power apostles at the Washington wailing wall. But it is more than a loud lament. It is a battle cry of sectional groups and some earnest believers in nationalization of the power industry. These advocates are fighting tooth and nail to smash the curb set upon expanding power subsidy.

Boiled down to essentials, the conflict is between the principle of public power versus private power development. Should Federal taxes be used to furnish cheap power for special areas of the Nation, or should the expansion of power business be turned back to private enterprise where it was for 150 years.

Edward W. O'Brien, Globe-Democrat Bureau Chief in Washington, in an article published in this section today, quotes Interior Secretary McKay as explaining the Eisenhower attitude: "The primary responsibility for supplying the power needs of an area rests with the people locally." The administration has abandoned the New-Fair Deal philosophy of Federal Government in the power business. Instead the President seeks a partnership between private companies and local interests in development of power to meet increasing needs.

This is anathema to public power missionaries. So they have seized on the Dixon-Yates contract, blasting it from every angle, as a test case to determine future power policy. Edgar H. Dixon and Eugene A. Yates head two utility concerns, which formed the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. The latter company has been given a contract to provide 600,000 kilowatts of power to the Tennessee Valley Authority, replacing an amount the Atomic Energy Commission must take from TVA for an atomic plant. TVA wanted to build its own steam plant, further expanding its empire facilities.

The tumult raised about giveaways of public rights is a cloak for the real purpose of TVA and other public power groups. They argue the rivers belong to the people and should be developed solely for the people. It might just as logically be said the farms, seashores, forests, and mineral rights belong to the people and should be developed or owned by the Government. As a matter of fact, TVA, presumably established to develop hydroelectric power, provide navigation and flood control, has been building steam-power plants hand over fist. This is not developing river potentialities, but a big Federal threat to socialize the power business.

Costs of TVA power are cheap. Quite cheap. That is why so much pressure is built to establish new TVA's at Niagara Falls and Hells Canyon in the Northwest. But part of TVA costs are reported charged to navigation, recreation, flood control. TVA is free of Federal taxes, partially free of State and local taxes. TVA was built by tax funds, and in some extent operates at public expense. Thus the cheap rates eujoyed in the TVA section are subsidized by all taxpayers of the country.

When the House of Congress repudiated its Appropriations Committee and decided to build a transmission line for the Dixon-Yates plant, its vote may have been partly because of logrolling. But no doubt a strong underlying reason was that taxpayers over the Nation resent subsidizing cheap power for favored localities. It is significant that the archenemy of the Dixon-Yates contract is Senator GORE, of Tennessee, now girding for a last-ditch struggle to defeat the proposal in the Senate.

The hullaballoo has been emotionalized and led through all kinds of political mazes. It will reverberate throughout the 1956 campaign. But the issue is simple: Should the Nation keep on the highway of Federal power subsidy, directed toward domination of the power industry by Government? Or shall we let free enterprise do the job, as it has done every other industrial job in America, steadily building the Nation to the acme of world prosperity?

Public power allowed to expand and aggrandize is an inherent danger to popular government, a gun at the head of a major industry. It is costly, unfair to millions of taxpayers, a system of bounty that could create the biggest bureaucracy America ever dreamed of.

U. S. S. R. Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, to the New York Herald Tribune, written by Bela Fabian, member of the executive committee of the Hungarian National Council, is deserving of our attention. It appeared in the June 25, 1955, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

U. S. S. R. REVOLT: RUSSIANS ATTACK REGIME WITH SILENT REVOLUTION

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The knowledge of the enemy's internal condition is essential to political warfare. Abundant information about prevailing conditions inside the Soviet Union is being furnished by the thousands of released Soviet prisoners returning to Germany and Austria within the last 2 years, as well as from prisoners who, after their return from Soviet captivity to their countries behind the Iron Curtain, have succeeded in escaping to the free world.

Such information is particularly valuable because, during the long years of captivity, the prisoners have gained a perfect knowledge of the Russian language. Moreover, their connections were not limited to dealing with their fellow prisoners or their guards. For as many as 10 to 14 years they were in close contact with the local population. Because these prisoners were scattered all over the vast territory of the Soviet Union—working in thousands of camps, industrial plants, and mines and on collective farms from Vladivostok to the Black Sea or the Arctic—their information covers practically every part of the Soviet Union.

All former prisoners are unanimous in their reports of having observed the hostile attitude of the people against the Soviet Government. The Government rules the people by terror and oppression, and the people hit back wherever they have the chance to do so. This is by no means an organized resistance: each fights for himself and impairs production whenever he has the occasion. This is a silent revolution which since Stalin's death has been paralyzing industrial and agrarian production, as well as administration. After having waited 8 years after the war for a better world to come, workers and peasants have come to the conclusion that the silent revolution is the only way to get rid of their tyrants.

Small items of information contained in the millions of letters sent from the Soviet orbit to the United States confirm the existence of such a silent revolution.

The silent revolution is the reason why countries such as the Soviet Union, Poland, Rumania, and Hungary, which were desperately in search of markets for their surplus agrarian products before the war, are now forced to import the same products from Australia, Argentina, Chile, and Cuba.

Sabotage in the factories of the Soviet orbit causes the shortage of essential consumer goods.

However, if any one should doubt the reports of returning prisoners released from the Soviet Union, or should refuse to believe the millions of letters sent to this country from the Soviet orbit, he will perhaps give credit to the top boss of the Soviet Union, Mr. Nikita Khrushchev, who openly admits that many things are wrong.

In a speech delivered on January 25, 1955, Mikita Khrushchev complains that "22 percent of the pigs are being delivered in bad condition, weighing 30 kilograms each" (instead of a minimum of 90 kilograms). "Great losses are being allowed * * * as a result of mismanagement and incorrect tending of cattle."

It was Mr. Khrushchev who had conceived the idea of the "agrogorods," agrarian townships, in 1950. He reduced the number of kolkhozes from 249,000 to 90,000. Now, he again wishes to reestablish smaller kolkhoz-units. Giant kolkhozes just didn't seem to work.

This silent revolution forced Khrushchev to go to Belgrade to sign the Austrian state treaty; to make friendly advances to Germany, and to show a smiling face to the West.

The silent revolution, nevertheless, is an implacable enemy, which neither the more lenient Malenkov regime, nor the renewed terror regime of Khrushchev are able to cope with. For the silent revolution can only win; it has nothing to lose.

BELA FABIAN,
Member of the Executive Committee of the Hungarian National Council.
NEW YORK, *June 23, 1955.*

Reserve Officers Personnel Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include a sectional analysis of S. 1718, which passed the House of Representatives late yesterday afternoon. I think that this analysis, prepared by committee counsel, should be made available to our membership:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF S. 1718

Section 1 (a) (p. 1, line 3): Increase from 2 to 3 years of constructive credit for promotion purposes of persons appointed as veterinarians.

Any person who is appointed for the purpose of, or with a view to assignment or designation as, a veterinary officer, shall be credited with a minimum of 2 years of constructive service. This section of the bill increases the 2-year minimum to 3 years, and conforms to present law with respect to regular veterinary officers.

Section 1 (b) (p. 1, line 7): Authority to retain on active duty Reserve officers who are within 2 years of qualifying for retirement.

This section provides that Reserve officers who are within 2 years of qualifying for retirement may be retained on active duty if they would otherwise be eliminated because of failure of promotion, or elimination for length of total service. In order to qualify under this subsection, the officer must not, within the 2-year period, attain the maximum age for transfer from an active status, or discharge, as required by this act. This subsection would then conform to present law for members of the Regular components, who, after completing 18 years of active duty, are entitled to remain an additional 2 years on active duty in order to qualify for retirement, if they would otherwise have been discharged after 18 years of active duty.

Section 1 (c) (p. 2, line 16): Deletion of unnecessary subsection.

The amendment contained in section 1 (b) just discussed, makes the inclusion of this section of the basic law no longer necessary.

Section 2 (p. 2, line 17): Retention of Army Reserve officers with period of obligated service.

Section 333 of the law has the effect of permitting an officer to elect to be released from active duty, even though he has a remaining obligated period of service from being recommended for promotion in certain instances. The purpose of this amendment to the law would be to prevent his release from active duty before completing his required service and it would also prevent him from serving in a higher permanent grade while on active duty under circumstances wherein any other Reserve officer on active duty could not so serve. However, the section expressly provides that, upon being temporarily promoted to the grade in which he was recommended for permanent promotion, or upon completing the period of required active duty, upon application, the officer must be promoted and restored to a position equal to that he would have attained had he been promoted but for the provisions of this section.

Section 3 (a) (p. 3, line 11): Authority to increase authorized numbers of Naval and Marine Reserve officers by 10 percent for a 5-year period.

This section provides that the Secretary of the Navy may increase by 10 percent the numbers authorized in terms of percentages of Naval or Marine Reserve officers in any grade during the period prior to July 1, 1960. Sections 402 (b) and (c) control the percentages of authorized grade distributions for the Navy and Marine Corps. These sections further provide that the percentages will be based on the number of reservists in an active status. The attrition of officers in an active status cannot be predicted due to the large number of voluntary separations and loss to an inactive status. This amendment will assist in providing a fair opportunity of promotion for officers who are eligible for promotion by relaxing the fixed number set forth in the law for authorized grade distributions.

Section 3 (b) (p. 3, line 18): Authority of Secretary of the Navy to specify numbers of officers of stated qualifications and experience.

This section amends section 403 of the act by adding language which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish selection boards considering Naval Reserve line officers the numbers of officers of stated qualifications and experience required to meet mobilization needs in the next higher grade, and is intended to permit promotional opportunities for line officers in special fields. This amendment also provides similar treatment for reservists as is now provided for regular officers who are defined as specialists by law.

Section 3 (c) (p. 4, line 4): Correction of typographical error.

Section 3 (d) (p. 4, line 4): Authority to consider for promotion of Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers whose names were omitted by administrative error from consideration.

The basic act provides no means for correcting an administrative error, where an officer's name is omitted from a list furnished to selection boards who are considering officers for promotion. The subsection also provides that, if the officer whose name was omitted is selected by the next selection board for promotion, he will be entitled to the same privileges in terms of date of rank and pay as if he had been selected by the board from which his name was withheld by error.

Section 3 (e) (p. 4, line 18): Validation of promotion of naval and marine officers selected under regulations.

This amendment provides a transition means by which those officers who are selected prior to the effective date of the basic act can be promoted under the Reserve Officers Personnel Act, without the necessity of a re-selection process.

Section 4 (a) (p. 5, line 3): Definition of promotion service in the Air Force Reserve.

This subsection adds two categories of service to the definition of "promotion service." The period within which such service is recognized is the period prior to the effective date of this act, which is July 1, 1955, and subsequently to June 25, 1950. The first type of service would be that service during which an officer was eligible for permanent Reserve promotion on the basis of service in a higher temporary grade. The need for the recognition of such service arises primarily because of the fact that during the period in question a Reserve officer on active duty was technically no longer in the Reserve, but became a member of the active component, and no administrative machinery existed for promoting him in the Reserve while he was on active duty. This type of service is recognized as the effective date of Public Law 773 in section 514 (a), which provides that a Reserve officer who is promoted to a higher temporary grade than his permanent grade while serving on active duty, shall upon application be promoted to the next higher permanent grade upon completing the minimum number of years in grade as prescribed elsewhere in the statute.

This section further provides that, for promotion service purposes, there would be recognized that period where an Air Force Reserve officer served in an equivalent or higher permanent grade in the same, or another service, including duty in a federally recognized commissioned status in the Army and Air National Guard. Subparagraph 2 affects primarily those National Guard officers who, without this amendment, would receive no recognition during the period in question where they served in a service other than the Air Force, or where they served in a higher permanent grade in the Air Force Reserve. In addition, it would credit for promotion purposes the federally recognized commissioned time in the Army and Air National Guard. Such time is already creditable for pay purposes and, under section 501 (b) (5), for mandatory retirement purposes. This amendment provides also that no service authorized under this subparagraph shall be counted more than once for promotion purposes.

Section 4 (b) (p. 5, line 18): Effective date of promotion for Air Force Reserve officers.

The purpose of this amendment is to allow promotions to be made effective on, before, or after, the day they are announced. The amendment further provides that the officer shall be entitled to the pay and allowances authorized for the higher grade from the effective date of his promotion, unless otherwise provided in the Reserve Officers Personnel Act.

This amendment is necessary, since the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, as presently written, requires promotions to be made in order of seniority. Because of the tremendous administrative burdens imposed by the act, and because of the varying nature of the assignments and types of service of Reserve officers, it will be impossible, in many cases, to determine the correct order of seniority of all Reserves eligible for promotion at any given time. If the amendment is adopted, any Reserve officer who, because of the circumstances of his particular case, is not considered and recommended for promotion at a time he should have been, can be promoted retroactively at a later date, and thereby be restored to his proper place in the promotion system.

Unless this amendment were adopted, an Air Force Reserve officer who was inadvertently omitted from promotion consideration could not be later considered without consideration being given to all officers senior to him for promotion purposes.

This amendment is similar to the provision already contained in the Army title of the Reserve Officers Personnel Act.

Section 4 (c) (p. 6, line 3): Recognition of constructive service and determination of seniority for promotion purposes.

This amendment deletes the language concerning service as a commissioned officer (which definition in other parts of the act does not include constructive service) and substitutes the term "total years of service," which in other sections of the act does not include constructive service.

Section 4 (d) (p. 6, line 9): Technical amendment.

Section 4 (e) (p. 6, line 12): Technical amendment to give effect to the provisions of the bill.

Section 4 (f) (p. 6, line 15): Promotion to first lieutenant in the Air Force Reserve.

This subsection provides that Air Force Reserve officers in the grade of second lieutenant may be promoted to the permanent grade of first lieutenant before the completion of 3 years of service, whenever the Secretary determines there are vacancies in the grade of first lieutenant and pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary. This subsection is similar to that now in existing law with respect to the promotion of second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force.

Section 4 (g) (p. 6, line 25): Exclusion of Air National Guard officers from promotion based on vacancies in the entire Air Force.

The effect of this section is to exclude Reserve officers who are members of the Air National Guard from promotion consideration solely under section 510 (b) of the act which provides that the Secretary may direct the consideration of Reserve officers, based upon existing or anticipated vacancies in the Air Force Reserve. The proposed amendment would, however, permit Air National Guard officers who have or are about to complete the maximum permissible periods of service to be considered for those vacancies.

This amendment is deemed necessary on the basis that Air National Guard officers considered for promotion solely on the basis of Air Force Reserve vacancies would be promoted out of their units earlier than necessary and, consequently, be lost to the Air National Guard.

Section 4 (h) (p. 7, line 7): Air Force Reserve officers on active duty who are promoted to a higher permanent grade.

511 (b) in the basic act provides that a Reserve officer on active duty who is recommended for a permanent promotion to a grade higher than that in which he is serving, shall, before being promoted, elect either to serve on active duty in the grade in which he is serving before being promoted, or be released. The basic purpose of 511 as written was to authorize the continuance on active duty in the grade in which he was serving of the Reserve officer whose services could not be utilized in the active establishment in the grade to which he was recommended for promotion. This subsection does not revise 511 in its concept, but it does change the administration of the problem. It would make unnecessary the securing of a positive election from each of the Reserve officers on active duty who will be promoted under the act. The election required by the basic act would effectively prevent the promotion of all officers whose names are on a recommended list beneath that of any other officer who is missing, is physically incompetent, or for any other reason cannot make a timely election. This was not the intent of the basic law. The amendment provides that the Reserve officer on active duty who is promoted to the next higher permanent grade will continue to serve on active duty in the lower grade, and he may decline the temporary appointment within 6 months after the date of order, and be released from active duty. However, this subsection does not prevent the officers from receiving a temporary promotion under other provisions of law.

Section 4 (i) (p. 8, line 19): Postponement of effective date of maximum age provisions relating to nurses and women medical specialists; retirement as of the last day of the month.

This subsection amends the section of the basic law providing for elimination based on age by providing that, instead of the officer in question being discharged and retired on the date he reaches the stipulated age, he will be discharged on the last day of the month during which he reaches the maximum age for elimination. The Army title of the basic law already contains such stipulation.

Section 4 (j) (p. 9, line 1): five-year postponement of provisions providing for elimination based on length of service.

Section 524 of the basic act provides for the elimination of various officers based on total periods of active service. The amendment would postpone for five years from the effective date of the act the necessary implementation of this section of the law.

Section 4 (k) (p. 9, line 8): Civilian Employees of the Air National Guard.

Subsection (k) adds a new provision to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954. This provision relates only to Reserve officers who are civilian employees of the Air National Guard prior to the effective date of the act (July 1, 1955) and who would be removed from an active status by virtue of mandatory promotion provisions of the Reserve Act. This subsection provides that such employees may not, before attaining age 60, be removed from an active status because of the mandatory promotion provisions except for cause, physical disability, or by reason of being passed over twice for promotion to the grade of captain, major, or lieutenant colonel.

This is a savings provision similar to that already contained in section 212 of the Reserve Officer Act which, by providing that notwithstanding any other provisions, Reserve officers assigned to the Selective Service System may be retained in an active status in such assignment until they become 60 years of age. The purpose of section 212 was to permit the retention on active duty of this small experienced group who administer the selective-service legislation.

Section 5 (a) (p. 9, line 25): Running mates United States Coast Guard.

This subsection concerns only Reserve officers of the Coast Guard. It provides that if a Regular running mate is retarded in promotion or has attained the highest rank to which he may be promoted, the Reserve officer shall have a new running mate of the Regular Coast Guard who is next senior to the retarded running mate. The purpose of this amendment is to avoid penalizing Coast Guard Reserve officers in terms of promotional opportunities because of their assignment of a Regular running mate who is restricted in promotional opportunities. This situation arises because Regular Coast Guard officers are classified either as general or special-duty officers, depending upon their qualifications as determined by previous training or experience. Those Regular officers classified as special-duty officers are restricted in promotional opportunity as compared to the general-duty officers. Under present law special-duty officers must be assigned a Reserve running mate with the result that the Reserve officer would be retarded in the rate of promotion, thereby imposing an inequity on the Reserve officer through no fault of his own. This subsection corrects this condition.

Section 5 (b) (p. 10, line 16): No retroactive pay.

Section 5 (b) amends section 608 of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act in order to make certain that there will be no retroactive pay authorized Coast Guard Reserve officers prior to their appointment to a higher grade. This subsection therefore clarifies the existing provision which technically could have permitted the authorization of retroactive pay prior to the date of appointment.

Section 5 (c) (p. 10, line 23): Validation of selections prior to July 1, 1955.

This subsection provides that officers who were selected for promotion prior to July 1, 1955, may be promoted under the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954. This provision, similar to the one contained in the bill with respect to Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force officers, is a savings provision which avoids the necessity of reselecting for promotion those officers who had been selected but whose promotion had not been accomplished prior to July 1, 1955.

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, among the claims being made about the proposed upper Colorado River project is that it would be high-cost development.

Editor Ken Byerly comments on this in a recent issue of his Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News.

Mr. Byerly is quick to point out that part of the opposition to development of the upper Colorado River comes from downstream water users and that part of the opposition comes from those who oppose any reclamation development in the West.

Irrigation projects, as Mr. Byerly says, "are our life blood, and we must continue to work toward the development of every feasible irrigation project possible."

The editorial follows:

BANANAS ON PIKES PEAK?

What is your reaction to the following from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is a quotation from Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California?

"Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the LaBarge irrigation project in Wyoming.

"The LaBarge project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

"The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the LaBarge project would be $1,250 an acre.

"The project would grow agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool."

We don't know whether or not the California congressman is right or wrong on his figures.

But we do know that southern California wants all the water from the Colorado River valley for its own use, and is opposed to any irrigation project in the upper valley which will benefit the people where the water comes from.

If the proposed La Barge project would cost $1,250 an acre, we agree with Representative HOSMER that it is too expensive.

However, we have a deep suspicion of most people from other parts of the country who oppose irrigation projects anywhere in the West. Such projects are important to this country. They are our life blood, and we must continue to work toward the development of every feasible irrigation project possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress need not appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak. But it should appropriate funds for needed irrigation and reclamation projects in the West.

It is conservatively estimated that the food needs of this country in 1975 will be 40 percent higher than they were in 1950.

During these 25 years an estimated 15 million acres of farm land will be lost to expanding nonfarm facilities, and 25 million acres will be lost by soil erosion.

Irrigation and reclamation projects will help provide the 20 million to 30 million acres in new cropland needed by 1975, as well as the 20-percent increase in production per acre needed to meet our food requirements only 20 years from now.

These projects will produce agricultural products which would otherwise eventually be in short supply. Among these are grains, livestock, and dairy products.

Delaware River Deeper Channel Project Given the Go-Ahead Signal by Bureau of Budget and Approval of President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to learn that the Bureau of the Budget and the President approved an item of $6 million to initiate dredging and rock removal in a section of the Delaware River and for replacement of the Delair Bridge. This is part of the general project of deepening the Delaware River channel between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., in accordance with the authorization contained in the River and Harbor Act of 1954.

As has been generally known, an appriation up to this line has been withheld. This was because the Bureau of the Budget insisted that there should be a local participation in meeting the cost of the project by certain interests that would be benefited by a deepening of the channel. This was a new principle to be applied to river and harbor improvements. It had never been applied to any similar project in all the years of the past history of our Nation. It was opposed on principle, and furthermore, because there was no general legislation making local participation in the costs a policy of our Government. It was therefore argued that it should not apply to the Delaware River until there had been congressional action adopting it as a policy applicable to all river and harbor improvement projects.

It is now gratifying to learn, following a conference between the United States Senators from Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and interested Members of Congress from those States, what the Bureau of the Budget has recognized the merit of the arguments advanced for deeping the upper channel without requiring local participation in the cost until a uniform policy has been adopted and made applicable to all similar projects. It is equally gratifying that President Eisenhower concurs in this viewpoint.

The correspondence relating to the matter is herewith included as a part of our remarks. It reads as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $12,300,000 for the Department of Defense, civil functions, as follows:

Department of Defense, civil functions; Department of the Army, rivers and harbors and flood control, construction, general: For an additional amount for "Construction, general," $6 million, to remain available until expended.

The budget document for fiscal year 1956 included an item under the heading "Proposed for later transmission," for the initiation of the dredging of the authorized 40-foot channel in the Delaware River between Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton, N. J., contingent upon reaching agreement with local interests on adequate cost sharing in some form.

This project was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1954, and is presently estimated by the Corps of Engineers to cost $95,100,000. The amount of $6 million is necessary to initiate dredging and rock removal in the section of the channel between Pennypacker Creek, Pa., and Delanco, N. J., and to initiate action toward replacement of the Delair Bridge.

Substantial benefits are derived by individual users of our waterways. The demand of many sections of the country for water-resources projects, involving large sums of money, focuses attention on the need for developing suitable arrangements to enable the beneficiaries to meet their fair share of the cost and to ease the burden on the general taxpayers of the Nation which results whenever an inordinate financial burden involved in such projects is imposed on the Federal Government. These arrangements should be consistent with an equitable general policy for sharing the cost of essential water-resources projects. We have been faced with the problem of developing a method which would be equitable with respect to the Delaware River project and yet would not discriminate against this project in relation to other water-resources projects. However, considerable time and effort will be required to develop a consistent overall policy and to work out arrangements for its application to individual projects.

Under the circumstances, and since no satisfactory proposal for bringing about an equitable sharing of the cost of the Delaware as a separate project has been found, it would seem fair not to further delay initiation of this project. We have in mind the importance of the Delaware River channel, not only to the continued economic development of the area but also to the Nation as a whole. Furthermore, local interests in the Delaware port area have made substantial investments in related harbor and terminal facilities to which an improved waterway is essential.

Initiation of work on the Delaware River does not change the basic objective of developing a satisfactory means for obtaining local contributions toward the cost of water development projects in line with the partnership policy of this administration, which would apply to the Delaware as well as other projects.

Federal contributions to partnership projects: For payment of contributions by the United States for flood storage in the Markham Ferry project, as authorized by the act of July 6, 1954 (68 Stat. 450), $6,300,000, to remain available until expended.

The 1956 budget message states that provision will be made for cooperation in authorized partnership projects such as the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma. This project, under the terms of the authorization contained in Public Law 476, approved July 6, 1954, will be constructed for hydroelectric power production and flood control in accordance with the terms of the Federal Power Act, by the Grand River Dam Authority, an instrumentality of the State of Oklahoma. The project will involve a total cost of about $25 million, of which not to exceed $6,500,000 is authorized to be contributed by the United States for flood-control storage in the reservoir. This authorized Federal payment will be reduced by an amount for certain lands to be conveyed to the Grand River Dam Authority by the United States, presently estimated at $200,000.

On June 22, 1955, the Federal Power Commission issued a license to the Grand River Dam Authority to construct the Markham Ferry project (FPC Project No. 2183). The full amount of $6,300,000 is required to be appropriated at this time in order to enable the Authority to sell revenue bonds to finance its part of the cost of construction. The appropriated funds will be administered by the Chief of Engineers, and transferred periodically to the Authority in amounts commensurate with the construction work completed by the Authority.

In view of the above considerations, I recommend that the foregoing proposed supplemental appropriations be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of $12,300,000 for the Department of Defense—Civil Functions.

The details of these proposed appropriations, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set further in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Lake Michigan Water Diversion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in view of the favorable action by the Committee on Public Works on the Lake Michigan water diversion bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN] and supported by the solid congressional delegation from Cook County, both Democratic and Republican, it is expected the measure soon will reach the floor of the House. I think it will be helpful to the House to know the public sentiment in the city of Chicago. I am extending my remarks to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of June 27, 1955, as follows:

DIVERSION NEEDED

President Eisenhower vetoed last year a bill to authorize an increase in the diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago through the Illinois Waterway. This was a great disappointment to Chicago, which has long sought the increase as a sanitary measure, and a lesser one to Army engineers, who would like to test the effect of an increased flow.

Another effort to win the increase (from 1,500 to 2,500 cubic feet per second) is being made in a new bill introduced by Representative O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois. It has just been approved by a House public works subcommittee.

This time the proponents of the increase have omitted from the measure any suggestion, such as was previously made, that the increase would be an aid to navigation. This is not, of course, a surrender on this important point but a stratagem designed

to circumvent one of the objections made by the President in his veto message last year.

Mr. Eisenhower's veto also was prompted by Canadian objections to diversion, made through the State Department. As of this date, no such objections have been made to the new bill.

The Army engineers say they would welcome the 3-year-test increase in order to determine once and for all the effects of the larger diversion.

We trust that Congress will again press this important legislation to passage and that the President will this time permit it to become law.

Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1955, the morning following the publication of the above editorial in the Chicago Daily News, the following editorial appeared in the Chicago Tribune:

TEST THE EFFECTS OF LAKE DIVERSION

A House subcommittee has approved the bill permitting a slight increase in lake diversion at Chicago, and chances for its approval by Congress appear to be good. A similar bill passed at the last session was vetoed by President Eisenhower for reasons which obviously were political; he was fearful of offending several well organized groups in other lake States.

The bill now pending has a preamble plainly stating that the purpose of the measure is to make a test of the effects of diversion. For 3 years the average flow out of the lake at Chicago would be increased from 1,500 to 2,500 cubic feet a second, and the Army engineers would study what results, if any, could be discerned in the levels of the Great Lakes. The engineers are heartily in favor of making such a study.

Opponents of the proposal have contended for many years that it is a horrid plot by Chicago to steal their water and that any increase in diversion is likely to damage the navigation capacity of the lakes. These claims, of course, are nonsense. As the leading port city on the lakes, Chicago would be the last to wish any harm to navigation and the first to join in any movement to conserve the water resources of the Great Lakes Basin.

These resources are getting more valuable every year as population growth increases the need for water in all the lake cities. The time may not be far off when some of the lake States will seek to divert water for irrigation to increase crop yields in dry years. Several proposals along this line have already been made, including a scheme for a canal across northern Michigan which could be tapped for distribution through most of the State.

Reliable information on the effects of diversion now is lacking. All the Lake States, for their own good, ought to join Chicago in supporting the pending bill so that a 3-year test can be made.

Williams-Hart Forest in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD, under unanimous consent, an editorial on the Williams-Hart Forest in Israel from the pen of Philip Slomovitz, the distinguished and productive editor of the Detroit Jewish News of June 24, 1955. It is a soulful narrative that comes from the heart of a man who has done so much for humanity, for Zionism, and for Jewry. Let it be preserved for posterity:

THE WILLIAMS-HART FOREST IN ISRAEL

On the slopes of the Galilean hills, overlooking Nazareth, the first saplings were planted recently to mark the beginnings for the Queen Elizabeth Coronation Forest in Israel. On that occasion, the British Ambassador to Israel, J. W. Nicholls, read this message from Her Majesty the Queen:

"The Jewish subjects of the British Crown have enjoyed freedom to profess their faith in England and in my territories for many centuries. Throughout the Commonwealth they now number over 800,000. Among them are men and woment distinguished in every walk of life and their loyalty and devotion to the Crown are matched only by their attachment to the faith of their forefathers. It was, therefore, with particular pleasure that I accepted the suggestion of my Jewish subjects that they should commemorate my coronation with the planting of a forest in Israel. May it flourish as a symbol of friendship which links my peoples and the people of Israel."

It is not the first such project in Israel; nor is it the last. Many forests have been planted in Israel, in honor and in memory of many distinguished personalities. But every effort of this magnitude entails such distinct honors that Queen Elizabeth has been able, in a very brief message, to incorporate heartfelt reactions to it.

We make mention of this historic occurrence in relation to a similar undertaking in Michigan to honor our 2 chief executives, Gov. G. Mennen Williams and Lt. Gov. Philip A. Hart, with a forest in Israel. We quote the above message as an admonition to them as well as to the Jewish community that a forest in Israel entails honor and responsibility—and a recognition of the historic significance of the rebirth of a state that has been in dormancy for 2,000 years.

The miracle of Israel's rebirth is so great that some people, even those who have the great privilege of visiting this state, seeing it in bloom, witnessing the progress made during the past 7 years, accept it as a normal fact. They fail to realize the abnormalcy of such growth. They compare it with Israel's neighbors who have been thriving on incomes from rich oil wells and they tell us that "Beirut also is progressing." Therefore, in introducing a new Israeli forest, it is properly excusable that it should be accompanied by recollections of events that have changed the course of history and have made possible the rise of a new era of dignity for Jewry at large.

"Eretz Israel"—"the land of Israel"—is a term that never faded from Jewish memories. It lived in the hearts and the minds of Jews everywhere. It was the symbol of an aspiration for the return of the people Israel to the land of Israel.

But for 2,000 years it was decreed otherwise. It was declared to be an impossibility. Zionists were called visionaries. Who would have dreamt that dreams and prophecies would come true.

But our generation was privileged to see the emergence of the miracle. The dream did come true. It came true in a most tragic period in our history, when a third of our people were murdered, in a time when the fate of mankind hung in the balance.

Many factors played their roles in this miracle, but the most important of all was the determined will of the Jewish people to end, once and for all time, the homelessness of Jews, to make the recurrence of Nazi extermination plans impossible, to restore to Jews their dignity, to straighten the backs of our kinsmen who have defied all obstacles to declare themselves free men and women.

It happened, contrary to all predictions, in defiance of conditions which seemed to militate against the establishment of a Jewish state. It happened in our time.

When, therefore, reality is taken for granted, when a miracle is reduced to simple comparisons of Tel Aviv with Cairo, it indicates a lack of vision and failure to grasp the significance of the great events occurring in the memory even of our children.

We make bold to say these things on the occasion of the planting of a new forest in Israel, in order that the great merit of such an occurrence should not be underestimated.

Every tree planted in Israel is part of the procedure of giving recognition to the miracle of Israel's rebirth. How much more important, therefore, is the establishment of an entire forest? And when the chief executives of a great State of our Union are honored with a forest that is to bear their names, the sanctity of the occasion deserves very great recognition.

Governor Williams and Lieutenant Governor Hart are greatly honored at this time by our community. We congratulate them on the distinction accorded them. May the event merit all the glory that centers in it.

Ohio Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dim view taken of the proposed upper Colorado project by Ohio voters has been expressed editorially in the Marietta Times on May 7 and the Cincinnati Enquirer on May 26. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Marietta (Ohio) Times of May 7, 1955]

HERE'S ONE FOR THE BOOK

Raids on the Federal Treasury for land reclamation and water conservation projects, many of them impractical and expensive, are so numerous that they attract little public attention when they are mentioned. Even when at best they can benefit only a few property owners or small communities at the expense of the whole people they are accepted almost as a matter of course.

Pork-barrel Senators and Representatives look around for something they can do for their States or districts, and incidentally for themselves politically. Cost means little to them, when it is tax money that is to be spent, nor do they concern themselves with whether the expenditure will be a good investment. They shut their eyes and vote for fellow members' pet measures, expecting to be repaid in kind, when the time comes. Now, while Government warehouses are bursting with surplus farm products, there are proposals that large areas of high sagebrush country be brought under irrigation at fantastic cost. Some 70 reclamation projects, to cost more than $4 billion, are either under construction or authorized by Congress.

Probably the most amazing of these schemes has been called to public attention by former Gov. Leslie A. Miller of Wyoming, chairman of one of the groups of the Hoover Commission. This is the supercolossal upper Colorado River project, designed for power and irrigation, the latter being largely in high altitudes where the growing seasons

are short. He gives some interesting figures for taxpayers.

Bringing water to these districts, he says, will cost $906 per acre, yet most of the land, after irrigation, will not be worth more than $150 an acre. But that is only the beginning, for hidden costs whoop this up to at least $2,900 per acre. Governor Miller shows by the Government's own figures that "Federal subsidy for each of the 420 chief farms controlling over half the (central Arizona) project acreage is $2,720,000." The proposal there is to pump water from the Colorado River to a height of 1,000 feet, then send it some 300 miles by canal to irrigate 226,000 Arizona acres at a construction cost of $9,200 an acre.

If the goal is more crop production, Mr. Miller sensibly points out, even a small fraction of such sums could be spent on lands in the humid belts that are now lying idle or are being destroyed by erosion, with greater benefits. It would be even more sensible for the public to demand of the legislators that such scandalous waste be stopped, and at the same time curb its demands for such handouts.

[From the Cincinnati (Ohio) Enquirer of May 26, 1955]

PUBLIC POWER AND ECHO PARK

The vast and spectacular canyons of the upper Colorado, on the Colorado-Utah border, are a long, long way from the placid valley of the Ohio. Yet every midwesterner has a stake in the fight now being waged in Congress to flood a part of the upper Colorado by construction of the highly controversial Echo Park Dam.

The stake we hold is both economic and spiritual. The dam would cost more than $1 billion and would crack the very core of our national parks concept.

It seem strange indeed that a Republican administration, representing the party which has opposed public power and the TVA, should endorse Echo Park Dam, one of the largest and certainly the most expensive public-power projects ever conceived. But even if we overlook this political ambiguity we, as taxpayers, cannot overlook the costs involved.

Echo Park would serve a dual purpose—power and irrigation. Conservative estimates indicate that the power from its proposed turbine would cost $883 a kilowatt. Power can be produced in the same area by steam generators for $170 a kilowatt. Echo Park kilowatts would cost 4½ times as much as those produced on the Columbia, and from 3 to 6 times as much as current produced along the Tennessee.

One must consider, of course, the added potential of the irrigation water which would flow from the impoundment. But a little study here indicates that these costs are even more fantastic.

According to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS—and he, remember, is a defender of public power projects generally—Echo Park irrigation costs would total around $2,142 an acre on land which might bring as much as $150 an acre. The Senator has commented that farm surpluses can be increased at a much more reasonable figure—if that's what the country wants to do.

The proposed impoundment would flood a part—the most important part—of the Dinosaur National Monument. It would thus invade the national park system, and set a precedent which most certainly would endanger vital park installations from one side of the Nation to the other. Conservationists and nature lovers all over the country are opposed.

Another consideration—and an important one—also appears. Echo Park, if it were to receive congressional approval today, couldn't start operation for at least a decade. In view of the lightninglike developments in the field of atomic-power production, isn't it reasonable to believe that hydro power production may be outmoded even before this dam can be completed? Shall we risk $1 billion and more and destroy a park system to build a public power plant which we may never use at all?

The answer now rests with the House of Representatives in Washington.

Taft's Memory Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am inserting a newspaper article from the Minot Daily News, Minot, N. Dak., which emphasizes the high regard in which the late Senator Robert A. Taft was held by members of all parties and all factions.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Stenvick, long a leader in the Democratic Party, was the first North Dakotan to contribute to this memorial tower to Senator Taft.

The article follows:

STENVICK, LIFELONG DEMOCRAT, FIRST NORTH DAKOTA DONOR TO TAFT TOWER

First citizen in North Dakota and possibly United States to donate money for a memorial tower in Washington to the late United States Senator Robert A. Taft was "Mr. Democrat" himself—E. H. Stenvick of Minot.

Stenvick sent a $25 check to the Minot Daily News today, requesting it be forwarded to the Robert A. Taft Memorial Foundation. The foundation plans a 100-foot-high bell tower in Washington as a memorial to the Republican Senate leader, who died of cancer on July 31, 1953.

Stenvick is a Democrat, has been for many, many years.

He made that point clear, but also stressed he had always considered Senator Taft an "incorruptible man of integrity and ability."

Stenvick's memories of politicians go back a long way. He can vividly recall the days when Taft's father, William Howard Taft, was in the White House.

Stenvick had a lot of respect for the elder Taft, too, but he didn't vote for him.

As a matter of fact, the Minot man confessed, he didn't vote for Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman either.

So that statement couldn't be misinterpreted, however, Stenvick added hastily:

"I am still a Democrat."

During the John Burke administration "Sten" was the Democratic power in North Dakota.

He is a former chairman of the Ward County Democratic committee, served on the State committee for 20 years, and was one of the top organizers of the party for a long, long time.

Stenvick also served as postmaster of Minot during President Wilson's administration and was chief game warden of North Dakota for a number of years.

The Minot man emphasized he wasn't giving the $25 for the memorial tower because of Taft's political leanings. He wrote out his check only because of one very simple reason—he respected and admired Senator Taft and if they want to raise a bell tower to the memory of Taft, why that's perfectly all right by Stenvick.

In fact, he thinks it's a fine idea.

Should We Encourage Our Youth Not To Finish High School?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, very soon we will be called upon to resume consideration of a military Reserve training program for our Nation. We will consider a bill that is different in certain respects from the one which this House debated more than a month ago, yet the present bill will be similar, in the overall picture, to its predecessor.

I know that the Armed Services Committee has devoted a lot of time, thought, and work to this very complex problem. Members of the committee and its staff have been cooperative and courteous whenever I have had occasion to confer with them upon any matter within their jurisdiction and I commend them most highly for the fine work they do. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I am not opposing a Reserve program. To the contrary, it is my considered opinion that the establishment and maintenance of a strong, effective Reserve training program is one of our best means of assuring our Nation's defense.

Properly administered, a fair and just Reserve program can afford this country an adequate manpower pool of trained men, and at the same time cause a minimum of dislocation to our basic economic system and to the normal lives of the individuals affected. A voluntary program of Reserve training, such as is provided by the forthcoming legislation, is, it seems to me, a necessity if we are to remain strong and free as a nation.

Despite all the time and effort, the committee has put into this legislation, Mr. Speaker, there still may be room for improvement. I have not yet seen the committee report on H. R. 7000, but it is my understanding that it will not contain a remedial amendment which I offered when H. R. 5297 was under consideration and which was accepted in principle. If the amendment were acceptable in principle, it seems to follow that it should be acceptable legislatively as well. I cannot conceive of a situation in which we would deliberately legislate against something conceded to be acceptable in principle. I hope that my understanding is incorrect, and that my amending provision will be a part of the new bill.

My concern with one feature of any Reserve training program involves the possibility of indirectly encouraging young men to interrupt or abandon their formal academic training before completing high school. When H. R. 5297 was being considered by this body, I offered an amendment which would have provided that men were not eligible to participate in the volunteer 6-month training program unless they had reached the age of 19 years or had completed their high-school education. This amendment, as I have said, was accepted

in principle by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee but without a formal vote of the membership of this body.

At that time, I wrote educators in my State advising them of my amendment. I have received responses from most of these people, 100 percent of these responses expressing approval of the amendment. In addition, there has been spontaneous interest shown in the matter by educators on the national level. Only this morning all of you, I am sure, found on your desks a letter from the National Association of Secondary School Principals which outlined in pretty concrete form the position of these people. The letter I received from this organization had an added note expressing the hope that I will introduce this amendment again.

My purpose today, Mr. Speaker, is to call attention to excerpts from letters I have received from these educators. Permit me to quote a few of them:

I have read your statement rather carefully. I feel the suggested changes that you have made in the bill are all important and definitely should be included if the bill is to become law.

Without doubt if your amendment is not adopted, we will see many high-school boys join the Armed Forces before they have graduated and, thereby, deplete our enrollment and halt the education progress of those boys.

The arguments presented by you in favoring the amendment cannot be improved upon as all school administrators will agree that it is imperative for a boy to first complete his high-school education as the first step toward a successful vocation.

Most educators have long opposed any program that would encourage young men to abandon high school in favor of early enlistment in the armed services. Recognizing that national defense is of primary concern, we, nonetheless, feel that they can be of greater service to their country after having received a basic high-school education. Therefore your amendment to H. R. 5297 seems to be very well considered.

It is an all-too-common occurrence to have one who has dropped out of school to enlist to start writing back to his school to find out how he can get his diploma.

It becomes increasingly important that our young people finish high school in order that they may be useful, constructive citizens in our society. It is hard enough to keep them in school without adding inducements for them to leave early. In fact, we can well use more inducements for them to remain until they have finished.

I feel that even now too many of our boys are leaving school to enter the armed services with the idea that they may complete their high-school education through the United States Armed Forces Institute or by other methods which have been recognized in the past. I feel that your amendment will eliminate some of these boys from wanting to drop out of high school, and will result in a better educated citizenry and a higher quality of men in our Armed Forces.

We believe that there is much to be gained by having students complete their high-school education before entering the armed services. I am very much in favor of your program concerning this bill.

I am sure that the bill without the amendment would cause a number of high-school students who are nearing the age of 19 to drop out of school and apply for the Reserve program. Certainly the amendment would eliminate the situation. I am very sure that you would rather have a boy in this type of program who had completed high school than one who had not.

There is always a tendency for some boys who are doing quite well in school to get over anxious to enter military service. Then when they come back 2 or 3 years later, they are out of harmony in swinging into the regular high-school routine.

I believe these few quotes illustrate very adequately the position taken by educators on this matter. I believe their position is a valid one in that encouragement for interruption or abandonment of high school is injurious to the individual and, in turn, to the Nation's future. I feel we should give very careful consideration to this feature of whatever reserve training program ultimately is approved by Congress. Again, I repeat, I do hope we pass a good reserve training bill.

Pennsylvania Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, urging Pennsylvania voters to let their Congressmen know of that State's stern opposition to the proposed upper Colorado project was a strong editorial in the Oil City Blizzard on May 20. The paper warned as follows:

LET YOUR CONGRESSMAN KNOW

Every resident of this area has a personal stake in a matter now pending before Congress which, if approved, would cost them plenty and return them absolutely nothing.

The matter is the Upper Colorado River project providing for the construction of huge dams on the Colorado and its tributaries at a cost to the Nation's taxpayers of an estimated $4 billion, all in hidden interest subsidies.

Pennsylvania's share of this staggering sum would be $277 million. This means that every taxpayer in this area, along with all others in the Commonwealth, would again be put through the tax wringer for something that would be of no benefit to them whatever.

In fact, the upper Colorado project would benefit only a mere handful of citizens and that at fantastic cost. It's about as wasteful and unwarranted as any project could possibly be. If carried out, it would result in power production at fantastically high rates; irrigation per area at a cost many times the conceivable value of the land; and it would threaten destruction of a large section of our national parks and monuments.

There is danger this project may be authorized, unless the people raise their voices in protest. The bill for it already has passed the Senate and is pending in the House.

Unless they want to be slapped with another unwarranted and unnecessary tax burden, citizens should make their protests heard and notify their Congressman they want the bill for the upper Colorado River project tossed into the wastebacket where it should be.

Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the American Bar Association Journal by Mr. Walter E. Wiles, an able member of the Illinois bar, dealing with the subject of congressional investigations:

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS: A REEXAMINATION OF THE BASIC PROBLEM

(By Walter E. Wiles, of the Illinois bar, Chicago)

Nowhere in the Constitution is anything said about investigations by congressional committees or even by Congress.

It follows that whatever power Congress has to conduct investigations through its committees is such as may be construed to be incident to the powers expressly conferred. The Constitution in article I, section 1, confers on the Congress "All legislative powers herein granted." Section 2, confers one power on the House of Representatives not strictly legislative, i. e., "the sole power of impeachment." Section 3 confers on the Senate "the sole power to try all impeachments." This is a measure of judicial power conferred on the Senate. Section 5 makes each House the "Judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members," and gives to each House the power to "punish its Members of disorderly behavior," and to "expel a Member." Those powers might also be said to be judicial in their nature, perhaps the power to expel a Member by a two-thirds vote might be considered an executive power.

Some of the 18 provisions of section 8 read as if they conferred power both legislative and executive, but that all of those powers are limited to legislative import is established by other provisions of the Constitution and by long-accepted construction.

It, therefore, follows that whatever powers Congress has to make investigations of anything must be incident to enabling it to perform its function of enacting legislation, or to enable it to perform one or more of its limited judicial functions.

Certainly, it would not be seriously contended that the Congress must originate all legislation within the powers conferred without inquiring into the need for legislation; hence, it follows that Congress may investigate all matters that will aid it to determine the need for legislation or in formulating the legislation when the need has been determined.

Also, it would be unrealistic to ascribe perfection to Congress in all its enactments. It follows that investigation of the operation of legislation already enacted to determine whether it is effectively accomplishing its purpose, and if not fully effective, whether more is needed or some should be taken away is a valuable aid to Congress in performing its duties.

Then, since the House of Representatives has the sole power of impeachment, it ob-

viously has the power and the duty when occasion demands to investigate the conduct of any executive or judicial officer subject to impeachment.

The Senate advises on and consents to treaties, and confirms many executive appointments. It can perform these duties only after sufficient investigation to be properly informed.

The Congress has the power to submit proposed constitutional amendments to the States for ratification.

These are all the instances beyond a consideration of its own organization and rules in which the power to conduct investigations can be fairly inferred from the powers conferred on the Congress.

It, therefore, follows that the purposes of every investigation by a congressional committee fall within one of the following groups:

(a) To ascertain what new legislation is needed.

(b) To ascertain what existing laws should be repealed.

(c) To ascertain whether legislation which has been enacted is effectively accomplishing its purpose, with a view to changes where called for.

(d) Inquiring into the fitness of nominees for office before confirmation. (Senate only.)

(e) Securing information on the advisability of ratifying a treaty. (Senate only.)

(f) Inquiring into the need for submission of a constitutional amendment.

(g) Policing the conduct of Members of Congress themselves and their elections.

(h) Inquiring into the conduct of public officers to determine whether there should be impeachment. (House only.)

None of these, except the last two, look to placing charges against anyone for anything. All other investigations are for the purpose of informing Congress. They are not judicial hearings. There is no need of the safeguards of the rules of evidence which have been developed over the centuries to try the guilt or innocence of men. Information to aid the Congress in the formulation of legislation may be of great value, yet it might not be admissible as evidence in a court of law. In short, a congressional investigation, except in impeachment cases, is neither a trial nor the gathering of evidence for purposes of a trial.

The theory has been advanced in some quarters that witnesses before congressional committees should be given the right to be represented by counsel, that they should have the right of cross-examination of other witnesses, as well as the right of examination by their own counsel, and that they should have the right to offer rebuttal testimony.

The proponents of these theories, if they are sincere, overlook the purpose of the presence of these people and the capacity in which they appear. They are subpenaed as witnesses, nothing else. Only those with guilty consciences fancy themselves as defendants. Even in courts of law, witnesses are not represented by counsel participating in the trial, they have no right of cross-examination or rebuttal. Only the parties to the lawsuit have these rights, yet witnesses subpenaed in a trial are compelled to testify. This may be and sometimes is, very embarrassing to the witness, yet he must answer unless he invokes his constitutional right to not testify so as to incriminate himself, and that, too, may be embarrassing to him.

A witness before a congressional committee has all the protection of a witness in a court of law. Why should he have any more? Is the business of all the people less important than the business of two litigants?

Actually congressional committees investigating subversive activities permit witnesses to be represented by counsel, and permit a witness to consult counsel before answering a question, even after the question has been asked, which is a concession to the witness that no court would tolerate.

We meet people who have not taken the trouble to inform themselves who complain that witnesses are deprived of their constitutional rights by not being confronted with their accusers as such. If a witness in a trial for theft should give evidence which reflects on a prior or subsequent witness, the witness reflected upon cannot confront his accuser in that trial, yet no one seems outraged because of this rule.

There would be no problem if we would keep in mind that a committee hearing is not a trial and that people are called there in the capacity of witnesses only, subject to the rights and protection of witnesses. They are not charged with anything, and the committee has no power to adjudicate the guilt of anyone.

Much misunderstanding has been developed in the minds of a considerable portion of the public by careless and misleading statements that appear in the press. These statements are sometimes by well intentioned persons who have pursued an erroneous approach to the subject. Other times they are the result of deliberate propaganda for the purpose of discrediting the congressional committees and destroying their effectiveness.

For example, we hear the man on the street remark that he is in sympathy with the object of Senator So-and-So, naming the chairman of a committee, but that he does not approve the Senator's method. Yet, when we inquire of this same citizen what methods have been used, that he disapproves, he cannot name a single thing that has been done that he objects to, and when pressed for his suggestions he indicates that he favors much more drastic action than has ever been taken by congressional committees. We also find many who think of these investigations as trials with charges and the right to answer, with a determination of guilt to be made by the committee. When this same citizen realizes that there is no indictment and no determination of guilt within the powers of the committees, he no longer finds any fault with the methods of the committee.

We are not unaware that the publicity attendant on the committee hearing may disseminate testimony which reflects on the character of a person named in the testimony and which may have a material effect on his social or economic standing in the future, but the same thing may happen in a lawsuit. The scope of the dissemination, and consequently its effect, is determined by the public interest in the proceedings.

We have yet to find a method by which this possibility can be avoided and at the same time permit our judicial and legislative bodies to effectively carry out their functions.

We doubt that many people would favor star chamber secret meetings of legislative bodies or judicial tribunals, and if such meetings were permitted they would presage the death of liberty.

Preliminary investigations may be made in secret by grand juries, but before the issues can be determined, the American way is an open trial. Legislative bodies may make inquiries in secret sessions, but before they take action to legislate or otherwise perform their functions, the basis on which they act should be disclosed to the people in whose name they act.

It may well be true that witnesses in both courts and legislative committee hearings have given testimony which tends to smear innocent people. That was notoriously true of witnesses appearing before investigating committees of the Senate during the Teapot Dome era, when regard for the effect of testimony which reflected on people who may have been innocent perhaps reached its all-time low; but it is difficult to see how this could have been avoided without denying to the Congress full exercise of its constitutional functions.

The policy of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives to afford opportunity to be heard to people who may have been reflected upon by the testimony of other witnesses is an example of the recent efforts of congressional committees to prevent injury to innocent persons whenever possible to do so.

It is of more than passing moment that the greatest hue and cry arises out of those instances of congressional investigations which lead into subversive conspiracies and treason.

If the same people who now object to the methods of investigation by the committees now engaged in obtaining information upon which to formulate legislation for our national security ever objected to the smear tactics of the Teapot Dome investigations, the subpenaing of telegraph records by a Senate committee headed by Senator Black, or the smear tactics, or worse, of the Bullwinkle committee, with regard to Dr. Wirt, in the thirties, or to the methods of the more recent Committee of the House headed by the late Congressman Buchanan, they never made their voices heard.

We would not like to conclude that it is fear of who may be exposed that provokes the objections rather than the methods of the investigators.

Certainly, we do not ascribe such motives to all the people who have voiced objections, but we do fear that those good people are sometimes influenced by the carefully planted propaganda of others whose motives are not nearly so pure.

In any event, we believe that the lawyers, and particularly the bar associations can render a public service by educating the public to the nature and purposes of legislative committee investigations.

If there were a complete understanding on the part of the public of the purposes and the reason for the procedure, there would never be any witnesses seeking to shield themselves with the fifth amendment unless they believed themselves to have committed a crime, if, indeed, there are any such now.

Members of Congress are human beings, they may make errors, and their record has not always been one of representing the people intelligently and effectively, but the hammering out of the legislative process by investigation and an attempt to understand both the will of the people and the means of accomplishing it is a safeguard of liberty and a check on excesses of the Executive without which constitutional government could not exist in a free country.

To Keep the News Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star of June 7, 1955:

TO KEEP THE NEWS FREE

A bill has been introduced in Congress that seeks to correct a dangerous infringement on freedom of the press by the Federal Communications Commission. In the House, the bill is sponsored by Congressman OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, Republican, of Indiana. In the Senate it is sponsored by

Democrat CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, and Republication HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana. Its purpose is to prevent the FCC from denying radio or TV licenses to newspapermen on the sole grounds that they own or control newspapers. Under present FCC policies this is being done, and it is a clear case of class discrimination.

When the FCC denies a license solely on the grounds that a newspaperman has applied for it, or because of the policies followed by the newspaper involved, it is applying indirect pressure on that paper to change, redirect, or drop some of its editorial activities. It is beginning to appear as though a newspaperman has to tailor his editorial views to suit those of FCC members before he can be considered unbiased enough to hold a radio or TV license.

Are newspapermen as a group somehow more suspect and less trustworthy than bankers, lawyers, businessmen, or politicians? Are they to be considered a group of second-class citizens just because they are experienced in the field of handling news and entertainment? It is an indictment of the entire newspaper profession to bar them, and only them, by administrative fiat as the FCC has done repeatedly in the past. It is rank discrimination to question the integrity of a newspaperman solely on the grounds that he belongs to this old and honored profession.

Senators CAPEHART and HAYDEN, Congressmen BEAMER and HARRIS are fighting a bipartisan battle to protect the press of America from this obvious attempt by the FCC to regiment and control newspapers as well as radio and TV. They deserve the support of all Members of Congress who want to see the press remain strong, free, and vital.

America, Ukraine, and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—The Example of San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been of late some talk to the effect that in the event of the withdrawal of Moscow's forces and influence to the borders of the Soviet Union, the basis of a durable and just peace will have been laid. Anyone who is at all conversant with the history of Russian Communist aggression since 1918, as has been so well disclosed by the House Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, cannot but view such talk as being naive and historically groundless. A shift of Russian occupation troops back to the borders of the Soviet Union would by no means eliminate the Iron Curtain, the very existence of which makes mockery of the concept of peaceful coexistence of nations. It would mean nothing more than shifting the Iron Curtain slightly eastward. No doubt, if such a step were realized, it would constitute much-needed relief for 100 million non-Russians, but the properties of durability and justice would still be patently lacking as long as the 120 million people in the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union continue to be held captive under the imperialist domination of Moscow.

In this country the fight for general recognition and understanding of this and other basic truths is being relentlessly waged by one of our leading anti-Communist organizations, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, led by its national chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University. An address delivered by Dr. Dobriansky to the Ukrainian Orthodox League of Lehigh Valley demonstrates this spirited fight for justice, freedom, and peace among all nations, particularly long-enslaved Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. It stresses the interrelationship of interests between America and Ukraine and outlines the constructive work of the Ukrainian Congress Committee in promoting those common interests.

I wish to include in the RECORD the short address by Dr. Dobriansky on America, Ukraine, and UCCA and the three statements issued by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America at San Francisco on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, entitled "Ten Years Ago and Today," "We Told You So," and "Some Are Here Who Should Not Be Here and Many Are Not Who Should":

AMERICA, UKRAINE AND UCCA

Whether some people are aware of it or not, a real and profound interrelationship exists between America, Ukraine and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Ukraine, being the largest and one of the most important non-Russian nations behind the European Iron Curtain, is a natural ally of the United States in its mortal struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. To fail in the recognition of this salient fact, whether out of blindness of ignorance or intellectual bias, is tantamount to assisting Moscow in its drive for world conquest, not America, in its fight for freedom and a secure peace. Thus, it is the prime and sole function of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a national body made up of Americans of Ukrainian ancestry, to widely propagate this basic political truth in all of its manifold aspects so that a sound and enlightened American policy toward the Soviet Union—one that does not exist today—can be founded.

In the light of this real interrelationship it is certainly not difficult to understand and rationally justify the proposition that your unstinting support of the objectives and activities of UCCA amounts in reality to a substantial contribution to the vital interests and welfare of our country. On the basis of its essential nature and the character of its outstanding operations, UCCA is conspicuously an American institution which has completely dedicated its resources to the furtherance of the fundamental interests of our Nation. And, above all, it is in the fundamental interest of our Nation to wage the century battle of liberation and freedom not only of Ukraine but of all the non-Russian nations that have been reduced to the Communist imperialism of Moscow; indeed, of the majority of the Russian masses itself who has never had a conscious stake in the autocratic and tyrannical government of Moscow.

The position and character of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America cannot logically and truthfully be otherwise in this great country of ours. If you have been troubled by the ill-founded notion that UCCA is a sort of "Ukrainian parliament," representing interests that are not wholly and absolutely American, then you can well dispense with such troublesome thoughts for this simply is not so, nor can it ever be. If you have been disturbed by some foolish, irresponsible talk to the effect that UCCA is organically related or in any degree dependent on or associated with foreign political parties or organs, be they Ukrainian or otherwise, then here, too, you will be relieved to know that this likewise is not true, nor can it ever be for effective political purposes. Moreover, if you have looked with distaste upon the petty political cleavages that exist in several of our communities, then let me assure you that UCCA has served, and will continue to serve, as a prime Americanizing agency for our many newly arrived immigrants who have intelligently applied themselves to a quick adaptation to American customs and procedures of political behavior. In so many instances it is gratifying to witness this process at work; and in the final analysis, it is these people who will contribute vastly more to the freedom and independence of Ukraine than those intractable souls who persist in their self-defeating ways to perpetuate a foreign brand of politics in the incompatible American environment. Only the backstage is the fitting place for the certain demise of these unadaptable individuals.

With these lingering misconceptions of UCCA properly dispelled, it should be clearly evident to you now that the major directions of the Congress committee these past few years are thoroughly constructive, productive and wholesome. There are circles of political activity and opinion in this country, not to mention those abroad, who deliberately concoct and spread such misconceptions in the hope of impeding the advances made by UCCA. Thus it is left to Americans like yourselves to become actively engaged in the work of UCCA.

At this point I should like to emphasize with the strongest possible overtones an observation that is most pertinent to your organization and similar groups. It has always been a source of wonderment to me as to why our young religious groups, the Orthodox Youth League and the Catholic Youth League, as well as other youth organizations, have failed to participate in the activities of the UCCA to the extent of becoming one of the most dominant voices in UCCA. To answer this question to my own satisfaction, I have considered a number of plausible reasons, and, I must confess to you, I still find myself in a state of bewilderment. First, surely there is no dearth of actual or potential leadership among these groups, so that one can immediately rule out this reason. Second, bearing in mind my earlier remarks on the real interrelationship, there is no logical divergence of thought concerning our common dedication to a strong America, a free Ukraine and the defeat of godless communism, which form the objectives of the Congress committee. Thus, this possible reason doesn't apply.

Third, religion and/or cultural and social affairs do not mix favorably with "politics." This seems like a plausible reason, but if you reflect on it for a few moments, you cannot but be impressed by its total invalidity and untenability. The fact that you, as Americans, have chosen to designate your group as being of Ukrainian background, is evidence enough of the value you attach to your heritage. This is most commendable, but do not allow the ruling perspective of it all to escape you. This heritage that you value so and will transmit to your children, in all its grandeur of language, customs, culture and faith, could never have developed without the formation and development of the Ukrainian nation itself. And with a continuously free and independent Ukrainian nation this heritage would have richly flowered many times more. In a real sense, the whole comes before its parts if the latter are to exist at all. If the adjective, Ukrainian, in your

organizational name is to have grounded meaning and indefinite temporal significance, what some are given to call "politics" must of necessity be combined with your religious and cultural or social activity.

It should be obvious then, that to actively support the survival and freedom of a nation, especially in these times when it is so crucial to the survival and freedom of our own Nation, cannot be flippantly cast aside as mere politics. UCCA is not as such interested in political parties: it places first things first, and fights for the freedom and independence of Ukraine, as a just end in itself and also as a powerful weapon for our America in the defeat of Russian Communist imperialism. Let us not forget that with the destruction of the Ukrainian national state or national organs went the destruction of both Ukrainian Orthodoxy and Catholicism. If it ever should come to pass, and it is no longer beyond the realm of real possibility, the destruction of our Nation would lead to similar consequences. Lest you have forgotten, the history of western society to present date is punctuated preeminently by the growing freedom of nations, spurred on by three closely associated ideas—religion, liberty and independence. Was it sheer "politics" that movivated Christians in several West European nations to participate actively in halting the tide of atheist communism? Is is just politics that caused many a lay and clerical Orthodox and Catholic Ukrainian to join and fight with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army for a free and independent Ukraine? Now, can you rationally regard it as simple politics to fight for a strong and independent America, in which we enjoy our religious and civil freedoms, by urging that we take enlightened advantage of the natural alliance that exists between Ukraine and America?

I leave the answers to these basic questions to you and your wise moderators. Your answers will find their adequate measure at the next convention of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. It is my sincerest hope that your answer, and the answers of our other youth organizations, will be a strong and affirmative one; that it will seize the opportunity for a determinative role in UCCA; that it will convincingly demonstrate the truth of close association among the ideas of religion, liberty and independence for the ultimate benefit of America and Ukraine. Faith in God and country is the overruling spirit of UCCA activity. It is this faith that requires your good works, your solid contributions and your full participation. With proper perspective, with fervor and devotion to the highest ideals, are you prepared to meet this challenge of active American ictizenship in upholding and furthering those things that you value most?

Ten Years Ago and Today

Ten years ago, on this very forum, at the time of the establishment of the United Nations, the U. S. S. R. became its charter member, along with subjected nations of Ukraine and Byelorussia, the latter two entering then the family of free nations of the world.

The Russian-Bolshevik hierarchy in the Kremlin was then, as it is now, aware of the importance of the dynamic force of national liberation of the Ukrainian people, and as a result it was continually compelled to make certain concessions in favor of Ukrainian sovereignty. In order to conceal from the world the struggle of the Ukrainian people for real national independence, the Russian Bolsheviks recognized the status of the Ukrainian S. S. R. as a nation in "constitutional" form and thus made possible Ukraine's membership in the U. N. The Bolsheviks' difficulties in Ukraine in this respect were admitted by Stalin during the Yalta conversations with President Roosevelt. "The President told me that evening at Yalta that Stalin felt his position in the Ukraine was difficult and insecure. A vote for Ukraine was essential the Marshal had declared, for Soviet Unity." (Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., "Roosevelt and the Russians at the Yalta Conference.")

Ten years ago the delegation of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America focused the attention of the appropriate powers on the anomalous fact that the Ukrainian S. S. R., although a member of the U. N., was still enslaved, and that those who were representing Ukraine in the U. N. then—as well as those of the present time—were not the spokesmen of the will of the people, but merely of the Bolshevik government controlled from Moscow. A memorandum presented at that time by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America stated, among others:

"Bill of National Rights for Stateless Peoples.

"Such a bill of National Rights for Stateless Peoples would have as its objective not only the preservation of the cultural and economic self-rule of foreign-ruled peoples, notably the Ukrainians, but also the opportunity of attaining by peaceful methods their sovereign equality with other nations. What makes such a bill all the more imperative is the fact that totalitarian rule in Eastern Europe with all its abuses of human rights is not likely to diminish now that the war in Europe is over; on the contrary, it may become even more rampant. Moreover, such a bill could be a means of guaranteeing to nations the Four Freedoms proclaimed by our late President Roosevelt in the Atlantic Charter." (Quotation from "The Ukrainian Weekly," New York, May 26, 1945.)

The threat of a third world war has intensified in the last few years, and this is only due to unchecked Russian Bolshevik aggression which has taken more victims among nations since the end of World War II. In this march toward world conquest the Bolsheviks utilize all available means which suit their purpose at the moment. The tried military tactics of Tsarist Russia that "our borders move along with us" is given practical application by Red Russia, now going under the name of the U. S. S. R.

The United Nations, designed to become the rampart against aggression and conquest, have not justified the hopes pinned on them by nations under Moscow's oppression. Aims of national liberation of the colonial peoples became in the hands of Moscow, herself an oppressor, a strong weapon against the democratic nations which Moscow represents to the world as reactionaries. The United Nations have thus far been unsuccessful in applying the same aims of national liberation in favor of nations enslaved by Russian bolshevism, although these aims are so fondly utilized by the Bolsheviks against the free world. This we consider a basic omission on the part of the United Nations and the nations of the free world. Only a clear program of a policy of liberation presented by the free world without any mental reservations will enhance the hopes of the enslaved nations for liberation and inject vigor into their resistance against Bolshevik dictatorship.

Certain principles adopted by some organs of the United Nations (as e. g. by the Commission on Human Rights, that "All peoples and all nations shall have the right to self-determination, namely, the right freely to determine their political, economic, social, and cultural status" without their application in practice do not provide the enslaved nations with any guaranties of liberation and throw them into a state of apathy, which is fraught with danger to the free world.

Ten years passed, and we American Ukrainians, descendants of those people who have been opposing Russian oppression for 300 years, again come to all peace-loving nations on this high forum with a word of warning. The present attitude of appeasement on the part of the Kremlin hierarchy is merely a maneuver to lull the vigilance of the free world and in preparation to create more trouble in the world and to continue aggression. Coexistence between freedom and Bolshevik tyranny must not become the program policy of the United Nations and of the free world.

Only a struggle against Russian Bolshevik colonialism and consequential practical application of those principles which lie at the foundation of the United Nations, with equality for all nations, will guarantee freedom to mankind and save mankind from the danger of total enslavement.

We Told You So

We are back. "We" means delegates of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a national organization representing some million and a half of Americans of Ukrainian descent; not the same identical individuals are here now who were here, in San Francisco, 10 years ago, but we still represent the same group, work for the same enslaved nation and carry on the same ideological tradition as 10 years ago.

"Representatives of neutral nations not invited to the San Francisco conference, as well as representatives of stateless peoples, made haste to attend it, determined to make full use of this international gathering. Among them, it is worth noting, were delegates of the nationally representative Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and also of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee." (Quoted from an editorial in the Ukrainian Quarterly, vol. I, No. 3 of June 1945.)

The delegates of democratic Ukrainian and Canadian organizations who attended the San Francisco Conference in 1945, then as now obviously only in a unofficial capacity, exerted themselves to the utmost to tell the whole world that Ukraine as a nation has all the right to be a member of the United Nations, but that the Kremlin henchmen displaying credentials of representatives of the Ukrainian nation had no mandate from the Ukrainian people. The same is true today.

We said 10 years ago, and events of the last 10 years entitle us to repeat today: "What is the reaction to the San Francisco conference decision in respect to Ukraine among democratic Americans and Canadians of Ukrainian extraction? It is none other than a positive reaction. With striking unanimity all of them have wholeheartedly endorsed the action of UNCIO in restoring to the Ukrainians the international recognition they lost at the close of their war of liberation a quarter of a century ago. At the same time, however, all of them have expressed the devout wish that this formal sovereignty should be made real, that the Ukrainians should be allowed to become truly sovereign, spiritually, politically, culturally, and economically, which today they are not and for which they must continue to struggle. Bearing this in mind an observer who is objective enough to distinguish between Soviet stock phrases and shibboleths, deeds and misdeeds, will readily understand why the Ukrainians are such ardent advocates of a bill of national rights for stateless peoples within the charter of the international organization. If they were a truly sovereign people there would be no necessity for them to be such advocates as then they would not require any international guaranty of their national rights but would safeguard these rights themselves. Obviously in Eastern Europe a "sovereign" nation cannot do that. Its citizens are always liable to arrest, imprisonment or execution by an act of a foreign government, i. e., the government in Moscow. As for the Soviet delegation at the conference, no one acquainted with the totalitarian nature of

the Soviet regime can believe even for a moment that it truly represents the Ukrainian masses." (Ukrainian Quarterly, June 1945.)

We took the position 10 years ago, and existing circumstances are proving the same position valid today, that there are actually two Ukraines:

One is the real Ukraine, a country of 45 million Ukrainians, a democratic and peace-loving nation, spiritually part of the West and its civilization. This Ukraine is persecuted by Moscow, its cultural and religious life is being brutally suppressed. This Ukraine exists in the underground (the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which was active for many years), in its imprisoned clergy of Catholic and Orthodox denominations and millions of Ukrainians who fill the slave-labor camps of Vorkuta, Kolyma, and others. This Ukraine has no representative in the United Nations, or in any other international organization.

The second Ukraine is the Kremlin's Ukraine, represented by hand-picked Communists, enemies of the democratic and Christian Ukrainian people, and international troublemakers. Those fictitious representatives of Ukraine should have been exposed 10 years ago. They should be exposed even today, and a true picture of the situation appraised by those who seek the establishment of a lasting peace.

The history of the last 10 years is too fresh in our memories to require reiteration. We all know that the Russian Communist aggressors with their headquarters in Moscow have conquered in the last 10 years more territory and more millions of people than their predecessors, the Tsars of Muscovy, in the preceding 400 years.

We therefore have to repeat on the same forum after 10 years: Unless the free world is reconciled to a continued engulfment of the world by the Russian Communist aggressors, it is still not too late to proclaim a world declaration of independence which would extend hope to the multitude of nations enslaved by Moscow that their struggle for liberation from Communist Russian slavery is looked upon with approval by the free world, and that the free world will welcome them as free and independent nations in the peace-loving United Nations when they succeed in throwing off their present yoke and send their democratic delegates to the esteemed Assembly of the United Nations.

SOME ARE HERE WHO SHOULD NOT BE HERE AND MANY ARE NOT WHO SHOULD

"Another reservoir of future members (of the United Nations) is contained within the Soviet Union. At present only 2 of the component Republics are represented directly in the United Nations, while the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has to represent not only the Russian S. F. S. R. but also the other 13 Republics. Some of these 13 remaining Republics have already started to present their claims to membership in specialized and regional agencies and, like the British Dominions, may succeed in improving their international status." (Louis B. Sohn, World Law, Brooklyn, 1950, p. 173.)

The focal point of the above statement contained in the book by the professor of international law of Harvard Law School is that which refers to the U. S. S. R. being the representative of the Russian S. F. S. R. In other words, Russia proper is not represented in the United Nations at all, only the Ukrainian and Byelorussian S. S. Republics and the Russian Empire.

Under present-day circumstances, when the right of heretofore subject and colonial peoples to full sovereignty and independence is recognized more and more, and the very existence of the United Nations being predicated on the recognition of the principle of sovereign equality, there is no room within the framework of the principles and purposes of this organization for empires and colonial conglomerates.

There is no justifiable reason, either on the basis of long accepted principles of the rights of man and of nations, nor on the basis of codified principles and purposes of the United Nations, to have a superstate dedicated to Communist world conquest to continue as a member of this organization.

The right and proper course for this august body to pursue on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of its establishment is to revert to the sacred principle of sovereign equality of all nations by (a) declaring the Soviet Union to be an anomalous body under existing principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations; (b) declaring the Soviet Union to be an artificial structure of aggressive conspirators bent on world conquest and directed by a small group of Russian Communists with headquarters in Moscow; (c) declaring the unequivocal right of all nations comprising the present Soviet Union to announce and exercise their right of secession from the Soviet Union, including such equal right to the Russian nation within its ethnographic borders; (d) declaring similar rights to the so-called bloc of satellites of the Soviet Union.

The above statement facilitates a classification of delegations here present at the United Nations meeting in San Francisco into those who have a right to be here, and those who have not; into those who are here under false pretenses, by trickery and subterfuge, and those who are not here, but should properly be here by a democratically expressed will of their people.

The conclusion is obvious and simple: the delegates of the U. S. S. R., the Ukrainian S. S. R., the Byelorussian S. S. R., and of the Soviet satellite bloc have no right to be here and have no right to speak in the name of the millions whom they purport to represent.

But a right to be here, a right which without reason is denied to them, belongs to delegations of democratically elected representatives of Ukraine, Byelorussia, Armenia, Georgia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Turkestan, and the other dozen of the present enslaved Soviet Republics and to similarly properly elected representatives of the satellite nations.

This is the real task before the present meeting of the United Nations. Otherwise there will be no subsequent decennial celebration, only obsequies for a defunct United Nations.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, that not everyone favors the expenditure of public funds to provide public housing is evident from a resolution adopted in April by the city of Pontiac, Mich., and which reads as follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 1270

AN ORDINANCE TO PROHIBIT ESTABLISHMENT OF ADDITIONAL PUBLIC HOUSING IN THE CITY OF PONTIAC, OAKLAND COUNTY, MICH.

Adopted April 19, 1955. Effective April 29, 1955

The city of Pontiac ordains:

SECTION 1. That the citizens and taxpayers of the city of Pontiac oppose the establishment of additional public housing rental units in the city of Pontiac either through the use of municipal funds or with the financial assistance of the county, State, or Federal Government.

SEC. 2. Therefore, neither the city commission, city manager, Pontiac Housing Commission, or any other city of Pontiac employee or agent shall establish or in any manner negotiate, assist, or cooperate in the establishment of additional public housing rental units in the city of Pontiac with either the county, State, or Federal Governments or any instrumentality of the county, State, or Federal Governments.

SEC. 3. This ordinance shall take effect 10 days after its passage.

WM. W. DONALDSON,
Mayor.
ADA R. EVANS,
City Clerk.

I, Ada R. Evans, clerk of the city of Pontiac, Mich., do hereby certify that said ordinance was initiated by electors of the city of Pontiac in accordance with requirements of section 2, chapter VII, of the city charter.

And I do further certify that said ordinance was adopted by the Pontiac City Commission April 19, 1955, and published in the Pontiac Press on April 23, 1955.

ADA R. EVANS,
City Clerk.

Small Business Administration Loans Should Be Made Available to Local Industrial and Community Development Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on June 27 I appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee and made the following statement regarding the perpetuation of the Small Business Administration and extending its authority to provide loans to industrial and community groups as an aid to their efforts to attract new industries to labor-surplus areas:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, JUNE 28, 1955, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND THE LIFE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND MAKE IT A PERMANENT AGENCY OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity of appearing before this committee in support of legislation to extend the life of the Small Business Administration and make it a permanent agency of Government.

My purpose of appearing before you is twofold. First, I should like to relate my experience in working with the Small Business Administration and, secondly, I wish to make several suggestions which will expand the activities of the Small Business Administration, thus enabling it to perform in a more effective manner.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the 20th District of Pennsylvania comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties. Geographically my district is in the central part of the Keystone State.

Since 1949 my district has been classified by the United States Department of Labor as a critical area and at the present time it is listed in group F because of having a very substantial labor surplus.

This classification means that we have over 13 percent of our employables walking the streets looking for work.

The cause of unemployment in my congressional district is due basically to a sick bituminous coal industry which has had adverse effect on the railroads and related industries.

The net result is that thousands of my constituents having exhausted their rights to unemployment compensation are forced to exist on public assistance from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and on surplus commodities.

This unemployment situation in my congressional district is not of recent origin. It has been developing for the past several years primarily because substitute fuels have replaced the use of bituminous coal.

The day of reckoning which is now upon us was delayed because of World War II and the Korean conflict.

In the meantime, having seen the handwriting on the wall, practically every one of our local communities organized industrial committees, and thousands of dollars have been raised by public subscription in an all-out and long-range program of rehabilitating the industrial economy of the area by attracting new industries or expanding the existing facilities of those already located in the community.

To date I can report some progress, but as you know the nationwide competition for new industries is keen and requires time, effort, and money.

Over a period of years the Small Business Administration and its predecessor, the Small Defense Plants Administration, have been a tower of strength in our efforts to rehabilitate and keep in operation existing plants as well as assisting in securing new industries.

To be more specific, in my congressional district the Small Business Administration made an inventory of our productive capacity and then assisted our industries to become eligible for defense contracts.

After eligibility was established the Small Business Administration has continued to furnish the industries concerned with full information regarding bids asked for by the Department of Defense.

In addition, full information on Government-owned patents has been made available to all businesses for the purpose of giving them new products to manufacture.

In the field of small-business procedures the regional and district offices of Small Business Administration have been very helpful to businessmen in my congressional district in acquainting them with new and modern business methods.

Probably the most effective assistance rendered by the Small Business Administration has been through loans to industries that have moved into my Congressional District or to those firms already there who needed financial aid for the purpose of expansion.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Small Business Administration is doing an effective job in aiding the small-business man of the Nation because without its assistance in congressional districts like my own where the economy is sagging our efforts to promote recovery would not be as far advanced.

As I said in the beginning I have several suggestions to offer. First, in extending the life of the Small Business Administration I hope that Congress will take prompt action in making it a permanent agency of Government so that the experience gained, together with long-range planning, will make it a more effective arm of the Federal Government in carrying out its mission in the field of small business.

Secondly, in drafting legislation to extend or perpetuate the Small Business Administration I believe that if it is within the jurisdiction of this committee it should be made mandatory that the Department of Defense set aside a reasonable percentage of defense orders so that industries in labor surplus areas may have an opportunity to obtain them as a means of providing employment.

At the present time the Department of Defense has discretionary authority with the result that the so-called "set aside" program has proved a farce.

My next suggestion concerns my bill H. R. 5729 which is designed to authorize loans by the Small Business Administration to development credit corporations or industrial foundations located in areas having a substantial labor surplus.

Under the present authority given in the Small Business Act of 1953 financial aid by the Small Business Administration, except for disaster loans, can be made only to businesses as such.

Since a development credit corporation as a nonprofit institution is not recognized as a business therefore granting the authority for such loans will be a new field of operation for the Small Business Administration.

In my study of the subject I find there are several questions that may arise.

1. Is there a demand for this type of lending?

2. Could such a program be administered under the Small Business Administration's present credit policy?

3. What would be the overall effect of such a program?

In seeking an answer to the first question I find there are several types of development credit corporations, namely, the statewide corporations and the local corporations sometimes known as industrial development corporations, etc.

As some of you know, statewide corporations exist in your own States and especially in the New England area.

It is my understanding that New York State recently enacted a law establishing a development credit corporation.

In the field of statewide corporations favorable results have been achieved from well-organized programs.

Mr. Chairman, my bill H. R. 5729 does not apply to Statewide corporations but is restricted to local development groups at the community level whose capitalization ranges from $50,000 to $500,000 with the majority having a capitalization of less than $100,000.

In practically every instance these local nonprofit industrial development groups incorporated under the laws of the State have obtained their funds through voluntary solicitation from residents of their communities.

These local development groups have as their objective the rehabilitation of the economy of their areas principally by attracting new industries and extending aid to existing business firms which may find themselves in difficulty.

These local development groups buy and sell real estate, offer good industrial sites at attractive sales prices to prospective manufacturers, buy or build plants to lease or sell to new industries, offer financial aid in the relocation of industrial plants, and in some instances, make funds available to industries through loans or through purchase of stock in them.

In a few words, these community groups represent a dynamic force in the ceaseless battle to solve the unemployment problem in labor surplus areas.

With this background information let me refer to my first question as to whether there is a demand for loans to local development corporations. I think I have answered the question in the affirmative but let me give you another reason.

Despite the fact that the economy of the Nation is on sound footing and recognized as being good in general let us not forget there are nearly 150 labor surplus areas certified by the U. S. Department of Labor as being in groups B to F which is the category for areas with a labor surplus.

The economy of most of these areas depends upon the coal, railroad, or textile industries; while some are affected because industries have moved elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that these labor surplus areas that are trying to pull themselves up by their own boot straps are definitely entitled to Federal assistance in the form of loans in preference to outright subsidies. Therefore, it is my contention that there is demand for Small Business Administration loans to local development corporations.

In regard to my question as to whether such a loan policy could be administered under the Small Business Administration's present credit policy I have been advised by competent authority that such a loan policy can be administered without any difficulty. I feel that Small Business Administration officials will confirm my views.

Mr. Chairman, there may be some curiosity aroused as to whether these proposed loans will be repaid. In this connection, let me point out that the officers of these local industrial development groups are mostly businessmen and can be depended upon to the nth degree in meeting any obligation assumed by these community groups.

In addition, all applications would be subject to careful screening by the Small Business Administration and development groups would have to stand on their own feet.

Mr. Chairman, there is another point I should like to mention and that is the psychological effect such a lending program would have on the formation of new industrial development groups and encouraging the activities of existing groups.

Even if no money were expended by the Federal Government under this loan program the effect its existence would have on the morale of the community groups would be highly beneficial.

You will recall my third and final question is, What would be the overall effect of such a program?

My answer to that question is that it would have a favorable and far-reaching effect on the economy of our Nation especially in labor surplus areas by relieving the unemployment situation.

This would be accomplished by permitting the Small Business Administration to make loans where the need at the present time is greatest and in areas where today by reason of the present Small Business Administration credit policy the Small Business Administration is restricted from activity.

I wish to give you a concrete example after which I will conclude my statement.

Assuming that H. R. 5729 becomes a law or its provisions are incorporated in the committee's bill extending the life of the Small Business Administration, any local industrial development corporation may make application for a loan provided it can furnish reasonable assurance of repayment.

For example, a local industrial development group planning to build a plant in order to attract new industry must as a condition of the loan give a first mortgage on the plant to the Small Business Administration as well as an assignment of the lease by the business firm which occupies the building, thus furnishing the Small Business Administration with what is regarded in commercial circles as adequate security for the loan.

The local industrial development group by reason of securing the Small Business Administration loan is then in position to

expand its activities by being permitted to use funds that possibly for months have been invested in the enterprise and now become available for the purchase of additional sites and the construction of additional buildings.

In other words, the funds of the local industrial development corporation become a revolving fund permitting further activities in rehabilitating the economy of the area.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will not only recommend perpetuation of the Small Business Administration but that it will also either favor my bill H. R. 5729 or incorporate its provisions in any legislation reported by this committee, thus enabling the Small Business Administration to be of even greater service in the overall effort to rehabilitate the critical areas of the Nation.

Jesuit Says United States Must Press for U. N. Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the Members' attention to the following article on U. N. Charter Review by Father Edward A. Conway, S. J., which appeared in the Catholic Messenger, of Davenport, Iowa, on June 9, 1955:

JESUIT SAYS UNITED STATES MUST PRESS FOR U. N. REVISION—FATHER CONWAY VIEWS PRESENT CHANCE AS POSSIBLY THE LAST

(By E. A. Conway, S. J.)

The cause of U. N. Charter revision suffered three staggering blows on the 18th, 20th, and 21st days of April. I refer to the testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Review of the United Nations Charter by former Presidents Harry Truman and Herbert Hoover, and by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Ex-Presidents Truman and Hoover left the net impression that little could be expected from any attempt to amend the Charter at this time. Mrs. Roosevelt flatly opposed a review conference. She would have the United States, when the question comes up for discussion in the 10th Assembly, agree only to the establishment of a U. N. committee to consider the possibility of Charter revision sometime in the indefinite future.

After the testimony of these three experienced public personalities, highly respected by sizable but, I might add, separate segments of the American public, the New York Times correspondent concluded that as of April 21:

"There are growing signs that the committee will propose that this country should not support any alteration because of the present tension of the world scene."

If this is an accurate forecast, it means that the State Department, confronted by this discouraging senatorial "advice," may hesitate to direct the United States delegation even to vote for the holding of a review conference.

TESTIMONY OF LODGE

It seems safe to say that the State Department as of today still favors a conference, but not too firmly.

In his testimony before the subcommittee on May 3, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., according to the New York Times report, suggested that the United States should support the holding of a charter-review conference but should seek to confine amendments to the elimination of the veto on new members.

Although Mr. Lodge insisted that his testimony should not be regarded as representing the settled conclusions of the administration, it must represent at least the trend of the administration's thinking. It tends to confirm private advices I have received that the State Department, though still desiring a conference, is resigned to making revision proposals for propaganda purposes only. Mr. Lodge, according to the Times, emphasized that he was opposed to any effort to open the charter to general amendment, and specifically to any changes which go toward a world government. This was Ambassador Lodge speaking, not Senator BRICKER.

MR. DULLES' EARLIER VIEWS

This was indeed a far cry from the position of Mr. Dulles in 1953. In a letter to Senator WILEY dated August 12, 1953, the Secretary of State declared that:

"The Department will favor the calling of a review conference when the question is put to the 1955 session of the United Nations General Assembly."

In his address to the American Bar Association on August 26, 1953, Mr. Dulles repeated this promise, and criticized the serious inadequacies of the charter. Among these was the lack, because the San Francisco conference did not know about the atomic bomb, of sufficiently emphatic and realistic provisions for disarmament; the requirement of unanimity among the great powers in all important decisions; and too little attention in the charter to law which embodies eternal principles of justice and morality. At that time he thought that the review conference would be comparable in its importance to the original San Francisco Conference.

Mr. Dulles went even farther in his testimony before the Wiley subcommittee on January 18, 1954, reiterating his suggestions of the preceding August and adding three more: Strengthening of collective security; achievement of universality of membership; and the introduction of weighted voting in the General Assembly.

What has happened between the letter of Mr. Dulles to Senator WILEY in 1953 and Mr. Lodge's testimony before the subcommittee on the 3d day of May? How account for what seems to be a drastic change in State Department policy?

WORK ON ANTIREVISIONISTS

As far as I can determine, this shocking shift represents the triumph—temporary I trust—of the antirevisionists among the supporters of the United Nations.

These antirevisionists directed the preparation of studies, conducted conferences, and distributed literature, in a cleverly conceived and adroitly directed campaign to undercut Mr. Dulles.

While ostensibly encouraging study of charter revision in response to the urgent invitation of the State Department, they have subtly shifted that discussion to the question of whether or not a review conference should be held at all. By raising a whole mountain range of difficulties in the way of charter revision, they have intimidated many who sincerely want a strengthened United Nations.

MR. TRUMAN'S STAND

The main line of their attack is reflected in this excerpt from Mr. Truman's testimony:

"If we go into such a conference with inflexible demands for particular changes, we can be sure that we will encounter strong Communist opposition, and there may be strong differences of opinion among the free nations, and the net result of such a clash may be concentration by the peoples of the world on the defects rather than on the virtues of the charter, and a weakening of the United Nations just when strength is most needed. This could do very great damage so far as the effectiveness of the United Nations is concerned."

This does not sound like Harry Truman. Indeed it is unworthy of him. Consider the loaded condition: "if we go into such a conference with inflexible demands." Suppose we went in with the spirit of sincere negotiation? And on what does he base his assumption that the United Nations today has any real "effectiveness" to damage?

What disappoints me most is the un-Trumanlike timidity of this passage. It is an almost verbatim replay of the Cassandra croakings of the antirevisionists, who paint a scarifying picture of the evils that would attend any attempt to tamper with their sacrosanct charter. "You'll give aid and comfort to the enemies of the United Nations." "You'll intensify international tension." (That means that you'll antagonize the Russians.) "You'll cause disappointment and disillusionment among true seekers after peace if you don't succeed, and of course you won't succeed because the Russians have an ultimate veto."

While I am ready to admit that these arguments spring from real devotion to the charter, I consider them the expression of a fundamental fear, fear of risking any decisive action. All the elaborate arguments against even calling a revision conference strike me as being really rationalizations of this deeply-lying fearfulness.

HEARD ALL THIS BEFORE

Personally, I am not impressed by the warnings of the standpatters. I have heard them all before: "Let well enough alone." "Don't upset the applecart." "You'll do more harm than good." I heard them just 10 years ago in almost identical circumstances.

It was in the fall of 1944, as you will recall, that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for an international organization were published. I was deeply interested in the proposals, since I had been responsible for the compilation of the seven-point Pattern for Peace issued in October 1943 by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Federal Council of Churches and the Synagog Council of America and signed by 147 leaders of the three religious groups.

The Pattern for Peace was based on a comparative study of dozens of peace plans they had published in preceding years, and was designed to make available to our policy planners the unanimous position of the major religions of the country. Let me direct your attention to the length an breadth and depth of the fifth point, the one on the need for an international organization to maintain peace. It reads:

"An enduring peace requires the organization of international institutions which will (a) develop a body of law; (b) guarantee faithful fulfilment of international obligations, and revise them when necessary; (c) assure collective security by drastic limitation and continuing control of armaments, compulsory arbitration and adjudication of controversies, and the use when necessary of adequate sanctions to enforce the law."

MADE COMPARATIVE STUDY

Upon the publication of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, various church bodies issued analyses of the document, most of them severely critical, and none more so than that of the Catholic bishops of the United States in their annual statement of November 1944.

Acting on the conviction that our policymakers should have a concensus of church criticism, I made a comparative study and found the churches substantially agreed on the need for nine improvements. In cooperation with a minister and a rabbi, who contributed to their final formulation, these suggestions were published April 5, 1945 in a leaflet known as "Goals for San Francisco."

At once we were bombarded with warnings by the "leave-well-enough-alone" school. "The big powers were satisfied with Dumbarton Oaks. The plan was as much as could be hoped for. The Russians wouldn't

agree to anything more. This would embarrass the State Department and do a disservice to the cause of peace. What presumption, what foolhardiness, what irresponsibility. Leave well enough alone; don't upset the applecart."

Unintimidated, we launched an intensive campaign in our respective religious presses calling on our communicants to bring these improvements to the attention of the State Department and of the members of the United States delegation.

Senator Vandenberg's secretary told me he received basketfuls of letters and telegrams.

The Rabbi and I went to San Francisco and distributed copies of the Goals throughout the conference. I lectured on them 17 times in the San Francisco bay area.

Mr. Dulles, chief adviser to the United States delegation, who had helped to draft the earlier joint statement, the Pattern for Peace, and to introduce it on the air in a joint broadcast, was deeply interested in this new inter-faith effort. He told me that he had personally distributed copies of the Goals in the drafting committees.

SEVEN IMPROVEMENTS ADOPTED

There is no way of knowing, of course, just how effective the goals themselves were. Many lay organizations were making somewhat similar appeals; the smaller nations had arrived laden with proposals for amendment.

I merely report that 7 of the 9 suggested improvements were actually adopted, which we published in another document, The San Francisco Charter: Goals and Achievements. The exceptions were limitation of the veto and provision of actual disarmament.

Judging from an incident at the end of the conference, I would say the goals made some impact. Senator Tom Connally, chief of the American delegation, and Mr. Dulles had to leave a day or two early. But they held a press conference, in which the Senator, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, was asked if he thought the Senate would ratify the Charter. He replied that he was sure the Senate would do so. Then, and I quote the New York Times story:

"Mr. Dulles predicted that the very fact that the Charter measured up to the 10 points laid down April 5 by leaders of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish Churches was the best evidence that Senator Connally was correct in predicting ratification by the Senate."

Mr. Dulles then distributed to the reporters the copies he had left of Goals for San Francisco, and the Times printed all 10 recommendations in full. The tenth approved of the idea of forming such an organization.

MR. DULLES' 1952 TRIBUTE

I might add that in his message to the Denver convention of the National Council of Churches on December 11, 1952, Mr. Dulles acknowledged that—

"The churches, particularly in this country, performed a historic task in developing public sentiment for world organization and in influencing the character of that organization."

Even then he urged "the free people of this country" to "take the lead in making the United Nations into a more effective instrument for achieving international order and justice." On the same occasion, Henry Cabot Lodge, according to the news story, predicted that in 1955 there would undoubtedly be a meeting of the United Nations to review the Charter.

"We should all be thinking of the great import of that meeting," he said, "and you who rendered such valuable service in developing public interest for creating the United Nations should, I believe, renew your efforts to support its further progress and evolution."

Mr. Dulles, of course, was in error at that press conference in claiming that the charter measured up to all the 10 points of the religious leaders. It fell short in the areas of disarmament and the big power veto.

Now we have another chance to work for those essential improvements; and I am as little inclined to listen to the cautionary whispers of the stand-patters today as I was 10 years ago. On the contrary, I strongly believe that there will never be a better opportunity to make the charter capable of supporting a veto-free, enforceable disarmament system that in a review conference in 1956 or 1957, agreed upon, be it noted, in the fall of 1955 by the U. N. assembly.

Not least among the rationalizations of the antirevisionists is the one they have made out of the question of "timing." A favorite argument is that "this is not the time to call a conference." "The United States should not urge the calling of a conference at this time." "The present world tensions make a review conference inadvisable and even dangerous."

It is vitally important to engage this question of timing more closely. It will soon be seen that it is more than a matter of putting the "time clause" in its proper place in the sentence. So let's break down the problem.

TWO TIMES TO PROPOSE

Obviously, there is here no question of having a conference now, say this month. The phrase "at this time" and its variations "goes with" the verb "proposing." Actually, there are two times for proposing, and two different propositions to be made.

If you think that is confusing, you are indubitably correct. Any American who proposes today that a review conference be held is really proposing that the United States delegation, sometime during the fall U. N. assembly, say 6 months from this date, propose that a review conference be held from 1 to 2 years from then. The question at once arises as to the wisdom of making the decision now, on the basis of the current world situation, considering how swiftly international events are moving and positions changing.

Mrs. Roosevelt, for example, in the only quotation given to the New York Times from her testimony said (and this is just as it appeared):

"There are changes in the world situation of today that a full revision conference might be actually harmful."

This seems to imply that world conditions today, which are presumed without proof to be unfavorable to charter revision, will be the same 6 months from now.

While I do not quarrel with President Eisenhower's claim to a sixth sense in the matter of war, I would require some justification for Mrs. Roosevelt's prophecy. I am conceding for the sake of the argument that a relaxation of tensions is necessary for fruitful negotiation on charter review and especially disarmament. Actually, I believe with Mr. Grenville Clark that most of the really important political settlements will probably come only as a result flowing from an accepted disarmament plan; in other words that the current tenseness and suspicion is generated largely by the desperate armament race and will not be dissipated until a serious and successful effort toward disarmament has been made.

But to return to the question of timing. To be concrete, I think it would be imprudently premature for the Senate subcommittee to make any public announcement, if it should decide soon, against approving of United States support for the calling of a review conference. It should at least await the results of the Big Four conference at the summit recently approved by the President, which, as reported, will deal with disarmament.

BIG DECISION THIS FALL

There are further considerations. The real time of decision will come during the debate in the General Assembly this fall. It would be the solemn responsibility of the delegates to decide then whether a review conference should be held a whole year or even 2 years later.

This, I submit, would call for statesmanship at once imaginative, honest, and courageous. I stress the need for imagination. The delegates will have to project themselves imaginatively into 1956 and even 1957 and try to picture the pressures, perhaps not present even in late 1955, to find a solution to the ever-mounting atomic-hydrogen armament race. I am convinced that those pressures will exist, and that anyone can convince himself that I am right by courageously thinking through to those coming years.

GRENVILLE CLARK'S VIEWS

I firmly believe that in a year—two at the most—the world will find itself in the situation described by Mr. Grenville Clark 2 years ago, on April 24, 1953, at the annual dinner of the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia:

"The essential point lies in the rapid and terrific increase in the destructiveness of modern weapons. This increase proceeds on a scale and at a rate hardly yet realized. It creates a threat to all mankind of so unprecedented a nature as to create unprecedented pressures to find a solution. The seriousness of that threat is so great as to vitiate, in my view, the current talk that we may drift along for 30 or 40 years in a state of tense armed truce. The colossal power and threat of the new weapons will, I believe, bring the situation to a head within a much shorter time. The world will then choose which road it will follow—whether toward a disarmed world organized under world law, or toward new and greater destruction."

Already we are beginning to realize the dimensions of the threat. We have it on the high authority of Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary for Air, in his book Power and Policy; published last fall, that "we are moving relentlessly toward this date of absolute Russian air-atomic power, when they will have enough bombs and planes to destroy our cities, or industry and, if we are not properly prepared, our ability to hit back. We should assume for the purposes of our national policy and planning that the Russians will reach this absolute point during the year 1956."

We should make this assumption now for the "purposes of our national planning and policy," specifically with reference to the possible charter review conference.

H-BOMB MAY BE STIMULUS

Mr. Finletter addresses himself to the same pressures described by Grenville Clark. He comments on the fact that not even the fission or atomic bomb made the United States do anything very vigorous to lead the world to enforced peace, even when "stimulus after stimulus and evidence after evidence came in that war was becoming a mortal threat to the United States and all the rest of civilization."

He thinks, however, that the hydrogen bomb will supply the needed stimulus. "It is different," he says, "and we know it is different."

"We know," he continues, "that although it may have been sensible, or at least acceptable, for us not to have done any more than we did to work for an enforced peace before the hydrogen bomb in the hands of the Russians became a known fact, it is no longer sensible or acceptable. And the United States is not deterministically inclined. If it becomes obvious that a present course of action is foolish and unless

changed will do great damage to the country, we will, I think, want to change it regardless of how deeply imbedded in practice, creed, and tradition the present course may be."

MR. LIPPMANN'S WARNING

The bitter fact we must face, however, is that our policymakers are not acting on that assumption. That seems to be the clear implication of these words of Mr. Walter Lippmann in his syndicated column for May 3:

"Our trouble, in my view, is that we have never adapted the great conceptions of our foreign policy to the revolutionary consequences which have followed from the Soviet Union's achievement of nuclear weapons. One basic conception of our foreign policy—in that it envisages a ring of anti-Communist states—is out of date. The conception was worked out under Truman and Acheson before 1949, that is to say before we knew that the Soviet Union was breaking our monopoly of the atomic bomb. Since that time, it has been the inexorable logic of atomic armaments that the borderland nations must, and that they will, seek security and survival in policies to prevent war, and to avoid being involved in war if war cannot be prevented. Since 1949, despite all the grandoise pacts floating on the surface of events (with the Bonn treaty, the United States is now in 18 of these pacts), there has been a deep and steady undertow which has been dragging the nonatomic powers—which include Japan and Germany, all the little border states and others too—into some kind of middle position where they have a hope, a chance, of not becoming involved in an atomic war. * * * Our policy, which is to expect every anti-Communist nation to line up with us in a posture of defiance is incompatible with the realities of nuclear weapons."

This argument strikes to the very heart of the basic concept of the United Nations—collective security by voluntary association. Will it not have seeped into the chancelleries of the world in the next 6 months? In the next couple of years?

As Mr. Lippmann says, the reappraisal of our current ideas, however agonizing it may be, is unavoidable. Let us hope, he adds, that it will be done by lucid and candid leadership from the top.

We can help that leadership in its agonizing task by giving as wide currency as possible to what Mr. Lippmann calls "the facts of life in the age of nuclear weapons."

PERHAPS ANNEX OF HELL

What we must develop is, in the words of Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, "a collective realization of the ugly awfulness of all-out atomic warfare such as an individual possesses when faced with sudden death.

"To postpone the soul's parting company with the body," he continues, "a man often finds energy, will, and capabilities he never before suspected he possessed. If the world can come to realize that this planet, which once was paradise, may soon become an annex of hell, it will find tremendous now hidden reserves to develop nondestructive solutions for the bitter problems that separate the free world from the Soviet."

MR. TRUMAN'S TESTIMONY

I am persuaded that this realization can be achieved and that therefore Mr. Truman was unduly pessimistic in his testimony before the subcommittee. He was warning that "we ought not to underestimate the difficulties and dangers involved in trying to get improvements at this time. And we ought to be extremely careful not to lose what we already have in the United Nations, because what we have now is very essential to world peace."

"We should consider," he continued, "that the circumstances were more favorable to getting agreement out of 50 different nations in 1945 than they are now." (Here I must interpose the point that it is not a question of now, but a question of how favorable circumstances will be in the fall of 1955, first of all, and, which is the crucial question, a year or more from then.)

"All around the world," Mr. Truman explained, "nations were prostrate and exhausted from 4 years of conflict. In this atmosphere of suffering, uncertainty, and continued fighting, the people yearned for peace. Statesmen were under pressure from their peoples to make concessions that would bring peace to the world. Peace and an end to suffering were the universal cry, even on the part of the Russians, whose losses had been among the worst suffered by any nation.

"These," he said, "were the circumstances in which the Charter was drawn up and signed. I do not have to point out to you that it would be much harder to get similar agreements from national leaders in 1955 than it was in 1945. And I respectfully suggest that this is something you should always have in mind when you consider amending the Charter today."

SCORPIONS IN A BOTTLE

I suggest that by 1956–57 the statesmen will be under far greater pressures from their peoples to make concessions that will bring peace through disarmament than they ever were in 1945.

By that time we shall have entered into the period of so-called atomic stalemate, when both Russia and the United States will have enough atomic and hydrogen bombs to wipe each other out.

By that time will be fulfilled President Eisenhower's dire prophecy of two hydrogen-powered colossi glaring malevolently at each other across a trembling world. And the peoples of the world will have learned in days of watchfulness and nights of worry the pitiful flimsiness of the peace Sir Winston Churchill has popularized, the peace of mutual terror, the precarious peace enjoyed by two scorpions in a bottle.

I consider it a psychological certainty that the peoples, once they do realize their predicament, will turn with a great rush in search of what Mr. Murray called "nondestructive solutions" if only to save themselves from an international nervous breakdown.

INTER-CONTINENTAL MISSILES

I submit, therefore, that sometime in 1956 or 1957 this realization will be widespread and this search serious. People will know likewise the truth of Mr. Finletter's warning that "the time of absolute Russian air atomic power and of hydrogen bombs carried mainly by big manned bombers will not last long." They will know by then that inter-continental ballistic missiles, with atomic and hydrogen warheads, able to speed from Moscow to Washington in 30 minutes, will be just around the corner. Mr. Finletter, who is one of the few really imaginative statesmen I know of, contemplating this vision of unstoppable guided missiles, then remarks:

"It does seem that we now are talking about our last chance to control these weapons, the last chance that man will be given to prevent his own science for destruction from ending his civilization and himself."

Do you wonder that I want to see a review conference in 1956 or 1957 in which these realizations may be voiced, and answer made to the demand for peaceful solutions? It is quite possible that even Soviet Russia will have achieved by then this cold realization of the literally dead-end nature of the so-called armed equilibrium—that, as AEC Commissioner Murray once phrased it, "even in the U. S. S. R. Marxism should eventually give way to the commonsense element in the instinct for self-preservation."

"QUANTUM JUMP" IN WORLD POLITICS

It is in such a receptive climate in 1956 or 1957 that the proposal of what Mr. Murray calls a "quantum jump" in world politics can be made with good hope of acceptance.

In layman's language, a "quantum jump" may be defined as a long leap onto a new and unfamiliar plane—something like an aircraft breaking through the sound barrier. As Stewart Alsop recently defined the term, "quantum jump" is "scientist's shorthand for an unprecedented, situation-transforming scientific breakthrough."

In a discussion of the quantum jump achieved in the production of the hydrogen bomb, Mr. Murray said all of 2 years ago at Duquesne University:

"Now the times cry out urgently for another quantum jump, but of an altogether different kind. This time a quantum jump is needed, not in technology but in world politics, that most difficult form of the art of the possible."

You and I know that this quantum jump is enforceable disarmament under a regime of limited world law administered by a revised United Nations. I hope you agree with me by now that the time and place for such a proposal is in a charter review conference in 1956 or 1957. I make bold to predict that if that conference is not held then it will never be held.

NEED MEANINGFUL AMENDMENTS

The alarming fact is that as of today the odds are against its being held. Unless the United States this fall takes the forceful initiative, showing convincing evidence of its sincere desire for meaningful amendments, primarily in the area of disarmament, I doubt very much that the conference will be held.

That is why I was so disturbed and disappointed by Mr. Truman's testimony. On this question he said: "If the majority of the nations desire a review conference I do not think we should oppose it. I only believe," he added, "that we should approach it with caution and with full realization that it may be impossible to get any worthwhile changes under present circumstances."

There again is that confusion over time. We should not be talking in terms of present circumstances. But what distresses me is the complete abdication of American leadership which Mr. Truman advocated. It is so grossly un-Trumanlike, that I can hardly believe he was in earnest. This advice echoes all too perfectly the timidities of the anti-revisionists. And this counsel will prevail unless strenuous efforts are made immediately to counteract it.

Therefore I would call upon all those who are still studying charter revision to stop and take stock of the situation. While they have been buried in their studies, placidly assuming that their suggestions would get an airing in a review conference, forces have been working to forestall that conference and already are well on the way to success.

All those who sincerely believe that a lasting peace demands a strengthened United Nations, and who are not obsessed by a blinding solicitude for the prestige of the U. N. as now constituted, should drop their studies and concentrate on developing a demand for powerful American initiative in favor of a conference. Drop the text, I might say, and study the context, the context of the times, especially the world context of 1956 and 1957.

FORCED BY THE OCCASION

We must accept as true of this case Benjamin Franklin's observation that "the best public measures are seldom adopted from previous wisdom, but forced by the occasion." Our immediate and urgent task is to picture as vividly as we can the stark dreadfulness of the occasion in which we shall all find ourselves a year or two from now. We must bring home to our policy planners without delay a realization of the need for the strong initiative this fall which that occasion makes imperative.

The next 3 or 4 months confront us with a supreme opportunity and a responsibility which we cannot in conscience shrug off. In these coming months we must concentrate all our efforts to rout the forces of drift and delay, of fear and defeatism in high and influential circles.

WORK OF FEDERALISTS

I think it would not be presumption but simple, and oh so sobering, truth to say that this may well be the moment in history for which in the providence of God, we have survived as organized advocates of authentic disarmament under enforceable world law.

This may well be the moment for which we have been tempered by criticism, contempt, and even contumely.

This may well be the moment for which we have been preserved uninfected by the polio-like virus of paralyzing fear.

Certainly our courage cannot be questioned. It remains for us speedily to give flashing evidence of our sense of responsibility for the public weal and our creativeness and persuasiveness in the cause of peace. It remains for us to summon forth whatever hidden reserves we may have of "energy, will, and capabilities" and hurl them into the fight for a strong American initiative in favor of a charter review conference.

Let me close with surprisingly appropriate words from Albert Einstein's "Out of My Later Years:"

"A tremendous effort is indispensable. If it fails now the supranational organization will be built later, but then it will have to be built upon the ruins of a large part of the now-existing world. Let us hope that the abolition of the existing international anarchy will not need to be brought by a self-inflicted world catastrophe, the dimensions of which none of us can possibly imagine. The time is terribly short. We must act now if we are to act at all."

The State of Our Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which Mr. Aaron M. Sargent, an able member of the San Francisco Bar, delivered to the annual meeting of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, Chicago, Ill., May 24, 1955. Mr. Sargent is one of the foremost authorities in the field covered by his address:

THE STATE OF OUR UNION

(An address by Aaron M. Sargent, of San Francisco)[1]

We know from bitter practical experience that our position on the antisubversive front has steadily deteriorated. In our preoccupation with the Communist menace we have made the dangerous mistake of overlooking the activities of another group—the so-called internationalists. They must be held responsible for helping to create some of the conditions facing us today.

AN INTELLECTUAL ELITE

Alger Hiss is an internationalist. He is closely identified with the intellectual elite which played such an important part in controlling the destiny of our country over the last quarter century. He was convicted of a crime which is the practical equivalent of treason. He was actively defended and supported by prominent intellectuals and internationalists. The character witnesses at his trials included 2 Justices of the United States Supreme Court, 2 judges of lower Federal courts, 3 trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Counsel for the International General Electric Co., an American delegate to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, a professor of international law, a director of the American Association for the United Nations, and the secretary of the American Friends Service Committee. Philip Jessup was one of the Carnegie trustees who testified for Hiss. At the time of his indictment, Alger Hiss was president of the endowment. None of these character witnesses appeared in response to subpena. They were all volunteers. The most important character witness was the Carnegie Endowment. It allowed its name and prestige to be used by defense counsel to influence the jury. In testifying at the second trial Hiss said that he was still a trustee of this tax-exempt organization.

THE GUILT OF ALGER HISS

In spite of these activities Hiss was found guilty. There was never a reasonable doubt. The court record includes memoranda in his own handwriting copied from confidential and restricted State Department files. The pumpkin papers were microfilm copies of several hundred highly confidential documents. These included dispatches between our State Department and American diplomatic representatives all over the world. With the aid of these microfilm copies the American code may have been broken. This is the damning evidence of guilt—the treason of Alger Hiss.

DISLOYALTY IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Now let us consider another case—the so-called investigation of State Department disloyalty by the Tydings committee. That committee made an attack on the Senator who had preferred charges, instead of making the kind of inquiry called for by the Senate resolution. Having suppressed the investigation it "found" that Philip Jessup had no unusual affinity for Communist causes; that his connections with the Institue of Pacific Relations did not reflect unfavorably upon him; that Owen Lattimore was not the architect of our far eastern policy; that he had no controlling or effective influence on that policy; that John Stewart Service was neither pro-Communist, disloyal, or a security risk; and that the charges of Communist infiltration and influence on the State Department were false. It required a second investigation by the Senate Internal Security Committee to expose the subversive and dangerous character of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

The IPR has been actively supported by three tax-exempt foundations—Carnegie Corp., of New York, Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The Internal Security Committee determined "* * * that the IPR has been in general, neither objective nor nonpartisan; * * * that the net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been pro-Communist and pro-Soviet, and has frequently and repeatedly been such as to serve the international Communist, and Soviet interests, and to subvert the interests of the United States" (Rept., p. 84).

The foundations contributed $2,500,000 to this subversive activity.[2] The Institute of Pacific Relations is still a tax-exempt organization.

CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT

Millions have been spent by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to build and develop an international propaganda machine, to produce masses of material for distribution, to create and support large numbers of international polity clubs at colleges and elsewhere, to disseminate books through "international mind alcoves," to collaborate with publicity agents such as newspaper editors, to prepare slanted material for school textbooks, to establish professorships at colleges and train and indoctrinate teachers, and to finance lecturers and import foreign lecturers and exchange professors.[3] The Reece committee took note of the dangerous lobby power of this tax-exempt trust and said:

"It is not beyond possibility that the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace might have followed the same course as did the Institute of Pacific Relations. After all, Alger Hiss was made president of the endowment. He was probably not in office long enough to do irremedial damage, but it is always possible that a great propaganda machine could get into the hands of another traitor, with tragic results to our country. When it is easy for a Hiss to become a trustee of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, a director of the executive committee of the American Association for the United Nations, a director of the American Peace Society, a trustee of the World Peace Foundation, a director of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, and the president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, it is highly doubtful that propaganda machines should be operated by foundations" (Rept., p. 172).

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFIDENCE GAME

The foundations are using their power to prevent the people from adopting a pro-American point of view toward the United Nations and they are falsely educating the public into the idea that the UNO is our light and savior; the hope of humanity.

"It may be granted that it has some usefulness as a place to exchange ideas with other nations and to reach some common understandings on lower levels of interest and importance, but to play it up as the magnificent instrument for peace which it so clearly is not, does our people a distinct disservice by obstructing that realism without which we cannot hope to solve our international problems."[4]

This is the greatest confidence game and the biggest lobby in American history. It is suppressing the truth about this organization responsible for our defeat in the Korean war where we sustained 150,000 casualties and squandered billions of American dollars.

INFLUENCE ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The Reece committee determined that tax-exempt foundations have exerted a powerful, if not decisive influence on American foreign policy. The reports of the Carnegie Endowment show that it has undertaken vital research projects for the State Department, created groups within the Department, supplied advisers and executives, and furnished a constant stream of Carnegie indoctrinated personnel. The report states:

"* * * that a majority of the 'experts' in the international field are on the side of globalism. It would be amazing if this were otherwise, after so many years of gigantic expenditure by foundations in virtually sole support of the globalist point of view. Professors and researchers have to eat and raise families. They cannot themselves spend the money to finance research and publications. The road to eminence in international areas, therefore, just as in the case of social sciences generally, is by way of foundation grants or support." (Report, p. 182.)

PATRONAGE, DISCRIMINATION, AND THOUGHT CONTROL

The committee found that the power of the individual large foundation is enormous. It can exercise various forms of pat-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ronage which carry with them elements of thought control. It can exert immense influence on educational institutions, educational processes, and educators.

"It is capable of invisible coercion through the power of its purse. It can materially determine the development of social and political concepts and courses of action through the process of granting and withholding foundation awards upon a selective basis, and by designing and promulgating projects which propel researchers in selective directions. It can play a powerful part in the determination of academic opinion, and, through this thought leadership, materially influence public opinion." (Report, p. 17.)

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

The 82d Congress created the first committee to study the foundation problem. It was set up under the chairmanship of the late Eugene Cox, of Georgia, who died while the inquiry was pending. Some strange and very unusual things happened. Most of the "witnesses" were not put under oath. Foundation presidents, trustees, and other spokesmen appeared and made long speeches for the record. The Ford Foundation provided 4 of these unsworn witnesses; there were 3 from Carnegie Corp., 3 from Rockefeller Foundation, and 2 from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. It was a love feast—"King's X" for everyone except some former Communists and a few others accused by them. No foundation or foundation representative was ever required to give a shred of evidence under the legal sanction of the oath. Even the foundations' answers to the committee's questionnaire were unsworn. In some cases they were not even signed. No adverse witness was heard until 2 weeks before the committee was required to report to the House of Representatives. After the investigation, many of the Cox committee files disappeared. No one seems to know what became of them. The report, as you would expect, was a whitewash—another performance like the circus before the Tydings committee.

The Reece committee was established by the 83d Congress. The opposition sought to load that committee. The work was crippled for lack of funds. The ranking minority member, a Congressman from Ohio, was guilty of such misconduct that public hearings had to be discontinued. He attacked and interrupted witnesses beyond all reason. There was bitter criticism in the press and on the radio—a barrage of propaganda to suppress the investigation. The foundations complained that they had been denied the hearing which their spokesman had made it impossible to conduct.

VILIFICATION AND SMEAR

Our major broadcasting system allowed its radio and television network to be used to attack this committee. The broadcast occurred in August 1954 several months before the filing of the Reece committee report. On that program the minority member falsely claimed that he was defending the honor and dignity of Congress. He attacked the majority members, the staff and committee witnesses. The obvious purpose was to discredit the investigation before the committee could file its report. The program was taken on film and sound recording; released 3 days later without editing. This attack was not the result of negligence. It was a deliberate assault on the integrity of a congressional committee.

CONSORSHIP IN FAVOR OF THE UNITED NATIONS

About a month later, a member of this society was summarily taken off the air by the same broadcasting company. That occurred because of his opposition to policies and practices of the United Nations. This man was a commentator on a television program at Los Angeles—a patriot who believed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and resented U. N. encroachment on American rights. He had been on the air for about a year prior to the incident to which I refer. His freedom on the air had included the opportunity to denounce the Communists. That was all right. No difficulty was experienced until he challenged the "internatoinalists." Then the reaction was immediate. His station arrangement was canceled almost without notice. He was deprived of his right to a 2 weeks' notice of cancellation—prevented from going on the air to explain his position to the members of the television audience. One would expect this sort of conduct in Soviet Russia. It is strange—very strange—to have it occur in the United States of America. The chairman of the corporation controlling this network is an "internationalist" who stands high in the councils of the present administration.

THE MONOPOLY IN COMMUNICATIONS

We are in dangerous shape when these things are possible. Effective censorship now exists in favor of the United Nations lobby and the "internationalists." Only a limited number of television channels are available. There is a practical condition which amounts to monopoly. Three broadcasting companies occupy the entire field. One of them is dominated by a giant holding company headed by a prominent "internationalist." Control of the entire television industry is in the hands of the three men who heard these broadcasting systems. Television has enormous power for good or evil. It can lift a man from obscurity to national prominence. It may destroy the reputations of some while assisting in a buildup for the benefit of others. Its power is too dangerous to be allowed to rest exclusively in the hands of three men. It is time to inquire whether the policies of these networks are directly or indirectly influenced by tax-exempt foundations; to what extent control may be exercised by the "internationalist" clique responsible for betraying of American interests. Fortunately, there is a safe and constitutional way to deal with this problem. It involves an extension of public utility law in the field of television and radio.

ARROGANCE AND DEFIANCE

These giant foundations have continued their arrogant disregard of the public interest. There is no evidence that they intend to reform. They have challenged the power and authority of Congress and the American people. Your affairs are now controlled by a movement which relies on propaganda, infiltration and smear. The Reece committee found that—

"The far-reaching power of the large foundations * * * has so influenced the press, the radio, and even the Government that it has become extremely difficult for objective criticism of foundation practices to get into news channels. * * * Nothing short of an unhampered congressional investigation could hope to bring out the vital facts. * * * As indicated by their arrogance in dealing with this committee, the major foundations and their associated intermediary organizations have intrenched themselves behind a totality of power which presumes to place them beyond serious criticism and attack" (Rept., p. 17–18).

This is the "flying wedge" of political, financial, and propaganda power which now covers and protects the advance of the subversive movement. Through infiltration, government is being conducted in defiance of public opinion. The people are rapidly losing control. The ballot privilege is becoming worthless because of the infiltration and control of political parties. When that happens the people are disenfranchised. The right of petition can be nullified with propaganda. Congress can investigate but its power is limited and ineffective against this sort of attack.

A BOSTON TEA PARTY

There is only one power fully adequate in this emergency—the power of the people. Basically, they have three weapons available for their defense: (1) the ballot, (2) the right of petition, and (3) the right of boycott. Two of these have been tried and failed. It remains for us to consider an effective use of the third remedy.

We have the right to discriminate in favor of patriotic pro-American business men. We can buy and recommend the products of those willing to help us in resisting subversion. An American resistance movement can be established. We are under no obligation to use the products of those who knowingly employ leftwing artists or commentators on radio or television, or who deliberately slant the news. Labor has the right of boycott and the right to strike. As consumers and patriotic cititzens we have the same right. An intelligent use of this remedy could provide the force needed to head us in the right direction. The patriotic boycott is an unalienable right as old as the Boston Tea Party. In my judgment it can be legally established.

A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE FOUNDATIONS

Have they ever supported research or education designed to expose the conduct, propaganda, or activities of the Communist or Socialist movements in this country?

Have they supported the work of active anti-Communists, anti-Communist organizations, or repentant Communists who have since demonstrated their loyalty and rendered valuable service to the cause of freedom by combating and exposing subversion?

The American people are patriotic. They pay heavy taxes. They carry their full share of responsibility in supporting and defending the Government and Constitution of the United States. Many of them have rendered military service. Some have made the supreme sacrifice.

Are the foundations patriotic or unpatriotic?

What is the attitude of the business and financial leaders who sit as trustees on the boards of these great tax-exempt corporations?

---

[1] Member of the Bar of United States Supreme Court, American Bar Association, American Judicature Society, San Francisco Bar; former chairman of the Americanization Committee of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution; special counsel for that society on the bill of grievances filed with Congress to obtain a national investigation of the subversive propaganda affecting public schools in the several States; called in 1952 as expert witness on subversive education and propaganda by Senate Internal Security Committee; in 1954 appeared before House of Representatives Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (Reece committee).

[2] Reece committe hearings, vol. 1, p. 894.

[3] Reece report, p. 171.

[4] Reece report, p. 183.

A Tale of Two Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article, written by Tom

Brooks, which appeared in the June 27, 1955, edition of the New Leader:

A TALE OF TWO COUNTRIES

(By Tom Brooks)

While worried American parents await the onset of the 1955 polio season with growing apprehension, Canadian parents are able to face the summer danger period with confidence. The mixture of joy and relief which greeted the announcement of Dr. Jonas E. Salk's discovery of a safe and efficient vaccine quickly turned sour in the United States.

Many Americans have wondered if the confusion of the last few months was the inevitable outcome of a great discovery prematurely announced. The Canadian experience indicates that it was not. The only serious disturbances marring the inoculation program of Canada's Federal and provincial governments have been the ruffles caused by the storm raging south of the border.

The events here which followed the April 12 announcement are well known. What is not so well known is the fact that America's trouble over the Salk vaccine—as well as the Canadian success—began early. Attempts by Dr. Salk and the National Foundation of Infantile Paralysis to get the major pharmaceutical companies to carry on further exhaustive work on the vaccine before marketing the serum floundered because of the manufacturers' reluctance to risk any money. The one company which accepted the offer, Parke-Davis, has been, so far, one of the two firms with a near-perfect record: The two polio cases reported among children who received vaccines made by Parke-Davis and Pitman-Moore companies were within the range expected by chance occurrence.

Canada, too, started early. Last fall, when it became clear that the Salk vaccine would, in all likelihood, turn out to be the answer to polio, the conservative Canadian Government "socialized" the vaccine.

Acting under a Food and Drug Act similar to that of the United States, Health Minister Paul Martin placed an order with the Connaught Medical Laboratories for enough vaccine to insure 3 doses for 600,000 children prior to the onset of the 1955 polio season. Martin acted with the full approval of the Dominion Council of Health, a statutory body consisting of the principal health officers of each of the 10 Provinces plus 5 others appointed at large. The Council mapped the plans last fall for the inoculation program now taking place in Canada.

The Connaught Laboratories are part of the University of Toronto. This nonprofit institution made the Canadian contribution to the Salk discovery. The cultural medium used in preparation of the vaccine for last year's tests was developed and provided by Connaught.

The 10 Provinces and the Federal Government split the cost of the vaccine at $1.50 for each triple dose. A private physician in the United States pays $4.50 and is entitled to charge a retail prescription price of $6 for the 3 doses. This does not include the doctor's charge for administering the injection.

In Canada, the Salk vaccine is allocated to each Province on the basis of population and becomes the property of the Province. It is given to inoculees free of charge. A priority for inoculation has been established. In 9 of the 10 Provinces, the first age group to be inoculated are in the first 2 grades of school, the 7-to-8 age group. Subsequently, the 5- and 6-year-olds will be added, supply permitting. (Quebec Province has given top priority to 1- and 2-year-olds.)

These were the plans made before Dr. Thomas Francis' report at Ann Arbor on April 12. The hitches since then have been in part of American origin. Under the priorities established to cope with the expected shortage of the vaccine supply, the Canadian health authorities hoped to inoculate 1½ million children before the polio season.

A halt in the supply of Rhesus monkeys temporarily crimped production. However, the launching of large-scale production of the Salk vaccine at the Institute of Microbiology, an affiliate of the University of Montreal, will more than offset the setback.

Canada expected to boost its available stocks of vaccine with supplementary orders to commercial pharmaceutical manufacturers in the United States. Two manufacturers had been licensed to sell in Canada when the United States Government halted all further deliveries of the vaccine in mid-May. (Some 13,000 children had been inoculated through private channels by Parke-Davis vaccine before the embargo.)

Health Minister Martin was forced to announce on May 19 that it "now appears that we will not reach the target * * * certain difficulties have developed in the supply of vaccine from commercial sources (in the United States)." Because of American uncertainty, the Canadian Government has suspended further distribution of commercial vaccine until such time as the situation clarifies in the United States. But Martin declared that Canada would have enough vaccine from its own laboratories to reach a million children before July.

Each batch of vaccine in Canada is double-checked—once by the manufacturer, and a second time by the Canadian Health Department's National Laboratory of Hygiene. Canadian caution and planning have paid off. As of June 1, more than 750,000 children had been inoculated; half of that number had received their second shot. "There have been no unfavorable reactions whatever," Health Minister Martin has been able to report. To date, not one child in Canada has become ill from the Salk vaccine.

Results have been somewhat different in the United States. Through May 31, a total of 114 cases of poliomyelitis with 5 deaths were reported in vaccinated individuals; 79 cases were the result of defective vaccine.

In contrast to Canada, the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby, decided to double-check vaccine in May after polio had turned up in children inoculated by the defective Cutter vaccine. Prior to the Cutter disaster, the Federal Laboratory of Biologics Control cleared vaccine on the basis of manufacturers' protocols, the detailed data of the manufacturing processes and testing method. It is still not clear whether or not Biologics Control even bothered to spot-check batches of released vaccine.

Mrs. Hobby has pleaded ignorance: "No one could have foreseen the public acclaim for the vaccine." Yet, her Department participated in every stage of the development of the vaccine. It participated in the publicity buildup which helped to create the pressures applied to rush the vaccine into mass production and mass inoculation—pressures which Surgeon General Leonard A. Scheele now so justly condemns.

Two months after the grand announcement of April 12, the Surgeon General's office issued a 100-page scientific report. The polio white paper indicated among other things that there was a difference of opinion among scientists and other experts on whether the mass inoculation program should be continued in view of the lack of a wide "margin of safety."

Surgeon General Scheele's report admitted that the Government's testing procedures were inadequate and the standards set for the manufacturers insufficient. It also noted that, early last year, the staff of biologics control had become concerned about the feasibility of producing safe vaccine on a large scale. In addition, it is all too apparent that the control lab was completely understaffed in relation to the massive job it faced.

Events forced these facts out into the open. Parents and whole communities have called a halt to further inoculations. Washington has alternated between statements of confidence and off-and-on-again releases of vaccine.

Meanwhile, Canada's citizens are confident that the available supply of vaccine will reach those first who need its protection most. They are sure that its quality is of the best. They can expect that inoculation coverage will be expanded as the supply of vaccine grows. Health Minister Martin has announced that by next March 31 at least 3 million Canadian children (in a total population of 15 million) will be immunized. The Province of Saskatchewan, for one, has announced plans for additional coverage, free of charge, in a progressive manner of every citizen up to 34 years of age as vaccine becomes available. Our conservative neighbors have been pragmatic where the Eisenhower administration has been dogmatic.

Free inoculations are available to protect United States cows from TB. Yet, a mother seeking protection for her children must haunt the black market to secure vaccination against polio: The price is high, the vaccine quality dubious. "How We Saved the Nation from Socialism" might well be the title of Mrs. Hobby's final report on her stewardship of the country's health, education, and welfare. Canadians find it incredible.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak." They are typical of the unfounded attacks on the Colorado River storage project, and I submit that they would have been more accurately entitled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

In her desperation somehow—anyhow—to head off development of the upper Colorado River Basin, southern California has even gone to the extreme of charging that the Colorado River storage project would imperil her own share of Colorado River water. No one who has made even a superficial examination of the project can avoid seeing how utterly ridiculous is such a charge. The initial phase of the storage project, for which we are now asking authorization, would bring consumptive use of water in the upper basin to less than half the total allocated to us under the compact; and the basic purpose of the storage project is to regulate the upper river and so guarantee continuous delivery of the share of the lower basin—including southern California.

The reason for southern California's frantic action is equally clear. Southern California has water problems like the rest of the semiarid West. Particularly, she foresees critical water shortages in the future. But I submit that southern California has the means to solve her

own problems, without crippling development of the upper Colorado River Basin. Let us look at a few facts:

More than 50 million acre-feet of good, fresh water are wasting into the Pacific Ocean from the State of California each year. That is more than 4 times the total allocation of Colorado River water to all 4 upper basin States.

A fabulous amount of Colorado River water is wasting annually into the Salton Sea in southern California, in one of the most glaring examples of bad irrigation practices on record.

An article in the current Saturday Evening Post tells of the tremendous advance made in the technique of desalting sea water to make it usable for irrigation and culinary purposes. Before southern California's need becomes critical, the water of the Pacific Ocean may well have become a usable source of supply.

Let southern California cease worrying about bananas on Pikes Peak, or about generating applesauce on Capitol Hill. Let her solve her own water problems by means readily at hand, and not try to steal our water—the only water available to the States of Utah, Colorado, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Now, Who's Crazy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a Vermont court decreed that Mrs. Manuel (Lucille) Miller was mentally incompetent, turned her over to the Attorney General, and he ordered her confined in St. Elizabeths. After some time there, on a writ of habeus corpus, a local court declared she was mentally competent.

So, back she goes to Vermont to stand trial on a charge that she violated a Federal law.

A part of the story is told by Westbrook Pegler in the June 28, 1955, issue of the New York Journal-American. This is the way Pegler describes the situation:

THE MAD MRS. MILLER AND SOME NEIGHBORS
(By Westbrook Pegler)

Mrs. Manuel Miller, who was gassed out of her home in Bethel, Vt., in the dead of night and railroaded to a horrible madhouse in Washington, had been having trouble with Dorothy Thompson, the columnist, and James Vincent Sheean, a precious double-dome of international politics and journalism.

The bulk of the American press has absolutely ignored this dramatic brutality to an American woman of the strongest patriotism. By contrast, the New York Times and many other papers have wailed over the "terror" of persons who refused to answer under oath whether they ever strove to destroy the Government of the United States for the benefit of the obvious enemy.

Dorothy Thompson and Sheean are "city people" who have summer places in the Green Mountains. Lucille Miller fell afoul of them when she was routing out notorious Communists snuggled in the hills. There is absolutely no doubt that these other persons were Communists, but the Vermont press sneered at Mrs. Miller and her husband, who backed her up.

On May 13, Dorothy Thompson wrote me that she had not touched the case because she wanted to investigate on the spot.

"I never met Lucille Miller," Miss Thompson wrote, "but I have had two or three telephone conversations with her and have been the recipient of several long letters. Judging from these, I believe her to be of definitely unbalanced mind. They were wild, incoherent, and completely irrational. They indicated that she believes that every prominent person is engaged in a Gargantuan complex of interlocking plots. This is not confined to communism. One letter concerned the American Friends of the Middle East (of which I happen to be president) and it was in total error. It is quite impossible to correct her views on anything.

"However, although many of her neighbors considered her more or less deranged, I have never heard anyone say that she was dangerous * * * It is certainly no proof of insanity to oppose selective service. Thousands of perfectly respectable pacifists and their organizations have fought conscription for years * * * When I get there, I shall certainly get the whole story."

Here we have a verdict by a lay person that Lucille Miller is "unbalanced" and that (according to equally unqualified "neighbors") she is "more or less deranged." Dorothy also decides that her own political society is above suspicion. As a matter of fact it is not above suspicion and there does exist "a Gargantuan complex of interlocking plots."

Sheean clearly disclosed that in his first book of any prominence, "Personal History." And, if Dorothy has never met Lucille, how does Dorothy know that it is impossible to "correct" her views? Is it possible that Dorothy's views need correction? She certainly has made mistakes.

For example, she gave asylum in her Vermont home to a refugee who turned out to be a Communist. Lucille refers to this in a letter about Dorothy and Jimmy. In that letter, written from the lunatic asylum in Washington, Lucille said:

"Dorothy lived over the hill in Barnard and we have never liked her because she was arrogant and parked on the wrong side of the curve in a noblesse oblige attitude."

(Lucille probably slipped here. Noblesse would have been more appropriate, but Dorothy surely will not insist that this error proves Lucille is insane.)

Continuing, Lucille said:

"She (Dorothy) has always had tough characters living up there with her. (Of course there is no suggestion of personal immorality here and Dorothy's Red refugee certainly would qualify as tough in a meaning of the word.)

"Before Sinclair Lewis, her husband, lammed out, she had Louis Adamic around. You know him and how he set Tito up."

I did know Adamic. He was a Communist who glorified Tito after Eleanor Roosevelt had entertained him, Adamic, at a dinner for Churchill at the White House. Adamic killed himself.

Lucille then mentioned Dorothy's Red refugee and said:

"Dot had to clean herself up and wrote that article in the Saturday Evening Post to try to explain it away in 1950.

"Then the slyest of all came and that was Vincent Sheean."

There follows some discussion of Dorothy's "Friends of the Middle East" and Sheean's part in the activity and the source of the financial backing. The political mixup here certainly is complex and it is by no means idiotic to venture the opinions which Lucille offers. And, acknowledging Dorothy's professional ability, I declare she writes no better than Lucille Miller, nor, I dare say, does Judge Gibson, who found Lucille crazy.

Sheean once took part in a mutual-admiration interview with John Gunther, a similar character, in the Sunday book section of the Herald Tribune of course.

This colloquy occurred between these two dear boys:

"GUNTHER. Who is the greatest man you have ever known?

"SHEEAN. Mahatma Gandhi, clearly.

"GUNTHER. Any runners-up?

"SHEEAN. I have revered Lenin, Nehru, Roosevelt (but more since his death than before) and, in a different way, Churchill, because I know purity when I see it."

When Gandhi was shot, Sheean wrote:

"We have lost our Guru."

In 1948 Sheean presided at a New York demonstration for the Hollywood Red writers and introduced Gerhardt Eisler, the Soviet spy, who got a great ovation. So Lucille Miller's patriotic suspicions seem justified by the conduct of some who would hold her to be insane.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, to the National Convention Banquet of the Reserve Officers' Association, Boston, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 24, 1955, our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], delivered a fine address to the national convention banquet of the Reserve Officers' Association at Boston, Mass. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, officers and members of Reserve Officers' Association, and guests, I am not one gifted with ability for phrasemaking or overpowering oratory. I wish I were—because there are times when the manner in which you say something can convince your group when your mere words won't. Yes; there are times when form prevails over substance.

As the convention of your great organization closes tonight with this banquet, I wish that I could give you a stirring speech to climax the series of great addresses that have been made to you in the past few days. I am sorry to be an anticlimax.

In a way I guess I'm somewhat like Dragnet's Joe Friday, since the only way I know to speak is frankly about the facts. I hesitate to speak Reserve facts to you sophisticates on Reserve matters. In doing so, I feel like Gravel Gertie telling Marilyn Monroe how to be glamorous—or like Republicans telling Dwight Eisenhower how to win an election.

But I do want to speak to you about Reserve facts tonight. I do because I have lived daily with those facts during the past decade—ever since the end of World War II when most of you started coming back home.

For a decade now I have been fighting for Reserve measures—for realistic Reserve measures—for Reserve parity with the Regulars.

Frankly, I have enjoyed that fight not because it was pleasant—for it has been very unpleasant at times—but rather because I believed in what I was doing and I knew that I had a good cause for which to fight.

Now what I am about to say, some of you may not like. I am sure that the Pentagon will not like it. And I do not want the Pentagon to hold ROA responsible for what I say. Nor is there anything personal in what I say for I have many friends in the Pentagon and have great admiration for the job that many Pentagon leaders are doing.

Back in 1946 and 1947 I started chanting a theme that had no originality outside of Congress. But in Congress I was certainly doing a solo on that theme. And I think that it was a solo rendition, as far as the executive branch of the Federal Government was concerned.

The theme of my solo was that the only way that this country could achieve military security and economic security at the same time—the only way we could maintain the military defense made necessary by the threat of communism without spending our country into bankruptcy on defense appropriations—was through the system of the smallest possible standing Regular Force backed up by the largest and best trained Reserve we could create and keep.

I argued that in past wars it has been the Reservists—the civilian soldiers—who did more than 90 percent of the actual fighting and defense of our country. I pointed out that training a Reservist costs only a fraction of what it costs to maintain a Regular. I said that the cost mathematics were simple enough for anyone to figure it out—that a Reservist taking training only once a week obviously costs only a fraction of a Regular on duty 7 days a week.

But my theme failed to strike a responsive chord. For several years I felt like a voice crying in the Washington wilderness.

Back in 1946 and 1947 I set out to implement my words with action, and during the years I introduced and pushed for legislation to create a Reserve system that would attract and retain top caliber personnel to the Reserve. I pushed for measures to give Reserve service better pay, retirement benefits, security, death and disability coverage, promotion, training equipment, and recognition.

My legislative proposals really got kicked around and pigeonholed for a long time. Finally the light began to break through into the Pentagon, and the Reserve facts of life began to sink in those cloistered and hallowed walls so immune to Reserve thinking.

Now, most of my legislative proposals have been adopted either by action by Congress or by Executive order. I want to review with you just a few of my experiences with the Pentagon in this 10-year fight that I have been making for the Reserve and the Reservists—and, most important of all, the fight for the security of our Nation because the Reserve has been the very backbone of our national security.

I introduced a bill to provide for inactive training pay. The Pentagon opposed it for a long time but ultimately saw the light and drafted its own bill along the same lines, got it introduced as a departmental measure, and passed. Perhaps the explanation of the Pentagon behavior pattern on this was inordinate pride of authorship. Whatever it is, it wasn't very important. What was important was that we got the inactive training pay on the statute books.

I introduced a bill to provide for Reserve retirement. Again it ran into Pentagon opposition. But then the Pentagon ultimately got up a departmental bill of its own and it was passed. Whose bill passed was not important. What was important was that a Reserve retirement system was established.

I introduced a bill to provide death and disability coverage for Reservists in that hiatus period when the shooting war had stopped but the war status had not been declared at an end—and when Reservists on training duty were not adequately covered.

What did the Pentagon do? For several weeks it failed to make a report on my bill and finally it came up with its own departmental bill which, with the exception of two minor, meaningless technical words, was verbatim with my bill the Pentagon had failed to make a report on and had thus effected a kind of pocket veto. This obviously was a case of inordinate pride of authorship.

After introducing several times a bill to give Reservists the same death and disability coverage while on training duty less than 30 days as the Regulars, I finally got one of my Reserve bills passed. It is known as the Smith Act and gives reservists parity with Regulars on death and disability incurred while on active duty training—except for disease. And I hope that a bill that Senator JOHN SPARKMAN has introduced will pass because it will cover the gap in the law on disease.

I proposed that there be created by Executive order an Army Reserve Medal just like the Naval Reserve Medal and an Army Reserve Special Commendation Ribbon just like the Naval Reserve Commendation Ribbon. But the then War Department rejected the proposal.

The reason for the rejection would be amusing if it did not so tragically reveal the then shortsightedness of the War Department. The Secretary of War vetoed the proposed Army Reserve Medal and the Army Reserve Commendation Ribbon because he said that they would foster a feeling of separation between the Reserves and the Regulars. In his rejection he said that the Navy looked upon its Reserves differently from the way the Army looked upon its Reserves. How right he was.

Having been rebuffed on proposed executive action, I tried legislative action and introduced bills to create by law Reserve Medals and Ribbons for the Army and the Air Force along the same lines as the Naval Reserve Medal and Ribbon. Again the Pentagon blocked action.

But they say that if you keep plugging long and hard enough, your patience and determination will be rewarded. And so it was with mixed satisfaction and amusement that a few years ago I read the announcement that the Pentagon had decided to establish by Executive order an Armed Forces Reserve Medal. The long fight had been won—and the weak excuse of the feeling of separation between the reservists and Regulars by such a Reserve Medal was rescinded and laid to rest as quietly as possible.

Last year, it was ROPA. You know the story on that. You know how together we got that bill passed over the opposition of the Pentagon.

This year again it has been the amendments to ROPA—a bill written by ROA and the honor given me by ROA to be the congressional sponsor of it and the opportunity to have another Smith Reserve Act in the laws. You know the disdain with which the Pentagon treated this bill.

You know the Pentagon attitude of "we didn't want this bill and so we aren't going to have anything to do with amending it." Yes, the Pentagon preferred to let ROPA operate for a year and then to be able on the basis of that year's operation come to Congress and say, "ROPA is wrong. We have proof of the inequities it works."

Reservists can thank the ROA for a different attitude—for the attitude that it did not want reservists to be made guinea pigs and convenient whipping boys for the Pentagon to be able to prove inequities. The ROA attitude was the simple, well-tested attitude of "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

There are many other experiences I could tell you that ROA and I have worked together on—have experienced puzzling and disappointing attitudes from the Pentagon on. I have related these not to indicate what I have done—but rather to indicate a traditional attitude on the part of the Pentagon that reservists and their advocates face.

It is enough to discourage the stouthearted and stop the fainthearted. The point that I want to make is this. Reservists will always need someone to stand up for them—to stand up to this negative attitude of the Pentagon. That is why reservists need ROA so much. I hate to think of what would be the lot of reservists today were it not for ROA.

I have seen firsthand what has happened to individual reservists who stood up to the brass and fought for the Reserve. I have seen in contrast the preferential treatment given some reservists who have adopted for their own personal advancement the expediency of being Regular-minded reservists.

I do not mean to say that there hasn't been some improvement in the attitude of the Pentagon for their evidently has. But it has come slowly and begrudgingly. Perhaps it is because of the realization of the great reliance on the Reserves for our national security. Perhaps it is because I am no longer singing a solo in Congress and in Washington on my Reserve song. Perhaps it is because several in Congress and the White House have now joined the chorus with ROA and myself.

Now that the President has made the Reserve bill so much of a legislative must that he has gone over the head of Congress with an appeal to the American people, let us hope that the Pentagon will see fit to give reservists the decent treatment they deserve and that the national security demands.

In closing let me say this to you. The Reserve program will be only as good as you want to be—only as good as you make it by alert vigilance directed toward the Pentagon. You can't as individual reservists get that action.

Instead, your most effective action is group action. And to be specific, I mean your activity in the ROA. Go back home and tell your fellow reservists this. Tell them of the experiences of an individual Senator if they have any illusions about how much an individual reservist can get done by himself.

I can accomplish very little of what you ask of me. But this much I do pledge to you. I shall continue my fight for the Reserve and the reservists. I shall resist that occupational disease that so often bests one after a little service on the Armed Services Committee—the occupational disease of becoming mesmerized by the Regular brass on attitudes regarding the reservists.

I thank you for the honor you have done me tonight in choosing me as your banquet speaker. I hope I have given you something to think about. I hope that I have given you, from one Senator's view, a new and deeper realization of the importance of your organization, the ROA to you, the Reserves generally and to the national security of our country.

Lynn Fire Department's Annual Memorial Day Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of city councilor and State representative, Francis J. Marr, the youngest member of the great and General Court, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, on the occasion of the Lynn fire department's annual Memorial Day services held at Pine Grove Cemetery, Lynn, Mass.

Representative Marr's address follows:

Reverend clergy, his honor the mayor, Federal, State and city officials, Chief Scanlon, and firefighters, I am deeply conscious of the very great privilege and honor the Lynn Firefighters Relief Association has bestowed in requesting me to address you on this day which means, and always will mean, so much to you, the firefighters of Lynn.

There will not be one single aspect of your year's activities in this association or as combined members of the Lynn fire department which will not reflect the ingenuity, judgment and determination of all the members of the association. Their good judgment has been inspired by the many, many fellow firefighters whose memory we, in our humble way, honor this morning.

It is well that we should stop in the busy turmoil of life and, by reflection, keep green the memory of these things. We are richer and better as a city for having done so.

It is difficult, however, to find words that will adequately express to those whom we honor the full measure of our feelings toward them and our regard for them for the service that they so nobly performed. Realizing the inadequacy and fleeting character of mere words in paying tribute to those whom we honor, it was particularly appropriate that your association had set apart a plot especially for firefighters in this beautiful cemetery and have erected the fitting monument on this plot so that all who pass may stop and pay tribute to the heroic firefighters of Lynn. In like manner, the gracious ladies of the Downing Chapter of the Lynn Firefighters Relief Association, commonly referred to as the Ladies Auxiliary, have done their part. The beautiful monument standing as a lasting memorial has been taken care of yearly by those ladies. Their works have not gone unnoticed by the firefighters, your municipal government, and the public.

And so, once again this year we pause in sacred solemn silence in reverent memorial to the dead. Our words become so shallow at a time like this. And as you men stand watch over the graves of your fellow firefighters, if you could but only speak with them and hear their words, I am sure that they would say to you and me, "Remember me—remember me."

Everyone longs to be remembered. God, the Infinite Creator, even in his divine law—in that commandment which bids man stop in his workweek and rest on the Sabbath, He began the command with the word, "Remember, remember thou keep holy the Sabbath." His own Divine Son, likewise, on the night before He died gave the greatest memorial ever known in the sacramental keepsake of His love when He said, "Do this in memory of Me." And, even the poor crucified thief next to Christ on Calvary asked only one thing, "Remember me when Thou shall come into Thy kingdom."

Remembrance—to be remembered—my dear friends, is the plea of both God and man.

Thus it is that we pause today in this memorial service to the devoted firefighters who served with us in this community. We pause to answer their plea, "Remember me."

That man would be slow of heart indeed who could not be moved by the circumstances under which we meet here this morning. We are gathered in this beautiful cemetery chapel located on consecrated ground, the ground that holds within it the bodily remains of those whom we love. There is not a spot on the face of the earth more conducive to recalling the blessed memory of our dear dead than here among the crosses and marble memorials of stone and in the atmosphere of this chapel. This is the place above all others on God's earth where it seems so easy, so natural to shed a tear for our loved ones.

As you men visit the graves and glance down and read the names on the markers, you no doubt recall their presence or some incident which you have heard from the older members of the department. You remember their doing the routine work in the fire station, or their heroic functions at fires. The common bond that unites you and your departed brothers is tangibly marked by the time honored symbol of the Maltese cross which distinguishes them and you from the ordinary citizen.

Through their unending efforts to accomplish the task of safeguarding their fellow citizens, many have fallen as victims to injury and death. Yours, then, is the task of not only carrying on in their footsteps, but to lend the hand of comfort, compassion and aid to their loved ones.

These are our holy dead, but surely this 6 feet of cold, dank earth does not hold them forever. We know by the light of faith that they will live again. Once more we shall hear their voices, feel the touch of their hands, see once more the light in their living eyes; because these graves have no lasting victory. It is only for a time. They will live again. This is the truth or there is no truth at all.

Not only this place but also the persons we memorialize should move our hearts. We honor the memory of firefighters, servants of the public. I too, as a councillor and representative, am a public servant. But I know that there is no group of people more easily nor more quickly forgotten than those who serve faithfully in positions of public trust and responsibility.

But, here and now we pause to remember the firefighters—the men who almost daily risk their lives for others, who endure the hardships of firefighting, who live apart from their families that other families might live together in safety; men who harken to the call for help in every need and in every hour; men whose watchful waiting, whose careful vigilance over a community, assures all others of peace and rest during the darkness of night.

And now, to these devoted firefighters who have lived among us, worked with us, and who have gone and sleep here in silence, we ask almighty God, be Thou their guardian. Preserve them now and forever from the dangers of suffering flames. Bring them to the peace and rest of paradise, that land amid whose sylvan bowers no tempter lurks, on whose sunny banks no shadow reposes, whose perfumed air no sin taints, where there are no alarms because there is no danger, where there is no sickness nor suffering, nor death, nor parting, where there is neither sorrow nor tears and no more goodbyes.

As we too sooner or later must follow them, we beg dear God, give us the strength and grace to prepare to meet Thee face to

face, that we may stand and answer the last, the greatest alarm of life, to make our last run into the outstretched hands of God, never more to be forgotten, but to be remembered—remembered forever and ever.

Amending Mutual Security Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in deep sympathy with the objectives of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, but I share the fear of my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] and others, that it would tie up the administration of this bill into an impossible situation.

For instance, let us look at some of the other countries' problems. Perhaps we are going into an internal matter that we should not, but take the case of French Morocco. I do not know whether the gentleman's amendment would apply to that or not. The French consider that to be a part of France. Morocco has the privilege of sending 30 deputies to the French Chamber of Deputies. Those deputies vote and have all of the prerogatives of any member of the Chamber of Deputies in France, which is more than we do for Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I am wondering if the gentleman is not thinking of Algeria. I think French Morocco is a protectorate.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his correction. It is Algeria that has the privilege to send members to the French parliament. French Morocco is a protectorate. But when Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. SELDEN and I were in France a few weeks ago we talked about this problem to the Prime Minister of France, and he said he hoped to work out a similar arrangement for the other French protectorates in Africa, and a slightly different one for Tunisia, and he said he was much aware of the problem. I do not think I am giving away any secret when I tell you that I said to the Prime Minister: "I hope you do not pull out of North Africa right now, because if you do the whole thing might collapse." It would certainly create a vacuum for the Communists to move in. I said: "I hope you can work out something with these people that will be mutually satisfactory to the French and to them."

So I say, if we adopt this amendment we might be tying the hands of people who are really trying to work out an agreement. I have faith in the sincerity of the Prime Minister of France. I think the proof is in the fact that he has succeeded in satisfying the Tunesians, that the French have released the Tunesian leader and he has gone back to Tunis, and that they have a long-range program giving that country its independence. But these things cannot happen overnight.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Has the gentleman any explanation why the French took those troops and sent them to Algeria?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Of course I have an explanation, but I can give you more than that. I think the Communists were trying to stir up a revolution down there. The French are trying to keep order. There are three radio stations daily which are beaming broadcasts, one of them from Rumania, which is behind the Iron Curtain, urging those people to rebel, urging them to rise against the French; and, incidentally, urging them to throw the Americans on their bases out of north Africa. I think the French sent the troops down there to keep order. We have a terrific investment down there. Our military people say that strategically these bases are worth a lot to us. In fact, they are something that we cannot afford to give up, at least not until such time as we get our bases in Spain completed, where we have a more firm arrangement, where we have the blessing of the government, but these things take time.

Mr. BENTLEY. Does the gentleman think it is the Communists rather than a nationalist movement?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, I think the Communists are exploiting it, and I am sure the gentleman thinks so too. They always exploit anything where they can create a dispute. They broadcast from behind the Iron Curtain and that would certainly add proof to the fact that they are exploiting it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not a fact there are broadcasts going out from Cairo and from French Morocco along with the others?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I mentioned three stations, one from Cairo, one from Rumania.

Mr. CELLER. Then there is one in Tetuan, in Spanish Morocco.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I had not heard of that. Then that would be four.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. We, by a vote of 367 to nothing told the world very recently that we are opposed to any form of colonialism. Must we give up that idea if we are afraid to put into this bill the fact that that vote represents what the people of the United States feel, namely, that we will support those people who seek national independence and national self-government and that we ask those free nations to whom we extend assistance to join with us in support of that principle. We must do our utmost to give the people what we agreed they are entitled to when we passed the McCormack resolution last week; the right to national sovereignty and individual liberty and protection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman's statement. I am for the resolution, but in this instance the amendment is getting a little more specific. I do not know when the proper time is to implement the McCormack amendment. Take the case of the Mau Maus in Africa. Are they ready for nationalism? I do not think they are ready for self-government, and while they have been subject to colonialism it is the sort of colonialism that has educated them, improved their status. I do not see that it is necessary for other nations to show their support of this principle by declaring war immediately to gain their independence. There is a difference between stating a principle and implementing it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. We are not saying: "You have got to do this." We are saying: "If you get our taxpayers' money you have got to do certain things."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Then we are saying they have got to do it. It is to be hoped they will gain their freedom ultimately. We do not have to tell them exactly how to do it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I disagree. The point is, nations which refuse to recognize the principle of national self-determination disqualify themselves from getting assistance from us. What we do is give them a choice—we do not tell them what choice to make. In this manner we stand by our basic principles and make clear to all the people of the world what we stand for.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I again say you are going beyond the principle and in effect telling these nations how they must put the principle into practice. This would require different solutions for different problems.

The National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the office of the Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

I am disturbed to find that provision for the support of the National Guard has been eliminated from the new proposals acted upon by the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House, as reported in the press. I earnestly hope that the Congress will restore that provision before taking final action.

There is no question involved as between Federal and State governmental jurisdiction over the National Guard. Naturally, as Governor, I am vitally interested in having a strong National Guard for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but I am just as

much interested in our National Guard being ready to respond to any call to duty, either to meet emergencies within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or to join in our national defense. The National Guard in general, the Pennsylvania National Guard in particular, is considered the primary force, after the Regular forces, upon which our national defense is dependent.

As I see it, there is no conflict between the National Guard and the Reserve. They are both on the same team and should not be placed in competitive positions as regards recruiting. If the provision for the support of the National Guard is not restored by the Congress, this would work a great hardship for the National Guard and would, accordingly, constitute a disservice to the national defense effort of our country.

The proposed legislation to establish a swiftly mobilizable, well-trained Reserve is vital to our national security—hence, to the security of of our 165 million citizens. It is strictly a military matter, and I, therefore, feel very strongly that there is no room in this legislation for any sort of considerations not inherent to the specific objectives of this military legislation.

Report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which has just submitted its report to the President, has had a remarkable and unique opportunity to make a telescopic and also a microscopic examination of our country and our Government. Our assignment, as embodied in Public Law 109, was "to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions to the end that these relations may be clearly defined, and the functions concerned may be allotted to their proper jurisdictions."

This was a large assignment. It necessitated a journey through history to the beginnings of our Republic, and the reassessment of government activities today at national, State, and local levels, as a prelude to laying down some guidelines for the future.

The result is a 300-page report which takes cognizance of the immutable principles of the Constitution, but is keyed to the realities of our times. It says, in many ways, that the basic strength of our country is in our people and our communities. It says that "a fundamental objective of our system of Government should be to keep centralization to a minimum and State-local responsibility to a maximum."

It says that, if we are to realize that objective, State and local government must be strengthened, while the national Government needs a discriminating sense of "when not to act."

Because there is so much of far-reaching value in the report to students, legislators, and the general public, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to include in the RECORD a series of excerpts from it, which I shall insert in the coming days, of which the first is taken from the introduction:

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Out of the trying events of this past quarter-century, and out of the accompanying doubts and fears, has come a deeper understanding of what is required to maintain a proper division of activities between the National Government and the States. As with all governmental institutions in our society, the basic purpose of the division of powers is to provide a climate that favors growth of the individual's material and spiritual potential. Power will not long rest with any government that cannot or will not make proper use of it for that end. Our system of Federal government can be in proper balance, therefore, only when each level is effective and responsible.

Responsibility implies restraint as well as action. The States have responsibilities not only to do efficiently what lies within their competence, but also to refrain from action injurious to the Nation; the National Government has responsibilities not only to perform, within the limits of its constitutional authority, those public functions the States cannot perform, but also to refrain from doing those things the States and their subdivisions are willing and able to do.

People in the United States, as elsewhere, have looked more and more to government for assistance in solving their social and economic problems. The National Government has sometimes responded more readily than have the State and local governments. The Commission does not deal with the issue of whether or not governments rather than individuals should satisfy these needs. What it faces is the fact that the National Government has gradually undertaken some new activities which are susceptible of a larger measure of State and local handling. The Commission does not essay a judgment as to whether unreadiness on the part of the States and localities or overzealousness on the part of the National Government, or both, may have caused the existing division of activities. It merely emphasizes the fact that the more effectively our State and local governmental structures, procedures, and policies can be adapted to present-day governmental objectives, the less occasion there will be for bypassing State action in the future.

Far from weakening the National Government, the strengthening of State and local government would increase its effectiveness. The responsibilities that unavoidably must fall on the National Government are formidable. The fullest possible utilization of the resources of the State and local governments is desirable both to supplement national action where national action is necessary, and to relieve the National Government of having to divert its resources and energies to activities that could be handled as well or better by the States and their subdivisions.

The National Government has therefore an interest, as well as a responsibility, in scrutinizing with the greatest care the degree of national participation in existing or proposed programs. It is not enough to ascertain that the contemplated activity is within the constitutional competence of the National Government and that there is a national interest in having the activity performed. In the light of recent Supreme Court decisions, and in our present highly interdependent society, there are few activities of Government indeed in which there is not some degree of national interest, and in which the National Government is without constitutional authority to participate in some manner.

The degree and limits of national participation must therefore be determined by the exercise of balanced judgment. In addition to appraising carefully in each instance the need for national participation, the National Government should hold essential participation to the minimum required for attaining its objective. In all of its actions the National Government should be concerned with their effects on State and local governments.

The preservation and strengthening of our Federal system depend in the last analysis on the self-restraint and responsibility, as well as the wisdom, of our actions as citizens. If we are not willing to leave some room for diversity of policy, to tolerate some lack of uniformity in standards, even in many matters which are of national concern and about which we may feel strongly, the essence of federalism, even if not the legal fiction, will have been lost. We must also realize that it can be lost, or its vitality sapped, by nonuse of State and local initiative as well as by overuse of national authority. We have therefore as citizens a responsibility to see to it that those legitimate needs of society that could be met by timely State and local action do not by default have to be met by the National Government.

Precise divisions of governmental activities need always to be considered in the light of varied and shifting circumstances; they need also to be viewed in the light of principles rooted in our history. Assuming efficient and responsible government at all levels, national, State, and local—we should seek to divide our civic responsibilities so that we:

Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economic performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake.

Letter From Resident of Panama Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which was received from a resident of the Panama Canal Zone which lauds Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD for his keen interest in the situation that exists in the Panama Canal Zone, regarding employment of American citizens in that area. The name of the writer has been eliminated for obvious reasons:

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: As a former resident of Pennsylvania (Beaver County) I would like to express my appreciation to you for the fine work you are doing on behalf of the American citizens who work on the Canal Zone.

The inducements for staying here on the isthmus are slowly being taken away. There are a large number of employees who came to the isthmus years ago and cannot afford to leave now and give up years of faithful service. Many of the employees are at an age where it would be impossible to find

decent employment elsewhere. The morale of the Canal Zone employees is very low.

We cannot understand the viewpoint of the present canal administration. It appears that the entire Panama Canal Company should be investigated. According to the local press, such an investigation is to be made by Members of the United States Congress in the near future, for which a great deal of credit is due you. If you are a member of this investigating committee, may I suggest that you, as well as the other members, spend some time talking to the employees themselves and get their personal viewpoints on matters here.

You are to be commended on your version of the revised United States-Panama Treaty now pending ratification by the United States Senate. Many American citizens here agree with you that we should not give away so much for so little in return.

The Panama Canal, which was built at the taxpayers' expense, is still of vital importance to today's shipping and should continue to be operated and maintained by American citizens who could faithfully, and with high morale, execute their duties under favorable and justifiable working conditions. However, the American citizens are being replaced by employees who are Panamanian citizens and this condition will become worse if the treaty, now before the United States Senate, is ratified. If and when this materializes it will be extremely unfair to all United States citizens as well as being hazardous from a general security standpoint. If and when the treaty is ratified it should be immediately made known what United States citizens are to be replaced in order that they may seek employment elsewhere at once.

I am only one of many former residents of the State of Pennsylvania, now residing on the isthmus, who are mighty proud of your record as Representative from Pennsylvania in the United States Congress. Please rest assured that any further action you take on behalf of the American citizens who are employees of the Panama Canal will be gratefully appreciated.

Harry Agganis: the Golden Greek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from a recent issue of the New York Times in tribute to the late Harry Agganis, the most fabulous athlete, whose home is in my congressional district, 118 Waterhill Street, Lynn, Mass., where emotional tributes and messages of sincere sympathy are cascading on the survivors of this highly respected star athlete:

SPORTS OF THE TIMES

(By Arthur Daley)

THE GOLDEN GREEK

When Clipper Smith was coaching the Boston Yanks of the National Football League in 1947, he cast wistful eyes in the direction of a solidly built, black-haired youngster.

"There's a kid," he said, "who can play regularly on my team right now. And I wouldn't be surprised if he could make every other team in the league."

The Clipper was not speaking of a collegian who had won unanimous All-America honors. He was talking about a 17-year-old schoolboy quarterback for Lynn Classical High, Harry Agganis. Perhaps nothing can better illustrate the extraordinary athletic gifts of the man all New England idolized as the Golden Greek.

When Agganis completed his college course at Boston University, he was eagerly sought by the Cleveland Browns as a football player. But the Boston Red Sox were just as eager to get him as a baseball player. Furthermore, they sweetened the kitty with a $40,000 bonus. So Harry elected the diamond.

Brief career

His career was much too brief. He failed to recover from an attack of pneumonia and died at the age of 25 the day before yesterday. It's trite to say that his death was a shock. But there's no other way to say it. Harry was a big fellow, 6 feet 2 inches, and 195 pounds. He seemed to be made of whipcord and pressed steel. He was vibrant and alive, bubbling with energy and buoyant spirits. He had admirable character and he was a matchless competitor.

When Harry joined the Red Sox they had to confess that they'd never met a rookie quite like him. He was as poised and as much at home as if he'd been a big leaguer for years. A friendly, easy-to-know fellow, he also handled the army of Boston sports writers with deftness and aplomb. The ballplayers couldn't understand it.

"Why shouldn't he?" asked Gerry Hern, the columnist. "He's been a star, a headline attraction, and a center of attention ever since he was in high school. This is all old stuff to him."

It was a true and penetrating analysis. When Harry was graduated from Lynn Classical, 76 colleges pleaded with him to enter their hallowed halls of learning for his higher education. The bidding was fierce because here was a kid who could do everything.

Prior claim

The place he selected was Boston University. The grapevine insists that the Boston Red Sox had spotted him long before anyone else and that they had paid his way through college. So they picked one close to home where they could keep an eye on him and where they could watch his progress.

But it wasn't as a diamond operative that Agganis caught the headlines. It was as a football player. He was a T-formation quarterback who was a magician in ball handling. He also was a left-handed passer of such artistry that he spun 34 touchdown passes while gaining 2,930 yards. As a punter he averaged 46 yards a kick, almost 4 yards longer than the best kicker averaged in the National Football League last season. He was a tremendous ball carrier. He kicked off. He added points after touchdowns. Few, if any, backs were better on defense.

"Harry Agganis is the greatest football player I have ever coached in 25 years of college and professional ball," said Buff Donelli, his coach at Boston University.

Donelli is one of the better strategists in the gridiron game and his pet formation was the winged T, which he had learned under Lou Little. The Buffer was wedded to it until Agganis came along. The result was a quick divorce. So exceptional a performer was the Golden Greek that Donelli had to switch to the straight T. Then Agganis would handle the ball on every play and be an even sharper offensive threat.

One-man gang

Agganis was both the delight and despair of Donelli. A rugged individualist, Harry often went counter to the book. But he did everything so well that the Buffer usually had to shrug his shoulders and accept it. Donelli was staring out the window in worried uncertainty just before a game with Syracuse.

"Stop worrying, coach," said Agganis, the epitome of confidence. "We'll win this."

Donelli almost began to believe him when the Terriers rolled up a 20 to 0 lead behind Harry's superb all-around play. But the Buffer soon was squirming unhappily when the Orange struck back for 3 touchdowns and a 21 to 20 advantage. Agganis flashed a reassuring smile at his coach and promptly engineered a 2-touchdown drive for a 33 to 21 triumph.

"What did I tell you?" said Harry. "There was nothing to worry about."

The Red Sox were sure that this Frank Merriwell would become as great a baseball player as he'd been a football player. Those who best knew this remarkable young man were in full agreement.

A Helping Hand for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, I introduced a bill to provide that Federal funds be provided to construct outright any new school facilities required by school districts which are carrying out, or are prepared to carry out, integration programs. This bill has received generous and favorable attention from many sources and I have been encouraged by the response.

However, I have found that some have not fully understood the spirit in which my proposal was conceived. Illustrative of such a lack of understanding is an editorial which appeared on June 16 in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch. I believe that my colleagues will find this editorial and the letter reply which I wrote to Mr. Virginius Dabney, the editor of the Times-Dispatch, most informative. An editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of the same day reveals a quite different reaction from another newspaper published in a State which is also confronted with this problem. In the interest of clarification, I present herewith the two editorials and my letter to the Richmond paper:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of June 16, 1955]

SILLY PLAN TO AID INTEGRATION

Illustrative of the profound and widespread misunderstanding in other sections of the issues involved in the South's segregation problem, is the action of Representative UDALL, of Arizona, in introducing a bill in Congress providing for Federal appropriations of up to $150 million a year to build whatever new buildings are required to integrate pupils in the public schools.

Strange as it must appear to Mr. UDALL, the immensely difficult problems posed by the Supreme Court's recent ruling with respect to integration in the public schools are not primarily, or even secondarily financial. They are mainly social and racial.

As a matter of fact, it has been argued by advocates of integration that a great deal of public money would be saved, if the races were mixed in the schools. Actually, the saving would be much less than some of these persons claim, but there probably would be a certain amount of saving, at least at the outset.

Yet if the number of children in the schools were to remain about the same as before integration, there could not be any great

difference in the number of school buildings, schoolrooms and schoolteachers required. As the school population mounted—which it is now doing more rapidly than in earlier years—the physical facilities and the teaching staffs would have to go up with it. This increase in staff and facilities will have to take place anyway, if the schools are to keep pace with mounting enrollments in the coming years.

True, there is the possibility that some such plan as separate schools for the two sexes might be adopted as one way of meeting the Court's integration order. There is also the proposal that 3 types of schools be maintained at each level—1 for white, 1 for colored, and 1 for members of both races who wish to attend a mixed school. Either of these plans would cost more than the system we now have.

But Representative UDALL is a wholesouled integrationist who wants to accelerate the process of mixing the races. When he introduced the bill for Federal aid, he was not thinking of financing expensive ways of reducing or avoiding the impact of integration.

It is impossible, therefore, to take him seriously. The Federal appropriations he proposes are not needed, even if the South were planning to integrate speedily—which it isn't.

Aside from everything else, Federal appropriations for schools are basically bad. They give the Federal Government a voice in the management of the schools, and they increase the already vastly excessive dependence of the States and localities on Washington. The sooner the Udall bill is forgotten the better.

JUNE 21, 1955.

Mr. VIRGINIUS DABNEY,
Editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest your editorial of June 16, 1955, entitled "Silly Plan to Aid Integration." Since you have chosen to describe my bill to assist school districts which are carrying out, or are prepared to carry out, a program of integration as illustrative of the profound and widespread misunderstanding on other sections of the issues involved in the South's segregation problem, I feel impelled to call certain facts to your attention.

Your editorial asserts: "Strange as it must appear to Mr. UDALL, the immensely difficult problems posed by the Supreme Court's recent ruling with respect to integration in the public schools are not primarily, or even secondarily financial. They are mainly social and racial." This statement does not appear strange to me; in fact, I expressed a similar belief when I introduced the bill, for I said:

"Without doubt, the main impediment to integration is the delicate and extremely complex human relations questions which are implicit in the Court's decision. This paramount problem is, of course, a local matter which must be worked out by the communities and individuals directly affected. It cannot be solved overnight by rulings of courts or by laws enacted in legislative bodies. Men of good will in these communities must wrestle with this problem and solve it as best they can, for admittedly any outside pressure or intrusion would only aggravate the situation."

I cannot agree with your statement that the financial effect of a program of integration probably would be a certain amount of saving, at least at the outset. Certainly, the people of the South have no inclination to lower the standard of education for any child as a result of integration. On the basis of findings by the Office of Education in its survey of school facilities throughout the country, it is indisputable that the South does face an excessive and unfair financial burden. Since I feel that this burden is partially a result of Federal action—the rulings of the Supreme Court—I have suggested that the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist in these terms: "This national obligation is emphasized, too, by the fact that under dual school systems many of the schools for Negro children have been markedly substandard. If we are really interested, then, in successfully implementing the Court's decision, we should guard against any program which would result in a leveling down of our schools. It is obvious that only under a substantial Federal-aid program such as I have outlined can we insure that the standard of the whole system will be raised, and thus protect the integrity of our educational enterprise."

The intention of my bill I described in these words:

"At the very least, such funds would help the areas concerned, begin the job which must be done. Most important, it would be warmhearted testimony to school districts facing this problem that the entire country is sympathetically interested and is willing to assist in the task ahead. No longer would the affected areas be justified in feeling that they are confronted by a Federal club, and are being ordered to integrate. Rather, they would realize that we all share their concern, and are prepared to help. Instead of self-righteous criticism, the rest of the country would hold out a helping hand, instead of threats; we would use understanding in place of compulsion we would offer cooperation."

If this qualifies as "silly" language, I plead guilty to your charge.

Inasmuch as I come from a State which has faced a similar integration problem in the recent past, I was somewhat distressed by your cavalier dismissal of my purposes. My own State in 1952 and 1953 faced and overcame problems no less serious than those which confront many Virginia communities today. As a school board member, I am thoroughly familiar with all of these attendant difficulties.

I am enclosing a copy of the statement which I made in the House of Representatives when I introduced the bill. I believe you will find when you read it that I have advanced a constructive proposal which deserves to be examined on its merits.

Sincerely,

STEWART L. UDALL.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 16, 1955]

AID FOR INTEGRATION

An Arizona Congressman has faced up to one of the real problems of ending racial segregation in the schools by proposing Federal aid during the transition.

Representative STEWART UDALL makes a persuasive case when he says that, just as the Federal Government grants funds for school construction where its defense projects create an impact on local facilities, so local districts which are put under a strain by the Supreme Court's mandate are entitled to claim some help in meeting extraordinary expenses that result.

In most States where segregation has been the rule, the myth of "separate but equal" has been exploded long since. Where separate schools fell short of equality, integrated schools cannot be brought up to equality without an increase in expenditures. That is what many southern districts will face, and there are reasons both of justice and expediency for Federal aid at least in limited areas, such as the construction of needed new schools, and raising the standards of teacher salaries.

Federal aid to education in the broader sense has been blockaded all too long by an unfortunate controversy over extending that aid to private church schools as well as public schools. There is no good reason why this controversy should enter into the consideration of the Udall bill. As the Supreme Court's opinion applied only to public schools, so by definition only public schools could be eligible for Federal aid in complying with it. Congress should lend a sympathetic ear to the proposal.

Hugh Milton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Honorable Hugh Milton, a Reserve officer, has rendered outstanding service as Assistant Secretary of the Army. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Steve Tillman, entitled "Hugh Milton, Reserve Chief, Has Genius for Conciliation," which was printed in the Army Times of May 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUGH MILTON, RESERVE CHIEF, HAS GENIUS FOR CONCILIATION

(By Steve Tillman)

WASHINGTON.—A tall man walks down corridor E of the Pentagon's second floor. Every few feet he is stopped for a friendly word or a handshake. For each well wisher, civilian or Army officer, the man has the same warm smile—the smile of one who loves people. This is Hugh Milton, one-time National Guard man, now a major general in the Army Reserve. He is Assistant Secretary of the Army, charged directly with the development of its Reserve components.

Milton is one of those rare souls—a natural leader, intelligent and, above all, broad-minded, with a genius for conciliation. After a trying day he gently closes the door on bombast and Pentagon "jungle warfare" and tries to win others over by reason and friendship.

I asked Milton how he felt about the pending national Reserve plan. He told me that whatever form the final measure takes, the Army will put it to work in the American way. In other words, as the bill now stands, universal military training has been ruled out.

"The plan's been critized," I said to Milton. "Many think it will make the starting of careers, marriages, homes and families more uncertain for young men today."

"Not so at all," said Milton politely but firmly. "It improved a man's chances. Why? Because his military service will be completely predictable. He'll know where he stands.

"I need not remind you that a successful Reserve program requires much more than good, old-fashioned, red-blooded patriotism on the part of our young men. We have never won a war yet without the full mobilization of our Reserves. While we have theoretically believed in the citizen-soldier concept since the days of George Washington, we have never really had a combat ready Reserve.

"So it is a matter of the greatest urgency that we provide facilities required in order that our Reserve may become thoroughly familiar with the equipment now necessary to conduct modern warfare.

"We have had National Guard programs in the past, true, but it has invariably taken

months to bring these wonderful forces to an acceptable degree of combat capability.

"Today and tomorrow we will have no time for the luxury of leisurely mobilization. Support of our Reserve bill is no partisan issue. It is a national problem on which we can all unite—and the time is now."

Defense Backs Down on News Blackout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I ask unanimous consent that a statement he has prepared regarding the reversal by the Defense Department of its position on the news blackout be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with an Associated Press article relating to that subject.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

I am interested to see that a reversal has been issued by the Defense Department as a result of the deluge of criticism in the Nation's press concerning the news blackout that the Department proposed to clamp down on newsmen.

I called attention to this development in a speech I delivered on April 30 in Huntington, W. Va. The Department had said that the new order on military information issued March 29 set up a new concept of news holding that information "must constitute a constructive contribution" to the Department's mission. In my April 30 speech, I questioned the propriety of the Department deciding what does or does not constitute "a constructive contribution" and I warned that news to which the public was entitled might be hidden merely by being labeled "not constructive."

In yesterday's Washington Evening Star I read a news article by the Associated Press noting that the Defense Department has been forced to reverse this drastic order. Robert T. Ross, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, is quoted as saying, "In providing information in answer to questions by the press or the public, it would be my view that we would not pass on whether or not it was 'constructive' to the primary mission of the Department of Defense." The article also said Mr. Ross has announced that statements about requiring information to be constructive applied only to the Department's own public-relations personnel.

I note with satisfaction that the Defense Department has thus been forced to back down, at least orally, in its efforts to withhold legitimate news from the public. I commend the Nation's press for being so vigilant in defending the freedom of the press.

I hope the Department will, in fact, carry out its intentions, as expressed by Mr. Ross, both in letter and in spirit. However, I also hope that the Nation's newspapers will continue to be vigilant and keep a sharp eye on Government departments which try to institute any form of censorship under any guise whatsoever.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 29, 1955]

PENTAGON NEWS CURB EXPLAINED

A Defense Department spokesman says statements about information having to be useful, interesting, or constructive applied only to that originated by its own public relations men.

It did not mean to imply that those criteria would have to be met before the Department would answer questions from the press or the public, Robert T. Ross, Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, said yesterday.

Protests arose when Defense Secretary Wilson issued a directive March 29 saying that information must be constructive to the mission of the Defense Department.

J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and chairman of the freedom of information committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and others charged that the Pentagon's information policies would enable officials to cover up their own errors.

When reporters asked Mr. Ross yesterday about the intent of Mr. Wilson's directive, Mr. Ross replied:

"In providing information in answer to questions by the press or the public, it would be my view that we would not pass on whether or not it was constructive to the primary mission of the Department of Defense."

Mr. Ross also wrote Senator CURTIS, Republican, of Nebraska, yesterday that when R. Karl Honaman, the Department's security expert, said he thought the requirements of being useful and interesting should be used as a yardstick in releasing information he meant only information originated by the Department's public relations offices.

Senator CURTIS had written Mr. Ross the day before inquiring about the remarks which Mr. Honaman had made in a letter to Mr. Wiggins.

Veterans' Organization Selects Buck Hood As Outstanding Texan of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Department of Texas, Veterans of Foreign Wars, each year selects a citizen of Texas to receive a Silver Citizenship Medal presented by the the organization.

I am happy to announce that the recipient of this award for 1955 is an outstanding Texas newspaperman and, I am proud to say, my personal friend for many years standing—Mr. Buck Hood, managing editor of the Austin American-Statesman.

The citation accompanying the award reads as follows:

Veterans of Foreign Wars, of the United States, awards this citation to Buck Hood for outstanding service to his State, community, and his fellowman regardless of creed or color, in his unceasing efforts toward public enlightenment, thereby maintaining vigilance for the safety of our country and for the principles set forth by the Founding Fathers of the United States of America.

Mr. President, no individual in the great State of Texas could be more deserving of such recognition than Buck Hood.

Tribute was paid to Mr. Hood in a presentation address by Mr. John E. McKelvey, Texas department commander, VFW. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. McKelvey's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS, PRESENTATION OF SILVER CITIZENSHIP AWARD, THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL DEPARTMENT ENCAMPMENT, CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., JUNE 25, 1955, TO MR. BUCK HOOD, MANAGING EDITOR, AUSTIN AMERICAN-STATESMAN, BY JOHN E. MCKELVEY, DEPARTMENT COMMANDER

Annually, we of the Department of Texas, Veterans of Foreign Wars, select the person whom we consider the outstanding Texan as a recipient of our silver citizenship medal. The recipient of this award is not the man who made the most money—rather, we consider the humanism of the various nominees for this award. We endeavor to select that person, who by his daily conduct, his ever-normal pursuits, and professional duties, exemplifies those qualities of citizenship we so greatly admire.

The recipient of the silver citizenship award for 1955 is a member of the working press. He started out in his profession as a newsboy, carrying papers on a daily route; he has risen in his profession until he is now managing editor of one of the most influential papers in Texas, and most important, he has missed none of the steps in between. He began writing at an early age for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram; he has covered assignments for one of the largest wire services; and was a reporter in the Escobar Revolution in Mexico in 1929. He has been with the same publishers, the Fentress organization, for over 27 years, which bears evidence that he now has a steady job.

We don't make it a requisite that the recipient of this award be a veteran, but it gladdens our hearts when veterans so distinguish themselves as to be eligible to receive it. We are, therefore, doubly proud that this year's recipient is a veteran, and a veteran of that great voluntary force, the United States Marine Corps.

We have often heard that no one has more time than a busy man. Here is a man who is charged with all of the administrative detail of publishing a daily newspaper in one of the largest cities in the largest State in the Union. Yet, he always finds time to assist his fellow man. The list of his accomplishments are legend, but I would briefly recite a few: He successfully instituted the Christmas Shoe Fund in Austin, which annually buys shoes for all of the under-privileged children of that city. One of the significant things about this program is that all of the money collected is expended for shoes, and not one cent is spent for any other purpose. The Salvation Army recognized the significance of this program, and awarded it their Meritorius Service Award in 1951.

Recognizing the need for youth activities in this city, he recently and almost singlehandedly received the Golden Gloves bouts, and achieved an all-time high in contestants and in spectators.

He has always strived to make his home city an actual home to the many servicemen stationed there, and has been persohally cited by the Commanding General of the Strategic Air Command for his efforts in

this regard. His participation in National Defense Week was so effective that the president of the Reserve Officers Association gave him great credit for the success of the program.

A very fervent and strong believer in his accepted faith, he nevertheless assists all faiths in their religious needs. He was instrumental in making the recent City-Wide Fellowship Mission in Austin an effective and meaningful program.

These are only a few of the many programs and projects which he has dutifully assisted. He has truly been a friend of his fellow man. For these many services, in so many varied fields, we proudly present to that outstanding citizen of the State of Texas, the managing editor of the Austin American-Statesman, that man, who like Will Rogers, said, "I never met a man I didn't like", the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Texas, Silver Citizenship Award for 1955, Mr. Buck Hood.

And Friend Buck, may you be in heaven a week before the devil finds out you're there.

Eisenhower Now and in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Walter Lippmann, published today in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW—EISENHOWER NOW AND IN 1956

(By Walter Lippmann)

Until very recently, Mr. Eisenhower has acted like a man who, knowing his duty, is determined to grin and bear it. But in the past weeks he has been talking and acting with a kind of ease and good humor which no one can put on if he does not feel them. I would not suppose that this is due to his having reached a decision, say about 1956, which takes a load off his mind. For the position of being able to take it or leave it in 1956, with so many begging him to take it, is a pleasant one for any man to be in. It is also a position of maximum political strength. It compels all the Republicans, except the McCarthy splinter, to toe the line, and it keeps the Democrats off balance for the presidential contest.

The most probable explanation of why he is enjoying his office is that, like the rest of us, he likes his work when things go well. He liked his work least, so it appeared to me, just before he extricated himself from the dilemma into which he had been maneuvered over those wretched offshore islands. And ever since the Austrian Treaty, there has been no mistaking his feeling that while Mr. Dulles, with his sterner conscience, still won't let him hope for much, he does not now have to fear the worst.

With prosperity and peace, the winds and the tides of politics are with him, and he is an enormously popular as well as a successful President.

Assuming that he allows himself to be drafted, the most interesting question about 1956 is whether the people will vote to keep the present combination of Eisenhower and a Democratic Congress. I do not think it is any exaggeration to say that Mr. Eisenhower's success as President began when Republicans lost control of Congress and of the standing committees. In his first 2 years he had suffered an almost unbroken record of frustration and of domination by the senior Republicans, and particularly the Republican committee chairmen, in the Senate.

They invaded, knocked about, infiltrated, smeared, and terrorized the administration's personnel to the verge of paralysis and demoralization. Worse than that, they terrorized some of the highest officials of the Eisenhower Cabinet into countenancing, and indeed participating in, acts of injustice—as in the Oppenheimer, Davies, Ladejinsky cases—which will not soon be forgotten. Most dangerously of all, they held the President and Secretary Dulles captive and on so short a string that the effective control of foreign policy was in the hands of a few Senators.

The reaction to these dark doings set in before the congressional election of 1954. But the defeat of the Republican chairmen, and the demotion of Senator KNOWLAND from the post of leader of the Senate, have been decisive in making it possible for Mr. Eisenhower to be a successful President.

The President has recovered the control, or at least the right and power to control, the integrity and the security of the executive department. The injustices that have been done have not yet been righted. But there is a disposition to think twice before heading into any more big witch hunts.

Since the new Congress came to Washington, the President has slowly but surely recovered control of the conduct of foreign policy. With all the Democrats and about half the Republicans behind him, there has been no chance for Senator KNOWLAND, or for the China war party, not to speak of MCCARTHY, to dominate the President—no chance, that is to say, unless Peiping did something sufficiently provocative to give Chiang the opportunity to entangle us. This did not happen. An important reason why it did not happen was that the administration had recovered control of foreign policy and was able to use diplomacy in Peiping and in Formosa. I do not think they could have used diplomacy of this kind in 1953 and 1954.

If Mr. Eisenhower decides to run again, one of his big headaches will come from the fact that as party leader he must work for a Republican Congress and frown upon the Democrats. Yet, as President, he needs a Democratic Congress. I know that it is looking very far into the unknown future to say this. But it looks to me that in a second term Mr. Eisenhower would need a Democratic Congress at least as much, perhaps even more, than he needs it today.

For in his second term there would be a long and hard Republican struggle for the succession in 1960, there being no obvious candidate to follow Eisenhower. The senior Republicans in the Congress, who are the great powers in the Republican Party organization, are opposed to the general tendency of the program of the Eisenhower wing of the party. Yet in the next few years the country will need domestic policies and measures which are more and not less progressive than those that the President has as yet ventured to propose. The President complained yesterday about the legislation which the Democratic Congress has not enacted. Nevertheless, for the progressive measures which the new President will need to propose, a Democratic Congress will be needed.

The growth of our population is great and rapid—almost explosive as compared with the capacity of many of our public services. The country is outgrowing its educational system, its hospital and health facilities, its road system, its parks, and many of its other public facilities. They will demand public investment and public support at a much higher level than we now regard as normal. This support will require Federal aid. For only the Federal Government has the capacity to raise the necessary revenues. The Federal aid will have to be on a much larger scale than we now are used to.

There will, moreover, be little prospect, and we must suppose that there will be no warrant for the reduction of military expenditures. We shall be able to postpone, but not for very long, going up to this new plateau of Federal expenditure. For schools, hospitals, roads, and housing are not luxuries. In a modern democratic urban society, such as ours, they are necessities which cannot for long be neglected. In the years to come the demand for them will be critical.

Funds for Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Cancer Research" from the New York Times of June 26, 1955, and an article entitled "Funds for Cancer" from the New York Herald Tribune of June 29, 1955, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Both of them are informative, and, therefore, I am asking that they be inserted.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 29, 1955]

FUNDS FOR CANCER

Now before a Senate-House conference committee is the question of appropriations for the National Cancer Institute. The House has recommended for fiscal 1956 a total of $22.3 million; the Senate, a total of $26.4 million. The difference of $4 million is not large as Federal moneys go; but it is enough to make a very serious difference in the progress of a research program in which the whole country has an interest. This newspaper earnestly hopes that the conference will vote the full amount recommended by the Senate.

Two approaches to the unsolved riddle of cancer, the scourge which takes some 280,000 American lives each year, will be impaired if the cut made by the House is allowed to stand. A chemotherapy program on a concerted and wide scale basis has been underway with congressional aid for a year. This seeks a cure through chemicals, and the success which has already been attained with experimental cancers in laboratory animals indicates that the road should be pursued. Secondly, there is involved a nationwide extension of the program for early detection of cancer of the uterine cervix. The program was developed in Memphis, Tenn., with results which warrant its extension as a means of drastically cutting down the second most frequent kind of cancer in women.

The Hoover Commission, in its report of May 1955, on research and development particularly recommended that greater support be given to basic medical research. The vote on cancer funds, as well as on the four other medical fields, will be an important test. It will be closely watched by the public.

[From the New York Times of June 26, 1955]

CANCER RESEARCH

The House Committee on Appropriations has recommended for the fiscal year 1956 the expenditure of $22,328,000 by the National Cancer Institute; the corresponding Senate committee has increased the sum to $26,400,000. The difference of $4,072,000 means little in these days of military expenditures that run into the billions, but it means much in terms of cancer research. Given this difference the National Cancer Institute will be able to expand its studies of chemical means for treating cancer and to strengthen its support of basic research.

The chemical treatment of cancer is a fact today. Leukemia, a sort of cancer of the blood, and diseases like it account for about half the deaths from cancer in children. There is no surgical method of dealing with the disease, but there are chemical means of which we ought to take more advantage than we do. Indeed, such is the progress recorded in recent years that Dr. Cornelius Rhoads, of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, boldly declared in Washington that if our scientific and above all our chemical knowledge were more fully exploited "both the medical cure of many forms of cancer and perhaps its elimination altogether" is probable. Dr. Sidney Farber of the Children Cancer Foundation of Boston made a deep impression when he reported to the Senate committee the case of a 3-month-old boy who was doomed to death by an adrenal tumor which had spread to the liver and the skeleton. One of the chemicals given for leukemia was administered. Six years have elapsed. There is no evidence of tumor today.

The committee heard a dozen tales like this. It was manifestly impressed. We hope that when the bill goes to conference within the next few days the impression will be intensified.

Lake Mead and Conservationists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] mailed to all congressional offices a statement he made on Lake Mead. When I read the statement that Lake Mead has nothing whatsoever to offer visitors, I could hardly believe my eyes. To me and to hundreds of my friends, Lake Mead is one of the most fascinating spots in the entire West.

If Lake Mead has "nothing whatsoever to offer visitors," then if one judges by the number of visitors who spend their time at Lake Mead, Yellowstone Park would rank very low on our points of national interest. Lake Mead in 1954 had 2,112,724 visitors; that same year Yellowstone Park had 1,328,858 visitors, or about half the attraction that Lake Mead held for visitors, according to the Statistics Division of the National Park Service.

Mr. SAYLOR then took one example of reclamation, as he has done on numerous occasions, and proceeded to inflate it into a condemnation of all reclamation projects. I am well aware of Mr. SAYLOR's attitude and opinions on reclamation as they apply to the upper Colorado, but I was surprised to find that he is apparently opposed to all "reclamation enthusiasts" who are "determined to improve upon nature." He noted that this "determination" in some places has resulted in a "desolate, swampy scene punctuated by scattered stumps of once-proud trees."

Mr. SAYLOR might also be interested in the "desolate swampy scenes" and the "mud flats" left in the basin of the uncontrolled Colorado when this untamed river fluctuates from year to year in its annual flow. He might also be interested in the thousands of tons of soil that is annually cut from beneath the "verdant growth" of the trees and foliage in the upper basin and carried by the uncontrolled Colorado River to silt up the Lake Mead area, and thus shorten the life of this lower basin control of the Colorado.

Mr. SAYLOR in his enthusiasm to attack reclamation, at least as it applies to the arid regions of the upper Colorado, has overlooked the basic purpose of the program. The term itself stems from "reclaim"—to make usable again. There are undoubtedly small areas of land covered by the impounding of waters for reclamation use, but for every acre of land so covered there are hundreds of acres made usable by the process of removing the water from the stream bed and placing it on the land where "the fragrance of blossoming foliage and verdant growth," as Mr. SAYLOR phrased it, is made possible on the arid soil. The fragrance of the orange groves, the verdant growth in the fields and the thousands of acres of cotton in southern California are a tribute to what can be done by the "reclamation enthusiasts determined to improve on nature."

The region of the West that I come from is beautiful. It was beautiful when the first Mormon pioneers entered it, but I suppose we would come under Mr. SAYLOR's definition of "reclamation enthusiasts determined to improve on nature," because we tried to do just that, we tried to improve on nature. We took nature's arid deserts and added life-giving water, and we produced fertile fields and life-sustaining crops and cities and towns in which people may live and prosper. This is also true of California, and especially the region of California that is in such solid agreement with Mr. SAYLOR and his views of the upper Colorado project. The phenomenal growth of this region has been a direct result of their ability to "improve upon nature," to utilize the waters of the streams and the rivers—part of which flow from the upper basin of the Colorado—to place the good, but dry soil into use.

Undoubtedly there are some small acreages behind the dams that impound the water that are taken out of production. But even this area is not taken out of circulation for public use, because these dams and reservoirs offer to us, and to all of the visitors who tour our country, excellent recreational opportunities and in many cases the finest fishing possible. This, I might point out, is true of Lake Mead, although Mr. SAYLOR makes reference to Lake Mead as a spot that "has nothing whatsoever to offer visitors."

Lake Mead has become a mecca for sportsmen from all parts of the West. It is a recreation area in which millions of Americans annually can, and do, enjoy the use of an area which, unless we had "tried to improve upon nature," would still be inhabited by cactus, mesquite, and lizards.

Mr. SAYLOR might be interested in the number of visitors who last year visited Dinosaur National Monument, whose beauties he so frequently and so lyrically extolls, as compared to what he calls the "mud flats of Lake Mead." Dinosaur in 1954 had 70,652; Lake Mead has, as I have previously noted, 2,112,724.

We of the West would like to have more people visit Dinosaur and all of our beautiful national parks and monuments, but we feel we could make them much more attractive if we can utilize our rivers and our water, as some of our water has been so well utilized in the lower basin. Our great neighbor States of Nevada and Arizona have created a wonderful recreation area in Lake Mead with over 2 million visitors in 1 year, and this figure seems to indicate that they "have something to offer." The waters impounded to create this vast recreation area are fully utilized to bring into production fields and trees and areas of beauty in Southern California. Mr. Speaker, we only ask that we too be allowed to do the same thing with our share of the waters of the Colorado.

Massachusetts Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on May 12 the Quincy Patriot-Ledger expressed an editorial warning to the voters of Massachusetts against the upper Colorado storage project in strong language. On May 6 the Lowell Sun carried a similar editorial caution. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Quincy (Mass.) Patriot-Ledger of May 12, 1955]

DAM FOOLISHNESS

Congress is now considering the administration's billion dollar proposal to develop the water resources of the upper Colorado Basin. On April 20 the Senate voted 58–23 to pass the bill. It now comes up for a vote in the House.

What happens along the Colorado River may seem remote to many of our readers, unless they realize that this project will cost Massachusetts taxpayers at least $70 million.

Now, we don't want to appear ungenerous toward the needs of other sections of the country, nor are we opposed to public reclamation projects. But such projects must

meet certain economic standards. We feel that the upper Colorado scheme fails to do so.

The plan calls for building 5 dams, 1 of which will be located at Echo Park in the Dinosaur National Monument. The dams will provide water storage for irrigation and hydroelectric power. Of course, the scheme is vigorously supported in the Mountain States. It will unquestionably bring great wealth to the area. The westerners even claim that the project will make money for the Federal Government.

But the evidence is all to the contrary. According to former Governor Miller, of Wyoming, the electricity, from which the project will derive its revenue, will cost $883 a kilowatt at the Echo Park plant, while power produced by steam plants in the same area costs less than $170. Irrigation will cost in one area, almost $400 per acre, while the land will sell for only $150. That just doesn't make sense.

What really puzzles us about the whole undertaking is President Eisenhower's personal support of it. He has described the Colorado project as well conceived and essential to the proper development of the intermountain region. At the same time he calls the TVA creeping socialism and has gone to great lengths to limit its expansion through the Dixon-Yates contract.

Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, who led the unsuccessful fight against the Colorado bill called it "almost the worst program I have ever seen during the time I have been a Member of the United States Senate." Good or bad, its whopping support there indicates that it will probably get through the House unless some very powerful opposition is exerted very soon.

[From the Lowell, (Mass.) Sun of May 6, 1955]

AND WHO PAYS?

A massive development project for the basin of the Colorado River has made some progress in Congress. It has not received too much public attention and it was only after the original bill had been approved by the Senate that bystanders started to ask searching questions.

The project calls for a number of large dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River and numerous irrigation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Large areas of wastelands would be made fertile, but, in the opinion of experts, this would lead to nothing since there would be no prospective tenants to work this land for at least several generations.

Colorado is far from Massachusetts; it is given little thought by the people of Greater-Lowell except in instances when tours are planned to the far West. Yet, if this project is finally and fully approved, the taxpayers of Massachusetts and of Greater-Lowell will be forced to dig down and help pay the costs.

All 48 States would be proportionately assessed, and in Massachusetts alone it would mean that the taxpayers woul dbe faced with $127,600,000 in added taxes for an undertaking which has been described as "improvident, extravagant, and unjustifiable."

Quickly the opposition to this mammoth project, estimated to cost $4 billion, is mounting. The Colorado River Association, a volunteer citizens' group that recognizes futility of the idea, has joined conservation and taxpayer groups in protesting.

The appropriate thing for Massachusetts residents to do, lest by some chance this bill should be passed by both houses of Congress, is to write to Senators and Congressmen explaining that the tax burden is already high enough without adding an extra load for a purpose which is so widely considered as being almost completely useless.

The Need of More Liberal Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, much has been said in this Chamber about how the Nation and humanity would benefit from more liberal immigration laws, the availability of opportunity for more people to make use of them, the ending of discrimination because of race, creed, or religion, and less stringent requirements of the system of national origins. Currently we have an example of all these factors contributing to the discovery of one of the greatest boons to mankind.

The example is Dr. Jonas E. Salk, the discoverer of the polio vaccine.

Dr. Salk was born of immigrant parents who came to this country from eastern Europe during the late 19th century. He was raised in the poverty of New York's East Side tenements. Dr. Salk is of the Jewish faith.

To the great glory—and the overwhelming benefit—of America, Dr. Salk's parents were not kept from these shores by a quota system. Nor was he deprived of an education because of its costs or prevented from realizing his full abilities because of religious prejudice.

The lesson that Dr. Salk's story teaches us about doing away with prejudice has been told in a very poignant editorial written by two of America's beloved labor leaders, Earl W. Jimerson and Patrick E. Gorman, president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America—AFL. The editorial was originally published in the Butcher Workman, the official publication of the union. But it has struck such a responsive chord that it has been reprinted in dozens of newspapers and magazines. I might say, Mr. President, that it is a fine example of the excellent writing and clear thinking which have made the editorials of these two men highly regarded in the labor movement.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Jimerson's and Mr. Gorman's editorial, So You Don't Like the Jews.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SO YOU DON'T LIKE THE JEWS

We have seen them everywhere—in the north, south, east, and west—in our crowded cities, our smallest villages—little tykes on crutches for whom the heart of the world, for many years, has been bleeding.

Their pitiful halting steps, behind smiling faces, in their efforts to walk, walk, walk, made them the greatest heroes of all time and yet the odds have always been a hundred to one against them. Their bodies in most cases twisted, their legs emaciated, and their iron braces sometimes hip high, only indicated that they were chained to a life of devastating illness and living death. Out of this holocaust of sadness was born our most modern miracle.

Originally from the tenements of the East Side of New York there appeared upon the scene at the University of Pittsburgh the son of a Jewish garment-pressing father and a Jewish seamstress mother, who was ordained to become the conqueror of the most evil scourge afflicting mankind, poliomyelitis, Dr. Jonas E. Salk.

It was not easy for him to work his way through medical college, but he made it. He set his mind and his heart upon the seemingly impossible task of developing a serum which would make the deadly polio virus impotent. The world now knows the glorious news, and the world pays tribute to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, the young Jewish-American scientist who gave his discovery to the suffering world without any intention of ever realizing a single penny of personal profit.

There is still a lot of intolerance existing in our own beloved country which is very devastating to human decency. The next time you hear someone say, "I don't like the Jews," just tell him to take a look at one of these poor kids with their legs in iron braces, and then remind him of the glorious accomplishment of a young Jewish scientist which will give sunshine and laughter and joy to the children of the world for generations to come.

Bless you, Dr. Salk. God must have been at your side constantly in your laboratory work, showing you the way.

Decline in Racial Bias in Western States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey revealing the decline in racial bias in Western States was reported by the distinguished New York Times newswriter, Mr. Gladwin Hill. In a State-by-State analysis of the progress made in racial relations, Mr. Hill's report again makes dramatically clear the fact that race relations are healthiest where legal and legislative mandates are strongest. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in Congress that we may be reminded of our duty and obligation, as lawmakers in the highest legislative body of our Nation, to make effective for all people, regardless of race, color, or creed, the democratic principles which form the basis of our Government.

The article follows:

SURVEY REVEALS MARKED DECLINE IN RACIAL BIAS IN WESTERN STATES

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, May 28.—While controversy seeths about desegregation in public schools below the Mason-Dixon line, unspectacular but marked progress is being made toward elimination of racial discrimination in the West.

This was indicated this week in a New York Times survey of interracial relations in 13 Far Western States.

In few sections of the West can it be said that all the principal minority groups—Negroes, Indians, and people of oriental and Spanish lineage—enjoy full equality with other people in public activities.

But in a few of the States and many localities the situation comes remarkably close to full equality. And there are widespread indications of steady improvement.

Among the 13 States, 8 legislatures in their current sessions have enacted measures aimed at reducing discrimination.

Washington strengthened its fair employment practices law and eliminated racial questions on drivers' license applications.

California outlawed discriminatory automobile insurance terms. This week, for the first time in many attempts, an FEPC bill won approval by the State assembly, although its enactment is considered unlikely.

Arizona passed an FEPC law covering public works only.

Wyoming repealed an old, unused statute that permitted Negro segregation in some public schools.

New Mexico and Montana both enacted measures ordering racial equality in places of public accommodation (hotels, restaurants, taverns, theaters, etc.), although they carried no enforcement machinery. Colorado strengthened its 4-year-old FEPC law.

North Dakota repealed a law against interracial marriage.

On the negative side, bills guaranteeing equality in places of public accommodation failed in Nevada and Arizona and measures to repeal bans on interracial marriage failed in Idaho and Colorado.

The survey found that:

Racial discrimination generally is worse in hinterland areas and small towns than in more developed districts.

In progressive areas first-class establishments, such as hotels and restaurants tend to take the lead in racial tolerance while the second-rate institutions cling to prejudicial treatment. In discriminatory areas the situation is the reverse.

Discrimination does not always go hand in hand with large minority populations. (In Nevada, where there are less than 10,000 Negroes, discrimination is much worse than in California, where there are more than 500,000.)

The West does not bear out the saying "You can't legislate tolerance." A State's statutory expressions on discrimination are not necessarily an indicator of actual conditions. But where efforts are made to enforce such laws, discrimination has lessened. And some of the most conspicuous progress against discrimination has been made in States where there has been strongest legislative pressure.

The 13 States contain about one-eighth of the Nation's population. The area has some 20 million people. In it are about 600,000 of the Nation's 15 million Negroes (as of the 1950 census), about half of its Indians (some 200,000 of them) and about 180,000 people of Chinese and Japanese lineage. A large portion of the Nation's approximately 3 million Spanish-speaking people of Spanish and Mexican lineage are in this region.

The minority group population is distributed unevenly among the States. California has about 500,000 Negroes, while North Dakota has less than 1,000. Arizona has 70,000 Indians, Colorado less than 2,000.

Since World War II, people of Japanese and Chinese lineage, who in the west coast States used to be the targets of the most systematic discrimination, have moved into a status close to first-class citizenship.

The most regular victims of discrimination are Negroes. But it is also applied, occasionally with greater emphasis to Indians and Spanish-speaking people. The latter are habitually referred to in some districts deprecatingly as "Mexicans," even though some are not even Mexican-Americans but are of Spanish descent.

In most of the 13 States there is nominal endorsement of racial equality, if only in constitutional provisions. A number of the States have fair employment practice laws and statutes prohibiting discrimination in public establishments. Some of these laws have no enforcement machinery.

Virtually the last vestiges of overt, sanctioned segregation in public schools in the region have been eliminated in the last few years.

The remaining pattern of discrimination is found to be irregular and inconsistent.

In places of public accommodation, the situation ranges from general acceptance of nonwhites in Washington, with only occasional prejudice in small towns, to a degree of southern-style Jim Crowism in southern Arizona, where "no Negroes allowed" signs are displayed in restaurants.

A major factor in antidiscrimination progress has been intensified legal and legislative pressure and public-relations activities in the last few years by organizations fostering tolerance. These include the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Urban League, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the principal labor organizations, the League of Women Voters, and various church organizations.

An important foundation for this work was laid by World War II. Correspondents near large military installations report that while influxes of Negro troops brought friction in some cases, the sight of Negroes in uniforms also has lessened local prejudice.

In respect to people of Japanese and Chinese lineage, an important additional factor was that the prewar legal sanctions and prejudice against them had been so extreme that they collapsed in the face of organizational campaigning.

The Communists' proclivity for exploiting minority treatment is said to have both helped and hindered the antidiscrimination cause. In the State of Washington, a correspondent reports, "a substantial factor in getting legislation has been a desire to keep Communist organizations from capitalizing upon instances of discrimination." A factor in the defeat of a 1948 California FEPC initiative measure, according to the regional NAACP director, was that the Communists' agitation put their label on it and damaged the campaign to a tremendous extent.

Racial relations in the region are, at worst, static in some sections. In more sections than not, relations are improving.

This is the consensus of both Times correspondents and spokesmen for antidiscrimination organizations whom they interviewed.

Professional advocates of tolerance are much happier about growing equality of acceptance in public places than in respect to deeper questions, such as discrimination in housing and employment.

They see full equality as a long way off. But, as one summarized the situation, "things are moving, and the obstacles seem a lot lower than they used to."

Here is a State-by-State summary of salient features of the interracial situation:

WASHINGTON

The FEPC law, enacted in 1947, is administered by a five-member Commission. It investigates discrimination complaints and can seek court injunctions. In practice, it has worked mainly by conciliation. It receives about one complaint a week and has never gone to court with a case. This year the Commission was given power to reinstate workers discharged for racial reasons and to collect their back pay.

The 1953 public accommodations law provides for civil action by aggrieved parties and criminal action by prosecuting attorneys. One action of each type has been brought, resulting respectively in a $500 fine and a $50 fine.

What is generally regarded as the Commission's most important action to date was its distribution in 1953 of a brochure to 100,000 employers explaining both the FEPC and anti-discrimination laws and the actions that could be taken under them.

OREGON

A 1951 FEPC Act, administered by a special division of the State Department of Labor, has been applied generally through conciliation.

An equality-in-public establishments law was adopted in 1953.

The influx of Negro shipyard workers in Portland, Oreg., in World War II led to some friction, but it has dwindled to almost the vanishing point.

Several years ago some Portland parents protested against sending their children to school with Negroes. School officials took a firm stand—including optional assignment of Negro teachers to all-white schools—and the complaining stopped.

CALIFORNIA

California has had a law prohibiting discrimination in public establishments since 1905, a civil-service nondiscrimination law since 1945 and a public works FEPC law for several years. Up to this year no general FEPC bill got anywhere.

The public accommodations law provides civil penalties of $100 or more. It has been invoked many times with results.

The California attorney general, in connection with a controversial school blackface minstrel show last year, issued an opinion denouncing "any and all entertainments which for any reason reflect adversely on a citizen because of race, creed, or color."

NEVADA

According to Franklyn Williams, regional director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "Nevada is a misplaced Mississippi—a Negro can't even lose his money at the gambling spots." To rectify this situation, a group of Negroes, including Joe Louis, the former boxer, this week opened a multi-million-dollar casino hotel in Las Vegas, welcoming the patronage of all races.

Nevada has no antidiscrimination laws. The 5,000 Indians among its 200,000 inhabitants are subject to little if any public discrimination.

ARIZONA

Arizona's new limited FEPC law makes it a misdemeanor for any State or local governmental subdivision or agency, or contractor to them to discriminate in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

In contrast to the little Dixie atmosphere in some southern sections of the State, first-class hotels in central Arizona have accommodated nationally prominent Negro personalities. The State has a Negro legislator. But in Phoenix there is segregation in most of the leading movie theaters.

UTAH

About 70 percent of Utah's 700,000 inhabitants (5,000 of them are Negroes) are Mormons. According to Mormon doctrine, rooted in slavery days, Negroes are black because of the curse put on Cain, and must do menial work and will never go to heaven. Many Mormons of the new generation are embarrassed by this bigotry, considering it in manifest conflict with Christian tenets of their faith. But little has been done about it legally.

Utah has no civil-rights law or antidiscrimination law, except an old, inoperative statute forbidding hotels to discriminate against nonwhites. Both Marian Anderson, the singer, and Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of Manhattan, have had trouble getting first-class hotel accommodations in Salt Lake City.

But there has been a general informal decrease in prejudice in Utah in recent years. Spanish-speaking people are no longer considered nonwhite in many communities. Negroes and Indians are increasingly numer-

ous in Federal jobs. And Negro spokesmen report an easing in trade union membership barriers.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico has a dual Anglo-Spanish culture.

Spanish is a second legal language. In public life there are about as many people of one strain, as the other, including the State's congressional delegation.

New Mexico adopted an FEPC law in 1949 and a public-accommodation law this year. Both lack enforcement provisions.

Discrimination against Negroes is so prevalent that, according to a correspondent, "it is as difficult to get a Negro a meal in Albuquerque, of 100,000 population, as it is in Ruidoso, a small mountain resort." In predominantly Anglo-Saxon southeastern New Mexico, near the Texas border, even Spanish-speaking white people and Indians from other parts of New Mexico are subject to considerable discrimination. Generally, however, the reception accorded Spanish-speaking people has improved greatly over pre-World War II days.

What a Shortcut!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Des Moines Tribune, a leading newspaper of Iowa, offers some criticism of a proposal in Congress, namely the contemplated transfer of jurisdiction from the House Administration Committee to the Appropriations Committee. The proposal is for reorganizing the staff of employees serving the House, increasing salaries, increasing stationery allowance and especially providing for a research specialist for each of the Members. As all times I have favored maintaining the jurisdiction of each of the great committees and I opposed the plan of asking the appropriations committee to take over the jurisdiction of the administration committee with respect to this recent proposal. The plan of course envisages a shortcut by way of a rule waiving points of order so that legislation may be put through the House on an appropriation bill.

The editorial from the Des Moines Tribune reads as follows:

WHAT A SHORTCUT!

Congressmen voted themselves a pay raise this year, which we think was merited. Now some congressmen would like to have an additional assistant, at $11,285 a year.

The proposal may have sufficient merit to warrant thorough consideration. But it isn't a proposal that should be slipped through Congress. The House Administration Committee is attempting to do this. It called upon the House Appropriations Committee to approve a $4,900,000 appropriation so that each representative could add a man (or woman) to his payroll.

By going directly to the Appropriations Committee, the Administration Committee has avoided the customary preliminary House vote on the merits of this proposal.

We suggest that the Congressmen would be well advised to avoid any legislative shortcuts on this $5 million item. Unless Congressmen are willing to stand up and be counted on such legislation, they always face the likelihood of being counted out by the voters at the next election.

Rodino Scores Nonenforcement Policy of Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr Speaker, I herewith submit for insertion in the RECORD the cogent remarks of my colleague, Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., concerning matters which have been brought to the attention of the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENT BY HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

The Federal Trade Commission appears to be asleep at the switch in enforcing the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950.

Our Antitrust Subcommittee, which is headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. EMANUEL CELLER, has held extensive hearings on present-day monopoly problems since May 10, 1955, and has probed deeply into the operation and enforcement of the antitrust laws at this time. These hearings have demonstrated that a wave of corporate mergers has occurred in recent years which is fraught with danger to our free-enterprise system. For example, during the 1950–54 period approximately 2,100 mergers have occurred, many involving instances where giant superconcentrated corporations have swallowed up their smaller competitors. In the face of this dangerous situation, the Federal Trade Commission has dragged its feet and done virtually nothing except study the problem. In the 2½ years that Edward F. Howrey has been Chairman, the Federal Trade Commission has filed a grand total of two merger complaints and completed action on none.

On July 1, 1954, Chairman Howrey with great fanfare announced a complete reorganization of the Commission in order to streamline and improve its operations. The fact is that not even one merger complaint has been filed by the Commission since this vaunted reorganization.

The Antitrust Subcommittee intends to pursue this matter further and determine why the Commission has been so chary of using the authority provided by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950 in order to stem this apparently unending series of corporate mergers.

Our subcommittee also heard extensive testimony on the subject of bank mergers. There again, there has occurred an unrelenting, unremitting wave of mergers which has increased concentration of control in the hands of the Nation's giant banking facilities and caused the demise of many strong, healthy, independent competing banks. It is strange, indeed, that Mr. Ray Gidney, the Comptroller of the Currency, who has plenary statutory authority over national bank mergers has not seen fit to disapprove even one bank merger on the basis that it might substantially lessen competition. In this regard it would seem that Mr. Gidney is merely emulating the example set by Mr. Howrey.

To correct this situation I will support vigorously a bill introduced by Chairman EMANUEL CELLER to tighten up existing laws on bank mergers. Hearings on this bill will be held by the Antitrust Subcommittee beginning Tuesday, July 5.

In the course of our hearings, the Antitrust Subcommittee considered extensively a purportedly objective and exhaustive study of the antitrust laws by a blue-ribbon 61-member committee appointed by Attorney General Brownell. The conclusion is inescapable that this Brownell committee was heavily weighted with attorneys for corporations that have been repeated offenders of the antitrust laws in the past. The subcommittee found that of the total membership of Attorney General Brownell's committee, 42 were practicing lawyers who had in the period 1946 through 1955 personally or through their law firms represented corporate defendants in a total of 132 antitrust cases brought by the Department of Justice, and a total of 132 antitrust proceedings instituted by the Federal Trade Commission.

Even more significant was the fact that of the 42 practicing attorneys who were members of the committee, 21 represented defendants in antitrust cases brought by the Department of Justice or by the Federal Trade Commission which were pending at the time the Brownell committee conducted its deliberations and issued its report. There were 32 such pending antitrust cases instituted by the Department of Justice and 22 such cases brought by the Federal Trade Commission.

Another fact brought out by the subcommittee in connection with the Attorney General's Committee's report was that no member of the Brownell Commitee disqualified himself from participating in the deliberations of the committee on any issue even though it was involved in a pending antitrust case which the member was handling for a corporate defendant.

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Brownell Committee's recommendations and suggestions would weaken the antitrust fabric rather than strengthen it. The report of Mr. Brownell's Committee makes no effective proposals to prevent further expansion of large firms by merger. It disapproves breaking up monopolistic concentrations except as a last resort even when such concentrations have been convicted of abusing that power. It failed even to consider, much less to suggest remedies for, the dangers to American democracy and free competitive enterprise resulting from corporate giantism.

The recommendations of the Brownell Committee concerning patents likewise tend to erode away present judicial effectiveness. It approves industry-dominating patent pools if they exercise their control reasonably. It approves price fixing under patents and restrictive licensing without regard to whether the licensor is a dominant firm. It would exclude compulsory royalty-free licensing as an available form of relief in patent-abuse cases.

The recommendations of Attorney General Brownell's committee encourage exclusive dealing, by making it necessary to show "actual foreclosure" from the market—a rule which, if appropriate in Sherman Act cases, is certainly inconsistent with the Clayton Act purpose to forbid restrictive practices that are potentially rather than actually impairing competition. It undermines the Robinson-Patman Act's effort to prevent big sellers from discriminating unjustifiably among their customers, and to prevent big buyers from coercing price concessions not related to the lower cost of doing business with them. And it proposes to impair existing right of the antitrust victim to recover mandatory treble damages and to restrict the period for which damages may be recovered.

The current hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee were of an exploratory nature to ascertain what the current antitrust and

monopoly problems are. Particularly noteworthy was the judicial and able manner in which Mr. CELLER conducted the hearings.

Many thoughtful proposals were made. For example, the subcommittee was urged to look into the pro's and con's of legislation to prohibit companies of specified size from merging except upon advance approval based upon a showing of technological necessity; to conduct pilot studies of a few of the very largest industrial giants with a view to drawing up tentative reorganization plans that might limit such enterprises to activities geared in kind and volume to minimum technological requirements; to amend the Motor Carrier Act so as to eliminate control of entry and rates for trucks and buses; to prohibit restrictive licensing of patents by large patentees.

Finally, the hearings of our Antitrust Subcommittee reemphasized that vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws is necessary not only for the preservation of small business and free enterprise, but for the preservation of democracy itself.

Defense of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] in Minneapolis last evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE OF FREE ENTERPRISE

(Address of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, before the Minnesota Retail Federation, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., June 29, 1955)

I have not been long in political life, but the short time I have spent in Washington representing the great State of Arizona has been a liberal education for me. It has given me a much better insight into national affairs, both political and businesswise. One cannot help having a deep sense of pride in playing even a small part in a system that has done so much for mankind. The courage of our forefathers in launching a new and untried system is beyond the power of mere words to express. Our difficulties in deciding what is best for the Nation, after our system has been in operation almost 200 years, must seem insignificant when considering what our forefathers went through in establishing the system. We owe these great men a debt of gratitude that can be repaid only by diligently preserving the system against all of the "isms" and radical changes that would slowly but surely destroy it.

My service in the Senate has given me a deeper appreciation of our American system, but has also created a little sense of fear at times when I hear people advocate things that I believe will ultimately destroy our free-enterprise system and, yes, our present political system, too. The approach they use is the thing that frightens me. Their very methods would tend to destroy confidence in our system. Business, and in particular big business, becomes their whipping boy. Wall Street, used to symbolize big business, is set up as the bogey to be destroyed. All of this is done under the guise of championing the little fellow. Much has been said that would accuse this administration of being a businessman's administration, in that way hoping to further some political careers by convincing the voters that everything the administration does is designed to favor some big special group of individuals far removed from the common man.

Now, I am accused of being reactionary because I defend our American business system from their political onslaughts, and I would like to make my position crystal clear. I do not defend business simply because it is business—I will fight for the rights of the so-called common man just as quickly as for those of the business executive. I am not for the American free enterprise system simply because it is American; I am for it because it provides the greatest freedom and opportunity for all people, both rich and poor, both worker and executive, regardless of race, color or creed, of any system yet devised by man.

No, I am not the reactionary. I realize that times change and that ways and means of doing things change with the times. We must always continue to progress forward—not backward. As much as one may revere our Constitution, one must realize that our forefathers, as remarkable as they were, were not infallible. They could not look into the future and design a document that would meet all of the necessities of future generations. But their accomplishment has been proven over the years to be so remarkably correct that it would not be changed without deep thought and due deliberation on the part of all of the people. It should not be flouted by executive fiat or circumscribed by congressional acts. When it proves inadequate or needs amending in the common interest, it should be amended as prescribed by the Constitution.

I am one who does not want to go back to the ways of the 19th century or even to the 1920's or 1930's. I do not want to go back to the 16th or 17th century either, or to the backward ways of so many countries both inside and outside of the Iron Curtain today. I am a true progressive—I want to go forward—and I want to go forward with a proven system, our free enterprise system, the only progressive system in the world today.

The reactionaries are those who either naively or otherwise want big central government run by bureaus and bureaucrats to determine what is best for us. The reactionaries want the Government to do for its citizens what those citizens are well able to do for themselves. They want the Government to enter the proprietary business field to furnish fictitious yardsticks as a measure against our American business methods. They want the Federal Government to hold onto its monopoly in atomic energy for peaceful purposes simply because tax dollars went into the development of it for national defense purposes—something for which we have been well repaid. They would have us reduce all business to small one-horse establishments. They want the Government to grant such power to labor leaders as will enable them not only to maintain an iron grip on their members but force millions of other free Americans under their jurisdiction. They are the ones who would again yoke us with big central government, a yoke that our forefathers threw off almost 200 years ago. They are the ones who through more and more central government, through more dependence upon government, would drag us down to the level of so many other countries in the world today whose people have to depend on a planned economy through big central government.

I do not fear business, we can regulate that—I fear big central Government which we cannot regulate.

Since being in Washington I have become alerted to a lot of things that never entered my mind before. Before going there I felt that all was not quite well, but I did not know that we had gone as far as we have down the road of big government. When anyone dares raise his voice against the bureaus or big government in defense of business, he is charged with being against the masses. Well, who are the masses, anyhow, but free-born American people who love their freedom and their rights and opportunities to get ahead? Are you against the American people when you defend business? What is business, anyhow, but the American people? It is a way American people have of getting things done.

From some of the attacks made on business one would think it was some foreign enemy—a vampire—extracting its pound of flesh and sucking the lifeblood of the little man. Do we, the American people, not realize that business is comprised of four equally important elements: the financiers, stockholders and bondowners who risk capital on the venture; the management team who are employees, more often than not owning little or no stock, selected for their ability to operate successfully; the general run of employees, workmen and foremen, who through their skills operate the machines and produce the products; and the consumers who, through purchase of products or services, support the operation. These four elements are the American people—the rich and the poor, the young and the old of all races, creed, and color.

Let's have a little closer look at these four elements of business.

Are the financiers a few rich people, drones who produce nothing and live off the sweat of others? Well, maybe some of them are, but the majority are people like you and me who have worked hard, saved a little money for a rainy day, and have it invested, working for us in a business we have confidence in. We may be an employee of the business or we may have saved our money from some other endeavor. Or we may not own any stocks or bonds as such but our insurance money, which protects ourselves or our family against misfortune or the pension fund we hope to enjoy when a rest from toil has been earned, is invested in those stocks and bonds.

Now who are these aristocrats called management? Are they a few people raised with silver spoons in their mouths who fell into some soft job which provides them with an unlimited amount of the peoples' money to throw away on luxurious living? Most of them started at the bottom, worked hard, studied their work, loved their job, had confidence in their ability, and worked up into the management circle. Their function is to plan and supervise the production of the product, merchandise it at a profit and see that the stockholders, the employees, and the consumers participate in their fair share of those profits.

Who are these general run of employees? Are they the masses of downtrodden people so many crocodile tears are shed over? Certainly not. They are free-born American people who apply their skills to the operation of the machines the money of others has provided to produce the products management believes will be acceptable to the consumer and profitable to the business. They are the people who can rise to the top and help manage the business if they are willing to apply themselves and work hard enough toward that end. They are the ones who can save their money, buy some of the stock and enter that large circle of owners of American industries. They are the ones who earn a wage that enables them to maintain the highest standard of living of any craftsmen in the world and enjoy a retirement pension for a job well done when they have raised their family and reached that age in life when their labor is no longer required to maintain our production schedules.

Who are the consumers? Are they people upon whom these American businesses thrive by exacting an exorbitant toll? No, they are just you and I who spend our dollars where we please and demand value received.

We are the ones who can select the particular business firm we wish to patronize or the one in which we wish to become a part owner by purchase of its stocks. We are the ones to whom business must answer if it expects to remain in operation through our dollars.

When these reactionaries who want to take us back into the 19th century by breaking up our industries, or who advocate our adoption of some of the foreign 'isms" that are now retarding progress in so many nations of the world, open their big guns on the progressive policies of this Administration, they accuse it of favoring "big business" or lending support to Wall Street. Here we have again the un-American act of creating class hatred. An attempt to pit the little fellow against the big. The words "trust" and "monopoly" are bandied about without any attempt at application of their true definition. These words are used because you and I hate trusts and monopolies. This approach is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Their hope is that there will be enough of us who let others do our thinking for us to accept such prejudiced propaganda, come into the camp of these disciples of doom and gloom and support them with the power of our votes.

When we refer to big business what are we thinking of? To some, whose votes are just as big and as important as yours and mine, the large local department store or the local factory employing a few people is big business. When these reactionaries talk against big business at least to some people they are talking against the very type of businesses these crusaders against big business contend to champion. In fact, their actions tend to undermine all business.

Most of us think of big business in terms of the General Motors, the General Electric, the United States Steel Corp., Westinghouse, etc. Do we ever stop to think that in 99 cases out of 100 the bigger the business the wider the ownership—the greater the number of American people dependent upon it for income, for future security from insurance or pension funds? Do we ever stop to think that practically every convenience and necessity we have today or will have in the future—the automobile, refrigerator, television, radio, cheap electric service, and thousands of other things we now accept as a matter of fact—result from years of experimental work requiring millions of dollars to develop? Do we stop to think of the millions of dollars required for plant investment to bring us these things at today's prices? We know that individuals or small companies under 2- or 3-man ownership would not or could not spend the millions of dollars required to develop or manufacture these things at present-day prices. If it had not been for large corporations with technical staffs and financing capable of developing and producing these things, many things now considered common necessities around the home would never have been produced, and those that were would still be luxuries far beyond the reach of the ordinary home.

Suppose instead of a few large automobile manufacturers we had a thousand or two small ones making cars by hand or by limited methods. What kind of cars do you think we would have today and how many of us do you think could afford one? Do these dispensers of hatred against big business who claim to champion the little fellow want to break up the large operators and go back to the type of business operations that would deprive the little fellow of his automobile and hundreds of other things he can afford under our present system? Or do they want the Government to get into the business of producing these things as they do in Russia so that only the politically favored could have them?

When the disciples of big central government and the welfare state really want to attack something they tie it in with Wall Street. We saw that in the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. negotiations. The opponents called it the Dixon-Yates contract right off the bat and identified these two gentlemen as a couple of Wall Street sharpies trying to get their hands in the Federal till.

If we follow these people we would believe that Wall Street is comprised of a few wealthy individuals looking down on the rest of us through glass eyes never missing an opportunity of grabbing our loose dollars or waiting to lend us a few dollars provided they get our eyeteeth as security.

Just what is Wall Street anyhow? Is it something to be despised? Is it some evil that has been injected into this country's economic system? Let's, without emotion, analyze the situation. Our competitive system, a system that has certainly been successful, is dependent upon investments and borrowing—dealing in large sums of money. It is nothing uncommon for our businesses, in order to maintain high productive ability, to borrow large sums of money—millions, yes, even hundreds of millions of dollars. Now where are they going to get that kind of money except from large money centers? What position would business be in when it needed several millions of dollars, if it had to peddle its borrowings to numerous banks, maybe located in several different States? How long do you think it would take to negotiate such loans if they had to be personally justified before and investigated by numerous different banking institutions? On the other hand we have large businesses handling our money in the form of insurance, pension funds, etc. Suppose those companies had to peddle all of that money out in small and scattered loans, what would the cost of servicing such loans be, assuming they were properly investigated?

Then getting down to the personal angle, once in a while some of us have a few dollars to put away for a rainy day or to take care of us in our old age and we want those dollars to work for us—not just lie idle. If we had to lend the money out ourselves, how would we go about it, remembering that most of us have our time fully occupied in running our own business? Would we sit down and write to various companies over the country asking them all about the company and if they had a few shares of stock to sell? No; most of us would be restricted to local loans.

As it is we can pick up the telephone and call a stock broker or a bond dealer and have them buy for us 1 or 1,000 shares in the company of our choosing. This service is performed at a very nominal fee. It permits millions of Americans to participate in the ownership of America's business and at the same time provides a way for business to expand, developing new and better products within the financial reach of most of our American citizens.

Wall Street happens to symbolize one of these money centers—still the principal one but yearly losing ground to others—that provides our businesses both lending and borrowing and us as individuals with this service which has made it possible for this Nation to become by far the largest producer in the world and at the same time to distribute ownership in this production to millions of individuals. What do these reactionaries, who let no opportunity go by to use Wall Street as a whipping boy, want us to do anyway? If their words do not belie their desires they want to destroy Wall Street and I assume our other large financial centers as well and go back to the horse and buggy days of yesteryear with all of our businesses small and under individual or closely held ownership.

To be sure, any institution that is lending other people's money and any business that is going to the general public through sale of stocks and bonds for financing should have to live up to a certain standard of ethics. Human nature being what it is, the only way to insure that all businesses meet the desired standard is by some public regulations. But there is a lot of difference between adequate and proper regulation and the iron hand of central government.

It is distressing to hear, when additional revenues are needed, advocation of pouring it on business. Business is now paying 52 cents out of every profit dollar in Federal income tax. Just how big a percentage of the profits can be taken in Federal income tax and still leave enough to permit expansion of business and attraction of investment capital? Those who pour it on business call themselves the "percolate-uppers" and we, who recognize the fact that business can be destroyed by taxation—are called the "trickle-downers."

Where do these "percolate-uppers" think the workingman gets his income from except from his participation in our American business system? If you stymie it by overtaxation, where is it going to get the money for expansion and development of new products? Only through continued business expansion and prosperity can we support our existing working force and provide work for new additions to that working force each year. What have the "percolate-uppers" done for the little fellow if they raise his exemptions to one or two thousand dollars or cut out his income tax altogether, if his earnings are so reduced by this action that he no longer has a job or a living wage, or if the action turns out to be inflationary and wipes out his tax savings? Just break the back of business and there will be no "percolate-up" or "trickle-down."

I do not like calling names or trying to play on the emotions of people with words that are misapplied or meaningless, but since it seems that we do have some words to contend with I would like to give my definition of two that are used most frequently politically.

The progressive stands to preserve our American free enterprise system and go forward to bigger and better things—a more abundant living—with each segment of that system, labor, management, the investor and consumer making his proper contribution and reaping his fair share of the rewards.

The reactionary wants either to break up this business system—and our American system is big—and go back to the days of individual or closely held ownership, or to big central government which has proven the downfall of nations of old and is slowly but surely deteriorating the nations under that type of government today. Whether that is what the "New Dealers" and Fair Dealers, the Do-Gooders and those seeking personal political power and special privileges say they want or not that is what their ideology and actions would lead us into—down a road from which no nation has yet returned.

My faith and trust in the good judgment of the American people assures me that we can safely leave to them the decision of which road to follow.

School Segregation in the Southern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have said many times that I believed the great majority of our fellow citizens in the

southern States were law-abiding people, and that once the Supreme Court gave its implementing decree in the school segregation cases, they would honor that decision.

Mr. President, it is gratifying to note that the school board in El Paso, Tex., recently voted 6 to 1 to abolish segregation in the public schools of that city. The school board is to be congratulated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the press dispatch reporting the action of the El Paso School Board.

I also noted in the press that the Maryland State Board of Education and the board of trustees of teachers' colleges in Maryland have decided to abolish segregation in the teachers' colleges of that State. In addition, they have urged public school officials in the 23 counties of the State to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court. I understand that Prince Georges County officials have already taken steps to end racial segregation in the public schools. These State and local officials in Maryland are likewise to be congratulated.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, entitled "Maryland Colleges for Teachers to Integrate," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press dispatch and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EL UASO BOARD BANS SEGREGATION

EL PASO, TEX., June 22.—The El Paso School Board voted last night, 6 to 1, to abolish segregation in the public schools.

El Paso thus became the first major Texas city to end segregation in accordance with the Supreme Court decisions.

There were 712 Negro pupils in El Paso public schools last school year. There is a single Negro school in this metropolitan area of more than 182,000 persons.

MARYLAND COLLEGES FOR TEACHERS TO INTEGRATE—STATE EDUCATION BOARD, TRUSTEES ABOLISH RACE BANS

(By Lou Panos)

BALTIMORE, June 22.—The color line was erased in Maryland State teachers colleges today.

The State board of education and board of trustees of the teachers colleges adopted a resolution declaring racial segregation in the five institutons "is hereby abolished."

In the same step it urged public-school officials in the 23 counties to comply with the recent Supreme Court decree banning segregation in public schools before further court action forces them to do so.

Dr. Thomas G. Pullen Jr., State superintendent of schools, proposed the resolution opening all teachers' colleges to all students. It was adopted unanimously.

The board of education had announced it would put integration machinery into motion as soon as the Court issued its follow-up decree, which would give further details on how and when the schools be opened to all races.

Today's resolution, marking Maryland's first statewide elimination of the color ban in education, came 52 days after the follow-up decree was issued.

(Colleges at Frostburg, Salisbury, and Towson have been used for white students. Negroes attended those at Bowie and Baltimore.)

"Now that the Supreme Court has passed its mandate and has directed compliance with its decree with deliberate speed and with due regard to local conditions and in conformity with equitable considerations," the resolution continued, "the State board of education calls upon the local public-school officials to commence this transition at the earliest practicable date, with the view of implementing the law of the land."

Current Progress and Problems in State Mental Health Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have received from the Council of State Governments an overall summary of legislative progress in State mental health programs, which was written by Mr. Sidney Spector. The article points out that the available State appropriations in the field of mental health have increased approximately 20 percent over the appropriations made during the last biennium, and it is significant that most of the increases will go to psychiatric research and for the training of psychiatric personnel.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, is deeply aware of the need for increased funds for psychiatric research and training at both the Federal and State levels. Our committee this year recommended, and the Senate approved, funds in the amount of $21,850,000 for the National Institute of Mental Health to carry out its research and training activities during fiscal year 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Spector's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN STATE MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

(By Sidney Spector, director, Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health, the Council of State Governments)

You often have heard the statement that mental illness is the No. 1 health problem of the Nation. It certainly has become the single most rapidly increasing element of budgets in nearly every State and accounts for as much as 30 percent of purely State expenditures in some States.

Yet in testimony and in conference, we constantly make reference to the tremendously unfulfilled needs in mental illness and mental health. We cite the ever increasing number of patients, great shortages in staff, overpowering costs of building construction; but in some degree we have overlooked the fact that the States have taken tremendous interest in this field in recent years. And I should like to summarize very briefly some of the progress as a kind of background for what the States are doing and still have to do.

The States were spending, in 1953, more than a half billion dollars a year on the care and treatment of the mentally ill in state mental hospitals alone. This is three times the amount which they were spending just 9 years before, in 1945. During the same period, as staffs were enlarged and salaries increased, salary and wage exepnditures rose from $89 million to $320 million, an almost fourfold increase, and within individual States, expenditures for salaries and wages multiplied 6 or 7 times. Notable among these States are Connecticut, Delaware, Kansas, North Carolina.

Figures for daily per patient costs for maintenance and operation of hospitals underline the same story. The average for the United States increased from $1.06 in 1945 to $2.70 in 1953. Here again, within many individual States the increases were truly spectacular: Delaware, from $0.97 in 1945 to $3.09 in 1953, a 218 percent increase; Kansas, from $0.70 to $3.87; Maryland, from $0.81 to $2.98; Connecticut, from $1.17 to $3.74; Nebraska, from $1.01 to $3.61. These, of course, are examples at the highest levels of increase, and a number of States could, of course, be cited as not having made increases of this substantial nature.

Much of this rise, of course, resulted from an increase of some 50 percent in the general cost of living. But the average increase for the Nation in this period was more than 150 percent, and in individual instances, as much as 450 percent. In part, these increases reflect higher salary scales, but more particularly, they reflect the expansion in the numbers of personnel. This was based on the belief that a heavy investment in staff would result in returning an increasing number of patients to their communities and to productive lives.

Thus, during this postwar period, the number of physicians in State mental hospitals went up from 1,458 in 1945 to 2,661 in 1953, an 82 percent increase. Similarly, the number of psychologists rose 574 percent, social workers, 165 percent, graduate nurses, 107 percent, and other nurses and attendants, 112 percent.

As a consequence, staff-patient ratios for these professions from 1945 to 1953 were improved by approximately 76 percent, despite the fact that the number of patients in State mental hospitals rose 16.7 percent, and the number of first admissions, 39 percent.

One of the best examples of what this has meant, both in terms of human values and financial returns, is the State of Kansas, where the legislative council recently assessed the results of the heavy investment in that State in personnel. It found that in the 7-year period, 1947–1953, the average patient population in Kansas State hospitals actually decreased 7.3 percent, as compared with an increase of 15.2 percent in the 15 States which comprise the model reporting area of the United States Public Health Service. The number of admissions in Kansas rose 21 percent, and the number of patients discharged within 6 months rose from 84 in 1947 to 664 in 1953, about 700 percent. The legislative council asserted that "in consequence it seems logical to conclude that investments in modern treatment over a 5-year period are now paying dividends as revealed by the 1954 statistics, and that greater accomplishments may be expected from the program in the future."

Despite improvements of this magnitude, however, the States are facing ever increasing obligations to house, treat, and rehabilitate mental patients. If the trend of the past 10 years in the number of resident patients in mental hospitals continues, we will add another 100,000 patients to the already tragically overcrowded mental hospitals we have today. The sums required for building alone to erect the great supercities of mental patients assume almost fantastic proportions.

Even though the number of physicians increased 82 percent from 1945 to 1953, there was still only 1 psychiatrist for every 325 patients in State mental hospitals. And even though the number of psychologists increased 574 percent, there still were only 465 in all State hospitals, an average of 1 to

1,142 patients; a number of hospitals still did not have a single social worker, the average for the Nation being 1 to 488. The greatest shortage was among nurses; their average ratio was approximately 1 to 100 patients, an almost impossible nursing load.

To begin to cite the figures on needs for personnel is to make the situation with regard to personnel look almost hopeless.

The recent task force report of the Hoover Commission indicated that State mental hospitals alone needed twice as many doctors as they have now; almost five times as many graduate nurses; more than four times as many social workers, and about 27 percent more attendants. It did not include the figures on needs for psychologists, but other data estimate that the number of psychologists should rise by a multiple of five.

Faced with shortages of personnel of such magnitude and with these tremendous outlays for building programs, States in the last few years have joined for a more effective attack on the problem. Each of the last six governors' conferences has been concerned with mental health. At the direction of the Governors, the Council of State Governments undertook a comprehensive examination of the care and treatment of the mentally ill, in 1950, and continued its studies, publishing a report in 1953 on training and reseach. Major emphasis of this latter study was that although care and treatment required the major share of a State's mental health resources, ultimate reduction of mental hospitals admissions could not be achieved by present methods alone. Hope for the future lay primarily in discovering better means of treatment and prevention—through research and through securing enough adequately trained personnel.

This latter report was adopted by the Governors in 1953 and at the same time they passed a resolution to hold a historic National Governors' Conference on Mental Health.

This National Governors' Conference on Mental Health was held in Detroit, Mich., in February, 1954—the first conference of the kind in the history of our country. Representatives of 47 States and Commonwealths gathered for a meeting which Governor Williams of the host State said "could well turn out to be one of the historic turning points in the ancient struggle of mankind against disease." For the first time, Governors, legislators, mental health and other State officials and leaders of all the relevant psychiatric professions gathered together in one place to discuss at the highest level in State government the means of attacking this great problem.

The meeting was an inspirational one, but by no means only that. The Governors adopted a concrete 10-point program on mental health which has now received the widest distribution and has become a guide for action in practically every State. The key recommendation was that training and research in the field of mental health are essential elements of effective mental health programs. The serious accumulation of patients and costs can only be reduced by discovering new knowledge and new methods of treatment and prevention and by more adequate training and development of mental health personnel.

The governors' conference, as a whole, moreover, felt that specific steps should be taken on a cooperative basis among the States. They, therefore, directed The Council of State Governments to establish an interstate clearinghouse on mental health, to assist the States in organizing effective programs of interstate cooperation.

What have been the results of all these meetings and interest? Partially, as a direct consequence, training of personnel and research into the causes and prevention of mental illness have been emphasized in State legislatures this year more than ever before. For example, Governor Williams in Michigan recommended that $4.5 million, or about 9 percent of the total mental health budget, be devoted to training and research. This amount becomes really significant when you consider that it almost equals the total amount that all States were spending for research just 2 years ago. In Indiana, $200,000 was appropriated as a basis for a $1 million psychiatric research foundation to be supported by private as well as public funds. In Illinois, the mental health fund, comprised of patient fees, has accumulated around $9 million for research and training, $5 million of which has been appropriated for a psychiatric institute to conduct research and to train a greatly expanded number of psychiatric residents. Other States, such as Minnesota, Wisconsin, Nebraska, California and many others I could cite, have expanded their research budgets in amounts ranging from $100,000 to $500,000. Some States have made special provisions for research this year for the first time.

In addition, large funds for research and training are being considered in Ohio, where profound thought on new directions in mental health is taking place. The State of New York, of course, has always devoted a substantial portion of its budget to research, usually equalling about one-half the amount spent by all of the States put together.

This means that over the Nation we may be embarrassed today not so much by the lack of funds for research as by the inability to spend what we have productively. Our major problem will be to find the brilliant trained researchers who can use these funds in the most effective manner and who can attract and train others in research. The competition for the outstanding research scientists will become extremely keen and fierce this year, as any number of States are attempting to entice magnetic personalities, offering them positions of independence, prestige and almost limitless funds.

The second emphasis this year with regard to securing personnel for staffing institutions and clinics also has reached record proportions. Budget recommendations in nearly every State call for increased mental health appropriations over the previous fiscal period, mainly for personnel reasons. According to a very rough survey of proposed budgets in 22 States, the average increase recommended was around 10 percent, going up to almost 30 percent—and practically all for increased numbers of personnel.

From a quick telegram survey we secured budget figures for States in which legislatures have adjourned. Fourteen of fifteen States that responded showed an increase in their total mental health budgets over the previous fiscal period. These States included Arizona, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. In one State there was a substantial decrease.

These figures mean, for example, that in Indiana operating expenditures for mental hosptials rose from $34.5 million to $46 million. Funds for clinics went up from approximately $70,000 to $290,000. A new family care program was instituted with an appropriation of $100,000, and the daily per capita expenditure in six psychiatric institutions will be $3.35 in fiscal 1956, and $3.87 in fiscal 1957. Compare this with the $1.97 in Indiana institutions in 1953.

Similarly, in the State of Washington operating funds for mental hosptials have risen from $13,357,000 for the biennium 1953–1955, to $17,477,000 for the next biennium. In Tennessee, appropriations went up from $7,290,000 in 1953–55 to $9,350,000 for the next biennium, and capital outlays of $10 million.

In Kansas, $750,000 was reappropriated for the mental hospital training fund for fiscal 1956. It will be used to pay extra staff necessary to maintain training programs in five mental institutions and to pay the salaries and wages of employees while in training. In addition, $500,000 was appropriated as a "salaries and wages contingent fund," which is a new approach, at least in Kansas, to budgeting for personnel. This $500,000 will be available to pay for staff which cannot be secured at present but may become available later. The building program in Kansas was given a boost by a measure increasing the special tax for the charitable and mental hospitals building fund from ½ to ¾ mills per year. In 1954, per capita cost in Kansas was $4.30 a day; their estimates for fiscal 1955 are $4.57 and for 1956, $4.66. This compares with an average for the Nation in 1953 of $2.70.

In Nebraska, both the outgoing and incoming governors recommended approximately a 20 percent increase for the State hospital and an earmarked research fund of $150,000 for the Psychiatric Institute, as well as $125,000 for community services. The mental health setup in Nebraska is in the process of being reorganized so that the director of the Psychiatric Institute will become in effect the director of mental health and coordinate treatment, research and training.

In Texas, the legislative budget called for expenditures of $53.4 million. This is contrasted to the approximately $40 million appropriated for the present biennium and does not include a $5 million appropriation for capital outlay, to come out of a special cigarette tax. There also is a recommendation for a $600,000 appropriation for a mental health research institute to be established in the Texas Medical Center in Houston.

In Idaho, legislation was passed to integrate the total mental health program of the State within the Department of Public Health, which will operate a new department of mental health. For the first time in the history of Idaho, there was appropriated money for preventive mental health, amounting to $41,310.

Other developments could be cited in numerous other States, but the emphasis in State after State on securing personnel to provide intensive treatment for patients and to staff community facilities is a theme that runs through governors' messages, budget documents and legislative discussion. We may be in the anomalous position in many States where ample funds are available for salaries, but hospitals and clinics still will be tragically understaffed. This does not mean that we have excessive funds for research and for personnel, or that more should not be appropriated. It does mean that those States which do not have large funds for research and personnel available will fall behind in the competition for the best people.

Someone has mentioned that interest in mental health is cyclical and that we may now be at one of the high points of recent generations. We need to take hold of this interest and find successful means of attracting, training and retaining the best people in the mental health field.

One of the dramatic means by which the States are acting to solve this problem is through programs of regional cooperation. Regional cooperation permits each participating State to obtain maximum benefit from the total resources of an area rather than relying only on facilities within its own limited geographical boundaries. If resources permit, each State individually might choose to provide training centers for each of the mental health specialties. But many States find it inadvisable or financially impossible to maintain all training facilities independently. The cost of buildings, laboratories, classrooms, and the difficulties, above all, of securing first rate staff often make it prohibitive.

A prime example of interstate cooperation in mental health is the program that has been carried out by the Southern Regional Education Board. As a result a southern regional mental health research and training council is being established and supported by the Southern States. A similar survey of mental health training and research was undertaken in the Midwest last year and climaxed by a Midwest Governors' Conference on Mental Health in Chicago, November 30. It was a duplicate on a regional basis of the National Governors' Conference on Mental Health and adopted a series of resolutions for implementing the earlier 10-point program. The final recommendation called for the establishment—and it has already been established—of a Midwest Governors' Committee on Mental Health, as a continuing body, to meet one or more times a year for regular examination of Midwest mental health efforts and for cooperative action. The Interstate Clearing House on Mental Health is serving as temporary secretariat for this continuing committee.

In the Far West, a movement for regional cooperation also has just gotten underway. At a meeting of governors' representatives in San Francisco, called by the Council of State Governments, March 25–26, a resolution was adopted requesting the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education to undertake an appraisal of training and research resources in the West and of preventive efforts, and to prepare recommendations for a conference of legislators in the fall and of governors in November. Committees are now being appointed by governors in each of the Western States, and they will join in what promises to be one of the most important developments in mental health in the West.

The meeting of the Northeast State Governments Conference on Mental Health in Wilmington, Del., April 28–29, is another example of the kind of regional conference recommended in the 10-point program adopted in Detroit. It permits the exchange of experience and ideas, accelerating efforts in mental health in the most promising directions.

Such is the unfolding pattern of interstate cooperation for mental health. For the first time in all regions of the Nation, there is continuing official impetus, with the highest executive and legislative support, for major strides in the treatment and prevention of mental illness and in the promotion of mental health.

The Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a newspaper article by George Sokolsky, of the Washington Post and Times Herald, which pays great personal tribute to the leadership and accomplishments of the Honorable Herbert Hoover, for his distinguished service as chairman of the Hoover Commission. The value of his contribution will become increasingly evident as the recommended proposals are eventually enacted into law. The article follows:

THESE DAYS—THE HOOVER COMMISSION

It is difficult to appraise the work of Herbert Hoover in relation to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. At his great age, he not only organized this body, directed its work, designed its purpose, assimilated all the millions of words of the various task forces, edited the reports, tried to reconcile differences, but sat at endless meetings, most of which occurred on Saturdays, killing any rest over the weekend.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Commission unanimously passed this resolution without regard to partisanship:

"We, the members of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, hereby express to our distinguished Chairman, Hon. Herbert Hoover, our very great appreciation for his able, fair, and patient leadership in the conduct of the work of this Commission and for the particularly outstanding contribution made by him to the successful completion of the complex tasks assigned to us by the Congress.

"We fully recognize the immense store of knowledge and experience which he possesses and which he utilized in his capacity as Chairman. We know and appreciate the fact that his accomplishments in analyzing data and drafting reports were greater than those of any other one person.

"We will always cherish the privilege and pleasure we have had of working with him as members of the Commission."

The Commission consisted of Herbert Hoover, Senator Styles Bridges, Representative Chet Holifield, Representative Clarence J. Brown, Solomon C. Hollister, Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., Joseph P. Kennedy, James A. Farley, Senator John L. McClellan, Arthur S. Flemming, Director, Office of Defense Mobilization; Sidney A. Mitchell, Robert G. Storey, of the American Bar Association.

Herbert Hoover has given 41 years of his life to the service of his country without compensation. He has served in accordance with his conscience, without compromising his sense of ethics. He might have been a more successful President were he a more compromising politician. He never felt that it was possible for him to view office as a reward for service or as a recompense for political activity. He worked under Presidents Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Harry Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower. He was utterly ignored by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The Hoover Commission was close to Mr. Hoover's heart because he regards waste and lost motion and inefficiency in Government operations as inexcusable.

In the Commission, he encountered considerable opposition, particularly from Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, who was against everything. Although Mr. Hoover's work is done, the effort to make his proposals into law has only just begun.

Anti-United States Terrorism in South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Anti-United States Terrorism Adds New Chaos to South Vietnam State," written by Charles M. McCann, and published in today's Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YANKEE-GO-HOME LEAFLETS APPEARING—ANTI-UNITED STATES TERRORISM ADDS NEW CHAOS TO SOUTH VIETNAM STATE

The situation in the State of South Vietnam in Indochina has been complicated by an outbreak of anti-Americanism.

Three incidents of anti-American terrorism have been reported from Saigon, the capital, within the last 2 weeks.

Leaflets containing the slogan "Yankee go home" which the Communists long ago made familiar in Europe, are being distributed in the city.

So far the origin of the leaflets and the identity of the terrorists remains a mystery.

POINTS TO REBELS

However, it is suggested in dispatches that South Vietnamese rebels are probably responsible for the terrorism and that both rebels and Communist agents are distributing the anti-American propaganda.

The United States strongly supports South Vietnam Premier Ngo Dinh Diem as offering the best hope of unifying South Vietnam and keeping it from falling into the hands of the Communists.

But Premier Diem, a strong and uncompromising Nationalist, is anti-French and the French Government is strongly anti-Diem.

The Communists, who are increasingly active in South Vietnam, are, of course, agents of Ho Chi Minh, President of the Communist State of North Vietnam.

Mr. Ho is now in Pelping, visiting Chinese Communist chieftains Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

Undoubtedly the three are cooking up trouble for South Vietnam, France, and the United States.

As things are now, no military attack may be necessary to win South Vietnam for communism.

ELECTIONS AHEAD

The Geneva armistice, which ended the Indochina war and split Vietnam into southern and northern parts, provided that elections shall be held in 1956 to unify the country.

South Vietnam voters are not being presented right now with very good arguments why they should vote anti-Communist when they are being told to demand that the United States get out of the country, as the Communists have told people in Germany and other European countries.

It is a new appeal to the Nationalist and anticolonial spirit which already has cost France so dearly in its colonies.

Salaries of the Judges of the Courts of the District of Columbia

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to trespass upon the time of the House at this late hour over what has been represented to be a rather minor matter. But it is not minor. It will set a very bad precedent for the District Government. It will result in greater deficit financing. It is contrary to the

recommendation of the City Commissioners.

The municipal court is not a part of the Federal court system. It is simply the police court of the city. It is in this court where traffic cases and simple misdemeanors and the police offenses are tried. This court regardless of what has been or may be said about it is comparable to the justice of the peace courts in your own districts. I will concede that it does have jurisdiction over a few matters of a little higher degree than those that are ordinarily vested within the jurisdiction of your justice of the peace courts. But, nevertheless, so far as the District of Columbia is concerned, this is the justice of the peace court for the District of Columbia. It has the lowest jurisdiction of any court in the district. It is positively and absolutely nothing more than a glorified justice of the peace court coupled with police court jurisdiction.

There has been no matter before the House this year or in the long time that I have been here affecting the District that has been lobbyed as much as this bill. These judges have practically surrendered the bench in the last few days and laid aside their duties in the interest of this bill. They and their friends have kept the telephones in the cloak rooms busy calling Members and pleading for the support of this conference report. It is not my purpose to name names, but I will be happy to do so if you insist. I repeat that everyone around here knows that the municipal court has practically been suspended for the past few days. I have been informed by one of our colleagues that some of these judges have left their jobs, come to the Capitol, and have been hanging around here presumably lobbying for this bill. What a shame. Now, their conduct would make just as much sense if the generals in the Pentagon left their desks and spent their time lobbying with Members of the House of Representatives for a raise in pay. It would be just as undignified. But when you consider the fact that this is hardly more than a J. P. court, then I presume we cannot expect much of them. Incidentally, there have been some business interests downtown that have gotten interested in this thing, both retail and wholesale. They have made some calls to the House Members. Maybe you can read between the lines and determine whom they are. If you do not know and want to know, I will be happy to tell you. This has been a heavy lobby, inspired by men who preside over what is supposed to be a dignified court. It has been a shameful and disgraceful thing. It would not be so bad if the demand was not so unreasonable.

The District of Columbia is in poor financial circumstances at this time. The responsibility for the legislative financing of the District of Columbia belongs to you and it belongs to me. Just a few days ago the House of Representatives saw fit to cut the sum of $4 million off the Federal payment to the district. This threw the District's budget further out of balance. Most of you voted for that cut. Now, where do you expect the District to get this additional money? You cut off the source of revenue and the next day increase the expenditures. What sort of legislating is that. Furthermore, the teachers of the District of Columbia with bachelor degrees have beginning salaries as low as $3,400 a year. Yet here are judges who are serving in capacities only slightly above that of a justice of the peace, coming here and asking for $18,000 a year. It is ridiculous. Raises are needed among some employees of the District—justifiable raises—but this court certainly is not one of them.

Furthermore, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have opposed such a high raise from the very inception. They reluctantly agreed to $4,000. Are you going to strike down their views? Are you going to ignore and run this thing over the officials of the District who have the responsibility of running the District Government? If you do, how can you criticize them for the financial distress of the city as you did a few weeks ago when you reduced their revenues by $4 million? Under extreme pressure, the Commissioners finally agreed on a raise of $4,000 and the House recommended $3,000. In other words, the House has agreed to raise the salary of these police court judges 23 percent. That is a pretty good raise by anyone's estimate. When the bill was considered in the Senate the raise was fixed at $5,500 or a 42 percent increase. You have fussed around here for more than a year over a 7- or 8-percent increase for postal workers and Federal employees.

Then we went to conference. The other body made a $500 compromise—not much of a compromise in my book. It was no compromise at all. So this House sent its conferees back to do the job over. You instructed us by a majority vote to stand pat, to insist on the House bill.

With all deference to my chairman, we stood for only 14 minutes. Just exactly that. The conference went into session 2 minutes before 3 o'clock, and at 3:13 the conference report was being signed by everyone but me. I attempted to stand, to carry out your orders, to preserve the position of the House and the integrity of the House. Conferees of the other body dropped down another $500, you might say another inch. If this conference report is adopted, it will mean a raise of 34.5 percent. It will be contrary to the position of your Committee on the District of Columbia. It will be contrary to the position of the House. It will be contrary to the recommendation of the City Commissioners. It is wrong. It is too much. It is unreasonable.

I am willing for these judges to have a raise. I supported the $3,000 raise. It will bring their salaries up to $16,000, a pretty good salary for presiding officers of the lowest court in the city. They will become the highest paid employees of the city.

The question involved here is not the amount of money involved. It is one of principle. If you fix the salaries of these judges at the high figure recommended in the conference report, are you not going to have to raise the salaries of other officials to a comparable level? Who would dare say the judges of the police court are more important or hold a higher position in the city government than the City Commissioners, or the Corporation Counsel, or the Chief of Police, the Fire Chief, the Director of Public Health, and so on? Where will this end? What will be the effect upon the city treasury? Who is going to pay the bill? And where will the money come from?

I said in the beginning of my remarks that these judges were not a part of the Federal court system of the District of Columbia. Some have attempted to so compare them but there is no comparison. This is a city court, a police court, the lowest court in this town.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia draw a salary of only $13,800, and they are the officers who run the town. Are you going to subrogate them, salarywise, to the police court?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The Director of Highways of the District of Columbia has a salary of $13,800. The Corporation Counsel a salary of only $13,400; the Director of Public Health, $13,400; the Director of Vehicles and Traffic, $12,600; the Chief of Police, only $12,900; Chief of the Fire Department, $12,900; the Superintendent of the city schools, $14,000. Yet we have been faced with a big lobby to pay these police court judges $18,500 a year. As a lawyer myself of 30 years experienice, I can think of no easier job. And, it certainly requires the least judicial skill of any court in this vicinity. This is just too much for me to swallow. Furthermore, I would be doing this House and the people of the District a disservice if I did.

The so-called compromise before the House is no compromise at all. Personally, it makes no difference with me what the House does with this report. But in fairness to the House, the City Commissioners and the taxpayers of the District, this matter ought to go back to conference with directions and instructions to the conferees to stand by the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Congressman Udall Outstanding Young Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in recent weeks, the Washington Post has had occasion to comment on the good sense of a proposal made by our colleague from Arizona, Mr. UDALL, who serves on my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and although a freshman in the House, is showing exceptional legislative ability.

In the first comment, the Washington Post praised Mr. UDALL's criticism of the President's highway plan, pointing out that he was eminently correct in his statement that the total debt of the country was the public debt—Federal, State, and local—plus the private debt, and that the administration's proposal on highways simply seeks to transfer a portion of the debt from the category of public debt to the category of private debt, but is nevertheless part and parcel of our national indebtedness, which is an addition of the two.

On June 28, 1955, the Washington Post again in an editorial entitled "Sympathetic Integration" referred to Mr. UDALL's highly constructive proposal for Federal aid to public schools directly affected by the Supreme Court decision outlawing school segregation. Mr. UDALL suggests that we help these school districts meet the problem rather than making it tougher for them. I believe that Mr. UDALL has made a sensible proposal in a highly sensitive and difficult field, which reflects credit upon him and the people of Arizona who have sent him to Congress.

On June 30 the Washington Post in an editorial entitled "Tax Aid in Campaigns" mentions approvingly the legislation sponsored by Mr. UDALL and Senator HENNINGS relating to political contributions. This is an area of our political system that sadly needs correction, and here again Mr. UDALL has stepped forward with a constructive suggestion. It is always a pleasure to applaud the younger Members of this House who show initiative and sound analysis in their approach to national problems, and I wish to commend my colleague from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], and to say that as chairman of the House Committee on Interior, his service has shown the same high order of legislative ability.

I ask unanimous consent to attach the Post editorials for the information of the Members:

SYMPATHETIC INTEGRATION

Representative STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona, has made a highly constructive proposal for Federal aid to the public schools directly affected by the Supreme Court's decision outlawing school segregation. His bill would in no sense be a substitute for the general Federal aid to education measures now under consideration by Congress. It would simply recognize that the change required by the court's decision entails difficult emotional and economic problems in areas where segregation is deeply rooted. And it would approach these problems sympathetically, not punitively.

Mr. UDALL would treat the areas called upon to change from segregated to integrated schools as areas of Federal impact similar to those areas which have received special financial help in school construction because of defense activities. He urges, in short, that the Federal Government give direct finanacial aid to such areas in order to enable them to build the additional school facilities necessary to bring about integration without any impairment of existing school standards. He is indisputably right, it seems to us, in asserting that there is a clear national obligation involved. The problem is an emergency one created by Federal action and calling for prompt and generous Federal aid.

Mr. UDALL's bill has another virtue which might well be applied to Federal aid to education in general. He proposes that Federal aid be extended not to States but to school districts and that a condition of receiving it be "that the local educational agency is carrying out, or is prepared to carry out, a program of racial integration of pupils." This is a far more sensible and flexible condition than the mischievous rider which Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL threatens to tack on to the pending aid to the pending aid to education bill. Mr. POWELL would forbid Federal aid to any State where any vestige of segregation remains in the public schools—a proviso that would rule out aid to the very States which need it most and that would insure the defeat of the aid bill. Mr. UDALL would encourage compliance by aiding it and by recognizing that different parts of a State may respond differently.

It may be, indeed, that Mr. UDALL has found a common ground for a meeting of those who object to the coercion implicit in Mr. POWELL's rider and those who object to the idea of having Federal funds expended for a purpose which the Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional. On the basis of just this kind of statesmanly compromise, the urgently needed program of Federal aid to education could at last become a reality.

TAX AID IN CAMPAIGNS

Senator HENNINGS and Representative UDALL have demonstrated that there is something Congress can do about political contributions. The similar bills they have introduced in their respective Houses permitting citizens to deduct contributions to political campaigns from their taxable income, up to $100, could bring about a most significant political reform. These bills are designed to encourage greater participation by the rank and file in the financing of political campaigns. In a broader sense they should help greatly to relieve candidates for public office from obligations to special interests and make them responsible to the people.

A wholesale exemption of campaign contributions from taxation could be an unmitigated evil. It could encourage wealthy people to pour large sums into political campaigns and thus defeat the purposes of the Corrupt Practices Act. But the $100 limitation in the Hennings-Udall bills eliminates this danger and throws the emphasis on small contributions. No public servant is going to feel any special obligation to a constituent contributing $100 or less to his campaign. And the multiplication of small contributions from many sources is one of the best ways of enhancing the feeling of a legislator or executive that he is indeed a representative of the people.

The bill ought to be enacted so as to make it effective in the 1956 campaign. As we have previously noted, political campaigns have never been so expensive as they are today. In some measure these expenses can and should be limited, but a self-governing people would be extremely unwise to deny to candidates for office the means of making themselves and their views known to the public. The simple fact is that government by the people is an expensive necessity, which much have financial support as well as sustained interest and alertness from the rank and file. Congress can aid the cause by making small political contributions tax exempt, as the Legislature of Minnesota has already done, but self-government can reach its full flower only when people recognize the obligation to support their party and their candidates as they now support their churches, and their fraternal, educational, and charitable organizations.

Appointment of Hon. Warren Burger as Judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter which was addressed to the President of the United States by Hon. Arnold Hatfield, judge, district court of Minnesota, and a list of district judges of the State of Minnesota commending the President upon the appointment of Mr. Burger to the office of Judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF MINNESOTA,
Rochester, Minn., June 27, 1955.

Re Warren E. Burger.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: News of your appointment of Warren E. Burger to the office of judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia was released shortly before the annual meeting of the district judges of the State of Minnesota. Just before the judges' meeting was to recess it occurred to us that the appointment of Mr. Burger must still be confirmed by the United States Senate.

There is enclosed herewith a letter signed by 25 district judges of the State of Minnesota, commending you upon the appointment of Mr. Burger. The 25 judges whose names are affixed to the letter represent every district judge who was in attendance. This is an indication of the high esteem in which Mr. Burger is held by the trial judges of this State. It is intended that this letter be used before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate or on the floor of the Senate if necessary.

Respectfully yours,

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned district judges of the State of Minnesota, hereby commend you upon the appointment of Warren Burger as judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

Arnold Hatfield, Rochester, 3d District; Rollin G. Johnson, Forest Lake, 19th District; Arlo E. Haering, Waconia, 8th District; Carl W. Gustafson, Center City, 19th District; George D. Erickson, New Ulm, 9th District; E. R. Selnes, Glenwood, 16th District; Irving R. Brand, Minneapolis, 4th District; J. K. Underhill, Virginia, 11th District; E. J. Kenny, Duluth, 11th District; Christ Holm, Hibbing, 11th District; Paul A. Lundgren, Thief River Falls, 14th District; Arthur A. Stewart, St. Paul, 2d District; J. J. Hadler, International Falls, 15th District; Leonard Keyes, Anoka, 18th District; Byron R. Wilson, Moorhead, 7th District; J. H. Sylvestre, Crookston, 14th District; W. A.

Schultz, South St. Paul, 1st District; C. A. Rolloff, Montevideo, 12th District; Milton D. Mason, Monkato, 6th District; James C. Otis, St. Paul, 2d District; Gustavus Loevinger, St. Paul, 2d District; Victor H. Johnson, Duluth, 11th District; Earl E. Huber, Wheaton, 16th District; A. C. Richardson, Austin, 10th District; B. M. Heinzen, Marshall, 9th District.

Boris Sirpo and the Oregon Little Chamber Orchestra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all Oregon is cheering the triumphant return of Boris Sirpo's Little Chamber Orchestra to Portland, Oreg.

The 14 young women instrumentalists were ambassadors of good will during their 7-week European tour of Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, England, and France.

Boris Sirpo, outstanding professor of music at Lewis and Clark College in Portland since 1945, fled his native Finland in 1940 in advance of the Russians when they destroyed the fine conservatory of music he founded at Viipuri in 1918.

The young women, who have practiced for two summers for the tour, range in age from 15 to 28, and ably represent American youth at its best.

Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a well-deserved tribute to Boris Sirpo and the Oregon Little Chamber Orchestra from the music columns of Time magazine for July 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUE RECEIVED

It was raining buckets in Paris' Boulevard Poissonnière one night last week as six taxi drivers shouted and gesticulated at the door of the Hotel Violet. "What kind of a circus is this?" cried one. "We'll get wet as pigs," complained another. "This calls for an extra tip." Eventually, the taxicabs got under way, carrying 16 American girls dressed in flowing silver-gray silk and toting violins, violas, cellos, and a string bass; their conductor, Boris Sirpo, and a few assistants. In sum total they were the Little Chamber Orchestra from Portland, Oreg., and their destination was the National French television studio in Rue Cognacq-Jay.

The orchestra's dampened debut before France's TV watchers was a cloud-high point of a 7-week European tour that had already won raves in Finland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and England. As the French cameras blinked on, Conductor Sirpo led the girls through a solemn, contemplative Corelli air, a Vivaldi piece (with violin solo by tall, blonde Claire Hodgkins), some modern variations by Alexander Tansman and an allegro by Stamitz. They played with fire and discipline that astonished their listeners—and played everything without a sheet of music. When they had done, the TV crew crowded around, and the studio audience burst into applause.

PART PAYMENT

The triumphal tour was the kind of stuff that winsome movies are made of. The girls themselves range in age from 15 to 28, have been rehearsing for their tour for the last 2 summers. Conductor Sirpo, 60, is a hard-driving, expatriate Finn who wants the old countries to understand the deep-down values he has found in the United States. "I felt the need to repay America for giving me so much," he explains, "and for a music teacher, music is the only way to repay something. I wanted to show Europeans what young Americans can do in music, to let them see something of the culture and spiritual power our country can produce."

Conductor Sirpo abandoned his own conservatory in Finland when the Russians invaded in 1939 and headed for the United States. Since 1945, he has been teaching at Portland's Presbyterian Lewis and Clark College, where as many as 70 students brave his celebrated sternness to play in his student orchestra. One reason: beneath the rigorous vigor lies a puckish streak that relieves the direst stress. For example, Sirpo was once felled on the podium by a minor stroke, and somebody shrieked that he had been shot. As the cops arrived, he regained his speech and muttered solemnly: "My wife did it." On another occasion, the Sirpos had just moved into a house that was supposed to be haunted. Sure enough, ghostly sounds wakened the couple, and Mrs. Sirpo suggested that he investigate. "No, my love," said he. "You go; your English is better."

MONEY BACK

The girls take their tour with all the seriousness that a dedicated Finn and a Presbyterian education can instill. "It's like a mission," said one. "We are here to represent the United States to foreign countries. We try to make a good impression everywhere." To make it better, they rehearse 2 or 3 hours after breakfast every day, and again after lunch and dinner. Even when sightseeing, they make an impression. One girl, faced with an untranslatable menu, left her table, buttonholed a Frenchman on the street, brought him back, and got him to translate the menu while other diners goggled.

Portland was hardly aware that it even had an all-girl orchestra before the girls departed, and managed to raise only a dismal $6,100 toward the tour expenses. As a result, each girl dug up—by borrowing, selling instruments, etc., some $1,500 of her own, and stands to spend it all. But Portland knows better now, will parade the girls through downtown streets when they get home next week, already has scheduled a big fund-raising concern 2 days after homecoming. After that? "This is only the beginning," says Sirpo. "We still have to go to South America."

Regulation of Natural Gas Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1955, the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., printed the following informative editorial on the subject of the much-debated Harris bill, dealing with regulation of natural gas production.

The statistics regarding the producers' share of the consumers' gas bill are particularly interesting, and merit the careful study of all Members who seek the truth in this controversy.

The editorial follows:

To the average Oklahoman who knows something about the oil and gas industry, there is much mystification over Congress' inability to reach a decision on the proposed freeing of natural gas producers from Federal regulation. It is fairly obvious in this section of the Nation that what the producer gets for his gas has little or nothing to do with what the ultimate consumers pay in the North and East.

Much demagoguery has entered the picture to confuse congressional action on the so-called Harris resolution. Because they have been blatantly misled by would-be government controllers, mayors, and other officials in northern and eastern cities are clamoring for rigid controls on pricing at the wellhead as the answer to high gas prices to their constituents. They are claiming that a free market among producers raises consumer gas bills in the East by as much as $400 million annually—a figure as mystifying to us as other claims.

Some of the newspapers have sought to get the facts of the issue. Among them is the Chicago Sun-Times, which has forthrightly advised its readers that producer prices at the wellhead do not justify Federal regulation at that point. The paper points out that there are 1,740,000 gas consumers in Illinois, but that out of each $1 paid on a gas bill the producer in Oklahoma, Texas or Louisiana receives but 8.6 cents per thousand cubic feet. Moreover, the paper cites figures showing increased gas consumption in Illinois actually brought about a 7-percent decrease in average consumer costs between 1945 and 1954—all of it in a free production market.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, another paper with an ambition to get all the facts, asks some legitimate questions which the gas controls advocates have carefully ignored. In particular, the Post wants to know how Federal controls at the wellhead will protect the Washington, D. C., consumer who is paying $1.39 per thousand cubic feet—when but 11 cents goes to the producer (in some instances only 8 cents).

Tulsa's Mayor L. C. Clark we believe has given as open and accurate a picture as anybody. At a recent Mayor's conference in New York City, Mr. Clark pointed out that New York City consumers pay $2.08 to $2.42 per thousand cubic feet for gas which brought the producers but 8 cents. He also could have cited these comparisons:

Philadelphia consumers pay $1.36 per thousand cubic feet for gas which the producer sells for 10 cents; Minneapolis consumers pay 82 cents for gas which brought the producer but 10 cents; Baltimore pays $1.51 for supplies for which producers received but 13 cents, while St. Louis—much closer to the supply fields—pays $1.09 for gas that brought 10 cents to the producer. Columbus, Ohio, much farther from the supply than St. Louis, pays 65 cents for each thousand feet.

These figures show one fact clearly: Control of gas at the wellhead has little or no effect upon the ultimate cost to the consumer. The point of issue lies, basically, in the fields of the gas transporter and the gas distributor—both of which already are regulated by the Federal Power Comission and State utility bodies.

It is obvious, thus, that the only issue is whether or not the Government is going to get in up to its neck in the oil and gas industry. It should not. The Harris bill should be approved.

Washington Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the voters of the State of Washington received a cogent warning against the proposed upper Colorado storage project in an editorial appearing May 1 in the Seattle Times. The editorial is as follows:

PROBLEM TOO INVOLVED TO TREAT SO LIGHTLY

Eastern conservationists take intense and often, it seems, undue interest in the development of natural resources in the West. They are perpetually concerned lest the western national parks be invaded and despoiled, and usually appear in solid opposition to reclamation and water projects concerning which westerners may be presumed to know considerably more than the easterners.

One of their principal present worries is the proposal in Congress—authorized in the Senate—to develop the upper Colorado River with a series of public power and reclamation projects, the eventual cost of which is estimated at more than a billion and a half dollars.

On this subject, an organization styled the Council of Conservationists and Trustees for Conservation has become vocal. Most recently, this group has circulated widely an editorial from the New York Times in vigorous opposition to the upper Colorado enterprise, with this accompanying message:

"Hundreds of thousands of conservationists and at least an equal number of taxpayers hope the House of Representatives will recognize an obligation to prevent Congress from authorizing this project, which appears to be a mammoth boondoggle, and in passing will mark the beginning of the end of the national parks system."

Remarking that the power from this project "will be produced at fantastically high rates and the irrigation per acre will cost many times the value of the land," the New York Times goes on to say: "This newspaper is all for the development of the undeveloped areas of our country where feasible; but we do believe that large-scale developments ought to have some realistic relation to expected costs and benefits. It would of course be possible to grow bananas on top of the Rockies if one wanted to spend the money; but the question is, couldn't this money be spent more advantageously elsewhere. Even such an able defender of public power as Senator NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, concedes that upper Colorado power will be produced at a rate so high it 'precludes extensive use for competitive manufacturing.' "

The several Colorado River projects constitute a problem that is immensely complicated, involving the rights of the States on the upper and lower reaches of that river basin, including Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and even Nevada. The States of the lower and upper Colorado basin have entered into an interstate compact on their rights to Colorado water, and even the compact is in complicated litigation between Arizona and California as to their respective rights to the river's water resources.

As the New York Times remarked, the Senate "coolly authorized" the upper Colorado project "with hardly a ripple." With so much at stake in States rights and in billions of dollars of cost, it seems reasonable to urge the House of Representatives to act on this question with full and careful deliberation. There are alternative plans for the development of the upper Colorado River which also deserve unhurried congressional consideration.

Hollywood's Inaccurate Interpretations of Bible Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by J. C. Furnas on the distorted, inaccurate, and at times quite disgusting interpretations of Bible stories by Hollywood, is something that has long needed to be written.

This article, appearing in the Christian Herald, should have wide circulation.

Apart from the revulsion that any informed student of the Bible must feel, from a religious standpoint the glaring distortions and outright falsehoods make these pictures historically useless and quite absurd.

The article follows:

Hollywood's hottest gimmick is Holy Writ. Last year film capital news stories were headed, "Scripture on Wide Screen," "Five Films on Biblical Subjects Keep Industry Wheels Turning."

Mentioned in various stages of assembly were the Silver Chalice, about the cup that Christ used at the Last Supper; a Cecil B. de Mille remake of The Ten Commandments, to cost $8 million; Joseph and His Brethren, Mary Magdalene, Daniel and the Woman of Babylon, The Big Fisherman, the Galileans, Son of Man, The Song of Ruth, The Song of Songs, and The Prodigal.

The Silver Chalice has since appeared, with still another actor trying to play Nero as Charles Laughton did in Sign of the Cross many years ago, and Nero's usual floor show of numerous young ladies wriggling through presumably Roman-style convolutions. More originally it has Jack Palance as Simon Magus juggling rabbits and finally doing a fatal high dive in a costume obviously borrowed from Batman.

Virginia Mayo is most distracting in gowns run up by an Antioch dressmaker that strangely anticipate what Gina Lollobrigida wants 1,900 years later. So you may have missed the offer that Simon made her when he came in tired from a long day of wizardry:

"Give us some wine, my fairest flower," quoth he to Virginia, "and we shall talk of miracles." The late W. C. Fields would have paid well for that line.

The Batman motif may have been what caused the lady with me to say it was all like the cornier kind of comic book.

I wonder how much longer people to whom the Bible is important and serious will let this sort of thing go unprotested. It has often verged on sacrilege and it has long been monotonous.

By the time Hollywood gets through with them, nobody entering in the middle will be able to tell The Song of Ruth from The Song of Songs. Actually it will be the orgy sequence from Daniel and the Woman of Babylon, the scarlet one, presumably, with technicolor preventing any possible mistakes, but otherwise pretty much the way it was in black and white in the old silent days when Betty Blythe was the Queen of Sheba.

Crude violence and crude sex were marketable showman's staples long before D. W. Griffith's Intolerance 40 years ago showed a human head lopped off like a barnyard chicken's close to the camera, and lingeringly explored Belshazzar's well-fed and well-housed but inadequately clothed harem. Griffith merely demonstrated how to lend such screen goings-on a backhanded relish by impertinent appeal to the prestige of religion—widening his potential public by masking sex and sadism as a necessarily religious Bible story.

De Mille has been going him bigger, if not better, ever since, with periodic Scriptural spectaculars that have become a sort of international institution. He has at least the excuse that, presumably without leave, he has repeatedly travestied God's word and nobody has objected. His sporadic imitators have no excuse whatsoever.

The usual plea is that the Bible is a treasure house of great stories and that Hollywood experts in story greatness are irresistibly moved to use such fine material. That would sound better if they confined their selection to Bible stories such as those of Joseph, Ruth, and Esther. The Silver Chalice, however, and The Robe, most successful of this recent cycle, are whole-cloth synthetics exploiting the names and sacred associations of a few traditional figures from the New Testament. And the Song of Songs, the Bible one which is Solomon's, has no story line at all, only rhapsody. This should leave Hollywood totally unhampered by a traditional plot.

Similarly the reticence of the Gospels about the past of Mary of Magdala before she met Christ gives the screen a stimulatingly free hand that, one may assume, will liberally sketch her ill-doings. Then what about Joshua's men and Rahab the harlot? And Ananias and Sapphira (this wife's life was a lie)? And a remake on the Queen of Sheba?

Jezebel is being done, I hear. David and Bathsheba had their turn 2 years ago. It's a pity there aren't more bath scenes in the Bible, but the Apocrypha does offer Susanna and the Elders.

According to the New York Times, this is how one such film was born: A staff member brought the parable of the prodigal son to the attention of Dore Schary of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer because he was impressed by the timeliness of the message for the young people of the present. Moreover, the setting of the drama, Damascus and Joppa in 70 B. C., excited his imagination.

It excites my imagination to wonder what black art led a Hollywood understrapper to conclude that the prodigal's trip to "a far country," as part of an illustrative parable of Christ's, meant Joppa-to-Damascus a generation before Christ was born. But this is the sort of thing that has always passed for "research" in publicity stories from out of the wild purple yonder.

Writers preparing the script, said the Times, found the implied drama so rich that they spun 82 pages of screenplay, three-fourths of the whole, from the few words of Luke 15: 13 on how the prodigal "wasted his substance in riotous living." I can see it coming: Damascus in 70 B. C. is going to be a cross between a travelogue of Constantinople and New Years' eve on the Barbary Coast, with Lana Turner, who plays Astarte, goddess of love, popping grapes into the young man's mouth to epitomize voluptuous depravity.

Only a bigot would bar free use of biblical themes in the arts. This same parable, for instance, was the occasion of Durer's superb early engraving, delicate and strong

as a frost pattern on glass, of the prodigal praying among the swine in a medieval German farmyard.

If creative artists had not used the Bible, we would lack "Paradise Lost," Handel's "Messiah," Michelangelo's Sistine frescoes, and many of the glories, majestic or gnarly, of Gothic sculpture. But in such cases the quality of handling matches the quality of material. The gulf between these Bible movies and their epic "source" is nothing short of monumental.

Just as crime movies are 98 percent glorification of felons and 2 percent hurried crime-doesn't-pay at the end, so Bible movies run pretty solid honky-tonk sex and comic-book violence, barely remembering to conclude with a sickly religiosity.

That Damascene orgy of the Prodigal's is likely to spoil the chance of many Christian youngsters ever to know the spiritual content of the lovely old parable. That movie version of King David's affair with Susan Hayward could go far to numb many teen-agers to the ethical values of the career of the son of Jesse.

Screen treatment of religious themes need not be shoddy.

Recently, for instance, the Lutherans and the Methodists have hired first-rate film experts and come out (in Martin Luther and John Wesley) with movies of dignity and religious value. One can readily imagine Louis (Lost Boundaries) de Rochemont, producer of Martin Luther, creating a film from the life of Moses or the career of Paul, that would well reward a church group putting up the several hundred thousand dollars—not several "Demillions"—that it would cost. It would have much burning bush and lack the usual surfeit of golden calf.

One can also imagine a highly worthwhile film of the Esther story acted against off-screen reading of the resonant old King James text, a device used effectively in many movies.

After such demonstration of what dignity can do, churchgoers, individually or by congregations or denominations, could effectively challenge Hollywood's persistence in offense.

I do not mean censorship.

Nobody should touch Hollywood's right to remake the Ten Commandants annually and the exhibitor's right to show it to as many cash customers as he can cajole to the box office. But people whose beliefs involve the Bible also have a right to write protests to the makers of such films and to back one another in neglecting to patronize them. In the past Hollywood has been vastly sensitive to pressure from religious forces making it clear they meant business.

Organized religion now includes 95 million Americans. Suppose only a third of them determined to stay home with television when the local theater runs a Bible picture cheapening things holy in their eyes. Suppose local newspaper ads vulgarizing biblical stories were posted on Sunday school bulletin boards as silent hints that such things are distasteful. Suppose suburban churchgoers seeing garish Bible films in first-run theaters in the big city put warning notes about them into church bulletins before they appear in local theaters.

Ministers might find a sermon in the thesis that one learns more of sacred things studying for oneself the gospel text of the story of John the Baptist than by watching Rita Hayworth as Salome.

Filmmakers and exhibitors are nervous folk and this sort of thing might helpfully spoil the sleep of some key figures. On reflection it might occur to them that travesty of the Bible is not essential to movies exploiting Hollywood's illiterate idea of the ancient world. The recent The Egyptian, for instance, had slathers of girls, bare-chested heroes and World's Fair-like sets without using the parable of the Five Foolish Virgins as pretext for the whole corroboree.

To suggest that last may be unwise, Hollywood may take me up on it. It's like this, see—these five foolish virgins and their five wise sisters get captured by one of these Mediterranean pirates and sold to Nero for slaves, and you know what that means, but the five wise ones are Christian on the quiet and they don't go for this orgy routine, and so it's the lions for them. But the other five, they don't care. I can see them now at Nero's banquet dancing away like crazy in five different technicolors of gauze.

And this is where I came in.

National Forest Timber Management Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress when I served as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, my attention was called to problems in connection with the management of national forest timber by the Comptroller General's Report of Investigation of Sale of Government-Owned Timber and by comments of the House Appropriations Committee in its report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for fiscal year 1954.

The management and sale of timber on the national forests is one of the principal activities of the Forest Service. In recent years the volume cut has greatly increased as have receipts from this timber. The Treasury now receives more than $70 million in revenue annually from national forest timber sales. This important and sizable activity is carried on under the general authority of the act of June 4, 1897, as amended.

After further study and consultation with experts in this field, it is my opinion that legislation is advisable to modernize and improve the laws governing these activities in order more adequately to protect the interest of both the United States and national forest timber purchasers. The bill (H. R. 7118) which I am introducing today has been prepared for this purpose. This bill would revise, modernize, and consolidate authority for timber management on all national forest lands, including both those proclaimed from the public domain, and those acquired by purchase, exchange, or donation. Existing authority for national forest timber management is contained primarily in the act of June 4, 1897—16 U. S. C. 476—which has been amended to only a minor degree in the intervening years. My bill would repeal part of this statute and replace it with a systematic statute fitted to present-day conditions. Included also in the statutes which would be repealed is the portion of the act of August 10, 1912, as set forth in section 489 of the United States Code which provides for sale of timber at cost to homestead settlers and farmers for their domestic use.

This bill is the first comprehensive revision of laws for conduct of timber management activities on the national forests. It is significant that the need for such revision has not heretofore developed. Seldom has so much activity been conducted under a general statute for over half a century without need for substantial revision of its provisions. The act of June 4, 1897 is still basically sound. My bill is not for the purpose of upsetting the wise provisions of that act which have formed the basis for 50 years of successful administration of the national forests by the Forest Service. Many of the provisions of portions of the act of June 4, 1897—16 U. S. Code 476—are restated in my bill.

The act of June 4, 1897, was drafted before the Federal Government had experience in the conduct of sale of timber from the forest reserves, as the national forests were then termed. Today 6 billion board feet annually are being harvested. In my opinion the work of the forest service will be facilitated now by reenactment of these well established principles in language suited to present conditions and with modification and adjustment of operating provisions and needed new authorities in the light of 50 years of experience.

This national forest timber management bill is applicable not only to the national forests, but also to other land administered by the Forest Service. Lands acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act have now been placed by the Secretary of Agriculture under administration of the Forest Service. In the interest of simplicity and avoidance of confusion, the timber resources of such lands should be subject to the same basic laws. Also, some forest experimental areas and minor miscellaneous tracts are under the administration of the Forest Service and should be subject to the same laws in respect to their timber management.

My bill provides a statement of policy by the Congress for the timber management of these properties. No comparable statement has heretofore been considered by the Congress. The statement provides for the application of coordinated use and conservation of all resources of these lands. For timber management the objectives are: First, to grow maximum crops of the best suited timber on such areas; second, to get full timber utilization consistent with stabilization of communities and with consideration of size of timber offerings to suit purchasers of different financial and operating capacities; third, to obtain at least fair market value for all timber sold from these lands; fourth, to grow and harvest timber in accordance with sustained yield management principles.

The policy statement also recognizes that in order to accomplish these objectives it is necessary to have (a) an adequate system of timber-access roads; (b) adequate measures against loss from fire, insects, disease, and windthrow; and (c) suitably located and efficient timber processing facilities.

My bill authorizes the sale of timber under terms and conditions appropriate to further these policies and objectives.

Provision for advertisements and bidding are prescribed. These requirements substantially restate existing law with minor modifications designed to facilitate the work of the Forest Service and service to timber purchasers in the light of administrative experience in recent years. Provisions are also prescribed for the cutting of timber to meet special purposes; cutting to remove deteriorating or other undesirable timber growth; cutting without charge such as for improvements of value in the administration of these lands and for relief work conducted by public agencies; and cutting necessary in connection with authorized use of the lands, such as clearing for a road or dam site. All of these special-purpose cuttings are now authorized by regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

All sales of timber under this bill would be at not less than fair market value as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after giving consideration to specific factors affecting such value. The Secretary would be authorized as a condition of sale first, to adjust rates of value for timber at specified times in conformity with his determination of fair-market value at such times; second, to adjust rates of timber value to obtain salvage action in emergencies through his determination of fair-market value under the changed conditions arising out of the emergencies; third, to make cutting and removal optional for specified areas or specified timber; fourth, to require purchasers to perform such road maintenance as is made necessary by their use, and to repair damages to land, vegetation, and improvements and to abate insect and disease hazards resulting from their activities; or to make deposits in lieu of such work of the estimated costs to the United States of performing such work.

Timber access roads are now of great importance in orderly harvesting of timber under sustained yield management principles. There is no specific legislation governing construction and maintenance of such roads by timber purchasers. A section in this bill makes several new provisions to improve administration of this important activity. The bill authorizes construction of timber access roads which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from all lands to which the bill is applicable tributary to such roads either with appropriated funds, by requirements of purchasers in timber sale contracts, or by cooperation with public or private agencies. Provisions are made for payment of fees for hauling non-federally owned timber over such roads and for deposits to cover the costs of maintenance occasioned by such hauling. To facilitate access to and across private land, the bill authorizes granting of right-of-way easements to owners of private property in the vicinity across the lands covered by this bill. Provision is also made for a system of selling timber under which stumpage rates are adjusted to give equitable recognition of the value of the timber access roads constructed by the purchaser as determined by the Government and the volume of timber which is finally cut by the purchaser.

Deposits from timber purchasers or users of timber access roads as provided in the bill would be covered into the Treasury as special funds and made available until expended to cover the costs of performing the work specified. Deposits which are found to be in excess of needs would be transferred to miscellaneous receipts. Certain provisions for consolidation of deposits in the same work unit and for determining of costs by estimate on the basis of costs analyses would be authorized in the interest of practical and efficient work performance. These arrangements are comparable to those authorized for other work of the Forest Service by the terms of the Granger-Thye Act of April 24, 1950—64 Statutes 82.

Transfer and assignments of timber-sale contracts would be authorized notwithstanding the provisions of section 3477 or 3737 of the Revised Statutes.

Modification of timber contracts entered into prior to enactment of this bill to provide for exercising the authority granted by the bill are not to be deemed contrary to the interest of the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions in the bill.

An activity of the Government which brings in better than $70 million to the Treasury and on the sound conduct of which the future strength and welfare of the Nation is so strongly dependent should be governed by comprehensive legislation. The subject of my bill merits the most careful consideration of the Congress. Existing statutes which have served remarkably well for more than 50 years should not be replaced without thorough study. It is in this spirit that I am introducing this bill. I hope it will be thoroughly scrutinized by Members of the Congress. This bill directly affects the welfare of a large segment of the forest products industries; it affects the welfare of thousands of timber dependent communities; it is of great interest to the many organizations concerned with sound use and conservation of our national resources. I hope these industries, communities, and organizations will also study this bill and communicate their views to me, the Committee on Agriculture, and their Representatives in Congress.

The Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, which states so clearly the position of those opposed to any kind of a universal military training program that I feel it deserves study and consideration by all who are interested in our national defense. Particularly, I would draw attention to the paragraph in which Master Newsom discusses the urgent need of a system of civilian defense in case of a tragic national emergency.

The letter follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1955.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: It is the hope of the National Grange that you will find it possible to vote against the pending compulsory universal reserve bill when it reaches the floor of the House.

The opposition of our people to this type of measure is based upon the fact that, to them, it violates a fundamental characteristic that has made this Nation the envy of the world. It substitutes compulsion for adequate incentives. We believe the American way is the incentive way. Government should encourage, not discourage this system. The nature of even this era, in our opinion, is not such that we feel a substitution is currently necessary.

The bill is a part of a proposed total Universal Military Training program. Is our present position so serious that we can afford, for the first time in our history, to adopt the principle of universality in this field?

You are unquestionably familiar with the basic arguments put forth by our forefathers who successfully fought matters of this nature, just as you are familiar with today's arguments against what we consider a very dangerous threatened action. Suffice it so say that such a system of universal compulsion has heretofore been foreign to our American way of life. We cannot now willingly accept a system that will both weaken and lower the total moral, economic, and political potential of the United States, and at the same time tend to undermine the real quality and effectiveness of the Organized Reserve forces.

In the event of a tragic national emergency brought on by an attack from a foreign power, we would urge that a system of civilian defense quickly be substituted for any martial law that might be initially instituted. The American people, I am sure, would respond to such a civilian operation in a surge of patriotism that would prove far more effective than any system of long-term military police control. In other words, we reject the argument that a large compulsory universal reserve is needed for civilian defense.

Then, too, I doubt if I need remind you of the special hardship that would be inflicted upon our youth who live in rural areas. Long, weekly trips would be required for their training. In some areas this would be expensive and time-consuming. There is also the possibility of camp duty occurring at critical periods on the land.

These and many other reasons impel us to come to you with the plea that you reject this type system as being foreign to our national posture, and as being certain to weaken rather than strengthen our national well-being. The greatest possible United States potential is to be found in the direction of expanded rather than impaired freedom and opportunity for our young people to plan and order their lives at an early age. Let us, therefore, determine the incentive needed to maintain the Reserve structure which is appropriate or required, and at the same time restore the principle of selectivity to the drafting of young men for the active forces.

We must be thoroughly aware that the world of today and the future of human beings everywhere demand more than simple American military might.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM,
Master.

What's Behind the Attack on Foundations?—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, what is behind the continuing attack on philanthropic institutions, such as the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations? The purpose of these attacks seems to be twofold—to destroy public confidence in these organizations and to set the stage for an attack on certain tax benefits which such organizations enjoy. It seems clear to me that these foundations have been supporting some of the most worthwhile projects being undertaken in America today. In a recent letter to me Mr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president of the Ford Foundation, said:

I find it difficult to believe that the critics of the work of private philanthropy on social and economic problems fully appreciate the implications of their position. Would they leave these problems untouched, or would they maintain that only government is competent to deal with them? Either position, it seems to me, derogates the spirit of private initiative and enterprise which is the hallmark of the American system.

I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16 a short statement in support of the fund for the Republic. I would like to include here for the information of my colleagues the letters I have received in regard to that statement as well as a speech delivered by Mr. Gaither at Tulane University on May 31, 1955:

THE FORD FOUNDATION,
New York, N. Y., June 28, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE THOMPSON: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, containing your remarks on the work of the Ford Foundation.

I find it difficult to believe that the critics of the work of private philanthropy on social and economic problems fully appreciate the implications of their position. Would they leave these problems untouched, or would they maintain that only government is competent to deal with them? Either position, it seems to me, derogates the spirit of private initiative and enterprise which is the hallmark of the American system.

I appreciate deeply your complimentary references to the Ford Foundation, and I am even more pleased that you chose to defend so effectively the broad principle of private philanthropy which, throughout our history, has been such an important factor in the growth and development of our free institutions.

Because of your interest, I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of a speech I made recently at Tulane University dealing with the general role of private philanthropy in American life.

Sincerely yours,

H. ROWAN GAITHER, Jr.

FORTUNE,
ROCKEFELLER CENTER,
New York, N. Y., June 21, 1955.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you for sending me a copy of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your remarks about the attack on the Fund for the Republic. One may not agree with the value of all the activities of the fund, but it seems to me absurd to assert, as Mr. George Sokolsky apparently did, that the fund is conducting "political propaganda" on behalf of communism.

As you well noted in your own remarks, the fund has issued a two-volume bibliography on the Communist record in the United States. It has made available on microfilm, especially for use in libraries, material on Communist trials in the country, and it has, of course, appropriated over $250,000 to prepare a detailed and documentary record of the history of the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

I am well acquainted with the individuals who have been selected to conduct these various studies. All of them are devoted Democrats with records of opposition to the Communist movement in the United States. As for myself, since my name arose in this connection, let me say that I have been writing about communism since 1938, the year I graduated college. My first published article in fact was an exposé of the Communist youth movements. In addition, I was for 4 years, from 1941–45, the managing editor of the New Leader, an anti-Communist weekly, at a time when anti-communism was not very popular.

The fund has concentrated the major weight of its activities on threats to freedom in the United States and quite naturally this has meant a concern with the "vigilante" activities of extremists on the right as well as some abuses which grew out of the administration of the security system.

There are, unfortunately, individuals in this country like Mr. Sokolsky who, in their extreme dogmatism and even self-righteousness, adopt the position that if one is not an anti-Communist on their terms, then one is not an anti-Communist at all. This is quite presumptuous, to say the least. One can have differing estimations about how to meet and expose the threat of communism, and to argue as Mr. Sokolsky does that his method alone is the right one smacks of an arbitrariness and at times a vindictiveness which I feel is itself quite un-American.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL BELL,
Associate Editor.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y., June 21, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: My only comment on your statement of June 14 is: Thank you most sincerely. The Fund for the Republic's study of communism has needed a defender on your side of the aisle, and we all appreciate your courage and candor.

If you want to see the silliest and most malicious of all attacks on us, see J. B. Matthews' article in the June American Mercury. I'm surprised Mr. Reece did not order 10,000 copies.

I hope to thank you sometime in person. Until then, with every good wish, I remain,

Cordially yours,

CLINTON ROSSITER.

THE COURIER-JOURNAL,
THE LOUISVILLE TIMES,
Louisville, Ky., June 20, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK T. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Somebody in your office was kind enough to send me the extension of remarks with regard to the Fund for the Republic and political propaganda. I read it with very great interest and approbation.

Best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

MARK ETHRIDGE.

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., June 22, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you for sending me the extension of remarks made by you in the House of Representatives on June 14, 1955. I have read your speech with great interest. I am glad that you made it, and I am grateful to you for making this fair and temperate comment on the work of the Fund for the Republic.

With my best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUTHERLAND.

HUNTER COLLEGE,
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., June 28, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much for sending me a copy of the comments you made on the subject of the Fund for the Republic. It seems to me that everybody who is associated with this enterprise will be grateful to you for having spoken so frankly and clearly. The notion that the Fund is interested in supporting communism is absurd, but, of course, if people like Sokolsky are not challenged, there will be those who will believe him.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE N. SHUSTER,
President.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 27, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for sending us the extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16 pertaining to your comments about the importance of free research and inquiry by American foundations. I found the article interesting and informative. The union agrees with you that the attacks on foundations must be vigorously opposed because of the important contribution foundations are making to the principle of freedom of thought and discussion in our country.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK MURPHY MALIN,
Executive Director.

What's Behind the Attack on Foundations?—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am including here the first section of a speech entitled, "Every Man a Philanthropist," delivered by Mr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president of the Ford Foundation, as the commencement address at Tulane University on May 31, 1955:

EVERY MAN A PHILANTHROPIST

I am grateful to Tulane University for the opportunity to return to this lovely and historic city where my great-grandfathers began their business and professional careers.

A few days ago, an old friend of Tulane's and of mine, Adm. Stanton Merrill, asked what I planned to talk about today. When I told him I was thinking of discussing the role you graduates will play as philanthropists, he thought this might be too limited a subject.

"After all," he said, "not many college graduates will ever become philanthropists."

But as we talked, it became clear that this audience would be filled with philanthropists. The truth is that every member of this graduating class is certain to engage in philanthropy, and in a wide variety of ways. Indeed, Tulane would feel its contribution to your education had been inadequate if this prediction turned out to be false.

Philanthropy is simply the spirit of active good will toward one's fellow men, and most of you became philanthropists long ago. You have raised money for your church, you have given to the Red Cross and your community chest, you have joined in the March of Dimes and other health campaigns, you have worked for numerous other worthy causes.

I hope, therefore, that each of you may see his own self-interest involved in the three points I want to stress here today.

First, philanthropy in America is a modern phenomenon through which most of us are benefactors and all of us beneficiaries.

Second, philanthropy is a vital part of our way of life as freemen.

Third, if we continue to support it, philanthropy can help all mankind toward new and higher levels of civilization.

I

The instinct to extend a helping hand perhaps marks the beginning of civilized life, and over the centuries philanthropy has found expression in a countless number of organized forms.

The Pharoahs of Egypt made bequests for charitable and religious purposes. Plato endowed his academy. The most enlightened years of the Roman era were marked by a sharp increase in the number and wealth of philanthropic trusts. In the centuries of darkness, the churches kept the light of philanthropy alive until, in England in the 17th century, it took on new life which spread into the New World.

The story is told that when Queen Elizabeth chided her Chancellor of the Exchequer for being absent from the court and demanded to know what he was doing away from public business, he replied:

"Madam, I have been away planting an acorn, and when it becomes an oak, God only knoweth what it will amount to."

The acorn he had planted was Emmanuel College, from which grew much of the intellectual power and zeal for liberty that created the American colonies. John Harvard was one of the early graduates of Emmanuel College, and Harvard College is only one of many institutions of higher learning in this country that can trace its roots to the acorn planted by Sir Walter Mildmay in England 350 years ago.

The idea of private action for worthy public services swiftly took root in American soil. A church and a school were among the first buildings erected by the Pilgrims. Within 16 years of landing, the early settlers had a college in operation. Ten of today's great institutions of higher learning were founded prior to the Revolution—all of them by private philanthropy.

And philanthropy has continued to flourish here as nowhere else in the world. As our country grew, so did the practice of giving to churches, schools, hospitals, and numerous other charitable interests. In terms of resources, diversity and public participation, philanthropy in this country today is truly unique. It has become a noble national habit. As partners in voluntary giving, the American people raise and invest in humanitarian causes more than $5 billion a year. That is more than the total Federal budget as recently as 1934.

Part of this huge amount comes from corporate gifts, and part from past gifts and bequests. But almost as remarkable as the size of the total sum itself is the fact that the bulk of it comes from the steady, spontaneous giving of millions of individual Americans.

Where does all this money go?

Most of it goes to support the basic institutions of our society—churches, schools, orphanages, hospitals, and other local charities.

The property and endowment of our churches as a result of private support exceeds $10 billion. Even with the great growth of public education, 65 percent of our institutions of higher learning remain in private hands, supported mainly from private funds. There are nearly twice as many privately supported hospitals as tax-supported ones.

We have become so used to this habit of private support of our institutions that we assume people of all lands to do the same thing. But that is not so. In many countries the state is the churches' chief source of support. The libraries built by private gifts in almost every American community of any size are seldom found elsewhere. There are few privately endowed hospitals. The multitude of privately supported colleges dotting the American landscape is not found abroad. Frequently, research and science in other lands are almost exclusively the responsibility of government.

It is quite apparent that the American people want to keep their basic institutions in their own hands. Philanthropy has been the tool they have used for that purpose.

The second largest share of the American philanthropic dollar goes to the work of more than 500,000 voluntary organizations working on all sorts of local, State and national problems. These range from local parent-teacher associations, through State educational associations to such national agencies as the Council for Financial Aid to Education. They include local world affairs councils and national study groups on foreign policy, rotary clubs, regional planning associations, and national economic study groups, veterans' organizations, women's clubs—all these and many, many more are all part of a vast pattern of voluntary action touching every conceivable human interest, activity and problem in American life. They represent one of the most active and impressive evidences of the American public's philanthropic instincts.

Truly, we are a Nation of "Joiners." We are constantly joining others of our fellow-citizens to make common cause for a constructive purpose.

In recent years, an important new movement in private philanthropy has grown rapidly—national campaigns, particularly in the field of medicine, to make massive attacks on important national problems. This development has already yielded dramatic results. Within the last few years these drives have become the third most important center of philanthropic effort. Today, nearly everyone of us is present by proxy in a laboratory where dedicated work is going forward to conquer killers like cancer, heart disease, cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, and polio. This partnership of people in great scientific assaults on major problems is a new and important chapter in the history of democratic action.

And finally, a small but important segment of the philanthropic dollar is represented by the support given by foundations like those bearing the name of Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford, usually for education and science.

At an early date, American philanthropy burst the bounds of our national frontiers. Many of the early clipper ships transported missionaries who carried not only the Bible but writing slates and medicine kits. Today, churches of our country devote to humanitarian, nonsectarian work beyond our borders more than $90 million a year. In this international expression of American philanthropy some of the foundations are following this humanitarian precedent.

All this voluntary effort reveals the vitality of our democratic system and processes. It is everyday evidence of our determination to make self-government work.

What's Behind the Attack on Foundations?—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, included here is the concluding portion of the commencement address delivered by Mr. H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president of the Ford Foundation, at Tulsa University on May 31, 1955:

This great university is itself a good example. It bears the name of one of its benefactors. He was one of several who saw the need for an educational center in this growing city. His funds and interest led others to become patrons. It has grown, along with this city and this region, through the generosity of individuals, of corporations, and of foundations.

Who have been the principal beneficiaries of this generosity? The University? The faculty? The students? This State? All of them partially, but the real beneficiaries are al of us—the entire country—including the donors themselves.

All of you are aware of the contributions made to health and wellbeing—on a national and international scale—by your medical school. The fruits of the work done here give nourishment wherever men of science gther. But it is only one of many parts of the University, and its services, great as they are, are but a segment of the constructive efforts in progress here. Medical men themselves are quick to acknowledge this dependence upon the work of scholars in the basic sciences, the humanities and the social sciences.

Recently, private and public funds joined to establish here an Urban Life Research Institute to focus academic and public at-

tention on the urgent problems of our rapidly growing urban centers. Its share of the total budget is small. Yet, I am told that even now it has made much progress in research upon the problems of civil defense, certain aspects of mental health, on leadership qualities and personal relationships in our armed services, and on community participation in democratic processes. The investments in research efforts such as these obviously give promise of benefiting the entire Nation.

Today's investors in projects such as these often can expect quick as well as rich dividends. But more is involved than the satisfaction of the donor; or the relief of the university official that his budget has been met; or the satisfaction of the faculty and the students in the work they can carry forward. The real return is a strengthening of the entire structure of American society, enriching the lives of each of us and brightening the future of our children.

Thus, Tulane illustrates in a very direct way, I believe, why it is that today's American philanthropy is all-pervasive—it involves everybody, all types of institutions, many sources of support, all forms of action for the public good. All of us are partners in it. Many of us are donors. Most of us are participants. All of us are beneficiaries.

II

I said in the beginning that American philanthropy is a unique institution, and that it is a vital part of our free society. Let me develop this second point more fully.

Democracy undeniably is a creation of faith; an expression of man's finest spiritual qualities. But making democracy work is a day-to-day practical problem.

In concrete terms, this means provision of increasingly improved educational opportunities for our children. It means maintaining a vigorous economy, building steadily a production and distribution system that will provide a high standard of living and a position of strength and leadership in the world. It means constant and intelligent effort to seek out and deal with society's maladies; whether they affect the minds and bodies of people as in the case of mental illness, or whether they represent moral and social problems, such as juvenile delinquency.

We Americans support our educational institutions because we recognize that a free society is composed of informed and enlightened people. We know that each generation must develop the leaders that will carry the society forward. We know that unless our educational system produces effective leadership for an enlightened public, the democratic process will not function effectively.

We know that our society is highly dependent upon a continuing flow of invention and production from science and technology. We recogize that basic research efforts, resting primarily in private institutions, must be supported and sustained. Without them, we would not have the trained personnel, the knowledge, the applied science and technology that gives us our strength and enables a democratic society to protect itself and move ahead.

If the age ahead is to be one of man and God rather than of machines, we must strengthen our education and learning in the arts and letters, in philosophy, literature, history, and the other humanities, and study social behavior to realize the full potential of the human mind and spirit. Material comfort and power, even that stored in the atom, gives insufficient strength to combat the evils of the impersonal and authoritarian states. Strengthening man's capacity to guide and adjust to the changes he produces increasingly is an essential companion to democracy's progress.

Improving education, maintaining a vigorous economy, and resolving social problems are major concerns of men of ideas devoted to freedom. It is these men—the scholars and teachers, the scientists and technicians, the creative businessmen, labor leaders and industrialists—and the institutions through which they work—that hold the forward positions in the battle for progress.

Philanthropy is only their aide in seeking for the points at which they can achieve advances or breakthroughs; and in providing the resources that will launch or sustain their drives.

The effectiveness of the partnership between men of ideas and philanthropy is established on the record. It is visible on every street corner and crossroads in our Nation. It ranges from the local public health center to the cyclotron that smashed the atom.

But more important by far than the measurable returns is the fact that free philanthropy possesses qualities that are synonymous with and that reinforce and invigorate our democratic processes.

It is diverse. It is made up of many different organizations. It is free of central direction and control. It cannot be chained to a single dogma, doctrine, or preconception. It makes possible a multiplicity of approaches to a single problem. Like democracy, philanthropy encourages diversity—whether in science or philosophy—and depends on it for survival.

It is competitive. It assists and supports competition in ideas. It stimulates competition for funds. If it gets remote from the needs of the people, it loses its source of support. The public does not long sustain private action which is not making a clear contribution to the welfare of society. Through the instruments of their philanthropy, the American people constantly evaluate the needs of our society, the means of dealing with them, and the qualifications of those holding power and responsibility.

Thus, it is also flexible. It changes as the problems change. When it fails to respond to change, it withers and dies.

Past misjudgments of our rate of progress serve to emphasize the importance of instruments which encourage desirable change, are responsive to it, and help individuals and institutions adjust to it.

Even the wise Thomas Jefferson could not foresee, as we cannot now, the vastness and rapidity of change in American life. In announcing the Louisiana Purchase, for example, he expressed the view that the territory might not be occupied for 25 generations, or somewhere along in the year 2600. This headlong advance continues to this day. A leading industrialist has said that half of the Nation's working force, within 20 years from now, will be engaged in producing and distributing things wholly unknown to us today.

Private philanthropy rooted in private action, diverse, flexible, and responsive to the practical needs of the Nation as seen by the citizens themselves, is another example of the fact that democracy in the United States is not merely forms and symbols, but has deep roots in the daily lives and the personal activities of all citizens.

This interwoven relationship of democracy and philanthropy was perceived more than a century ago by that shrewd observer, de Tocqueville. After a visit to this and other American centers of culture and industry, he wrote:

"These Americans are the most peculiar people in the world. You'll not believe it when I tell you how they behave. In a local community in their country, a citizen may conceive of some need which is not being met. What does he do? He goes across the street and discusses it with his neighbor. Then what happens? A committee comes into existence, and then the committee begins functioning on behalf of that need. And you won't believe this, but it is true. All this happens without reference to any bureaucrat. All of this is done by private citizens on their own initiative."

And then the astute Frenchman added:

"The health of a democratic society may be measured by the quality of functions performed by private citizens."

Democracy and philanthropy together demonstrate the irrepressible ingenuity of the free individual—the creative strength that is born of freedom. No one pretends that democracy is perfect or that it will ever become perfect. It is a system of principles, not of rigid rules. These principles must be reinterpreted as times and conditions change. The need for new interpretations and applications will always exist.

In times of uncertainty like those through which we are passing some seek for an imagined security in the status quo. Some cling to the illusion that democracy and its institutions are made more secure by unchanging order. Such a static concept strikes at the heart of democracy by denying it the right to grow. Democracy's greatest strength lies in its ability to move constantly forward in action toward meeting changing needs of human beings. It is man's faith in his ability to do this, and his willingness to join personally in its support that assures the survival of democracy.

III

Today's graduates stand on the threshold of a new and enlightened era in world history. That such an era is possible is undeniable. Man possesses the capacity to fulfill his material and physical needs. This capacity could, in decades, not centuries, spread throughout the world and transform the life of all mankind not only in material terms but in terms of cultural richness and spiritual fulfillment.

The only barrier to this tomorrow is man himself. Do we have the wisdom, the patience, the determination that will permit these attainments? Can we suppress the impatience and the hysteria that man has manifested in the past by waging war?

Our free institutions can help us provide an affirmative answer. They can be encouraged and strengthened here and in other parts of the world where people may adopt different forms to achieve their desires but whose dedication to freedom is no less intense than our own.

Maintaining the strength and integrity of free institutions is the real experiment—the real challenge—of the 20th century. Without the churches, the center of learning; without all our institutions of private, voluntary action, including the institutions of a free economic system, self-government will not survive. Philanthropy and its organizations are a small but vital part of the free science, free education, and free enterprise that protect and promote the freedom, independence, and dignity of man.

Your careers will span decades in which the course of civilization for centuries may be set. You will be afforded many opportunities to initiate and join in voluntary action designed to make forces for peace and progress prevail over those of decadence and destruction. I am confident that you will seize these opportunities with the same sense of duty and dedication that illuminates the record of this great university and its alumni.

A Bill for Freedom of Choice in Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on

Small Business, House of Representatives and as Chairman of its Subcommittee No. 5, dealing with distribution problems, of which Hon. TOM STEED and Hon. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN are members, we were authorized by the full committee to investigate and study distribution problems affecting small business.

Immediately following the assignment of that task, representatives of gasoline station operators comprising one of the large segments of small business in our country, complained to our committee that coercive, discriminatory and related practices on the part of major oil companies were destroying their independence as small-business men and their ability to survive unless they followed the demands and dictates of the major oil companies. Subcommittee No. 5 was specifically concerned with the problems which arise in the trade relations between numerous small and highly competitive independent businesses on the one hand and a few large monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic suppliers on the other hand.

Consequently, a determination was made to investigate the charges in an effort to ascertain whether they were well founded and if so, whether these small-business men have a remedy under our present laws and whether it is being enforced properly by Government agencies. We commenced taking evidence concerning these matters in the course of public hearings on March 28, 1955. Those hearings continued until last month, during the course of which we received sworn testimony from 62 witnesses who came from all parts of the United States. Upon the basis of the record of that testimony it was concluded that a great many of the so-called independent businessmen, who are retail gasoline operators, do not fully possess the rights that are inherent and basic to a small-business man in a free and competitive economy. A fair reading of the record shows that through the use of short-term leases, often cancelable upon short notice, major oil company suppliers have enforced exclusive dealing practices and price discrimination which resulted in the substantial lessening of competition in the retail distribution of tires, batteries, accessories, and petroleum products.

Specifically the record supports the following findings:

First. A substantial proportion of all sales of refined gasoline of major oil companies is made through retail outlets where the dealer has a short-term lease from the oil company supplier, usually for 1 year. The importance and the proportion of the total retail market serviced by such short-term lessee dealers has been increasing.

Second. The dealer operating his station under a short-term lease with the oil company supplier frequently is not in fact independent and is subject to control by the oil-company supplier. The freedom of choice of the dealer with respect to the manner in which he operates his station is circumscribed by the economic power of his oil company supplier, whether or not such power is specifically exercised against him. Representatives of some of the oil companies testified that such control is necessary in order that the oil companies may protect their substantial investments. Other witnesses testified that many retail stations have been maintained at locations long after economic reasons for their operation had disappeared.

Third. The short-term leases and sales practices of major oil companies in relation to their sponsored products have had the effect of operating against a dealer's freedom of choice in using or dealing in competitive products, and operate to substantially lessen competition and tend to eliminate price competition.

Fourth. Price discrimination: Oil company suppliers, for the avowed purpose of having their dealers reduce their retail prices at a particular location to meet the competition of a dealer selling at a lower but nondiscriminatory price, including off-brand gasoline, have discriminated in price through the device of holding the level of their prices generally while, at the same time, cutting their prices to one or more dealers at a particular location. In such situations discriminations have been practiced by oil company suppliers until the low-price dealer saw fit to increase his price. This device of price discrimination has had the immediate effect of fomenting price wars among the retail dealers, but the ultimate result of eliminating a substantial amount of price competition between and among dealers handling the products of the oil company suppliers and those dealers handling off-brand gasoline. Short-term lessee dealers in many instances have been coerced or induced by their oil company suppliers into so-called price wars in furtherance of the price discrimination practices of the oil company suppliers designed to eliminate competition as hereinbefore described. It was also established that on occasion price wars have been started when some dealers engaged in price cutting activities on their own initiative.

Fifth. The record indicates the probability that the short-term leases and practices toward lessee dealers are the product of control by the major oil companies in the production, transportation, and refining of crude oil and the retail distribution of gasoline.

Sixth. The present laws, procedures, and enforcement policies are inadequate to achieve effective and permanent relief.

If it is truly believed that the small-business man plays an irreplaceable role in our society and economy, it follows that such evidence as has been received by the subcommittee calls for immediate and effective action. I have, therefore, introduced a bill, H. R. 7096, amending sections 3 and 4 of the Clayton Act for the purpose of protecting and preserving small and independent business enterprises, such as the retail gasoline dealer. The bill is designed to assure small business enterprises freedom of choice in trade and in the commodities they handle. It is hoped that my bill will accomplish this purpose by, first, making it unlawful in any course of action or any act which, in connection with any sale or contract to sell, lease, franchise, or license, operates to interfere in any manner with the freedom of choice of any lessee or purchaser to deal in or use any product which is competitive with a product sponsored by his supplier. Such unlawful course of conduct or act includes, of course, the taking or threatening of any action against a person in retaliation for exercising his freedom of choice in respect to the commodities that he might desire to use and sell; second, a prima facie violation of the law may be established by showing a refusal or the threat of a refusal to deal, lease, license, or the threat to refuse to renew or the refusal to renew any lease, license, or contract. The burden of rebutting such a prima facie case then is upon the supplier; and, third, the plaintiff in any action under the Clayton Act may move the court at any time to certify that his cause of action is based upon probable cause and if the court grants such a certification then, even though the plaintiff should not prevail in the final judgment of the cause, the plaintiff shall nevertheless recover from the United States a reasonable attorney's fee and the cost of the suit shall be borne by the United States.

It is felt that while this proposed legislation is modest, it can go a long way toward accomplishing the purpose of protecting freedom of choice and free competition, and there is no good reason for any objection to it by the oil company suppliers or by suppliers in other industries. In their sworn testimony the oil company executives uniformly testified that their companies' policy was against, and that they would not countenance, any coercion by their salesmen against dealers. I was impressed with the sincerity of this testimony and trust that the oil companies will be included among the supporters of this amendment, which would implement and strengthen the policies they state they follow.

Attached is the text of the bill.

FOR FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN TRADE

A bill to amend sections 3 and 4 of the Clayton Act to free those in commerce from restraints of trade and to allow small businessmen freedom of choice in the conduct of their respective businesses as independent enterprises

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 3 and 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (33 Stat. 731; 15 U. S. C. secs. 14 and 15), are amended as follows:

"SECTION 1. Section 3 of the Clayton Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to lease or make a sale or contract for sale of goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or services or facilities, whether patented or unpatented, for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any territory thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any insular possessions, or any place under the jurisdiction of the United States, or fix a price charged therefor, or discount from, or rebate upon such price, on the condition, agreement, or upon the basis of any arrangement, or course of action, which prevents the lessee or purchaser thereof from using or dealing, or which operates against such person's freedom of choice in using or dealing, in the goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or services or facilities of a competitor or competitors of the lessor or seller, or where the effect of such lease, sale, or con-

tract for sale, or such condition, agreement, understanding, arrangement, or course of action may be to prevent or eliminate a substantial amount of competition, or to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce in any section, community, or trading area.

" 'It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce in the course of such commerce to be a party to or assist in the commission of any act in connection with any sale, or contract to sell, or lease, license, or franchise, which

" '(a) Operates to hinder, restrict, prevent, or otherwise interfere with the freedom of choice of any lessee or purchaser to deal in or use any goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or services, or facilities aavilable from any other person that a purchaser, lessee, licensee, or grantee may wish to acquire, advertise, display, use, or resell; providing that this provision shall not be construed to prevent a lessor from entering into an agreement with his lessee that the leased premises shall be used to conduct a certain type of business or that equipment owned by the lessor shall not be utilized to display or vend commodities different from those advertised as offered for sale in or through such equipment.

" '(b) Includes the taking or threatening any action or course of action against any person in retaliation as a result of such person's dealing in or using goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or services or facilities of his choice.

" 'Proof of violation of this section may be established prima facie by showing a refusal or the threat of a refusal to deal, lease, license, or the threat to refuse to renew or the refusal of renewal of any lease, license, or contract, where the seller, lessor, or licensor, is engaged in or solicits business generally from a class of trade in the section, community, or trading area and where such seller does or has control over a substantial amount of the trade in the goods, wares, merchandise, machinery, supplies, or services or facilities in the section, community, or trading area to which the refusal or threat of refusal applies.

" 'Upon proof being made in any proceeding under this section that there has been a violation of this section, the burden of rebutting the prime facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with the violation of this section and unless justification shall be shown affirmatively the tribunal before which the proceeding is brought is authorized to issue an order terminating the violation: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained in the section shall prevent a seller, lessor, licensor, or other person charged with such violation from rebutting the prima facie case made, as provided, by showing that the alleged violation was based upon an act or course of action expressly provided for and specified in a contract, lease, or license, consistent with the provisions of this section and not otherwise unlawful.'

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Clayton Act is amended by adding at the end of the section the following language:

" 'The district court in such action is vested with jurisdiction to make and enter such rulings on motions and temporary restraining orders, including orders of prohibition, at any time during such proceedings, as it may deem just in the premises.

" 'Whenever the plaintiff moves the court to do so, it shall determine and certify whether the plaintiff's suit is founded upon a showing of probable cause, and in those cases where it is certified that a showing of probable cause has been established, then, even though the plaintiff should not prevail in the final judgment of the cause, the plaintiff shall nevertheless recover from the United States a reasonable attorney's fee and the cost of the suit shall be borne by the United States.' "

It's No Longer Book Burning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am setting out a letter I recently wrote a constituent on the subject of It's No Longer Book Burning:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DR. JOHN JOHNSTONE, JR.,
Beaumont Medical Building,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR DR. JOHNSTONE: Thank you very much for your letter of June 21, 1955 and the enclosed article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch entitled "Losing the Battle of Books." I deeply appreciate your calling this matter to my attention. I thoroughly agree with your statement that the problem involved here is of the greatest importance.

I have directed a great deal of thought and study to this problem. Incidentally, I am preparing right now two treatises on collateral subjects which I intend to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the very near future. I will send you copies when this is done.

I do have a couple of additional thoughts I would like to add at this time: 1. It was not so long ago the Chicago Daily News (whether Mr. Bradley, the literary editor, was among the group I don't know), other newspapers and publications of similar approach and other scholars were shouting to high heavens about book burners, referring to the efforts of one Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, to "clean out" (JOE's words) the shelves of the USIA libraries abroad and have in their place books that gave a better and more representative picture of America and American life. The intelligensia (self-styled) of this country had a great day being righteously indignant against book burners, brute anti-intellectualism, etc. MCCARTHY, having already been sufficiently smeared, they had a field day even to the extent that President Eisenhower himself joined the antibook burners in his commencement address at Dartmouth College. Everything was so liberal and everyone was so enjoying the emotion of fighting the devil and being righteously indignant, that it was pretty hard for anyone to step up and try to talk sense on the subject.

Now, in order to be able to discuss the subject, or at least have people whom I want to do some thinking on the subject not turn away in prejudice and not listen to what I want to say, I hasten to state there is no one I can think of who would be less able to select the proper balance of books to be on our USIA shelves than the aforesaid Senator from Wisconsin. Furthermore, the manner in which he sought to call the public's attention to the fact that the bookshelves of the USIA did not have a good balance, in my opinion, was not a manner conducive to attaining good results.

But to call the process of selection of a limited library book burning was equally as anti-intellectual. It was a pure smear and unreasoned attack. As I said to a friend of mine, if selectivity is to be book burning, I in truth am both figuratively and literally a bookburner because I have on many occasions in balancing off my own private library burned what I didn't want and concluded no one else wanted that particular trash I had accumulated.

So now the intellectuals come back through Mr. Van Allen Bradley and recognize that it is a scholarly and professional task to get a proper balance in a limited library and that you can have trash, and that you can have imbalance, and that the overall effect can be one inconducive to the purposes in mind. The only difference seems to be they didn't want MCCARTHY pointing this out, and they didn't want to believe it possible that books which actually misrepresented the true America were in the libraries abroad and that possibly some of these books had been put there deliberately.

Now I don't say that the libraries did contain books misrepresenting America or if they did that these books were put there deliberately. I do say knowing the Comintern (Cominform) and not underestimating either its abilities or intelligence that such things were not beyond the realm of possibility and certainly deserved serious looking into. I didn't want the Senator from Wisconsin doing it; I wanted an objective scholarly group to do it. But it needed doing. So now that the intellectuals are ready to do the selection (not book burning anymore) maybe we can really get the show on the road.

The second point I want to make and it will not take so long to make, because it follows essentially the same pattern of thinking as my previous point is this. The book publishers of this country and their allies, the book reviewers, indeed seem to have a tight control over what books Americans will buy and read and, of course, dependent upon what books are bought and read depends what books are published and disseminated. Perhaps we do have topnotch authors who do know and have been writing about the American scene, but their fine works never really see the light of day. I do not know that this is so, but I have read enough books published by small and unknown publishing houses that never do come to the attention of the American public and, in effect, never do see the light of day, all because the magic of the favorable book review is lacking. Also, I have read the most amazing sort of tripe that has received great book reviewing praise for no apparent reason.

Again, let me say I am happy you brought this matter to my attention. I intend to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with the remarks contained in this letter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

P. S.—As far as the USIA being "rather disappointed recently when Congress turned down an appropriation to create a Government publishing house to produce cheap books to be distributed throughout the world," I would suggest that these USIA people do a little understanding of the books "representative of the basic philosophy on which the American concept of freedom was built" they are translating for foreigners. Perhaps putting this philosophy together with a look around the American publishing industry, they would be glad Congress did reject their plea. If they believe in the private enterprise system, they will utilize it, not subvert it even in small things.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of June 20, 1955]

LOSING THE BATTLE OF BOOKS

(By Van Allen Bradley)

If it is true that the pen is mightier than the sword, then the United States is in danger of losing the battle of the books to Soviet Russia.

While the Kremlin is engaged in a giant international program of subsidized book distribution, the United States Information Agency is carrying on an appallingly weak and inadequate counteroffensive.

Russia is making sure that in every country where communism seeks a foothold the classic books and pamphlets of Communist

political theory are abundantly and easily available in cheap native-language editions.

The United States, on the other hand, is virtually ignoring the classic statements of democratic thought while it translates and distributes such secondary items as John Steinbeck's the Red Pony, Arthur E. Hertzler's Horse and Buggy Doctor, and Eleanor Roosevelt's the U. N. and How It Works.

Russia is turning out, in many languages millions of volumes of inexpensive editions of the classic Communist statements of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other writers.

The USIA book translation program includes only a little of Thomas Jefferson and selections from the Federalist as representative of the basic philosophy on which the American concept of freedom was built.

The books on its lists for translation are, at least to date, overwhelmingly in the category of devotional works and repentences of sinners. The gospels of democracy go virtually unknown in favor of books like former Russian Gen. Alexander Barmine's One Who Survived and Arthur Koestler's Darkness at Noon.

Nowhere in the USIA lists are there such basic works of democratic thought as Locke's Letters on Toleration, John Stuart Mill's On Liberty, De Tocqueville's Democracy in America, Bryce's the American Commonwealth, the works of Lincoln, and Emerson's Moral and Political Essays.

These are the conclusions made by a group of Chicagoans interested in how the United States is faring in spreading the gospel of democracy abroad. It was this group that was responsible for focusing national attention on the problem when Representative BARRATT O'HARA of Chicago, a Democrat, brought it up before the House in debate on the State Department appropriations.

Their reason for stressing basic documents is based on an observation in history: Wherever there has been a movement for constitutional democracy, it has been accompanied by a recourse to the original and fundamental statements of the democratic theory.

The Federalist, for instance, appeared in Paris in 1792 and was one of the textbooks for the statesmen of the French Revolution. De Tocqueville and Mill were used by the Russian liberal leaders of the nineteenth century.

The men who have joined in trying to persuade Congress and the USIA of the need for such books are Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century; Jerome G. Kerwin, chairman of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation at the University of Chicago; Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy at the university and a State Department visitor to universities in India; Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus at the university; Thomas B. Stauffer, humanities instructor at Wilson Junior College; and Leland G. Stauber, an undergraduate student at the unimersity.

Their spadework recently brought them a letter of approval in principle from the advisory committee on books abroad for the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

Mark A. Day, chairman of the committee and director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale, in reporting his committee's approval to seek an expanded translation program, called upon the Chicagoans to supply a list of books to be considered. Such a proposed list was submitted by Stauffer, serving as secretary of the Chicago group. It included the following titles:

Madison, Hamilton, and Jay's The Federalist; Thoreau's Walden and Civil Disobedience; Locke's Letters on Toleration and Of Civil Government; Mill's On Liberty and Representtive Government; Jefferson's selected writings; De Tocqueville; Bryce; Emerson's selected essays; John Dewey's The Public and Its Problems; Woodrow Wilson's The New Freedom; Mazzini's The Duties of Man; Abraham Lincoln's Selected Papers; and Learned Hand's The Spirit of Liberty.

Representative O'HARA in an unsuccessful attempt to amend the State Department appropriations bill said: "Briefly stated, this is our program: Select 20 or 30 classics of American democracy, such as The Federalist and the writings of Thomas Jefferson, translate them into all the languages of the world, issue them in paper editions and make them available at trifling cost to the little people everywhere.

"This was the literature that inspired and guided our forefathers in the task of building this democracy. It will inspire and guide those who now, in foreign lands, are looking for the light."

The Chicago Daily News in February called upon its correspondents to investigate the extent of the Communist book campaign and what the United States is doing to meet it. Following are some of their reports:

Paris (William H. Stoneman reporting): "There are at least six bookshops in France that are devoted exclusively to the sale of Communist literature in either Russian or French. Generally attractive in appearance and sold at low prices. Works of the basic American philosophers are difficult to buy in France because of the high cost of American books."

Rome (Charlotte Ebener reporting): "There are many Communist bookshops in Rome. All the Communist classics as well as later writings are available in Italian, at approximately half the price of the paperbacks on Italian or American political and economic thought. There is no American bookstore."

London (Ernie Hill reporting): "There are numerous bookstores that sell Marx & Co. at a low cost. The Communist Party itself operates 36 regional bookstores and sells at below cost. Nowhere can you buy Jefferson, Lincoln, etc., at anything like these prices.

"The USIA people were rather disappointed recently when Congress turned down an appropriation to create a Government publishing house to produce cheap books to be distributed throughout the world to compete with the U. S. S. R. The fact remains that we have nothing to compare with the Communists' cheap books distribution plan."

New York Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dim view of the proposed upper Colorado project taken by New York voters has already been expressed in the news and editorial columns of the New York Times. Similar thoughts were expressed editorial columns of the New York April 29 by the Malone Telegram, on April 30 by the Middletown Times-Herald, and on April 21 by the Dansville Breeze, as follows:

[From the Malone (N. Y.) Telegram of April 29, 1955]

BIG SPENDERS BACK AGAIN

The good old big-spending days seemed to be coming back again when the Senate approved the $1½ billion upper Colorado River storage project.

Don't let the price tag mislead you. The Senate bill covers only a part of the project. It authorizes 6 storage reservoirs and 12 irrigation projects along the upper Colorado River and its tributaries.

But the whole plan calls for 12 reservoirs and 39 irrigation projects. Leslie A. Miller, former governor of Wyoming and an authority on reclamation and water supply, says the completed project will cost close to $5 billion.

New York taxpayers' share of this cost, from which they will get no direct benefit, is estimated at $493,600,000—more than the total State purposes budget adopted by the 1955 legislature.

Senator LEHMAN is recorded as voting for the Colorado project, Senator IVES voted against it.

This is the first new giant Federal project for irrigation, flood control, and water power since President Eisenhower took office. Its feasibility and economic worth are extremely questionable. The costs in view are unwarranted. In a period of crushing Federal debt and deficit spending, such authorizations cannot be justified.

[From the Dansville (N. Y.) Breeze of April 21, 1955]

THEY GET—WE PAY

Should New Yorkers be required to pay $622 million in taxes to destroy Dinosaur National Monument? If Congress approves the upper Colorado River storage project, that is exactly what will happen. According to the Wilderness Society, Washington, D. C., the proposed project "would destroy one of the unique, irreplacable, scenic, wild wonders of the world."

If this project passes, American taxpayers will be given the dubious privilege of pumping as much as $5 billion into worthless desert so that a few western landowners can grow the type of crops which are already stocked high in Government surplus warehouses.

Evidence has been presented to Congress showing reclamation costs would run $2,700 per acre but that each acre, after reclamation, would be worth a maximum of $225. In other words, every $12 we pour into western deserts would yield only $1 worth of tillable land.

Since that's the case, you may wonder who wants the project built and why. Four States want it—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The reason they do is that they'll get 100 percent of the benefits for putting up less than 2 percent of the cost. The rest of the country—the other 44 States—will pay 98.2 percent of the cost while receiving none of the benefits. New York State taxpayers would pay nearly seven times as much for it as Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming combined.

[From the Middletown (N. Y.) Times-Herald of April 30, 1955]

DOLLARS INTO DUST REQUIRED READING

Every citizen who is concerned as to the future of this Nation should read Dollars Into Dust, in the May issue of Reader's Digest. The author is former Gov. Leslie A. Miller, of Wyoming, a resident of one of the chief beneficiaries of these projects. He certainly cannot be accused of sectional bias.

Miller is chairman of the Hoover Commission tax group on reclamation and water supply, and his position is so conspicuous that he cannot afford to be wrong or even inaccurate. As a matter of fact, various parts of his stunning indictment have been made public from time to time, and none of them have been challenged by the pork-barrel Congressmen and Senators who are in favor of this series of projects.

Apparently all they do is to shut their eyes and vote for the raid on the Treasury, hoping

that the immediate political beneficiaries will vote for some of their own pet projects, also hoping that the American people will pay no attention to the scandalous performance.

While Government warehouses are bursting with surplus farm products, it is proposed that large areas of high sagebrush country be brought under irrigation at fantastic cost, to add further to the surpluses. No less than 70 reclamation projects, to cost more than $4 billion, are either under construction or already authorized by Congress.

And now comes the supercolossal Upper Colorado project designed for power and irrigation at a time when hydropower is already obsolete, in the face of cheaper steam power and imminent atomic power, and irrigation is not only a threat of greater surpluses, but enormously expensive—this irrigation being largely in high altitudes where growing seasons are short.

Bringing water to these lands will cost $906 per acre, yet most of the land, after irrigation, will not be worth more than $150 per acre. But that is only the beginning, for a hidden cost whoops the cost up to at least $2,900 per acre.

But there is more. Miller shows by the Government's own figures that "Federal subsidy for each of 420 chief farms controlling over half the (central Arizona) project acreage is $2,720,000." This central Arizona project would pump water from the Colorado River to a height of 1,000 feet, then send it some 300 miles by canal to irrigate 226,000 Arizona acres at a construction cost of $9,200 per acre. These are samples.

Miller sensibly contends that even a small fraction of such sums could be spent on lands in the humid belts that are now lying idle or are being destroyed by erosion, and if the goal is more crop production, the job could be accomplished at a very low price compared with what is planned in these fantastic desert projects.

He cites a large tract in the Virginia-North Carolina region as an example. Why should citizens be taxed to coax desert lands into unneeded production when their own soil is being neglected?

The Military Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that national farm and labor organizations so completely join on an important national issue as do the National Grange and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The letter quoted below from Mr. Thomas H. Burke, chief of congressional liaison, Congress of Industrial Organizations, supplements the letter which I have included in the Appendix of the RECORD from the National Grange. I hope that the two letters will be considered together as a clear indication of the views of a vast segment of the American people.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1955.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: A subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has approved a Military Reserve bill which, in only slightly altered form, revives provisions in earlier proposals which would inaugurate the first steps toward universal military training, and would authorize the President to call to active duty up to 1 million ready reservists without the approval of Congress. It would also make about 3 million youths liable to from 6 to 10 years of military indoctrination. The Congress of Industrial Organizations strongly opposes the proposed legislation and urges you to vote against it.

There is no question but that a ready and mobile Reserve would strengthen the Armed Forces, but there are governing doubts that the current proposals would, in practice, add to our posture of national strength.

1. Is a period of up to 10 years under the jurisdiction of the military, in training that would not in any adequate sense be a preparation for effective military duty, a positive factor in our national strength?

The CIO believes that such first steps toward universal military training actually weaken our national vitality by imposing arbitrary military jurisdiction on young men during a period in their lives when they should be awakening with their maturity to the fuller dimensions of American life with its freedoms and opportunities.

We also urge that a legislative "step by step" approach to a universal military training program is fully as undesirable as its full-fledged enactment at once.

We doubt the value of relatively nontechnical "one night a week" Reserve training for 4 years for those reservists who will have had 2 years of highly specialized active duty training.

2. The present legislative proposals represent an approach to national military security characterized by emphasis on the quantity of Reserves under military jurisdiction rather than on the quality of technical or specialized training. Several months of additional training, over and above Reserve programs, would be necessary to bring the reservist to combat readiness. Is such a program worth the long-term commitment of our young men to the military? Does it warrant the estimated expenditure by 1959 of three times our current outlay for the Reserve program?

3. Serious problems in dustrial relations will also arise under the proposed legislation. Will night shift workers who have to take one night of training a week be penalized financially or otherwise? Will a Reserve member who is an industrial worker have to use his vacation to serve his annual military field duty? Will men who are liable to call to active duty be discriminated against in employment or promotion? What will happen to the mobility of a man with a Reserve training obligation who may want to change jobs, or move as a result of marriage, schooling or other personal factors?

Such questions are indicative of the extent of the influence of the proposed legislation into our national life.

4. Even though some of the specific features of these proposals may be altered by amendment, the fundamental nature of the program is one of prolonged compulsory military control and indoctrination of our youth. It is control in the name of training which will not be adequate. It is control in the name of balancing-off reductions in our active forces in prime stages of readiness by increasing the Reserve forces, yet the total effect is weakened military posture. It is a pervasion of the compulsory military influence into our national life in a manner which we of the C. I. O. cannot see justified either by disputed claims of military preparedness or by fairness to the young men who would be affected. We support selective service and a truly voluntary Reserve system. We believe that there are deeper values involved in the compulsory proposals, however, than technical procedural differences in military Reserve training, and that is why we so strongly urge you to vote against the compulsory military Reserve legislation.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. BURKE,
Chief of Congressional Liaison.

Results of the 1955 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important and most difficult jobs facing anyone elected to sit in this great House is how best to represent the views of those who have elected him. Many of us have found that one of the most useful tools in solving this problem is the public-opinion questionnaire mailed to our constituents. I have just completed tabulating the results of a poll I made earlier this year. The response was most gratifying and is a clear indication of the very real interest citizens of this Nation take in the affairs of government. The results were also gratifying to me as they show a clear belief in a liberal political philosophy and this liberalism is the back bone of the democratic tradition. The questions and the answers in tabulated form follow:

1. Do you favor the deepening of the Delaware River Channel to Trenton? Yes, 680; no, 69.

2. Do you favor the administration's policy of requiring local contributions toward the cost of the channel, or do you believe the national economy and defense make the deepening project the sole responsibility of the Federal Government? Local contributions, 188; Federal responsibility, 484.

3. Do you agree with Attorney General Brownell who proposes the legalization of tapping private telephone wires? Yes, 221; no, 501.

4. Do you favor the President's proposed $101 billion program for the construction and improvement of the Nation's highways to be paid by such means as toll roads? Yes, 490; no, 215.

5. Do you believe the present 75 cents per hour minimum wage should be increased to 90 cents per hour, 150; $1.15, 136; $1.25, 268; $1.35, 107; not at all, 69.

6. In view of the present world crisis, as well as budgetary considerations, do you believe that the proposed cut in the size of the Army is proper? Yes, 198; no, 502.

Present immigration law operates against immigrants from southern Europe and other parts of the world. Do you believe this law should be changed to allow entry on a more equal basis? Yes, 501; no, 259.

8. Do you favor continued United States support of the various health, educational, and technical assistance programs of the United Nations? Yes, 590; no, 125.

9. Do you believe that Congress should increase the pay of postal and other Government employees? Yes, 480; no, 110.

10. Do you favor granting statehood now to—

Alaska: Yes, 630; no, 64.

Hawaii: Yes, 604; no, 69.

11. Do you favor the Federal Government's providing direct assistance to the States for school construction? Yes, 590; no, 116.

12. Do you believe that the United States should undertake to defend Quemoy and Matsu Islands even at the risk of war? Yes, 249; no, 439.

Do you consider yourself: Republican, 165; Democratic, 376; independent, 166.

Mississippi Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the pitfalls of the proposed upper Colorado storage project were explained to the voters of Mississippi in the following editorials appearing in the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger on May 1 and the Pascagoula (Miss.) Chronicle Star and Advertiser on April 29:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of May 1, 1955]

FAR FROM A BARGAIN

The writer sat in the Senate gallery the other day and watched the Members put on a burst of speed for passage of the Colorado River storage project, a new venture into paternalism that may eventually cost the taxpayers billions of dollars. The billion agreed upon for the beginning is merely a starter. The finish will be something else again.

Thirty Democrats and twenty-eight Republicans joined to push the billion-dollar project through the upper Chamber against the opposition of 15 Democrats and 8 Republicans. If the House now approves Senate bill 500, it will mean big Federal expenditures for irrigation and hydroelectric power in such States as Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

But examination of the proposed expenditures reveal clearly why they would be economically unsound. The Colorado River bill would use waterpower to generate electricity at a cost of $883 a kilowatt—whereas electricity produced by steam plants in the same area costs less than $170 a kilowatt. And it has been estimated that generating plants utilizing atomic power could be built at a cost of $225 a kilowatt of capacity.

The Colorado River bill would mean the expenditure of as much as $1,000 an acre to irrigate mountainous land that has a very short growing season and which would be used chiefly to support dairying—whereas the Federal Government already has spent so lavishly to support dairying that it now has enough surplus milk on hand to give every American 3 quarts, enough surplus butter to supply every American family for more than 2 months.

Finally, the Colorado River legislation would set a precedent for invading the national park system by authorizing the construction of a 525-foot dam in scenically unique Dinosaur National Mounment. The Senate rejected an amendment which would have excluded the questionable dam from the project.

Although the measure, as it now goes to the House, is opposed by the Hoover Commission's Water Resources Task Force, by the national Council of Conservationists, and many other groups, it is being supported by the administration because of the influence of such westerners as Senator MILLIKIN of Colorado and WATKINS of Utah. The House should look at the facts in the interests of the Nation as a whole and reject the bill.

[From the Pascagoula (Miss.) Chronicle Star and Advertiser of April 29, 1955]

OVER THE EDITOR'S DESK

Last week the United States Senate passed a bill for $1.5 billion to finance cost of an upper Colorado reclamation project designed to stimulate a vast tract of new land into crop production by bringing water to arid wastes in the Rocky Mountain section.

The $1½ billion is only the first cost of the project. Completion would bring the total cost to taxpayers nearer $4 billion, opponents have estimated.

Exactly 1 week later, the same United States Senate okayed a measure setting up $250 million for Federal payments to farmers who comply with acreage reductions in order to raise less crops. The appropriation was actualy $55 million above recommendations of Agriculture Secretary Benson. The Senate farm bloc added the extra millions with only five votes in opposition.

How the Congress can reconcile these actions is beyond us. We are desperately trying to unload huge surpluses bought and stored at taxpayer expense under the agricultural-subsidy program, and at the same time planning to spend billions to put more land into cultivation.

Michigan Week: Michigan State Society White Pine Tree Planting Southeast Lawn, United States Capitol, May 17, 1955, 9:30 a. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, buttressed by four lovely Michigan princesses, I have been honored in responding to the commanding invitation from Col. I. D. Brent, the distinguished president of the Michigan State Society, to plant upon these magnificent Capitol Grounds a virile and beautiful white pine sapling of great prospect and future promise. By what right, other than seniority, I was chosen to do the honors on the southeast lawn this morning matters naught. The thing that is important is that Michigan's symbolic tree, the great white pine, was planted here in connection with Michigan Week simultaneously being observed throughout our great State. It is important to note that this sapling is not only symbolic of the great strength, spaciousness and wealth of Michigan, but it is the same white pine at which at one time served as nature's covering for Michigan terrain from the southeast corner to the very tip of the Upper Peninsula some eight or nine hundred miles away. It was this great blanket of wealth-producing vegetation that created some of the greatest, most lasting and prodigiously expansive fortunes which developed and today underlay the great industries centered in Michigan, the Peninsular State.

A brief but significant and hopeful program was laid out surrounding the planting ceremonies, a copy of which I shall attach to these remarks. The program quite properly included an invocation and a benediction, together with the historic Michigan State song which wafted melodiously over the breeze upon the silver tones emanating from the throat of my gifted colleague and friend of the 14 District, Congressman LOUIS RABAUT. All of those assembled for this short but impressive ceremony prayed silently in their hearts that this little white pine tree proffered by a Home State Association would, under these auspicious circumstances, take root, grow great and strong, lifting its head ever higher and higher toward heaven and God to pay its Creator the homage we all owe Him, and that in the far distant future the white pine sapling grown to the unbelievable heights of its mighty possibilities might give inspiration to the wayfarer and the tourist, and cast its comforting shadow in the heat of the summer's day upon the statesmen and lawmakers, whom God grant shall continue successfully to struggle with the problems of our beloved Nation, and to aid in the maintenance and preservation of universal peace throughout the world.

The program follows:

MICHIGAN WEEK: MICHIGAN STATE SOCIETY WHITE PINE TREE PLANTING, SOUTHEAST LAWN, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, MAY 17, 1955, 9:30 A. M.

Music—Bolling Air Force Band
Lieutenant Meuser, leader
Invocation—Father Quinn
Archdiocese of Washington
Master of ceremonies—Col. I. D. Brent
Michigan State Society
Singing—Michigan, My Michigan
Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, Member of Congress, Grosse Point Park, Mich.
Address—Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER
United States Senator, Cheboygan, Mich.
Presentation of white pine tree—Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA
United States Senator, Detroit, Mich.
Official pages—The Michigan Agricultural Princesses
Planting—Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL
Member of Congress, Detroit, Mich.
Acceptance of white pine tree—Hon. J. George Stewart
Architect of the Capitol
National Anthem—Bolling Air Force Band
Benediction—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D.
Chaplain, United States House of Representatives (University of Michigan, 1908)

Aid for Rural Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD an excellent editorial published recently in the Toledo Blade in support of Federal aid for libraries in rural areas. In February I was among those who sponsored a bill providing for such assistance, and I hope that Congress will act favorably on this proposal. As the Blade editorial says:

No other investment so small is likely to yield greater or more lasting results than one in books.

The editorial follows:

AID FOR RURAL LIBRARIES

Making useful books and manuals available to rural areas through an extension of public library service is something which States and localities are able to do, and should do, on their own. But the sad fact is that many are remiss in this regard. There is so much more pressure for so many other sorts of spending that bookmobiles to spread knowledge through the countryside have a low priority with beset politicians.

And this is why there seems to be ample justification for a bill designed to give a moderate amount of United States aid as a pump primer for more adequate rural libraries.

The amount of money involved is relatively small: $7.5 million a year for 5 years to go to the States on a matching basis and in proportion to the size of their rural populations. The American Library Association contends—perhaps the better word would be hopes—that at the end of that time the States and localities would have become so attached to good library service they would take on the chore for themselves.

The administration may argue in principle against such an extension of Federal aid; but we do not share its fear, as expressed by United States Commissioner of Education Samuel M. Brownell, that in practice the grants would "be frittered away in activities yielding no permanent results." No other investment so small is likely to yield greater or more lasting results than one in books.

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway Retires From Active Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this occasion to pay tribute to a man who has selflessly devoted his entire life to the service of our country. He is a great soldier, a great American, a great human being. I refer to Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

On June 30 he is ending his tour as Chief of Staff of the United States Army and retiring from active duty. In so doing he is ending one of the most distinguished military careers in our history as a Nation. Throughout the existence of the United States, the United States Army has consistently rendered devoted and invaluable service to the American people. But few of the men who have even worn the Army uniform have matched the value of the services General Ridgway has rendered. None has rendered greater service.

Matthew Ridgway was born to be a soldier. As the son of an Army officer, he grew up to the sound of the bugle. From his infancy he absorbed the principles which have made our Army and our Nation great—the principles of duty, honor, country.

Almost as a matter of course, when he reached the proper age, he entered the United States Military Academy at West Point, graduating with the class of 1917. Out of that West Point class, 1 out of every 3 graduates became a general. It is proof of General Ridgway's distinction that, even compared with such an outstanding group, his reputation towers so high.

Early in his career as an officer he began to demonstrate unusual talents as a planner and an administrator. These alone could have provided the basis for an outstanding career, but he showed other great talents as well. He carried out a number of important and delicate tasks in the military aspects of our diplomatic relations with foreign nations.

By the time of the attack at Pearl Harbor, General Ridgway was well on the way to becoming one of our most outstanding younger military statesmen. It was then that he revealed still another side of his brilliant ability as a soldier. He took command of the 82d Infantry Division and under him it became one of our first airborne divisions. General Ridgway became a pioneer in the infant science of airborne warfare.

He led his division into Sicily in the first large-scale night airborne operation in history. When the record of the Sicilian campaign was written and evaluated, it was obvious that the paratroopers led by Ridgway had earned a large share of the credit for bringing about the rapid collapse of enemy resistance in that campaign. His own extraordinary heroism in Sicily earned General Ridgway the Distinguished Service Cross.

After the Sicilian campaign, Ridgway led his troops in the Battle of Salerno, in Italy. Then, because of the valor and skill which the 82d Division had displayed, it was included in the forces being gathered together in Britain to make one of the most significant efforts of the whole war in Europe—the invasion across the English Channel.

Matthew Ridgway is the kind of general who never tells his men, "Go on," but always says, "Come on, follow me." He jumped with his paratroopers into Normandy on the night before the landings on the Continent. Once the paratroopers were on the ground Ridgway directed the battle with such skill and with such vigorous and inspiring leadership that, although the division was heavily outnumbered, it successfully trapped an enemy force made up of no less than four divisions.

The ability and courage which General Ridgway again displayed so conspicuously in the Normandy campaign led to his being awarded a second Distinguished Service Cross and to his promotion to be commander of the first airborne corps ever to be formed in our Army. He led this command throughout the remainder of the war in Europe—the campaigns of northern France, the Rhineland, and the Bulge. He led it across the Rhine in a massive daylight airborne operation at Wesel. In this operation he was wounded in close combat with enemy infantry. When the war was drawing to a close, he daringly threw a bridgehead across the Elbe River and drove through to the Baltic Sea. By so doing he was able to reach the Baltic in time to keep the Russians from moving into Denmark. In this act alone he made a tremendous contribution. If the Russian troops had occupied Denmark, no one can guess what the whole postwar history of Western Europe might have been like.

With the end of World War II, General Ridgway had a solid reputation as one of our most distinguished combat generals. He was one of the world's greatest experts on airborne warfare. And over and over again, he had demonstrated the highest qualities of leadership. During World War II, they used to say, "If you're looking for Ridgway, look for the most advanced outfit in the corps. When you get to its forward point you'll find Ridgway and anybody else who has been able to keep up." He got down to the companies and the platoons. He carried a rifle with him whenever he left his command post, and plenty of times he used it.

After the war he performed with conspicuous success a number of valuable services which called for a high order of skill in planning and administration, for outstanding qualities of diplomacy and foresight. He worked on the United Nations Military Staff Committee, he commanded forces in the Caribbean, and then he became a Deputy Chief of Staff.

He was holding that post when he was suddenly called upon to take command of the Eighth Army in Korea.

We all remember that dark December of 1950. The U. N. forces were retreating through the bitter cold. They had suffered heavy casualties. They were suffering extreme hardship. They were short of supplies. They had had to abandon quantities of equipment and munitions.

When General Ridgway landed in Korea, we were hearing talk of a Korean Dunkirk, of pulling back to Japan whatever we could save.

But there was no such notion in Matthew Ridgway's mind. All he said was, "I aim to stay." And he stayed. He took over a demoralized, disspirited, beaten army. By the force of his remarkable personality, by the brilliance of his military skill, by the inspiration of his peerless leadership he infused it with a completely new spirit of confidence in itself and in its cause. No one could possibly fail to have confidence in such a commander. No one could possibly have any doubts of success under his leadership.

Within 3 days he had visited the command posts of all 7 of the American divisions, all 3 of the American corps, and 2 of the 3 South Korean corps. "I am not interested in your plans for retreat," he told the staffs. "Show me your plans to attack." And within 10 days he not only had brought a major Chinese offensive to a halt but had launched a full-scale counterattack of his own. He kept up his aggressive tactics, driving the enemy steadily back—an enemy that never thereafter regained the strategic initiative from the Eighth Army.

He did this with an Army made up of the same men, but men with a completely different spirit—a spirit derived directly from the strength and character of their great commander.

Mr. Speaker, the pages of the military history books, the accounts of all the world's greatest commanders record no more remarkable achievement than that

of General Ridgway in the virtual miracle he wrought with the Eighth Army.

He went on to become the Commander in Chief of the United Nations Command and of United States forces in the Far East, and then was called to be the Supreme Allied Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. He thus is the only officer ever to have held the supreme command in both the Far East and in Europe.

A little less than 2 years ago he was assigned to the post of Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the highest position—and the greatest responsibility—which can be given within our Army.

I do not know if, outside the Army itself, there is adequate realization of the tremendous impact of his service as the Army's top officer. As Chief of Staff, he has unfailingly placed primary attention where it belongs—upon the skill, the stamina, and the courage of the individual combat soldier. He has spared no effort to see that that soldier is provided with the best attainable training, the best equipment, the best leadership, and the best conditions under which to work and fight. He has vigorously pursued the development of forces realistically prepared to take on and successfully carry out any task which they could reasonably be called upon to perform.

In seeking the development of such forces, General Ridgway fought what was perhaps one of the hardest battles of his career. Unlike his other battles, it did not end in complete victory. And yet, it would be wrong to say it ended in complete defeat, for because of the unquestionable authority with which he presented his views, he focused the attention of the public upon matters of the most vital import which might otherwise have gone unquestioned. He spoke with an authority based not on theory, not on secondhand information, but based solidly on intimate, personal experience gained in the frontlines of some of the most hard-fought battlefields in history. It was experience gained in Sicily, in Italy, in France, in Germany, and in Korea.

But in serving as advocate for the cause in which he believed with all his mind and all his heart, he did so without once transgressing by a fraction of an inch the proper sphere of a soldier. He not only believes, but he exemplifies the principle that a soldier should give his conscientious advice on the choice of a course of action but that he should wholeheartedly execute his share of carrying out whatever course is adopted, and that he should never question or trespass against the authority of the elected officials of the people to make the decision as to what that course will be.

I think that the essential greatness of this great American is brought out clearly in the way that, without compromising the integrity of his convictions and without violating the soldier's code he lives by, he conducted himself throughout a difficult situation with dignity, with restraint, and with unfailing propriety.

Make no mistake about it. Matthew Ridgway is one of America's truly great men. I have spoken of his brilliant achievements in many fields. I have not mentioned his warm, human qualities as a man. Once in Korea he saw a soldier loaded down with a heavy pack and with bandoliers of ammunition, making his way up the line as best he could under the burden he was carrying. One of the soldier's combat boots was untied, but he was too heavily loaded to bend over and tie his bootlace. All of a sudden he heard a voice say, "Could I tie that lace for you, soldier?" And before he could say anything he saw General Ridgway, the Army commander, kneeling in the mud in front of him and tying the dangling laces of his boot. That story reveals volumes about Matthew Ridgway.

He has true dignity. He has a depth of intellect and a depth of feeling, and he has greatness of soul. He has ever been fearless in battle, fearless in upholding what he believed to be right, but he is humble before God.

He is leaving the Army after 42 years of active service as an officer and cadet, and after a lifetime of dedication to his country. Fittingly, he is leaving the Army after having held its highest position, in which, without any question, he proved himself in one of the most difficult periods of our military history to be one of the most outstanding Chiefs of Staff our Army has ever had. But his service to the American people is not ending. It is typical of the man that in the position he has accepted as chairman of the board of a great research foundation he will continue to contribute to the welfare of the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this great country may be grateful, all of us may humbly thank God, that for these past years we have had the benefit of the selfless and devoted service of this great man and that for the future we have the inspiration of the magnificent example he has given us.

Grove Patterson, of Toledo Blade, Honored for Work for World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the recent award given to Mr. Grove Patterson, editor in chief of the Toledo Blade, by the midlakes region of the United World Federalists.

Mr. Patterson has been named "the outstanding worker for peace in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan." In making the award, Mr. Harry H. Hollingsworth, a regional vice president, said:

> After years and years of working for peace, Mr. Patterson has continued during the last year to write, speak, and work in the cause of world peace.

Even those of us who do not necessarily agree completely with the United World Federalists will admit that they are sincerely doing their best for the cause of peace that all of us try to serve. Mr. Patterson certainly deserved his award. For many years he has run one of the best newspapers in the Nation, one that is not afraid to criticize where criticism is due in the effort to keep our citizenry well informed.

Farmers and Towns Imperiled by Lower Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week members of the House Committee on Agriculture concluded a trip through the cotton, rice, and soybean areas of Texas and Arkansas, holding hearings at Jonesboro, Ark., in Craighead County.

Mr. Clarence W. Adams, a member of the editorial staff of the Jonesboro Evening Sun, covered the hearings for area newspapers, and his article printed in the Tuesday, June 28, issue of the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, provides the membership an excellent account of the testimonies given your committee.

I wish to commend Mr. Adams for his factual account of the hearings and for the completeness of his article. Members of the Congress will find the information in this article of vital interest to themselves and to the people they serve:

FARMERS AND TOWNS ARE HELD IMPERILED BY LOWERED INCOME—ARKANSANS TELL HOUSE MEMBERS OF DWINDLING CASH IN JONESBORO HEARING—DISAGREE ON SUPPORTS—RICE, COTTON, SOYBEAN GROWERS TELL CROWD AT COURTROOM SESSION OF PROBLEMS FACED IN MARKET TODAY

(By Clarence Adams)

JONESBORO, ARK., June 27.—Dwindling farm income is forcing small farmers from the land and threatening the existence of small town merchants, Mid-South farmers told a 10-member United States House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture here Monday.

Representatives E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS, of West Memphis, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Cotton, presided at the hearing, aided by Representative PAUL C. JONES, of Kennett, Mo., chairman of the Soybean Subcommittee, and Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas, chairman of the Rice Subcommittee.

COURTROOM JAMMED

Craighead County courtroom, where the hearing was held Monday, was jammed as dirt farmers, planters, and farm organization leaders sought to hear every word.

Bob Downs of Harrisburg, president of Poinsett County Farmers Union Association, urged the Representatives to do something about dwindling farm income. He asserted, "farmers are leaving the country," causing the small town businessmen to suffer.

Rupert Blalock of Paragould, president of the Arkansas Ginners Association, declared that to continue price supports and controls in the present manner "is leading us to doom." But, he added, "I'm glad the decision is yours to make not mine," referring as to what sort of solution might be made to strengthen farm prices.

Mr. Blalock said "to remove the supports of cotton, rice, and soybeans would break the South." He added he personally favored removing controls and supports, but declared that if this is done, he would have to stop furnishing farmers a ginner.

DISAGREE ON PRICE

Representative HARLAN HAGEN, of California, interrupted Mr. Blalock to say that "a large cotton farmer in Texas said he could make a profit at 20 cents; you say it would take 32 cents."

Mr. Blalock commented the large farmers can and do produce cotton cheaper than the small farmer, but he said he would set 30 cents as the break-even points for a 15-acre farmer.

Lewis "Red" Johnson of Little Rock, State vice president of the Arkansas Farmers Union, asked the representatives to provide a "program of 100 percent parity, not based on farm needs but on the national benefit." He declared the economy of the Nation depends on the family-type farmer and called for control program based on gross income per family rather than acreage.

The president of the Arkansas Farmers Union, J. Albert Hopkins, was not at the hearing, but his statement was filed with the committee.

In suggesting a solution, Mr. Hopkins asserted, "I believe price supports should be limited to what it takes to provide a farmer with an opportunity to earn a decent living for himself and his family. If this is the policy of Congress, as it has indicated by resolution, it probably could be done by limiting production payments to any individual farmer to $2,000 annually.

"I believe you could allow the individual farmer full parity on his production up to $7,000 of gross product, and stop at that point," Mr. Hopkins wrote.

LOWER LEVEL HINTED

Joe Hardin, president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau, which favors a program almost directly opposed to that of the Farmers Union, charged "We have failed miserably to control production." He pointed to the surplus of about 11 million bales of cotton in warehouses. He called this "cause for rejoicing among our competitors in the world market."

Mr. Hardin called for creation of greater markets, adding that synthetics are being consumed "purely because of price competition." He hinted at a lower price level for cotton.

In lashing out against controls, Mr. Hardin said it's "not a matter of voting in favor of controls, but in voting against a greatly reduced support program."

In suggesting a possible solution as he visualized it, Mr. Hardin said he favored "lowering support prices and allowing increased acreage."

Representative GATHINGS interrupted to take issue with Mr. Hardin. He asserted, "I can't for the life of me see how cutting the price of cotton and producing more acres is going to get rid of the surplus overnight. Our farmers can't take any less money for their crops than they're getting right now and survive."

EXEMPTION ASKED

Representative CLARK THOMPSON of Texas asked Mr. Hardin at what point he thought the price would have to be dropped to enter the world market.

Mr. Hardin replied: "I can't say."

Representative THOMPSON pointed out that "what puzzles us is at what price we can meet the world market." He cited that in India there is cheap labor.

William Wyatt of Blytheville, State vice president of the Farm Bureau, spoke briefly, citing Farm Bureau policy. Max Miller of Marianna, who heads the Arkansas Farm Bureau matters on labor, urged representatives to assist in getting the Mexican national labor bill extended indefinitely without amendment.

Mr. Miller asked revision of the social-security bill to eliminate what he called "cash labor," explaining it is difficult to pay social security to cottonpickers because of the tremendous turnover and bookkeeping involved.

Bob Smith, Walnut Ridge rice farmer and member of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Board, said he was opposed to a suggested two-price plan for rice. He declared growers "can't undersell Asia when Asia has rice to sell. We couldn't do it even when we sold our rice for 50 cents per bushel."

HONORED AT BREAKFAST

Hilton Bracey, executive vice president of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, asserted the "cotton farmers will have to produce more cotton if they are to stay in business."

He suggested farmers must be allowed to produce 14 million bales to "discourage production of synthetics, to put the American cotton farmer back in the export market and discourage foreign production of cotton."

W. S. Edwards, of New Madrid, Mo., said a percentage of the cotton acreage must be set aside for new ground farmers.

The delegation was honored at a breakfast Monday. They arrived at municipal airport Sunday night from Texas. Others participating in the hearing were Representative HARLAN HAGEN, of California; Representative LESTER R. JOHNSON, of Wisconsin; Representative OLIN TEAGUE and Representative JOHN DOWDY, of Texas, all Democrats; Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa; Representative HAROLD O. LOVRE, of South Dakota; and Representative ROBERT D. HARRISON of Nebraska, Republicans.

Maine Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the dim view taken by the voters of Maine of the upper Colorado project is reflected in the following editorial appearing in the Portland (Maine) Express on May 24:

COLORADO BOONDOGGLE

The House of Representatives certainly should kill the Senate-passed bill authorizing public power and reclamation projects for the upper Colorado Basin. As additional details come in, this measure emerges as one of the most useless and foolish boondoggles of the century.

Official estimates of the costs of Government projects are notoriously low. The official estimate of the cost of this scheme is given at $1.5 billion. That means the real cost could be 3 or 4 times that amount.

Even the New York Times balks at this proposal for needless squandering.

"It would of course be possible," notes the Times, "to grow bananas on top of the Rockies if one wanted to spend the money. But the question is, couldn't this money be spent more advantageously elsewhere? Hydroelectric power is important to the West, but is it essential to produce hydroelectric power at great cost when steam power can be produced in the same area at a fraction of the price?"

The project's sponsors themselves concede that the power produced would be so expensive that it could not be used for "competitive manufacturing." Also, the lands to be reclaimed—at fabulously high prices—would compete with existing farmlands which already yield such surpluses as to face the Federal Government with the constant problem of where to find sufficient storage space.

If there's one thing the country obviously doesn't need at this stage of the game, it is the opening up of a vast new farm belt in the upper Colorado—at the taxpayers' expense.

Federal-Aid Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have just read H. R. 7072, the new Federal Aid Highway bill, writen and introduced by the Democratic members of the House Public Works Committee. I have no differences with many, in fact most, of the basic provisions of this new bill, H. R. 7072. However, I am most emphatically opposed to the financing provision of this bill. The President's program calls for financing the expanded program by means of a bond issue to be paid off from the increased revenue occurring from the gasoline tax which is expanding year after year. On the other hand the proponents of this new bill have set up a tax structure for the financing of their proposed bill that is in my judgment completely unrealistic and grossly unfair. The discriminatory tax placed burdens out of all proportion on certain segments of industry. Briefly they propose to raise the present 2 cents a gallon Federal gas tax to 3 cents, a 50 percent increase, and the present 2 cents a gallon tax on diesel fuel to 6 cents, a 200 percent increase. This tax is obviously grossly unfair to the users of our airways and the operators of gasoline- and diesel-powered small craft, as well as the users of diesel fuel for heating purposes, not to mention the general public already struggling with a tax burden out of all proportion to earned income.

Aside from these fuel taxes, H. R. 7072 comes up with a startling new proposal, the levying of a special tax on truck tires in sizes 8.50 by 18 and larger. I am informed that this size tire weighs approximately 100 pounds or more. The tax is to be 50 cents a pound on tires and tubes. Then, too, for the purposes of this act, every time the owner of a tire has occasion to have it retreaded or recapped, he pays an additional 20 cents per pound tax on the overall weight of this same tire.

This is an exorbitant tax. Heavy truck tires presently sell for approximately $1 a pound, to which there is added a 10-percent Federal excise tax. Under the new proposal the sponsors of this bill would add 50 cents per pound. Thus on a 100-pound tire now selling at

$100 there would be the present $10 excise tax, plus the proposed new 50-cents-per-pound tax, making the cost of the tire $100 plus $10 plus $50, or $160, and with an additional tax of $20 every time the tire is recapped. In addition, all of the money derived from the new tire tax is to be earmarked for use on the Interstate Highway System, which in the case of my State of Washington would involve Highway 99, running north and south from Vancouver to Blaine, Wash., and Highway 10, running east and west from Seattle to Spokane, Wash. Logging is one of the chief industries in the State of Washington, yet owing to the location of the camps in relation to the mills, logging trucks seldom use the interstate highways. Nevertheless, logging-truck owners would be compelled to pay this exorbitant $50 or more tax on every tire purchased under this bill. The average logging truck has a complement of 16 tires, so that for every set of tires purchased an additional tax of $800 or more would be assessed, this in addition to the already substantial excise tax.

Referring once again to the staggering increase proposed in the gasoline and diesel-fuel tax, in the case of the former 50 percent and of the latter 200 percent, consider the plight of the airlines, the owner of private airplanes and small craft, the farmer operating tractors and stationery power-driven farm equipment. All these individuals would pay their tax without ever using the highways for which the tax was levied.

In my opinion this constitutes a perfect example of a discriminatory tax bordering on confiscation, and should most definitely be deleted from any legislation brought before the distinguished Members of this House. I strongly urge the financing of this program be based on the sound business practices suggested in the administration's recommendation.

Massachusetts and the Nation Salute the Patriotic, Devoted Service of Representative Edith Nourse Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, during the time that most deserving tributes were being paid to our revered colleague and my dear friend, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, I was attending an important conference at the General Services Administration and therefore unable to be present here.

Upon the beginning of my service in this House in 1947, it was my good fortune to be assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, then presided over, as chairman, by this great lady. It was an inspiring experience for me through the next 5 years to be guided, directed, and befriended by this wonderful woman whose devotion to and vigorous legislative leadership for the veterans' cause has made her a legend, not only in this country, but throughout the civilized world.

Gracefully kind and courteous in her social life, valiant and courageous as a conscientious legislator, inspiring in her energy and industry, richly endowed with the deepest wisdom and most sympathetic understanding, the name of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS is a shining symbol of the highest character, ability and sincerity that can be associated with the political life of America. I am certain that the people throughout the United States join with us of Massachusetts in saluting the 30 years of hard work, personal sacrifice, and intense patriotism expended so enthusiastically by Mrs. ROGERS in devoted legislative service to this Nation.

In my judgment, the highest testimony of the loving esteem in which this gracious lady is held is revealed by the admiration she is accorded from all racial, religious, and political groups of the country. The legislative history of this era will record the personality and achievements of Mrs. ROGERS as unique in our political annals and provide an everlasting example to the women of America, as indeed to the men, of true and faithful service to the country.

It is my earnest prayer that the good Lord will bless us all with the continuing presence of Mrs. ROGERS in our midst for many, many more long and fruitful years.

Douglas MacArthur II, Troubleshooter at the Big Four Meeting—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the fine article which appeared in the July issue of Nation's Business. It deals with a man whose name does not appear in the newspaper as much as did that of his uncle. However, this man is doing as much, if not more, in writing our Nation's history.

The following is written about Douglas MacArthur II, a career diplomat and one of Secretary Dulles' closest advisors.

The article follows:

TROUBLESHOOTER AT THE BIG FOUR MEETING

When President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles sit down to talk peace with the leaders of Russia, Britain and France at the Big Four meeting, the news photographs of the historic occasion may reveal a lean, smartly dressed career diplomat hovering not far from Mr. Dulles' elbow. Few will recognize his face but his name is a household word from Penobscot Bay to Panmunjon.

The man who will be passing notes to Mr. Dulles when the talks get down to negotiating a cold war truce is Douglas MacArthur II, 46-year-old nephew and namesake of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

It is Mr. MacArthur's peculiar fate that he is usually introduced as the general's nephew, rather than by his own title, Counselor of the State Department. Although he is the State Department's troubleshooter-at-large and one of Mr. Dulles' closest advisers, he has learned, like his colleague, Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., that it is exceedingly difficult to make a name for yourself when the name you bear is already known to history.

This hard truth was brought home to Mr. MacArthur, for perhaps the thousandth time, on a recent trip to Europe. He had wired ahead for hotel reservations, taking pains as he always does to include the numerals after his signature. He arrived to find the royal suite awaiting him—and the manager bitterly disappointed that his guest was not le général célèbre.

He experienced a similar "Oh, it's only you" reaction when he came to Washington in early 1953 to assume his present post. An excited real estate man passed the word that Douglas MacArthur was buying a house in Georgetown, and several gossip columnists leaped to the conclusion that the general was going to be Mr. Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense.

A surprising number of people who do notice the "II" after his name take him to be General MacArthur's son. This puzzles Mr. MacArthur, since considerable publicity has been given to the fact that the general's only son, Arthur, is just 17 years old. Mr. MacArthur is often tempted to shout that he has a daughter 1 year older than Arthur.

Mr. MacArthur's problem is compounded by the fact that he has not one, but two illustrious relatives. His father-in-law is former Vice President (now Senator) ALBEN W. BARKLEY. But the cynics are wrong if they credit the general or the Veep with Mr. MacArthur's present job. It was another general who plucked him from comparative obscurity and installed him in the top echelon of State Department policymakers.

When General Eisenhower was preparing to become supreme commander of the newly formed North Atlantic Treaty Organization, he instructed his chief of staff, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, to recruit someone from the State Department to serve as diplomatic adviser on the SHAPE headquarters staff. General Gruenther chose Mr. MacArthur, who, as deputy director of the State Department's Office of European Affairs, had been working closely with Pentagon officials on NATO preparations.

General Eisenhower had expected General Gruenther to come up with a prominent ambassador. But he remembered that Mr. MacArthur had served as an assistant political adviser on his SHAEF staff during the liberation of France and that he had formed a good impression of him then.

"O. K.; go ahead and hire him," he said.

General Gruenther telephoned Mr. MacArthur at his home that evening.

"Ike wants you to serve on his staff at SHAPE," he announced. "Can you leave for Paris in 48 hours?"

Mr. MacArthur stammered something about having a job to close out and a house to sell.

"All right," said General Gruenther magnanimously: "Take a whole week."

Mr. MacArthur served at SHAPE for 2 years, helping to steer the NATO command through the difficulties and complications that beset a defense force in which 14 sovereign nations have a stake. Salving the sore spots of allied relations is highly confidential work and his efforts attracted little public attention. But his boss admired and appreciated his work.

"Mr. MacArthur made a tremendous contribution to the success of NATO," General Gruenther said recently. General Eisenhower grew to trust him implicitly and to rely heavily on his judgment."

Shortly after General Eisenhower was elected President, Mr. MacArthur was called home from Europe to be Counselor of the State Department. There is no doubt that he was the President's personal choice for

the post; at the time of his appointment he had met Mr. Dulles only once.

The Counselor is not, as some people think, the State Department's chief legal officer. He is precisely what the title implies—a man who gives top-level advice and counsel to the Secretary of State. On the Department's organizational chart, the office ranks below the two Deputy Under Secretaries of State and above the eight Assistant Secretaries. Actually, the Counselor's influence on foreign policy may be much greater than that of the Deputy Under Secretaries. These officials are heavily burdened with administrative duties, whereas he is deliberately freed from routine responsibilities to devote his full attention to major current projects and policy decisions. Mr. MacArthur's predecessor in the post was Charles E. Bohlen, now Ambassador to Russia. Mr. Bohlen's predecessor was George F. Kennan.

Both Mr. Bohlen and Mr. Kennan operated primarily as heavy-duty thinkers and as experts on Russia. Mr. MacArthur has taken on, in addition to the Counselor's traditional advisory role, many of the operational functions of Ambassador at Large, a post formerly held by Philip C. Jessup and now vacant.

It was in this latter capacity, for example, that he took charge last year of preparations for the Manila Conference at which the southeast Asia collective defense pact was signed. The fact that this Conference went off without a serious hitch and produced a treaty which is now regarded as a keystone of the free world's defenses against Red China's imperialism is testimony to his skill in the unromantic but important work that diplomats call coordinating.

Coordinating is gobbledygook for two of the essential task of diplomacy: First, ironing out as many differences as possible before the formal negotiations begin; and second, making sure that our foreign policy doesn't go off halfcocked out of ignorance of how the other fellow feels.

In these intramural negotiations Mr. MacArthur is careful never to gloss over any differences that crop up. He feels that it is his job not to bury conflicting viewpoints but to pinpoint the exact areas of disagreement. This gives the Secretary of State, and if necessary the President, an accurate picture of the choices and consequences involved in executive decisions. It also insures that any official or agency whose position is overruled will recognize the fact and fall in line with the decided course of the Government.

Once United States policy for the Manila Conference had been threshed out and a proposed draft of the treaty prepared, Mr. MacArthur began meeting informally and individually with Washington representatives of the other pact nations. This shirtsleeves diplomacy began in July, nearly 2 months before the conference convened. In late August, Mr. MacArthur flew to Manila where an eight-nation working group proceeded to hammer out the actual terms of the treaty. By the time the foreign ministers arrived, virtually everything had been settled except the wording of the key clause committing the signatories to come to each other's aid in case of attack.

Here there were basic differences—some of the Asian nations wanted a more sweeping pledge than the United States was prepared to give. With lesser problems out of the way, the foreign ministers were able to agree on this clause in a couple of days, and the treaty was signed in an impressive display of speed and harmony.

Although the Manila Pact was perhaps his greatest personal triumph, Mr. MacArthur played a similar advance man role in other major international conferences, including the December 1953 Big Three meeting at Bermuda and the January 1954 Big Four foreign ministers meeting in Berlin. He has been deeply involved in the preparations for the coming meeting at the summit since the first diplomatic feelers were put out early this spring. If Mr. Molotov throws a curve, Mr. MacArthur should be in a position to give Mr. Dulles a quick, whispered briefing on any previous consideration which United States, British, and French experts have given that matter.

Douglas MacArthur II Troubleshooter at the Big Four Meeting—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the concluding part of the article from Nation's Business concerning Douglas MacArthur II:

Mr. MacArthur has found advising Mr. Dulles a highly nomadic occupation. The Secretary has a habit of ordering up his airplane and flying to wherever he thinks personal diplomacy may help settle a crisis. Usually Mr. MacArthur has to pack his bags in a hurry (his wife says they are never really unpacked) and roar away with his boss. Since he became counselor in early 1953, Mr. MacArthur has logged approximately 168,000 miles of air travel, some of it on his own missions, but most often in the company of Mr. Dulles. He has made 10 visits to Paris, 4 to London, 3 to Bonn, 2 each to Taipei and Manila, and one each to Rome, The Hague, Brussels, Luxembourg, Cairo, Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Amman, Damascus, Beirut, Baghdad, Riyadh, Dhahran, New Delhi, Karachi, Istanbul, Ankara, Athens, Tripoli, Bermuda, Berlin, Geneva, Milan, Tokyo, Bangkok, Rangoon, Saigon, Phnom Penh, Vientiane, Ottawa, and Vienna.

We winces, however, when someone suggests that he has seen a lot of the world at the taxpayers' expense. What he usually sees is the road between the airport and the United States Embassy, and the four walls of a conference room. From these vantage points, he has discovered, the landscapes of Paris and Phnom Penh are remarkably similar.

When he does get home to Washington, Mr. MacArthur earns his $15,000 a year by putting in a 12-hour day, 6-day week at the State Department with about half of his evenings requisitioned for official social occasions, and a good many Sunday afternoons devoted to conferences at Mr. Dulles' home.

His day begins at 6:45 a. m., when he goes to the study of his federal period house in Georgetown to read the New York Times and the Washington Post and Times Herald while eating an unvarying breakfast of orange juice, melba toast, and coffee. He usually gets to his office by 8 a. m. There he spends another hour reading the secret messages and diplomatic reports that have arrived overnight.

By 9:15, Mr. MacArthur is ready for the Secretary's daily staff conference. It often lasts from 45 minutes to an hour, and is attended by Mr. MacArthur, Mr. Hoover, Deputy Undersecretaries Loy Henderson and Robert D. Murphy, and the assistant secretaries. It is a key part of the formal machinery for making State Department policy on all current problems.

Mr. Dulles spent much of his adult life preparing for his present job, and he brought to it definite ideas about United States foreign policy. This fact, coupled with his far-ranging travels and his determination to conduct personally as many important negotiations as possible, has exposed him to the charge that he tries to run the State Department as a one-man show.

Mr. MacArthur, who has a high regard for Mr. Dulles, contends that the Secretary's daily staff meeting and other policy meetings on specific problems refute this allegation. He says Mr. Dulles demands candid advice from his subordinates and if one of his own pet ideas is vulnerable, "he wants it shot down in flames."

"In fact," Mr. MacArthur says, "I have never known a man who so thoroughly exposes his thoughts and ideas to his advisers for honest opinions. He does not like 'yes men.'"

When the staff meeting adjourns, Mr. MacArthur returns to his office, but he is usually interrupted several times by telephone calls summoning him back to Mr. Dulles' office. If the call is urgent—and during periods of great international stress it often is—he barrels out of his office with the fleet-footed grace of a natural athlete who won his letter in football at Yale. But the time that he saves by good brokenfield running down the corridor is usually lost when he arrives at the do-it-yourself private elevator that runs to the executive sanctum. In his impatience, he frequently stalls the mechanism entirely by jamming 3 or 4 buttons at once.

This streak of impatience appears to be a factor in what his associates identify as both his outstanding virtue and his chief handicap. On the good side, it is reflected in a hard-driving passion to get ahead with a project, and an almost ruthless dedication of time and energy to the problem at hand. On the debit side, it shows up in occasional outbursts of temper—which he himself deplores—and an inability at times to hide the fact that he does not suffer fools gladly.

It may also help to explain why, with Mr. MacArthur, as with his famous uncle, people tend to divide into two camps: those who admire him tremendously, and those who cannot abide him.

Candid appraisals that were solicited through numerous State Department offices included such diverse comments as:

From a veteran ambassador: "He is one of the best men we have in the foreign service. He is forceful, persuasive, a skillful negotiator, and has highly developed powers of analysis."

A second-echelon career official: "He can be nice or nasty, depending on his mood. Frankly, he irks the hell out of me."

A subordinate: "He is a driver, but he drives himself harder than anyone else. The one thing in his mind is to get the job done."

An equal on the policy level: "I rate his intelligence and ability highly. He is extremely direct and has a faculty for cutting through the underbrush and getting to the real problem. I have found him most cooperative, but he has a few personal qualities that irritate some people. I think there is also a dab of jealousy here and there about his rapid rise."

The pattern of these comments suggests that, in Mr. MacArthur's case, familiarity breeds respect. The people who know him best and who have worked most closely with him have the highest regard for him.

It is easy to misjudge Mr. MacArthur on the basis of casual acquaintance. The first time I saw him, he was addressing a luncheon of the Overseas Writers Club in Washington. His manner was reserved, even aloof. He spoke precisely, choosing each word with obvious care, in an accent born of an Ivy League education and many years abroad. I commented to a luncheon companion that

"he looks like a pretty stuffy type." Later, in private conversations under more relaxed circumstances, I found him a friendly, gregarious extrovert with a great deal of personal charm.

The public's legitimate concern, of course, is not with the MacArthur personality but with his ability. How much wisdom, experience and skill does he contribute to the delicate task of keeping the peace?

In seeking an answer to this question, we run up against the fact that a confidential adviser, by the nature of his job, cannot be judged by the same yardstick as an executive. It is the executive, in this case Mr. Dulles, who inevitably gets credit or blame, and Mr. MacArthur is too loyal to his boss either to claim or disavow the authorship of any particular aspect of United States policy.

The consensus of his closest colleagues' opinions is that he is a superior diplomatic technician, and a shrewd analyst of tactical problems, but not a profound thinker of Mr. Kennan's caliber. To put it differently, he is more concerned with making current United States foreign policy work than with brooding over different and possibly better solutions to the ultimate questions of atomic age diplomacy. Someone once described him as a carpenter rather than an architect of our basic cold war strategy, and he accepts this as a fair description.

One of Mr. MacArthur's most appealing traits is his unabashed enthusiasm for his job and his organization. He loves diplomacy, even the tedious aspects of it, and his attitude toward the Foreign Service is like that of an old leatherneck toward the United State Marine Corps.

His never regretted decision in favor of a diplomatic career was made when he was 14, an age when by all logic he should have had his heart set on going to West Point or Annapolis. All of his family antecedents pointed him toward a military career. His grandfather, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, had been a famous soldier; his Uncle Douglas was making a brilliant record in the Army; and his father, Arthur MacArthur, Jr., was a captain in the Navy.

In 1923, Captain MacArthur's ship took the Secretary of the Navy on a goodwill tour of Japan. With a view toward introducing his son early to shipboard life, Captain MacArthur asked and received permission for young Douglas to go along. They sailed from Hampton Roads in May, visited the West Indies, Panama, Hawaii, Japan, China and the Philippines.

At each port of call, Douglas was placed in the custody of the local United States consul, or embassy staff, while his father was involved in ceremonial duties. He took a great liking to the Foreign Service people who cared for him and for the kind of life they led in faraway, exotic places. When the cruise ended in September, Douglas had firmly made up his mind that he would join the Foreign Service when he grew up.

His father, who died a few years later, assented. Douglas was sent to Milton Academy, a fashionable prep school near Boston, and then to Yale, where he majored in history and broke his nose three times running interference for Albie Booth.

He graduated from Yale in 1932 and passed the examinations for admission to the Foreign Service. But a long waiting list was ahead of him, and it was 1935 before his appointment came through. He spent the intervening 3 years plying the family trade as a lieutenant in the Army. He was stationed at various Civilian Conservation Corps camps in Virginia, an humble duty ameliorated somewhat by the fact that he often spent his weekends in Washington as the house guest of the Army Chief of Staff, his Uncle Douglas.

When he was finally appointed as a Foreign Service officer, he spent routine tours of duty as a vice consul in Vancouver and Naples. Then, in 1938, he was sent to the Paris Embassy. He left Paris shortly before the Nazis overran it in 1940, and followed the French Government to Vichy. His wartime work in Vichy had the cloak-and-dagger overtones that are always associated with a diplomatic career in the movies but only rarely in real life. One of his jobs was to help arrange escape routes for Allied fliers shot down over Europe, and he worked closely with the French underground.

Many of the leaders of the French resistance movement whom he met clandestinely in those furtive days are now leaders of the French Government, and Mr. MacArthur's war-born friendship with them has helped to smooth over many a postwar French-United States diplomatic misunderstanding.

The Germans moved into Vichy in 1942, and Mr. MacArthur was sent to an internment camp where he stayed until March 1944, when he was repatriated in an exchange of diplomatic personnel.

In June of that year, General Eisenhower's forces invaded Europe and within a month Mr. MacArthur was on his way back to France to serve as an assistant political adviser on the Eisenhower staff, a job in which he made good use of his contacts with the French underground. Paris was liberated in August, and Mr. MacArthur returned to the embassy he had fled 4 years before. He stayed there, as first secretary, until 1948. In 1949, he was brought back to Washington to be chief of the State Department's Western European Division and subsequently deputy director of the Office of European Affairs, the post in which General Gruenther discovered him.

That part of Mr. MacArthur's life which is not devoted to his country's service is built around the two women who have shared his nomadic existence for 21 and 18 years respectively. Mrs. MacArthur, the former Laura Louise Barkley, is a gracious and charming Kentuckian who inherited her father's sense of humor and a good deal of his skill as a raconteur. Their daughter, christened Laura but always called Mimi, is a senior at the fashionable Holton Arms School in Washington.

Mr. MacArthur's only real complaint about his job is that the long hours, the frequent trips abroad and the interminable social obligations leave him too little time for family life.

At least 3, sometimes 4, evenings a week, Mr. and Mrs. MacArthur have to dress up and go out to a party given by or for someone of diplomatic importance. Mrs. MacArthur tries to minimize the impact of the social circuit on her husband's health (and her own) by arranging their calendar so that they alternate an evening out with an evening at home.

The off-night-at-home is Mr. MacArthur's main joy in life, and he plans carefully in advance how he will spend these few rationed hours with his family. Dinner is a pleasant ritual that recalls their long residence in France. Mr. MacArthur has what his wife calls gourmet taste and a spartan conscience—he likes good food and vintage wines, but has an ex-athlete's fear of gaining weight. After dinner, Mr. MacArthur likes to watch the fights or a baseball game on television. He is a die-hard fan of the Washington Senators.

Aside from Mrs. MacArthur and Mimi, the person closest to Mr. MacArthur is his widowed mother, who lives in Washington, and with whom he visits frequently. He also sees a lot of the Veep, who once counseled his daughter not to marry that young fellow MacArthur and traipse all around the world, but who now regards his son-in-law as the paragon of all filial virtues. He calls on General MacArthur whenever he goes to New York, but their relationship, while warm and cordial, is no closer than could be expected of an uncle and nephew who spent most of their adult lives on opposite sides of the earth.

From the public utterances of the general and Mr. MacArthur, there would seem to be divergencies in their views on foreign policy. The general on numerous occasions has attacked the collective security concept which was expressed in the NATO and SEATO pacts, and which has become the foundation stone of United States cold war policy. Mr. MacArthur believes that collective security—a network of alliances against Communist aggression in which each nation is a full, free and willing partner—offers the best hope of maintaining peace and freedom.

To Aid Arab Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter to the editor of the New York Times is deserving of our attention. It appeared in the June 28, 1955, edition of the New York Times:

TO AID ARAB REFUGEES—ACTION TO SUPPLEMENT TOKEN ENTRY OF HOMELESS PROPOSED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

With a sense of gratitude we noted the recent arrival in the United States of the first of some 2,000 Arab refugees from the Near East who are to be settled here under the President's Refugee and Relief Act.

We were gratified because such an act of hospitality demonstrates once again America's concern for the tempest tost and her desire to provide them with the opportunity for a new life.

We are confident that the American credo will be strengthened by this newest group of immigrant peoples. The bonds of fellowship forged in America between peoples of every conceivable background prove in a very concrete way that peace and brotherhood can be the lot of diverse nations as well.

ARAB STATES' CONTRIBUTION

We hope that America's good faith in receiving some of the Arab refugees will inspire greater efforts on the part of the Arab states to resettle the great bulk of the refugees sheltered by them but given little opportunity to contribute their labor to their host lands.

Israel, as well—in an atmosphere of peace which has not yet dawned—will contribute more to the solution of this problem. It should be remembered, however, that Israel has already received 3,500 Arab refugees in her program to reunite families separated by war, and has accepted as citizens some 30,000 who infiltrated into Israel. Just prior to the signing of the armistice agreements Israel had an Arab population of about 70,000. Today, due to boundary adjustments and this acceptance of Arab infiltrees and returnees, the Arab population in Israel is approximately 180,000.

In a peace settlement an accounting of the property abandoned by the Arab refugees could be made and the moneys in payment would help greatly in the resettlement program. The Jordan River development plan advanced by Ambassador Eric Johnston and the various development schemes proposed by the United Nations would, if accepted and implemented, go a long way toward wiping out one of the world's many refugee problems.

We are proud that the United States is doing its share by receiving at least a token number of the refugees, by advancing the Johnston plan for the joint use by Arabs and Israelis of the Jordan River, and by contributing generously ($124,450,000 from 1950 to December 1, 1954) for the care of the refugees under the United Nations Relief and Work Agency.

INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS

Lest we be complacent about this matter, at least two matters of action are required of the American people. First, they must urge our Government administrators of the President's Refugee and Relief Act to facilitate the coming of the 2,000 Arab refugees, and express their own willingness to aid in their integration into the American social and economic life.

Second, they should urge our State Department to work more forthrightly than they have thus far to urge meetings of Israeli and Arab leaders, so that a negotiated settlement might bring a greater measure of security and promise to all the Arab and Jewish refugees in the Near East.

MARSHALL N. DANA,
Assistant to the President, United States National Bank, Portland, Oreg.
WILLIAM STUART NELSON,
Dean, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
GLENN R. PHILLIPS,
Bishop (Methodist), Denver, Colo.
CHARLES J. TURCK,
President, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.
RALPH W. SOCKMAN,
Christ Church (Methodist), New York City.

NEW YORK, *June 20, 1955.*

Faith in Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James P. McGranery, the distinguished former Attorney General of the United States and a former Member of this House, recently delivered a very inspiring address on the subject "Faith in Our Time" on a radio program of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Many of our colleagues here, I am sure, will recall his distinguished service in this House during the 75th, 76th, 77th, and 78th Congresses, comprising the years 1937 through 1943. In November 1943 he resigned to become an assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, a post which he held for 3 years. In October 1946 he was named United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, serving until 1952 when he was appointed Attorney General in the Cabinet of President Harry S. Truman.

James McGranery was a most outstanding Attorney General, one who placed duty to country above his own personal interests and those of his family by relinquishing a lifetime high judicial post to accept a short-term appointment in the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD his radio address, which he delivered on June 8, 1955:

FAITH IN OUR TIME
(By Hon. James P. McGranery)

My gratitude for the gift of faith is like the thankfulness that fills all of our hearts for the sunlight that makes our days golden and for the power of love that gives meaning to living.

If I speak of faith as a gift, it is in recognition of the fact that I have been blessed with faith since childhood, through no merit on my part; for, like so many of my brothers, I have been heir to the infinite merits of Our Saviour, who suffered and died in order to bring men to His divine Father.

Throughout the varied happenings of my life, I have been given fortitude in my convictions as I repeated again and again the familiar, age-old yet ever new beliefs that have come down to us from the apostles whom Jesus bade to go forth and teach.

Any attempt to paraphrase for the ears of other men the creed that I recite in solitude would fail, perhaps, to clarify the faith that I have tried, with God's help, to follow.

And so, today, with humility and profound appreciation, I am happy to say to you that: "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God. Born of the Father before all ages. God of God, Light of Light, True God of True God. Begotten not made; being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made. Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven. And was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; and was made man. He was crucified also for us, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and was buried. And the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures. He ascended into heaven, He sitteth at the right hand of the Father. And He shall come again with glory to judge both the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life; Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son. Who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified. Who spake by the prophets. And in one holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead. And the life of the world to come."

Certainly, without the radiant sunlight of faith, without hope and love, this world, where good and evil are locked in mortal combat; where godless men of the Kremlin strive for sovereignty over the souls of men; where "there is no lasting city;" and where the petty hates of little men aim barbed arrows at the "tranquil order" of a task completed; this world—would be dark and cold and full of despair.

Indeed, problems confront all of us; yet no matter how difficult, how baffling at first glance, they can be solved with the aid of 2 criteria—2 measuring rods of motive and purpose—the 2 commandments that our Lord gave to the Pharisee, a doctor of the law, who asked, "Master, which is the great commandment of the law?"

Jesus said to him: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with they whole mind. This is the greatest and the first commandment. And the second is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments dependeth the whole law and the prophets." Thus we have come to know that justice, and truth, and love, must walk hand in hand—even as we do with our brothers. For, all of us are related to each other by the bond of God's love and our reflected love of Him and His image in all men of all time, everywhere.

We are God's creatures, sharing the same origin, nature, and destiny—as America's forefathers declared in Jefferson's immortal document which founded our Nation, dedicating it to the liberty men need if they are to pursue happiness in time and for eternity.

We know, too, that our Lord came to bring peace to all men of good will.

In this, His divine mission, each of us is destined to share some part.

And so, I pray that every day in some small, hidden way, I may have grace to act, to bring peace, "the tranquillity of order" to some neighbor; a peace shared through our love of God, and love of God's image in my neighbor and in myself—translating into reality the brotherhood of men under the fatherhood of God.

This I believe: "I can do all things in Him who strengthens me."

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a joint resolution to designate December 15 of each year as Bill of Rights Day. Ratification of the Bill of Rights originally took place on December 15, 1791. This year we shall celebrate the 164th anniversary of this historic event.

The Bill of Rights, which encompasses the first 10 amendments to the United States Constitution, guarantees to the American people our fundamental freedoms: Freedom of religion, freedom of speech and press, freedom of peaceful assembly, and the freedom to petition for redress of grievances. The preservation of these constitutional guaranties and privileges from which all American citizens benefit can best be achieved through eternal vigilance and a fuller appreciation of the true meaning of these American rights and principles.

Only through a fuller knowledge and understanding of these rights by the American people throughout the length and breadth of our country can they act with courage and determination, in unity and in strength, to uphold these rights and safeguard them from being distorted and destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution authorizes the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation setting aside December 15th as an occasion for public celebration, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of our country on all public buildings, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies.

I suggest that the first of these annual proclamations be issued beginning with 1955 and that the event be celebrated on a nationwide scale. In order to have sufficient time to make the neecssary preparations, I urge the Congress to give my resolution early consideration and prompt approval.

Security Risks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, suppose your mother-in-law, 20 years before you ever knew her, had gone to some meetings of the American League Against War and Facism and contributed to what she thought was a legitimate antiwar movement.

Suppose your wife's uncle, Dave, a wounded veteran of World War I, had been a leader in the bonus march back in the Herbert Hoover administration, and had helped to plan some of the "direct action" strategy for that unhappy army of unemployed and undernourished veterans.

Suppose your sister's brother-in-law had once gone to some leftwing meetings while in college.

Could you, under those circumstances, prove you were not a security risk to the United States?

Note, now, that in none of these cases were you personally involved—no question of your own participation in Communist activities of any sort, no accusation that you had subscribed to any of the wrong magazines or had ever read the Daily Worker, or had otherwise done anything the least bit out of line. In fact, you might be a decorated and wounded war veteran.

The point is that we are having case after case of this sort—not of "guilt by association" but of "guilt by marriage or inheritance"—coming to light most every month. Many never do come to light. But those which do frequently give those of us in Congress who learn about them a nauseated feeling, as if we were seeing a running sore in the body politic of free America.

No one argues that Americans must not take every step to protect our country against subversion and infiltration by communism. We have devoted billions of dollars to that for these past many years. The FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency have money for every possible need they tell Congress they want it for. We do not ever stint on appropriations for such work.

But we find innocent people being kicked out of career Government jobs because they have relatives who were suspected of having leftwing sympathies, or who once attended leftwing affairs. The most frightful type of security trouble I have come across is that which hits a career soldier or airman who is suddenly handed a discharge from the service because of a mother-in-law's activities 20 years ago or a far-removed cousin's mixup with a leftwing union or other outfit.

I have personally intervened in such a case and have found that the military services suddenly get a little more careful and much more reasonable about these matters when Members of Congress show an interest in a particular case. Otherwise, the poor fellow would be out on his ear—and identified for the rest of his life as an unworthy officer or noncom who had to be kicked out of the service because he was a security risk.

No American should sit by and let any public official push him around in violation of law and decency. If it involves a Federal official, I would want people from my district to call it to my attention. Of course, any citizen automatically feels persecuted when he runs into trouble with a public official, but it is not too hard to tell a legitimate complaint from one of the crybaby kind.

On this coming Fourth of July weekend, besides taking our lives in our hands on the highways, I would suggest we also take into our hands the text of the Declaration of Independence and read it again; and see how the Founding Fathers reacted to denial of their rights as human beings and to attacks upon their dignity as men.

Thanks to the courts, to Congress, and to a lot of individuals who have insisted on standing up for their rights, the Eisenhower administration's security hysteria is now beginning to simmer down. The suppression of news which it has invoked against our newspapers on security grounds is now under such fire from the press it may soon be replaced with a much more intelligent approach to the security information problem.

Let us hope so. For we can make our Government so secure, you know, that it does not dare do anything for fear of breaching security. We can deny security clearance to the Oppenheimers and Einsteins and other scientists who were not always too careful with whom they associated, and the first thing we know America may have lost the race for scientific leadership behind an Iron Curtain of our own.

Death to the Communist atomic espionage agents. But let us use come commonsense about calling a career soldier a security risk and dismissing him from the service just because his wife had parents or in-laws who associated with some peculiar crackpots 25 years ago.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Appendix

Address by Hon. Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, Before International Lutheran Laymen's League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] before the International Lutheran Laymen's League at Seattle, Wash., on June 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE INTERNATIONAL LUTHERAN LAYMEN'S LEAGUE, SEATTLE, WASH., JUNE 29, 1955

I come before you this morning as a Lutheran layman—who was born into the Lutheran Church as it were—who has spent his entire life there—and as a United States Senator who has served in that body for 11 years after an 8-year apprenticeship as a Member of the House of Representatives.

As we all know, the Lutheran Church is not a politcally minded church. It was the first church to insist upon the complete separation of church and state—a conception that was later to become one of the basic principles incorporated in the Constitution of the United States.

There is, however, a close tie between the two. Being a United States Senator, I find it quite impossible not also to be a Lutheran and to carry over the teachings and concepts I acquired as a boy.

I was raised in a Lutheran church back in North Dakota. Dr. Stub was the pastor. His son is here in Seattle, the pastor of the Emmanuel Lutheran Church, of which I am a member.

As Lutherans, we have always stood for the separation of the church and state. Luther himself fought as persistently against the encroachment of the state upon the church as against oppression of the church by the state. He felt that the ordinary man was endowed with enough integrity and insight to administer civil affairs with justice and equity—but that it was the duty of the church to inculcate the virtues of humility, patience, and charity to temper and give direction to his administration.

In thinking over what I should say to you this morning, I reviewed decisions I have made as a Congressman and fought for and I have been surprised at the number of these that have been influenced by my Lutheran training.

In politics, of all places, a person's fundamental conceptions of human relations, his sense of duty and responsibility—come to the surface every day.

I believe in the separation of the church and state—that every man's religious and political beliefs should be respected. This goes for the individual citizen as well as the state. No man should take up where the state leaves off and promote intolerance, prejudice, and hatred on religious or political grounds.

I also feel that the state or the government has a definite, but sometimes not well defined, responsibility to its citizens. I feel there is enough hardship. Ill fortune, lack of opportunity, enough just plain misery in human life, without the state adding to it with laws that grant small groups special privileges or with laws permitting one group to prey upon another legally. I feel, what is more, that it is the duty of the government to see that hardship is lightened—that ill fortune is minimized—that opportunity is equalized and that just plain misery is abolished.

All this, I think you will agree, is both Lutheran and Christian. What is more, I feel that since I have been given the job of representing a lot of people in the most powerful legislative body in the world, I should do something about it.

This comes down to what you might call applied Christianity. And it is my opinion, that by applied Christianity, and by applied Christianity only, have we created a strong and prosperous Nation and can we meet with any hope of success the terrible challenge that faces us today throughout the world. It is not only what we believe that counts—it is, in larger measure, what we do about it. The golden rule is of no use to anyone if it is not put to work.

One of the outstanding examples of applied Christianity comes from your group. Look at the birth of the organization. The Missouri Synod was having a tough struggle back in the early depression when a group of laymen met, affirmed positively that the work of the church was the work of the laymen. That is why we have the Lutheran Laymen's League. That is why it has grown so much since that early roundtable session. That is why you will continue to grow just as long as the Christianity can be applied in the other important avenues of the church that you are broadening and using in your daily lives.

I am going to take a few examples from my own political experience and hope they will not sound presumptuous.

Back in the very early thirties—1932—I was elected to the State legislature here in Washington. I was pretty young then. Everyone was broke. The fabulous purchasing power of the United States we boast about today was nonexistent. People were hungry, and through no fault of their own. All had been thrifty, useful citizens. The injustice of the whole thing kept me awake nights. I felt that any government worth its salt had a responsibility to see that such a thing could never happen again.

What did we do? A few of us got together and wrote up a State social-security bill. We used to work on it at night and we had a lot of good legal assistance because the best lawyers were as broke as everyone else. The result was that I introduced the first social-security bill that was ever passed in this country. Later I had the honor of having our bill taken as the basis of the social-security bill passed by Congress which is in effect today.

We did two other things at that session, too. I got through the first bill abolishing the poorhouse and started a long fight to stop corporations from making excess profits out of such things as electricity, which everyone has to use.

Along this same line of applied Christianity there is another instance I would like to tell you about. I have been called the father of cancer research, of government research to save human life, and of the National Institute of Health.

This is not entirely true. I was one of many—but I did lead off, and the best scientists of the country did camp in my office for 2 years while we put over the National Science Foundation bill without any fanfare at all.

It happened this way. When I got to Congress back in 1937 I was under the tutelage, more or less, of Homer T. Bone, a Senator from this State. We were struck by an inconsistency which we felt intolerable. Uncle Sam was spending millions to cure disease in cattle, to exterminate beetles in timber, and rust in wheat, but not one cent to control the diseases that were taking human lives and hospitalizing millions. Today you can scarcely believe it. Up to that time, however, the only research for the control of disease had been done by the Army for its own purposes, especially to wipe out yellow fever at the Panama Canal, which the Army controlled.

Cancer, then as now, was the great killer. We introduced a bill putting the Government in the research business. I got the money through the House. Bone handled the Senate. And believe it or not, some of the best medical talent in the Nation came to Washington, called us socialists, insisted this was not the Government's responsibility, that the medical profession could do it better themselves.

Later when I became a Senator, toward the end of the last war, Dr. Vannevar Bush and a group of the best-known scientists in the country came down and asked me to help expand this small cancer program.

As head of the Government's scientific research then, Dr. Bush had set up teams of scientists, provided them with funds, used existing laboratories, and assigned them specific problems. They had developed the atomic bomb, perfected radar, proximity fuses—scores of things. They now wanted to do the same things—not to destroy, but to preserve human life. Dr. Bush's assistant took a desk in my office and we did the job.

Today we have the National Health Institute working on cancer, heart, and mental afflictions. A few months ago they were able to make the most optimistic reports yet on cancer. We have no trouble now in getting appropriations. We are no longer called socialists. Our Government is performing what, in my opinion, is one of its first responsibilities to its citizens.

We should be doing much more to safeguard the national health and to pass those developments along to peoples over the world because we're following the greatest example of all when we do it. It was Christ who not only was the great Teacher, but the great Healer who points the way.

It is a grave injustice to look only at His teaching—and his preaching—without re-

membering the example in healing. Everything that He did was done for others. Never was the concern for Himself. Out of that example comes one that our Nation can take to heart. We may make the developments in the treatment of disease, whether of the mind or of the body. But the greatest test is what we do after the developments and the improvements are known. If we selfishly keep them for ourselves or our Nation alone, are we following His teaching? If we choose to build a wall around the discoveries, are we living applied Christianity?

The same is true of international relations. As a Senator, I have to face the international situation directly. I have a definite responsibility. I must meet it with what conceptions of justice and equity I have.

When you start to think about our international situation, the growth and aggressiveness of international communism, our inability so far to halt it, we must remember that our ultimate goal is international peace.

We must also start out by realizing what sort of a world we actually live in.

We do not live in a Christian world. Outside of communism, which is definitely anti-Christian—this world of ours has three times as many professing Moslems, Hindus, Confucianists, Buddhists as it has had Christians of all faiths, Protestant, Roman and Greek Catholic. Moslems and Confucianists each outnumber Protestants 3 to 2. Each of these groups are as devoted to their faith as we are to ours. And each because of his faith do not have the same ideas of justice, mercy, and long-suffering as we have.

Then we most definitely do not live in a white man's world. We live in a world overwhelmingly black and yellow.

Furthermore, we live in a world overwhelmingly ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed. A tremendous majority of the human beings in this world go to bed hungry according to our standards. They can give their children nothing in the way of education, and they can promise them nothing in the way of hope.

It is this last; this little matter of hope and the realization of hope where our applied Christianity may go to work.

After all, God sends His rain "upon the just and the unjust." Before Him, we as Lutherans and Americans believe all men stand as equals. The king and the pauper—also the United States Senator and the Hottentot—anyone of you here and, say, the Javanese.

What is more, into each one of these humans God has put a soul and has lit a spiritual in intellectual fire. Be it ever so dim, it will burn so long as a man lives. Because of it, he hopes for the same things we do. He wants freedom from want, disease, and fear. He wants to enjoy better food, better clothing, better opportunity. At bottom he wants to be freed from his economic oppressors, whoever they be, and given the privilege of sitting, as it were, in the same sun we enjoy.

Because of these wants, this hope is alive in the hearts of the people of the world more today than it ever has been. We face the spectacle of the common man being on the march. From the jungles to the Arctic he is demanding his place in the sun and is making ready to fight for it.

Communism has taken advantage of this. Actually it has stirred it up with malicious intent and cunning. It has promised economic freedom to the underprivileged and pictured it as salvation in as glowing terms as Martin Luther used. That the masses don't get it—that they project themselves into chaos and the most bitter form of slavery the world has ever known—is beside the point. Communism uses these natural instincts of man as their chief weapon against us.

Our first and most emphatic answer has been—what? An atomic bomb. We have enunciated a policy of massive retaliation. We have fenced ourselves in with airfields and planes and said whoever raises his hand against us will be showered with atomic death.

This sounds all right as a temporary safety measure. But it is far from applied Christianity. God most certainly does not hate or fear our enemies as we do. Most important our policy does not fulfill our Christian responsibility of helping our fellow man regardless of race or persuasion to a realization of the better things in life. After all, if we are Christians, that is our job.

Aside from that, however fearful it is to say, but the worst part is that the whole conception will not stand up. We have no monopoly on invention and inspiration. Russia has as brilliant mathematicians and scientists as we have. They have atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs. They have as many planes as we have. Whatever they lack, they will make up in time. Our military intelligence tells us they will probably surpass us in some fields before the end of the year.

At best, what we have enjoyed and still enjoy is only a temporary technical advantage over the rest of the world—and if ever we drop an atomic bomb and a war of extermination falls upon us—if six of us here today survive we will be unbelievably lucky.

What, then, is the answer? Simply applied Christianity.

Our foreign-aid programs are built on this rock. We have spent billions in rebuilding the world and we must spend more and more. Through the United Nations we are daily promoting world understanding, easing injustice, in a slow and apparently endless effort, working out the problems that plague mankind.

All this is not enough. When we started our foreign-aid program Congress wrote into the act that it was to be aimed principally toward assisting the little man in these other countries. I think we have forgotten that. We have built up cartels. In many cases we have made the exploiters stronger and the poor weaker, and have given the Communists a better argument.

In this we have a very delicate problem. Just how much can we meddle in the business affairs, in the economic setup as it were, of some other country in order to better the living standards, expand opportunity, and social justice as we see it? Our State Department says not at all. Yet I feel we have a duty there, too.

I know a lot about China. In fact, I was decorated by the Chinese Government for repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act. I have had Chinese come to my office and with tears in their eyes, saying, "If with all these millions you are pouring into China you could just insist upon some small reforms, could just give the people some hope of better conditions, they will never go Communist." We didn't, or couldn't—they went Communist. It is really a problem we must apply ourselves to.

How, I cannot detail. But having the goal in mind, realizing the road we must take little by little, everything we do must be aimed in that direction.

Of this I am convinced, and I hope you are too, that so long as there is a slave in this world, so long as any human being is denied justice and opportunity, so long as the fruit of one man's work is exploited—taken from him by another—we shall never have peace in this world and shall live in danger. Abraham Lincoln said that "no man had the right to a loaf of bread earned by the sweat of another man's brow." So long as one man is permitted to take that loaf—one other has the right and will fight against it.

Our job is to so conduct ourselves first that we deny none what we would have ourselves. Second, that we help every man achieve what we enjoy; and third, that we declare implacable opposition to all who would do otherwise.

This is the Christian doctrine and responsibility. If we do it, we—with the grace of God—may achieve peace. If we don't, by the grace of God, the rest of the world will take it for itself by whatever means comes to hand.

Is It Appropriate for a Supreme Court Justice To Be Advocating Abroad the Opposite of the Repeatedly Declared Foreign Policies of the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Star:

JUSTICE DOUGLAS' FOREIGN POLICY—JURIST TAKES LEAVE OF OWN DOMAIN TO URGE RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

(By David Lawrence)

Should the President of the United States be permitted to conduct the foreign policies of the United States without interference by members of any other branch of the Government?

This question has usually been resolved in favor of the executive. And that's why criticism has recently been directed against Senator MCCARTHY for endeavoring to secure the passage of a resolution urging that at the four-power conference at Geneva the United States raise the issue of the status of the satellite states.

Curiously enough, no such criticism, alleging interference with the executive, has been directed at Senators LEHMAN, MORSE, MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, and others, who recently have expressed themselves on the subject of foreign policy at variance with the President—which, of course, they have a right to do.

But now a member of the judicial branch of the Government has spoken up and given an interview at Tokyo which will be read throughout Asia as a sign that there is dissension inside the United States Government. If the Supreme Court is to stay out of politics, as Chief Justice Warren declares it should, it would appear that the members of the Court are not obeying his warnings.

Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States held a press conference in Japan and urged a course of action directly opposite to that being pursued by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. It could conceivably be of considerable embarrassment to the American Government in its relations with other powers.

The Justice urged, for example, that the West should recognize Communist China and recommended that China itself no longer be a member of the security council.

"There are two Chinas today," Justice Douglas said. "The thing to do is to recognize that fact and work out a settlement with Red China toward her recognition. At the same time we should protect Nationalist China."

The Supreme Court Justice suggested that Formosa be placed under a United Nations trusteeship until its future is decided and that a decision might be reached by a plebiscite or referendum. He added that Red China, if admitted to the U. N., should not be given a seat on the security council and that the Nationalist Government's seat should be given to some other power so that neither China would be on the council.

This is exactly what many Europeans and not a few Asians really want to see happen. It's the way to kill the Nationalist Government and deprive the United States of the biggest military force it now has allied with it for the protection of Southeast Asia against Communist aggression.

The moment the 600,000 Nationalist troops in Formosa are formally advised that they cannot hope to go back to the mainland of China and that the great Government of the United States has forever cut them off from the opportunity to regain their liberty in their own homeland, the Nationalist Government will collapse overnight. Their case would be hopeless. America would lose face throughout Asia.

Also, when a Supreme Court Justice advances that kind of a formula, it is bound to give the European governments which have been at odds with Secretary Dulles on this issue considerable encouragement.

Now, it so happens that American sentiment against the admission of Red China has on the whole not changed. There is still a deep-seated feeling that the aggressor should not be rewarded by a seat in the United Nations. The latter organization denounced the Peiping Government as an aggressor in February, 1951, and 40,000 American boys were killed and 110,000 wounded in repelling that aggression.

Many Americans formerly in public life—as, for instance, former Senator Austin of Vermont, head of the United States delegation at the U. N., and Gen. George Marshall—are members of a Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

But, irrespective of the merits or demerits of Justice Douglas' proposals, will the "left-wingers" in America be as vociferous in criticizing him for butting in on the executive branch of the Government as they have been in the case of Senator McCarthy? Indeed will they criticize Justice Douglas at all? It will be interesting to watch for any such comments from the "left wing" press in America.

REA in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert a radio broadcast by my colleague the Honorable Wayne N. Aspinall who has ably explained rural electrification and how it has developed in the great State of Colorado. The broadcast is as follows:

Greetings to my friends and neighbors of Colorado's fourth district. This is Congressman Wayne Aspinall speaking to you by transcription over your own local radio station. I should like today to discuss with you a part of the great story of rural electrification and the benefits that have come to this Nation through the operation of the Rural Electrification Act.

Just last week, approval was given to a $10,155,000 generation and transmission loan to the Colorado Ute organization by the REA. This is a matter of considerable importance to western Colorado for Colorado Ute is made up of four REA co-ops which serve a substantial part of southwestern Colorado. These co-ops joined together in order to obtain this loan to build their own generating plant and certain lines necessary to utilize the power to be produced. When the plant is in operation it will help to provide power to areas now served by the Delta-Montrose Rural Power Lines Association, the San Miguel Power Association, the LaPlata Electric Association and the Empire Electric Association. The need for this generation facility highlighted at the moment by the installation of temporary diesel generating facilities by the San Miguel Association to meet the power needs of this REA co-op serving not only rural areas of the co-op but a good part of the uranium area of western Colorado.

I will return to this loan in a moment but reference should first be made to the 20th anniversary of the REA program. REA began back in 1935 by executive order as the outgrowth of the demand by rural groups that they were entitled to have electric service. At that time private utilities were refusing to serve them. In 1936 the REA Act gave permanent status to this program and in 1940 it was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. In 1949 a rural telephone program was passed into law as an outgrowth of the great success in the providing of electric power to rural areas.

On May 11 the Congress of the United States [illegible] used in its other duties and paid tribute to the 20th anniversary of the REA program. On that date more favorable comment concerning REA was read into the Congressional Record than could have been gathered in a year back in the days of its infancy. In 1935 when the program began, it was supported and pushed to passage by men of vision for a better tomorrow, and the greatest of these, of course, was Senator Norris of Nebraska. As usual, it received the standard opposition of those who had little confidence in the past, virtually none in the future, and even less confidence in the ability of rural America to supply itself with central station electric power. As the years rolled by and as there has been living demonstration of the soundness, the doubters and distractors have diminished and the supporters have increased to the extent that on the May anniversary of the program, no voice was raised in opposition. However, just last year it was necessary for the Congress to insist that additional funds be provided for the REA Administration to insure the availability of funds for all who could come forward with a sound program. This indicated clearly that no longer is there overt opposition to this valuable program. • • • but unfortunately, it does not indicate that there is no covert opposition, as that remains and no doubt always will. One of the many recommendations of the present Hoover Commission is that the policy and procedures of the Rural Electrification system be substantially modified and if they are modified as recommended, the REA program as we know it today will be consigned into outer darkness and in its place will come a banker-utility type operation of little value. I am inclined to doubt that any such program could ever be sold to the Congress, but I mention it merely as a reminder that though opposition may be less vocal, it lives on. More open and obvious opposition is easier to meet and overcome but if a relative disinterest replaces emphatic and enthusiastic support in policy and program centers, then we have entered a dangerous situation.

I believe the most explicit testimony of the need for a bold program for rural electrification and the relative disinterest of private utilities to provide such power is the very success of the REA program. Back in 1935 when the necessary sort of support and enthusiasm was available to start the REA venture the cities of America had long had electric power, but only 11 percent of the rural areas had central station power, and it seemed that such situation would long be the case. Ample testimony was given to the effect that it was impossible to provide area coverage for scattered rural customers, and it was just not economic to build lines to serve rural areas. Many rural customers who had obtained power had been able to do so only by insisting that they be served by the private utility and by paying exhorbitant costs for the installation of lines, poles and lead in lines; and anyhow, in the opinion of some, lamplight somehow improved the character of the farmer and made him more hardy just as the washboard and the wash bucket improved the character of the farm wife, even though it might be a bit hard on her back. In just 15 years the percentage of farms on the line was completely reversed; in 1935 about 10 percent of the farms had service and in 1950, 90 percent had service and only about 10 percent did not have. Surely if so much could be done in so short a time just by having a program of loans to those wishing to establish service, then more should have been done in earlier years. What remains now, and in a way its a bit peculiar, is to make provision for supplying the amount of power desired by the farm users. Just a while back he was not an economic customer—today he is such a good customer that his company is having difficulty in keeping its line heavy enough and in finding reasonably priced sources of power. It is this very factor which stood behind the recently approved Generation and Transmission loan for Colorado UTE. Once you get power down on the farm, its hard to keep up with the new uses and demands of this once shunned customer. It is estimated that there are something like 250 separate uses for electric power on the farm. By reference to actual consumption this is shown in Colorado by the average increase in use from 162 kilowatt hours per month in 1949 to 258 kilowatt hours in 1954. A power source and a mainline adequate in 1949 would not meet the needs of 1954.

For those of you who have received such power, I need not recount the values and blessings of power on the farm; power to make domestic life more comfortable with washers, refrigerators, freezers, mixers, plumbing and light and power for radio, reading and now television. Of equal value, and actually more important to the economy of the Nation, is the wired hand that has come to help the farm producer, power to install milk coolers, stock watering facilities, repair facilities, hay drying equipment, lifting equipment, feed mixing equipment and again even lights for evening and morning chores. Such equipment and such assistance from electric power has not only made farm life more pleasant and less of a back-breaking enterprise, but it has enabled the farmer to produce more food and fiber in a situation where the number of farmers is decreasing and the general population is increasing. (Just as a side note, it is most unfortunate that the farmer has seen his income go steadily down the last few years while general income has gone up, but his increase in efficiency has thus helped the Nation most and perhaps enabled him to survive.) Beyond this, the availability of central power service has had other substantial benefits to the Nation. It is estimated that for each $1 spent in bringing power to the farm, $4 are spent by the farmer for electrical equipment. Thus, as we approach the $3 billion point in total loans from the REA program, we have the record that at least $12 billion has been spent for equipment—pumps, motors, grinders, household equipment—all products of American industry. The bene-

fit then has spread to all parts of the Nation, to manufacturing establishments, to workers in such plants, to service and trade organizations. Put in another way, the old mail order catalog has been brought into the house and now is used to order those modern conveniences and work saving devices which used to be but pretty pictures of what others had. Of the many social programs that we have established over the years, I believe that this program to help electrify rural America has been one of the most successful and worthwhile.

Figures tend to be boring but perhaps these have a special interest to you. As of January 1 of this year, the REA had approved $3 billion in loans to 1,075 borrowers. Of these 90 percent or almost 1,000 were cooperative associations organized under State laws by rural people seeking electric service, an outstanding example of local, independent, private enterprise. For Colorado, the figures are almost as substantial. 90 percent of Colorado farms are now served while but 11 percent were in 1935. Up to Junst 1, the REA had approved a total of $80,700,000 in electric loans to 25 organizations, 24 of which were co-ops. These groups have built 30,000 miles of line to serve 70,600 rural consumers. Of the funds actually advanced, the borrowing groups in Colorado have paid $3,738,000 in interest and repaid $6,710,000 of principal. This includes, and this is an important figure, $1,690,000 of payments made ahead of schedule.

The national repayment picture is just as remarkable as the total interest payment runs over $192 million and repayment of principal at $376 million of which over $78 million represents payments made ahead of schedule. Only a minute fraction is delinquent over 30 days. Truly this is an achievement of great magnitude.

The recent generation and transmission loan approved for Colorado Ute is the second approved of recent weeks for co-ops in Colorado. At the end of April, a $3½ million G & T loan was approved for the Arkansas Valley organization to serve three REA financed co-ops of southeastern Colorado, part of which comes under the Sangre De Cristo Electric Association of Salida. Like the loan to Colorado Ute, this loan for generation equipment involves an agreement between the member co-ops and a private utility for the construction, operation and use of the plant.

In the case of Colorado Ute, the private utility, Western Colorado Power (owned by Utah Power & Light) will operate and maintain the generating plant on an established fee basis. The co-op groups will retain ownership of the generating plant and own, operate, and maintain the distribution system to its members. It can, under certain situations, take over the plant, but the main advantage is the pooling of generation and reserve facilities of the 2 systems, 1 cooperative, 1 a private utility for a firm supply of energy. The exact site of the plant is not known, but the initial installation will be a 2-unit 25,300-kilowatt steam plant. A third unit of 12,650 kilowatts will be added later but the first service in late 1956 will not be any too soon.

This particular loan has long been pending and I wish it were possible to recount all the effort that has gone into this program on the part of the member co-op organizations and the many pitfalls that have marked the path to success. The agreement between Colorado Ute and Western Colorado Power is not all that was desired by Colorado Ute, but the form involved is necessary if a loan is to be secured. Some of the delay can be laid to the time required for Utah Power & Light to obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity and a rapid writeoff certificate, to build a new line down into southern Utah. Left alone, the Colorado Ute organization could have served this territory without the tax writeoff proposition—a form of subsidy—but as usual, it just works out where the co-ops are left with the area the private utilities do not want; or if one would paraphrase it, but to us (the co-ops) they keep the leavings of the lights far from shore.

Additionally, the REA Act has always contained an allocation formula designed to insure a division of the loan funds by States so that each State got an equal chance to obtain loans. This worked out without particular difficulty in the early years, but as the bulk of the job got done, the formula did not leave enough for some States and too much for others. The Congress this year has amended this formula to straighten out this new problem, but in order to make the Colorado Ute loan now, the REA had to do a bit of fancy footwork among its figures and draw down on its reserve funds.

May I sum this up quickly. One of the greatest of our programs of joint government and private initiative has been the rural electrification program. It has proved that electric service is possible to rural areas, and so feasible and worthwhile that with over 90 percent of our farms now electrified, the big job is to increase the load factor of the distribution lines and to find reasonably priced power. If the old determination lives on, and I for one think it will, then we will see this problem fall away and a better day tomorrow for rural America.

Where Are Yesterday's Foes of Dictatorship?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the overwhelming votes in the Congress, favoring both General Tito and Premier Nehru's aspirations and ambitions, which scarcely seem to coincide with what has long been regarded as the American way of life, I should like to include an article which is expressive of the thinking of a few Americans.

Mr. Speaker, these few Americans are like the story of the speaker whose subject was announced as The Buffalo and the American Way of Life. He got up and started his speech with these words: "There are no buffaloes. There is no American way of life." Maybe that is the answer, but I hope not.

The article follows:

WHERE ARE YESTERDAY'S FOES OF DICTATORSHIP?

(By Mark Graubard)

What ever happened to the American sense of proportion, not to mention the American conscience? At a time when millions of people in Europe and Asia live under a Communist terror, denied the elemental freedoms of action and thought which we take for granted, leading writers and intellectuals in the free United States spread abroad the falsehood that oppression and book-burning prevail in the United States, that terror stalks our universities, school boards, libraries and even haunts the average citizen.

What a contrast to the situation in the United States of America when another totalitarian tyrant, Adolph Hitler, rose to power. Even before the Aryan laws, the pogroms and the incineration chambers darkened the German horizon, the reaction of the American public, its Government, and the college campus was prompt and unequivocal.

In the fall of 1933, as the executive secretary of the first anti-Nazi Student Congress in America, at Columbia University, I felt the pulse of this moral response. Our organization expressed the deep current of American sentiment that pervaded Rotary Clubs as deeply as labor unions, cultural societies as much as corner pubs. Opposition to nazism in the United States was nationwide. In colleges committees were formed to aid refugees from Nazi persecution; student newspapers protested the exclusion of Jews from German universities, the burning of books and the race laws. Some Americans even suggested intervention; others demanded a boycott of German goods.

Others, of course, fearing war or having some sympathy with Hitler's supposed aims, denounced these protests as interventionism, insisted that each nation had a right to act as it pleased, and declared that the Roosevelt administration's anti-Nazi actions were propaganda equaling that of the Nazis. But, regardless of differences as to what this country should do about it, there was little confusion about the evil of nazism.

How different the scene today. For the past 10 years, communism has shouted to the world that America must be destroyed, that America is the chief warmonger, the cause of world poverty and the mainspring of tyranny and oppression. Its first task was to obliterate America's good name among the peoples of the world. For this enterprise the Soviet propaganda machine has received aid from the writers of hysterical books and articles deriding America as a tyrannt.

Soviet propaganda has encountered no opposition of the kind that made Nazi propaganda futile in the United States. There is hardly a single campus committee to aid refugees from the sovietized universities in Europe and Asia; no student anti-communist congresses; no Women's Leagues Against Concentration Camps. The eloquent voices of our liberal leaders are raised more passionately against alleged American misdeeds and tyranny than against the darkness behind the Iron Curtain. One receives no telegrams urging one's signature under a manifesto pledging the signers' lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to the downfall of the Red tyranny. There are no pacards reading "Stop Khrushchev" attached to the front bumpers of motorcars. There were some silly aspects of the anti-Nazi campaign in the late 1930's, but at any rate few of us confused slavery with human engineering, or tyranny with progress.

Had American liberalism displayed the same moral vigor against Communist fanaticism that it did against Hitlerism, the world might be a safer place, and our moral leadership, established by our stand against aggression in the 1930's and our unstinted effort in World War II, would be unquestioned. We are now paying dearly in taxes, confusion and fear for maintaining a double standard of political morality.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, which follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

This is being written in fear, in dread, before the frightful toll is known, before the final figures are in.

It is being written in fear of friends hurt—of neighbors maimed—of people we know being killed—losing loved ones. We shall know soon enough how many—how badly. But this is being written before we know who, and where, and under what terrible circumstances, injury or death has struck.

Why can we not—why can't we—celebrate a glorious national holiday—a great patriotic anniversary—or any holiday, and particularly a holiday which brings with it an extended weekend—why can't we celebrate such a wonderful occasion without destroying each other like armies in battle, or like hoodlums in a gang vendetta?

Individually we are such pleasant people, we Americans; we are normally fine, decent, genial, courteous.

And the automobile, the great American blessing, is such a fine instrument for transporting people and things quickly, cheaply, efficiently; a finely made, beautifully engineered, attractively designed machine.

When this handsome automobile swallows in its shiny and inviting interior a fine, decent, genial, courteous American, why is it that the driver becomes a different person, mesmerized by the purring, rarin'-to-go horsepower of a powerful motor, and seems often to forget every civilized virtue?

Why is it that the combination of good American and fine motorcar seems to make cannibals out of us? We do not eat each other. But we maim and kill each other.

True, the hurt is always unintentional. But that makes it hurt no less.

Haven't you, too, noticed how the neighbor who may smile at you as you walk past each other on the sidewalk will as often as not snarl and scream at you, roaring past you and snaking in front of you with a squeal of tires on a crowded highway? How, as a fellow pedestrian, he will yield to you, but as a driver he is unable to wait until you cross the street to safety but will honk his horn and scare you half to death, letting his car creep across the intersection and block your path? How he will speed past you on an approach to a curve, putting the occupants of your car as well as his in danger?

We can redesign our highways until they stretch out in the straight true line of perfect horizontals; we can redesign our cars to make them easier to maneuver, stronger, safer. Yet accidents mount, and highway deaths multiply.

Have we built into our cars more speed than the average driver can handle, more zip than his reflexes can control, more getaway than he can tame and manage and direct?

The experts all say that our basic highway trouble is speed—excessive speeds for road conditions, for driver skill. Well, then, we must discipline ourselves, restrain ourselves or suffer a punishment which is instant and meaningful.

I think the best hope on the horizon for restoring sanity—and that would mean safety—to the American highway is that unseen but everseeing miracle of science which is now helping our police in so many places to catch speeders and nail them without argument or alibi to the undisputed evidence of their transgressions.

Reporters have begun to identify this scientific marvel as the "Whammy." It puts an evil eye, indeed, on those whose excessive speeds on the highway jeopardize not only their own lives but the lives of everyone they meet and pass on the road.

That marvel would be, of course, radar—an electronic conscience for the forgetful driver. And I say let's have more radar detection on our highways until we finally come around again to believing in signs—in speed-limit signs. Maybe then we will stop driving ourselves headlong to disaster by being forced to slow down or pay up.

Perhaps then, too, a 3-day Fourth of July weekend would be a happier event for more motorists, with fewer broken speed limits, broken bodies, and broken families.

The William Willis Raft Voyage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, during November 1954 I had the pleasurable experience of leading a special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to American Samoa, our only Territory in the South Pacific. Included on this special subcommittee were Mr. Anthony T. Lausi, Director, Office of Territories, Department of the Interior, and Mr. J. L. Taylor, Territories consultant, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This Territory, with its 76 square miles and 23,000 Samoan inhabitants, has been under the American flag since 1900, but only rarely gets into the world news. A few days before our visit another visitor, Mr. William Willis, arrived alone in Pago Pago following a 115-day trip from Callao, Peru, aboard his raft, the *Seven Little Sisters.*

I am happy to include in the RECORD the following account of the Willis voyage as printed in volume LII, No. 1, O Le Fa'atonu, dated January 1955, and published by the Government of American Samoa:

THE WILLIAM WILLIS RAFT VOYAGE

(By Edward Johnson)

American Samoa will long remember the visit of the lone raftsman, William Willis, who came to Pago Pago shortly after 1 a. m. on October 15, 1954.

His strange craft was slowly towed by a motor launch and swung into the dock where under a flood of lights the sea-scarred craft, fringed with seaweed, looked like an object from a strange world.

An erect figure stood on the raft's deck. The man who had spent 115 days at sea, apart from eyes which appeared burned from the tropical sun, was in good physical condition. His feat: a 6,400-mile journey from Callao, Peru, to Pago Pago, a daring venture, especially for a man 61 years of age.

Mr. Willis had planned the voyage carefully. Using his savings and money from an interested financial backer, Mr. Werner Woehlk, of Milford, Conn., Willis proceeded to South America on January 6, 1954, and carefully searched the forests of Ecuador for large-sized balsa wood logs to make his raft. It took much searching to find trees with a 2½-foot diameter. These were hauled by oxen to the river town of Quevedo and floated down the river to Guayaquil. Here, Willis carefully built his raft with the seven huge logs for the basic structure.

Across the seven balsa wood logs, Willis lashed three Mangrove beams to strengthen the raft and six cross logs of 18-inch balsa wood were placed on top.

A decking of split bamboo lashed to bamboo crosspieces was laid. He also fitted on a special bowsprit to carry a jib sail which would be handy in case storms destroyed his mainsail. For the mainmast, he built a double mast which was supported by steel cables. The design was similar in some respects to old South American rafts. The raft had an aftermast that carried a big triangular sail and instead of the old steering car, he designed and fitted the raft with a steering wheel. The raft was also fitted with seven pieces of timber or planks which he used for centerboards, the largest weighing almost a ton.

Toward the rear of the raft a hut was constructed with thick bamboo frame and walls of split bamboo. This was to be Willis' home for close to 4 months.

When completed, the raft was lifted on board the Santa Cecilia and transported to Callao, Peru, arriving there May 10. Here, the Peruvian Navy helped Willis complete the fitting of his raft and assisting him with his stores.

On June 22, he bade farewell to the Peruvian authorities and his wife, Teddy. Then, he received the gift of a black cat from officers of the Peruvian submarine base and a Spanish-speaking parrot from the company that had supplied him with fresh water. Willis named the cat and parrot "Meekie" and "Eekie."

On board for provisions Willis had 50 pounds of roasted and ground barley and 50 pounds of Canihua, a cereal that South American Indians had reportedly eaten for body strength. He also had 50 pounds of raw sugar, plus 20 pounds of vegetable fat, 40 gallons of lemon juice, a gallon of lime juice and a supply of instant coffee. For the parrot he had 10 pounds of shelled corn and 10 pounds of rice. The cat had a case of evaporated milk. Willis' water supply consisted of 120 gallons stored in 5 gallon cans.

When the raft was towed to the point of the voyage origin, three Peruvian sailors who had gone along with the raftsman bade him farewell and rejoined their ship and Willis was ready for his great voyage.

Early on his lone voyage Willis suffered from severe pains in his stomach that were so great he was afraid he would not survive. He sent out distress signals on his radio transmitter which was presented to him by the Marconi corporation. He generated power by turning a crank and tapping out signals with the wireless key. Fortunately, he later recovered from his affliction and, though weak, was able to ultimately haul up his mainsail and continue the voyage.

One-third of the way to Samoa he discovered to his horror that most of his cans of fresh water had rusted through and he had to cut his water ration from 2 quarts a day to a single cup. He experimented by drinking a cup of salt water daily which he later balanced by drinking a cup or cup and a half of the precious fresh water.

On another occasion he nearly lost his life while hauling in a shark which he had hooked. The fish made a last-minute struggle which resulted in Willis falling overboard. His left hand was injured, but he fortunately managed to cling to a line that dangled from his raft. By pulling himself forward he succeeded in getting back on board where he sewed up his wound.

He used his sails to the maximum when the weather permitted, even hoisting small sails on the native fishing boat that was lashed to the raft. Willis found that the main centerboard was to cumbersome so he cut it away and abandoned it.

The Seven Little Sisters, as Willis named his raft, was 33 feet at its greatest length and tapered at the bow, making the sides 28 feet long. The forward beam was 20 feet wide and there was a 28-foot beam astern.

Handling the raft required considerable attention and almost constant vigilance. Willis states that he could only take catnaps and adapted himself to waken at the slightest unusual movement of the raft.

About September 2, Willis ran into a storm which churned the seas into huge waves. He stated that an unusual heavy gust of wind ripped his mainsail down the middle, which was a severe blow as he did not have spare sails. The raft climbed the waves and rode most of them well, but there were times when Willis was filled with misgivings. Masses of spray and water were pushed up through the bamboo decking forward, but no heavy damage other than that to the sail was done.

During the first 4,300 miles of the voyage, Willis saw many fish and occasionally watched sharks battle with dolphins. After passing the Marquesas islands he said, the warmer waters seemed to result in a scarcity of fish which were also much harder to catch. His kerosene stoves had gone bad earlier and he was forced to do as Meekie did—eat raw fish.

Again on September 8 gusts of wind tore his mainsail, but he was able to repair it after laborious sewing. Inspecting the rigging, Willis noted that a line in a block had become fouled and climbed up to repair it. On his way down he slipped and fell 10 feet to the deck, striking his head, knocking him unconscious. He related that it was evening when he finally regained consciousness.

Other problems confronted Willis. He noted that his balsa logs seemed to be sinking farther into the water. On September 18, he saw Flint Island and was seriously tempted to make a landing, but the coastline looked too formidable and he knew he would wreck the raft if he attempted a landing.

Throughout the voyage Willis saw no ships or planes and the pets, who were his two companions on the raft, were his primary source of entertainment. He told of one occasion when the cat was washed overboard and he had to go over the side to rescue him. The parrot, Eekie, often entertained him by imitating humans at various ages. He had saved the bird once from the cat's claws, but shortly after Willis sighted Manu'a on October 12, the parrot met its end when Meekie broke into its cage.

Ta'u in the Manu'a group was the first island Willis sighted in Samoa. At 6:15 p. m. on October 11, Willis gazed at the island through binoculars but saw no one. Unfavorable winds prevented him from making a landing. People on shore, however, noted the raft which was reported by the Government of American Samoa's Public Works Director, Elmer Wilson, who was in Manu'a at the time engaged in construction work.

As Willis approached Ofu and Olosega, the other two islands of the Manu'a group, he saw only steep rugged cliffs and no signs of inhabitants. He then planned to try to land at Tutuila.

Gov. Richard Barrett Lowe, accompanied by Mrs. Lowe and party of volunteers, embarked on the Manu'a Tele and searched the area due east of Tutuila, swinging north and then south in an attempt to spot Willis. After dark the ship flashed searchlights into the sky to draw his attention. However, Willis by then had sailed along the north shores of Tutuila. He made attempts that night to steer the raft into the north shore of the island, but again unfavorable winds made a landing impossible. He was disappointed (the greatest disappointment of the voyage, he later said), but resigned himself to making another try at Upolu or Savaii in western Samoa.

The next morning the Manu'a Tele again left to continue the search. Capt. R. E. Payes turned the ship around the northeast coast of Tutuila and headed down the north shore, approximately in a southwesterly direction.

At 11 a. m., October 14, Willis' raft was sighted directly, ahead of the Manu'a Tele's course, between Tutuila and Upolu.

When the Government of American Samoa ship pulled alongside the raft three Samoan sailors jumped overboard and swam to the raft to assist Willis in making fast tow lines. Later the raft passengers were joined by Dr. Dean Smith and Mr. J. P. Mosher.

The towing was slow work and the line broke several times but finally, after 13 hours, the Manu'a Tele brought the raft into Pago Pago harbor. Willis' journey was ended.

Over 500 people from the Pago Pago area had gathered at the customs and boat shed landing to greet the raftsman. Applause and cheers greeted the lone traveler. Governor and Mrs. Lowe were the first to greet Willis and present him with ulas, amid a shower of flash photographs. Willis was then taken to Government House and there recounted briefly his experiences. At the Governor's residence he ate his first meal in months and slept in a comfortable bed.

The next day Samoan chiefs held a special 'Ava ceremony for Willis and presented him with an 'Ava cup title meaning "Captain of the High Seas."

Mr. Willis made a gift of his raft, The Seven Little Sisters, to the people of American Samoa and immediately Governor Lowe met with the chiefs and local government officials to draw up plans for a museum which will house the raft and Samoan curios.

Willis left American Samoa October 19 and arrived back in New York on the 24th, where he was greeted by his wife and crowds. Willis was flooded with offers from newspapers and syndicates for the rights to his story: the story of an elderly man who had courageously combatted nature and the elements to successfully prove that a fearless and brave man can sometimes win against the sea.

Minnesota Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, voters in the State of Minnesota were warned editorially against the proposed upper Colorado River storage project by the Fergus Falls Daily Journal on May 3 as follows:

YOU WILL HELP PAY FOR THEM

The Government, spurred on by those great spenders, the Army engineers, is planning to put in a series of dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River, at a cost of $4 billion, and probably more. The bill for the dams has already passed the Senate and is expected to pass the House. The dams are to be in New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. It is going to be difficult to claim they will prevent flood control, which would be a joke in those areas, but there will be the usual claim that they will furnish electric power—which is not needed there—and will irrigate land to grow crops. These crops will be grown in competition with farmers who own and operate farms, and most of whatever they produce will have to be sold to the Government to add to the huge stores already spoiling on its hands; nevertheless, the bills for the dams are being pushed through by the progressives in Congress, who think the Government is never spending or taxing heavily enough, or going into business deeply enough.

It has been figured out that on a per capita basis, these upper Colorado River dams will cost the taxpayers of Minnesota $69,900,000. They give lower power rates to a few favored localities, and a subsidy to a few people in irrigation districts, but all of us will have to pay for this.

North Dakota's share of the cost will be $12 million and South Dakota's $13,500,000.

You will not be told about it, as these are among the vast numbers of hidden taxes that all of us are compelled to pay.

Soil Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Hon. Woodrow Melvin, a member of the Florida State Senate, and under the permission to extend my remarks granted June 28, 1955, I ask that the following be carried in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

House of Representatives Memorial No. 421

Memorial to Congress, the President of the United States, and the Commission of Intergovernmental Relations urging that the Federal Soil Conservation Service, the Federal soil-conservation program, and the organization, administration, and operations of said Service and program not be abolished, abridged, amended, altered, or in any way changed, but rather that they be allowed to remain and continue to operate as they now exist and operate as has been their custom in their recent past

Whereas it appears that the abolition, alteration, abridgement, amendment, or change in organization, administration, procedures, powers, duties, or operations of the Federal Soil Conservation Service or the Federal soil-conservation program, or both, is imminent; and

Whereas the Federal soil-conservation program as carried on by and under the Federal Soil Conservation Service and the organization, administration, procedures, powers, duties, and operations thereof, has produced bountiful blessings and benefits, which blessings and benefits have accrued to, achieved, and accomplished, the immeasurable and inestimable edification and enrichment of this Nation through conservation of its precious natural resources, the people of this Nation through richer lands, better crops, and lower consumer costs made possible by sound conservation practices of the program, and to the farmers of this Nation and of Florida through better, more practical, and more reasonable farming practices and procedures; and

Whereas the several States possess neither the funds, the administrative machinery, the physical facilities, the valuable experience, nor the trained technicians to adequately carry on the service now performed by the Federal Soil Conservation Service under the Federal soil-conservation program; and

Whereas to make such changes in the service and program as are presently proposed would seriously hinder, interfere with, retard, impair, or possibly even destroy our national soil conservation program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the Commission on Intergovernmental

Relations, are hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to take all possible appropriate action to insure that the Federal Soil Conservation program and the Federal Soil Conservation Service and the organization, administration, operations and procedures thereof are not abridged, altered, abolished or in any way changed, and further to take any and all actions which may be calculated to make doubly certain that the said service and program shall continue as it now is and operates and that the present law on the subject shall not be amended or changed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted forthwith by the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the Federal Congress from the State of Florida.

Passed by Florida House of Representatives, May 4, 1955.

Passed by Florida Senate, May 18, 1955.

Filed with Florida secretary of state, May 30, 1955.

The 1956 Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The 1956 Olympics," which appeared in the June 28, 1955, issue of the Irvington Herald, Irvington, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

THE 1956 OLYMPICS

There is little reason to hide the fact that American sportsmen, and even some Olympic games official and veterans, think Russia is the favorite to win the 1956 Olympic games.

Such a belief represents no lack of patriotism, or faith in the youth of America, but is based on solid facts, and the developments inside the U. S. S. R. in recent years. The Russians are training millions of athletes in a manner which is not being matched, or even approached, in this country.

In the 1952 games the Russians almost won unofficial team honors because the United States entrants were poor in women's events, in track and field, and wrestling, and in certain other classes, where the Russians took most of the honors—and points.

Since 1952 the Russians have made a great progress in other fields, and have developed stars which are sure to give United States competitors a run for the money, in our own specialty fields, in Australia next year. The Government in this country does not prepare athletes for world contests such as the Olympic games, so private contributions must be relied upon.

Any citizen is able to contribute by sending in his dollar, or check, to the Olympic games committee, the address being available at most post offices. Competitors in these games are amateurs, contributions, therefore, are used to stage eliminations, aid in the search for talent, and provide athletic equipment.

If our system of producing great athletes is to remain a symbol before the world, of democracy, the people of this country will have to give a helping hand between now and 1956. The need is urgent.

America's Book Program Abroad Is Making Good Headway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that during the first few years of our United States information program, established by the 80th Congress in 1948, there was considerable criticism of the book program in our libraries abroad. Many of the books were badly chosen. The Communist books and and pamphlets were more numerous, more simply written, better illustrated, more persuasive, cheaper.

Recently I asked Dr. Franklin Burdette, who has been Chief of the Library Division for 2 years, for an up-to-date report. His reply is informative and encouraging. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my correspondence with Dr. Burdette:

JUNE 1, 1955.

DR. FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE,
Chief, Information Center Service, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BURDETTE: I note that the book program of the United States Information Agency recently brought out its 500th edition in a foreign language.

In view of the importance of meeting the flood of Communist books, I should like to know more about your foreign-language-book program.

In conducting the program, to what extent does the Agency enlist the cooperation of American publishers and foreign publishers? How are books selected for this program?

Sincerely yours,

WALTER H. JUDD.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, June 3, 1955.

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR DR. JUDD: I am happy to answer your inquiry of June 1 about the book-translation program of the United States Information Agency.

Cooperation with publishers here and abroad is the principle guiding the conduct of the book-translation program of the United States Information Agency. The Agency itself does not publish books. It strives rather to create the conditions which will enable authors, book publishers, and booksellers to make the strongest case for the cause of freedom in the current contest of ideas.

A book is selected for translation because the Agency is convinced that it can make a vital contribution to the understanding, somewhere in the world, of the aims and objectives, the fabric and pattern of life and thought, in the United States. Such a book may appear in many languages, in French or German, Japanese, or Korean—perhaps even in Urdu or Tagalog. American books have appeared in more than 44 languages through Agency encouragement. They are issued by foreign publishers and sold in commercial channels of the world. Demand for American books is rapidly growing abroad. As they become known for their truth and integrity, publication in foreign languages in native commercial channels, without financial or other assistance, is becoming more and more frequent. Agency assistance is given only when native-language editions would otherwise not be possible. This worldwide program of encouraging translation is the responsibility of the Translations Branch of the Agency's Information Center Service, located in Washington, and also of field officers in 205 posts in 76 countries.

The Agency creates favorable conditions in many ways for foreign-language editions. In some cases no more is required to stimulate a foreign edition than a call from our overseas post bringing an American book to the attention of a foreign publisher. The Agency staffs abroad, including Americans and nationals of countries where we work, also introduce American books to foreign readers and publishers through the overseas libraries, through book reviews in the press and on the radio, and through traveling book exhibits.

In other cases the overseas posts take a more active part in the production or the distribution of a foreign-language edition. Such activity may involve promotion of the foreign edition through a program of bringing the book to the attention of the widest circle of potential readers. In some cases our staffs cooperate in the actual distribution of foreign editions, with presentation of copies to key readers, libraries, or schools, assistance to book clubs and wholesalers, or assistance to the publishers to assure a modest local price necessary to encourage purchaser interest.

Assistance in the production of a foreign-language edition—when necessary because of obstacles in the path of free international commerce or because of the limited operating capital in the hands of the overseas publisher—requires even more extensive cooperation between the United States Information Agency and publishers here and abroad. The Agency may assist in the negotiation of foreign-language rights with the American publisher; it may help in the translation of the book; it may assure purchase of a part of the foreign edition. American publishers have cooperated unselfishly in making available translation rights for a larger world audience. They receive no payment except a small sum for assignment of rights, usually a nominal fee of $50 for each language.

The book translation program is an active means of fulfilling the mission given to the Agency by the Congress and the President, to "submit evidence to peoples of other nations by means of communication techniques that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace." Its scope does not necessarily extend to every book published in the United States. In advancing freedom's cause in the present ideological struggle, the Agency supports those books which will do the cause of America and the free world teh most good in terms of intrinsic content and foreign reader interest. Judgment of a book's value in terms of the Agency's mission results from the combined thinking of readers here and abroad, including Agency personnel in Washington and in the country of the proposed foreign-language edition.

The United States is now more than ever meeting the competition of Moscow and Peiping in the international book market, both in numbers and in quality. Over the past 30 years Moscow alone has published for use outside the U. S. S. R. a yearly average of 5 million copies of foreign-language books. Since July 1950 the United States Information Agency has assisted in the publication of an average of 4 million copies of foreign-language book translations a year. During the past 2 years the Agency has been responsible for more than 1,100 foreign-language editions of American books. Their impact, we know from sources of information all over the free world, is a permanent sharing of American culture and achievement.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE,
Chief, Information Center Service.

Well Done, Mr. Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include therein an editorial which appeared under date of June 29 in the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, entitled "Well Done, Mr. Hoover":

Few men have served their country more devotedly than the 31st President of the United States—Herbert Hoover.

Few men have drunk the bitter dregs of public disapproval in larger draughts than Herbert Hoover, victim of a depression which he did not create; few men have borne undeserved blame with greater fortitude than he. And few have risen from the ashes of bitter defeat to such a high place in the hearts of his countrymen as Herbert Hoover.

The Hoover Commission, able foe of Government waste, bungling, and redtape—the taxpayer's greatest friend—expires tomorrow. Mr. Hoover, the Commission's chairman for eight worthwhile years, will retire as he nears his 81st birthday, after 41 years of almost constant unpaid public service.

The Commission undertook the most thorough and detailed investigations to which any Government ever has been subjected. It dug up some 2 million facts for consideration by the public, Congress and the President. Ben Price of the Associated Press put it this way:

"Teams of Commission investigators have looked over the shoulder of just about every agency head in Washington, inspected food in the Korean foxholes, counted the Navy's 100-year supply of anchors and added up the Budget Bureau's books. They found room for improvement everywhere. They turned up the fact that the Nation has commitments and other obligations of $240 billion above and beyond the $277 billion technically in the public debt. * * *"

It should warm Mr. Hoover's heart to know that President Eisenhower has ordered "early and vigorous" action to carry out most of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for improving the Government. Thus far there has been little action, but the Commission has said that carrying out its recommendations would save the taxpayers at least $2 billion.

During its lifetime the Commission has issued 30 reports and countless recommendations on how to rid the Government of waste and inefficiency. Four other reports, now being completed, will be made public soon. Of the reports already released, Mr. Hoover considers the one relating to the civil service of greatest importance because he feels that the men in top civil-service jobs "are not good enough—they got there by seniority and redtape."

It is one thing to collect facts; quite another to have them believed. But of the 2 million facts assembled by the Commission, only two have ever been questioned, giving the Commission an unbelievable batting average of 999.999.

At the commission's final meeting in Washington last Thursday evening, James A. Farley, former Democratic postmaster general and a member of the Commission, said: "I know of no American alive who could have made the same contribution as Mr. Hoover."

Nor do we. It was a magnificent job, worthy of a great man.

The Role of the States in Our Federal System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, one of the major areas of study by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was, of course, the States, and their historic and contemporary relation to our National Government. The States in our Union are unique in their capacities as units of government. Nowhere else in the world are there governmental entities, below the national level, with so much autonomy, authority, and responsibility. The whole concept of our Government is a strong union of strong States.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations made an analysis of State governments, therefore, to determine the effectiveness with which they are meeting their great responsibilities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD excerpts from chapter 2 of the Commission's report, setting forth some of the Commission's observations and findings on this subject:

THE ROLE OF THE STATES—CHAPTER 2

The American Federal system was founded on the general principle that the National Government should act only where the States would be incompetent to act, or where action by the individual States might be injurious to the harmony of the United States. The changes in our society reviewed in the preceding chapter have deeply influenced the application of this principle, but have not affected its validity.

The success of our Federal system thus depends in large measure upon the performance of the States. They have the primary responsibility for all government below the national level. The States and their subdivisions bear directly more than two-thirds of the growing fiscal burdens of domestic government. In recent years their activities have been increasing faster than the nondefense activities of the National Government.

Some activities of government are of such a nature that only the National Government is competent to perform them. By and large, however, the ability of the States to perform governmental activities is flexible, depending in part on the nature of the activity, and in part on the way in which the States and local governments organize and utilize their governmental resources. Even where a vital national interest requires national action, the initiative, energy, and competence of State and local governments may help to determine whether the national role is to be minor or major, cooperative or dominant. There is, therefore, a direct relationship between the ability of the States to perform their functions adequately and the duty of this Commission "to study the proper role of the National Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions."

To be sure, under our constitutional system as currently interpreted, the National Government can, if it wills, undertake to perform certain activities regardless of the competence of the States to perform them. This makes it even more important to develop the capacity of the States to handle a larger share of the total task of government. It means also that the National Government has a responsibility on its part to leave room for and not to frustrate such development.

The strengthening of State and local governments is essentially a task for the States themselves. Thomas Jefferson observed that the only way in which the States can erect a barrier against the extension of national power into areas within their proper sphere is "to strengthen the State governments, and as this cannot be done by any change in the Federal Constitution * * * it must be done by the States themselves * * *." He explained: "The only barrier in their power is a wise government. A weak one will lose ground in every contest." [1]

There is a growing knowledge and understanding of the means available to strengthen State and local governments. For example, the Council of State Governments, an organization founded and supported by the States, has called upon them to revise their constitutions, to modernize their legislative processes and procedures, to reorganize their executive branches, to make more extensive use of interstate compacts and other methods of interstate cooperation, to reorganize their tax systems, to maintain adequate planning and resource agencies, and to extend home rule to their political subdivisions.

State constitutions

Early in its study, the Commission was confronted with the fact that many State constitutions restrict the scope, effectiveness, and adaptability of State and local action. These self-imposed constitutional limitations make it difficult for many States to perform all of the services their citizens require, and consequently have frequently been the underlying cause of State and municipal pleas for Federal assistance.

It is significant that the Constitution prepared by the Founding Fathers, with its broad grants of authority and avoidance of legislative detail, has withstood the test of time far better than the constitutions later adopted by the States. A due regard for the need for stability in government requires adherence to basic constitutional principles until strong and persistent public policy requires a change. A dynamic society requires a constant review of legislative detail to meet changing conditions and circumstances.

The Commission finds a very real and pressing need for the States to improve their constitutions. A number of States recently have taken energetic action to rewrite outmoded charters. In these States this action has been regarded as a first step in the program to achieve the flexibility required to meet the modern needs of their citizens.

THE STATE LEGISLATURE

In the early history of our country, State legislatures were the most powerful and influential instruments of government in the Nation. It was to them that the average citizen looked primarily for initiative and wisdom in the formulation of public policy on domestic issues. They overshadowed the other branches of State government. In power and influence they are no longer as dominant as they were, partly because of the ascendancy of the National Government, partly because of the increased influence of the State executive, but primarily because they have not found effective solutions to problems that become more chronic and more difficult to cope with in a rapidly changing society.

---

[1] Letter to Archibald Stuart, December 23, 1791, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, ed. Paul L. Ford, New York, 1892, vol. V, pp. 409–410.

Importance of reapportionment

One of these problems is to maintain an equitable system of representation. In a majority of States, city dwellers outnumber the citizens of rural areas. Yet in most States the rural voters are overwhelmingly in control of one legislative house, and overweighted, if not dominant, in the other.

In a majority of State constitutions, population is the sole or principal basis of representation in both houses. But this basis is in many cases modified, at least for one house, by provision for a certain minimum or maximum number of representatives per county or other district. As cities have grown more rapidly than rural areas, these systems of apportionment have tended to create an increasing imbalance in legislative representation in favor of rural areas.

The constitutions of 43 States call for some reapportionment in at least 1 house as often as every 10 years. In nearly half of these States, reapportionment lags behind schedule. Ten States provide for reapportionment of one or both houses by some agency other than the legislature, either initially or in case the legislature fails to act. In these States, some reapportionment takes place on schedule—a fact worthy of study by States whose legislatures have been reluctant to obey the constitutional mandate to reapportion themselves.

Revising an outmoded pattern of representation is, to be sure, a difficult act for a legislative body, each of whose members has a vested interest in the status quo. Many States would need a constitutional amendment to redistrict, for at least one house, as well as legislation to carry out the constitutional intent of periodic reapportionment. Since both require action by the legislature, except in States where they may be initiated by petition, a heavy premium is placed upon the farsightedness of legislators and upon the willingness of citizens to reconcile their special interests with the general good.

Reapportionment should not be thought of solely in terms of a conflict of interests between urban and rural areas. In the long run, the interests of all in an equitable system of representation that will strengthen State government is far more important than any temporary advantage to an area enjoying overrepresentation.

The problem of reapportionment is important in the area of study of this Commission because legislative neglect of urban communities has led more and more people to look to Washington for more and more of the services and controls they desire. One of the study reports prepared for the Commission makes this very clear:

"If States do not give cities their rightful allocation of seats in the legislature, the tendency will be toward direct Federal-municipal dealings. These began in earnest in the early days of the depression. There is only one way to avoid this in the future. It is for the States to take an interest in urban problems, in metropolitan government, in city needs. If they do not do this, the cities will find a path to Washington as they did before, and this time it may be permanent, with the ultimate result that there may be a new government arrangement that will break down the constitutional pattern which has worked so well up to now."

One result of State neglect of the reapportionment problem is that urban governments have bypassed the States and made direct cooperative arrangements with the National Government in such fields as housing and urban development, airports, and defense community facilities. Although necessary in some cases, the multiplication of national-local relationships tends to weaken the State's proper control over its own policies and its authority over its own political subdivisions.

Paradoxically enough, the interests of urban areas are often more effectively represented in the National Legislature than in their own State legislatures. Originally there was no substantial difference between the representativeness of Congress and of State legislatures, but history and population shifts have affected these bodies differently. Reapportionment in the House of Representatives has occurred after nearly every census; since 1929 it has been automatic. The same shift of population which has resulted in State legislatures becoming less representative of urban areas has had the effect of making the United States Senate more representative of these areas, because Senators, elected at large, must depend heavily upon urban voters, even in predominantly rural States.

For these and other reasons, the Commission has come to the conclusion that the more the role of the States in our system is emphasized, the more important it is that the State legislatures be reasonably representative of all the people. This conclusion is in line with the view of the Commission's Advisory Committee on Local Government that the States could help "to minimize the pressure for greater centralization or greater Federal participation in State and local affairs," by making sure that representation in their legislatures is "on a fair and equitable basis."

When Mrs. Hobby Found Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary of what some call the Department of Not-Too-Much Health, Education, and Welfare, said recently that any trouble with the Salk polio vaccine was the fault of Dr. Leonard Scheele, the Surgeon General, who is her subordinate.

I offer for the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which speaks for itself on this issue:

WHEN MRS. HOBBY FOUND OUT

Secretary Hobby's discovery that she was not legally responsible for the Government's actions on Salk polio vaccine comes very late, indeed.

Back in mid-April, when plans for distribution of the vaccine were being made, nary a word was said about the responsibility being Surgeon General Scheele's instead of Mrs. Hobbys.

It was Mrs. Hobby, in those days, who posed for photographers signing the official orders licensing production and distribution of the vaccine. It was Mrs. Hobby who spoke a few well chosen words for press and newsreels, and not one of those words, as we recall, suggested that Dr. Scheele rather than Mrs. Hobby was officially in charge.

During that first rosy week, when excitement ran high and the headlines were forecasting vaccination of 57 million Americans before midsummer, the name of Dr. Scheele was still relatively unknown. When the White House announced that President Eisenhower had ordered a survey to assure fair supplies of vaccine for all sections of the country, it was Mrs. Hobby and not Dr. Scheele who was directed to make the survey.

So far as we know, Mrs. Hobby first announced that Dr. Scheele was legally responsible for the vaccine enterprise on June 20, when she was asked in a radio interview whether she had any apologies for the way the enterprise had been handled.

By that date the project had become a fiasco. By that date difficulties had turned up and the results of Government indecision and lack of advance planning had become plain for all to see. By that date it was evident that relatively few children, instead of the millions so hopefully talked about in April, would get Salk protection against polio this year.

It was at this point that Mrs. Hobby, adding another remarkable episode to a remarkable record on polio vaccine, decided that the responsibility belonged on Dr. Scheele's shoulders.

The Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, in the discussions of the Colorado River storage project a great many loose charges have been made concerning the cost estimates prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation. Opponents of the project have tried to create the impression that reclamation projects always cost substantially more than the original Bureau estimates.

This simply is not true.

In many cases, of course, cost estimates, prepared in accordance with prices which were current at the time the estimates were made, have gone up when basic construction costs rose sharply between the time the estimates were made and the time construction got under way. This was particularly true of projects planned before the war and constructed after the war, under entirely different economic conditions.

Projects planned by the Bureau of Reclamation since the end of World War II have been and are being constructed at costs very close to, and in many cases substantially below, original cost estimates.

Let me give you an example from my own State of Utah. The Weber Basin project was authorized in 1949, at which time the Bureau's cost estimate was $69,534,000. When construction began in 1952, construction costs had risen to the extent that the same cost estimate, adjusted to the current price index in accordance with a study made by the Engineering News-Record—a nongovernment professional publication—was $88,968,000.

At the present time the Weber Basin project is 22 percent complete and the current cost estimate—based very largely on actual contracts—is $65,362,000. This is 27 percent below the original estimate when adjusted to reflect the current cost index. More impressive still, it is 7.3 percent below the original 1949 estimate, in spite of the rise in construction costs in the interim.

For one major phase of the project—construction of Wanship Dam, Davis Aqueduct, Gateway Tunnel, and Weber Aqueduct—the original 1949 cost estimate was $12,700,000. Actual contracts

have been let for this work at a total cost of $9,094,000, or $3,606,000 less than the estimate. This is a saving of 28.4 percent of the original estimate, again in spite of a sharply rising cost index.

This is but one example of many that could be presented. The Glendo unit in Wyoming is being constructed at a cost 13 percent below the original estimate made in 1953. The Middle Rio Grande project in New Mexico is running 2 percent under the 1947 estimate—and a fabulous 48 percent below the original estimate when adjusted in accordance with the Engineering News Report index.

In the case of the Colorado River storage project itself, you should know that the construction price iudex, as of October 1954, was down approximately 1 percent since the Bureau's estimates were prepared on a basis of January 1953 prices. That means the actual cost of the project will probably be substantially below the estimate, if the downward trend continues.

Critics of the project have also attacked the ability of the reclamation projects to pay themselves out. Once again I should like to cite an example with which I am familiar. It is the Strawberry project in Utah—one which I know not only from studying it as a reclamation project, but also from frequent contact with it as a very fine fishing ground.

Repayment on the Strawberry project was begun in 1916, on a basis of individual water users' contracts with the Government. In 1926 the repayment setup was changed. The individual water users made contracts with the Strawberry Valley Water Users' Association, which, in turn, handled the repayment contract with the Government. Commissioner Dexheimer informs me that as of December 31, 1954, all repayment installments that had accrued had been paid and there were no delinquencies. Total repayment is a little more than three-fourths completed.

I think this distinguished body should consider these facts in looking at the Colorado River storage project and other major reclamation proposals.

Fly the Flag on Monday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I want to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a three-sentence editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune today.

In this era of sophistication maybe we ought to pause and revert to those tender exercises of patriotism which symbolize so much of our country's greatness.

FLY THE FLAG ON MONDAY

Some call it Independence Day and some call it the Fourth of July but, whatever you call it, it is the day to fly the flag. We should like to see it waving from every building in Chicago on Monday, attesting the love of our people for their land and their pride in its goodness and in its strength.

Every household should have its flag and fly it on the Nation's birthday, a symbol of a family's dedication to the Nation's cause, a pledge of its loyalty, a sign that in each household there is a lively sense of the debt we all owe to the Revolutionary patriots who won us our independence and made us a nation.

German Reluctance To Rearm Offers an Ace to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "German Reluctance To Rearm Offers an Ace to Moscow," which appeared in the June 30, 1955, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

GERMAN RELUCTANCE TO REARM OFFERS AN ACE TO MOSCOW

Like the people of France, we of the United States have for so long regarded the Germans as a military nation that we have based our plans on the assumption they would jump at the chance to rearm.

All of our ideas of collective European defense have presupposed that West Germany would supply substantial strength to that collective European force. Any suggestion of a zone of neutral nations between the Soviet and the western spheres has been labeled dangerous Communist propaganda by such respectable United States commentators as David Lawrence.

Yet the venerable and forceful Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has just collided twice with blunt reality: If West Germany does rearm, it will do so most reluctantly. When Dr. Adenauer was in the United States earlier this month he gave warm assurance that the Bonn government would not trade off the western alliance for reunification with the Soviet-controlled East Germany. Then he went home and faced what some German observers have called "the greatest surprise in diplomatic circles since sovereignty." This was rejection of the German volunteer bill (Adenauer's first step toward actual rearming) by the Bundesrat (Senate) of the German Federal Republic.

The volunteer bill would have given the Government temporary power to call up volunteers to start the 500,000-man armed force until permanent legislation could be passed to establish an army. It was a simple act of three clauses, purposely drawn so as to avoid controversy. A conscription law would require a constitutional amendment by two-thirds majority of both houses.

The Bundestag (House of Representatives) passed the volunteer bill before the Bundesrat vetoed it. This threw the bill back to the lower house, which could have made it law by passing it a second time; the upper house has only one right of veto.

But what happened Tuesday? Instead of passing the volunteer bill, the lower house argued long and heatedly, and then sent it back to committee, despite a personal plea by the Chancellor. Members of Parliament maintained that while they agreed in principle with rearmament, there was no guaranty of tight civilian control in the bill. They weren't risking the rebirth of German militarism.

The Bonn Parliament adjourns for the summer on July 17. Unless the volunteer bill can be rewritten and passed before then, Soviet Premier Bulganin can count some extra blue chips when he goes to Geneva to meet the Big Three of the West—President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden, and Premier Faure.

Suppose the Kremlin spokesman should offer German reunification at the price of neutrality. At one stroke he would appeal to the deep national desire for reunification in Germany and to the deep national distrust of rearmament. Despite Dr. Adenauer's assurance in Washington, there is no guaranty that he could remain the West German Chief of State, rejecting such an offer. Indeed, if one may judge from the two votes in the Bonn Parliament, it is most unlikely that he could.

Dr. Adenauer understands the risk of neutrality on the doorstep of a power he has no reason to trust. Unquestionably he will throw his powerful personal prestige into an effort to pass the volunteer bill before the Geneva Conference. If he fails it will be no fault of his, and it is still possible that a complete rearmament and conscription plan may be adopted sometime in the future. However, if the Parliament adjourns with this business unfinished, it stacks the cards for a Soviet play, and it should not take us by surprise.

Continued Growth of Foreign Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing on page 2 of the Anthracite Institute Bulletin, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., dated June 22, 1955, regarding the increasing importation of foreign crude oil and refined products:

CONTINUED GROWTH OF FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS

While domestic crude-oil production is expected to drop an average of 250,000 barrels per day during the next 6 months as compared with the first half of 1955, oil imports, as now scheduled for the last half of 1955, will exceed the levels recommended by President Eisenhower's Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy by an average of about 100,000 barrels per day.

These figures were cited by Minor S. Jameson, Jr., assistant to the president, Independent Petroleum Association of America, in a report presented to the quarterly meeting of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission in Denver last Friday.

The IPAA official further commented, "Imports of crude oil and refined products have increased at a much faster rate than either demand or domestic production. Total imports will average close to 1,250,000 barrels daily for the first 6 months, an increase of 20 percent over the same 6 months of 1954 * * *.

"Imports of foreign oil are scheduled to increase at a faster rate than demand, as they have done on the average during the postwar years. For example, imports of crude oil, according to the latest programs of the principal importing companies, will continue at about 750,000 barrels daily during the third quarter of this year—almost 15 percent above the average for the year 1954. Third quarter imports of refined products are also scheduled to increase by 15 percent."

Fraud in the Name of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the earnest hope for a just peace is a common tie among men of good will everywhere. However, if the blessings of a genuine peace are to be realized, the world must recognize the propaganda tricks of nations which would seek to subvert this universal longing in a cruel hoax to abridge freedom and to further their own aggressive national ambitions.

In this regard, I wish to commend to the House of Representatives a most thoughtful editorial from the Tuesday, June 28, edition of the Zanesville Signal of Zanesville, Ohio.

The editorial follows:

FRAUD IN THE NAME OF PEACE

To judge from the tone and content of the Moscow declaration India's Prime Minister Nehru signed with Soviet Premier Bulganin, it is really the United States and its Western friends that have been making trouble all these postwar years.

The two leaders propose a ban on nuclear weapons and reduction of conventional armaments. They agree that recent Soviet disarmament proposals are a contribution to peace. They mention effective international control.

Nehru and Buganin champion Red China's bid for entry into the U. N. And they favor handling Formosa over to the Communist Chinese.

They also reaffirm the principles of international coexistence drafted by Nehru and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai at Bandung, Indonesia.

At that conference in May, Nehru showed that he has deliberately blinded himself to the truth of Russian and Chinese history, especially of the last decade.

One of the principles of coexistence he now espouses with Bulganin is noninterference in the internal affairs of other nations. Another is mutual respect for the territory of other countries. A third is nonaggression.

The undisputed facts of history are that Russia has subjugated, either by military threat or subversive coup, the satellite countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria.

Across the globe, the Red Chinese, those kindly chaps, have managed and powered an effort to subdue all Korea, and have lent vital aid and guidance to a similar drive against Indochina.

What Russia and China want, obviously, is noninterference after the fact of their conquests. By signing declarations with Bulganin and Chou, Nehru makes himself a party to this international plunder and seeks to put over it the cloak of decency. It is his most immoral performance in a long catalog of shameful actions in the name of peace and justice.

These same Red Chinese Nehru would permit to seize Formosa. Any rational solution of the Formosan problem will ultimately give it to the Formosans, not the conquering Chinese. And its defense rightly belongs in the hands of those who would keep it free.

As for the nuclear weapon ban, Nehru might remember that one could have been had long ago but for the stubbornness of the Russians. The proposals they now make are only a rough approach to plans long advanced by the United States. Where was Nehru's praise for America when these first were offered?

By this declaration at Moscow, Nehru appears to say he is now in league with the true peacemakers, the Communists in Russia, and it is only the terrible warmongers of the West who prevent a grand accord which would make the world safe from war.

The world truly hungers for peace. But we must hope that there are enough wise people in the world to recognize fraud when they see it and to demand the genuine substance of peace—not the propaganda variety the Russians celebrate and Nehru applauds.

Illinois Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 the voters of Illinois were warned against the upper Colorado storage project by the following editorial appearing in the Rockford Register-Republic:

BADLY CONCEIVED COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Illinois has a direct stake in the upper Colorado River Basin project bill which has been approved by the Senate and is pending in the House. Tax Foundation of New York estimates that the bill would cost the Nation's taxpayers more than $4 billion in hidden subsidies. Illinois' share of the added tax bill would be $276 million.

The bill calls for a number of large dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River and numerous irrigation projects in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. These four States would receive the benefits of the bill, but their combined added taxes would amount to only $75,600,000—just over one-fourth of the cost to Illinois alone.

Conservation and taxpayer groups throughout the country have joined in opposition to the bill. The present measure would cost 80 percent more than the bill approved by President Eisenhower and the Interior Department last year. Critics of the project doubt if the President would approve the plan in its present form.

Again we are confronted with the problem of Mountain State Senators joining together to promote a project for their own benefit. The 8 Mountain States have 16 Senators, one-sixth of the Senate, but only 3 percent of the United States population. And the States directly benefited pay only a fraction of the cost, while the rest of the Nation picks up the major part of the bill.

Sponsors of the Colorado River project say that the irrigation project would permit more food to be produced. But the Department of Agriculture says that present acreage devoted to food production is sufficient.

Engineers have raised doubts as to the capacity of Glen Canyon to support one of the large dams planned on the Colorado River. Conservation groups oppose the invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument by the project, with the destruction of part of a scenic national park. And utility officials say that steampower can be generated at a fraction of the cost of the hydroelectric power made possible by the project.

The Colorado River project has not been carefully planned, and pertinent engineering, agricultural, and other data has not been presented to Congress and Federal agencies. This vast investment of taxpayers' money should be given a searching review in the House.

The Need for Open Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to insert two editorials and a newspaper account relating to proposed changes in our social-security legislation. Of special interest are the views of the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative KEAN, who has devoted long years of study to the social-security program and who deserves major credit for the sweeping improvements approved last year

I am in agreement with the two editorials in their criticism of the Democrats' decision that the Ways and Means Committee need not hold open hearings on pending social-security legislation. These are far-reaching proposals. The need is apparent for adequate public hearings so as to avoid jeopardizing benefits available to millions of Americans.

The editorials and the newspaper article follow:

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News]

REPRESENTATIVE KEAN IS RIGHT

Refusal of the House Ways and Means Committee's Democratic majority to hold open hearings on pending social-security legislation has been sharply attacked by Representative KEAN, of New Jersey, recognized as the House's best-informed Member on the subject.

Mr. KEAN's stand against such procedure is thoroughly sound. It is a matter that vitally concerns 90 percent of the Nation's workers and their families. They have the right to be fully informed of the effect of any proposed changes in the social security system, but this right has been denied them by the committee majority.

No one will question that the system is still capable of improvement even after the broad revision last year. But each step in that direction must be carefully evaluated and widely publicized before action is taken, lest the system be seriously jeopardized by becoming a political football.

That has been a constant danger, but has not, heretofore, been quite so baldly apparent as now. For one thing the party leaders debated quite a while whether it would be more profitable politically to liberalize this year or wait until 1956, a presidential election year.

Proof that the committee majority has itself come to the conclusion that its "politically appealing proposals"—the quota is Mr. KEAN's—go too far is found in last weekend's backpedaling.

As originally presented, the Democratic bill under consideration involved an additional estimated outlay of $2 billion, or 40 percent of the old-age and survivors insurance fund's current yearly income. How soon that would have forced higher old-age insurance taxes is problematical.

The modifications now made reduce the estimated outlay to $1 billion, which patently compelled drastic trimming. That action alone is indicative of a lack of adequate study in the bill's preparation, granting that it has some good features. It offers the strongest argument that could be advanced against the closed hearing procedure in legislation of such importance.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger]

OPEN THE DISCUSSION

The Democratic leadership in Congress has proposed a series of changes in social security benefits. The most important of these changes would be starting benefits to women at 62 instead of 65. Others include giving benefits to workers who are totally disabled before they reach 65, and giving benefits to children over 18 who are mentally or physically handicapped. The present limit is 18.

There may be great justification for these changes, but the Democrats have not enhanced their case by refusing to hold public hearings on the changes. Their action has drawn fire from Representative KEAN of Essex County. Congressman KEAN is a Republican, but he is nonpartisan when it comes to social security. He has been recognized as the foremost expert in Congress on this extremely complicated subject. Yet he says that he will find it hard to judge the merits of the changes unless full-scale, open hearings are held. How much more difficult will it be for the layman?

Social security is a subject which affects every person in the country. It would be unwise, in the extreme, to alter it without the widest possible discussion.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of June 24, 1955]

KEAN RAPS BAN ON HEARING TO WIDEN SOCIAL SECURITY

WASHINGTON.—Representative KEAN, Republican of the 12th District of New Jersey, today charged the Democratic-controlled House Ways and Means Committee with being unfaithful to 9 out of 10 American families in refusing to hold public hearings on social security revisions proposed by the Democrats.

KEAN, joining in the Eisenhower administration's efforts to sidetrack a projected liberalization of social security as economically unsound, pointed out it would be easier for him "to take the irresponsible course and back, without full study, the politically appealing Democratic proposals."

KEAN is up for reelection next year in a marginal district.

However, he continued, the revision represents about 40 percent of the total yearly income of the social security system and the people are entitled to "hear all sides of the question before a red cent of their money is touched."

MORE FOR CHILDREN

The Democratic legislation would lower from 65 to 62 the age at which women could receive benefits. It would provide benefits for workers who become totally disabled before reaching the retirement age of 65. Benefits for children, now limited to those under 18, would be extended to older children who are physically or mentally handicapped.

Legislation sponsored by KEAN last year was hailed as the most important improvement in the social security system since its inception. Because of his knowledge of the subject he was chosen by the House leadership last year to serve on a special committee studying benefits for survivors of servicemen.

WANTS SAFEGUARDS

The Congressman said:

"After years of work to broaden social security coverage to where now 90 percent of the American working force and their families are protected by the system, I cannot help but feel a very great responsibility to these people.

"I am proud of our Social Security System and want to be sure it will not be jeopardized. Millions of Americans placed their faith in the Congress to guard the investment they have made from their paychecks in the social-security trust fund. They are willingly investing their money in social security with the belief that the Congress will take every precaution to see that they will receive their just benefits in the future.

* * * * *

"However, I could not in conscience face my people or anyone who has faith in the Congress if I jumped to a snap decision on these amendments whatever their merits. And, although I have spent long hours for many years studying social security, I would be fooling myself if I thought I could give a worthwhile opinion on these amendments based on the inadequate additional knowledge I can gain in brief closed hearings.

"Before the Ways and Means Committee offers its recommendation to the full House not only must every aspect of the amendments be studied, but those who will be directly affected—the workers, the unions, that represent them, the employers, the farmers, and many others—must be given opportunity to express their views. The findings must be made known to the general public through the traditional forum of the Congress, the open hearing."

By Way of the Pole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in a clear and hard-hitting editorial on June 15 the San Francisco News appeals for quick approval of Pan American Airways' application to fly the great circle route from the west coast to Europe.

If this country is to continue its lead in international aviation, in the face of the stiffest possible competition from Government-owned and highly subsidized foreign lines, it is imperative that prompt action be taken on any application before the CAB which would place our carriers on an equal competitive basis.

San Francisco, as of now, has no polar route to Europe although Los Angeles is served by Scandinavian Airlines System. Swift approval of Pan American's application for service from the west coast to Europe will go a long way toward keeping San Francisco in modern touch with the trade centers of the world.

Under unanimous consent, I include the News editorial of June 15, as follows:

BY WAY OF THE POLE

Sandinavian Airlines passengers are winging between California and Europe via the Arctic. But Californians who seek to travel that way must go to Los Angeles to take a plane or land there on return. The Scandinavian lines do not stop in San Francisco.

Pan American World Airways is asking Civil Aeronautics Board permission to fly from four west-coast cities, including San Francisco, to London and other European points over the Arctic route.

A Canadian airline soon will start service from Vancouver, British Columbia, to Europe over the route. A bilateral agreement between the United States and Great Britain permits a British airline to operate the same route.

It is only logical, and certainly reasonable that a United States airline should have the same privilege.

And certainly San Francisco should be one terminus of such service.

Soo Locks Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, June 28 marked the opening of the Soo locks centennial celebration commemorating the locks on their 100 years of operation.

On this momentous occasion Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., the home of the Soo locks, was highly honored with the presence of the Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield.

I deemed it a great honor and privilege to be invited and take part in the opening ceremonies of this occasion.

Tuesday, June 28, was the date set by the Postmaster General to offer to the public the commemorative stamp, which was designed and authorized by the Post Office Department, carrying a complete picture of the Great Lakes, the Soo locks with a vessel approaching the locks and one steaming westerly toward Duluth. At 9 a. m. the morning of the stamp sale, there were 165,000 requests for cancellation of the stamp. At 2 p. m. the same day, the requests for cancellation of the stamp had reached one-fourth of a million. It was estimated that the Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., post office would possibly cancel up to 1 million stamps on the first day's issue.

The Postmaster General delivered the main address, which I am including with my remarks. Undoubtedly this masterpiece will become a part of the first chapter of the second volume of the history of the Soo locks.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include therein the address of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield on the opening day of the centennial celebration of the Soo locks:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD AT SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH., JUNE 28, 1955

We stand at a signicant milestone in American and Canadian history—the centennial of the Soo locks.

Behind us is a century of achievement that began with the pioneers whose foresight and enterprise transformed a wilderness river into a great artery of transportation.

But our past—a magnificent record of accomplishment—only faintly foreshadows the mighty strides in every human good that the people of this continent can make, joined in partnership with like-minded peoples around the globe.

Before us lies a future that is limitless in its promise of an abundant prosperity, for the United States; for Canada; for all free nations.

The Soo—a cardinal agent in the unlocking of continental riches—will be a potent agent in the unlocking of the free world's potential for human betterment.

As a native of Michigan, quite naturally I am proud that the Post Office Department is issuing a commemorative postage stamp in honor of this centennial celebration.

The 110 million 3-cent stamps that we are issuing for this occasion will be a constant reminder through years to come of the wisdom and the courage of those great men who made this achievement possible: Charles T. Harvey, who inspired the entire project;

James Joy; the Fairbank brothers, and a host of other dedicated men who triumphed over discouragement and adversity and built here a major channel to economic growth for the continent.

Yet—broad as his vision was—I cannot believe that Charles T. Harvey could possibly have foreseen the tremendous future that lay in store for the Soo.

Today these are the most important set of locks ever built by man. Here is the busiest canal in the world. In 9 months of the year, the Soo locks handle almost as much cargo as do the Panama and Suez Canals combined in 12.

In the dark days of World War II, the Soo was the chief link in a lifeline that stretched from the Middle West to the battlefronts of the entire world. This was then the most heavily guarded and protected area in America. No other section compared with it in strategic importance. On these locks depended victory and freedom.

More than that: They are, in fact, a showcase of freedom—of free men, citizens of two independent nations, using together their talent, and energy, and initiative, risking their private capital for a public purpose and international benefit.

When the pioneer builders undertook to build these locks they stretched out their hands for tools—not for Government subsidies.

They were subsidized only by their own determination, their own courage, and their own faith in the boundless future of our two countries.

I doubt that they ever thought of failure. But if they had failed, there would have been no soothing application of taxpayer dollars to ease the pain.

The responsibility of such failure would have rested completely on their shoulders—and there was nobody to lighten that burden or to shift it to others.

The Soo locks are one of the great examples of private enterprise in this hemisphere.

Now, we have reached a milestone in history. It is entirely natural that we should look back and consider the way we have traveled. But it is proper that we consider the way we shall travel.

What does the future hold for us?

It has never looked so bright—so clear—so promising.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, who led a wartime crusade against the Communist, the defeatist, and the neutralist, now leads a third crusade—for a better and stronger and greater America; for a world of peace and justice and freedom among men.

And in this third crusade, he will be once again the triumphant leader.

The American people know that he will not rest until his full share of the job is done.

He now works on a daring, dynamic campaign to harness the atom for the peaceful service of mankind. The Soo, the hemisphere, the entire free world will reap a golden harvest from his proposals.

Before us, we see mighty advances in the standards of living, the increase of leisure, the welfare of humanity.

Under the leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower, we already have moved far.

Here in the United States the economy has never been stronger than it is today, and the economy is based on production for peace—it is not dependent on the spurious hypodermic of wartime expenditures.

Manufacturing productivity increased this year by 6 percent over last year—as contrasted with the average increase of 4 percent in the years immediately following World War II.

This increase reflects industry's huge capital investments in new plants and equipment. These investments, in turn, demonstrate industry's unlimited faith in America and in the ability and integrity of an administration led by a great President.

Labor and management relations are better than ever before. In the automobile industry, for instance, long strides have been taken to insure permanent progress. As a result, we can confidently expect an all-time record of production this year. Almost certainly our production lines will build more than 7 million passenger cars by the year's end—almost half a million more than were produced in 1950.

Seven million passenger cars in 1 year—that is more than the entire industry produced in all the years prior to World War I.

Every index of economic activity shows that we have either regained or exceeded our previous highs.

Every indication we have shows that 1955 will be the greatest year in history for our national economy.

And, I repeat, this will be peacetime prosperity—not wartime inflation.

Here in Michigan—and this applies with equal force to our good neighbors across the border—the future looks brighter than anywhere else in the world.

The St. Lawrence seaway—when it is completed and the Soo Locks are widened—will enable 3 out of 4 ocean-going ships to make Duluth a port of call.

Our inland cities will become thriving seaports.

Our steel industry—essential to Soo prosperity—faces an unprecedented inflow of orders. Ahead, undoubtedly, is a major expansion of our steel mills.

During the next 25 years more tonnage will pass through these locks than during the entire first century of their existence.

And when the great Mackinac Bridge is finished—thus perfecting the arteries of transportation between the rich and productive central sections of the United States and Canada—the pattern for our future joint economic prosperity and cooperation will be at last complete.

So, for us here in Michigan—and for our good friends and neighbors in Canada—the future today is without precedent in the past. The possibilities are immeasurable in traditional terms.

Here in the United States this happy state of affairs has not come about by accident. It is the result of careful planning. It is the fruit of integrity in administering the Nation's business.

To Washington, Dwight Eisenhower brought men and women—great in mind and heart and vision—to work on the problems of the Nation Inspired by his genius, his love of America, his tremendous integrity, they dedicated themselves to their task.

His program in domestic and foreign policy is, consequently, a safe, sure chart to prosperity and to a peace that will be just and lasting. Already, a new climate of hope and confidence and optimism is its offspring.

Never in generations have people had so much faith in our economy—our Government—our future.

Never before in history have so many people had so many of the good things in life.

We are fortunate indeed to live in such an age as this.

But Canada and the United States—alone—cannot achieve either the richest prosperity or the stoutest security.

The free world must be a market place for all free nations. Their peoples must be our friends and our partners.

With them we must labor in many fields:

That we may come to know each other better and understand each other with a deeper sympathy.

That we may enrich each other by a more free exchange in thought and trade and travel.

That we may bind ourselves together more tightly in the defense of human freedom against those who by force and fraud would destroy it.

That we come to realize more sharply the common humanity, the common aspirations, the common goals that are rooted in our common brotherhood.

The future is infinite in promise. But, as we stand on the threshold of a bright new age—the age of atoms for peace—let us not be infected with the withering contagion of false pride.

There will be days to test our spirit.

They shall not shake us, if we are men and women of faith—faith in ourselves; in our two countries; in the providence of Almighty God whose guiding hand is seen throughout the history of men and of nations, aiding those who strive for righteousness and justice and mercy.

In that faith, every day, may we humbly thank God, the Author of all our benefits, that He has seen fit to bless us with vast resources of His making.

And may we pray the Almighty that He endow our two countries with an abundance of the greatest of all His natural resources—men of stature, men of courage, of vision, of integrity—men like those who conceived and brought to completion the Soo Locks, transforming a wilderness into an empire of material and cultural and spiritual richness.

It is now my pleasure to present special albums, each containing an autographed sheet of the new commemorative Soo Locks stamps, to—

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States.

Louis S. St. Laurent, Premier of Canada.

The University of Michigan, Dr. Harlan Hatcher, president.

Victor A. Knox, United States House of Representatives.

Herbert Smale, mayor, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada.

James B. Robertson, mayor, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and president, Soo Locks Centennial Corp.

John A. Curran, Chairman, Soo Ontario Locks Centennial Committee, Ontario, Canada.

Roy D. Hollingsworth, Chairman, United States Soo Locks Centennial Commission.

George A. Osborn, chairman, Michigan Soo Locks Centennial Commission.

Chippewa County Historical Society, Miss Myrtle Elliott, president.

Carnegie Library, Miss Alice Clapp, librarian.

Clifford Aune, superintendent, St. Marys Falls canals.

Verne Biggings, postmaster, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada.

Mrs. Mary Ripley, postmaster, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.

Joseph Patton, lockman, Soo locks, the employee now active with longest service record.

George Tardiff, rural carrier, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., Post Office, the employee now active with longest service record.

Robert C. Kline, Jr., chairman, Soo locks commemorative stamp luncheon.

Stanley R. Pratt, chairman, Soo locks commemorative stamp day.

An Open Letter to a Little Brain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in too many communities there still remain traces of bigotry and hatred. One of the outstanding publishers of my district, Mr. Al S. Waxman, recently wrote an editorial in an-

swer to a letter received reportedly from one of his readers. The depth of understanding and feeling which this editorial contains has prompted much comment throughout my district and I feel that it will be much appreciated by many others who have the opportunity to see and read it. I, therefore, include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, that it might have wider circulation:

AN OPEN LETTER TO A LITTLE BRAIN

(By Al S. Waxman)

Mrs. WILSON: The members of my staff who read your letter suggested that I throw it in the wastebasket, where we put all anonymous and stupid letters, but I am publishing your letter herewith, so that the community might know that among us lives a stupid, bigoted, small-brained excuse for a person. First, I am going to publish your letter so that our 150,000 readers might know what has infuriated me. The letter reads as follows:

"Mr. WAXMAN: Reading your Reporter I noticed an article about the 14-year-old boys who held up the grocery store. I can't understand why you didn't give the names of the boys. Why shield them? They should be exposed, instead of shielded. Or is it because they are Jews?

"Mrs. WILSON."

For your information, Mrs. Wilson, if this is your name, there exists a city ordinance in Los Angeles to protect juveniles. Yes, even those who get in trouble. That law specifies that the police department may not divulge the names and addresses of youngsters who have broken the law. At the same time, newspapermen make no effort to find these names, which they very easily could do, because they, too, feel that a boy at the age of 14 might be saved from a horrible future.

You might not understand this, Mrs. Wilson, but there is a great deal of kindness and humanity in this world. There are more people, and thank God for them, who believe in the Biblical expression "I am my brother's keeper" than there are of your ilk. These people are not altogether concerned with the act committed by the youngsters, but with the reasons behind this act. It might be that this boy, or these boys, have come from a home which is bad environment, as yours probably would be. It might be that they have a mother who is filled with jealousy, envy, greed and hatred, as you probably are, Mrs. Wilson. This condition is not conducive toward raising good children.

In 25 years of reporting, this writer has come in contact with many fine men on the juvenile squad of the Los Angeles Police Department. These men have shown us, time and time again, that they are more concerned with saving the youngster from his possible future than they are with condemning him for his present act.

Right here in the city of Los Angeles there are a number of outstanding citizens in the various trades and professions who at one time or another came in contact with the police juvenile department while they were youngsters. Once straightened out, they went along the straight and narrow path to become good and useful citizens. For this we are all thankful.

There exists in the county of Los Angeles a committee on human relations and this group makes every effort to establish happy relationships between the various people in the county, whether they be minors or adults. You could do well to contact this group and ask them how you might develop your little brain so that it could fit into the modern trend of times. No, Mrs. Wilson (?), we didn't publish the names of the boys, and we are truly proud of the fact. Our readers were appraised of the fact that a crime had been committed and that the culprits had been brought to justice. We knew that our readers wouldn't have the morbid curiosity which you display. For all we know, Mrs. Wilson (?), their name might have been Wilson. We doubt it, though, because the Wilsons whom we know are truly fine people. We can't understand why you picked that name to sign to an anonymous letter. Of course you understand that we don't believe your name is "Wilson."

Government Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, one illustration out of many possible ones of Government waste is expressed in a recent editorial in the Bridgeton Evening News by W. E. Middleton, and the message it brings us is that we have got to give detailed consideration to a great many recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and particularly in respect to the buying practices of the Department of Defense. The editorial follows:

GOVERNMENT WASTE

The United States Government is a pretty large concern, and because it is a concern of such dimensions its affairs should be conducted on a strictly business basis, otherwise the possibility of disastrous waste is so apparent as to be appalling. Not only is this opportunity apparent, but it has been made use of as a few facts quoted below will abundantly substantiate. No less a person than Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson is quoted as saying that, "It doesn't require dishonesty or stealing to bring this about, it can be easily done through lack of business methods in administration." Former President Herbert Hoover recognized this fact, hence his assault on the Government's business methods, leading to his appointment as head of the Commission to place the business of the Government on such a basis.

This Commission has had several months to complete the job and the public is becoming somewhat impatient for the complete report.

But for some of the examples of waste, well, here are samples and plenty more are available:

In 1951 the Army purchased 875,000 pounds of tomatoes in California for shipment to the Atlantic coast. The same year the Navy purchased nearly 800,000 pounds of tomatoes for shipment to California. Now business administration would never tolerate such waste of time and freight charges as this. The Army would have purchased its tomatoes on the Atlantic coast and the Navy would have supplied its needs from California growers.

The Government now finds itself with $3 billion worth of unused Army clothing on its hands. Through what kind of lack of business methods was all this surplus clothing accumulated?

To have accumulated all this surplus clothing was bad enough, but the waste does not end there. It costs $33 million annually in interest and storage charges to hold such a huge pile of needless clothing.

Then the Government is in the real-estate business on a losing basis. In short, by one means or another, it has come into possession of a lot of real estate for which it has no use. To hold on to this real estate means the employment of several thousand employees at a cost of many millions annually.

The waste in these cases, and they are only samples, runs into the hundreds of millions annually and proves beyond question the need of business in government.

Making all due allowances for the creeping into Government jobs of derelicts and misfits, there is no excuse for such waste as this and shows the great need of a complete overhauling of our Government machinery.

Red Peace Moves Show Our Policies Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this week the House has voted to extend the draft, strengthen our Reserve forces, and render assistance to other countries who are ready to stand with us in the struggle we face. There can be no doubt that such evidence of firmness on the part of the Congress in backing up the President is bound to bring home to the attention of any would-be aggressor the solidarity and unity of our people.

The uniformly firm policy which has been pursued by the President and the Secretary of State and the fine results it has achieved are reflected in an editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, which, under leave to extend my remarks, follows:

RED PEACE MOVES SHOW OUR POLICIES WORK

Mr. Dulles adroitly pointed out Friday that the recent gestures toward peace by the Soviets merely underlined the success of American foreign policy.

The Communists may now be kicking themselves for having created that policy. For as Mr. Dulles said, everything of which Molotov complained in his speech was done merely in reaction against the Reds' aggressive attitude and actions.

Russia can have peace, Mr. Dulles said, any time she will drop her program of expansion by force and subversion. This is boiling the whole situation down to the one point that means anything. When the Reds shove others around, they are making peace impossible. All the words that Molotov or the whole Kremlin hierarchy can employ cannot hide the facts.

This was one of the bluntest speeches Mr. Dulles ever made. His bluntness did not mean, however, that he has no hopes for further progress toward peace. The same pressures that have made the Russians change their tactics in recent months will go on exerting force on the top Reds.

The fact that democracy and freedom work well while communism is a brokendown, badly operating machine provides the greatest pressure. While prosperity thrives in Western Europe and America struggles with problems of surpluses, the Russian citizen remains poorly fed, badly housed, and lives under constant threat and abuse.

Now that the western armament stymies the use of force by the Russians, they must settle down to make their ideology operate. For this, the Reds need peace. They need trade, they need help from the more advanced nations. So the chances are that

despite diatribes by Molotov, they will continue to make peaceful gestures.

But true peace will only come as Secretary Dulles has outlined. When the Soviets stop trying to reshape the rest of the world and pay attention to running their own nation, peace will be automatic. It will not come by paper agreements, easily broken, or by meetings at any level. But when the Bolsheviks unshackle the chains of the peoples they have enslaved, they will have made a start toward true peace.

Fifty-ninth Anniversary of Twin Shaft Mine Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorial by John C. Kehoe, Sr., appearing in the Sunday Dispatch, Pittston, Pa., of June 26, 1955, marking June 28, 1955, the 59th anniversary of the terrible mine disaster which occurred in Twin Shaft, Upper Pittston, Pa.:

(By John C. Kehoe, Sr.)

HARDING, PA., June 26, 1955.—The month of June always brings to my mind the tragic day in June 1896, when the terrible disaster occurred in Twin Shaft, Upper Pittston—a disaster that buried alive 58 men and boys including my father, my brother Frank and my uncle, Thomas Barrett.

Next Tuesday, June 28, is the 59th anniversary of that catastrophe. Like so many things, the Twin Shaft disaster is remembered less and less as the children and other close relatives of its victims die off, so I made plans to have a memorial high mass said at St. Mary's Help of Christian Church at Pittston Junction, at 8 o'clock next Tuesday morning for the victims of the disaster.

At the time the disaster occurred the Twin Shaft was operated by the Newton Coal Mining Co. Later the property was sold to Lehigh Valley Coal Co., and for a number of years past it has been operated by Kehoe-Berge Coal Co. The bodies of the 58 victims were never recovered, and the area in which they are entombed is so badly caved and flooded with water that it never will be possible to get to them.

Three terrific sounds like explosions about 3 o'clock on Sunday morning, June 28, 1896, wakened people in greater Pittston. The fire gongs were sounded and soon the whole community knew of the disaster that had hit us. I was one of the first to go down the shaft in the rescue attempt, and I will never forget the awful feeling as I went in that mine, knowing that my father, brother and uncle, and many of my buddies were trapped behind or under the fallen roof. Neither will I ever forget the weeping wives and mothers and children who waited around the shaft opening during the days of our rescue efforts—begging us each time we came out for the word of hope that we could never give. So far as I know, everyone who went in the mines on those rescue parties is now dead with the exception of Billy Lee of Prospect Street, Pittston, and myself. We were two of the youngest in the rescue party. We were merely young boys at that time.

The 58 victims of that disaster are listed below. They have many descendants and other relatives living in greater Pittston.

M. J. Langan, M. T. Lynott, Alex McCormick, Thomas Tenpenny, Michael Hughes, Cornelius McGuire, John Gill, Thomas W. O'Brien, Thomas Carden, John O'Boyle, James Golden, James McDonald.

Edward Delaney, Peter Martin, Anthony Teleskie, Sylvester Dooner, Anthony Gordon, Michael Ford, Timothy Derrig.

Daniel Ward, Thomas Gaffney, Patrick Ruane, Peter Zavatskie, Joseph Zerinda, Andrew Slavinskie, John Highstrick, Adam Zmuiden, Simon Mosock.

Frank Sheoskie, James Wall, John Kehoe, James Daley, John Hart, Thomas Duigg, Peter Bukoskie, Michael Connell, Patrick Bolin, Dominick O'Malley.

James Costello, Thomas Barrett, Peter Joyce, Thomas Murphy, Anthony Kane, Anthony Covoleskie, Mathias Teleskie, Anthony Mohinskie, John Gaffney, Edward Gildea.

Owen Lee, Thomas Wall, Michael Gaughan, Patrick Kelly, Martin Gilbride, Frank Kehoe, Robert Haston, M. J. Burke, James Burke, John Calamis.

May God rest their souls.

The American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate another anniversary of our Independence Day, I hope everyone will take time out to reflect on the many blessings and privileges that have been ours, both as a Nation, and as individuals, during these years of our independence. We have heard much of the hardships and sufferings behind the Iron Curtain, where the freedoms we take for granted are practically nonexistent. However, it frequently takes a firsthand account from someone who has experienced this loss of freedom, to bring us to a realization of what the loss of these privileges and rights can mean, and to a deeper appreciation of our heritage.

I believe we will all find the article written by Mr. Igor Blosfelds, a former Latvian, worthy of our careful and thoughtful consideration. This article was published in a recent edition of Locke News, a biweekly publication of the Locke Department of the General Electric Company. Mr. Blosfelds recently received his LL. B. degree from the University of Maryland and is the first displaced person admitted to the Maryland Bar. One month later he became a citizen of the United States. I think it is especially appropriate that his article be placed in the RECORD at this time. It follows:

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE—I AM A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Igor Blosfelds)

Do you realize what a great honor it is to be a citizen of the United States of America?

To be a member of this great family of free men and women is a priceless possession. Its ideals reflect the hopes and aspirations of liberty-loving people down through the centuries. But there are thousands and thousands of people in this world who are not as lucky as you are. They cannot enjoy the God-given, unalienable rights which the Constitution of the United States sets forth as the natural right of all men. I was one of these thousands of people.

Eleven years ago I was a young lawyer in my native country, Latvia. I had just started to make my career in life as a legal counsel for a shipyard and farm machinery factory. But, suddenly all this ended. My native country, Latvia, was occupied by a brutal aggressor—the Soviet Union. Overnight the fundamental principles of freedom, equality, justice and humanity, which I had enjoyed before and even had taken for granted, were destroyed by the Soviet occupation forces. Any organized resistance became hopelessly impossible.

Rights to private property ceased to exist and thousands of people lost their freedom. Within a few days the Soviets managed to destroy the country, and they declared it then part of the Soviet Union.

But the Soviets did not succeed in destroying my faith in God and my belief in freedom and justice. They could destroy the flesh but not the spirit.

I was one of the few thousands who escaped from the hell on earth, and I became a refugee—one of those thousands who are the living witnesses of Soviet cruelties.

And then, a few years later, I was on my way to the United States of America. When the Statue of Liberty and the skyline of New York came into sight, I felt as if I was already a citizen of the United States. But then I thought of the 5 more years of required residency that I would have to wait before this became true.

These 5 years went by fast. I became a member of the Locke family of General Electric and was also given a General Electric scholarship for graduate studies at the University of Maryland Law School.

Then came April 11, 1955. I took the oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and I became a citizen of the United States of America.

This great honor carries with it wonderful rights and privileges, and also the duty to work for and make secure our great country. Let us appreciate these great values.

Do you realize what a wonderful right freedom of thought and speech is? Just think for a moment. We can think as we please, we can speak or write as we please, so long as we do not interfere with the rights of others. Millions of people behind the Iron Curtain are deprived of this fundamental right, and many of them had to pay with their lives when they expressed their thoughts freely.

People sometimes appreciate fully the value of a thing only when they have lost it, and I was no exception.

When I saw Soviet-held elections, where there was only one candidate for each office to be filled—and no free choice, then I appreciated what it means to have the right to vote for a public officer of my own choice, so the government may truly represent the will of the people. Our right to vote is not only a duty but also a great privilege.

Seeking any job for which my experience and ability have fitted me—this wonderful right to choose my work—is one of the most valuable rights. No doubt you have heard about the slave-labor camps behind the Iron Curtain. Who are those people who have to perform slave labor under the Soviet police supervision? They are people like you and me who believe in certain rights and privileges of a citizen. For this "crime" they now have to work in inhuman conditions, separated from their families—and only a few of them survive.

Another fundamental right of an American is the right to bargain with his employer. He can do this through his union if one exists where he works. Or, if there is no union, he still has this right to bargain as an

individual. The Soviet workers would be happy to have this right, particularly if they were protected by law so that no one could fire them if they refused to join a union, nor refuse to give them a job for the same reason. Of course, these rights are wholly denied to the worker of the Soviet Union.

If ever a Soviet worker should take into his head to protest, there is always only one solution—forced-labor camps are plentiful in the Soviet Union.

Freedom of religion: I have the right to worship as I think best. We can attend the church services of our preference. Can you imagine that your Sunday morning walk to the church of your choice and your participation in the services could be called a crime? I have seen this happen under Soviet rule, where churchgoers as well as ministers and priests were arrested.

Should I ever be accused of a crime I have the right, as an American citizen, to a prompt trial by jury. You may ask: Is this a privilege? Yes; and a very important one. I have seen thousands of people arrested by the Soviet police—and that was the last I ever heard of them. All efforts of their relatives to find out their whereabouts were in vain. No arraignment, no trial, no due process of the law. These people were just erased from this world. Their only crime was that they did not believe in communism, and they had no court where they could seek justice. Many of my relatives and friends were "erased" this way by the Soviet police.

These are only a few of the most fundamental rights of a United States citizen. There are many more important rights and privileges, and nowhere else in the world does a person have a better opportunity to exercise the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Let us appreciate these great values. I know what it means to be deprived of these rights and I, therefore, cherish even more these values which are consistent with the democratic way of life.

But these precious rights include a solemn responsibility: The duty to maintain and advance the principles and ideals upon which the United States of America was founded and built, so our great Republic will always remain the land of the free and the home of the brave.

The Baltimore Sun of June 30 carried an interesting article on Mr. Blosfelds which I would also like to include at this point:

LATVIAN LAWYER, FORMER DISPLACED PERSON, RESUMES PROFESSIONAL LIFE

The first formerly displaced person admitted to the Maryland bar, Igors Blosfelds, a 33-year-old Latvian-born immigrant who has lived under both Stalin's and Hitler's dictatorships, at last has been able to continue his long-interrupted law career.

Between the time he graduated in law from the University of Riga and the time he joined two University of Maryland Law School classmates to set up the firm of Erlich, Evelius, Blosfelds in south Baltimore, 11 years of difficulties intervened.

CONSCRIPTED BY GERMANS

His first professional experience, as legal counsel to a Latvian shipyard and a farm machinery factory, was short lasting. This was in 1944, when the capital of his country was still occupied by the Germans but was already threatened by the imminent return of the Russians.

The Germans conscripted the young lawyer and assigned him to forced labor, first clearing air-raid debris in Bremen, then packing what he thought were parts for tanks in a factory in German-occupied Czechoslovakia.

This displacement, though unwelcome at the time, proved to be a lucky break. It enabled him to be liberated by the United States Third Army.

After a succession of administrative jobs in United States-operated camps for displaced persons, Mr. Blosfelds was able to migrate to the United States under the Displaced Persons Act.

The Lutheran Federation arranged sponsorship for him and for his mother, Dr. Valentine Blosfelds, and his sister, Dr. Irina Lotti, who had been practicing medicine in other displaced-persons camps in Germany.

Dr. Lotti, who preceded Mr. Blosfelds to this country, now lives in La Plata, Md. His mother lives with him at 400 Edgewood Road, in Ashburton.

AWARDED SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. Blosfeld's first jobs in Baltimore included selling vacuum cleaners from door to door and working as a clerk and a mechanic's helper. His Riga degree and the fact that he could speak French, German, Latvian, and Russian, as well as fluent English, did not seem to be much help to him.

His fortunes began to improve when he got a job with the Locke department of the General Electric Co., in Baltimore. The company awarded him a scholarship to study law at night.

He graduated in June 1954, and took his State bar exams last March, 1 month before being sworn in as a citizen of the United States.

Comparing the two phase of his law training, in Riga and here, he said his two schools have "very different approaches: The University of Riga gives one a broader theoretical background; the University of Maryland is more practical."

Interviewed in his south Baltimore office, where he already had plenty of mail on his desk, he said that he is very grateful for all the help that people here have given in getting him reestablished in his chosen profession.

GIRL FROM CLEVELAND

"Few people here can possibly realize fully what it means to enjoy American freedom if they themselves haven't ever had to live under any form of totalitarian rule," he said.

Among those who do fully appreciate freedom are his associates of the Latvian Society of Baltimore. He is an active member of the organization and represented it on the Baltic Council of Baltimore, which observed Baltic States Day on June 15.

Mr. Blosfelds will continue for the time being to work at his old job with Locke as well as developing his law practice in the evenings.

But he doesn't work incessantly—not quite. He turned aside from the affairs of his general practice, matters such as immigration, real estate, accidents, and bankruptcy at least 1 night last week.

"An important case at the airport," he said. "But not a client. It's a girl from Cleveland."

Federal Aid to This State Near Lowest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper article appearing in the recent publication of the Sunday Independent, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., which reveals from a survey made by the Council of State Governments that the national average of Federal aid per capita is $17, but the figure for Pennsylvania is only $10.03.

FEDERAL AID TO THIS STATE NEAR LOWEST

HARRISBURG.—Of all the States only New Jersey receives a lower return in the form of Federal aid per capita than Pennsylvania, it was learned last week.

According to the Department of Commerce, a survey made by the Council of State Governments shows that the national average of Federal aid per capita is $17, but the figure for Pennsylvania is only $10.03.

CALIFORNIA HIGH

As a point of comparison the department gave these figures for other States: California, $23.36; Texas, $19.17; Massachusetts $16.67; Michigan, $15.01; and New York, $13.06.

Pennsylvania is third lowest among the States in the percent which Federal aid bears to the total income of its people. Only Connecticut and New Jersey show a lower percentage than the .59 percent of income which is returned to Pennsylvania.

The average for the United States is 1.08 percent. Twelve States receive a return of more than 2 percent and one of more than 3 percent of their total income payments.

"In more than one respect the proportionately low Federal payments received by Pennsylvania provide evidence of the State's ability to conduct all its governmental affairs on its own resources," the department commented.

Medicine's Proclamation of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the opening of the annual convention of the American Medical Association in Atlantic City, N. J., on June 7, 1955, the invocation was pronounced by Rabbi Martin M. Weitz of Beth Israel Temple of Atlantic City. Since I feel it is worthy of the attention of the House, I am including herewith a copy of that invocation:

INVOCATION FOR MEDICINE'S PROCLAMATION ON FAITH, INAUGURAL EVENING OF AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, CONVENTION HALL, ATLANTIC CITY, JUNE 7, 1955

(By Rabbi Martin M. Weitz, Beth Israel Temple of Atlantic City)

O Source Divine, Lord of All Creation:

We have been but preservers of health rather than creators of well-being.

We have put conformity to old customs above curiosity, above new ideas.

We have thought more about our subject than about our object.

We have been peddlers of petty accuracies when we should have been priests and prophets of abundant living and radiant health.

We have counted knowledge more precious than wisdom; surgery more wizardry than healing.

We have tried to teach our students what to think instead of how to think; our nurses what to do instead of how to do; our docotrs what to discover by specialization than how to recover total health.

We have thought it our business to furnish the minds of our students when we should have been laboring to free their minds, and furnish the interior of our hospitals when

we should be devoted to the health of our patients.

May we realize that it is important to know the past only that we may live wisely in the present.

Help us to be more interested in stimulating the builders of modern sanctuaries than in retailing to students the glories of ancient temples; in creating more stately mansions of healing than in prefabricated institutions of health.

May we be shepherds of the spirit as well as masters of the mind; healers of broken hopes as well as menders of broken bones.

Help us, O Lord of Health, to know Thy way when we study Thy word. When we study geology, to learn that it leads us not only to the ages of rocks but to the Rock of Ages; when we study botany, that it helps us find Thine imprint on the lily of the valley and the rose of Sharon; when we study geography, that it helps us find Thy spirit on the very current of life unto the ocean beyond life; when we study astronomy, that it helps us find Thee as the morning star of life itself; when we study medicine, that it be for greater harmony among parts of men, as well as among men of parts.

Help us, O Source of Wisdom, Supreme Becoming as well as Supreme Being, to translate human being into human becoming; to know that the world rests upon three things—truth, justice, and peace—for where there is no truth there can be no justice, even where there is no justice there can be no peace.

Enlighten Thou our minds with the knowledge of truth; ennoble Thou our hearts with the promptings of justice; endow Thou our hands with the tasks of peace—for the greater health of the greater number; for Thy mission of mercy unto each of us.

Help us to understand what the ancient proverb tells us for today: "I have learned much from my parents, more from my teachers, but most have I learned from my pupils"; and also that he who helps save a life labors with Thee in Thy workshop.

O Source of All Health and Happiness, Master Physician of Mankind, help us help others always and thus serve Thee always. When one has mud on his feet, to remove that mud; when one has blood on his hands, to cleanse that blood; when one has pains of body, to heal that body; when one has fears in his heart, to remove those fears; when one has tears in his eyes, to dry those tears. Amen.

Naive Newsmen and the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 1, 1955:

NAIVE NEWSMEN AND THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Citizens of the United States of America can be grouped roughly into 3 categories with respect to the Communist conspiracy:

One, those who became Communists and are still Communists; two, those who became Communists, regained their senses and repudiated the party; three, those who never fell for the Commie line at all.

For the first group we have only revulsion and contempt. For the second we are baffled by their judgment but we respect their courage.

For the third group—vast bulk of the Nation—we have confidence in their calm common sense which has remained the bedrock of American strength and principle during two dizzy decades of ideological nonsense peddled as "liberalism."

During the past few days we have seen two prominent newsmen make confessions to the Senate Internal Security Committee: Winston Burdett, CBS correspondent at the U. N., and Charles Grutzner, of the New York Times. Both made a clean breast of their activities. Especially Burdett, who frankly admitted serving as a Soviet spy.

We do not hail these men as heroes. We do credit their sincerity, accept their professions of loyalty and commend their patriotism in helping the Senate committee expose the Red network in this country. Burdett's testimony in particular tied in with that of Elizabeth Bentley and other former Reds who told the truth, only to be persecuted by left-wingers who still occupy some key posts in United States publicity channels.

Why did newsmen as supposedly experienced and sophisticated as Burdett and Grutzner fall for the Red line in the first place? Burdett says he was "emotionally compelled to identify myself with a larger cause outside myself which I believe to be a good one." Grutzner says he was interested in promoting civil rights, thought the Reds were, too, and believed it when they told him the Communist Party was just a political party like the GOP or the Democrats.

How naive could you get back in the 1930's? Especially after the Stalin-Hitler pact? And after the hoop-jumping of Red leaders here to Moscow's orders? We don't know the full answer. And neither apparently do Burdett, Grutzner, and so many others who had to learn about Communism the hard way.

In any case, they have done a good service. And everyone should be on guard. The smear brigade of the fifth amendment takers will soon be out in force to try to discredit them. As "informers." Which is to say, those who tell the truth.

Off the Beaten Path

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, members of your Committee on Agriculture conducted hearings in Jonesboro, Ark., on Monday of this week, and in the Tuesday, June 28, issue of the Jonesboro Sun, in a regular column written by members of the newspaper editorial staff called Off the Beaten Path, there appeared a story which will be of interest to the House.

I might point out that this hearing met with widespread favor among the farmers of the Midsouth, and the editorial comment contained in the article is highly complimentary of the fine Representatives who attended the hearings.

A portion of the credit for the success of this hearing must go to the fine newspapers and radio stations in the Midsouth who made announcement of this meeting and who carried such complete and accurate accounts of the meeting. These news stories aided in informing many people who could not attend or who could not get into the hearings. The meeting was conducted in the Craighead County Courthouse, a commodious building, but so many farmers attended that not all could get in. For this reason the outstanding reporting by the newspapers rendered a signal service both to the Members and to the citizens.

The article reads as follows:

[From the Jonesboro (Ark.) Sun of June 28, 1955]

OFF THE BEATEN PATH

(By the Sun Staff)

CONGRESSMEN

United States Representatives were swarming all over the place Monday, here to conduct a hearing on farm policies. From all reports, they made quite an impression.

Listening to the Congressmen ask questions and discuss problems with men who do the farming, we came to the conclusion that they're a pretty sharp lot. We decided also that if more such congressional hearings were conducted out in the field, so to speak, the feeling of the people toward Congressmen in general might improve. The group here Monday certainly earned the respect of those who met or heard them.

NEIGHBORS

It is always a mystery to us why people away from home try to discover they have some affiliation with the locality in which they are visiting. The Congressmen are no different from anyone else in that respect. Here are some of the statements the solons made at the chamber of commerce breakfast Monday morning: "I have a reason to like Arkansas, because"—

Representative OLIN (TIGER) TEAGUE of Texas, a comparatively young man to head the extremely important House Veterans' Affairs Committee, explained that he lived 13 years at Mena in western Arkansas, married a Mena girl, his mother still lives there, and his 9-year-old daughter is visiting there now. Incidentally, Representative TEAGUE tried in vain Sunday night and all day Monday to get in contact with local veteran officials, but they all seemed to be out of town or could not be reached.

HIS TEACHER

Representative BOB HARRISON, of Nebraska, told the group that shortly after being sent to Congress following a special election in 1951, he got a letter from a lady at Siloam Springs asking if he had a brother named Leo, etc. If so, she wanted to be identified as the lady who started him on the ladder of success. It was his first school teacher, he learned.

Immediately upon arrival here, Representative HARRISON wanted to know how far it was to Siloam Springs. He couldn't make the jaunt this trip, "but I'm coming back to Arkansas to visit her. She was Miss Lena Pearson, but now she is Mrs. Sampson," he related.

HIS OPPONENT

Representative HARLAN HAGEN, a balding young man who knows his cotton, is from California, a State which has been right in the middle of the cotton control and quota fight. His tie with Arkansas is different. "I had to beat an Arkansan to go to Washington. My opponent was Roy Riales, of Mena, who moved back to Arkansas and is now one of your State senators," he stated. Riales was living in California.

And for you cotton farmers, Representative HAGEN said he thought the cotton expansion program had reached its peak in California, though there probably would be a little more expansion in Nevada and Arizona.

Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN discovered that Dr. Carl Reng, president of Arkansas State College, is a native of his district and that Dr. Reng's mother lives only 40 miles from his hometown. The Con-

gressman is going to visit her on his next trip home.

HIS VOTERS

Representative PAUL C. JONES, of Missouri, topped them all, though. "You know, my district and your district are probably the most alike in the country. I live in Dunklin County. Four counties in the First Congressional District of Arkansas touch my district—Craighead, Clay, Greene, and Mississippi.

"I feel like I have some constituents in Arkansas, because there probably are some people living in Arkansas who vote for me in the Missouri elections," he quipped.

Just one big happy family—until the issues get taut. Somebody drew the line yesterday, and Representative ROBERT LOVRE, of South Dakota, was quick to turn it into a laugh. The 7 Democrats all wound up on the right side of the Speaker's stand and the 3 Republicans on the left. "I see you all still believe in segregation," said Representative LOVRE, with a big broad grin.

Required Amendments to Refugee Relief Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter I have received from Commissioner Patrick A. Thompkins, Department of Public Welfare, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, registering his interest in gaining the requested amendments to the Refugee Relief Act as asked by the President, so that the act's objectives can be achieved:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Boston, June 28, 1955.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: In addition to my official position as Commissioner of Public Welfare for the Commonwealth and a direct concern for 6,000 neglected and dependent children in the care of the Department, I have also been honored by appointment to the Governor's Commission on Refugees for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Officially, also, the Department is the clearance agency for all refugee children or foreign adoptions by proxy, or children admitted to this State for purposes of either sponsorship or adoption from foreign countries.

With other members of our Massachusetts commission and also as an American citizen, I have been gravely concerned with the legal impediments in the current Refugee Act which have so greatly contributed to a frustration of the intent of the act rather than its implementation to rapid admission of displaced persons within the period of time covered by current legislation.

Like other Americans of goodwill, I warmly applauded the recommendations of the President of the United States to the Congress for amendments to the current act. These amendments, if enacted, will greatly strengthen and assist the work of sponsorship agencies, particularly the Church World Service, the War Relief National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Massachusetts Lutheran Committee, and the International Rescue Committee, Inc., in securing sponsorship for refugees now so hungrily eyeing the opportunities that could be made available to them in the United States.

Both as an official officer holder of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and as a member of the Governor's Commission on Refugees in the Commonwealth, I urge your favorable consideration of President Eisenhower's 10 amendments to the current Refugee Act.

Very truly yours,
PATRICK A. TOMPKINS,
Commissioner.

The Manufacture of Panama Hats in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a constituent of mine, Mr. I. Benjamin Parrill, of Dallas, president of the Adam Hat Manufacturers, Inc., was in Washington recently, and during his visit here he was interviewed by Fred Othman, columnist for the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Mr. Othman, exercising his well-known ability to be amusing and informative at the same time, wrote an article about Mr. Parrill and the hat-manufacturing business which I commend to the attention of the Senators. I ask unanimous consent that this article, as published in the Washington Daily News of June 27, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I had on my fine, new imported-from-Italy chocolate-colored Milan straw hat, with navy-blue band, when I ran into my friend from Dallas, Tex., I. Benjamin Parrill.

He, being president of the Adam Hat Manufacturers, Inc., took a long, hard look at my hat. He said would I mind letting him see it. I handed it to him and when he started turning it inside out, I told him to be careful. After all, it cost $15.

So he examined the interior of the sweat band and the center of the crown and he said:

"Ah, ha, you're wearing a hat from Red China."

This, I can tell my fellow proprietors of Milan straw, was a jolt. Hatter Parrill said no telling how many millions of Communist hats were being worn in America this summer by innocents like me.

He said the Italians these many years have been making first-class hats from Milan straw.

"And then back before the war they discovered that they could buy a better grade of straw from China, cheaper than they could grow their own," he continued. "This trade between China and Italy continued during the Korean war and it still continues."

He said that up until this year American hatters imported from Ecuador $3.5 million worth of panama hats annually. Came the fad for dark straws and the business now has fallen off to one-third.

His own firm, which is the biggest of panama hat importers, now has 700 people at work in a factory at Corsicana, Tex., finishing and blocking hats, mostly Panamas. If the business gets worse about half of them, he said, will lose their jobs. He fears it'll get much worse.

"The trouble is that the reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Ecuador will expire on July 16," he said. "This will raise the tariff on panama hats from 12½ to 25 percent ad valorem and it'll just about push the panama off the American head."

Mr. Parrill said this panama hat business probably didn't mean much in the general scheme of things, but that it was important in Ecuador and also in Corsicana.

So he's been talking to his Senators, his Congressman, the tariff people, and the State Department. They've all been very nice, he said, but mostly they've been inclined to shunt him along to the next fellow. What happens to panamas he still has no clear idea.

He's also got troubles involving winter hats, which are made from Australian rabbit fur. No other rabbits are so good for hats. These Australian bunnies got so thick, Parrill said, that the Government there inoculated them with disease germs. Now they're dying by the drove, and the price of felt fur is skyrocketing, and the rabbit disease is spreading. It's already reached England, he said.

Mr. Parrill was wearing one of his own panamas, unbleached. It was gray in color and, according to him, the most comfortable summer hat of all. On account of all the small holes, he said. My Milan, in addition to being communistic, he said, is hot because it's tightly woven.

Now We Ditch a Rocket Wizard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, within recent days, Mr. Joseph Alsop, the well-known newspaper columnist, published an article on the subject of internal security and the relationship of the subject to our immigration and citizenship laws. It is an excellent piece, an arresting piece, entitled "Now We Ditch a Rocket Wizard."

I ask unanimous consent that this interesting article, which discusses a single case typical of scores, and even of hundreds of other cases, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 26, 1955]

NOW WE DITCH A ROCKET WIZARD

(By Joseph Alsop)

The Department of Defense has now suspended the security clearance of Dr. Fritz Zwicky, professor of astrophysics at the California Institute of Technology.

The security of the United States has been triumphantly safeguarded by depriving the United States of the services of one of the world leaders in the vital fields of astrophysics and rocket propulsion. Thus Dr. Zwicky's suspension again raises the ques-

tion whether the so-called security program is not really an insecurity program.

This is not a new question, of course, but it is a much more acute question than most people suppose. To name one other really lurid example, the eager flatfeet came within a hairsbreadth of lifting the security clearance of the President's personal scientific adviser, the great president of Caltech, Dr. Lee Dubridge. The decision to deprive Dr. Dubridge of clearance was in fact tentatively made in the Pentagon some months ago.

The charges against Dr. Dubridge were the usual insubstantial, unsupported, poison-pen-letter stuff. But the flatfeet might have had their way if the Assistant Secretary of Defense in charge of research and development, Donald Quarles, had not grimly warned that every other scientist would automatically leave the Government service along with Dr. Dubridge.

The idiotic harassment of Dr. Dubridge, the shocking injustice done to Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the suspension of Dr. Zwicky form what the flatfeet like to call a pattern.

In the case of Dr. Zwicky, his Swiss citizenship seems to be the main charge against him. In giving notice of the suspension of Dr. Zwicky's clearance, the Defense Department flatfeet indicated that the case would be instantly reopened if the astrophysicist would just take out his American first papers. Dr. Zwicky, however, has an extremely cogent reason for not requesting American citizenship, which he expressed to this reporter with some vigor by telephone from the west coast.

"I would apply for American citizenship tomorrow," he said, "if you did not now have two classes of citizens. If you are a naturalized citizen, you are a second-class citizen. My friend, Prof. Herman Weyl, the great mathematician, became an American citizen without studying the class rules. So his citizenship was taken away because he went to Zurich to lecture and stayed abroad too long. If I am more free as a Swiss than as an American, I stay Swiss."

Such, then, is the nature of the deadlock between the American Government and Dr. Zwicky. From the viewpoint of the national interest, this deadlock is a rather serious matter.

A deadly, unseen race is now going on between this country and the Soviet Union to get there first with the best guided missiles. In winning this race, and especially in the development of the crucial missiles of intercontinental range, no fields of knowledge are more important than astrophysics and rocket propulsion. And Dr. Zwicky is not only one of the tiny group of world leaders in these abstruse fields; he has also proved his value to the Government by important services already rendered.

His contributions to defense projects began in 1943, when he organized the research department of the Aerojet Corp., the largest American company exclusively engaged in rocket development and manufacture. Most rocket projects are still classified, so that no results of Dr. Zwicky's work can be pointed to except the jet-assisted take-off device which was so important to our carrier aviation in the last war. But Aerojet officials state that Dr. Zwicky's contributions have been "very great," and he was formally classified as an "essential" scientist until his clearance was suspended.

But, of course, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss established the rule in the Oppenheimer case that neither past services nor present usefulness are to be considered in weighing the "security" of our public servants. Of course, the dangerous old American habit of welcoming men of learning to these shores has been properly abandoned. Of course, Gen. Leslie Groves and the other leaders of the Manhattan District project, who used scores of foreign scientists to make the atomic bomb, were nothing but a lot of pinkos who were definitely soft on the great security issue.

To be sure, as General Groves has testified, America would never have been first with the atomic bomb if Dr. Neils Bohr and all the other foreigners had not joined the project. To be sure, the research and development chiefs of the Defense Department are now engaged in a rather desperate effort to recruit foreign scientists for work in this country. But practical considerations must be forgotten, and America's proudest traditions must naturally be trampled upon, when the thing at stake is this wonderful new security of ours.

Perspective and Prospective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, today marks the fifth anniversary of the repeal of the discriminatory Federal taxes on margarine.

Many Members of the Senate and the House will recall the bitter resistance to the proposal to remove the margarine taxes which had been in existence since 1886. It is appropriate, therefore, to point out that during the last 5 years, the dairy industry has not been destroyed; rather, milk production has increased 6 percent since 1950.

Dairy leaders are devoting much thought to further means for increasing milk consumption, and I have been pleased to note the increase in consumption of fluid milk and other whole milk products during the past few years. The repeal of the Federal taxes has also brought about a rapid expansion of margarine production and Americans may now enjoy in most States this fine nutritious table spread.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered at a conference on margarine at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on June 24.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE

Speech by Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, before the Conference on Margarine, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., June 24, 1955

We stand now only a few days from the fifth anniversary of the repeal of the old Federal taxes on margarine. I say "old" advisedly. For I believe all of us, those of you in the margarine manufacturing industry, those in the great agricultural industries related to it, and those of us in Congress and in the State legislatures who labored for repeal of unfair restrictive laws against the product, and certainly the great mass of consumers throughout the land whose voice was the deciding vote in our cause—I believe all of us agree that the Federal taxes are now well buried in the dust heap of historical failures.

In our busy world of the past 5 years, we have left them to the yellowing pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And this is as it should be. None of us is interested in reviving the controversy. All of us are deeply interested in ties of constructive activity between important industries like those of margarine and dairying. It is for that purpose that I hinge my remarks on the fifth anniversary of Federal repeal.

Five years of intense activity are drawing to an end. Briefly recapitulated, it is possible to sum up margarine's history in this country as a series of waves. First, there was the initial introduction and the period from 1886 to 1902 of early restrictive efforts. Those were crucial days for margarine, although the product then bore no resemblance to the one now provided by your industry, and although market and tonnage alike were scarcely enough to keep a single modern plant going. For in a group of early court decisions it was determined that margarine is a nutritious, healthful food; that it has a right to be sold in interstate commerce; that it represents a legitimate interest of American agriculture and American consumers. Thus, despite another wave of restrictionist activity after 1902, the basic right of margarine existed and gradually rallied public opinion to the cause that if a product is made as good or better than another at less cost, the consumer has a right to be offered it without artificial protective legislation; and—to state it another way—American farm products all should have unhampered free access to our markets. During the thirties, another wave brought severe new Federal and State restrictions, but beginning about 1940, the emergence of margarine as an unfettered product began, signalized by the repeal of Federal taxes effective July 1, 1950.

What has happened during these past 5 years? What is the shape, the promise of margarine's new historic period? For one thing, the movement to afford consumers margarine without legislative restriction has not finished. There is this piece of unfinished business. Let me say that those of us who fought the good, if somewhat hectic, fight for free margarine in Congress and many State legislatures—and, despite the passage of time and elections we still remain a numerous battalion—believe this unfinished business should not be permitted to stand by indefinitely. Now let me add to that the fact that we did not act to repeal the restrictions on margarine to please the margarine manufacturing industry alone. I know of no occasion when your industry assumed any such thing.

The repeal came because, preeminently, the housewives and families throughout the country accepted margarine and were opposed to its restriction. It arrived because farmers producing your ingredients had come to realize there was a legitimate market for them that was denied by laws erroneous in principle and wrong in their discriminatory effect. It came because there arose, quite apart from the interests involved, a sense that laws fostering one legitimate product in trade to the injury of another were not in accord with our sense of justice and were inimical to our national well-being. These reasons are just as strong now as before. Today, two States still bar yellow margarine; 15 States still tax the product; 13 States impose various license fees on its makers and distributors; 8 States bar its use in their tax-supported institutions in whole or in part. The record of legislative history so far this year shows that this kind of threat to your industry, however much we may decry it or think "it, too, shall pass away," is with us still. In Congress, a simple bill to permit our Navy to buy margarine if it chooses for serving to its personnel is, for the 4th consecutive year, not getting past the floor of the House. In 19 States, some 30 bills were introduced affecting your product. Three might be construed as neither particularly

for nor against; 10 as favorable; and 17 as imposing new restrictions. The restrictive bills were successfully pushed through at a ratio of 5 to 1 of the favorable type.

From one point of view, margarine legislation can be considered as successive changes in national policy toward the product. Thus, in 1886, 1902, and 1931, Congress adopted a policy of restricting margarine. In 1950, Congress reversed this policy in respect to taxes and license fees. But Congress did not pass any resolution or law stating that Government policy must be to safeguard margarine's right of fair competition in every market. Congress did not, for example, enact any rule that any solution to the problem of surplus butter must not be discriminatory in its effect on the vegetable spread. Quite the contrary, last year Congress passed the Agricultural Act of 1954, with a provision authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to do as he sees fit to remove the taxpayers' surplus butter burden. The present administration is attempting to dispose of much of the butter overseas, and in all frankness I think they are doing the more difficult and desirable thing. Many leaders of the dairy industry have worked hard to solve this problem in such a manner. But others have worked hard toward some type of program whereby butter will be sold into your market at a low price made possible by tax subsidy. It is estimated that margarine is losing about 150 million pounds a year to subsidized surplus butter being sold or given to the Army, the school lunch, and various other recipients. From the standpoint of simple interest, say, for instance, the cottonseed growers' interest, what is the difference between a tax on margarine and a subsidy for its chief competitor?

Let us look at this question of "free" or "unfree" margarine a little more. Let us go into what may be debatable ground, yet which also deserves to be covered in a thoughtful way in the light of the past 5 years. The repeal act of 1950 created two principal conditions under which margarine might legally be sold. First, it specified that colored margarine in public eating places must be made known to the patrons, as a matter of fair protection to butter, much of which is also colored. You and I and a majority of Congress readily agreed to this principle—proposed it, in fact. As finally passed, if colored, or yellow margarine is served in public eating places, patrons must be notified by a sign on the wall, or notice on the menu; and also by a label on the plate, or by being in triangular shape. The Food and Drug Administration was given the enforcement task. Each year at their budget hearings, the agency's representatives tell Congress that they do not have sufficient funds to enforce these regulations. They have also stated that compliance with the law, which is admittedly a difficult one to follow, is increasing. To my mind, the problem calls not so much for more enforcement as it does for a more efficient law that will protect all interests concerned. It seems to me that a simple requirement that each restaurant serving yellow margarine serve it in triangular patties, only, would suffice. In stating this, I do not at all agree with proposals that retail margarine be forced to package in or with triangular or other shapes or markings. Such proposals are clearly aimed to secure the very kind of unenforceable, discriminatory laws Congress and most States have canceled.

I have so far limited myself to the subject of legislative matters. The margarine industry has followed a wise course in not provoking or responding to senseless controversy about "margarine versus butter," in not reaching for headlines but rather emphasizing the story of your product as a good food product. Where your existence is threatened by discriminatory legislation, however, you should enter the lists and be heard. It is a distinction that, to my mind, presents no very great problems, except that from time to time it may be misunderstood, and therefore needs occasional restatement. But what exactly are the conditions you face now? What is the margarine industry of June 1955? The obvious charactertistics need little comment—margarine consumption has risen to a record high of 8.4 pounds per capita, or 1,365,000,000 pounds a year; margarine utilizing farm products, contributed a considerable sum (estimated at $150 million) to farm cash income yearly; and margarine as a national resource has a capacity probably sufficient to take care of all our national vitamin A—high calorie needs in its field in the event of emergency. The ruin to the dairy industry and to agriculture so freely prophesied when repeal was proposed, has not materialized. The price of margarine has been kept low. The increase in its usage has resulted in a greater merchandising effort for butter which, by last year, resulted in gains for both spreads, showing that both products can compete normally.

The margarine repeal movement is of interest today for the broader results it may be achieving. It was a movement based upon the idea of freedom in the market place. This is an exceedingly old idea. It is deep in the history of western civilization as we know it today. In a sense, the men of the margarine industry are experts on freedom. For two generations they were preoccupied with their special problem of securing freedom of their product. Of course, concepts change with circumstances and doubtless what was freedom to you before July 1, 1950, is not exactly what it is now. Then, freedom meant relief from certain restrictive laws. Now, freedom for you must have a wider significance. It must mean freedom for all products, and for persons also, for what you won was given through the opportunities afforded you by our history and economic and political systems of freedom. We realize that the very word "freedom" is, by the pressure of our times, much abused and disabused. I think it is worthwhile today, as we approach this fifth anniversary of your declaration of independence, to consider some aspects of freedom today—in reference to your product, in reference to our Nation, and to the world.

Today, for one thing, freedom means, for you, living together in the field of business, promoting your brands as skillfully as you can to attract the eye of the purchaser, and promoting the idea of your product among yourselves and to your consumers. Without the existence of the old oppressive laws, you face new problems. Competition in all industries has incerased a great deal. That is natural and, so far as it is not destructive, healthy. The very purpose of margarine tax repeal was to create more, not less, competition. The natural result of the violent adjustment the margarine industry has had to make within the past 5 years is an intensified search for markets. An examination of our economic situation leads one to the conclusion that margarine can and will continue to expand its consumption. It can be said that the margarine industry in the United States is, practically, but 5 years old. You have here, I think, the problem of developing leadership for the greater industry you are bound to become.

Your business freedom offers to you today another challenge. Margarine is of course a part of the highly competitive fats and oils industry. I have read with interest the observations made at your last Conference concerning the role margarine can play in the development of a stronger protein pillar for our agriculture. During the repeal effort many of us in Congress learned much about your industry, the diary industry, and the agricultural economics behind each. Currently we in Congress are hearing more and more about the problem of increasing milk consumption. I know that diary leaders are devoting a very considerable amount of thought to this subject, so vital to their industry. One of the good fruits of the margarine movement is that attention is being directed increasingly to ways and means of increasing and improving or utilization of milk. We produced last year 123½ million pounds of milk, of which about 63 percent is estimated to have gone into fluid, cheese, condensed, evaporated, ice cream, and dry whole milk. We are especially proud of our growing cheese industry and fluid consumption. I am informed that our milk production has increased 6 percent since 1950; our fluid milk consumption, 3 percent; and our cheese production 14 percent. I congratulate this Conference upon its theme—greater consumption of "milk, bread, and spread." Insofar as the dairy industry can move toward greater whole milk markets, your difficulty is lessened. It is no accident that a great many dairy companies now offer margarine. In different ways your industry can help promote the theme you have stated here. If the past 5 years offer any lesson, it is that this subject deserves continued study by your industry: It is a new opportunity for you to work cooperatively to benefit consumers and farmers alike. You can help your product by providing it with a theme important to your progress and commensurate with your experience and Association. We in the legislatures are watching this whole field with interest, as, to some degree, an extension of the margarine freedom concept.

And so in these 5 years your opportunities for freedom have grown. So freedom has grown in our modern world. The margarine industry is well acquainted with what might be called the point of view of history. And sharp though our present changes from the past are, we have only history for a guide. Like your industry, America is essentially young. As your industry contains a diversity of firms, so America contains (and I think probably always will) a great many differences. You are facing the problems of your new freedom; the United States has done so from its inception. As a nation we had to win independence from European domination, principally by the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Monroe Doctrine, and national growth. We had to win unity on our form of democratic government, through constitutional development and the Civil War. Through all this runs a stream of liberalism that is continuous and deep in American development. This liberal trend seems to have been most pronounced in periods of economic expansion such as we have now. The point I wish to make is that while freedom may seem a different thing from one generation to another, it is inherent in our national mind and spirit. Your "Declaration of Independence" in 1950 was merely one more result of the Declaration of 1776.

Is our national policy today, by and large, dominated by this spirit to protect our traditional liberties? We are told that this is a businessman's administration. All administrations have to more or less extent considerably reflected the businessman for he is a central figure in our progress. Certainly the Federal Government is calling upon businessmen to give more than lip service to the fantastically large and complicated work of running the country. A heavy responsibility therefore rests upon the business community. All industry, large and small, shares this responsibility. I think businessmen today are considerably more sophisticated, more "knowable" about Government matters than ever before. Through their personal participation in Government; through the many laws and regulations affecting them; through their trade associations and in other ways, the idea that the average businessman need neither know nor

care what Government is doing, is obsolete. But where a President once would say, "The business of America is business," we recognize now that the business of America is to protect its true liberties.

In this connection I should like to comment briefly on the national business outlook. It is a subject of so much comment and discussion and analysis that I doubt there is much I can add to it. A question often asked me is "What is the econmic outlook for the next year or so as seen from the standpoint of the Banking and Currency Committee's stock market hearings and research?" I will tell you frankly that I am no more able than the next person to give a concrete phophecy on such a vast subject. The object of the recent hearings, however, was an attempt to bring about greater stability in our economic system. The violent fluctuations of the past should be prevented, or at least minimized.

Farm Groups Offer Opposing Solutions to Rural Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the Jonesboro, Ark., hearings on the farm program held on Monday, June 27, the Little Rock, Arkansas Gazette on Tuesday carried a splendid article written by their agricultural editor, Mr. Leland B. Duvall.

Mr. Duvall graphically outlines the several proposed solutions to our farm problem as presented to your House Committee on Agriculture members who attended the hearings.

For the benefit of all the Members, and particularly those who represent agricultural areas, this article is reprinted in full, as follows:

FARM GROUPS OFFER OPPOSING SOLUTIONS TO RURAL PROBLEMS

(By Leland B. Duvall, of the Gazette staff)

JONESBORO, June 27.—Arkansas and Missouri farm groups and individuals trotted out their pet theories on rural problems for the benefit of a House Agricultural Subcommittee here today. Speakers at the special hearing agreed that declining farm income threatened the stability of the economy, but each group offered a different solution.

E. C. ("TOOK") GATHINGS, of West Memphis, is chairman of the subcommittee.

GATHINGS clashed with Joe C. Hardin, president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, over the theory of increased cotton acreage and declining price supports. Hardin suggested that the acreage should be increased to 21,500,000 acres and the price supports should be reduced to the point that would allow American cotton to find its way into world markets.

"I can't understand the propaganda that lowering price supports would automatically wipe out our surpluses, if we increase our acreage to more than compensate for the possible increased sales," GATHINGS said. He noted that the production of cotton was 341 pounds an acre last year, for a new record. Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, Democrat, of Texas, asked Hardin for a guess on the price at which United States cotton could enter the world market. Hardin admitted that he could not make an intelligent guess at the figure, but said the price should be lowered to that point, whatever it happened to be.

FAMILY PARITY PLAN

At the other extreme, the Arkansas Farmers Union unveiled a new suggestion for maintaining farm income at a level that would preserve a healthy economy. The plan was offered in a statement by J. Albert Hopkins, State president, filed with the subcommittee by Louis J. Johnson, vice president of the organization.

Hopkins' statement, which Johnson expanded in a speech before the subcommittee, said the agricultural economy of this country was threatened by a creeping feudalism created by the machine farming. He added that the system threatened the family-sized farms with extinction.

As a solution, Hopkins suggested that price supports be limited to the amount necessary to provide each farmer with a decent living for himself and his family.

The plan would limit the total amount of supplemental pay provided by the Government to $2,000 for each farm. He said this could be done by eliminating acreage controls and allowing farm prices to seek their own level in both the domestic and the world market places.

Government support, under the plan, would be provided only for the part of production of any crop that would be necessary to assure the needed living standard. He suggested that the Government might find the answer by offering enough payment to assure "full parity" on the first $7,000 in sales of farm products.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

The total payment would still be limited to $2,000. Here is how the plan would work:

Suppose a farmer produces 10 bales of cotton which he sells for 25 cents a pound. His return would be $1,250. If the parity price were 35 cents, the Government would pay this farmer 10 cents a pound on all the cotton he produced.

Suppose another farmer produces 1,000 bales of cotton, which he sells for the same price. He would be entitled to subsidy—at the same rate—on the first $7,000 in gross income, but not more than $2,000. The remainder of his crop would move at the prevailing price, without support.

Backing this argument, Hopkins noted that 9 percent of the farmers last year received more than 50 percent of the benefits from the farm program.

Price support loans to the five largest cotton growers in California averaged $649,000 in 1953, he said.

OTHER GROUPS HEARD

The Agricultural Council of Arkansas presented a third approach to the situation. Charles Adams, president of the council, said his group was opposed to reduction of price supports and was also against a two-price system. He said the cotton surpluses could be reduced only by offering the CCC stocks of cotton at prices that would move the product.

Rice growers came in for a share in the hearing. A group of rice farmers held a special meeting at noon and came into the afternoon session with a plea for "eliminating the inequalities of the acreage allotment."

The group passed a resolution asking that the acreage be limited to 40 percent of the amount on which the price history of the farm was based.

Other speakers generally opposed the present social security program for farm workers and the increase of minimum wages for agriculture.

Menace of Bolshevism Theme of Providence College Commencement—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago at the 25th reunion of my class at Providence College, I was reminded of a singular incident that occurred at the graduation exercises in 1930. Too many of us these days seem to feel that the menace of communism and the evils of Communist aggression were not recognized or deplored until after World War II. Too many apologists take the position that if we had only known about it, we could have done something to alter the course of world events.

That is why I would like to call to your attention three prophetic addresses on the economic, social, and religious menace of Bolshevism given at commencement exercises 25 years ago.

One was the address of the distinguished scientist, Dr. Arthur L. Quirk. The others by Ambrose V. Aylward and Ralph S. Daniels, now distinguished members of the bar.

MENACE OF BOLSHEVISM THEME OF PROVIDENCE COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

PART 1—FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF ECONOMICS

(By Arthur L. Quirk)

There is taking place today an experiment in government which is attracting the attention of thoughtful men the world over. It is the subject of countless discussions and articles, for its importance in the field of human relationship is undeniable. It can hardly be called new, for its fundamental principles are almost a century old. It is, however, the first time that these principles have been applied on a truly national scale. The experiment to which I refer is the rule of bolshevism in Russia. It is our purpose today to show how such a system of government is resulting in dire and tragic consequences in each of the three great divisions of human society, the economic sphere, the social sphere, and the religious sphere.

In treating the economic aspects of bolshevism we shall examine its application as manifested under the new 5-year program, which was proposed and adopted in 1928, when it was most evident to all observers that Russia faced almost certain economic destruction. Reduced to essentials the 5-year program resolves itself to this: That Russia is attempting an economic revolution requiring a vast accumulation of capital, an expensive reorganization of productive methods, and a thoroughgoing change in the behavior and habits of the people. All this is to be accomplished without foreign assistance, and, as it were, in a moment of time. Every phase of this intricate program requires the investment of current income in nonconsumable articles of wealth—factories, mines, powerplants, schools, machinery, and experiment stations; and the capital to execute this plan can come from no other source than the enforced savings of Russia's impoverished people, thus reducing a standard of living already incredibly low. Only absolute dictatorship and iron discipline can wring from the people of Russia the economic means demanded by the 5-year program. The present Soviet leaders manipulate the entire structure of economic life to

the end that the common man shall be denied as large a fraction of the fruits of his labor as possible, that they may be invested by the Government in capital equipment for the benefit of future generations. This plan, moreover, is maintained by the Government by a severe domination over the daily life of the common people. Such materials as cloth, shoes, household utensils, and other products so necessary for the ordinary existence of the people, are taken from the people, and are shipped to foreign markets to be exchanged for raw materials and machine equipment. Wages are fixed by law at a level which maintains only a primitive mode of existence. Funds are extorted from all the people, either directly, through taxes and forced loans, or indirectly, through an underpayment of labor, an overcharge in prices, or the issue of government paper money. Additional taxes are levied upon any social class which appears to possess a margin of income above essential needs. In short the program is financed by a series of open or covert expropriations of the wealth and income of a people subjected to an absolute political and industrial autocracy.

The basic error of such a system of government is the denial of the right of private property. This fallacy has ever been the cornerstone of all systems of socialism, of which bolshevism is but a new outcropping. Briefly, it means that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the state. Such a proposal is manifestly against justice. Every man has by nature the right to possess private property as his own. This is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation. He possesses, on the one hand, the full perfection of animal nature and, therefore, he enjoys, at least as much as the rest of the animal race, the fruition of the things of the body. But animality is far from being the whole of humanity. It is the mind—the reason—which is the chief thing in us who are human beings; it is this which makes a human being human and distinguishes him completely and essentially from the brute. It is because man alone among the animals possesses reason that it must be within his right to have things, not merely for temporary and momentary use but in stable and permanent possession; he must have not only those things which perish in the using but also those which, though used, remain for use in the future. Again, if we consider man's nature a little more deeply, this becomes still more evident, for man, by the power of his reason, not only sees that there are thing which regard his present welfare but also that there are those which will be for his advantage in time to come. Man's needs do not die out but recur; satisfied today, they demand new supplies tomorrow. Hence it is that man can possess not only the fruits of the earth but the earth itself, for of the products of the earth he can make provisions for the future.

Furthermore, to say that God has given the earth for the use of the universal human race is not to deny that there can be private property. The earth, though divided among private owners, does not thereby cease to minister to the needs of all, for there is no one who does not live on what the land brings forth. Those who do not possess the soil contribute their labor, so that truly may it be said that all human subsistence is derived from labor on one's own land, or by some laborious industry which is paid for either in the produce of the land itself or in that which is exchanged for what the land produces.

These arguments are so strong and convincing that the theory underlying the Bolshevist regime cannot but crumble beneath their weight. The principle of private ownership of property has been consecrated by the practice of all ages as conformable with human nature and as conducive, in the most unmistakable manner, to the peace and tranquility of human life. The same principle is confirmed and enforced by civil law, which, when just, derives its force from the laws of nature. Divine authority adds its sanction, forbidding us in gravest terms even to covet that which is anothers: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his house, nor his field, nor anything which is his."

In practice the 5-year program of the Bolshevist government has already encountered great difficulties. The most serious of these difficulties is the problem of transforming the Russian peasant into a trained industrial worker within the period of the 5-year program. There also remain the critical need for technicians, engineers, and other specialists who are the pivot of the entire system. It is probably this human factor which accounts for the unfavorable results of the last 3 months. It must also be remembered that the great majority of the Russian people are untouched by the zeal and fervor which inspires the Russian Bolshevist to feats of energy and endurance surpassing normal human endeavor. With these facts in mind, it appears that the rule is bolshevism is destined for ultimate ruin; that it is but a transient upon the stage of history. Just as the French Revolution faded and finally disappeared, so will this new and even more powerful menace to the safety and stability of economic relationship eventually succumb to the dictates of reason, the demands of necessity, and the evidence of experience.

Menace of Bolshevism Theme of Providence College Commencement—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago at the 25th reunion of my class at Providence College, I was reminded of a singular incident that occurred at the graduation exercises in 1930. Too many of us these days seem to feel that the menace of communism and the evils of Communist aggression were not recognized or deplored until after World War II. Too many apologists take the position that if we had only known about it, we could have done something to alter the course of world events.

That is why I would like to call to your attention three prophetic addresses on the economic, social, and religious menace of bolshevism given at commencement exercises 25 years ago.

One was the address of the distinguished member of the bar, Ambrose V. Aylward. The others by Ralph S. Daniels, a distinguished member of the bar, and the distinguished scientist, Dr. Arthur L. Quirk.

MENACE OF BOLSHEVISM THEME OF PROVIDENCE COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

PART 2—FROM THE SOCIAL POINT OF VIEW

(By Ambrose V. Aylward)

In every civil society, there are certain essential doctrines, certain fundamental principles fixed by the natural law, respect or disrespect for which determines whether that civil society shall be looked upon as a legitimate sovereign state or whether it shall be considered a menace and a source of contamination to all righteous governments. These elementary requirements are fourfold: First, the preservation of the family as the normal and necessary unit of society; secondly, the establishment and perpetuation of social order and protection of the means by which man may obtain temporal happiness; thirdly, there must be an honest exercise of legitimate and rightly reasoned authority, and, lastly, under that authority there must be opportunity for the just development of the physical, mental, and moral faculties of the members of the community.

These four determining features of a rightly ordered government have been repeatedly disregarded by Sovietism since its inception, disregarded so flagrantly that Sovietism constitutes an unwholesome detriment to the people of Russia and a menace to all just governments.

The menace of Sovietism is first observed in the fact that Sovietism seeks to destroy, rather than preserve, the family as the normal and necessary unit of society. In keeping with the diabolical program to which it is devoted, Sovietism has destroyed the sanctity of the marriage. According to the laws of the Soviet Government, a marriage may be dissolved by either party thereto, without the consent of the other party, and without any sufficiently reasonable cause being offered for the dissolution. With the passing away of the stable bond of matrimony, and with the consequent encouragement of divorce, marriage in Russia is now considered a temporary convenience, and, as a result, countless children ignorant of their parentage, have become totally dependent upon the state; the foundation of society has been destroyed; the floodgates of vice and corruption have been opened wide, and the state has encouraged and directed its citizens to become irresponsible immoral beings. Under such conditions, salutary family life in Russia has perished and the normal and necessary unit of society is no longer recognized by the Soviet regime.

Sovietism is a menace, moreover, because it fails to establish and maintain a strong and healthy social order. The chaotic conditions under which Russia is struggling are the result of the revolution and bloodshed by which Bolshevism was conceived. Sovietism had its inception in the slaughter of the imperial family in 1918, an inception entirely in keeping with the radical nature of its instigators. Criminally perpetrated in the confines of a cellar, inspired by a fanatical hatred for the royal family, that slaughter threw the whole empire of Russia, with its 150 million people, into a state of chaos. A rule of terroism followed in which the rights of life, liberty, and property have been ruthlessly violated; a rule of terrorism which has destroyed justice; a rule under which nothing is considered right except the uncompromising tenets of sovietism; a rule which has developed an elaborate system of espionage under which no man can trust his brother; a rule which has resulted in the slaughter of countless citizens of Russia, citizens who died rather than sacrifice their rights to the encroaching exponents of Bolshevism.

In addition to destroying family life, and in addition to creating a rule of terrorism, sovietism has deprived the citizens of Russia of their just allowance of the means to temporal happiness. Since the advent of sovietism, the people of Russia have gradually been deprived of their just privileges. They cannot speak unless they voice the words which sovietism has taught them at the point of the bayonet. They can no longer read the truth, for the press in Russia has degenerated into a huge organ of propaganda which feeds upon malice and lies. They cannot seek refuge in literature, for censorship in Russia is not exercised as a defense

against immorality, but rather as an insidious means of keeping the Russian people hopelessly ignorant of the evil conditions under which their country is laboring. Conscientious religious worship has been forbidden by the leaders of sovietism. Although the right to vote and the right of trial by jury have long been recognized by nations as inviolable, both have been denied to huge numbers of the Russian people. Article 4, chapter 13, of the Soviet Constitution provides for the disenfranchisement of all private employers of labor, private merchants and brokers, all persons living on investments, monks, clergymen, former members of the Romanoff service, and all other persons incurring the disfavor of the Soviet Government for any reason whatsoever. Again, article 1, chapter 3, of the same constitution denied to man his recognized right to ownership of private property. And thus, even in such a brief sketch as this, we see the menace of sovietism; we see that while claiming to liberate man from bondage, sovietism thrusts upon him chains and restrictions which more enlightened peoples have long since banished from their government systems.

In addition to these indictments, we condemn Sovietism as a menace because no just or righteous authority exists today in Russia. The only authority existing in Russia today is that which was usurped by the Bolshevists in 1918. This authority is neither just nor righteous, not only because it is based upon a hideous program of bloodshed, but also because it is representative of but one class of the Russian people—a class in which there are said to be four types: fanatics, who make a religion of their theory of Sovietism; adventurers, who are participating only for personal gain; ambitious men, who seek fame and power; and fools, who do not know what they are doing or why they are doing it. This is the authority which dispersed the truly representative assembly which followed the revolution, and replaced it with an assembly which is representative of the Bolshevists rather than the whole people of Russia. This is the authority which has repudiated international debts which were honorably acquired. This is the authority which has confiscated without provocation the rightful property of both citizens of Russian and of foreign investors. This is the authority which, according to article 1, chapter 2, of the Soviet Constitution is devoted to a program of worldwide revolution by which it seeks to overthrow all existing governments which are opposed to Sovietism and to substitute instead the same political principles which have already thrown a blank, impenetrable cloud over the once great Empire of Russia.

Finally, since the unity and sanctity of family life have been destroyed; since there is only chaos and terrorism in the Soviet government; since man has been deprived by the Bolshevists of his right to temporal happiness, and since there is no exercise under Sovietism of just and righteous authority, it follows without a question, that under such hopeless conditions, there can be no just exercise of the physical, mental, and moral faculties of the members of the community.

In view of these facts, we cannot but be led to the firm conclusion that Sovietism represents a menace, not only to the Russian people but to every righteous government in the world. It had its beginnings in a hatred for man; in a jealous reluctance to see one man promote his prosperity while another remained dormant. Since its inauguration, Sovietism has been tossed on the sea of chance, grasping now at this, now at that policy, in a hopeless effort to right itself and to escape the unavoidable consequences of its folly. In its inception, its operation, and its logical consequences, Sovietism is but a travesty upon good government, a travesty from the effects of which Russia will be slow to recover—but a travesty which shall offer to the world a lasting proof that "no nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

Menace of Bolshevism Theme of Providence College Commencement—Part 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago at the 25th reunion of my class at Providence College, I was reminded of a singular incident that occurred at the graduation exercises in 1930. Too many of us these days seem to feel that the menace of communism and the evils of Communist aggression were not recognized or deplored until after World War II. Too many apologists take the position that if we had only known about it, we could have done something to alter the course of world events.

That is why I would like to call to your attention 3 prophetic addresses on the economic, social, and religious menace of Bolshevism given at commencement exercises 25 years ago.

One was the address of the distinguished member of the bar, Ralph S. Daniels. The others by Ambrose V. Aylward, a distinguished member of the bar, and Dr. Arthur L. Quirk, a distinguished scientist:

MENACE OF BOLSHEVISM THEME OF PROVIDENCE COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT

PART 3—FROM A RELIGIOUS POINT OF VIEW

(By Ralph S. Daniels)

Since the advent of the Bolshevist regime, there has been nothing so proper to Russian history as the word "revolution." Revolution, not only in politics and government, but in the fields of economics, religion, art, science, education, and all other human activities. Revolution to the point where it has all but destroyed the integrity of the Russian nation and the international esteem it once enjoyed. Revolution, in fact, so violent that consensus has termed it astonishing, disgraceful, and unbelievable.

From a supernatural, or religious, point of view, much of Russia's misfortune is excusable. In a spirit of Christian charity, we are disposed to reserve a too severe condemnation of bolshevism. We prefer to seek the causes of unrest in the racial background or the social inequality, or the historic despotism, or the economic instability which have long encumbered the Russian people. But there is one aspect of bolshevism that not even Christian charity can condone, for thereby the very motive of Christian charity would be defeated. The Bolshevist attempt to expel God and religion from the character of a nation constitutes a crime that positively cannot be minimized, because it is a crime committed against the most fundamental and inalienable right of man, and against the nature of organized society.

Religion, or the worship of God, means simply rendering honor to whom honor is due. It is the willing submission of man to a Supreme Being whom he knows to be his Creator, Preserver, and Redeemer, and to whom, accordingly, he deems himself responsible for acts of love, honor, and devotion. The practice of this answers to a deeply felt need in the heart of man. Man seeks, by religion, to enter into communion with God, who is above him, and thus to enrich and to ennoble his own nature, and to attain the completion and perfection for which he yearns. Thus it is that religion, implanted in human nature, confirmed by human reason, and actuated by man's desire for perfect happiness, has always been recognized as man's highest duty and most sacred right; and as such, nations and governments have, for the most part, preserved it inviolate.

But now bolshevism seeks to undermine this supernatural virtue. Based on a philosophy that looks upon God as an enemy of man and calls religion an opium for the people, and therefore, demands the expulsion of both from society; operating under a program that openly designates armed force as the only adequate means for the realization of its end; strengthened and upheld by a national constitution that calls explicitly and unconditionally for the propagation of atheism. Bolshevism today presents a spectacle almost incredible in an era of advanced civilization. Religious persecution, the dread of the ancient world, is a function of government in modern Russia. No person, place, or thing held sacred in religious belief is spared the barbarism of the Bolshevists. Hundreds of priests and ministers are being put to death or physically tortured on charges of "counterrevolution," and in a manner so brutal that it is scarcely equaled in the annals of history. Thousands of churches and convents are being confiscated for "public purposes," which are never fulfilled. Religious articles of priceless value are being appropriated for the "benefit of the masses," whose advancement is cleverly held in check by bolshevism itself. And the worst injustice of all bolshevism commits against the youth of the country. Through its powerful agent, "The League of the Godless," it circulates throughout the land books, plays, pamphlets, and motion pictures, especially designed to attract those of tender years, in which the old notions of religious piety are put to ridicule, and an inordinate and licentious life is held up as the ideal to be sought after. There are the means that bolshevism employs in its attempt to create a godless state. Nor does bolshevism limit its operations to the Russian nation, but boldly and defiantly carries its campaign against God into every nation of the world. Our own country, conceived and dedicated to religious liberty, is even now infested with representatives of bolshevism, awaiting their opportunity to strike a fatal blow at the religious institutions we cherish most highly.

Bolshevism, however, little realizes the futility of its task. It cannot gain its objective, for in so doing it must first re-create human nature, and the absurdity of such an action is manifest.

Nor does bolshevism realize that in attacking religion it is really attacking itself; for no government—however powerful, however violent, however revolutionary it may be—can endure without the saving influence of religion. Religion is one force among men that makes government possible. It holds lawful authority to be of divine origin, and thus confers upon governments a power that is more than human. It charges rulers with a divine command, reminding them of the gravity of their duties, and advising them to govern always in accord with the eternal principles of justice and charity. It teaches subjects to honor and respect lawful authority, and to be submissive to it because it represents the authority of God up earth. It distinguishes sharply between liberty and license, thus preserving at all times right order in civil society. It holds the common good to be the objective of all law, on ac-

count of which it rightly condemns unjust discrimination in legal matters. It defines the relative rights and obligations of society and the individual; of man and his fellowman; of husbands and wives; of masters and servants. Religion, in short, is nothing less than the very mainstay of the commonwealth—and history proves that without it no nation has ever been able to subsist.

Russia is no exception. Religion is just as necessary in the constitution of that state, as in this, or any other. And yet, there it is profaned and defiled, while the Bolshevists stand and applaud. Herein bolshevism creates a menace that consists not only in the defiance of the dictates of God and man alike, but it also has disastrous consequences that magnify its iniquities. By the pursuance of such a policy, bolshevism aims directly at the degeneration of civil government, the disintegration of civil society, and the destruction of everything exemplary and noble in human life.

Is it now a plausible explanation, then, that the social chaos and economic strife which now prevail in Russia are but manifestations of the wrath of God, avenging itself upon a nation that dared to divorce His sovereignty? This, indeed, is a sad ending for any nation. How much more pitiable it is for Russia, whose extensive population and wide expanse and vast resources afford her such rare opportunities to reflect the Divine majesty and grandeur with a brilliance that would command for her the respect and reverence of the whole civilized world. But such must be the fate of Russia, as long as she permits bolshevism to rule her destiny. Such is the fate of any nation that tries to live without God.

Texas Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dim view held by Texas voters of the upper Colorado storage project being proposed to this Congress is well expressed by the following editorial appearing May 2 in the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise:

MONEY CAN BE SAVED

Not a few American taxpayers have gloomily concluded that the national debt cannot be reduced much, if at all, during their lifetime, that the high cost of Government will continue more or less at its present level and economy, while it may be in the dictionaries, is not in the lexicon of log-rolling Members of Congress.

If Members of the Senate who voted for the upper Colorado River project really believed in economy—for their own States as well as other States—they would not have acted as they did to involve the Federal Government in another multi-billion-dollar spending spree, for which there is no legitimate excuse, no national necessity.

Nevertheless, the second Hoover Commission believes in economy. What is more to the purpose, the Commission tells Congress how billions can be saved, how budget deficits can be eliminated. A little more economy and efficiency in handling surplus Government property alone would save billions of dollars—and it would not be necessary, presumably, to tread on the tender toes of any Member of Congress who follows the traditional practice of voting money for the other fellow's home spending projects if the other fellow will vote for his home spending projects.

The Commission estimates that "for the next several years, huge quantities of supplies approaching an annual rate of $2 billion, acquisition cost, will be purged from Government warehouses."

It has been the practice to sell such goods to civilians for the proverbial song, or a small fraction of their original cost, from 5 to 7 percent of what taxpayers paid for them, when eager-beaver procurement officials of the armed services were buying and competing against one another, thus raising the price still higher.

If the Government received only 1 cent more on each dollar cost of surplus property sold, the yield to the Government would be an extra $20 million a year. This is a tidy sum, even though it does not run into the nine-cipher class.

More care in buying, wider redistribution of surplus goods among Government agencies, and a little more attention paid to selling as done by merchandising experts, instead of treating Government surplus as something to be got rid of at any price, are recommended.

The Red Fly-By Over Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bonner Fellers, United States Army, retired, has been making important contributions on the subject of our Air Force. On June 25, in Human Events, appears a most forceful article entitled, "The Red Fly-By Over Moscow." As General Fellers states, the recent Red Air Force demonstration over Moscow has stunned the American people. It seems incredible that our enemy in the cold war has been able to achieve such apparent success with its air force.

The article by General Fellers follows and I commend it to all who are interested:

THE RED FLY-BY OVER MOSCOW

(By Bonner Fellers, brigadier general, U. S. Army, retired)

The recent Red Air Force demonstration—fly-by—over Moscow stunned American observers. For the first time United States intelligence agents were confronted by concrete evidence. The result is the most alarming and direct peacetime challenge our military planners have ever faced. This early May fly-by disclosed:

New supersonic fighters, in numbers.

New all-weather fighters, in numbers.

New turbo-prop long-range bombers, in numbers.

New long-range jet bombers, in numbers.

The Pentagon released news of this Red Air Force strength only after the Defense Public Relations Office had learned that General Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, had included it in a forthcoming speech.

What is the military meaning of the Moscow fly-by demonstration?

It means that the Red air force now has gained the advantage over the free world in modern fighters. For sometime it has been known that the Soviets have built more jet fighters than all the free world combined. In Korea there was only one American Air Force fighter, the F–86 Sabrejet, which was superior to the Red's MIG–15. Neither the Navy nor our Allies possessed a comparable fighter. Now, however, the Soviets have thousands of MIG–17's, a product vastly superior to their old MIG–15. But we have less than 200 of any model of fighter aircraft which can compare favorably with the MIG–17.

The fly-by gave new and disconcerting meaning to our strategic air position. The Strategic Air Force is our arm of deep penetration capable of striking, from North American and overseas bases, the enemy heartland. It is our best defensive weapon. With it, were we attacked, we plan to destroy the Soviets' means to make war. The thousands of MIG–17 interceptor fighters now in service with Red combat units mean that our Strategic Air Force will encounter stiffer defense over the Soviet Union. This stiffer defense means that we will suffer greater loss in combat and with less certainty of success.

The new Red turboprop and jet bombers mean first, that the Soviets are pouring vast resources into an offensive intercontinental weapon; and second, the Soviets have the technical knowledge and the industrial capacity to carry out, simultaneously, the immense production of long-range turboprop and jet bomber developments. This dual undertaking is something which our Air Force, because of enforced economy, has been unable to undertake.

Finally, the fly-by disclosed 17 Red Bison type–37 jet bombers, comparable to our best heavy bomber, the B–52. This, our aircraft industry believes, indicates that the Soviets have produced the type–37 bomber in 2 years. To accomplish a similar task, it has taken our industry 6 years.

For several years the Red air force has had its special weapon poised to strike Europe. This is the IL–28, a 2-engine jet bomber capable of striking any capital of Europe within 80 minutes after takeoff from Red satellite bases.

Clearly, therefore, the Soviet turboprop and jet bomber production is not being built for use against Europe or Asia. For months General Twining has warned that the long-range bomber capability of the Red air force is aimed squarely at the United States.

The box score on comparative air strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union, called for by Senator SYMINGTON, will be shocking if the actual facts are presented. It will show that the United States has the lead in airpower only in one category of aircraft—our medium jet bomber, the B–47. In all other offensive aircraft we are behind. Such air advantage as we now possess rests in the B–47, our advance bases, in the superior skill of our incomparable airmen, and in our technical flying aids. At best this margin of advantage is tenuous.

This problem of relative air strengths transcends all other defense efforts because our survival depends upon maintaining global air advantage over the Soviet Union.

There are two real threats to our existence. The more devastating is the threat of nuclear bombing by Red planes from bases already established in the Soviet Arctic. The Soviets now have nearly 2,000 bombers capable of striking industrial areas, military bases and population centers in the United States.

The second threat is from Red submarines. The Soviets have 350 modern submarines capable of launching guided missiles with atomic war heads and a range of 200 miles. The coastal cities of North America and Europe are vulnerable to this type of attack.

Red bombers from the Artic can be met only by a superior American Air Force.

It is the role of our Strategic Air Force to strike enemy bases and destroy the fuel, weapons, runways, and planes on the ground. In this role air power becomes our first line of defense.

The second best defense against the Red air threat is for our fighter interceptors—based on North America—to shoot down the Red bombers in flight from their Arctic bases to their targets in the United States.

The third defense—a passive one—against enemy bombers lies in ground antiaircraft fire and in wide dispersion of our population, bases, and war industry.

The threat from missile launching submarines must be met by the Navy and by air power. We have reason to hope that the Navy will develop the techniques to cope with the submarine.

Much has been made of the NATO defense effort in Europe. The NATO army is too weak to stop the Red Army; the NATO Air Force is too weak to conquer the Red Air Force. Yet some of our own leaders, at the highest level, hold that the United States can be defended only within the framework of the NATO organization. The truth is, even if NATO had a defensive proponderance in surface forces, these forces could not influence the defense of the United States against Red bomber and submarine attack. This Red threat against us is independent of European support.

Moreover, the 5 million men, callable reserves—for which our Congress is now being pressured—can in no way defend against or even influence a Red bombing or submarine-launched guided missile attack against us. Only air power and our Fleet—which is already in being—can protect us against these threats.

In our defense planning, therefore, the Air Force budget must be given priority over all other allocation of funds.

This is no plea for overall increased defense spending. The 1956 military budget of $31.8 billion now before the Congress is ample. But since in war neither our surface forces nor our allies can adequately protect us from attack, some two-thirds of the defense budget should be allocated to the Air Force. Moreover, there is now an appropriation of $8,828 million for foreign mutual-security activities, which has not been spent. Yet the Congress is being asked to appropriate an additional $3.35 billion for foreign aid. Until we have overwhelming air supremacy, no expenditure should take precedence over Air Force requirements.

In our defense planning this fact must never escape us. Should the next war come, decision will be reached with the weapons available when the war starts. Therefore, unless we have the air advantage initially, there can be neither a general mobilization of surface forces nor an industrial effort to produce the necessary weapons for victory.

Why were we not warned of this danger?

Let's look at the record of our military intelligence. It has consistently underestimated enemy air strengths. The World War II Luftwaffe strength surprised us. The Japanese Zero fighter surprised us. The MIG–15 over Korea was better than we knew. In each of these surprises we paid dearly in lives and in treasure.

Not long ago Secretary of Defense Wilson claimed that the Russians were not 8 feet tall and that their air force was a defensive one. (The fly-by proves it is powerfully offensive.) He even repudiated our intelligence sources, although they had underestimated Red air strength.

We have seen both the Secretary of Defense and the President contradict themselves on defense requirements. The $5 billion Air Force cut of 2 years ago, then stoutly defended by both, has now returned to plague them. They have reversed their stand and are making ineffective moves to repair the damage.

How did our air position become unenviable?

The answer is, despite the fact that we were warned repeatedly, our top policy people did not listen. Either they could not believe the Soviets were becoming dangerous, or they did not want to believe it. Many doubt the ability of the Soviets to design and build complex weapons. They point to the lack of indoor plumbing, to a paucity of automobiles, telephones, radio, and TV, as indicative of Soviet inability to create airpower.

The emergence of a first-rate airpower in an industrially backward country—unable to feed itself—is a paradox. But the industrial growth was not sudden. It began during World War II. It is neither a miracle nor a fraud. After World War II, Moscow announced that the Red Air Force must be made the best in the world. Meanwhile our Air Force was reduced from 243 wings to 2.

After inspecting Soviet industry during World War II, the late Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg said: "I took away from the Soviet Union the conviction that toward God knows what end, these secretive and incomprehensible people were slaving * * * to repair the industrial neglect of a century." And shortly before his death, he grimly warned "What I now fear most is complacency in the midst of inexorably rising peril."

Fortunately, production of the B–52 is stepped up. Similar stepups must be made in fighter production.

Moreover, the contest for technological superiority must be won. If the Soviets were able to overcome our advantage in aircraft production, what are they doing in guided missile development? As an economy measure, our guided missile development was retarded. Consequently, we probably lag behind the Soviets in missile development.

Today our industry has designs for aircraft capable of travelling at 2 or 3 times the speed of sound. Such projects must be pushed. Only by daring research and development can we maintain the air advantage.

With American air advantage—which is within our capabilities—there need be no war. If we possess the power to destroy him, the enemy is not likely to strike. The longer war is deterred the less likely it is to eventuate.

If war can be avoided, the inhuman Communist enslavement will consume itself. Human beings cannot be mismanaged forever. In our possession of the air advantage, therefore, lies the most realistic hope for world peace.

In the face of the Moscow fly-by disclosure of the Red air threat, who is so naive as to claim that the size, composition and timetable for our Air Force—which was determined 2 years ago—is now adequate?

The Moscow fly-by has sounded the alarm. We must step up our air effort now.

Resolutions Adopted by Nebraska Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska Young Republican Club, at its annual convention, held on May 28, 1955, in Lincoln, Nebr., adopted these resolutions, among others:

RESOLUTION No. 1

Whereas this administration under Dwight D. Eisenhower has made tremendous progress by ending the tragic slaughter of our young men in Korea and by maintaining prosperity at its highest peacetime level and by reducing Government spending, reducing the budget deficit and stabilizing the value of the American dollar; and

Whereas this administration under Dwight D. Eisenhower has been free from scandal and has made significant progress in the field of foreign relations, and has taken steps to return government to the people and to the States, and has made the greatest advancement in the field of civil rights of any administration in our history: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this convention of the Nebraska Young Republican Club hereby express its deep gratitude to this administration for its tremendous accomplishments, and that Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his devotion and duty to his country, seek reelection as President of the United States in 1956.

RESOLUTION No. 2

Whereas the Nebraska Young Republican Club has assembled in Lincoln, Nebr., this 28 day of May 1955 in its annual State convention; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that at such time we reexamine and reaffirm the principles and programs of our organization: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we express our profound confidence in the leadership of our congressional delegation, namely, Senators CURTIS and HRUSKA, and Congressmen MILLER, WEAVER, HARRISON, and CHASE, for their intelligent cooperation and leadership demonstrated thus far in the Halls of Congress.

RESOLUTION No. 3

Whereas the present State administration is continuing the policies of efficiency, honesty, and good government: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this convention of the Nebraska Young Republican Club go on record as congratulating Gov. Victor E. Anderson and his administration.

I, in turn, am deeply grateful to the Nebraska Young Republican Club for the many significant contributions it has made to the cause of good government in the Nation and the State of Nebraska. A large number of its members are active in the affairs of the State central committee. Many county central committee chairmen are young Republicans. Many young Republicans hold State and county elective offices. One of the Members of Congress from Nebraska is a Young Republican, the Honorable PHIL WEAVER, representing the First District. The United States district attorney for the district of Nebraska was formerly active in Young Republican organizations. Many others are performing outstanding services to their communities, the State, and the Nation by taking roles of leadership in the Republican Party.

Last year the Nebraska Young Republican Club inaugurated a "first voters campaign" in our State, which will help to bring home the responsibilities of voting to thousands of young men and women who reach their majority each year, and which I feel is a very worthwhile program. I am informed that the progress of this campaign has been quite satisfactory. More than 3,000 young people have been contacted by the First Voters Campaign Committee,

according to the present State chairman of the Nebraska Young Republican Club, Jack F. Jacobson, of Lexington, Nebr.

The Young Republican movement has received great encouragement from President Eisenhower, who, many times, has publicly recognized the tremendous value of this vital and dynamic organization. I am heartily in accord.

Amend Refugee Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope before the end of the Congress it will be possible to secure changes in the Refugee Relief Act, which have been recommended by the President. It has been apparent since the beginning that certain provisions of the act presented great administrative difficulties and nullified some of its intended benefits.

It is not only desirable, but urgent, that these deficiencies should be cured as soon as possible, and I hope that Congress will be able to take early action eliminating present legal impediments which are standing in the way of carrying out the intent of the original law.

There are moving humane causes involved in this question which I think that the Congress can ill-afford to overlook, and prompt attention in applying remedies and corrective measures should be re sult not only in clarifying the law but in permitting fuller implementation of its basic provisions and objectives. As part of my remarks, I insert a recent letter from the Honorable Patrick A Tompkins, Commissioner of the Department of Public Welfare of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a faithful and distinguished public servant, who has given careful study and vigorous attention to these matters.

The letter follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Boston, June 28, 1955.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: In addition to my official position as Commissioner of Public Welfare for the Commonwealth and a direct concern for 6,000 neglected and dependent children in the care of the Department, I have also been honored by appointment to the Governor's Commission on Refugees for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Officially, also, the Department is the clearance agency for all refugee children or foreign adoptions by proxy, or children admitted to this State for purposes of either sponsorship or adoption from foreign countries.

With other members of our Massachusetts Commission and also as an American citizen, I have been gravely concerned with the legal impediments in the current Refugee Act which have so greatly contributed to a frustration of the intent of the act rather than its implementation to rapid admission of displaced persons within the period of time covered by current legislation.

Like other Americans of goodwill, I warmly applauded the recommendations of the President of the United States to the Congress for amendments to the current Act. These amendments, if enacted, will greatly strengthen and assist the work of sponsorship agencies, particularly the Church World Service, the War Relief National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Massachusetts Lutheran Committee, and the International Rescue Committee, Inc., in securing sponsorship for refugees now so hungrily eyeing the opportunities that could be made available to them in the United States.

Both as an official office holder of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and as a member of the Governor's Commission on Refugees in the Commonwealth, I urge your favorable consideration of President Eisenhower's 10 amendments to the current Refugee Act.

Very truly yours,
PATRICK A. TOMPKINS,
Commissioner.

Text of Remarks Given by Benjamin C. Stanczyk, an Assistant Prosecuting Attorney for Wayne County, Mich., on Thursday, May 19, 1955, at Post 78 of the Polish Army Veterans' Association, Martin and Lindsey, Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the address given by Mr. Benjamin C. Stanczyk, assistant prosecuting attorney for Wayne County, Mich., on May 19, 1955, at Detroit, Mich., before post 78 of the Polish Army Veterans' Association.

His speech follows:

TEXT OF REMARKS GIVEN BY BENJAMIN C. STANCZYK, AN ASSISTANT PROSECUTING ATTORNEY FOR WAYNE COUNTY, MICH., ON THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1955, AT POST 78 OF THE POLISH ARMY VETERANS' ASSOCIATION, MARTIN AND LINDSEY, DETROIT, MICH.

Ladies and gentlemen, the poem just recited by the young lady, whose father was killed 15 years ago in Katyn Forest, brought a tear to my eye as it did to many of you. This is a most solemn gathering. We met to pay respect to the memory of the 15,000 officers of the Polish Army who were murdered at Katyn Forest in eastern Poland 15 years ago. I use the word "murdered" after having studied the report of the select congressional committee which investigated that massacre. That committee, of which Congressman MACHROWICZ of this city was a member, heard the testimony of many credible witnesses, all under oath, both in this country and abroad. The committee investigated all of the circumstances surrounding the death of these Polish officers, many of whom were related to you here in this hall. Reading the report, one comes to the conclusion that the killing of these Polish men was a carefully calculated and well-planned deliberate act on the part of the Soviet armed forces. The date was carefully fixed by the committee as the spring or late winter of 1940. The testimony of eye witnesses, medical experts, German intelligence sources, and some frugal Russian intelligence sources, all tend to corroborate this statement.

The killing of these 15,000 men was a carefully planned murder. It was not death as a result of military aggression for these reasons: The Polish armed forces, as such, had capitulated in October of 1939. These officers were unarmed. They had been taken prisoners of war by the Russians, and they were gathered at Katyn Forest by the Russians, who were their captors. The killing of these men was the first step in Russia's plan to eventually capture all of Eastern Europe and make Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe, including the Baltic States, Russian satellites. By killing the military leaders of the country, Poland was deprived of the flower of its manhood to defend the country against Russian aggression and deprived of leaders who might lead an eventual rebellion against their Russian captors; further, Russian Communists planned and calculated the death of these men, many of whom were reserve officers, civil servants, university professors, and political leaders. It is curious that the invitation sent to the puppet government in Warsaw and to Moscow by the select congressional committee was not answered and no attempt was made by the Communists to offer an explanation for the death of these 15,000 Polish officers.

We here in the United States ask ourselves what can be done to right the wrong to the Polish people who suffered from this Communist brutality. One of the first steps suggested by our congressional leaders was ratification of the Genocide Convention, which would make similar mass killings of the leaders of a country an international crime so that the government and officers of a government, which might perpetrate such a crime in the future,. would be punished in a manner comparable to the punishment of the Nazi war criminals. However, the pleas of these men of good will have not been heard by the President or the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. It appears to me that it is mandatory for the United States to move for the swift ratification of the Genocide Convention to prevent similar atrocities in the future. Secondly, the demand made of the Democratic leaders of the select congressional committee, including the chairman, Congressman MADDEN, and our own Congressmen, of course, that the question of punishment of the perpetrators of the Katyn Forest massacre be referred to the United Nations, has also fallen on deaf ears. Mr. Dulles has indicated that it would be inappropriate at this time to discuss such matters with Russia. Thirdly, it was known as early as 1942 in American military circles that the Russians had killed Poland's army officers at Katyn. General Eisenhower was queried about this in 1944 and again in 1945. His answer was that he was too busy fighting a war to concern himself with such trivial matters.

Ten years ago, a defeated Nazi Germany sued for an armistice, an armistice which was to bring an end to one of the most destructive wars known to mankind. World War II, which was the result of England and France declaring war on Germany because Nazi Germany had invaded the territory of Poland. However, that war was never fought to a successful conclusion since Poland is still occupied by an enemy.

Ladies and gentlemen, we must not despair. We can once again look forward to freedom and independence and civil liberty to be restored in Poland. The Austrian treaty, signed last Sunday, leads me to believe that all is not yet lost and that there are definite signs of weakening behind the iron curtain. However, you and I must be firm. We must support the actions of our congressional leaders. We must stand behind Senator MCNAMARA, Congressmen DINGELL, LESINSKI, and MACHROWICZ. We must give them the ammunition and tools

which they need in order to carry on their good work.

The usual authoritative New York Times in an editorial on Sunday, May 8, of this year indicated that our administration was committed to return to Germany the lands ceded to Poland at the Potsdam Conference. The economic balance of Europe requires that Poland's westerly border be on the Rivers Oder and Neisse in order to give Poland raw materials and at the same time deprive military Germany of the sinews of war. We must be firm in supporting our democratic congressional leaders who are fighting against this action.

Iowa Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the voters of Iowa have been warned against the upper Colorado project by the following editorials appearing in the Oskaloosa Daily Herald on May 16 and the Indianola Record-Herald on May 12:

[From the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Daily Herald of May 16, 1955]

WHY DESTROY ANY MORE SCENIC SPOTS IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA?

With Congress perturbed over food surplushes the Herald is being besieged with stories, brochures, and pictures relating to the proposed upper Colorado River storage project which would result in the flooding of a Dinosaur National Monument and the destruction of many scenic spots in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico.

The federally financed project would store water from melting mountain snows for the irrigation of many acres of arid land to further increase farm surpluses. And water would operate a new system of power plants in some of the most sparsely populated sections of the Mountain States.

That horde of Americans that annually fills highways with vacation-bound traffic, overruns inadequate housing facilities of the national parks and forests, and enjoys the beauties that have been preserved from commercial exploitation is alarmed over the inroads of Government bureaucratic job promotion.

No less person than Oskaloosa's own Maj. John F. Lacey was among the first to raise a voice in protest of the despoilation of the natural wonders and beauties of America. First actual conservation had its beginning under President Teddy Roosevelt. Succeeding administrations have courageously protected parks and forests for Americans.

Joining the opponents of the upper Colorado Basin reclamation development are the Western States who now benefit from the Rocky Mountain waters that now race through colorful gorges, plunge over high precipices to become sparkling water falls, and meander across highland meadows.

We cast our lot with the opposition, for modern farm technology promises to keep food production apace with population growth through scientific use of present fertile agricultural lands. And our annual urge to be on the open highways and see America first adds weight to that opposition.

[From the Indianola (Iowa) Record-Herald of May 12, 1955]

WHAT $62 MILLION COULD DO AT HOME

The Record-Herald has not gone back on Senator HICKENLOOPER. We are still proud to have his autographed photograph hanging over the editorial desk.

However, we cannot understand his wholehearted support of the upper Colorado River project recently enacted by the Senate. That project will cost the taxpayers of Iowa $62 million to help promote a power and real-estate scheme that won't support itself.

That same $62 million, if spent in the Des Moines River watershed, would bring a third of it under upstream flood control and soil conservation management, which would prevent disastrous floods, and, in the long run, add more food to the national supply than 10 times the amount spent in irrigation projects along the Colorado River. In Iowa a tremendous investment already made could be conserved and made permanent with the expenditure of $62 million in the Des Moines River Basin.

The series of dams in the Colorado River will be bomb targets if we ever get into war. The same amount spent in Iowa would raise more food, and its structures would be scattered over such a wide and divergent area as to defy bombers.

It strikes us Senator HICKENLOOPER had better talk more to the farmers and soil-conservation committeemen of Iowa and not so much to the Army engineers and the reclamation zealots.

Japanese Textile Tariff Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, only recently the Congress gave final approval to H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. This was accomplished only after long consideration and extended debate. When H. R. 1 was first considered in the House, I joined many Members in seeking to write into the bill some safeguards for domestic industries against unfair competition from low-paid labor abroad. We did not win that fight in the House, but it was won in the Senate. In approving the conference report a few days ago, the House indicated its general satisfaction with the measure as amended in the Senate.

While the conferees of the House and Senate were seeking to reconcile the differences over H. R. 1, the State Department announced that our Government had just concluded, at Geneva, a new trade agreement with Japan.

An analysis of the terms of the agreement indicates that our country is granting heavy additional tariff reductions on cotton goods imported from Japan, effective September 10, 1955. In addition, the United States granted tariff concessions to third countries in exchange for concessions by those countries to Japan.

These new tariff cuts on textile products imported from Japan concern me very much, because the production of cotton and the manufacture of cotton goods are very important activities in the District I have the honor to represent in Congress. They apply to goods representing a substantial part of our domestic textile production, and I fear the results will be disastrous to millions of our citizens who derive their livelihood directly or indirectly from cotton textiles.

Notwithstanding the fact that our present tariff rates are so moderate that Japanese-made textile goods are being imported into this country now in substantial quantities, our representatives at Geneva granted additional tariff cuts ranging upward to 50 percent. In some cases these tariff cuts, when translated into prices per pound or yard, will exceed the total profit being earned by domestic mills. It is difficult for me to see how our representatives who negotiated this agreement at Geneva expect the United States textile industry to exist, much less prosper, when subjected to such handicaps.

The argument is advanced by those who defend these tariff cuts that the quantity of textiles imported by this country is insignificant in comparison with domestic production. This is an utterly fallacious and unrealistic argument. It ignores the fact that the importation of textile goods, even in small quantities, affects the domestic market price—not only affects it, but in many cases dictates it.

All of us are, of course, interested in the rehabilitation of Japan. But I submit that the domestic textile industry, and the millions of our citizens who depend upon it for a living, should not be expected to absorb the cost.

The truth about the matter is that the textile industry in Japan does not need stimulation. The facts are that imports of textiles by the United States have been rising rapidly. In the first quarter of 1955, for example, imports of textiles were almost double the amount imported in the first quarter of 1954, and approximately two-thirds of the total came from Japan. Moreover, 90 percent of the textile equipment now in use in Japan is new machinery. It is just as modern and efficient as the equipment in our own mills. The textile business in Japan is exceedingly profitable, and Japanese textile firms are paying substantial dividends. All of this indicates that the Japanese textile industry is flourishing, is able to pay our very modest tariff import duties and still undersell domestic producers in our home market.

The fact should not be overlooked that the United States textile manufacturer furnishes the principal market for the cotton produced in this country. Japan imports cotton in large quantities, but more than half of it is obtained from countries other than the United States. If these drastic textile tariff cuts remain in effect, and if imports are not limited, I am afraid that the result will be disastrous not only to the cotton processors and manufacturers, and their employees, but also to the cotton farmers of our country.

In the light of these actions and these facts, the executive committee of the

American Cotton Manufacturers Institute met in an emergency session in Charlotte, N. C., on June 30, 1955, and adopted a resolution setting forth a sound and sensible plan to cushion the effect of these new and drastic tariff reductions. This plan recognizes the importance of expanding and stimulating international trade and contemplates a substantial increase in textile imports from Japan. At the same time, it indicates a commendable concern lest we inadvertently and mistakenly subject a great and important domestic industry to destruction by opening our home markets to unlimited, unfair competition from abroad.

In the interest of acquainting the Members of the House with the position taken by that organization, which speaks for 85 percent of the domestic textile industry, I incorporate the statement issued by the executive committee of ACMI as a part of my remarks.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN COTTON MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, INC.

Meeting in Charlotte, N. C., on June 30, 1955, the executive committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute herewith recommends the adoption of an equitable quota system on imports of cotton goods as the only practical solution to the problem created by drastic tariff reductions at Geneva.

In reaching this conclusion the committee had in mind the best interests of all segments of the cotton industry, including 3½ million people in cotton farmers' families, 8 million in the families of textile-mill employees and apparel employees, plus hundreds of thousands more engaged in cotton ginning, shipping, and warehousing.

It is the judgment of this committee that American mills will find it impossible to adjust to conditions resulting from the Geneva action; and that heavy inroads of cotton-goods shipments from foreign countries will nullify the present quota protection for American cotton farmers.

This committee's judgment is that the vastly reduced tariff rates, when they go into effect September 10, will force many cotton mills to import foreign gray goods, particularly from Japan, for finishing and distribution as a competitive necessity. Converters likewise will be forced into similar action because of the lower prices of Japanese goods, as some are already doing.

In addition, the situation is certain to create the opportunity for a new type of adventurer-importer who, without a spindle or loom or a vestige of textile experience, will operate largely on a speculative basis to disrupt and demoralize the established system of textile distribution.

Under these circumstances, American cotton is destined to a minor role in cotton-goods consumption in the United States. Today, over 98 percent of the cotton goods manufactured and consumed in this country is American-grown cotton. The prevailing State Department policy points to the loss of the American cotton farmer's chief customer. Just as foreign-made goods are the product of foreign labor, so are foreign fabrics likewise in greater part—upwards of 75 percent—the products of foreign cotton.

Any effort to establish free, unrestrained competition with Japanese goods must inevitably fail, because the only outcome will be Japanese monopoly at the cost not only of American industry but also American agriculture.

It is imperative, therefore, that a system of overall quantitative limitation be placed on imports of foreign cotton goods. In advocating a system of import controls, this committee wishes to emphasize that the cotton textile industry makes its sales, purchases its raw materials, and schedules its manufacturing operations all on a futures basis. For this reason, a condition of reasonable certainty regarding imports is essential.

In the spirit of the Government's foreign economic policy to expand international trade, it is not our wish to restrict unduly such imports. To the contrary, in the interest of industry stability and at the same time in the interest of considerate treatment for Japan, we favor a quota which will permit a substantial increase of Japanese imports. It is our belief that this industry would approve an increase not over 50 percent, based on the average annual volume of 1953–54, which are the two highest import years since World War II.

To assure equity of treatment for importers, foreign exporting countries and the various divisions of the domestic industry, the total quota should be appropriately subdivided by products, or produce categories, in such manner as to avoid injurious or inequitable import concentration. In arriving at such determinations, representatives of the industry and the cotton goods trade should be consulted.

Applesauce on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from southern California is putting into the RECORD statements whimsically entitled "Bananas on Pikes Peak." They are typical of the unfounded exaggerations being circulated about the Colorado River storage project, and I submit they would have been more accurately entitled "Applesauce on Capitol Hill."

Water to be developed by the Colorado River storage project would not be used to grow bananas on Pikes Peak, or, indeed, anywhere else. But this water will be used to grow sinews and muscle for an expanding America.

The Geneva steel plant was built in my State, Mr. Speaker, during World War II. It has continued in operation, under private ownership and management, and is now contributing substantially to the backbone of American industrial might—the output of steel.

The Geneva plant turns out 1.8 million tons of steel a year, and to achieve that production it consumes from 12 to 25 million gallons of water every day. That is a lot of water, especially in a dry country such as ours.

How, then, did the steel plant obtain the needed water? Mostly through reclamation development. Substantial quantities were purchased from a comparatively small reclamation project just being completed when the steel plant was first constructed—Deer Creek Reservoir. Other supplies were purchased wherever they could be found. But most important of all, land for the steel plant was purchased complete with appurtenant water rights. The water which for years had been used for irrigating farmland was purchased along with that farmland, and made possible this great industrial development.

The same pattern will be repeated many times in the future, as this great Nation grows and her industry expands. Water developed for use through the Colorado River storage project will, much of it, eventually be turned to the development and expansion of America's strategic industries—and repay the cost of development many times over.

Connecticut Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, citizens of Connecticut have received stern warnings against the proposed upper Colorado project in editorials appearing in prominent newspapers of that State. The following appeared in the Waterbury Republican of May 19, and the New Britain Herald on May 16:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of May 19, 1955]

WE WOULD PAY

One of the evils of centralization of power at Washington is the way in which remoteness from the scenes where money is appropriated and spent blinds too many of us to the fact that it's our money.

Most of us have heard of the upper Colorado and Fryingpan-Arkansas project bills now before the Congress. Via these projects great arid sections of the West would be brought into cultivation. To social planners on a massive scale the idea has its obvious attractions. To the areas immediately involved it is gravy. What's Connecticut's stake in the proposition?

Well, our modest little interest, as based on the United States Bureau of Reclamation repayment schedules will be just under $70 million. That will be our contribution to the $4 billion total required. And for what?

These projects would flood some of the Nation's great scenic canyons to irrigate highlands with a very short growing season so that a few farmers in four States could grow crops that are already in great surplus. It is estimated that the irrigation thus provided would run as high as $5,000 per acre and that far more productive land could be reclaimed in other States at one-tenth the cost.

Not a very commendable proposition from the Connecticut view, but if this spending program is to be blocked the people who will have to pay the bill must get excited enough about it to protest. Congress is hearing from the people interested in these projects because there's money in it for them. Because it's money out of our pockets, Congress ought to hear from us.

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald of May 16, 1955]

DEVELOPMENT ISN'T BEST

Irrigation and hydroelectric power development for the upper Colorado River seem quite remote from this distance—until one stops and thinks just who is going to pay for those things.

Should the project—costing $4 billion—be passed, Connecticut taxpayers will be asked to fork over $69,600,000.

On the basis of the cost factor alone, Connecticut residents should urge defeat of such a project. But when that cost is analyzed, even stronger arguments develop against the reclamation idea.

This project, mind you, is no TVA. It is not to be built in an area which will conceivably justify its cost. Development of a series of dams, to irrigate highland areas will flood beautiful valleys, including the inspiring Dinosaur National Monument.

Further, the area which would be irrigated has a short growing season, and is best acclimated to crops which, we are informed, are already in surplus production.

The conception of hydroelectric power development, while it has worked miracles in the Tennessee Valley, is not naturally adaptable to all areas. Further, with atomic generation for powerplants "just around the corner," the Nation is liable to find itself with a hydroelectric white elephant on its hands.

It would seem here that additional Federal taxation, spread throughout the Nation to benefit a few farmers, is dubious at best. We are constantly faced with awesome defense spending and terrific national debt payments without having so major a project as the Colorado River Development plan added to our pocketbooks.

Democrat Bill Proposes To Saddle $850 Million New and Additional Taxes on American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss some unusual aspects of the new highway bill which was introduced this week in behalf of a majority of the Democratic members of the House Public Works Committee.

This Democratic highway bill, H. R. 7072, proposed to levy $850 million in new and additional taxes on American automobile and truck users.

The new taxes which the Democrats would levy by the terms of the bill they introduced last Tuesday are: First. An increase of the present 2 cents a gallon Federal gasoline tax to 3 cents a gallon which it is estimated will yield an additional $500 million annually; second, an increase of the present 2 cents a gallon diesel fuel tax to 6 cents a gallon which it is estimated will yield an additional $50 million a year; and third, an increase in the present tax of 5 cents a pound on large-sized truck tires to 50 cents a pound, and a new 20 cents a pound tax on retread material, all of which is expected to raise an additional $300 million a year.

TIRE TAX CALLED UNFAIR

Until the time that the Democrats introduced their highway bill this week, no one knew the Democrats were considering imposing a tax on tires and retread material or of additional taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel. In fact, when witnesses during the hearings on bills that would authorize an expanded highway program tried to testify against the imposition of new taxes they were shut off from so testifying by statements of committee members that no new taxes were proposed in the highway legislation then under consideration. The bill, H. R. 7072, just introduced in behalf of the Democratic majority of the Public Works Committee, carries $850 million in proposed new and additional taxes on automobile and truck owners. No public hearings have been held on the tax aspects of this bill although these tax increases will total almost a billion dollars a year.

The proposed tax on truck tires is 10 times the tax now paid on tires. It increases the present 5-cents-a-pound truck tire tax to a tax of 50 cents a pound.

Not one of those upon whom this 1,000-percent, tenfold increase in the Federal taxes on tires will be imposed, if the Democratic bill is enacted, have been provided an opportunity to give their views on this proposed exorbitant tax increase. Certainly, before $850 million in new and additional taxes are imposed upon the truck and automobile owners of America, public hearings ought to be held for at least a few days to provide those who must pay this $850 million in new and additional taxes a right to be heard as to how these new taxes will affect them.

I have received telegrams from some truckers who seldom if ever use interstate-highway systems that the proposed 1,000-percent, tenfold increase in the tax on tires, will put them out of business. I do not know whether these people will be ruined financially by the new proposed taxes but most certainly these people, on whom almost a billion dollars in new taxes would be imposed by this Democratic bill, ought to be heard, in public hearings. No provision, as yet, has been made for any hearings on the imposition of these proposed new taxes.

Most of the money in the Democratic highway bill is to be spent on the interstate highway system. I will agree that perhaps the big trucking companies which operate great freight and passenger trucks over the interstate system of highways, which roads will get most of the highway money in the Democratic bill, should pay extra taxes. They will get the benefits of the interstate highway improvements.

There are, however, tens of thousands of trucks that are operated only on city streets or only on secondary and rural roads, and which never or seldom get onto any interstate highway. The off-interstate highway truckers will be taxed just as much under the Democratic bill as the truckers using the interstate system of highways. The imposition of a tax amounting to as much as a 1,000 percent, tenfold, increases over present taxes on truckers who never or seldom use the interstate highway system to provide a better interstate highway system for other truck lines obviously is unfair and unjustifiable.

LOG TRUCKER TAX EXORBITANT

Take the case of the logging industry. Nearly all timber today is hauled to tidewater or to the mills on trucks.

The average logging truck in the Pacific coast States is equipped with 16 to 22 tires. These tires sell at about $100 each, plus a $5 tax.

The Democratic bill introduced this week proposed to increase this $5 a tire tax to a tax of 50 cents-a-pound, which means a tax of $50 a tire in place of the present about $5-a-tire tax. In short, the logging truck owner who now pays a tax of $80 to $110—this is $5 a tire—will be required under the proposal in the Democratic highway bill to pay a total tire tax of $800 to $1,100 a truck. This is $50 a tire for 16 to 22 tires.

This is a 1,000-percent increase in the logger's tire tax.

These logging truckers who are to have their tire taxes increased 100 percent, or by about $800 to $1,100 a truck every time they get a tire change, seldom, if ever, use the interstate highway system.

If there is any doubt in your mind that most of the new money in the Democratic bill will go onto the interstate system of highways and very little of it on other roads, consider these facts:

Under the present law the Federal Government provides $175 million a year for the interstate highway system, but under the new Democratic bill will provide $1,200,000,000 a year, or more than a billion dollars a year above what is provided under the present law.

On the other hand, under the present law, the Federal Government provides $700 million a year in matching funds for primary, secondary, and urban State roads, whereas under the new Democratic bill—H. R. 7072—the Federal Government will provide $725 million the first year, or only $25 million a year more than is provided by the present law.

In other words, the new Democratic bill increases Federal allowances for the interstate system of highways by more than a billion dollars a year and allows an increase in Federal funds of only $25 million for all other types of roads.

I am not objecting to this. I am objecting, however, to making users who confine their operations almost entirely to primary, secondary, and urban State roads, on which very little additional money will be spent under the Democratic bill, pay an enormously increased tax to finance an interstate system of highways for those truckers who do use the interstate system.

A DEMOCRATIC BILL

In this speech I repeatedly have referred to H. R. 7072, the bill to impose $850 million in new and additional taxes on automobile and truck owners as "the Democratic bill."

I call it "the Democratic bill" because it was prepared and drafted in a series of conferences of the Democratic members of the Public Works Committee to which no Republican members of the committee were invited.

These secret meetings of the Democrats to draft their bill to increase taxes by $850 million extended from June 1 to June 28 when, on the last date their

bill, H. R. 7072, was introduced. No Republicans were invited to any of these meetings. The bill, H. R. 7072, and its proposal to boost taxes by $850 million therefore is a 100-percent Democratic proposal.

It often is said that the users of the highways should pay for them. Of course highway users should. As a matter of fact the highway users for years in the past and even now, already, are paying enough in special taxes to finance the entire proposed expanded highway program.

The trouble is and has been that the money motorists have paid in special Federal taxes has not gone into building highways. It has gone for all other kinds of purposes, including foreign aid and the construction of highways, power dams, and buildings in foreign lands.

For years now the automobile and truck owners of our Nation have been paying special excise taxes on new cars, on new trucks, on tires, on automobile accessories, on gasoline and on diesel fuel. These special automotive taxes, paid almost exclusively by automobile and truck owners have brought into the Federal Treasury more than $2 billion annually. Yet, throughout the past 10 years the Federal Government never has provided more than $575 million in any year for highway construction despite the fact that it was collecting four times that amount in special taxes from automobile and truck owners.

The Federal Government never has put back into Federal highway construction at any time in the past even as much as it collected from the 2-cent gasoline tax alone. The collections from the gasoline tax in recent years has exceeded $800 million annually of which never more than $575 million and often less than that, has been spent on highways.

Not until the Republican Congress last year at President Eisenhower's urging enacted legislation increasing appropriations for highway spending to $850 million a year has our Government approached spending as much on highways as it collected from the gas tax. None of the money collected in excise taxes on new cars and trucks, on tires, on tubes and on accessories has gone to highway building. These taxes were and are being paid exclusively by highway users. None of these revenues, however, has been or is being spent for highway building or betterment—except that some of it is being spent to build highways abroad for foreign countries.

MANY INJUSTICES IN BILL

There are a number of injustices in the democratic highway bill that ought to be corrected. Among these are:

First. The increasing of the tax on truck tires from 5 cents a pound to 50 cents a pound is a tenfold, 1,000 percent, increase in tire taxes. Such an increase is exorbitant. Under the tire tax proposal of the Democrats a tire that sells for $100 will be taxed approximately $50 or 50 percent of its retail price. No other commodity, even whiskey or cigarettes, is taxed so excessively.

Second. The tax on tubes, now 9 cents a pound, under the Democratic bill will be increased to 50 cents a pound. I make the same complaint against the proposed tube tax as I do to the tire tax. Both are excessive.

Third. Practically all of the increased highway money to be raised by the tax increases proposed in the Democratic highway bill will be spent on the interstate highway system and little of it on the other roads. Yet, automobile and truck owners whose equipment is seldom or never on the interstate highway system will be taxed just as heavily under the Democratic bill (H. R. 7072) as those truck owners who operate almost exclusively over interstate roads. The taxes on school busses and city bus lines, for example, which operate exclusively over city streets and rural roads will be taxed, comparatively, just as much as the heavy truckers who use interstate highways almost exclusively.

Fourth. The gasoline that goes into on-the-farm tractors and other farm equipment used entirely on farms and never on any highway, gasoline that is used in motor boats or in the operation of aircraft will be taxed at the same rates as gasoline used in trucks that travel the interstate and other roads of the Nation.

Fifth. The Democratic bill will be unfair to independent tire dealers unless one important change is made. Under the Democratic bill, the independent tire dealer will be required to pay the proposed 50-cents-a-pound tire tax the instant he buys tires from the factory. On the other hand the factory-owned retail outlet will not pay the 50-cents-a-pound tire tax until the factory's tire station actually sells the tire to a consumer. This will give the factory-owned retail tire stores a substantial advantage over independent tire dealers.

Sixth. The diesel fuel tax is to be raised by the Democratic highway bill from 2 cents a gallon to 6 cents a gallon. The retail outlet that sells diesel fuel must collect the 6-cents-a-gallon diesel fuel tax and forward the tax money to the Federal Government with suitable reports. Every little service station handling diesel fuel, therefore, will be a tax-collection agency entailing great extra work on the service-station operators for which they will receive no compensation. In the case of gasoline the tax is collected at the wholesale level thus simplifying collection by the Government and relieving the service-station operators of the onerous work of collecting and reporting tax collections. Something like this ought to be worked out for handling diesel fuel tax collections.

Seventh. The Democratic highway bill proposes that the collection of the new and additional taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel and tires which it is anticipated will yield about $70 million a month shall start within about 30 days after the Democratic bill becomes law, if it does become law. Actual construction work on the proposed expanded highway program, however, will not start until about a year after the collection of taxes is begun. Automobile and trucker owners, therefore, will not be paying for the improved roads as they use them. They will be paying in advance for them.

Eighth. While the imposing of the $850 million in new and additional taxes in the Democratic highway bill creates and leaves the impression that this additional tax money is to be spent on bettering highways there is nothing in the bill that says that this $850 million is to be used for highway work. The $850 million like most other taxes will go into the general Treasury. If for any reason some future administration decides not to go ahead with highway construction, as outlined in the bill H. R. 7072, and stops or curtails highway building, the increased taxes will continue in effect anyway, even if the highway program proposed is curtailed, lags, or is stopped.

Considering that in the past only about 25 cents out of each dollar collected from automobile and truck owners in taxes has gone into highway building the proposed $850 million tax increase proposed by the Democrats, should it be adopted, should be tied down and earmarked for exclusive use on the highways.

There never have been any hearings on the tax proposals in the Democratic bill. Certainly those upon whom $850 million in new taxes are to be imposed, if the Democratic majority of the committee has its way, should be given an opportunity to be heard.

Address by Prime Minister U Nu of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during debate on the Mutual Security Act, I sought to answer some queries and adverse comments regarding the neutralist position of the leaders of some of the newly independent countries of south Asia. Far better explanation of that position is presented vividly by one of those leaders himself, the distinguished Prime Minister of the Union of Burma, the Honorable U Nu, in the following address at a luncheon given by the National Press Club, July 1, 1955:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and members of the National Press Club, this is a very happy event for me. I do not feel that I am a total stranger here. I suppose that this is partly because I, too, am a writer. In a certain sense, I am even a reporter. Therefore, we have a common interest and a common love for truth and the expression of truth.

Furthermore, I feel that I know you. How could anyone in public life these days fail to know the American press? You are everywhere, at all times, and under all circumstances. In fact, having seen so many of you recently in so many parts of the world, I wonder that so many of you could be here today. In any event, I am very pleased to join the long list of guests who have appeared before you and which has included so many distinguished names.

When I accepted your invitation, I did so with a certain feeling of responsibility not to waste your time with generalities and platitudes—a responsibility to speak frankly what is in my mind on the subjects that are important to all of us. I believe that this is in the tradition of the National Press Club.

For a little over 7 years now Burma has been a sovereign, independent nation. We are independent of foreign rule. And we are independent of any power blocs based on military treaties. Nations that choose not to participate in military blocs usually are referred to in this country as neutrals. If my impression is correct, this word "neutral" has acquired a distinct and unfavorable semantic coloration. Apparently, the word suggests the image of the ostrich with his head in the sand, a negative attitude toward world politics, a blind withdrawal from reality. The implication seems to be that a nation that does not choose sides and join irrevocably with one or the other camp in the armed truce that exists in the world today lacks courage and conviction. And very often the inference which seems to be drawn is "if you are not with us, then you are against us. And if you are not with us, you must be either openly or secretly in tow with communism."

At least these are the impressions which I have received from my conversations about neutralism with American friends and visitors, including representatives of the press. And if this is the case, there is real need for clarification, so that we can better understand each other. That is why I want to discuss with you some of the meanings and implications of independence to the people and Government of Burma.

First of all, as most of you probably know, Burma has a long history. We had a great and flourishing civilization in Burma based on one of the great religions of the world, Buddhism, at the time when William the Conqueror was crossing the English Channel. This civilization, passed on to us by our forebears, has now become our national heritage. It is our way of life. We prefer it to any other way of life on this earth. We do not say that it cannot be improved, or that it cannot be adapted to suit modern conditions, but we do not wish to change its basis. We are not prepared to exchange it for any other way of life.

This is not a matter of conceit. We do not claim that our way of life is better than that of other people. We merely say that it is different, that it suits us better, and that we cannot therefore be induced to give it up in exchange for some other way of life, be that the Communist way, the West European way, the American way, or any other way.

Now, I submit to you that if the citizens of any nation are deeply devoted to their culture, to their religion, to their way of life, to their country—as we in Burma are—then they will defend their way of life and their national frontiers with all the forces at their command. I can assure you that we are just as determined as any people to defend ourselves against foreign invasion or the imposition of any alien way of life by whatever method. And we have concluded that in the present phase of our history, and in the present state of the world, the wisest, and even the only, course for Burma is to pursue an independent policy, unshackled by what George Washington called entangling foreign alliances.

Now I can hear some of you saying to yourselves, "How can he be so foolish. Burma is small; Burma is weak; how can she hope to repel foreign invasion alone? Besides, don't these Burmese know that the real danger to countries like Burma comes not from overt aggression, but from subversion? Surely their own interests demand that they should join in some military bloc which will give them the protection they need?"

I am afraid I must beg to differ. To begin with, Burma is not alone. She is a member of the United Nations. As such she is entitled to the protection which collective security affords. The Charter of the United Nations is in effect one great mutual security pact. This is a fact which is very often overlooked.

It will probably be said at once that this implicit faith in the United Nations is pathetic; that the United Nations system of collective security has broken down and can no longer be relied on. Here again, we must beg to differ. We say that the system has not broken down, but merely that it has not been made to work; that the remedy is not to push the United Nations aside but to strengthen it and put more life into it.

It is possible to disagree with this point of view. But whether one agrees or disagrees is immaterial, because in the present circumstances of Burma her membership in any alliance with a great-power military bloc is incompatible with her continued existence as an independent state. This may seem to be putting it strongly, but it is a fact. Our recent history is such, our experience with great powers is such, that in the minds of the people of Burma an alliance with a big power immediately means domination by that power. It means the loss of independence. You may question the validity of that belief. But perhaps you will accept my statement that it is a political fact of life today that any Government of Burma which alined itself with a big-power bloc would at once lose the confidence and support of the people. In other words, the chances of subversion would be greatly increased. And if it is true that the real danger to countries like Burma lies in subversion rather than overt aggression, then it follows that membership in a big-power bloc would only tend to add to what is already said to be the greater of the two dangers.

What is the practical effect of this? It is that Burma at the present time has no choice but to pursue her policy of neutrality if she wishes to preserve her independence, and that to us is more important than anything else. It is part of her defense, and an important part, against subversion. But in another way, she cannot abandon her neutrality without increasing the risk of losing her independence through subversion.

But of course subversion cannot be successfully combated merely by following a foreign policy of neutrality, as we in Burma know only too well. Despite our strict adherence to a neutral foreign policy, Burma has been the victim of subversion both from Communist and non-Communist elements. Indeed, at one time some 5 years ago, it seemed certain that she would go under. At that time the Government's authority extended only to 4 or 5 of our cities and towns. Even Rangoon, the capital, was infiltrated by subversive elements. The rest of the country was controlled by various kinds of subversive groups ranging in political hue from the Communists who received their orders from outside, to the anti-Communist Karen National Defense Organization which also was inspired and encouraged from abroad.

Today that situation has completely changed. The Government's authority runs throughout the length and breadth of Burma. Not only has the Government succeeded in smashing the various internal rebellious groups; it has also succeeded in virtually putting an end to the unwarranted intrusion into our country of some 12,000 Kuomintang troops who seized on our earlier weakness to entrench themselves on our soil, and, by allying themselves with indigenous subversive elements, tried to bring about the overthrow of the Government.

All this was done without any outside military assistance of any kind. It may seem incredible but it is true. Since it is possible that there is a lesson to be drawn from our experience, let me relate to you in some detail how we went about our task of fighting subversion and building stability out of the chaos of insurrection in Burma.

Our troubles started almost as soon as we achieved independence in January 1948. Six months before that historic event, the Burmese Communist leaders had pledged us their full cooperation after independence. One month after independence, these leaders attended a southeast Asian Communist conference in Calcutta where insurrection was plotted. Two months later, the Burmese Communists embarked on an armed insurrection against the Government. Misled by the Communists, a section of the People's Volunteer Organization, a militant pro-Government group which had been raised to fight for our independence should it be necessary, also rebelled against the Government. The spirit of revolt and rebellion against authority soon spread to the armed forces and police, and large elements of them also succumbed. The Karen National Defense Organization, sensing that the time had come for them to try to get by force those unreasonable demands which they had not been able to obtain through negotiation, were the next to rebel; and they were soon joined by three Karen battalions of the army, these being the best trained and equipped units in the Burma Army at the time. At that time, only one and a half battalions of the army remained loyal to the Government. Insurrection was in the air, and there seemed precious little the Government could do about it.

As you can imagine, these events had the most demoralizing effect on the country as a whole. Large sections of the populations, including some members of our own political organization, took to fence sitting, ready to jump to the side that appeared to be winning. Those of us who were loyal to the Union of Burma in those days felt like the crew of a small sailboat tossed about unmercifully in the open sea with storms raging all round.

The truth of the matter is we were quite puzzled. We finally had won the independence from foreign control for which we had worked so long and so hard. Apart from the hard core of subversives and traitors who were trying to seize control in an alien interest, why were our people so disinterested, so apathetic that for many the main concern seemed to be just to get on the winning side?

Gradually we began to see the heart of the problem. The real problem was that the people had not yet realized the true meaning of independence. Having lived for so long under an alien ruler, the people found it hard to believe that they now had the opportunity to work for themselves and their children. They had lost their pride in their country and their people. They looked upon the new government as just another government engaged in a struggle to detemine which group would have the privilege of exploiting the people. So what we had to deal with basically was not just an armed rebellion, but with underlying evils that had crept into our society and with the resulting psychological attitudes of large numbers of people.

This called for nothing less than a comprehensive program of nation building that involved religion, ethics, politics, health, education, and economic and social betterment. We drew up just such a program, and I should now like to outline it for you.

First, we recalled from past Burmese history the importance of religion in maintaining the basic unity of our country. So the Government sponsored a religious revival. This was not a fanatical campaign on behalf of Buddhism. Burma has no state religion, although 85 percent of her population is Buddhist. What was done for Buddhism was also done in regard to other religions, including Christianity. The heads of the other religious sects in the country were brought into the campaign, and financial assistance was provided by the Government. The ef-

fect of this campaign has been nothing short of startling. A wave of spiritual enthusiasm has swept the country.

In the broad moral field, the Government took stern measures to root out corruption and graft in public life. We had vivid recollections of the part played by corruption and graft in the decay and collapse of the Kuomintang regime in China, and we resolved that this history should not be repeated in our country. Strict remedial measures have been applied uniformly to all, no consideration being given to the position or influence of the malefactor. Those dealt with have ranged all the way from the lowest officials to cabinet ministers. These measures demonstrated to the public that they had an honest government, which was not afraid to do a job of drastic house cleaning whenever it was necessary. This brought respect and esteem from the people, and thus raised the prestige of the government.

Then, of course, we knew that ignorance is incompatible with democracy, and that its existence was a continual invitation to subversion. So we set out to spread education throughout the country as quickly as possible. Today, there are 10 times as many schools as there were before we achieved our independence. In all of these schools, as well as at the greatly expanded university, education is free except in the post graduate law courses.

To cope with the need for adult education, especially in the rural areas, a mass education council was formed a few years ago. This council trains teams of workers who then fan out into the countryside. The work being done by the mass education council has received the highest praise from many foreign observers.

While on this subject of education, I feel I should also cite the rehabilitation center near Rangoon where thousands of young insurgents who have surrendered under the armistices issued by government not only receive some kind of vocational training, but also get spiritual instruction, and live, many of them for the first time in their lives, in conditions calculated to help them become good citizens.

Nor do we forget that healthy minds need healthy bodies. What we have tried to do in the field of public education, we have tried to repeat in the field of public health. Though hampered by the shortage of qualified personnel, the Government has embarked on an ambitious program of making medical care available, without charge, to all. I could not pretend that every citizen of the Union of Burma now receives free medical attention. That is a goal for the future. But there has been a steady increase in the facilities which are available, and this gives hope to those who now live beyond the reach of existing facilities that the day is not too far distant when they may expect to receive free medical care in case of need. We also have an active minister of housing who is engaged in devising better housing for our people at a price they can afford.

The removal of economic and social injustice was and is a major objective. Since Burma is predominantly agricultural, we gave first priority to tackling the problems which beset the peasant. As in the other countries of Asia, these problems involved landlordism, agricultural indebtedness, insecurity of tenure, and uncertain prices. The existence of these problems had been recognized long before the outbreak of World War II, but the governments of the day had been powerless to deal with the vested interests which by then had acquired a stranglehold. The government which I had the honor to lead was compelled to apply drastic remedies to cope with a drastic situation. We have taken steps to abolish landlordism with payment of compensation, to prevent a return to it, to mitigate the effects of agricultural indebtedness, to insure security of tenure, and to secure to the farmer a fair and steady return for his produce. Of course, not all these measures could be applied throughout the country at one and the same time, where they could not be applied immediately, interim steps were taken to alleviate the lot of the farmer pending the implementation of these programs. And I am convinced that this program has played a large part in the failure of the subversive elements to win over the peasantry. In the field of industrial labor also, reforms have been introduced to protect the rights of labor, and much attention is given to its welfare.

Realizing the need for raising the standard of living we have devoted a great deal of our time and resources toward working out plans for the economic development of the country. These plans, which take in the fields of agriculture, mining, transportation, and industrialization, are now being implemented. It is an ambitious program, but perhaps we can be forgiven any excessive zeal since we are in a hurry to get a move on, and prove to our people that independence is more than an empty slogan.

Over and above these achievements, I am firmly convinced that a major contribution to the restoration of stability in Burma was brought about by the fact that we in the government stuck to the ways and procedures of democracy throughout. Fundamental freedoms and human rights were assured at all times, even at the height of the rebellion, and even in regard to the insurgents. Insurgent leaders captured in the course of operations have been brought before the courts and given a fair trial. This was in such glaring contrast to the record of summary executions and punishments inflicted by the insurgent groups that it could not fail to get a favorable response from the masses of the people who, like the masses everywhere, are fundamentally decent and fairminded. And finally, the decision of the government to go ahead with the elections in 1951, the first year since independence when conditions permitted the holding of elections, made a tremendous impact on the people. For the first time in their lives, they had a government placing before them its policies and asking them to decide on its merits. This was something entirely new, and gave them a sense that they were being associated, in a personal sense, with those policies and with the process of governing the country.

Now we are going even further. In addition to associating the people with the determination of our policies, we are now associating them with the implementation of those policies and plans. Under our Pyidawtha or Happy Land plan, the Government has delegated to the people some of the powers entrusted to it by the people themselves. The old system of a highly centralized form of government is now being gradually replaced by a decentralized system of local administration in which the people themselves exercise administrative, judicial, and revenue functions. This has instilled a strong sense of civic consciousness in the minds of a people, who, under long colonial rule, had become apathetic to all such activities except where their own personal interests were involved. The old inclination to leave everything to government and to remain indifferent to what was happening around them, unless it affected them, is slowly disappearing, and the people are developing a new sense of responsibility to their community and to their country.

All these measures have combined to bring home to the people the meaning of independence. It has dawned on them that independence has brought them a government which is dedicated to their welfare, and which furthermore does not just order them about but seeks their cooperation; and that the future of their country rests in their hands. The results have been startling. Large numbers of people who has been misled by one group of rebels or onother have repudiated them as stooges of foreign agents, as fifth columnists, and those who long for distant aunts over the heads of their own mothers. Today the situation is such that these rebel leaders are on the run, the subjects of scorn and ridicule, trying hard to keep out of the reach of the very people to whom they had promised a heaven on earth. Two years ago, these same people were content to sit in their villages and wait indifferently for the government forces to drive out the rebels. Today, they give their full cooperation to the government forces, and there have been many instances where they have driven out the rebels by themselves even before the government forces could get to them.

I have gone into this rather lengthy account of our own experience with subversion because many well-meaning people have suggested to us that the proper defense against the danger of internal subversion is to ally ourselves with a great-power military bloc. My answer, at which I arrive both intellectually and from harsh experience, is that military power is not the answer to the danger of internal subversion. I say that the major answer to internal subversion lies in honest government and in dedication to the interests and welfare of the people. , And I support this conclusion with the fact that we tried just such a program in Burma and it worked. Now that the advent of the atomic era reduces even further the chances of overt aggression, it seems to me that what is required is for greater stress to be laid on such programs.

In this talk, I have been trying to explain how our love of independence, call it preoccupation if you will, leads us logically and inevitably to a foreign policy of independence from any alinement of major powers on the basis of a military treaty. This policy has been called neutralism in the cold war. Perhaps that is the right name for it.

But I should like to take just another minute or two to point out that this is not a negative policy toward world affairs. Rather, it is a positive concept. It is a positive policy of seeking peace and friendship with all countries. It is a policy of actively seeking to discover through negotiation and compromise and accommodation some acceptable basis on which the peace of the world can be secured. Of course we do not pretend to have ready answers to these baffling and stubborn problems. But we do have the will to work actively, in collaboration with all, in searching for the answers. In the last analysis, the best way for a nation to promote its own security is to promote the peace. And we could not even hope to help promote the peace if we became members of an armed bloc. As independents, perhaps we can, and in doing so we would of course be serving the cause of democracy and the cause of man himself.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Future of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an addresss delivered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], at a luncheon sponsored by the Institute for International Order to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, Washington, D. C., Friday, June 24, 1955.

The address, entitled "Disarmament and the Future of the United Nations," is timely and challenging, and I hope that every Member of the Senate will read it.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISARMAMENT AND THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(Speech by Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN at a luncheon sponsored by the Institute for International Order in Washington to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, June 24, 1955)

This is a great week in the world's history—this week in which men of many nations are celebrating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. I am glad to take part in this celebration today with Americans who are dedicated to the preservation and strengthening of the world organization which holds our best hope for peace.

In San Francisco, statesmen from all parts of the earth have gathered to reaffirm their faith in the United Nations and to try to recapture the spirit of conciliation which prevailed in the summer of 1945. President Eisenhower and former President Truman, two American leaders with very different views on many things, have shown the essential unity of America's support for the United Nations by their participating in the San Francisco celebration.

I believe everyone here shares my belief that American membership in the world organization is extremely valuable.

I do not think I need to list all the benefits the United States has received from its membership—the opportunity for world leadership, the friendships we have made, the achievements we have helped the United Nations attain in its crusade against poverty, misery, and dispair.

Today I want to discuss with you two topics which affect the lives of every human being—disarmament and the future of the United Nations.

I approach these topics with the full consciousness of how many complexities are involved in each of them, and a realization that my own knowledge of many aspects of these complexities certainly is limited. I have studied them and thought about them for a long time, and I offer my views and my suggestions today because I think we all have a responsibility and an obligation to talk about these questions, however lacking in wisdom we may be. I think so because these matters are issues of life and death for ourselves and our children.

Let us look first at the future of the United Nations.

When 40 nations send their foreign ministers to a celebration of the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, that is evidence of their conviction that the U. N. is tremendously important.

When 21 nations are trying to get into the United Nations and no nation is trying to get out, that is evidence of the prestige and moral power of the organization.

When the President and two former Presidents of the United States tell the American people of their belief in the United Nations, that is evidence of the impression made by the United Nations during its first 10 years.

As a member of the United States Senate, I know that the majority of Senators—in addition to knowing of its positive achievements—are well aware of the value of the United Nations as a forum for mankind, as an escape valve for the tensions existing between nations, as a great debating society.

Senators are not among those who regard debates and discussions as a waste of time. Senators realize that they learn from one another, correct their misconceptions, broaden their viewpoints, increase their tolerance and understanding, through the process of full and free debates. Sometimes the debates go on a little too long, but it is better to have them run too long than to cut them off short, to prevent men from having their say.

I think the United Nations will endure because it has the qualities of adaptation which have enabled parliamentary systems of government to function successfully.

It has proved flexible enough to meet the needs of the last 10 years.

When the Security Council after an initial success in the Iranian case, seemed to be virtually paralyzed by the exercise of vetoes by the great powers, principally Soviet Russia, the General Assembly was given greater power.

Without any formal amendment of the charter, the Assembly adopted the uniting for peace resolution. Under that resolution, it made recommendations for keeping the peace in cases where the Security Council seemed unable to throw off the shackles of the Russian vetoes.

Of course, the charter did not authorize the Assembly to require action from member nations. The Assembly simply had the power to adopt resolutions and make recommendations.

But that power proved strong enough. Its strength astonished some of the experts who overlooked the fact that a recommendation resulting from a vote taken by representatives of 60 nations had immediate effects upon public opinion around the world.

The leaders of nations could not afford to ignore the impact of votes in the General Assembly. In fact it has been said that the assembly carried greater weight with the people of the earth than the Security Council with its 11 members.

So the United Nations moved around the roadblocks cast in its path by Soviet vetoes.

It was able to move because mankind was determined that the United Nations should not fail.

Sick of war, impatient with the arguments of demagogic leaders, the people of the world brushed aside technical obstacles and infused the Assembly with the strength it needed.

Of course, the United Nations did not develop the power to solve all the difficult issues existing between nations. It has not proved itself able to settle the cold war between the Communist and non-Communist countries.

These two facts have led some diplomats and some newspaper correspondents to conclude that the failures of the U. N. outweigh its successes.

In an article which appeared recently in many newspapers, one of these correspondents—R. H. Shackford, a Scripps-Howard staff writer—declared: "Any balance sheet of the first 10 years of the United Nations is bound to show a deficit—fewer major successes than failures."

He went on to give a balance sheet which contained, it seems to me, quite a number of major achievements for the U. N. Here are his headings and his summaries:

"Iran: The most outstanding peaceful settlement was the U. N.'s very first problem in 1946. Russia refused to remove its troops from northern Iran as provided for by treaty. Iran appealed to the Security Council. Soviet Delegate Andrei Gromyko walked out and refused to participate in the deliberations. But in the end Russia, confronted with overwhelming world and U. N. opinion, withdrew her troops and returned to the Council.

"Korea: Here the U. N.'s only collective action goes into the credit column. To be sure, the United States took the initiative and carried the ball, both militarily and financially—and was extremely unhappy at times about U. N. interference. But the fact is it was the first time in history that the principle of collective security was invoked to stop an aggressor. However small or grudging the token contributions of others were, the United States did not have only moral support of many big and little U. N. members individually, but also the U. N.'s legal support.

"Greece: This is similar to the Korean war case where the decisive factors were the initiative and action of the United States. The U. N. did focus attention on the Balkan Communist attempts to subvert Greece and established and publicized the facts.

"Italian colonies: After failure of the Big Four, the U. N. Assembly did work out a formula for a settlement—an independent Libya and ultimately independent Somaliland—which was put into effect.

"Indonesia: The United Nations played a major role in bringing about independence of Indonesia from the Netherlands. In that sense U. N. action was successful.

"Syria-Lebanon: Britain and France withdrew troops after complaints were aired in the U. N.

"Trieste: Total failure after exhaustive efforts. Subsequently settled by a direct Italian-Yugoslav deal.

"Berlin blockade: Possible minor contribution to its lifting; but direct U. N. efforts failed.

"Palestine: Success in obtaining an uneasy truce, but total failure since to obtain an Israeli-Arab settlement.

"Kashmir: U. N. arranged a cease-fire but there is still no political agreement between India and Pakistan.

"North Africa: A lot of smoke in the Assembly, but no signs of any effect on French colonial policy.

"Apartheid: No change in racial policies in South Africa, but much increase in tensions between South Africa and India each time it is debated.

"Germany and Austria: Total failure each time it has adopted resolutions urging settlements. Russia refused the U. N. Commission entry to East Germany.

"Korea, again: On the political side, total failure before and after the war to make any progress toward unification and freedom for all of Korea.

"Formosa: Efforts to seek a cease-fire rudely rejected by Red China."

Before presenting this balance sheet, Mr. Shackford wrote: "It would be unreasonable to write the U. N. off as a total and hopeless loss today, just as it was fatuous and naive 10 years ago in San Francisco to believe that the U. N. would solve all the world's problems and let us live happily ever after."

In a later article, he indicated that he thought the United Nations would survive in some form, although he foresaw many dangers ahead for it. He said: "The future of the U. N. points to an existence that will fluctuate, in unison with the ebb and flow of relations between East and West."

I have not quoted Mr. Shackford's opinions out of any desire to engage in any quarrel with him or to pick his statements apart, although I do not agree completely with his review of the United Nations first 10 years or his doubts about its future. But he is an excellent newspaperman, and he has given in his articles his honest views of how the United Nations looks through his eyes.

His very excellence as a newspaperman led me to quote some of his statements—because I believe he has expressed, in his own vivid manner, ideas about the United Nations held by a great many Americans who know that organization only as it appears in the newspapers.

Mr. Shackford, like many Americans, seems to feel some impatience with the United Nations. It does not get results fast enough. With a few exceptions, it has not provided scenes of dramatic excitement. It has not produced electrifying answers for the world's troubles—so its failures, to many people outweigh its successes.

In our country, drama is the stuff from which news is made. Drama implies conflict. To be satisfying, the conflict must move to some definite outcome. If this does not happen, it is considered vague, unfinished, not professionally successful—and not thrilling enough for many in the audience.

When I look at Mr. Shakford's balance sheet for the United Nations I think it reflects the feeling of many Americans that the drama in the United Nations has not reached a smashing third-act curtain. While he disavows any hope for a completely happy ending, it seems to me that he has been disappointed—as many Americans have been disappointed.

It is true that the world has not been straightened out.

It is true that guns are still being fired from time to time—in Argentina, in Palestine, in Indochina, in other areas of trouble.

It is true that the Red Chinese still threaten Formosa.

It is true that Korea is still a divided and tragic land of suffering.

It is true that the Communist villians still walk the stage—and they are deadly, they are dangerous, even though they have begun to make sounds like cooing doves.

Yet I believe the greatest achievement of the United Nations in its first 10 years is a thing that has not happened.

There has been no third world war.

That does not appear in big black headlines in our newspapers—and yet it is the most tremendous fact of our time.

There has been no third world war.

When we pause and think, we realize that millions of us are alive today because of this fact—and there is much evidence to prove that this is largely due to the existence of the United Nations.

This point was made clear recently in testimony given before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by former President Truman, a moving force in the establishment of the United Nations. In speaking of the contributions that the organization has made to the maintenance of peace during the past 10 years, Mr. Truman said:

"I believe that had we not had the United Nations, the events of the past 10 years would again have plunged the world into unlimited international warfare. The fact that we have not had such a war is attributable in considerable measure to the existence of the United Nations."

There has been no third world war.

That is a mighty achievement, which cannot be mentioned too often, which cannot be praised too much.

There has been no third world war.

If we had a peace day every year—a day when bells would ring and proclamations would call for public rejoicing at the passage of another year without the devastation of a global struggle—perhaps we would realize how much we have gained by preventing this catastrophe.

I would like to see the establishment of such a day, to be observed under the auspices of the United Nations in every country belonging to the United Nations. Perhaps October 24, now observed as U. N. Day, might be renamed world peace day. The United Nations anniversaries could be celebrated in June, perhaps on June 26, the date of the charter's actual signing in 1945.

I would like to see the countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain accept this idea—and join wholeheartedly in its observance.

Perhaps the Communists would try to steal this peace day celebration, or claim that they thought of it first, as they have tried to claim many things developed in the free countries.

Let them try, I say. Let them try to outdo us in proclaiming their devotion to peace.

Such a competition could not bring harm to the world.

Such a contest could not be lost by any nation, or won by any nation.

Such a day would be dedicated to the veterans and the casualties of past world wars—the millions of men, women, and children who were sacrificed in the furnaces of past destruction.

On this day of rejoicing, each nation could recite what it had done in a year to spread the benefits of life and to get along in harmony with its neighbors.

That would be news worth sending around the world.

That would be news of achievement, news of construction, news of man's upward climb toward the stars.

Think of how often the world has seemed close to the burning pit of disaster in the last 10 years.

There was the tension over Iran in 1946, when U. N. had scarcely begun to function.

There was the tension over the Berlin blockade in 1948, when the East and the West seemed poised for battle.

There was the fierce outbreak of hostilities in Korea in 1950, when the world wondered whether the flames would spread from one nation to another.

There was the tension over Indochina last fall, when we seemed on the verge of committing American troops to the front once again.

There was the tension over Formosa this spring, when the vision of a holocaust rose before us.

And yet we came through.

And yet the world was spared the ultimate horror of universal slaughter.

Whether the United Nations was involved in the foreground of all these events or not, it was always involved in the background.

No matter how loud the voices of anger grew, the voices calling for peace were always speaking at the U. N., day and night, tirelessly, endlessly—and those voices prevailed in the end.

That is why I am sure the United Nations has a magnificent future and humanity is determined to use the U. N. as a key to open the doors of peace.

The future of the U. N. is dependent to a large degree upon the maintenance of a stable international order—and the maintenance of such a stable order depends to some degree upon the progress we make in creating an unarmed peace.

Let us look now at the difficulties involved in disarmament, the second topic I want to discuss with you today.

On this, the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, one of the world's great unattained goals is disarmament.

While I think that the preservation of an armed peace, such as we now have, is worth celebrating in the light of the tensins existing in the world, I believe we must recognize that an armed peace is an uneasy peace.

An armed peace has an unsteady equilibrium—and has a constant tendency to break down .

An armed peace contains the elements for war—because the growth of enormous military power causes the growth of fear, although the expansion of military forces is also due to fear. These two things are linked together and feed upon one another

When nations agree to disarm, fear begins to go down.

The more fear declines, the more possible it becomes to disarm.

In the last few years we have lived in such an atmosphere of fear that those who advocated any form of disarmament were likely to be branded by some as appeasers.

Appeasers were subject to suspicion, and regarded as the possible friends of the Communists.

Now the idea of disarmament is in the air again.

Now the nations are putting forth plans and proposals, amendments, and counterproposals.

Now the President has appointed a Special Assistant in Charge of Disarmament and has called upon all citizens to aid him by providing ideas and suggestions.

Now a leading American newspaper publisher, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., has asked consideration for a resolution calling upon members of the U. N. "to reduce by 1 percent their respective military expenditures for the year 1955–56 and further agree to contribute at least 50 percent of this saving to a United Nations pool for research in the cure and prevention of children's diseases, including possible new applications of atomic energy for that purpose."

You may recall that on June 3, 1953, along with several other Senators, I joined Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, in introducing Senator Concurrent Resolution 32.

Briefly, this resolution declared it to be the purpose of the United States to obtain, within the United Nations, agreements by all nations for enforceable universal disarmament, down to those arms and forces needed for the maintenance of domestic order, under a continuing system of United Nations inspection, control, and international police protection.

I have already discussed the reintroduction of this resolution with Senator FLANDERS, and it is my hope and belief that we will reintroduce it in the future.

This spring the United Nations Disarmament Commission subcommittee resumed its long-adjourned sessions in London.

Many proposals were offered at these sessions, which continued from February 25 to May 9. The major proposals were made public a month ago. Some experts found in the Soviet program some signs that Russia was moving toward acceptance of the Western demand for international inspection of atomic facilities as an essential condition for effective disarmament.

Some of the ideas now being discussed were foreshadowed 5 years ago by the late Senator Brien McMahon in a brilliant speech on the floor of the United States Senate. He introduced a resolution, of which I was a cosponsor, embodying these ideas.

Later in 1950, when I represented the United States at the United Nations General Assembly, I presented these proposals before the Economic Committee.

President Truman expressed similar hopes and promises in his address on United Nations Day on October 24, 1950. And in January 1953, President Eisenhower repeated the promise.

The disarmament resolution which I joined Senator FLANDERS in introducing in 1953 gives furtherance to this great possibility by calling on the President to develop a plan for the transfer of resources and manpower now being used for arms to constructive ends at home and abroad. Moreover, the resolution recommends similar action to the United Nations and member states.

I believe the world is now ready for more serious consideration of these ideas, which rose in the mind and heart of Brien McMahon when he saw the people of the earth walking into the dark shadow of the hydrogen bomb. As chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, he knew the power that would come from that bomb and the other awesome weapons springing from the laboratories of the scientists.

Last week our country went through an Operation Alert. It was assumed that hydrogen bombs had wrecked 58 cities, killed about 8,200,000 people, injured 6,550,000, and contaminated vast areas with radioactive fallout. Reporting these facts, the New York Times declared: "Operation Alert had underlined a fact that was well known before it was staged: The country is far short of being ready to deal with the problems a hydrogen bomb attack would create. The effort to drive home that point—to the people and to Congress—is believed to have been one of the principal reasons why the Government staged the test."

After the test, one Cabinet member was quoted by a newspaper as saying that the results indicated the Nation would survive even such a disaster as a real hydrogen bomb raid and would make surprisingly quick recovery.

Would the millions killed in such a raid ever make a recovery? Would the millions of maimed people make a quick recovery? Would the millions who lost their homes and their jobs find it passible to make a surprisingly quick recovery?

I do not believe we should talk in such terms or think in such terms. I believe we should acknowledge that our Nation would not surrender, no matter how hard it might be hit, but we should use the results of such tests to show the world that we are aware of what another global war would cost—and we do not want to pay such a fearful price unless we are compelled to.

We must take the leadership in proposals for disarmament, as we have taken the leadership in combating communism, launching the Marshall plan, meeting aggression wherever it has occurred.

We must take the leadership because the world looks to the United States for constant and positive efforts to reduce the possibility of war and increase the likelihood of peace.

At the same time we will insist upon guaranties to make any disarmament program effective, with safeguards to make certain that the Communist nations carry out each step in the program. We can be sure that the free nations, eager to be rid of the crushing weight of gigantic armaments, will do their share.

In an address honoring the memory of Woodrow Wilson just a month ago, Bernard Baruch reached the heart of the matter.

Baruch said: "It is the hope of the world, of course, that the threat of war will be lifted, that the fear of atomic devastation will be dispelled, that the burden of armament will be lightened. But we must not be beguiled by wishful thinking. Every plan for disarmament deserves careful consideration, but none can be adopted which fails to provide direct, effective, and certain guaranties for enforcement of its terms.

"International disarmament of both conventional and atomic weapons requires an international authority with power to inspect, control, and impose punishment, swift, sure, and condign, against any transgressor. Any agreement which does not establish the authority to enforce it would be incalculably dangerous. To permit any nation the right to veto the decisions of the control agency, or actions taken against violators, would be to make the plan meaningless."

Much as we want disarmament, much as we want peace, we can never abandon these conditions.

It takes courage to advocate a plan which places so much power in the hands of an international authority, as Mr. Baruch does.

Yet, there seems to be no alternative which offers any real possibility of a disarmed peace that will endure.

Mr. Baruch feels, as many other American leaders feel, that we must rely upon the development of the United Nations in the future to make any disarmament plan workable.

Today, knowing that the power of modern weapons gives mankind the terrible strength to wipe out civilization itself, we must summon all the courage and all the faith and all the hope we have within us to support the United Nations.

For the sake of our children and the generations to come, we must help the U. N. to grow stronger in the years ahead.

We must help to make it a true parliament of man and a firm shield against the scourge of war.

Swiss Watch Tariff Hike and the So-Called "Defense Essentiality" Theme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 23, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, recent congressional passage of the Reciprocal Trade Extension Act has focused attention upon a new provision of the law which will permit domestic industries to seek additional protection under the guise of their so-called "defense essentiality."

The world has already witnessed how this "defense essentiality" argument was used as a justification for the tariff increase on Swiss watch imports last year. The lessons of the watch case should be carefully studied by everyone concerned with the future of international trade.

The New York Journal of Commerce recently made an intensive study of the watch-import problem, its defense aspects, and its possible impact on other industries. The facts were reported in a series of seven articles by Mr. Jerome Oelbaum.

These articles, to my mind, raise serious and important questions concerning the administration's handling of the entire watch problem. I do know that, since President Eisenhower boosted watch tariffs by 50 percent on July 27, 1954, imports of watches and watch movements have declined more than 30 percent, and the American watch importing-assembling industry—largely centered in my State of New York—is being adversely affected.

Indeed, Governor Harriman, of the State of New York; Mayor Wagner, of New York City; and Members of the United States House of Representatives from New York, moved by the threat to this skilled and economically important industry, have strongly urged the Office of Defense Mobilization to review and reconsider its June 1954 report, which paved the way for the imposition of higher tariffs and other anti-import actions by the Government.

Since the Journal of Commerce articles throw such significant light upon current trade problems, I ask unanimous consent that a condensation of this series be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the 27th of July many people will commemorate—some with satisfaction, others with resentment—one of the most controversial episodes in this Nation's postwar record of foreign-trade relations. It was on that day last year that President Eisenhower announced his decision to raise American tariffs on Swiss watches by 50 percent.

It has already become clear that the President's action charted a new course in tariff administration that will profoundly affect major industries both in the United States and abroad. The guiding concept behind the change was that the tariff, formerly regarded generally as a commercial weapon, is a legitimate device for the protection of industries that believe themselves essential to the national defense.

But that principle grew to a national issue in an atmosphere that cannot by any stretch of either imagination or good will be called conducive to objective reflection on the national welfare. The "watch case" is a story composed largely of bewildering barrages of propaganda, displays of heavy political pressure, and heated exchanges between domestic manufacturers and their competitors who import watches from Switzerland.

There was even an element of mystery in the form of a so-called secret report that embarrassed the Defense Department considerably and led to charges that this key agency had changed its mind at a crucial point in the proceedings that culminated in the President's decision.

The shooting is by no means over. The tariff increase has been followed by other official actions against Swiss watch producers and importers—a Treasury Department rul-

ing that could substantially raise the duties paid on some imported watches, a Justice Department antitrust suit against watch importers and Swiss producers, a congressional investigation of complaints that watch importers have allegedly defrauded the Government of customs duties.

The impact of the "watch case," moreover, has been spreading in seemingly ever-widening circles outside the watch industry. There are a number of industries now trying to use the national-defense approach to obtain the additional protection against foreign competition won by the United States watch companies. And the entire procedure has been formalized in an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act allowing the President to limit imports when he feels such industries are endangered.

The watch-import dispute technically originated in 1936, when this country and Switzerland negotiated tariff reductions on a number of products, including watches, each exported to the other. There was a long period of relative calm, lasting until 1950, when Switzerland, at the insistence of this country, agreed to insert into the 1936 agreement an escape clause.

This clause, common in the trade pacts of United States negotiated since the war, permits the signatory countries to withdraw or cancel tariff concessions without necessarily terminating the entire agreement. In such an event, the two governments can attempt to work out other concessions to compensate the nation that has lost tariff benefits stipulated in the original agreement.

But the watch case did not become really hot until the following year. On February 13, Elgin National Watch Co., Elgin, Ill., and Hamilton Watch Co., Lancaster, Pa., applied to the Tariff Commission for an increase in the tariff on imported watches containing 7 to 17 jewels.

A majority of the Commissioners (4 out of 6) concluded that: (1) domestic producers were threatened with serious injury from imports of watches of 1 to 17 jewels, watches containing no jewels (known as pin-lever watches), and self-winding watches; (2) to prevent that threat of injury "from materializing," the President should increase the tariff rates by 50 percent.

Commissioners Oscar B. Ryder and George McGill opposed an increase in the tariff because, in their view, the domestic industry was neither being injured nor threatened with injury as a result of larger imports. "The American watch industries," the two-man minority said, "are not weak, defeated industries, in dire need of help; instead they are well able to take care of themselves despite ups and downs due to changes in trade conditions." Their opinion prevailed with Mr. Truman. On August 14, he rejected the majority recommendations.

The President went on to say that in reaching his decision he had been "mindful" of the need for maintaining a domestic industry adequate to meet defense requirements. Mr. Truman proved himself somewhat of a seer in alluding to what would emerge as a fundamental issue 3 years hence: "If special measures," he said "should be necessary to preserve the watch industry for defense purposes, it is by no means certain that an increase in import duties constitutes an effective approach to that objective."

The doctrine that tariffs are a proper device to protect industries deemed "essential" to national defense from foreign competition did not reach full maturity until shortly before President Eisenhower's decision of July 27, 1954, raising watch import duties by 50 percent. Then, in a period of about 5 months, the fledgling grew to such tremendous size that it was able to carry the domestic watch companies to victory.

The President's tariff decision was made in response to a majority recommendation of the Tariff Commission to which the American producers had reapplied September 1, 1953, for additional duties on imports. Watchmaking, he said, represented a type of essential skill that must be preserved in the national interest. President Truman 2 years earlier rejected similar recommendations by the Tariff Commission, but he acted at a time when American industry was in the midst of the Korean war boom.

But the most persuasive arguments in favor of the domestic watch industry came from within the administration. The Commerce Department, in official memoranda and testimony of top aides in the agency, was perhaps the strongest single ally the domestic producers found in the Eisenhower administration. The Office of Defense Mobilization was brought into the picture as a result of a directive issued by Mr. Eisenhower in July 1953 ordering a full-scale study of the defense essentiality of the domestic industry.

In February and March of 1954 ODM held informal hearings with companies and individuals concerned with the issue. Early in February the Tariff Commission had held its hearings. ODM restricted its inquiry to jeweled watches. The Tariff Commission, as it had in its 1951 investigation, broadened its field to include other types of watches.

ODM made its report to the President June 30 last year—less than a month before Mr. Eisenhower was required to render a decision on the report that had been given him by the Tariff Commission on May 27 in which the Commission by a 4-to-2 vote recommended, as it did in 1951, an increase in the tariff.

ODM's interdepartmental committee concluded in its study that the "skills of the jeweled watch industry constitute an essential part of our defense mobilization base. These skills should be maintained at a level from which a quick and effective expansion of production can be made in the event of national emergency." It was the judgment of the committee that the "peacetime production of jeweled watch movements should be at least an average of 2 million units per year, which at current levels of productivity would provide employment for about 4,000 production workers."

Output for 1954 was expected to reach 1.7 million jeweled watch movements compared to the 2 million level which ODM believed was the safe annual average for mobilization purposes. The forecast turned out to be correct. Production in 1954 amounted to 1,685,000 units.

However, apparently no attempt was made to determine whether the drop in 1954 below the 2 million level was a transient decline or likely to persist. Between the time the domestic producers had applied to the Tariff Commission, September 1953, and the time the ODM issued its report, June 30, 1954, manufacturing output of the country as a whole fell by approximately 6 percent.

Jeweled watch production fell by considerably more—about 28 percent. But some disparity is natural, for jeweled watches, are, after all, more of a luxury than an essential from the viewpoint of the consumer, and consequently more sensitive to changes in general demand.

The Swiss were certainly not immune to the market forces that had hit the domestic producers. Imports of watches into the United States in the first half of 1954 dropped 26 percent below the comparable period of the previous year.

There are sections of the report that are, in fact, unfavorable to the domestic producers. For example, ODM pointed out that a tariff increase was only one, and possibly not the best, method for protecting the industry against foreign competition. It indicated that direct Government subsidies might be preferable in the long run.

In other circumstances—had the tariff issue not arisen—the report might have passed unnoticed except as valuable background information. But the domestic watch producers needed this substantiation for their contention that a tariff increase was vital for their preservation; and that it is hardly conceivable that ODM and other Government departments were not aware of the probable impact of their conclusions on the outcome of the fight between the United States watch manufacturers and the importers of Swiss watches.

The domestic producers with the help of their supporters in Congress immediately seized upon the report and quickly proceeded to buttress the weak points. The stage was prepared with obvious attention to obtaining the maximum effect on public opinion and, thereby, on President Eisenhower's then impending decision on the Tariff Commission's recommendation for a 50 percent increase in the tariff.

On May 22, 1954, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts (home State of Waltham Watch Co., the weakest member of the domestic industry), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, asked Senator JAMES H. DUFF, of Pennsylvania, to head a subcommittee to study the watch problem.

The subcommittee began open hearings June 30—the date of the formal completion of the Office of Defense Mobilization's study.

No less than 18 Congressmen, the majority from States in which domestic producers have plants, either testified or submitted statements in support of the United States manufacturers.

The representation of the importers was limited to former Senator Millard Tydings, counsel for the American Watch Association, the importers' trade organization. From the moment that hearings began, there was little doubt of the direction the subcommittee would take.

Introduced into the RECORD on the first morning was the letter in which Senator SALTONSTALL had asked Senator DUFF to form the subcommittee. Senator SALTONSTALL said, in part: "It is my conviction that, before we allow the domestic watch industry to be forced out of business by foreign competition, the Senate Armed Services Committee should satisfy itself as to the importance of this unique industry to our national defense."

The Government departments—Defense, Commerce, and the Office of Defense Mobilization—supplied the subcommittee with the foundation for the conclusion in its final report that "it is in the interest of national defense to keep this essential industry alive and vital." It was also in the testimony of these departments that certain differences of opinion began to emerge that were not to become fully apparent or explicable until 9 months later when the Defense Department released its so-called secret report—a document that created strong doubts as to the Government's evaluation of the domestic watch companies as an essential industry.

The secret report of the Defense Department on the domestic jeweled watch industry originated in a routine, but thorough, investigation that produced explosive results. The Defense Department report was transmitted to ODM April 29, 1954. The letter of transmittal, signed by Assistant Secretary of Defense C. S. Thomas, who later became Secretary of the Navy, pointed out that the report had been prepared so that the classified military information could be easily dropped in the event the document was to be issued to the press. It was not released to the press, however, for 11 months, until the latter part of March 1955.

The Defense Department's study, had it been made public in 1954, could have weighed heavily in the balance against the persistent assertions of various Government departments, the domestic producers, and a number of Congressmen that United States watchmaking facilities were vital for United States mobilization.

The major conclusions of the Defense Department study were these:

1. "While the jeweled-watch facilities visited clearly represent excellent and desirable capacity, the needs of the Department of Defense for industrial capacity clearly demonstrate that no special nor preferential treatment for the industry is essential."

2. Defense Department combined needs for jeweled-watch movements for the Army, Navy, and Air Force over a 3-year mobilization period have been considerably reduced since the last war as a result of certain research developments and new methods of economy to a "nominal" amount—747,670 watches.

This compares with peak deliveries over a 3-year period during the war of 3 million jeweled movements. The domestic producers estimate that they can at present produce between 4 and 5 million movements a year without affecting current production or military items.

3. "The Defense Department can, therefore, at this time, reasonably assume that sufficient capacity will remain and can be used for current procurement needs and be the basis for supplying the mobilization requirements.

"If in the future it should become apparent that sufficient capacity will not be maintained and available, the Defense Department can then procure all of its requirements of jeweled movements for the mobilization reserve."

4. Manufacturers outside the jeweled watch industry, and even outside the horological industry as a whole, are capable of producing mechanical time fuzes and ready fitting safety devices for ammunition.

The first conclusion, of course, would have given the watch importers valuable assistance in countering the drive of the domestic producers for a tariff increase. But between the time the Defense Department report was transmitted to ODM and the beginning of the subcommittee hearings, a period of 2 months, a significant shift in attitude seems to have taken place. Mr. Thomas left for his Navy post a few weeks after the report was sent to ODM. His position was taken by his former deputy, Thomas P. Pike.

It was Mr. Pike who testified at the subcommittee hearings. Directly before Mr. Pike spoke, the committee heard from Arthur S. Flemming, Director of ODM, who said:

"I would like to address myself first of all to the question: Is the preservation of the skills of the American jeweled-watch industry essential to national security?

"My answer to that question is unqualifiedly 'Yes.' There is no doubt in my mind on the basis of the evidence that I have had the opportunity of considering and on the basis of my own experience that the question should and must be answered in the affirmative."

Mr. Pike was the next witness. When he came to that point at which the report had said that the "no special nor preferential treatment for the industry is essential," Mr. Pike's comments took this form:

"* * * we did not feel that special treatment should be extended the jeweled watch industry in preference to the rest of the horological industry."

He went on to testify that he completely concurred in the preceding testimony of Mr. Flemming (who had taken the position that the jeweled-watch producers alone and the rest of the horological industry as well were essential to national defense).

The Defense Department, since the release of the report, has maintained that there was no contradiction between Mr. Pike's testimony and the report. Officials in the Department say that it was their original intention that the term "preferential" should be taken to mean "in preference to the rest of the horological industry."

If the Defense Department did alter its position, the reason for its change of mind has yet to be explained. The question that must be answered in that case is why the Department saw fit to discard results of an investigation in which "no effort had been spared" to achieve accuracy.

On July 27, 1954, Mr. Eisenhower ordered the 50-percent increase in tariffs the majority of the Commissioners had recommended.

The White House announcement brought immediate outcries from abroad where many had been fearful that the American Government was moving toward a revival of the protectionist spirit that had produced the high Hawley-Smoot tariffs of 1930.

President Eisenhower's increase in watch import duties almost a year ago was the point of departure for a national tariff policy whose broad implications are just now becoming clear.

The success of the domestic watch manufacturers in justifying their request for protection against foreign competition by the asserted essentiality of their industry to national defense has opened up tantalizing vistas for other manufacturers with an import problem.

The doctrine implicit in the watch case has already been embodied in an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act. Many industries will undoubtedly attempt to use the defense essentiality road to higher tariffs or other curbs on imports. In fact, some fast-moving industrialists are fairly sprinting down the track carved out by the watch companies.

The defense-tariff approach was born in the watch case amidst partisan maneuvers and political pressures that tended to obscure the basic issue. Generally overlooked was the fact that the Office of Defense Mobilization advanced several possible methods of helping the watch industry other than a tariff increase or import quotas.

Outside of the Office of Defense Mobilization report, however, there was little discussion of alternatives at the time the watch dispute was being decided.

This lack of objective inquiry characterized much of the watch case proceedings.

The Government departments showed a remarkable willingness to accept without question the producers' claims on some vital points—for example, the assertion that they would give up a business running into many millions of dollars a year unless imports were restricted.

The four-man majority of the Tariff Commission went far out of its fields of investigation to declare that the industry was integral to the defense effort.

Officials of the Defense Department, from whom the public has the right to expect complete responsibility, particularly on a defense problem, conveniently reinterpreted findings that ran contrary to the objectives of the domestic producers.

Congressmen, in fulfilling their duty to represent the interests of their constituents, appear to have lost sight of the larger obligation to consider the national implications of their position.

It is these facts that have led critics of the Government's handling of the case to conclude that the watch tariff dispute was a shaky foundation on which to build a new national policy.

Unanswered Questions Concerning the Military Reserve Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, the letter to the editor of the New York Times by Walter Millis on the subject of Creating Military Reserves is a thoughtful analysis which deserves careful reading by Members of both bodies of Congress.

Mr. Millis has a distinguished background as a military commentator and as a journalist. An editorial writer for the Baltimore News, 1920 to 1923, New York Sun and Globe, 1923 to 1924, editorial and staff writer of the New York Herald Tribune since 1924. He has written extensively of military matters including, The Martial Spirit, 1931; Road to War, 1935; Why Europe Fights, 1940; The Last Phase, 1946; This Is Pearl 1947; and edited the Forrestal Diaries, 1951.

Besides agreeing with Mr. Millis that the question of the Powell amendment was not peripheral, I find the questions he raises in the last half of his letter so penetrating and stimulating that, under unanimous consent, I include his letter in the RECORD. "Why is just this number, 2,950,000 men, needed, what are they needed for and how well is the Reserve plan calculated to train them for the duties in which they might be required," asks Mr. Millis in the seventh paragraph,, and this is but one of the sharp questions developed in his letter to which every supporter of the Reserve or U. M. T. legislation should have a ready and carefully documented answer. Mr. Millis' letter was written before our debate on H. R. 7000 on the Floor of the House last Thursday and Friday. Most of his questions are unfortunately, still unanswered, even after the bill was shouted to passage.

The letter follows:

CREATING MILITARY RESERVES—PURPOSE AND EFFECT OF PENDING MEASURES ARE EXAMINED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of June 24 on the national Reserve plan bill confirms a feeling that there is a great deal of misconception about this measure. It is at least difficult to accept either your suggestion that the matter of UMT was merely "dragged into the background of debate" or the President's contention that the Powell antisegregation amendment was "extraneous" to the subject.

While it is of course true that the present bill differs widely from previous UMT proposals, the fact remains that its effect, and apparent major purpose, are to impose a substantially universal compulsion to military training. So, far from being "background" matter, this is the one most salient feature of the bill. It would at the least greatly widen the already onerous and somewhat arbitrary claims which the Department of Defense now asserts over the time, the careers and freedoms of American citizens.

And this being so, Representative POWELL's insistence that it be nondiscriminatory in operation seems anything but "extraneous"; it really comes close to the heart of the whole matter.

VALUE OF AMENDMENT

The Powell amendment may not represent the best, the wisest or the militarily most practicable way of dealing with the question of racial discrimination in the National Guard of the Southern States. But the question is not peripheral.

I think the amendment has already rendered a national service by recalling us to a realization that compulsory military duty is in fact a serious tax, not on property perhaps but on individual liberty; that as such it is bound to raise issues of human relationships like those involved in the problems of segregation, and that the State— all-powerful as it is tending to become—still has obligations to the individual in these matters possibly as important as the individual's obligations to the State.

In presenting the National Reserve Plan it seems to me that the State (or the administration acting for it) has neglected its obligations to the individual in ways even more important than those concerning segregation. In asking these new powers to conscript young men's time and liberties it has failed to explain the real need for or purpose of the measure and has been less than frank in such justifications as have been offered.

The stated objectives are two: to fill an estimated military requirement for a trained ready reserve of 2,950,000 men by 1960; and, in perhaps intentionally obscure gobledygook of a Department of Defense spokesman, "to maximize the equitable sharing of military obligation by those militarily qualified to serve."

TRAINING UNDER PLAN

That there is a military need for a reserve system is hardly disputable. But it is astonishing that no one has even asked how this 2,950,000-man figure has been arrived at, why just this number is needed, what they are needed for or how well the reserve plan is calculated to train them for the duties in which they might be required.

Hardly anyone has asked what is really meant by "maximizing the equitable sharing of obligation" or how it would work out. If there had been any real probing by Congress or the public on either of these surely crucial points, I believe that by this time it would have brought the National Reserve plan into quite a new light.

At any rate, nearly everything about the plan, the arguments for it and the official statistics, is consistent with the view that the basic purpose is not to draft men in order to create a needed Reserve, but to create a Reserve in order that we may continue to draft men. The Department's dilemma is surely quite obvious. The active establishment is far too large to be maintainable without compulsion—indeed, much of the volunteering which now fills the ranks and reduces draft calls would collapse if the shadow of the universal obligation were removed—but it is also, unhappily, too small by many hundreds of thousands to receive the floods of qualified young men now annually entering the manpower pool. And no military system based upon a universal obligation can long survive unless the obligation is really universal and enforcible.

INDUCTION AGE

It is not always understood that a reduction in draft calls releases no one from his duty to serve; it simply pushes forward the age at which he can get in and get his service over with. The excess of men has already pushed the average age of induction up from 18½ to about 21—undesirably high from a military no less than from the individual's point of view.

But the prognosis is that by mid-1959, at the present rate, we shall have something like 1,790,000 young men waiting their turn in active forces which will then be absorbing only 490,000 men a year. It will present an impossible situation. Either it will have to be admitted that most of them will never serve at all—which would wreck the whole present system by removing its compulsory foundation—or they will have to be taken up by hook or crook into some kind of Reserve duty which will at least look like the equivalent of the 2 years' active service imposed upon those who are caught in the draft.

The details could be discussed at much greater length. I think this is enough to lend color to my contention that the bill has not been frankly presented; it has not been well understood; that congressional and public comment has not been keen in analysis and has suffered far too much under the "papa knows best" theory of government; and that Representative POWELL, even if unintentionally, did a genuine service by forcing the Nation to stand and take thought in a matter which does reach close to all issues of individual liberty and civil right in a democratic society.

WALTER MILLIS.

NEW YORK, *June 28, 1955.*

All Electric Farm Program Is Launched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD a news story in the July issue of the Wisconsin REA News describing one of the first all electric farms served by REA in Barron county.

The Ninth Congressional District of Wisconsin which I have the privilege of representing, is one of the strongest REA districts percentagewise in the country. That is why this story on the all electric farm of Mr. William Meisegeier was of interest to me. Mr. Meisegeier was one of the first farmers in Barron County to receive electric service from the Barron County REA Cooperative. The story on this all electric farm follows:

William E. Meisegeier is a good farmer and a good member of the Barron County Electric Cooperative.

The shipshape appearance of his farm buildings and premises shows that he is a good farmer. The manner in which he employs the use of power for improving farm living for himself and family shows that he is a good member of his cooperative.

"There should be a law," he says, "that would require safe and adequate wiring around a farm."

There are plenty of major appliances doing the work for Mr. and Mrs. Meisegeier. There is no bottle gas on the place.

These, incidentally, are the qualifications a member must meet to merit an all electric farm sign along the lines of Barron County Electric Cooperative.

Although many members of the Barron co-op can undoubtedly qualify for one of the signs, Meisegeier was the first to receive one. It was installed June 10 at the entrance to his farm, 7 miles north of Barron. Milton Haugestuen, power-use adviser for the Barron co-op, put up the sign.

Meisegeier has operated his 40-acre farm, plus rented pasture acreage, for the past 21 years. He was among the first of the Barron members to receive co-op electric service.

He is milking 15 head of purebred and grade Holsteins. His barn is equipped with running water, milking machine, hay hoist, ventilating fans, and radio. His new and modern milkhouse is electrically heated and has an electric water heater and milk cooler.

The Meisegeier home is electrified, having range, refrigerator, home freezer, running water, bathroom, water heater, electrically operated oil burner, washing machine, and television.

Installation of the all electric farm sign at the Meisegeier farm launches the program for the Barron co-op. Seven other rural electric co-ops in the State, include Adams-Marquette, Crawford, Vernon, Trempealeau, Price, Jackson, and Taylor, are participating at the present time.

The signs are made of 20-gage steel, attractively designed and enameled, with the member's name in reflecting tape for nighttime identification. These signs are furnished and installed by the cooperative to all members who meet the qualifications.

The public relations department of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative designs and distributes the signs for the participating co-ops as one of its statewide services.

Costly Snag Revealed in River Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Tribune, San Diego, Calif., of Wednesday, June 22, 1955:

COSTLY SNAG REVEALED IN RIVER PLAN—GIFT OF IRRIGATION PROJECTS HELD CHEAPER TO TAXPAYER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of a series on the dispute over a proposed development of the upper Colorado River. It is written by a Long Beach Congressman who is leading his southern California associates in a fight against the development.)

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The upper Colorado River storage project now before Congress seeks the construction of 11 irrigation projects in Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. These would irrigate about 200 square miles of new land and supply supplemental water to about 400 square miles of land irrigated inadequately at present. They are known as participating projects.

According to Government experts, they would cost about $300 million, and that amount would be repaid to the United States without interest over a 50-year period as required by reclamation law and precedent.

ENTITLED TO WATER

The participating projects would use an estimated 400,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water a year for irrigation, domestic, and industrial purposes. This amount is well within what the upper basin is entitled to use and California cannot object on that score.

There is, however, a "but" to the proposal and it is a big one. It is that revenues from the sale of water from the 11 projects during the 50 years would bring in only about 15 percent of the money needed to repay the Government for its investment.

Thus, proponents of the projects had to look elsewhere for an additional source of revenue to pay the remaining 85 percent.

IN NATIONAL MONUMENT

They seized on the idea of building vast power dams and utilizing the revenues from the sale of power for this purpose. In the proposals before Congress, these are called storage projects to obscure their true "cash-register" nature.

As a starter two power projects are proposed—one at Glen Canyon and one at Echo Park, within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Other power projects would follow later.

The Glen Canyon and Echo Park power projects are unrelated in any way to the 11 participating projects, except as cash registers. The 11 projects could function to supply water entirely without Glen Canyon and Echo Park. Yet Congress is being asked to spend about $600 million additional for the power features for the sole purpose of paying the $300 million participating projects' cost.

Federal taxpayers would be better off if Congress makes an outright gift of the 11 participating projects to the upper basin States and forgets the power features completely.

CALIFORNIANS CONCERNED

It is with these power features that Californians also have a special concern. The power projects would hold back, for power use, most of the 48 million acre-feet of water to be stored by the development. In the storage process, another 10 million acre-feet of water would disappear by evaporation.

Thereafter, they would evaporate another $600,000 acre-feet of water a year, enough to supply the needs of a city of 3 million persons.

The magnitude of the evaporation is apparent when compared with the 400,000 acre-feet that is to be put to beneficial use by all 11 participating projects.

District of Columbia Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. For the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit some financial information on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for 1956 which the House has just passed.

The House considered budget estimates in the amount of $175,405,300, $134,925,600 for operating expenses and $40,479,700 for capital outlay. As the bill passed the House it provided $132,595,280 for operating expenses and $34,306,500 for capital outlay.

The Senate increased these amounts to the following figures: $134,011,249 for operating expenses and $35,445,500 for capital outlay.

The conference committee resolved the differences between the two Houses and provided the following amounts: $133,397,940 for operating expenses and $35,445,500 for capital outlay.

A table depicting congressional action on the bill is as follows:

Item	Budget estimate 1956	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Operating expenses	$134,925,600	$132,595,280	$134,011,249	$133,397,940
Capital outlay	40,479,700	34,306,500	35,445,500	35,445,500
Total	175,405,300	166,901,780	[1] 169,456,749	168,843,440

[1] Includes $56,720 not considered by the House.

The Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the following report which was publicized by the Washington research office of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce labels the proposed multibillion upper Colorado River project, "one of the most expensive water resources projects ever acted upon by the Congress."

This analysis of the upper Colorado River project was prepared for the council's 31 member State and regional chambers of commerce in various sections of the country.

The analysis—which labels what this project would cost in terms of the taxes that must be borne by the people in each State—also raises serious questions as to the economic feasibility of the project and the wisdom of burdening the taxpayers with the high irrigation costs.

The Colorado River project has already been passed by the Senate and is currently under consideration by the House of Representatives.

The report follows:

THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate has already approved and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is now considering one of the most expensive but least economic water resource projects ever acted on by the Congress. This is the proposed series of multipurpose dams and irrigation units in the upper Colorado River Basin known as the Colorado River storage project.

The main concerted opposition to this project has come from two unrelated groups and for entirely different reasons. Water users in the lower Colorado River area, particularly those in California, oppose the project for fear it will cause a reduction in the Colorado River water supply available to them. Numerous conservation groups have voiced their opposition to one important feature of the project, the Echo Park Dam, on the grounds that its construction would destroy the scenic beauty of Dinosaur National Monument.

There are good reasons why the taxpayers as a group, too, should question the wisdom of the Federal Government embarking on this project. These reasons are economic and they are discussed briefly in the paragraps that follow.

SENATE EXPANDS PROJECT AS PROPOSED BY ADMINISTRATION

Last year the administration recommended approval by Congress of a bill to authorize irrigation and hydroelectric power development in the upper Colorado River Basin. The bill was not enacted, so the President again urged its approval in his January 1955 messages on the State of the Union and the 1956 budget. As recommended by the administration, the project would include two large dams, the Echo Park and the Glen Canyon, to be used for water storage and power production, and 11 participating projects designed primarily for irrigation purposes. The construction cost of all these units is estimated at $902 million.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee added 4 water storage dams and 1 irrigation unit to those proposed by the administration and these additions increased the cost to $1,093 million. Moreover, the committee opened the door to further expansion of the overall project by including in its bill, S. 500, 21 additional irrigation units which will require further approval by Congress after the Secretary of Interior has certified that the benefits to be derived from each unit will exceed the unit's cost. These 21 units would raise the overall construction cost to $1,651 million.

INTEREST ON IRRIGATION UNITS TO EXCEED ENTIRE CONSTRUCTION COST

The Senate report on S. 500 states that the entire cost of the power and municipal water features of the project, plus interest during their construction and payout period, will be returned to the Treasury. It states further that the construction costs of irrigation units will also be returned to the Treasury, but that pursuant to reclamation law no interest will be charged against irrigation costs. This interest will, of course, be a direct subsidy to the water users paid for by the taxpayers.

The interest cost on the irrigation investment of $305 million in the administration's proposed project was calculated by the Interior Department as amounting to $1,153 million. This calculation is at 2½ percent compounded annually and assumes a final payout of construction costs for irrigation in the year 2032. Assuming the same proportionate payout schedule for the irrigation investment of $378 million in S. 500, as approved by the Senate, the interest cost on the irrigation works will be $1,428 million. This amount is $335 million more than the construction cost of the entire project, including the hydroelectric and municipal water facilities as well as the irrigation works.

If the upper Colorado project should be further expanded to include the 21 conditionally approved units, as is contemplated in S. 500, the construction cost of the irrigation units will be $908 million. The interest which the taxpayers would have to pay on that amount would total at least $3,429 million by the time the irrigation units are paid for by power revenues and water users.

EVENTUAL COSTS MAY BE MUCH HIGHER THAN NOW ESTIMATED

The cost estimating experience on Federal projects, and particularly the projects built by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, gives reason to take with a grain of salt the cost estimates submitted to Congress before projects are authorized. A report of a special subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee dated December 5, 1952, shows that the total cost of all Bureau of Reclamation projects, except

the Missouri River Basin program, had increased 106 percent as of 1952 from the estimates originally submitted to Congress. The 1952 estimated cost of the Missouri Basin program had risen 274 percent from the figure used at the time it was approved by Congress. Similarly, the Corps of Engineers' figures showed that 182 projects had increased in cost by 124 percent from the time they were originally considered by Congress.

Price changes accounted for about 30 percent of the increased cost of reclamation projects while project modifications and other factors accounted for the balance. These factors are likely to affect costs in coming years too. The prospect for higher labor and material costs in the future is very real and the desirability of making changes in project plans after they are authorized will continue to be evident as it always has been.

POSSIBILITY OF PROJECT PAYING FOR ITSELF QUESTIONED

The definite possibility of actual construction costs of the upper Colorado project exceeding the estimated costs by an appreciable amount raises a serious question as to the likelihood of the project ever paying its way. Even under the optimistic assumptions that the project can be built within estimated costs and that power can be sold over the years at the relatively high cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour at the bus bar, it will still take 78 years from the time construction is started to pay off all construction costs.

Ten private electric companies in the upper Colorado River area have expressed a willingness to purchase power from the project to the extent that it is made available at costs reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs. In their statement to the Senate committee, however, these companies also pointed out that the upper Colorado Basin "is one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world." They said that these resources include "vast deposits of coal, great underground reservoirs of oil and natural gas, mountains of oil shale and perhaps more important than all of these are the deposits of uranium ores." The companies' statement added, "The potential thermal power resources of this area stagger the imagination."

The existence of these great resources for the production of thermal energy in the area is reason in itself to question whether power from the upper Colorado project will be competitive some years hence when development of the resources is increased.

DOES THE AGRICULTURAL POTENTIAL WARRANT THE IRRIGATION EXPENSE?

The projects actually authorized in S. 500 would provide water for 132,360 acres of new land and supplemental water for 250,330 acres of irrigated land, for a total irrigated acreage of 382,690. The $378 million construction cost of the irrigation facilities indicates an average cost of $988 per acre. If the ultimate interest cost of $1,428 million on the irrigation investment is added to the construction cost, the average cost per acre becomes $4,719.

If the irrigation units which the Senate approved subject to further authorization are included, the irrigated acreage would be increased to 583,690 acres of new land and 638,705 acres that would be furnished supplemental water. On the basis of the $908 million cost estimate for the entire irrigation works, the construction cost per acre would be $743. The $3,429 million cost of interest on the irrigation investment added to the construction cost would raise the per acre cost to $3,548.

These costs per acre of irrigation in the upper Colorado project are more significant when compared with values of farm land. The national average value per acre for farm land, including farm buildings, was $78.81 in March 1955 according to the United States Department of Agriculture. The averages in the States ranged from $14 per acre in Arizona to $360.49 per acre in New Jersey.

Agriculture Department statistics indicate that farm land values, including improvements, in the five States which would be benefited by the project were as follows in March 1955:

	Value per acre	
	Irrigated farms	Average for all farms
Arizona	$200–$400	$17.61
Colorado	150– 200	29.34
New Mexico	225– 300	15.07
Utah	250– 300	43.85
Wyoming	125– 150	14.00

The lands which would be irrigated by the project would be used largely for grazing and forage crops and to a lesser extent for grains, fruits, vegetables, and sugar beets. Studies by recognized agricultural authorities, including the United States Department of Agriculture, indicate that food needs for years to come can be met from existing cultivated acreage. The Department's studies also show that about 20 million acres of presently unused lands east of the Rocky Mountain area can be reclaimed at a fraction of what it would cost per acre in the upper Colorado Basin.

WHAT THE PROJECT WILL MEAN IN COSTS TO ALL THE STATES

The table at the end of this bulletin allocates to each of the States the portion of the estimated construction costs of the upper Colorado project which they would have to bear on the basis of their present shares of the Federal tax burden. Figures are given for both the project cost as authorized by the Senate and the full project cost as contemplated by the Senate in S. 500.

It is these project costs which taxpayers in the next decade will have to finance. It is argued by the project's proponents, however, that these costs will be reimbursed to the Treasury and consequently they are not a burden on the taxpayer. Except for one fact, it would be true that taxpayers of the future would gain to the extent that today's taxpayers lose, provided, of course, that the project could actually pay for itself. And that fact is that future taxpayers will have to bear the interest cost on the irrigation works in amounts greater than what the Treasury will get back as reimbursement for project costs. Accordingly, these interest costs, too, are allocated to the States to show what each State will contribute in the future to the irrigation of a modest acreage in the five States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

EUGENE F. RINTA,
Research Director.

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project as authorized and contemplated in S. 500

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,459,200
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,975,600
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa	1.71	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana	1.09	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,196,200
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,400	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin	2.05	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

EXPLANATION OF FEDERAL TAX BURDEN PERCENTAGES

Federal tax collections actually received from the States do not always reflect the actual tax burden borne by the people of that State. Accordingly, the Council of State Chambers of Commerce utilizes a formula designed to reflect more accurately than do collection figures each State's share of the Federal tax burden. This formula is brought up to date each year and here is the way the percentages are determined:

1. Direct taxes on individuals are apportioned to each State in the ratio which the amount of individual income taxes collected from each State in fiscal 1954 bears to total Federal individual income taxes collected in that year.

2. Corporation and miscellaneous taxes are apportioned in the ratio which each State's income bears to the total national income on the basis of latest Department of Commerce data.

Reece A. Caudle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on June 21 Reece A. Caudle, civil leader and outstanding worker for improvement of the Arkansas River, died at his home in Russellville, Ark. His passing is a great loss to the State and to the Southwest. Many tributes have been paid to his distinguished service, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette praising his contribution to the river program:

REECE CAUDLE

There is a certain element of justice in the fact that shortly before Reece Caudle died the House of Representatives, which traditionally has been less interested in river development than the Senate, approved, by a decisive vote, money for a start on the Dardanelle Dam—one of the key hydroelectric projects of the Arkansas River Valley—and restored an earlier-reduced appropriation for the stabilization of the river's meandering channel.

The development of the Arkansas River Valley was Reece Caudle's dream for many years. For the last decade he was intimately concerned with it as one of the leaders in the effort to win approval for the comprehensive flood control, hydroelectric and navigation program of the big river. And in recent years he had become even more active in support of the development plan as executive secretary of the Arkansas Basin Association, which he also once served as president.

Mr. Caudle's efforts in the field of river development overshadowed, in a way, his other constributions to the development of Arkansas—but they, too, were impressive. He was a legislator of note (once speaker of the State's house of representatives), an attorney of prominence, and for years he was president of the State's Soil Conservation District Supervisors Association—an organization whose membership was expanded to cover the entire State shortly before his death.

Arkansas has lost an outstanding citizen in Reece Caudle. And the relatively small band of farsighted people who dream of someday developing its largest and most neglected river has lost an able and effective leader.

Americans Known To Be Held Prisoners by the Red Chinese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote Allyn C. Donaldson, Director, Office of Special Consular Services, Department of State, requesting information of the breakdown of Americans known to be held prisoners by the Red Chinese, as follows: (a) Servicemen, (b) civilians, and to let me know the number and the names of bishops and priests of the Catholic Church; ministers of the Protestant creeds; and any rabbis who are prisoners of the Red Chinese.

Under date of June 27 I received a letter from Mr. Donaldson in which he conveyed to me the information I sought, and which I include in my extension of remarks (a) letter of Mr. Donaldson; and (b) the names of Americans known to be prisoners of the Red Chinese, together with their breakdown, in accordance with my request:

JUNE 27, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of June 15 in which you inquire concerning the number of American citizens known by the Department to be prisoners of the Chinese Communists.

The Department carries on its lists of American citizens held in Chinese Communist jails or held under house arrest in Communist China the names of 28 civilians and 11 Air Force personnel, whom the Chinese Communists admit holding. The enclosed copies of these lists indicate to the best of the Department's knowledge, in the cases of clergymen, their church affiliation and rank as you requested.

The Department has also been pressing the Chinese Communists for information concerning other Americans regarding whom they might possibly have information, such as the 6 Navy and 5 Coast Guard personnel (list attached) shot down off Swatow in 1953, and the large number of missing military personnel never accounted for in the Korean fighting.

In addition to the American civilians under formal and house arrest, there are approximately 10 American civilians who, while not under either arrest or house arrest, have applied to the Chinese Communists without success for exit permits. In this group there is one missionary, Eva Stella DuGay (Sister Theresa), a nun of the Carmelite Order.

Sincerely yours,

ALLYN C. DONALDSON,
Director, Office of Special Consular Services.

AMERICAN CIVILIANS UNDER ARREST IN COMMUNIST CHINA

Bradshaw, Dr. Homer V., Presbyterian missionary; Buol, Lawrence Robert, aviation company employee; Clifford, Rev. John William, Jesuit missionary; Downey, John Thomas, Army employee; Fecteau, Richard George, Army employee; Garvey, Rev. Justin, Passionist missionary; Gross, Rev. Fulgence, Franciscan missionary; Houle, Rev. John Alexander, Jesuit missionary; Kanady, Dilmus T., employee of cotton brokerage; Lovegren, Levi A., Conservative Baptist missionary; Mackensen, Paul J., Jr., Lutheran missionary; McCann, Robert, businessman; McCarthy, Rev. Charles Joseph, Jesuit missionary; McCormack, Very Rev. Joseph Patrick (prefect apostolic), Maryknoll missionary; Middleton, Dorothy, Presbyterian missionary; Mills, Harriet, Fulbright scholar; Perkins, Sarah, Presbyterian missionary; Phillips, Rev. Thomas Leonard, Jesuit missionary; Pinger, Bishop Ambrose H., Franciscan missionary; Proulx, Rev. Armand, Jesuit missionary; Redmond, Hugh Francis, import-export business; Rickett, W. A., Fulbright scholar; Rigney, Rev. Harold W., Society of Divine Word; Wagner, Rev. John Paul, Franciscan missionary; White, Rev. Marcellus, Passionist missionary.

AMERICAN CIVILIANS BELIEVED UNDER HOUSE ARREST

Gordon, Very Rev. Frederick D. (prefect apostolic), Dominican missionary; Hyde, Rev. Joseph Eugene, Dominican missionary; Joyce, Rev. James Gerald, Dominican missionary.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE PERSONNEL WHO WERE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMAND IN KOREA NOW HELD IN COMMUNIST CHINA

Arnold, John K., Jr., colonel, 1212A; Baumer, William J., major, AO733786; Benjamin, Harry M., airman, second class, AF-27345838; Brown, Howard W., technical sergeant, AF36809947; Brown, Wallace L., first lieutenant, AO2221928; Buck, John W., first lieutenant, AO787245; Kiba, Steve E., airman, first class, AF14526310; Llewellyn, Elmer P., captain, AO2072360; Schmidt, Daniel C., airman, second class, AF19391475; Thompson, John W., III, airman, second class, AF13361-709; Vaadi, Eugene J., captain, AO825008.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AND NAVY AIRMEN MISSING FOLLOWING SHOOTING DOWN OF UNITED STATES NAVY PLANE OFF COAST OF CHINA, JANUARY 18, 1953, AND CRASH OF UNITED STATES COAST GUARD PLANE AT SAME LOCATION DURING RESCUE OPERATIONS

From the Navy aircraft: Angell, Dwight C., ensign, USNR, 552173; Beahm, Ronald A., ALAN, USN., 4268297; Byars, Clifford R., ATAN, USN, 3618355; McClure, William F., Jr., PHI, USN, 5682573; Morley, Paul A., AT 3, USN, 4268438; Smith, Lloyd, Jr., RAD 2, USN, 6306390.

From the Coast Guard rescue plane: Stuart, Gerald William, lieutenant junior grade, USCGR, 39984; Bridge, Joseph Richard, AO–1, USCG, 208–836; Hammond, Winfield James, ALC, USCG, 203–380; Miller, Tracy Wesley, AD–3, USCG, 288–273; Tornell, Carl Raymond, AL–1, USCG, 251–723.

S. 928

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a measure of very vital importance not only to every large city but to the people living within a radius of 10 or 20 miles of those cities.

Smoke abatement has generally been well brought under control, but in recent years industrial growth has loaded the air in or near cities with fumes of not only annoying but actually injurious intensity.

All urban communities are affected. Because Chicago, the windy city, has lots of wind, air pollution is less serious there.

Los Angeles, with less wind has had a disproportionate notoriety in this regard.

Most of us agree that air pollution enforcement is a matter for local authorities. But this is a nationwide problem. This bill as the committee presents it, provides for national coordination and cooperation under the direction of the Surgeon General and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In this way all of the scientific studies and research of all the cities, especially Los Angeles, can be pooled and built upon for the good of all.

The money authorization, $5 million, is nominal and I urge the immediate passage of the bill.

Words To Nab Reds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the folly of attempting to establish rigid rules of mental conduct by which to determine the loyalty and patriotism of an individual is most aptly pointed out in an editorial published in the Carlisle (Pa.) Evening Sentinel of June 27.

The editorial points out that under the rules set up in a pamphlet recently published by the First Army, the Commander in Chief of not only that Army, but of all our Armed Forces, would be suspect.

The editorial follows:

WORDS TO NAB REDS?

A pamphlet, recently released by the First Army for intelligence officers, is supposed to be a guide as to How To Spot a Communist?

How can a Communist be spotted? Well, according to the pamphlet, the language of the man or woman who is suspected of being a Red must be carefully studied and set down in a notebook or something. The thought-to-be Communist will, naturally be too clever to quote Lenin or Stalin or any of the other former Kremlin gang. But he will reveal himself as a subversive by use of certain words (says the pamphlet) such as progressive, colonialism, demogogy, reactionary, chauvinism, book burning, etc.

Trouble is, a little research shows, that one very well-known citizen, above suspicion, made the following remarks at the following places on the following dates:

"If we take the road to the right, we become reactionaries." (Boise, Idaho, August 20, 1952.)

"Don't joint the book burners." (Hanover, N. H., June 14, 1953.)

"You have seen war in Indochina described variously as an outgrowth of 'French colonialism' and the French refusal to treat indigenous populations decently." (Seattle, Wash., August 4, 1953.)

"We will drive from the temple of freedom all who seek to establish over us thought-control—whether they be agents of a foreign state or demagogs that try for personal power and public notice." (New York City, May 31, 1954.)

"From the beginning I have tried to stand for something that is positive and progressive." (Washington, D. C., December 8, 1954.)

Dwight D. Eisenhower used these suspect words. Throw the pamphlets out—or, better still, let the First Army have a book burning.

Negotiations by GSA With Aluminum Producers To Alleviate Aluminum Shortage Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the General Services Administration is undertaking to reach an agreement with Aluminum Company of America, Reynolds Metals Co., and Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp., whereby these producers will provide an additional amount of aluminum to independent users.

These negotiations which are now taking place have as their objective making available to the independents sufficient supplies to alleviate a distressing situation in the industry which has threatened many independents with business failure.

I understand that these negotiations with GSA have been entered into by Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser on a voluntary basis. This is not only commendable but a manifestation of enlightened public interest. Especially commendable are the General Services Administration's positive efforts to resolve what has been a most serious situation in the aluminum industry. I hope the current negotiations will be concluded successfully and in a form fair to all segments of the industry.

On June 10, 1955, the Office of Defense Mobilization announced that there would be no Government stockpiling of aluminum during the third quarter of this year. As a result of this decision there will be approximately 400 million additional pounds of aluminum available to the three producers, Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser. Pursuant to the Government's guaranteed market contracts with these producers, by which new facilities for producing aluminum were established, two-thirds of this amount must be sold to independent nonintegrated users of aluminum.

GSA and the aluminum producers are now examining methods to assure that independents will be appreciably benefited by the ODM decision not to stockpile during the third quarter. Previously Reynolds and Kaiser have taken the position that their obligation is to sell to the independents as a maximum, a quantity of aluminum not to exceed two-thirds of the output of the new facilities.

I have maintained the aluminum companies should sell to the independents these amounts in addition to what they would normally have sold to the independents. Otherwise, it is questionable whether the independents would be benefited by a stockpile cutback since their normal or historical pattern of sales might exceed the amounts made available by release from the ODM stockpile. In the past, only one producer, Alcoa, agreed to sell to the independents the two-thirds accruing to them by release from the stockpile in addition to the amounts sold to them on a historical basis.

I have been much concerned with this problem because of the serious shortages in aluminum facing the independents. Therefore, it was most disappointing to hear at the time of the June 10 announcement by ODM that no action was being taken by that agency to resolve or alleviate the problem. On two different occasions I requested the Director of ODM to take action to protect the independents and to insure that they receive cutback amounts as additions to the general pattern of supplies they had been receiving. From ODM and its Director, Arthur Flemming, we received no action. They made no effort to help.

Instead the General Services Administration is now taking up the slack and is attempting to reach an arrangement with the Alcoa, Reynolds, and Kaiser Cos., whereby an equitable historical sales pattern will be agreed upon as a basis by which the two-thirds contract entitlements of the independents will be computed as additional sales to the independents. These negotiations now taking place have as an objective a reasonable industrywide average which in effect will serve as a protective floor for the independents in future stockpiling cutbacks or releases. If a fair and equitable arrangement can be reached along these lines, then an important consideration in the aluminum expansion program can be effectuated.

Secret Sessions on Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, written by the fearless reporter, Mr. Drew Pearson, and appearing this morning, July 5, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, is worthy of wider circulation and news coverage.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be reproduced in the RECORD.

The article follows:

SECRET SESSION ON DIXON-YATES

(By Drew Pearson)

The sudden Eisenhower decision to reexamine the dynamite-laben Dixon-Yates contract was preceded by a secret, highly important meeting at the White House.

It took place on the morning before Ike issued his statement indicating the Dixon-Yates retreat, and was attended by Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, with Attorney General Brownell later called in for consultation. What worried them was possible violation of the criminal code as charged by Senator KEFAUVER when he discovered that Adolph Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp., which helped arrange Dixon-Yates financing, had sat in on the super-secret Budget Bureau-Atomic Energy sessions.

Though an alibi has been issued that the First Boston Corp. took no fee for arranging the Dixon-Yates financing, the criminal code which Senator KEFAUVER cited does not rest on the actual taking of money. This was why Brownell was consulted.

Also worrying Admiral Strauss and the President was the fact that Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, had subpenaed the records of the Atomic Energy Commission showing what visitors had called on Admiral Strauss during the Dixon-Yates talks.

BACK DOOR EXIT

The AEC keeps a careful record of every visitor entering the building. He has to sign his name, tell whom he is going to see, and is assigned an escort to take him to the appropriate office. Furthermore, the record shows what material, brief case, etc., every visitor carries.

And the AEC records subpenaed by Senator ANDERSON showed that on January 20 none other than Adolph Wenzell, vice president of First Boston, had called on Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission. With him, believe it or not, were Edgar Dixon, partner in the Dixon-Yates combine, plus Paul Miller, also of First Boston.

Furthermore, the AEC visitors' record meticuously noted: "Mr. Wenzell left by the back door carrying a large envelope."

In contrast to this official record in the hands of Democratic Senators, the President had stated at his press conference that Mr. Wenzell "was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract."

CONFLICTING EVIDENCE

In further contrast to the President's denial, Dick Cook, Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, had admitted under oath on June 8 before the SEC that Wenzell attended meetings at the AEC, which considered Dixon-Yates in January.

In addition, Chairman Strauss himself was placed in rather an embarrassing position by the written record of visitors to his own AEC. Because last November, when the Joint Congressional Committee was probing the mysterious manner in which the Dixon-Yates contract was hurriedly O. K.'d by the President despite a 3-to-2 vote against it by the AEC, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD of California asked Strauss:

"Do you know if Mr. Dodge was advised by a consultant who is now employed by any of the Dixon-Yates utility companies?"

"I have no knowledge of any consultations that Mr. Dodge may have had," Strauss replied, "or whether he had any."

Most of this information was in the hands of the eagle-eyed Senator KEFAUVER, who had summoned Budget Director Hughes, himself the former controller of the National City Bank which helped arrange the insurance financing of Dixon-Yates, to an extraordinary 8 p. m. Senate investigation.

HASTY ALIBI

Faced with all this, the hastily called White House meeting decided to give the President some kind of an out. So it was arranged for Gen. Herbert Vogel, Ike's newly appointed head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, to write a letter to the Budget Bureau notifying them that TVA would no longer have to supply power to the city of Memphis, in view of Memphis' own newly proposed city powerplant. Therefore, said General Vogel, TVA would not need Dixon-Yates power.

Actually, this was not at all new. Last November the city of Memphis testified before the SEC, with an AEC representative present, that it would not take power from Dixon-Yates.

Again, on May 18, Mayor Frank Tobey, of Memphis, wrote General Vogel that it would not take Dixon-Yates power.

"As for Dixon-Yates," wrote Mayor Tobey, "the position of the city of Memphis has, from the outset, been clear and unequivocal.

"It is inconceivable that Memphis should be dependent upon a source of power which is clearly inconsistent with the continued growth and development of our community."

Thus, the facts about Memphis had been known for months. However, faced with the inquisitive investigative eye of Senator KEFAUVER at 8 p. m., Vogel wrote Budget Director Hughes the letter he needed to give Ike a chance to get off the worst political hook he's been on since entering the White House. Ike was summoned off the golf course and the statement was issued at 7 p. m., just in time to call off the Kefauver investigation.

Federal-State Relations Report Can Be Valuable Guide to Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of July 1, 1955:

After nearly 2 years of study President Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has brought out a document of the first importance on the relationship between Federal and State Governments.

As the first official study of that relationship since the Constitutional Convention of 1787, it points out how we have departed in many respects from the original Federal system, but it shows that these departures, in view of changed circumstances, have been surprisingly small.

The Constitution was written for a country that was sparsely settled, mainly agricultural, with no great cities, and with a homogeneous population almost entirely English in origin.

Since then all of these circumstances have radically changed. A country predominantly agricultural has become chiefly urban. Some of the former farmlands are now among the most thickly populated areas on earth. And the homogeneous people has been diluted by heavy immigration from all parts of the world.

Through all this, however, the Federal-State relationship has remained. Its flexibility and adaptability have been demonstrated by the way it fits these changed conditions.

Nevertheless, as the report shows, there have been some ominous trends toward centralization of authority in Washington. The Commission does not seem greatly alarmed by this trend so far, but, if it continues long enough without check, the time will come when the States are mere administrative divisions of an all-powerful Federal Government like French departments.

The Commission sees the importance of maintaining the States and local governments as independent entities, because they serve as training grounds for leaders in government and fortify the principle of popular participation in government.

They keep the people at all levels in closer touch with their public officials than would be possible if everything were directed from Washington.

The report says, however, that the States must take the initiative in holding for themselves and for the local governments the powers that they have recently been surrendering to the Federal authorities.

Only the States can strengthen the local governments by changing city charters and granting more home rule to counties. Only the States can bring themselves up to date by reapportionment.

In nearly all States the constitutions were written and the basis of representation was established for an agricultural society. In most cases these have not been changed to meet the needs of the new urban populations.

So the States, before complaining about Federal encroachment, must first modernize themselves.

The report goes into the subjects of overlapping taxes that deprive the States of some of their sources of revenue and suggests that these overlaps should be eliminated as far as possible, but not completely, because a too-hard-and-fast line would be difficult to keep.

It attacks also the problem of grants-in-aid, which have been the most usual instrument for Federal encroachment on State authority. The report recommends that grants be reserved strictly for projects that have a national objective, and they should be held to this specific purpose.

Since the Federal Government has the right to control whatever it subsidizes, the grant-in-aid gives the Federal bureaucracy a weapon that it can use against local governments down to the lowest level.

The report, it seems to us, is not vigorous enough in pointing out this danger to State and local governments that resides in the grant-in-aid.

Altogether, this is a study of great moment to the future of the American Federal system. It does not make recommendations for specific legislation, but it can be used as an invaluable guide for future governmental relations.

That is, provided it is not put in a pigeonhole and forgotten, as has happened to too many reports of this kind.

For Clean Campaign Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues three editorials which have come to my attention the past week. The first appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on June 24; the second is from the June 27 edition of one of my hometown papers, the Tucson Daily Citizen; and the third was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 30. All of them are concerned with a bill introduced on June 23 in the Senate by Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., of Missouri, and by myself in this House. The bill, H. R. 7001, proposes to allow individuals to deduct political contributions in amounts up to $100 from their income for tax purposes. These editorials comment clearly on the merits and purpose of the bill, and demonstrate the significance and importance of the measure.

The editorials follow:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 24, 1955]

FOR CLEAN CAMPAIGN FUNDS

Most politicians favor one feature of Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS' proposed new campaign spending rules. They like the higher ceilings. These would spare national

committeemen the necessity of pretending that, so far as they know a $100 million campaign cost little more than the now legally sanctioned $6 million.

But some of them do not at all like the Hennings bill's provision for early and full reporting of every cent spent. They would rather have uncounted shadow committees spending uncounted dollars as the law now allows. But a man who periodically appeals for votes cannot say this frankly. The Republican minority on the Rules Committee, including Senator JENNER and Senator MCCARTHY, just calls the measure "cumbersome." It has nonetheless been reported favorably.

For those who believe their political spending is nobody's business, the mildest restrictions on slush funds must seem cumbersome. But the voter hardly sees it that way. Nor is he impressed by the argument that and accounting of funds locally collected for Federal officeseekers is an intolerable Federal invasion of local authority, and that a ban on spending not approved by the candidate would violate the constitutional rights of repudiated supporters.

As Washington Post Publisher Philip L. Graham suggests, the sources of a campaign fund are even more significant than its amount. It is an old story that far too much campaign money comes from the underworld and favor-seekers.

Mr. Graham's answer to the problem is more novel but it, too, is not brand new. He urges $5 contributions by voters to the party of their choice. Beardsley Ruml asked just such gifts for Adlai Stevenson in 1952. The Post-Dispatch has more than once suggested that millions of individual $5 contributions—or even $1 contributions—could meet the need without the unsavory implications and obligations now forced on even the most honorable candidates. In 1952 a dollar from every voter would have given the Republican National Committee $33 million and the Democrats $27 million—enough for the shorter campaigns made possible by radio and television.

A poll shows that at least 16 million families are ready to make $5 contributions. Americans dig into their pockets for everything from the community chest to the recruiting of a better football team for Old Siwash.

Senator HENNINGS and Representative UDALL, of Arizona, have introduced a supplementary bill which would encourage small contributions by making those of $100 or less tax-exempt. If adopted, this also could reduce such devious devices as tax-exempt gifts to, say, veterans organizations which may then use them for political purposes.

Congress can give impetus to a change in the raising of party funds—if it wants to.

[From the Tucson Daily Citizen of June 27, 1955]

EXEMPTION FOR POLITICAL GIFTS

Representative STEWART UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona, from Tucson, has introduced a bill in Congress which raises attractive possibilities. It would provide for a Federal income tax deduction up to $100 a year for political contributions.

Individual initiative and individual responsibility are considered cornerstones of our American system of Government. There has been a strong—and unhealthy—trend of late away from the individual and toward the mass in political campaigns and in the functioning of representative government.

Candidates for State and national offices cannot escape all the pressures inherent in financial support of their campaigns from big unions, big business, or big individual contributors. Even on a local city and county level, political parties and individual candidates have difficulty in getting relatively small campaign funds by means of many small gifts.

A tax-deductible status for small gifts could conceivably encourage many persons to give $10 or $100 to their own party or to favorite candidates. Any sincere candidate would prefer the encouragement, moral as well as financial, of a hundred $10 givers to one of $1,000. And in turn, if more individuals contributed to campaign funds it is reasonable to expect they also would be aroused to go further and take an active part in the campaign itself.

The man or group that gives large sums to a candidate or party may have a political ax he wants ground in return. It is safe to say that a person who would contribute within the limits of a $100 tax exemption would be interested simply in good candidates and in good government.

It will be interesting to see what, if any, reactions develop in Congress to the Udall proposal. It would be even more interesting to know how citizens themselves react to the proposition.

[From the Washington Post of June 30, 1955]

TAX AID IN CAMPAIGNS

Senator HENNINGS and Representative UDALL have demonstrated that there is something Congress can do about political contributions. The similar bills they have introduced in their respective Houses permitting citizens to deduct contributions to political campaigns from their taxable income, up to $100, could bring about a most significant political reform. These bills are designed to encourage greater participation by the rank and file in the financing of political campaigns. In a broader sense they should help greatly to relieve candidates for public office from obligations to special interests and make them responsible to the people.

A wholesale exemption of campaign contributions from taxation could be an unmitigated evil. It could encourage wealthy people to pour large sums into political campaigns and thus defeat the purposes of the Corrupt Practices Act. But the $100 limitation in the Hennings-Udall bills eliminates this danger and throws the emphasis on small contributions. No public servant is going to feel any special obligation to a constituent contributing $100 or less to his campaign. And the multiplication of small contributions from many sources is one of the best ways of enhancing the feeling of a legislator or executive that he is indeed a representative of the people.

The bill ought to be enacted so as to make it effective in the 1956 campaign. As we have previously noted, political campaigns have never been so expensive as they are today. In some measure these expenses can and should be limited, but a self-governing people would be extremely unwise to deny to candidates for office the means of making themselves and their views known to the public. The simple fact is that government by the people is an expensive necessity, which must have financial support as well as sustained interest and alertness from the rank and file. Congress can aid the cause by making small political contributions tax exempt, as the Legislature of Minnesota has already done, but self-government can reach its full flower only when people recognize the obligation to support their party and their candidates as they now support their churches, and their fraternal, educational, and charitable organizations.

H. R. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Mr. W. L. Waldrip, of Moro, Ark., has written me a most interesting letter as a part of his views and thinking on the recent congressional hearing on the land at Jonesboro, Ark.

Mr. Waldrip is one of the fine agricultural leaders in Arkansas who, from time to time, write me giving me their thoughts on pending agricultural legislation. This permits me to know the thinking of these farmers and pass it on to other Members of both Houses of Congress interested in improving our various farm programs.

Because of the timeliness of Mr. Waldrip's recent letter, and the thought-provoking views contained in it, I am placing it in the RECORD for the study and thought of the Members:

MORO, ARK., *June 30, 1955.*

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOOK: For myself as well as in behalf of many other people, I wish again to thank you and the other members of the subcommittee for taking the time away from your many tasks in your office to come out among us hayseed, callous-hands, dirt farmers to observe and discuss our needs with us. This is indeed a true example of democracy at work.

There were many things that I wanted to bring out up at Jonesboro the other day, but I felt to do so might appear that I was trying to hog our limited time. I wish herein to discuss a couple of matters that were omitted.

First, this initial topic can be best discussed by analogous reference to the human body, a system composed of numerous organs; the heart, the lungs, the brain, etc., each of which has a very special and distinct duty to perform. Significant is the fact that even though these organs have distinct functions, yet they are very much interdependent, one upon the other. The system is no stronger than the ability of the weakest organ to perform its function. In like manner our national economy is composed of many segments, of which agriculture is a major one. Industry, business, agriculture, and all the other segments of our economy has a specific function to perform, yet all are very interdependent, one upon the other. Further, we can justly assume that our national economy is no stronger than the ability of the weakest segment to perform its work. Please keep this preface in mind, as I refer to one of the other main segments of our economy whose leader so ably expounded in support of H. R. 12. As you will recall, this very eloquent spokesman in his testimony was profusely abundant in his outpouring of sympathy for the farmer. In fact, sympathy flowed so freely from his learned statement that we are inclined to feel much like the wife whose husband brings her a gift when he comes home late at night. Naturally, the farmer feels somewhat cautious if not skeptical. We gratefully accept this sympathy if it is genuine and well-meant,

but we do beg of you—who we in a way consider our guardian—to assay very carefully all proffered sentiment of this nature and, as far as humanly possible, discern if such is genuine and not only a subterfuge with a seething content of an officious and mettling nature. If this CIO high official is as genuine in his sentiment as it appears, well and good, but if it is a glittering bait to lull and subordinate one segment of our economy to another, then the result would be as disastrous as if the liver attempted to relegate the functions of the brain, or heart, or any other organ. We have confidence and faith in you to accurately analyze such instances.

Secondly: I should like to discuss H. R. 12. At an earlier date I wrote you admitting my meager study of this matter up to that time and made the tentative statement that it might be feasible to give the flexible price support legislation a try. Since that time I have made an intense study of this matter, and have definitely come to this conclusion. It is absolutely imperative that we not decrease the price of cotton or rice until such time we are assured a proportionate decrease in the cost of producting these commodities. The administration has many times made the statement that agriculture had to stand on its own two feet. That is absolutely true—as must a baby learn to stand on its own feet, if progress is to continue, but if this task is thrust on the infant too early you will break its back. In like manner, if we permit any legislation which will result in the decrease in price with costs still soaring, you will inevitably break the back of a major segment of our economy—agriculture. I definitely am for H. R. 12, because as I see it, this step will give agriculture time to stand alone without breaking its back. As to how much time needed will depend on how much time it will take to ease the price-cost squeeze.

We are all glad that the ASC recommendations were adopted. As it has been this year, the arrangement was unfair and ineffective. Again, we do want you to know that we so much appreciate your work in bringing about this important correction, or at least a big part in helping to bring it about.

We are looking forward to the rice meeting in Memphis as has been tentatively proposed. This would be a great opportunity to do needed and helpful work in the rice producers field. I would appreciate very much when such time is set, that you will let me know ahead as much as possible so we will have time enough to organize concerted recommendations to present.

Respectfully yours,

W. L. WALDRIP.

P. S.—I would suggest that the time not be set until after the harvest rush, or if that would be too late then make it before harvest starts.

Japanese Textile Tariff Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the chamber of commerce of Charlotte, N. C., concerning recent tariff concessions made by our Government at Geneva. The resolution was adopted on June 30, 1955, and indicates a growing concern on the part of the people in North Carolina's 10th District over these tariff concessions.

The resolution follows:

The United States has signed at Geneva, Switzerland, a document providing for the entrance of Japan into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In direct bargaining with Japan, prior to signing the document, the United States made substantial tariff concessions, including very deep cuts in the tariff on cotton textiles.

Japan enjoys a tremendous cost advantage over American textiles with wages in the United States approximately 10 times those in Japan, and already is selling in American markets at a substantial profit. The Geneva reductions accentuate this advantage to the critical point. With Japan buying two-thirds of its raw cotton in countries other than the United States, the Geneva action threatens the only reliable and large-scale market for the American cotton farmer—the American textile industry.

With approximately one-fourth of the Nation's textile spindles operating in North Carolina, and with approximately one-half million bales of cotton being grown and marketed in this State, these actions by the Government place this great textile industry of our State, and, indeed, our entire Nation, in economic jeopardy; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the chamber of commerce of Charlotte, N. C., petitions the President of the United States to take immediate and positive steps to establish sensible, reasonable, and specific limitations on the amounts of foreign-made cotton textiles permitted in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture and the congressional delegation from North Carolina.

JUNE 30, 1955.

Tomorrow's Answer Is You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the senior-class oration, delivered at graduation exercises at Stanford University, which is located in my district, by Mr. Tim Sharpe. The title of the address is "Tomorrow's Answer Is You":

TOMORROW'S ANSWER IS YOU

(By Tim Sharpe)

My fellow seniors, graduation is now upon us.

Who are we, this class of 1955? From varied backgrounds and distant homes, we arrived here 4 years ago, impatient to taste the sweet that is Stanford. For the most part, these have been happy and rewarding years. And each of us has now been blessed with at least the bare rudiments of education. Now, as individuals, we begin life's real journey.

Who are we, this class of 1955? Each of us, in the briefness of less than a quarter century, has witnessed events of great magnitude: A crippling national depression, an all-engulfing World War, and today's cold war, which threatens to explode into the horror of atomic warfare. In each of these great crises, the American people have shown they can meet the great challenges with a resolute heart and a willingness, a desire, to give of themselves.

And yet it is true that each generation produces its own peculiar brand of pessimists. In our national life today, they are popularly referred to as the "prophets of gloom." And then, there are those who operate on the more personal level of life, those who might well be called the "prophets of doom." But they both have one thing in common, and that is their product—sheer hopelessness.

I am sure that we all hope for something more than hopelessness.

These "prophets of doom" on a personal level are pessimists who try to justify their own lack of success or happiness by attaching their failings to other individuals, or to the times in which they live. It is this situation that I wish to discuss with you today.

History clearly points to the fact that no one incident, and no one individual ever ruined another man's destiny. His temporary happiness, certainly; and perhaps his ability to cope with his immediate environment; but his total life? Never.

Can life be a success? To each of us, success will mean a different concept: Public acclaim, financial reward, recognition of creativity, philosophical wisdom, and the nearness of our dear ones. Yet the hope to which most of us will only pay lip service throughout our lives, and not an active, living service, is that we may end life's journey seeking only this success: To stand in the presence of God Almighty and receive from Him this simple but eternal gift: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Many good and great men do not reach heights of fame, and are not chronicled by their current fellowmen. Indeed, perhaps most of our really greatest heroes have died unsung and unrevered because their very greatness lay in accepting themselves as they were, and going on from there.

What is success then? Who is successful? Granted than Van Gogh ended his life in a maddened frenzy; granted that Socrates ended his with imposed hemlock; granted that Jesus of Nazareth was betrayed and humiliated by death upon a cross. Yet each contributed to a hungry and grief-ridden world a conviction that man is more than an assembly of chromosomes. Each could have been labeled by his contemporaries as ruined by his particular times and environment. And yet nothing could be further from the truth.

Poverty, illness, lack of opportunity, heartbreak, defeat after defeat; these have been the very challenges with which ordinary mortals have turned their particular hells into triumph.

Indeed, it seems that if life is too easy, if individuals are too blessed, complacency and mediocrity set in. And by the same token, most of our country's truly great heroes, Lincoln, the Roosevelts, Eisenhower, just to mention a few, had to face and conquer many of life's most difficult challenges in their early years, only to emerge years later as the Nation's chosen and tested leaders in both peace and war. In their weakest hour they found the strength and courage to carry them through to the greatness of their finest hour—be it on the battlefield of war, or in the halls of great statesmanship.

Understand, it matters little from whence the challenge comes or what form it takes, but it matters everything whether we are ready to meet the challenges of today—the tests of courage, character, and faith that each of us must face. Obviously, we cannot all be generals of armies or presidents of the United States, but this is no excuse—no escape—from not fully using our talents and gifts to fulfill the responsibilities that each of us will meet as we leave the quiet serenity of this university.

The world walks the swaying tightrope of peace today, not knowing what the next step

will bring. Today we of the graduating class are faced with the possibility of a devastating war which could put democracy and the entire free world to its greatest test. If this great crisis be thrust upon us, the only hope for victory—yes; the only hope for survival—is the collective action of freedom-loving individuals.

Yet we must not wait for the coercive thrust of war to make us conscious of our responsibilities as individuals in a democratic society. Today we stand on the threshold of a new experience which will see us take our places in the world; our positions in our chosen vocations, in our homes, and in our communities.

But what does the prospect of this new experience mean to you? This is the crucial question facing each of us today.

What, then, is to be our future? Possibly to have lived a few short years and not run away is the best that is asked of us. Possibly our task will be to live long years in dread and agony. But never let us fall heir to the fallacy that an era defeated us. No era—no master—ever ultimately defeated the man or woman who refused to be beaten by the great challenge each of us must face. We only allow ourselves to be ruined.

And never let us be guilty of directing a jealousy-inspired criticism to those individuals who, through their own courage and initiative—through their own abilities—have passed us by. Instead, let us be big enough to applaud their efforts and take genuine satisfaction in their triumphs.

Some call it destiny. To a great many of us it seems more honest to call it the spirit of man. The spirit that has wavered and lost control and sunk to the soggiest depths. The same spirit which has painfully climbed, rung by rung, upward through suffering and self-betrayal to acknowledge at last the everlasting kinship of all mankind.

Class of 1955, no person, no bomb, no war, no economic depression, no malicious thought or deed can ruin you. You alone are your most bitter or most benevolent judge. No other person or thing can ruin you. It is left to each of us ourselves. What happens now is a decision each of us must make. The choice is ours. The future is ours.

With confidence in ourselves and an abiding faith in Almighty God, let us step boldly and courageously into the dawn af a new day—a new future that waits for our answer.

I Am the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of the House to a noteworthy public service performed by the Norfolk & Western Railway. It appeared in the form of a nationwide ad published in leading magazines and is titled I Am the Nation. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the U. S. News & World Report ad of the July issue be included in the RECORD.

The ad follows:

I AM THE NATION

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the Nation.

I am 165 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys, and Davy Crocket. I am Lee and Grant, and Abe Lincoln.

I remember the Alamo, the *Maine*, and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called, I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rock of Corregidor, and on the bleak slopes of Korea.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheat lands of Kansas, and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate, and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the Monitor, and the Merrimac.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific, 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 5 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain, and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of Auld Lang Syne as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the World Series. I am 169,000 schools and colleges, and 250,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium, and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper, and a letter to a Congressman.

I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein, and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers, and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster, and Jonas Salk.

I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman, and Thomas Paine.

Yes, I am the Nation, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer on July 4, 1955—179 years after I was born.

Jets for Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHIL WEAVER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the comments expressed in an editorial under date of Friday, July 1, 1955, from the Omaha World Herald.

Nebraskans, in general, share this viewpoint on extravagant, unnecessary, and dangerous giveaways and especially to Communists such as Tito.

A reasonable formula to help those who want to be friends of democracy and want to be free cannot by any stretch of the imagination include grants such as this.

Nebraskans do not believe in a calculated risk that will within the very near future give this Communist leader possession of the No. 5 air power in the world.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial entitled "Jets for Tito":

JETS FOR TITO

In these times it's a little difficult even for the most consecrated globalist to make a plausible case for any part of the European aid program.

But of all the items included in the $3,285,800,000 bill now pending in Congress, none is harder to justify than the proposal for military and economic aid to Yugoslavia.

That country is ruled by the iron dictatorship of Marshal Tito. He is a Communist. All his associates and deputies are Communist. The way they govern is indistinguishable from the way the Red regimes in other lands operate.

American aid to Tito was started some years ago when he fell out with the Kremlin gang. This lovers' quarrel was hailed by American globalists as proof that Tito was on our side. They tried to butter him up with gifts and loans, and by making a great fuss over him in the American left-wing press.

The inter-Communist breach is healed now. Marshal Tito recently played host to the Kremlin's top roisterers, and is planning soon to return their call. In Belgrade these Red bosses—Russian and Yugoslav varieties—talked in terms of Communist solidarity against capitalism.

Yet American propagandists for globalisimo are trying to pretend that Tito is on the side of the West.

They are twisting and distorting the meaning of his comments on world affairs to make it seem that he is a great and true friend of democracy.

And they are insisting, above all, that this Communist dictator be kept on the American dole, that he be given a generous share of the money which the American Government takes out of the pockets of every citizen.

When the aid bill came up for discussion this week, Representative FULTON of Pennsylvania suggested that gifts of latest model American jet fighter planes to Yugoslavia be forbidden, until the American Air Force has all of those planes it needs.

Doesn't that seem sensible?

Wouldn't almost any American wish to have those high-flying, hard-hitting jets based on American soil, where they could protect New York, Washington, Detroit—and Omaha—rather than Belgrade?

Isn't it obvious to almost any rational mind that there is grave danger in handing equipment of that kind to any Communist nation?

Yet what a commotion there was in Washington when Representative FULTON made his rather conservative suggestion. A body would think he was proposing to tear down the Washington Monument, or give Manhattan Island back to the Indians.

There is great force, an almost incredible zeal, behind the drive to give away America's wealth and the savings of her people. From what headwaters this power flows has never been fully determined. It's an interesting subject and we offer it, gratis, to some open-minded young man or woman who is about to start work on a doctor's thesis.

Republican Fiscal Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago when the Democratic Party was endeavoring to give a $20 tax credit to the American people we listened to some unwarranted and unfounded charges about fiscal irresponsibility directed toward Democratic Members of Congress. This allegation of fiscal irresponsibility was made by the Eisenhower administration because the Democratic Party was endeavoring to give approximately $2 billion in individual income tax relief which would principally have gone to low income families.

This tax reduction was necessary to balance the distribution of the tax burden equitably among all taxpayers. The so-called tax relief of the 83d Congress had cast our tax structure into imbalance by giving over 75 percent of the tax reduction to individuals with incomes over $25,000 and to corporations. It was against that background that the Secretary of the Treasury termed as fiscal irresponsibility the recent attempt by Democratic Members of the Congress to give needed tax relief to our low income families.

Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight I would like to point out an instance of true fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the same Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable George M. Humphrey.

I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to certain responses made by that Secretary of the Treasury to questions which I addressed to him during the recent public hearings held by the Committee on Ways and Means on legislation providing for a temporary increase in the statutory debt limit.

In these hearings a distinguished Republican member of our committee raised the question of the proposed liberalization of our social-security laws on which the Committee on Ways and Means is presently working. These Democratic-sponsored amendments are designed to correct certain inadequacies in the present law and to make benefits available to certain classes of people that, in general, are now enduring real hardship. In response to an observation by this Republican member of our committee to the effect that it would be irresponsible on the part of Congress to enact these long overdue changes in the social-security law, the Secretary of the Treasury said as follows:

> It would be an extremely serious thing, with the amount of debt we owe, to not pay our bills. It is unthinkable.

At that point I undertook to set the record straight and to determine what the Secretary's position was with respect to these amendments. The Secretary informed me that the proposed social-security changes would very definitely change the national debt if the funds provided for social-security were not sufficient to cover the obligations incurred by social security. I then asked the Secretary if it was not true that he was the managing trustee of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. He stated that he was. He agreed with me that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and costs of the social-security program are financed by the contributions made to the fund rather than out of the general funds of the Treasury but he volunteered the information that if the contributions fall below the obligations of the fund it will be necessary to meet the deficit out of the general funds of the Treasury. I then asked the Secretary this question:

> Is it—
>
> Referring to the trust fund—
>
> able to meet its current obligations, Mr. Secretary?

To which the Secretary of the Treasury, who had charged the Democratic Party with fiscal irresponsibility, replied:

> It can meet current obligations. I think it is very questionable that the fund is sufficient to meet its full obligations if they are incurred.

I then asked the Secretary of the Treasury, whom I will remind you is the managing trustee of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, if it was his opinion that the old-age and survivors insurance system is actuarially unsound. In response to this question the Secretary of the Treasury replied:

> Yes, under the present provisions of collection and disbursement.

Mr. Speaker, the law requires that the trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund report annually to the Congress on the status of the trust fund. The trustees are also required by law to report immediately to the Congress whenever the trustees are of the opinion that the amount of the trust fund is unduly small. To date the Congress has received no notification from the managing trustee of the trust fund—the Secretary of the Treasury, or any of the other trustees of the trust fund, either individually or collectively, that the old-age and survivors insurance system was not actuarially sound. In fact, in the report of the trustees on March 1, 1955, which is printed as Senate Document No. 39, of the 84th Congress, it is stated on page 30 thereof, as follows:

> Accordingly, it might be said that in the 1954 amendments, the increase in the ultimate contribution rate meets all of the additional costs of the benefits proposed and a substantial part of the deficiency which the latest estimates indicated in the financing of the 1952 act.

Hon. George M. Humphrey, when wearing the hat of the Secretary of the Treasury, is totally inconsistent in maintaining that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is actuarially unsound with his utterances when he is wearing the hat of the managing trustee of the old-age and surivors insurance trust fund in assuring the Congress that the system is actuarially sound.

Mr. Speaker, the fraud is even more serious than that. I call the attention of the Members of the House to the tax recommendations of the President of the United States contained in his message to the Congress of May 20, 1953. In those recommendations he stated:

> The increase in the old-age insurance tax from 1½ to 2 percent on both employees and employers, now scheduled to go into effect next January 1, should be postponed until January 1, 1955.
>
> The old-age and survivors trust fund has now reached almost $18 billion. Receipts at present tax rates are currently well in excess of expenditures. The further addition to the fund which would flow from the projected tax increase is not required.
>
> From now on, the old-age tax and trust accounts, while maintaining the contributary principle, should be handled more nearly on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Republican administration is in the position of having Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey disagreeing with Managing Trustee Humphrey and with the President. We are compelled to wonder who is right and who is wrong.

In view of the fact that the Republican Members of the 84th Congress are desperately resorting to their traditional obstructionism in opposing any liberalization of the social security program, I am inclined to believe that the Honorable George M. Humphrey is talking through his Secretary of the Treasury's hat when he condemns the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance program.

It is inconceivable to me that any President who even feigns any semblance of fiscal responsibility would advocate a delay in the scheduled increase in social security taxes without the most thorough and thoughtful consideration of the matter.

It would seem that the Secretary of the Treasury is basing his charge of fiscal irresponsibility in regard to the proposed liberalization of the social-security program on the same political expediency and opportunism that motivated his charge of fiscal irresponsibility when he opposed the $20 tax cut that would have meant so much to the average American family. The administration's shotgun opposition is in keeping with what I have always regarded as the unstated underlying philosophy of the Republican Party to the effect that "what is good for the common man is not good for him unless the Republican Party condescends to give it to him."

The truth with respect to the actuarial soundness of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is that it is sound. Furthermore, I am sure that I am correct in stating that it is the intention and conviction of every Member of Congress that the fund always be maintained in an actuarially sound condition. I think it is important to set the record straight on this matter because otherwise there can be no confidence in the social-security system on the part of the American public.

The actuarial experts at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are extremely able and competent in their field. The Committee on Ways and Means has always given careful consid-

eration to their recommendations and counsel in enacting any amendments to our social security law. In reporting social security legislation to the House, the Committee on Ways and Means has always acted prudently and provided a tax constribution schedule that was consistent and in keeping with the actuarial aspects of the program.

Mr. Speaker, in view of these conflicting and inconsistent statements by representatives of the Republican administration, I would like to recommend that those representatives of the Eisenhower administration abandon their allegations of fiscal irresponsibility whenever they are opposed to something that the Democratic Party is trying to do for the welfare of our American citizens.

The First Fourth of July and America's Historic Shrines Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the July 3, last, issue of the newspaper magazine This Week 2 articles of great interest in connection with the July 4 observation for the year 1955. One article entitled "The First Fourth of July" is by Mr. Dumas Malone; the other, "The Seven Historic Wonders of America," is by the famed historian, Mr. Bruce Catton.

I ask consent that these articles be reproduced in the RECORD, and, in connection with Mr. Catton's listing of historic shrines, would add that many more should and could be added to his list, and, no doubt, in the future the list will be expanded to include others of our national shrines.

Both articles, which are worthy of being preserved, are as follows:

THE FIRST FOURTH OF JULY
(By Dumas Malone)

However the weather may turn out tomorrow, the day of this Nation's birth, July 4, 1776, was bright and pleasant. Thomas Jefferson, 33, youngest member of the Virginia delegation to the Continental Congress in Philadelphia, noted that the temperature was 68 at 6 a. m., the wind was from the southeast, and the mercury rose to 76 in the heat of the day.

In Pennsylvania's brick State House—now revered as Independence Hall—from 40 to 50 representatives of America's 13 Original Colonies and Commonwealths had for several days been discussing the adoption of an independence declaration. On this day, their debates didn't end until evening.

Above them in the State House's tall, white spire hung a 1-ton, 12-by-5-foot bronze bell, known then as the Province Bell—now as the Liberty Bell. Cast in England, it had cracked while being tested in Philadelphia and had had to be remolded twice before its installation in 1753. Around its crown, the bell bore an inscription from Leviticus: Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof.

An old bellman is said to have been stationed in the steeple, patiently awaiting a signal from a boy posted at the door below. When finally, in the hush of evening, the boy clapped his hands and shouted "Ring! Ring!" the aged patriot yanked the rope that was to signalize the birth of a new nation. (Contrary to popular legend, the bell cracked not during this historic tolling but 59 years later, while it was being rung for the funeral of Chief Justice John Marshall.)

TWO-DAY DELAY

A resolution of political independence had been adopted by the Congress on July 2, and John Adams, of Massachusetts, had written his wife Abigail he felt sure that day would be commemorated by later generations. But the birth certificate of the infant Republic bears the date July 4, when a full charter of freedom was finally and formally approved.

Broadsides of the authenticated Declaration were ordered, hastily run off by a local printer on the night of July 4. His punctuation and capitalization were so erratic that the first printed version has been described as following neither previous copies, nor reason, nor the custom of any age known to man.

The official parchment Declaration of Independence in the National Archives wasn't ordered engrossed until July 19. It is headed: "In Congress, July 4, 1776. The unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America." (The word united was inscribed in small letters to make a line fit.) But only 12 States actually voted for it on July 4, because New York's delegates weren't empowered to do so until July 9. And the 55 signers who subsequently inscribed their names (on August 2 and thereafter) were not identical with those who had voted for the resolution on July 4. Some of the latter had since left the Congress, and new members had appeared on the scene.

Jefferson, chosen to write the Declaration because of his felicity of expression, composed the historic document, without recourse to reference books or pamphlets, on a portable writing desk of his own design, in the second-floor parlor of a Philadelphia bricklayer's home where he had lodgings. By June 28, he submitted a rough draft to John Adams and Benjamin Franklin to enable them to write in their suggestions. The Congress later deleted references to slave trade and Scottish mercenaries, along with some of Jefferson's more high-flown passages. But the rough draft, scored and scratched like a schoolboy's exercise, was treasured by its author all his life.

The signers of the Declaration included 20 lawyers, 15 planters and large holders, 7 merchants, 4 doctors, 3 businessmen, 2 farmers, a judge, a surveyor, a clergyman, and a scientist-philosopher-diplomat (Franklin). Their ages ranged from 26 to 70; the average was under 45. They ran the gamut from the continent's wealthiest men to plain men of the people.

SOME SIGNERS WERE DOUBTFUL

John Adams observed that some "signed with regret, and several others with many doubts." It was as he affixed his signature that Franklin is supposed to have remarked, "Yes, we must all indeed hang together or most assuredly we shall hang separately." Portly Benjamin Harrison of Virginia is reputed to have boasted to spare Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts that his own great weight would insure his neck's snapping instantly, whereas Gerry would probably be left kicking in the air for over half an hour. Hancock, who inscribed his famed signature about a third larger than usual, is said to have commented that he did so to enable John Bull to read it without his spectacles, and to double the price on Hancock's head.

After signing, some of the men withdrew into relative obscurity, leaving scarcely a trace behind. A considerable number lost most of their fortunes in the subsequent Revolutionary War. The majority continued in public service.

The first to die was John Morton of Pennsylvania, in April 1777. The last was Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Md., often described as the country's richest man and the sole Catholic among these Founding Fathers. He died in 1832 at the age of 95, and was the only signer who survived long enough to see anything faster than a horse—a railroad train.

THE SEVEN HISTORIC WONDERS OF AMERICA
(By Bruce Catton)

Question: "We are all familiar with the Seven Wonders of the World," writes Grant C. Vietsch, of Nashua, N. H., "but what are the seven historic wonders of America?" To get the answer, we called on historian Bruce Catton, who in turn asked several leading Americans for their choices.

Answer: Month after month the automobiles move along the American highways. Since the world began there never was a movement of people like this. And especially at this time of year, all America is on wheels, going some place * * * looking for something not to be found by stay-at-homes.

A great number of these travelers are moving simply to have a look at their country, to visit the places that are so deeply embedded in the national memory that they have become shrines. They are traveling not merely from here to there but from now to then, seeking to get back into the past, and to find tangible reminders of some of the great moments in American history.

All across the country you can find those spots where bits of our past become very real and eloquent—a particular building, a certain hilltop, a sleepy little town, a pile of rocks. Standing in such places, we are no longer alone. The past comes alive, and we see our own lives as part of an endless, unbroken procession; we understand a little better what it is to be an American.

So the question naturally arises: Which are the finest and most precious of these national shrines of ours? Which places are most worth a visit?

When this writer was asked to join in This Week's question game and reply to that query, he felt the need of consultation, and so he wrote to a number of distinguished Americans asking for their guidance. Of each one, he asked: What historic shrines in this country seem to you to be of the greatest value?

Answers were received from Irving S. Olds and Eleanor Roosevelt, from Paul G. Hoffman, and Senator Margaret Chase Smith, from Cecil B. De Mille and Adlai Stevenson, from Dorothy Canfield Fisher, from Bernard M. Baruch, Carl Sandburg, Walter Lippmann, and Robert Frost. And this article is devoted to a brief discussion of the places that seemed to this eminent jury to be most worthy of attention by roving Americans.

1. THE VIRGINIA SHRINES

The first "historic wonder" comes in three parts—the great Virginia shrines—Yorktown, Williamsburg, and Mount Vernon, lying within a few hours' drive of each other.

Williamsburg is both new and old: a reconstructed colonial capital, skillfully recreated so that the auto traveler can, simply by parking his car and stepping out of it, walk back into a past more than two centuries old. Here is one of the places where we began. Strolling about, you can feel, "Well, this is what it looked like then, this is how life was lived." This dignity and quaint elegance moved into our national bloodstream and are somehow responsible

for at least a part of the heritage by which we live.

And a little farther along the road is Yorktown, where men died amid the rattle and crash of cannon and small arms, and where a proud empire at last acknowledged the existence of a prodigious new democracy while impudent fifers shrilled a tune aptly called "The World Turned Upside Down."

And north by a pleasant morning's drive lies that great mansion by a dreamy river, home place of one of the greatest of all Americans—Mount Vernon.

There is little to say about Mount Vernon that has not been said many times. If any place in America is the American shrine, it is Mount Vernon. It bespeaks the man without whom, almost certainly, the Nation could not have come to birth; more than that, it also tells of a kind of society, a way of living and of looking at life, that go to the very roots of our national memories.

Out of this luxurious home of a wealthy aristocrat there came, sowehow, an element essential to democracy itself; underneath the restless, eternally moving striving of our heterogeneous society there are calm and dignity and secure peace.

2. THE PUEBLO OF TAOS

And now, cross the continent, all the way to New Mexico—endless horizons, undimmed sunlight, great mountain masses that look misty-blue and insubstantial in the distance.

Here is a village more ancient than any our European ancestors ever built in this country: the pueblo of Taos, a humped pile of adobe brick, preserving an Indian culture that was old before Coronado rode out on his romantic and hopeless quest. Here, too, the culture that the Spaniards brought with them is a living reality, the great days of the friars and conquistadors speak with a different voice, and the long-ago lingers in the shadows of an ancient church.

Our heritage is not all English Cavaliers and Puritans, not all of our roads began at Plymouth Rock or between the rivers on the Virginia peninsula; all nations and races had a part in building America, and Taos is a fine reminder of the fact.

3. THE MINUTEMAN

Now New England: the twin towns of Lexington and Concord, authentic bits of the colonial past.

By the time history began to take shape on Lexington green and along the Concord bridge, people who had begun to think of themselves as Americans had lived along the eastern seaboard for generations.

Yet here, in a way, is where we began. Here occurred the great act of defiance—defiance not merely of a blind autocracy but of the crippling past itself, which seemed to decree that men's lives should be lived within narrow limits.

The Minuteman is a stiff bronze figure on a pedestal now, but once he was a living human being, with warm blood in his veins, and here he pointed the way for us * * * if they mean to have a war, let it begin here; the shot fired by this little stream will be heard around the world, since it is being fired to make freedom a reality for people who have not yet been born.

4. INDEPENDENCE HALL

Go to Philadelphia, next, to see Independence Hall. Built with the grace and good proportion that the colonial builders knew how to put into their architecture, it nevertheless is an ordinary sort of building—except that men used it to hammer a dream into shape, risking their necks to make good the assertion that members of the human race owe earthly allegiance to no one except themselves, their fellows, and their own consciences.

Very likely the men of the Continental Congress were people much like ourselves, with their full share of pettiness, self-seeking, and stupidity; yet out of their labors came something greater than any of them, and from this old building there still shines a light that lies along the pathway ahead.

5. THE LINCOLN CABIN

Not all of our American shrines are imposing to look at. One of the greatest of them is very humble; a simple log cabin, built more than a century and a half ago in what was then tolerably wild country near Hodgenville, in central Kentucky.

It was one of thousands of similar buildings scattered across the western frontier, and nobody would ever remember it except that Abraham Lincoln was born in it. But you can go and see it today; it is enshrined in a marble memorial, and it is very much worth a visit because it is the birthplace not only of one of our greatest men but also of one of our greatest legends.

It is a reminder, somehow, that human life has a miraculous element bound up in it. Out of this backwoods cabin there could come, in defiance of all probability, great strength and a brooding vision, a will that could set a Nation on a new path and an insight that could find a new birth of freedom in bloodshed and suffering and the blinding, choking murk of battle smoke.

6. THE ALAMO

Now to San Antonio, for a visit to the Alamo, where Davy Crockett fell.

Here again, surface indications are deceiving. This is just an old church, surrounded now by a bustling modern city, a fragment of the past incongruously surviving in the midst of the present. But here is one of those places where men forged an enduring element in American myth and American character.

Quite simply, they served notice here that Americans were up to something in this country that death itself could not stop. We "remember the Alamo" and we always well, as long as we have any need for that element in our national character that turns out to be so hard that it breaks the hammer that is pounding it.

7. GETTYSBURG

One more: a little town in Pennsylvania.

Here again the past lives, not because of the archaic monuments that clutter the ridges and hills, but simply because the things that men did in and around this little market town can never be forgotten.

Actually, the place does not commemorate a great military victory—we were not fighting an enemy here, we were fighting against ourselves. Rather, it symbolizes the tremendous price that Americans have paid in the unending effort to perfect the process of making their expanding democracy a permanent, all-inclusive thing. In some inexplicable way, what was done here contributed to the freedom and the solidity of the national life we enjoy today.

The battlefield, somehow, expresses that fact. What more can you ask of a national shrine?

The list of shrines could be extended—Fort Ticonderoga and New Salem, the Natchez Trace and Greenfield Village, Mackinac Island and Cooperstown and the California Missions, and many more.

All of them are worth a visit. From each one, as from the places described briefly in this article, there can come a new appreciation of the price people have paid for what we enjoy today, a sense of the mystic bond which unites us with the dreams and ideals and lofty hopes that went into the making of this country.

The future grows out of the past. The past was rich and inspiring; it gives us the right to believe that the future will be the same.

Address by Past Commander Ralph M. Snyder at Flag Day Celebration, Aviation Post, No. 651, American Legion, June 14, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1955, in the city of Chicago, Aviation Post, No. 651, of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, celebrated the 178th anniversary of the adoption of the American flag by the Continental Congress June 14, 1777. An address was delivered by the Honorable Ralph M. Snyder, past commander of the American Legion, a distinguished and scholarly leader of the bar, whose eloquent discourses have stirred, inspired and influenced his audiences and fellow Americans on occasions too numerous to mention. He is a member of the American, Illinois, and Chicago Bar Associations, and of the outstanding legal societies, a man whose patriotic devotion is known by all citizens of Illinois. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of the Honorable Ralph M. Snyder:

Commander Lipsner, comrade, and guests, 178 years ago today the Continental Congress adopted the flag of our country. It had one stripe for each of the Original Thirteen Colonies and a star for each. One star has been added for each new State.

Our flag is a symbol, a symbol of freedom, purity, and determination. It was a symbol to Francis Scott Key as he walked the decks of an English frigate bombarding the fort at Baltimore. As he gazed between smoke and the early flecks of morning light our flag told him that he fort still held.

It was a symbol which enshrouded the bodies of our fallen buddies of the great wars, telling us that they are forever wrapped in the glory symbol of the country for which they were willing to lay down their lives.

It was a symbol with Washington at Yorktown, an inspiration with Jackson at New Orleans, a fiery challenge with Winfield Scott at Palto Alto, it matched the rugged determination of Grant at Richmand and Appomattox, it beckoned onward to Dewey at Manila, lead Pershing at Sedan and Eisenhower at Rheims. Proudly it flies over the once royal palace at Honolulu and from our ships and outposts encircling the globe.

It stands for the dignity of man, the keystone of our Government, the first government built as a compact between men.

"Epaulettes of Farragut,
Powder horn of Boone,
Hawaii's fateful morning,
Shiloh's fearful moon.

"Bayonets in Belleau Wood,
Song of Marion's men
Foxholes in the Philippines,
Wake's grim garrison.

"Lincoln's face, its sadness;
'That from these honored dead
We take increased devotion.'
Other things he said.

"Stars above our cornfields
Morning-colored wind,
Snow, and wood fires burning
On hearths we leave behind.

"God of the hidden purpose,
Let our embarking be
The prayer of proud men asking
Not to be safe, but free."

Our flag means more to us than any other flag. First, we have more freedom and rights under it. Secondly, it means us individually because our Government is a compact between men. All other previous governments were formed as a compact between cities, leagues, states, and principalities.

The United States is neither a dictatorship nor a complete political democracy. It depends for its perpetuation on continuous and vital faith in the capacity of the individual for self-advancement.

James Madison, writing in the Federalist, No. 39, said:

"It is evident that no other form would be reconcilable with the genius of the people of America; or with that honorable determination which animates every votary of freedom, to rest all our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

Democracy, as an equalitarian approach in all aspects of human relationships, results naturally from faith in the fundamental decency of human beings.

Walt Whitman has poetically identified the individual, the very core of our government:

"I swear I begin to see the meaning of these things,
It is not the earth, it is not America who is so great,
It is I who am great, it is you up there, or any one.
It is to walk rapidly through civilizations, governments, theories,
Through poems, pageants, shows to form individuals.

"Underneath all individuals,
I swear nothing is good to me now that ignores individuals,
The American compact is altogether with individuals,
The only government is that which makes minute of individuals,
The whole theory of the universe is directed unerringly to one single individual—namely, to you.

"O, I see flashing that this America is only you and me,
Its power, weapons, testimony, are you and me,
Its crimes, lies, thefts, defections, are you and me,
Its Congress is you and me, the officers, capitols, armies, ships, are you and me,
Its endless gestations of new States are you and me.

"The war (that was so bloody and grim, the war I will henceforth forget) was you and me,
Natural and artificial are you and me,
Freedom, language, poems, employments, are you and me,
Past, present, future, are you and me."

Now, look at this flag, in reverence, and adoration.

Down through the pages of history, since it first was created, other forces have worked to replace it by symbols of their own. In 1812, the British sought to return their emblem which we renounced in 1776. The Kaiser sought to replace it in 1917. A man named Hitler wanted to substitute a swastika in 1941 and even today there are forces which would replace it with a hammer and sickle. But still it flies proudly on, telling the story of toleration and of good will, of a Nation of free education, where the citizens of tomorrow can learn the truth about yesterday and today. It is the symbol of a Nation of industry which has become a home for millions from foreign shores who saw in it so many of the freedoms and privileges which could not have been theirs in their native land. It represents a Nation of equal opportunity where a boy from the slums of New York or a tenant farm in Georgia can rise to a position of prestige and power along with the boy who is born with a silver spoon in his mouth.

So, my dear friends, on this sacred day, June 14, 1955, as we celebrate the birthday of our beloved flag, let us highly resolve, that the leadership of our invincible Republic, shall bring peace, and freedom to all the peoples of the earth.

Restore Free Enterprise in Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include herein an editorial from the La Crosse Tribune, La Crosse, Wis., in the June 30, 1955, edition of the paper.

This is a splendid exposition on the question of free enterprise, and I commend it to all Members of the House for their attention:

RESTORE FREE ENTERPRISE IN GAS

Awaiting action in Congress, probably before the week is out, is a bill to free independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation.

It had been assumed for many years that Congress should no more set the price at which gas is sold at the well than it should regulate the price of coal, iron, or other materials at the mine.

In June 1954, however, the Supreme Court handed down a divided opinion which interpreted the wording of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as meaning that producers were to be under Federal control.

The bill now pending, which in the interest of free enterprise should be passed, specifically exempts natural gas producers from Federal control and aims to restore conditions to the 1938–54 status.

Competition works to keep prices low at the wellhead just as competition works to keep any price low. The country enjoys a high standard of living because industry has been allowed to operate in an atmosphere of freedom, known as free enterprise.

Competition has brought low prices and an abundance of the goods and services provided by industry. Where there is a monopoly or an exclusive franchise involved in supplying goods, regulation has justifications, but it can only jeopardize the free flow and low prices that prevail when an industry is highly competitive.

Before Federal price fixing, natural gas was a fast-growing, low-priced fuel and promised so to remain. Only 10 percent of the consumer price goes to the producer—the rest goes for cost of transporting the gas and distribution in the local market.

Assurance of a future supply of natural gas with production at reasonable prices can come only by creating an opportunity for producers to explore and develop new supplies in the same competitive manner that applies to other industries.

The President's Fuel Policy Committee has reported in favor of freeing producers from control in the consumers' interest. The Federal Power Commission itself has said, "From every aspect of public interest and particularly that of national defense, there should be no regulation of gas production."

It is one thing to place regulation on industry with the hope of benefiting the consumer, but it is quite another to have such regulation destroy incentives, stifle initiative, and thereby restrict supply and cause high prices to the consumers' detriment.

Gas production for conservation purposes has long been a matter for the States to handle. Federal regulation not only borders on socialism, but it would interfere with sound State regulatory measures.

The old exhortation to write your Congressman and Senator bears some revision in view of the imminence of congressional action. We suggest a wire, in the belief that consumers will be better off if free enterprise in natural-gas production is restored.

Shipbuilding in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as one who has devoted considerable time and energy to conditions in our maritime and shipbuilding industries, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article entitled "It's Slowly Working Out of Its Doldrums," which appeared in the June 11, 1955, issue of Business Week magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPBUILDING: IT'S SLOWLY WORKING OUT OF ITS DOLDRUMS

Local builders eye foreign-tonnage reports with alarm. Since World War II, United States companies have ordered 302 vessels (6.1 million deadweight tons) from foreign yards. This, the builders say, represents a loss of $1.8 billion for domestic yards.

Some, however, remain skeptical—especially about Government spending for ships. They claim that when Washington starts trimming budgets, maritime money is the first to get the ax. As an example, they point to what happened in the House last month. The President asked for $102.8 million for ship-construction programs. This was hacked to $64.7 million, eliminating 3 prototype vessels, 1 high-speed tanker, and 2 cargo ships. Five tankers, part of an extended trade-in-and-build program, were also cut out.

The House also cut $25 million from the $115 million requested to pay operating subsidies. This is money the Government agreed to pay shippers to keep them on a parity, coastwise, with the cheaper operating foreign lines. It is owed under contract made with certain lines that operate a set number of ships on specific routes. Because of the $25 million cut, shippers complain, the money will be more thinly spread throughout the industry and payments will be years late. One line said it had to borrow money at interest to operate, which made it impossible to put in any orders for new ships.

But Government spending on the Navy is keeping most yards alive. A billion-dollar program for the modernization of 28 ships and expansion of the fleet is well underway. The biggest job for private yards is an order for 3 *Forrestal* class

carriers, costing about $200 million apiece.

L. R. Sorenson, production manager for Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., told the Senate Merchant Marine Subcommittee: "If it had not been for the naval contracts we probably would have to go out of business." Sorenson added that a year ago his yard had 5,500 men working on merchant ships, while today there are only 50 men there working on a single commercial tanker. In the Navy section of the yard, however, there are about 8,500 men working on new fleet orders.

CHEAP LABOR

The big reason that domestic yards are losing out is that foreign yards can trim prices way below United States bids because of their cheap labor supply. The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers gives these basic hourly wages for yard workers: United States, $1.80; Scandinavia, 80 cents; Great Britain, 54 cents; Germany, 40 cents; Holland, 38 cents; Italy, 33 cents; and Japan, 10 cents.

Several United States yards are getting around this problem by pursuing this cheap labor to its home base. National Bulk Carriers, Inc., has closed down its Virginia yard and moved to Kure, Japan. Gibbs Corp., of Jacksonville, Fla., has moved to the Dominican Republic, where labor costs run about 15 cents an hour. Gibbs opened a portion of the yard last month. Eventually it will have 5 drydocks, including 1 that will be big enough to house the *Queen Elizabeth*.

Gibbs plans to build the hulls in the Dominican Republic, then tow them to American yards for the more exacting process of fitting out. The final cost, according to the company, will "be competitive with the cost of a ship built anywhere in the world." Gibbs believes the yard might become the hub of a shipbuilding and repair boom as trade increases with South America. The main headache now is the slave-labor tag that United States unions put on the deals.

HARD HIT

Gibbs says it took a look at what was going on (or not going on) in other east coast yards and decided to move out. Sun Shipyards, Chester, Pa., with capacity for 12 ships now has only two in the ways. Bethlehem Steel Co's Fore River yard, Quincy, Mass., with 13 available slips has only 2 Navy destroyers under construction.

The Bethlehem yard really has been hit. In World War II days, it employed 32,000 workers; today, only 3,350. But there is a sort of negative form of optimism at Fore River that seems to be common to the whole industry: "If we can hold out until the end of the year—things are going to be much better." The optimism has been kindled by Government maritime programs that are just beginning to take blueprint form.

Immediate prospects for Bethlehem are 3 Navy destroyers and 2 $30-million Moore-McCormack passenger ships. The Moore-McCormack bids will be out July 12 and Bethlehem hopes to get them. Grace Line also will be in the market for two $20-million passenger-cargo liners, but no bid dates have been set.

INSECURITY

The negative side of the optimism comes from the insecure feeling caused by the lag between the shipbuilding program and actual construction. There are delays in contract awards, switches in appropriations, and snarled design problems. The work probably will be there next year and the year after, most builders say, but they are not sure the labor supply will be there when the big orders do come through. During the famine, skilled workers are moving into other trades—a great many to other parts of the country.

One yard took several ships on a distress bid far below cost just to try to hold the organization together until the present Maritime Administration building programs take shape. So far the programs have been spread out this way:

Under construction by fall, will be 6 cargo ships, 11 tankers, 4 special design ships (icebreakers), 2 hull and engine conversion jobs; total cost, $160.1 million.

Scheduled to start by December 31, 1955, are 4 passenger ships (Moore-McCormack and Grace), 2 passenger cargo, 19 tanks (4 are in doubt), and 9 engine conversion jobs; total cost, $318.1 million.

Planned for 1956–57 are 2 passenger ships, 4 passenger-cargo vessels, 3 cargo, 15 tankers (5 were cut out by the House but might be restored by the Senate), and 5 conversion jobs (3 cut by House, Senate might restore 2). Total cost if Senate restores the money, the House cut will be $183.3 million.

HELP IN THE OFFING

This program is just one part of a Federal shipbuilding bundle being tied together in Washington. The bundle is designed to make it easier for private enterprise to invest in ships. Here is what is already under way:

Construction subsidies and payment for national defense features built into ships (the Government pays the difference in the cost of building a ship in United States yards against what foreign yards charge).

A trade-in program designed to add old tankers to the reserve fleet and get new ones in operation. Companies sell tankers (10 years or older) to the Government on condition they build new ones in United States yards. Steps are being taken to extend this program to cargo vessels.

LIBERALIZED MORTGAGE INSURANCE

The Government plans to insure ship construction mortgages, including interest and 90 percent of the unpaid balance up to 20 years. The entire unpaid balance can be included if the vessel is designated as a special-purpose vessel. This 100 percent insurance feature has been the object of a squabble over a current tanker financing deal. Builders say Navy requirements make the ships special purposes, the Government says the design is general enough.

Government construction of prototype ships. Two new cargo vessels and one tanker meeting both commercial and military needs have been designed by the Maritime Administration and are being drawn up for construction.

A possible field for a future program might be atomic ships. The President's atomic show ship and research activities by various yards indicate considerable future spending on nuclear propulsion with a lot of money coming from the Government. George Killion, president of American President Lines, says his company is interested in operating an atomic ship, and is ready to work out the details with the Government.

POT BOILERS

Although atomic propulsion is the big thing for the future, other experiments are being made with conventional propulsion that may prove of more immediate benefit to owners and builders. The Government has been experimenting with diesel engines using cheap bunker "C" fuel, gas turbines with controllable pitch propellers, and a free piston, generator-gas turbine combination.

The major goal (as far as Washington is concerned) for all shipbuilding programs is to keep a nucleus of skilled workers available for an emergency. Rear Adm. Wilson D. Leggett, Jr., told the House Committee on Merchant Marine Activities: "The situation in our private shipyards is so critical that I have grave concern whether the industry can meet mobilization production schedules." Right now there are only about 4,500 workers employer in civilian construction. The critical minimum, according to the Navy, is 36,000 workers.

Peak employment under the present program schedule won't come until the fall of 1956, when about 23,000 workers are expected to be on the job. Taking an average of 2 years to complete a ship after the contract has been awarded, employment after the 1956 peak should remain high for some time.

Private yards now have 15 new ships and 2 conversion jobs underway and 4 new ships to start soon, with an estimated 34 more contracts to be awarded before the end of the year. This will be enough nourishment for the "starved" yards to keep construction crews in condition for the big push next year and the year after.

Even with the Government benefits going to shippers building in United States yards, more and more companies are going abroad. The 15 ships now being built in the United States can be compared with a total of 423 in Great Britain and 241 in Germany. Right now, there are about 90 vessels belonging to United States companies under construction in foreign yards. Builders hope that when the present Government programs get rolling, some of these companies buying foreign-built ships will return to the fold.

SPURS

Another hope for United States builders is the problem of block obsolescence facing the American merchant marine today. By the mid-1960's, approximately 80 percent of the current operating fleet will be 20 years old. Theoretically, ships become obsolete after 20 years and if they were replaced on time, work would overflow the yards. All ships reaching the 20-year mark will not be replaced, but enough new construction is expected to sell the Government on building early to avoid the rush.

Another spur to future building is the St. Lawrence seaway, which has inspired interest in the Great Lakes area as a shipbuilding ground. United States Lines plans to build five fast freighters (costing around $2 million apiece) designed for the new Atlantic-Great Lakes route.

At present, the foreign ships have this route practically to themselves—the leaders being the Scandinavians, Germans, and British. In Germany, one yard operated by Blohm & Voss (former U-boat builders) is concentrating on what they call "combiships" for the shallow-water trade. These ships will be 10,000 tons or under, and will be of the passenger-cargo variety.

Eighty-fourth Session Beats 1953 Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Vincent J. Burke:

EIGHTY-FOURTH SESSION BEATS 1953 CONGRESS

The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress is running far ahead of its Republican-dominated predecessor in the sheer number of bills approved to date, official records showed yesterday.

During its first 6 months, the current Senate passed 700 bills and resolutions. This was 67 percent more than were approved by the GOP-controlled Senate in 1953. The House passed 860 measures, 44 percent more than in January–June 1953.

The record of the 84th Congress became a political issue last week when Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON listed its achievements and criticized President

Eisenhower's 1954 campaign forecast that a Democratic Congress would mean a cold war between the Capitol and the White House.

Mr. Eisenhower promptly challenged JOHNSON's statement, reeling off a long list of bills he wants Congress to pass this year. He declared "someone is confused as to where credit lies or blame" should be attached for actions of the Democratic-steered Congress.

Through June 30, the Senate passed its 700 measures in 414 hours and 38 minutes of deliberation. It took the Senate in the 83d Congress 542 hours and 55 minutes to pass 419 measures in the corresponding period of 1953.

The current House spend 345 hours and 39 minutes in session through June 30 to pass its 860 measures. Two years ago, it was in session 42 minutes longer and approved 596 measures.

Republicans argue that any exact comparison is unfair because it took the new Eisenhower administration some time in 1953 before it could develop a legislative program. Work on money bills was delayed 2 years ago while the new administration revised the budget estimates of the Truman administration.

The only legislation that comes before every Congress is money bills to carry the various branches and departments of Government through the new fiscal year.

Before fiscal 1956 started Friday, the present Congress had completed action on eight regular appropriations bills, including the huge $31,882,815,726 defense money bill.

Two years ago, the Republican-controlled 83d Congress got only one regular money bill under the wire before July 1. It didn't finish work on the bill to carry the Armed Forces through the new fiscal year until July 29.

The 1st session of the 83d Congress adjourned August 3. Democratic leaders of the current Congress hope to complete the work of this session by July 30.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showed Mr. Eisenhower had signed 111 public bills and 132 private bills through June 30. Two years ago, he signed 100 public measures and 76 private bills by June 30.

Independence Day Is Time of Reflection for all Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Independence Day traditionally is a time of reflection for all Americans—a period of giving thought to the intangibles of our national heritage. In this connection, there have recently appeared in two of the fine weekly newspapers of the Fourth District of Tennessee, editorials which put into words the reflective thoughts of the day of many citizens. One which is from the Jackson, Tenn., County Sentinel is entitled "Primer for Americans" and the other, from the Hartsville, Tenn., Vidette, published in Trousdale County, Tenn., is entitled "Independence Day 1776–1955."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these fine editorials be included in the RECORD. They follow:

PRIMER FOR AMERICANS

(By Fred L. Tardy)

You live in the United States of America. You are an American. Real Americans like their country. They are proud of it. They think it is a good place to live. And they want to keep it good—to keep it getting better all the time.

Why is America the way it is? What makes it a good place to live? The answer is simply this:

Throughout our history most Americans have believed that every person has certain rights and duties and responsibilities.

Americans have believed that there are certain things people should do, and things they should not do.

They have also believed in certain things that people are, and are not.

These things that people believe are called principles. This book is an attempt to state the principles of America in simple, primer fashion so that you can understand them, learn them, and remember them.

This is important. It was because earlier Americans believed in these principles and guided their lives by them, that America has grown to be the good place it is.

If all of us learn and remember these principles—if we also guide our lives by them—then we can help to keep America growing better, and better, and better.

And if we follow these principles of America, we can help make the world a better place to live in, too.

The principles of America are these—

1. Each person is of importance and value as an individual.

This is the cornerstone—the foundation of all our other beliefs in a person's right to live his own life, to speak for himself, to choose and change his leaders.

From it comes our hatred of those "isms" under which the individual has no value or importance as a person, but is only one of many unimportant people who have to live the way their leaders tell them to.

Coming directly from that first principle are two others that are also part of the foundation of Americanism.

2. We believe that all men should enjoy personal freedom.

3. We believe that all men are created equal.

It is worth noting that the Declaration of Independence expressed the belief that all men are created equal. It did not state or imply a belief that men develop equally or have equal ability, or that they should ever be forced to an exact equality of thought, speech, or material possessions.

That would be equality without freedom. Americans have always believed the two should go together.

In our Constitution, and in other laws of our land, there are set down principles to protect the rights and freedoms and equality of individuals.

4. The right to freedom of speech.

This includes freedom of the press, of radio, of motion pictures, of every means by which man may express his thoughts.

5. The right to freedom of assembly.

As we believe in the right of individual actions, so we believe that individuals should be free to act together.

6. The right to freedom of worship.

Not only is the individual free to worship as he will, but religions themselves are free and equal.

7. The right to security of person and property.

Not just 1 but 3 amendments to the Constitution (4th, 5th, and 14th) protect against illegal search and seizure, or loss of life, liberty, or property, without "due process of law."

8. The right to equal protection before the law.

As individuals are equally important, so laws must apply equally to all, without special privileges for any group.

9. The right to freedom from slavery.

This includes "the right to quit," for no individual may be forced to work for another.

10. The right to petition the Government.

The right of the individual to "petition the Government for redress of grievances" is evidence of the American belief that Government is the servant, not the master, of the people.

11. The right to vote for people of your choice.

This is the individual's most potent weapon in the protection of his rights and freedoms * * * a weapon that to be effective must be constantly and wisely used.

Other principles hold that every man has—

12. The right to a good education.
13. The right to live where he pleases.
14. The right to work where he wants to.
15. The right to belong to an organization.
16. The right to own property.
17. The right to start his own business.
18. The right to manage his own affairs.
19. The right to make a profit or to fail, depending on his own ability.

There are other, similar rights of individual action which are principles of America, but all of these individual rights may be combined in these two broad principles—

20. Every man is entitled to freedom and equality of opportunity.

21. Every man may earn his living when, where, and how he wants to.

There are also limiting principles.

Principles of individual freedom sometimes clash with those of individual equality. Therefore, our rights as individuals must be limited and those limitations are themselves principles.

22. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with those of other individuals.

Your right to swing your arms stops where the other fellow's nose starts.

23. The rights of any individual shall not interfere with the welfare of the people.

Freedom of speech does not give the individual the right to shout "fire" in a crowded theater.

24. Every individual owes obedience to the laws under which he lives.

The individual has the right to talk against a law, to work and vote to change that law, but not to disobey that law.

Principles that are patterns of behavior.

Many of our principles of individual freedom and equality are guaranteed to us by law. But we have other beliefs—other general rules of action and conduct that have grown to the status of principles—and these, too, are foundations of Americanism.

25. A man shall be judged by his own record.

A man's family background, his race or his religion, is not as important as what that man himself can do, for Americans believe a man must stand on his own feet.

26. A man is free to achieve as much as he can.

We believe that where any boy may be some President, where any man may achieve greatness, there is the greatest incentive for every man to do his best.

27. To achieve anything, a man should be willing to work.

Americans have always known that "you don't get something for nothing"; that to get anything takes a willingness to work.

28. Achievement also depends upon the ability to do a good job.

Add to "willingness to work" the ability to produce results and the combination is the basis for most individual achievement in our country.

29. Every man has the right to a fair share of the results of his work and his ability.

Because of this belief, America has not only produced more goods, but they have been more fairly and more widely shared by more people than in any other country.

30. Security is the ability of a man to provide for himself.

The only true security for any individual is the opportunity, the ability, and the determination to work and plan and save for his own present and future. Self-reliance is vital to individual independence and per-

sonal freedom. No man can be "proud and free' who depends on others for his security.

31. When an individual cannot provide his own security, the responsibility should be assumed by others.

We believe that no one should starve, or be without adequate clothing and shelter, so those who have more than their basic needs share the responsibility of providing the essentials of security for those who need help.

32. Each individual must deal fairly with others.

Honesty, fairness, and personal integrity are virtues that help free and independent individuals get along with each other without losing their independence.

33. Fair and free competition is a good thing.

Americans have always believed that competition among individuals or groups encourages greater effort which in turn brings greater benefits to all.

34. Cooperation among individuals is vital.

"The freedom to compete vigorously accompanied by a readiness to cooperate wholeheartedly for the performance of community and national functions, together make our system the most productive on earth."

Principle of individual responsibility—Freedom for individuals carries with it an equal responsibility to use that freedom wisely. If we wish to remain free, we must faithfully fulfill this responsibility.

35. The individual is responsible for himself and his family.

He must protect them and provide for their present and future well-being.

36. The individual has responsibilities to the group of which he is a part.

He must give of his best to his community, his church, his employer, his union, and to every group in which individuals cooperate for their mutual benefit.

37. The individual has responsibilities to his country.

He must be an active citizen, interesting himself in local, State, and national government, voting wisely, thinking and speaking and acting to preserve and strengthen freedom, equality and opportunity for every individual.

38. The individual has responsibilities to the world.

Man's horizons have expanded. What happens in the world affects him, and his actions can affect the world. Today, therefore, each man has a responsibility to act, and to encourage his country to act, so that freedom and cooperation will be encouraged among the people and the nations of the world.

FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

Most of us have faith in our country's ability to move forward, to improve, to grow, to provide more and more individuals with more and more of everything they want and need in life.

39. The only way we can have more is to produce more; and

40. As we produce more, we must make it possible for more and more people to enjoy that which we produce.

If we, the people of the United States, want to have a better life, spiritually as well as materially—

41. We must stand firmly for our beliefs, our rights, our principles.

There are those who would chip away our confidence so that their special brand of tyranny might creep into America. They must not succeed. So, let us ask of every plan, or act, or idea—

Is it with or against the principles of America?

INDEPENDENCE DAY, 1776–1955

(By Jesse S. McMurray)

One hundred and seventy-nine years ago, delegates to the Continental Congress from the Thirteen Colonies defied the mighty England and King George III, and voted to declare their independence by adopting Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence—the greatest document ever penned by mortal man. To sign the document was not necessary, but those 56 immortal leaders defiantly and boldly signed their names to what was to become a death warrant to many of them, through retaliatory measures imposed by soldiers of the King. History records that not 1 of the 56 signers of that greatest of documents ever regretted his action of wavered in his devotion to the cause of liberty. It is related that the great Benjamin Franklin, when the going got rough and deliberations deadlocked, arose and said, "Gentlemen, let us pray." And a divine providence lifted the hearts and minds of those men above selfish interests and personal considerations and inspired them to stand fast for those principles of liberty and justice and freedom that have transformed 13 struggling, straggling colonies into the greatest Nation ever conceived and formed by man. Ten years ago, representatives of 56 nations met to form a United Nations, that the principles of liberty and justice and freedom might be extended to alll peoples of all nations throughout the world, that they might enjoy the blessings of peace and prosperity that we take so lightly. That some progress has been made is evident, but the organization has fallen far short of fulfilling the mission it originally was to fill. Could it be that in the not too distant future, another Franklin may arise and say simply and quietly, "Gentlemen, let us pray."

Full Freedom of Captive Nations an Essential Prerequisite to Any Big Four Decisions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1955, the President of the United States will meet at Geneva with the heads of the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. This will be the first Four Powers Conference on the summit to be held with the Russians since 1945. The purpose of this meeting will be to explore the possibilities of relieving world tensions.

According to a statement made recently by Mr. Herbert Hoover before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee "it has been agreed in the preliminary conversations that have already taken place regarding arrangements for the Conference, that each of the participants would be free to take up any subject which is believed to be a contributory cause of world tensions."

In this connection I would like to make the following remarks for the RECORD.

As far as Europe is concerned the tension started, when—after Hitler's defeat—the Red army occupied Eastern and Central Europe to the Elbe River, and communist expansion became a menacing threat to the continent.

Since that time we have witnessed the subjugation, one after another, of the Central Eastern European countries by brutal force or fraudulent methods exercised by the Kremlin powers.

Before World War II those countries were sovereign states, forming an integral part of Europe and of its cultural heritage, contributing to Europe's political stability and peaceful development.

Speaking in this connection of Poland, this country fought on our side during World War II, it had an alliance with France and Great Britain and became a signatory on January 1, 1942, of the Washington Declaration of the United Nations. The Polish Government in Exile, residing in London, cooperated closely with the nations at war with Hitlerites Germany, and was generally recognized by all governments with the exception of the axis partners. Polish forces fought under the Supreme Allied Command in France, Italy, Germany, Africa and took an active part in allied air and sea operations.

It seems appropriate to remember these facts at the present juncture.

Poland is today an enslaved country.

The grim Soviet technique in depriving individuals and nations of personal freedom and political independence was revealed in all details during the hearings of the Select Committee on the House of Representatives to investigate Communist aggression—and I therefore will not dwell on this subject.

From a moral point of view, the American people strongly resent this brutal Communist assault against the free nations of Europe.

It is our national tradition inherited from those who inspired the Declaration of American Independence, to defend and promote freedom. We therefore abhor every form of moral and physical tyranny.

Apart from ethical considerations we have a direct interest in the fate of the Central Eastern European countries and in the restoration of their national independence. We have assumed a large part of responsibility in maintaining peace and security in Europe. We should not forget that the Soviet-occupied countries are an essential component of the European Continent, and that the artificial line separating today the free from the enslaved is a most disturbing factor and a serious menace to peace.

We cannot envisage a return to normalcy in Europe or believe in the validity of security pacts as long as an iron curtain is drawn over nearly 100 million Europeans, submitted to totalitarian Communist rule and denied political and personal rights.

This in practice means severance of all cultural and social links between the two parts of Europe, disruption of economic ties, compulsory political and military realinement of the subdued states against the West.

The closing up by Soviet Russia of its zone of influence from the Free World and the imposition of puppet governments was followed by the integration of the subjugated countries into Moscow's military organization. The national resources of these countries, their industrial output, labor and skill have been added to the Soviet war potential. Our friends, the Poles, and the other nations linked with us by common traditions are

forced against their will to deliver the goods to the oppressors hostile to the West. It is generally estimated that the U. S. S. R. has gained a biological and economic surplus of about 40 percent as a result of the occupation of the nine captive countries.

In spite of 10 years of Soviet oppressive rule there is abundant evidence that the spirit of resistance still remains strong behind the Iron Curtain. The people of Poland as well as of other captive nations in Europe do not morally surrender to their forcefully imposed Communist regimes. The resistance is silent without spectacular moves, it is rather of a psychological nature, very subtle, taking various forms according to circumstances. Despite Communist propaganda directed specially against the United States of America the people behind the Iron Curtain maintain a very friendly interest toward America. They consider this country as the bastion of freedom and center their hopes on it.

On the threshold of our talks with Soviet Russia on the highest level we should remember that behind the Iron Curtain millions of our natural allies are watching us with hope and extreme anxiety.

Let us not deceive them, or lure them by vain illusions.

Since Stalin's deah Soviet diplomacy has gradually abandoned its rigid form, becoming more subtle and flexible. Quite recently it has shown unprecedented initiative. Soviet moves with regard to Austria, Yugoslavia and Western Germany, constituting a complete about-face in the position Moscow had taken so far, came as a surprise to the free world.

When analyzing Soviet policy we should make a distinction between essentials and mere tactics. After all this apparent change of Soviet attitude has paid them a good dividend from the propaganda point of view although behind the smokescreen their objectives remain unchanged.

Moscow's initiative in the last months centered on problems connected with the Western security system. In other words it was an effort to weaken our position of strength.

Moscow did not hesitate to make direct approaches to Vienna, Belgrade and even to Bonn, and we can still expect further surprise moves. This should encourage us even more to take the initiative in our hands.

The Four Power Conference offers an opportunity to raise an essential problem on which peace depends—namely the restoration of freedom to the captive countries of Europe.

On that score, we stand on firm ground from a moral, legal, and political point of view.

I have already dealt with the moral and political aspects.

Legally, the Soviets are well aware of the weakness of their position in view of flagrant violations on their behalf of practically all bilateral and multilateral agreements and treaties to which the U. S. S. R. was a partner. On the other hand the United States of America has in these agreements and common declarations of policy solid ground for claims to restore peaceful conditions in Soviet occupied part of Europe. In the face of broken pledges by the U. S. S. R., to insist on respect of human rights and national independence is a moral obligation and sound policy for the United States and its Western Allies.

It, therefore, is essential to the future of the world and to the maintenance of the high position of leadership of the United States that at the coming meeting of the four powers, the representatives of our Government insist, as a prerequisite to any agreements, that certain conditions be met with reference to the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

The restoration of independence and the creation of peaceful conditions of life to the captive nations of Central and Eastern Europe should be carried out under international protection and control. Such control must be insisted upon to give the agreements any meaning whatsoever.

It should comprise the withdrawal of Soviet forces to the prewar frontiers as well as of Russian military and police personnel, the end of every form of Soviet occupation, the release of political prisoners and return of deportees from Russia, freedom of activities for political parties and self-determination expressed through free elections.

Unless such demands are made by our Government and agreed to by the Soviet powers, there can be little, if any, hope for beneficial results from the summit meetings.

The Fund for the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "The Fund for the Republic," by George E. Sokolsky. It is disturbing to a great many of us to find the Fund for the Republic engaging in the activities as set forth in Mr. Sokolsky's article, but it is a matter of even greater concern to us to learn that Richard H. Rovere, author of the Harper magazine article, "The Kept Witnesses," is a writer with a considerable and well-documented record of Communist and leftwing sympathies. During the 1930's Richard H. Rovere contributed regularly to the Communist publication, New Masses, and the general tenor of his writings at that time were in a vein consistent with the line of the Communist Party. It would appear that his political stripes have not changed materially during the interim. It is to be regretted that the Fund for the Republic, made possible by American free enterprise, and benefiting from tax exemptions, should consider it necessary or desirable to utilize the writing services of one whose articles have been consistently slanted toward the Communist ideology.

I certainly approve of Mr. Sokolsky's view that if the allegations made by Mr. Rovere with respect to witnesses appearing before Government agencies and congressional committees is correct a hearing to investigate the matter appears to be in order and I would suggest that Mr. Rovere himself be subpenaed as the first witness.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Herald and Express of June 8, 1955]

THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When the Ford Foundation gave Paul Hoffman, its president, $15 million to form the Fund for the Republic, Hoffman ceased to be the head of the Ford Foundation. Similarly when Robert Hutchins left the Ford Foundation, he found a position with the Fund for the Republic. Since then the two organizations have gone their separate course and, I understand, no love is lost between them.

QUESTIONNAIRE

In the public mind, however, the Fund for the Republic remains in some manner related to the Ford Foundation and no steps have been taken by the parent to speak of its offspring in public as some speak of it in private. If then it is suggested that Ford Foundation money is being used for political purposes and therefore subject to reexamination as to tax exemption, it is only because the Ford Foundation has avoided explaining to the public that a $15 million error was made.

Meanwhile the Fund for the Republic has been antagonistic to all congressional investigations and investigators, has teams all over the country ostensibly investigating the Communists but actually seeking to discover what active anti-Communists have been doing. A very complex questionnaire has been sent to firms using radio and television programs to advertise their wares, asking in the minutest detail what their policies are concerning the employment of Communists or alleged Communists on radio and television.

THE QUESTIONS

In a letter addressed to such firms, the following questions are asked:

"(1) Does your organization hold that certain political criteria should be met by artists whom you engage, i. e., would you disapprove of hiring an artist—

"(A) Named as a Communist by a Government agency?

"(B) One who was an unfriendly witness before a governmental investigating body?

"(C) One who stood on the fifth amendment before such a body?

"(D) One who has been listed in such private organs as Counterattacks, Red Channels, Firing Line?

POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

"(E) An artist who in the public mind, or at least before a goodly section of the public, is deemed controversial?

"(F) Any other category?

"(2) If such criteria are to be met, does your organization leave the application of them to the advertising agency and the network or do you take an active interest?

"(3) Is it your experience that the employment of controversial personalities hurts the sale of products?

"(4) Are you satisfied with the way the question has been handled to date?"

The Fund for the Republic has also become engaged in the free distribution of books, pamphlets, newspaper articles, etc. One phase of political propaganda is the uninvited, unsolicited, unpaid-for distribu-

tion of material on one side of a question with the object of influencing public opinion. The fund has sent such material to clergymen, college presidents, and Federal judges, among others.

I have before me a list of such material as received by one person who has asked for none of it and resents being made its recipient. As I have not read all of it, I cannot adequately comment on it, but one article widely distributed by the Fund for the Republic is the Kept Witness, by Richard H. Rovere, with a subtitle that states:

SERIOUS CHARGE

"At least 83 people have been set up by the Government in the trade of professional witnesses. One calls it "a racket" * * * three are confessed liars * * * and all of them are exempt from security clearance."

This article gives me the impression that the Government of the United States, particularly the Department of Justice and the FBI, is engaged in a conspiracy to frame Americans by the use of false and paid witnesses. It is the most serious charge that can be made against a public official. It is deserving of a congressional investigation, because if Rovere is correct, the security system is faulty and criminal in intent. Such an investigation could include the author of the article and the Fund for the Republic.

Natural Gas Prices: Regulated or Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the Harris bill affecting Federal regulation of natural gas producers will soon come to the floor of Congress.

I commend to the attention of the Members of this House a provocative article, "Natural Gas Prices: Regulated or Free?" carried in the July 9, 1955, issue of America and written by the Reverend Benjamin L. Masse. After citing the pros and cons of the controversy, he comes to the conclusion that only Federal regulation of gas prices at the wellhead can do the job of protecting the consumer. Mr. Speaker, I share that conclusion and ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

NATURAL-GAS PRICES: REGULATED OR FREE?

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

Within the next few weeks Congress is scheduled to decide the bitter, 20-year-old controversy over the pricing of natural gas. Unlike most protracted controversies, this one has not mellowed with age. On the contrary, like good cheese, it has grown sharper with the passing of time. The reason is that over the past two decades, and more especially since the end of the war, the number of producers and consumers of natural gas has grown enormously. Thus, the financial stakes are very much higher today than they were when Congress passed the Natural Gas Act of 1938. With some 4,365 companies producing gas for interstate sale to some 60 million consumers, the pressures on Washington are nothing short of terrific. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved.

What is the fighting all about?

It is not about the method of pricing natural gas to the ultimate consumer. No one questions that local utilities, which buy gas from interstate pipelines and bring it into homes and business establishments, should be regulated by local or State authorities. They are clearly monopolies, like the local waterworks or electric powerplant, and hence are natural candidates for public regulation.

Neither is there much dispute any more about the prices which pipeline companies charge local utilities. The Federal Power Commission has been successfully regulating these prices for nearly 20 years.

Nor is the controversy concerned with sales of natural gas made within the borders of the various States. Such sales are beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

THE INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS

The fighting has to do solely with the method of pricing the gas which the so-called independent producers sell to interstate pipelines. These independents, which produce but do not transport gas, insist that the price of their product should be determined by competition. Some pipeline companies, notably those which supply part of their needs from their own fields, agree with them. On the other hand, most of the people charged with protecting the interests of consumers advocate Government regulation. It is scarcely necessary to add that both sides in this controversy claim to have the well-being of consumers at heart.

Before examining the arguments pro and con, it may be helpful to take a closer look at the independent producers. As was mentioned above, there are 4,365 companies producing natural gas for sale in interstate commerce. The vast majority of these firms are so small, however, that it is no insult to them to term their sales insignificant. According to FPC figures, 3,736 producers, or 85 percent of all producers, together furnished only 2.1 percent of the gas sold to pipelines in 1953. At the other end of the scale, 174 companies sold more than 90 percent of all the gas the pipelines bought. The 5 largest producers accounted for 27 percent of the total sales.

These big gas producers, or, more correctly, their parent companies, are well-known to the general public. They are the Nation's major oil companies—Standard Oil of New Jersey, Phillips Petroleum, Shell Oil, Standard Oil of Indiana and Socony Vacuum.

Why are these companies opposed to Federal regulation?

ARGUMENTS AGAINST REGULATION

They argue, in the first place, that regulation of gas prices at the wellhead, or in the field, is unnecessary because, with so many companies in the business, competition can be relied on to ensure fair prices to consumers. They insist that this is the American way, the same way the country follows in pricing other natural resources, such as coal, oil, lead, and copper.

The producers contend, furthermore, that regulation would be impractical and extremely expensive. They point to the large number of producers, all of whom would have to file rates and other data with FPC, and whose costs of exploration and production, which the regulating agency would have to take into account in fixing prices, vary considerably.

Finally, producers warn of the consequences which may be expected to follow from Government regulation. In their 1954 report to stockholders, the directors of Jersey Standard note that Federal regulation "could retard development of the natural-gas industry in the United States and reduce supplies of this fuel to industrial and private consumers." Regulation would, in other words, destroy the industry's incentive to search for new sources of supply. In the long run, dwindling supplies of gas would affect consumers adversely. They would, so the argument goes, pay more for gas under regulation than under competition. Other producers have openly warned that regulation would lead them to abandon the interstate market for more profitable operations within the boarders of the producing States.

FOR REGULATION

Spokesmen for consumer interests base their case chiefly on the contention that at the producing end of the gas business no real competition exists or, in the nature of things, can exist. Pipelines involve tremendous expense, costing, in the case of large-diameter lines, from $40,000 to $100,000 a mile to construct. Before they are laid down, their owners must be assured of a large and long-time supply of gas. That is why contracts between pipelines and producers generally run for 20 years or more. Once a pipeline has been built to a field, it is at the mercy of those who own the gas reserves there. Its owners cannot shop around for better prices among 4,000-odd producers because few of them have wells adjacent to the pipeline. Anyway, most of these producers, as we have seen, are tiny operators with insignificant amounts of gas to sell.

This inability to shop around among various producers is the cardinal fact, say the consumer spokesmen, which differentiates gas from other unregulated natural resources. Gas can be transported in only one way, by pipeline. It cannot, like oil or coal, be brought in by ship, or moved by truck or rail to the point of ultimate consumption. So the pipeline companies which distribute the gas are bound to one supplier, or to a group of suppliers producing in one geographical locality. The terminus of the pipeline determines who the supplier must be.

With gas in short supply today, and likely to remain so, consumer spokesmen argue that competition among producers to attract pipeline companies is completely nonexistent. The only competition in the gas industry, they maintain, is competition among pipelines seeking a supply of gas. But in view of the supply-demand situation, that kind of competition can have but one effect—an increase in the price of gas.

The producers are well aware of this. That explains why in their long-term contracts with pipelines they insist on escalator clauses of one kind or another. One such clause, the favored-nation clause, obliges pipelines to pay a producer, regardless of the figure stipulated in the contract, the highest price they pay to any of their other suppliers.

During the hearings conducted last month by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, an economist for Standard Oil of Indiana disparaged the immobility of pipelines as a factor inhibiting competition among producers. He argued that pipelines companies can tap alternative sources of supplies by interconnections with other pipelines. Actually, say the consumer spokesmen, pipelines buy little gas from one another, and even when they do, the buyer has no voice in the price which the seller originally paid the independent producer.

With the other anti-regulation arguments, the consumer spokesmen are not much concerned. They do not seem to take very seriously threats to withhold gas from interstate commerce, or to abandon the search for new sources of gas. The big market for gas is not in Texas, Louisiana, Kansas, and Oklahoma—the major gas-producing States—but in the East and Middle West and on the Pacific coast. The proponents of regulation are fairly certain that the big gas producers are not capable of the financial self-denial required to forego their most profitable markets in the North in favor of relatively piddling sales in the Southwest.

For the same reason they feel that the search for gas will continue. Under FPC rules allowing a fair profit over and above all costs, including exploration costs, the search for gas will still be reasonably re-

munerative. (The pipeline companies have done very well for themselves under FPC regulation.) Anyway, natural gas is generally found mixed with oil. So long as the big oil companies continue their ceaseless hunt for new sources of crude, they will automatically continue the search for gas.

As for the administrative difficulties of regulation, these are certainly not insurmountable. Much of the difficulty would be removed if Congress would exempt from the rules of the Federal Power Commission the 85 percent of the firms which produce only a tiny part of the gas in interstate commerce. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS introduced a bill on May 11 which would remove from Federal regulation all producers whose sales in interstate commerce for resale do not aggregate 2 billion cubic feet of gas a year. This would exempt from control all but about 175 producers.

THREE BILLS

The legislative fight revolves chiefly around three bills—the Fulbright bill and its companion in the House, the Harris bill, and the Douglas bill. The Douglas bill reaffirms the decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips Petroleum case. That was the key 1954 decision which held that independent producers selling to interstate pipelines are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The Fulbright-Harris bill exempts the independent producers from direct FPC regulation but provides for a kind of indirect control. The bill places the onus of keeping prices at the wellhead within bounds on the interstate pipelines, which in turn are subject to direct FPC regulation.

Consumer spokesmen oppose the Fulbright-Harris compromise on the ground that it is inadequate to protect the public interest. So do the local gas utilities. The rest of the industry, including the pipelines, are supporting these bills.

Ultimately, since the vote in Congress promises to be close, the decision may well rest with the President. In 1950, President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill, which would have exempted the independent producers from Federal regulation. What will Mr. Eisenhower do if Congress approves the Fulbright-Harris bill? Some of his advisers, conscious of the voting power of northern gas consumers, are reported to be urging a veto. On the other hand, a leading New York daily observed recently that the oil and gas interests were heavy contributors to the President's 1952 campaign fund. If Mr. Eisenhower follows the advice of his Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources, his decision seems a foregone conclusion. Last February this committee, though recognizing the need of some Federal control over wellhead prices to protect consumers, recommended that the independent producers be exempt from FPC regulation. The oil and gas interests seem confident that if the Fulbright-Harris bill can be steered through Congress, the President will not veto it.

From a moral standpoint, the controversy largely hinges on the effectiveness of competition as a regulator of the price of gas at the wellhead. If the reader feels, after studying the facts, that competition cannot be counted on to assure reasonable prices to consumers, he should logically, it seems to me, support Government regulation. If, to pursue the question further, he does not believe that the type of indirect control provided for in the Fulbright-Harris bill is likely to succeed, he is then left with no alternative except to support regulation of producers by the Federal Power Commission. For whatever it's worth, at the present stage of his inquiry this writer inclines to the opinion that only Federal regulation of gas prices at the wellhead can do the job.

Indian Injustices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me from John Hart, Executive Director, North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission; and an editorial entitled "Must Indian Injustices Go to the President," published in the Christian Century of June 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA INDIAN
AFFAIRS COMMISSION,
Rolla, N. Dak., June 3, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Enclosed herewith you will find a copy of the June 1 editorial page of the Christian Century. The article appearing thereon entitled "Must Indian Injustices Go to the President?" is interesting and significant.

The thought occurs to me that this editorial may give you a perfect excuse for writing a letter to President Eisenhower as to the law enforcement or lack of law enforcement you found on the Indian reservations during the hearings you held in North Dakota last year.

Just thought I'd pass this editorial on in case you believe it may give you the inside track on the situation the late Joe Wicks and myself complained about so bitterly.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. HART.

[From the Christian Century of June 1, 1955]

MUST INDIAN INJUSTICES GO TO THE PRESIDENT?

At the White House press conference on May 18 a reporter asked President Eisenhower whether the 1952 Republican campaign pledges of justice for American Indians would be honored. Some Indians, he said, have to haul their water in dirty barrels from 30 to 100 miles; disease, poverty, and high infant mortality stalk the reservations; many Indians must live under conditions little better than those of refugees in Korea. (We leave it to our readers where the reporter gathered that information.) The President answered: "I agree with your implicit criticism; if such conditions exist it is high time they were stopped. And I think it can be stopped." This is admirable. Yet behind it lurks an evident condition which is disturbing. The inference to be drawn clearly is that, in a matter of this sort, nothing happens unless and until the case reaches the very top. The Department of the Interior and the Indian Bureau know all about the miseries under which Indians live on many reservations, but nothing seems to come of their knowledge. Evidently it goes no higher. It remained for a reporter to bring the Indians' plight to Mr. Eisenhower's attention. Once that was done, the President's response was immediate and gratifying. When he says something will be done to right these wrongs, we believe it will be done. But an organization as big as the Government of the United States which stalls over providing simple justice to one of its minorities until the top man gives it his personal attention is either badly organized or badly served on its lower administrative levels.

Beware Either Private or Public Monopoly of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I include a notable editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

PUBLIC POWER'S ROLE

The basic question raised by the Hoover Commission's report on water resources and power is whether it is a good thing for the Federal Government in certain circumstances to engage effectively in the generation and distribution of power.

By and large, the Commission majority answers "No." It does not go quite as far as its task force, which actually proposed the sale or lease of publicly owned power facilities to private enterprise. But there can be no question that the Commission recommendations, if carried out, would destroy the effectiveness of Federal public power.

That is their obvious purpose, as the numerous dissents suggest and as the Commission itself makes clear when it complains that Federal competition with private enterprise is more extensive in the power field than in any other.

The Commission's objection to this competition is broad, philosophical, and basic. It sees in this competition a negation of our fundamental economic system. Once that premise has been adopted, the Commission's many detailed recommendations to cripple, impede, or curtail Federal power activity flow naturally and easily.

But what about the premise? It is, in our opinion, broadly, philosophically, and basically mistaken. We hold no brief, on abstract and all-inclusive grounds, for either public power or private power as such. We believe that in most instances the electric energy business can be efficiently and with due regard for the public interest carried on by private capital under vigorous and alert public regulations.

But it does not follow that private enterprise should be given an absolute monopoly in all branches of the field. That could be just as bad as a national monopoly under Federal control. Public enterprise in power, within its proper sphere, can have positive and socially beneficial values.

What is the proper sphere? So far as Federal enterprise is concerned, it is reasonably clear. Federal generation and distribution of electric energy is proper and necessary where the full development of water resources—which belong to all of the people and not to any private interests—require such public endeavor.

No private or local enterprise was willing or able to develop the full potential of the Tennessee Valley's water resources. Hence it was proper and necessary that the Federal Government undertake the job. And once having undertaken it, the Federal Government should do the job effectively and well—which means harnessing steam plants and hydro plants together as the growth of the region's needs requires.

The power business is a natural monopoly within the geographical limits of each efficient market area. But not all of these regional monopolies need to be in either private or public hands exclusively. Indeed there is much of value in mixed ownership and operational patterns.

When private local monopolies, municipal local monopolies, private regional systems, and public regional systems all coexist, set-

ting yardsticks for each other and competing for public support, the public has the best chance of seeing its best interests best served.

Idaho Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, voters in the State of Idaho were warned against the proposed upper Colorado storage project on April 27 by the following editorial appearing in the Lewiston Tribune:

SOME ASPECTS OF COLORADO STORAGE VOTE

The Senate's 58 to 23 approval last Wednesday of a billion-dollar authorization bill for the Colorado River storage project reflected some interesting byproducts of this year's congressional battle of river development.

An examination of Senate debate and the rollcall on the bill indicates that considerably more was involved than the unsuccessful effort of Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, to eliminate Echo Park Dam from the project. First press dispatches had highlighted the Senate's rejection of NEUBERGER's amendment by a 52 to 30 vote.

Perhaps the most significant phase of the voting was the absence of any party-line Democratic opposition to this administration-backed project. Several Democrats, to be sure, voted for NEUBERGER's amendment, along with several Republicans. But it was noteworthy that among the Democrats voting against it were Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, and Senator HENRY JACKSON, of Washington. NEUBERGER voted for the project after his amendment was defeated. HENRY DWORSHAK opposed the amendment and favored the authorization bill on the final vote. Senator HERMAN WELKER, Republican, of Idaho, did not vote.

The Denver Post, which has supported the project and naturally followed developments closely, said in an editorial that the lopsided Senate vote did not necessarily mean that the project would be approved by the House of Representatives.

"The storage project will face its crucial test in the House of Representatives," the Post predicts. "In the Senate, California has only 2 Members, but in the House it has 30 Members, most of whom may be expected to oppose any further use of water in the upper basin."

With 1 or 2 notable exceptions, it became apparent in the Senate debate that the main forces against the Colorado storage project were Californians who feared that the project might provide more water for the upper basin States and less for them.

The notable exceptions included NEUBERGER, who supported the overall project but opposed Echo Park on the grounds that it would flood out part of a national monument. Supporters of Echo Park did an excellent job in debate of convincing doubters that this eventuality was specifically provided for in the original creation of the national monument. Thus, the argument that a dangerous precedent would be created which would threaten public parks and recreational areas in the future was effectively refuted. It is noteworthy, incidentally, that NEUBERGER made every effort in debate to bring out both sides of this argument even though he led opposition to the dam.

Perhaps a major outgrowth of the defeat of the Neuberger amendment will be the reappraisal by supporters of river projects elsewhere in the Nation of the actual strength in the Senate of the "wildlife-conservation bloc." The Echo Park dispute had been widely heralded as a test of the "nature-lovers'" strength. Perhaps their case was not as good upon final examination as they first believed. And certainly the defenders of Echo Park did an excellent job in organization and debate. Nevertheless, the lopsided vote on the amendment may come as a surprise to many.

Perhaps the soundest argument against the entire project was offered by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, he said:

"Although I have supported public power developments in the Tennessee Valley and on the Columbia, and although I am supporting them on the Snake, and although I would support such developments on the Niagara, the area covered by this bill is the worst place in the country at which to develop hydroelectric power. The flow of the Colorado River is only one-tenth the flow of the Columbia River, only one-tenth the flow of the Niagara River, only one-third the flow of the Tennessee River, and only one-half the flow of the Snake River.

"The cost of installing power capacity in the area covered by this bill will be over $500 per kilowatt, or 4 to 5 times the cost on the Tennessee River, and more than 5 times the cost of most dams on the Columbia River.

"The cost of generating power at the most favorable damsite covered by the pending bill, namely, Glen Canyon, will be from 4¼ to 4¾ mills per kilowatt-hour. The cost of generating power at Echo Park will be close to 6 mills.

"In comparison, the generating costs for the multiple-use dams on the TVA average 1.1 mills; on the Columbia, about 1 mill, including indirect costs, and at Hells Canyon, the estimate is only 2½ mills, directly."

Doubtless the DOUGLAS criticism served mainly to reassure the Republican side of the aisle. There are those who doubtless felt that a chief argument for this project was that it would produce power at such a high cost that local interests would not be interested. There could be no creeping socialism here. There would be no need to fret whether some private power corporation would accuse the Government of encroaching upon private rights, because, the project just wouldn't pay as a private proposition.

These considerations, of course, should not detract in any way from the merits of the project as a method of storing water for consumptive use in an area which badly needs such storage. But it is significant that the very arguments DOUGLAS used against the project probably consoled many anti-public-power Senators who respect DOUGLAS' arithmetic but shrink from his conclusions.

The unanswered question is why so many Democratic Senators who are proposing authorization of Hells Canyon Dam at this session of Congress sided with the administration in approving the Colorado authorization project.

The principal answer, doubtless, is that they believed that the Colorado bill was a good one. The wide variation of Democratic views expressed in debate indicated that the Senators were voting their convictions with no party pressure evident.

Nevertheless, it seems obvious that the Democrats who are fighting for Hells Canyon made few enemies, if any, in the Senate in their vote for the Colorado project. It would be too much to expect similar nonpartisan cooperation from the Republican side of the aisle when the Hells Canyon bill comes out for debate, but at least the stage has been set thus far for reasonable discussion and reasonable action on river development.

After Polio, War on Mental Disease?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, mental illness is the Nation's No. 1 health problem, filling more than 50 percent of the beds in this country. Up until a few years ago the outlook for most mental patients was merely hopeless. However, with the introduction of the new drugs, there is real hope that many thousands of mental patients will be returned to their families and their communities.

The June 27 edition of Life International carried a superb editorial on the potential of these new drugs. The editorial quoted the National Mental Health Committee of Washington, D. C., as advocating an appropriation of at least $100 million annually for intensified psychiatric research. Mr. President, as a Nation we could make no wiser investment than this really small amount of money to conquer this widespread ailment.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER POLIO, WAR ON MENTAL DISEASE?

Few great achievements are ever born without a certain amount of shock and unforeseen dislocations. So it has proved with the Salk vaccine, which marked man's final conquest of the dread disease of polio (Life International, May 16). After the dramatic announcement that the vaccine worked, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis went into high speed to try to get enough vaccine to immunize every first- and second-grade school child (the most vulnerable) before summer. But it soon became evident that the speed was too great; things began to go wrong.

The major mistake was to take what had been a limited, pilot production of vaccine and a pilot testing of its effectiveness, and try to transform it overnight into mass production and mass immunization. Before long, to everyone's horror, some of the vaccinated children began getting polio, most of them those who had received vaccine made by California's Cutter Laboratories. On May 8, as the number of victims mounted, all inoculations were suspended until the source of the trouble could be found. In all a total of 113 polio cases developed, 69 of them among Cutter recipients—and 5 children died.

For a time it looked as if the great Salk triumph might end in tragedy. But by the end of May, President Eisenhower, Dr. Salk and Surgeon General Scheele were convinced that all troubles had been identified and eradicated so that vaccination could be resumed full scale, as it was. The main trouble was that, for speed, the exhaustive testing procedures used on 1954's vaccine had been reduced to a minimum which proved to be inadequate (for example, each batch of 1955's vaccine was tested on only 18 monkeys versus 54 used by Salk). While the inoculations were suspended, elaborate precautions were established by the Government to prevent any recurrence of what had probably happened at Cutter—the shipping of vaccine containing supposedly killed virus which actually contained live polio

virus. With this done, no one doubted that every child could be made immune.

With this great medical breakthrough in the war against physical disease now established, there were heartening signs that an equally important breakthrough might soon be obtained against the baffling diseases that afflict the human mind. These hopeful signs were the fruit of an international detective hunt whose heroes were not only Americans but the researchers of a dozen nations.

In 1949 Dr. Rustom Jal Vakil of the King Edward Memorial Hospital in Bombay reported that a herb called Rauwolfia serpentina (snakeroot) had given marked relief to 50 victims of high blood pressure. His report excited the interest of Boston's Dr. Robert Wilkins, head of Massachusetts Memorial Hospital's high blood pressure clinic. He obtained some of the drug and started experiments of his own. He not only found that it was very effective with high blood pressure, but also that it made his patients relaxed, at ease and free from worries. Later Dr. Nathan S. Kline tried the drug on 411 destructive, assaultive, and suicidal mental patients at New York's Rockland State Hospital and reported that it reduced incidents of violence by a third. Longer tests at a Modesto, Calif., hospital on 74 patients produced improvement in 59, including 8 who became well enough to be released.

Meanwhile exploration along a similar line began in 1950 when French researchers at the Rhône-Poulenc Laboratories synthesized a drug called chlorpromazine (better known in Europe as Largactil), which a Paris obstetrician, Dr. Henri Laborit, found relieved the nausea of pregnant women. He found it also relieved their anxiety. As a result 2 Parisian psychiatrists tried it on 38 mental cases, all but 3 of whom showed substantial improvement. Like Rauwolfia (or resperine, as its chemically pure derivative is called) it seemed to ease anxiety by blocking the transfer of impulses between the hypothalmus, generally regarded as the seat of emotions, and the cerebral cortex.

Back in 1943 an accident which befell a Swiss chemist, Albert Hofmann, had given a clue as to how such breakdowns are produced. He had helped develop a synthetic derivative of ergot, the rust on rye which can cause madness when eaten. One day, while mixing a batch of this (called LSD), he became suddenly dizzy and had to go home to bed. Next morning he recorded: "My not unpleasant state was characterized by an extremely stimulated series of fantasies." He then took a small quantity of LSD by mouth and quickly went into a state of apparent psychosis: "Faces of people around me appeared like colored masks, I watched, with objective detachment, while I yelled and babbled incoherently." Now the chain was complete. There were drugs which alleviated madness; LSD could temporarily create it. As might be expected, further tests showed that chlorpromazine and other blocking agents offset the effects created by LSD. It was reasonable to suspect that if LSD could cause artificial schizophrenia, something similar might be causing it in the bodies of genuine schizophrenics.

Research at the United States Army's Chemical Center in Maryland now indicates that the basic cause of mental disease is a disturbance in the balance of "stop" and "go" chemicals known as adrenergic and cholinergic. Uninhibited or "crazy" actions result when some other chemical prevents the stop chemicals from exercising their inhibiting influence. Further search indicated that the offending chemical might be a hormone, serotonin. It is normally present in the brain, but an excess of it may cause basic trouble. Interestingly enough, serotonin has a chemical structure similar to LSD—only it is 6 to 8 times more potent.

In the June issue of Scientific American staff members of Boston Psycopathic Hospital, reporting on 6 years of experiments with LSD on human volunteers and psychotic patients, conclude the the artificial schizophrenia which this drug creates, lasting from 6 to 12 hours, may bring invaluable new knowledge of the mental processes of actual schizophrenics, opening new ways of reaching their minds with psychatric therapy. All of these milestones are contributing to the belief that if United States psychiatric researchers could raise the funds to make a national effort on the scale of that which produced the Salk vaccine against polio, they might make much faster strides toward bringing the international detective hunt to a successful conclusion.

Nothing could be more important, for at the present time over 700,000 people are in United States mental institutions and 1 out of 12 persons now living is expected to be in one at some time in his life. The annual cost of mental care in this country is in excess of $2.9 billion. For the first time, the alleviative drugs raise the hope that more and more patients can be rendered more amenable for treatment and eventual release, while spreading research into the chemical and physical causes of madness creates still greater hope for ultimate prevention.

Even so, the hazy borderline between sanity and insanity, between genius and crazed eccentricity, may remain an elusive one. One of the volunteer human guinea pigs, after imbibing LSD which had been offset by one of the chemical blocking agents, wrote of a rapturous experience of "pure unblemished happiness" in which he had visual hallucinations of amorphous swirls of color and "an almost unspoken voice arising in response to the overwhelming abundance of sensation." This strange kinship of indescribable beauty with the unutterable terrors of insanity described by other LSD-users must remain one of the insoluble mysteries of that infinite mystery, the human mind.

But that does not mean that the causes of mental disease cannot be isolated and thus in many cases prevented. Wherever the possibility of such a major breakthrough is opened, the one predictable certainty about American research is that it will hurl enough men and money at the gap in an effort to accomplish the victory. The National Mental Health Committee contends that a fund of at least $100 million annually will be needed to begin with, to finance much greater research on the problem. Dr. Salk himself has urged that with the conquest of polio in sight, mental disease be made the next great target of a national effort. This is now beginning.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch Joins Parade of Distinguished Newspapers Supporting Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, another major newspaper has reexamined the upper Colorado River storage project in the light of the House bill, which omits Echo Park Dam. As in every case where this project is investigated on the basis of fact, the editors have found that the inflated cost figures being promulgated by southern California are false.

Following is an editorial urging authorization of the project from the June 13 issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

REASON ON THE UPPER COLORADO

A statesmanlike solution to the bill for the upper Colorado River storage project has been arrived at by the House Interior Subcommittee headed by Representative ASPINALL, of Colorado. The subcommittee has eliminated Echo Park Dam, a project of most questionable wisdom because it would have invaded Dinosaur National Monument. The subcommittee thus went as far as it could to insure the enactment of the upper Colorado project as a whole, to provide water for a group of Western States.

The subcommittee then went on to propose a study by a Presidential Commission of alternatives to Echo Park. Water losses due to evaporation differences in power production, scenic and recreational values, and river regulation would all be considered in the Commission's study.

Such a study has long been needed and was proposed months ago, both by Bernard DeVoto in Harper's magazine and by the Post-Dispatch. Hot dispute has done little to compose the issue. The cool facts should help measurably.

Wisconsin Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dim and dark reception to the proposed upper Colorado storage project by voters in Wisconsin was reflected editorially in the Madison State Journal on May 23, the Janesville Gazette on May 13, and the Oshkosh Northwestern on May 5, as follows:

GOLD BRICK ON THE COLORADO

We hope no Wisconsin Member of the House of Representatives will vote for the upper Colorado River storage project which passed the Senate on April 20. If this measure passes, Wisconsin taxpayers will have to put up at least $88 million out of the total cost of this water-storage-power-irrigation project which is planned for five Southwest States.

It is extremely surprising, incidentally, to see the Eisenhower administration giving such enthusiastic support to the upper Colorado project, in view of the administration's general attitude in regard to public power and irrigation projects. And at a time when the President claims to be interested in cuting government expenditures, support for a project whose cost estimates range from $1½ to $4 billion dollars seem completely out of line.

This project would authorize 6 major water storage and power dams and 11 related irrigation projects spanning Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona. It would also "conditionally authorize" 21 additional irrigation works.

This was sold to Senators as a reclamation program with the power aspect purely coincidental. This matter of reclaming arid land for agricultural purposes presents the Congress—and the American taxpayer—with some questions that cannot be avoided.

Bringing water to these desert lands will cost about $906 per acre—yet most of the land, after irrigation, will be worth not more than $150 per acre, according to established values of developed cropland in the area. Even this estimate of cost per acre is low. If interest charges were added, the cost of improving the land would run to $2,900 per acre.

This makes no sense whatever, in a period of our history when we are paying about $700,000 a day to store the $6 billion worth of surplus foods that is grown on presently productive land. Even if it could be proved that new farm land is needed to feed the United States, there are many acres of land in more humid areas that can be developed at a fraction of the cost of the upper Colorado project.

And even the strong advocates of public power cannot orate too loudly on the advantages of this project. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, a notable friend of public power, points out that the Echo Park Dam—one of the most controversial in this gigantic scheme—would generate power at a cost of $640 per kilowatt. This compares with $115 at Bonneville, $90 at Grand Coulee, and $166 claimed for the 18 dams in the TVA.

Critics of the upper Colorado River project also claim that the Echo Park Dam would destroy much of the natural beauty of the Dinosaur National Monument, and might open up the way for further invasion of the national park system.

The upper Colorado storage project is an extravagant, unprecedented and thoroughly unjustified project. It can be stopped in the House of Representatives, and Wisconsin Congressmen should help put the axe to a program that never should have passed the Senate.

UPPER COLORADO PROJECT, TIME TO CALL A HALT

Note was made in this column on May 6 that Wisconsin taxpayers are threatened with an $88 million tax load if the House follows the Senate in approval of the $4 billion upper Colorado water control, power, and irrigation project. This vast sum for a single western project, if Wisconsin is obliged to shoulder its share, would amount to one-third of all of the State income taxes collected in a year, the major source of revenues for support of the entire State government.

The fantastic expenditures for western reclamation projects and the utter uselessness is further exposed in an articles recently published by Leslie A. Miller, Chairman of the Hoover Commission task group on reclamation and water supply. It will be difficult for the West to write off his comments as prejudice because Miller is a former governor of Wyoming, one of the States which has enjoyed some of the benefits of the billions of dollars in Federal gifts.

Here are some of the points of his case:

1. Additional irrigated land would be brought into production while the Federal Government has on hand surplus farm commodities valued at $6 billion, with the prospect of having $8 billion worth by the end of this crop year. Storage costs alone run to $700,000 per day.

2. The 345 million acres of crop land now in use, most of it needing no irrigation, provides more food and farm produce than can be consumed. Yet 70 western reclamation projects running to $4 billion in cost are under construction or already authorized by Congress.

3. In the last Congress, 16 bills for additional projects were introduced, with a cost estimated at $3 billion more. The United States Bureau of Reclamation has 269 new irrigation possibilities listed for future development.

4. Technical advances now known and in use, if applied to present acreage of cropland, could increase food production by 200 percent. The possibilities are proven because farm yields for the period 1940–1951 actually increased 32 percent for the same cultivated acres.

5. In the face of growing water shortages all over the West, irrigation in 1 year used 25 trillion gallons to produce crops valued at about $2,400,000,000, which figures out to 10 cents worth of produce for each 1,000 gallons of water.

6. On the basis of estimated costs, the upper Colorado River project will bring water to dry lands at a cost of $906 per acre, and the land, after irrigation, is expected to be worth no more than $150 per acre for farming.

7. The cost of $906 per acre are on the estimates of irrigation costs alone. If the whole project cost is taken into consideration, the cost would be $2,900 per acre.

8. Estimated costs, meanwhile, are likely to fall far short of actual costs. Examples: Milke River in Montana, estimated at $1 million, cost more than $7 million; Minidoka, Idaho, estimated at $2,600,000, completed at $17,900,000; Salt River, Ariz., estimated at $2,800,000, cost $18,041,000; Colorado-Big Thompson, estimated at $31,703,000, required $159 million; Central Valley of California, estimated at $170 million, cost $667,934,000.

9. Irrigation costs for the upper Colorado area would run to a figure equal to the 80 percent of the total value of all farm lands and buildings in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

10. The central Arizona project, for irrigation of 226,000 acres, would cost $1,991 per acre on the basis of supporters' figures, and would involve an additional hidden subsidy of $9,200 per acre. The cost would be almost four times the total current value of all farm lands and buildings in Arizona. In addition, 55 percent of the area it is proposed to irrigate is owned by only 420 large landowners.

11. About 200 million acres of additional farm land could be brought into production by clearing it of brush or installing simple drainage systems at a cost of not more than $150 per acre. It has not been developed because it is not needed. This land is in areas which enjoy ample rainfall.

The time is long past to call a halt to the Treasury raids in behalf of western projects. The rest of the Nation is being literally robbed of billions of tax dollars for the political well-being of westerners in Congress.

The States and regions which pay the Federal tax bills are willing to provide for their poorer neighbors in the West in the way of Government aids and services. For a long period of time, contributions have gone far beyond that point. Wisconsin among other States has had its leg pulled to the tune of millions per year. This State and other States ought to wake up to the fact that they are being victimized.

WHY HELP FINANCE COLORADO RIVER PROJECT?

Congress has been going too fast, we believe, in regard to a bill which would provide vast sums for irrigation programs in several Western States through improvement of portions of the Colorado River.

The extensive and costly plan, it is learned, has not been thoroughly analyzed. Adequate information as to engineering, financial and economic feasibility and other phases of the project is needed and should be had before the taxpayers of the Nation are asked to dig down into their pockets to pay the bill.

According to a statement sent out from the Washington office of the Colorado River Association, Wisconsin taxpayers would be faced with $88 million in added taxes if the proposed upper Colorado River Basin project measure is passed by Congress.

The Senate has already approved the bill and it is now pending in the House.

Information issued by the association mentioned says the bill calls for a number of large dams on the upper reaches of the Colorado River and numerous irrigation projects in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. And this program, it is asserted, would cost the Nation's taxpayers more than $4 billion in hidden subsidies.

The total cost to the taxpayers is based on repayment schedules presented to the Senate and House Interior Committees by the United States Bureau of Reclamation (1954). The cost to each State is based on computations by the Tax Foundation, New York City, and Washington, D. C.

The Colorado River Association, a volunteer citizens' organization with members in California and many other States, has joined conservation and taxpayer groups throughout the country in opposing the upper Colorado River Basin project bill.

The association pointed out that numerous other objections to this bill have been raised by large numbers of witnesses testifying before Senate and House Interior Committees.

Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, now chairman of the Hoover Commission Task Group on Reclamation and Water Supply, has stated that no new farmland is needed to feed America today. And when it is, lands in humid areas can be developed at a fraction of the cost of this project.

The proposition would tax the many for a privileged few.

Reds Back at Their Old Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the present atmosphere of world conditions, there are many who bespeak the thesis that the masters of the Kremlin have changed—that a spirit of friendship and cooperation has replaced the fundamental doctrines of the international Communist conspiracy. How wrong these misguided individuals are.

As an illustration, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Reds Back at Their Old Game," which appeared in the July 1, 1955, issue of the U. S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS BACK AT THEIR OLD GAME—STIRRING STRIKES, BORING INTO UNIONS

Communists are as busy as ever in promoting strikes in key industries. Peace talk hasn't changed the Kremlin's real aims.

Infiltration of unions goes on. Trouble is kicked up whenever possible. The goal is a foothold where the Soviet masters can be helped most.

A look around the world shows what the Reds are doing now.

Ask a non-Communist labor leader anywhere in the world about the new sweet talk coming from the Kremlin, and he will answer something like this:

"Don't be taken in. The Communists haven't changed any. When they talk peace, coexistence, and let's get along with everybody they are just covering up. The game

is the same: keep boring into key labor unions, promote strikes, stir up trouble."

AFL President George Meany, just back from Europe, says that the basic aim of the Communists is to plant members in positions in unions where they can paralyze the defenses of free countries, whenever they see fit, by calling general strikes. Other heads of unions—in Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and many other countries—are finding fresh evidence that there is little connection between what the Kremlin preaches and what its agents in the unions are trying to do.

In Britain, these leaders have seen at least one Communist-inspired strike in an important industry in recent months. France sees signs that the Communists in unions are feeling their oats. In Singapore, on the other side of the world, Communists were behind bloody uprisings a short time ago.

Labor leaders find more than coincidence in the fact that recent strikes abroad, more often than not, have been in industries where tie-ups can hurt the economy the most.

Regional editors for U. S. News & World Report assigned to foreign capitals have sounded out labor leaders of the world on what the Communists really are up to, and this is what they find:

LONDON

Warnings are being sounded in Britain about the activities of Communists in the labor movement. There have been charges that the Communists had a hand in some of the strikes in recent months.

As labor authorities size things up, Communists in Britain are conducting a campaign that shows up again and again in costly strikes, carried out with lightning speed against vital activities often related to defense, ordnance, fuel, and communications.

This year, the most notable Red success was the 26-day stoppage of London newspapers. That shutdown was caused by two small unions, one led by Communists.

On the surface, the newspaper strike resulted from a wage dispute involving less than 5 percent of 15,000 mechanical workers. Underneath was found the strong influence of the Electrical Trades Union, whose leaders are Communists.

One observer, looking at the Communist campaign in Britain, declares: "Within industry and the unions a great battle is in progress between responsible union leaders and a highly organized and disciplined Communist army. The prize is to get traitors into the decisive positions, the key men in the unions, so the nation might sometime be brought to a standstill at a nod from Moscow rulers."

How it's done: The Communist drive is being concentrated at the factory branches of the unions. Communists seem to be out to seize the day-to-day apparatus of unions. They often resort to all sorts of tricks to get a party member or fellow traveler elected as a shop steward, the contact man between the union and its members in the plant. Non-Communists report that a rather high proportion of shop stewards in Britain are Communist sympathizers.

Communists, it seems, are careful in selecting the union to be infiltrated. They are interested in more chaos in coal mining, but not in milk distribution. They infiltrate into the engineering trades, especially aiming at warplane output, but do not worry about farm machinery.

There is a greater concentration on the docks than on railways, because in Britain the docks are where the most congestion can be caused. Communists are more anxious to get a foothold among workers in electronics plants than in chemical factories. They are far more concerned with scientists than with mail carriers.

An example of Communist strategy is provided by the Electrical Trades Union, the same one involved in the newspaper walkout. This union has 220,000 members. Its leaders can call strikes in newspapers, new atomic plants, or nearly anything that involves electrical construction.

Some of the union leaders boast of calling "guerrilla strikes" to tie up industry. These walkouts are called at strategic centers of an industry. Only a few members are called out, but construction is halted. Meanwhile, most of the members remain at their jobs, pay dues to support those who are on the picket line.

"March for your money": The Electrical Trades Union is cited as having staged a big "solidarity march" on one occasion, to bolster a 6-week wave of guerrilla strikes. About 7,000 members paraded through London streets, behind well-known Communist leaders. Most spectators didn't know the members had been told that they had to march in order to collect strike benefits. The benefits were handed out at the end of the parade route.

However, this union is only one of several where Communists have power.

A dock strike late in 1954 was exploited by Communists, although they were not held responsible for starting the walkout in the first place. A 1949 wildcat strike on the docks also was charged to Communist activities.

A strike of truckdrivers cut off deliveries of gasoline in London in 1953. Two auto strikes in 1952 were blamed on Communist attempts to disrupt production of tanks and military vehicles.

SINGAPORE

Far around the globe from London, the Communists have been testing their power in this crown colony. The biggest tests came recently with the call for a general strike in protest against arrest of five Communist leaders.

Although most observers decided that the Communists had not been entirely successful in the test, there were threats of further trouble later on. The Communists are credited with having powerful "cells" in many unions here.

The 6-day walkout brought out about 16,000 strikers, according to police estimates. Union leaders had predicted that 70,000 workers would join the protest strike. The colony has about 120,000 workers in all.

Most of the strikers were preparing to go back to work before union leaders announced that the strike was being called off. Public transportation systems were hardest hit while the strike was on, but workers in most industries declined to join the protest.

A bus strike last month touched off a wave of violence, causing four deaths. Even after the protest strike ended, there were about 2,700 workers out on strike in several industries. Some of these walkouts have been under way for weeks.

Colony officials blame Communists for these walkouts and for the protest demonstrations that go with them.

PARIS

As in Singapore, Communist labor leaders are flexing their muscles in France by staging demonstrations or calling strikes.

An example of the Reds' strike tactics is the walkout of printers staged last month. For 24 hours, the strike stopped publication of most French daily newspapers. It was a "protest" against a law then pending in the National Assembly to outlaw, in effect, the "closed shop" in printing plants.

The law was passed overwhelmingly. The printers had lost a day's pay for nothing—except that the Communist leaders had a chance to test their strength.

That strike was ordered by the General Confederation of Labor, which is considered to be under the domination of Communists. This organization also has staged bus strikes and other walkouts, while its members have helped out in street demonstrations on various political issues.

In France, however, unionists believe the Communists are losing some power in the labor movement. The many "protests" and brief strikes—each costing workers some pay—are turning many workers against the Red leaders.

BONN

Communists also are showing that they can call strikes and set off "protests" of various kinds in Western Germany. "Protest" meetings usually have strong political overtones.

An example of strike tactics is a recent walkout at an auto plant in Bremen. The purported issue at stake was 48 hours of pay for 45 hours of work. Top union officials refused to authorize the walkout, charged that it was inspired by Communists.

The Communists also are accused of trying to discredit the elected officials of unions in an effort to capture the organizations. Labor experts say that there is a widening gap between German workers and their union officials in many areas where unions have been given places on company boards of directors.

Communists, it is argued, are waiting to take over the unions, if they can discredit the regular leaders. At times, Communists help to arrange wildcat strikes in order to cause trouble for the union officials.

The Career of Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, former President Herbert Hoover has just closed another important mission in the service of the United States.

With the submission of the final report of the Hoover Commission this great American has completed 41 years of almost continuous effort for the benefit of our Republic and the world.

As he nears the age of 81 the former President can look back on a career of dedicated statesmanship which few men have equaled.

His service as chairman of the two Commissions on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was monumental in scope. It has been estimated that the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission resulted in the saving of $4 billion a year.

The recommendations of the second Hoover Commission contemplate an additional saving of several billion dollars in the cost of Government as well as substantial benefits in increased efficiency.

In all parts of the world Herbert Hoover will long be remembered and honored as a great humanitarian.

His achievements in wartime relief saved the lives of many thousands of people who were facing starvation in the war-stricken countries of Europe. His success as United States Food Administrator was outstanding.

Newspapers all over the country have given high praise to the work of the Hoover Commission. Two examples, representing metropolitan newspapers in Pennsylvania, are editorials from the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. Another fine editorial was published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer, an extremely good newspaper of the smaller city type.

I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

MR. HOOVER: PUBLIC SERVANT

The American people have come to regard Herbert Hoover as such a hardy perennial among public servants that they will hardly accept the termination of his latest tour of duty, as head of the second Hoover Commission, as writing finis to his public career.

The 80-year-old former President would seem to bear them out in stating that "No man who is physically able has the right to refuse his services to the Government."

Certainly, Mr. Hoover has never refused his. Whenever called upon, he has served the Nation with the quiet efficiency and selfless devotion that have been his lifetime hallmarks.

The second Hoover Commission, during its 2-year existence, has produced 19 reports containing 319 specific recommendations for improving the efficiency and reducing the cost of Government operations. Its predecessor, the first Hoover Commission, which operated between 1947 and 1949, had about 70 percent of its recommended reforms put into effect.

Not nearly so favorable has been the record of action on the present Commission's proposals, but the Bureau of the Budget is still considering many of the major suggestions. We hope Congress acts on them.

With presentation of the final report, the chairman may now take time for a little recreation and for attention to the many educational and scientific institutions in which he is interested. Meanwhile, we may put it down as certain that if and when his Nation needs him and his extraordinary talents again, Mr. Hoover will be ready to answer the call.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette]

MR HOOVER RETIRES

Herbert Hoover this week completed another chore in his more than four decades of public service. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission), which he headed in two safaris into the jungles of bureaucracy, has now done its work and is disbanding.

Mr. Hoover, who will be 81 next month, may be sure that he has the gratitude and respect of many millions of his fellow citizens. Even those who disagree with his political philosophy acknowledge, unless partisanship wholly blinds them, that he is a great and dedicated citizen.

For at least a decade and a half after his defeat for reelection to the Presidency in 1932, Mr. Hoover was political scapegoat for the great depression. History now shows more clearly that the causes of that catastrophe were worldwide in nature and grew out of policies that long preceded Mr. Hoover's term in the White House.

But since 1946, when President Truman summoned him to undertake an economic mission to Germany and Austria, Mr. Hoover's once-tarnished reputation has steadily brightened.. His work as head of the Hoover Commission—first from 1947 through 1949, then again from 1953 to this week, has been justly celebrated.

Back in 1939, the then President Hoover was criticized in a radio speech by Franklin Delano Roosevelt thus: "If we do not halt this steady process of building commissions and regulatory bodies and special legislation like huge inverted pyramids over every one of the simple constitutional provisions, we shall soon be spending many billions more."

What a singular irony of history that these very words might have been spoken by Mr. Hoover as he completed his latest public assignment.

[From the Washington (Pa.) Observer]

HERBERT HOOVER HAS BEEN GREAT AMERICAN

Former President Herbert Hoover will be completing what may be his last public service to the Nation he has served over 41 years when the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of Government expires today.

"Eighty years is a long time for a man to live. As the shadows lengthen over my years, my confidence, my hopes and dreams for my countrymen are undimmed. This confidence is that with advancing knowledge, toil will grow less exacting; that fear, hatred, pain and tears may subside; that the regenerating sun of creative ability and religious devotion will refresh each morning the strength and progress of my country."

The words above were those of Herbert Clark Hoover at ceremonies at West Branch, Iowa, on August 10, 1954 honoring his 80th birthday. They might have been the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, or any of the other political opponents Hoover had outlived. But other words spoken by Hoover on that day reflected more fully his forthright conservatism.

"The remedy," Hoover said, "is to restore the checks and balance of power, to reinvigorate State and local governments and to deflate the bureaucratic empires." The Democrats over 20 years had reduced human freedom throughout the world, he said. While he had no fears of the "evil" of "unrestrained presidential actons" from President Eisenhower, "he will not always be president."

As he now retires from public life, Herbert Hoover can look back on a post-presidential career that had much to do with restoring checks and balances. The Hoover Commission staff figures that about 70 percent of the recommendations of the first body for improving government efficiency have been accepted completely or in some degree. Hoover Commission studies are the bases of 26 bills now before Congress.

But ironically, the first Hoover Commission, created by the Republican 80th Congress in 1947, found more acceptance by a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration than the Republican Congress of 1952–53 or the present Republican administration has given to the second. The second Hoover Commission was established by Congress in 1953. It was to complete its work by May 31, 1955—later extended, this year, to June 30.

The first Hoover Commission had been limited to proposing changes that would make for efficiency and economy in operation of the Federal establishment under existing law. The second one had a broader field of study; it was directed, among other things, to survey Federal activities which compete with private business. It had authority, also, to recommend alterations of basic Federal laws.

Congress has twice adopted resolutions congratulating Hoover on his birthday—in 1949 on the occasion of his 75th and in 1954 on his 80th. The blacksmith's son who became a multimillionaire early in life had carried only six States when he ran for re-election in 1932, but the defeat by no means divorced him from public life. As President Eisenhower put it in his message of August 1954: "Few men in our country's history have been privileged to serve the Nation in so many important capacities as have you, and certainly none has done so with greater brilliance and devotion."

Hoover, the only Quaker President, was the first President to be born west of the Mississippi River and the first to have been trained in science.

And the Hoover name is carrying on in public life; Herbert Clark Hoover, Jr., Under Secretary of State, assumed that office in October 1954, after receiving wide praise as the negotiator of a British-Iranian oil agreement.

New Ships, Old Virtues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the 4th of July issue of the Hartford (Conn.) Courant contained a timely, appropriate, and very worthwhile editorial entitled "New Ships, Old Virtues."

I was again very vividly reminded of this editorial which I read at my home in Rockville, Conn., early yesterday morning following its delivery by our very reliable newsboy when I continued my return by air this morning from LaGuardia Field to Washington and I viewed anchored in the Hudson a large aircraft carrier and a heavy cruiser. The core of this article is the concluding statement, namely:

The heart of our naval service remains what it has always been—the courage, the skill, and the devotion of those who man our ships.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this fine editorial:

NEW SHIPS, OLD VIRTUES

The ships that Lord Nelson led into action in the Napoleonic wars were not greatly different in type of function from the vessels in which, more than 200 years earlier, the seamen under Howard, Hawkins, and Drake scattered and drove off Philip's armada. Wood was still the shipwright's principal material. Naval armament basically was unchanged. Naval tactics were still fundamentally captive to the laws of tide and current, and to the vagaries of wind.

But in the 150 years since Trafalgar, and especially in the last 4 decades since Jutland, transformations in naval construction, armament, and tactics have been spectacular. The advent of steam started the naval revolution that has now been brought to new flower in this age of aviation, nuclear fission, and electronics.

These changes in design, equipment, motive power, and function create a need for new nomenclature. The early 20th century brought forth the English dreadnaught, the first all big-gun warship that made the world's capital-ship fleets obsolete, and in turn made necessary the protecting destroyer. Now the big-gun vessel upon which governments have, since 1904, spent incredible sums, has been forced to share, if indeed not to yield, high-seas precedence to the fast-developing carrier. The battleship has been in peril of losing even its historic and awesome name. If certain naval spokesmen

had their way, these one-time queens of the line of battle would be redesignated into prosaic heavy support ships.

The destroyer, which came into being simply as a defense against the greatly feared torpedo boat, has undergone many a sea change. The United States Navy now lists no fewer than 11 destroyer-class categories. These range from the DL's, formerly called destroyer leaders, which are virtually light cruisers, to a bewildering technical array of DDG's (guided missile destroyers); DE's (escort vessels); DDR's (radar picket destroyers); radar-picket escort vessels, and minesweepers and minelayers of destroyer type.

The aircraft carrier, latest ship of the line, has already blossomed into seven types. The submarine has taken on new duties and new designations in cargo and transport service. So swift and far reaching has been the naval proliferation of our time that there is difficulty in finding suitably salty names to describe all the new types.

But however cut and dried, however coldly technical some of the new naval nomenclature may seem to us, we need have no fears that naval service itself is destined to become a prosy routine in which the better set of scientific gadgets will invariably assure success. The heart of our naval service remains what it has always been—the courage, the skill, and the devotion of those who man our ships.

Marines and Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to have printed an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., on July 3, 1955. The editorial, entitled "Marines and Reserves," will be of interest to our Members. It is as follows:

MARINES AND RESERVES

In passing the $32 billion Armed Forces appropriation bill, the Senate gave President Eisenhower just about exactly what he requested, including reduction in spending and manpower, with one exception. The one exception was the President's proposal to cut the Marine Corps by 22,000 men. The Senate balked on this and eliminated the cut. It accepted a cut in Army personnel of 88,000 men and an 8,000-man reduction in the Navy.

The Senate's action in refusing to accept the Marine Corps cut doesn't make much sense in view of the fact that Congress has been kicking around the military reserve bill, drawn up by Representative OVERTON BROOKS' subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee and approved by that committee with only one dissenting vote. While the House approved the bill Friday, there is considerable talk in Washington that the Senate may stall it and that there may be no reserve legislation at this session.

The value of the Marine Corps is unquestionable. It carries a glamour held by no other branch of the armed services. But in a war, 22,000 marines one way or the other could make no decisive difference.

What would make a difference would be whether the Marine Corps and the Army and the Navy and the Air Force, regardless of their numerical strength, were fully backed by a strong Reserve force. The Regular forces of the various services must carry the brunt of the initial defense and attack in war, but wars themselves are fought by reserve power.

Congress can vote every billion dollars available in the Nation to the Armed Forces and still not be making the Nation militarily strong enough to defend itself from an aggressor unless it sets up an adequate Reserve.

Brooklyn's Industrial Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of the annual report of the president of the Borough of Brooklyn, the Honorable John Cashmore, in which he reviews the civic progress recorded in Brooklyn during the past 12 months, from June 1954 to June 1955. Magnificent progress has been recorded during this time which makes our borough the great industrial and residential center of 3 million people that it is today.

Mr. Cashmore's report contains much information on civic improvements, industrial expansion, achievements in education, the development of hospital and health facilities, the growth of housing projects, playgrounds, libraries, parks, highways, the sewer system, transportation, and many other needs of a community of this size. As one who represents a sizable section of Brooklyn, I take great pride that our borough is continuing its expansion as one of the country's foremost centers of diversified industry and a great center of civic and educational progress.

In reading Mr. Cashmore's report I felt extremely proud that Brooklyn is blessed with the services of this devoted public servant, who is progressively doing a good job for the people of this large community. I am certain many will find it most interesting to read Mr. Cashmore's chapter in the report dealing with the industrial expansion of Brooklyn, which reads as follows.

INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

(At the beginning of 1955 the borough president completed a study of official departmental reports as well as various factors relative to the construction of many new industrial buildings in Brooklyn during 1954. His conclusions were expressed in the statement which follows:)

(By John Cashmore)

A study of the facts clearly indicates Brooklyn is continuing its growth as one of America's leading centers of diversified industry.

For example, there is scarcely a week which does not witness the completion of at least one new factory or loft building in this borough. Actually, the rate of construction is even livelier than this, for the records show that during the 52 weeks of 1954 a total of 64 new buildings in these classifications were constructed.

The rate of industrial expansion is further emphasized by the fact that during the past year plans for the construction of 98 new factories and lofts were filed in the department of housing and buildings and that additional plans were submitted for the alteration and enlargement of 273 existing buildings in factory and loft classification.

In order to understand that this expansion of industrial space is not a new, but a continuing trend, all that is needed is to turn to another source, the records of the tax department. These show that since the assessment year of 1951–52 the combined assessed valuations of factories and lofts have grown from $233,114,375 to $272,030,150, an increase of nearly $39 million, and that in the two assessment years of 1953–54 and 1954–55 as many as 160 such buildings were added to the roll of taxable properties.

In almost any other community a record of industrial development such as this would be regarded, perhaps, as phenomenal. But Brooklyn, the greatest city's greatest borough, appears to have a characteristic way of building and contributing to the Nation's economy in a manner which does not, unfortunately, command the attention it properly deserves.

Perhaps this is due to the fact that for generation after generation Brooklyn has been one of America's greatest industrial and business communities, the principal foreign trade center of the United States, and one with tremendous manpower skills which serve our country efficiently and without fanfare in time of peace as well as war.

Certainly there is no other community, to my knowledge, which has Brooklyn's capacity for producing almost everything, from the smallest manufactured article to the world's largest aircraft carrier, such as the new $200 million *Forrestal*-class U. S. S. *Saratoga*, now under construction in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, with another to follow.

Nevertheless, the record is remarkable, and especially so in the face of efforts to induce industries to move to rural or out-of-state areas. The fact that thousands of manufacturing plants choose to remain here and that many new establishments have been opened is an expression of faith and confidence in Brooklyn's future.

Clearly, to my way of thinking, Brooklyn is entitled to the distinction of being one community where industry is moving ahead, not just gradually, but in every week of the year by adding another building to the many thousands already in existence which are turning out products and commodities needed in our domestic and foreign markets.

This record of expansion would be impossible, of course, without the exceptional opportunities and advantages Brooklyn offers, and without the extensive program of public improvements we now have in progress in many sections of our borough.

Unparalleled progress is being made in the expansion of our highway system. An outstanding example of this progress is the Brooklyn-Queens connecting highway, a great expressway which enables through traffic to bypass densely populated residential and business areas and to keep moving quickly, economically and safely.

This toll-free highway, an important part of our metropolitan arterial system, with connections to Long Island, upstate New York, New England and points south on the Atlantic seaboard, was constructed for the very purpose of serving mixed traffic, commercial vehicles as well as passenger cars.

Three-lane express roadways link the boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens and provide connections with all East River bridges and tunnels. In Brooklyn itself the highway is advantageously located so that it is in close proximity to the piers along the many miles of Brooklyn's commercially developed waterfront and also to manufacturing plants in Brooklyn's industrial area.

Another example of our highway improvement program is the Adams Street widening project in downtown Brooklyn. Adams

Street forms the main traffic artery through our civic center and serves as the new approach to the modernized Brooklyn Bridge.

Our progress, of course, is not limited to highway improvements. Huge drainage projects are also being constructed by the borough president's office, and these, when considered in conjunction with highway improvements, have a special significance. They are largely instrumental in helping to bring about the development of extensive areas which are now witnessing much residential construction and industrial development.

In another important field, there is further cooperation which enables industry and business to expand. This is in the matter of building zone changes. One important example of this was the Board of Estimate's approval of an application for a building zone change which will enable Charles Pfizer & Co., probably the world's most important producer of antibiotics, to proceed with plans for a $5 million expansion of its facilities.

Thus, step by step, civic contributions have been made which help business and industry and also promote the well-being of our 3 million people who have an important interest in the preservation of the community's prosperity.

In one of its annual reports the chamber of commerce has described Brooklyn as a good place for business and industry and has pointed out that Brooklyn's employment ratio is high.

The chamber's report emphasized that Brooklyn is at the center of the concentrated metropolitan area and reviewed the statistics relating to its industries, wholesale business, retail sales, and other data.

"This is the only area in the United States and most likely, the world, to which massive statistics may be applied," the chamber's report stated. "Surely they mean something to those seeking customers, manpower, and the economical distribution of goods and services."

Until the United States Commerce Department's new 1955 census of manufactures and business is completed, the only official United States Government statistics available in this field are the returns of the Census of Manufacturers of 1947. From this source the chamber of commerce pointed out that 7,298 Brooklyn manufacturers employed 229,395 persons at that time.

"The transportation, communications, and other public-utility industries," the report continued, "employed 103,800 people."

In all categories throughout Brooklyn, the report stated, the total of all persons employed was 1,087,479 out of an available labor force of 1,170,403.

The availability of manpower skills has always been an important factor contributing to Brooklyn's industrial growth during generation after generation.

Before the turn of the century, more than 50 years ago, our industrial strength was concentrated largely in shipping and shipbuilding and in other industries such as chemicals, sugar refining, boot and shoe making, the roasting and grinding of coffee and spices, the working of cordage and twine, oil refining, foundries and machine shops, and confectionery making.

Brooklyn has continued, of course, to be a great international seaport and many of our original industries, some of them in business without interruption for more than 100 years, find it to their advantage to continue their activities here.

Today, however, Brooklyn industry has become much more diversified, and this is highly important, for in diversification there are strength and stability.

The facts also show that when a number of our long-existing manufacturing and business establishments have found it necessary to expand, they have decided, after careful study, to select new sites within the borough where new plants have been erected or are now in the course of construction.

Just recently, for example, work was begun on a new $750,000 distribution center for Towns & James, Inc., who have been in Brooklyn for 70 years. The new building, occupying an area of 85,000 square feet and providing a total capacity of more than 1,700,000 cubic feet, was described in the press as the metropolitan area's largest and most modern distribution center of its kind devoted exclusively to drugs and pharmaceuticals.

In December one of Brooklyn's concerns which is engaged in making a nationally advertised product filed plans for a $1,500,000 building addition to its plant.

Facts such as these do not come to everyday notice. It is unfortunate that, notwithstanding their importance, they usually receive far less attention than the occasional determination of a firm to transfer its activities elsewhere.

While it is true that plants do occasionally move to other areas, it is our experience, in practically every such instance, that some other business expanding its facilities takes over the vacated property or that it is subdivided to provide space for other diversified occupancies. Our industry keeps growing consistently. I am confident this growth will go forward and that our industries will continue to serve the Nation's economy and will further strengthen the foundations for Brooklyn's own present and future prosperity.

Birth of an Anthem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an article that appeared in the magazine section of the Sunday Star. This article reminds us that the beautiful hymn, America the Beautiful, was inspired by a trip to Pikes Peak by Katharine Lee Bates, aunt of the author of this article.

This article is of special significance in view of the fact that the Air Force Academy will be located in the shadow of Pikes Peak near Colorado Springs, Colo. The young men attending this Academy will no doubt be inspired by the same majestic view that caused the following words to be penned:

O beautiful for spacious skies,
For amber waves of grain,
For purple mountain majesties,
Above the fruited plain!
America! America!
God shed His grace on thee
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea!

The article by Mrs. Burgess follows:

BIRTH OF AN ANTHEM

(By Dorothy Burgess)

On July 4, 1895—exactly 60 years ago Monday—the Congregationalist, a leading magazine of the time, first published the inspiring stanzas of America the Beautiful. The fact that this poem to her country was written by my aunt, Katharine Lee Bates, has always made Independence Day a doubly partiotic and sentimental anniversary for my family.

Like no other hymn in our history, America the Beautiful echoes the dreams and hopes, the bounty, the strength, the compassion of this land. When, in 1926, its lines were finally set to the music of Materna, by Samuel A. Ward, a spontaneous demand arose to make it our national anthem. Many organizations joined in a popular movement to have Congress adopt it over My Country, 'tis of Thee and The Star-Spangled Banner. Their efforts proved fruitless. The martial qualities of Francis Scott Key's composition were more attuned to the times.

But some day, war will be abolished. It will become only a memory in man's long history. When that millennium arrives, people will no longer thrill to the thought of "bombs bursting in air." "The rockets' red glare" will illuminate past rather than perpetuate forever the ideas and attitudes of war.

The peaceful birthplace of America the Beautiful makes it unique among our anthems. It was composed on a mountaintop—not a battlefield.

Katharine Lee Bates, a professor of English literature at Wellesley College, made the journey up Pikes Peak by prairie wagon in the summer of 1893. Her stay at the summit was very brief; because of the altitude, two members of the party became ill, necessitating a hasty retreat.

To the poet and teacher, however, the altitude meant a closeness to God and a sweeping vista of America's grandeur. Her poetic inspiraiton was born of that brief vision from a mountaintop. Before her western visit ended, America the Beautiful was completed.

Perhaps no other American song is so widely used and loved. It is learned by the youngest children in our schools. Our armed services have sung it around the world. It expresses the loftiest ideals of patriotism. It rejoices in the blessings of our country, it honors our dead, it pays homage to our past, it utters our aspirations, it lifts our prayers.

Today, America the Beautiful—born on a mountaintop in Colorado—is marking time, its message of brotherhood waiting, not to sound the call to arms but to ring in world peace. Some day, when the world is ready, the United States may yet embrace America the Beautiful as its rightful national anthem.

American-Israel Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Attorney General of the United States, at the 58th Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, held recently in Washington. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, DELIVERED BEFORE THE 58TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, HOTEL WILLARD, WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 18, 1955

It gives me great pleasure to participate in this evening's session of the 58th national convention of the Zionist Organization of America and to convey the warmest greetings of the Government of the United States on this important occasion.

The theme of your convention—American-Israel friendship—is one with which I believe an overwhelmingly majority of our fellow-Americans would wish to be identified; for the task of creating understanding and promoting friendship between our country and other free nations throughout the world is one of the supreme challenges to Americans at this moment in our country's history. If we are to discharge successfully the tremendous responsibility which America has been called upon to assume in our generation—the obligation to lead the free world toward security, progress and peace—it is imperative that our life should be correctly interpreted to our friends of other lands and that their hopes and aspirations should be fully explained to us.

The young State of Israel stands high on the list of nations whose friendship is of great importance to the American Government and people. The significance of that friendship is not to be measured by Israel's size and numbers, although that country's strategic location and the high caliber of its population are no doubt weighty factors which must be recognized. It is the spirit that animates Israel that is of primary importance to us. We see in Israel a pilot-plant of American ideas in an area of the world that sorely needs these concepts, a striving after goals that are similar to our own.

I recently found striking evidence of this in a field in which I find myself continually occupied, the area of constitutional law. I have had occasion to read a fascinating account of four cases, involving important constitutional questions of law, which recently came before the Supreme Court of Israel. The central fact that emerged from this paper by Judge Cheshin, Deputy President of Israel's Supreme Court, is that Israel's still-evolving system of justice not only shows a close affinity for our American system, but often utilizes opinions delivered throughout the years by the Supreme Court of the United States. No one who is close to the legal procedures of our Nation can fail to be both proud and inspired by what I have just described. This trend augurs well for the citizens of Israel and the protection of their rights. It also reflects the continued vigor and health of our American legal system.

As the chief legal officer of this country, I am naturally interested in comparative law. I am mindful that the Talmudic law has contributed to our own. During all the time that the Jews formed communities in one country after another, often only to be expelled, the elaboration of the Talmud continued. This was, and is, a manifestation of the creative spirit of Israel.

I am also aware, sympathetically aware, of the complex structure of the law in Israel, consisting, as it does, of the law of the old Ottoman Empire, the British Mandatory law, and the laws enacted by the new state. In addition, each religious community applies its own laws to all matters affecting personal status, such as marriage and divorce, guardianship and alimony.

This complicated structure of laws is undoubtedly cumbersome. The Government of Israel long has recognized the necessity of developing a new legal system for Israel. It is approaching this momentous task in a manner which has impressed me from the beginning and which I have spoken of before. It manifests not only a creative spirit, but also a flexibility which is characteristic of youth, strength, and growth.

About 3 years ago the Ministry of Justice of Israel joined with Harvard Law School in the establishment of the Harvard Law School-Israel Cooperative Research project, supported by voluntary funds. Harvard University, on its part, has made available the resources of its outstanding Library of Comparative Law and the scholarly advice of its staff. But it has done more. It has enlisted the active participation of scholars from many other leading American law schools and is expanding their participation. On its part, Israel has provided representatives of the Ministry of Justice and experts in Hebrew and in jurisprudence. In no sense, of course, are laws for Israel being drafted at the Harvard Law School-Israel Cooperative Research project center. What is being done is the collection and organization of the infinite variety of information necessary to enable the Knesseth, Israel's legislative body, to draft the new code in the light of complete knowledge.

This approach to this problem, which has such huge importance, is of particular significance in this day and age. How good it is to see scholarly cooperation across continents in creating means to enable men and women to live in peace and confidence.

I have no doubt that from this present effort new concepts may arise. They will take their place along with the many gifts which the legal minds of Israel have bestowed upon the philosophy of the law. I believe that when the work of Harvard is utilized by the Knesseth, it will carry with it the conviction that ultimate good and justice can be achieved through peaceful cooperation with neighboring nations.

I am interested not only in the development of the law of Israel, but as a member of the Cabinet I have watched with admiration Israel's growth among the community of nations in almost every area of human endeavor—in science, industry, literature, and other areas of mankind's never-ending struggle for progress. There is already a great deal of traffic over the American-Israel "Friendship Bridge." As time goes on, I am convinced, this will increasingly become a two-way movement, for we will surely have much to learn from a people that has produced the ethical values that are held in common by all Americans, particularly after this people has resumed its normal existence in its ancestral homeland. This close collaboration extends to the most important areas of scientific research. All of us were gratified to hear of the atomic energy agreement recently concluded between the United States and Israel. The promise of nuclear energy means much to Israel where natural resources are sparse. The prospect of Israel's scientific genius being brought to bear on the peaceful use of atomic energy means much to the United States and to free people everywhere. In dealing with the question of this two-way bridge between the United States and Israel, I wish to express my hearty congratulations to the Zionist Organization of America, whose current work in this field is no less important than the historic role it played in the creation of the State of Israel.

Now, I am persuaded that in our relations with Israel, any differences which may arise from time to time will undoubtedly be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both countries. Occasional differences are bound to arise between the friendliest of nations, and the Government of the United States has encountered this even in its dealings with its closest allies. But where there are strong ties of mutual interest, identity of outlook, and common aspirations, the disagreements are bound to be temporary. The geographic distance between the Potomac and Jordan Rivers may be great, but there is certainly little difference in spirit between the two countries. I, therefore, firmly believe that our initial premise is that Israel's destiny will remain linked with that of the United States of America.

I know that the continuing tension between Israel and her neighbors figures prominently in your deliberations at this convention. The absence of peace between Israel and the Arab States certainly provides ample reason for concern. The Government of the United States is not only mindful of the urgency of the problem, but is actively seeking to bring about a solution. This was recently clearly expressed by President Eisenhower. In his message requesting congressional approval for the new mutual security program, the President stated:

"The continuing tension between the Arab States and Israel handicaps the people of all Near East nations. We should continue to work with the governments and peoples of both sides to improve their economic status and accelerate their progress toward lasting peace between them. Our cooperation is beginning to bring results, particularly in the development of water resources. Such developments in the Palestine area can go far to remove present causes of tension."

This Government is determined to move forward in the spirit reflected in the President's message and we shall persist in our efforts until we have achieved the peace which is required in the region by all those who seek to achieve a free world, and without which neither Israel nor the Arab States will be able to prosper. The issues of the Arab-Israel conflict can be resolved through patience and understanding. It is the task of everyone to recognize this and to work toward it.

By continuing our economic and technical assistance to both Israel and the Arab States and by raising living standards throughout the region, we shall be doing much to bring peace to the area. With respect to our planning for regional defense, I should like to say this:

The United States Government, I assure you, is not unmindful of Israel's security and the protection and welfare of its people. It is our hope and our desire that area defense arrangements will develop through which all countries in the area can contribute toward their mutual protection against aggression from the Communist menace. This is definitely in our own interest and represents a major element in our policy for the Middle East and for strengthening the defense of the free world.

Mine Drainage for Northeastern Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader Evening News of Saturday, July 2, 1955, on the mine drainage program for northeastern Pennsylvania.

VALLEY VIEWS

(By Harrison Smith)

FACE LIFTING FOR VALLEY

Wyoming Valley, as well as the other communities within the four mining districts of northeastern Pennsylvania, will be in line for a "face-lifting" operation of such magnitude that it will be without parallel in the history of mining, if the present Federal aid bill to assume a share of a $17 million mine drainage program is passed by the full United States House committee.

This week, with Governor Leader's signature, full approval was given for Pennsylvania's share in the mammoth undertaking, amounting to an appropriation of $8½ million, which is one-half the estimated funds required for the work. The plan culminates years of study by engineers of local mining companies and the State as to the measures

necessary to fight the general mine flood problem in the anthracite region which has become increasingly worse in recent years due to additional mine shutdowns.

It is estimated that the proposed overall project will provide jobs for up to 3,000 men throughout the northern district, incuding Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties, as well as the two middle districts and the southern fields.

LUZERNE GETS MAJOR SHARE

The main plan includes more than 100 major projects throughout the entire area, of which nearly one-half will be allocated for Luzerne county. Largest portion of the joint appropriation is earmarked for the backfilling and grading of mine stripping areas, mainly on the mountain sides, which have been eyesores in this community for decades.

According to initial estimates, approximately 40 million cubic yards of fill will be required to level off these scarred and torn faces along the mountainous slopes which have long acted as funnels for surface runoff waters, carrying underground a continuous volume causing seepage through rock strata and abandoned workings to coal measures being currently operated.

Other phases of the contemplated engineering plan include the construction and realinement of earth ditches and sluiceways to direct the flow of surface waters into the Susquehanna and its tributary creeks; erection of culverts; bypassing of cave-holes with flumes, and drilling of drainage tunnels within the mines, as well as pumping out abandoned workings.

Moreover, these provisions preventing underground seepage of surface water will curtail to a great extent the amount of acid waters which now find their way into the Susquehanna and its tributaries, causing great damage to fish and aquatic life.

REDUCED PUMPING COSTS

On the economic side, the proposed mine drainage plan is expected to provide a larger measure of security for coal miners presently employed through means of reduced operating costs. The present average requirement of 54 tons of water pumped for every ton of coal mined, which in itself is the cost equivalent of 90 cents per ton, is expected to be reduced from 36 to 40 percent, thus alleviating a burden which has been constantly growing in mine operating costs during the past 10 years.

The present plan, which has been developed in final form during the last 18 months through cooperation of coal company engineering staffs with engineers of Pennsylvania Department of Mines, with local supervision being directed by Deputy Secretary Daniel Connelly, of Kingston, is a successor to a proposal to the Federal Government following World War II to construct a 13-foot diameter tunnel from Olyphant to Conowingo, Md., a distance of 147 miles, which was abandoned not only due to its excessive costs, but because it would not provide a practical solution to the present mine pumping problem.

SUPPORT BILL NEEDED

Full support of this mine drainage program should be given at once by this community to focus attention on the need and significance of the plan. Members of the House committee in Washington, who are scheduled to decide within the near future whether to recommend to the Congress that the Federal Government's share in the program be appropriated, should be immediately apprised of the situation. Local backing of the project should come not only from the coal interests and United Mine Workers, who stand to benefit directly from the program, but also from community leaders who have long been interested in making Wyoming Valley a more attractive place to visit and in which to reside by removing the scars of its mining industry, putting this wasteland to use again and ridding the streams and creeks of acid mine waters.

Public Law 51

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a detailed analysis of Public Law 51, the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act of 1955, prepared on my request by Elizabeth Elward, American Law Division, Legislative Reference Service, and which I wish to share with my colleagues for study and ready reference:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC LAW 51, 84TH CONGRESS

(Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1956)

Title I—Treasury Department

Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$2,680,000
Bureau of Accounts:	
Salaries and expenses	2,600,000
Division of Disbursement, salaries and expenses	15,475,000
Total, Bureau of Accounts	18,075,000
Bureau of the Public Debt	44,500,000
Office of Treasurer, United States: Salaries and expenses	15,000,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	41,200,000
Internal Revenue Service: Salaries and expenses	282,250,000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	2,990,000
U. S. Secret Service:	
Salaries and expenses	2,960,000
Salaries and expenses, White House Police	800,000
Salaries and expenses, Guard Force	268,000
Total, U. S. Secret Service	4,028,000
Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	3,650,000
U. S. Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	153,750,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	7,000,000
Retired pay	21,300,000
Reserve training	3,175,000
Total, Coast Guard	185,225,000
Total, title I—Treasury Department	599,598,000
Federal Facilities Corporation	[1] (800,000)
Liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation	[1] (1,400,000)
Total	[1] (2,200,000)

Title II—Post Office Department

Administration	$15,500,000
Operations	1,870,000,000
Transportation	661,620,500
Finance	17,200,000
Facilities	157,400,000
Total, title II, Post Office Department	2,721,720,500

Title III—The Tax Court of the United States

Salaries and expenses	$1,170,000
Total, title III, The Tax Court of the United States	1,170,000
Grand total appropriations, titles I, II, and III	3,322,488,500

[1] Authorized expenditures.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Treasury Department

(a) Makes available from travel expenses the expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the applicable appropriation is made.

(b) Authorizes appropriations necessary for the care and treatment of Halsford V. Sharpe as authorized by Private Law 419, 83d Congress.

Post Office Department

(a) Makes expenses of attendance at certain meetings available from any funds at the disposal of the Post Office Department.

(b) Authorizes the use of up to $100,000 during the current fiscal year for training programs from available funds.

(c) Authorizes the use of up to $12 million from available funds for property improvement.

Contains antistrike provisions.

ELIZABETH ELWARD,
American Law Division.

JUNE 16, 1955.

South Carolina Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the dim view of the proposed upper Colorado storage project taken by the voters of South Carolina is well expressed in the following editorials which appeared in the Dillon Herald on May 13, the Charleston Post on May 10, the Beshopville Messenger on May 5, and the Bamberg Herald on May 26:

WE DON'T NEED MORE LAND

A bill is before the Congress to spend billions on what is known as the upper Colorado River Basin project. The purpose of the bill is to develop more land at a cost that runs as high as $1,000 per acre. But what we don't need is more cleared land. Mechanized and scientific farming are producing a surplus of food and fiber and the South alone is able to produce enough of these necessities to feed the world. But the most amazing feature of this fantastic proj-

ect is that the greater portion of these millions will have to come out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

ANOTHER ATTEMPTED RAID ON TREASURY

Irresponsibility is a mild word for the action of the Senate majority which recently voted for one of the most wasteful projects in the history of boondoggling.

It is the upper Colorado River scheme, as sorry a piece of business as has ever soaked the American taxpayer.

At a cost of millions upon millions of dollars it is proposed by the sponsors of this wild program to build a series of dams on the upper Colorado River. The claim is it would impound water for irrigating many acres of arid western lands; also that it would provide hydroelectric power.

So it would, but at a price that would make the development fantastically extravagant. It is estimated that the cost of irrigation would be at least $900 an acre—and the land thus watered would then be worth only $150 an acre, producing only 10 cents worth of products for each thousand gallons of water.

The arithmetic of it is so plain that a graded school child could see how preposterous the scheme is. Yet we find mature men approving it regardless of how economically unjustified it is. The scheme is being advanced at a time when Government warehouses are bulging with huge crop surpluses, when existing farmlands are producing on a scale vastly exceeding demand. If the project is adopted, it will be a matter of more subsidization to be added to handouts that are already a heavy burden upon the taxpayers.

Another consideration arguing against the project is that the dams would flood the noted Dinosaur National Monument and other beauty spots which conservationists wish to preserve.

South Carolina's two Senators voted for an amendment to exclude a dam that would mean the flooding of Dinosaur Park. The motion failed, then they split. Senator JOHNSTON voted for the project as a whole, Senator THURMOND opposed it. In doing so the latter championed the interests of the taxpayers and of the Nation generally. It will be a costly experience for the country if this attempted raid on the Treasury isn't turned back.

NO MORE LAND IS NEEDED AT PRESENT TIME

Congress has before it a bill for a proposed upper Colorado River Basin project. It has been figured out that this project, if it is started, will cost the taxpayers of South Carolina an estimated $34,400,000 in additional taxes. The few acres of desert land made available for planting by such a project are not needed at the present time and probably never will be needed. As it is, there is a surplus of farm crops at the present time. Added acres to agriculture—at a huge reclamation cost—would increase the surplus.

If Uncle Sam wants additional acres to reclaim—and at a less cost—we are sure that South Carolinians can point out quite a few sandhills which would possibly blossom if they had sufficient water.

No, we are against any more projects like that mentioned above. We believe tax money can be spent to better advantage for other things.

WHERE OUR MONEY GOES

Billions of dollars are proposed to be spent by Uncle Sam on what is known as the upper Colorado River Basin project. If Congress follows its usual procedure, approval will finally be given to the project although, judging from what has been published, it will cost something like $1,000 per acre to develop or reclaim the farmland by irrigation. And, unless land values in that area are far different from this section of the country, the land so developed would not be worth much more than a tenth of the cost.

The Alcohol Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Alcohol Researches at Yale," written by Thomas R. Henry and published in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, July 4, 1955; and a letter I received from Dr. Ole Stalheim, of Vermillion, S. Dak., which brings to our attention once again the entire liquor problem, which we have ignored too long.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALCOHOL RESEARCHES AT YALE

(By Thomas R. Henry)

Beer is not intoxicating—mathematically. Such is the conclusion of Dr. Leon A. Greenberg, associate professor of physiology at Yale. It's almost, if not quite, impossible to drink enough beer to put enough alcohol in the blood to constitute legal drunkenness, he has reported to the Yale Laboratory of Applied Physiology, center of alcohol studies in this country.

Dr. Greenberg's report has just been published in the Quarterly Journal of Studies of Alcohol—but before publication it was submitted for comment to a philosopher, a school superintendent, a psychiatrist, and a lawyer. They came back with somewhat conflicting views.

DRUNKENNESS DEFINED

The results of many studies, Dr. Greenberg says, are in general agreement that, except in quite unusual individuals, a concentration of alcohol in the blood of at least .15 of 1 percent is necessary to affect a person's behavior to a degree constituting intoxication. From this basis he draws up a "fingerprint of alcoholism" for the three class of drinks—hard liquors, wines, and beer.

For hard liquor, of course, there is no question. Almost anybody can drink enough of it in a relatively short time to be "drunk" in anybody's judgment. Mathematically, it's a little more complicated.

Says Dr. Greenberg: "In the average person the amount of alcohol required to cause a concentration in the blood of .15 of 1 percent is 8 fluid ounces. Thus a half pint of whisky consumed at once may cause intoxication. But beverages usually are consumed over a period of time and, since alcohol disappears from the body at an appreciable rate, the time spent in drinking must be taken into consideration. The rate of elimination is practically uniform and is equivalent to about 1 ounce of distilled spirits per hour.

"Thus to achieve intoxication in 2 hours of drinking, 10 ounces are required and, if the drinking lasts 4 hours, 12 ounces."

For fortified wines containing 20 percent alcohol the amount contained in a pint must be present in the body to cause an intoxicating concentration in the blood. The rate of elimination is equivalent to 2 ounces each hour. Thus a pint and a half must be consumed in 4 hours to cause intoxication, according to Dr. Greenberg's formula.

For ordinary wine containing about 10 percent alcohol a quart is necessary to make one drunk—if consumed at once. In 4 hours of drinking it would require a quart and three-fourths to reach the same effect.

Thus, Dr. Greenberg says, it would be quite possible, although rather unusual, for one to get mathematically soused on wines.

Beer, however, seldom contains more than 3.7 percent alcohol. It would require approximately 2½ quarts, consumed in a very short time, to get the average person tight. In experiments it is shown, Dr. Greenberg explains, that drinking a bottle of beer every half hour for 8 consecutive hours—a total of about 6 quarts—brings the average man to the edge of intoxication, although seldom completely over the line.

Forced drinking at a much faster rate is practically impossible. The drinker gets sick before he gets drunk.

TESTS CONTRADICT EXCUSES

The primary purpose of the experiments was not to encourage beer drinking but rather to offset the frequent explanation given to wives and policemen: "I've only had 2 or 3 beers."

Also quite valid, Dr. Greenberg says, is the contention that the alcohol in beer may create an appetite for hard liquor and a few bottles may mark the start of a prolonged drunk. He doesn't approve of beer for anybody with a strong alcohol craving.

But, comments Dr. Albion R. King, professor of philosophy at Cornell: "The formulas compiled by Dr. Greenberg simply make more graphic what everybody knows—that it takes more drinking to get tight on beer than whisky."

"The formulas leave out of consideration the very important health status of the individual which is a very important factor," observes Dr. Frank J. O'Brien, associate superintendent of schools of New York City. They give "a meaning to the word 'intoxication' which would cover only a small proportion of those who would be called drunk if the currently prevailing use of the word were to continue," declares Dr. Harry M. Tiebout, psychiatrist of the Connecticut Commission on Alcoholism.

The formulas, however, should bring about less ambiguous definitions of drunkenness in future legislation, says Dr. George H. Dession, Yale law professor.

VERMILLION, S. DAK., *June 17, 1955.*

WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: June 5, a local known drunkard, convicted three times of drunken driving, was returning to his farm after drinking beer in our town all day on the Sabbath; he veered into the path of a family from Atlanta, Ga., with the result that the parents were killed. He also died.

Details can be furnished by the local police of motor patrol.

Please continue your fight to control this.

Yours truly,

OLE STALHEIM.

H. R. 7117

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under

consideration the bill (H. R. 7117) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of $5 million. It provides for an extension of the Capitol. It authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of a commission composed of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the minority leader of the Senate, and the minority leader of the House, to, among other things, "provide for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol" * * * "but with such modifications and additions, including provisions for restaurant facilities, and such other facilities in the Capitol Grounds," and so forth.

The amendment just offered is to strike out the word "restaurant," the comma following the word "facilities," and insert the words, "for the feeding of Members of the House, their guests, and their employees."

Mr. Chairman and my dear colleagues, we all know that for 10 years or more the Members and their guests have been herded down on the first floor of the corridor adjoining the House Restaurant, like sheep waiting to be herded into a new and lush pasture. It is nothing unusual for Members and their guests to wait as long as a half an hour in order to obtain an opportunity to sit down for a few moments, hurriedly snatch something to eat, drink a cup of scalding coffee, and then to again be herded out.

This is not a criticism of those in charge, for all of us are anxious and impatient to be seated, and we know that if we linger over our food or attempt to visit with a constituent, others, usually impatient are waiting to take our places.

Because our constituents judge us not only by what they see from the gallery, but from what they observe around the Capitol, we are subject to an unfair impression when they note the discourtesy which they, as our guests, are subjected to when we ask them to lunch at the House restaurant.

It is all very well for some to talk about maintaining the dignity of the House, but if we cannot provide suitable and adequate facilities where we can get food which is necessary if we are to carry on our duties, where we can entertain, as we are under obligation to do, those who elect us, those who furnish the funds to run this Government, in a dignified, respectable manner, naturally our constituents, as they visit us, wonder if we are competent to transact the Nation's business, whether we are competent to handle our own.

You will note this provision in the bill that a restaurant should be established. Well, we have a restaurant, and from past experience I want no more of a House-type restaurant. I have had more than enough of that. What assurance have we that if this change is to be left to the decision of those named in the bill—and the same officials have been in charge for the last 20 years or more—we will not get a diner, a snack bar, a hole-in-the-wall, a continuance of the present facilities. The expression "facilities for feeding" is not an elegant expression, and if someone in conference wants to make the language more appropriate, such a change, I am sure, will be welcomed by every Member of the House.

On the west side of the Capitol, facing the mall, is an unused space, three floors deep.

There is ample room for a ground floor, well-ventilated, sanitary kitchen. There is ample room for a cafeteria, for a restaurant, and for a dining room, all of which might well reflect credit upon the Congress or which might give our constituents, who are taxed so heavily for the maintenance of their Government, an opportunity to dine, to consult with their Representatives here in Washington, to view the reflecting pool, the Washington and Lincoln Monuments, and to sit back and reflect that here, indeed, is the Capitol of one of the greatest nations in the world, where the Government's business will, they hope, be carried on efficiently.

There are some 42 or more cafeterias in Government buildings. In some of the buildings there are private dining rooms. In none, so far as I know, are the dining facilities of the employees and those whose presence is required by their official duties, as cramped, as unsanitary, as inadequate, as are those in the Capitol.

My great admiration for the ability of those under whose direction this change will be made is unlimited. But, if a suggestion may be made, it would be that the Speaker and the minority leader in the House consult with some southern mammy or Yankee housewife when they give consideration to the ways and means and the manner of providing food for the Members of the House, House employees, and their guests.

The suggested facility is one which, adequately managed, would return at least a nominal profit to the Government. Lest there be misunderstanding, permit me to add, I am not thinking of myself. I can carry a paper sack or I can go to the grocery, as I have done some times in the past, get a package of cheese and crackers, and get along without too much discomfort.

Calumet Sag: A Stimulant to a Dynamic National Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the solid delegation from Illinois, comprising all the Democratic and all the Republican Members, has sponsored the Calumet-Sag project as vital to the interest of the great Middle Western area especially and in a large sense to the interest of all sections of the Nation. The newspapers of Chicago and of other cities in Illinois with equal unanimity and zeal have proclaimed this development as essential to the progress of the Middle West and the dynamic contribution to the economy of the Nation that will result.

The Army engineers, who have given years of study to the subject, have voiced their approval and their recommendation.

Following a White House conference with the President by a bipartisan representation of the Illinois congressional delegation, the Bureau of the Budget gave its endorsement, and an appropriation of $4 million for immediate commencement of the work so vitally demanded and so strongly recommended was included in the appropriation bill passed by this body.

That a so-called task force at this late day should come up with a report questioning the findings and the judgment of men of the highest prestige and of the greatest experience came as a surprise to the people and the press of Chicago. It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to attempt at this time a search for the motivation. Suffice to point out the facts, and that my colleagues may know the facts I am extending my remarks to include the following statement:

COMMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE TASK FORCE OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION IN RELATION TO THE CAL-SAG PROJECT

The conclusions of the so-called task-force report of the Hoover Commission are not only unsupported by facts, but are contrary to well-established facts. For this reason the parties[1] submitting the original statement to the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, and to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations are obliged to comment as follows:

1. The task force asserts that "the estimate of 3,979,000 tons of coal being shipped through the channel is unrealistic, metallurgical coal will continue to be shipped by rail and lake steamer, coal shipments for heat and power will not be diverted because powerplants are not on the channel, and there is a trend toward building powerplants near sources of coal."

It is a well-established fact that generating plants favor locality of use rather than source of raw materials. It is cheaper to ship coal than to acquire property, erect towers, string lines, and suffer loss of energy in transmission. Moreover, generating plants must be situated near water, since to produce power several hundred pounds of condensing water are required to each one pound of coal.

The task force is equally wrong in its assertion that "powerplants are not on the channel." The Calumet station of Commonwealth Edison Co. is on the Cal-Sag Channel. In addition, the State Line station of the same company, where expansion is badly needed, while on Lake Michigan proper, is nevertheless in the Calumet area and is served by Cal-Sag. Moreover, the power requirements of the tremendous productive area served by this essential utility call for a doubling of generating capacity within the next 10 years. This can be done cheaper and more efficiently by prompt development of the Cal-Sag Channel.

[1] Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee, Inc., International Association of Machinists, AFL, and Joseph Germano, district director, United Steelworkers of America, CIO.

The task force states that "metallurgical coal will continue to be shipped by rail and lake steamer." The significant fact is that the Nation's economy is better off when there is full utilization of resources. If coal can be shipped cheaper and more efficiently as a result of the widening of Cal-Sag, the economy of the Nation will profit, as will great numbers of users of electrical energy, miners, and mine operators. The assertion that coal will continue to be shipped by rail or steamer is an assumption which is contrary to the universally accepted economic precept that the most efficient means to produce or transport should be, and in time are usually adopted.

The Task Force assertion that "the estimate of 3,979,000 tons of coal being shipped through the channel is unrealistic" is also erroneous. One company alone (Commonwealth Edison Co.) ships approximately 5 million tons of coal per year on the Illinois Waterway. The proposed additional unit at the State Line station would use an additional 750,000 tons of coal per year; and the required expansion of generating capacity in the Chicago area, to say nothing of the gigantic coal requirements of the steel industry of the Calument area, likewise undergoing great expansion, demonstrate that the estimates deemed to be unrealistic by the Task Force are in fact underestimation.[2]

2. The Task Force states that "little oil would be shipped through the channel because the Chicago area is served by a network of pipelines." We refer the Task Force to pages 54 and 55 of our original statement, where it is stated as follows:

"Crude oil for refining in Metropolitan Chicago comes in principally by pipeline from Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, although some comes by barge. On the other hand, Indiana Harbor is by far the most important petroleum shipping port on the Great Lakes. In 1951, from that harbor were shipped 5,377,000 tons of petroleum products, all but 27,000 tons of which moved lakewise. The 27,000 tons moved via the Calumet River and the Chicago River to points along the Lakes-to-Gulf Waterway, in spite of the hazards of open lake navigation by inland waterway barges. With a direct connection between the wharves of the oil refineries along the Indiana Harbor Canal and the inland waterway system via the Grand Calument River and the Calumet-Sag Channel, there is little doubt that substantial additional tonnages would move. On the other hand, there is a substantial movement of up-bound petroleum products on the Illinois Lakes-to-Gulf Waterway from refineries on the lower river system to tank terminals along the Calumet-Sag Channel at Blue Island and along the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal west of Chicago. If a direct barge route were provided to the Indiana Harbor area, a substantial volume of refined petroleum traffic would probably develop from points on the lower Mississippi River, because of the concentration of storage and distribution facilities in the Indiana portion of the Calumet district."

3. The Task Force asserts that "if there are any savings in grain shipments they will be absorbed by grain brokers and barge operators rather than by farmers."

The crassness and cynicism of this statement are beneath the dignity and intelligence of the commission and its task force. It assumes that all grain brokers and barge operators are wholly selfish and that farmers are unable to demand and choose the most favorable means of transportation. No reasonable person is willing to concede these assumptions. We refer the task force to page 33 of our statement, where it is said:

"It [Chicago] is also the port nearest to the agricultural heart of the continent—the Corn Belt and the Wheat Belt—and therefore is in the best position to handle the agricultural produce of that area. In all ports of the world, experience has demonstrated that freighters will penetrate as far inlind as physically possible, in order to pick up and deliver cargoes which benefit from the longest possible transport by the largest possible transport units: ships, which produce lower ton-mile transport costs than do any overland carriers."

One company (Glidden Co.) has already announced plans for a 6 million bushel grain elevator on the Calumet River, and elevators of 13 million bushel capacity are to be provided by the Chicago Port District Authority on Lake Calumet, the terminus of the first stage of the Cal-Sag project. Such expenditures alone are ample proof of the disposition of farmers to make use of the cheapest and most efficient means of transport.

The task force states that "last September the District Army Engineers estimated traffic in the improved channel would total 8,648,000 tons a year, and that transportation savings would be $2.04 a ton. The savings estimate was 4 times that of 1946 and the tonnage estimate about $1 more than earlier estimates, and therefore the validity of the estimates is open to question."

No facts in denial of current estimates are cited—rather, the task force attempts to cast doubt on the entire project, because its economic value allegedly was underestimated in the past. The postwar industrial expansion of the Calumet district in particular has been astonishing, and according to announced plans for expansion in the steel, petroleum and other industries in this industrial section alone, even current estimates will be greatly exceeded 2 or 3 years hence.

We again take the liberty to quote from our original statement (p. 65):

"In view of the postwar industrial expansion in the Calumet district, the tremendous increases in inland waterway traffic generally, the prospects for further industrial growth, and hence of growth in potential traffic volume on the Calumet-Sag Channel and its authorized extension, the prospects of the St. Lawrence seaway and its major terminal directly on the Calumet-Sag route with accompanying potential industrial growth as well as the prospects for direct ocean vessel-barge transfer of cargoes in Lake Calumet, it is apparent that, even though the estimated costs of the Calumet-Sag project have substantially increased since the time of its authorization in 1946, the potential benefits have also very substantially increased. Not only are the original estimates of traffic volume far behind present actuality, but, because of general increases in transport costs, the savings from low-cost water transportation have at least proportionately increased entirely aside from the increased potential volume of traffic."

CONCLUSION

The general method of attack of the task force is isolated criticism in general terms on minor points without recourse to facts. This is beneath the dignity and reputation for accurate factfinding of the Hoover Commission. We raise the question whether the view of the task force is based on the narrow concept that vested interests must not be disturbed even though the total national good dictates otherwise.

The need of the Nation to improve the efficiency of its productive system, the need to acquire a reservoir of transportation facilities in critical areas for national-defense purposes, and the need to achieve full utilization of our economic resources are all overlooked by the so-called task force.

Likewise the task force overlooks the fact that the Cal-Sag project benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.6 to 1[3] is the highest and most favorable from the Government's point of view of any public-works project in this general classification.

Finally, the project has great job-making potentials, and through industrial expansion may be expected to return large additional sums to the Federal Treasury in the form of income taxes on corporations and other firms, and on personal incomes and other taxes.

The project will contribute substantially to a proper allocation of resources, distribution of income, and full resource utilization. It will be a stimulant to the dynamic characteristics of our national economy. From every point of view it will contribute to the total national good.

THE CAL-SAG WATERWAYS DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE, INC.,
HENRY E. SEYFARTH, *Chairman.*
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, AFL,
P. L. SIEMILLER, *District Director*
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO,
JOSEPH GERMANO,

[2] The authority for the foregoing factual statements is John W. Evers, Jr., president of Commonwealth Edison Co. and president of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

[3] This estimate of benefit-to-cost ratio was made by the U. S. Army engineers in 1946, based upon 1932 traffic figures. Since those dates both the costs and the benefits have increased substantially. The 2.6 to 1 figure is a very conservative estimate in the light of present knowledge and recent and prospective developments, according to Harold M. Mayer, economic geographer, University of Chicago.

Washington Post Joins Parade of Distinguished Newspapers Supporting Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, another major newspaper has reexamined the upper Colorado River storage project in the light of the House bill, which omits Echo Park Dam. As in every case where this project is investigated on the basis of fact, the editors have found that the inflated cost figures being promulgated by southern California are false.

Following is an editorial urging authorization of the project from the July 5 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald:

SHEARED COLORADO PROJECT

In approving the $760 million upper Colorado River project the other day, the House Interior Committee struck out all reference to the proposed Echo Park Dam. It recognized that Echo Park has become a rallying cry for conservationists who fear that a dam at that site in the Dinosaur National Monument would stand as a precedent for encroachment upon the national parks. So the Echo Park Dam was abandoned by its sponsors to save the project as a whole. This appears to be a wise solution, whatever view one may take of the Echo Park project, for there are strong indications that the dream

of developing the upper Colorado was headed for the rocks if the crucial vote should come on the conservation issue.

The committee went so far as to strike out a provision authorizing the President to appoint a commission to study and report on the Echo Park project and possible substitutes. This seems to us a mistake. Last April we suggested that the upper Colorado River development be authorized without Echo Park and that a body of experts be created to determine whether suitable alternative dam sites are available. We still think that would be a good solution. Apparently, however, the Interior Committee feared that this would be interpreted as an effort to bring in Echo Park by the back door at a later date.

Certainly the important thing at present is to get the major project underway. The conservation of water in the semiarid country through which the Green and Yampa Rivers and other streams of the Colorado system flow is necessary to the normal development of large parts of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Arizona. The waters of the river have been equally divided between the upper basin and lower basin States. Only by storing large quantities of water behind dams in the upper basin will it be possible for that area to supply the water quota of the lower basin and at the same time retain water for its own requirements.

The bill sent to the House is a conservation measure in the largest sense of the word. Our water resources are so vital to the Nation that many billions will have to be spent for their development in the decades ahead. It would be difficult to point to any area where the need for large-scale efforts is more urgent than in the basin of the upper Colorado.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*——3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*——
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Religious Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD his remarks concerning a sermon delivered by Rev. John H. Haldeman, entitled "Religious Liberty," together with the sermon referred to.

There being no objection, the remarks and sermon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

It was my very great privilege to attend on July 3, the Sunday services at the Allapattah Baptist Church, the largest Baptist church in the South.

At those services my very dear and able friend, Rev. John H. Haldeman, delivered a most enlightening and inspiring sermon entitled "Religious Liberty." Dr. Haldeman, who is vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention, pointed out the relationship and dependence which exist between political freedom and religious freedom.

Because this sermon was delivered the day prior to the 179th birthday of our Republic, it was indeed most timely. I was gratified that I was able to hear this marvelous talk and regretted that there were not more who could enjoy and be moved by it. I am confident that Members of the Senate will read this important speech with great profit and enjoyment and for that reason I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

(Sermon delivered by Dr. John H. Haldeman, pastor of the Allapattah Baptist Church and vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention, Sunday, July 3, 1955)

Liberty—soul liberty, political liberty—has challenged the deepest devotion of its devotees through the ages. One of the most militant battle signals in all history is the signal for liberty. This battle played a major part in colonizing America and building here a great Nation. It was the cause of religious liberty that ignited that magic movement—and swayed, solidified, and molded it into a mighty empire. This cause was written in blood on the banners of revolutions, on the altars of martyrdom, in constitutions of government, and in struggle of churches so deeply that it awakened a new consciousness in mankind.

The cause of religious liberty has called forth orations of surpassing eloquence; its bewitching cause has led statesmen to enact laws which have blessed humanity; it has inspired the sweetest symphonies of music; it has caused a new sunrise for humanity; it has borne burdens too heavy for finite man, and breathed prayers burning with compassion out of hearts throbbing for humanity's highest good. Its followers are too numerous to be recorded and too heroic to be forgotten. They have tasted the bitter dregs of damp dungeons, the hate and cruelty of the scaffold. They have also sipped the sweetest amenities of life.

America is a demonstration that a free nation cannot be stricken down as long as she is guarded by free churches.

May we notice first, the principles; second, the protagonists; third, the propagation of religious liberty.

I. THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

1. One bedrock principle of religious liberty is freedom of conscience.

Dr. Philip Schaff said, "Religious liberty is the natural, fundamental, and inalienable right of every man. It is founded on the sacredness of conscience, which is the voice of God in man, and above the reach and control of human authority. There is a law above all human laws. It is not written on parchment, and tables of stone, but on the heart of man by the finger of God—'We must obey God rather than man.'"

God alone is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to impose itself between man and God. Liberty of conscience requires liberty of worship as its manifestation.

Religious liberty goes much further than mere toleration. It rests upon the inalienable right of every man. With us this is conviction, not a contrivance. To this end our forefathers have fought, suffered, bled and died that all persons, of all faiths, in all the world might be free to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. We would say with one in another day—"I may not believe a word you utter, but I would go to the death for your right to say it." Religious liberty is more than a license. It is a God-given right.

Dr. Philip Schaff said in 1889, "There is a wide difference in toleration and liberty. The one is a concession, the other is a right. The one is a matter of expediency, the other is a principle. The one is a gift of man, the other is the gift of God."

Dr. George W. Truett, whose clarion voice held thousands spellbound from the steps of the Capitol in Washington, and sounded a bugle call not only to Baptists but to all Christians everywhere, said: "It is the consistent and insistent contention of our Baptist people, always and everywhere, that religion must be forever voluntary and uncoerced, and that it is not the prerogative of any power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, to compel men to conform to any religious creed or form of worship or to pay taxes for the support of a religious organization to which they do not belong and in whose creed they do not believe. God wants free worshipers and no other kind."

Toleration is better than religious persecution, which results from the union of church and state, but it is a thousand times less desirable than religious liberty, which stems from fundamental principles.

2. Religious liberty rests also on the freedom of choice.

Freedom of choice would liberate all men everywhere from the thralldom and bondage of intolerance. Coercion will bind the minds of men with the shackles of slavery and subservience. Freedom of choice frees men from the corruptions of state churches. Where religious liberty is not found, spiritual thralldom is the rule. Here in America has been established the greatest haven of religious liberty known to the world.

3. Freedom of worship is another principle of religious liberty.

Roger Williams established in Rhode Island the first government in the world where there was complete separation of church and state. Here for the first time in all time men had the opportunity to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. Here soul liberty was guaranteed. Now multiplied millions of many faiths enjoy this priceless privilege. This principle fundamental and indispensable to man's highest welfare, has spread, radiating its blessings in the earth.

4. Religious liberty stems from the principle of freedom of the individual to read and interpret the Bible for himself.

We believe the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the rule of faith. Our one creed is the Bible; not customs, not councils, not confessions, not ecclesiastical formulas, not traditions, but the Bible.

Not only is the Bible to us an unerring guide, an inviolable trust, but to us all men are to be absolutely free to read and interpret its message for themselves. We hold that for any man or group of men to arrogate to themselves the sole right to interpret God's Word is an arrogance, the stench of which reaches to high heaven. This is dictatorship in religion. This is the foulest form of dictatorship. This coercion set over against freedom. This is absolutism set over against individualism. Under such system religion becomes a slavery to forms, traditions, and overlordship. Freedom to interpret the Bible for oneself breaks the paralyzing spell of tradition and glorifies the individual.

II. THE PROTAGONISTS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Through the centuries, our forefathers have been the chief protagonists of religious liberty. Their belief that the Bible is the unerring, infallible guide for men, their belief in the absolute right of the individual, in the lordship of Christ, and in the church as a complete democracy, had led them to pioneer in, be the chief promoters of, and the true protagonists of, religious liberty.

For the cause of religious liberty, our early fathers lived, suffered, bled, and died. Roger Williams was banished. Henry Dunster was removed from the presidency of Harvard; John Clark was put in prison; Obadiah Holmes was whipped on Boston Common, for his adherence to and propagation of religious liberty.

No pen can describe, no artist can paint, no speaker can tell the humiliation, the hardships, and the struggles of our early fathers in seeking to gain religious freedom for the world.

Removed far from the scenes of conflict, and never having experienced intolerance in religion—it is not easy for us to appreciate the terrific struggle for and the high privilege of religious liberty. Many of us have become so soft and have so far forgotten what this priceless heritage cost those who purchased it for us, that we have come to acquiesce in anything that masquerades under the name of religion. We have, too many of us, become static on this vitally live issue, tepid and apathetic in our attitude.

The rehearsal of a scene in a courtroom in Virginia should awaken us. Three ministers were arraigned before the bar of justice, indicted as disturbers of the peace. People thronged the courtroom. Patrick Henry was

the defending lawyer. He took the indictment from the officers of the law and made a plea which, for effective oratory, as well as for effect in getting the right decision, perhaps, has never been surpassed. When he reached his climax, he thrice reiterated the terrible offense of the three preachers. "These men, your honor, and gentlemen of the jury, are guilty of no less a crime than preaching the glorious gospel of the Son of God." Then waving the indictment over his head, he shouted, "Great God! Great God! Great God! Indicted for preaching the gospel of the Son of God."

James Madison became the political apostle, backing and defending those of his day in their struggles for legislation granting the right of religious liberty. The British statesman, John Bright, asked Dr. Curry what distinct contribution America had made to the science of government. Dr. Curry replied, "The doctrine of religious liberty." Bright replied, "And that is a tremendous contribution."

III. THE PROPAGATION OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

1. The need: Liberty is never safe.

Liberty, both civil and religious, must be propagated in order that it may be safeguarded. Another has said, "Liberty cannot pause." The principle of religious liberty must be held so dear, guarded so securely, and propagated so compassionately that its beauty may shine upon all the world. Our duty to propagate this blessing is obligatory. We must hold it as a trust inviolate.

2. The means: All the forces of our churches, schools, organizations, papers, legislators—forces small and great should be harnessed to propagate this basic principle. Just as we cannot, must not, dare not, isolate ourselves from the responsibility of this battered, bruised, bleeding, needy world—we must not shirk our task of propagating this fundamental principle. We cannot escape the needs of this bludgeoned world, nor can we evade its cry. We should make religious liberty the boon of all nations.

The pace of progress is the fastest where people are the freest. Our task is not only to free the world from the shackles of political tyranny, but also to free the world from the heathenish shambles of religious intolerance.

3. The end: We should say today about religious liberty what George H. Lorimer said years ago about liberty, generally: "From her hands you must unfasten every shackle, from her wings you must unloose every band, from her feet you must remove every dragging chain. If she is faint, you must revive her; if she is weak, you must strengthen her; if she is maligned, you must vindicate her. To this you must enrich her with knowledge, invigorate her with justice, and adorn her with beauty. Then from your side she will speed her way into ages you shall not see, and into lands you shall never tread, to bless them with her sublime philanthropy forever."

With Jesus we must declare: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Steel Plot Gets Out of Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, some interesting reports are coming through with reference to what will result from the recent boost in steel prices, and pointing to some of the backstage handling which has taken place. A very interesting article appeared in today's Washington Post and Times Herald, written by J. A. Livingston, in the column entitled "Business Outlook," and under the heading "Steel Plot Gets Out of Hand." If the facts related in the article are true, it is a very interesting discussion, and I think it is worthy of the attention of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS OUTLOOK

(By J. A. Livingston)

STEEL PLOT GETS OUT OF HAND

David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers, and John A. Stephens, vice president in charge of industrial relations at United States Steel Corp., are bad actors. They flubbed their parts.

McDonald used the script written for Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. And Stephens somehow got entangled with lines for John S. Bugas, vice president in charge of industrial relations at the Ford Motor Co.

Bugas and Reuther were supposed to have a knockdown, dragout fight, and a strike. Reuther was demanding the guaranteed annual wage. To him it was a matter of principle. Bugas was saying, "No," also as a matter of principle.

One of the smartest labor-management consultants I know predoped the Ford-NAW settlement in this way: "There's got to be a strike. Bugas can't yield on GAW until the Ford plants are down. At the same time, Reuther can't back down until his men are walking the streets. Then each can say, 'I was forced to make concessions.'"

To this expert, a strike was part of the face-saving hocus-pocus we have come to associate with labor-management relations, including the meetings in smoke-filled rooms until 3 a. m., the intemperate presettlement statements, the waiting reporters and photographers, and the final handshakes, smiles, and pats on backs.

But steel was to be different. The leading characters were to agree—John A. Stephens, well-dressed, dapper, the complete opposite of the fist-using, hard-cursing steel baron of the turn of the century; McDonald, tall, smooth, white-haired, and fatherly, the benign negotiator, thoroughly unlike the rough-and-tumble, brass-knuckles unioneer of sit-down-strike days, though he was part of that epoch and those episodes.

Of course, they'd argue. They'd issue statements of defiance. They'd have to prove their toughness, their mettle, their last-ditch fighting qualities. That's ritual.

But just before the midnight deadline, looking beaten down and brainwashed, they'd shake hands, pose for pictures, and sign. Union officials would triumphantly hoist McDonald to their shoulders. Hurray. Curtain.

Why this certainty of a peaceful settlement in steel as contrasted with the equal certainty of a strike in autos? Because:

1. McDonald is Reuther's bitter rival in the American labor movement. He's more conservative in political outlook than Reuther. The steel industry is not averse to building him up as a countervailing power to Reuther.

2. McDonald has enunciated a philosophy of "industrial cotrusteeship." Union leaders are trustees for workers. Management is trustee for the stockholders. They have an obligation to try to get along in the common interest of workers and shareholders. That philosophy is a lot more "simpatico" to the steel companies than some of the eternal-conflict ideas expressed by more militant Congress of Industrial Organizations leaders.

In hazarding a guess that there'd be no strike, Iron Age said: "The steel companies want to get along with Mr. McDonald and have leaned over backward to do so." Iron Age went on to suggest that the industry would raise steel prices—$4.50 a ton, or about 5 percent. A strike threat would provide setting for a price boost. The public would pick up the tab—in relief. Anything's better than a strike.

But the script was so pat—everyone knew it so long in advance—that a strike threat wasn't enough. McDonald and Stephens had to have a war, not a Munich, to bring one another to his knees, to legitimatize their concessions.

McDonald required a wage boost (15½ cents) which would compare well with Reuther's 10 cents in wages and 10 cents in fringe benefits. He had to show union members he'd really forced Stephens to up his original 10-cents-an-hour offer. Similarly, Stephens had to show he was unyielding, until a strike actually choked off the steel industry's profits. Then, of course, he had to agree.

Then, the original script was back in force—handshakes, pictures, and cheers for McDonald.

The leading characters altered the sequence but didn't change the text. They did it to convert the expected into drama and thus justify the happy ending—a wage boost for the steelworkers and a price boost for the industry.

The Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and issued on November 11, 1954, concerning the Dixon-Yates contract.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, OF NEW MEXICO, MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

I have just learned that the AEC and Dixon-Yates have signed a contract, the terms of which I do not know.

But I do know this: The fat is now in the fire. I appeal to my colleagues on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to the AEC, and to the President to let reason prevail and save AEC's house before it is burned down.

During the days of debate, headlines, and editorials about the Dixon-Yates contract, the real issues have become confused. What started out as problem of supplying power for the future needs of the Greater Memphis area has been turned into a public versus private power battle. Now fresh clarity is needed.

On Wednesday, a Washington newspaper which is a member of a great chain of newspapers, published an editorial urging the President to reject the Dixon-Yates contract and call for competitive bids on a contract to furnish the power needed by the AEC.

Here is a great newspaper, which has made a commendable fight for a better approach to this problem, trying to clarify the situation. Yet even this editorial indicates a misunderstanding of the problem with which we are confronted.

The evidence which has been presented to the Joint Committee clearly establishes the fact that the AEC does not need the power to be generated in the Dixon-Yates plant. It has firm commitments from TVA, EEI, and OVEC for all its power needs at Paducah and Portsmouth. The TVA provides all its present needs at Oak Ridge and the only additional power the AEC now has a need for is about 175,000 kilowatts for new facilities at Oak Ridge. The TVA can supply this. But if TVA cannot supply the added power, the way to get it is already clearly pointed to in the private power contracts with EEI and OVEC. These plants were built near the AEC plants which needed the power; they were built with private funds under private enterprise on contracts involving only the private companies and the AEC. No one else is involved in those contracts—neither TVA nor any municipality in the TVA area.

Who is it then who needs Dixon-Yates power now? Clearly, it is the city of Memphis and its environs. We are dealing here with the problem of that area and of no other. The question, therefore, is what is the best way to prepare to meet the future power needs of the Memphis area. Now, every municipality in the United States has faced this problem from time to time. Each city has worked it out for itself. What is there about the city of Memphis and its power requirements which results in this being a national problem occupying the time of the TVA, the AEC, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the President himself?

The Memphis area today obtains its power from the TVA. Some of its comes from TVA generating plants. Some of it is purchased by TVA from private electric generating companies outside the TVA area and is fed into the distribution system for the Memphis area. The decision of where to get its electric power is a local decision for the Memphis area. In the past 20 years, TVA has been able to supply that area. The ability of TVA to continue to meet the growing electric power needs of that area have been limited by the refusal of the Congress during the past 3 years to appropriate funds for the construction of additional steam generating facilities at Fulton, but that is a wholly separate fight.

We need not confuse this issue. As members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we are not concerned whether the Fulton steam plant should or should not be built. We are not concerned here with whether TVA should be expanded, contracted, or held at present levels. What we are concerned with is a problem involving a local area—Memphis—of getting power for that area. And I say most intently that this has nothing, I repeat, nothing to do with the Atomic Energy Commission or its power needs or with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Solving the Memphis problem won't build a single bomb; it won't bring a single peacetime atom to the service of mankind. But it will—it has to some extent—contaminate the AEC—an agency that should be, indeed must be, kept out of political fights.

The Dixon-Yates contract must be rejected because it is the wrong way to handle a local area problem. The supply of power to the Memphis area is a problem of that area. We have had no evidence that that area has made any serious efforts to obtain commitments to cover its power needs from other sources. This is not a problem of the Federal Government or of the Congress. It is a problem before the people of the Memphis area.

The Memphis area is a great and growing industrial center. It is entirely able to deal with its own problems. Let the people of Memphis seek competitive bids for the supplying of their future power needs. If TVA can compete successfully, then TVA can be the supplier of this power. But if the TVA cannot compete successfully because the Congress has refused to allow it to expand by building the Fulton plant, then there are other means of getting electric power besides drawing on the public resources made available through the TVA. There are municipal bond issues, contracts with private power groups, and other mechanisms which I am sure are more familiar to the competent Government officials of the Memphis area than they are to me.

Under no circumstances should we get confused. This is a local problem which has no business being before us at all. President Eisenhower has stated that if anyone can offer a better solution to the supplying of the power needs of the Memphis area, he is ready to consider it.

I therefore urge the President, the AEC, and the Joint Committee to have nothing more to do with this matter and to withdraw the Government signatures from the present contract. Let us then turn the problem back to those to whom it really belongs. Let Memphis and TVA work out between themselves that local power supply problem.

More importantly, let the Atomic Energy Commission put its time and talents into bombs and not bonanzas.

The Search for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am certain that all Members of the Senate have endeavored to view the approaching four-power conference in Geneva with calm, yet cautious, contemplations. In the light of the history of the U. S. S. R., and with a full realization of the cunning of the international Communist conspiracy, one could not do otherwise.

In response to a number of inquiries from my constituents, I have attempted to summarize my own opinions in a newsletter entitled "The Search for Peace," which, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE
(A Weekly Newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, June 20, 1955.—To suggest that our country should not participate in the forthcoming meeting at the summit—if it can be called that—is hardly a popular view. Public opinion has crystallized a pervading attitude, rightfully so, that every conceivable avenue of consideration in the search for lasting peace should be fully exhausted before any overt action is even contemplated.

With many of the unfortunate experiences of the Yalta and other conferences still fresh in memory, more especially as a consequence of the recent release of the Yalta papers, it can be reasonably assumed that our negotiations will reflect an enlightened understanding of rapport with the Communists. Moreover, we must never close our eyes to the real motivations, objectives and treacheries of the international Communist conspiracy. The mistakes of the past most certainly must set the stage for any conference involving the extremely tenuous and complex problem of global peace.

At this point, it would seem timely and pertinent to observe that, in the past 25 years, the Soviet Union has been a party to 52 international agreements, 50 of which they have blithely violated. These have been the end result of some 3,400 meetings between representatives of the United States and Russia since 1933. But, in seven or more years of discussions of more recent vintage, no semblance of accord has been reached on such major issues as the control of atomic weapons, the reunification of Germany, settlement of lease-lend, disarmament, and world peace. Unproductive though this record might be, it nonetheless must be the setting for the coming four-power meeting, and we would be more than naive—if not indeed asinine—to expect that another series of discussions will cause an immediate or early abridgement of deep-seated differences between antagonistic philosophies of life and government.

Senator KNOWLAND last week, properly summarized the sentiments of many when he said, "I do not believe we are bankrupt in our negotiating power. On the contrary, I believe we have an opportunity to cause some grave concern to the Soviet world." At Geneva, next month, the free world will be at another cross-road in history. Rather than peace at any price, the path to peace must be charted by a solid demonstration of honor and good will on the part of the Russians in conjunction with an unflinching willingness to remove from bondage the many enslaved people now trapped in the shadow of the Iron Curtain.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

H. R. 7072, Excise Tax on Truck Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the proposal in H. R. 7072 to increase the excise tax on truck tires to 900 percent.

Both the truck-tire industry and the trucking industry are big and important industries in my district. Both have voiced strong support of the President's highway program. The tire-manufacturing industry in particular has been one of the sparkplugs in the good-roads movement since it was started in 1910.

But both of these industries take vigorous exception to the tax which would be levied against them by this highway-construction bill. They regard it as unfair and grossly discriminatory.

They contend, moreover, with compelling logic, that it would actually constitute a national sales tax—since the tax would be passed on—on every commodity moved by truck and a special transportation tax on the millions of Americans who travel by bus.

This Congress has promised to cut back the present high excise tax on tires

and tubes to prewar levels as soon as it can do so. A 900-percent increase in the levy at this time is unthinkable.

A particularly odious feature of the money provisions of H. R. 7072 is that it would saddle upon one industry almost the entire cost of financing a national highway program that would be constructed for the benefit of every segment of the American economy.

Over and above the highly selective character of the levy and the burden that it would add to the users of all goods moved by truck, the tire people in my district object that the tax proposed would encourage tire use practices that would greatly increase highway safety hazards. In this connection, they believe operators would be forced in competition with other carriers to recap tires beyond their safe life. They believe that truck and bus tires would be operated beyond their true safe life. They feel quite sure that operators, either to minimize or avoid the tax, would resort to use of tires in smaller sizes and thus introduce a dangerous element of overloading.

A special hardship would be worked upon the small-business element of the tire industry. The investment of small dealers in new tire inventory would be tremendously increased at the expense of meager working capital. The proposed floor stock on existing inventories would involve a large and immediate capital outlay, sterilized until such time as that stock would move into retail sale.

It is difficult to believe, but the truck tire tax proposed in H. R. 7072 would in the case of large truck-bus tires supplied as original equipment nearly equal the excise tax levied on the truck itself. The current excise tax amounts to 6.3 percent of the tire price. This bill would increase it to an average of 63 percent of the tire price, and would impose a tax on recaps and retreads averaging 84 percent of the price of the recap or retread itself.

May I say, in conclusion, that highway truck and bus transportation would be forced to bear an enormous and disproportionate share of the cost of new highways under this proposal. These highways are for the use of the whole economy, and revenues for them should be raised in a fair and equitable manner, not harmful to the public safety and without special injury to the small-business men in the trade or to the low income consumer who uses both the buses and goods moved by truck.

The breakdown listed below will show the amount of tax now paid by various vehicles and also the amount of the proposed increase:

Increase in gasoline tax from 2 cents per gallon to 3 cents per gallon.

Increase in diesel fuel tax (for highway use) from 2 cents to 6 cents per gallon.

Increase in truck and bus tire tax (size 8.50 and above) from 5 cents per pound to 50 cents per pound; and imposing a tax of 20 cents per pound (total weight) on recapped and retreaded truck and bus tires. No increase in tax on smaller tires.

Increase in tax on tubes for truck and bus tires from 9 cents per pound to 50 cents per pound.

No increase in tax on smaller tubes.

	Present tax	Present tax plus proposed increase	Amount of increase
LIGHTWEIGHT PASSENGER CAR			
Tax on—			
New car	$157.50	$157.50	None
Set of new tires	4.40	4.40	None
Set of new tubes	1.62	1.62	None
Fuel [1]	11.52	17.28	$5.76
Total	175.04	180.80	5.76
4-AXLE TRUCK			
Tax on—			
New truck	1,056.96	1,056.96	None
Set of new tires	77.00	770.00	693.00
Set of new tubes	15.37	85.40	70.03
Fuel [1]	325.00	487.50	162.50
Total	1,474.33	2,399.86	925.53
5-AXLE TRUCK			
Tax on—			
New truck	1,918.96	1,918.96	None
Set of new tires	99.00	990.00	891.00
Set of new tubes	19.76	109.80	90.84
Fuel [1]	340.42	1,021.26	680.84
Total	2,378.14	4,040.02	1,661.88
6-AXLE TRUCK			
Tax on—			
New truck	2,071.92	2,071.92	None
Set of new tires	121.00	1,210.00	1,089.00
Set of new tubes	24.16	134.20	110.04
Fuel [1]	418.60	1,255.80	837.20
Total	2,635.68	4,671.92	2,036.24

[1] Based on 1 year's operation.

President's Action With Reference to Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Eisenhower's Particular Albatross," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of July 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER'S PARTICULAR ALBATROSS

President Eisenhower seems suddenly to have awakened to the realization that he has, in the Dixon-Yates contract, a scandal on his hands. In a hasty order he has directed the Budget Bureau to restudy the contract to see whether it is in the public interest to continue or cancel what amounts to an outright gift to a private firm.

This may, let us hope, mean the death of Dixon-Yates. Actually it has been obvious for several weeks that the whole odious deal was on shaky legs, as repeated disclosures were made revealing its true nature. Now the President and his advisers, after valiant efforts to do their duty to the private power interests, have apparently decided to get themselves off of the hook before election time rolls around. And it is a good bet that an attempt will now be made, as it has been made in the past, to assure the public that the President didn't have any idea of the details of Dixon-Yates, but was just trying to support the cause of free enterprise.

For two good reasons this argument won't hold water. In the first place, it is the President's duty to know what is going on in his administration, and the Dixon-Yates thing has been strictly an administration, rather than a congressional, attempt to ram through a change in national policy by administrative decree. Warren Harding was too busy playing poker to discover that his cronies were trying to rob the country, but history has not forgiven him. Neither can President Eisenhower be excused on the grounds that he doesn't like to read newspapers or that he was too busy relaxing to watch his subordinates.

Furthermore there is every reason to believe that President Eisenhower knew very well what was going on in the Dixon-Yates fight. It might be well to review the history of this extraordinary proposal, to see how it started and under whose protective care it grew.

On December 8, 1953, Walter Williams, Deputy General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, called in J. W. McAfee, president of the Union Electric Co. of Missouri, and told him that the administration was trying to find some way to get more power for atomic energy plants without having it supplied by TVA. Mr. McAfee wanted no part of the idea. The power combine of which he was a member, Electric Energy, Inc., had already had its head bloodied in a "race" with TVA to supply power for the Paducah atomic energy plant. It had started a plant at Joppa, Ill., at an estimated cost of $198 per kilowatt capacity, but had exceeded cost estimates and run behind schedule, while TVA, just across the Ohio River, was quickly and efficiently building a plant producing power for $145 per kilowatt capacity. Mr. McAfee did, however, introduce Mr. Williams to Edgar Dixon, president of Middle South Utilities, also a member of EEI, and eager for a chance at the Government contract.

On February 25, 1954, Mr. Dixon and Eugene Yates, of the Southern Co., submitted a proposal to the Atomic Energy Commission for supplying 600,000 kilowatts of power to the AEC under a 20-year contract. On March 2, Lewis Strauss, AEC chairman, sent an approving analysis of the Dixon-Yates offer to the Budget Bureau whose director, Joseph Dodge, had first suggested such a deal. The offer, simply stated, proposed to let Dixon-Yates take over TVA's Memphis territory, so that TVA, relieved of this obligation, could supply more power to AEC at Paducah. In return, the Government was to pay rates that would guarantee the $107 million cost of plant construction and payment of all taxes, and insure a healthy profit. And if there was any power produced that AEC or TVA did not want at these rates, Dixon-Yates was to be allowed to sell it through its Arkansas and Louisiana plants at private-power rates. Mr. Dodge indicated that he thought this was fine.

Though TVA was directly involved, none of its officials was allowed at any of the meetings between Dixon-Yates, AEC, and the Budget Bureau, but they were finally presented with the finished plan in April. On April 5, TVA engineers released an analysis of the proposed contract, showing that it would cost the public nearly $10 million a year more than TVA power, instead of the $4,138,000 a year that Mr. Strauss had estimated. On April 10, Dixon and Yates withdrew their offer for further study. Later they submitted a new bid to reduce the power bill by more than $2 million a year. On April 18 TVA analysts again protested that the contract would cost the public at least $150 million more than other methods. Mr. Strauss and new Budget Director Row-

land Hughes again said they thought the contract was fine, and Mr. Strauss wrote to Mr. Hughes suggesting that TVA rather than AEC should bear the additional cost of Dixon-Yates power for AEC.

On April 28, however, Walter Von Tresckow, a New York industrialist and power engineer, protested to the AEC and to the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee, that he had a cheaper and more attractive offer to make but could not get a hearing. He offered to build the needed powerplant for less than estimated by Dixon-Yates, supply the power at lower rates, finance the entire project with 3½ percent bonds to eliminate high interest costs, and at the end of a 30-year period turn the whole plant over to TVA for $1. On May 6, his protest was acknowledged by AEC. Eight days later his engineers resigned under alleged pressure from private-utility groups. He was finally given a hearing by second-rank AEC officials, and on May 10 Chairman Strauss again wrote to Mr. Hughes favoring Dixon-Yates.

On April 16, however, two members of the AEC, Henry D. Smyth and Eugene Zuckert, had written to Mr. Hughes opposing the Dixon-Yates contract. In later hearings before the Joint Atomic Energy Commission, AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray testified that he agreed with Smyth and Zuckert, and for the first time it was revealed that Mr. Strauss had pushed through the Dixon-Yates plan without permitting the AEC five-man board to vote on it. Incidentally, when Mr. Hughes wrote to President Eisenhower on April 24, proposing approval of Dixon-Yates, he did not mention this opposition, the Von Tresckow proposal or the TVA objections.

On June 14, the President held a meeting of congressional and administration leaders at which Mr. Strauss summarized the TVA, Von Tresckow, and Dixon-Yates proposals. On June 16, Mr. Hughes announced that the President had ordered a go-ahead with Dixon-Yates. On June 15, Senate debate on Dixon-Yates began. On June 17, Kentucky Senator John Sherman Cooper went to the White House to propose an alternate plan, but was dismissed without a hearing, White House counsel Bernard Shanley having informed him that he did not consider the matter worth the President's time.

On May 18, 1954, President Eisenhower refused to reappoint Gordon Clapp, who had opposed the Dixon-Yates contract, as chairman of the board of TVA. On August 2, the President nominated for chairman General Herbert Vogel. General Vogel promptly announced that he favored Dixon-Yates as a "good deal for TVA."

By tacking the Dixon-Yates contract to the Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill, Senate and House Republicans managed to pass it, despite a filibuster by Senator WAYNE MORSE. The Senate, however, cut from the contract the proposal to have AEC pay Dixon-Yates' income taxes. In September, Mr. Strauss announced that he intended to "go ahead with the contract" despite announced Senate hearings, as soon as "some snags were ironed out." He repeated his belief that the contract would cost only $90 million more than the TVA proposal. President Eisenhower termed the contract "the best plan proposed," and said it would be "good for the country."

On September 27, the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee scheduled hearings on the Dixon-Yates contract, and advised the AEC to sign no contract until the hearings were finished. On September 28, J. P. Stietenroth, former secretary-treasurer of a Dixon-Yates subsidiary, the Mississippi Power & Light Co., blasted Dixon-Yates, accused the subsidiary of keeping two sets of books to mislead the Federal power authorities, and said he believed the firm was acting in violation of the Holding Company Act.

On November 12 the Dixon-Yates contract was signed by the AEC. It provided that Dixon-Yates would build, under Government contract, a plant to produce 650,000 kilowatts of capacity, although AEC had previously said it needed only 600,000. The additional 50,000 kilowatts, produced under Government subsidy for 1.83 mills, under the contract could be sold by Dixon-Yates to private customers.

On December 6, 1954, the Securities Exchange Commission opened hearings on the financing plan proposed by Dixon-Yates, under which the firm would put up only $5,557,000 of the $107 million cost of the power plant. On December 10, Dixon-Yates officials refused to bare correspondence and other papers relating to the contract. On December 15, Eugene Yates told the SEC that the contract had resulted from a "challenge" by President Eisenhower. On December 21, the SEC was told that pressure had been brought to bear on the University of Mississippi by "substantial contributors" to quiet university professors who had expressed opposition to Dixon-Yates. Dr. Frederick Kellogg, dean of the college of engineering, said he had been "threatened in connection with his adverse testimony" on Dixon-Yates.

December 20, the city of Memphis, Tenn., which was supposed to absorb the power produced by Dixon-Yates, warned through its power board that it would not use Dixon-Yates power but would rather build its own steam plant. President Eisenhower later replied that Memphis had "every right" to build its own plant if it wished.

On February 10, the SEC approved key provisions of the Dixon-Yates financing plan.

On January 28, the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee adopted a resolution calling on President Eisenhower to cancel the Dixon-Yates contract. On February 2, 1955, the President publicly refused to cancel the contract, attacked the Democrats for their opposition to it, and again praised it as a sound move.

On February 2, Strauss denied that defense of the Dixon-Yates contract was holding up AEC work on atomic weapons development. On February 11 Strauss wheeled into Senate committee hearings a pile of boxes containing, he said, papers which he and his colleagues had been given to examine on subjects other than Dixon-Yates, and protested that Dixon-Yates was consuming too much valuable time.

On February 8, Strauss, who said he had entered into negotiations leading to Dixon-Yates at the request of President Eisenhower, defended the contract, and refused to cancel it, as requested by the Senate-House Committee on Atomic Energy.

On February 18, the mayor of Memphis warned that Memphis intended to supply its own power needs. Edgar Dixon said that the Government had no right to cancel the Dixon-Yates contract without paying the firm a penalty.

On June 7, House Democrats pushed through the Appropriations Committee an amendment to the appropriations bill cutting off $6,500,000 to connect the Dixon-Yates plant in West Memphis, Ark., to TVA lines near Memphis. Instead, the group voted to give the money to TVA to begin work on the long-sought powerplant at Fulton, near Memphis.

On June 13, TVA Board Chairman Vogel told the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that he opposed the Fulton plant, and urged the members to restore funds for the Dixon-Yates connecting lines. On June 14, President Eisenhower again made a strong plea for popular and congressional approval of the Dixon-Yates plant. On June 16, the House restored the $6,500,000 to permit Dixon-Yates to build lines connecting its plant with TVA. On June 18, the city of Memphis announced plans to build its own powerplant. On June 24, the city voted to permit the municipal power board to proceed as quickly as possible with its plans to build a $100 million municipal plant.

June 14 the Securities Exchange Commission, hearing debate on the new Dixon-Yates financing plan, suddenly and without explanation halted its hearings.

On June 21, Gov. Frank Clement of Tennessee told a Senate appropriations subcommittee that Budget Director Rowland Hughes "has deliberately concealed essential facts" about the Dixon-Yates contract. He also charged that "this whole transaction is surrounded by a course of conduct which is clearly inconsistent with the high moral standards which we have every reason to expect in the conduct of Government business."

He based his charges against Hughes mainly on the fact that Adolphe H. Wenzell served in the Budget Bureau, preparing adverse reports on TVA financing and helping to arrange the Dixon-Yates contract while he was at the same time employed by the First Boston Corp., which handled the financing for Dixon-Yates.

On June 22, Senator LISTER HILL accused Hughes of playing "fast and loose with the truth" in letters to HILL. Senator HILL said that Hughes had written him earlier that Wenzell had no connection with Dixon-Yates, and had been brought into the Bureau by former Budget Director Joseph Dodge. HILL said that Hughes later admitted in a letter that Wenzell had worked on the Dixon-Yates contract. Tennessee Governor Clement charged that Hughes had known "perfectly well" of Wenzell's connection with Dixon-Yates because "it was Hughes, not Dodge, who brought him into the Bureau." He referred to SEC testimony by Hughes to the effect that he had called Wenzell to Washington in connection with the power contract.

On June 25, a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee announced that it intended to investigate the several suspicious new aspects of the Dixon-Yates affair. On June 27, supporters of the TVA announced that they would demand the "full story" of Dixon-Yates. Senator KEFAUVER announced that he "fully intended" to investigate the "conflicting, hazy stories of the administration and Dixon-Yates people." He announced that Budget Director Hughes would be called.

On June 29, Director Hughes refused to permit investigators from a Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee look at office files and memoranda which passed between his bureau, the White House, Dixon-Yates, and the AEC. On June 30, President Eisenhower defended Hughes' refusal, saying that investigation of the files would "disrupt the Agency."

On July 1, with the situation becoming worse at every moment, President Eisenhower told the Budget Bureau to "restudy" the Dixon-Yates contract, in view of the fact that Memphis had announced that it would build its own plant, and Dixon-Yates might become useless. Budget Director Hughes, relief oozing from every pore, announced on a television program that abandonment of Dixon-Yates was probable.

The implication of this record is too clear to be misunderstood. The entire Dixon-Yates history is veiled in secrecy, silence, and subterfuge. It is a preposterous contract, under which the AEC acts as buyer and broker for power that it would not use. It was loaded to give a private company a slice of TVA territory and a huge profit at the same time. It would have led eventually to the crippling of TVA and the destruction of its value as a power yardstick. The President saddled TVA with a chairman who is not in sympathy with the aims of TVA and is constantly at odds with his fellow board members and his other officials.

The Dixon-Yates contract attempted to saddle a city and an area with power it did not want in order to please the private power people who are so influential in this administration. It is the antithesis of responsible democratic government.

The President's pretense that Dixon-Yates is now being restudied because of the Memphis action is unacceptable. Memphis warned more than 6 months ago that it would build its own powerplant rather than use Dixon-Yates power. The President acknowledged this warning the next day, and has since referred to it. The fact is that the President persisted in his support of Dixon-Yates until its scandal became dangerously obvious.

Nor can the President escape responsibility for his critical role in this scandal by disavowing the Dixon-Yates mess now. It was upon his direction that AEC Director Strauss first began the negotiations that led to the contract. The contract and its alternatives were explained to him and he chose the Dixon-Yates thing himself. He repeatedly defended the contract, even against his own supporters, such as Senator COOPER.

Repeatedly, he gave the contract his blessing. Repeatedly, he insisted that Congress approve it. Repeatedly, he accused the Democrats of politics in their objection to it. He personally asked Congress to waive the customary period of delay in order to rush the contract to completion. He himself defended Hughes for refusing to let Senate investigators see the files on the contract.

Is there the slightest evidence in this that the President didn't know the truth about Dixon-Yates? Certainly it was and is his business to know. Surely he has had every opportunity. The press, periodicals, radio and television for over a year have explored every aspect of the subject. It is hard to believe that even a man with the President's devotion to light reading could be so totally unknowing about the most controversial issue of the day.

Even if ignorance were an excuse—and it is not—there is no evidence of ignorance here. The President and his advisers pushed this shabby plan to the last. When it became too unseemly, they retreated. They should not be allowed to escape so lightly. The investigation should be continued, even after Dixon-Yates is dropped.

Lt. Gen. Charles T. Myers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on July 3 the Charleston Gazette called attention in a leading article to an outstanding West Virginian whose life and career have been devoted to making this Nation invincible in the skies. Lt. Gen. Charles T. Myers was born at Mannington in 1900, and attended high school in Huntington. As commander of the Air Training Command, General Myers provides the United States Air Force with the skilled fliers and technicians who are the pride of our air arm. He is a fine example of the excellent public servants born and bred in my State of West Virginia.

I may say I am particularly interested in the article because I grew up in the same town of Mannington. I knew General Myers' father and mother, and knew him as a boy. For that reason the article is of particular interest to me.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, written by Wallace E. Knight, which is entitled "Manpower Man From Mannington," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MYERS: MANPOWER MAN FROM MANNINGTON

(By Wallace E. Knight)

On December 17, 1903, when a child by the name of Charles T. Myers was toddling around his Mannington home and just beginning to learn that a world lay outside the front door, the air age was born.

On that day, on the sands of Kitty Hawk, N. C., the Wright brothers sent their first plane aloft for a brief but epochal flight.

Charles Myers, who grew up with this age of flight, now is a major part of it himself.

The stocky, graying West Virginian is the top man in providing the United States Air Force with skilled manpower.

A lieutenant general, he commands the Air Training Command with headquarters at Scott Air Force Base, just across the Mississippi River from St. Louis.

Everybody who joins the Air Force starts out under General Myers' jurisdiction. He runs the USAF recruiting service, the basic training centers, and all of the Air Force technical and flying schools.

Recently General Myers visited Charleston to inspect the Air Force recruiting office here, and then traveled on to Beckley to check the recruiting service there.

And last November he was the speaker when the West Virginia Turnpike's Yeager Bridge was dedicated.

These two trips to his native State have been brief ones, though, and he's had little time to return and reminisce since he became a member of the Air Force.

Seated in the Kanawha Hotel lobby on his most recent visit, though, the General revived memories about Huntington High School's memorable 20–13 football victory over Charleston in 1917, about his oil field life as a child and about leaving the State to enter Virginia Military Institute and then West Point.

The high-ranking officer, who won his pilot's wings in 1923, is the son of the late Charles T. and Anna Myers. He was born at Mannington, the Marion County town near the Pennsylvania border, on February 10, 1900.

But by the time Charles was ready to enter high school they had settled at Huntington.

Here the youth became quite a football star—although he never had seen a football game before he reported for practice as a sophomore.

He played end for 3 years, graduating in 1918, and then was off to VMI for more football and his first taste of military training.

One year at the Virginia school apparently whetted the young man's interest in this field; for in 1919 he accepted an appointment to the United States Military Academy.

And then the air age caught up with him. Lieutenant Myers entered flying school at Brooks Field, Tex., that September and won his wings at Kelly Field, Tex., a year later.

From 1924 until the summer of 1929 he remained at Brooks Field as an instructor, and then transferred to Nichols Field in the Philippines to serve as squadron officer of a bombardment outfit.

Shortly before the Pearl Harbor attack, Myers got assignments at Randolph Field and Foster Field, both in Texas, and until December 1943, he remained at Foster as a wing commander.

Then to Italy and the fighting. Assigned to the 12th Air Force, General Myers became chief of staff and then commanding general of the Air Force units in the theater of operations holding this post until the end of the war.

Texas apparently had some powerful connection with Myers' career; in December 1945, he returned there to become chief of staff of the 334th Flying Training Wing at Randolph Field. He was made commanding general there in February 1946, and in following months he got new posts in training capacities, finally being named chief of staff of the Flying Division.

Since then General Myers has served in Japan, Okinawa, New York, Colorado, and Illinois; and among posts he has held have been vice commander of the Air Defense Command, commander in chief of the Northeast Command, and since last July, commander of the Air Training Command.

He is married and the father of one son, Charles III, now a student at Rice Institute.

An airman for 32 years, West Virginian Charles T. Myers is a first-line defender of his country.

From Mannington to America's air frontier, General Myers has progressed steadily as a man well worthy of confidence and trust.

Proposed Federations of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Detroit Free Press of June 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE-WORLDERS AT WORK TO SELL OUT INDEPENDENCE

As a citizen of the United States, do you believe in preserving your country's independence?

If the answer is "Yes," be on guard against the efforts of the globally minded visionaries who are trying to destroy it.

Two powerful and well-financed groups, Atlantic Union and the United World Federalists, Inc., are again beating the drums for federation with other nations.

The UWF's plan would take us into world government by amending the charter of the United Nations. Atlantic Union's scheme is less ambitious but likewise, within the framework of the U. N., would join the United States and the Western democracies, federally or otherwise, into a defense, economic, and political union.

What does all this mean to you?

It could mean that the United States, except in purely domestic matters, would be subservient to a world legislature.

It could mean, since treaty law takes precedence over domestic law, that if the United Nations is permitted to assume the responsibilities of world government, our constitutional guaranties might well be destroyed.

Any form of defense, economic, and political union with other countries would spell the end of our Republic as conceived by the Founding Fathers.

We now have defense agreements such as NATO which insure our freedom of action.

We give economic assistance to less fortunate countries without thought of repayment.

We cooperate in diplomatic and political affairs to promote peace and better understanding.

But once the United States joins either a limited or global federation of nations, your country then loses its right of self-determination while assuming the defense, economic, and political burdens of the world.

There are presently before both Houses of Congress concurrent resolutions requesting the President to invite appointed delegates from the democracies to meet with similar appointed representatives from the United States for the purpose of exploring the possibilities of creating a supergovernment.

The resolution, advanced by the Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., is being sponsored by 16 Senators and 53 Representatives.

The United World Federalists are even more active through a large number of local chapters and the emotional propaganda that is generated whenever they can induce anyone of national importance to join their cause.

Both groups speak of the dangers which confront our country and imply that somehow these dangers would disappear if their pet nostrums were used to save the world.

But they never quite get around to explaining how or why, except in the most naive and fatuous terms.

Without questioning the sincerity of those who favor our federating with other countries, it would seem they are ready to abandon the principles for which this Nation has fought and bled.

Although U. N. Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold said recently at Stanford University that "the times are for from ripe for world government," its advocates are recruiting new followers at an alarming rate.

True, our country is facing, as it has through the pages of its glorious history, many critical and dangerous problems.

But haven't we the strength and the patriotism to face them as courageously as we have in the past?

It is appalling that responsible elements of our citizenship have so little national pride that they would be willing to sacrifice our independence on the altar of a super state.

They ought to try on some Davy Crockett caps for size and read a few volumes of American history.

Private Versus Public Development of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, with obvious political overtones, the Dixon-Yates issue has been under constant attack since last summer. This sensationalism springs from a controversy which has long been raging in this country—a controversy which pits those who advocate private development of power against those who favor public control and ownership.

Even now, certain political factions are preparing further fusillades. These are occasioned by the recently released report of the Hoover Commission concerning water resources and power. As an example of the range of these attacks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Power Propaganda," published in the Wall Street Journal of July 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER PROPAGANDA

"Twenty years of private power company propaganda have been invested with the dignity of an official Government report bearing the name of the (Hoover) Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government."

Thus Representative HOLIFIELD, a member of this same Hoover Commission, dismisses its generally moderate report on water resources and power—a report based on the findings of a select 26-man task force which undertook what the Commission believes to be the most exhaustive study yet made of the problems, including on-the-spot investigations of more than 200 power, navigation, irrigation, and flood-control installations. Just propaganda.

In this attitude lies much of the difficulty with trying to fashion a sensible power policy for the Nation. The typical public-power advocates are not searching for a sensible power policy. They are zealots, determined that the public-power empire shall grow at any cost, as it has mightily in these 20 years of private-power-company propaganda. Conversely they despise private power as the crusader the infidel; it is not something with which coexistence is possible. In their view it is something innately evil and therefore to be extirpated.

This is the attitude which has inflamed the Dixon-Yates contract, for one current example, into an absurdly heated issue.

The public-power attitude is especially strange in view of the indisputable accomplishments of the public-power people in extending their domain. The Hoover report notes that the Federal Government's share of the Nation's total electric-generating capacity was seven-tenths percent in 1933; in 1953 it was 12.4 percent and when projects already authorized are completed it will be 17 percent. That is quite a tribute to public-power propaganda.

This vast growth has been founded, moreover, on some dubious bases. TVA was never supposed to build steam plants, but it did. Municipalities and cooperatives get preference over private utilities in the allocation of federally generated power. When present Federal programs are finished, according to the Hoover report, less than 10 percent of the Nation's population will directly benefit from the tax outlay of all the people. The public-power advocates rarely mention these points.

In such an atmosphere, where everything concerning public power is right and everything concerning private power is wrong, the comparatively modest proposals of the Hoover report will be bitterly attacked. The report does not suggest, as the task force had suggested, that the Government's hydroelectric power projects should be sold to private industry, but it does say the Government shouldn't build any more steam plants or transmission lines.

It recommends that private utilities should be allowed to build the electric-power facilities for Federal multipurpose dams and be permitted to market the power through their own systems. And it criticizes some of the present practices which make the competitive position of public power both uneconomic and inequitable, as well as the multitude of inconsistencies and conflicts in national power policy.

We do not necessarily agree with every single one of the Hoover recommendations; we do not maintain that any of them is sacrosanct. But they do point in the direction of moderation and commonsense. They deserve more careful study than moderate proposals are likely to get in a climate of zealotry.

The Steel Settlement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, today's issue of the Wall Street Journal points out that the price of steel will be increased from $4.50 to $16.75 a ton, touching every segment of the American economy when the prices go into effect. Apropos of the matter, there appeared an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of July 5, 1955, entitled "The Steel Settlement." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STEEL SETTLEMENT

A steel wage increase which will result in increasing steel prices an average of $7.50 a ton is by no means a cause for unalloyed rejoicing. But the settlement is not without its satisfactions.

One disturbing thing is that it will mean increased costs for every user of steel—that is, practically every fabricator of goods for consumption, be he large or small. This coincides with other rising raw material costs.

Eventually rising costs run into consumer opposition and when that happens there is a slowdown in business and industry. Of course, no one can say that the steel boost alone will have that effect. Further, no one can say just where rising costs will cause consumers to withhold purchases. But it is quite certain that the point of resistance can be reached and every advance in prices is an approach to that point.

Well, all of this may seem like a bootless ex post facto quarrel with the inevitable. Certainly we have no wish to seem a professional prophet of gloom. But we do think it useful to point out again that it is the excesses to which men are tempted in times of booming prosperity which pile one upon another and lead to depressions. It is well if that is kept in mind. Sane men do not deliberately steer for rocks which they know are there. The trouble comes when they forget the presence of the rocks.

The satisfactions arising from this steel wage settlement can be exemplified by a contrast with what took place under similar circumstances in 1952.

It was then that the Federal Government attempted to become the biggest factor in a dispute about steel wages. Mr. Truman attempted to take over the steel mills. The courts declared such action unconstitutional.

Now all of that official activity did not avert a strike. Despite the presence of a "friendly man" in the White House, the steel workers went without wages. Steel production facilities were down. Not only was steel short for civilian purposes but the shortage delayed the rearmament program.

This time the Government at Washington refused to be tempted into crisis tactics. It took the position that the wage dispute could best be settled by free and untrammeled negotiations between the employers and the

employees. And a settlement was reached without a strike.

The income of the steelworkers will not be interrupted. The mills will continue their operations to supply a near record demand for steel. Factories will not be shut down because they cannot get steel.

Had either party to the steel dispute thought it could have won a better bargain by an appeal to Washington, be sure that it would have appealed. And the other party to the dispute would have been resentful.

It is to be hoped that the settlement will prove workable and that the extra costs which it will entail can be absorbed without injury to business and industry in general. If that hope is realized, it will be because the settlement was reached by men whose dominating considerations were economic considerations. Emotional and political considerations did not enter into negotiations where they have no place.

Retirement of Chancellor Byrne of Oregon State System of Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last Thursday Oregon lost by retirement one of its finest educators who has ably worked to build the Oregon State System of Higher Education to a position of national respect and prestige.

Charles D. Byrne, chancellor of the State system of higher education for the past 5 years, has been associated with Oregon higher education since 1929. During this period, higher education in Oregon has seen its most rapid growth and development.

During his chancellorship, Dr. Byrne has stood firmly for academic freedom in the fact of many pressures. This year Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam spoke on the campuses of the State system.

Even though Dr. Byrne has retired, I am pleased that he will continue to give his experienced advice and service to our State of Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to Dr. Byrne from the Eugene Register Guard of June 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW COLLEGE SYSTEM RAISED TO MANHOOD—CHANCELLOR BYRNE RETIRES THURSDAY

(By James G. Welch)

Charles D. Byrne, the man who sat up nights with the infant concept of a new college system, is leaving the child he helped raise to sturdy manhood.

To carry the analogy another step, Chancellor Byrne is leaving a God-son which now is a father itself. Because the unified system has been copied by seven other States and many more States are studying it.

The system now is a battle-scarred 23, and Byrne is leaving it for a rest. The rest means finishing his new home south of town, visiting many of the Nation's colleges, and taking a busman's holiday in Europe. Then Byrne will return, still technically retired, possibly to teach college students about colleges.

The reason Byrne thinks this full schedule will be "retirement" is that it will contain none of the bloody street battles that marked the system's childhood and adolescence.

The chancellor who leaves the office upstairs in Johnson Hall Thursday knows that many fights still are ahead for the still-growing system. But he's tremendously happy to leave feeling that the present State Board of Higher Education has the courage to protect Oregon's colleges from any opponent.

The interview interrupted one of Byrne's last tasks, the sort of thing he likes to do, writing a guest editorial for the student newspaper at Oregon State College (he's a former journalist).

Although he fired the last shots in the latest battle only a month ago, he feels that the system is in its best shape ever. Despite the certain critical shortage of teachers, and the threat of continued encroachment by other State agencies, he predicts that the State's schools will thrive.

PLENTY OF TROUBLE

The guidance of the present board will be one reason. Another reason will be groundwork laid by the board members who have served since the modern system was born in 1932.

When Byrne came to the State in 1929 as head of the OSC's news bureau and director of the school's journalism courses, Oregon had the survival-of-the-fittest setup in higher education. This sort of system was the only system then.

In Oregon it meant plenty of trouble. Each school fended for itself, with each going to the legislature for money, and with each competing for faculty and students. The result was pay inequities, duplicated facilities and courses, wasted money, and acrimony.

Byrne came just at the time the legislature was trying to do something about the civil war. The lawmakers passed a new law to allow a changed system and then called in authorities in the field to device a new system—which became a reality in 1932. Byrne was hired first as its director of information, and, a year later, as the board's secretary and the chancellor's assistant.

Radical changes aren't sudden successes, and there was trouble aplenty.

The new system gave all the schools a particular place in the system to avoid duplication. It assigned a single executive head over all school presidents and to advise a board of unsalaried laymen appointed by the Governor.

It also provided centralization of accounting, property control, investments, and other management matters—including the touchy budget job.

The idea since has become known as the Oregon plan, and Byrne has been loaned as an adviser on its functioning to six States—Florida, North Carolina, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma.

Since Byrne became chancellor in 1950 there has been a series of tussels which he states are all part of one large battle—the struggle by educators to keep their freedom from encroaching State agencies.

In the past 5 years there have been 4 clashes. One was the attempt by the State civil service commission to classify a multude of college and university people, including some of the deans and all nonclassroom personnel.

Another was centralized purchasing whereby another arm of the State had to pass upon and supply everything needed by all the schools.

Byrne's comment on the latter item actually applies to both: "If they can control what kind of microscope we can buy, they can control what kind of courses we teach."

There also was an attempt to centralize all State publications, which has obvious dangers in the field of education. All of these attempts, aided by Byrne's determined resistance, were defeated to a degree. Compromises were brought about in each case, and the most dangerous effects avoided.

LATEST THREAT

The latest threat turned out to be from a group in the legislature. It, too, was met and there was a compromise. Byrne isn't happy, but he's always been an optimist.

A subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee ripped into the State board's budget, and then told the board how to spend the remaining money to make the cut hurt the least.

This, Byrne said, with plenty of vocal support from the board, was an infringement of powers justly given to the board, a group which is better qualified than the average legislator to make such decisions. This, Byrne said, is a direct threat to the life of the system which has been developing so satisfactorily since 1932.

The chancellor believes that the subcommittee was not representative of the whole legislature, however, and he is hopeful that the 1957 session will have a new subcommittee to handle the State board's budget.

All these threats, he maintains, were stimulated by the Hoover report, which resulted in Oregon's Little Hoover Commission findings. Many good things came out of this, he allows, but overzealousness and misunderstandings of the basic ideas have caused the troubles. And he says that the same trend will cause more trouble before it dissipates.

UNIVERSITY STUDENT

But, the 60-year-old educator, who calls himself a student of universities, is certain that within the next decade the greatest problem will be a clear one that asks for a solution arrived at out in the open, not behind closed committee room doors.

That's the teacher shortage. "Children already in the public schools show us that the problem is unavoidable," he says. To keep up with the increase in students, 12,000 new faculty members will have to appear each year in the Nation, Byrne notes. But only 4,000 are completing their post-graduate work each year now.

Byrne sees many solutions, all of them contributing only a small bit to the solution.

Here are some of his ideas, and he stresses that some are only ideas needing much thought.

Increase the incentive to teach by increasing the salaries. "We must make a college professor's salary at least equal to that of a timber topper."

The search for new faculty members, armed with scholarships and guidance, must go much beyond the upper-division level. It must extend into the high schools to lure the best brains into college.

Make the faculty environment better, better retirement-insurance programs and other fringe benefits. "Industry is showing us the way in this respect, and as a result we are losing many good teachers and researchers to industry."

Extend the retirement age.

Look to educated women who are free to teach as their children grow up.

Get business and professional men from the community on a part-time basis (as now is being done at the University of Oregon medical school).

Byrne carefully avoids offering higher qualifications for entering students as one of his solutions, because he believes that the State should offer all a chance.

But this problem is one he'll give more careful thought as he visits many campuses in America and Europe during the next year, while resting.

Thermonuclear Reactions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in the current issue of Foreign Affairs magazine there appeared an article entitled "Thermonuclear Reactions: Can They Be Used for Man's Benefit?"

This article, which deals with possible peacetime applications of hydrogen energy, was written by Mr. John S. Walker, the able and gifted former counsel of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THERMONUCLEAR REACTIONS: CAN THEY BE USED FOR MAN'S BENEFIT?

(By John S. Walker)

There have been three historic developments during the short dozen years of our national atomic-energy program. The A-bomb, of course, was one. We are just now attaining the second, the controlling of the A-bomb process by means of the fission reactor so as to yield power and peacetime products on a significant scale. The third was the success in making the H-bomb. Now we must consider a fourth step, which appears the next and best atomic bet—the mastering and controlling of thermonuclear, or fusion, reactions for man's benefit.

The process underlying this potential source of power and energy, however, must be distinguished from the fission chain reaction with which we have become familiar. Thermonuclear reactions produce energy through the combination of nuclei of appropriate light elements at the hydrogen end of the table of elements. If suitable light nuclei are weighed individually, and then fused together, the resulting weight of the fused nucleus is less than the original components. The difference in weight corresponds to an enormous conversion of matter into energy. However, accomplishing the fusion which releases this energy is most difficult, in part because nuclei are charged positively, and as the particles approach, their like positive charges repel each other. The nuclei must therefore be made to approach with the high energies necessary to overcome the repulsion, and for this purpose huge amounts of heat energy are necessary. When fusion does occur, a great amount of energy is released, which can be utilized to help maintain the high energies of the material so as to contribute toward propagation of the reaction.

Heretofore the prospects for beneficent applications of atomic energy have been limited to the fission chain reaction. In the fission reaction neutrons are used to bombard the nuclei of suitable heavy elements, such as uranium or plutonium. Because neutrons carry no electrical charge, they encounter no repulsion in approaching the nuclei. When fission occurs, energy is released, and the additional neutrons required for a self-sustaining chain reaction are also produced. A nuclear reactor therefore has two key functions. The first of these is to provide what scientists call a neutron source. It is by means of neutron bombardment that radioisotopes useful in medicine, agriculture, industry, and science can be created. So also entirely new materials can be made, just as uranium is transmuted into plutonium at Hanford. The second function of a reactor is to furnish a new and plentiful source of power. A nuclear reaction generates huge amounts of energy in the form of heat; for years we have looked forward to the time when this heat could be used economically to produce steam for the generation of electricity.

Fusion of the light elements, if controlled in a thermonuclear reactor, would produce great quantities of neutrons and heat energy, and the scale of production might be vastly beyond hopes which are confined to the fission reactor. The energy inherent in thermonuclear reactions is significantly greater than the fission chain reaction, just as an H-bomb is vastly more powerful than the A-bomb. Nor is there any theoretical limit to the amount of the fuel which might be burned in a thermonuclear reaction. The latter does not have a limiting critical size, as does the fission chain reaction, beyond which the reaction would proceed out of control (i. e., explosively). Furthermore, thermonuclear materials appear more abundant and cheaper than the relatively expensive uranium and plutonium used in the fission chain reaction. Sir John Cockcroft, the eminent British expert, recently characterized the source of power which would be provided by light element fusion as "without limit."

An even more spectacular hope would be the direct production of power through controlled fusion reactions, a possibility raised a year ago by Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Despite considerable improvement in our generatinf plants, the conversion of heat to steam and steam to electricity remains exceeding wasteful. Efficiencies are on the order of 25–35 percent, and conversion losses are on the order of 65–75 percent. The direct generation of electricity would constitute a revolutionary advance in man's conquest of energy, because the steam cycle would be entirely bypassed.

Such prospects, if they can be realized, would presage a new competitor for our future source of power. At their most optimistic, they dwarf existing hopes for material benefit from atomic energy. By this means power might become available for the most ambitious of projects, even processing the waters of the oceans for their contents. The worth of our present achievements in atomic energy might then, from such a vantage point, be measured not in terms of what they now produce, but by the yardstick of what they contribute to helping achieve control of thermonuclear reactions.

II

How much work, if any, is the Atomic Energy Commission doing in this field? There is little clue. At no time has the Atomic Energy Commission referred in any way to beneficent thermonuclear possibilities or to the absence of them. Reports published by industrial participation groups studying atomic power are also strikingly silent on this subject. The realities of organizing and obtaining appropriations for major Federal projects suggest that if a substantial thermonuclear power program were underway, there would be a budgetary or other reference to it in the public domain. (The hydrogen bomb program, for example, was announced at the inception of active development in 1950. Quite recently the Air Force has confirmed interest in the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile.) Nor was any attention apparently accorded thermonuclear reactor possibilities during consideration of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. While the record of inquiry into peacetime atomic uses was otherwise voluminous, only one reference to thermonuclear power appears in the hearings, and that reference was made by a public witness. The total silence emanating from the Commission and the relative silence of the law suggest that any such work is quite modest in scope.

There is some guidance, however, from other sources. As early as 1945 Dr. Hans Bethe, who had first explained the thermonuclear cycle of the sun's energy, told a congressional committee that light element reactions were of possible interest for the future development of atomic power, although the difficulties would undoubtedly be very great. His remark, made in passing, was unheard or unheeded. Seven years passed before the late Senator Brien McMahon, then Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, made the next square public reference to a hopeful prospect. In the last speech before his death, he held out the possibility of important peacetime applications of hydrogen principles, and he noted also that this prospect might amount to a basic change in the focus of atomic energy control.

Later in 1952 the world's first full-scale hydrogen explosion, the "Mike" test at Eniwetok in the Marshall Islands, fired the starter's gun of the thermonuclear age. As awesome reports of the bomb's power were carried on the first pages of our newspapers, Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy announced "hope, in time" for peaceful and constructive applications of hydrogen energy. The Senator's statement was hailed in the Federation of American Scientists Newsletter as more startling to scientists outside the Atomic Energy Commission than accounts of the bomb. It was in comment upon this statement that Dr. George Gamov, who had been interested in thermonuclear energies since the 1920's, referred to "theoretically possible" techniques for "slowed-down atomic reactions with hydrogen bomb materials.

Other encouraging comments have occurred recently. Among these is the passing but unmistakable reference made in February 1954, by then Chairman STERLING COLE of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to fateful consequences "for good as well as evil" from the fusion of nuclei. That April Senator HICKENLOOPER reaffirmed his 1952 statement by noting "definite reason to hope that applications of new principles we are learning in the so-called fusion field can have great possibilities in the future for industrial and humanitarian uses." The Senator's reference to the possibility that power might be generated directly from thermonuclear reactions dates from a year ago, and Sir John Cockcroft's reference to thermonuclear power without limit was made last September.

Others have contended that such a development is impossible. Most of the contrary statements, however, occurred before and during the controversy over whether the hydrogen bomb should be built. Many who doubted the wisdom of proceeding with the hydrogen bomb expressed a one-dimensional moral view of thermonuclear work, arguing that it would be directed solely toward killing and destruction. The statements were made with surprising flatness; if it were true that thermonuclear reactions could have only destructive applications, the result would be unique in the history of science.

The technical difficulty of harnessing thermonuclear reactions represents a sounder basis for great pessimism. Every statement holding out hope has characterized any peacetime potential of the light elements as long range, or has in other ways underscored the magnitude of the scientific challenge. The difficulties of igniting a fusion reaction, and then of containing the extremely high temperatures which would be produced, are in all probability huge. Indeed, President Eisenhower in his April 7, 1954, press conference suggested that no direct application of the hydrogen bomb principle to peacetime power was known. The

report of his statement is ambiguous; it probably is to be interpreted as saying merely that the H-bomb apparatus held no known promise for peacetime applications. Hopes for constructive uses, of course, might well not be limited to direct application (or any application) of the bomb principle. In any event, however, the President chose a comment which had a negative answer, and it was reported in the press as such.

III

Eventual success in harnessing the fusion reaction is not assured. Indeed, it could prove unattainable. Or, if attainable, fusion power might prove merely to be marginally competitive with other power sources. The statements on the subject suggest that technical prospects for controlling light element reactions approximate those for the hydrogen bomb in the mid-40's.

As against this, success would represent a "quantum jump" forward in nuclear technology. Nor can we easily gage the difficulties before those difficulties have been subjected to prolonged attack. In the case of every major discovery since fire, the obstacles must have loomed disheartenlingly large before solutions were found. How one assesses these difficulties may therefore reflect in large measure a deep-seated attitude toward discoveries in nuclear technology. Ultimately, in resolving supremely difficult questions of this nature, we perform an act of faith or, as has sometimes been the case, lack of faith.

Throughout the brief history of our atomic program, there have been the optimists and the pessimists. At the outset there was doubt about achieving the atom bomb; the Navy, to which development was first proposed in 1939, did not proceed to develop it because its representatives "weren't sure" of success. For more than a half decade after the Hiroshima bomb it was taken for granted that both our bomb stockpile and our chances for atomic power would be severely limited by a scarcity of uranium ore. American pessimism concerning the early attainment of atomic power has contributed to the likelihood that the British will be the first to complete and operate a commercial-type atomic power plant. Only a few years ago doubts concerning the feasibility of the hydrogen bomb were widely expressed.

Hindsight may show that we have consistently exaggerated the difficulties of exploiting atomic energy. Morally as well as militarily, our Nation might have benfited had the mysteries of the atom proved more impenetrable. The greater the difficulties, the greater the advantage to the United States as a morally responsible and scientifically superior nation. But there are disturbing signs that the book of nature was not so written. We may be forced to conclude that the whole business across the board is easier of exploitation than we first thought. And, although we cannot be sure, harnessing thermonuclear reactions may also prove less refractory than now appears.

There are persuasive nontechnical reasons for emphasizing fusion development. By an apparent lack of interest in developing beneficent hydrogen applications, we increase our vulnerability to foreign charges that the United States is preoccupied with the destructive aspects of atomic energy. From Japan to the British Isles, these charges have been focused upon H-bomb work. We had no alternative but to build the H-bomb and have no alternative now but to continue its development. So far as observers can tell, however, we act as though no other use of fusion energy were of interest. In this respect, the 1949 debate over the hydrogen bomb has left behind a scar: The later comments holding out hope for constructive applications, such as the congressional statements, have been given little public consideration and have never caught up with the representations of the 1949–50 period. As long as the earlier statements continue unchallenged, we can be pictured as the developers of a thermonuclear force which can only wipe out cities and crater battlefields but which has no place in peace. The most unfortunate consequence of such an attitude would be to obscure from us, ourselves, the nature of thermonuclear work as a major avenue of science—perhaps the major avenue of nuclear science—to be traveled by inquisitive men, unhampered by moral prejudgments.

Would work toward a thermonuclear reactor interfere with the atomic fission power program? It seems hardly possible that prospects for thermonuclear power are so immediate that the fission program would be disrupted in the short term (although, conceivably, breakthroughs could occur at any time). The long-term concern would undoubtedly be that fission reactors be rendered obsolete before they could earn back capital investment in the tens of millions of dollars for each facility. If there be any such problem, it should be met only one way: As squarely as possible and as soon as possible. It should be understood (to the extent that it can be) while fission reactor commitments are made. Far from arguing against thermonuclear effort, any possibility of technical obsolescence of fission facilities constitutes a major reason for going forward. If we fear technical progress toward the enormously beneficial results promised by the harnessing of thermonuclear reactions, we do not deserve the scientific supremacy upon which we predicate our defense and survival. Nor will we have it for long.

Would success in controlling fusion reactions lead to an increase in the destructive potential of nuclear energy? If a means could be achieved to control the interaction of light elements of a scale producing useful neutrons or commercial power, it seems likely that the reaction might be made to proceed out of control with the effect of a nuclear weapon explosion. The abundance of thermonuclear materials plus the apparently open-ended size of the fusion reaction conjures up the possibility of a genuinely huge reaction and an enormous explosive and radioactive force. Apart from cataclysmic conjectures, any advance in a peacetime thermonuclear program might have a secondary military consequence, even if only that the neutrons produced might be diverted to the manufactures of war.

If, however, we forego technical progress because constructive goals in the art may also entail a military use, we will be the first great power to do so—and probably the last. There is considerable probability (and scant comfort) that by the time thermonuclear reactions could be harnessed, their mastery would not prove a radical addition to the science of destruction. But if thermonuclear work could significantly affect our future military posture, it is the ineluctable logic of the atomic arms race that we understand it first and that we attain the answers first. Control of thermonuclear reactions may thus provide the most recent example of the duality of atomic energy—but one in which both the constructive and military stakes are exponentially increased.

IV

What kind of program, then, is practical today? The following steps could be taken immediately.

Initially, a policy in favor of bold development could be crystallized and announced. In the past our major atomic-energy programs have been preceded by firm decision and top-level directives. No less may be fitting in this case. The President would be the most suitable spokesman to declare American interest in any aspect of thermonuclear development which may lead to the betterment of man or industry. Indeed, there may be need for the peacetime counterpart of the historic White House statement of January 31, 1950, which launched our real assault on the hydrogen bomb.

Secondly, this policy should be implemented by having work proceed as publicly as is prudent. Urging lower security classifications on the Atomic Energy Commission has been a popular pastime. But there may be unusual reasons why the Commission should adopt the most liberal policy consistent with security in declassifying any data which would help develop peacetime applications of the light elements.

Such work, after all, would look toward humanitarian objectives: Creating vast new sources of power and electricity, manufacturing radioisotopes for medicine, agriculture, and industry. It is perhaps true that an apparatus performing these constructive tasks might be diverted to military use. However, with past developments we seem to have recognized a distinction between weapons, as such, and items designed for peacetime purposes but which could be adapted to war. The internal-combustion engine and electronics have vital combat applications, yet for classification purposes they are treated (and correctly so) quite differently from such an item as the long-range ballistic missile. If our intentions are realized, controlled fusion reactions would resemble the former rather than the latter.

The resolution of classification problems must be left to those officials who have before them the full range of considerations and who bear the responsibility of maintaining the most scrupulous attention to national security. The judgments are difficult and the considerations competing. How much concealment do we gain and how much achievement do we lose? Among the considerations are two on the affirmative side of what might be achieved by recognizing a large area of low-security sensitivity. First, we would make manifest here and abroad our interest in the constructive side of fusion energy. More importantly, however, release of information may furnish the only feasible way of making rapid progress toward understanding this subject. To develop the A-bomb, the H-bomb, and much of the fission-power program, large numbers of scientists were assembled behind walls of secrecy to make an intensive effort at Government expense. A repetition today of the H-bomb effort in order to develop its peacetime counterpart is quite unlikely, although the technical problems are at least as great, and perhaps greater. The alternative way to enlist new minds and more people in harnessing the light elements for constructive applications is to make as much information as prudent available to non-AEC scientists and personnel.

The other side of the problem is what may be lost by making information public. It is striking that every public reference to beneficent thermonuclear possibilities has characterized them as long range. Radically new ideas (and perhaps many of them) appear needed. It is at this stage that the risk of losing time is perhaps the greatest. In all these respects information policies seem different from those for the controlled fission reaction (which had been demonstrated as feasible) and the A-bomb and the H-bomb (which are useful solely as weapons).

As a third stimulus, the Atomic Energy Commission might urge as many companies as possible to undertake study and development contracts as soon as their interest warranted. Some industries might be willing to carry part of the financial and developmental burden at the present time. Other firms may feel encouraged to study thermonuclear possibilities because such research might contribute to the soundness of their atomic-energy business. Furthermore, the knowledge that there was an opportunity to participate would bring the know-how of

American industry to a challenging effort. It might also ease the way for integrating an eventual thermonuclear power industry (if there is to be one) into our economy.

A further step should be taken which would cost the Government (or industry) a modest amount of money, but which would add greatly to the effectiveness of the effort and the rate of development. A laboratory should be established to pursue all avenues which might lead to constructive thermonuclear uses. A new site should be chosen for the work, possibly in conjunction with a university, but distinct from nuclear weapons work. Such a laboratory, in addition to providing a focal point of all effort in this field, could symbolize our intentions to give thermonuclear development every chance for realization. Particularly now, when our scientists have been divided by controversies concerning the history of the hydrogen-bomb program, there might be advantages in offering them the challenge of working to control fusion reactions.

We cannot seek security by military supremacy alone; we must demonstrate our constructive intentions and capabilities with comparable emphasis. Scarcely 16 years have passed since the fission of uranium was discovered, and a bare 2½ years since the first full-scale hydrogen test. In all likelihood, progress in nuclear energy has just begun.

A correct guess as to the future of controlled thermonuclear reactions could be of overriding importance. We may now be able to contemplate what may prove the biggest step of all; harnessing thermonuclear reactions would be a conquest equal to or greater than any other in our national effort. Again we cannot assume success; but we can recognize that if we were to succeed, all our present work could prove to have been merely preparatory. We have, then, every moral and practical incentive to develop what appears our leading chance for the next big step forward in atomic energy. The initial cost may be little more than a decision to proceed boldly. Failure to do so could lose for the United States the accelerating race for scientific discovery and the contest for the allegiance of men of good will.

How to Build a House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a very interesting item entitled "How to Build a House," which appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent, was recently brought to my attention.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO BUILD A HOUSE

You know the right people in the White House. You go there and tell them there's a housing shortage in Anderson, S. C., and you would like to have a $20,000 home.

All right, they say, you just put up 5 percent, or $1,000, and the United States Government will guarantee your getting a loan of $19,000. Fine, you say—but paying it back? Oh, says Uncle Ike, we will instruct a United States agency to pay you $100 rent a month on the house and you can live in it all the time. Further, says Uncle Ike, we will make the whole thing tax exempt.

So you say all right, but what about my $1,000 investment? Oh, says Uncle Ike, don't worry about that—we'll guarantee you 9 percent per annum.

So you put up $1,000 and float a Government guaranteed $19,000 loan at, say, 3 percent, and build the house and move in.

At the end of 25 years, you have received $30,000 in rent from the Government, at least $2,250 on your $1,000 investment, or a total of $32,250.

In the meanwhile, you have paid $14,250 interest. The difference is $18,000 in your pocket. You take the $18,000, add $1,000 and pay the $19,000 principal.

What have you? You have a $20,000 house that has cost you $2,000 or $80 a year, or $6.66 a month. The $18,000 difference came from the Government—the taxpayers.

That's the kind of deal you could get in Washington if you were Messrs. Dixon and Yates representing two Wall Street utilities holding companies. Only difference, they're putting up $5,500,000 in return for a $107 million power plant to be bought for them by the taxpayers on the same basis you got your house.

And this Ike calls "private enterprise." "Private" benefits, yes, but at "public" expense.

Statism at Westinghouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from Fortune magazine:

STATISM AT WESTINGHOUSE

During the Senate Finance Committee's hearings on H. R. 1, the administration's foreign-trade bill, the electric-equipment manufacturers were represented by Gwilym A. Price, president of Westinghouse. Since Westinghouse and other United States manufacturers of heavy-duty generators and transformers have recently been losing business to foreign competitors, it is not surprising that Mr. Price wants tariffs on these items raised. What is surprising in Mr. Price's testimony, which has been reprinted in pamphlet form by Westinghouse, is a seeming bias—hitherto completely unsuspected—in favor of a planned economy.

After registering the conventional complaint about the low wages paid by European manufacturers, Mr. Price cites some evidence to show that the electric equipment they make is less reliable than that made in the United States. Moreover, he maintains, foreign manufacturers either can't or won't provide the repair and maintenance service that United States firms like Westinghouse give their customers. Now these are indeed compelling sales arguments for Westinghouse or General Electric, but hardly a good reason for boosting tariffs. Even accepting at face value Mr. Price's hair-raising description of the way foreign generators tend to break down, it is nevertheless the privilege of United States utilities to buy them if they want to do so. Mr. Price would presumably be outraged, and rightly so, if Congress told Westinghouse to stop buying from certain of its suppliers because their products didn't measure up to scratch.

Mr. Price, however, not only wants to protect American utilities and other users of heavy electric equipment from their desire to buy cheap, but to protect the British from themselves. He notes that while there is unemployment in the United States electric-equipment industry, British firms (which have in fact underbid United States manufacturers on several jobs in recent years) are going full blast. "It does not make sense," he says, "to permit orders to go overseas, where they are suffering from a power shortage and the electric-equipment industry is strained to capacity, when the United States electric-equipment industry has substantial idle capacity."

Well, in a way it doesn't make sense, and perhaps in a perfectly planned society such a situation wouldn't arise. But in this case, who is to do the planning? The United States Government is not responsible for correcting alleged imbalances in the economy of England or other Western European countries. And if there were a world planning body with authority to allocate production among nations, it might well decide that since Westinghouse can't compete with certain foreign suppliers, Westinghouse should stop trying to sell generators and transformers. This is absurd, of course, but it is a logical extension of Mr. Price's argument, and another illustration of the way businessmen, in an attempt to justify higher tariffs, can paint themselves into an intellectual corner.

Oklahoma Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the voters of the State of Oklahoma were advised editorially by the Hobart Star Review on May 12 on the pitfalls of the proposed upper Colorado storage project and advised to write their Congressmen protesting it. The editorial is as follows:

Like so much of the literature which reaches my desk, that about the proposed upper Colorado River Basin project has been pushed back for future attention for quite some time—until this week I detected an ominous note in that statement about Oklahomans going to have to pay $44,800,000 in added taxes if it goes through. That's a lot of money, it occurred to me, for Oklahomans to pay to help irrigate some land in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Altogether, the big project will cost at least $4 billions in the American taxpayers' money, we are told by the Tax Foundation, New York City and Washington, D. C. And in addition to that, the project will mean flooding of the Dinosaur National Monument. Opponents of the project point out there is a growing tendency to destroy "those stretches of natural beauty set aside for us and our descendents to enjoy as national parks or monuments." The Wichita Wildlife Refuge, for instance? And for what it might be worth, I'm against both the projects until such time as more urgent need can be shown than has been shown up to date. A letter to your Congressman would not do any harm on either project—because we do have an interest in the Colorado River deal, too, if it's going to cost us that much Oklahoma money.

Colorado Citizens Talk Over School Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Denver Post of Sunday, June 5, 1955, contained a very interesting and informative feature written by Lawrence Martin, its able associate editor. The article is entitled "Nonsense Versus Commonsense: Colorado Citizens Get Together To Talk Over School Problems."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NONSENSE VERSUS COMMONSENSE—COLORADO CITIZENS GET TOGETHER TO TALK OVER SCHOOL PROBLEMS

(By Lawrence Martin, associate editor of the Post)

A man away at the back of the room got to his feet and said: "Mr. Chairman, there's been a lot of nonsense talked around this town in the last couple of years. I've contributed to it. I rise to confess that I didn't know what I was talking about a lot of the time. You may take that to mean that I've been cured by what I've learned here." Then he sat down.

This odd and cryptic speech was greeted with applause by 150 of the man's fellow citizens who were just finishing off a meeting that had lasted 5 hours. When the handclapping stopped, the chairman said: "Thank you, sir. You have just attested to the fact that this meeting has lived up to its purpose, which was to talk sense about our school problems."

That is what several thousand Colorado men and women have been doing all over the State through the late winter and spring—talking sense about their schools. In community meetings large and small, they have considered many aspects of the problems they face in providing serviceable education for their children. By late summer, 40 such meetings—local, county, and regional—will have penetrated every corner of Colorado with a heightened sense of obligation to see that Colorado's schoolchildren are better done by.

The man who got up to say that nonsense had been talked in his town meant nonsense about schools. He was right. In that community, as in many others, a good many people had been more critical than constructive when the impact of skyrocketing school population made them uneasily aware of overcrowding, teacher shortage, inadequate, outworn buildings, and internal schisms about what the kids should be taught, and how. The gentleman who confessed his part in that said after the meeting: "I blamed the school board for letting this thing creep up on us. I told the school superintendent to his face that he was changing the three R's into rot, rubbish, and ruination for the kids. Now I know that our school problems will be solved a lot sooner because people like me have substituted information for ignorance, and have sat down with the school people to talk practical sense."

On September 12 and 13, the common sense that has come out of the 40 meetings will be brought together in a State conference. That 2-day meeting, to be held in Denver, will edit the great volume of conclusions and recommendations into a statement of, for, and by the people of Colorado.

That statement will be carried to Washington, D. C., in November by 11 Colorado delegates to the White House Conference on Education, which President Eisenhower has summoned. More than 1,400 delegates representing every State and Territory will be there with their grassroots ideas. From them guidance is expected toward more effective educational policy and practice in the several States and at the Federal level.

President Eisenhower will embody the recommendations of the national conference in one or more messages to Congress as the basis for legislation. Similarly State legislation will be urged to revise and improve their laws, to deal better with the daily increasing needs of the schools, brought on principally by the spectacular increase in the number of school-age children.

The many little White House conferences held in Colorado have been so well organized by the Colorado committee for the White House Conference, so well attended and so fruitful in conclusions and recommendations that they have attracted wide attention elsewhere, and have been copied in other States.

This is not to say, however, that Colorado citizens have come up with any magic formula, or even that they have faced up squarely to all the troublesome problems involved. In fact, some of the toughest problems were ducked, with pious expressions of hope.

In general, however, this much was done: The problems were clearly defined and the discussions produced such similarity of judgment, arrived at in meetings widely scattered throughout the State, that a clear pattern of agreement was woven. Furthermore, and perhaps most important of all, many citizens who had previously taken no part in community coping with the issues were brought into active, and probably continuing relation to this vital phase of their business as citizens.

One businessman who went to a local meeting in a rather cynical frame of mind, became so interested he traveled far and took much time in order to sit in on four other sessions in his part of the State.

"I thought this whole thing might turn out to be a case of the unfit selecting the unwilling to do the unnecessary," he said later. "But I am sold on it.

"All the meetings I attended brought out hardheaded, businesslike, practical ideas, and gave me a new respect for the way we do things in this country when we set our minds to it. I discovered something else. At those meetings, I found out who 'somebody' is—you know, the chap who is supposed to 'do something' when problems get too big. That 'somebody' on this school business is everybody."

Abashed by his own eloquence, he hastily lit a cigarette and added: "Longest speech I ever made."

There were many like him in these Colorado meetings. Here follows a sketchy summary of some of the things they talked about and a few of their conclusions.

The discussions followed a general pattern of first asking broadly: "What are the problems of education in Colorado?" That was broken down into such components as these:

What do we expect our schools to accomplish?

How can we get enough facilities—buildings, equipment, transportation—to do the job?

Where is the money to come from?

How do we get and keep enough of the right kind of teachers?

Do all Colorado children have reasonable equality of education? If not, why not, and what are we going to do about it?

Are our schools equipped to provide all the services demanded by the changing times—adequate counseling, proper preparation for college, attention to exceptional children, both the unusually gifted and the handicapped? If not, what are we going to do about that?

Do the schools teach the fundamentals adequately, and are their policies geared to the production of adequately educated people, or just to getting children through school at a certain time?

Are we making the fullest possible use of the school facilities we have; should the school day, week, or year be extended to take care of more pupils?

Are the needs of higher education being provided for in a way that approaches the demand?

Only a few of the answers to these questions can be considered here, but the scope of them indicates what Colorado people want to know about their schools.

Here are some conclusions and recommendations that emerged:

1. The pressing need for more school facilities is obvious, both at the elementary and secondary levels. A good many Colorado schools are not only inadequate to house the increased enrollment; they are also obsolete, too old for safety; too far from today's centers of school population, or in their ways fail to meet need. To cure this condition, careful local planning is needed. The State department of education should assist with information and guidance in such planning.

2. There was general agreement that both State and Federal financial aid for school building should be provided. Many groups recommended that the legislature increase State aid for schools from the present 19 percent of total cost to 50 percent. On Federal aid, a majority agreed that it probably is necessary and acceptable for school-building purposes, but undesirable for any other educational needs.

The judgment was unanimous that if a program of Federal aid is set up, the money should be paid directly to some State agency, and distributed by it to school districts. In other words, Federal aid, if accompanied by Federal control of local schools, in any degree, was universally held to be a revolutionary and improper invasion of local sovereignty.

On one point all agreed—that Colorado's tax on real property—the principal source of local school revenues—has reached the limit. Many suggested that earmarking of present or future excise taxes be abolished, and some of that money be diverted to the schools. One group proposed that the State create a revolving fund for loans to districts or counties for school construction.

3. The problem of teacher shortages is not wholly one of higher pay, though that is a very large factor. Both citizens and educators agreed that housing and living conditions, the status of teachers in the community, have a lot to do with getting and keeping good teachers. Scholarships to encourage young people to become teachers were also stressed by several groups.

4. Transportation needs were widely discussed. The need for more bus transportation grows as enrollment grows in many areas. State aid for this specific item was held inadequate.

5. District reorganization, one of the thorniest problems, evoked general expressions that more effective district organization is essential in Colorado, in order to give all the State's children equality of education. The tremendous local resistance in many cases, based very largely on taxation questions, was recognized. This was one area in which most groups could go little further than hoping that something can be done.

There was much, much more, all of it to the point. It should be noted that the meet-

ings covered by this review covered every part of the State, in regional conferences, except the four-county area of Jefferson, Arapahoe, Adams, and Denver Counties. The final regional conference will be held June 15, at Morey Junior High School, Denver.

This, then, represents the thinking of Coloradans in the northeast, southeast, northwest, and southwest sections. In all of these areas, both in local, county, and regional sessions, it was notable that lay citizens—parents, business, and professional people, workers—outnumbered the professional school people present by anywhere from 2 to 1, to 10 to 1.

H. R. 3792 and S. 59

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the Members of the House to two communications addressed to me from the Massachusetts Chapter of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees. They concern the request of this organization that this session of the Congress take favorable action on H. R. 3792 and S. 59. I join in this appeal and, under unanimous consent, I ask that the communications and resolutions be printed in the RECORD:

MASSACHUSETTS STATE FEDERATION
OF CHAPTERS NO. 9,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES,
Cambridge, Mass., June 24, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts State Federation of Chapters No. 9, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, in convention held June 4 at Worcester, Mass., and directed me to mail a copy to the Massachusetts delegation in Congress, and ask your support for same.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT A. WILLIAMS,
Secretary.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees assembled in convention at Worcester, Mass., on June 4, 1955, that an inequity exists in that Government employees who retired between April 1, 1948 and September 30, 1949 and who elected to provide a continued annuity if the wife survives the husband are being charged a higher cost for this protection to their wives than those who retired after September 30, 1949, that date Public Law 310 became effective: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this convention endorse bill S. 59 now in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and respectfully urge and request that appropriate steps be taken looking to the enactment of this bill.

"Furthermore, since bill S. 59 contains a provision restricting the benefits of bill S. 59 to date following its enactment, it is respectfully urged and requested that this provision be eliminated and instead there be inserted a provision that the law be applied beginning October 1, 1949, the date Public Law 310 became effective (which is the date the inequity began to exist)."

The secretary of this convention is directed to send copies of this resolution to the Chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and to each Member of the Senate and House from Massachusetts.

MASSACHUSETTS STATE
FEDERATION OF
CHAPTERS NO. 9,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES,
Cambridge, Mass., June 27, 1955.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Massachusetts State Federation of Chapters No. 9, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, in convention held June 4, at Worchester, Mass., adopted a resolution that the Members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation be strongly urged to use their most powerful influence with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House to take favorable action, at the earliest possible time, on H. R. 3792, a bill that would increase the annuity of all retired civil employees.

Thanking you for your support, I am,
Very truly yours,
ROBERT A. WILLIAMS, *Secretary.*

The Foreign Aid Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on July 5, 1955, there appeared a most timely editorial in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "Tinker to Evers to Chance." This most enlightening editorial relates to what took place in the recent shift in the foreign aid agency. In 1951 the Economic Cooperation Administration became the Mutual Security Administration, and in 1953 the Mutual Security Administration became the Foreign Operations Administration. The editorial points out that "last Friday, because Congress passed a law which many Congressmen erroneously thought was to end foreign economic aid, FOA went out of business like a spiked second baseman."

The concluding paragraph of the editorial reads:

It is probably too radical a thought to suggest that Congress call the game, but it certainly might do something about the crowded bench. A reduction in players might, some day, mean a reduction in admission prices, and we have an idea that would be as welcome to the taxpayers as the seventh inning stretch.

The editorial is most timely, and points up a situation in which there was no reason in the world for the shift. As pointed out, apparently there will be no reduction in the number of employees of the old organization, which, by a sleight-of-hand performance, was shifted to another agency of the Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TINKER TO EVERS TO CHANCE

In the light of this newspaper's recent report on the ending of the Foreign Operations Administration, it is probably a very good thing for Mr. Tinker, Mr. Evers, and Mr. Chance that their fame is already secure in American annals. For what took place the other day completed a $31 billion double double-play with scarcely a bobble.

The major postwar foreign-aid programs began in 1948 with the creation of the Economic Cooperation Administration. In 1951 ECA became the Mutual Security Administration and in 1953 MSA became the Foreign Operations Administration. Last Friday, because Congress passed a law the intent of which many Congressmen erroneously thought was to end foreign economic aid, FOA went out of business like a spiked second baseman.

But the ball was already on its way and State Department's International Cooperation Administration gloved it right neatly. As our Mr. Geyelin reported, all that really happened was a change in names and uniforms. The players remain the same; some 6,500, give or take a few, are still around dispensing American dollars overseas. And the change doesn't affect the billions, either; what FOA would have spent on economic aid if it hadn't been sent to the showers, ICA will spend.

And it has a right nice sum at hand; some $8 billion already appropriated and earmarked for specific projects; some $620 million left over and unspent and if the Congress goes along with the administration requests, another $812 million will be ready for disbursement, mostly in Asia. Military aid and defense support to be spent by the Department of Defense will add another $2.7 billion to overseas aid unless Congress reduces the budget demands.

Thus foreign-aid spending goes on even though it has been split between the Department of Defense and the State Department's ICA. And while a certain sense of sportsmanship demands acknowledgment that whipping the ball from ECA to MSA to FOA to ICA was a finely executed play, it is fair to ask some questions. Why, for example, does ICA need the 6,500 players Mr. Geyelin mentioned when FOA got along in 1954 with only 5,856 all of whom, including the 12 part-time employees, managed to spend the taxpayers' taxes without too much trouble?

It is probably too radical a thought to suggest that Congress call the game, but it certainly might do something about the crowded bench. A reduction in players might some day mean a reduction in admission prices, and we have an idea that would be as welcome to the taxpayers as the seventh inning stretch.

Air Force Academy Dedication, July 11, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, Colorado's poet laureate, Mr. Milford E. Shields, makes his usual inspiring contribution to the outstanding events of the day in one of his most recent poems. Under leave to extend my remarks, I give

you Air Force Academy Dedication, July 11, 1955, and commend it to my colleagues for their reading:

As our strong eagle guards our Nation free,
So have our peerless airmen come to be;
Forged in the image of his spirit bold,
They will wing on to duties manifold.

To house this noble and dynamic breed
Has this academy been well decreed;
Here on this high and patriotic ground
Shall rise their outpost of the air profound.

This day of destiny we dedicate
This institution to our country great;
We seal it to the service of our land,
And flaming glory freemen understand.

Lord God of Liberty wing with us here
Until earth's tyrannies shall disappear;
Grant us that turbulence of men shall cease
And airmen fly the skies in worldwide peace.

Water Resources Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

WATER RESOURCES REPORT

The Hoover Commission's report on water resources and power is more surprising because of what was omitted than for what was contained. According to those who had opportunity to study the task force reports, the Commission's findings and recommendations constitute a greatly softened end result.

The matter of public power received a major share of attention. If its recommendations were to be adopted, and that is most unlikely, Federal power operations would be greatly curtailed and the cost of public power heavily increased. TVA, for instance, would be forbidden to build any more steam plants and further building of Federal power transmission lines would be forbidden wherever private utilities or other agencies could provide the service.

The Commission recommended imposition of user charges for inland rivers. A better name would be tolls, for that is what the user charge would amount to. They would be imposed on larger pleasure craft as well as on commercial users.

As one Commission dissenter to the report pointed out, the task force on whose report the user charge recommendation was based tried its hand at rewriting history and attempted to place its own interpretation on the unequivocating language of article 4 of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, which directs that the Nation's navigable streams "shall be common highways, and forever free * * * without any tax, impost, or duty therefor."

Inasmuch as imposition of tolls would affect every navigable stream in the country and have a consequential, retarding effect on the economy of areas served by the rivers, the recommendation may not have even remote chance of being approved by Congress.

The report drew sharp dissents from four influential members: Attorney General Brownell, Defense Mobilizer Flemming, former Postmaster General James A. Farley, and Representative Chet Holifield (Democrat, California), who wrote 84 pages of stinging criticism of findings and recommendations. In many instances findings and recommendations were at variance with presidential policies.

No other single commission report is apt to stir conflicts and controversies as the one on water resources and power. It touches every area and every river valley of the country, and it would require intensive and prolonged study against the background of a mountain of task force reports to determine merit and demerit other than that which is obvious.

Such a study would be easier, and the report itself would have been fairer, if the dissents had been published in the same volume as the recommendations.

Alabama Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the voters of the State of Alabama have been warned of the pitfalls of the upper Colorado River storage project by way of the following editorial in the May 15 Birmingham News:

ECHO PARK REVERBERATES WITH OLD CONTROVERSY

Discussion has been going on in Congress for several years over a project that directly affects only a small part of the Nation's population, but indirectly affects all citizens. Popularly known as the Echo Park Dam, the project calls for a huge irrigation and power dam on upper tributaries of the Colorado River in Colorado and Utah.

Many conflicting arguments are being made in Congress, where a bill authorizing first steps in the $4 billion project is making slow progress. A similar bill perished in previous sessions, but one has passed the present Senate, 58 to 23, and awaits committee hearings in the House. The project is opposed by conservationists as well as by other groups and individuals that think the huge expenditure all out of line with the benefits to be received by the public in general.

It is charged that the project would damage the scenic and scientific values of Dinosaur National Monument, of which Echo Park is a part. But the reply to that is that the famous beds of dinosaur bones would not be submerged and that the whole area would be more accessible by reason of the development. Of what use is natural beauty, it is argued, if nobody can get there to see it?

Proponents of the project are basing their contentions on the need for a water reservoir to meet irrigation requirements downstream. To that comes the reply asking why should the National Government spend $4 billion to irrigate inferior land to produce crops already in excess supply?

These are more or less old arguments, usually appearing in some manner whenever large projects of this sort are considered. But a new element has been introduced in this case. For the first time in the history of the Nation, land regarded as a part of the Nation's system of national parks is sought for development for the benefit, largely, of private interests. This so-called invasion of a national scenic area is regarded by conservationists as a serious menace to all national parks and monuments.

The issue is not clear-cut. The area of 204,000 acres designated a national monument by President Roosevelt in 1938 contains a few portions which power interests say were reserved for their future use or consideration. However, the national government has maintained a kind of jurisdiction over the whole area, and the reservations do not seem to be either explicit or positive. As far as the general public is concerned, the whole area has been regarded as a national monument, rich in scenic and scientific value.

Amid all the conflicting claims, there stands out the fear that once private lumber and power interests are permitted an entry into national park lands, no matter what kind of a prior claim they may present, the whole system of national recreational areas will be threatened. Those areas are already rather restricted. As population needs increase, the threat against them may be expected to increase.

People need scenery as well as irrigation dams and power. They need wilderness areas to remind them of the nature of which they are a part. They need magnificent river canyons as well as reservoirs. And they should be on the alert against any unwarranted invasion of these irreplaceable natural beauties.

Speech of Senator Barry Goldwater Before the Sigma Chi Fraternity Centennial Commission, June 28, 1955, at Cincinnati, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

SPEECH OF SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER BEFORE THE SIGMA CHI FRATERNITY CENTENNIAL COMMISSION, JUNE 28, 1955, CINCINNATI, OHIO

To have been asked by our fraternity to talk with you this evening is an honor of such magnitude as to defy accurate and adequate description. I am humbly grateful to all of you, and to those who guide the destinies of this observance of the 100th anniversary of our fraternity's founding, for this honor.

Humble, yes, for as I stand here tonight, I do so with full memory of the importance of this day to all of us and I pray that my words will not dull the brilliance that has been given this occasion by those who have preceded me.

As you might well imagine, the selection of the theme for our meeting has not been an easy task. Realizing full well the importance of this anniversary, I was at first tempted to confine my remarks to Sigma Chi. However, inasmuch as we meet as fraternity men, it can be assumed that we meet in full recognition of our obligations to our fraternity, and, inasmuch as we meet as Americans, it is hoped that we gather with the same full understanding of our obligations to our country. I chose, therefore, to deviate from the specific theme of Sigma Chi to attempt to offer an interpretation of our duties and our challenges based on reverence for the American ideal, its defense and its survival.

This approach came to me in the vast and stimulating vault of heaven as I flew several weeks ago with a crew of the Strategic Air Command in a B–47. In fact, it came to me as New Orleans, whose lights made the city appear as a diamond and emerald broach pinned across the dark bosom of the delta, passed 35,000 feet below us. These were the lights of American homes and of American business—lights that this crew and thousands like them are devoted to protecting. The people living with those lights were free people.

As I flew that night in a material expression of that freedom, the thought came to me that, in some other part of this world, there must have been at that same time, a Russian crew in a Russian plane, looking down on Russian lights. I imagined myself calling the captain of this crew on the radio and asking, "Why do you fly this night? What is your purpose?" He would have answered, I am sure, that freedom was his purpose.

Now there would have been the two of us, both flying in machines which were tangible evidence of material strength, achieved through two entirely different concepts of freedom, both flying to protect and to further the interests of those concepts.

Freedom that night—and, I suggest, on too many other nights and days—rested literally on material power. Our B–47 flew as a symbol of power, but I wondered if it had to be the sole and all-important symbol. Surely, there must be some stronger symbol of our freedom; some symbol that could some day preclude the need for material force.

The detection of that symbol, then, becomes our target for tonight. It will require some delving into philosophy and history, but both ventures should provide stimulating and refreshing journeys. Indeed, we will find in the fabric of our fraternity the same threads from which the cloth of our freedom is woven. We will find that our obligations to that freedom are closely akin to the meaning of Sigma Chi and of all fraternities.

The thought that the Russian airman would probably answer "freedom" to my query as to why he flew that night was and is a disturbing one. On thinking about it, one must conclude tht wrapped up in its ramifications, is the situation in which the free world finds itself today.

Freedom has inwardly and outwardly been man's goal since the beginning of time. He has fought many battles with his own conscience and with actual physical enemies in searching for a basis for freedom. For brief periods throughout history, man has enjoyed freedoms of a sort, but always he has gone back into the locked grip of oppression and tyranny through control of the State. This has been true mainly because man has never exactly understood from whence freedom comes. It is evident that civilizations preceding ours sought the free life through strength of arms, through material strength expressed either by armed might or by economic might. It is also evident that these peoples never found true freedom under these concepts of their source.

It wasn't until our Republic was born that man finally recognized that he cannot be free as a materialistic being, but can only enjoy those blessings when he has expressed acceptance of the idea that man's freedom comes from God.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that acceptance for us when he placed these words in the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

When he noted in that way for all of us that our freedom stems from God, he set us aside in man's search for freedom, and the truth and wisdom of that recognition has been attested to by our nearly 200 years of the world's greatest progress as freemen.

So much have we served as the leaders of freedom, that until the last 20 or 30 years, we were looked on as the citadel of freedom, and our way of life was the goal of all people who sought those blessings. Yet, here is a Russian pilot who would tell me that he flew for and would fight for freedom. Could it be true that after so clear a demonstration of the power of our concept of freedom, a man pledged to the opposite of every facet of freedom we hold true could say those words?

Our understanding is based on the recognition of God as the source of freedom. We uphold the dignity of man. We believe in the freedom of worship, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of assembly; and we hold that the majority rules in free elections.

Now examine the tenets of communism, which would be the ideological manifestation of the philosophy of that Russian pilot who also flies for freedom. God is not recognized. Man has no dignity, for he is a servant of the state. Freedom of worship, speech, and assembly are denied, and a free election in a Communist state is an impossibility. Yet, he speaks of freedom and two-thirds of the earth's population go with this pilot in their search for freedom. Freedom has become, as Tom Payne once predicted it would, "The cause of all mankind."

The struggle in Indochina is one in which freedom is the objective. The issue in Africa is freedom. All over the globe men are engaged in a frenzied search for freedom. Yet, with our example to serve them, compared to that which communism offers them, two-thirds of the world's people have shunned our concept for that offered by this godless philosophy.

This, despite the fact that, as these people have succumbed to or have been driven to this philosophy, they have been denied the very foundations of true freedom as we understand them. They have been imprisoned, tortured, and killed. Yet, in this race for the minds of men, we find ourselves, as of this moment, the losers. Why is not our theory of freedom accepted by all? Where have we fallen down in our responsibilities to freedom?

To find the answer, we must renew our search for truth. We must search ourselves for evidence of weakness. I suggest, too, that these cracks in our armor are quite evident if we are honest in our appraisals.

It is difficult to put one's finger on the date or even the exact period of our history that this weakness first evidenced itself, but I believe that it occurred during the 1920's. Then, after years of fantastic economic growth, under the strength of our basic ideals, we began to feel another surge of power, a lust for materialism.

We gained material strength through our God-given freedoms, through our ideals; but then the idea began to develop that our freedoms came from our economic strength, from physical strength evidenced by arms, or from government itself. As more and more Americans began to retreat into this concept, more and more Americans began to forget the true source of our strength and, slowly, America's light as the beacon of freedom throughout the world began to dim.

As it became clear to the rest of the world that material goals meant more to us than spiritual or idealistic ones, the idea opposite from ours, which is based entirely on man as a materialistic creature, gained strength. As our light dimmed from within, people all over the earth saw this material light as a beacon leading them to an easier attainment of freedom. This is easily understood, of course; but, when the people who epitomized freedom to all the world showed more concern for the material result than for the spiritual cause, and when they began to fear the vehicle of this new idea, communism, the rest of the world began to visualize in this new philosophy a shortcut to freedom.

We had lost so much of our old inward strength that when communism broke on us, after the Second Word War, we became a frightened people—frightened to the extent that we could not recognize that communism, in itself, was but a force to gain control of man's mind. It is, in fact, a tool, and a powerful one, to use to supplant our idea of freedom with the idea of materialistic freedom.

We did not see that we had become engrossed in a struggle between two ideas. Failing to recognize this, we retreated into the shell of materialism where we sought and still seek escape in military, economic, and political actions.

As a result of this, we have failed to see the true nature of the conflict going on in the world today. It is a pitted battle for the mastery of man's mind, a war between two diametrically opposed philosophies of freedom. Now we have reached a position of world leadership, but we have it because of material strength, which we achieved by our God-given freedoms. Yet, there is no great clarity in this doctrine of freedom. We believe taht we can preserve it with our might of arms and with our dollars; but we will find, if we pursue that idea, that we will become just another page in the history of man, for we have not made clear our doctrines of freedom. In short, we are not giving real leadership to the world.

Mind you, this clarity cannot come from a political party or parties. It can only come from the whole people. Either we believe our doctrines or we don't; and, if we do, then the world must be told and shown that we do.

The hope that this Republic once stirred in the breasts of freedom-loving people everywhere was a hope based on ideals and not on the hardness of material things. Yet, of late, there has been a curious lack of explanation of these ideals to even our own people, to say nothing of the others who live in this world with us.

Having reviewed what I feel to be the weakness of our position in this freedom-seeking world, I suggest that there are immediate remedies which, if followed, will achieve in a few years that which might and dollars have, in the long run, failed to accomplish.

It should be evident that we can arm ourselves and our allies to the hilt, and we can fight the biggest and most costly war of history, and still lose our freedom. This should be most obvious because the war we are wrapped up in is a war of ideas. As such, our task becomes clear and challenging: To win peace and to lead all people to real freedom, we must win this struggle for man's ideas of himself.

We must show to all men that we were right in recognizing our source of freedom as being from God. We must show that, from this concept, man obtains dignity. We must know anew that our freedoms cannot be taken lightly and that, by constantly and honestly searching for the truth, we can rekindle that light which for so long was the sole beacon of freedom in the world.

We must, as Americans, live that American concept, so that our actions in our homes, our offices, over the backyard fence, and over the fences of the world, will demonstrate to all people that there is only one concept of freedom that produces real freedom, and that is ours.

Yours and my challenge tonight, first as Americans, and then as American fraternity men, is to carry into effect the doctrine of God, but to carry it, we must first rediscover it.

Added Excise Tax Means Fewer Small Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to insert in the RECORD the following letter received from Orville L. Bohnet, of Lodi, Calif., calling attention to the serious disruption the proposed increase in excise tax on tires can have on the small operator, both the retail dealer and the independent, who have established retread tires as a major factor in tire sales:

In our great concern over the newly proposed legislation, H. R. 7072, coming out of the Public Works Committee, we immediately sent you a night wire urging your rejection of the bill in its present form.

Our advice indicates that proposed legislation intends to finance the Federal road-building program by imposing a ridiculous increase in excise tax on truck tires from 5 cents to 50 cents per pound. Interpreted in present-day values that would mean a 1,000 x 20 truck tire now bearing excise tax in the amount of $5.82 would impose a tax burden of about $70 under the new legislation. Included in our tire inventory valued at $64,500 we have, at present-day excise-tax rates, an investment of $5,850 just for excise taxes passed on to us by the manufacturer which we must collect from the consumer at the point of sale for our recovery. Excise taxes on tires and tubes represent a frozen investment by the dealer on which there is no return for the investment whatsoever. We are certain that you can appreciate the hardship already experienced by the dealer who must maintain an inventory of $64,000 in tires and tubes with over $5,000 of his working capital being tied up in the inventory investment just for excise taxes already paid by the manufacturer to the Government and passed on to the dealer for recovery from the ultimate consumer. Should the imposition of an increased excise-tax rate be made by new legislation, it would put the average businessman in an impossible situation by tying up a greater amount of his much needed working capital than he could spare. The independent tire dealers throughout the Nation need your active, energetic, and sympathetic support to relieve the present already overburdening excise tax. Actually the excise taxes on tires which were created as an emergency war measure to finance the production and manufacture of synthetic rubbers have now served their true purpose and these taxes should now be repealed.

Any effort to increase this burden by legislation in any form should be strenuously and consistently resisted. We sincerely hope and trust that you will thoroughly acquaint yourself with our grave problems in this respect and champion our present fight for very existence.

This excessive increase of excise tax on truck tires would make it prohibitive for the average dealer to carry any representative truck tire inventory. Most of us do not have the necessary capital to finance such impossible investments. With the keen competition already existent in this field, this added burden would certainly squeeze a large percentage of the independent tire dealers out of the truck tire market entirely. Your fight should certainly be for the small-business man, not against him.

The imposition of excise tax in any amount on camelback is even more dangerous to the independent businessman. Do you realize that a major source of income to the majority of independent tire dealers is from their retreading operations? Our retreading sales account for about 60 percent of our net profits here at Bohnet's in Lodi, Calif. Loss of this revenue could spell our ruination.

The retreading industry was pioneered by independent businessmen. Little shops with 1 or 2 molds struggled through the early days creating public acceptance for recapping. In 1930 new passenger tire sales amounted to $36,194,000 while the retread volume was only $500,000; in 1955 the new passenger tires sold amounted to $49 million compared to $19,500,000 of retread sales—this represented a comparison of retread sales to new tire dollar volume of $0.014 in 1930 with an increase to $0.398 in 1955. Truck tire recapping showed a much greater percentage of acceptance. In 1930 there was only $0.088 of retreading for every dollar of new truck tire sales; while in 1955 this ratio rose to $0.667. So an ever-growing industry is being created in the American way by small business—80 percent of the current retreading is being done by the independent shops. Several years ago 95 percent, or better, of the retreading was produced by the independents. Small business needs every encouragement it can get to survive and surmount in this highly competitive business—especially since big business is eyeing the retreading industry and already encroaching on it. Is your vote going to strengthen—or kill—this economy created by and for small-business men?

One of the present biggest inroads on retreading is the major rubber companies' program of third line new tire promotions in which they create a consumer's price for a 6.00 x 16 tire at $12.85 plus $1.05 excise tax. This tire is billed to us (a dealer with a "max-max" deal) net, at $10.30, plus $1.05 excise tax—very little profit in this item for us. Our manufactured retread on this same size tire, exclusive of the value of the casing, sells for $10.15, which is competitively priced. Approximately 8 pounds of camelback are required to produce this retread, which would add $1.60 to our present costs of production if a 20-cent-per-pound tax were imposed on the camelback. It does not take a great deal of calculation to understand that with this added cost our retread would be priced out of public acceptance. Any tax on camelback will do immeasurable harm to the independent retreader and have very serious, even fatal, effect on the economy of this vital industry which was created and nourished by the independent tire dealers all over the Nation.

We are looking to you for leadership in representing us in this vital matter and ask you to do all you can to influence decisions against this legislation now imposing such a great threat to our industry. Your personal views and response to this letter will be anticipated with great expectation.

ORVILLE L. BOHNET.

Steel Boosts To Average $7.35 a Ton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my remarks, in discussing the recent steel contract between Big Steel and the union leaders, I estimated that the action taken would cause the price of steel to be raised by $6.50 a ton, or more.

I am inserting the attached clipping from this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, in which Big Steel has announced an immediate average increase of $7.35 a ton:

STEEL BOOSTS TO AVERAGE $7.35 A TON

PITTSBURGH, July 5.—United States Steel Corp., published new price listings today on more than 50 items of steel and said the changes average out to an increase of $7.35 a ton or about 5.8 percent.

The price changes become effective at midnight. Most other basic steel producing firms are expected to announce similar price increases.

Big Steel said last Friday it would increase prices—partially because of an average 15 cents an hour wage increase granted workers under an agreement with the CIO United Steelworkers.

The wage increase ended the shortest industry strike in the history of the 19-year-old union. Production was halted about 12 hours in most plants.

The itemized price lists published by United States Steel showed such big tonnage items as cold rolled sheets up $5.50 a ton and hot rolled sheets up $7.50 a ton. Both are in heavy demand by the auto industry.

The new price on cold rolled sheets is $86.40 a ton and on hot rolled $160.40 a ton.

Structural shapes go up $4 a ton from $85 to $92. The shapes include many of the steel items used in construction.

Face the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the fact that Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov was to appear on the Face the Nation program on the occasion of the 10th anniversary meetings of the United Nations in San Francisco, and later refused to appear unless questions that he submitted were asked by those on the panel interrogating him. Of course, as we are aware, no one ever submitted such conditions to their appearance on this program. I have appeared on the program several times, and the thought never entered my mind to submit conditions of this kind, and the same thing applies to all others who have appeared on this program. Furthermore, the interrogators could not respect themselves if they submitted to such conditions.

When the Soviet Foreign Minister refused to appear unless his conditions were met, and those conducting the program would not meet them, as they properly did, our former colleague, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, jumped into the breach when Columbia Broadcasting Co. was forced to cancel the appearance on Face the Nation program of Soviet Minister Molotov. General Romulo made an outstanding appearance. It is a pleasure for me to include in my extension of remarks the questions and answers asked of and given by General Romulo on the program which took place in San

Francisco, Calif., on Sunday, June 26, 1955. I might say that participating in the program were three outstanding newspapermen, James Reston, of the New York Times; Arthur Sylvester, of the Newark News; and James Shepley, of the Time and Life magazines. The moderator was Ted Koop, Columbia Broadcasting System, Washington director of news and public affairs.

The text of the program follows:

ANNOUNCER. Through the eyes of this television camera in San Francisco, Calif., you are about to see Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo, special envoy of the President of the Philippines to the United States, face the Nation with questions from veteran correspondents representing the American press.

And now the moderator of Face the Nation and Washington director of CBS News and Public Affairs, Ted Koop.

Mr. KOOP. General Romulo, you are appearing on this program under unusual circumstances here in San Francisco, just after the close of the 10th anniversary meeting of the United Nations.

Foreign Minister Molotov, of the Soviet Union, had accepted our invitation to be our guest today, but it developed that he would not agree to our ground rules that provide for free and impromptu questioning. Therefore, on Friday evening, the Columbia Broadcasting System withdrew its invitation to Mr. Molotov.

I do not even need to inquire of you if you are willing to accept our usual ground rules for free and unrestricted questioning.

An author of no mean ability, you often raise your voice in behalf of the freemen of the Philippines, the Far East, and the entire world. We have heard you most recently as a leader at the Bandung Conference and here at the United Nations meeting.

As special envoy of the Philippines to the United States, your views on world problems carry great weight.

To ask you about them here is our panel of newsmen:

James Reston, Washington correspondent of the New York Times;

Art Sylvester, Washington correspondent of the Newark News; and

James Shepley, Washington Bureau Chief of Time and Life.

Now for the first question, Mr. Reston.

Mr. RESTON. General, how do you find the spirit of this San Francisco Conference as compared with 1945, when you were here at that time?

General ROMULO. I find that there is quite a misconception here. I have heard so many say that they were trying to catch again the spirit of San Francisco of 1945, and you know very well, because you were here, that that spirit of 1945, within the Conference, was so full of dissension and friction and irritants, that we don't catch here now because this is a different atmosphere.

There is really more of a spirit of concord and harmony and peace that we didn't have in 1945, and which you, Mr. Reston, very well expressed in one of your columns recently.

Mr. RESTON. Is it not actually a better atmosphere?

General ROMULO. It is a much better atmosphere because then we had so many illusions about the United Nations, and now we have a more realistic understanding of the limitations of the United Nations.

Mr. SHEPLEY. General, you have been here ever since the United Nations has and you have seen these things come and go. How do you account for the new Molotov that has come to the United States in the last 10 days and gone across the country wearing 10-gallon hats and greeting delegates here in San Francisco with amiability and the warm hand?

General ROMULO. Well, you see, I have always felt since this new strategy has been offered by Soviet Russia that there must be some strong, powerful, inner compulsion in Moscow to compel them to change tactics.

Mr. SHEPLEY. What would you think that inner compulsion might be?

General ROMULO. Well, it may be this rift that they have. You know, it is strange that Malenkov, after being replaced, is still breathing.

Mr. SHEPLEY. Do you think that Stalin's death might, in itself, have something to do with the change? Do you attribute any better motive to the new rulers of the Kremlin than, let us say, we attributed to Stalin?

General ROMULO. I have a strong feeling it is a breathing spell that they need to consolidate themselves.

Mr. SHEPLEY. And you think that their fight between themselves for power——

General ROMULO. That is what I think.

Mr. SHEPLEY. Might have more to do with it than anything else?

General ROMULO. That is what I think.

Mr. SHEPLEY. And if one of them comes to power you might expect to see the old Molotov back again?

General ROMULO. Back again, and that is why I never thought he would appear in a program called Face the Nation. His people don't face the nation; they can't face the nation.

Mr. KOOP. I should like to say right there, General, that you are in no sense substituting for Mr. Molotov today. We are very proud to have you as our guest.

General ROMULO. I am happy that you used that word because you know it is dangerous to try and substitute or replace anybody from the Kremlin. You know what I mean. So I dare not try to substitute for or replace; that is why I told Mr. Reston I was really just pinch hitting.

Mr. KOOP. How do you think the Russians are going to carry on their attitude from San Francisco to the Big Four meeting?

General ROMULO. Well, as I said, I feel that with this climate I hope they would carry this on, but we know more or less the blueprint after reading the speech of Mr. Molotov.

Mr. SHEPLEY. What would you say that blueprint consisted of?

General ROMULO. Those proposals he made in his speech.

Mr. SHEPLEY. He seemed to want three things mostly: Withdrawal of the American strategic aircraft from foreign bases; Formosa; and an end to the economic sanctions against the Communist society.

Do you think that the latter might indicate the Russians are hurting even worse than you suggested in their fight over power?

General ROMULO. Well, you know the Russians always ask for the maximum at the beginning expecting to get the minimum; and that generally sometimes they ask for the maximum and while asking for the maximum, they rattle the sword.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Didn't it seem to you that the Russians were at this time operating from a very weak base for them?

General ROMULO. Of course, yes.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Have you ever seen them in an international conference in such a weak position as even Mr. Molotov's speech indicated him to be now in this country?

General ROMULO. When I read that speech—I heard it and read it later—I found that Molotov was really a poor substitute for Vishinsky, because Vishinsky would never have made a speech like that, so doctrinaire and without any of the usual propaganda.

And so I feel that all the peace offensive that they have now is really the result of—aside from the inner compulsion that they find compelling them to do that from Moscow—the position of strength of the free world is making them retreat.

Just review the past events. The rearmament of Germany; Bandung—they found something unexpected in Bandung. They didn't think Bandung would turn out the way it did. That certainly is acting also as a restraint, as a curb.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Actually here, aren't they admitting that they are having to do a lot of things they have sworn they wouldn't do?

General ROMULO. Why, of course.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Over and over through that speech that was shown, wasn't it?

General ROMULO. Certainly, yes.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Peace seems to have broken out all around, except in the Bering Sea. You have had a part in that, apparently. You have a declaration.

Can you give me a little background of what made you think there should be some expression at this time? What good will it do?

General ROMULO. Well, when I made a telecast here in San Francisco the day I arrived, Sunday, I proposed that after all the speeches have been delivered and forgotten, there must be something concrete that we should leave behind, and that is why I thought that we should have a resolution, a declaration. Well, I knew from the very beginning that we could not propose or approve resolutions here because we are merely a commemorative meeting. It is not even a General Assembly meeting; it is a commemorative meeting.

So I suggested that there should be a symphysis that could epitomize the universal yearning for peace that we can leave behind us for the world to read after we are gone, and that is what I suggested in my opening speech.

Mr. RESTON. General, going beyond the theme of desiring peace which, of course, everybody wants, what were the other themes of this conference coming out of all these various speeches?

General ROMULO. Well, listening to these speeches you find, first of all, of course, the yearning for peace. Then I was struck by the almost unanimity of the chief delegates when they discussed the admission of members. They want the admission of members. There is an implied desire to eliminate the veto of members, not openly expressed, but you could see it in their speeches.

Then the emphasis on the specialized agencies, the constructive work that the specialized agencies are doing in the technical assistance phase.

Then again the division, yes, but a preponderance of desire on the part of the delegates for a conference to be held to revise the charter. No specific suggestions made, but you could see a silver thread going through of desire for a conference. Then again, and this is important, did you notice how Bandung was emphasized by not only the delegates of the small nations, but especially by the big powers? I don't consider Belgium, of course, one of the big 5, but Henri Spaak of Belgium made a beautiful reference to Bandung and that, it seems to me, is significant because I believe Bandung is one of the turning points in history, and for this commemorative meeting to give it practically official sanction by the repeated mention of the conference, I know that will draw the peoples of Asia and Africa closer to the West and, of course, closer to the United Nations.

Mr. SHEPLEY. General Romulo, Mr. Molotov also mentioned Bandung, and mentioned it repeatedly, as if it was a great Communist victory. How does he think it is a victory if you do?

General ROMULO. I don't see how he can because when I remember the opening day, for example, of the conference when every chief delegate, with the exception of three or four, either started his speech or ended his speech with an invocation of the Almighty

which compelled, I think, Chou En Lai to ask for authority from the conference to rewrite his speech that he was to deliver the first day. Apparently he found the atmosphere of the conference in Bandung different from what he had expected, so the speech he had written did not jibe with that atmosphere, so he wrote a second speech and in that second speech he was so put on the defensive by that spiritual offensive that developed the first day that he asked for tolerance for atheism.

Mr. SHEPLEY. Do you think it might have been that factor which prompted the Peking Government to reduce its pressure and hostile preparations against the offshore island?

General ROMULO. Partly. I am convinced of that. That universal desire for peace there among the delegates was so strong, and Chou En Lai saw it and felt it and sensed it that he just had to go back to Peking and report to his boss that Bandung is for peace; that whatever aggressive designs they may have must be restrained and curbed.

Mr. RESTON. General, you talked about the desire here in this meeting for elimination of the veto in membership. What effect is that going to have on the dispute here about bringing Communist China into the U. N. itself?

General ROMULO. Well, it has no effect because really the question of the admission of Red China into the United Nations is a matter of credentials. It is not a question of membership. We already have Nationalist China in the United Nations, so the question that is before the United Nations, if and when Red China presents its admission, is which credentials to accept, whether it is the credentials of Red China or the credentials of Nationalist China, so that I mean Red China does not fall within the purview of the possible abolition of the veto on membership.

Mr. RESTON. But aside from the technicality, what is the feeling so far as having a nation have that much power outside the U. N.?

General ROMULO. Well, if you refer to the actual number of votes, I feel that those in favor of admitting Red China can't muster the majority they need for the admission of Red China in the United Nations right now.

Mr. SYLVESTER. What is your interpretation of the visit of Mr. Nehru to Moscow? There seems to be two different interpretations: One, it is an attempt to win the leading neutralist country. And the other, it is an attempt to offset pressure of Red China on them by showing Red China that they can make friends with another great, important country.

How do you interpret this visit?

General ROMULO. You will recall Mr. Nehru announced his visit to Moscow before the holding of the Bandung Conference. Well, I suppose he expected that the Bandung Conference would turn out as originally announced; that it may be the sounding board for either communism or neutralism.

It didn't turn out that way. The Asians and Africans showed they can be sober, dignified, and mature, and did not allow themselves to be used. And so he had to go through with his visit, which he had announced before the holding of the Bandung Conference.

When you examine the position of India, India is sure the United States will never invade India; will never attack India; but, India is not so sure of Soviet Russia. Now, placed in that situation, Nehru visits Moscow, apparently to be friendly to a country which he doesn't fear—I mean he doesn't trust and apparently fears, at the risk of being misunderstood by the United States, which he trusts and doesn't fear.

Now that may be an oversimplification, but that is how I look at it.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Did it strike you strange to hear Mr. Molotov describe Mr. Nehru as a dear friend, Russia's dear friend, yet Mr. Nehru has been utterly ruthless in stamping out communism in his own country, India?

General ROMULO. Well, that is not right.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Isn't it?

General ROMULO. Well, when you consider that even in Bandung, there you had Mr. Nehru acting really as the sponsor of Chou En Lai, for Chou En Lai, as you know, is an out-and-out Communist, and Mr. Nehru is fighting communism within India.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is what I mean.

General ROMULO. But again, as I say, China, Red China, is building itself up militarily. India is not so strong militarily.

Mr. SHEPLEY. While we are on the point of the visit itself, it ended with Nehru and the Premier of Russia declaring that Formosa should be turned over to Communist China. You are the closest free neighbor of Formosa, I think. How do you stand on that point?

General ROMULO. We feel that for the security and peace of the Pacific, Formosa should be under the free world because the free world has a chain of defense there that should not be breached by communism.

Mr. SHEPLEY. What would the situation be in the Philippines if Formosa were in the hands of Communist China?

General ROMULO. It would be in a very precarious position.

Mr. SHEPLEY. Why?

General ROMULO. Because it is next to a Red bastion and we belong to the democratic free world.

Mr. SHEPLEY. But there are 200 miles or so of water between Luzon and Formosa.

General ROMULO. That has been annihilated by technology, jet planes.

Do you realize that most of the planes that attacked the Philippines during the Second World War came from Formosa or were based on Formosa?

Mr. SHEPLEY. Is there Communist activity underground in the Philippines now?

General ROMULO. There was, but President Magsaysay succeeded in controlling that.

Mr. SHEPLEY. Is it completely controlled?

General ROMULO. It is more or less completely under control.

Mr. SHEPLEY. If Formosa were in the hands of Chinese Communists, would it be any more difficult to control underground Communist activity?

General ROMULO. It would be.

Mr. RESTON. General, what about the situation in Indochina with that election coming up next year there?

General ROMULO. That is a very dangerous situation, Mr. Reston, a very dangerous situation. In fact, I would say that as of today Indochina is being nibbled away from us slowly, and so I would like to call the attention of the American people to the danger.

Mr. RESTON. What can be done about that, General?

General ROMULO. I think outright, determined, strong, aggressive support for Vietnam.

Mr. RESTON. By troops or by political force, or what?

General ROMULO. By everything that we can think of because Vietnam represents real nationalism in Vietnam, and Ho Chi Minh; to beat Ho Chi Minh, you have to outnationalize Ho Chi Minh.

Mr. RESTON. Well, General, haven't the Communists broken the truce agreement there?

General ROMULO. They have.

Mr. RESTON. Then are we not relieved from our responsibilities under the armistice agreement?

General ROMULO. Well, I wish that can be taken up because these free elections provided for in Geneva for 1956, should give us real food for thought. It is very dangerous that at this time that election is to take place.

And I would agree with Mr. Reston, this violation of the truce agreement should be brought up to the attention of the world.

Mr. RESTON. Through the Security Council or——

General ROMULO. I hope so.

Mr. RESTON. In what way?

General ROMULO. Well, by resolution, by one of the powers taking it up.

Mr. RESTON. In the light of these violations, do you believe the election should be held?

General ROMULO. I think they should be postponed.

Mr. RESTON. They should be postponed?

General ROMULO. Yes; in the light of this violation.

Mr. KOOP. General, the Premier of Burma, Mr. U Nu, is about to visit the United States. What do you consider the real purpose of his mission here?

General ROMULO. I really don't know. I think it is one of the regular state visits.

Mr. KOOP. Do you expect to have any special conferences with Mr. U Nu in Washington?

General ROMULO. No, no. I have seen him; I have talked with him, conferred with him in Bandung, but I don't expect to have any conference with him in Washington. I will see him in one of the receptions.

Mr. KOOP. The Foreign Minister of Thailand, Prince Wan, was on this program a couple weeks ago. I have been very curious as to why it is why some countries like Thailand in southeast Asia are so very friendly to the United States, as are the Philippines, and some are not so friendly.

How do you account for that?

General ROMULO. Well, you know that was one revelation, an eye-opener in the Bandung Conference, that there should be in that area that reservoir of good will towards the Free World and towards democracy in the United States that was unsuspected, unexpected here.

When you, yourself, Ted, say that you did not suspect, it explains why you should have such friends in Asia. That too is food for thought for us in Asia; why was this democratic alinement and this friendship for you in Bandung unexpected?

There is a gap somewhere there, a gap that should be a good subject for national introspection because you have friends, and yet when the conference was announced so many premonitory fears were expressed about the conference, and so many misgivings, and when the conference was held and you found you had friends, you were surprised.

Mr. RESTON. Are we out of touch with you on things like that?

General ROMULO. That is what I would like you to ask yourselves. There is a gap here somewhere.

Mr. RESTON. What are the facts in the case? Did you discuss the Bandung Conference with Foster Dulles before it took place?

General ROMULO. No; I did not.

Mr. RESTON. Were you in Washington?

General ROMULO. I was in Washington, but I did not have any chance to discuss the Bandung Conference with Mr. Dulles before leaving for Bandung.

Mr. RESTON. Did you see him?

General ROMULO. I did not.

Mr. SYLVESTER. General Romulo, do you think we should have had representation or greater status there than we did?

General ROMULO. No.

Mr. SYLVESTER. You do not?

General ROMULO. No; because you had no choice. You were not invited.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Could the SEAPO pact be invoked—going back to your discussion of Indochina—could the SEAPO pact be invoked to handle things in case of violence of any sort?

General ROMULO. If any of the signatories to the SEAPO pact are affected, it can be invoked. But Indochina is not a signatory to the pact.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am thinking of your idea that something should be done. Do you think it could be accomplished through SEAPO, rather than through the——

General ROMULO. No; it is through the U. N. Security Council only, not through SEAPO.

Mr. SYLVESTER. You don't think it would be of any effect?

General ROMULO. No. In fact, SEAPO was assailed by Mr. Nehru in Bandung as aggressive, and I had to answer him, and that is when I said that Mr. Nehru's fear, his fear of this empire of yesterday on which it was said the sun never sets, I said they are departing one by one from Asia; what we fear now and what he should fear are the shadowy empires of today on which the sun never rises.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I would like to switch back momentarily to the meeting here. Were you impressed by the reception Mr. Truman got on Friday night?

General ROMULO. I was impressed, yes, frankly.

Mr. SYLVESTER. How do you account for that?

General ROMULO. Well, here is a private citizen who certainly has caught the imagination of the world. He has acted with dignity as a private citizen, and he played an important role in the founding of the United Nations. He has supported the United Nations all along, and then his decision on the Korean question, I think, caught the imagination of the world.

Mr. SYLVESTER. You would agree with his statement that that decision may have been a turning point?

General ROMULO. I agree with it wholeheartedly.

Mr. SHEPLEY. General Romulo, what do you expect will come out of the conferences at Geneva that are just ahead?

General ROMULO. Gee, I wish I could answer you that question. I hope that they will help at least to relax the tensions that we have now. I hope that President Eisenhower will be able to so express the views of the free world, together with his two colleagues of France and the United Kingdom, that Soviet Russia will realize that it is Soviet Russia that is out of step with the world today.

Mr. SHEPLEY. Do you think Mr. Molotov is serious this time about disarmament?

General ROMULO. Well, you know, when I read that speech of his, it is exactly the May 10 proposal of his delegation in London, exactly, no change at all.

And when they say that they have changed, it has not changed, they have changed. They are slowly accepting the views that they had stubbornly fought, and virulently fought in the past, and I have heard them in the U. N.

Mr. SHEPLEY. The May 10 proposals were an advance from previous Soviet positions?

General ROMULO. Yes, a little. But they have accepted western attitudes and standards that they did not accept in the past.

Mr. RESTON. Isn't that the essence of the thing here; there is disagreement on procedural questions, but on fundamental policy questions there are very little differences.

General ROMULO. Absolutely true; yes; and I think the San Francisco meeting has helped materially. In fact, the foreign ministers met, and in the United Nations, decided that this summit meeting be held under the auspices of the United Nations in Geneva. That is a great boost for the United Nations and that is an achievement of this San Francisco meeting.

Mr. RESTON. Was that anything more than a technicality that they are merely using the facilities of the United Nations in Geneva?

General ROMULO. It may be a technicality, but psychologically it has a good significance and is a real lift to the United Nations.

Mr. SYLVESTER. From what you have seen, do you expect the Russians to do business in Geneva?

General ROMULO. Yes. Well, they will do business, but in the usual way, and we have to be wary always.

Mr. KOOP. Gentlemen, our time is up. I want to thank you particularly today, General Romulo, for facing the Nation and answering the questions from our panel of newsmen: James Reston, of the New York Times; Art Sylvester, of the Newark News; and James Shepley, of Time and Life.

This program has come to you from San Francisco.

Ted Koop was your moderator today on Face the Nation. Your director, Forrester Mashbir; associated in production, Harriet Culley.

Face the Nation was produced by Ted Ayers.

ANNOUNCER. Today on this CBS public-affairs program you saw, through the eyes of this television camera, Ambassador Carlos Romulo, special envoy of the President of the Philippines to the United States.

A Special Place in U. N. History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, too often we inscribe the virtues of a man in stone and all too seldom do we give adequate credit at a time when he can yet know that his contemporaries consider his endeavors worthwhile.

The man of the postwar upheaval who has least received his just due for his efforts for world peace is former President Harry Truman. Accordingly, I should like to include in my remarks an editorial from the July 3 issue of the Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo., which in a few choice words points out this omission and paints in quick strokes some of President Truman's great contribution. I recommend it highly for those who like to keep the record straight:

A SPECIAL PLACE IN U. N. HISTORY

The United States Senate has voted for the creation of a commission to study the Government's security program. In discussing the proposal one Senator expressed the thought that "this sort of study should take the Communists in government out of next year's campaign." Just a few days before that, in the city of San Francisco, an event occurred that may take out of all future campaigns another propaganda issue that was injected into the 1952 election. That was the partisan designation of the Korean conflict as "Truman's war."

When Harry Truman appeared before the United Nations delegates, assembled to observe the 10th birthday of the organization, "the little man from Independence got the longest and loudest ovation of the week"—a week that had been filled with speeches by statesmen from all parts of the world.

Reporting on the former President's appearance there, James Reston, of the New York Times, says this great tribute was paid Mr. Truman because that audience realized that "it was he who redeemed its (the U. N.'s) pledges at the moment of crisis 5 years ago. It was he who, with invaluable support from the Republicans (then a majority in Congress), pronounced the Truman doctrine, initiated the Greek-Turkish aid program, and presided over the European recovery plan. * * * There was not a man in the hall, outside the Communist bloc, who did not feel that Harry Truman's decision of June 25, 1950, was the single most important act in the history of the United Nations."

So, regardless of American politics, history will record the Korean war as a United Nations war as it also will "accord Harry Truman a special place in the history of this world security organization." For had there been no decision to take that collective action against aggression back in 1950, the chances are there would be no United Nations today.

Economic Democracy: A Credit Union Is Based on Self-Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the annual meeting of the Credit Union National Association and its associated organizations was held in St. Louis, Mo., during the week of May 9–15 this year. At this meeting, Mr. H. B. Yates, of Dallas, Tex., who was completing his second year as president of the association, gave his annual report, which was carried in the June 1955 issue of the Texas Credit Union League Bulletin. It is a very interesting and informative report and I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD.. It is as follows:

PRESIDENT H. B. YATES REPORTS TO NATIONAL MEETING IN ST. LOUIS

It has been a great honor to serve as your president for the past 2 years and I wish to express my sincere appreciation to those with whom I have worked. As the managing director's report covers our progress for the past year, I will confine my report to some of the needs of the Credit Union National Association.

The Cuna World Extension work is off at an unavoidable slow beginning, but progress is being made. The entire civilized world is aware of the need of practical assistance to the peoples of these underdeveloped countries. This is a rare opportunity to extend credit unions throughout the world. It is a disgrace to civilization that untold millions of people in the underdeveloped countries live on the verge of starvation. We frequently hear the statement that approximately one-third of the world's people are always hungry. The credit union movement originated in Germany under famine conditions. Raiffeisen, after trying several plans to relieve the suffering of the people of his village during the potato famines of the late 1840's, finally came up with the democratic credit union based on self-help.

The theme of the manager's report to the International Cooperative Alliance Congress, held in Paris, September 1954, where 24 nations and 117 million members were represented, was the "Development of the Underdeveloped Countries." The Credit Union National Association was the only organization represented at this meeting which had made any move in that direction. The main business of this congress was to pass a resolution to set up a fund for the development

of cooperatives in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

We are all in favor of a democratic world; we are all in favor of a peaceful world. The Bandung conference of 29 Asian-African countries, showed that we are slowly, but surely, winning these two objectives. Canada and the United States have about 6 percent of the world's population of 2½ billions of people. We enjoy approximately 50 percent of the world's wealth; produce about 50 percent of all the manufactured goods, and use up about 50 percent of the raw materials. The other 94 percent of the people have the remaining 50 percent and those near the bottom are not too happy about their lot. Our Cuna budget shows $25,000 for the extension work for next year; needless to say, little can be accomplished with this small amount of money. This world extension work is nothing more than a small contribution of the credit union people of North America to the establishment of peace and democracy throughout the world. All the little peoples of these nations want, is a chance. They will be given this opportunity by being allowed to find their own economic strength through mutual self-help. What will this work mean to the untold millions of little peoples? It will mean the dignity and feeling of independence that goes with having savings and being able to borrow. It will mean the right to make their decisions and to control their own affairs. It will mean democracy.

The miracle of Cuna Mutual has been told time and again. There is no way of estimating the importance of this insurance company to the credit unions of North America. The insurance of loans has allowed our credit unions further to extend the principle of character credit; the prompt payment of claims has allowed our credit unions further to extend the principle of Christian charity. We appreciate the fact that some of our ablest leaders have spent years as Cuna Mutual directors. We appreciate the fact that low-cost insurance has helped to sell the credit union idea and tied our membership more closely to the credit union. But, it is not the business of the Cuna Mutual Insurance Society to finance the Credit Union National Association.

If the credit union movement on the North American Continent is to remain an independent, democratic movement, it is going to be necessary for the Credit Union National Association to raise enough money in dues to support the national association and stop depending upon Cuna Mutual Insurance Society to bear so much of the burden. If we are going to govern the Credit Union National Association, we should be willing to put up the money to support it. Cuna Mutual should be allowed to return its earnings to the policy holders in the form of dividends, or reduced rates, where it properly belongs. Because of the fact that the board of directors of the Credit Union National Association has never been willing to raise enough money in dues to support the national association, Cuna Mutual has stepped in to fill this need. As we have it today, the Credit Union National Association is spending $45,000 to bring 170 directors to this national board meeting * * * the main business of the meeting being to pass on a budget of $380,000. This one meeting accounts for about 12 percent of our total budget for the year. The total Cuna administrative expense including the national board, the executive committee, the subcommittees and elected officials is $67,000 or 17 percent of our total budget.

In contrast, the 10 members of the Cuna Mutual Insurance Society, board of directors, at the February quarterly meeting, voted a budget of approximately $1,900,000, over $700,000 of it to support the magazine advertising and most of the field force of the Credit Union National Association. This $700,000 is credit union money, but it is not coming from the proper source, nor is it coming through the proper channels. The credit union movement is entirely too important to serve as a kite tail for any life insurance company.

No. 24, Policies of Cuna, reads as follows:

"It shall be the policy of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., that all departments of the association shall be financed from the budgeted funds of the association."

Some serious attempt should be made to follow this policy or else it should be repealed. At the present, the Credit Union National Association is supporting three field men, and Cuna Mutual Insurance Society has 8 men in the field. On the field force, the Credit Union National Association is spending $38,460 in 1955–56, and Cuna Mutual is spending $119,540; in the advertising budget for 1955–56, Cuna is spending $21,938 and Cuna Mutual is spending $571,046. This is an unnatural, unhealthy situation which should be corrected by this national board. If Cuna Mutual continues to shoulder the expenses, there is danger of the national board degenerating into a debating society with no power. There is an old proverb that whoever pays the fiddler, calls the tune. The Credit Union National Association should finance the field men and leave the advertising to Cuna Mutual, except the small amount required of Cuna by the Wisconsin Department of Insurance.

It is a law of nature that power flows to the body capable of exercising that power; today, the Cuna Mutual Insurance Board, not the board of directors of the Credit Union National Association decides how many field men will be used and how much money will be spent on advertising. The Cuna Mutual Insurance Board is not responsible to the credit unions belonging to the Credit Union National Association, but only the policyholders of the Cuna Mutual Insurance Society through the use of proxies. There is nothing democratic about the use of proxies. On the contrary, proxy voting points up to boss control. The one in the position to collect the most proxies can elect the most directors and as a result has the most power. Benjamin Franklin certainly had no provisions for proxies in his first mutual insurance company. Proxy voting was originally designed to elect directors to stock companies. The mutual insurance laws have been written to provide for proxy voting in order to allow American capitalists to operate insurance companies behind the word mutual.

We are continually advancing into new fields; public relations, credit union school, and world extension. Any new department calls for the expenditure of some money. Because of the fact that we seem to be making more enemies as we grow larger, the public relations department will probably be needing more money. The Cuna Credit Union School has raised the question of an education department. As I see it, the greatest need is to get the field force on the Cuna payroll and increase the amount being spent on world extension. Credit unions are making money and leagues are prosperous. We have one State league with a budget of $283,000 or 60 percent of the Cuna budget. An increase of 2 cents a member for 1956–57 would make a floor of 7 cents and a ceiling of 11 cents and based on a projected membership of six and one-half million by December 31, 1955, should produce approximate $529,000, or $149,000 more than this year's budget. This amount should bring the entire field force under Cuna and increase the $25,000 being spent on world extension work this year. It is well for us to remember that the Credit Union National Association is all that stands between the credit unions and taxation, unfriendly legislation, and destruction. It now appears that the false propaganda of the National Tax Equality Association is finally working. The Treasury Department is now making a study of taxation for credit unions, building and loan companies, cooperatives, and savings banks. An increase of 3 cents a member would be more in keeping with the actual needs of the Credit Union National Association.

It is imperative that we keep this credit union movement democratic and not allow it to go the way of most mutual insurance companies, savings and loan organizations, and other organizations originally organized on a democratic basis. We claim that the credit union is economic democracy; but to have economic democracy, it is absolutely necessary to have political democracy. Democracy is an ideal that we must continually fight, work, and strive for. It is not the easy way.

Respectfully submitted.

H. B. YATES.

McCormack Resolution: Opposition to Colonialism and Communist Imperialism—Statement of President Ramon Magsaysay and General Carlos P. Romulo

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the impact of the McCormack resolution which passed this House on June 23, 1955, is being felt around the world. Nations and peoples that have experienced the effects of colonialism and Communist imperialism have harkened to the clear, concise stand taken by the Congress regarding these evils that have plagued mankind in most sections of the world, evils that have brought that same world to the brink of destruction. This resolution emphatically stated and the Congress, by unanimous action, clearly indicated the sense of the Congress in opposing colonialism and Communist imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, has been universally praised for sponsoring this resolution. I am pleased to call the attention of the Members of the House to recent statements of Ramon Magsaysay, the great President of the Philippines, and his distinguished countryman and statesman, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT RAMON MAGSAYSAY, OF THE PHILIPPINES

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK's resolution is the best and most effective implementation of the Pacific charter which the Philippines proposed in the Manila Conference last September and which was adopted by that conference as a companion document of the Manila treaty. It throws into bold relief America's traditional policy of supporting the legitimate national aspirations of all non-self-governing peoples to freedom and independence. It is a reaffirmation of America's determination to keep faith with its history as the birthplace of the Declaration of Independence. It gives the lie to Communist propaganda that the American people are supporting obsolete

colonial polices and are helping perpetuate colonialism in Asia and Africa.

We who are engaged in the fight against communism are grateful to Congressman McCormack for his resolution which we can now wield as an effective weapon against the blandishments of Soviet ideology.

EXCERPTS OF BROADCAST MADE BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO OVER STATION KPIX, SAN FRANCISCO

I have just learned of the passage by the United States House of Representatives of a resolution presented by that great American statesman, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, currently majority floor leader in the House. While this piece of news did not rate front-page eight-column streamers, in the long range view of history it will have an impact that will prove to be one of the most substantial contributions to American prestige all over the world.

Congressman McCORMACK's resolution expresses the sense of the United States Congress that the foreign policies and programs of the United States Government as well as the actions of the United States Delegation in the United Nations, should be to support the legitimate aspirations to freedom and independence of all non-self-governing peoples everywhere. When one considers that Communist propoganda presents American as an imperialistic nation, this resolution is an effective refutation of such a baseless charge. While it is true that America is fundamentally libertarian in its traditions, in the recent past, however, it has been quite equivocal in its policies in Asia and has not supported foursquare the fight for freedom of peoples in that region from colonial yoke.

It is for this reason that Congressman McCORMACK's resolution is an act of enlightened statesmanship and will serve to enhance American prestige and win for America the good will and friendship of millions of Asians and Africans who have been waiting for some such reiteration of America's good faith. Floor Leader McCormack deserves not only the congratulations of the American people for his vision and courage, but also the thanks of the entire freedom-loving world.

Ohio Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the voters of Ohio have been warned against the upper Colorado project by the following editorials appearing in the Willshire (Ohio) Herald on May 19 and the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News on May 18:

[From the Willshire (Ohio) Herald of May 19, 1955]

A $4 BILLION TAX THREAT

There are now pending in Congress several so-called reclamation project bills which, if passed, would increase the national tax burden more than $4 billion. These bills are the upper Colorado River bills.

These bills call for a large number of irrigation projects on the upper Colorado River which would provide water for a favored few in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Small portions of these 4 States would receive 100 percent of the benefits of these projects but the 4 States combined would pay less than 2 percent of the cost. The balance would be paid by the taxpayers of the other 44 States who would not profit one iota.

In fact, farmers in other parts of the country would be injured as these projects would only furnish water to grow the kind of crops which already are in great surplus in this country, and which are heavily subsidized by the Nation's taxpayers.

Proponents of the upper Colorado River Basin project claim that its construction cost would be only (?) about $1½ billion. They do not mention the hidden subsidies in the bills which would result in interest losses running into added billions which would come out of the pockets of American taxpayers.

Aside from the uneconomical aspect of these projects, conservation authorities say that the building of the proposed dams would invade some of the Nation's most beautiful scenic places, including Dinosaur National Monument. Much of this marvel of nature would be inundated and lost forever to the American people.

Questions also have been raised by eminent geologists regarding the condition of the rock formations at the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site. This dam is a key structure in the upper Colorado River Basin project.

This proposed project is of vital concern to all taxpayers. Authorization of this project is sought in 1 bill in the Senate and 5 varying but similar bills in the House. These bills call for some 6 huge dams and from 14 to 39 irrigation projects.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas project would divert water from an upper tributary of the Colorado River system through the Rocky Mountains into the Arkansas River basin in eastern Colorado at an ultimate cost to the taxpayers of $500 million. Its sponsors admit, however, that this is only the initial step in what is known as the Gunnison-Arkansas project, which would cost 10 times as much.

The Colorado River Board of California is vigorously opposing the projects for still another reason. The projects would deprive the people of that State of vitally needed Colorado River water for which they have long-standing contracts with the Federal Government. They have invested hundreds of millions of dollars of their own money to bring their share of this water to their homes and factories.

Projects with as many objectionable features as these should not be foisted off on the American people for the benefit of a privileged few.

The people of every community in America can help defeat these bills by writing to their Senators and Congressmen urging them to work against the upper Colorado River Basin project bills (S. 500, H. R. 270, and similar bills) and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project bills (S. 300 and H. R. 412). These bills may be up for adoption in the Senate and House very soon. The need for action is urgent.

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News of May 18, 1955]

THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIX MILLION DOLLARS FOR WHAT?

Everybody knows about the country's problem of farm surpluses; about the vast amount of wheat, corn, and other products bought by the Government as a means of propping up prices.

We have been told time and time again that these surpluses are increasing every month in the year; that the country—meaning the taxpayer—has $6 billion invested in them with the prospects that the total will go to $8 billion before the year is out.

It is costing the Government—the people—$700,000 a day in storage charges on these surpluses.

There is little, if any, hope that more than a small fraction of the investment can be recovered.

The surpluses can't be dumped on the domestic markets without disrupting the markets on these products, collapsing prices and making matters worse than they are.

We can't sell them abroad at prices that would let us come close to breaking even because peoples in other countries cannot afford to pay those kind of prices.

The Eisenhower administration, through its Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, is attempting to remedy the situation to some extent with the hope of later working out a plan which would make such huge investments in surpluses unnecessary.

At the same time, in another branch of the Government, determined effort is being made to increase the amount of money tied up in farm surpluses.

This is being pressed in Congress by a band of Senators and Representatives, some Democrats and some Republicans, who want the country to return to the rigid high price-support system under which subsidy payments on the farm surpluses would be considerably higher than they are at present.

And, there is in progress, a powerful drive which would have somewhat the same effect, only in a different way.

This is the drive by a powerful faction in Congress which is backing a reclamation program that would increase the number of tillable acres in the country and, therefore, the total farm output and, of necessity, the surpluses in which the Government would have to invest the people's money.

There are in progress in the western part of the country some 70 reclamation projects which have as their objective the conversion of vast areas of arid wasteland into productive farmland through irrigation.

The combined cost of these projects, as estimated at the present time, is some $4 billion. The total may go higher, as there is indication the Reclamation Bureau may have to request additional appropriations to complete the projects in which vast sums have already been poured.

Who will pay the bill for all this? The American taxpayers, of course. Millions of citizens will never see these projects but they will know they are there and in operation because part of the tax money they pay the Federal Government is to be used for this purpose.

But that's not the whole story. There are also pending in Congress, 16 bills asking for authority to start additional projects the total cost of which has been estimated at $3 billion.

Among them is a program for the development of the upper Colorado River Basin in five States, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico.

As in the other reclamation projects, the cost would be distributed throughout the country.

Ohio's share, for instance, would be $236 million under a system of computation employed by the Tax Foundation of New York City and Washington, D. C.

The five States directly affected would pay only a small part—an estimated $96 million altogether—of the vast cost of these projects.

And they are not unanimous in supporting the proposed use of the enormous amount of Federal money within their confines.

Former Gov. Leslie A. Miller of Wyoming, authored an article in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest which constituted a powerful argument against undertaking the reclamation projects.

And an organiaztion known as the Colorado River Association is engaged in an active campaign designed to persuade Congress to withhold authorization of the projects on the upper reaches of that river.

It is pointed out in both these sources that the proposed projects are not economi-

cally sound, that the cost of reclaiming the land is many times the price of putting into production potentially valuable farm land in other parts of the Nation.

They also point out that in view of the present overproduction of farm commodities the addition of still more cultivated land is not desirable at this time.

On the contrary, it is pointed out the Colorado River projects, if authorized, would only increase the production of those things we have in oversupply, and therefore would increase the cost of handling still greater subsidies.

So Ohioans would derive no benefit at all from the $236 million they would be forced to contribute to the cost of improving the Colorado River. As a matter of fact, they would thereby be committed to still higher taxes to supply the revenue for handling a bigger and bigger farm surplus problem.

When you come right do to it, the Colorado River projects, along with the other similar undertakings, are mostly phases of the New Dealers' grand dream of remaking the face of America, of dividing the country into various authorities and converting them into a semblance of what their sponsors envisioned as small paradises on earth.

Unless they are stopped without too much delay they will spend us into bankruptcy.

WCTU Opposes H. R. 1297

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including herein a petition which I received from some 45 members of the Alabama Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Birmingham, Ala.:

ALABAMA WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
June 24, 1955.

We, the undersigned members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Ninth District, Alabama, WCTU, do hereby petition you to oppose H. R. 1297, the Reserve UMT bill.

It would give us military conscription and return our youth of today and tomorrow to military servitude which our forefathers came here to escape. Today's armed service's regulations on alcoholic beverages are also most harmful with beer in the PX's, liquor in officers' and noncom clubs, even package liquor store when the nearest package liquor store is more than 10 miles away.

Mrs. Walter E. Barnes, Mrs. John Chadbourne, Mrs. F. C. Phillips, Mrs. S. C. Crawford, Mrs. D. D. Pittman, Mrs. J. G. Coker, Mrs. H. C. Pool, Mrs. W. L. Hardy, Mrs. Eula D. Wilson, Mrs. R. A Wood, Mrs. J. C. Porter, Mrs. C. L. Autry, Mrs. W. H. Bennett, Mrs. M. Oakley, Mrs. George Tindall, Mrs. J. D. Spriggo, Mrs. J. E. Dillard, Mrs. F. P. Morrison, Mrs. G. B. Taff, Mrs. A. M. Clark, Mrs. F. E. Hearn, Mrs. J. F. Brady, Mrs. J. F. Phillips, Mrs. J. B. Downs, James H. Butler, Joe Holbert, Mrs. F. L. Chandler, Mrs. Malcolm E. Harden, Mrs. George W. Williams, Mrs. W. E. Stewart, Mrs. L. P. Riddle, Mrs. J. L. Bell, Mrs. C. A. Shepherd, Mrs. Thad Belsher, Mrs. Olin Storey, Mrs. W. F. Huey, Mrs. J. O. Zellner, Mrs. Pearl B. Morris, Mrs. G. P. Griswold, Mrs. Lila Jacobs, Mrs. S. C. Randall, Sr., Mrs. Mary B. Triplett.

Italian Historical Society of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at the instigation of the Italian Historical Society of America, New York City has been celebrating these past few years Verrazzano Day in honor of the great Italian navigator, Giovanni de Verrazzano, who discovered the harbor of New York in April 1524. This year's celebration, which was proclaimed by Mayor Robert F. Wagner for April 30, was dedicated to the 431st anniversary of this historic event.

Verrazzano was a native of Florence, Italy, where he was born in 1485. In 1508 he embarked as a seaman on a French ship and participated in the discovery of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In 1523 he was commissioned to pilot a 100-ton, 3-masted vessel *La Dauphine* in search for "the blessed land of Cathay." Verrazzano first landed in South Carolina, then followed the coast northward until by mid-April 1524 he had come to the area now known as the Bay of New York. In his report to King Francis I, who sponsored that voyage, Verrazzano gave the first description of the eastern coast of present-day United States.

The Italian Historical Society of America has made a formal request that the proposed bridge connecting Brooklyn and Staten Island be named in honor of this great explorer Verrazzano.

The Italian Historical Society is a comparatively young organization, having been founded on Columbus Day, October 12, 1948, and chartered by the State of New York in 1949. Its purposes are as follows:

A. To gather and preserve historical, biographical, and other material relating to Italians or persons of Italian lineage who have rendered outstanding service to the advancement of mankind.

B. To establish and maintain Italian cultural centers in New York State and elsewhere which will foster knowledge and information on the contributions made by Italians and Italo-Americans in the discovery and development of the new world.

C. To establish scholarships and fellowships for the encouragement of cultural progress.

D. To publish and distribute documents, reports, and periodicals which will serve to make Italian culture more widely known and more fully appreciated in America.

Among its more immediate objectives, the Italian Historical Society is planning the publication of an Italian American almanac for use as a reference work. It is also hoping to obtain wider recognition in school textbooks of the role of Italians and Americans of Italian descent who have enriched American history. Finally, it is taking steps to encourage the study of the Italian language in American schools.

The society is planning eventually to obtain its own building which would serve as a center of the Italian cultural heritage and research in the field of Italian American history.

The honorary president of the Italian Historical Society of America was the late Prof. Enrico Fermi, the noted physicist. Among the members of its board of trustees are: the Honorable John C. Pastore, Senator of Rhode Island; the Honorable Hugh J. Addonizio, and the Honorable Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Members of Congress from New Jersey; the Honorable Laurence E. Gerosa, comptroller of the city of New York; the Honorable Michael A. Musmanno, justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; Dr. Edward D. Re, professor of law at St. John's University in New York; and others. Mr. John N. LaCorte is the director of the society.

New Aid for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert a reprint from the Guaranty Survey prepared by the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York relative to a new plan for aiding small business, which I think will be of interest throughout the country:

NEW AID FOR SMALL BUSINESS

A new device for making private capital more readily available to small business is being tried out in a number of Eastern States. Banks, insurance companies, and other business organizations in those States, along with some individuals, have cooperated in establishing and financing statewide institutions known as development credit corporations or business development corporations. With the funds thus supplied, these corporations extend intermediate or long-term loans and other forms of aid to small businesses which are deemed worthy of credit but have not been able to obtain it from other sources.

The history of this new type of business finance is probably too brief to warrant judgment as to its potential scope of usefulness. The first of the development corporations was formed in Maine in 1949. New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut now have similar institutions in active operation. Credit corporations in Vermont and New York are in the formative stage. Several other States are reported to be planning action along the same line. Some authorities closely associated with the activities of the New England credit corporations believe that this novel method of financing has already achieved sufficient growth to indicate that it has an important and lasting place in the economy.

WHY AID IS NEEDED

The credit corporations are designed to fill a financial gap that seems to have been created, in part at least, by heavy taxation. The traditional source of outside capital for small business was the local investor, the well-to-do citizen who was able and willing to take large risks in the hope of substantial rewards. In recent years, high and steeply progressive tax rates on individual incomes, combined with the capital-gains tax, have

tended to dry up this source of funds and also to limit the earnings opportunities necessary to attract them. Many individual taxpayers in the higher income brackets now seek refuge in tax-exempt investments rather than expose themselves to risks that no longer seem worth taking.

Savings habits and practices have changed in other ways also. To an increasing extent, personal savings are now taking such forms as bank deposits, life insurance, savings and loan shares, and trust funds of various kinds. These funds, almost without exception, seek low-risk investment. Only in rare cases—or by new financing methods—can they be used to supply capital to new and small business.

At the same time, the high tax rates have tended to limit the ability of small business to finance its own expansion by reinvesting earnings. Thus, the small concern has been made more dependent upon outside capital while the supply of capital seeking such investment has dwindled.

It is natural that the problem should be most acute in the older and more settled areas where opportunities for the development of new resources are limited and where some long-established industries may have reached or passed their peaks. To maintain income and employment in such areas, static or declining industries must be supplemented, and, where necessary, replaced by vigorous new growth. This probably explains why the idea of the business development corporation originated in the Northeast. Yet, interest in the new financing method is by no means confined to that region. It spreads into the South and through the Middle West into the Far West, indicating that the underlying problem is not sectional, but national.

A NEW FINANCING METHOD

The business development corporations endeavor to meet this problem by applying the time-honored investment principle of diversification of risk. The diversification is achieved by pooling many small contributions into a substantial fund, which is then distributed among a number of borrowers. In this way money which ordinarily could not be used for supplying capital to small business because of the risk involved is made available for that purpose.

The credit corporations raise funds by issuing stock and by borrowing from member institutions, which are not necessarily stockholders. The stockholders are drawn from the general business community—manufacturers, utilities, transportation companies, dealers of various kinds, chambers of commerce, and individuals. The members are financial institutions, mostly banks and insurance companies, with a few building and loan associations. In most of the States banks are not permitted to become stockholders. Massachusetts and New York are exceptions.

Financial institutions become members by agreeing to supply funds as called for by the corporation up to a specified loan limit, which is a low percentage (2 percent in New York) of each member's capital and surplus or other comparable measure as defined in the corporation's charter. Calls for funds are prorated among members in proportion to their respective loan limits.

The 5 active New England credit corporations had 551 stockholders and 283 institutional members in April of this year. The members included 193 commercial banks and trust companies, 67 savings banks, 15 insurance companies, and 8 others. The available funds totaled approximately $16.4 million, of which $1.1 million, or about 7 percent, had been received from the sale of stock, the remainder consisting of members' pledges. Commercial banks and trust companies had pledged $9.1 million, savings banks $2.3 million, insurance companies $3.8 million, and others $75,000. Of the $15.3 million pledged by members, $3.7 million had been called. The amount of stock sold was slightly more than one-fifth of the authorized total of $5 million.

VARYING PRACTICES

Practice varies with respect to the interest rates paid to members on their outstanding balances. Some of the corporations pay a flat 2 percent on the theory that membership is a public service rather than an ordinary business relationship and that members benefit indirectly from the general economic improvement brought about by the corporation's activities. Others take the view that membership should be made attractive as a business proposition and that the rate should be closely adjusted to prevailing rates in the open market. In Massachusetts, for example, the rate is one-fourth of 1 percent above the prime bank rate in Boston on the date of the call.

The amount that a corporation can borrow from members is limited, of course, by the total of the members' individual loan limits. In addition, some States limit borrowings to a multiple of the amount of stock sold. In Massachusetts the maximum is 8 to 1, and 2 other States it is 10 to 1. The New York charter sets the limit at 10 to 1 or $50 million, whichever is greater.

The closeness of actual loan volume to the loan limit tends to vary with the age of the corporation. In Maine, members have advanced 72 percent of the amount of their aggregate loan limit. The ratios in other States range downward from 34 percent in New Hampshire and Connecticut to 19 percent in Massachusetts. This suggests at least the possibility that the corporations, especially the newer ones, have a much wider potential field of activity than the present volume of their operations would indicate.

One absolute limit on the activities of the corporations as now organized is the total of the potential loan limits of all financial institutions legally eligible for membership. This total is more than 50 times the amount of funds now pledged. In addition to this theoretical maximum, there are legal limits imposed by the amounts of authorized stock and the ratios of total obligations to paid-in capital and surplus. Most of the New England corporations are far from having issued all the stock authorized. They are reported to have made no determined effort to sell stock to the general public, preferring to have a limited number of stockholders, as long as sufficient capital to provide a basis for their actual volume of operations can be obtained in this way. These considerations tend to reinforce the view that all the corporations are still small in comparison with what they are capable of becoming if a sufficiently large field for economically justifiable activity is found.

FIELD OF OPERATIONS

The nature of the New England corporations' credit operations is indicated by the fact that more than 90 percent of the firms aided have fewer than 300 employees and more than 80 percent fewer than 100. Most of the borrowing firms are engaged in manufacturing, although a few loans have been made to wholesale and service companies. The industries aided cover a wide range, with no clear pattern yet visible. Most of the loans have been made to companies already in business, although some of the borrowers were newly organized. Only a few of the companies aided were from outside the State where the loan was made, and still fewer from outside New England.

Loans have been made for a variety of purposes, the most common being to supply working capital. Other frequent objectives are to purchase equipment, construct new buildings, and refinance existing obligations. The remaining loans are for such purposes as to develop new products, aid local industrial foundations, and purchase real estate.

In view of the preponderance of small concerns among the borrowers, the average size of loans has naturally been moderate. The Maine corporation has made loans ranging up to $75,000 and averaging about $20,000, while the average in Massachusetts has been about $100,000. Maturities have varied, with the average falling somewhere between 5 and 10 years. Regular repayments are required, usually at monthly intervals. The general practice is to take collateral security for loans, although some advances are made on an unsecured basis. The usual interest rate is 6 percent, the prevailing rate for bank loans in the smaller New England communities.

Loans are often made on a participation basis with regular financial institutions and local industrial foundations. In such cases, the credit corporation's position is usually subordinate to that of the financial institution but prior to that of the foundation. The corporation never competes with regular financial institutions for loans. In some instances the corporation is able to refer the applicant to an institution from which the loan can be obtained.

OPERATING EXPERIENCE

Loss experience thus far has been favorable, although the period covered has been too short to provide significant data. Losses have been few and small. The Maine corporation has had only one loss in 5 years of operation. The Massachusetts corporation had no losses during its first 14 months of operation, and at the end of that period all but one of its 24 loans were on a current basis. In judging these fragmentary results, it is important to remember not only that the experience was brief but also that it covered a time of exceptionally favorable operating conditions for business in general.

On the whole, the record of the New England credit corporations has been such as to encourage the hope that a useful means has been found for adapting the credit facilities of a private-enterprise economy to the changing needs of that economy. Longer experience covering a wider variety of economic conditions will be needed to determine whether this hope is to be fulfilled. It it is, a long step will have been taken in smoothing the transitions that are bound to occur in a dynamic society and in avoiding the pitfalls of governmental ventures into the field of business credit.

On the Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the Fourth of July message of the Women for Freedom of Europe—a member of the General Federation of Women's Clubs—of which Mrs. Robert P. Patterson, wife of the late Secretary of War, is chairman of the advisory board:

ON THE FOURTH OF JULY

The American people celebrate the Fourth of July as the birthday of their Nation. To the rest of the free world this national holiday stands as a beacon of courage and leadership in the fight for preservation of the ideals set forth in their Declaration of Independence. It carries a promise and hope for justice to the oppressed nations of the

world which no longer have national holidays of their own.

On these solemn holidays in the past their old and their young joined voices in national anthems, put on national costumes, and paid tribute to their national spiritual heritage. Today such observance is strictly forbidden, along with the singing of the national anthems and any tribute to national leaders and liberators of the pre-Communist era. Only Communist red letter days are observed in Europe behind the Iron Curtain.

In our celebration of the Fourth of July let us sound just one somber note of remembrance to those vanished independence days and their symbol of the tragic loss of freedom to millions of people. In this historic year of "peace" and "coexistence," humanity on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains is dominated by the same vital thought of freedom. Behind these curtains the oppressed nations hope to regain their individual and national freedom lost under the Communists. People of the free world gravely face the threat to their own liberty. If they lose it they would have the final grim choice of Communist totalitarianism or annihilation. They see Soviet peace and coexistence as moves cleverly manipulated in order to gain time for internal erosion. They see the free world deluded and trapped into making concessions in order to avoid a world war, whereas in reality strength is the only insurance against Communist attack. While the Women for Freedom of Europe join their voices in the Fourth of July celebration, they ask the American people and the rest of the free world to heed the tragic lesson of the treaties and agreements the Soviets have broken at their own time and place, using violent methods and military might. Let us put the aims of the Soviet leaders to a real test. In place of the neutralization of the still free countries which lean to the West, let us ask for the restoration of freedom in the captive countries, under a guaranty of neutrality not only by the Communist governments but also by the free countries, whose guaranties can be trusted. The time has come to apply principles of human rights in good faith to all people of the world. Only then can the first step to peaceful coexistence be taken by the Nation which today celebrates the signing of its articles on human dignity and freedom.

Let the South Speak Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an editorial which appeared in the Charleston News and Courier under date of June 15, 1955, titled "Let the South Speak Out."

Mr. Speaker, this is a timely editorial and one in which I thoroughly concur. The South has done nothing for which to be ashamed or which to command us in the Congress to continue our silence with respect to segregation. The only thing the South can be guilty of is that since the history of this country began, she has contributed more outstanding men of the Congress than any other section of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the South has been silent too long and too long some of us have been apologizing. Thank God my newspaper is not one of these. The Supreme Court of the United States should be exposed for what it is. I propose in the very near future to pay my respect to that body for the manner in which it is day by day legislating for this country and leaving legal decisions to other branches of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Charleston News and Courier is known for its firm and clear voice on many subjects. On the instant subject, she is even more clear.

The editorial is as follows:

LET THE SOUTH SPEAK OUT

Senator EASTLAND's devastating speech on the Supreme Court and its psychological sources was a ringing contrast to the silence that has cloaked some of the other southern Senators on the greatest domestic issue of our time.

While the feelings of most southerners in Congress is well known, and has been expressed by some on occasion, for the most part there has been an extraordinary lack in Congress of effective protest against forcing racial mixture on the South.

Among the most powerful men in the Senate are southerners. When Senator GEORGE of Georgia speaks everyone listens. He has said little about race. If former Gov. Herman Talmadge runs against the venerable GEORGE for the Senate, Talmadge will not keep silent.

What about Senator RUSSELL of Georgia? And BYRD of Virginia, MCCLELLAN of Arkansas, and THURMOND of South Carolina? (Senator JOHNSTON ably seconded Senator EASTLAND's proposal to investigate the Supreme Court's sociological sources.)

The United States Senate is one of the world's great forums. When a Senator arises to make an important speech his words wing far outside the corridors and the cloakrooms.

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, has made some telling statements. So has Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina.

What have Senators HILL and SPARKMAN, of Alabama, said? Is Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas inarticulate? How about HOLLAND and SMATHERS, of Florida; LONG and ELLENDER, of Louisiana; SCOTT, of North Carolina; KEFAUVER and GORE, of Tennessee; JOHNSON and DANIEL, of Texas; and ROBERTSON, of Virginia?

Of course, some of them have said something, but what did they say and how long ago? We would like to see the dome lifted clear off the Capitol at least once a week by southern oratory. We have mentioned Senators only, but there are plenty of Representatives in the House if the Senators' vocal cords grow weary.

Investigate the Skeletons in the Textile Closet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I addressed to the members of the House Rules Committee this morning in connection with House Concurrent Resolution 107, which I filed providing that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the economic problems connected with the loss of employment in the textile industry, together with a summary of current economic data on the textile industry which points emphatically to the urgent need for a comprehensive and far-reaching investigation into conditions in the textile industry with a view to developing suitable remedies to check the widespread deterioration.

My statement and the summary follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, there is no need to prove that clothing is second only to food and shelter, in maintaining the life of our people.

While the textile industry serves other economic purposes, its chief responsibility is to make and sell the cotton, woolen, worsted, and synthetic goods from which clothing is made to give us elemental protection.

This basic industry is not only sick; it is suffering from many mysterious complications.

In some cases, the patient has failed to look after his own health.

In others, there are signs that he has been poisoned.

Since 1948, during a period of great expansion in the American economy, 300,000 jobs have disappeared from the textile industry.

While the population has been increasing by 20 million, the production of broad-woven fabrics, cotton goods, silk, and synthetic yarn fabrics, has remained at the same level. But woolen and worsted output has shrunk from 516 million linear in 1947, to a depression-low of 281 million yards in 1954.

Five hundred and forty-one mills, providing employment for 147,000 people, have been liquidated in the postwar years.

Very few new and modern mills have been constructed during 1951–52–53. Of the $1,008,000,000 spent for new plant and equipment in this same time, only little more than 1 percent was for completely new establishments.

These are cold figures.

The human loss and suffering can never be charted.

In many instances, the closed mills were the economic heart of the communities. Local governments, jobs, stores, professions, services, and churches, depended upon them for income.

Closed mills, runaway mills, merged mills * * * failing or evading their trusteeship in the public interest * * * abandoned the people who had worked for them so long and faithfully.

For thousands of displaced workers there are no jobs of any kind.

One of the most recent casualties was the one-industry city of Sanford, Maine (population 15,000) that lost 3,000 jobs when the textile firm of Goodall-Sanford folded.

"We refuse to die" became the battle-cry of the people.

They knew that they had become the victims of an ultraconservative industry that had failed to keep up with the times, but they refused to quit. The people of Sanford set out with fortitude and initiative to attract new industries, in a determined campaign that has won admiration, and will produce results.

But in the meantime, who was responsible for their serious loss? Any reason?

Must the people of textile communities go on suffering because of poor mill management, or because financial manipulators buy and dispose of mills, and the people in them, as if human beings were as expendable as old plants and outmoded machinery?

A searching investigation of the whole textile industry is imperative.

It must, in the words of House Concurrent Resolution 107, look into the widespread and prolonged loss of employment, the rea-

sons for the outright liquidation of long-established textile factories, the migration of textile factories, agricultural areas, the loss of foreign markets, the decline in domestic consumption of textile production while the demand for other products has been increasing, and the economic effect of synthetic fibers and processes upon the textile industry as a whole.

This is the conventional approach.

Behind the scenes there are other forces at work, that must not escape investigation.

The consolidation of textile power and domination through mergers, is one.

Loopholes in the laws, is another. The incentives given to manipulation by the capital gains tax. Carryover provisions, pensions trusts, and charitable trusts, must be explored.

Price policies, production policies, the impact of mergers upon small and independent concerns, the reasons why textiles have been so deficient in research and innovation, the ill-conceived and antiunion policies prevailing in some areas, are worthy of close attention.

Take the case of the A company. In 1948 it employed 25,000 workers. The problems of this corporation could have been solved by bringing in new and modern management. Instead, a financial manipulator moved in to get at the cash in the till and avail himself of the carryover losses. Then he closed many mills, and expanded elsewhere.

Or the case of W company. It earned more that $20 million before taxes, in the 6-year period ending November 30, 1952. Financial manipulators bought up stock to gain control. They fattened themselves on dividends, then sold the machinery, and finally the plants. A huge profit was made via capital gains, which are taxed at drastically lower rates than ordinary income.

They came, and looted, and went, throwing over 8,000 out of work. Many of the longtime workers, in their fifties, will perhaps never get another job for a long time, if ever.

Maybe Federal incorporation of king-sized enterprises that are developing through mergers is one way to halt such piracy.

Tightening of our income-tax laws would do much to curb this inhuman exploitation.

A case could be made for the imposition of a special tax on the financial gains of large corporations that abandon plants, communities, and workers with the provision that such revenues should be used for the reconstruction of affected communities.

Slick operators have no sense of economic responsibility.

They have no thought of meeting the problems of modernization, of making the enterprise an economic success, of maintaining employment for workers, and the communities.

Vultures, in the likeness of men, are raising havoc with the American textile industry.

Is an investigation of their operations justified?

It is mandatory.

SUMMARY

Second quarter of 1955 statistics on employment and production in the textile industry in the United States shows a continuance of the alarming economic deterioration in practically all sections of this industry.

Although there was a sharp pickup in output and sales in the first quarter of 1955, the second quarter shows a rapid and serious decline. Figures for employment in May 1955 show that a total of a little over 9,500,000 persons were listed as holding jobs. The tragic and startling fact is that employment in the textile industry is lower today than in 1932.

Over 200,000 or more than 25 percent of the textile workers of the United States, are now out of work or have permanently lost their jobs through mill closing, or because of technological changes or for other reasons.

Of those who remain nominally on the payroll, hundreds of thousands are working drastically curtailed hours.

Widespread distress exists in textile communities where many thousands have exhausted unemployment-insurance benefits and have no prospect of being absorbed in other types of employment.

Here are the overall figures in textile employment.

In 1948, there were 1,280,000 production workers. This number dropped to 1,200,000 in 1950. In both 1952 and 1953 the total was about 1,100,000. The low point in 1954 was in July with 953,000 workers. Recovery since July has been minor; in December the total was 998,000 compared to 980,000 in June and August 1954. The latest 1955 figures, as we pointed out earlier, show a still further loss of employment.

The decline in textile employment is not confined to one section of the country, although it is a fact that certain branches of the industry (wool and worsted, for example) have been most severely affected.

Between February 1951 and October 1954, 117,000 textile jobs were lost in New England.

In the same period 85,000 textile jobs were lost in the mid-Atlantic States.

In the South, in this same period, 52,000 textile jobs were lost.

PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION DROPS

Per capital consumption of all textile fabrics in the period 1951–54 was 34 pounds as compared with 35.8 pounds for the years 1947–1950. This drop in consumption occurred despite a per capita increase of real disposable income in the United States of 11 percent from 1947 to 1954. Consumer expenditures per capita on apparel have not increased in proportion to over-all consumer expenditures. The share of the consumer dollar formerly spent on textiles is decreasing.

Except for the year 1959, total broad-woven fabric production has varied between 12 and 13 billion yards a year since 1947, with cotton goods production being maintained at the most stable level, varying between 9.5 billion in 1952 and 10.1 billion in 1951, except for 1949. Silk and synthetic yarn fabric production ranged from 2 billion to a maximum of 2.6 billion in 1950. But the woolen and worsted output has continued to shrink from 516 million linear yards in 1947 to a low of 281 million in 1954.

This drop in the volume of production is being experienced in face of a rising population which increased from 144 million in 1947 to 165 million at the present time. Part of the production amounting to 925 million square yards, the difference between the volume exported in 1947 and 1954 (1,730 million and 805 million, respectively) was diverted from export to domestic markets. But fundamentally, domestic textile consumption has diminished.

PRODUCTIVITY PER WORKER UP

While total volume of textile output has been lagging, the productivity per worker has continued to mount even more decisively than has average productivity in all manufacturing industries.

Evidence points to the conclusion that average manhour productivity in textiles has risen by about 5 percent per year since 1947. Yardage output per hour has gone up from 7.8 in 1947 to 8.8 in 1950 to 10.8 in 1954 and in the first quarter of 1955 to 11.2.

The shrinkage in total output and the more devastating drop in employment has been marked by widespread closing down and liquidation of mills.

MILL LIQUIDATIONS

There are no official figures on mill closings. The textile Workers Union of America has made the following startling computations which have not been challenged as far as we know by any responsible person in or out of the industry.

Mr. Solomon Barkin, research director of the Textile Workers Union of America, calls a liquidated bill one in which the equipment has been entirely removed.

A total of at least 541 mills, providing normal employment for 147,000 persons have been liquidated in the postwar years, distributed as follows among the various divisions: 248 mills employing 65,800 persons in the cotton-rayon division; 218 mills employing 70,000 in the woolen and worsted industry; and 75 mills employing 11,350 in the dyeing and finishing industry.

Equally indicative of the importance of the concentration has been the degree to which operating equipment has been reduced in the industry. Active cotton spinning spindles dropped by half a million between 1947 and 1950 and an additional 600,000 by April 1955. Over the 8-year period, some 16,000 looms were scrapped in the basic cotton and synthetic division and 13,000 in the woolen and worsted industry. The latter represents a reduction of one-third of the 1947 capacity in the industry.

MACHINERY HAS BEEN MODERNIZED

It should be noted that while mills have been liquidated the industry has spent between three and four billions of dollars in the postwar period to install up-to-date automatic equipment until today over 70 percent of the total productive machine plant in the industry is completely modern and highly productive. Practically all of this new machinery has been installed in old structures.

TEXTILE SLUMP HAS HIT MANY COMMUNITIES SEVERELY

As textile mills are generally located in nonmetropolitan areas, frequently comprising 1-industry or 1-mill communities, alternative employments in the locality are lacking. The slump in textile employment therefore depresses entire communities and leaves workers and their families stranded. The significance of this concentration is borne out by the fact that 5 of the 8 major areas in the continental United States which are designated "areas of very substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security, are textile areas. In addition, four smaller textile areas are classified in this category (having 12 percent or more of the labor force unemployed). There are also 20 textile areas (including 7 major communities) in the "substantial labor surplus" classification, i. e., with more than 6 percent but less than 12 percent of the labor force unemployed. These communities have not prepared for this situation with new industrial developments. The people have a lifetime investment of skills in the textile industry.

The concentration of textile manufacturing in the States along the Atlantic seaboard makes these areas peculiarly dependent upon the industry. The proportion of total manufacturing employment accounted for by the textile industry is in excess of 50 percent in North and South Carolina and more than 25 percent in Rhode Island and Georgia. In addition, substantial proportions of the factory employment in New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Virginia, Alabama, and Tennessee are provided by the textile industry.

REASONS FOR PRESENT CONDITIONS

We cite herewith a few of the many reasons for the deplorable conditions in the industry.

1. Loss of domestic outlets

The industry has lost many major outlets for textiles. These are reflected by the loss of textiles for wrapping, packing, and bagging to paper and plastics. Window shades have been replaced by blinds. Table cloths,

aprons, and curtains have lost out to plastics. The losses have been particularly large in industrial and household uses.

2. Loss of export markets

The industry has lost major export markets. From a level in excess of 1.5 billion yards in 1947, the volume of cotton fabric exports has dropped below 600 million yards, with every likelihood that even this level will not be maintained.

3. Changes in types of garments

There has been a drop in the per capita consumption of textiles due to the diminished use of such garments as overcoats. Casual attitudes and habits have reduced consumption and turnover, particularly as clothing lasts longer. Many significant changes in clothing patterns such as the substitution of blouses and skirts for suits and dresses for women and the acceptance of slacks and sport shirts instead of suits among men have sharply affected total output.

4. Changing pattern of consumer expenditures

The inadequacy of income, the appeal of other expenditures, particularly consumer goods, the heavy burden of mortgage debt, have all contributed to a reduced expenditure on apparel. The ratio of apparel expenditures to total consumer expenditures amounted to 6.9 percent in 1954 as compared with 7.7 percent in 1951, 8.5 percent in 1949, 9.5 percent in 1945, and 8.7 percent in 1939.

5. Tardiness in meeting new consumer trends

Apparel has been designed for urban living despite the larger number of people now living in suburban areas. People want washable items. Rayon and woolen fabrics which have been tardy in meeting this demand lost markets which were not entirely filled by other fibers.

6. Interfiber competition has discouraged buying

The excessive claims of the fibre manufacturers have done much to repel the American consumer. Many apparel manufacturers and fabric producers put fabrics on the markets without proper testing for specific end uses. Their shortcomings finally led to their withdrawal and the bad experience brought a revulsion among many consumers who have been wary about buying unproven items.

The substitutions have provided bonanzas for the innovators but later failures followed as the items did not stand up under actual wear. In the meantime demoralization has ensued and the older industries such as woolens and rayons have suffered. New substitutions are rendering obsolete even new innovations. In tire cord, rayon displaced cotton. Now nylon is battling it out with rayon. Already we hear of nonfabric tire.

7. Many textile owners have abandoned their mills

The textile industry has suffered from unprogressive managements.

In the first place many mills have been owned by the same interests for several generations. They had survived the depression and were capitalized at very low values.

(a) Some of these older interests sold out to other textile interests, textile users or financial speculators, during or immediately after the war, who were primarily interested in avoiding the excess profits tax. They paid high prices, which gave the original owners large capital gains. The purchasers financed the transaction with the cash accumulated in the old business and then could continue business with a high capitalization and therefore pay little or no excess profit taxes.

(b) Others sold out to established textile interests, particularly since the carryover provisions of the corporate income tax law have become more attractive. They hereby profited through a merger and acquired the stock of the successor corporation which was generally a nontaxable transaction. The successor corporation has been able to use the carryover provision as a means of escaping future taxes. In some instances these tax savings have amounted to 20 and 30 millions of dollars. These mergers, based on the capitalization of the loss position of the merged companies, have been widespread within the textile industry and are matters for real public investigation.

In the second place, a number of interests have been unwilling to invest to modernize their operations. No mill can survive unless it has the latest type of equipment and those owners who have been unwilling to keep abreast of the times have often abandoned their mills in preference to modernizing them. This procedure was attractive particularly at times and places where the real estate was of substantial value and when a market existed for the used equipment.

In the third place, the decline in the market for certain products has limited the capacity required in them. Older managements have in those cases been unwilling to move into new product areas and start afresh in the competitive struggle.

We urge a tnorough investigation into the effect of our tax structure upon the process of plant abandonment and mergers and purchases. Our tax system has inordinately encouraged these movements. And the textile industry has been one of the most important areas for the utilization of the tax laws for personal aggrandizement accompanied by widespread plant abandonment.

8. Imports have seriously affected some division of the industry

While the textile industry as a whole has not been particularly affected by imports, the woolen and worsted divisions has been seriously injured from time to time as the volume of imports has risen in the face of a shrinking market. These imports have then tended to aggravate and demoralize an already difficult situation. The industry must look with alarm at any increase of imports of serious proportions since they would aggravate what is now a seriously disturbed condition. It is an industry which must be maintained.

The hard and soft fiber cordage and twin division has also felt the impact of rising imports and is in need of protection as an essential industry. The threat of a major increase in cotton textile imports from Japan as a result of impending tariff negotiations is a real one. Any action which would compound the difficulties of this depressed industry must be avoided.

9. Prices have been set by the highly efficient mills

In this highly competitive market, prices have been driven to very low levels. Mill margins have also been very low. With the industry now highly concentrated in a relatively few hands, the major mill and selling organizations have set their prices at levels which reflect the southern wage scales and their high efficiencies. As a consequence the less efficient mills and those paying more than the southern wage scales on products predominantly produced in the South have had severe pressure on their income levels.

10. The high rate of mergers and mill purchases has concentrated the industry

The mill mergers and purchases have continued in large numbers since they began during the last war. The movement from 1944 through 1948 has been revived during the last few years so that we are now in a new period of consolidation. This has been stimulated by the tax laws; the decline of the woolen and worsted industry; the drive for diversification; and the practice of integration which has brought production, selling and factoring within the same interest grouping.

11. Local tax and finance subsidies create unfair advantages leading to unnecessary migration

Another stimulant to disorganization and unfair competition has been the local inducements offered by communities in the form of tax exemptions, profitable lease arrangements and local financing of plants and equipment. These have encouraged companies to abandon existing locations and move to new properties with little cost and investment. The result has been an unhealthy competitive situation which has called forth protests both from labor and management in the North and in the South.

GOVERNMENT RESEARCH ASSISTANCE BADLY NEEDED

Government research has aided certain sections of the textile industry; other branches such as the woolen and worsted section desperately need research assistance to retrieve drastically curtailed market.

Impartial, competent research is needed to aid the consumer beset by the insistent claims of the producers of certain synthetic fibers.

Research assistance is urgently needed on the potentialities of textiles for new industrial uses. New designs in textiles must be stimulated to meet the needs of present-day living habits.

Salutatory Address by Annette Schwartzberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, 5½ years ago a young lady by the name of Annette Schwartzberg lived in France. Her father had fought with the French underground movement. Her family came to the United States and in due course took up residence in the town of West New York where she attended Memorial High School, one of the finest high schools in the State of New Jersey. This year she graduated from high school and was given the honor of being the salutatorian of her class, Enid Willstadter, her classmate, having been selected as valedictorian. Recently I introduced a bill to have Ellis Island set aside by the Federal Government as a "Hall of Fame" for American immigrants who made good in America. The salutatory address by Annette Schwartzberg was well received and again demonstrates the greatness of America and the wonderful contribution made by those who came here from foreign nations. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith Miss Schwartzberg's address:

Members of the board of education, Mr. Bain, Miss Borneman, Mr. Hart, faculty, parents, friends, and you, my fellow classmates, tonight, we are about to step aboard the great ship known as the World. It is a perilous craft which we will steer through peaceful or stormy seas. The rules by which we will navigate our vessel may be found engraved not only on the Statute of Liberty, but also in the hearts and minds of all those who sought the refuge of our shores.

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuge of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Can words express more forcefully the meaning, the hope, which America has meant to millions throughout the world since its very beginning?

For there, enumerated or implied, are the reasons why America came into being, as immigrants, fleeing oppression, want, bigotry, and political persecution, flocked to her welcoming shores. From seeking these things merely for self, they progressed to seeking them for others, adding equality and brotherhood to their goals. They grew in strength. From 13 separate, weak colonies, a great Nation emerged, great because its ideals and the purpose of its being were lofty ones.

What these immigrants from the four corners of the globe accomplished stands as a unique achievement in the annals of mankind. They were not merely founders of a nation, but they were the pioneers who inspired others, oppressed as they had been, to throw off their shackles. Having risen from the twin bondage of want and tyranny, they proved the essential dignity of the common man, and his unlimited powers when he unites in search of truth.

Today, these ideals are threatened by forces within and without America. The world is seething and in turmoil. But, shall we, who have so much, prove less than those who had so little? Shall we lose their priceless heritage? Everywhere, alarmists are proclaiming dire predictions of the end of our civilization. But, must we believe them? We refuse to be pessimists. We, the youth, will pioneer a new era, in which our ideals will become the very cornerstone upon which the world of tomorrow will be built.

Let the lamp of freedom held high aloft by the first lady of our land, light our way to a bright future.

We, the youth, lifting our hearts and minds to one common God, are not afraid of our destiny, for its possibilities are boundless.

And with faith and hope, we salute it, and embark.

The Summit Meeting at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are skeptical of the "summit" meeting at Geneva; this is understandable in view of the results of meetings of this kind in the past. Let us hope and pray that past mistakes will serve to forewarn our representatives today and being forewarned they will be forearmed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the July 6, 1955, editions of the New York Daily Mirror and the New York Daily News:

[From the New York Daily Mirror of July 6, 1955]

GOOD-WILL CAMPAIGN

Never has a better campaign for good will been put on by any country than Soviet Russia has been promoting in advance of the "summit" meeting at Geneva. It has been universal, well-organized, and, one must admit, brilliantly handled.

It is a good sign and many rejoice in it. However, a preconference campaign does not establish facts; it only establishes the climate in which the statesmen work. It softens opposition and embarrasses the statesmen on the other side of the table. What establishes the facts is that which is put down on paper, the terms of the agreements, the unmistakable written words that are binding.

Therefore, as we approach the Geneva conference our guards must be up. Two important questions to be discussed at that conference will be disarmament and the role of the satellite countries. President Eisenhower, in a Fourth of July speech, emphasized our deep interest in the freedom of the satellites; the Russians are constantly discussing the removal of the atom and hydrogen bombs from warfare. Can we afford to agree to the latter; will they consent even to a discussion of the former?

The conference, it is now planned, will last 6 days. How much can be done in that short time? Actually, most of the work will have to be done by the experts after Geneva.

It is significant and by no means to be ignored that the Russians have taken the following steps in their preconference goodwill campaign:

1. The Austrian Treaty.
2. The invitation to Chancellor Adenauer to come to Moscow.
3. The visit of Nehru to Russia and to satellite countries with attendant peace publicity.
4. The voluntary truce in the fight in the Formosan Straits.
5. The visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Tito.
6. The mission of Krishna Menon to the United States, during which he pursued the Soviet Russian good-will mission.
7. The visit of Molotov to the United States, where he changed his personality, smiled all over the place, wore a 10-gallon hat, and nearly creaked with admiration for things American.
8. Khrushchev's speech at the Fourth of July celebration at the American Embassy in Moscow, during which he exuded love for this country.

It is all very nice and may have good results, but the only thing that can make it sure is an agreement, publicly announced. Then we shall know that it is all real and not the product of sound public relations. Let's see the text.

Meanwhile, it could well be that the Russians are up against an inadequate supply of food and need to get away from production for war so that they can stimulate production of consumers' goods, which alone will encourage the farmers to greater output. There is no fake about the Russian food shortages. The Soviet Government and the Russian Communist Party are battling this problem in every way, but the results are not good, and the Russian people are constantly being told that grain production is low and that the livestock census has dropped. They are now buying grain in the United States.

So, this may be just the right moment to reach a satisfactory arrangement. But enthusiasm should be based on the text, not on good-will propaganda.

[From the New York Daily News of July 6, 1955]

MOSCOW: LOUDER AND FUNNIER

The Soviet Russian "peace" offensive gets funnier by the day.

On Sunday the Kremlin stages a big airshow over Moscow, flaunting some new planes which impress many observers.

On Monday the Kremlin's top gangsters—Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, Malenkov—come whooping around to the United States Embassy to help the Americanskis celebrate July 4. Such a thing has never happened before.

At this rangdoo, Communist Party Secretary Nikita Khrushchev did all the talking, with Premier Nikolai Bulganin acting solely as yes man. That raises again the question why President Eisenhower should consent to talk at Geneva week after next with any Russian but Khrushchev.

As for Khrush the Lush, he bellowed that the Kremlin will be speaking from strength at Geneva, not from weakness. The Reds are not, he said, "going to Geneva with broken legs." If Russia is treated as an equal at the "summit" conference, something good will result; if not, Russia can wait and blah blah blah.

At the same time, the United Nations military command in Korea, through United States Maj. Gen. Harlan C. Parks, was blasting the Reds for violating the armistice terms with "complete insincerity, dishonesty, and utter lack of integrity."

GET TOUGH AT GENEVA

That, we think, provides the tipoff to the real meaning of the Kremlin's current didoes.

It looks to us as if Khrushchev and his comrade hoods are acting like scared mobsters who try to bluff their enemies by brandishing weapons with their hands and making sweet talk with their mouths. It's old gangster practice.

As for these Red gangsters, they may not have broken legs, but they at least have a couple of turned ankles and maybe a dose of housemaid's knee. Their farm program is flopping on its face, good shortages are growing, inflation is on the march, unrest is increasing in the Red empire's slave nations. One analyst estimates that the Kremlin arms program is as rough on the Russian economy as a yearly outlay of $150 billion for defense instead of the current $40 billion would be on ours.

All of which, it seems to us, indicates that if the British, French, and United States heads of state will be tough and united at Geneva they can bulldoze some valuable concessions out of the Kremlin.

Why not pursue such a policy of toughness? Why take any more nonsense from a bunch of frightened and faltering gangsters?

Wave Our Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following well-written article by Rev. George W. Casey, which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., Saturday, July 2, 1955:

IT'S A GRAND OLD FLAG

(By Rev. George W. Casey)

As far as flags go, ours isn't really a very old one, George M. Cohan was using affectionate rather than accurate language when he sang that it was. Compared with China and Japan, Spain and France, England and Sweden, our flag is a new one. Our Nation with its hardly more than 175 years of independent life is still young, and as a matter of fact, still unformed.

Our national characteristics have not yet been determined, the American type has, to my mind, not yet emerged. I think this is

because too large a proportion of our population has not yet entered into the full stream of American life, has not had its full, and eventual, share in shaping the American man. The accepted version of this American man, here and abroad, is nothing more than the transplanted Englishman of colonial times. He is considered to be an Anglo-Saxon.

But he will be different from that, because sooner or later the immigrants of the last 100 years and their descendants, a huge segment of our present population and vastly non-Anglo-Saxon, will cease being sealed off and distinct and will blend with the older stock and make him a composite of all. The European tradition of ethnic irredentism is not going to prevail here. One of these days Polish, Italian, French, Swedish, Irish, Spanish, German, etc., genes are going to be as discernible and as influential as English genes and we will have our typical American.

Our America still hardly knows what to do with itself, what course to take. It was born of a desire to get away from Europe and its stratified society and religion. It grew up determined to keep away from its entangling alliances and power politics, and to develop in its own way. Its youthful ventures into imperialism came out of sheer exuberance, and, one must add, the plain desire to set up protection for its wide shores and tempting prosperity. Yet 3 times (4 if you count the Boxer business) within 50 years it became involved in foreign wars. And now it has world leadership thrust upon it, and because of the menace of communistic imperialism, it also has militarism and power politics thrust upon it. This dichotomy between its original orientation and historical necessity has confused it, and has caused bitter division and recrimination in the public mind and great uncertainty of policy.

With all its inner conflicts and immaturity in diplomatic and foreign affairs, and its hesitancy and difficulty in according full justice to such of its minorities as the colored people and the migrant laborers in the Southwest, America has been faithful to its early inspirations and declarations. Powerful groups and powerful prejudices have often misdirected it from the paths of justice and idealism but its own dedication to these principles have brought it back.

No country in history ever suffered more to extirpate, and expiate, the crime of human slavery than did ours. Our involvements in the foreign wars of our history certainly had the motives of self-protection in them, and maybe of aggrandizement in the case of the 19th century war with Spain, but always, and prominently, there were moral considerations as well. The ardent participation of the people could not have been secured without this appeal to their consciences.

One of the hardest things to maintain in times of stress and emergency is personal liberty. Unity and discipline, even regimentation, are more useful, or at least seem to be so, in these cases. Honest difference of opinion and conscientious objection are considered by the majority to be dispensable luxuries at best, and dangers and treason at worst. Despite provocation and pressure, and temporary yieldings here and there, America has protected personal liberty and the rights of conscience, if not perfectly, then better, we maintain, than any other great power in history. Its pretension to be the land of the free has been vindicated in time of temptation.

The Declaration of Independence was hailed by idealists all over the world not only as the bringing forth of a new nation but the implementation of a new idea for the times, a government of the people, by the people and for the people. History has heard many proud proclamations of the sort, but never has it seen such fulfillment. For this, and many other good reasons, the Fourth of July is a day of pride, and prayer, for all who believe in the dignity of man under God. And we Americans can wave our flag not only for the glory it has gained, but what is more at this point in history, for the hope it reflects upon a worried world.

Santa Fe Pact Divides Basis of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of June 23, 1955:

SANTA FE PACT DIVIDES BASIN OF COLORADO—LAW OF RIVER ALLOCATES NO WATER TO STATES AS SUCH

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

The Colorado River Compact was completed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in 1929 by the seven States bordering on the river. It is a contract between these States and authority for such interstate agreements is found in the United States Constitution. Herbert Hoover acted as chairman during the negotiations.

The compact did not attempt to divide up water in the river as such, nor did it make any specific allocations of water as such to the States involved. Rather, it proceeded by regarding the river as consisting of three parts:

First, the upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah.

Second, the lower basin: California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Third, that part of the river which crosses the international boundary and flows in the Republic of Mexico.

DIVIDING LINE FIXED

The dividing line between the upper and lower basins was fixed at a point called Lee Ferry in Arizona, near the Utah border.

Thereupon, the negotiators proceeded to apportion "beneficial consumptive use" of the river's waters between the basins. The compact nowhere defines "beneficial consumptive use," and its meaning is one of the issues in the pending Supreme Court suit by Arizona against California. In general, it amounts to use of water for irrigation, industrial or domestic purposes.

That kind of use of water in the amount of 7,500,000 acre-feet yearly was apportioned to each basin. This totals 15 million acre-feet, and since that was not all the water the negotiators believed available, they permitted the lower basin to make use of an additional 1 million acre-feet of "surplus" water.

MEXICO TREATY MADE

Having no authority to cut Mexico out of water to which she might legally be entitled, they agreed Mexico was to have whatever might be determined by a later treaty. This, again, was to come out of "surplus," but if need be, equally out of each basin's apportionment. A subsequent treaty fixed Mexico's entitlement at 1,500,000 acre-feet a year.

At this point the negotiators had disposed of 17,500,000 acre-feet of water a year, but they thought there was even more in the river so they set up machinery for a "further equitable apportionment" of remaining water at a later date. Subsequent experience with the river has shown not only that this additional water is nonexistent, but also that part of the apportioned water likewise is nonexistent. The river in fact averages a critical deficiency of almost 2,500,000 acre-feet a year.

Unless she desires to enter into a one party "suicide pact" California must resist to the utmost the upper basin's bold attempt by means of the upper Colorado Basin storage project as now planned, to charge almost all this deficiency against California's preexisting water rights.

INTERPRETATIONS TOLD

Unfortunately, this is only one of many ingenious ways in which the attempted invasion of California's water rights is being conducted. There are about a dozen other provisions in the compact on which upper basin proponents are placing weird interpretations trying to deny California and the lower basin even more water.

Since the flow of the river varies widely from year to year, lower basin negotiators insisted on guaranties preventing the upper basin from manipulating its uses between wet and dry years to the disadvantage of the lower basin. Thus the upper basin was prohibited from depleting the amount of water flowing past Lee Ferry below a total of 75 million acre-feet in any period of 10 consecutive years.

In their desperate water grab, project proponents now contend this proviso, rather than amounting to a minimum guaranty to the lower basin, amounts to the maximum amount of water they are required to turn down the river. They say they can keep everything in excess, storing it for power purposes or making any other use or nonuse they desire.

HOOVER QUOTED

They persist in this contention even in the face of an intepretation of the compact made by Herbert Hoover at the time it was negotiated in his words as follows:

"* * * The compact provides that no water is to be withheld above what cannot be used for purposes of agriculture. The lower basin will therefore receive the entire flow of the river, less only the amount consumptively used in the upper States for agricultural purposes * * *"

In the past California has not opposed upper basin developments. Many projects in Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado have passed Congress without an objection from the Golden State. But when schemes are proposed such as this that cut deeply into the vital water supply, like a man attacked in his own home, Californians must command their every means and skill for self-preservation.

H. R. 3253

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks as to my convictions in signing the minority report on H. R. 3253, signed also by Mrs. EDITH GREEN, RALPH W. GWINN, and ALBERT H. BOSCH, I include a statement provided by Dr. Samuel Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, reviewing the situation as of March 24, 1955:

The bill we are considering, H. R. 3253, has the intent of continuing a high school on

the Marine Corps base at Quantico, Va., even though adequate high school facilities are available in nearby public schools. Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, which H. R. 3253 would amend, clearly provides that the Commissioner of Education cannot use Federal funds for the operation of schools on military bases if suitable school facilities are available in local public schools. This is a sound provision, Mr. Speaker, because it keeps the responsibility for the control and operation of our public schools where it rightfully belongs—in our States and local communities.

Prince William County, where the Marine Corps base is located, built a new high school more than a year ago and has signified its willingness to accept the approximately 80 children enrolled in grades 8–12 who live on the Quantico base. The Commissioner has therefore no alternative but to follow the requirements of the law. The respective schools were so advised a year ago, in order that there would be ample time to work out any necessary arrangements.

But the consequences of H. R. 3253, if it were to be enacted, reach far beyond the confines of the Quantico base. In effect, the bill would give to the military agencies a veto power over whether or not any local public schools are suitable for providing free education to children who reside on military bases. Under existing law this judgment is exercised by the Commissioner of Education, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency. H. R. 3253 would require this determination to be made jointly, by the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of the military department concerned.

Such a requirement would have serious and important implications for the relationship, nationwide, between the military authorities, on the one hand, and the State and local school authorities on the other, implications which go to the very heart of the American system of State and local control of education.

The history of Public Law 874 indicates that the Congress clearly intended that wherever possible education for children residing on Federal property should be provided by local educational agencies under State law. At the same time it was recognized that there might be some exceptional situations in which the local educational agency might be overwhelmed because of the Federal impact and thus find it impossible to provide suitable free public education for children living on Federal property. To meet these situations Congress included section 6 of Public Law 874 which authorized the Commissioner of Education to make arrangements to provide free public education for those children living on Federal property wherever, after consultation with State departments of education, he determined that suitable free public education for children living on Federal property could not be provided in the regular manner. Thus section 6 of Public Law 874 authorizes the Commissioner to make arrangements for the education of children living on Federal property in cases where "it is the judgment of the Commissioner, after he has consulted with the appropriate State educational agency, that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children."

This provision of the law, together with Report No. 2287 of the House Committee on Education and Labor (81st Cong.) dated June 30, 1950, indicates that the Congress intended that wherever possible education for children living on Federal property should be provided by local educational agencies in accordance with State law, and only in exceptional cases where no local educational agency was able in the judgment of the Commissioner to provide suitable free public education should the Federal Government undertake directly to operate schools. This position is entirely consistent with the fundamental educational policies of this country. It was wholeheartedly accepted by practically all State and local school administrators as being consistent with our basic education philosophy and in the best interest of the educational programs for the children concerned.

Under the law the responsibility of the Commissioner of Education is to make a finding, after he has consulted the appropriate State educational agency, as to whether a local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for the children in question.

I would furthermore call attention to one other section of Public Law 874. It is section 7 which reads:

"(a) In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system of any local or State educational agency."

Surely this shows the clear intent of Congress that the Commissioner shall accept the curriculum, instruction program and personnel approved by the State in making his determination of what is a suitable school and not attempt to have the program of the local schools modified to suit his ideas which might differ from those established by the State and the local community.

Here we have a situation where in carrying out the law it means that an operating school on a military base would be discontinued and the children would attend a local public school. The parents do not want to make the change.

Thus the issue is clear. Does this Congress wish to take the position, by passing the proposed amendment, that children who live on the Quantico or any other military base, shall have provided by the Federal Government separate schools from children in the local community when the local community is able and willing to provide such schools?

The problem is not a question of a narrow or a liberal interpretation of what is a "suitable" school, for the history of the law is clear that Congress did not intend that the Commissioner of Education should use that term to open or to continue in operation schools on military bases when local public schools were available to pupils living on such bases.

Let us be frank in recognizing that if we adopt the amendment we are in effect saying to the Commissioner of Education not only that we want to continue the school on base at Quantico but that we do not want to close existing schools on any military bases even though the quality of educational program and facilities may be better in the local schools than on the base.

North Dakota VFW Members Oppose Closing VA Office at Fort Snelling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars recently held their 34th encampment at Fargo, N. Dak., and have expressed their concern over plans by the Veterans' Administration to close their district office at Fort Snelling and transfer insurance and dependent claims records from that point to Denver, Colo. Their resolution is as follows:

"Resolution 6

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced its intention to close the district office at Fort Snelling and transfer all insurance and death-claim records currently included in that office to the district office at Denver, Colo.; and

"Whereas insurance records for veterans of North Dakota and death claims for dependents of deceased veterans formerly residing in North Dakota are currently housed at the Fort Snelling center; and

"Whereas the delay in mail connections between North Dakota points and Denver would result in a loss of benefits, particularly to dependents of deceased veterans due to such delay in the mails and to the fact that VA regulations state that effective date of payment shall be the date of receipt by the VA; and

"Whereas unusual and necessary delay in correspondence concerning insurance cases will be occasioned by the transfer of records from Fort Snelling to Denver; and

"Whereas service to the veterans of North Dakota by the Fort Snelling office has always been as rapid and efficient as VA regulations will permit: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Department of North Dakota, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in annual encampment duly convened at Fargo, N. Dak., on June 5, 6, and 7, 1955, That we hereby strenuously and vigorously oppose any move on the part of the VA to close the district office at Fort Snelling and to transfer insurance and dependents claims records from Fort Snelling to any other district office; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to each of the Representatives from North Dakota in the United States Senate and United States House of Representatives with a strong request for their support in preventing the transfer of the district office from Fort Snelling."

Adopted by the 34th Encampment, Department of North Dakota, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in session at Fargo, N. Dak., on the 7th day of June 1955.

HOMER FERRIS,
Department Commander.
FRED G. JORDAN,
Department Adjutant.

The Ames Aeronautical Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 27, I attended a most interesting and well-organized presentation. The national advisory committee for aeronautics opened their Ames aeronautical laboratory to a gathering of representatives of Government, industry, and transportation. The occasion was the laboratory's triennial inspection. This installation, located at Moffett Field, Calif., some 40 miles south of the Oakland-San Francisco area, was the scene of a very impressive picture of the committee's valuable contributions to the aircraft industry and to our national defense.

About 400 visitors were shown through the Ames Laboratory on the above date,

and another 400 on the following day; the rigorous time schedule, adhered to closely, set the pattern for the extremely well-run manner in which the full day's inspection was handled. The 9 demonstrations illustrating some of the activities of the laboratory necessitated splitting the visiting group into smaller contingents of about 40 each, which proceeded on a staggered-shift basis. The presentation was excellent, and the planning and organization of the inspection program enabled the tour to proceed smoothly and quickly.

At each of the 9 stops the subject-matter was discussed by 3 able speakers in concise, explicit, and relatively nontechnical terms. The 27 speakers who presented the problems faced and their eventual solutions worked out in the committee's laboratories gave ample testimony of the quality of the young engineers with which the laboratory is staffed. Averaging approximately 33 years of age these men are among the top researchers in the aeronautical field, and exemplify the forward looking scope of the committee's work.

In a maze of windtunnels, oscillographs and gages of all types, this corps of civilian engineers probes the complex questions which constitute known obstacles to aircraft design progress. The valuable work now being done by this group deserves high commendation, and an enumeration of the benefits of the Committee's past research accomplishments offers us every indication that the research now being conducted will yield a constant flow of knowledge which will serve to continually advance the military and commercial aeronautical superiority of our Nation.

The saving of time, money, and materials which result from the laboratory's predictions with regard to the behavior of prospective airplane designs seems to justify the expenditures for this extremely practicable service.

Admit Italy to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have recently been celebrating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations. Statesmen from all over the world assembled at San Francisco, the site of the United Nations' birth, to pledge again their loyalty, and the devotion of the countries they represent, to the ideals embodied in the United Nations Charter. From far-off Moscow came the new Mr. Molotov, to promote the new look in Russian foreign policy. When he had finished his speech to the assembled delegates, however, they might have been pardoned for failing to discern anything new in what he said. The true prescription for easing tensions in the world was given by Mr. Dulles, when he told the delegates that the key to peace lay in observing the United Nations Charter. This is an injunction which the Soviet Union, if it is really interested in world peace, might well take to heart, for the Soviet Union, as we all know, has been the principal obstruction to the effective functioning of the United Nations Charter.

Take, if you will, the simple matter of the admission of new members to the United Nations. The charter provides only that membership is open to all "peace loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations." A two-thirds vote in the General Assembly is necessary for admission, along with the affirmative vote of 7 of the 11 members of the Security Council. While there is room for a difference of interpretation of the latter provision, in practice the Security Council has held that the votes of its permanent members must be included in the affirmative vote required for admission.

This interpretation has worked to the disadvantage of a state which richly deserves membership in the United Nations. I refer to the Republic of Italy. Certainly Italy meets the criteria for admission to the U. N. Having experienced the horrors of war at first hand, having been laid waste by fire and sword, Italy does not rattle the saber. Indeed, there is nothing Italy so ardently desires today as continued peace. Her restraint in the matter of Trieste, despite strong claims to the area, is further testimony of her character as a peace loving state.

Nor can there be any legitimate ground for doubt as to Italy's ability to live up to her international obligations. She is a valued ally in NATO, enthusiastic in the observance of its obligations. Her contribution to the security of free Europe's southern flank is vital. Although she is faced with a strong domestic Communist Party, no one can seriously allege that the Italian Government is not in full control of the internal situation. There is no question about it, her Government has the power and the desire to live up to its international obligations, in the spirit of the charter.

If this is true, why is it that Italy, which has consistently sought admission to the United Nations, has not yet been able to attain that goal? The answer is simple. It is that the Soviet Union, with petty spite for failure to get its own way, has five times seen fit to veto proposals for the admission of Italy to the United Nations. An Australian proposal which would have recommended Italy's admission "at such time and under such conditions as the General Assembly may deem appropriate," was vetoed in August of 1947. After the Italian peace treaty went into effect, the application of Italy was again examined by the Security Council, in the light of a provision in the preamble of that treaty, which stated that the conclusion of the treaty would enable Italy's ex-enemies to support her application for membership in the United Nations. A similar provision was included in the peace treaties with Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Finland, and the Soviet Union thus upheld the view that all five applications be acted upon together. The United States stood for separate action on the merits of each application, which was the method adopted. On that basis Italy and Finland received enough votes in the Security Council to be admitted, but they did not receive the approval of the Soviet Union. This was in October 1947.

The next month the General Assembly found that Italy was a peace-loving state within the meaning of the charter, and therefore merited admission. The International Court of Justice, in an advisory opinion, held by a vote of 9 to 6 that no member of the United Nations was entitled to make its consent to the admission of a new member subject to conditions not found in the charter. Particularly, it was not to make its consent conditional upon simultaneous admission of other members. Despite these decisions, the Soviet Union vetoed moves for Italy's admission to the United Nations in 1948, 1949, and 1952. It has persisted in regarding admission to the United Nations as a matter of horse-trading, and therefore, has insisted on the admission of states such as Albania and Mongolia in return for an affirmative vote on the admission of a nation such as Italy. The American view has been that admission to the United Nations should be based on the criteria set forth in the charter, and should not be the subject of political deals. The result has been frustration for Italy, whose admission to the United Nations would serve to strengthen that organization, and futility in the United Nations, which has consistently seen the favorable recommendations of the General Assembly on Italian membership flouted by the will of one power. The United States, which has consistently supported Italian aspirations to membership in the United Nations, has seen that policy thwarted time and again.

Yet in spite of previous disappointments, I believe that the time is ripe for a new attempt to bring Italy into the United Nations. That is why I believe that this Congress should go on record with a demonstration of America's continuing support for Italy's entrance into the world organization. To that end I introduce herewith a resolution "that it is the sense of Congress that Italy should be admitted to full membership in the United Nations at the earliest possible time, and that all of the influence of the Government of the United States should be exerted to accomplish that end."

This resolution can serve several useful purposes. In the first place, it will test the good faith of the Russians. They say they want peace, they say they want good will. Let them prove it. Let them, as Mr. Dulles has said, observe the charter by omitting extraneous considerations, and voting on the question of Italy's admission to the U. N. on the merits of Italy's application. Any such vote, if truly objective, can only lead to Italy's admission. If, however, the Soviet continues to insist on a "package deal" before she will consider Italy favorably, that will be at least one piece

of evidence that the Russians have not really changed their ways.

Furthermore, a congressional declaration of support for Italian admission to the United Nations will certainly strengthen the hand of our representatives there in pressing for a resolution to that effect. If Soviet policy has truly changed, such a congressional declaration will be taken as a demonstration of America's unity, and should give impetus to favorable Russian action. Finally, the United States should benefit in its relations with Italy if Congress passes this resolution, for in so doing we will make it clear to the Italian people that we are concerned for the status and prestige of Italy in the world, and that we appreciate her cooperation as a loyal ally.

Let us then strike while the iron is hot. Let us put the Soviet Union in a position where she must show her change of heart by deeds, and not by words. Let us show the world that the United States will continue to support and strengthen the United Nations, in the true spirit of the charter.

Alaska Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, mental illness is the No. 1 health problem in the United States. An important part of this total problem is the treatment of mental patients from Alaska. The present picture in Alaska is a patchwork—indeed a crazy quilt—of provisions proceeding from inconsistent concepts and administered by different authorities.

Federal statutes now provide a commitment procedure of an archaic type which offends the conscience of the community.

I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial that appeared in the Anchorage Daily Times of June 20, 1955. In my opinion, it fairly and accurately describes this unfortunate situation which needs the immediate attention of this Congress:

MORNINGSIDE MESS

The secret of the mysterious power of Morningside Hospital seems to have been discovered in Congress. It is money.

For many years Alaskans have been trying to get rid of the Portland institution as the place where territorial mental patients are treated. The efforts have proven futile.

Last week, for the first time, the commercial aspects of the hospital venture were brought to light by the House Interior Committee. It was shown that the hospital is owned by one man and that he has profited handsomely under a Government contract to treat Alaskans. Millions are involved.

The protection of those profits has apparently been given more importance than the welfare of Alaska's mental patients. Every attempt to improve the procedures for commitment or treatment have been rebuffed.

The situation wears many of the badges of a racket. Congress kept for itself the responsibility of providing for mental cases. Alaskans were left without any power. The Interior Department has carried the responsibility by granting a contract to the Morningside Hospital. The amounts involved have grown steadily until now it is more than $750,000 annually.

Alaskans have sought various improvements in this phase of welfare and health administration.

They have complained about the barbaric procedures of commitment. The law requires that a mental patient be charged and convicted of the "crime" of being insane before treatment is available. It requires that the patient be handled by the United States marshall like any other "criminal." It involves confinement in jail and transportation to the hospital in the custody of the marshal.

These complaints have won the support of every investigating group that has looked into the matter. The Nation's top medical experts have joined in the demand for more humane and modern commitment procedures.

But getting the law modified has proven impossible to this date. Any move to modify the law pertaining to that commercial institution in Portland runs up against mysterious and powerful opposition.

While seeking improved commitment procedures, Alaskans have sought other improvements, too. They have tried at various times to have responsibility for mental patients transferred to the Territory. They have tried to win support for the construction of a mental institution within the Territory to replace the Portland institution in the Alaska program.

Each effort for improvement has become involved in complicated and prolonged discussions and debate. Recently the opposition summed up the situation as saying it is too cold in Alaska to treat mental patients.

This was not the only instance of such tomfoolery. There was a time when a committee considering the transfer of responsibility to the Territory amended the law so as to protect the Morningside Hospital contract and force Alaskans to continue patronizing that institution.

The amendment would have forbidden Alaskans from dealing with any institution that was not west of the Rocky Mountains. Other restrictions virtually spelled it out that Morningside was the only institution they could use.

It was obvious that Morningside has friends in high places who are willing to go to any ends to perpetuate the Morningside monopoly in the treatment of Alaska's mental patients.

The present investigation into the commercial aspects of the Morningside contract has been initiated by Oregon's own representative, Mrs. EDITH GREEN.

This is a new turn of events. She has a colleague from Oregon in the Senate who is equally active in trying to right the terrible wrongs that have been inflicted so long. He is Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER.

The investigation has already revealed that the hospital is owned by one man, Wayne W. Coe. He has taken more than a million dollars out of the institution in salaries for himself. The Interior Department has allowed him to operate the institution without audits of his accounts.

He has been allowed to use the patients as grounds keepers to make his hospital pretty. Indeed, he has been the dictator of the entire procedure. No patient can be discharged without his approval. His control over the patients has been that of a jailer over his prisoners.

Every phase of the relationships with the Morningside Hospital has proven ugly.

The procedures under the law are barbaric. The complaints against the treatment of patients in the institution give rise to substantial questions of the effectiveness of the entire program. The commercial aspects look selfish and greedy. Supervision in the public interest seems to be lacking.

All Alaskans can do is hope that the Members of Congress from Oregon will be successful in their efforts to liberate the Territory from this horrible mistreatment.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Battle of Springfield

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the week-long observance of the 175th anniversary of the Battle of Springfield, N. J., which drew to a close Sunday, June 26, dramatized the 1870 battle which marked the last penetration of the British into New Jersey and served to place due emphasis on the importance of this battle in the War for Independence.

Col. Henry B. Carrington wrote in his Battles of the American Revolution:

There were few movements during the war which bore so directly upon the safety of the American Army and the general cause, as the operations of the British Army before Springfield during June of 1780; and the conduct of both sides indicated some appreciation of its importance.

A cheering audience of more than 3,000 witnessed last week the reenactment of the Battle of Springfield in a pageant presented as part of the 175th anniversary of the conflict. The gathering saw a graphic portrayal of the engagement between a small band of New Jersey Militia and Continental troops and a force of 5,000 British and Hessian soldiers. It included a reenactment of Rev. James Caldwell bringing Watt's hymnals to the troops to use for musket wadding and closed with the portrayal of the burning of the town as church bells chimed throughout the township.

I was privileged to be on the reviewing stand on Saturday afternoon, June 25, for a six-division parade, including numerous military service units, bands, floats, antique autos, and horse-driven surreys. Officials of the township's historical society noted at the close of the commemoration that it hopes to continue its work of reviving interest in the history of this area and bringing the importance of the battle into its true light, and I would like to commend the society for their outstanding commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the Battle of Springfield. The committees that arranged all of the aspects of this important historical anniversary are to be commended for making this significant moment of American history come alive for the people of the Springfield area.

Cotton Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been recently brought to the attention of the Nation that a great many wheat farmers are producing for Government storage rather than consumptive use in the sense that they have turned to inferior, high-yield varieties of wheat which enjoy a favorable support price. In fact, American housewives have been eating inferior spaghetti and other semolina products because of a short production of quality wheat. This scandalous situation has become so prominent that the Secretary of Agriculture is proposing to do something about it by establishing quality standards of real significance in wheat price-support operations.

A similar situation exists with respect to cotton, although it has received much less publicity. In fact, unless existing surpluses are disposed of and cotton allowed to go back to free production, there will be a shortage of the cotton most needed by American manufacturers in the face of large quantities of relatively worthless cotton in Government storage. This creates an acute problem for California cotton growers who have suffered the most severe quota restrictions in the business in spite of the fact that they produce the cotton which is most in demand and is potentially in short supply. I am hopeful that the Secretary of Agriculture will consider initiating a program with respect to cotton support prices which will give the greatest incentives to those grades of cotton which are most in demand. Parenthetically I might add that California growers have less cotton under Government loan than do the growers of any other State.

In this connection I am submitting for your consideration an excellent speech, with accompanying charts, delivered by Lamar Fleming, Jr., chairman of the board of the Anderson, Clayton & Co., recently at Harlingen, Tex. The speech is the following:

The national interest in American cotton production is primarily the interest of 165 million American consumers in having abundant supplies of the end products, of good quality and wide variety and at reasonable prices. A secondary national interest is the prosperity of those who are engaged in producing and servicing cotton and in manufacturing it into products, so that these groups can share the tax load, be good customers of the rest of the economy, and be contributors to the general prosperity rather than drags upon it.

To serve the national interest, the growers must keep the American mills supplied abundantly with the kinds of cotton that make the kinds of end products that the people want, at reasonable costs of the cotton itself and of conversion of it into goods. To serve the growers' own interests, the net income from cotton production must be adequate. To the extent that the adequacy of this income results from high price, the group interest of the growers conflicts with the national interest. To the extent that it results from low costs of production, the national interest and the group interest are in complete harmony.

The net income of cotton production is measured by price times volume, less all costs. Some factors in cost are per-pound factors, the amount of them fluctuating with volume. Other factors are fixed charges which do not fluctuate with volume. These include the carrying costs of the land, improvements, equipment, and persons involved. For each cotton farm there is at any time and under any set of circumstances a rate of cotton production that may be likened to the most efficient rate of production of a factory or an oil well; and to force production to a higher rate than this or to cut it to a lower rate increases the production cost per pound. The interests of the owner of each cotton farm and the national interest both are served if its cotton production is operated at this most efficient rate.

Two kinds of deviations by cotton farmers from their most efficient rates of cotton production have been not uncommon. In periods of high prices some farmers have planted too much of their land over and over again in cotton, impairing its fertility, to the detriment of long-range income. In times of low prices some farmers have not been able to pay for the labor, fertilizer, or insecticides needed to make a low-cost crop. Today we see an entirely different case compulsory reduction of volume through compulsory acreage curtailment, with the effect that all cotton farms are operating so far below their most efficient rates of production that their costs of production per pound have risen to a point that narrows and threatens to wipe out the gap between cost and price, which is net income.

This, of course, is unsatisfactory for the cotton farmer. It is unsatisfactory for 165 million American consumers, because one phase of it is a high cotton price, unsatisfactory for our mill people who are squeezed between high cotton and consumer resistance, and unsatisfactory for the taxpayers who are footing the bill for a tremendously costly Government support program for cotton and other crops. Another important effect of high cotton prices has been that they have sheltered an increase of 7 million bales in world rayon production since prewar, largely at the expense of use of cotton, and the postwar recovery in uses of jute and a great expansion in the uses of paper, at the expense of coarse cotton yarns. And, of course, the maintenance of artificially high cotton prices in the United States tends to shelter expansion of cotton production abroad and to make it difficult for us to sell American cotton abroad. Some have urged the Government to offset this difficulty by subsidizing our export sales. This would be an additional burden upon the taxpayers and would place our mills at a handicap in competition with foreign mills; and I am convinced anyhow that we cannot take this course because it would so upset the world economy that the net economic effects for the United States would be detrimental and because it would utterly torpedo our policies of cooperative amity with the other free nations.

We are in a very bad fix; and we have to find a way out that really will get us out, not some panic-conceived nostrum that will make the fix worse tomorrow.

I suggest that the way out will best be found by a mental attitude that gives principal emphasis to costs of production and secondary emphasis to price—the reverse of the attitude that conceived the policies which have brought us to our present condition. I suggest too that more dollars can be saved by producing cotton cheaper than can be made by selling it higher, and I repeat that producing it cheaper is the way toward greater cotton-grower income that is in complete harmony with the national consumer and taxpayer interest. Also, it is the best way to check and if possible reverse the losses of offtake to rayon, jute, paper, and foreign-grown cotton.

I will not discuss the ways of reducing production costs through improvements in the techniques of farming, for this is a field which the country's most competent experts are covering at this meeting. What I will discuss is the selection of lands for cotton production on which the cheapest costs per pound can be achieved and the return of farm units to their most efficient rates of production.

I have furnished you with two maps. One of them appeared in a recent number of the Cotton Digest, showing how United States cotton production has migrated in the last 35 years. Each dot represents a thousand bales. You will observe that in 1920 the counties that were solid black, that is, completely covered with dots, were principally in the rolling Piedmont country of the Southeast, the rolling Blackland strip of Texas, and the rolling lands of central and east Oklahoma, and in the flat alluvial counties of the Mississippi Valley, and Nueces and San Patricio Counties of Texas, which of course are flat. You will find in 1954 dense production had left the Piedmont country except for several counties and had left the Texas Blacklands and Oklahoma, that it continued in the flat country of the Mississippi Valley and in Nueces and San Patricio Counties, and that it now appeared in the counties at the mouth of the Rio Grande, in El Paso County, in 11 counties on the Texas High Plains, and in the San Joaquin Valley of California, all of them flat areas. You will note also a big increase in production in the Imperial Valley of California and the flat valleys of Arizona. The other map shows the recent acre-yields for the various regions of the belt, related to the land contours.

These maps reveal that cotton growing has been shifting from hilly and rolling country, which typically were farmed with a man and a mule, to flatter lands where a man can farm many more acres with a tractor and doesn't have to grow feed for the mule. International Harvester, John Deere, and others did this when they made the tractors available, and they and others add to it progressively as they make other useful farm machinery available. And the effect on the people of the rolling and hilly countries has not been as cruel as we feared. Thousands of them have been attracted to industrial employment with the industrialization of the South and are earning more than they could have earned if they had stayed on the farm. Thousands have moved in order to farm flatter lands. Of those who remain, the majority are faring better producing food for the swelling industrial and urban population of the South. Many have found prosperity in meat animals and dairying.

Some of the flat lands, including the lower Rio Grande counties, the valleys watered by the upper Rio Grande and the Pecos, the Texas High Plains counties, and the Arizona and California valleys have prospered in cotton production by the use of surface water or well water to irrigate otherwise arid or semiarid land. In the more arid of these regions, the relative absence of water except when needed furnishes ideal conditions for economical insect control. Operators of rain grown flat lands only now are learning the possibilities of supplementary standby irrigation.

The second map shows that acre yields generally are greatest in the flat lands that enjoy particularly favorable rainfall conditions, like the Mississippi Delta, and in the irrigated areas.

Acre yields are not a close measure of cost of production, but high yields are at least an indication of relatively low costs. So it ap-

pears that we could achieve our lowest costs of production if we concentrated our cotton growing in the areas of high acre yield, which generally are the blacker areas on the first map.

This would be a natural and inexorable development if the solutions were left to economics and human nature. People are too smart to starve on hillsides when flat fertile land is available to them, with appropriate moisture also economically available from clouds, streams, or wells—or when more remunerative employment is available in nearby industry or in production of food for industrial and urban consumers.

The natural tempo of this change has been retarded by the workings of our acreage allotment scheme in the years of marketing quotas and by the incentive which this scheme gives to marginal farmers to go on planting cotton with little or no profit in order to maintain a historical allotment base as a perquisite of the land. The scheme impedes the shift from uneconomic cotton farms to economic cotton farms, including new ones. And, when individual allotments are cut back as drastically as they are today, it tends to make all United States cotton farms uneconomic, marginal, high-cost producers.

The allotment scheme was a device to hold prices up by cutting production back. It not only cuts everybody's production below his most efficient rate of production and thus increases his per-pound costs; it prevents a man from transferring his productive efforts from a fifth-of-a-bale-to-the-acre farm to a two-bale-to-the-acre farm, thus condemning him to be a high-cost producer, even though nature invites him to be a low-cost producer. By putting predominant emphasis on price, we have sacrificed the opportunity of higher yield and lower cost of production. No one should know this better than you people of this lower Rio Grande Valley, with your fertile flat land and the wonderful store of water above the Falcon Dam.

The people of the Cotton States are too intelligent to strangle themselves in this manner. I say strangle themselves because the part of our farm laws that has to do with cotton is fashioned principally by our own Representatives in Congress; and our Representatives will not write laws that injure us if once we see the facts ourselves and explain them to our Representatives.

We have got to approach the problem from the cost of production angle and cease to be blinded to everything but price. Only in this way can we improve our competitive position with other materials and foreign cotton, and only in this way can we harmonize our interest with the national interest.

The obvious first goal is to get away from the scheme that limits a farmer's right to plant land in cotton to a nationwide proportion of past cotton plantings on that land. We must again become free to seek land that can produce cotton cheaper, to spend our productive energies there, and to farm it at its most efficient rate of production.

As a political matter, it may not be possible overnight to wipe the entire acreage allotment and marketing quota scheme from the statute book. As a practical matter, removal of restrictions on planting may have to be gradual, synchronized with a reduction of our present cotton surplus. But the intelligent people of the Cotton States cannot afford to see their cotton production shackled indefinitely to lands where production costs are higher than they need be and to inefficient rates of operation, nor to see business lost to other materials and to foreign cottons which they themselves could get with profit were they in these respects the free and brave men which the national anthem says we are.

I believe the light is dawning on many of those whose vision heretofore has been obscured by the obsession of price, that many crave freedom to return to their most efficient rates of operation, and that many would like to shift their energies to lands of lower production costs that now are sterilized by the present program. I believe this mounting sentiment will demand freedom to regain efficiency and low cost, and that this freedom will be regained, not overnight but by steps. But there is no time to lose in winning the first steps; for any productive segment of our economy that submits to conditions of high cost for long will waken some day to find that competitors in the same line or producers of alternative materials or products have taken over its business.

If this makes sense to you, don't bother to tell me about it: tell your Congressman—and talk the matter out with your neighbors and get them to tell him too.

There is an angle to the surplus problem that holds great dangers for us in the Southwest. Except in the irrigated valleys of the Rio Grande and the Pecos, Texas and Oklahoma are the short-cotton producers of the belt. The upper Rio Grande and Pecos Valleys of Texas and New Mexico produce long cotton, some of it the longest Upland cotton grown anywhere. The heavy Texas and Oklahoma production of short cotton is due in part to climatic limitations, in part to the drought cycle, and in part to the planting of short varieties for amenability to stripping. However, another very important cause is the fact that the Government loan rates for short cotton are such that the production of it is remunerative without regard to the prices which would have to be accepted to move it all into mills. People will say that the loan rates are determined by the commercial quality differentials quoted by Spot Quotations Committees. It is true that they are computed by averaging these quoted differentials for the preceding cotton season; but when the CCC loan rate for a surplus quality is the top market price for it, that is the price that the committees have to quote, for they have no means of knowing what the price would be if determined by commercial factors.

The upper El Paso and Pecos Valleys in Texas and New Mexico are producing a great deal more 1⅛ inch and longer than there is a mill demand for. This is due largely to the fact that the long-staple Acala 1517–C variety has the quick-maturing characteristic that is required at high altitudes. It is due also to the planting of even longer varieties, which are taken into the loan at very wide premiums. The heavy excess of production over demand for these lengths, in fact most of the production of them, winds up in CCC stocks, since the wide loan premiums for them prevent mills that don't need so much length from buying them.

Demand for 15/16 inch and shorter, as reflected by the 1953–54 national disappearance, has declined to 40 percent of what it was in 1939–40—of 31/32 inch and 1 inch to less than 50 percent—and of 1⅛ inch and longer to less than 30 percent. On the other hand, demand for 1 1/32 inch through 1 3/32 inch is now more than double what it was in 1939–40 and constitutes 64 percent of aggregate demand, as contrasted with 26 percent in 1939–40. Among the causes for these changes are the encroachments of jute and new paper materials upon cotton in the coarse uses and of rayon and other fibers upon cotton in the finer uses, a general speeding up of spinning processes which calls for the use of somewhat better staples in the medium count yarns that constitute the bulk of production, and changes in end-product demand and spinning technique that have reduced the demand for coarse yarns and very fine count cotton yarns and have enabled the mills to make finer products out of the medium staple category 1 1/32 inch through 1 3/32 inch. A not indifferent factor in the loss of short staple offtake is the loss of the low-income Chinese market, which used to be a big user of coarse goods.

Other cotton-growing countries have adapted themselves to the qualitative changes in demand. Some of our States have done so too, as evidenced by the great proportions of 1 1/32 inch through 1 3/32 inch now produced in the Atlantic States, the Mississippi Valley, Arizona, and California. The lower Rio Grande Valley, due to its now abundant supplies of irrigation water, should be able to stabilize its quality to match this preponderant segment of demand. But most of Texas and Oklahoma has continued to produce unwanted quantities of 15/16 inch and shorter, and the upper Rio Grande and Pecos Valleys of Texas and New Mexico have continued to produce unwanted quantities of 1⅛ inch and longer.

Why? With very great embarrassment, I confess that a significant part of the cause is that some of us who should have felt a great responsibility in this matter neglected our responsibility—or at best that we let the urgency of immediate problems divert us from responsibilities of profound long-range importance. All of us who have a stake in southwestern cotton should have been studying the matter and should have made it our business to see that the Texas cotton farmers were fully advised as to the changes in demand and the changes which it would be wise for them to make in the varieties that they were planting. Since my company has a much greater stake in cotton in the Southwest than anyone else, I volunteer that my share in the responsibility and the blame is the greatest. Most of us here share it, in varying degrees. I will suggest in a few minutes how we might atone for our shortcoming.

The other major cause, aside from natural causes such as drought, is that the loan rates for 15/16 inch and shorter and for 1⅛ inches and longer made production of surpluses of them appear to be the most profitable thing that many southwestern farmers could do, if they could not peer ahead to the repercussions in the future. Part of my confession is that we did not help them to peer ahead. In the same breath I must add that I suspect that many of them, whatever we had prophesied for the future, would have gone ahead and done what appeared to be the most profitable thing for the present.

You have several tables, along with the maps, which show the qualitative unbalance that has resulted and what it may lead to if the recent trends continue. Between 1951 and 1954 the total carryover of American upland cotton increased from 2,144,000 bales to 9,550,000 bales. By staple lengths the increase was: 15/16 inch and shorter, from 223,000 to 2,381,000; 31/32 inch and 1 inch, from 318,000 to 1,571,000; 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches from 1,287,000 to 5,198,000; 1⅛ inches and longer from 316,000 to 400,000, after dropping to 154,000 in 1952. The Government figures on supply for 1954–55 are available. If we should assume a 1954–55 disappearance in all staple categories of 9 percent more than in 1953–54, or 13,277,000 bales total, the carryover this summer would be 9,826,000 bales total, of which 2,977,000 15/16 inch and shorter 2,394,000 31/32 inch and 1 inch, 3,815,000 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches, and 640,000 1⅛ inches and longer. This would represent increases for all categories except 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches, which would show a decline of 1,383,000. Then, if we should assume a 1955 crop of 15 percent less than the 1954 crop in all the staple categories, or a total of 11,520,000 bales, and a 1955–56 disappearance of 15 percent more than in 1953–54 in all staple categories, or 14,004,000 bales, we would wind up with a 1956 carryover of 7,338,000 bales of which 2,981,000 15/16 inch and shorter, 2,662,000 31/32 inch and 1 inch, 890,000 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches, and 805,000 1⅛ inches and longer.

At this rate of disappearance, these carryovers would represent provision for 14 months disappearance of 15/16 inch and shorter, 14.4 months for 31/32 inch and 1 inch, 1.2 months for 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches, and 47.4 months for 1 1/8 inches and longer.

If things work out like this, next fall and winter all of us will see a situation developing that will culminate in an acute scarcity of 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches in the summer of 1956, which will be perpetuated unless the Southeast, the Mississippi Valley, and the Far Western States are allowed to increase their acreages in order to produce as much of this kind of cotton as is needed or unless the Southwest adapts its production to the qualities in demand, or unless both these developments occur. On the other hand, if these projections materialize, we will see no reduction in 1955–56 of the burdensome surplus of 15/16 inch and shorter and a marked increase so far as 1 1/8 inches and longer is concerned. We probably won't see much reduction in the surplus of 31/32 inch and 1 inch; but that might be a blessing, since it would give the mills something to turn to in default of adequate supplies of the staples immediately longer.

I don't pretend that we can project into the summer of 1956 with even approximate accuracy. For example, I don't believe supplies of 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches will be so nearly exhausted; I believe scarcity will drive the prices of these lengths to levels that will divert some mill use of them to the more abundant lengths. But I do think we can see in these projections enough to indicate that by next summer demand will require an increase in production of 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches, while conditions of burdensome surplus of 15/16 inch and shorter and of 1 1/8 inches and longer still will call for reduction in the surpluses of them, which cannot be achieved in big enough proportions without reduction in production of them. So, if we of the Southwest continue to be the offending overproducers of unwanted qualities, while continued acreage curtailment in the other States prevents them from filling the demand for the 1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches which they produce and compels them to surrender this demand to rayon and foreign cottons, what will you expect the people of the Central, Eastern, and Far Western States to do? I don't know; but would they be human if they failed to think of another scheme of regimentation that would restrict the producers of surplus qualities and release the producers of scarce and wanted qualities, which would be themselves?

I can see two ways for Texas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico to protect themselves. One is to use every means at their disposal to adapt their production to demand, that is, to produce longer cotton in Oklahoma and Texas, except the upper Rio Grande and Pecos Valleys, to the extent that this is compatible with climate and soil and reasonable yield, and to shift from the extra long cottons to cotton nearer 1 1/16 inches in the upper Rio Grande and Pecos Valleys of Texas and New Mexico, unless they are reconciled to sell the longer cotton close to the 1 1/16 inches price. The other is to attract demand to the qualities that presently are surplus by pricing them at levels relative to the prices of the scarcer qualities that will make it profitable for mills to use more of them in substitution for the scarcer qualities or in blends with the scarcer qualities.

I do not imply that all of Texas and Oklahoma can convert to production of 1 1/16 inches. The irrigated lands of the lower Rio Grande Valley, however, have produced a lot of it in the past and can produce more of it than they have in the last several years. We can produce more of it and much more 1 1/32 inches in the Coastal Bend counties and in most of the bottom lands of the Southwest. Nueces and San Patricio Counties, Central Texas, North Texas, East Texas, and Eastern Oklahoma have produced a great deal of 31/32 inch, 1 inch, and 1 1/32 inches in the past and can do so again. We certainly can add a thirty-second to the average staple of West Texas and Western Oklahoma. Thus we can get into a position where the reconciliation of our production to demand will become a matter of inducing mills to make small shifts in the lengths that they are spinning, say to use some 1 inch in their 1 1/32 inches mix, some 31/32 inch in their 1 inch mix, and so on, instead of to shift 2 or 3 staples.

For the upper Rio Grande and Pecos Valleys, the adaptation of production to demand would entail the planting of less of the varieties longer than Acala 1517–C and perhaps a roguing of the latter variety to slightly shorten its length, although this may not be necessary if the growers of it are reconciled to sell it close to the 1 1/16 inch price.

The second line of attack, more realistic pricing of the present surplus qualities, would have two effects. As reflected in the loan rates, it would prevent these rates of themselves from making it temporarily profitable for people to produce additional surpluses of qualities already in surplus, and it would again permit demand to select the qualities to be encouraged by price. As reflected in the market prices for the various qualities, it would restore the elasticity that permits surplus qualities to seek price levels that will induce the mills to use them.

According to what I hear, many Texas growers have taken steps this spring to bring the staple of their crops more in line with demand. I hear more of this from the high plains than elsewhere. Nature also has contributed with copious rains in most of Texas and Oklahoma during the recent weeks; and if her kindness lasts through the summer, this will contribute to an improvement over the drought-blighted staple of the last 2 years.

But we here must resolve to organize our several services, businesses, and groups in a joint endeavor this year and every future year to follow the demand for and performances of the various cotton varieties in the various areas and to see that accurate and up-to-date information on these subjects is brought to the attention of every cotton grower, county agent, ginner, crusher, cotton buyer, and banker in the Southwest. I will not presume to say how this should be done, as that is a matter before this Cotton Congress. But, when the plans are made, we all must get behind them with time, effort, and enthusiasm, and must stay behind them permanently.

The way to return to realistic pricing of the surplus qualities has been pointed out by a resolution of the American Cotton Shippers Association. It is to amend the law so that after 1955 middling 1 1/32 inches can be made the hinge quality of the CCC loan, instead of middling 7/8 inch, and so that the CCC shall have the authority to weight its quality differentials in a manner that will reasonably reduce the relative loan rates of qualities that are in great surplus. This would tend to restore the natural incentive of the cotton growers of the Southwest to plant varieties that would produce cotton of the kinds in greater demand. It would allow price relationships to become such as to give greater incentive to mills for greater use of the lagging qualities. Combined with intelligent and vigorous efforts by all of us, it would help to get Southwestern production more in line with demand.

At first I was apprehensive lest the thought of wider discounts for short cotton be received as an attack upon the cotton income of the areas that have been producing it. I tried the idea on a friend who understands the grower's problems more closely than I do, and I put it to him as a question of a short-term sacrifice for a long-term benefit. His reaction was that the growers would benefit from the outset if spurred to shift to longer varieties, for which he thought they would get equal yields and more price. Reduction of production of the shortest varieties would give the remaining producers of them a better chance to dispose of them for more than the loan price of them. I am inclined to believe this friend is correct. Whether he is correct or not, I know we are in for a very dangerous reaction from the rest of the Cotton Belt when the inevitable realization comes of impending acute scarcity of the qualities which they produce and which mills principally want, combined with continued severe acreage restrictions resulting from a continued tremendous surplus in the Southwest of qualities of which mill needs are relatively small. It may then be too late to head off legislative proposals very detrimental to the interest of the Southwest, unless we then can show effective measures already taken to convert Southwestern production in 1956 and later years to staple lengths that the mills of the world need, instead of continuing to produce unwanted surplus cotton for sale to the Government.

This matter cannot wait. To avert disaster, we must get the right varieties planted in 1956 and help our Congressmen and the Administration to hold the Government loan to its intended function of reasonable price protection instead of the role of our principal customer.

EXHIBIT A

Upland cotton: Supply and disappearance by staple groups

[Thousands of bales]

	Distribution				Production	
	1938–39		1953–54		1954–55	
	Bales	Percent	Bales	Percent	Bales	Percent
15/16-inch and shorter [1]	4,118	40.8	2,247	18.4	3,045	22.5
31/32-inch and 1-inch [1]	2,758	27.3	1,930	15.9	2,927	21.5
1 1/32-inch through 1 3/32-inch [1]	2,513	24.9	7,828	64.2	7,147	52.8
1 1/8-inch and longer [1]	702	7.0	178	1.5	434	3.2
Total	10,091		12,181		13,553	

Footnote at end of table.

EXHIBIT B

Upland cotton: Supply and disappearance by staple groups—Continued

	15/16 inch and shorter	31/32 inch and inch	1 1/32 inch through 1 3/32 inch	1 1/16 inch and longer	Totals	
Supplies 1954 [1]	5,426	4,498	12,345	834	23,103	
(Disappearance 1953) [1]	(2,247)	(1,930)	(7,826)	(178)	(12,181)	1954/55.
(Add 9 percent)	(202)	(174)	(704)	(16)	(1,096)	
X. Disappearance 1954 if 9 percent more than 1953	2,449	2,104	8,530	194	13,277	
Carryover August 1955	2,977	2,394	3,815	640	9,826	
Production 1954 [1]	3,045	2,927	7,147	434	13,553	
Deduct 15 percent	457	439	1,072	65	2,033	
Supplies 1955	5,565	4,882	9,890	1,009	21,346	1955/56.
(Disappearance 1953) [1]	(2,247)	(1,930)	(7,826)	(178)	(12,181)	
(Add 15 percent)	(337)	(290)	(1,174)	(26)	(1,827)	
Y. Disappearance 1955 if 15 percent more than 1953	2,584	2,220	9,000	204	14,008	
Carryover August 1956	2,981	2,662	890	805	7,338	
Carryover 1955 divided by X/12 (months)	14.3	13.7	5.4	40	----------	
Carryover 1956 divided by Y/12 (months)	14	14.4	1.2	47.4	----------	

[1] Taken from U. S. Department of Agriculture Reports.

NOTE.—Addendum to report of National Affairs Committee, American Cotton Shippers Association.

EXHIBIT C

Supply and disappearance by staple groups—Upland cotton only

[In thousands of running bales and in percent of the whole]

Season	15/16 inch and shorter			31/32 inch and inch			1 1/32 inches through 1 3/32 inches			1 1/16 inches and longer			Total		
	Production	Disappearance	Carryover	Production	Disappearance	Carryover	Production	Disappearance	Carryover	Production	Disappearance	Carryover	Production	Disappearance	Carryover
1938–39	4,004	4,118	6,742	3,335	2,758	2,796	3,290	2,513	2,636	969	702	769	11,598	10,091	12,943
Percent	35	41	52	29	27	22	28	25	20	8	7	6	100	100	100
1939–40	4,310	5,685	5,367	3,330	3,968	2,158	3,278	3,660	2,254	534	629	674	11,452	13,942	10,453
Percent	38	41	51	29	29	21	28	26	22	5	4	6	100	100	100
1950–51	1,859	2,626	223	1,302	2,262	318	6,305	9,273	1,287	290	346	316	9,846	14,447	2,144
Percent	19	18	10	14	15	15	64	64	60	3	3	15	100	100	100
1951–52	3,461	2,915	769	1,971	1,770	519	9,271	9,290	1,267	323	486	154	15,026	14,461	2,709
Percent	23	20	28	13	11	19	62	65	47	2	4	6	100	100	100
1952–53	3,260	2,572	1,487	2,610	2,196	933	8,629	7,029	2,867	329	292	191	14,858	12,089	5,478
Percent	22	21	27	18	18	17	58	58	52	2	3	4	100	100	100
1953–54	3,141	2,247	2,381	2,568	1,930	1,571	10,157	7,826	5,198	387	178	400	16,253	12,181	9,550
Percent	19	18	25	16	16	17	63	64	54	2	1	4	100	100	100
1954–55 [1]	3,045	2,449	2,977	2,927	2,104	2,394	7,147	8,530	3,815	434	194	640	13,553	13,277	9,826
Percent	22	18	30	22	16	24	53	64	39	3	2	7	100	100	100
1955–56 [2]	2,588	2,584	2,981	2,488	2,220	2,662	6,075	9,000	890	369	204	805	11,520	14,008	7,338
Percent	22	18	41	21	16	36	54	64	12	3	2	11	100	100	100

[1] If 1954–55 disappearance 9 percent more than in 1953–54.
[2] If 1955–56 production 15 percent less than in 1954–55 and disappearance 15 percent more than in 1953–54.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Alabama?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Alabama has more than 683,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production—when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But, it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Bob Zachary Proclaimed Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I know his numerous friends in Washington will be delighted to learn of the most recent honor conferred upon Mr. Robert A. Zachary, vice president of Public Service Corporation of Newark. Mr. Zachary has been proclaimed Man of the Year by Mr. M. Martin Turpanjian, president and editor of the Jersey Parade and founder of the New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers.

The following tribute to Mr. Zachary appeared in the Jersey Parade of June 24th:

BOB ZACHARY PROCLAIMED MAN OF THE YEAR

(By M. Martin Turpanjian)

M. Martin Turpanjian, editor of this newspaper, takes great pride in proclaiming Robert A. Zachary, vice president of Public Service Corp., of Newark, N. J., in charge of public relations, advertising, and publicity, as the man of the year and also as the friend No. 1 of the press of the Garden State for his efforts as ambassador of good will for spreading friendship among masses and the classes.

Bob Zachary is the son of George W. and Mary Zachary. He was born on April 13, 1888, in Washington, D. C., and married on April 25, 1914, to the former Miss Mary Edwards. They have two sons, Robert, Jr. who resides in Essex Fells, N. J., and Roy who lives in Cranford, N. J. He recently rounded up 25 years of services with the huge utility firm and was the recipient of a golden emblem from the Board Chairman Lyle McDonald in presence of President Donald C. Luce and many other executives of the company at a fitting ceremony. Bob Zachary resides at 460 Harding Drive, South Orange.

Editor Turpanjian could not think of a more appropriate tribute to Bob Zachary than to ask former United States Senator Edge to say a few words about the man who began his political career as secretary to him who was then United States Senator from New Jersey in October 1921.

We are more than proud to reprint verbatim the message of former United States Senator Edge which was received recently by the editor of this newspaper.

"Bob Zachary was of invaluable assistance to me while I was a Member of the United States Senate. He always was diplomatic, courteous, and, of course, absolutely loyal.

"It was a great pleasure to me to recommend him to my old friend Ed Wakelee, when an official of Public Service Corp., and his rapid rise in that organization has been a source of much gratification to me."

Bob Zachary was executive assistant in the company's law department from 1930 to April 1937 when he was made assistant vice president of the firm and in 1939 he was elected a director and since December 1945 he has been designated as vice president in charge of public relations, advertising, and publicity departments.

Mr. Zachary went to work as an office boy in the Washington, D. C., office of the then Brooklyn Eagle, on November 2, 1904. He worked up to assistant Washington correspondent and was in the employ of that newspaper 17 years. He was also assistant to the Washington correspondent of the Newark Evening News. In October 1921 he became secretary to former United States Senator Edge. He managed the Edge's campaign for reelection in 1924.

He is a progressive in thought and action. He has been known to pour oil on the troubled waters and iron out differences by applying his golden rule methods and they are effectual. He is a conscientious worker and possesses extraordinary forcefulness and daring initiative.

He is one of the best-informed men in New Jersey. With his intellectual elasticity of mind, charm, and poise, Bob Zachary is on the way to greater heights of glory. He is a logical thinker and works out every idea to a definite conclusion. He is very humble. Anyone and everyone can talk to him. He is a self-made power for good and is a man of noble personality and his character stands out cameolike.

He has always displayed much tact and wisdom. He has a heart of gold and finds happiness in seeing others happy. He is also widely known as a prince of good fellowship for he is a man of dynamic personality and of ultrafidelity. He has indeed the greatness of heart and mind. He is also honorary member of New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers, Inc.

There is another outstanding characteristic that marks him for public service. His utter selflessness. When other men put themselves and their personal interests first, he puts himself last. The good of the masses is the thing that is of paramount importance to him.

Washington, D. C., may well be proud of having produced so illustrious a citizen as Bob Zachary whose governmental career began when he became secretary to the former United States Senator Walter E. Edge at the Nation's Capital.

This newspaper presented a certificate of appreciation to Bob Zachary yesterday. M. Martin Turpanjian, as president of New Jersey League of Weekly Newspapers wishes for Bob Zachary the best of luck and happiness as honorary member of the league. New Jersey has 28 daily newspapers and close to 400 weeklies.

To Bob Zachary, statesman, tactician, patriot, newspaperman, publicist, and director of public relations, I lift my hat in a salute of pride. Long may he live and conquer.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Woody Creek irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Woody Creek project is a part of the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Eulogy to Harry Agganis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following complete text of the inspiring eulogy delivered by Rev. Charles Mihos, assistant at St. George's Church, Lynn, Mass., on Thursday, June 30, 1955:

MEMORY WILL ALWAYS BE AN EXAMPLE OF HUMILITY

No greater match was made in Heaven when Harry Agganis was married to God in the wonderful tradition of the Greek Orthodox Church yesterday afternoon.

Many thousands of words have been written and spoken in the memory of Harry Agganis but none will immortalize his remains greater than the words spoken by the Reverend Charles Mihos, assistant at St. George's Church in Lynn, when he said: "Our children who idolize him will never again feel the warmth of his handshake and smile. Yet his spirit will never leave us and his memory will always be an example of the accomplishments of a humble person who, although he reached the pinnacle of success and greatness, he never forgot that humility was the only road to success."

Following is the complete text of the eulogy delivered by Reverend Mihos:

"'I am the resurrection, and the life, he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.'

"Your Grace, fellow clergymen, and bereaved brethren, as we are about to bid our last earthly farewell to one of God's children we realize that even words are inadequate and too poor beyond compare to comfort the hearts of those that through death have lost a loved one. As I stand here and try to eulogize not only a member of my faith but also a true friend I cannot help but acknowledge the fact that Harry Agganis' eulogy has been written on the pages of practically every newspaper in the country long before his untimely death. In the past 2 days thousands of his friends and admirers have paid their respects by his bier and have mourned his passing in this church on the common that was truly an integral part of his life. The world mourns the death of Harry Agganis, the athlete, St. George mourns the passing of Harry Agganis, a humble parishioner.

"We may read the story from Matthew of the young lawyer that approached Jesus and asked, 'Master, which is the greatest commandment in the laws?' Jesus said unto him, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul, and with all thy mind.' This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the laws and the prophets.

"Love for God, Love for neighbor, two prerequisites for Christians, for one cannot be separated from the other. These two virtues, love for God, and love for neighbor, were virtues characteristic of Harry's virtues.

"His love for God was evident especially to his people. The parishioners of St. George had watched him grow from a child into manhood. Upon my visitation to his bedside his first question always concerned the progress of our church and parish.

"Typical questions were, 'When will the church be landscaped? Are we receiving enough donations?' He asked that I pray for his recovery and I can still too vividly recall the eagerness and piousness with which he received his Holy Communion.

"Evidence that he loved his neighbors is proven by the fact that so many people mourned his passing.

"Last night in the church, as thousands of people filed by his bier, I stood by his mother and in the usual way tried to comfort her. Instead of comforting her, I was comforted for she taught me a great Christian lesson. 'Harry,' she said, 'is where he belongs, in the arms of God. He never really was exclusively mine. Just as Christ never really belonged to His mother, the Virgin. Christ belonged to God and His people. My Harry belongs to Christ and to these people that loved him.'

"This is the Christian courage and fortitude that a great Christian mother imbued into the heart of a great Christian son.

"We, of St. George, will never again have the privilege of seeing our Harry piously enter the church and light his candle in participation in the worship service. He will never again visit our office and nonchalantly sit and talk to us about his church, his mother, and his work. Our children, who idolize him, will never again feel the warmth of his handshake and his smile. Yet his spirit will never leave us and his memory will always be an example of the accomplishments of a humble person that, although he gained the pinnacle of success and greatness, he never forgot that humility was the only road to success.

"O Lord, our God, Thou Who has created us and Thou Who has given us life look down upon this bereavement of Thy servants and grant us solace and comfort. Have mercy upon Thy servant Harry's soul and repose him amongst Thy saints where there is no sorrow or sighing but life everlasting. Amen."

Certain Medical Costs Should Be Paid by VA, Says North Dakota VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent 34th encampment of the North Dakota Department, VFW, has passed a resolution pertaining to medical examinations for disabled veterans which deserves the attention of the Congress. The resolution follows:

"Resolution 24

"Resolution to authorize the VA to pay the necessary cost of medical examinations for disabled veterans who have been notified by the VA that a reduction in their disability compensation will be made based upon the findings of VA authorized medical examinations

"Whereas veterans who have been examined by authorized VA examinations; and

"Whereas in many cases when these examination reports are reviewed by VA adjudication divisions it results in the lowering of the veteran's disability rating; and

"Whereas when this decision is reached by VA adjudication divisions the veteran is then notified by letter from the VA that a reduction in his compensation will be made within 60 days from the date of the said letter unless medical evidence is submitted by the veteran to show that the proposed rating is not just: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of North Dakota, assembled in encampment in Fargo, N. Dak., on this 7th day of June 1955,* That we request our Senators and Representatives to initiate the necessary action to change Veterans' Administration regulations to allow these veterans to have medical examinations by medical doctors of their choice, and impartial to both parties, and the results of this examination to be submitted by the examining physician to the VA as medical evidence needed within the 60-day period; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the cost of this examination be paid by the Veterans' Administration."

Adopted by the 34th encampment, Department of North Dakota, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in session at Fargo, N. Dak., on the 7th day of June 1955.

HOMER FERRIS,
Department Commander.
FRED B. JORDAN,
Department Adjutant.

It's Distribution That Ups Your Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an article from the New York World Telegram and Sun of July 5, on the subject of the sale and distribution of natural gas, together with an editorial from the same newspaper on the subject.

During the long hearings which were held on H. R. 4560 and certain other bills dealing with this subject, it became crystal clear that all segments of the gas industry—that is, the producers, the transmission companies, and the distributors—had a very vital bearing on the prices paid by the consumers of natural gas. No one segment should be unregulated, since all have a terrific impact on the amount the consumer has to pay for the use of the gas. That is my main reason for opposing this bill to exempt the producers from Federal regulation.

This article indicates, and I agree with it wholeheartedly, that something should be done with regard to determining why the markup by the distributor is so great, particularly where it is regulated by a State body.

Obviously, the Federal Government cannot go into a State in a purely intrastate transaction and regulate or fix the rates to be charged to consumers in that State. It seems to be clear, however, that the State regulation to which the distribution companies are subjected does not seem to be adequate in keeping the price down.

I am hopeful that a resolution now pending before the Rules Committee, to provide for a complete investigation of all phases of this problem, will be passed, so that we may determine just what can be done to keep the price of this essential commodity down and just where Federal and State regulation fail, if they do.

The article and editorial follow:

IT'S DISTRIBUTION THAT UPS YOUR GAS BILL—PRODUCERS GET MERE FRACTION

(By Marshall McNeil)

WASHINGTON, July 5.—Distributors, not producers back in the field, are the big money grabbers in the natural-gas business, figures from the General Gas Committee showed today.

These figures substantiate the recent statement by House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, in appealing for President Eisenhower's support of the bill to relieve independent producers and gatherers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

"The great cost in getting the gas to the consumers," said Mr. RAYBURN, "is not in getting gas to the neighborhood of the consumers, but the cost of distribution after it gets there. I could name some cities * * * where it costs less than 70 cents per 1,000 cubic feet to get the gas out of the ground and transported to the cities where the consumer is paying more than $3 per thousand cubic feet for the gas to the house."

PRICE RISE REAL ISSUE

According to the General Gas Committee, the natural gas which costs the residential consumer in New York City $2.42 per 1,000 cubic feet brought the producers an average price of 7.8 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. The average cost at the city gate was put at 31.8 cents.

Regarding this price spread, a spokesman for the Consolidated Edison Co. declared:

"The prices quoted of 7.8 cents to the producer and 31.8 cents at the city gate apparently reflect prices as of September and October 1954. Current prices are, to the best of our knowledge, 10.8 cents for the producers and 34.8 cents at the city gate. This rise in prices in the last 6 or 7 months presents the real issue now before Congress.

"As for the spread in the price between that paid at the city gate and prices paid by the consumers, it is one thing to buy gas in large quantities at a constant rate at a single point and to distribute gas to 1,500,000 customers who use gas only intermittently and often in very small quantities. It should be remembered that Consolidated Edison is strictly regulated by the New York State public service commission and its gas rates are supposed to be sufficient to pay for the cost of operation and to provide a fair return on the money invested in our gas distribution facilities."

CONSUMERS OPPOSE

Mr. RAYBURN said that he is convinced that relieving independent producers and gatherers of Federal regulation would not raise prices to the ultimate consumers. If he thought otherwise, he went on, he would oppose the pending bill to eliminate Federal controls in the producing fields.

Yet, it is the consumers, abetted by distributing companies, who are opposing enactment of the pending bill. They claim the end of Federal regulation which was imposed by the United States Supreme Court over protests of the United States regulatory agency concerned will cause rates to skyrocket.

The General Gas Committee's figures appear to show that the skyrocketing has already occurred in the area between the prices paid by distributors for gas at the city gates and the prices they charge consumers.

LITTLE FOR PRODUCER

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's report on the natural-gas bill stresses the spreads between the prices producers receive and prices consumers pay.

The report, just filed, notes that by far the greatest part of the consumer's gas dollar goes to pay for transmission and distribution, both of which are utility functions and are regulated.

Only about 10 percent of the amount the average residential consumer pays goes to the producer, the report shows, and in many cases the producer gets an even smaller amount.

The General Gas Committee is an organization supported chiefly by producers, registered under the Federal Lobbying Act. It opposes Federal regulation. Its figures were compiled from official reports to the Federal Power Commission and from rate statistics gathered by the American Gas Association, the recognized trade association of the industry.

These show that natural gas which costs the residential consumer in Washington, D. C., an average of $1.37 per 1,000 cubic feet brought the producer in the Southwest only 12.5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. The middleman paid 41.36 cents per 1,000 cubic feet for the gas he sold at $1.37. The figures are cumulative, the gas rate including the price paid producers, and the price to consumers including both.

Here's another example: In Birmingham, the residential consumer who uses gas for cooking and water heating pays $1.36 per 1,000 cubic feet. At the city gate the distributor paid 23.7 cents per 1,000 cubic feet for this gas for which the producer back in the field received 9.31 cents.

Here are latest available figures of the General Gas Committee on charges affecting other leading cities:

Albuquerque

Average price received by producer for gas supplied to distributor, 9.72 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average cost to consumer for residential service, 75.2 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

(Supplier and distributor same company.)

Knoxville

Average price paid to producer for gas supplied to city, 10.6 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average price paid by distributor (municipal system) at city gate, 35.1 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average cost to consumer for typical residential cooking and water heating, $1.98 per 1,000 cubic feet. (For cooking, water heating and home heating, $1.11 per 1,000 cubic feet.)

Cincinnati

Average price received by producers for gas supplied to city, 11.4 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average cost to distributing company 45.6 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average price to consumer for typical residential cooking and water heating use, 90.3 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. (For cooking, water heating, and home heating, 72.6 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.)

Denver

Average price received by producers for gas supplied to city, 12.9 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average cost to distributor, 22 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average cost to consumer for typical cooking, water heating and home heating use, 47.5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Indianapolis

Average price paid to producers for gas supplied to city, 8.2 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average price paid at city gate by distributor, 26.5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet.

Average cost to consumer for typical residential cooking and water heating, $1.18 per 1,000 cubic feet. (For cooking, water heating, and home heating, $1.18 per 1,000 cubic feet.)

Here consumers get mixed gas, part manufactured, part natural. Prices quoted are weighted to show what consumer would pay if he received at burner tip gas with as much heating value as that delivered at city gate. City is seeking more natural gas to increase heating value.

QUITE A MARKUP

Consumers opposing a bill to free natural gas producers from Federal regulation would appear to be concentrating on a molehill and ignoring a mountain.

The lion's share of the public's gas bill goes not to the producer but to the distributor, as Marshall McNeil's story today shows.

For example, here's the New York price structure as charted by the General Gas Committee: Producers get 7.8 cents per 1,000 cubic feet; the distributor pays 31.8 cents at the city gate; the residential consumer pays $2.42.

Con Ed says these figures are outdated, lists current prices as 10.8 cents for producers and 34.8 at the city gate and asserts that these recent increases pose the real issue before Congress.

But even by that reckoning the local markup is still over $2. Compared to other cities, the markup is much higher and the reason why is not too clear.

As far as we can see, geography is no factor. Cost to the distributor is 31.8 cents here (or 34.8 according to Con Ed) but it's 45.6 cents in Cincinnati. Yet Cincinnati consumers pay 90.3 cents (72.6 in gas-heated homes) while New Yorkers pay $2.42.

Now, Con Ed points out that local rates are strictly regulated by the State Public Service Commission.

Very true. And that's why we suggest that the PSC take a fresh look at gas rates and markups in this city. Consumers deserve it.

Crisis in Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on June 27 Senator FRANK CARLSON introduced in the Senate the companion measures to my bills to strengthen and improve the civil service. In a recent book, Crisis in Civil Service, Herbert Hollander writes as follows:

The present attack upon the merit system is less spectacular, less obvious, less clearly defined. * * * Now each move designed to take positions out of the classified service is accompanied by expressions of official devotion to the merit system and fervent assurances that the announced actions will result in a stronger civil service.

Mr. Hollander sees special danger to the civil service in the one-package deal which combines the administration's political appointments with civil service. This is personified by Chairman Phillip Young of the Civil Service Commission who is also on the White House staff as adviser on personnel, for it places an almost irresistable squeeze on Mr. Young who has often expressed his determination to fight for merit and fitness as the sole prerequisites for Federal employment.

These current attacks on the civil service are most generally associated with Charles Willis, Jr., who until recently was on the White House staff. In a recent letter to me, Jerome Keating, vice president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, pointed out that "the Willis proposition, however, places the power in the administrative branch of the Government and to that we are very much opposed. As a matter of fact, there has been a growing tendency for administrators in the Government to attempt to exercise unwarranted authority over the Members of Congress." Because of its interest, I would like to include the text of Mr. Keating's letter as a part of my remarks.

Various moves on the part of the Administration have created a great and grave problem for those of us who feel a deep interest in maintaining the effectiveness of the civil service. One of the best ways of combating any campaign of this type is to develop an informed public opinion. I was therefore greatly pleased to note the great interest shown in the press in Mr. Hollander's book, from which I have already quoted. I would also like to include as a part of my remarks some of the newspaper comment on this book, namely, an article by John Herlong appearing in the Washington Daily News and one by Joseph Young from the Washington Sunday Star. For the information of my colleagues, I would also like to include press summaries of the bills that have been introduced by Senator CARLSON and myself. These appeared in the Government Standard and the Washington Star.

It is my belief that the bills we have introduced would do much to meet criticisms leveled at the civil service administration today by such critics as Mr. Hollander and Mr. Keating. If we are to maintain the efficiency, moral and effectiveness of the Government in these times of crisis these problems must be met and solved. In closing, I should like to quote once more from Mr. Hollander's able book:

The United States can no longer entrust the thousand and one functions of government to persons whose selection has been decisively influenced by political considerations * * * until the American people make it abundantly plain that they will accept no compromises which tend to weaken rather than strengthen the career service, the Federal Government will not be the fully effective instrumentality which these times so urgently demand.

Mr. Hollander has been for more than 25 years the public relations director of the great National Federation of Federal Employees. His book should be read by everyone concerned with strengthening and improving the civil service.

The matters referred to follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1955.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: I read very carefully your insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under dates of May 26 and June 16. We feel that you are absolutely right in your belief that the career employee has been hurt by the policies of Mr. Willis, and also by the policies of the Commission.

Frankly, we are a little dubious of many of the proposals made by the Hoover Commission. Some of the proposals that they have offered in the past would not have helped civil service, but would have placed an excessive amount of authority in the hands of the administrative officers of Government. The grant of excessive authority to administrative officers of Government generally reacts to the disadvantage of the individual employees.

We believe that a balance must be maintained and control must be retained by the legislative branch of the Government over the actions of the administrators. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission, if they were all adopted, would take an immeasurable amount of control over administrative officers out of the hands of Congress and place it in the hands of the Cabinet officers and other administrative men appointed by the President. This type of procedure builds up a tyranny that is probably even worse than the spoils system, and certainly far less desirable than a balanced program.

The Willis proposition, however, places the power in the administrative branch of the Government, and to that we are very much opposed. As a matter of fact, there has been a growing tendency for administrators in the Government to attempt to exercise unwarranted authority over the Members of Congress.

We believe that you are performing a splendid service by analyzing the patronage program and asserting the need for defense of the civil-service system. It was very well brought out recently that the Civil Service Commission must be independent to maintain a proper civil-service program.

With very best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

JEROME J. KEATING,
Vice President.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 30, 1955]

SPOILS SYSTEM VS. LIFETIME CAREER IN GOVERNMENT

(By John Herling)

About 2,300,000 citizens—or targets—are on the Federal payroll. The average Government worker receives less than $4,000 a year. Fewer than 4 percent receive more than $7,000.

If you have worked yourself up to the level of $7,000 and beyond, you're apt to be in trouble. You may be working yourself out of a job. Your civil-service status—established presumably to make merit and fitness the sole qualifications for a Federal job—suddenly starts to change shape, like looking into a Coney Island-type distortion mirror.

IT'S NOT FUNNY

Except this distortion is not funny. Just how unfunny the situation is appears in Herbert Hollander's swiftly moving new book, Crisis in Civil Service. Mr. Hollander is a veteran Washington newspaperman who is an expert in this field.

In developing his charges that the essential nature of civil service is being corrupted, Mr. Hollander names the Eisenhower administration as the current sinner, but he says the sin is by no means original with this administration.

In the early thirties, Mr. Hollander recalls, the first years of the Roosevelt administration saw a dangerous, open attack against civil service. At that time, however, he finds that public opinion was so effectively marshaled that the merit sys-

tem was finally rescued from the clutches of the spoilsmen.

Today, Mr. Hollander says another crusade to save the civil service is unmistakably indicated.

As contrasted with 1933–36, Mr. Hollander says, "The present attack upon the merit system is less spectacular, less obvious, less clearly defined. * * * Now each move designed to take positions out of the classified service is accompanied by expressions of official devotion to the merit system and fervent assurances that the announced actions will result in a stronger civil service."

SPECIAL DANGER

Mr. Hollander sees special danger to the civil service in the one-package deal which combines the administration's political appointments with civil service. This is personified by Chairman Philip Young of the Civil Service Commission who is also on the White House staff as adviser on personnel. This places an almost irresistible political squeeze on the man whose avowed intention is to fight for merit and fitness as the sole prerequisites for a Federal job.

Mr. Hollander acknowledges that genuinely confidential and policymaking jobs—perhaps about 1,000 in all—should fall outside civil service. But, aside from these obvious exceptions, he says the merit system should be extended in the interest of more efficient Government.

He calls for:

A new, realistic approach to compensation, with salary rates which attract and then hold the most competent employees.

A health insurance program for Federal personnel, to keep pace with progressive practice in business and industry.

A central personnel agency in the Civil Service Commission with overall responsibility for formulating and supervising Federal personnel policies.

Laws and regulations against use of military personnel in civilian positions.

Finally, a far-reaching revision of Federal promotion policies with greater advancement and incentives as well as the reduction of dead-end jobs in all categories of employment.

[From the Washington Star]

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Joseph Young)

Hoover proposals: Legislation to carry out the main recommendations of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Federal Personnel and Civil Service is sponsored by Representative THOMPSON, Democract, of New Jersey, and Senator CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas.

The bills would abolish the present performance rating system and set up a once-a-year report only on those employees whose work entitles them to promotion or commendation, or whose unsatisfactory work merits a warning or dismissal; establish a senior civil-service system to fill top career jobs in Government; revise the Classification Act to reduce the number of grades, and authorize the transfer of employees from the civil service to other Government merit systems without loss of status.

Veterans' preference: In addition, Senator CARLSON, who is the top ranking minority member of the Senate Civil Service Committee, has sponsored two more Hoover group proposals to limit veterans' preference.

One bill would require veterans to compete on equal terms with nonveteran career employees who have 15 years or more of service in reduction-in-force programs. The other would limit veterans' rights of appeal to the Civil Service Commission on agency actions to the first 5 years that a veteran is in Government.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of July 3, 1955]

THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT

(By Joseph Young)

AUTHOR SEES POLITICS HURTING MERIT SYSTEM

The Government's merit system is gradually being undermined, a veteran observer of the Federal scene declares.

Herbert Hollander, public relations director of the National Federation of Federal Employees for more than 25 years, has written a new book Crisis in the Civil Service (Current Issues Publishers, Inc., $2.75), in which he calls for concerted action to stop "the rising tide of spoilsmanship."

The book is certain to stir lively discussion and will be read avidly by those interested in civil service.

Here are some excerpts from Mr. Hollander's book:

"The merit system in the Federal service is facing a crisis. Through the years, by dint of prodigious effort, the percentage of Federal positions subject to patronage appointment—to the spoils system—was steadily reduced. Today that trend is being reversed and the undermining of the merit principle goes forward on a much larger scale than is generally recognized and by various means. The need for a new effort to combat the rising tide of spoilsmanship can not be doubted.

"The pressure for Federal jobs to be dispensed as political spoils remains a constant threat to the integrity of the career civil service.

"The Civil Service Commission, traditionally in the forefront of efforts to extend the merit system, has lent itself to stratagems designed to give an aura of respectability and plausibility to the removal of positions from the competitive service."

Morale: "Much more is involved than the substantial numbers of positions which already have been removed from the merit system directly and the scores of thousands of others now subject to an elaborate political clearance procedure.

"The effect upon the efficiency and the morale of the service is all-pervasive.

"In department after department, in agency after agency, positions which for many years have been considered beyond spoils reach either have been removed from the career service or are receiving the eager attention of seekers after additional patronage.

"Inevitably this has adversely affected morale; but it has had even more tangible effects on recruitment and retention of highly competent, experienced, long-time career employees. Moreover, the whole situation is influencing the decisions of many qualified younger men and women with special training and abilities not to enter public service.

"The serious national implications of this as well as other aspects of the whole problem cannot be overestimated, particularly in view of the immense responsibilities of the Federal service at this time."

Change urged: "The whole situation has been further clouded by the fact that for the first time the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission also is serving at the White House as the President's staff adviser on personnel matters. Heretofore these two positions have been, as they should be, separate and distinct. Their functions are only apparently identical; actually, it is anomalous for the head of the Civil Service Commission to function within the White House staff.

"The change has not worked out well. The President has suffered from the lack of a full-time staff member able to function as did Mr. (William H.) McReynolds, for example, during the Roosevelt administrations. Moreover, the pressures which inevitably are found at the White House should not properly be placed upon the officer charged with administering the Federal Government's civil service system through the chairmanship of the Commission. It may well be that the arrangement at first appeared to some to be a sound and logical one. Experience has conclusively proved otherwise.

"The persistent removal of higher level positions will have the effect—already is having the effect—of placing a damper upon initiative, enterprise, and ambition. One of the greatest virtues of a genuine career service is that it affords employees far larger opportunities for advancement and thus stimulates them to higher efficiency and productivity.

"The growing system of personal patronage, even when it is pursued by the most patriotic administrators with the best of motives, is contrary to sound public policy. In addition to its many other faults, it creates a class of employees who have come into the service through the influence of certain individuals to whom they owe their appointments and their tenure and to whom they are, in an important sense, primarily indebted. They have come into the service without regard to civil service; frequently they have little respect for civil-service requirements as a whole. The situation is essentially unhealthy, and it leads inevitably to the conclusion that notwithstanding strenuous attempts to rationalization, there is no such thing as a good spoils system. * * *"

Public service impaired: "In contrast to other times all citizens now are directly and intimately concerned with the functioning of the Federal Government every day and in many ways. The problems of administration have an immediacy and an urgency for each individual in the Nation which would not have seemed possible even in the relatively recent past. Today there is nothing academic about these problems, for upon their sound solution depends, quite directly, the well-being of all.

"Actions inimical to the merit system in the Federal service thus affect the whole people. Whether in Federal laboratory or office, in forest or on conservation project, in any one of the literally thousands of administrative, technical, scientific, professional, and crafts categories, the way Federal employees are recruited and trained, and the climate of public opinion in which they carry out their assignments, all are matters of vital and continuing concern to every American. No one now is remote from the practical, day-by-day working problems of Government.

"The United States can no longer entrust the thousand and one functions of Government to persons whose selection has been decisively influenced by political considerations. Beyond the limits of strictly policymaking and confidential posts, all Federal positions, without exception, should be included within the competitive service.

"Until that has been accomplished, until the American people make it abundantly plain that they will accept no compromises which tend to weaken rather than strengthen the career service, the Federal Government will not be the fully effective instrumentality which these times so urgently demand.

"Both political parties for more than 80 years have pledged complete belief in and unswerving support for the merit system in Federal employment.

"The time is long overdue for redemption of those pledges in full."

[From the Government Standard of July 1, 1955]

BASED ON HOOVER REPORT—NEW BILLS INTRODUCED

Legislation to carry out the principal recommendations of the Hoover Commission

task force on Federal personnel and civil service has been introduced in the Senate by Senator FRANK CARLSON, Republican, of Kansas, and in the House of Representatives by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey.

Both legislators introduced identical bills calling for a revision of the Classification Act to reduce the number of grades, a simplified performance rating system, establishment of a senior civil service to fill the top career jobs in Government, and authorizing the transfer of employees from the civil service to other Government merit systems without loss of status.

In addition, Senator CARLSON introduced two bills relating to veterans preference appeals and reduction in force priorities.

NO HEARING SET

With Congress moving toward adjournment, there is little likelihood that hearings will be held during this session. However, several of the bills may become live issues during the 2d session of the 84th Congress next year.

S. 2332 and H. R. 6546 would direct the Civil Service Commission to consolidate grades GS–1 through GS–6 into three new grades, to be designated GS–1, GS–2, and GS–3. Grades GS–7 through GS–11 would be combined into GS–4, 5, and 6. New pay rates would be set within the range of pay now covered by the first 11 grades. Employees would be protected against a loss in pay.

PERFORMANCE RATINGS

The performance rating proposals (S. 2334 and H. R. 6547) carry out the Hoover Commission proposal that written performance rating be abolished except for employees who, in the judgment of the supervisor, should be considered for advancement, deserve special awards, should be assigned to other work, should be denied a within-grade raise or should be dismissed. A single appeal against unfavorable action is provided before a board of review established by the Civil Service Commission for each department.

Most controversial of all are two bills introduced by Senator CARLSON. One (S. 2335) would limit the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission under the Veterans' Preference Act to the first 5 years that a veteran is in the Federal civil service.

The other bill (S. 2336) would greatly reduce the advantage held by veterans in reduction-in-force priority. It would also eliminate the bumping system.

Similar proposals have been made from time to time in recent years, but Congress has consistently rejected moves to weaken veterans' preference.

Dairy Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following two excerpts from the May 18, 1955, Dairy Record:

A POLITICAL CONFERENCE

Perhaps it was because so much was expected by so many individuals that the degeneration of the much-publicized Minnesota-New York governors' conference into a cheap political bally-hoo has created so much bitterness among dairy people in Governor Freeman's home State and in the Midwest.

If the statement issued from Senator HUMPHREY's office is any criterion, the Minnesota Governor and Senator HUMPHREY not only joined in attempting to foist the blame for the shortcomings of the Federal milk marketing orders upon an administration activity which isn't even germane to the discussion, but they proved singularly inept in matching wits with the two New York politicians. The Minnesotans gained no concessions and the New Yorkers, in a separate statement saw to it that the people of their State would not get any false impressions that they had yielded one jot.

Because Senator LEHMAN is a veteran of the milk order wars and Governor Harriman of New York was probably well coached, Midwest dairymen might be indulgent of the failure of Senator HUMPHREY and Governor Freeman, since they are obviously babes in the woods in tackling this complex subject—or at least the criticism would be limited to their failure to get a little expert advice—had they refrained from insulting the intelligence of the dairymen of Minnesota and the Midwest by trying to convert the occasion into a political rally.

Because of the great interest in the subject, we are publishing elsewhere in this issue the complete joint statement issued by Senators Humphrey and Lehman and Governors Harriman and Freeman. We are also publishing the statement issued separately by Senator LEHMAN and Governor Harriman.

We call the attention of the reader particularly to the fact that the statement indicates that not only was no satisfactory solution of an admittedly vexatious problem reached, but there was an obvious attempt to hide that failure by launching an attack on the administration.

"We are agreed that producers have all been unfairly hit by the extent to which the present administration reduced dairy price supports * * *," says the statement, in part. What has that to do with the operation of the Federal milk market orders?

"We are agreed that the machinery of State government is inadequate to help the dairy producers absorb the multifold and contagious effects of the cut in dairy price supports," it continues. And what has that to do with Federal milk market orders?

To continue this discussion is futile. Unless Governor Freeman can come up with some better approach, the Minnesota Legislature may as well resign itself to an acceptance of the fact that the $30,000 which it appropriated to circumvent the evils of the orders, as administered, is money poured down a rathole. The Minnesota dairy industry isn't going to take kindly to the idea that it should be used in building a political career.

As for us, we had no illusions that the conference would solve the problem, but we didn't think that it would sink to the low level that it reached. As indicated, we suspect that the entire manufacturing milk industry shares our disgust.

NEW YORK-MINNESOTA OFFICIALS' STATEMENT DRAWS FIRE

Because of the widespread interest in and the criticism arising from the issuance of the joint statement following the conference in Washington of Gov. Averell Harriman and Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, and Gov. Orville Freeman and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, that statement is here published in complete text.

Also appended is a separate statement of Governor Harriman and Senator LEHMAN:

The statements follow:

"Because we share a mutual concern over the serious economic difficulties confronting dairy producers in our respective States, we have met today to consider what can be done to improve existing conditions and protect this vital segment of our agricultural economy from further decline in earning power.

"Many States share our concern and our problems. Because Minnesota is one of the major producers of manufactured milk products, and New York one of the larger producers of fluid milk, we felt it would be beneficial to exchange ideas and see what common grounds could be developed for bettering the future economic outlook for all dairy producers.

BLAMES ADMINISTRATION

"We are agreed that producers have all been unfairly hit by the extent to which the present administration reduced dairy price supports in one blow a year ago. We are agreed that the machinery of State government is inadequate to help the dairy producers absorb the multifold and contagious effects of the cut in dairy price supports.

"We believe the scope and extent of the dairy problem should be brought to the attention of Congress for such remedial action as is called for. The Congress would be in a better position to understand the seriousness of dairy problems if studies and hearings were conducted in the dairy-producing areas themselves. Therefore, we feel that the Senate Committee on Agriculture, or a subcommittee thereof, should undertake such an inquiry embracing the economic plight of dairymen, and alternative methods of alleviating such conditions.

"We feel that better economic protection must be provided for the dairy industry which is so essential to the American economy and so economically important in terms of total agricultural income.

WOULD FORM COMMITTEE

"We recognize the need for exploring all possible ways and means of achieving such improved economic opportunities for dairying, including alternate price-support methods, improved marketing procedures and methods, and organized efforts to stimulate consumption. We recognize that differences in problems of different geographic areas add to the complexity of seeking sound solutions for some of our dairy producers' difficulties, and feel it is important to work toward better understanding between dairy leaders of such areas so that each may become more familiar with the problems of their fellow dairy farmers in other areas.

"Toward that end, we propose continuing joint consultations extended to a producer level, through appointment of dairy producer advisory committees to work with our Commissioners of Agriculture, so that our respective States may provide leadership toward a more constructive Federal approach to dairy problems. We invite other interested dairy States to join us, through establishment of similar advisory committees to work together toward an improved dairy program.—Governor Averell Harriman, Senator Herbert H. Lehman, New York; Governor Orville L. Freeman, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota."

Lectured by Rich Uncle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Members of Congress will read this informative article by Mr. Constantine Brown. It is pleasing to me that Mr. Brown relates the contribution

in Korea of our proven ally, Turkey. I believe they sent 40,000 troops to Korea, whereas Tito sat that conflict out. Why do we treat Turkey, our proven ally, with disdain while we act like a social climber toward Tito, who accepts our largesse with his tongue in his cheek and then bows gracefully to his Kremlin mentors who will soon at Moscow fete and soak him in vodka and caviar? Under leave granted, I wish to insert this article in the RECORD:

LECTURED BY RICH UNCLE—TURKEY, IN SERIOUS FINANCIAL TROUBLE, GETS ONLY 10 PERCENT OF LOAN SOUGHT IN UNITED STATES

Turkey, our stanchest and most reliable ally, is in serious financial trouble. Not only is its budget unbalanced—a situation by no means unfamiliar to us—but it cannot meet its payments abroad.

Turkey has serious inflation. Its pound, officially pegged at 2.85 to the dollar, sells in the black market in Istanbul at between 8 and 9 and at an even lower rate in Switzerland.

The Turkish Government had asked Washington for a loan of $300 million. After many months of discussion it was granted 10 percent of the amount. And rich Uncle Sam lectured his Turkish nephew that he has not been careful in handling his finances and that a number of tax resources, such as the prosperous farmers, have not been sufficiently tapped.

The nephew replied that he is spending much more than America's other proteges for military preparedness and is maintaining a combat force ready for action considerably larger than that of any other individual member of the NATO. This remarkable military force can be considered by America actually as a United States army because of its willingness to fight wherever necessary.

Turkey also pointed out that it has to pay sizable amounts (for that impoverished government) as pensions to families of thousands of casualties in the Korean war.

Our officials recognize the heavy burdens on the Ankara treasury but continue to maintain that it has husbanded its resources poorly and heeded none of the fatherly counsels of the FOA representatives.

It is very true the Turks have not been careful housekeepers. But neither have the French whose taxation system may be modern but whose collections are even more sporadic and "political" than in Turkey. Yet we have never denied anything to our French allies—who are far less cooperative in the international military and political fields. Last year we helped the French in Indochina alone to the tune of $1 billion. Most of that amount went down the drain.

Only a few days ago Congress authorized the expenditure of $3.2 billion for foreign military and economic assistance. For high policy reasons and against their better judgment the Senate and House approved about $150 million in economic assistance to India and Yugoslavia. The heads of both republics, Messrs. Nehru and Tito, are definitely cuddling up to Moscow and have endorsed unreservedly the Kremlin's foreign policies aimed against us. Many Senators and Representatives declared privately that they held their noses when they voted for those authorization. But they fell into line so as not to cause trouble to the administration in its handling of foreign affairs.

The stand taken by the White House and State Department is that we must give wholeheartedly to everybody, regardless of what the present policies of the governments of the needy nations may be. By the same token, it is not impossible (the matter is now being discussed in middle echelons in the administration) to see a request that we send wheat from our vast surpluses to the Chinese Communists. The argument is that the helpless people themselves must not be punished because of their governments.

The Turks are not asking the United States for a "grant" or a loan without interest repayable at some uncertain distant time. They have presented sheets of facts and figures which, they maintain, should amply prove they want only an accommodation loan and will repay it with interest.

The past demonstrates that the Ankara government means what it says. It paid to the last cent in gold the old Ottoman debt—the vast amount borrowed and spent by the corrupt and inefficient sultans on their own luxuries. The republic which replaced the sultanate could have easily reneged on these loans as did, for instance, the Communists after the overthrow of the czars. Yet Ankara assumed the obligations of the old regime. It appears that the Turkish Government's pleas were ignored in Washington when a paltry $30 million was offered to meet the present situation.

On repeated occasions Government spokesmen have told Members of Congress when they pressed for further billions for foreign nations: "No country can be militarily sound while it is in economic difficulties." That applies today more than ever in regard to America's outpost in the Near East right on the borders of our potential enemy, the U. S. S. R. Turkey spends more than 60 percent of its budget on military preparedness to keep ready for action 21 combat divisions and a small but effective air force.

It is conceivable, say some American military observers who are impressed with the value of the Turkish Army, that in order to solve its financial problems the Ankara government may be compelled to cut down its military forces. And this would be a blow not only to the NATO's security in the area but also to America's influence in the whole Near and Middle East. It would be said that the Turks, America's loyal and unflinching allies, to whom neutralism is completely unknown, have been abandoned by the United States.

July Fourth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is an unmistakable trend in our great country to play down patriotism to things strictly American—the trend has been to internationalism. In my opinion, it is time to study our history, thoroughly analyze the precepts upon which the United States was founded. We will see that what was true in 1776 is true today. Our forefathers recognized the dangers of foreign entanglements, and these dangers are just as great today, 1955.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the July 4, 1955, editions of the New York Daily Mirror and the New York Daily News which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of July 4, 1955]

JULY FOURTH

The Fourth of July used to be called Independence Day. That was in memory of the Revolutionary War, when the Thirteen Colonies freed themselves by bloodshed from Great Britain.

Today we celebrate the Fourth of July as the birthday of our Nation. In the place of our memory of the Revolutionary War is the memory of the philosophic Declaration of Independence, the statement of the principles of life upon which our Nation is founded.

In an era of intensive nationalism, when every country in Europe, Asia, and Africa is stressing nationalism, is proclaiming its significance as a people, a trend toward internationalism has developed in the United States, a trend that has been costly to our country. This has not been accidental. Throughout our two wars, tremendous propagandas were set forth by our Government and by private agencies to stimulate love for our allies and to play down American nationalism and American patriotism.

LOVE OF COUNTRY

While these efforts have been effective, they have not been sufficiently effective to influence enough of our people to deaden love of country. George Washington, Father of our Nation and one of the most brilliant minds that laid the foundation for our existence, wrote, as early as 1794, to Gouverneur Morris:

"The affairs of this country cannot go amiss. There are so many watchful guardians of them, and such infallible guides, that one is at no loss for a director at every turn."

As we think of the birthday of our Nation, we cannot help but think of the leader of the men who established it, and in this era when internationalism is being so stressed by minds much more limited than his, it is important to recall the great words of his Farewell Address:

"The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop."

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

We have pursued a different course in recent years because we insist that times have changed since 1776 and that our people have grown more mature, more responsible, more obligated to the rest of the world. Yet as we look at our history, from 1776 to 1914 was the upbuilding period during which we peopled a continent, built an enormous industry, cultivated agriculture until it became a science and an art, and created a magnificent efficient society in freedom.

Since 1914, we have become involved in world politics and every man is his own statesman. We have taken on an enormous burden of debt, our taxes have rocketed beyond all reason, our Government has been expanded until one cannot avoid thinking of the complaints in the Declaration of Independence against George III:

"He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."

It is because nationalism has been weakened that our people take to little interest in the preservation of the ideals and principles of the Founding Fathers.

On this Fourth of July, the birthday of our Nation, let us dedicate ourselves to the high purposes which made us a distinct civilization.

[From the New York Daily News of July 4, 1955]

NO SADDLES ON OUR BACKS

Some American history, appropriate to the day:

On July 4, 1776, the Declaration of Independence was adopted at Philadelphia, and the American Revolution (which had been simmering for months) became official.

Fifty years later—in the spring and early summer of 1826—it came over a lot of Americans that something special ought to be done in the way of celebrating the completion of the Nation's first half-century of independence.

Still living were 3 signers of the Declaration of Independence: ex-President Thomas Jefferson (who wrote most of it), ex-President John Adams, and Charles Carroll. Also still alive were 2 other ex-Presidents: James Madison and James Monroe.

The city of Washington invited all five of these eminent statesmen and patriots to be guests of honor at the national capital's July 4 celebration.

None of the five was able to attend. All sent letters regretfully explaining why they couldn't get there. These letters, says the American Heritage magazine's current (June) issue, "were happily phrased, and several contain sentiments worthy of remembrance."

The Jefferson letter said that its author was ill at his Virginia home, Monticello (near Charlottesville), and deeply regretted that he couldn't come to Washingtan to gather with the remnant of the Declaration's signers, and rejoice with them "that our fellow citizens, after half a century of experience and prosperity, continue to approve the choice we made."

From that point, Jefferson's letter took off into what seems to us some of the most striking prose Jefferson ever wrote:

"May it [the Declaration] be to the world, what I believe it will be (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all), the signal of arousing men to burst the chains, under which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government * * *.

"The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few, booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God. These are grounds of hope for others; for ourselves, let the annual return of this day [July 4] forever refresh our recollections of these rights, and an undiminished devotion to them."

By one of the most dramatic and melancholy coincidences in American history, Thomas Jefferson and John Adams died on the same day—July 4, 1826—exactly 50 years after both had signed the Declaration of Independence, and thereby, with the other signers, taken their lives in their hands for the sake of their fellow Americans.

REA Yardstick Protects Against Urban Profiteering as Well as Rural Profiteering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks I include a salient editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

THE VOICE OF PRIVATE MONOPOLY

The private monopoly theory of utility operation is not dead. John Jirgal, head of the power section of the Hoover Commission's task force on water resources and power, has reiterated it here in just about every conceivable application.

To the American Society of Civil Engineers, Mr. Jirgal spoke against virtually every public interest in the resources of the country for the production of electric power.

He spoke against the preference clause which for 50 years has enabled public bodies to obtain a modest share of publicly generated electric power though the lion's share continues to go to privately owned utilities.

He spoke against Government generation of electric power from atomic energy.

He spoke against REA, praising the privately owned utilities' record in rural electrification, but deceptively neglecting to say that they hardly started compiling it until forced by REA's example.

He spoke against low-cost public power, urging an increase in rates which by his own estimate would cost consumers throughout the Nation between $110 million and $130 million a year immediately and, when present projects are completed, $400 million a year.

He spoke against any federally generated power at all, which would leave the privately owned power monopolies without either the example or the spur of public agencies showing what can be done.

Views such as these are self-defeating because they are so drastically out of tune with the times. The elementary fact which Mr. Jirgal overlooks is that these measures which he abhors came into existence because of a majority of the people of the United States wanted them. They continue in effect for the same reason.

The people of the United States are not going to give up their interest in their resources of falling water, or in the resources of atomic fission. They are not going to give up their right to have these resources developed primarily for the public and not exclusively private benefit.

The Permanent Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address delivered by the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, United States Ambassador to Italy, at the Independence Day exercises at Faneuil Hall, Boston, July 4. I commend this address to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

Ladies and gentlemen, today, in this historic Faneuil Hall, revered by all American patriots but especially beloved by Bostonians, we come together to commemorate the 179th signing of the Declaration of Independence.

You may guess with what emotion, with what a mingled sense of pride and humbleness I speak to you today, in this place, known throughout America as the Cradle of Liberty.

I remember that well over two centuries ago, Peter Faneuil, a Huguenot refugee from the political and religous intolerance of an Old World king fled to Boston, that he prospered and was happy here, and that in gratitude he gave this hall to his townsfolk for a market place. Before the last brick had been laid, Peter Faneuil died. His eulogy was delivered at the first annual town meeting by the master of the Boston Latin School, John Lovell. In concluding Lovell said, "What now remains, but my ardent wishes * * * that this hall may be ever sacred to the interests of truth, of justice, of loyalty, of honor, of liberty. * * * May liberty always spread its joyful wings over this place. Liberty that opens men's hearts to beneficence and gives the relish to those who enjoy the effects of it."

And so it has been. Since that far-off day, the walls of Faneuil Hall have echoed to the eloquent voices and the heroic footsteps of the greatest patriots in our history—Washnigton and Lafayette, Daniel Webster, Charles Sumner, Wendell Phillips—who made his greatest antislavery speech here—are but a few.

I, a daughter of New England, and a child of Connecticut, presume to share this hour here with you only because I know that it behooves your speaker to say nothing original, nothing startling, nothing new. Yet I feel that a moment of beauty, ever old and ever new, is achieved whenever we make a reaffirmation of our dedication to John Lovell's ideals—truth, justice, loyalty, honor, liberty. Indeed, this reaffirmation is the prime duty of the glorious Fourth.

Today historians are accustomed to say that what began in 1776 was not properly a "revolution" but rather a colonial rebellion. The word "revolution" (they say) connotes the idea of destroying an old order and establishing a new order, after the fashion of what happened in the France of 1789 and in the Russia of 1917.

Certainly, this is not what happened in the America of 1776. The proof of this assertion lies in the latter section of the Declaration of Independence. Few people listen carefully to the reading of this section—a lengthy legal indictment of George III as a "tyrant." But this indictment makes it quite clear that the American colonial rebellion was staged in the name not of a new order—but of an old order. It was staged in the name of that tradition of freedom and order whose repository was the British Constitution. It was the intention of the rebelling colonists to reestablish this old order and this venerable tradition by giving to their sustaining inner principles—which our Founding Fathers passionately believed to be external principles of justice under law and God—a newly vital political expression. Renovation, not innovation, was their purpose. To preserve and extend the political values of the past and the spiritual truths of Christianity, not to create new political values, or new spiritual truths, was their clearly seen and clearly stated objective.

Our Founding Fathers took up arms to vindicate for themselves the traditional rights of Englishmen, guaranteed by long-standing laws.

These rights were in substance the rights of the Christian citizen who, because he is a Christian, knows his own personal dignity, and also knows the duty of society to a higher law, a law not made by earthly powers, but written by the Creator in the very nature of man.

The essential appeal made by the spokesmen of the American Revolution—most of them men trained in the common law of England—was to this tradition of a higher law, the law that they called "natural."

In this inviolable law they found the strong roots of all the personal freedoms that they cherished and claimed. In this natural law they also found the sanction for the order of social life that they sought to establish on the American Continent. They fought for liberty indeed—for liberation from the yoke of a rule grown harsh and tyrannical, and therefore ungodly. The Declaration of Independence makes this clear. But this historic document makes it equally clear that the freedom for which our forbears fought was not the illusory autonomy of the 18th century continental rationalist who fancied himself to be free from all law because he had begun to fancy that man—

every individual man was a law unto himself.

The freedom of American society—so our Founding Fathers thought—was to be an ordered freedom, a freedom under God and under the law. The rights of the American citizen—so they likewise thought—were those rights which we call unalienable precisely because man is not endowed with them by other men, but by Him who is the author both of the individual man and of human society.

This was the doctrine of the American Revolution. It was a conservative doctrine. But what it sought to conserve was an idea that is forever revolutionary. The idea that man can govern himself, under law. The Founding Fathers themselves were quite aware of the revolutionary character of this idea. Liberty and self-government, George Washington said, are "finally staked on the experiment entrusted to the American people." That "grand scheme and design in providence," John Adams called it. Lincoln who in his own day called our form of government "the last best hope" of mankind, called the revolution "the germ which has vegetated and still is to grow and expand into the universal liberty of mankind." Said Ralph Waldo Emerson, "The office of America is to liberate." Of the startling and beneficient results in human affairs that the doctrine of the revolution could effect, every American President has been convinced. Every year of our history has committed us to the office, as Emerson called it, of liberation achieved by the spreading of our revolutionary doctrine.

If this be true, then we must not shrink when we are told that our future task, our great historic task, is to continue the American Revolution, both by perfecting here in America and also by helping other peoples to establish the universal principles of liberty in their own homelands. For our concept is universal—and applies to all mankind.

In this task, all mankind is our potential ally. The desire for liberty is the eternal ferment in the affairs of men. The need for order is the eternal inner form that keeps this ferment from wasting itself in political turbulences that lead to bloody civil and international strife.

Throughout the world today the human desire for freedom from ancient tyrannies, exploitations, injustices, and inequalities, is agitating peoples everywhere—especially colonial peoples. To help lead these peoples into the path toward true freedom, wherever our leadership can be made effective by example, by aid, by wise diplomacy, is today the supreme challenge to our statecraft.

The newly tyrannical colonialism that follows in the wake of tyrannical Soviet imperialism now threatens to engulf all of Asia as it has already engulfed great portions of Europe. It threatens to imprison behind the Iron Curtain more millions of people whose first hopes of liberty were stirred long ago by the world encircling echoes of the voices that once reverberated in the rafters of Faneuil Hall. For they have seen, over the decades, these principles attract here men from many lands in search of freedom. They have seen these principles create here the happiest, strongest, richest, most productive Nation that civilization has ever known.

Today, however, the principles have grown blurred in the minds of many—even unhappily of many Americans. The beneficent effects, the material effects, prosperity, productivity, economic progress, are now passionately coveted by those who have too long been denied them by old tyrannies. Communism has falsely promised the world's malcontents and dispossessed to achieve the new effects rapidly, without the old principles. The falseness of the Communist promise is now widely evident, but the power which communism gained by false promises is still a brutal fact in our world.

So today, in 1955, with the United States at the very apex of its power, the great drama of the American Revolution versus the Russian Revolution, the drama of freedom and order under God versus slavery and final chaos under the Kremlin, is inexorably moving to a climax.

Yes, ours is a rich and prosperous and happy land. Nevertheless, one dark and terrible thought tortures every mind and constricts every heart. Can the United States continue the revolution it began? Can we strongly and respectfully press our universal concept of liberty under law upon the world? Can we even safeguard our Revolutionary heritage within our own boundaries? Can we do all this—short of war?

We know what that war would be like. Atomic weapons would make vast cities, such as this fair city of Boston, radio-active cemeteries. If, for want of vigilance, preparedness, or adequate military intelligence reports, we failed to apprise ourselves in advance of attack, an atomic Pearl Harbor launched by Russia could in a few short hours disrupt our organized national life. Twenty minutes after such an attack, America would never again in our lifetime be as strong as it had been 20 minutes before. Unbearable and unbelievable though the very thought may be, we must face the possibility that such an onslaught might bring to an end our privileged prosperity, and leave us living, or at best surviving amidst the ruins—the ruins not only of our cities, but of the dreams for a free world that we have cherished for two centuries.

Still more unbearable for the Christian conscience to contemplate is the idea that we ourselves should ever launch such a war. No; we will not, must not accept the idea that war is inevitable, or that only war can resolve this gigantic struggle between the freedom of men living under God in faith, and the order of men existing under tyrants in fear.

What then? The temptation is great to avoid war by withdrawal from the struggle, by retirement into isolation, by appeasing. But we have resisted, and will resist that temptation. We know that America was not made by cowards. We know that freedom is more precious than security. We know we will cease to be Americans if we cease trying to fulfill our historic destiny which is to lead the world towards those ideals of Liberty so often propounded here in Faneuil Hall. And this being so, we know we have no choice but to make those efforts—with all their consequent sacrifices which alone have a chance to win victory with peace.

Our first duty is the duty imposed on us by George Washington: eternal vigilance in the conduct of our military affairs. This means the willingness of every able-bodied man to serve his country when called, and of every citizen to pay for what is needed to keep us strong on land, on water, and in the skies. Our second duty is to support, in unity a bold and yet cautious foreign policy, activated by a generous and yet prudent diplomacy. And this means our willingness to be helpful and patient with our allies. Looking back, as we are today, for guidance from the great figures of our past, we can get it from Samuel Adams whose statute stands in the square before this hall. Said Samuel Adams, when the question of the conquest of little nations by great ones was raised in his day, "Let Congress study what measures may be taken in common with the European nations, that national differences may be settled and determined without the necessity of war, in which the world has too long been deluged to the disgrace of human reason and government."

If our peace diplomacy is to succeed, such measures—cold war measures as we have come to call them—of mutual aid and assistance to our allies and to those seeking to maintain their independence from Russia, must be vigorously and generously pursued.

Here, speaking as a diplomat—a member of America's Foreign Service—I shall permit myself two reflections.

First, I believe that no foreign policy can ever be stronger than the Foreign Service charged with putting it into effect. If the American people want a good Foreign Service, made up of the highest type of dedicated men and women, they must cease being ungenerous and unduly critical toward their Foreign Service. They must begin to treat it with at least the affection and respect and generosity they show to other branches of their Government.

Second, speaking specifically as your Ambassador to Italy, in asking for patience and generosity with our allies, I make a special plea for the young Italian republic. Born only a decade ago, today it is still meeting enormous difficulties. There are the problems created by its own lack of natural resources, by its understandable want of experience with parliamentary democracy and a consequent factionalism, above all by the existence of millions of Italians who vote for the Communists. We must remember that these misguided millions are the very examples of those whose right desires for a better and fuller life, have been wrongly channeled by the false prophets of the new Soviet order. These Italians want the wrong thing—for their own worldly as well as spiritual salvation when they want communism. But may God bless them, and help to guide them still, they want it for the right reason—they want to be free of the old economic tyrannies that denied them equality of opportunity with others in their society.

America, which has been built and strengthened my immigrants from many lands, knows what fine citizens most Italians make when they come to our land, and to our free cities like Boston. Many more will be coming to our shores in the next year. Let me say in passing that, all news stories to the contrary, I think I can assure you that as regards Italy at least, the President's Refugee Relief Act will fulfill its provisions. By December 1956, we shall have issued to Italians every one of the visas permitted to us under the law.

The shining fact is that postwar Italy is emerging as a vibrant and dynamic nation. In spite of all its internal difficulties, it moves steadily forward to a sound recovery. And it continues firm in the framework of the great Western alliance. Above all, it has stayed true to its Christian heritage. If we ourselves do not fail Italy, Italy will not fail us, or the West.

I shall conclude with one inspiriting thought. This time of supreme strain is an opportunity for new greatness. We have a rare heritage. We have unlimited spiritual resources on which to draw. Today, on our national birthday, we make newly vital contact with the treasures in our American tradition. Strengthened by a fresh sense of the inner meaning of our revolutionary past, we face the future with confidence. Our spirit and our resolution today are not other than those expressed by George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, and echoed anew by President Eisenhower when he said at Evanston, "Now is a time when great things must again be dared in faith. Let us dare again to dedicate our generation to the fairest dream mankind has ever known—the dream that moved us to found a Nation under God in freedom."

This dream is still fair. But today it is broader. We do not cherish it for ourselves alone. We wish it realized in the wider world of a just and peaceful international community. Unto the task of this new realization let us pledge, as did our forbears, "Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The Army Must Learn To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Independent Editorial Services, Ltd., Washington, D. C., a newsletter, dated June 28, 1955, regarding the state of the United States Army:

THE ARMY MUST LEARN TO FIGHT

The former Secretary of the Army, Robert Stevens, has returned to his textile business, and draws attention to the state of the United States Army, an important matter in this kind of a world. Mr. Stevens did a good job for the Army, as good a job as could be expected in view of the sad state into which the Army has fallen.

The Army has taken the back seat in public regard among the services, largely because of the tight-lipped, self-effacing people that have been running it. Not so, the exception, Douglas MacArthur, when he was in charge. But inevitably the Chiefs of Staff and the real brass of the Army carry the stoical service traditions of West Point through the years of their duties, never being aggressive so far as their civilian bosses are concerned, always silent when politicians are slashing budgets, never saucy to newspapermen, never asking for more than the necessities.

The result has been that this country has never been prepared for war. The further result is that every young man in the country has been taught to regard the Army as second-class service.

In public regard, the Air Force comes first, the Navy with its elite corps of Marines second, and the Army a tail-dragging third.

It is getting so that Army officers rarely wear their uniforms off duty, and the enlisted men wouldn't wear them at all if they weren't required to. The menial tasks of housekeeping throughout the world are parcelled out to the Army.

When a cut in funds is required, the Army always is first in line to get it. After the wars, the battle-stained colors of the regiments are put away, remembered only by the inarticulate heroes of a hundred actions and their companions in Valhalla.

The military service as represented by the Army is an honored and glorious profession. It is valued in every nation in the world but the United States. For the glory of the Army the guardsmen are stationed at Buckingham Palace. Millions of Frenchmen thrill to the Sambre-et-Meuse. The Germans still keep sacrosanct the memory of those standards the Russians dragged along the streets in Red Square.

But here, in a country whose liberties have rested upon the Army from the Concord Bridge to the Yalu, we have a shoddy, sloppy regard for our benefactors.

The reason that Congress treats the Army with such little regard is that the Army never fights for itself on Capitol Hill. The engineers, it is true, get good treatment, but that is because they are charged with the rivers and harbors work which is so vital to many Congressmen.

The infantry, flower of the Army and the Queen of Battles, gets the dirty end of the stick in United States peace, no matter how superb and heroic in United States wars.

The way young men jump into the uniforms of the more glamorous services in order to avoid being drafted into the Army is a national scandal, and a reflection upon the way patriotism is cultivated in this country.

The tragedy of the Army is that it has never learned the simple fact that it has to fight for itself in order to better fight for America.

Resolutions Adopted by 35th Annual Encampment, Department of Kansas, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolutions which were among those adopted by the 35th annual encampment of the Department of Kansas, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Wichita, Kans., on June 3, 4, and 5, 1955.

These resolutions do not necessarily express my views, but I feel it is of importance that the resolutions which I now present should be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress:

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS

Whereas thousands of war veterans are returning to civilian life from the Armed Forces monthly; and

Whereas many of these veterans are young, and had no gainful occupation prior to their entrance into the Armed Forces, and will require the counseling and employment help of the Veterans' Employment Service to obtain suitable employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 35th annual encampment of the Department of Kansas, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in Wichita, Kans., June 3, 4, 5, 1955, urge the Congress to appropriate adequate funds to enable the Veterans' Employment Service to fully assist veterans in their employment problems; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the national officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from Kansas.

VETERANS REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Whereas reemployment in his preservice job is the most important step in a veteran's adjustment to civilian life; and

Whereas the Congress meant to provide such protection in the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act; and

Whereas The United States Supreme Court has just reaffirmed (*Diehl v. Lehigh Valley Railroad*) that such veterans' rights are governed by the reemployment statutes rather than by the Union contract; and

Whereas the Kansas City regional office of the bureau of veterans' reemployment rights, with just one field representative is responsible for the program in four States of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri (with the other Regional offices similarly understaffed), we are concerned, for the understaffing of these offices causes considerable delay for those veterans who meet with difficulty in returning to their preservice job, in their readjustment to civilian life: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of Kansas, Veterans of Foreign Wars, assembled at Wichita, Kans., June 3, 4, and 5, 1955, in its 35th annual encampment, urge upon the Congress that the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights, United States Department of Labor be strengthened, by making sufficient funds available so the field representatives of the agency can be readily available to all veterans requiring reemployment rights assistance; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be made available to the Kansas Congressmen and Senators as well as to the national officers of the VFW.

FOR THE SAFETY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Be it resolved by the Department of Kansas, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That for the safety of the United States of America and the welfare of the people, we advocate:

(a) Building and maintaining the most powerful offensive and defensive Air Force in the world, together with an adequate Army, Navy, and Marine Corps;

(b) Adoption of a system of universal military training;

(c) Development of an effective civil-defense program;

(d) Conservation of our natural resources;

(e) Development of a strong merchant marine;

(f) Enforcement of immigration laws;

(g) Courageous and sustained action on all fronts against communism;

(h) Continued support of the United Nations as an association of sovereign nations but opposing any and all efforts to convert it into some form of world government or Atlantic union; and

(i) Opposition to admission of Red China to United Nations.

HOME AND FARMHOUSE LOAN PROGRAM

Be it resolved by the Department of Kansas, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we—

(a) Favor continuation of the direct home-loan program with increased appropriations to insure the availability of mortgage credit in rural areas;

(b) Favor authorization of loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing;

(c) Oppose any increase in the present 4¼ percent interest rate on GI home loans and urge a return to the 4 percent rate as soon as the fiscal policy of the Federal Government and the availability of mortgage money insure adequate financing at the reduced rate; and

(d) Oppose any transfer of functions of the VA home-loan program to the FHA or any other Federal agency, either by legislation or administrative action.

The Reserve Forces Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join those Members of the House in deploring the voice vote on H. R. 7000, the Reserve forces bill, on Friday, July 1.

If finally enacted into law, the lives of all young men will be changed, the

way of American life will be vastly different and universal military training will become a reality.

The public certainly is entitled to have access to a recorded vote on a measure of such far-reaching importance.

An Interesting Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a report on the Bill of Rights survey conducted by the American government class of John Rogers High School in Spokane, Wash.

I feel that it is a most interesting report:

THE ROGERS HIGH SCHOOL GOVERNMENT CLASS SURVEY ON THE BILL OF RIGHTS OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

(Conducted by students in the 2d and 5th period American Government classes during the first 3 weeks of April 1955. Student general chairman, Susan Weston; instructor, E. T. Becher; committee: Jackie Amsdem, Herb Bradshaw, Marilyn Carlson, Frances Cline, Virginia Dever, Dick Haag, Barbara Johnson, James Joirman, Judy Mayberry, Stanley Paul, Virginia Roberts, and Cora May Sanger.)

The idea for the survey grew out of a study of the Constitution of the United States and a questioning of the students as to just what they knew about their rights under the Constitution. Finding themselves low on facts, a general curiosity arose as to what other people knew about it. This was later limited to just the Bill of Rights which is located in the first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution.

In general, the following were the reasons or objectives for making the survey:

1. To give the students themselves more knowledge.

2. To educate the people in the community and make them more aware of their rights in the Constitution.

3. To learn how effective teaching methods have been.

4. To learn which rights seemed most important to the public in varying degrees.

5. To give students the opportunity to meet the public.

In the process of making up the questions, the students were compelled to become more familiar with the entire list of their constitutional rights. They were also faced with problems in English composition. These self-governing students, through group effort, faced and conquered the problem of making the survey sheets clear and concise. Making a complete list required much thought and time and had to be redone many times.

Both American Government classes worked to compose and revise the questions to be asked. The age, educational, and occupational groupings then were made. The age groupings were two: over and under 21. The educational groupings were made as to graduates of grade school, high school, and college. There were eight general occupational groups into which people were classified: (1) Housewives, (2) students, (3) laborers, (4) executives, (5) professional people, (6) white-collar workers, (7) servicemen, and (8) unemployed persons.

After the survey sheets were completed, students participating were schooled in the proper method of conducting these interviews. They practiced on students from other classes to get "on the spot" interviews from people who knew nothing about this project. Introducing themselves and identifying the survey was practiced in class until the students felt themselves ready to tackle the project on the outside. Six hundred survey sheets were distributed. Two hundred fifty-eight were completed and returned.

Conclusions or evaluations of the survey:

1. Amount of education was most important factor in knowing rights.

2. Most people take the Bill of Rights for granted.

3. Students enjoyed working with people outside of school.

4. Most people interviewed were greatly interested.

5. Of those interviewed, 93 percent definitely believed that Americans have more freedom than people of other countries.

6. Freedom of speech was named most often.

7. The controversial fifth amendment was rated comparatively not important by those interviewed.

An important result of this survey showed that education makes the most difference in the degree of awareness of the Bill of Rights. The students found that executives and professional people made the highest scores when asked to name the number of freedoms that are guaranteed them. Consistently, the more schooling the person had completed, the more he knew about the Government, the Constitution, and specifically, the Bill of Rights. The executives rated highest with 11 and the professional people rated second with 8.3. The norm was 4.7.

The students of these two Government classes found that most people take the Bill of Rights for granted. Only 1 in every 4 actually knew where the freedom they enjoy every day were listed, namely in the first 10 amendments. Most had only a vague idea of what they were and could not give many concrete examples of these freedoms.

Some of the answers to the question "Where in the Constitution is the Bill of Rights located?" were: "In the appendix," "after the preamble," "in the Declaration of Independence," "end of the third paragraph," "back of Constitution," and "the middle."

The students also found, when conducting these interviews, that the people were greatly interested in the project. All were helpful in giving information and many asked for duplicate survey sheets in order to study the rights later.

The survey showed that 93 percent of the people interviewed definitely believe that Americans have more freedom than people of other countries. Two percent of the people interviewed stated "no" to this question, another 2 percent were undecided, and 3 percent had no comment to this question. The answer most often given as a reason for Americans having greater freedom was the right to vote for the people they want in office, which is not in the Bill of Rights.

Freedom of speech was unquestionably mentioned most with freedom of religion and freedom of the press running second and third respectively. The right named fourth most often was the right to a jury trial, and fifth was the right not to be tried twice for the same crime. A public trial, a speedy trial, and a counsel for defense ranked 6th, 7th, and 8th while the controversial fifth amendment of not being forced to be a witness against one self, came in a poor 9th. This was surprising to many of the students who worked on the survey. In the light of the recent senatorial investigations they expected this one right to do better than ninth in importance.

The person to enumerate the most rights in the entire survey was a senior boy at Rogers (none of those interviewed were in the government classes) with 17 out of 26. Two of the professional people interviewed could list 16.

One Marine, recently back from Korea, when interviewed said:

"Certainly, Americans have more freedom. The people who don't believe that should see what is going on in Korea. Here the secret police are for, not against, the people. We're glad we have the FBI. Over there you're never sure just where you stand.

"I never realized how glad I was to be an American until I could see the difference in the two countries. The ability of a person to move around and get a job when and where he wants to is the greatest freedom a person could have."

RESULTS OF SURVEY

Question 1: Do you think Americans have greater freedom than people of other countries:

1. Housewives (53 participating): 1 no comment, 1 undecided, 51 yes.

2. Students (82 participating): 3 no, 2 no comment, 1 undecided, 76 yes.

3. Laborers (47 participating): 3 no comment, 2 undecided, 42 yes.

4. Executives (2 participating): 2 yes.

5. Professional people (24 participating): 1 no, 23 yes.

6. White-collar workers (37 participating): 1 no, 2 undecided, 34 yes.

7. Servicemen (3 participating): 3 yes.

8. Unemployed persons (9 participating): 1 no, 8 yes.

Question 3: How many of the rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights can you name?

Rights guaranteed by the Constitution: (1) religion; (2) speech; (3) press; (4) petition government; (5) cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; (6) no housing soldiers without consent; (7) search warrant required or protection against unreasonable searches and seizures; (8) speedy trial; (9) jury made up of peers or equals; (10) cannot be tried twice for same offense; (11) cannot be made to be a witness against yourself; (12) private property cannot be taken away without just compensation (eminent domain); (13) must be tried in locality where crime was committed; (14) council for defense; (15) jury trial; (16) no excessive bail; (17) subpena witnesses; (18) public trial; (19) no cruel and unusual punishment; (20) grand jury indictment; (21) confronted with the witnesses; (22) jury in civil cases; (23) no excessive fines; (24) habeas corpus (release if no hearing); (25) ex post facto (cannot be punished for an act when it was innocent when committed); (26) peacefully assemble.

Number of rights mentioned (normal, 4.7): (1) Housewives, 3.9; (2) students, 4.7; (3) laborers, 4.3; (4) executives, 11; (5) professional people, 8.3; (6) white-collar workers, 4.2; (7) servicemen, 6; (8) unemployed persons, 4.

Well Done, Mrs. Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Bedford Standard:

WELL DONE, MRS. ROGERS

One of the Nation's most distinguished legislators and a distaff pioneer in Con-

gress, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has passed a notable milestone—completion of 3 decades of service in the United States House of Representatives.

It was 30 years ago yesterday that Mrs. ROGERS of Lowell was elected Congresswoman from the Fifth Massachusetts District to fill a vacancy created by the death of her husband, John Jacob Rogers, who had represented the district in Congress 13 years. She was the sixth woman to serve in Congress and the first from New England.

A Republican, Mrs. ROGERS has won well-deserved admiration from Congressmen of both parties as a competent lawmaker with an exceptionally keen understanding of national and world issues. As a member and former chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, she is recognized as an authority on veterans' activities. She went overseas with the American Red Cross in World War I to help care for disabled veterans and later served as personal representative of three Presidents (Harding, Coolidge and Hoover) in Government hospitals caring for disabled veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS is the senior woman Member of Congress in length of service, and her 3 decades in the House are topped by only 8 of her 434 colleagues. Massachusetts now has the distinction of having two 30-year Representatives in the House, Mrs. ROGERS and GOP Floor Leader MARTIN of North Attleboro.

Among the many tributes to Mrs. ROGERS were these especially appropriate words by Representative MCCORMACK of Boston, Democratic floor leader and Massachusetts' senior Democrat in Congress. He lauded Mrs. ROGERS as "a great humanitarian, a great American, and an outstanding legislator."

Representative ROGERS has served her district, State and country well. Americans everywhere, regardless of section or party, will join in saying: "Congratulations, well done."

An Ohioan Grows in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as my Ohio colleagues know, the Clevelander, official publication of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, is carrying a series of interesting articles on prominent Cleveland people in Washington. These articles are written by the nationally known business writer, Larston D. Farrar, with whom I have been acquainted for many years. The most recent article was about our colleague on the other side of the Hill, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER. I ask unanimous consent that this article be carried in full in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that others might have the pleasure of reading it.

The article follows:

AN OHIOAN GROWS IN WASHINGTON

(By Larston D. Farrar)

JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio, now beginning the third year of his second term as United States Senator from Ohio, is the State's senior legislative official in the national halls of the people. He also is a very distinguished native son of Ohio, for his name increasingly is becoming known to men in every profession and on every continent and he steadily has grown in wisdom and in national favor in recent years.

Senator BRICKER is not a Clevelander by birth. He has never lived in Cleveland, in the sense of maintaining a residence there. But he is well-known to thousands of Clevelanders personally and he regularly has increased the pluralities among Cleveland area voters in the various political races in which he has competed through the decades.

For instance, when he first was elected Governor of Ohio in 1938, leading the Republican ticket to victory, he lost out in Cleveland itself, and in Akron, Youngstown, and other industrial centers. But his vote was heavier in 1940 and in 1942 and by the time he ran for the Senate in 1946, he was carrying Cleveland and surrounding areas by substantial majorities.

"I'm from Madison County—a farm near Mount Sterling, Ohio," he tells interviewers laconically. "But I've been in Cleveland so many times it is as familiar to me as the Main Street of Mount Sterling. I've attended the annual Nisi Prius show, given by the members of the Cleveland bar, for years, and I have spoken at the City Club there on the Saturday before elections for so long I have got to thinking it is part of the qualifications necessary to run for public office."

PROUD OF CLEVELAND

The Senator says that he has observed the unparalleled industrial growth of Cleveland for decades with great pride.

"But even more than its bustling growth," he says, "Cleveland is associated in my mind—and in the mind of all who knew it—with civic pride. There is more civic enthusiasm in Cleveland in the professions, among the industrialists, and among labor and other groups than in almost any large city with which I am familiar. The people of Cleveland work together for their own civic good. That is something of which they all can be proud, individually and collectively."

Senator BRICKER's name—in the headlines—most often these days is connected with his famous Bricker amendment to the Constitution, which would amend the Constitution so as to make inoperative any treaty, or executive agreement with other nations, that contravenes United States law. This controversial amendment almost was passed by the Senate during the Republican 83d Congress, and it has been the subject of widely publicized hearings in this Congress. It does not seem likely to pass this year, but most observers in Washington would agree that it yet will be taken up by the Senate and sooner or later may go to the people of the various States for ratification.

"When he was an athletic director at Camp Sherman, Ohio, in World War I, for the 329th Infantry, one of the boys of foreign extraction called him 'Johnny de Brick,'" one of his friends recalled recently. "Senator BRICKER really is a brick. Many have said that he is like a stonewall—standing for all the verities and proving again, in his life, the value of straight thinking and straight shooting with the American people in a time of widespread political confusion. He particularly is a 'brick' toward Ohio, which is never far from his thoughts."

A STUBBORN MAN

The Senator always has been a stubborn man—stubborn on the side of what he believes to be political righteousness. Years ago, as a member of the Ohio Public Utilities Commission, he stubbornly refused to go along with the majority in setting a higher rate for gas in Columbus, the capital city. The Ohio State Supreme Court upheld him.

Merely because some stand might prove popular temporarily—or unpopular—never has influenced him in standing for what he believes is right. He voted against the censure of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican of Wisconsin, in spite of intense pressure from the executive branch, because he was familiar with the precedents of the Senate and believed that Senator MCCARTHY had acted within these precedents. He also continued to work for passage of the famous Bricker amendment, relating to treaty power, in spite of the unremitting opposition of the White House. When JOHN BRICKER sets his jaw, something besides him must give. Generally, experience has shown, it is the people who change their minds—not JOHN BRICKER. He is guided by principles which, in his judgment, are unerring.

Senator BRICKER's regimen of work is heavy, whether the Republicans on Capitol Hill are in the majority or minority. He gets to his office early, has won a reputation for being at committee meetings on time and for staying through the hearings, no matter how long-drawn-out they may be. He has cultivated his colleagues of both parties and has grown steadily in their estimation during more than 8 years in which he has served in the Senate.

Chairmen of various committees know, without being told, that if they are taking up any project that impinges upon Ohio in any way, Senator BRICKER is liable to be in attendance, whether he is a member of the particular committee or not. He won a reputation for watching out for the interests of the people of Ohio in his 30's, and, now that he is in his 60's, he is sticking to that task.

The Senator maintains a pleasant and easy relationship with his fellow Ohian, Senator GEORGE BENDER, Republican, of Ohio, who was elected in 1954.

"GEORGE and I have been friends since he served in the Ohio Legislature," Senator BRICKER recalls. "He has a wonderful lot of experience in the House of Representatives here and his election to the Senate by the people was a well-deserved promotion. We get along extremely well."

LIKES PEOPLE

The truth is, Senator BRICKER gets along with many different people, from all sections of the Nation, and from big cities and rural areas. He has a natural liking for people and feels easy and comfortable in all kinds of company, particularly among those who, like himself, have an abiding interest in the welfare of the Nation and in legislation which affects the Nation. He has been debating since he was in high school and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD files bear mute witness to the manner in which he took to the instructions given him by various teachers.

Senator BRICKER has been termed "the master of the second wind" by some who have followed his ascending political star. The point out that when he tried to serve as a soldier in World War I, he was turned down because of a slow heart—his heart beats 55 times a minute instead of the more-normal 72 times. But he did not give up. He even went to the extreme of appealing to his pastor to help him become ordained as a Christian Church minister in order to qualify for a chaplain commission so that he could go overseas with the 329th Infantry, 82d Division. Even after he became an Army chaplain, he missed out on the European service and, instead, served gallantly among men at Camp Eustis, Va., during the worst siege of influenza in United States history.

In 1928, when he ran for attorney general of Ohio on the Republican ticket, at 34, he came out second in a field of 6. Nothing daunted, he served on the public utilities commission by appointment until he ran again for attorney general in 1932, when he won by a plurality of 10,008. In the same election, Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President as a Democrat by overwhelming vote and the Ohio Legislature went strongly Democratic, as did the governorship and virtually every State office. Only 6 Republicans were sent to Congress out of the State's 24 that year.

Again, when he ran against Gov. Martin L. Davey, in 1936, Mr. BRICKER was defeated.

But he ran again—on his second wind—in 1938 and won handily.

He tried for the Republican nomination for President in 1944. He lost, but was named to the second place on the ticket. There are many who believe that he will get his second wind in this respect, one of these days, and yet may be the Republican standard bearer for President of the United States.

As most everyone in Ohio knows already, JOHN BRICKER married Harriett Day, of Urbana, Ohio, in 1920, when he was just beginning his steady but unspectacular rise to political fame. They have one adopted son, Jack, in his twenties.

Senator BRICKER has been immersed in political activities for some 30 years. Unless some unforeseen circumstances intervene, he is liable to be active—for Ohio and Cleveland—for a good many years yet. He is not just growing older in Washington. He is growing there in every good way. Clevelanders have every right to be proud of him, even those who did not agree with every facet of his thinking about national and international problems.

What the Wheat Vote Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAGE BELCHER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "What the Wheat Vote Means," as it appeared in the Enid Morning News, Monday, June 27, 1955:

WHAT THE WHEAT VOTE MEANS

With an estimated 77.5 percent of the voting wheat growers of the United States having voted Saturday for continuation of the Government control-support program, the wheat areas now are assured a support price for next year of around $1.81.

Although there was much grumbling before the balloting, obviously many farmers finally decided that support at 76 percent of parity under the program was better for them than either 50 percent of parity or the open market price, had the control plan been junked. With so much controversy over a proper farm program, the vote was a democratic way of at least partially pleasing the greatest number.

But Saturday's balloting leaves many things unsolved in the wheat puzzle. The problem of huge surpluses remains. The fact that we can easily grow each year, even under the present allotments, enough wheat to more than feed ourselves remains. Likewise the fact that chances of marketing abroad huge surpluses, both present and those possible without an allotment program, are becoming slimmer each year. Wheat is being planted all over the globe now, in annually increasing acreage.

Secretary Benson can take the vote as appreciation of his courageous efforts to solve the wheat and other farm problems; as an expression of farmer confidence in his continued efforts in this direction; and as an expression of belief in his promises to keep working on a still better plan.

Another problem of the surplus which is coming to light is the fact that much of the grain in storage is inferior wheat, mixed down to or below minimum grades permissible under the support program. It is believed one of the chief causes of our loss of foreign markets is disinclination of buyers to take our wheat, much of it said to be fit only for stock or poultry feed. Some positive plan for tighter check on such wheat, and for putting it into the feed markets where it belongs is still called for.

One factor in the allotment vote thinking, too, may have been a growing acceptance among farmers along with others that within limits, surpluses may be considered as necessary stockpiles against the possibilities of war.

But whatever the immediate results or significance of Saturday's wheat vote, Congress must realize there still is a farm problem; that there still is room for study and action to bring the farmers up to 100 percent participation in the good things of our booming national economy. That in effect would be the full parity about which there has long been so much political talk.

Nevadans Oppose H. R. 7072

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, Nevadans are particularly attentive to what transpires here in Congress, but I believe a new degree of interest has been reached since the introduction of H. R. 7072.

Seldom in my congressional experience have I received such a great number of telegrams and letters on a single measure. And never have I received an expression from my constituents that is 100 percent in agreement—in his case deeply, strongly, thoroughly, and irrevocably opposed to H. R. 7072 in its present form.

Nevada needs highways. But we do not want them at the expense of Nevada industry.

The ill-considered tax provisions of H. R. 7072—developed apparently without benefit of public hearing, without consultation of this body's officially designated taxation committee—would ruin businesses and destroy jobs that are an integral part of our western economy.

This applies not just to our trucking and heavy duty equipment operators, although increases on typical line-haul operations in my State should H. R. 7072 become law would amount to approximately $200 per truck yearly.

Our local bus lines, upon which we depend for much of our internal transportation in Nevada, are already in financial difficulties, and I am advised H. R. 7072 would mean ruination.

Our small mining firms, operating already under great obstacles, would be greatly burdened as the added taxes in H. R. 7072 would probably absorb present profits.

Small contractors in Nevada fear these proposed tax increases because it may eliminate them, as only large concerns can stand the capital outlays which would be required for tires on dirt-moving and similar construction equipment.

For the RECORD I want to bring to your attention some of the typical messages I have received in the past few days from the extremely concerned people of Nevada—typical messages which plainly show the anger and the fear with which H. R. 7072 is justifiably regarded in my State. They follow:

RENO, NEV., *July 5, 1955.*
Representative CLIFTON YOUNG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Tax increase in proposed H. R. 7072 will be reflected heavily on cost of transporting cattle. In operation such as ours no justification for saddling trucking industry such heavy share of cost of highway program.

GARIBALDI LIVESTOCK TRANSPORTATION,
AL REPETTI.

RENO, NEV., *July 5, 1955.*
Congressman CLIFF YOUNG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We sincerely request that you vigorously oppose passage of H. R. 7072 as this increase tax structure is prohibitive. On behalf of the trucking industry throughout the United States. Thank you for your attention.

A. O. MAY,
Secretary, Teamsters Union No. 533.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *July 5, 1955.*
Representative CLIFTON YOUNG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Where will prices of hamburgers, milk, and other commodities go if motor transports have to double freight rates to realize fair profit. Conferences various groups consider H. R. 7072 immature thinking. Citizens' pocketbooks unreasonably affected.

DESERT DEVELOPMENT, INC.,
C. VAN PATTEN.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *July 2, 1955.*
Representative CLIFTON YOUNG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Financing proposals contained in H. R. 7072 are fantastic. Urge you to do all in your power to prevent this sort of legislation.

WELLS & STEWART.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *July 5, 1955.*
Representative CLIFTON YOUNG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fantastic tax program H. R. 7072 will be most damaging to trucking concerns, automotive and allied industries, even to ultimate consumer of products. Primary interstate roads now, others later. Next 12 years use automotive, gasoline, diesel, and rubber tax now being collected.

LEMBKE, CLOUGH & KING, INC.

RENO, NEV., *July 1, 1955.*
Hon. CLIFTON YOUNG,
Congressman for Nevada,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We are in favor of the administration or Clay bill for a public highway system and feel that the Gore bill S. 1048, has many objectionable features as far as Nevada is concerned. Latest bill, H. R. 7072, has tax provisions which would be ruinous to mining industry, especially tax on diesel fuel and rubber. As bill is drawn, these taxes would apply whether or not vehicles are used on public roads. Rubber tax increases are as much as 1,000 percent on large size truck tires and 500 percent on tubes. Diesel fuel tax is increased 300 percent. Please do everything possible to defeat or greatly modify tax provisions of bill or mines in our State will suffer irreparable damage.

GETCHELL MINE, INC.

Appendix

Work of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first part of testimony given by me on yesterday before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in connection with Senate bill 728. The first part of the testimony deals with the general planning, as of this time, of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee regarding the problem of delinquency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER ON S. 728

Mr. Chairman and fellow colleagues of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before your committee and presenting certain pertinent facts and arguments as to why Senate bill 728, which was introduced by Senator HENNINGS, Senator LANGER, and me as members of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, should be passed.

Before discussing the merits of the various provisions in said bill, it might be well to give you a brief background discussion as to the juvenile delinquency problem in the United States which, we believe, makes legislation such as this a necessity.

The recent Federal Bureau of Investigation Annual Report shows that 72 percent of all auto thefts in the United States are committee by persons under 22 years of age and that 57 percent are committed by persons under 18 years of age. These are figures which should shock the citizens of the United States into a dynamic program to combat juvenile delinquency in the United States. This year, 1,200,000 juveniles have been apprehended as juvenile delinquents. If this upsurge is not corrected, by 1960, 1,700,000 juveniles will get into trouble with the law. This Nation cannot afford such a rise in juvenile delinquency.

The fight against juvenile delinquency must be a two-pronged fight. We must devote sufficient energy and resources not merely to rehabilitate boys and girls after they get into trouble, but, most important, to prevent their getting into trouble in the first place. There are certain other factors that we should consider in the increase in number of juveniles who get into trouble. This increase appears even more serious when it is realized that there are at least three juvenile offenders brought to the attention of the police for every child actually brought before the juvenile courts. Nor is this the whole problem. As Fillmore H. Sanford, then executive secretary of the American Psychological Association, pointed out to the subcommittee, "For every juvenile who actually engages in delinquent behavior—or who is caught in delinquent behavior—there are hundreds or thousands who may have delinquent tendencies or who fail in subtle and socially harmless but still dreadfully crippling ways, to make a full and creative adjustment to life."

Let us consider some other facts:

1. There is an increase in the seriousness of the acts committed by boys and girls. During each successive year since 1948, for example, a larger number of persons under 18 years of age have been involved in such offenses as burglaries, robberies, and automobile thefts.

2. Heretofore, juvenile delinquency has been thought of as a big-city problem and indeed it does manifest its most acute form in large metropolitan areas. It should be noted, however, that whereas juvenile delinquency increased 29 percent in the Nation between 1948 and 1952, the number of juvenile offenders appearing in courts serving populations of less than 100,000 increased 41 percent.

3. An increase in both the number of boys and girls committing offenses and in the severity of these offenses has been noted in every region of the United States. Although many individual communities seem excepted, communities reporting such increases range from rural and semirural to large urban centers.

4. Neither are more particular forms of delinquent conduct peculiar to one type of community or any one geographical region. Juvenile drug addiction would seem to represent the only exception to this rule, in that it is limited to communities where there is substantial traffic in illicit drugs. Gangs, commonly considered a big-city phenomenon, also appear in communities relatively small in size. While the pattern of juvenile delinquency varies from community to community, these differences do not appear to be directly related to size, wealth, or other obvious differentials.

5. Delinquency exists in all economic groups. Although physically deteriorated and socially disorganized neighborhoods, usually termed "slum areas," contribute disproportionately to the delinquency caseloads of police and juvenile courts, economically well-to-do communities also produce many juvenile delinquents. As a matter of fact, certain forms of delinquent conduct appear more prevalent in the latter type of neighborhoods.

It is also reasonable to believe, and it was so brought out in testimony, that in many instances delinquents from better neighborhoods are less likely to come to the attention of the police and courts. School authorities may be more inclined to permit parents of means to work out the problems of their children, for example, than parents with no financial ability and standing. The children of parents with available funds may be sent quietly to private psychiatrists or to boarding schools, and consequently, the transgressions of those children are not likely to be presented to the juvenile court.

The subcommittee has received through testimony and in the form of studies, publications, and correspondence, extensive information on the causes of juvenile delinquency. A complete analysis of these voluminous materials is not yet available. The following presentation represents but a preliminary digest.

Juvenile delinquency does not result from a single cause. Neither the illegal behavior of an individual nor the total problem of juvenile delinquency in society can be attributed to any one cause. One delinquent child has been strictly disciplined since birth. Another has been subjected to little or no parental control. Some delinquent boys and girls have suffered gross neglect. Others have been overprotected by their parents. Both delinquents and nondelinquent youngsters read comic books and watch crime programs on television. Delinquent behavior stems from a multitude of causal factors, and is always the product of many and closely interrelated influences or forces.

The causes of juvenile delinquency are not unknown, although much remains to be learned about how they operate in relation to a particular individual. Neither is the causation of delinquency so complex that an intelligent attack upon the problem cannot be launched.

No child is born delinquent, but he is subject to a wide variety of influences and conditions which tend to either lessen or increase his chances of becoming delinquent. He is subjected, first of all, to the profound influence exerted by his parents and immediate family. The child of parents who provide affectionate and consistent care, correct instruction and example, who can offer support and protection and yet give sufficient freedom for growth and development, has little need or inclination to become seriously delinquent. He has found the world a friendly place. He has not built up abnormal hostilities. He has learned to trust others. He feels worthy of love and respect. He faces new situations with at least some security and confidence. A solid foundation has been laid down for the development of normal self-discipline and self-control.

Not all children enjoy such family relationships. Some homes are broken by desertion or death. Some parents, though physically present, are, because of their own problems—financial lack, health, or emotional handicaps—unable to give their children the type of care and rearing outlined above. To some degree, and many times to a severe degree, such children are deprived of the love, care, guidance, example, protection, or freedom which they need for normal development. To some degree, depending upon the nature and severity of the deprivation, the development of normal self-control suffers.

But influences bearing upon a child's development are not limited to those within the family, and many delinquent boys and girls do not come from homes marked by internal conflict and abnormal family relationships. This seems particularly true of delinquents who grow up in deteriorated and blighted neighborhoods where many forms of crime and delinquency flourish. Such neighborhoods, it should be noted, are frequently occupied by minority groups which are denied the advantages and opportunities thought normal to American living.

Through both acts of commission and omission, larger society may and does contribute to the development of delinquency. The child who is denied acceptance and opportunity because of his race, religion, or nationality, for example, may learn to hate and rebel against the community, even though he has received affection and guidance at home. The child exposed to adult

examples of vice and crime, reared in neighborhoods whose most influential and opulent residents are racketeers, may grow up into a life of crime despite the devoted efforts of law-abiding parents. So may the perfectly normal urge for achievement, for new experiences, for adventure and excitement lead to delinquency in a community which fails to make provision for meeting these needs through adequate school, work, recreational, and leisure-time programs.

The possible negative effects upon child behavior of certain other imponderable but pervasive influences should not be overlooked. The materialism of our age, with its emphasis upon getting ahead and financial success, subjects children to great strain and oftentimes frustration. Modern advertising, coupled with easy pay-as-you-go plans which tend to divert a disproportionate share of family income to keeping up with the neighbors may throw added strains upon family life.

Through TV, radio, movies, and comics, children are fed a heavy diet of violence and crime. Although it is claimed that law and order eventually prevail in these presentations, the life of the underworld is frequently glamorized in the process. Lawlessness and evil are overcome only by brute force. The witnesses have testified that the constant viewing of crime and horror in the various forms of mass media has a noticeable impact on youth and youth's behavior patterns. That it has some influence is manifest in the play and garb of children. The old western tradition of checking your gun at the door is now literally carried on in the elementary classroom. The subcommittee has had called to its attention instances in which youngsters are required to leave their play "shooting irons" outside the classroom, indicating the effect of mass media western programs upon such children.

6. Our investigations and hearings have shown that there are certain contributing factors to juvenile delinquency that needed special attention. For example, in some cities, excessive drinking of alcoholic beverages by juveniles was tolerated. Some restaurants and cocktail lounges permitted juveniles to drink without any attempt to check on the age of the persons involved. I need not elaborate on the impact that the drinking of alcoholic beverages has on youth, and it is a contributing factor toward the committing of delinquent acts. Testimony showed that one of the most sinister of all delinquency problems was that of narcotic addiction among children. An area where there is a concentration of population and one where there is easy accessibility to importation of narcotics, such as seaports and areas near the international borders, proves to be an area where the narcotic addiction among juveniles is most prevalent.

7. Indecent, lewd, and pornographic material reaching the youth of our Nation has been emphatically emphasized in recent hearings before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. A nationwide business, estimated at $350 million, is thriving today because of the inadequacy of our laws and the administration of those laws to cope with the problem. Our subcommittee has had much evidence presented as to the effect that such mass media as television programs, movies, radio, and horror and crime comics have on our youth and its relationship to the increase in juvenile delinquency in this country.

There is no doubt in my mind, nor could there be any doubt in the minds of the Members of the Congress of the United States, that juvenile delinquency has increased far out of proportion and that there must be undertaken effective means of combating it. I have heard people say that this is the job of the parent, of the school, of the immediate neighborhood. However, that is what may be known as a piecemeal approach to the problem.

A total community effort is the only answer to the crime problem. And there is not a single city today which is using all of its resources in combating crime and juvenile delinquency. Wherever one turns, the operation is a piecemeal one.

It is time for the piecemeal effort to be put to a stop and for constructive, well-coordinated programs to be put into effect.

It is interesting to note that not until 1945 did New York State Legislature pass the first law creating the official State Youth Commission. Very few States in the Union have followed the example, and those few States are the larger and richer ones. Even so, they agree that the financial burden on them is great. It is the concern of the Federal Government, for the protection of the youth of our Nation and the future of America, to present a nationwide program to help all of the 48 States to provide a well-coordinated program to combat juvenile delinquency. That is one of the principal objectives of S. 728.

The importance of the objectives of S. 728 is beyond question and I think that we can all agree on the importance of those objectives. The times demand that we take action to check the appalling nationwide upsurge in juvenile delinquency. There is a great unanimity of opinion which prevails as to the kinds of activities that should be undertaken by the Federal Government to assist in the problem.

To achieve the objectives which are, and should be, above controversy, we should approach this legislation with a determination that we shall not permit any differences over petty details to prevail over our concern for the well-being of tens of thousands of American children.

I am not urging favorable action on this matter from pride of authorship of S. 728, but I do have deep feeling concern that the Congress act promptly to pass legislation which would achieve the objectives which are so generally accepted.

It is, I believe, highly significant to note that the legislative branch, acting through the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, and the executive branch pursued their investigations in their own way but they both arrived at the same destination—recommending legislation to achieve the same objectives. I, therefore, call the attention of this subcommittee to the fact that you do not really have two separate proposals, but you do have two bills which seek to achieve essentially the same objectives. These two bills seek to achieve these objectives in the main through the same methods.

There are some details of method on which S. 728 and S. 894 differ but basically those differences, as I am sure you will find, are both aimed at the achievement of the same goals. Certainly, we are vitally interested in the end goal of saving young people.

Let us turn briefly to examination of the objectives that both pieces of proposed legislation would seek to achieve. Both bills would make funds available for three different but closely related purposes. I would like for you to look at these purposes in the light of problems found by the juvenile-delinquency subcommittee. Those are the problems that the legislation is designed to meet.

First, grants for training: S. 728 has provision for grants for training. S. 894 has provision for grants for training. Although there are slight differences in the method for the granting of funds to the States, the common objective of both bills is to get the money out to the States so that people can be trained to fight juvenile delinquency with the utilization of all available knowledge at their disposal.

Why do both bills emphasize the importance of training personnel? Because the training of greater numbers of qualified personnel to staff prevention and treatment agencies means it will be necessary to expand certain training programs and to launch new ones. Schools of social work, law schools, sociology and psychology departments all provide training which partially prepares people for work in the delinquency field. Almost without exception, however, the training offered needs to be supplemented in terms of content and, in some instances, in methodology to qualify personnel for certain functions within the field. Many institutions and police departments attempt to provide some on-the-job training and orientation and although such training is valuable, it is no substitute for the intensive and comprehensive training of persons assigned the crucial task of protecting and rehabilitating children in trouble. Federal funds are necessary to remove the bottleneck to improving the Nation's attack upon juvenile delinquency which has been imposed by the lack of trained and qualified personnel.

Second, both bills provide for grants-in-aid to the States to fight juvenile delinquency. That provision is in keeping with the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's findings after extensive hearings.

It was found that while juvenile delinquency has increased seriously and widely in every type of American community during the past 5 years, local efforts and programs to combat the problem fall far short of coping with it. Efforts in the local communities and States to enlarge existing programs and develop new ones to combat juvenile delinqency are seriously handicapped in several ways. There is ofttimes a lack of technical knowledge locally regarding what has and has not worked in other communities. Rapid strides have been made in technical knowledge which is not yet widely transmitted. Not only is the supply of qualified personnel insufficient to staff even the existing services, but communities often lack the ready means necessary to produce the financial support needed to expand or launch programs.

To break through this kind of stalemate, the Federal Government must launch a three-pronged attack. It must provide increased consultation or technical aid, it must give assistance in attracting and training personnel, and it must temporarily provide the "risk capital" needed for local organizations and agencies to launch and demonstrate the value of new services and programs.

Again, I want to emphasize that this objective is the same in both bills. The differences relate to the type of State organization required to administer the State plan. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's idea in S. 728 was that the administration of the plan must be in a State agency as widely representative of as many professions as are necessarily involved in the fight against delinquency.

Under the provisions of S. 894, it was thought the coordination and the avoidance of duplication could be achieved through a State advisory body.

These are essentially differences in the methodology.

Third, it is the third objective of both bills to provide for risk capital. The funds to be granted under such a program for demonstrations should be channeled to States through State councils or committees. These would be established by the governors or the legislators of the respective States for the purpose of cooperating in such a program. The State councils should include, but not be limited to, representatives of State and local agencies providing preventive and treatment services. The device of a State council or committee rather than an existing State agency is proposed here because a variety of types of agencies, organization, and disciplines would participate in planning and carrying out the program.

Although grants to a variety of State and local agencies might be approved by the

State council, all such grants, to be most effective, should be predicated upon a State plan developed by the council and should be allocated according to needs and priorities stipulated in that plan.

It is not contemplated that the Federal Government underwrite existing programs. Rather, funds made available to States for utilization as risk capital should be used solely to launch and temporarily support new services only. It is realized that any program which protects children from the ravages of neglect and rejection or from exposure to vice and lawlessness helps prevent juvenile delinquency. It is, therefore, these kinds of protective services which are basic and fundamental. It is proposed that the risk-capital grants for demonstrations be directed to the establishment of services to achieve such purposes. It is further recommended that the program itself be limited in duration to no more than 10 years, but that its value be reexamined at the end of 5 years and a report on the desirability of its extension be made to the Congress at that time.

Again it is noted that both bills have the same objective. The difference lies in how the money is to be allocated to the States.

There are two other points that I want to stress in this matter. Both deal with administration of the proposed program. Both bills provide for an advisory committee. S. 728 spells out in considerable details the organizations to be represented on the advisory council. S. 894 leaves it entirely within the discretion of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the hearings and investigations held by the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, it became very apparent that there is much waste and duplication in the Nation's efforts to combat juvenile delinquency because of a lack of coordination.

An impressive array of national organizations and agencies are concerned and more or less active in combating juvenile delinquency. These include religious organizations and agencies; youth-serving organizations, such as Boy Scouts, Y. M. C. A., and citizens' groups such as PTA, women's clubs, consultative agencies which provide technical consultation to States and local communities on one or more phases of delinquency control, such as the National Probation and Parole Association, the Child Welfare League of America, The American Public Welfare Association, the Industrial Areas Project, the Family Service Association of America, and the Children's Bureau of the National Institute of Mental Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the professional organizations with memberships consisting of persons whose profession is in some way related to the field such as the American Bar Association, the American Association of Social Workers, the National Council of Juvenile Delinquency Court Judges, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Association of Training Schools and Juvenile Agencies. Forward movement in filling gaps and in extending present services is seriously handicapped by the lack of joint planning among the agencies concerned.

Where S. 728, in the printed copy as it appears before you, lists on page 3 a number of specific organizations which shall be represented by at least one Representative, S. 894 leaves the question of selection of the advisory committee as to professional background and affiliation entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It has been suggested that this provision of S. 728 be amended to spell out various professional backgrounds of the personnel to be represented on the advisory group. Some believe that such a change would assure a broader representation of professional personnel with the wealth of experience essential to obtaining the greatest possible contribution from the advisory committee.

Title I of S. 728 provides for the establishment in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of an Office for Children and Youth, with the chief of the Children's Bureau acting as head of that office. There is no similar provision in S. 894.

The reason for such a change would be to place the Children's Bureau on the same level as other offices within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Thus, the Office for Children and Youth would be in a more advantageous position in presenting many of the problems dealing with youth than the Children's Bureau within the Department.

Much of what is proposed in this bill can be done by departmental order. There does not appear on the part of the present Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare any inclination to take such action.

The benefit of this provision would be to bring about closer liaison between the Secretary and the Chief of the Children's Bureau, and to give the Children's Bureau the status it deserves as a single agency in our Government in the interests of our children in this great land of ours.

It is a shame that the press had to report recently that within a year the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not even spoken to the Chief of the Children's Bureau. In the planning of programs to help children, how can a Secretary under such circumstances plan intelligently on programs which would benefit children?

Title II of S. 728, as I have already mentioned, provides for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on Juvenile Delinquency. This advisory council, consisting of the Secretary, the Attorney General of the United States, or his designee, also includes 20 members appointed by the Secretary.

The purpose of the council is to review applications for special projects submitted to the Secretary under title V of this act, and to recommend to the Secretary for grants under such title. The purpose in creating this council is to get the expert knowledge of the leaders in the many fields concerned with juvenile delinquency, education, and related areas, who will be in a position to give valuable assistance to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in matters necessary to properly administer said act.

Title III of S. 728 provides for grants to the States to strengthen and improve programs. It provides a $3 million appropriation for the next fiscal year and for each of the following 6 years such sums as Congress may determine. The purpose of the appropriation is to provide to the States funds to strengthen and improve Statewide programs to combat juvenile delinquency. As pointed out earlier, very few States have State youth commissions established by law, hence there is the greater need for this bill.

Most of the States, however, do have some agency which can qualify under said bill to carry out the purpose intended.

Title IV of S. 728 provides for grants for the training of personnel employed, or preparing for employment, in programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, or for the development of courses for such training, including the establishment and maintenance of such fellowships and traineeships.

One of the glowing needs in the field of delinquency is the need for trained personnel in many categories in both the preventive and correctional aspects of the delinquency problem. There is much evidence in our investigations and hearings to bear out this point.

Title V of S. 728 provides for special projects for the purpose of demonstrating improved techniques and practices for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency. The object of this provision is to encourage special projects which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the strengthening of programs for the control or treatment of juvenile delinquency.

Title VI of S. 728 provides for certain activities in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which would serve the purpose for which the bill was introduced. These include the following:

To make such studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports as will promote the strengthening of programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

To cooperate with and render technical assistance to States in matters relating to programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency;

To disseminate information as to studies, investigations, demonstrations, and reports; and

To provide short-term courses of training and instruction in technical matters relating to the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency, etc.

It is respectfully submitted that S. 728 will materially aid State and local programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency in the United States. Our hearings are replete with testimony showing that in order for juvenile delinquency to be properly controlled and treated, it must be done so on a systematic, all-inclusive plan, with the coordinated efforts of all interested groups from a National, State, and local level.

Gentlemen, in this matter we have a great responsibility. We must keep our eyes on the ball. The ball, in this contest, is the welfare of our children.

Address by Paul Harvey Before the National Defense Meeting of the Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Paul Harvey before the national defense meeting of the Daughters of the American Revolution, on April 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY PAUL HARVEY DELIVERED BEFORE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE MEETING ON APRIL 19, 1955

Good evening, Americans.

The late George Orwell wrote a series of essays, the best of which was called Shooting an Elephant. Mr. Orwell described his experiences as a minor official of the British colonial government in a small village in Burma. One afternoon a group of natives came rushing up to his thatched hut to announce that an elephant had trampled its master to death. Mr. Orwell's responsibility was plain: As emissary of the Queen he must be both judge and executioner, so he slung

a gun over his shoulder and started off tracking this great beast.

Mr. Orwell didn't want to shoot the elephant in the first place. A sensitive man never likes to kill an animal; somehow it is always more difficult if it is a big animal.

In the second place, economically speaking, it didn't make sense. Alive, this great work beast was worth a hundred pounds; dead, its tusks would be worth less than 5 pounds.

George Orwell didn't want to shoot the elephant, but as he walked along and the excited natives strode along beside him, waiting for one show of weakness on the part of the white man so they might laugh and jeer at him—that, you must understand, is the white man's greatest problem in Asia, just to keep from being laughed at—suddenly he know what he must do, he must shoot the elephant, and in that awful instant George Orwell came to realize what colonialism really implies, that whenever one man seeks to rule another it is his own freedom he destroys, for he must do then not what he wants but what is expected of him.

Like it or not, we now have been thrust into a position of world leadership. It isn't going to be fun, and it isn't going to be easy, and maybe you don't want to shoot the elephant, and I can't say I blame you; maybe you want to leave the dirty work up to somebody else. All right, but then we must not be surprised if one day this vast mass of humanity over the land surface of the earth, hungrily searching for leadership, looks to Russia as the only place where they can find it.

If, on the other hand, knowing the price we must pay, we want to be leaders, then we have got to start acting the part. It made a splendid headline in the newspapers of our frightened friends when recently we took the initiative in recommending atomic disarmament. There is now consultation at a lower echelon to see whether or not there is common meeting ground between our world and theirs, so that we might engage in upper-level discussions of atomic disarmament.

Now, wait a minute. In World War II we outnumbered our enemies 7 to 1. The Allies outnumbered the Axis Powers 7 to 1. In world war III, God forbid it should be, they are going to outnumber us, you know, 8 to 3; and I mean even if all of our sometimes allies stick with us, they are going to outnumber us 8 to 3.

Suppose we plow under the big bomb. Suppose we destroy the technological advantage which thus far has kept the big Red Bear at bay. Then what do we say when one day somebody gets mad at somebody and blows the whistle on another shooting match? We go back to fighting with bamboo spears again. Oh, my dear Americans, give your sons better arms than that.

I think maybe it would be well if this we understood—wars never end. Wars never end. In the three and a half thousand years of recorded history fewer than 8 percent of these years have been warless ones, and even then the wars between the wars, what we have come to call cold wars waged by the forces of espionage and counterespionage, go on.

Wars are never ended, and it is generally who gets the advantage during this war between the wars that determines who gets the drop on whom when somebody pulls the cork on a gunfight.

Cold wars are not new. Nor are the tactics necessary for waging such a war. Ever since Moses sent his first advance agents into Canaan to find out what he could expect there, ever since Joshua carefully planted behind the curtains of a harlot in the walls of Jericho, somebody who could do a little wiretapping for him, it has not been ignoble for us to refer to such methods for keeping track of our enemies. There is nothing moral about war, hot or cold.

Quintus Fabius Maximus, the Roman general, was the original "cold war kid," I guess you could say. The Romans nicknamed him the "Cunctator," one who delays. He marched and countermarched, turned the battlefield into a parade ground, but he wouldn't fight. Hannibal is getting ulcers, but he isn't getting shot, and they say one day he met the Carthaginians on the field and he said in a dramatic way, "What will it be, war or peace?"

By that time they were so bushed chasing him around they said it didn't make much difference one way or another, and then he said, "Let it be war," and with a dramatic flourish he let his toga fall to the ground and ran as fast as he could in the opposite direction.

There are those in this anxious hour, and I suspect that perhaps they are the same who sought to develop a campaign to immobilize the FBI in 1939 and 1940 just before that other great war, who, by some perverted reasoning seemed to think it is all right for those charged with the responsibility for our internal security to face our enemy with a handicap. If there were evidence received by wiretap tonight that somebody was going to bomb the White House at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, legally, at least, according to recent Supreme Court interpretation of what constitutes constitutionality, our Federal authorities could not detain the conspirators if they were led to the arrest on wiretap evidence.

Those who are so anxious about their freedom that they consider it entirely appropriate that certain Americans should duck behind the Constitution when asked about their allegiance might, I think, harken to the words of old Oliver Wendell Holmes, who once said: "No man is free to shout fire in a crowded theater."

My dear Americans, I cherish with all my heart the freedom of the press and yet I am not free to libel you, nor to defame you, nor to slander you, nor to invade your privacy.

Freedom implies responsibility too. That is why you are not free to park in front of my fire hydrant. That is why no one, not even the greatest of us all, must be left free to sign any foreign treaty which cancels one word of our Bill of Rights, yours and mine.

That is why no man must be left free to hide behind our Constitution, yours and mine, while he seeks to set fire to it.

When we were boys we used to resolve our differences as boys with our fists. Now that we are men we don't do that any more and we like to pretend to you ladies that there is some noble motive involved; but it isn't so, you know. The real deterrent is the fact that we have so increased in physical prowess, along with the rather soft midsection and the possible complications arising from there, that if we were to engage in fisticuffs it is entirely likely that one of us would be maimed, perhaps killed; perhaps both, and so it isn't worth the price.

It is conceivable to me that one day all the great nation states of the world might approach such a point of physical prowess that no one dare attack the other, for such an attack would be suicidal, and that is a mighty nice prospect, but you have got to remember that the first prerequisite is that we keep us strong, and that is spelled U. S. and not U. N.

I don't mean that to be a disparaging reflection on the noble efforts to set up a world forum where one day conceivably by example we might help lead the other great nation states of the world unto a better way and unto a higher level of living; but I say to you that we will serve no man well, neither theirs nor ours, meanwhile if we have merely permitted a bunch of muddle-headed mathematicians to drag our level of living down to match theirs.

I would urgently recommend to this organization that at the earliest opportunity serious consideration be given, if it has not already, to the establishment of an academy for diplomacy. Some of you may know that this has been a pet of mine for a long time and, you know, I am anxious for this, that our capable warriors have somehow managed to win every outdoor fight in our history until this most recent embarrassing situation, and that was largely brought about by the fact that they deferred to our indoor warriors, and we have never won an indoor fight yet.

I don't know how you are going to select the faculty but may I suggest that in this academy of diplomacy, fashioned after the academies at West Point and Annapolis, where we groom men to wage our cold wars in our behalf, high in the curriculum, if not uppermost, we should have a course in moral consideration, that each man at the outset might determine what is right and what is wrong.

It is indeed unfortunate that those charged with planning for our defense should give prior consideration to such things as, "Now, how is this going to look just 5 weeks before a British election?" or we sit around and chew our fingernails up past the second knuckle and ask ourselves, "Now, wait a minute. This isn't going to read very well in the British press;" or "I wonder how it's going to look next campaign time;" and then, maybe toward the conclusion of this consideration, somebody will ask, "Is it right or is it wrong?"

I know this sounds like an oversimplification but somehow sometimes we country boys from up in the woods have been far enough away from the forest to see around certain obstacles, and it has always been singularly confusing to us that right and wrong, that basic, old-fashioned American yardstick, is so often neglected in these considerations.

Imagine yourself a Hungarian patriot tonight. You are a man who has let three freedoms slip through his fingers. You didn't throw it away, you just relaxed your grasp for a little while and suddenly it was gone and you now will give your life if that will get it back, but that won't get it back. Tomorrow you pick up your paper and you say, "What's the matter with those crazy Americans? Do they believe as they say? Do they believe what they have been preaching to us on their Voice of America? Do they believe in the open church door and the freedom for a man to worship as he will and work where he pleases? Then, how inconceivable," this Hungarian patriot says, "How can they offer immediate financial assistance and the hand of friendship to the Godless Communist dictator of Jugoslavia, who permits none of these things?"

Or, says the Hungarian patriot, "Is the American willing now to sell even his soul for a Communist's promise of 38 divisions?"

I wonder if it wouldn't have helped, just following that last great war that we had, if we had evaluated in terms of right and wrong instead of some other expediency or instead of being guided by some criminal conspiracy, when those charged with the responsibility for the vast Boeing operation in Wichita, Kans., where our greatest bomber, the B–29, was built, were instructed by Washington to remove to a great concrete loading ramp on the outside of their largest hangar their jigs and dies and presses and fixtures, and all of the components required for the construction of that then mightiest bomber and run over them with a road roller, turning $35 million worth of property into junk.

While we were then reducing our 250 wings to 2, the Communist agitator published in Moscow was saying the U. S. S. R. must have an air force that can fly higher, faster, and farther than any in the world.

I wonder if it might not have changed the complexion of things if we had asked ourselves, is it right or is it wrong, that in a

mighty military establishment, or at least a civilian establishment charged largely with military production, at the insistence of the management, every employee has been fingerprinted and yet those charged with responsibility for our internal security had not the authority to catalog those fingerprints. Earl Browder's brother could be working at the Boeing plant in Wichita tonight and there wouldn't be anything anybody could do about it. Let me amend that last remark. Within recent weeks it has been made possible in the instance which I then described for somebody to do something about it, but only within recent weeks.

I am not saying that anybody who goes to work in a war plant who refuses to testify as to his allegiance is necessarily a traitor. I, like George Elliott, am not one of those who look at a cat in a creamery and wonder what he came for.

Is it right or is it wrong? We pulled the rug out from under Chiang Kai-shek in China, told him he had to compromise with Communists, and so he was deposed from the mainland. We said, "Tsk, tsk, how we erred here."

Then we turned right around and put a gun against the neck of Syngman Rhee and told him to do the same thing.

The only recent public utterance I have heard concerning exactly what we are for in the south half of Indochina, not what we are against—we are all against communism—but what is our affirmative faith with which we are going to counter this godless alienism which is spreading itself over the face of the earth, 100 million new disciples a year?

Whittaker Chambers has said communism is an atheistic substitute for religion, that communism succeeds in direct proportion to the failure of other faiths. What is our affirmative faith? What are we for?

I have heard it said that we cannot allow the rest of Indochina to go because it would then open to the floodtide of communism all of southeast Asia and its resources of tin and rubber and rice. Now, I don't pretend to know anything about these geopolitical considerations, and I am not a military strategist, and maybe it is necessary that we should go to war there for tin and rubber and rice, but I think before this decision is behind us we should evaluate it first in terms of is it right or is it wrong.

I don't understand it. I mean, we are exporting tin from our own hemisphere. The ersatz rubber which we are presently manufacturing is better than the real thing. Rice—we are growing enough rice in Arkansas to supply all the 48 States, and one of the biggest headaches Ezra Benson has is the surplus of that commodity; but still maybe I am wrong, and maybe it is necessary that we go to war in southeast Asia for tin and rubber and rice.

Then let us have the character and the courtesy to go back to America's Gold Star Mother and tell her that she might have to give another son for tin and rubber and rice, but in heaven's name, let's not perpetuate this ridiculous pose of opposing communism with the blood of our best sons, 6,000 miles away, while Earl Browder and William Z. Foster and Judy Coplan are running loose in the United States of America.

Recently we were ready to declare a national holiday when we turned back the *Aruba*; big deal. Oh, we were so proud of ourselves, and for a little while, if you didn't read the fine print on the back page, it kind of felt good to be an American again, for we had raised a voice in the international language or force, and they understood, and with 13,000 tons of jet fuel they turned that little old freighter around and they headed back for Rumania and Finland, from whence it came. We had turned back the *Aruba*. All over page one.

Oh, my dear Americans, 12 other ships of Finnish registry put in with strategic cargoes for Communist China during that same month of March, and we failed to protest. In 6 months, 36 vessels. We made such a big to-do over 13,000 tons of jet fuel—20 million tons were delivered last year just to the one Communist port of Canton. There is a direct railroad from there to Fukien Province, immediately opposite Formosa.

My moral concern has perhaps become a little involved, and not a little confused. When the allies, our British friends, have been permitted without protest to continue not only to approve such trade, but to protect it with the ships of their navy, little wonder that this day, today, they the British, conveniently just before an election, were able to wipe out all income taxes for 2½ million of the British people.

For 7,000 years we went in circles. From monarchy to oligarchy, from oligarchy to dictatorship, from dictatorship to bureaucracy, from bureaucracy to democracy, from democracy to mob rule, and finally chaos and confusion in the streets. Then the people would cry out, "God give us a king," and God would do that, and they would have a monarchy, and start the whole cycle over again.

Do you know why? Because each great nation state enjoyed about 150 years at its zenth, which is just about our time in the New World, and then it started to decay. It was never destroyed by anybody else's marching legions, but by rot, internal, social, economic, cultural decay.

But something strange and wonderful and new happened here in the New World. I sometimes figure about the only reason these other great nation states threw in the towel was that they were good governments; it was because they were good, each in its time, that they bore such bountiful fruit the people got fat, they got lazy, and when they got lazy they began to want to absolve themselves of personal responsibility and wanted to turn over to government things to do for them that they ought to do for themselves, and in order to do this the government would get bigger and the individual would get littler, and the government would get bigger and the individual would get littler, until finally the individual was hardly anything at all, and suddenly less than 200 years ago, and it was such an incident in world history, there was created on our shores what Dean Clarence Manion has called, in his splendid volume, Key to Peace, the world's first government under God—not a democracy, for that word is not found in our Constitution or in the constitutions of any of the several States.

You will find that each of these documents, with the specific exception of the Constitution which confines itself to civil law, calls upon the blessing of Almighty God. When that pioneer turned his eyes to the West it was a funny thing. He didn't ask for a whole lot for himself, but yet look how far we have come in this brief instant of history. We, suddenly, 7 percent of the earth's people, have come to possess more than half of all the world's good things. We hadn't inherited anything from 7,000 years of agriculture; that farmer was still tilling his field with a crooked stick. In this little while we took that crooked stick, the wooden plow, and gave the world a tractor, and we built skyscrapers over the blacksmith shops.

Where the pioneer had only Indian trails to follow through the wilderness, today you can rollerskate from Miami to Seattle, and from Boston to San Diego. The United States has a car for every three people. That's right; we could all ride at once. I thought for a while a little earlier this evening we were. In the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, according to our best estimates, there is a car for every 1,200 people.

So far we have come, and in such a brief span, and I think it has to do with the creed that may never have passed pioneer lips in this form, but if it had he would have said something like this, "I believe in my God, my country, and in myself."

It's a simple thing to say and yet it is a rare man today who will dare to stand up and say, "I believe in my God and my country and in myself"; and in that order. He turned his eyes toward the West. He didn't demand that somebody else take care of him. If he got ill or he got old there was an old-fashioned philosophy in those days that a man was supposed to provide for his own and for his own future. He didn't demand a guaranteed rocking chair at eventide. He didn't demand that somebody else assure him a free education. He didn't demand the maximum amount of pay for a minimum of work and even pay for no work at all.

Come to think of it, he didn't demand much of anything. He just looked out there at the rolling plans stretching away to the tall green mountains, lifted his eyes to the blue skies, and said, "Thank you, God. Now I can take it from here."

That spirit isn't dead in this country. It's dormant. It has been driven underground but I have a wonderful abiding faith that the American people, when they get mad enough, can do anything.

I think it is unfortunate that too often recently we have been talking of the American heritage and so have come to think of it as an inheritance, something that was bought by somebody else's blood back there at Ticonderoga, Valley Forge, something that you could sew up in a mattress and keep intact for your children; but it isn't that way. You know, freedom is something even as your daily bread that you have to go on earning over and over again, every hour that you live. If being an American is worth fighting for, it is worth working at.

Once in a while I get away from the highly industrialized area in which my profession requires that I spend most of my time. I take my shoes off and wade around in the good green grass roots of this country.

I want to preface this, particularly since my own severest critic puts a high premium on truth, and my own D. A. R. ling is with me, that I am not one of those to fit a remark to a situation if I don't mean it with all that's in me, but I want to tell you something about women. Ever since Molly Pitcher took her place beside the cannon of the colonists, ever since that early pioneer woman walked along beside the Conestoga wagon, carrying a coop of chickens and a bag of seed in one hand and a few heirlooms in the other, the average disorganized American woman has known where this country was going a long time before word ever got to Washington.

Forgetting everything else I have said up to here, because I want you to remember this, storms are a part of the normal climate of life. Paul Harvey has said wars have ever been with us and they will ever be, and that is so. There are clouds of other shapes and sizes and hues out there on the horizon too.

I pretend no Pollyanna outlook for it has never been so. Storms are a part of the normal climate of life. They have always been here. Sometimes they take the shape of a drop, sometimes they take the shape of a severe economic recession; but storms are a part of the normal year-in and year-out climate of life. Every generation mothers have wondered whether they ought to bring babies into this era of armamentation. Young people have wondered whether they ought to marry. Young people wonder whether they ought to follow the professions.

But in every hour there have been these challenges and that seems part of the master plan, the master of which knows more about what he is doing than we do. Storms are a part of the normal climate of life. This is the

testing time. This is the shakedown cruise. Here is where we separate the men from the boys and if there were perpetual sunshine there would be no victory, so storms are a part of the normal climate of life.

If we conceivably could roll out for our youth a plush carpet on which they might walk off into a problem-free future it wouldn't be to their best interests to do so, for storms are a part of the normal climate of life. Here is where we case-harden character.

What happens to a rooster in a storm? He goes over in a corner of the henhouse and he sits there and gets soaking wet and shivers and shakes and develops psittacosis or one of those things. He gets it and dies.

What happens to an eagle in a storm? He takes off. He sees those dark clouds coming, did you know that? He actually takes off into the teeth of it, lets the tremendous thermal currents in the vanguard of the big blow actually buoy him aloft and carry him higher and higher and higher until finally the eagle is soaring above the storm in the sunshine.

That's the answer, Americans: Storms are a part of the normal climate of life. We have got to learn to ride them and we can if somehow we can revive first in ourselves and then in our youth that basic American's creed, "I believe in my God and in my country and in myself."

Don't for one instant doubt that this has been the formula for our bountiful success because I can give you his written word, that believing on these things all else shall be added unto you, but if there is too much din in the market place for that still small voice to be heard, then let us, nonetheless, with just the conscience of reasonable men, give all that is in us to preserve unmortgaged and intact this last great, green, and precious place on earth.

Let us first die valiantly and cleanly under the H-bomb rather than to rot away under any form of anybody's godless slave state. Don't ever take it lightly, because too many people you never knew have broken their hearts to get it and to keep it for you.

Thank you all very, very much.

The Challenge to American Learning in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 23, it was my privilege to address the Wisconsin State Teachers College at Eau Claire, Wis., on the subject The Challenge to American Learning in the Atomic Age.

At that time I emphasized the importance of closer relations between the people of the United States and the peoples of southeast Asia and of other relatively far distant areas, which we have too often overlooked in times past.

Our tendency has been to preoccupy ourselves with relations with our friends in Western Europe. While these Atlantic relations must ever be improved, we must seek to strengthen our ties with the peoples of the Pacific, the peoples of Eastern cultures, and, yes, of African and Middle Eastern cultures.

One of our most important means of doing so is through the medium of Asian-African representatives among 34,000 or so foreign students who are now receiving educational training in this country.

To my way of thinking, these foreign students represent one of the greatest assets, so to speak, of their countries, and one of the foremost means for us of conveying the truth about America to the world

I may say, incidentally, that on July 4, in London, the fifth annual International Student Conference opened, with delegates and observers from 53 countries represented. This is the free world student body which has completely "taken the play away" from the Communist-dominated International Union of Students.

I send to the desk the text of my address before the State Teachers College, followed by the text of a New York Times editorial on the foreign students and other exchanges as a good asset to free world foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the texts of my speech and the Times editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN LEARNING IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(Address by Senator WILEY before summer session, Wisconsin State Teachers College, Eau Claire, Wis., Thursday, June 23, 1955)

I am pleased to address this fine audience.

I am particularly pleased, of course, to come home—to be back with friends and neighbors.

But it is a special honor to appear before this great institution of learning which has contributed so many outstanding leaders to Wisconsin and American education.

VARIOUS TOPICS OF POSSIBLE INTEREST

In contemplating my visit with you this morning, many thoughts had occurred to me as to what might be the principal phase of my address.

On the home front, on the foreign scene—your country and mine is challenged with such a tremendous variety of issues on which I might submit observations to you, that my scope could have been very broad indeed.

This is a new world in which we are living, a new world, as you know, of supersonic travel, a new age, an atomic age.

Now, what are some of the specific problems in this new world which I had in mind and to which I shall just make a passing reference, at the outset?

WILEY BILL FOR TAX CREDIT FOR SCHOOLING

Well, I had thought of referring in detail to a bill which I have offered which comes very close to a problem in your heart and mine.

It is the matter of encouraging more Americans to attend institutions of higher learning, by being financially able to do so.

Thus, I have offered bill S. 1778. It will provide a 30 percent tax credit in filing income tax returns—a credit against amounts expended to put students through institutions of higher learning.

You and I know that all institutions of higher learning these days involve a good deal of expense, even when the tuition problem is taken care of.

We know that the overhead costs of academic facilities—both public and private—have constantly increased and so rates must constantly rise to students.

We know that teachers however, are still underpaid, both in State institutions and in private institutions.

And, on another phase, we know that in this inflationary time, a great many of our students, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, are pursuing their studies at financial sacrifice to themselves and often to their parents.

In the light of all of these realities, I have offered this bill for a 30 percent tax credit. This is only a beginning toward tax liberalization. And it in turn is but one phase of a problem with which you and I are familiar. It is the problem of making sure that those who want to increase their learning, those who want to make themselves better citizens, those who want to enter professions—shall have the opportunity to do so.

STRENGTHEN WORLDWIDE EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Well, friends, I thought of another subject of interest to you and to me. It is the matter of international exchange of teachers, students, and other specialists under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs.

I am an enthusiastic supporter of these exchange programs.

I favor 100 percent the idea of exchanging more qualified Americans with more qualified foreigners, visiting each others' countries.

I want more of our teachers and students and specialists in labor, business, agriculture to visit overseas.

I want them to meet personally with foreign peoples and I want them to give those foreign peoples a truer understanding of what makes us Americans "tick."

FOREIGN STUDENTS—AN ASSET TO AMERICA

Yes; and I want more well-qualified foreign students and teachers and specialists to visit our own land.

In both instances, of course, there must be careful selection of applicants.

But, at the same time, the program should be expanded.

There are some 3,000 foreign students in our country today. They are and will be a great asset to their own nations, and they are a great asset to this country and to its enlightened foreign policy.

I wish that there were more of these foreign students here.

And I wish that more were done to help them feel at home, to have them meet average Americans at the grassroots in American homes and offices and factories and on American campuses.

I believe in person-to-person contact.

I don't have the slightest doubt of the favorable results of Americans going abroad and of foreigners coming here. This is provided, however, that a little advance thought goes into the arrangements, so that a true and accurate picture will result.

These, then, are two of the subjects which I might have discussed in greater detail today.

WE NEED MORE EXPERTS ON FOREIGN CULTURES

There is a third subject.

It is the need for more learners, more scholars in America interested in foreign places.

It used to be thought that a relatively rare individual who was interested in, let us say, the language of Laos or the culture of Cambodia or the religious sects of Vietnam—was an "ivy towered" professor, a "highbrow" intellectual whose studies did not matter one bit to this Nation.

But now, our acquaintance with these and other foreign peoples has become a matter of life-and-death necessity for us and for the Western World.

SPECIALISTS IN NON-WESTERN AREAS

The fact of the matter is that we do not have enough specialists in foreign peoples and foreign cultures—particularly non-Western peoples and non-Western cultures.

Today, the ramparts of American defense are spread throughout the whole world. To-

day, the fate of Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Southern Vietnam, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, Nepal, India, and a vast number of other faraway places are matters of deepest interest to us.

It is not that we have to shoulder all of their problems or try to bear all of their burdens, because obviously we cannot, could not, nor would they want us to.

But we do want to extend a friendly hand, a helping hand.

We want to give them the benefit of American technical know-how. We want to help them banish age-old diseases. Tens of millions of people in India alone reportedly suffer from malaria, to cite but one of innumerable maladies.

We want to the extent that it is feasible to help the diseased and the weak and impoverished of southeast Asia, to help pregnant mothers or tiny infants through the United Nations Children's Fund. We want to help uplift southeast Asia's agriculture from widespread use of mere primitive sticks which scrape the soil, to the use of more effective types of implements, of seed and fertilizer.

But how can we help these diverse underdeveloped peoples, how can we even talk to them if we know next to nothing about them?

In all the United States there is but a handful of specialists who can talk, much less be fully acquainted with, let us say, the Thai people and the Thai culture.

The same is true with other peoples in some other relatively distant areas.

To fulfill this need, therefore, we need to encourage American scholarship. We need to increase the reservoir of specialists in foreign areas. We need to get away from the utterly obsolete and mistaken notion of ivy-towered professors or highbrow intellectuals who happen to be interested in once remote peoples and cultures who are now very, very close to all of us.

Yes, we need to accord American scholars the respect and esteem to which they are entitled, as they pursue their respective interests.

FINE WORK OF COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

On the language problems in particular, for quite some time, I have been in contact with the American Council of Learned Societies. It has given a great deal of consideration to this challenge.

Included, I may say, in the American council are a great many national organizations concerned with the humanities—with the languages and the literatures, philosophies and religions, history and the arts—the humanistic element in the social sciences.

This includes the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, the American Anthropological Association, and others.

I do not presume to be an expert in any of these fields, but I do know that the council has done a most constructive job in spotlighting this problem of expanding the reservoir of our foreign specialists.

SOVIETS PREPARING DICTIONARIES IN 80 LANGUAGES

Not so long ago, I pointed out on the Senate floor material which had come to my attention from the council.

It included the stark fact that the Soviet newspaper Pravda had reported that the Soviets were at work in preparing dictionaries for 80 different languages. That is, the Soviets have been preparing dictionaries so that Russians could communicate in Punjabi, Telegu, Swahili, Zulu, and a vast variety of other African, Asian, and other tongues.

The reason the Russians are at work in these 80 languages is obvious. They know that they are in a war for men's minds throughout the world. And how can they stir up an African tribe, let us say, if they cannot overcome the language barrier between Russian and, let us say, Swahili?

By way of contrast, the American Council of Learned Societies has been so starved for funds as to be able, unfortunately, to work on only three language dictionaries such as English translated into Korean and Korean into English.

Now, this is a grave shortcoming which must be remedied.

WE NEED MORE TRANSLATIONS OF ATOMIC ABSTRACTS

Every passing day, we are learning that we have got to communicate more and more with foreign peoples and in their own tongues. Take the field of atomic energy alone.

From all over the world scientific papers on nuclear power are being disseminated. Many of them (even from non-Russian sources) are, of course, being written in languages other than English.

How can we possibly take full advantage of these foreign scientific developments and how may foreign scientists make full use of our own findings—if they cannot read English or have abstracts of our papers readily and reliably translated into their tongues and vice versa?

In August, will occur the important atoms-for-peace conference in Geneva Switzerland. At my request, a Senate document on atoms-for-peace is being prepared. But the language barrier still remains a tremendous one which must be hurled for this or any other document to be effective. To achieve the goals of atoms-for-peace, vast numbers of scientists, engineers and technicans will have to be trained. But what is being done to handle the language gulf? Very little indeed unfortunately.

We must, however, be able to conquer more than the language barrier. There is a barrier of differing traditions, differing cultural outlooks, differing philosophies, differing religions.

WE MUST UNDERSTAND INDIA BETTER

Consider, for example, our relations with the great subcontinent of India. Here is a mighty people—of proud, rich, ancient culture—rising by its own bootstraps now from material conditions of serious shortcomings.

Here is a people determined to conduct a full-scale assault on the age-old material enemies of illiteracy, disease, poverty, malnutrition.

We wish them every possible success in this effort. They have made outstanding progress in their few short years of independence.

We have nothing but good will for the government and people of India. We have a deep respect for the able, tireless Premier of India, His Excellency, Pandit Nehru. Admittedly, we have had our differences with him, and he with us. But we admire him as a great public servant and heir of the immortal saintly Gandhi.

Recently, we have witnessed especially significant activity on the world scene on the part of India's Ambassador Krishna Menon. Ambassador Menon is a man of strong convictions, who has at times held views likewise at wide variance with our own. But it is our earnest desire to work with him in the cause of peace and security and plenty.

To do so, to work cordially and effectively with him or any other leader of a free nation, we must understand them, as we ask them to understand us. We know far too little and tend to be far too implusive in our criticism at times of various foreign leaders.

You know, it is customary to speak of the "mysterious East." But there is nothing really mysterious about the East, if we will take the time and make the effort to learn about it and then to put ourselves in its shoes and gain an insight into its problems.

MORE ASIATIC CULTURE CENTERS IN UNITED STATES NEEDED

For better United States relations with India, for better United States relations with our good friends of Pakistan, and all the other lands of Asia and elsewhere in the world, we need more people-to-people interchange. We need increased understanding of one another.

To achieve this, we need more training and study centers of Asiatic culture in our land. We need more American universities and colleges establishing "chairs" in individual Asiatic or African or Middle Eastern regions and countries.

We need more seminars and institutes on Asia. One such helpful conference will take place on July 29 on the subject of south Asia at the University of Pennsylvania. We need more of the same all over America.

We Americans have tended to overconcentrate on Europe. It is natural that this pattern should have developed because, after all, we are descended largely from European forbears. But we can no longer afford this overconcentration on western culture and western peoples. Without in any way detracting from our links with the West, we must develop new links with the East.

GREAT PROGRESS AT BANDUNG

We will find that many eastern leaders know far more about us than we about them.

For example, President Soekarno, of the great Republic of Indonesia, almost amazed some American observers at the recent Bandung Conference by referring expertly to the Midnight Ride of Paul Revere as a great landmark in colonial peoples' fight for independence.

He pointed out that the very opening day of the conference—marked the anniversary of Paul Revere's ride back on April 18, 1775—which started the "first successful anticolonial war in history." Then the distinguished Indonesian President proceeded to quote Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's hallowed poem of the event.

The American observers who seemed surprised at this erudite reference should not really have been amazed. The Bandung Conference showed on that and other occasions that Indonesian leaders and Ceylonese and other leaders—particularly wonderful statesmen like the Philippines' Gen. Carlos Romulo—have a deep reservoir of admiration for us and know far more about us than some Americans tend to give them credit for.

Bandung was a magnificent landmark in free world relations, even though some Americans had held utterly erroneous ideas about it prior to its convening. Indonesia, the host country, is to be congratulated for its splendid contributions. I might cite, incidentally, that Indonesia has, in accordance with the U. N. embargo on shipment of strategic materials to Red China, faithfully turned down Peking offers for rubber and other items.

THE NEED FOR WELL-ROUNDED MAN

And now, my friends, I come to the last phase of my fundamental theme this morning.

The challenge to American learning is infinitely broader than simply increasing the reservoir of specialists in, let us say, southeast Asia cultures.

The challenge relates right here at home.

Never before in American history have we needed more truly well-rounded citizens.

Never before have we needed more Americans who have a true understanding of modern civics, modern psychology, modern sociology, and modern education; and, yes, far more important, a true understanding of philosophy and of religion as well.

COPING WITH CRIME AND OTHER EVILS

Look at today's headlines. Look at the million juvenile delinquents getting into trouble with the law every year. What are we doing about it?

Look at the story of 7 million American youngsters living in broken homes, where the parents are either divorced, separated, or where one of the parents has died. What are we doing about it?

Look at the problem of slums in our major cities, or the $20 billion annual crime bill, or, say, the problem of traffic choking downtown areas.

Look at these or a hundred other sociological and other problems of our times and you and I see the answer why we need well-rounded citizens—citizens who have studied inside and outside institutions of higher learning and who will really do something with their education.

THE CHALLENGES OF NUCLEAR SCIENCE

Then, turn to the international scene. Contemplate the significance of the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb to this country. See how these new weapons have utterly changed past obsolete concepts.

And so, we need Americans who are truly acquainted with these swift-changing realities. We can ill-afford Americans still living in a horse-and-buggy age with horse-and-buggy prejudices.

Too many of our citizens think today, for example, that American leadership of the free world is a luxury, which can be dispensed with. But it is not a luxury, it is a necessity in this contracted world.

When my parents emigrated to this country, it took months to cross the ocean. Today, the ocean can be crossed in less than 4 hours.

When my parents landed on the east coast and proceeded to Wisconsin, it took weeks. Today, you can cross from New York not just to Wisconsin, but to San Francisco, in 3¾ hours.

Supersonic speed has utterly changed not only American defense but American living.

DANGER OF INTERCONTINENTAL MISSILES

We are in for still more revolutionary discoveries ahead.

We are approaching the age of intercontinental missiles, guided missiles, and ballistic missiles. Their war potential is obvious and grim. These missiles, it is believed, may travel 5,000 miles per hour. I repeat, 5,000 miles per hour, and may cover distances of 5,000 miles or more.

That means that if someone were to press a button at a launching site at the Arctic Circle in Soviet Siberia, a missile might start off to hit any area of the United States within 30 minutes thereafter.

See how this development can utterly change our defense concepts, for every nation is now literally in every other nation's backyard.

In Congress, we are preparing for an atomic-powered merchant ship. The Department of Defense is experimenting with an atomic-powered aircraft. We already have an atomic-powered underseas craft.

Atomic energy in ground transportation, atomic energy for home heating, radio-isotopes to cope with man's old-age diseases and with the diseases of livestock and plants—these are not just possibilities, these are breathtaking realities today.

THE NEED FOR ASPIRING MINDS

And, so, we need minds that are capable of grasping these developments and their deeper significance.

We need growing minds, aspiring minds, open minds, dedicated minds. We need more educated Americans. We need more scientists in this country. We need more engineers.

But what use will all our physical scientists be, all our engineers, all our technicians be if they develop mighty new instruments and if we don't know how constructively to use these instruments for the betment of man?

So, we need more able social scientists, more people with a true understanding of the humanities, more people with a vital understanding of ethics and philosophy and religion.

We need more people who have received the real values of education, meaning more than the accumulation of facts by rote memory.

We need education in its truest sense—education of character, of soul, of mind.

We need people who, like yourselves, are eager to contemplate new ideas and trace them down to their lair.

We need people who are capable of real thinking, constructive thinking, fearless thinking, and not synthetic thinking, meaning thinking on the basis or irrational prejudices, obsolete stereotypes, selfish biases and outworn dogmas.

We need a truly educated man. We need a well-rounded man for the dynamic interrelated problems of our times.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is the fundamental theme which I should like to leave with you today.

It has been a great privilege to address this outstanding audience in this fine institution of learning. I hope that I shall have a similar opportunity in the not too distant future.

[From the New York Times of July 4, 1955]

OVERSEAS STUDENTS

In 1872 the Government of China sent a group of 30 teen-age boys to the United States for training. That, it is believed, was the first organized visit of foreign students to our shores. Since then, with the exception of periods of war, the number of foreign students and scholars coming to this country has increased with each year.

In its annual census of the foreign student population, which was recently made public, the Institute of International Education reports that during 1954–55 the United States played host to a record number of foreign students, 34,232. This figure exceeded by 400 the high mark set the previous year. And counting the number of foreign faculty members who came here to accept temporary posts, and foreign doctors who trained as internes or residents at United States hospitals, the total foreign exchangees nearly reached the 40,000 mark.

The value of these exchange programs is obvious. There is a pressing need to communicate with the peoples of other nations, to try to understand them and to learn about the cultures they have developed over the centuries. As Dr. Kenneth Holland, president of the institute, recently observed: "Exchange of persons is one means of communication. It is, in relation to the world's population, a small movement. Yet it is of vital importance, because it is face-to-face communication which enables us to gain direct, firsthand knowledge of each other."

Address Delivered by Dr. Ruth Miller Steese at Keystone Girls' Camp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there is nothing better for our country than to teach the young people the glories of our Nation. At the opening of the Keystone Girls' Camp at Shippensburg State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa., Dr. Ruth Miller Steese made an exceptionally fine address on the features of our Government and why our country has become so great.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Steese's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the glorious setting of an educational institution over three-quarters of a century old, the citizens of this new commonwealth, Keystone Camp, today, join to inaugurate new officers and to invest them with the insignia and duties of their office. The new governor in taking the oath of office, pledged to be true to her oath and to seek to achieve greater success and progress than has been the record of any of her predecessors. It has been said that "In America we never move horizontally, but always vertically. We don't follow blindly in our fathers' way; we go our own way, always upward." "We are the democracy of a people with a vision." And so as these new officers assume office, they too face their new assignments with the goal of—upward and onward.

As we consider Keystone Camp and its position of value in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we are cognizant of the fact that there are terms in use which have a meaning inherent to Pennsylvania alone. What is the tradition connected with the use of the words—Commonwealth—Keystone?

Pennsylvania has had three constitutions, namely, the constitution of 1790, the constitution of 1838 and the constitution of 1873, the last mentioned being the constitution in effect today.

Did you know that each of our Pennsylvania constitutions began with the same words, which are these, "We, the people of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania"?

Pennsylvania is one of four States, the others being Kentucky, Massachusetts, and Virginia, which share the designation—Commonwealth. The term is of English derivation and implies a special devotion by the government to the commonweal or welfare of its citizens.

As to the term, Keystone or Keystone State, there is an interesting tradition apparently based on fact as to the application of the term Keystone State to Pennsylvania, alone, of all the States in the United States.

On the 12th of February 1868, a marble tablet was erected in Morton Hall, corner 41st and Haverford Streets, West Philadelphia, bearing the following inscription, to wit:

"John Morton, Member of the Stamp Act Congress from this Colony; Judge of the Supreme Court; Delegate to the First Congress in 1774; Speaker of the House of Assembly; reelected to the Congress of 1776, where, in giving the casting vote of his delegation, he crowned Pennsylvania the keystone of the arch of liberty and secured to the American people the Declaration of Independence, himself a signer. Born, A. D. 1724; died, A. D. 1777."

John Morton's vote was the decisive one in the adoption or rejection of the Declaration of Independence. His friends sought to have him vote against the adoption of it, which would have placed Pennsylvania in the position of deciding for all the 13 colonies against the adoption of this historic document and the ultimate freedom of the colonies. Morton believed in the Declaration and he never changed his belief. Below the marble tablet in Morton Hall, there appear the words

which formed his death-bed statement and show his lasting belief in the righteousness of his vote for the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. Remembering the friends who had counseled him to vote against the Declaration and its avowed purpose, Morton made this final statement, "Tell them that they will live to see the hour when they will acknowledge it to have been the most glorious service that I ever rendered my country."

Such was the faith, such the willing devotion and service of one of Pennsylvania's Founding Fathers.

It brings to our minds the incident of the vast crowd assembled in Philadelphia where they were awaiting the news of the decision as to the new pattern of Government. A spokesman asked Benjamin Franklin "What have you given us, Mr. Franklin?" The wise old statesman and patriot measured his words carefully as he replied: "A Republic—if you can keep it."

Those words of Franklin, and the words and deeds of similar patriots have reverberated down through the years and continue to ring out a challenge to the men and women of today. Can we keep this Republic with all its glorious traditions of freedom, with its mighty challenge to achievement?

Today as you, the citizens of Keystone, the officers of Keystone, assume new duties and responsibilities, as you seek to put into practical use all the lessons on citizenship which you have learned, I should like to ask you to consider, carefully and sincerely, the words of a new creed, a creed which is thought-provoking, a creed written in terms of modern thinking but which is in keeping with the pioneering spirit of our Founding Fathers.

"I do not choose to be a common man. It is my right to be uncommon—if I can. I seek opportunity—not security. I do not wish to be a kept citizen, humbled and dulled by having the state look after me. I want to take the calculated risk; to dream and to build, to fail and to succeed. I refuse to barter incentive for a dole. I prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; the thrill of fulfillment to the stale calm of Utopia. I will not trade freedom for beneficence, nor my dignity for a handout. I will never cower before any master, nor bend to any threat. It is my heritage to stand erect, proud, and unafraid; to think and act for myself, enjoy the benefit of my creations, and to face the world boldly and say, 'This I have done'."

I know of no better creed to offer you as you face the future. If you can live this creed and at the end face your creator and your fellow citizens and proudly say—"This I have done"—you shall have earned the accolade—"Well done."

In 1916, the late Woodrow Wilson sent forth a challenge in these words, "America is not anything if it consists of each of us. It is something only if it consists of all of us; and it can consist of all of us only as our spirits are banded together in a common enterprise. That common enterprise is the enterprise of liberty and justice and right."

You, the citizens of Keystone, share the glory of youth, today, but you will be the maturity, the womanhood, of tomorrow. Our national character will never be any higher or any finer than the composite of all the individual and personal characteristics of all the citizens who constitute our United States of America.

Every time a young woman goes wrong, a good woman dies. Every time a young woman is reclaimed or rehabilitated, a good woman is born.

Each young woman who is a citizen of Keystone was sent here because she was a good woman and a good citizen in her home community. To that good citizenship has been added the opportunities which one week of concentrated and accelerated training can give. You go forth from here better qualified and better trained, to be even better citizens and finer leaders. You go forth to prove that the glory of youth can be the power of youth, the power and the glory of youth marching forward to a more glorious womanhood, a more powerful adulthood, a finer maturity.

President Eisenhauer in speaking at the Centennial Commencement of Pennsylvania State University closed with an admonition to the graduates of the class of 1955. You are the graduates of Keystone Camp for 1955—you as new citizens face the same problems, the same world. May I ask you to consider the president's admonition as a personal message to you;

"The peoples of this earth share today a great aspiration. They all have a common dream of lasting peace with freedom and justice. But the realization of the dream calls for many types of cooperation based upon sympathetic and thorough mutual understanding. In turn, such understanding is dependent on education that produces disciplined thinking.

"Throughout the world mutual suspicions flourish in ignorance and misunderstanding. They can be dispelled only with knowledge and wisdom.

"If we are to have partners for peace, then we must first be partners in sympathetic recognition that all mankind possesses in common like aspirations and hungers, like ideals and appetities, like purposes and frailties, a like demand for economic advancement. The divisions between us are artificial and transient. Our common humanity is God made and enduring.

"I know that you who today complete your education at this great university in its centennial year recognize that truth. As you apply it to the problems you meet—as productive leaders, as American citizens, as members of the free world community—you will grow in personal stature and in your contribution to human peace, human independence, human advancement."

The President stressed human peace, human independence, human advancement, our heritage in the American tradition. In the Pennsylvania tradition you were taught to stress and live the State motto of Virtue, Liberty, and Independence. These are the only ways to live to be a true Pennsylvanian and a positive American.

Dr. McCracken, chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, spoke recently to the delegates from the National Association of Student Councils.

"World supremacy, whether we like it or not, has now been forced upon us. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to learn the hard way, through trial and error, stumbling and recovering and paying through the nose for the losses we create for ourselves?

"Right here is where proficiency in writing and speaking comes in. We can't all be Presidents, or Senators, or Governors, or even mayors, but we can and will mingle with our fellow men, exchange ideas with them and debate topics of current interest."

McCracken assailed the old axiom that politics was the domain of the venerable. He said young people—high school students—should pay attention to the affairs of local government. He said "if all States, counties, and cities in the United States are honestly and intelligently governed, we would not have to worry about the national scene."

And I would remind you of the statement of another fighting American.

Theodore Roosevelt asserted: "There is one quality which we must bring to the solution of every problem—that is an intense and fervid Americanism. We shall never be successful over the dangers that confront us; we shall never achieve true greatness, nor reach the lofty ideals which the founders and preservers of our mighty Federal Republic have set before us, unless we are Americans in heart and soul, in spirit and purpose, keenly alive to the responsibility implied in the very name of American, and proud beyond measure of the glorious privilege of bearing it."

Yes, the American way excels all others. It is your duty, it is our duty to maintain it, with confidence in ourselves, faith in its high principles, and trust in Divine guidance.

My final challenge to you is embodied in the words of our President, who said: "The common responsibility of all Americans is to become effective, helpful participants in a way of life that blends and harmonizes the fiercely competitive demands of the individual and society."

And now may I salute the new governor and all the officers and citizens of Keystone Camp. As each of you goes forth tomorrow, may the many communities of Pennsylvania be the richer for your attendance at Keystone Camp and may the later history of Pennsylvania record the accumulated leadership which derived from your attendance at Keystone Camp in the year of our Lord, 1955.

May success—American version—attend each of you, as you go forth—always remembering the challenge that "nothing unjust can be eternal—nothing just can be impossible."

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Ed Meeman, from the Memphis Press Scimitar, which emphasizes the need for the United States to participate in the NATO Conference in Paris, this month.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS DONE AT PARIS MAY BE MORE IMPORTANT THAN THAT AT GENEVA

(By Edward J. Meeman)

President Eisenhower said at the 10th anniversary of the United Nations at San Francisco:

"Those who wrote it (the U. N. Charter) • • • recognized that the first responsibility of every nation is to provide for its own defense; and, in the pursuance of this responsibility, it has the clear right to associate itself with other like-minded peoples for the promotion of their common security".

Such an association of like-minded peoples for their common defense is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It is more than a military alliance. Article II of the Atlantic Treaty pledges the signatories to develop "peaceful and friendly relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being."

NORWAY STARTED IT

The Parliament of Norway thought something ought to be done to make article II effective, and proposed that representatives of the law-making bodies of all the NATO

countries meet in Paris in July. Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and Iceland decided to send delegations to the NATO meeting. Now our own House of Representatives has voted to do so.

What is done at Paris in July can be more important that what is done at the Big Four meeting in Geneva. For what can be accomplished at Geneva is measured by the present strength of the free world, and the free world is not now strong enough. But at Paris freemen from the parliaments of freedom can make the free world stronger.

Peace can be assured only by the strength of the free world, and only in union is there strength.

The trouble with the free world is that it has sat open-mouthed asking, "What will the Communists do next?" fearing that they will do something else terrible, and hoping, despite repeated disappointments, that they will change and do something sincerely good.

LET FREE START DOING

Let the free world stop being a spectator and start doing. If the free world does all it can to unite its strength, attention will focus on the free world, instead of on Moscow and Peiping. Neutrals will ask, "May we join?" And even Moscow and Peiping will say: "May we cooperate?"

The place for the free world to start making itself strong is at Paris in July.

The first 10 years of the United Nations were disappointing because the free nations within it were not closely enough united to put overwhelming strength on the side of freedom and peace. We can make the next 10 years tell a different story. And the place to begin is Paris in July.

The Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter in support of the Bricker amendment, from Mr. J. F. Schlafly, Jr., of Alton, Ill., and published in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—IN SUPPORT OF THE AMENDMENT

To the New York Herald Tribune:

On May 23 you published an article by Prof. Edward S. Corwin entitled "Case Against Bricker Amendment.." Yet Corwin's first and main point proves the need for the Bricker amendment. Corwin argues that, because of what Congress said in the Judiciary Act of 1789 and the Supreme Court said in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* in 1890, treaties should "be conformable to the Constitution."

There would be no need for the Bricker amendment if the Supreme Court had followed its 1890 precedent and if President Roosevelt had followed President Thomas Jefferson's interpretation of our Constitution (Parliamentary Practice, 1801): "For surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole Government is interdicted from doing in any way."

It was not until the Supreme Court reversed itself and held that treaties (*Missouri* v. *Holland* (1920)) and executive agreements (*U. S.* v. *Pink* (1942)) are the supreme law of the land, that a majority of the Senate voted to pass the 23d amendment putting treaties back under the Constitution where Thomas Jefferson and the Supreme Court for 100 years thought they were supposed to be.

In saying that treaties are limited by the Constitution, Professor Corwin is dissenting from Chief Justice Hughes' statement in 1929: "I should not care to voice any opinion as to an implied limitation on the treaty-making power. The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such."

In the Pink case, the Supreme Court decided that an exchange of letters between President Roosevelt and a Communist named Litvinov superseded New York law safeguarding the assets of insurance companies. Because of this decision, Roosevelt and his advisors were supremely confident that any secret agreements he made at Tehran and Yalta became the supreme law of our land without ever being submitted to the Senate for approval.

Just as it became necessary to pass the 22d amendment to prevent power-hungry presidents from seeking a third term, so it has become necessary to pass the Bricker amendment to prevent future Yaltas, and to restore the Constitution to what Jefferson said it meant.

Corwin's point that Congress can protect us from treaties which affect internal law overlooks the fact that executive agreements are never submitted to Congress. Just this year, the Supreme Court assumed in the case of *U. S.* v. *Capps* that the Federal Government had the power to impose a $150,000 fine on a produce merchant in Virginia because he sold Canadian potatoes for food instead of for seed, and thereby violated not Virginia law, not Federal law, but an executive agreement created by an exchange of letters between a State Department assistant and a Canadian official.

American law should be made by our elected legislators over whom we have control of the ballot, and not by an exchange of letters between the State Department and foreign countries.

J. F. SCHLAFLY, Jr.
ALTON, ILL., *May 31, 1955.*

The Illness of the Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from a great liberal American newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, for July 5, 1955, entitled "LYNDON JOHNSON'S Illness." This editorial highlights the effective leadership of our majority leader, and emphasizes the fact that, under the skillful direction of Senator JOHNSON, President Eisenhower has received far more support in enlightened matters of foreign policy than he ever enjoyed when the Senate was under the control of the President's own party.

I am glad that the editors of the Post-Dispatch, in praising Senator JOHNSON'S resourceful leadership, have seen fit to refer to my own article about our majority leader in the New Republic for July 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LYNDON JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The serious heart illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON is just about as regrettable from the standpoint of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican side as it is from that of the Democratic majority of which the 46-year-old Texan is Senate leader.

When the 84th Congress met 6 months ago, Senator JOHNSON, thanks to the political revolution in Oregon, moved up from the minority post to majority leader. From the outset he and his fellow Texan, Speaker RAYBURN in the House, have demonstrated the inaccuracy of the President's 1954 campaign prediction that Democratic Congress would produce a cold war with the White House.

On international issues the Democrats, under Senator JOHNSON'S leadership, have given the President far better support than he ever got from his own party when the McCarthys, Jenners, Brickers, Bridgeses and other old guardsmen were able to throw their weight around as committee chairmen. In the early months of the present session the Democrats were the President's strong backers when Minority Leader KNOWLAND was going off on his own repeatedly.

This also is at least partially true in the domestic field. Under the Johnson leadership the Democrats have advanced and enlarged some White House domestic proposals that were allowed to languish during Republican rule of Congress. Postal pay, Government pay, housing, minimum wage—these are only four of the domestic bills that might be cited.

Senator JOHNSON has looked out for Texas and Texas interests and at times these come into conflict with national interest as on offshore oil and natural gas price regulation. But it is not fair to blame him for every shortcoming among the Democrats as some progressives in politics find it easy to do. Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, sets this record clear in his timely article, Making a Scapegoat of LYNDON JOHNSON, in the current New Republic.

Senate Democrats have been harder hit by illness in this session than the Republicans. Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, missed much of the forepart of the session and Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, Foreign Relations chairman, has been away from Capitol Hill for more than a month. Fortunately, neither side has sustained a loss such as that of the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, who died just 2 years ago this month, after having occupied the leadership post for a similar grueling 6 months.

The Social Security System—Activities of Representative Kean, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, there are few people, if any, in the Congress with a broader understanding of our social-security system—its needs, its shortcomings, and its background—than Representative ROBERT W. KEAN. We of New Jersey are proud of his distinguished service in this field and I commend to my colleagues an article

from the Eagle magazine, published by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, which describes just a few of the activities of the Representative from the 12th District of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Michael Strauss)

Congressman ROBERT WINTHROP KEAN, of of New Jersey, is an authority about lots of subjects. Among them are history, sports, and tariff questions. But the one that really makes his face light up is social security.

KEAN, a Republican, is now serving his ninth term in the lower House in Washington. He acknowledges he became vitally interested in the subject shortly after joining the Newark, N. J., Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. Since then, he probably has worked harder on social security than any other legislator.

It was a long, uphill battle. Kean finally realized some of his dreams when the present bill was passed. It provided coverage for 90 percent of our citizens, plus larger payments.

"One of the principal groups not covered at the present time," Kean explains, "are self-employed doctors, lawyers, and dentists. But, I have always been and still am, for coverage for all. I feel no system can be entirely successful unless everyone is covered."

Social security always has been a pet of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. When the Democrats in Washington, under F. D. R., were nursing the idea, the Eagles, it has been said, already were thinking in terms 10 years ahead.

The same could be said of Kean. Even before becoming a member of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1946, the New Jersey Congressman constantly was coming up with ideas and proposals. It is small wonder then, that today, there are some in Washington who fondly refer to him as "Mr. Social Security."

KEAN was one of the first to bring to light the inequities of social security as the law existed in the late 1940's. He pointed out that rising costs-of-living made the payments inadequate.

His was a long struggle. In 1951, KEAN's incessant efforts finally bore some real fruit. Benefits were increased immeasurably and the scope of coverage broadened. The self-employed finally were covered. But still left out in the cold were farmers and certain professionals.

When Eisenhower was a candidate for the presidency, KEAN was called to meet him in Denver to discuss social security. This meeting pioneered a movement that last year included everyone—with the few exceptions mentioned—in the program.

Just how great have been strides may be judged from just one example. Today's law provides that if a man with average earnings of $4,200 dies leaving a widow with two children, the widow is entitled to $200 a month until the children reach the age of 18.

In addition to his work for liberalization of social security, KEAN also is noted for his tax-reduction programs. In recent sessions of Congress, he also had important roles in the Internal Revenue Service investigation and in the furtherance of the administration's foreign-trade program.

KEAN comes from a prominent banking family. He is a tall, distinguished figure with graying hair and mustache. He has a background that might lead some to believe he might not be aware of the problems of the underprivileged. But it is a known fact that the underprivileged never had a better friend.

KEAN's great success as a legislator comes as no surprise. It seems to be a birthright. Keans have been active in government since shortly after the first Kean came to these shores in the early 18th century. The original settler made his home in Beaufort, S. C.

His son, John Kean, was a member of the Continental Congress representing the Palmetto State. Eventually, John moved north and married a niece of William Livingston, New Jersey's first governor in the United States.

Congressman KEAN's uncle John and his father Hamilton were United States senators from the Garden State. His uncle served in the Senate from 1898 until 1910—his father from 1928 to 1934. The present Congressman has been in office since 1939. He represents New Jersey's 12th District.

KEAN, the father of 3 sons and 3 daughters, is a Harvard graduate. He played some football as a collegian with such Crimson gridiron greats as Charley Brickley and Eddie Mahon. He was a member of the Cantab squad that helped open the Yale Bowl.

During World War I, Congressman KEAN served as a first lieutenant with the Second Division. He was the recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross and Silver Star for bravery.

Although already an extremely busy man because of his great interest in legislative work, Congressman KEAN continues to look ahead. His plans for the future as a legislator include the following:

1. Social security for all.
2. Benefits based on 10 years of earnings.
3. Extra benefits for people who work past the age of 65.
4. The lowering of trade barriers.

Sound like a huge program? Congressman KEAN, it must be mentioned, looks toward it all optimistically.

Farm Bureau Teaches Citizenship at the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Farm Bureau Teaches Citizenship at the Grassroots" as it appeared in the Enid Morning News, Tuesday, June 27, 1955:

FARM BUREAU TEACHES CITIZENSHIP AT THE GRASSROOTS

(By Dr. George S. Benson)

Many signs point toward a continuous danger from encroaching "back door" socialism in America, but the bright, encouraging signs, I think, offset the gloomy ones. As this column is written I have just returned to my office from Purdue University after having participated in the annual American Farm Bureau Institute. What I know about the Farm Bureau's nationwide work among the farming population, together with what I saw and heard at the Institute, gives me a comforting feeling about the future of our great Nation.

At Purdue, I addressed 300 Farm Bureau national, State and regional officials. They were representing more than 1.6 million Farm Bureau families in 48 States, or nearly 10 million Americans. And the keynote of their week-long Institute was American citizenship education—with particular discussion on how the Farm Bureau can activate the people at the grassroots to fulfill their subject was "Basic Concepts of Government."

DESIRE FOR UNDERSTANDING

The impressive thing at the Institute was the earnest desire of the Farm Bureau's national leadership to get across to its field workers and member families the very clearest understanding of our American political and economic system, as well as an awareness of the dangers confronting it. My colleague at Harding College, Dr. Clifton L. Ganus, Jr., dean of Harding's pioneering School of American Studies, dramatized the elements in our unique system by actually building for the 300 conferees a 10-foot-high pyramid representing the political and economic structure of "The American Way of Life." Other speakers on the citizenship subject were Charles B. Shuman, President, American Farm Bureau Federation; D. B. Varner, Vice President, Michigan State University; and Harry J. Reed, Dean, School of Agriculture, Purdue University.

Another impressive thing was the well-organized program for carrying American citizenship education to the grass roots through the farm bureau's more than 3,000 county organizations. There is an excellent kit of materials which has been in the process of development and refinement for a number of years. Training in the use of this kit was one of the chief purposes of the institute.

THE MOTIVES

The educational project has two frankly stated motives: (1) To improve the welfare of America's farm families; and (2) to strengthen and protect the basic elements of our American system. The farm bureau leadership feels that No. 1 depends on the success of No. 2. And for this reason, the bureau's grass roots educational project is of great worth to all of us in America.

Here is what the farm bureau is preaching and teaching in every phase of its citizenship education project: "We believe in the American competitive enterprise system; that man's search for progress should be encouraged by maintenance of opportunity, not hindered by illusions of security; that a person should be rewarded in accordance with his productive contribution to society; that every man is entitled to own property, earn money honestly, save, invest, and spend as he chooses;

SUPPLY AND DEMAND

"(And to continue) that property rights cannot be taken away without infringing on rights guaranteed by the Constitution; that the Constitution is the basic law of the land, and that its interpretation should be in accordance with the intent of its authors; that government should operate impartially in the interest of all; that government's regulatory functions should be based on law; that government should provide only a minimum of controls and aids; that government should stimulate, not discourage individual inititative * * *"

The bureau's fundamental agriculture economic concepts are stated thus: "Grow for profit what the market wants. Get bigger markets—at home and abroad. Cut costs—on and off the farm. Permit the earning of honest dollars. Any program which has the result of expanding agricultural output in the absence of a comparable increase in effective market demand * * * is contrary to the interest of farmers."

Since I was born and raised on a farm, operate a farm today, and have been close to the agricultural scene all my life, I am confident that our farm population is inherently self-reliant; and that, when given all the facts, it will be a potent force against encroaching socialism.

Mrs. Gallo Draws a Bead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an article entitled "Mrs. Gallo Draws a Bead," which appeared in the May 3, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor dealing with the assessment of taxes against real estate as compared with other sources of tax income. The article reads as follows:

MRS. GALLO DRAWS A BEAD—AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM THE PACIFIC COAST

(By Harlan Trott)

SAN FRANCISCO.—Work on the new south Sacramento Freeway almost struck a snag when Mrs. Floyd Gallo struck a Mollie Pitcher pose.

The State was exercising its power of eminent domain in offering her $30,000, but Mrs. Gallo felt her adobe house and 4½ acres of marginal ranch land on the city outskirts was worth much more.

Brandishing a shotgun, Mrs. Gallo vowed that before the State removed a shovelful of dirt the dispute would have to go to court. Later, Mrs. Gallo said that the gun wasn't loaded. Perhaps she was only dramatizing her protest somewhat in the American fashion made famous by a bunch of colonial taxpayers who dressed up like Indians and dumped some British tea into Boston Harbor.

Another angle to Mrs. Gallo's belligerent stand seems to have been overlooked in the excitement, namely that the property the State proposed to take for $30,000 was valued on the tax rolls at $3,790. The assessed valuation on the land alone was $200.

Last week when San Francisco's Mayor Elmer Robinson proposed that the city start taxing payrolls and also double the city sales tax to balance next year's budget, there was nobody around with Mrs. Gallo's 12-gage flair for the dramatic to protest.

This pyramiding of almost countless taxes on consumers is becoming rather general. More than 100 Pennsylvania cities now levy special taxes on wage earners.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes spoke for most Americans when he said "taxes are what we pay for civilized society." But that doesn't mean they like to pay the other fellow's share, particularly when it is taken out of their wages or grocery basket.

Addressing an international conference of mayors in Vienna last year, San Francisco's Mayor Robinson asked: "Is local government being destroyed or controlled by higher echelons of government which have steadily over the years usurped just about every source of revenue?"

But is San Francisco in common with other American cities neglecting a legitimate revenue source right at home, and one that was long traditional after the Republic was founded, namely the ad valorem property tax.

Have assessed valuations followed the rise in market values of real estate, or is there a big untapped source of revenue still available in that traditional tax base?

When that question came under the microscope at a meeting of the National Association of Assessing Officers last year, a speaker said: "Indications are that assessments have failed to keep pace with the rise of national wealth and that nonuniformity in assessment has increased as property values have risen."

John A. Zangerle, for many years auditor of Cuyahoga County, Cleveland, Ohio, applies this yardstick: "Whether property is being taxed to death is best proven by its value."

Here in San Francisco assessed land values have gone up only from $304 million to $369 million since 1905, while assessed value of improvements has risen from $98 million to $634 million over the same period.

This means that 50 years ago the taxes paid by land holders as such were over three times the amount paid by building owners as such, whereas today the amount collected from landholders is about half that paid by building owners.

"In the golden days of Caesar Augustus, they labored with income, inheritance, sales, general property, import and export taxes," Mr. Zangerle once told his brother assessors in praising the justice of the traditional American ad valorem land tax. "It is our great pride that the last 25 years have seen more improvement in assessment technique openly applied than is historically observable during the previous 2,000 years. It is the difference between democracy and autocracy in the most sacred, fundamental, and necessary function of government. We have a duty—to guard, protect, and foster the simplest, least avoided, or evaded, most sanctified tax of antiquity."

Mr. Zangerle was speaking in the mid-1930's when the enormous tax shift away from traditionally local sources to the Federal Government, from unearned income to earned income, was only just beginning.

Some people think taxes are taxes, and that the consumer always pays in the end anyhow. Mr. Zangerle says this isn't so and that, on the contrary, the traditionally American ad valorem land tax is the only tax that can't be passed along to the consumer.

Clearly the assessed value of land in most big cities has not kept pace with market or true value. Recently, when the Shriners Hospital put out a feeler to acquire three vacant parcels in San Francisco, the owner indicated he would not be interested in an offer as low as $50,000, although the lots are valued for tax purposes at only $2,700.

Anyone who thinks such examples are uncommon should keep out of range of Mrs. Gallo's gun.

Automotive Avalanche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Connersville, Ind., News-Examiner:

AUTOMOTIVE AVALANCHE

In the world of the highway, when you start bypassing the bypassers you're in trouble. And that, apparently, is about to happen.

The Wall Street Journal, in a roundup look at the Nation's traffic tangles, found that situation just one of many oddities as cities across the land strive desperately to cope with their problems.

The avalanche of vehicles is snowing them under. In half a year there will be 60 million cars and trucks on the road, virtually double the number of a decade ago.

By 1965 say the experts, the total will pass 80 million vehicles. Beyond that, we'll begin to talk in terms of 100 million.

The highways we have, even most of the ones we're planning, won't be able to take the load. They're already saturated with traffic in many, many instances.

Two-lane roads have a safe, comfortable load limit of around 5,000 cars a day. But many bear far greater burdens, sometimes 6 times that many.

Even fabulous new expressways are smothered in traffic. The Hollywood freeway in Los Angeles was built to accommodate 100,000, but already it is handling 168,000 daily. New Jersey Turnpike authorities will tell you that superhighway carries traffic now that the engineers thought it wouldn't see for three decades.

At rush hours or on crowded weekends, the slightest mishap sometimes can tie up traffic for miles. Los Angeles is seriously searching for helicopters big enough to hoist wrecked cars off its freeways to uncork accident bottlenecks.

It would be foolish to say that the country is not at last awake to the magnitude of the traffic prolem. President Eisenhower's proposal for a $101 billion highway program, by far the costliest yet suggested, shows recognition of the difficulties ahead.

But all the evidence at hand indicates that neither the Federal Government nor the States and cities are planning with sufficient vision and scope to surmount the problem in the foreseeable future.

The truth is painful: We are swamped by the swelling flood of traffic. And the tide of cars is rising so swiftly and so high that we are likely to stay swamped unless we get some plans that fit the size of the problem.

The answer clearly belongs in the realm of staggering billions. Anything less won't buy us much space on the highways. And space means lives.

Position of Jewish War Veterans on the Reserve Bill and on Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by my office which I think will be of interest to the Members. I am including a press release from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America:

JUNE 30, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I take the liberty of calling to your attention the stated position of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, first, in connection with legislative riders, in general, and second, as to certain proposals suggested as riders to specific bills before the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, by resolution passed at national conventions, has decried the use of riders as inappropriate and very often harmful means of enacting legislation.

Our organization believes that such riders, which at best are negative in effect, do not accomplish in an affirmative manner what the legislation aims to do.

This is evidenced by the recent impasse on the Reserve bill as well as by the fact that legislation to aid in the construction of schools has not yet been reported in either House because of the threat of a rider.

Our organization insists that action which holds up legislation of such importance as the Reserve bill and the school-construction bill is harmful to American security and welfare.

In public utterances during recent weeks, we have posed the following questions:

Must veterans who have already given years of service in the Armed Forces face the possibility of another call to service in the event of an emergency while those who have never served remain at home simply because they have not had the necessary training? Is our Nation to go into the four power meeting at Geneva without the kind of a reserve armed force which would enable our representatives to speak from a position of strength?

We believe the lack of adequate legislation to aid school construction is a national disgrace. With the Nation's schools already admittedly taxed far beyond their resources at this moment, the Nation's population of school age, most of them children of veterans, face the prospect of progressively worsened school facilities unless such aid is provided.

I take pleasure in enclosing a copy of a press release recently issued by our organization on this very issue.

It is our hope that you will bring the foregoing to the attention of the appropriate committees, as well as including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours truly,

JOSEPH F. BARR,
National Commander.

JWV NATIONAL COMMANDER SHARPLY CRITICIZES USE OF RIDERS AS "INSTRUMENT OF DEATH" TO PENDING LEGISLATION AFFECTING WELFARE AND SECURITY OF COUNTRY—CALLS ACTION TO INCLUDE RIDERS TO RESERVE BILL AND SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL NOW BOTTLENECKED IN CONGRESS A "CARELESS INDIFFERENCE TO THE NEEDS OF AMERICA"

Joseph F. Barr, national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, sharply criticized the use of riders as an "instrument of death" to pending legislation "which deeply affect the welfare and security of our country."

He referred specifically to the Reserve bill and the school construction bill now bottlenecked in congressional committees largely because of the insertion of extraneous riders.

"Only a careless indifference to the needs of America could motivate such action," Commander Barr said.

He pointed out that the Nation's veterans, those largely affected by the two bills, "deserve a better fate than to be let down again on two issues of such paramount importance to themselves and their families."

"Must the veteran once again be asked to shoulder the responsibility of service in the event of emergency while others who have never served remain at home?" Commander Barr asked. "Are we to go before the four power meeting in Geneva talking big, but without the kind of Reserve Force to give the national security the stability it needs?"

He termed the lack of passage of the school construction bill "a national disgrace."

"With the Nation's schools taxed well beyond their resources at this moment, the country's enormous school age population, most of them the children of veterans, will have to look forward to the prospect of progressively worsened school facilities. Why must we gamble with the welfare of our Nation's future citizens?"

He urged all veterans, of all races and creeds, to rally behind these two bills with all the power at their command and to urge all Congressmen to secure passage of these bills "as its very next order of business," leaving it to the constituted authorities to comply with the law of the land.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America is the oldest active war veterans organization in the United States.

The Permanent Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce at historic Faneuil Hall, July 4, in connection with the Boston Fourth of July celebration.

The address follows:

Today, in this historic Faneuil Hall, revered by all American patriots but especially beloved by Bostonians, we come together to commemorate the 179th signing of the Declaration of Independence.

You may guess with what emotion, with what a mingled sense of pride and humbleness I speak to you today, in this place, known throughout America as the cradle of liberty.

I remember that well over two centuries ago, Peter Faneuil, a Huguenot refugee from the political and religious intolerance of an old world king fled to Boston, that he prospered and was happy here, and that in gratitude he gave this hall to his townsfolk for a marketplace. Before the last brick had been laid, Peter Faneuil died. His eulogy was delivered at the first annual town meeting by the master of the Boston Latin School, John Lovell. In concluding Lovell said, "What now remains, but my ardent wishes * * * that this hall may be ever sacred to the interests of truth, of justice, of loyalty, of honor, of liberty. * * * May liberty always spread its joyful wings over this place. Liberty that opens men's hearts to beneficence and gives the relish of those who enjoy the effects of it."

And so it has been. Since that far off day, the walls of Faneuil Hall have echoed to the eloquent voices and the heroic footsteps of the greatest patriots in our history—Washington and Lafayette, Daniel Webster, Charles Sumner, Wendell Phillips—who made his greatest antislavery speech here—are but a few.

I, a daughter of New England, and a child of Connecticut, presume to share this hour here with you only because I know that it behooves your speaker to say nothing original, nothing startling, nothing new. Yet I feel that a moment of beauty, ever old and ever new, is achieved whenever we make a reaffirmation of our dedication to John Lovell's ideals—truth, justice, loyalty, honor, liberty. Indeed, this reaffirmation is the prime duty of the glorious fourth.

Today historians are accustomed to say that what began in 1776 was not properly a revolution but rather a colonial rebellion. The word revolution (they say) connotes the idea of destroying an old order and establishing a new order, after the fashion of what happened in the France of 1789 and in the Russia of 1917.

Certainly, this is not what happened in the America of 1776. The proof of this assertion lies in the latter section of the Declaration of Independence. Few people listen carefully to the reading of this section—a lengthy legal indictment of George III as a tyrant. But this indictment makes it quite clear that the American colonial rebellion was staged in the name not of a new order—but of an old order. It was staged in the name of that tradition of freedom and order whose repository was the British constitution. It was the intention of the rebelling colonists to reestablish this old order and this venerable tradition by giving to their sustaining inner principles—which our Founding Fathers passionately believed to be external principles of justice under law and God—a newly vital political expression. Renovation, not innovation, was their purpose. To preserve and extend the political values of the past and the spiritual truths of Christianity, not to create new political values, or new spiritual truths, was their clearly seen and clearly stated objective.

Our Founding Fathers took up arms to vindicate for themselves the traditional rights of Englishmen, guaranteed by long-standing laws.

These rights were in substance the rights of the Christian citizen who, because he is a Christian, knows his own personal dignity, and also knows the duty of society to a higher law, a law not made by earthly powers, but written by the Creator in the very nature of man.

The essential appeal made by the spokesmen of the American Revolution—most of them men trained in the common law of England—was to this tradition of a higher law, the law that they called natural.

In this inviolable law they found the strong roots of all the personal freedoms that they cherished and claimed. In this natural law they also found the sanction for the order of social life that they sought to establish on the American Continent. They fought for liberty indeed—for liberation from the yoke of a rule grown harsh and tyrannical, and therefore ungodly. The Declaration of Independence makes this clear. But this historic document makes it equally clear that the freedom for which our forebears fought was not the illusory autonomy of the 18th century continental rationalist who fancied himself to be free from all law because he had begun to fancy that man—every individual man—was a law unto himself.

The freedom of American society—so our Founding Fathers thought—was to be an ordered freedom, a freedom under God and under the law. The rights of the American citizen—so they likewise thought—were those rights which we call unalienable precisely because man is not endowed with them by other men, but by Him who is the Author both of the individual man and of human society.

This was the doctrine of the American Revolution. It was a conservative doctrine. But what it sought to conserve was an idea that is forever revolutionary. The idea that man can govern himself, under law. The Founding Fathers themselves were quite aware of the revolutionary character of this idea. Liberty and self-government, George Washington said, are "finally staked on the experiment entrusted to the American people." That "grand scheme and design in providence," John Adams called it. Lincoln, who in his own day called our form of government the last best hope of mankind, called the Revolution the germ which has vegetated and still is to grow and expand into the universal liberty of mankind. Said Ralph Waldo Emerson: "The office of America is to liberate." Of the startling and beneficent results in human affairs that the doctrine of the Revolution could effect, every American President has been convinced. Every year of our history has committed us to the office, as Emerson called it, of liberation achieved by the spreading of our revolutionary doctrine.

If this be true, then we must not shrink when we are told that our future task, our great historic task, is to continue the American Revolution, both by perfecting here in America and also by helping other peoples to establish the universal principles of liberty in their own homelands. For our concept is universal—and applies to all mankind.

In this task, all mankind is our potential ally. The desire for liberty is the eternal ferment in the affairs of men. The need for order is the eternal inner form that keeps

this ferment from wasting itself in political turbulences that lead to bloody civil and international strife.

Throughout the world today the human desire for freedom from ancient tyrannies, exploitations, injustices, and inequalities, is agitating peoples everywhere—especially colonial peoples. To help lead these peoples into the path toward true freedom, wherever our leadership can be made effective by example, by aid, by wise diplomacy, is today the supreme challenge to our statecraft.

The newly tyrannical colonialism that follows in the wake of tyrannical Soviet imperialism now threatens to engulf all of Asia as it has already engulfed great portions of Europe. It threatens to imprison behind the Iron Curtain more millions of people whose first hopes of liberty were stirred long ago by the world-encircling echoes of the voices that once reverberated in the rafters of Faneuil Hall. For they have seen, over the decades, these principles attract here men from many lands in search of freedom. They have seen these principles create here the happiest, strongest, richest, most productive Nation that civilization has ever known.

Today, however, the principles have grown blurred in the minds of many—even unhappily of many Americans. The beneficent effects, the material effects, prosperity, productivity, economic progress, are now passionately coveted by those who have too long been denied them by old tyrannies. Communism has falsely promised the world's malcontents and dispossessed to achieve the new effects rapidly, without the old principles. The falseness of the Communist promise is now widely evident, but the power which communism gained by false promises is still a brutal fact in our world.

So today, in 1955, with the United States at the very apex of its power, the great drama of the American Revolution versus the Russian revolution, the drama of freedom and order under God versus slavery and final chaos under the Kremlin, is inexorably moving to a climax.

Yes, ours is a rich and prosperous and happy land. Nevertheless, one dark and terrible thought tortures every mind and constricts every heart. Can the United States continue the revolution it began? Can we strongly and respectfully press our universal concept of liberty under law upon the world? Can we even safeguard our Revolutionary heritage within our own boundaries? Can we do all this—short of war?

We know what that war would be like. Atomic weapons would make vast cities, such as this fair city of Boston, radioactive cemeteries. If, for want of vigilance, preparedness or adequate military intelligence reports, we failed to apprise ourselves in advance of attack, an atomic Pearl Harbor launched by Russia could in a few short hours disrupt our organized national life. Twenty minutes after such an attack, America would never again in our lifetime be as strong as it had been 20 minutes before. Unbearable and unbelievable though the very thought may be, we must face the possibility that such an onslaught might bring to an end our privileged prosperity, and leave us living, or at best surviving amidst the ruins—the ruins not only of our cities, but of the dreams for a free world that we have cherished for two centuries.

Still more unbearable for the Christian conscience to contemplate is the idea that we ourselves should ever launch such a war. No, we will not, must not accept the idea that war is inevitable, or that only war can resolve this gigantic struggle between the freedom of men living under God in faith, and the order of men existing under tyrants in fear.

What then? The temptation is great to avoid war by withdrawal from the struggle, by retirement into isolation, by appeasing. But we have resisted, and will resist that temptation. We know that America was not made by cowards. We know that freedom is more precious than security. We know we will cease to be Americans if we cease trying to fulfill our historic destiny which is to lead the world toward those ideals of liberty, so often propounded here in Faneuil Hall. And this being so, we know we have no choice but to make those efforts, with all their consequent sacrifices which alone have a chance to win victory with peace.

Our first duty is the duty imposed on us by George Washington: Eternal vigilance in the conduct of our military affairs. This means the willingness of every able-bodied man to serve his country when called, and of every citizen to pay for what is needed to keep us strong on land, on water, and in the skies. Our second duty is to support, in unity, a bold and yet cautious foreign policy, activated by a generous and yet prudent diplomacy. And this means our willingness to be helpful and patient with our allies. Looking back, as we are today, for guidance from the great figures of our past, we can get it from Samuel Adams whose statue stands in the square before this hall. Said Samuel Adams, when the question of the conquest of little nations by great ones was raised in his day, "Let Congress study what measures may be taken in common with the European nations, that national differences may be settled and determined without the necessity of war, in which the world has too long been deluged to the disgrace of human reason and government."

If our peace diplomacy is to succeed, such measures—cold-war measures as we have come to call them—of mutual aid and assistance to our allies and to those seeking to maintain their independence from Russia, must be vigorously and generously pursued.

Here, speaking as a diplomat, a member of America's Foreign Service, I shall permit myself two reflections.

First, I believe that no foreign policy can ever be stronger than the foreign service charged with putting it into effect. If the American people want a good foreign service, made up of the highest type of dedicated men and women, they must cease being ungenerous and unduly critical toward their Foreign Service. They must begin to treat it with at least the affection and respect and generosity they show to other branches of their Government.

Second, speaking specifically as your Ambassador to Italy, in asking for patience and generosity with our allies, I make a special plea for the young Italian republic. Born only a decade ago, today it is still meeting enormous difficulties. There are the problems created by its own lack of natural resources, by its understandable want of experience with parliamentary democracy and a consequent factionalism, above all by the existence of millions of Italians who vote for the Communists. We must remember that these misguided millions are the very examples of those whose right desires for a better and fuller life, have been wrongly channeled by the false prophets of the new Soviet order. These Italians want the wrong thing—for their own worldly as well as spiritual salvation when they want communism. But may God bless them, and help to guide them still, they want it for the right reason—they want to be free of the old economic tyrannies that denied them equality of opportunity with others in their society.

America, which has been built and strengthened by immigrants from many lands, knows what fine citizens most Italians make when they come to our land, and to our free cities like Boston. Many more will be coming to our shores in the next year. Let me say in passing that, all news stories to the contrary, I think I can assure you that as regards Italy, at least, the President's Refugee Relief Act will fulfill its provisions. By December 1956 we shall have issued to Italians every one of the visas permitted to us under the law.

The shining fact is that postwar Italy is emerging as a vibrant and dynamic nation. In spite of all of its internal difficulties, it moves steadily forward to a sound recovery. And it continues firm in the framework of the great Western Alliance. Above all, it has stayed true to its Christian heritage. If we ourselves do not fail Italy, Italy will not fail us, or the West.

I shall conclude with one inspiring thought. This time of supreme strain is an opportunity for new greatness. We have a rare heritage. We have unlimited spiritual resources on which to draw. Today, on our national birthday, we make newly vital contact with the treasures in our American tradition. Strengthened by a fresh sense of the inner meaning of our Revolutionary past, we face the future with confidence. Our spirit and our resolution today are not other than those expressed by George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, and echoed anew by President Eisenhower when he said at Evanston, "Now is a time when great things must again be dared in faith. Let us dare again to dedicate our generation to the fairest dream mankind has ever known—the dream that moved us to found a nation under God in freedom."

This dream is still fair. But today it is broader. We do not cherish it for ourselves alone. We wish it realized in the wider world of a just and peaceful international community. Unto the task of this new realization let us pledge, as did our forebears, "Our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Submit the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the June 1955 issue of the Farm Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBMIT BRICKER AMENDMENT

Governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed," it says in the Declaration of Independence.

New circumstances in the world have placed that principle in danger for Americans. To keep it safe, an amendment to the Constitution has been placed before Congress. President Eisenhower declares himself against the amendment. The Farm Bureau, the Grange, the American Bar Association, the American Legion, and many other groups are for it. Whether or not the present Congress agrees to submit it to the people, the proposal will come up again and again.

Generally known as the Bricker amendment because Senator BRICKER introduced it, the purpose of the measure can be stated simply. It provides that a treaty or executive agreement shall not change the Constitution.

Everyone knows that a treaty becomes valid when signed by the President and approved by two-thirds of the Senate. The Constitution also says that a treaty "shall be the supreme law of the land * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

This provision was meant to give the National Government full control of foreign affairs, as is proper. Treaties were expected to involve such matters as navigation, fishing rights, commerce, and national boundaries. There was then no United Nations and no such abundance of treaties and agreements among nations as modern times have brought into being.

No stronger statement has been made in favor of the Bricker amendment than one by John Foster Dulles in April 1952 when he said:

"The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties are more supreme than ordinary law, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President. They can take powers away from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body. They can cut across the rights given to the people by the Constitutional Bill of Rights."

Since becoming Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles has changed his position. The President recently restated his opposition, giving as his reason that the Bricker amendment would bring the 48 States into foreign-policy agreements. Actually the amendment would do no such thing; Mr. Eisenhower has accepted a misinterpretation of its meaning.

The point to remember is that the Bricker amendment in no way limits the traditional method by which the President makes treaties with the consent of two-thirds of the Senate. It simply makes certain that no treaty or executive agreement shall be valid, if it conflicts with the Constitution. Nor could it have any internal effect, except "through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty."

In other words, the purpose is to keep legislation within the power of the people and to prevent any future Executive, even with Senate consent, from agreeing to any international measure which may infringe on American constitutional rights.

We think the people ought to have the right to vote upon such an amendment in their respective States, and that Congress should authorize its submission to the people.

Arbitrary Rules Adopted by NLRB Limiting Its Jurisdiction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter dated June 27, 1955, from Mr. Claude Ballard, international vice president of the International Woodworkers of America.

I have previously drawn the attention of my colleagues to the difficulties suffered by certain small businesses in connection with the refusal of the National Labor Relations Board to assume jurisdiction in their cases. It would appear that consideration should be given to Mr. Ballard's suggestion for a congressional investigation in this matter.

The letter follows:

INTERNATIONAL WOODWORKERS
OF AMERICA,
Portland, Oreg., June 27, 1955.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: I have delayed answering your letter, relating to the activity or lack of activity on the part of the NLRB, because of my absence from the office on business of our union. We are sincerely sorry that we have delayed our comments on this important problem where the NLRB is refusing to accept jurisdiction of many cases in our industry because of the arbitrary rules it has adopted limiting its jurisdiction.

This industry is not comparable to those of steel, auto, rubber, and electrical manufacturers, where giant corporations have practically eliminated small competitors. The lumbering industry is one where, as yet, the major part of production is carried on through comparatively small units employing 100 men or less. This type of production is normally sold through sales arrangements with other companies or through brokerage concerns.

This situation makes the present policy of the NLRB completely inoperative in the lumber industry as such. It is, as expressed, the intent of the Federal Government to protect the rights of all persons who work in industry involved in interstate commerce and also their right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers. Inasmuch as there is not effective State legislation, in the States where our union operates, that guarantees these rights or provides the mechanics necessary to enforce such rights, we protest the action of the Board in their administrative maneuvers to bypass the intent of Congress that these workers be guaranteed these rights under Federal law.

We have read, with some misgiving, letters written to Senators and Congressmen by Mr. Guy Farmer, Chairman of the NLRB, in answer to our protest against the policy of the Board and its jurisdictional rules.

Our memorandum was sent to various Congressmen and Senators so they might be apprised of the unfair position being taken by the Board—a policy that affects not only lumber workers but all workers in any industry where there still remains real free enterprise and free competition in the form of small manufacturing.

Mr. Farmer fails to recognize that the workers who are employed in smaller enterprises have the same rights under the law to collective bargaining as workers in a giant corporation as long as both are engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. Farmer says the Board has a self-delimiting policy on jurisdictional authority and these policies are formulated, according to his analysis, by two considerations, namely, a limited budget and the impact that strikes would have on the national economy.

The first excuse, for not assuming jurisdiction because of lack of appropriations, certainly would be important if the facts were not so well known. It is true that the present funds allotted to the Board are insufficient for it to function properly. But neither the administration which selected Mr. Farmer or Mr. Farmer himself, for that matter, urged that adequate funds be supplied to allow the Board to carry out the intent of the act. As we recall the passage of both the Wagner Act and the present act, it became the public policy of the United States Government to make it possible for all workers, employed in operations involved in interstate commerce, to have a right to organize and bargain collectively. The Government also recognized that the machinery should be set up to implement this right when a certain percentage of the employees desired representation. There is no record, to out knowledge, that Congress intended to choose between the large and the small.

The second reason given by the Chairman must necessarily have been partially covered by the first but it is well to briefly discuss his reasoning because our thinking doesn't run in the same channel. We feel that the lumber industry, its products and their free flow into the stream of commerce have a very substantial impact on the national economy. It is the backbone of the present construction boom, one of the principal props under our national economy along with auto and steel.

We believe that neither the industry nor the workers within the industry should be treated as orphans by the arbitrary rulings of the NLRB. We feel that those who labor in a sawmill or a logging camp are entitled to the protection intended by Congress when the act was written. It certainly did not intend that the Board would use their administrative prerogatives to deny these lawful rights to any individual or groups for any reason—including lack of funds as suggested by Mr. Farmer.

We have one further comment to make on the position of the Board Chairman with regard to the fact that we did not submit a brief in the Mast Lumber Co. case No. 20–CA–944. If we had had the slightest doubt of the facts being clear, we would have supported the General Counsel, by brief, in this instance. It was obvious that the said company was engaged in substantial interstate commerce—just how much is not a matter we can readily determine since only the Federal Government is in a position to ascertain such facts. In the Mast case, the Board's lack of actual investigation and their reliance on "assumption" caused the case to be misrepresented, to the detriment of the workers involved.

The Board and not the union has the power of investigation in these cases. If they fail to meet that responsibility, they are neither carrying out the intent of Congress nor protecting the just rights of the affected employees seeking protection under the law.

We are more convinced than ever that a Congressional investigation into the whole NLRB setup is long overdue. With a new Chairman to be forthcoming in the immediate future, it would appear that now is the time to call for such investigation. It could be conducted during the recess of Congress and it would be kept plenty busy. We are not the only union with something to uncover in this matter.

We appreciate the prodding you must have given the Board to have "smoked out" Mr. Farmer so effectively. His letters would appear to substantiate and at the same time defy investigation. Thank you for your cooperation in behalf of all workers in small interstate enterprises and ourselves.

Very sincerely yours,

CLAUDE BALLARD,
International Vice President.

Farley on Freedoms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following is an editorial from the Journal and Courier of Lafayette, Ind., setting out enlightening comments regarding the commencement day address made by the Honorable James A. Farley at St.

Joseph's College, Rensselaer, Ind., on June 5, 1955:

FARLEY ON FREEDOMS

Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and onetime chairman of the Democratic National Committee, had much to say about freedom in his commencement address at St. Joseph College, Rensselaer.

As a matter of fact, the subject of his address was Freedom and Faith. He spoke of the many dangers besetting freedom, but spoke the assurance that "We need not despair of keeping freedom so long as it is rooted in faith."

Of peculiar interest locally may be his reference to academic freedom, a subject of wide and contrasting interpretations. Now, Mr. Farley does not necessarily have the final answers, but he has proved himself a successful and practical man of the world, whose opinions command respect and attention. His comments in this respect are at least interesting and challenging.

Some, he declared, would set academic freedom apart, as though it were some special kind of freedom peculiar to teaching. He went on: "The obligation of the teacher is to point the way to truth, more especially to bring the student to arrive at the truth by his own thinking."

Speaking negatively, he held "It is not the function of the teacher to convert by suppressing any part of the truth or ridiculing any thinking he cannot refute."

Academic freedom, Mr. Farley went on, "is a sacred inheritance from the wisdom of the past, tempered by the revelation of religion. In true academic freedom, teachers should be dedicated, under God, to teaching truthfully and to employing their reason to the full extent of their ability."

As to loyalty oaths, Mr. Farley declared he could never see anything degrading about taking one. "In my years of public life I never felt myself a second-class citizen, as some academicians contend, because I raised my right hand to pledge allegiance to the Government and people I served. I remember feeling deep pride in such occasions and enjoying peace of mind similar to that which comes in prayer."

"Big Jim," in keeping with his nature, was speaking frankly and with complete candor. In the same vein he declared "there is no denying that the flame of liberty is more difficult to keep alive today than it was in the days of the Founding Fathers." But he also expressed the confidence that "liberty is not something that can be distorted by the shrill cries of vocal groups."

Gallant Mermaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, a gallant and strong-hearted young girl from my district set out in the early morning hours to achieve something that had never been done before. Thirteen hours and 3 minutes later her goal was accomplished. In the intervening hours, she had swum across Lake Erie from Angola in the United States to Crystal Beach in Canada, a total swimming distance of 17 miles.

Beautiful and buoyant Greta Patterson, who accomplished this feat, is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Guy W. Patterson, of 41 Ellicott Avenue, Batavia, N. Y. She is a graduate of Batavia High School, and at 18, she is clearly on the threshold of a great career as a long-distance swimmer.

Her triumph has won the admiration of tens of thousands, who applaud her pluck, courage, self-confidence, and high-hearted determination.

Greta's feat was made possible, in part, by the intelligent counsel of her manager, Frank Kline, and her trainer, Lawrence Slocum, both of whom are guards at Attica State prison. And a large measure of credit, according to Greta herself, goes to Joe Glaser, boat columnist of the Buffalo Courier-Express, who charted her course and piloted the lead boat which Greta followed across the international boundary from the United States to Canada.

Already Greta has her eyes on other feats of a similar nature, her next objective being to swim Lake Ontario from Toronto to Youngstown, N. Y.

Her well wishers will, I am certain, be legion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, editorials from the Daily News of Batavia and the Buffalo Courier-Express applauding Greta's triumph and wishing her success for the future.

[From the Batavia (N. Y.) Daily News of July 5, 1955]

GRETA AT 18 SHOWS THE WAY

In Greta Patterson, her generation certainly had a true representative Monday.

The 18-year-old Batavia High School graduate showed her colors in a grueling 15-mile Lake Erie swim from Angola to Crystal Beach, the first person ever to negotiate that circuit.

The odds necessarily had to be figured as against her as she waded into the water with her eyes and her heart on the distant shore.

Any one of numerous factors could have mitigated against her. But that is all beside the point now. The young lady accomplished the feat with finesse and distinction.

As she methodically stroked her way minute after minute, hour after hour, there must have been times when her endurance and spirit were taxed.

But she made it—a remarkable feat, to say the least, a tribute to the pluck, courage, ability, confidence, perseverance, and gallant heart of a charming young lady.

The word is that Miss Patterson has her sights trained on an even more rigorous and challenging swim. There is every reason to believe that she will handle this assignment with the same finesse and distinction.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of July 6, 1955]

SUCCESS IN LAKE ERIE SWIM CROWNS 13-HOUR EFFORT

Long-distance swimming is a particularly arduous undertaking. It calls in the highest measure for skill, endurance, and determination, attributes obviously possessed by 18-year-old Greta Patterson, of Batavia, who on Monday became the first person to swim Lake Erie, from Angola to Crystal Beach.

Skill was evident in the easy but effective crawl stroke with which she negotiated the choppy lake water. Endurance enabled her to carry on where two male competitors failed. And determination drove her to conquer stomach cramps and reach her goal even when she thought she might not be able to make it.

Thousands cheered the completion of the radiantly attractive girl's feat. Thousands more followed her progress by radio with hopes for her success. The Courier-Express offers her its heartiest congratulations on an outstanding performance and best wishes, in any similar endeavors on which she may set her sights.

George C. Clarke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to include a very interesting article that appeared in the Chelsea Record, newspaper of Chelsea, Mass., concerning a man for whom all of us have great respect and admiration.

During his lifetime, you will note from the background of this community leader, he has been a high-type organizer, and his accomplishments are well known throughout Massachusetts.

His activities in Chelsea and Revere, Mass., have impressed us vividly, and I also wish to extend my sincere congratulations and best wishes to George C. Clarke for his honorable and upright service to the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce and Kiwanis, with the hope that he will be spared to us for countless years to continue this enviable reputation.

The article follows:

GEORGE CLARKE HONORED AT KIWANIS MEETING

George C. Clarke, manager of the Chelsea Chamber of Commerce for nearly 10 years, and present secretary of the Kiwanis Club of Chelsea, was honored at the weekly meeting of the Kiwanis Club for the completion of 33 years of perfect attendance. Joseph L. Carr, of Revere, with a record of 24 years of perfect attendance, made the presentation of the 33-year pin to the guest of honor. Carr is now retired, after serving over 40 years as postal carrier and superintendent of mails in Revere. He is a past president of the Revere Kiwanis Club, which will observe its 25th anniversary in 1956.

Mr. Clarke joined Kiwanis June 16, 1922, and is one of the eight living charter members of the Kiwanis Club of Augusta, Maine, and its first secretary. In May 1923, he accepted a position as manager of the Pawtucket Chamber of Commerce and transferred his Kiwanis membership to that city known as the birthplace of the cotton textile industry in America. He served the Pawtucket club as secretary for most of his 13 years in that city, the club's president in 1931, with 3 successive years immediate past president, and a member of the board of directors. While in Pawtucket, he was appointed in 1933 district secretary for New England by the last past Gov. Burton K. Harris. Then followed in 1934 two important major positions in Kiwanis, namely international chairman of the business standards committee in the year when business codes of fair competition were being formulated under NRA, and lieutenant governor over the 14 clubs of the newly formed third division, which included New England's second and third largest cities, namely Providence and Worcester.

Three years later, in 1936, he became industrial commissioner of the city of Marlboro, and conducted a recovery program for

its shoe industry. The Marlboro Club was given international recognition for the part which the club played in rehabilitating the city's industries in less than 3 years from a condition of considerable distress to one of general prosperity and peaceful labor relations in all of its many shoeshops. Clarke's membership there, by transfer, started on February 15, 1936. He also served the club as secretary for 1 year.

In 1945 after a career as campaign manager, organizer, and municipal consultant in various parts of New England, and as public speaker and writer, with a perfect record of Kiwanis attendance and 10 new clubs formed under his chairmanship of the district committee on extension, Mr. Clarke took over the managership of the reorganized Revere Chamber of Commerce and club secretary of the Beach City Kiwanis Club, joining thereon January 3, 1945.

He came to Chelsea late in 1945 and managed, for 5 years, to attend weekly meetings of both the Kiwanis Clubs of Revere and Chelsea, serving the former as secretary for a total of 6 years. While in Pawtucket at the lowest point in the great depression, he served as secretary pro tempore of the nearby Providence Kiwanis Club for over a year until a successor from the club's own membership could be found. His combined weekly attendance at Revere and Chelsea added 260 meetings to his attendance record and he was known as the only 200 percent member in Kiwanis—2 meetings weekly for 5 years.

He joined the Chelsea club on January 1, 1951, and for 1 year held no office in Kiwanis. The following year, 1952, he was chosen secretary.

Mr. Carr stated in his remarks about his friend, which were both serious and humorous, that the guest of honor had attended 1,716 weekly meetings for his perfect 33-year attendance; 260 additional meetings in Chelsea for 5 years; and all sorts of conventions, interclub meetings, and extra visits to Kiwanis clubs as guest speaker, for a total of nearly 3,500 meetings, probably a record unexcelled in Kiwanis. There are only two other New England Kiwanians in the "Legion of Honor of Kiwanis International" with a better record of perfect weekly attendance, one for 34 years and one for 35 years. Mr. Clarke is the chairman of the legion of honor for the New England district to which only certified members can belong when they have completed 25, 30, or 35 years attendance. He is both a 25-year and a 30-year member of the honor group.

National Handicapped Worker of Year—Bill To Establish Federal Agency To Assist Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would establish a Federal agency to assist the physically handicapped. The bill provides, through the agency, for extension of medical services, vocational guidance and counseling, educational training, and employment opportunities to citizens handicapped by physical or mental disability. I would like to point out to my colleagues the importance of this bill to our Nation in terms of untapped potential manpower by relating an experience which I had on yesterday.

Miss Evelyn Herala, National Handicapped Goodwill Worker of the Year, a resident of my Congressional District in Detroit, Mich., visited my office on yesterday. She was here in Washington, D. C., on an expense-paid trip, as winner of the Goodwill Industries' coveted title for which 107 candidates in the United States were named. Miss Herala came to Washington on July 2 and will leave today. She has represented the Goodwill Industries in a wreath-laying ceremony on July 4 at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. She has visited the President and Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan.

Miss Herala was born without hands and feet, yet today she is an employee in the promotion department of the Detroit Goodwill Industries, where she has worked since 1943. She walks and writes as freely as any worker in carrying out her office duties—which entail writing more than 1,000 words a day in letters, handling telephone calls, and managing employee recreational activities. She has artificial feet, but she has learned to use the stubs of her arms with amazing dexterity for writing, dialing the telephone, and caring for all personal needs, including housework, without the help of any other person. In addition, Miss Herala plays the piano and trombone.

This young lady was born of Finnish parents in Minnesota. At the age of eight, following her mother's death, she went to live first with relatives and then with a Mrs. Jennie Johnson, who took a very special interest in the child's development. At the age of nine, she went to school for the first time. She now holds a degree from Hamline University in St. Paul. Her major was in the field of sociology.

Miss Herala shares an apartment with a sister, Miss Hilda Herala, who came to Washington with her. Of the sisters, Goodwill Industries officials state, "they are both so unselfish, always trying to help someone else, they have little time to think of their own hardships."

I am certain that if my distinguished colleagues could witness the fashion in which Miss Herala has overcome seemingly insurmountable physical difficulties to make such a very useful citizen, each would be inspired to support the measure which I am introducing to assist handicapped people through a comprehensive program of rehabilitation.

The International Situation on the Eve of the Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the forthcoming Big Four conference, I am inserting the text of a letter received by me from Gen. Kazimierz Sosnkowski, discussing some of the problems facing this Nation and the world on the eve of the conference.

General Sosnkowski has had a distinguished career as a military leader, having been the inspector general of the Polish Army at the outbreak of World War II. He served as Minister of War in 12 Polish prewar cabinets. During the war he served in the cabinet of General Sikorski's government in exile as minister in charge of organization of the Polish underground forces.

He is now generally conceded to be the elderly statesman reflecting the consensus of opinion of Poles in exile.

Because of the profoundness of his observations and their direct application to the problems which face us, I believe them to be of great interest to us and worthy of serious consideration.

The letter follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Following our recent conversation, I would like to put down in writing my personal views on the international situation on the eve of the Geneva Conference.

All nations, free and captive, will look upon this conference with mixed feelings, realizing how much their future depends upon the West's choosing the right course at this juncture which may prove to be a crossroads of history. If this meeting with the U. S. S. R. "at the summit" confirms the general impression, as yet not certain, that the Red Empire is having to cope with serious internal difficulties, then the negotiations should exploit these difficulties in an attempt to solve the key problems of peace. The right answer to the question, peace or war, depends on the correct estimate of Soviet Russia's real intentions. Unfortunately everything seems to demonstrate that she has not given up her principal goal of world domination. She changes only her tactics, shrewdly capitalizing on the free world's genuine longing for peace. Everything seems to prove that Red strategy, unchanging in its essence, is now playing to gain time. Time is necessary for the Soviet Union not only to ease her own internal troubles but also to complete her preparations for worldwide aggression: to keep up the Red war potential especially as far as strategic air force and atomic arms are concerned; to disrupt NATO, SEATO, and the Paris treaties; to reorganize, rearm, and train the Red Chinese armies, and to build up the land communications between the Soviet industrial bases and Communist China.

It is not possible to consider European problems apart from those of the Far East. In the strategic sense, both these sectors of the Communist struggle for world mastery are interconnected. For several years Soviet strategy has been aiming at the control of the Asian continent. Along with the problem of Germany, this control remains the most important Soviet objective.

A European security pact based on a reduction of arms of both the Soviet bloc and the NATO countries will not (by itself) secure a lasting peace; in fact, it will strengthen the position of Soviet Russia by providing her with with direct influence on European affairs. Communist penetration and infiltration would thus gain a better prospect of success in Western Europe; such a pact would undoubtedly be exploited by the Soviet Union in furthering her plans to neutralize Europe and NATO countries politically and psychologically, and would give her much greater freedom of action in the Far East. No paper agreement, no matter how carefully it is worded, will guarantee effective control of armaments in the Soviet

sphere; the Communists will always find ways to circumvent any methods of international control and make them only illusory in the immense territory of the Red empire. In other words, Soviet Russia hopes to be able by every ruse to lessen the watchfulness of the free world, to lull it into a false security, and, simultaneously, to proceed with her own war potential while sabotaging the agreed system of international control.

In its wish to bring about enduring peace, the free world should pursue a course based on one simple premise—that the cause of peace is served by everything that weakens the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union. First of all, the West, exploiting Russia's internal difficulties, if they are in fact serious enough, should make her abandon her advanced bases pointed at the very heart of Western Europe; the numerous countries captured by the U. S. S. R. in 1939 and after World War II by aggression, occupation, and penetration have been transformed by her into such bases. It is not possible to achieve real peace in Europe unless Russia is made to give up these springboards of her strategy.

Now after the settlement of the Austrian problem, it is probable that the discussion of the German problem will come up at Geneva—not only because of Germany's geographical position, importance, legitimate claims for justice, unification, and independence, but also to protect the world against a possible rebirth of German imperialism.

For these very reasons the German problem cannot be solved except within the framework of the whole of Europe. Any solution of this problem made without removing the element of Russia's present preponderance in Europe would be illusory. For example, the evacuation of NATO armed forces from Germany could be counterbalanced only by the evacuation beyond Russia's 1938 frontiers of her armed forces and bases.

The restoration of real independence to the captive nations is essential for the political and economic balance in Europe, and such a balance is, after all, the necessary basis for a true and lasting peace. The independence of the captive nations is not only a matter of justice, a principle to which Americans are so devoted, but is also fundamental for all considerations concerning the future of Europe as a whole. There can be no satisfactory solution—neither from the ideological, social, economic point of view, nor from the point of view of security—as long as Europe is dismembered and Germany divided. To abandon the captive nations to their fate of present slavery would be equivalent to leaving Europe, West Germany in particular, to the mercy of Soviet Russia. It would pave the way for Soviet Russia to influence the internal affairs of Germany and thus to absorb her gradually into the Communist orbit. The principles of freedom and justice have to be one and the same everywhere; betrayed, they become the source of all difficulties and conflicts.

A policy thus conceived obviously implies the liberation of Poland. The first step for liberation is the lifting of the present occupation, both political and military, i. e., removing all instruments of Soviet oppression and control from the whole Polish territory.

The 1945 Potsdam decisions determined the western frontiers of Poland; the inherent irrevocability of these decisions was emphasized by ordering the transfer of populations on a scale never before known in modern times. An enormous effort has been made in West Germany to integrate the populations resettled from the east; an even greater effort has been made by Poland to settle and reconstruct the territories recovered under the Potsdam decisions. Today 7 million Poles live and work in this area. These facts cannot be ignored. The present Polish-German frontiers, while creating a safeguard against the rebirth of German Drang nach Osten, a long-range possibility which cannot be discounted, at the same time leave the German economy with the necessary conditions for prosperity and further development. It is a well-known fact that West Germany has no unemployment, although she has integrated some 10 million Germans from the east.

The territories recovered by Poland were always, under German rule, a hotbed of Prussian chauvinism and militarism. Specifically, the Silesian area (long with the Ruhr was the arsenal for German aggressions. This same Silesian region will, in Polish hands, serve the peaceful economic interests of all the countries of Central Eastern Europe, and will constitute no menace whatever, unless it remains, as at present, under the control of Russia who simultaneously owns the Donets basin. Furthermore, the present shortened and natural eastern frontiers of Germany, by eliminating the East Prussian enclave and the so-called Polish corridor, will help to prevent hegemony by any one power along the Baltic.

Under prevailing conditions, the Polish nation is forced to cooperate with the Communist camp, although in heart and spirit she still stands by and with the western community of nations. But any attitude of the West toward revising the present Polish-German frontiers could make the Poles look to Russia for support. On the contrary, Poland not menaced by Germany and with her present western frontiers guaranteed by the great democracies, would have no cause for seeking Russian help. An atmosphere of mutual confidence between Germany and a liberated Poland would become an important, perhaps decisive, factor in the European security system.

As hinted above, it would be foolish to discount the possibility of a future change in the political views prevailing in Germany today. It would be a real misfortune for Europe if Germany should depart from the principles of democracy and return to nationalism and militarism. It would be a catastrophe for the world if a reunited and rearmed Germany should engage in all-out conquest in alliance with Russia. The possibility of such a catastrophe could be reduced by the existence, between Russia and Germany, of a really independent and strong Poland, allied with a free Czechoslovakia and other Central European countries within a European defense system. So therefore from this point of view also, any encouragement given to German revisionism by the great democracies would be a tragically mistaken policy in the long run.

From the economic point of view, the territories recovered by Poland (except Silesia, whose specific role in the Reich has already been stressed) never had any real significance for Germany; there was a constant shift of population toward her western provinces; these territories never attained the high level of prosperity of the rest of Germany despite all kinds of government support. However, these same territories integrated into Poland, because of their mineral resources and their road and waterways systems, are furthering a basic change in her economic structure. From being an agricultural country, overpopulated and suffering from unemployment, Poland is now gradually becoming a well balanced industrial and agricultural country. Thus integration of these territories also creates the prerequisites for economic cooperation with the group of nations in central eastern Europe, a group that will be able to develop freely and withstand political pressures from any European power.

The profound awareness of these truths, intensified by the innuemrable losses suffered by Poland and by the effort already invested by her in the recovered territories, unites the whole Polish nation—the homeland, the political emigres, and also Americans of Polish descent, in a common effort to hold these territories. The other captive nations regard this as a test case for the policy of the west. If these truths are underestimated, the Russian Government will only strengthen its case and win over public opinion in the subjugated countries which now hate the oppressor.

To sum up, the restoration of the 1938 eastern frontiers of the captive nations, the restoration of their freedom, and the restitutio in integrum of the rights of Poland—these are basic Polish aims. They likewise comprehend the obvious truth that the present status of central Eastern Europe has not resulted from justice but from force; and that the further Russian military might is pushed back, i. e., to the prewar frontiers, the more favorable will be the prospect for peace in Europe and in the whole world.

Implementing the universal concepts of freedom will bring about a basic change in Europe, will bring to a halt the systems of conquest and government by force. It will prove that a turning point in history has been reached—that the sound principles of the free world will prevail and that peaceful coexistence in the true sense of the term can be established.

Poland's faith in her ultimate freedom is inspired by the universal ideals that are identical with those of the West. The western democracies for the sake of their own security should do everything in their power not to kill this faith by failing to act.

Power politics, spheres of influence, tacit consent to aggression, and paying lip service to principles inevitable lead to wars and catastrophes. Therefore, western civilization can be saved only by establishing a permanent political system which in all honesty and sincerity, by deeds, will equate peace with freedom and justice.

Yours very sincerely,

Gen. K. SOSNKOWSKI.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 5, 1925.*

Supplemental Budget Request, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a brief statement prepared by Congressman FJARE and myself for presentation before the House Appropriations Committee in conjunction with the supplemental budget request, 1956, for the White House Conference on Education.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST, 1956

(Statement to House Appropriations Committee by Congressman ORVIN B. FJARE and Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., July 6, 1955)

The education of our children is of supreme importance to the future security and well-being of this Nation. We are particularly interested in legislation and activities aimed at improving the quality of American education. All of us are aware that our schools are today faced with many prob-

lems, and that in many localities across the Nation these problems constitute a growing crisis in education. Teacher shortages, crowded and antiquated facilities, poorly organized school systems, and inadequate tax structures are but some of the difficulties which, when taken together with swelling school enrollments, may result in millions of our youngsters not receiving the education they need and the Nation so urgently requires.

Fortunately, these conditions are getting increasing attention from educators, parents, and interested citizens in every part of the country. The State and White House conferences on education comprise a national program designed to focus the attention of every citizen on these educational problems, and to seek solutions at all levels of government. The supplemental budget request before you seeks additional funds necessary for the successful completion of this program. We are pleased to have an opportunity to support this request.

Ever since the school system began, it has been left to the citizens of the communities and the States to determine what their educational needs have been and how much should be paid to attain these ends. Through our locally elected boards of education, our educators, and our State school officials, the citizens of this country have, in real fact, built a school system second to none in history.

The program of State and White House conferences on education is the best opportunity the American people have ever had to say what they think should be done to meet our educational deficits. Already in every State in the Union, in the District of Columbia, and in four outlying Territories, Governors have called conferences of educators and lay citizens to discuss what should be done to provide the kind and amount of education the children in those areas should receive. This program is, without question, the largest attempt of its kind ever made, and its success is well indicated by the 100 percent participation on the parts of the States and Territories. If there is a clear demonstration of pure democracy at work in our times, it is here—where every citizen has an opportunity to say what he thinks should be done.

The States and Territories have entered voluntarily into this program. The White House Conference on Education is called for later this year. Already some startling results have been shown. We are told that more than 3,800 conferences at the community and regional level within the States are being held in conjunction with State Conferences, preparatory to the national meeting. Many more no doubt will be held. The interest in this program is extremely heavy.

We Members of Congress, who join in this statement, believe that the White House Conference on Education this fall should be a fitting climax to this nationwide study of school needs, and hope that you agree with us. In order that the conference may be broadly representative, as required by law, funds for travel of delegates to and from Washington are now being requested. This request, we are advised, is endorsed wholeheartedly by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the United States Commissioner of education. It was forwarded only after serious consideration by the outstanding citizens who compose the President's Committee.

Many citizens—unable to pay their own costs to a national meeting—cannot attend the White House Conference unless part of their expenses are met for them. They should be here to advise on the methods of meeting the Nation's school needs. Citizens from every walk of life and from every State and Territory will be asked to take part, to bring with them the opinions which exist toward schools within their own States. They come not as representatives of organized factions pleading sperial interests, but as citizens of their own communities and States pleading only that public interest. If it is the desire of Congress and the President to hear from all sides on the important issues facing our schools, it is necessary that persons of every economic standing and every section of our Nation take part in this program. Without part payment of their expenses, this broad representation, so important in this citizen study of education, cannot be obtained.

We earnestly request that favorable consideration be given this request for funds necessary to carry out this important program.

A Bright Ray in the Dark Cloud of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a most heartening story by Auleen B. Eberhardt, appearing in the May 7, 1955, issue of the magazine America titled, "Teen-agers Turn the Tide," which explains the activities of the youth of Dubuque, Iowa, in waging the fight for much needed decency and good morals.

Let us earnestly hope and pray that the encouraging example of these wholesome youngsters will sweep over the land in furtherance of that wise admonition of our beloved founder, George Washington, that religion and morality are indispensable supports of any lasting Christian society.

The article follows:

TEEN-AGERS TURN THE TIDE

(By Auleen Bordeaux Eberhardt)

Many parents have recently had the shock of their lives. For years they have been crusading against immodesty in dress, indecent books, and class B movies and stage productions. After long discouragement over fighting an apparently losing battle, they now see the tide turning. Crusading teen-agers are backing up the efforts of their parents.

Take the teen-agers of Dubuque, Iowa, for example. For the past 8 months, teen-agers have been moving in the right direction through an interschool council which brings the boys and girls from 4 academies and 1 high school together at regular intervals to plan genuine Catholic action. They tackled two big problems—immodesty in dress and indecent literature.

MODEST MODISHNESS

The first signs of the girls' determination to get some action against the constant display in stores of strapless and off-the-shoulder formals, risqué sun dresses and low-cut sports clothes came from Immaculate Conception Academy. The entire student body of over 330, with the cooperation of their teachers, held a series of meetings and decided to adopt the Marylyke fashions as their standard of dress. These are largely promoted by Maryville College of the Sacred Heart, St. Louis, Mo., under the auspices of the organization Supply the Demand for the Supply, i. e. of modest fashions.

Once the decision was made, the students began to stage panel discussions on modesty in dress before many of the city's women's organizations. Stores were requested to stock modest clothing and within a short time, many of the leading merchants had agreed to carry the Marylyke line.

The girls of St. Columbkille's High School voted to adopt the Marylyke fashions. The two other academies, Visitation and St. Joseph's, set up "Supply the Demand for the Supply." Their students were all enthusiastic about the new plan.

The girls carried home the story of their crusade, and before long they were urging their mothers to suggest to the older women of their acquaintance the necessity for modest dress for persons of all ages. The teen-agers realized, as did the older women, that fashions of the past several seasons had popularized styles so extreme that the epithet, "immodest" was fully justified. The girls encouraged their mothers to join the campaign to get merchants to stock wearing apparel that met the requirements of modesty.

CLEAN LITERATURE

Meanwhile, the student interschool council had come out strongly against indecent literature. The boys volunteered to organize the work of getting newsstands to eliminate objectionable comics, books, magazines. The girls, of course, worked along with them. One of the direct results of their efforts was a decrease in the number of indecent books displayed and sold.

Every high school and grade school in the city now has a bulletin board on which each movie currently showing is listed according to classification. There is a definite movement on the part of youth against class B films, which seem to be on the increase. Teen-agers on movie dates began to awaken to the fact that off-color dialog and double-meaning conversations were a source of embarrassment to them. It was a quick step from embarrassment to resentment. The youngsters determined to avoid certain films, no matter how good they were reputed to be from an artistic standpoint.

At present, there is a big campaign going on in the schools for support of the Catholic press and Catholic books. Many of the student organizations have set aside sums of money to be expended in enlarging the number of Catholic magazines in the school reading rooms and getting more current and established Catholic books onto library shelves. Teen-agers have pledged themselves to read Catholic publications and to discuss them in the home.

The work of the Dubuque teen-agers is being spread to places outside Dubuque through the medium of their student publications, which go, of course, to other schools. Then, too, scores of Dubuque students have attended scholastic press conventions and other regional meetings in the Midwest. Ideas on modesty in dress, indecent literature, steady dating, etc., are discussed at these gatherings.

The parents of these teen-agers are thrilled. Twenty years ago or more, they first heard of Catholic action at Holy Name Society meetings or conventions of the National Council of Catholic Women. They worked hard to bring religion into everyday living. They, too, in their day, campaigned against bad literature, immodesty in dress, vulgar entertainment. But, as they were caught up more and more in the cares of everyday wage earning and homemaking, their efforts unconsciously slackened. Then suddenly they saw filth in literature, immodesty in dress, and risqué entertainment soar to all-time highs. Their campaign had to start over again.

Today these parents are greatly encouraged, yet deeply humble, as they see their teen-age girls and boys man the dikes against the rising tide of indecency in dress, entertainment, and literature.

Parents are pleased with the enthusiasm with which their youngsters are attacking

these problems. And because of their children's courage, parents are gaining new strength to go on with the work in adult groups. They realize that, in the past, adults often were guilty of furthering the sale of salacious books, of breaking the legion-of-decency pledge, of wearing too-revealing gowns.

Television? Anytime now the teen-agers, through their school publications, will be sounding the charge against programs detrimental to the morals of youth. Emphasis will be against brutality, glamorizing criminals, immodesty in dress, and suggestive dances and conversation.

Amid so much talking and writing about the growth of juvenile delinquency and crime, it is heartening to see youth on the march for decency and good morals. They are the parents of tomorrow's juveniles.

The Need for Legislative Flexibility in the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out earlier, the need to strengthen government at the State and local level became abundantly clear as the studies of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations proceeded. In earlier excerpts from the Commission's report, I have included its view with respect to the need for review and revision of State constitutions, and for review of our system of representation, to insure that our representative government truly represents.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD today further excerpts from the Commission's report dealing with State government, including references to some needed changes in legislative processes and procedures, and some findings and recommendations with respect to State executives:

STATE LEGISLATURES—THE NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY

In addition to reapportionment, there are a number of other measures that would enable State legislatures to become more effective instruments of policy formation. In this age of rapid change, legislative bodies are called upon to deal with an increasing number of complex and technical issues. Most State legislatures are not, however, in a position to give the time and study that many of these issues should have. Most of the States impose constitutional limitations on the frequency and length of sessions. Only 10 State constitutions provide for annual sessions and several of those limit every other session to fiscal matters. The low pay of most legislators and their inadequate physical and staff arrangements accentuate the effect of limited sessions.

There is a discernible movement to correct these conditions. A few States have recently provided for annual sessions, at least for action on the budget. More than two-thirds of the legislatures have equipped themselves with legislative councils to develop objective information as a basis for policy decisions. A smaller number of States have reorganized their committee systems and revised their rules. Legislative pay is improving, though slowly and moderately.

Perhaps the chief obstacles to legislative flexibility are those created by overdetailed provisions of State constitutions, designed to correct specific actions of past legislative sessions. Some of these provisions rigidly prohibit certain forms of legislative action; others contain elaborate restrictions and prescriptions of an essentially statutory nature. Some of them attempt to regulate in detail such rapidly changing or technical matters as the powers of corporations, the routes of the State highway system, and the conduct of State and county administration. Some interfere with the full use of modern tools of budgeting, accounting, auditing, and personnel administration.

In a number of States, the constitution earmarks so high a proportion of the tax revenues that the legislature's power to appropriate money applies to less than half of the State's expenditures. This tends to undermine the principle of responsible representative government and limits the ability of the legislators to adapt the spending policies of the State to changing needs and conditions. Chapter 4 will discuss constitutional limitations on State and local taxing and spending powers in somewhat more detail and show how they tend to build up pressures for national spending for essentially State and local purposes.

It is abundantly clear that restrictions and limitations of the type described have engendered at least as many errors and excesses as they have prevented. Removing these limitations would be an important step toward strengthening State government.

THE STATE EXECUTIVE

The American system of separation of powers works best when all branches of Government are strong, energetic, and responsible. Men of such diverse points of view as John Adams, Alexander Hamilton, and Thomas Jefferson recognized that the successful operation of a government based on the separation of powers depends on provision for adequate executive authority as well as for a representative legislature and an independent judiciary. Jefferson saw the need for a governor bearing the "whole weight" of executive responsibility. Hamilton insisted that "Energy in the executive is a leading character in the definition of good government." Adams looked upon a strong, independent executive as "the natural friend of the people," the chief defender of their rights and liberties.

Today, few States have an adequate executive branch headed by a governor who can be held generally accountable for executing and administering the laws of the State. State constitutions provide in principle for three equal branches of government, but most of these constitutions and numerous laws based on them include provisions that tend to undermine this principle. Early fears of royal governors and the natural preference for the legislative bodies that had spoken for the colonies in their contests with the crown have left their mark on the development of the State executive. The growth of State functions in the last half century and the increasing importance of national-State cooperative relations have created the need for a governor who is in a position to provide executive direction to the State's business, and to see to it that grant-aided programs dovetail with other State programs and operate under State supervision.

LIMITATIONS ON THE POWER OF THE GOVERNOR

Typically, though not universally, the governor is the nominal chief of a sprawling State administration consisting of scores of separate departments, commissions, and agencies. Department heads, many of them boards or commissions, are often selected or appointed for long or overlapping terms. This enables them to be more or less independent of normal executive controls. Still other agency heads may be separately elected, or may be appointed by the legislature or by someone other than the governor. In most States, the governor's removal power over many of his "subordinates" is so restricted that it is of little value as a tool of administrative control. Few governors have been supplied with modern staff agencies and tools of management adequate to the administrative responsibility presumed to be vested in them. Furthermore, constitutional limitations on tenure frequently weaken their leadership in policy and administration. More than one-third of our governors still have only 2-year terms, while of the 4-year governors, more than one-half may not succeed themselves.[1]

The separate election of other State administrative officers deserves special attention. In 40 States, the people elect from 5 to 12 administrative officials or agency heads, in addition to the governor. Since the agencies are in some cases headed by boards, the actual number of persons elected may run even higher, being over 20 in 4 States. This arrangement seriously divides or hides responsibility and makes difficult the achievement of unity of command and consistency of action within a State administration.

Experience in the administration of Federal grants-in-aid emphasizes the need for effective gubernatorial supervision of State administration and for effective review by both governor and legislature of policies carried out by all State agencies. In the absence of such supervision and review, there is a tendency for groups of professional administrators in a single, specialized field, working at National, State, and local levels, to become a more or less independent government of their own, organized vertically and substantially independent of other State agencies. Programs may be agreed upon, State as well as Federal money may be committed, and important public projects may be carried out without even a review by the governor's office to deterine how they relate to other State activities or requirements. On the other hand, States with fairly strong governors served by active budget and other staff aids have reported relatively little difficulty of this sort.

MOVEMENT FOR REORGANIZATION

The movement for reorganization of State administration has produced some concrete results. It has also revealed the nature of the difficulties to be overcome and pointed to directions in which further progress can be sought. A few States, notably New Jersey, New York, and Virginia, have achieved substantially integrated administrations under governors constitutionally equipped to be chief executives in the full sense of the term. More States have brought about appreciable reductions in the number of separate departments and have curtailed somewhat the use of boards and commissions as department heads. Approximately half of the States now have civil-service systems applicable to all employees, while the rest have partial coverage.

Probably the greatest progress in State administration has been in the field of budgeting and fiscal management, although the usefulness of these tools is often seriously impaired by constitutional limitations and by the existence of officials independent of the chief executive. A number of States have developed departments of finance or of administration that bring management functions together in an agency directly responsible to the governor.

Footnotes at end of speech.

THE TASK AHEAD

While there is no unanimous agreement on a precise pattern of administrative organization applicable to all States, there is substantial agreement on certain arrangements which, if generally applied, would greatly strengthen State administration. The following statement reflects the consensus of some 20 State reorganization commissions: "* * * In general it was felt that reorganization movements should result in strengthening the office of the governor; reducing the independent agencies and administrative boards and commissions and grouping them into major departments; extending the gubernatorial power over appointment and removal of department heads; and strengthening executive controls over budgeting, accounting, purchasing, State property, etc. At the same time, it was pointed out, it is of the utmost necessity to revise legislative procedures in the direction of greater efficiency, and to provide the legislature with more effective reporting and auditing controls—in order that the executive may be held to proper accountability." [2]

Deficiencies in national administration sometimes hinder prudent policymaking and responsible administration by the States. Among these deficiencies are the inflexibility of rules affecting State participation in joint programs, uncertainty as to the location of responsibility for decisions within a national agency dealing with the States, and competition or duplication between different national agencies concerned with the same or similar State programs. Some of these conditions tend toward further splintering of State administration and weakening of the governor's authority. The National Government has an obligation to overhaul policies and administrative arrangements that impede action by the States to strengthen their own administration.

INTERSTATE COOPERATION

Interstate cooperation extends the scope of State action. Wisely employed, it can greatly increase the people's satisfaction with their State governments and reduce the demand for national action. Through uniform and reciprocal laws and interstate compacts nationwide in scope, such as those on probation and parole, it helps to promote uniform action by the States. Through regional compacts, it can minimize the need for regional administration by the National Government.

There has been during this century a substantial development of regional governmental activity based upon interstate compacts of varying formality, yet their potentialities have hardly been tapped. Development of terminal and transportation facilities, maintenance of an interstate park, forest-fire protection, water supply, control of water pollution, marine fisheries, conservation, aspects of higher education—this is but a random list of present activities. The recently adopted Water Front Commission Compact, by which New York and New Jersey regulate hiring practices affecting longshoremen and stevedores in the port of New York, may point the way toward wider use of interstate compacts for regulatory purposes. If the States do these and other things for themselves on a cooperative basis, there will not be as strong a case for national action.

The Council of State Governments, established by the States in 1933 to promote interstate cooperation and improve National-State relations through a program of research, publication, and information, can be made even more effective by expanding its research and clearinghouse activities and its services as convener and staff agency for national or regional conferences and committees. Each State could help by reviewing its procedures for recording and passing on information and experience that might be useful to other States.

Uniform laws strength the States and increase the confidence of the people in State government by improving the quality of State legislation. Uniform laws and model acts are promoted by the Council of State Governments, with the cooperation of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. The subjects covered include various aspects of commercial law, crime control, national defense, traffic, and motor vehicle regulation, health, welfare, and absentee voting.

These laws have proved to be effective instruments of interstate cooperation, even though the rate of adoptions has been slow, and despite the fact that the courts do not interpret uniform laws uniformly. More vigorous prosecution of this approach would enable the States to meet widely recognized needs which, if neglected, will invite increasing attention from the National Government.

The National Government can help to promote interstate cooperation in various ways. Congress can facilitate interstate cooperation by wider application of its policy of giving advance authorization for interstate compacts, as it does in the civil defense program. In chapter 3, the Commission recommends the establishment of a Presidential staff agency on intergovernmental relations. Such an agency could assist the States in connection with interstate compacts and other cooperative arrangements.

---

[1] Governors Jones and Battle and Congressman HAYS do not believe that the fact that a governor serving a 4-year term may not succeed himself weakens his leadership in policy or administration.

[2] Summary of Conference on State Government Reorganization, Council of State Governments, September 1949.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Dairyman's Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, despite the fine statements by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, all designed to tell us how well off our farm population might be, actual statistical evidence constantly proves just the opposite.

General Eisenhower, when he was a candidate for office, told a farm audience in Kassoon, Minn., that he and his administration would be pledged to 100 percent of parity. Once they were inducted into office, President Eisenhower and his policymakers apparently kissed that one off as just so much campaign oratory, and immediately began depressing farm prices. They are still at it.

The 19th District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, has many dairy farmers. I know from personal experience they are not enjoying a boom period. Figures just released indicate that our Pennsylvania dairymen are going in the red. These figures and other aspects of the tough job of the dairyman are analyzed by Harold Howell, farm editor of the Harrisburg Patriot-News, in an article published on Sunday, July 3. I include this article as a part of my remarks:

STATE DAIRY FARMERS FACE PRICE BATTLE

(By Harold Howell)

Thousands of Pennsylvania dairymen are hanging onto their farms by a margin that grows narrower day by day.

Prices paid dairymen in Pennsylvania during the last 15 months averaged $3.86 a hundred pounds (46½ quarts), the National Milk Producers Federation reported in June. The federation said the average cost of producing 100 pounds of milk is $5.77, indicating that it is only a matter of time before bankruptcy faces many a dairyman.

Dairymen are finding many ways to hang on. He first dips into reserves, mostly war or defense savings bonds. Then he seeks short term loans and a mortgage increase. After that he can reduce his use of fertilizers and lime, delay needed paint jobs and neglect repairs on his buildings.

FERTILIZER CUT

Only last week the United States Department of Agriculture reported Pennsylvania farmers had cut the use of phosphate fertilizers by 5 percent, and a survey made by the Plant Food Review from Washington showed Pennsylvania farmers had reduced the use of all fertilizers by 3.1 percent, in 1954. Total fertilizer reduction in Pennsylvania, according to the Plant Food Review, was 18,646 tons of commercial fertilizers.

Dairymen date their troubles back to April 1, 1954, when dairy supports were cut from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent. Parity is the standard used to measure farm prices. It is designed to give farm products equal value or purchasing power in terms of nonfarm goods and services as they had in a past favorable period, usually 1910–14. Parity prices are those needed to put farm products on a par with commodities bought by farmers.

SUUPPORTS PRICE

The Government supports the price of dairy products by buying them from the manufacturer. In a House investigating subcommittee inquiry June 1 into Commodity Credit Corporation, sales and purchases, USDA officials said the Government lost $2,381,000 buying and selling cheese that never left the manufacturers' hands.

The USDA officials said they bought 86,600,000 pounds of cheese just before the April 1, 1954, effective date for 75 percent dairy price supports, and sold it immediately afterwards to the same cheesemakers at a $2,381,000 loss.

They told the House investigators they paid 37 cents a pound for 86,600,000 pounds of cheese and sold it for 34.25 cents a pound. The USDA officials said the Government saved money on the transaction by saving on the cost of warehousing and handling.

United States agriculture officials said the simultaneous purchase—resales were made when dairy price supports were dropped from 90 percent of parity in March, 1954 to 75 percent on April 1.

BIGGEST BUYER

Don. S. Anderson, acting director of the livestock and dairy division of the Commodity Stabilization Service, said the biggest buyer and seller was Kraft Foods Co. Chicago, with 29,164,860 pounds. He said cheese companies cleared $2,381,000 on the deal. Kraft Foods Co. is part of the National Dairy Products Corp.

The National Dairy Products Corp. in its annual financial statement published in the Wall Street Journal and the Rural New Yorker, reported a net profit in 1954, after taxes and depreciation, of $37,393,012, highest in its history.

EARNINGS JUMP

The Borden Co., another nationwide dairy concern, listed a 1954 net profit of $22,724,336—gain of $2,500,000 over 1953.

According to the financial statement, the two companies' dividend records were equally impressive. With earnings at $2.77 a share in 1954, up 46 cents a share, National Dairy declared a 100 percent stock dividend last August, paid $3.05 cash dividend against $3 in the previous year and has now placed its new stock on a $1.60 annual dividend basis, equal to $3.20 a share on the old stock.

Borden's earnings jumped 37 cents a share to $2.93 in 1954 and the company declared a 10 percent stock dividend, worth approximately $7 a share at the time of declaration. The $2.80 a share dividend remains the same.

The Art of Negotiating With the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times magazine, June 12, 1955, in which the writer, Mr. Louis J. Halle, outlines his theories on how the United States Government and its democratic allies should deal with the Russians at the upcoming meeting at the summit:

THE ART OF NEGOTIATING WITH THE RUSSIANS—AS THE SUMMIT MEETING APPROACHES, AN OBSERVER CALLS ON US TO UNITE BEHIND OUR DIPLOMATS, TEMPER ANY GREAT EXPECTATIONS, AND KEEP UP OUR MILITARY POWER

(By Louis J. Halle)

Ten years after World War II, we see the beginning of a new chapter in postwar history. During the coming months, the leaders of the free world are to engage in negotiations with the masters of the Communist world. Whatever the terms of the technical agenda, the real issue may be that of civilization or ruin in the atomic age. Much will depend on the skill with which the negotiations are conducted on both sides. Both sides, however, have shown marked disabilities in what was once known as the art of diplomacy.

We can do little to improve the negotiating technique of the Communists, but we can deal with it more confidently if we understand its limitations. What we know of these limitations is based chiefly on our experience of them prior to Stalin's death. While there may have been some relaxation since, we have no reason to expect any radical change.

The limitations of Communist diplomacy appear to rise out of doctrinal rigidity and the awkwardness of an administrative system disciplined by fear. Every Communist negotiator below the summit negotiates with a gun in his back. It might be fatal for him to see eye to eye with those who sit across the table, or to report back to his home office that their arguments have merit, or to interpret the development of negotiations in terms of personal observation rather than doctrinal authority. It might be dangerous even to transmit the views of his antagonists to his masters for consideration. He may, therefore, be confined to insisting on the acceptance, unchanged and in their entirety, of such proposals as he has been authorized to make.

Our negotiators are baffled when the negotiators across the table have no power to negotiate, while those who have it are inaccessible in Moscow and Peiping. Even negotiations at the summit, however, must reckon with imposing psychological barriers. The Communists, because they think in terms of absolute authority, appear ill at ease in an international society that is not based on dictation and submission. The process of give and take on which diplomatic negotiation depends is hard for them to understand.

In most situations they are debarred by their own dogma from recognizing any common ground between themselves and the "capitalist imperialists." A concession offered by our side must represent either a sinister plot or a retreat which calls for hot pursuit in the form of redoubled demands. This, too, baffles our own negotiators, who expect concession to produce counter-concession.

Since the Communists regard negotiations with non-Communists as the conduct of war by other means, their objectives in negotiation may not include that of reaching any agreement at all. Instead, the objectives may be simply to divide their opponents, to make propaganda, or to gain time. No agreement can result from a negotiation unless the parties are willing to agree. Finally, there is the well-known difficulty of reaching agreement on what has been agreed on after agreement has been reached—vide Yalta and Potsdam.

It would be easy to conclude that it is impossible to make meaningful agreements with the Communists. The record, however, shows that it is not quite impossible. The Communists have repeatedly entered into agreements with independent governments and honored such agreements, especially when the strength of the opposition or their own weakness has made is advisable to do so.

This was demonstrated by the Popular-Front strategy of the 1930's and Russia's participation in the League of Nations. During the war, we found no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Soviet desire for a lend-lease agreement, or the willingness, however grudging, to make concessions for it. We can hardly doubt, today, that the agreements between Moscow and Peiping represent negotiated compromises by both sides.

If the strength of the free world now makes it desirable to either or both of the Communist powers to seek a stabilization of the international situation by mutual agreement, then the possibility of fruitful negotiation exists. The realization of such a possibility would depend in some measure, however, on our own skill in diplomatic negotiation.

As we approach this subject, it may be good for us to recognize, with candor and humility, that our democratic system, too, has shown marked disabilities in the art of diplomacy. Diplomacy has never been a democratic profession. Our American Revolution, as it eventuated in Jacksonian democracy, was a revolution against the old diplomacy in the sense that it was a revolution against what the old diplomacy stood for. The unsolved problem, still with us today, has been what to put in its place.

The old diplomacy, especially after the Congress of Vienna, appeared to be a conspiratorial device in the hands of aristocrats for defeating republicanism and the rights of man. Its practitioners constituted an international clique conspiring secretly to thwart the popular will in their respective countries and the political development of the New World. This is a caricature, but it is close to being the traditional picture of the old diplomacy in our American minds. That diplomacy was adapted to the service of princes; we found it unadapted to the service of the people.

Even our own diplomatic corps, with its former preponderance of wealthy Ivy League graduates, with its cosmopolitanism, and with the mystery of its secret operations, has seemed to us un-American. The sense of unfitness with which we have viewed it has given rise to political pressures that have tended at last to destroy it.

The question remains, therefore: What can take the place of the old diplomacy?

The conspiratorial diplomacy of princes and oligarchs was improper to a regime in which the people governed. The people cannot conspire; the public cannot conduct its affairs in private. This disability impressed Alexis de Tocqueville in the Eighteen Thirties as the fatal weakness of our democracy, which would prevent it from holding its own against the wily autocracies of the Old World.

Elihu Root concluded that the only solution was to eliminate the autocracies. Woodrow Wilson thought to make the world safe for a democratic diplomacy by requiring that all international negotiation be conducted in the public view.

Actually, the conduct by the democracies of their foreign affairs has generally represented a departure from strict democratic principles, a departure which was widely accepted as necessary. Today, however, our people appear less disposed than they once were to leave these matters to the discretion and good faith of the Executive.

But the direct and continuous determination of our foreign affairs is beyond the competence of the public or of their representatives in a legislature where responsibility is as widely diffused as it has come to be in our own. The issues are too ramified, too charged with emotion, too delicate, and too obscure for mass management. Moreover, as our Founding Fathers understood, the people as a whole are subject to waves of feeling which expose them to demagogy and lead them to mistake their own long-range interests.

The direct control of foreign affairs by the public is not without tragic precedent in the annals of history. The world's first democracy, Athens, when she had her one saving opportunity to make a favorable peace in the Peloponnesian War, could not take advantage of it because of the disability that attends the public conduct of diplomacy.

The governing body of Athens was the assembly, made up of all the Athenian citizens. Thucydides has reported how the Lacedaemonian envoys, come to sue for peace, asked the Athenian demagog, Cleon, to appoint commissioners with whom they could confer in private. Cleon, replying in front of the assembly, charged that their lack of "honest intentions" was demonstrated "by their refusing to speak before the people and wanting to confer in secret."

"The Lacedaemonians, seeing that, whatever concessions they might be prepared to made * * * it was impossible for them to speak before the multitude and lose credit with their allies for a negotiation which might after all miscarry * * * returned from Athens without having effected anything."

Thucydides is explicit in attributing the catastrophic defeat of the Athenian democracy at the hands of the Spartan autocracy to that progressive development whereby the determination of Athenian foreign policy became incidental to the domestic political maneuvers of rival demagogs.

There are those who see in the present international dissemination of official propaganda the new diplomacy of democracy. An official of our Government has referred to the activities of the Voice of America as representing "the direct approach in diplomacy. It is the very opposite to secret diplomacy."

But diplomacy is negotiation, and the legitimate purpose of negotiation is to make agreements. Do these interchanges over shortwave represent negotiation? Are they, in fact, undertaken for the fashioning of agreements?

The method of diplomacy is to calm the violence of international antagonisms, to mollify intransigence, to minimize differences, and to find common ground so as to establish conditions in which agreement becomes possible. But the propaganda war between us and our opponents is like the shouted exchange of insults between rival armies about to engage in battle. Such propaganda is directly antithetical to the purpose of diplomacy.

The mixing of diplomacy and propaganda, especially in a democracy, incurs a peculiar danger. What the Government says publicly to others may be determined less by the anticipated effect on those addressed than by the expected reaction of the voters at home. It is not often that this danger is as explicitly demonstrated as it was in our State Department's initial response to the offer by Communist China, last April, to negotiate the Formosan issue.

Our recent Formosan policy had aimed at the single objective of bringing the Chinese Reds to agree to negotiate. The policy committed us to war if it should fail to deter them from a course of action to which they were equally committed. As the weeks passed, it appeared to be failing.

Then the unexpected happened at the Bandung Conference, where various Asiatic nations brought such pressure on Communist China for a retreat that, at last, it acquiesced and agreed to negotiate.

The implicit abandonment by the Communist spokesman, Chou En-lai, of a position which had been maintained for 5 years—that the question of Formosa was internal to China—and his offer to negotiate with us constituted the virtual achievement of an objective for which we had risked war.

But the response of our State Department, issued on the day the Chinese offer was received, was so challenging as to constitute a rejection of the offer. It cast doubt on the sincerity of the Communists as Cleon had questioned the sincerity of the Lacedoaemonians. It specified the steps that Red China would be required to take "immediately" to demonstrate its good intentions "before the world" if it wished to have a negotiation. In making a further condition, which was likely to be unrealizable under the best of circumstances, the Department used the new language of Russian diplomacy, saying we would "insist" upon it.

The statement left our opponent no choice but to retreive his concession if he was to save his face. The next day Chou En-lai renewed the threat to take Formosa by force.

At this point Secretary Dullest returned to Washington from a holiday and reversed the Department's position. The President announced that a mistake had been made.

What accounted for this mistake?

"The official explanation for putting the statement out before Mr. Dulles' return," James Reston reported in the Times, "was that the Chinese Communists should not have the propaganda field all to themselves over the weekend." In other words, propaganda had usurped the place of diplomacy in our foreign office. Our blunder demonstrated the extent to which the professional diplomatists had disappeared or lost influence in the Department's councils.

The official explanation leaves us still, however, with a paradox. The statement was manifestly bad propaganda abroad. It lessened the confidence in us of our friends, especially those who had labored long behind the scenes to bring about the Communist concession. It made us appear to be the war party. Could our propagandists really have thought that it would recapture a propaganda advantage from the Chinese Communists?

For years, the State Department had smarted under the demagogic charge that it was "soft on communism." For years, its officials had heard every hint of negotiation attacked as "appeasement." Many who had been unmoved by this pressure were no longer on hand. Others had developed a protective impulse to bluster against communism in public and strike belligerent poses. This is not the first time there has been reason to believe that our officials were responding primarily to domestic political pressures, even when their response was at odds with the explicit purpose of our foreign policy.

At a United Nations meeting some years ago, a friendly delegate buttonholed one of our men to tell him that he was about to make a speech attacking us. He apologized in advance and asked that we not take seriously what he was going to say. "This speech," he said, "is strictly out the window." He meant by this that his speech was not designed for the assembly he was addressing but for his own public at home.

This is the danger of public diplomacy. This is the disability that threatens the public conduct of international negotiations in a democratic world.

It is not, however, a necessary disability. The example of Athens under Cleon is offset by the example of Athens under Pericles. Our own history, too, has furnished demonstrations of leaders who, because they could lead, did not have to follow.

If our negotiators are to serve our interests they must feel, as they sit across the table from the Communists, that they have a mandate from us to use their unfettered judgment in conducting our side of the negotiations. Otherwise they will be constantly looking back over their shoulders and they will be powerfully impelled to talk "out the window." They will not feel themselves free to exercise that art of diplomacy on which so much depends.

For the main rules of diplomacy are quite opposed to the rules of demagogy on the home grounds. However tough the diplomat may be underneath, he must advance his proposals in terms that minimize any difficulty in accepting them. If he accompanies them, instead, with bombast for the benefit of the domestic audience he will lessen the chance of getting them accepted.

When our negotiators want to win a concession from the adversary, they must generally find a formula that will save his face, and they must not boast of triumph to the voters back home. It may be good domestic propaganda to be seen with your foot on the other man's neck, but it is poor diplomacy.

Our negotiators must be wary of pushing the other side against a locked door, even for the sake of "propaganda advantage." It can be dangerous. They must be prepared to practice the first as well as the last term in the give-and-take equation, however they may be attacked at home for practicing any except the last.

No diplomat of the past ever functioned effectively when he did not have his master's confidence. Today, when the people are masters, that is still true. If we want our diplomacy to succeed, we must understand the problems of those who practice it for us and we must give them the assurance of our trust. A democracy is invincible only when its people have confidence in themselves and in their government, and when its leaders have the courage to do right.

The success of our diplomacy will depend at least as much on us, the American people, as on our diplomats. Our confidence, however, is only one element in the strength we can give to their hand at the conference table.

They would be dangerously weakened in the coming negotiations if ungoverned expectations on our part committed them to achieve a settlement no matter what. Once the Communist negotiators saw that our representatives did not dare go home empty-handed, the price of any settlement would soar. We must therefore temper our hopes, preparing our minds for the possible failure of negotiation to relieve international tensions.

Finally, let us not repeat our spectacular mistake of 1945. Let us not dismantle our military power in anticipation of a settlement that we have not yet got. Diplomacy offers no alternative to power; rather, it is a means by which power may realize its ends without war.

The Communist negotiators will surely have in mind the military forces available to us for the defense of freedom. If the effectiveness of those forces is increasing, they will be the more likely to want a genuine settlement. But if we are in process of reducing those forces, their game may well be to temporize, playing us like a hooked fish until we are weak enough to be pulled in.

In sum, our duty in the coming negotiations is: (1) To unite in giving our negotiators the moral support that frees them for the practice of an effective diplomacy; (2) to remain sober in our expectations; and (3) to make sure that we still maintain and develop that military strength on which any possibility of a constructive settlement depends.

Good Government on Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a first-hand report on conditions on present-day Formosa by Walter T. Ridder, of the St. Paul Dispatch. The Communists and their dupes did a thorough job of discrediting the Nationalist Government of China in the postwar years as it struggled with problems of exhaustion, infiltration, disorganized communications, the lawlessness developed during 8 years of Japanese invasion—problems beyond its power to cope with successfully. On Formosa the problems have involved 10 million people instead of 500 million—a reduction of 98 percent in magnitude. With American support and assistance of a kind it did not receive on the mainland, the Nationalist Government has been able to pull itself together in the resilient way so characteristic of the Chinese race. It deserves full recognition for its success in becoming one of the best governments anywhere in Asia today.

The article follows:

FORMOSA OFFICIALS CITE END OF GRAFT

(By Walter T. Ridder)

TAIPEI.—Only a few moments conversation with any Free Chinese official reveals obvious pride in the present government. Sensitive to criticisms leveled during their tenure on the Chinese mainland, they take pains to point out to the casual visitor that many of past weaknesses have been entirely or substantially rectified.

They hammer most insistently on the theme that corruption among government and army officials has disappeared. During the hectic days which led to ousting of the Nationalists from the mainland, the most devastating foreign criticism of Chiang Kai-shek's regime revolved around its inefficiency, graft, and corruption.

"That's all changed now," any Chinese Government official will tell you at the first opportunity, and their claims are backed up by competent foreign observers. Government moneys, as far as can be ascertained by the foreign visitor, are scrupulously handled. The days when each official took what he considered to be his share as the moneys filtered downward are said to be over. In this, the government rejoices and the visitor is promptly told of what is, after all, a fairly new phenomenon on the Chinese scene.

The Nationalist Chinese are proud of the land reform program which they enacted here after their flight from the mainland. Here again, qualified foreign experts say they have every right to point with pride at their agrarian reform.

The so-called "Land to the Tiller" program did actually get much of the land into the hands of those who cultivate and work it. Those who know about such matters say the land reform program here compares more than favorably with those undertaken in other countries and it has become a kind of model for others to study. No visitor can be here for more than a few hours without being made aware of Formosa's land reform.

The Nationalist Chinese are proud of the standard of living maintained on this island. For Asia, it is high. The island produces quite enough food for its inhabitants and has enough rice left over for export—mostly to Japan. In addition, excess sugar is shipped to other parts of the world. American economic aid helps maintain the relatively good living standards, but Chinese declare they make the most of this benevolent island.

They speak of relative economic equality. "There are no rich," one government official explained. "The gap between those reasonably well off and the poor is smaller here in Taiwan (as Formosa is known to the Chinese) than any other place in the Far East."

That statement is probably true. There are conspicuously few vestiges of wealth here. The top government officials, except perhaps President Chiang Kai-shek, lead by any standards simple lives. One gets the impression they are embarrassed by the very simplicity of their living quarters and their mode of life.

"We have no way in which to entertain foreigners," is a refrain heard more than once from those who in days gone by were able to entertain in the most lavish style. Those in a position to judge say the austerity imposed by the leading figures here is real and not something merely staged for the benefit of itinerant Americans.

Another thing of which the people here are proud is, curiously enough, the lack of beggars. Almost everyone to whom one speaks mentions in one context or another that in Formosa people have enough to eat and don't therefore have to beg. Normally in the Far East, the streets are filled with mendicants and the Nationalist Chinese take pleasure in contrasting their country with other Asiatic nations.

The absence of beggars probably stems in part from deliberate Government policy and to a larger measure from the fact that practically no unemployment exists. No one is starving and while a vast number of what is called underemployed live on the island, nearly everyone gets enough to eat.

Judged from the number of times in which the statement has been made, the Nationalist Chinese are proud that your wife can walk any street in any city in Taiwan at any time of day and night and not be molested.

In that statement, the Nationalists differentiate their country from the rest of Asia where the crime rate is notoriously high.

The Government is proud that it is run under democratic principles. Free elections, they say, are held and anyone who wishes can run and be elected—if he polls enough votes. As the outstanding example of that, the present mayor of Taipei, the island's largest city, is trotted out. In the last election, he opposed the incumbent, a Government party man, yet he won the post. This amply proves, the free Chinese repeatedly say, that their Government is indeed a democracy, for candidates do not need the blessing of Chiang to win office.

Throughout the statements which explain the reforms runs the spoken or unspoken thought: "If only we had done this on the mainland."

The effort to make Formosa a model republic (and it appears to be a sincere effort) is at one and the same time noble and tragic. Noble because a people with their backs against the wall are refusing to strike their colors; are building for a future which they see only hazily before them; tragic because they obviously are plagued by the thought it all might have been different had they done all these things sooner.

Address of H. Vincent Strout Upon the Occasion of the 180th Anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address of H. Vincent Strout upon the occasion of the 180th anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill:

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

(Address by H. Vincent Strout, P. C., delivered at the 37th annual night before banquet of Bunker Hill Post, No. 26, the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, in commemoration of the 180th anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill, June 16, 1955)

Tradition has established a definite oratorical pattern (to which I must confess past adherence) that at this annual observance the essential element of each speaker's remarks should contain a summary of the valorous deeds which were perpetrated on this very site 180 years ago tonight and tomorrow. Often have we heard the recitation of those stirring events, and, on each occasion, we have marveled not only at the daring endeavor but at the magnificent achievement of an undisciplined rabble in arms in wresting a moral victory of such magnitude from a mercenary army.

But this evening, ladies and gentlemen, I do not purpose to conjure an image of a homespun-clad yeomanry huddled in defiance beneath their earthwork ramparts, nor extol the bravery of Warren, the steadfastness of Prescott, the stubbornness of Putnam, nor the vainglory of Pitcairn. This evening I should like to assume the role of iconoclast and break with established tradition. I prefer not to respond to the toast "The Day We Celebrate," but rather "Why We of the American Legion Celebrate This Day." Gaze about you. Reflect on the faces you see. Ask yourself what connection those here assembled have with an event almost 200 years old which, with the passage of time, has been relegated to its proper niche in the chronicles of history. And, with inner reflection, consider why this post of the American Legion, membership in whose ranks, unlike the Sons of the American Revolution, the Order of the Cincinnati, and their confederated groups, is not predicated on lineal descent from those revolutionary patriots, has ordained this day as its primary feast and consecrated itself to its proper observance.

For a clearer concept of such selfless dedication, it is necessary to attain an insight into the fundamental tenets of this organization which its founding fathers, with wisdom and deliberation, embodied in the basic assertion of its organizational aims and principles; the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion. For therein in the initial four words "For God and country" is contained not only a spiritual dedication but a declaration of human rights as well. The impetus given to these principles by its members on a national and international scope for the past 37 years has resulted in the defamation of the American Legion and has caused the very name to become anathema to the starry-eyed parlor pinks and quasi-intellectuals who conceive of themselves as the self-appointed redeemers of mankind.

But there can be no denial, my friends, of the positive role enacted by this organization in the almost four decades since its inception in alerting the governments and citizens of the world to the incipient perils to our basic freedoms. Who can deny the Legion's advocacy of the development of airpower and its defense of Billy Mitchell? Or its denunciation of the Fascist rise to power in Germany and Italy and the attendant evils? Or its demand for the augmentation of national defense through the expansion of America's armed might? And, last but not least, its exposé of the ultimate aims of world communism and the insidious subterfuges utilized by its agents in subverting lawful government? And while rendering these services, it has cosistently sustained its primary purpose, the care of the maimed and disabled, the widowed and orphaned, and the enactment of improved statutory legislation in the field of veterans' affairs.

And even today in this age of international revulsion at the degradation of human dignity behind the so-called Iron and Bamboo Curtains, the American Legion is constantly chided for the retention of high moral values. Less than 2 weeks ago on the rostrum of an English auditorium, the man whom 1 year ago the members of this organization chose to guide their destiny, Seaborn P. Collins, of Las Cruces, N. Mex., the national commander of the American Legion, was publicly upbraided and censured by Lord Louis Mountbatten, Earl Mountbatten of Burma, Britain's First Lord of the Admiralty, official guardian and preceptor to Elizabeth's consort, the Duke of Edinburgh, and unofficial spokesman for the British Crown, for having the audacity to berate his British comrades in arms for their tacit acceptance of the Communist conspiracy and their abject complacency in the face of impending international disaster. From the context of his statement, it would appear that the august First Sea Lord envisions veterans' activity as a synthesis of social ping teas, private club privileges, and annual reunions for the embellishment of tall tales. But what Lord Louis, in the austerity of his political preeminence, has chosen to forget is that complacency is the handmaiden of tyrannical design and that by civic apathy men become pawns of the masters of political intrigue. We cannot and will not accept such facts.

And so tonight we gather in the cradle of freedom in commemoration of freedom's birth. And now or in the future, wherever or whenever, this Legion of Americans bands

together in solemn tribute to our sacred dead, it is done in perpetuation of the American ideal and for the education of our youth in the American heritage. So long as this be so, the Government established here and since nurtured so zealously shall endure, political cleavages shall be maintained in their proper perspective, and equitable justice shall prevail. For all of which, we may humbly and revently say, "Thank God."

Freedom's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, we can never convey with full adequacy the full meaning of July 4 as the date of birth of our national freedom. In an editorial in the East Side News of July 2, Harry H. Schlacht has gone far to dramatize its meaning.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the editorial:

FREEDOM'S BIRTHDAY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Fourth of July is freedom's birthday. It is a glorious day. It is an immortal day. It is our national holiday.

It is the day that our birth certificate as a Nation was signed. It is the 179th anniversary of our Declaration of Independence. For the blessings of liberty have sprung from God and are enshrined in the hearts of His children.

Our sacred document recognized the principle that all men are created equal. It declared that man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. It was a fearless arraignment of tyranny. It was the bold assertion of the rights of man. It was indeed soul of the Liberty Bell.

It pealed like a trumpet blast throughout the world. It roused men and women to thought and to action. It was the fulfillment of the prayers of every living soul.

Here was a land where liberty is the property of every man. Here was a land where freemen dare to think, to speak, and to write their convictions. Here was a land where every man dares to go from any schoolhouse to any church house. Here was a land where every man is a peer and where no man dares to wear a crown.

The pillars of all races and creeds came to our shores. They drank deep from the fountain of liberty. They helped to forge and build a new civilization. They fought and died that liberty might live—that our flag might be unstained. They fought so that all men underneath its fold shall bear no chains, and that no man shall sigh for freedom while a single star shines in the heavens. It was truly God's country.

Nature throughout the centuries has created great intellect to serve the purposes of an all-wise Creator in shaping the destinies of the human race. The accomplishments of these noble minds stand out upon the pages of world history like the snow-capped peaks of the lofty mountain range upon the vast expanse of the continent.

It seems that our sainted heroes of the Revolutionary era have been the chosen instruments of God to guard our country in all its strength and glory. Today we yearn to grasp the spirit of their great intellects. Today we yearn to hear the accents of their thrilling utterances. Their every thought is vivified and enlarged. Rays of immortality flame around us. And our whole being bows to the majesty of their mighty minds.

Our hearts are stirred by the echo of their words. Our hearts are lifted with ennobling inspiration.

Their words are as immortal as their immaculate glory. Their words will live in history as the guns of Lexington and Bunker Hill. Indeed, their names beam upon us from the heavens above, and like celestial luminaries shine forever in our pathway.

America has become the worldwide synonym for truth, charity, justice, liberty, and equality. American sons and daughters have fallen on every battlefield where the inherent rights of free people have been challenged since the birth of our Nation.

What a travesty of a glorious past, of a precious present, and a hopeful future to exchange a government in possession of such honors for an alien system that would imperil her masses upon the vanishing sands of time.

Our homes within this fair land are the sacred precincts across whose threshold tyrants and demons of destruction should fear to tread.

We can hear today the message of the Liberty Bell. We can hear her say: I am what you believe me to be. I am all that you believe I can be. I am the faith upon which our Nation was reared. I am the faith for which we fought. I am the epic of America. I am the splendor of the American dream.

I stand for the noblest traditions of mankind. I stand for the protection of all who love liberty. I stand for dignity, honor, and equality. I stand for peace throughout the world.

May the God of our fathers ever shield us. May He ever trust us through shadow and sun. May He ever guide us. May He ever unite us. May He never divide us. May He keep us, the many, in one.

The Pursuit of Truth To Make Men Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body an address delivered by the Reverend Edward J. Drummond, S. J., academic vice president of Marquette University, at a dinner marking the beginning of the university's 75th anniversary celebration.

Father Drummond's remarks center on the theme chosen by Marquette University for her anniversary year: the Pursuit of Truth To Make Men Free. They are deeply penetrating, and informative. I commend them earnestly to the attention of my distinguished colleagues:

THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH TO MAKE MEN FREE

Pere Marquette was born on June 1, 318 years ago, and Jesuit educational tradition is almost a century older. But the history of universities is older still and before there were universities, scholars had gathered around wise men in Athens and in Alexandria. These scholars, whether attracted by the wisdom of a single man or gathered into the early universities, were concerned with the pursuit of truth. If they did not profess that this pursuit was formally aimed at making men free, nevertheless they would have been, it appears to me, quite willing to accept that as one statement of their objectives.

Marquette University, which is just beginning her 75th anniversary, is young as an institution; but she has a history and a heritage that go beyond her own first days. When asked to describe her work, she has written down, "The pursuit of truth to make men free," and taken this as the theme for her anniversary year. It should deepen our appreciation of the great tradition of higher learning and our understanding of our specific characteristics if we talk a bit about each of those words, "pursuit," "truth," "men," "free."

PURSUIT

A pursuit is a quest—therefore, eagerness; it is a quest by many—therefore, cooperative. It calls for patience and humility. We must be willing, as it has been said, to sit down humbly before a fact like a child. Carlyle, when told that Margaret Fuller had said she was willing to accept the universe, wryly remarked, "Gad, she'd better."

This pursuit implies the wish and the deed to practice a kind of celibacy so far as goals like wealth and power are concerned in order to devote oneself more fixedly to education, to a field within it. For the pursuit which marks the scholar is as warmhearted as a lover's and as steady as a star's. Where it has existed, schools have flourished; and where it has weakened and died, schools have died, no matter what alumni or legislatures say or do.

Men of wealth have helped to found universities; popes and kings and presidents have granted them special status and privileges. But ultimately it is the dedication to the pursuit of truth which creates the university; it is the scholar which makes the institution. And this is true whether we recall the royal foundations at Oxford and Cambridge or the Jesuit schools which dotted Europe during the 17th and early 18th centuries. In our own country where Americans have always tended to look on education as the eighth sacrament, there has been strong support from public funds for our State institutions, and private benefactors have assisted great institutions of learning. John Harvard and Ezra Cornell have given to universities which bear their names; the Johnston family has more anonymously served Marquette. Our debt is great to the Johnstons and all our generous friends, but our debt is also great to the scholars and those who have pursued wisdom; in the classroom and out of it, men like Rigge, Burrowes, Spalding, Corpus, McCormick have helped to build Marquette.

TRUTH

What is this truth to which the scholar is committed, for which the university organizes its quest? In a sense, it might seem to the outsider that the university dichotomizes reality and finds legal truth in buckram volumes, medical truth in test tubes, social truth in statistics. But it is not truth itself which is dichotomized; it is rather that the university professes no area of reality to be foreign to her search.

Truth itself, however, is more simple and profound than the proliferated questings which a large university may undertake. Truth is a relation between the knowing mind and the object. It is essentially involved with being; we know when we can say "is." There is a relative side to our knowing, for not all our knowing is certain and all of it is limited and finite. Nevertheless, truth is concerned with absolutes, eventually and ultimately. So also must be our knowing or the pursuit of truth becomes a ghost-chasing game.

Truth is a relation, and only I can know it for me. No human being can find truth

and give it to me as you might feed a baby or pass our pamphlets or mimeographed notes. Although we possess truth as individuals, it can hardly be pursued profitably and efficiently in complete isolation. One of the complaints of the scientist today about the restricted nature of information concerning nuclear physics is the loss of cooperative efforts in the pursuit of physical truth. In many areas of research teamwork has become almost a strict necessity. And on the part of the learners, the students, the community aspect of learning is just as important. Newman said that if he were building a university the first thing he would build would be the common room. Vae solis in the pursuit of truth.

A university can embrace many disciplines because there is an ultimate unity; there is only one truth. Truth cannot contradict itself or ultimately we have have "is" arrayed against "is not." In that case there would only be a world of unintelligibility and of nothing. Nevertheless, man must seek truth in the way he can. And that is why he divides it into different disciplines and professions within a university and why we have faculties of law, of medicine, of theology, of arts, and the like.

And there are different orders of truth. There is the truth we know naturally, by our own pure efforts, so to speak; and there is supernatural truth which we know only because God gave it directly. Yet there is still only a single truth; there is, if you will, only one revelation. Some facts God reveals indirectly by giving us this cosmos to know and our minds by which to know it. And there is His direct revelation which He made through His own special instruments—the Scriptures, the prophets, the Church.

It is not my purpose to become formally theological. But it is my purpose to emphasize that Marquette is a university which can concern itself with the whole range of intelligibility, the whole gamut of truth, the total of all that is. A technical school by its commitment does not profess to be able to undertake research in, nor communication of, the fine arts nor of law and medicine; it confines itself to the truth in the area of the pure and applied physical sciences. Some universities, because of their historical heritage, the fact or interpretation of positive law, or the development of their own institutional epistemology, have limited themselves to that "is" which can be known naturally. Theoretically, that limitation is satisfactory so long as it is understood that such institutions do not profess to commit themselves to the pursuit of all possible truth in its fullest range. Practically, this limitation raises other problems which I do not wish to develop here and at this time. But I do say that at Marquette we can count it among our blessings that this university can pursue truth full circle and embrace all its 360 degrees.

MAN

The simple fact is that man, compared to the visible world around him, is unique. Sophocles sang about his singular qualities; literature, before and since Antigone, in dwelling on the glory and on the tragic side of man has but spelled out this fact of singularity. He is made to the image of God, for he can think and he can say, "I will."

He is not dwarfed when compared to giant reds seen through the telescope at Palomar nor lost in the maze discovered through the electron microscope. If he has existence like a stone, organic growth like a tree, sensitive awareness like a dog, he has more than just the ability to develop callouses on two rather than four of his extremities. He can get at reality and do something about it. He can possess something of what is with his mind, and he can possess something of reality with his will; he can know, become wiser; he can want, desire, love.

Man is a microcosm. He is partly matter and partly spirit, but he is neither angel nor orangutan. He has his economic side, and though economics is a mighty motive in the acts of individuals and of society, there is no purely economic man. He is an individual with rights and responsibilities which he can neither forswear nor be deprived of; yet he is a social being and must live with other men. Man has a composite nature; in understanding his composite nature, he must recognize that there is a duality, that there is a natural and supernatural order, that his destiny is not completely explained in terms of the nitrogen cycle nor his days fully numbered by carbon 14.

Man cannot overlook nor deny any of his multi-faceted character and live his full life. He must be aware that his cultural and genetic roots thrust far back into history and his future arcs into eternity. And if he oversimplifies anything of his composite nature, he becomes an unrealist. That on the side of knowing and of truth. Nor can he over look nor deny any of his multiplied reality without losing something of his freedom in his denial. If he ties up an arm or covers up his eyes, he neither increases his knowledge nor his freedom.

Man is a microcosm, but what makes him essentially man is not his being an unfeathered biped dependent upon an inherited genetic structure which is complicated and qualified by policemen, cycles of supply and demand, billboards and commercials, osmotic pressure, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Man can think and man can will, even of these are not unlimited powers. Man can lay hold of truth with his mind, fumblingly, haltingly—yes—but, within limits, firmly and certainly. Furthermore, in part, man achieves his own destiny. If he keeps conformed to reality by his intelligence, he can choose to maintain that conformity by his will. The more he knows of reality, the more he freely chooses to conform to it, the more he really is a man.

A university can assist man to understand the complex composite that he is. It can develop more widely the known truth in the biological sciences, and in sociology, history, in economics. It can assist him to know more and more of himself and all reality through the humanities, through philosophy, and theology. By providing that knowledge for man, the university is providing a basis for man to act with fuller freedom. What aids man to know the truth, what aids him in keeping himself free to commit himself to the whole of truth and reality, aids him in matters paramount.

FREEDOM

Of course, there is always the problem of meddling. Meddling is halfway between kibitzing and real constraint. Men do not like meddling because they like to be free; they want to do things their own way, as they see them. You can make a man do something, but that does not mean you can make him like it. Nothing can make a man wish to do something he does not wish to do. That is the essence of being a man and of being free.

Many of man's actions are automatic and many are only partly free. But we do have some free choices. We know in some things that we are acting quite freely, doing our own deciding. Moreover, we can see real alternatives, whether to do this or that—drink beer or scotch or go dry. All this is to say that man has the power of freedom. Today freedom is a good word; just as subversive, divisive, and egghead today are bad words. But freedom is more than a good word; it is a good thing. The more man is really free, the more he is a man. Right here, however, some wrong notions can quite literally cramp man's proper style. Thus, the way to stay free is to keep from really committing yourself. Once you've decided, you've done it; you're no longer free to decide. Worse, because truth is so slippery, you're probably wrong besides. So the pursuit of truth becomes a game of musical chairs, and freedom is the power to sit on the edge of your seat and be ready to run.

One of our colleagues has lined up this question and its answer very well. "An open mind," he wrote, "is an excellent thing, like an open mouth. But mouths were made to close on food and minds on truth. We cannot be openminded about the multiplication table, nor should we be openminded about the one we love. Certainly when we we choose to love we've lost the power of making that choice again. What of it? We have gained the beloved, and I take it that it is better to have than not to have. To commit ourselves, this is excellent."

But we must make sure the commitment is right. We choose the good and by choosing make it our good. Nevertheless, it is not a real good unless we have chosen reality. To know the truth will not make a man good, and a man may be good without being a learned man. Still a man cannot direct his desires fully toward reality and square himself with it unless he does know the truth. The more he knows of reality, other things being equal, the more he can exercise his freedom properly so that, seeing reality, he can choose it and make it his.

There is a delicate balance and interrelationship between will and intellect, for they are powers born and rooted in the same person, the individual man. Man the knower will not know fully unless he loves and is attracted by and wants the truth, unless he pursues it. He cannot be a neutralist toward the truth and regard it coldly and sterilely. Man, if he is to continue to be man and not something else, must always seek reality, intently, intelligently, and when he has found it, commit himself to it.

A university pursues truth so that men may be able to see reality in more and more accurate detail, so that men can understand economic reality and not be caught up in useless strife, senseless and selfish manipulation of trade—so that men can understand the laws of health and more and more be free from the inroads of disease—that more and more they may comprehend their individual and social natures, and neither regard society purely as their instrument and creation nor develop a society which looks on individual persons as its creatures or tools. So for all the rest, up to theology where the university scholar, the theologian, discusses the data of revelation in order that men may understand more and more of this reality and freely accept it.

The university in its concern with the further development of the known truth and with its communication must realize that it cannot be neutralist, not merely toward the truth, for that were to negate its very objective, but not neutralist toward the good. For the university is made up of persons, the learner and the learned, and in these persons the powers of mind and will strongly influence each other; psychology and common observation make this clear. Moreover, even if a neutralism were possible psychologically, it would not be possible ontologically. Men decide their ultimate destiny and write their personal failure or success with their wills. No community of persons may be unconcerned about that.

Nevertheless, a university's first concern is with truth. Not that a university believes knowledge of itself will make a man good; rather a university's commitment to develop and communicate what is known is the specific sign distinguishing its work and marking it off. Why this concern and commitment? Because knowledge befits man, because it is better than ignorance. More than that, because the work of a university properly done assists man to see more clearly that which is good, choose it more freely, and

avoid being fooled into choosing something less than reality.

Marquette University, as she steadily and eagerly pursues the whole truth can help all its members, those inside the university as well as the communities it serves, to know and to be free. This is a great thing not only because it aids them to know and thus to maintain their freedom, the greatest human good, but because in assisting them to see reality steadily the university is ultimately aiding them to see and to accept freely the greatest good, the Summum Bonum, which is God.

Address by Matthew J. Cuffe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the following address by Matthew J. Cuffe who very ably exposes to the American people this fraud being practiced in the name of reciprocal trade:

ADDRESS BY MATTHEW J. CUFFE, PRESIDENT, AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE TEXTILE EXPORT ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK CITY, JUNE 15, 1955

Since our last annual meeting there has been little change in the volume or direction of export trade in American cotton and synthetic piece goods but there has been a profound change in the forces likely to influence our overseas business in the years ahead. Probably the most important and, at the same time, the most depressing change lies in the announced policy of our Government to smooth the path for our principal competitor, Japan, not only in our domestic market but in foreign markets as well. The most significant demonstration of this policy was the pact negotiated at Geneva which was nothing more than an outright invitation to the Japanese industry to invade our market here.

I am somewhat familiar with foreign textile industries but I do not know of a single exporting nation which has been placed in such a grievous dilemma as ours by its own government. British markets in recent months have been inundated by a flood of Indian goods but the London government at least paid some recognition to the pleas of the Lancashire mills by eliminating the purchase tax and negotiating a new trade treaty with India. In short, the British Government has been trying to correct the ills that afflict the cotton industry although its attempts have fallen short of the expectations of the Manchester trade. On this side of the water the State Department has turned a deaf ear to all of our pleas and has embarked on a policy of encouraging imports of cotton textiles and discouraging exports. It is obvious that our industry will have to combat this destructive policy with the courage and fervor it displayed in the recent struggle over the reciprocal trade act.

In this struggle against what we regard as an utterly impractical and unrealistic trade policy, exporters of American textiles have stood shoulder to shoulder with the industries of which they are so essential a part. The stand we have taken has been assailed violently by those so ignorant of the facts of foreign trade that they have become nothing more than dupes for those whose personal interests lie in picturing Uncle Sam as the villain responsible for all of the economic ills of the world.

I must confess that when the reciprocal trade agreement program was first launched back in the early thirties some of us felt that the theory behind it was sound enough. It had not been in operation very long before we began to wonder if a new definition of the word "reciprocal" had been coined and if we had been using the wrong dictionary. As far as the textile industries are concerned, the reciprocal trade program has been a one-way street from which we have derived no discernable benefit. At the present time there are more barriers such as exorbitant tariffs, quotas, and outright embargoes against the international flow of textiles than at any time in the 20th century. As a matter of fact, the volume of international trade in cotton goods for the last 10 years has lingered at 70 to 75 percent of prewar volume despite the increase in world population and the substantial rise in purchasing power in a number of countries.

Last fall we had occasion to analyze the operation of the program. Dr. Murchison, our speaker here today, asked us to check our records and supply him with a detailed report of our experiences under the program. This information was incorporated in a brief which Dr. Murchison presented at a hearing conducted by the so-called Committee for Reciprocity Information. With your permission, I would like to summarize some of the highlights of this report.

In 1947, the first year of GATT, when our tariff structure was being revised, in the interest of world trade, our exports amounted to a billion-and-a-half yards. Since then they have rapidly declined to 600 million square yards per annum. During the lifetime of the GATT the United States has lost about two-thirds of its textile export trade. While this has been our reward as the most generous Nation in granting tariff concessions, the other net exporting countries have accomplished rapid recovery, both in production and trade. Japan, India, Western Europe as a unit, and the United Kingdom have all swept ahead of the United States in export volume.

The tariff concessions received by the United States have been for all practical purposes confined to a few net importing countries; that is, countries whose domestic production is inadequate for home requirements. Most of them were negotiated directly, although 2 or 3 were received indirectly, in whole or in part, as the result of generalization under the most-favored-nation principle.

In 1948 the Tariff Commission reported glowingly: "Concessions on cotton cloth have been obtained from 11 countries * * * the concessions (on the 1939 basis) accounted for about 66 percent of the exports of cotton cloth." We cannot identify the entire group without detailed research through the voluminous protocols of GATT, but the more important members appear to be Australia, Canada, Cuba, Guatemala, Indonesia (tarpaulins), Mexico, and the Union of South Africa.

Of these, only Canada has made its concessions fully and continuously effective. Australia for several years has virtually embargoed American textiles. Cuba, at Torquay, renegotiated her concessions and substituted for them the highest rates ever imposed on her textile imports. Indonesia is under a program of rigid controls and acquires her textiles from Japan. Mexico withdrew from GATT to launch a program of trade restrictions and higher duties.

The Union of South Africa has been spasmodic, utilizing as a basic policy a system of import licensing and exchange allocations, but with occasional and limited relaxations. It recently upped tariffs on many types of cotton goods.

In the last 12 months additional restrictions in the form of higher tariffs, quotas, or embargoes were imposed on American textiles by Mexico, Honduras, Costa Rica, Colombia, French Morocco, Nicaragua, Chile, Peru, and Venezuela. I do not know of a single country which liberalized its restrictions on American cotton goods in the past year.

In view of the outcome of GATT bargaining, one wonders how the United States has maintained its export trade even at the greatly reduced current level. The answer is that with the exception of Canada, which has observed its concessions, and the exception of the Philippines whose trade with us is on a special treaty basis, United States exports have had to overleap increasingly high trade barriers, and be content with a diminishing number of substantial foreign markets. Of the 156 million square yards exported in the first quarter of the current year, 120 million went to Canada, Philippines, Cuba, Indonesia, Union of South Africa, and Venezuela.

Because of the long and intimate trade relationship between the United States and Cuba, the tariff actions of Cuba at Torquay against American textiles came as a specially stunning blow. They were carried out with the consent and approval of our State Department and took the form of drastically higher duties not only on the fabrics made by the Cuban industry, but on a wide range of textiles which they do not produce. Cuba has again notified the State Department that she intends to press for higher tariffs at the forthcoming Geneva Conference. If the success she achieved at Torquay is any criterion, then Cuba will probably get everything she asks for and give nothing in return. American cottongrowers may be interested in knowing that in 1938, a year of worldwide depression and low purchasing power, cotton consumption in Cuba averaged 6.4 pounds per person. By 1953, the last year for which official United Nations data are available, a very prosperous period in Cuba, it had dropped to 5.1 pounds per person. In the same period consumption in the United States rose from 21.1 pounds per person to 27.6 pounds, and in Canada from 14.1 pounds to 16.5 pounds. The drop in Cuba can be attributed to the Torquay Conference which pushed prices on imported textiles beyond the reach of the average Cuban consumer who had to curtail his purchases.

Last October we decided to analyze the landed cost of key fabrics at selected Latin American ports. Among these fabrics was the 80 square printed percale, which is the most important of all cotton textile items in terms of volume. At that time the price here was 27.5 cents per yard. The landed cost of this fabric ran as follows in these markets: Cuba, 42 cents; Dominican Republic, 49 cents; Guatemala, 42.5 cents; Honduras, 34 cents; Haiti, 36 cents; Venezuela, 69.5 cents; Costa Rica, 40.5 cents; Peru, 46.1 cents. The duty on this same fabric entering the United States is 20¾ percent ad valorem on foreign valuation.

The United Nations report to which I referred also contains data as to cotton consumption in most of the countries of the world. Central and South America are of particular interest to us. In 1938 cotton consumption in this enormous market averaged 6.2 pounds per person. By 1953 it had dropped to 5.9 pounds. In Asia per capita consumption in 1953 averaged 4.2 pounds. In 1953 the figure was 3.7 pounds. Australia in 1938 consumed on an average of 10.3 pounds per person. In 1953 it was 5.9 pounds.

We cite these figures to prove our long-time contention that the commercial policies of our Government insofar as textiles are concerned are not based on an intelligent appraisal of worldwide trade conditions. United States is normally and naturally a net exporting country insofar as cottons and rayons are concerned. We believe that the

problems of international textile competition can be solved only through a concerted effort to expand worldwide cotton consumption. The major condition of such an objective is the reduction of trade barriers against cotton goods by those countries whose domestic production is inadequate to their needs. This objective cannot be met by increasing imports into the United States which is already a country of overabundance throughout the whole range of textile fabrics.

The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 Needs Prompt Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 26, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this time a very pertinent article, appearing in the May 14, 1955, issue of the American magazine, entitled "What Hope for the Escapees?" vividly pointing out the imperative need for early revision of the current Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so that the full Christian intent of this legislation may be more effectively and more efficiently realized.

The editorial follows:

WHAT HOPE FOR THE ESCAPEES?

Two dramatic reports in the New York Times, dated April 25 from Munich and April 26 from Nuremberg, underscore the plight of escapees from Iron Curtain countries as they languish in detention camps, waiting for clearance to enter the free countries of the world and particularly the United States.

These people have fled the satellites, often at the risk of their lives, mainly in the hope of asylum and help promised by the United States Refugee Act of 1953 (cf. America magazine May 7, p. 141). What happens? Though adequate visas are available under the act to bring to our shores hundreds of thousands of escapees, redtape is keeping the flow to a trickle. This is what the escapee in Bavaria faces:

"German investigation 3 months to 1 year; investigation by United States intelligence, 1 year; investigation by United States consulate, 6 to 9 months; obtaining promise of support and employment in the United States, 1 to 2 years, if at all * * *. The waiting time stretches into years."

Communist propaganda has not been slow to move into this heartbreaking situation. The Times reports state that within the past months an intensive program has been building up to persuade the internees that they will be given jobs and other assistance if they return home. Refugee leaders in Munich estimate that as high as 25 percent of Czech refugees are already negotiating their return home.

This drive by the Communists throws a most embarrassing spotlight on the heartlessness of our refugee program as now administered. It is dealing us a diplomatic defeat. It should be a reminder to President Eisenhower that it is utterly unrealistic merely to state, as he did in his news conference on April 27, that he "endorses revision of the restrictive refugee law." There was no evidence, says the report that gave that Presidential quote, "that the White House was ready to suggest specific amendments to Congress."

Refugees waiting for freedom will no doubt be happy to hear that "revision is endorsed." But unless they hear soon that definite and effective action is to be taken, who can blame them if they go home?

We Cannot Afford To Treat the Russian Bear as a Playful Kitten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an address I delivered July 2, before the 62d annual convention of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, held at the Sheraton Park Hotel, in Washington, titled "We Cannot Afford To Treat the Russian Bear as a Playful Kitten":

It is a pleasure for me to join with the Armenian Revolutionary Federation in this, its 62d annual convention. The cause of Armenia is well known to the American people, and the never ending struggle of the Armenian people for their national independence is a matter of inspiration to all those of us who have come to know about it.

The cause of Armenian independence is of unusual importance today because its success or failure, will echo the success or failure of the cause of peace and human freedom.

During the past several months there have been a number of developments which bear an important relationship to the fight for Armenian national independence, and the struggle of all the captive non-Russian nations within the Russian Communist empire. Those developments are a natural outgrowth of the work done by the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress, whose chairman was our friend, CHARLES KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

The first of those developments came when 6 former members of the select committee in Congress introduced simultaneously on March 22, 1955, a resolution calling for the Secretary of State—

1. To instruct the United States Representative to the United Nations to transmit to each member nation of the United Nations copies of the summary report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, as well as copies of all other reports submitted to the House by such Select Committee;

2. To formulate a resolution, based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations contained in such House report, naming the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as an aggressor against the nations enslaved by communism; and

3. To instruct the United States Representative to the United Nations to take immediate steps to place such resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

This resolution was referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee and after a careful study of the matter, including a full opportunity for the career officers of the Department of State and others, to present their opinions on the resolution, the committee then approved it by a vote of 17 to 5. Our good friend, the very able Congressman from Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS DODD, played a major role in the preparation of the majority report accompanying his resolution on this matter which was numbered House Resolution 183. Many long time observers of the international scene have commended this resolution and the report which accompanied it, as the most significant political action taken against the international Communist conspiracy during the 38 years of its despotic reign.

House Resolution 183 was then referred to the Rules Committee, and a hearing was held. Mr. RICHARDS, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, together with Mr. DODD, and Mr. WALTER JUDD, and I, appeared in support of that resolution.

The spokesman for the well organized minority of four was Congressman VORYS, of Ohio. By an unfortunate turn of events, the spokesman for the minority presented a last minute letter signed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles requesting the rejection of this resolution on the basis that it would likely provoke the Russians, and therefore disturb the tranquility of the waters upon which the leaders of the Big Four expect to bask during their conference at the Summit. Equally unfortunate, but understandably, the House Rules Committee, upon receipt of the letter from Secretary of State Dulles, determined that further hearings would be held on the resolution.

Since these further hearings would involve the testimony of Secretary Dulles himself, it is very unlikely that any action will be taken on House Resolution 183 before the conference at the Summit because Secretary Dulles will not be available for such hearings.

Several weeks ago, on the occasion of my appearance at the Baltic States freedom rally in New York City, I expressed my concern that Secretary of State Dulles may have fallen under the influence of the tip-toe artists in the Department of State who have long advocated a policy of delicate diplomacy in dealing with the Russian autocrats. I made it clear that the same group who sabotaged the dynamic policies of President Truman were still in the career service of the Department of State, and that it appeared they would never learn that anyone who regards the Russian Bear as a playful kitten would soon fall under the gentle strangling embrace of the red-nosed Bear. I hope we will soon be able to rid our ship of state of these parasitic barnacles and that we will be able to launch an all-out political offensive against the international Communist conspiracy.

The Russian conspirators in the Kremlin consider House Resolution 183 to be a matter of major crisis for them. One development in recent days which demonstrates the importance they attach to that resolution is the following monitored broadcast of Radio Prague on June 21, this year:

"UNITED STATES SENATE RESOLUTION PROVOCATIVE

"CZECHOSLOVAKIA, June 21, 1955.—Certain United States politicians are doing everything possible to provoke a war as they are obsessed with the idea of war. Recently, these people succeeded in piloting through the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee a new, nonsensical, and provocative resolution. They want the United States Government to propose to the United Nations that the Soviet Union and her relations with the people's democracies be condemned.

"The purpose of this provocation is quite clear: Its authors want to poison and trouble the international atmosphere just before the beginning of the forthcoming four-power conference. They do not like the lessening of international tension achieved by the great and tireless efforts of the Soviet Government, and, for that reason, they would also like to drag the United Nation into their dark plans. However, there is an immense abyss between the plans of the United

States aggressive circles and the possibility of realizing these plans. Despite all the pressure in the Senate, four of its Members refused to support this provocative resolution.

"Assistant Secretary of State Morton also declared, by way of a warning addressed to United States Senators, that the United States might be isolated if it submitted the above-mentioned resolution to the United Nations. Morton also mentioned the nonexistent problem of the east European countries, which is so ardently propagated by some United States circles, and he made an interesting admission. He said that United States interventions about the people's democracies were worthless, because the nations of those countries were proud of the fact that their countries were independent, that their governments were freely elected, and that their relationship with the Soviet Union constituted a bond of friendship characterized by mutual respect for independence.

"These words uttered by Morton, therefore, confirm the fact that certain United States officials, for example, Mr. Dulles, although they submit for discussion to the forthcoming four-power conference the so-called problem of the east European countries, know full well that such a problem does not exist."

The compliments paid by the international Communist conspiracy to Assistant Secretary of State Morton, Congressman VORYS, and his three associates, to put it mildly and as gently as circumstances permit, is indeed dubious. To put it another way, the Kremlin, in its overanxiety over the telling effects of that resolution, has let the cat out of the bag.

I regret to say that there is a striking similarity between the monitored broadcast and some of President Eisenhower's answers during his most recent press conference, Wednesday. According to the New York Times, June 30, the White House authorized release of a transcript, and I quote therefrom:

Mrs. May Craig, of Maine papers: "Mr. President, in relation to Mr. Theis' question, the House passed last week, 367 to nothing, a resolution of Democratic Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, expressing sympathy with the satellites, condemning colonialism of all kinds, and asking that the United Nations and any organization in which we participated do what they could to release them.

"Did you favor that resolution? Did you know about that?

"Answer. As a matter of fact, I did not know about that. Maybe I was fishing that day. I don't know.

"Question. Three hundred and sixty-seven to nothing.

"Answer. Well, I still say that there are all-kinds of nuances in any such statement, possible complications, that make you very careful in uttering an official statement.

"For example, if you believe that, how far are you going? You are certainly not going to declare a war, are you? So there instantly you fix for yourself limitations on how far we, as a people, will go in accomplishing this thing.

"That means, therefore, that we use peaceful means and means that are not provocative. But we use moral suasion. We use refusal to be drawn into any seeming approval of such a situation. But we do place limits on ourselves instantly when we think about the thing. And so that means that there is a problem. It is not just as simple as just saying something and forgetting it."

I am sure, this must be for President Eisenhower a coincidence, but in any case, it is a very unhappy coincidence.

On May 31, the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives introduced House Concurrent Resolution 149 which condemns all forms of colonialism and imperialism and restates the support of the American people to the right of all people to national independence and national sovereignty. That resolution passed the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote of 376. This action on the part of the House of Representatives, speaking as it does for the American people, should give renewed hope to the hundreds of millions of non-Russian people enslaved within the Russian Communist empire as well as a new confidence that as sure as day follows night, the despotism of the Russians will be destroyed.

During the past week the House of Representatives had before it the 1955 Mutual Security Act. During the course of debate on this legislation, I offered two amendments, the object of which was to support the principles embodied in the McCormack resolution. I offered an amendment which required Tito and his henchmen to permit United States Representatives to make complete and continuous inspection of the manner in which all assistance received from the United States was used, including the utilization and possession of all military equipment we give to Tito.

I am happy to report that this amendment was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives and I trust will very soon bring us the final answer as to what Dictator Tito is really up to. By making complete and continuous inspection of all the assistance we give to the Communist leader, Tito, including the location and utilization of all the military equipment we have given and will continue to give to him, I am sure we will soon have the answer to that important question. It may shock you to know that the executive branch of this Government has not, up to now, carried on any thoroughgoing complete, or continuous inspection of what Tito has been doing with our assistance, including military end items.

I should also like to remind you that in the hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee having to do with economic and military assistance to Tito, the Republican administration put themselves clearly on record stating that it was essential that this assistance be given to the Communist dictator, Tito. I should also like to commend four members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who dissented, on the question of giving aid to the Communist dictator, Tito, and who submitted a minority report strongly recommending to all the Members of Congress that we stand firmly by our adherence to anticolonialism and antiimperialism, and that we reject all forms of communism, even the so-called national style of which Tito is the leader.

We, as a nation, are still suffering from a tremendous amount of ignorance concerning the international Communist conspiracy and the part the Russian imperialists play in that design for world conquest. While some improvement in our understanding of the crises of our time has taken place in recent years, I feel we have a very long way to go before we have established in the public mind the real force behind the scourge of international communism. When we have gotten across to the people of the United States, and to all the other people of the still free world, that the Russian despots who, under the czars, had a well developed plan of world conquest and who now, under the commissars, utilize the Pied Piper promises of Marx and Engels to further their diabolical scheme of world domain, we will have taken our most important step on the path to peace and freedom.

The effort which is made today to disguise the historical Russian involvement in the international Communist conspiracy must be exposed and ridiculed. We must return to the reality of the moral and political principles upon which the American way of life is based.

We must support without hesitation, and with fervor and determination, all those nations and people who adhere to and strive for those same moral and political principles. We must regard as an enemy the cause of peace and freedom, anyone who rejects those moral and political principles and who considers them inapplicable in the world in which we live today.

I know that you, as delegates of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, will continue the patriotic work which you have engaged in throughout the years and that you will increase your work of educating all the still free people on the facts concerning Russian imperial communism. In the performance of this urgently needed public service, you will have made a great contribution to the preservation of the American way of life.

May God give you strength and wisdom to succeed in that mission.

A Rational Policy on Waterpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower and his administration have made clear their position with regard to private and public power development. There is a proper and legitimate field for each. There are some projects so vast and extensive that they do not lend themselves to private development. On the other hand, where private initiative is able, willing, and anxious to cope with the problem, every opportunity should be afforded them to do so.

We have recently heard a lot about Dixon-Yates. Political effort has been exerted to make them words of opprobrium. The effort has failed. People throughout the Nation are more and more coming to realize that the President in this matter, as in so many others, has pursued the best policy for the Nation as a whole.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials from the Rochester Times-Union on this subject, as follows:

AS WE SEE IT—A RATIONAL POLICY ON WATERPOWER

Public power advocates have labored for 20 years to plant in people's minds the idea that the Nation has the responsibility to develop hydroelectric power with tax funds.

The idea has no basis in American tradition. Until 20 years ago the Government was in the power business only as a sideline to some other national purpose. But by constant repetition, drumming at the same theme, they have hoped to make the idea stick.

The Hoover Commission's report on water uses puts this idea into the perspective it has long needed.

Suppose, in a fit of absentmindedness, we go ahead and complete the projects now abuilding or authorized at a cost of $10 billion. Less than 10 percent of our population would benefit.

The 90 percent who would pay for these projects would go on developing their power by private investment.

New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania with 20 percent of the population pay one-third of the taxes and would get no benefit at all.

It is not and never was the responsibility of 90 percent of the people to provide tax-free power for the other 10 percent. And it certainly is not their responsibility to provide tax-supported competition for their own industry.

From this the remainder of the Hoover Commission's conclusions follow logically.

The Government should get out of dam-building where private, State, or municipal investment is available to do the job.

Existing projects like TVA should be required to finance themselves and their steam plants by their own bonds, not from the Federal Treasury.

They should be required to include in their rate base the taxes and financing costs that are required of private companies.

Preferential treatment on rates for municipalities and cooperatives should be ended. It is designed to destroy private investments.

Under such policies the Nation's water resources could be developed rationally, and the direct Federal interest in navigation, reclamation, flood control and irrigation would still provide some electric power as a byproduct.

MEMPHIS FINALLY ACTS

The reasons for President Eisenhower's order for a review of the Dixon-Yates contract to supply TVA's power shortage by private enterprise are revealing.

The city of Memphis notified the TVA Authority that it is erecting its own municipal power plant and that it would not need TVA power after 1958. This permitted the TVA to notify the President that it would not need added power to supply the Atomic Energy Commission's needs, so the President ordered a new look at the necessity for the private plant.

This seems to add up to the fact that so long as Memphis had any hope of getting Federal taxpayers to supply it with power, it would do nothing to supply itself. But when that hope vanished, it bestirred itself.

The need for more power arose when TVA could not supply its regional contracts and the AEC's new Kentucky plant at the same time. The public power lobby's solution was, of course, that the United States should build more steam plants for TVA.

Many months ago the President recommended that Memphis build its own plant, but nothing was done.

When it looked as if Dixon-Yates couldn't be blocked, Memphis acted, but not until. But the situation will bear watching. The public power lobby never gives up, and it still may be back wanting more Federal money for steam generators down there.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Parshall irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Parshall project is a part of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

One-Hundred-Dollar Award to Boston Newsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the Christopher News containing the story of an award to Boston newsman Anthony La Camera. I feel that his activities have done much in spotlighting attention on objectionable programs, and I wish to commend this article to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

ONE-HUNDRED-DOLLAR AWARD TO BOSTON NEWSMAN

Alert, constructive Christopher action on the part of one person is helping to rid Boston airwaves of offcolor tunes.

Early in December 1954, Mr. Anthony La Camera, radio-TV editor of the Boston Evening American, wrote his first article drawing attention to the "new low" of the music and record industry, especially in its approach to the Christmas season. The response was both encouraging and discouraging—some letters condemned him.

But week after week, he continued his drive on what he called "shabby songs." His city editor backed him with an editorial entitled "Music and Lyrics" in the March 12, 1955, issue of the paper.

Mr. La Camera's efforts seemed contagious. Soon other Boston papers joined the drive, and outside the Boston area, the newsman's sentiments were echoed.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

"Although the condition calls for regulation at the sources," Mr. La Camera wrote in one article, "that still does not absolve offending radio stations and disk jockeys from their grave responsibility in the matter."

Apparently, station managers and disk jockeys felt the same, because those in the Boston area got together to discuss the whole situation and "outlined a program for killing this profitable business of unprincipled recording companies and distributors."

This is a good example of trying to correct an evil from within. The elimination of offending records is being achieved "from within" by those whose business it is to deal with the music industry and its wares. When those with a high sense of purpose begin to swing into action within their own field of activity, the results are generally more lasting and better understood than if the "policing" action comes from outside.

HIS ENTHUSIASM WAS RESTRAINED

It is important to note in this particular case that Mr. La Camera kept a fine sense of proportion throughout his drive. In one of his columns he wrote:

"It is unfortunate that a few must give a black eye to the disk jockey profession because Boston has its share of conscientious, responsible deejays who wouldn't be caught dead with the trash spilled around by their self-seeking, indiscriminate confreres."

For his courageous and persevering action, the Christopher $100 Award for this month goes to Mr. La Camera. He has exemplified well what one person can do within an industry in the way of a little housekeeping, thus raising its standards.

Back to McKinley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of July 4, 1955:

BACK TO MCKINLEY

The Hoover Commission report on water resources and power is unlikely to make much impression on the administration, Congress, or the public. The reason is that the report, despite valid observations and criticisms, is so reactionary in its guiding philosophy as to be a wholly unworkable yardstick for present-day government. It would undo in one swoop many of the power and irrigation practices that have grown up over 50 years or more, and it would severely limit the role of the Federal Government in meeting future water development needs. This restrictive line forced the two administration representatives, Herbert Brownell, Jr., and Arthur S. Flemming, to object to many of the recommendations. It is difficult to refute the complaint of Congressman HOLIFIELD, whose dissent is almost as long as the main study, that the Commission's report is based on the investigation of a task force mainly inspired by preconceived ideas and personal predilections.

Unquestionably there has been, as the report points out, a vast duplication of effort between the various Federal water development and conservation agencies. It is doubtful whether the Government would save money by transferring the retention-dam functions of the Soil Conservation Service to the Corps of Engineers; the engineers have not been reticent in pushing ahead with their own high-cost projects. But certainly there is something askew when such agencies (including the Bureau of Reclamation) underestimate costs on major projects by as much as 50 percent.

Similarily, the Commission has a legitimate point in questioning the disparity of treatment between different sections of the country on Federal power and irrigation expenses and benefits. How great are the inequities is a matter of continual controversy; it always is necessary to ascribe somewhat arbitrary cost factors. This newspaper believes, however, that there are inequities, and it shares the Commission's conviction that taxpayers in one section ought not to be compelled to subsidize low-priced power for consumers in another section. For this reason we applaud the suggestion that Federal power projects be placed on a self-financing revenue bond basis as a partial remedy—though this of course could not be an inflexible rule.

But as a practical matter existing inequities will not be overcome by tying the hands of the Government and forestalling Federal development when private development is infeasible. The Commission, which incidentally had no public power representatives as members, exhibits an altogether doctri-

naire and punitive attitude toward existing public power arrangements. It would sharply increase power rates to consumers without any real showing of fact as to actual costs. It would severely hamper the sound policy of preferences to municipalities and cooperatives in publicly generated power. If we read the report correctly, it also would forbid Federal construction of transmission lines where private utilities could construct them, even though the private activity might be flagrantly uneconomic.

Commissioner James A. Farley summed up the situation well when he said (and his comment is similar to that of Messrs. Brownell and Flemming):

"The cumulative effect of the recommendations in this report come dangerously close to inviting an abdication by the Federal Government of its responsibilities to insure the proper development of the country's great natural resources.

"It is one thing to say that the Federal Government should not compete unnecessarily with soundly incorporated private utilities, and quite another to say that the Federal Government should be restrained in developing water resources for the people. Experience has shown that in many instances the works which must be constructed to conserve and utilize water and waterpower have been wholly beyond the financial capacity of State and local governments and have not attracted the investment of private capital."

Sooner or later the country will have to take a hard look at whether it is wise to bring in new high-cost irrigation land in view of the crop surplus problem, and whether Federal hydroelectric projects should be undertaken if private steam plants could produce power more cheaply. Such an examination will have to start, however, with the situation as it is today and not with a wistful look at how things might have been if different policies had been adopted 50 years ago.

Religion Big Factor in Sports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A sports column became a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the proceedings of the House of Representatives today.

Representative FRANK J. BECKER, Republican, New York, asked that the Sunday, July 3, column of Sports Editor Mike Lee, of the Long Island (Jamaica, N. Y.) Press be made part of the RECORD.

Lee's column pointing out the various sports champions who asked the intercession of Almighty God in their endeavors was referred to by the Long Island Congressman who is the sponsor of House Resolution 23 that would have the United Nations open their sessions with prayer at each meeting.

The Long Island Press sports editor quoted such outstanding figures in the world of sports as Jack Fleck, national open winner; Ed Furgol, Babe Zaharias, Sad Sam Jones, Rev. Bob Richards, Amos Alonzo Stagg, Biggie Munn, Joe Louis, and Jersey Joe Wolcott. Lee in his column said all of them attributed their success to faith in prayer.

Congressman BECKER said that if champions in the world of sport can and do ask for divine intercession, the United Nations, if it wants to be successful, should follow their example.

Congressman BECKER's resolution would request the President to instruct the United States delegation to the United Nations to take such steps as necessary to open the United Nations sessions with prayer.

The Long Island Congressman is an ardent sportsman and a keen amateur golfer. He is a member of the Rockville Country Club, Rockville Centre, N. Y.

I am hoping before this session adjourns that Congress will see fit to pass this resolution, thereby reaffirming our faith and our belief that the United Nations can use all the divine assistance that would come through the use of prayer.

RELIGION BIG FACTOR IN SPORTS

A 32-year-old municipal course pro no one ever heard of outside of Davenport, Iowa, wins the national open, the most treasured championship in golf.

Last year a determined man with a left arm crippled since childhood wins the same coveted crown.

A gallant lady who underwent an operation for cancer less than a year and a half before wins the women's national open.

A man who almost gave up baseball because his arm went dead 2 years earlier pitched his way into the Hall of Fame and the baseball record books forever with a no-hit, no-run game for the Cubs.

A preacher going on 30 years pole vaults 15 feet in every major track meet.

What do Jack Fleck, Ed Furgol, Mildred "Babe" Didrikson Zaharias, "Sad" Sam Jones, and the Reverend Bob Richards and so many other topnotchers in sports have in common?

The answer is startlingly clear: They have an abiding faith in God, they believe.

After Fleck had won the national open in a Cinderella finish in which he overcame "Bantam" Ben Hogan, one of the greatest of all time, he said simply:

"I thank God for his help. He gave me unbelievable power."

You have to like Fleck.

"The toughest job lies ahead—the job of being a good champion," he says simply.

What does the Reverend Richards say about the question of faith?

"I can sincerely say that I owe all of my athletic achievements to the power of the Lord," declares the vaulting parson. * * * Dick Ganslen, an eminenent authority in the science of pole vaulting, once "proved" that it was physically impossible for Richards, who stands 5 feet 10 inches and weighs 165 pounds, to clear 15 feet, but with God's help the pastor of the First Church of the Brethren in Long Beach, Calif., the 1952 Olympic champion, has turned an athletic miracle into routine action almost every time he competes.

All golfers and others who have competed on their own know what Ed Furgol meant when he said:

"You're out there all alone and on your own. The tournament is yours to win or lose. I had some help, however. The good Lord was on my side. He had to be or I'd never have made it."

STORY OF "BABE" ZAHARIAS GREAT ONE

The story of "Babe" Zaharias is a great one. The sports world that she has dominated for years was shocked when the news came out that she was going under a knife for cancer. Sixteen months after the operation she won the women's national and then she was named the woman athlete of the year for the sixth time. "Babe" would be defending her women's open crown this year but another operation, a minor one for a disc, is keeping her sidelined.

When "Babe" was given the accolade as the woman athlete of the year, she said:

"It really should go to God and to my doctors. God takes care of everything."

TAKE THE CASE OF SAD SAM JONES

Take the case of Sam Jones. During the 1952 Cuban Winter League season he came home with a useless arm. The speed and cunning were gone. He underwent a year of treatments without success. The doctor urged him to quit baseball, but Sam refused—baseball was his life. You know how his persistence paid off in the no-hit no-run game against the Pirates.

"Everything I've done I owe to 'The Man Upstairs,'" he said reverently.

The examples cited are current ones, but there have been many others.

The Reverend Gil Dodds, now the Wheaton College track and field coach, used to say when he was the No. 1 miler in the world:

"God runs with me every step of the way."

Faith is a vital, living thing to Dodds.

"Many of the greatest athletes of today, champions in all fields, are deeply religious men and pray before each contest," Gil observes. Gil relates that he once asked the famous Gunder Hagg, superb Swedish miler, what he prayed for before each race.

"I just prayed that each one of us would do his best," Hagg answered.

STAGG CITES COURAGE AND FAITH

One of the greatest football coaches of all time, Amos Alonzo Stagg, started out to be a minister, but he found public speaking difficult at the Yale Divinity School, and turned to coaching. He would have been as good a preacher as he was a coach because he was a leader.

"The great thing in life is to have courage and faith and keep on battling," is the way he expressed it. "Prayer is a good thing for any man who wants to live his life to the fullest. I am sure it helps in the process of making men."

To that credo, Clarence (Biggie) Munn agrees. The former Michigan State football coach, now the athletic director at M. S. U., said:

"Along with blocking and tackling, I stressed to my boys the importance of love of country, faith in its institutions and the religious base on which it all rests."

Do you recall the way Joe Louis, then the heavyweight champion of the world, said it when introduced from the ring at Madison Square Garden during a war benefit show.

We would win the war, the Brown Bomber said, because "we were on God's side."

Jersey Joe Walcott will take a ticket on that.

"If God is on your side, you're bound to win sooner or later," said Walcott, who became the heavyweight champion of the world on his fifth try.

"I prayed to be champion. And those who laughed when I said I would be were mistaken. God gave me the last laugh."

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell from the New York Daily News and also an editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

[From the New York Daily News of July 1, 1955]

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, June 30.—The worthy lawmakers of Senate and House who have the authority to decide how our tax money is to be spent in the highly important job of saving our necks (if and when our Commie enemy decides to lay a murderous clutch of airborne atomic eggs on our cities) have come up with an important decision. It's a step in the right direction, but the boys on Capitol Hill still aren't marching far and fast enough toward the objective of saving the collective American hide.

Because of new information—information which the Congress should have been privately studying months ago if our intelligence men are worth their salaries and expense accounts—we have suddenly come up with a boost of a third of a billion dollars for more B–52 bombers. Last month this hadn't been seriously considered. Now we go into action. So far, so good. Good, too, is the item calling for an additional $27 million to expand the bases to handle these intercontinental jet bombers and an additional $14 million to set up new top secret defenses at home bases of these B–52s.

Sixty days ago none of this was on the agenda. Then on May 1 came the big show in Moscow when—and let's be honest about this—the Russians scared the living lights out of our professional experts by boldly putting on a show of their atomic air strength.

No question but that the Russians were far better than we had suspected. No question that our professionals had been wrong in previous estimates and reports.

The unanswered question is why did the Russians brazenly tip off their hand and reveal their strength?

We Americans wouldn't do it. Neither would the British. Why the Russians did it recalls the famous crack by Winston Churchill when he told the House of Commons that trying to understand the Commie mind and figure out what makes the Kremlin brain tick brought the Anglo-American brain up against a situation that was "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma."

In the few weeks between the now famous Red fly-by over Moscow on their May Day celebration and the present action of Congress, there have been two highly intelligent reports that certainly influenced our lawmakers.

One was written by Gen. Bonner Fellers, World War II staff secretary of General MacArthur's Pacific command, and the other by Harry Truman's Secretary for Air, Thomas K. Finletter. Both are important—and also a trifle alarming.

MOSCOW SHOW STUNNED AMERICAN OBSERVERS

General Fellers, in his report printed in the Washington newsletter Human Events, stated that the May Day demonstration "stunned American observers" and continued:

"For the first time United States intelligence agents were confronted by concrete evidence. The result is the most alarming and direct peacetime challenge our military planners have ever faced. This early May fly-by disclosed:

"New supersonic fighters, in numbers;

"New all-weather fighters, in numbers;

"New, turbo-prop long-range bombers, in numbers;

"New long-range jet bombers, in numbers.

"The Pentagon released news of this Red air force strength only after the Defense public relations office had learned that General Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, had included it in a forthcoming speech.

"What is the military meaning of the Moscow fly-by demonstration?

"It means that the Red air force now has gained the advantage over the free world in modern fighters. For some time it has been known that the Soviets have built more jet fighters than all the free world combined. In Korea, there was only one American Air Force fighter, the F–86 Sabrejet, which was superior to the Red MIG–15. Neither the Navy nor our allies possessed a comparable fighter. Now, however, the Soviets have thousands of MIG–17's, a product vastly superior to their old MIG–15. But we have less than 200 of any model of fighter aircraft which can compare favorably with the MIG–17.

AVAILABLE WEAPONS WILL DECIDE

"In our defense planning, this fact must never escape us. Should the next war come, decision will be reached with the weapons available when the war starts. Therefore, unless we have the air advantage initially, there can be neither a general mobilization of surface forces nor an industrial effort to produce the necessary weapons for victory.

"Why were we not warned of this danger?"

And the civilian Finletter—most certainly on the opposite side of the political fence from the professional military man General Fellers—raises the same question when he asks:

"Shall we allow the Russians to catch us and, indeed, surpass us in the absolute weapons, in that air-atomic power of which we have always thought ourselves the undisputed master? Are we really on the right track with these proposals for unenforceable disarmament which the United States Government has been making recently?

"These two questions together make up one single issue, compared to which all other matters of foreign or domestic policy are secondary.

"Nothing can be more threatening to the security of our country and more damaging to any hopes we have for a successful foreign policy than to let the Russians catch up to us in airpower."

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of July 5, 1955]

THE ATOMIC DANGER AND HOW NOT TO MEET IT

Gen. Bonner Fellers stated the obvious when he wrote recently in Human Events that the Air Force and the Navy will be the chief reliance of the United States if Russia tries to drop atom bombs on us. No matter how big an Army we might have in an atom war, only the very small part of it that fires antiaircraft weapons would endanger the raiders. Our NATO Army in Europe would be of no more value than our divisions at home, for tanks, infantry, and artillery can't intercept high-flying planes.

General Fellers concludes that the Air Force should have first priority in spending the Defense Department's appropriation. In a sense the Air Force has this already because it gets somewhat more money than either the Navy or the Army. Quite generally, however, the people think of the Army as their principal defender and the Navy and Air Force as its auxiliaries.

Because of this habit of thought, Congress can always be depended upon to renew the draft law as it did this year although neither the Air Force nor the Navy takes any of the conscripts. They all go into the Army, the obsolescent branch in the opinion of General Fellers and a good many other students.

In effect, General Fellers is showing how careless is the thinking of many of those who cry loudest for the draft. They say that the seas have been narrowed to the point where they no longer afford America the protection that it had only a generation or two ago. In fact, the speed of ships on the surface of the sea has increased only a little in recent decades and therefore, if they are regarded as obstacles to moving and supporting an army of invasion overseas, the oceans are about as wide today as they were a generation or two ago.

The oceans have grown steadily narrower to the airplane, but the draft offers no slightest protection against enemy planes. We are not in danger of invasion by an army, against which a bigger army would be a rational defense; we are in some danger of being bombed from the air, against which the draft offers no defense at all.

Let's Educate Grade Schoolers, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I think the following editorial from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel which makes reference to Hillsdale College will be of general interest. It appears that Hillsdale College has a continuing awareness of the need for teaching the fundamentals of our own very successful economic system—a need which is, unfortunately, not recognized by all institutions of higher learning.

The editorial follows:

LET'S EDUCATE GRADE SCHOOLERS, TOO

In the wake of a number of independent surveys instituted recently showing that most high-school pupils are appallingly ignorant of even the rudimentary principles of our American economic system, no little public agitation has developed demanding that this condition in high schools be corrected.

These surveys have also resulted in some colleges undertaking self-examination to determine whether all their professors are seriously and factually teaching the facts of life of the American free-enterprise system. Hillsdale College, of Hilldale, Mich., for instance, has made it mandatory that all college freshmen there be taught a complete comprehensive understanding in practical detail, of the theory and practice of the American economic system.

The president of Hillsdale College took this action after he had studied the results of a survey in which 3,000 high-school seniors in Michigan had been interviewed, which to his amazement showed that high-school pupils generally actually know very little about what makes our free-enterprise system operate.

It is all very well to see to it that students in colleges and high school pupils gain a comprehensive education in our American economic system, and that high school pupils cannot be graduated, and college students get through their freshman year, unless they have received such a liberal education in the American free enterprise system.

However, it is even more important that this vitally essential learning be inculcated among all pupils in at least the upper classes in grade schools. For a surprising total of grade school pupils never enter high school. And a surprising percentage of those who enter high school never graduate. And if so many pupils are found to be so woefully ignorant of this vital education when they get into high school, that of course, is proof positive that they were no less ignorant when they were in grade school.

The high school student surveys show that in most cases, while the high schoolers

were taught very little about the American economic system, they were heavily indoctrinated with United Nations, one world, and UNESCO. And all of this was found to be portrayed in a most favorable light without any fair and realistic emphasis on the short-comings of these ideological dreams, such, as for instance, that UNESCO proposes to have treaty law supersede our domestic law and our Constitution.

When one considers that very large increments annually entering into our American citizenship are from ranks of those who never enter high school, the importance that all these be given a thorough grounding in the American economic system, should be apparent to everyone.

Most of this percentage, the surveys show, enter into the privileges of American citizenship without having any adequtae recognition of the correlating responsibilities that should go along with these privileges.

Few of them, the surveys show, ever learn to realize the Government is they—that they—each and every one of them are an integral part of the Government under our American way of life. They conceive of the Government as some mystic entity far away and detached from them, but which despite this detachment nevertheless is obliged to give them any kind of help they want. That concept, of course, has lamentably, all too generally been adopted by all too many segments of our citizenry.

Basin Project Peril Outlined by Hosmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of Friday, June 24, 1955:

BASIN PROJECT PERIL OUTLINED BY HOSMER

(By Representative CRAIG HOSMER)

That the proposed upper Colorado Basin storage project would euchre California out of vast quantities of Colorado River water to which she is legally entitled is well known and understood.

Two additional specific objections to the project must not be ignored by Californians:

It threatens seriously to impair the quality of water, if any, southern California might receive from the river after project construction; and

POWER CURTAILED

Power generating capacity at Hoover Dam would be curtailed and the lost power would have to be replaced at a cost of millions to southland California consumers.

No one contends the quality of the water even now received from the Colorado River approaches excellence. Millions of dollars have been spent for purifying devices to remove hardening alkalis and salts before use in homes and factories.

Yet witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation have told Congress they neither concern themselves with water quality nor recognize any responsibility whatever to operate the proposed project with regard to this vital subject.

Only after searching cross-examination would they admit that their files contained no more than the most sketchy information on the subject.

Based on it they reluctantly confessed even the initial features of the overall project would raise these impurities by a thumping 12 percent when the water reaches California.

FIGURE WOULD JUMP

That figure would jump to 54 percent if additional projects now in the planning stage are added to those presently under consideration.

The reasons why southern California's water quality would suffer are simple: First, water returning to the river after new upstream irrigation uses would contain added impurities dissolved from the soil.

Second, pure upstream water diverted in large amounts through mountains and out of the river system forever would not be available to dilute concentrated impurities farther downstream.

Third, water withheld in upstream storage reservoirs would likewise be lost for dilution purposes.

ENGINEERS ESTIMATE

Competent engineers estimate 1.2 tons of alkali and salt would be added to every acre-foot of water available for use in southern California.

Irrigators use at least 3 acre-feet of water per acre in a year to grow their crops. That would deposit 3.6 tons a year of such impurities on every acre.

Adding further insult to these injuries, the project would cost home and industrial customers of the Southern California Edison Co., the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, and other Hoover Dam power contractors an extra $2 million a year in higher electric rates.

Gilmore Tillman, assistant Los Angles city attorney, places the exact figure at $2,152,000 a year. This would be the cost of fuel oil burned in steam generating plants for replacement power, less what would have been paid for the same amount of Hoover power.

At the same time, and for the remaining life of the power contracts at Hoover Dam (until 1987) the Federal Government, and thus the United States taxpayers, would lose a total of $187 million in revenue from power not sold because there was no water to generate it.

This $187 million loss to taxpayers illustrates that there are substantial reasons not to build the upper Colorado River storage project in addition to those local to California. These reasons, shared by the citizens of all 48 States, are varied and compelling.

Department of Agriculture Should Defer Movement of Old Grain During Peak of Harvest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks of yesterday, I include a report from today's Wall Street Journal on the efforts of the Governor of Missouri to secure freight cars for shipment of new wheat to save farmers from loss and deterioration of the 1955 crop:

Because of a shortage of freight cars to haul grain, Gov. Phil M. Donnelly, of Missouri, asked all railroads serving the Midwest to do what they can to alleviate the situation.

The Governor said there were 7,500 unloaded cars at Kansas City and that he has received many calls from farmers around the State. In one town it was reported wheat is being dumped on the street because there is no elevator space. In many towns the farmers turn around and drive back because elevator space is at a premium.

A 6.5 million-bushel deluge of Kansas and Missouri wheat shipped into Kansas City over the Fourth of July weekend was being cleared in rail yards here.

The 3-day receipts of 3,445 cars were above last year's 2,428 on the like weekend but far short of the 1952 record of 5,164.

About 80 percent of the wheat will go into storage. Joseph Chartrand, transportation assistant of the board of trade, estimated. The remainder is sold and reconsigned, mostly for shipment to millers.

Despite the big weekend, wheat receipts still are running behind normal for this season, as late rains have delayed the Kansas harvest, Mr. Chartrand said.

The Association of American Railroads office here said there were 5,265 grain cars awaiting unloading at Kansas City, compared with 6,056 after the like weekend last year.

Some Gains Anyway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Mesa Tribune June 22, 1955. This editorial points out the steady progress that has been made toward the attainment of a balanced budget:

SOME GAINS ANYWAY

When the United States started out to hang the Kaiser in 1916, the national debt was a mere $1,023,000,000.

In the 10th year of the somewhat questionable peace, the United States public debt has soared close to the high reached with World War II spending.

War spending boosted the national debt to a peak of $277,912,000,000 on February 28, 1946. That was 10 months after the shooting actually stopped, but it took that long to reverse the spending trend.

Treasury figures for the first 11 months of the fiscal year 1955 show the public debt as of May 31 to have been $277,009,000,000. This figure, however, will have been considerably reduced when the fiscal year ends next week on June 30.

Even so, the budget successfully has resisted Republican efforts to bring it into balance and President Eisenhower is apparently fighting a losing battle in his first term.

When the books close next week the Treasury will be in the red for the 12-month fiscal period by about $4,504,000,000. The deficit estimated for the next fiscal year is $2,408,000,000.

It is likely that Mr. Eisenhower will end his White House term with an average deficit of about $3 billion for each of the 4 years.

Republicans have been trying for years to achieve economy in government and to reduce the national debt and spending. When in control of Congress, Republicans slashed a proposed $60 billion Democratic program to $39 billion and then to $33 billion to

achieve budget surpluses in fiscal years 1947 and 1948.

But Harry Truman led the Democrats in a surprise triumph in 1948 elections and spending in that fiscal year jumped nearly $7 billion. The hot war in Korea and the cold worldwide war started another spending wave.

Mr. Eisenhower, however, has turned the spending wave down by trimming defense budgets some $5 billion.

While little promise of much tax relief for American taxpayers during the next fiscal year, it is certain President Eisenhower will make every effort to round out his first term with economy.

Some gains have been made. More will be forthcoming.

Lithuanians of Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1955, the people of Lithuanian descent in a large mass meeting held at Gary, Ind., unanimously adopted the following resolution. This gathering was sponsored by the Lithuanian Political Club of Gary, Ind.:

RESOLUTION VOTED BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF THE CITY OF GARY, IND., GATHERED ON JUNE 29, 1955, TO COMMEMORATE THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEIZURE AND FORCED INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA BY THE SOVIET UNION

Whereas the Lithuanian people, like all other nations of the world, expected at the end of mankind's most terrible war the establishment of a peaceful world order of truly united nations based upon respect of freedom, human dignity, and national independence;

Whereas instead they were thrown into a slavery never before experienced in their long and often tragic history;

Whereas silenced but not conquered, the enslaved Lithuanian people have placed, and still place, their hopes in the free world and especially in the United States, the strongest champion of the ideals of freedom and humanity;

Whereas the present administration of the United States has committed itself to make no deal or arrangement with the Soviet Union that would tend to confirm or acknowledge the present unhappy status of the captive nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, American citizens of Lithuanian descent, gathered here today, raise our voice in behalf of our brethren in protest against their subjugation and the intolerable slavery into which they have been plunged by the Communist imperialists; be it further

Resolved, That we express our gratitude and appreciation to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles for their recent statements in which they stressed the necessity of discussing during the forthcoming Big Power meeting the issue of captive nations; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the Government of the United States to vigorously demand that Soviet Russia abide by her treaties and pledges by withdrawing her troops, police, political agents, and colonists from the Baltic States and other countries and restoring sovereign rights and self-government to their native peoples; be it finally

Resolved, That we shall continue to support wholeheartedly the Government of the United States in its efforts to effect a just and durable peace in the world. Believe us,

Faithfully yours,
AMERICAN LITHUANIAN POLITICAL CLUB OF GARY, IND., INC.,
ALEX NAVARDAUSKAS,
President.
JUNE EVANSECK,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
ANTIONETTE NENIOS,
Vice President,
JOSEPH J. JANUSAITIS,
Secretary.

Gary, Ind.

The American Legion, Department of Texas, Second Division, Adopts Resolutions on the Status of Forces Treaty, UNESCO, Bricker Amendment, and Atoms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including resolutions adopted by the American Legion, Department of Texas, Second Division, on important matters now being considered by this Congress. This great organization is truly American.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION ON STATUS OF FORCES TREATY UNDER NATO

Whereas an agreement commonly known as the status of forces treaty was signed by the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization on June 19, 1951; and

Whereas said status of forces treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 15, 1953; and

Whereas said status of forces treaty places American military personnel under the criminal jurisdiction of the North Atlantic Treaty Nation in which such American military personnel are physically present; and

Whereas said status of forces treaty deprives American military personnel of the right to trial by either an American military court or an American civil court; and

Whereas the vast majority of the members of the American military forces did not choose of their own free will to enter the military service nor to be assigned to duty on foreign soil, yet are being denied the protection guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the second division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention assembled, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation prohibiting the use of American military personnel in nations in which they are subject to the provisions of the status of forces treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the adjutant be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to all Members of the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION REGARDING UNESCO

Whereas a special committee of the National American Legion of which Mr. Ray Murphy is chairman, at a meeting of the national executive committee, May 4, 5, and 6, 1955, in Indianapolis, has again beclouded the position of the American Legion on UNESCO by again submitting a report supposedly clearing UNESCO of sponsoring world government, being atheistic, being communistic in basic concept, and infiltrating schools; and

Whereas UNESCO's advocacy of the world government, now deliberately clothed in the terminology "education for international understanding" in order to avoid arousing popular opposition (as revealed in the minutes of UNESCO), is clearly outlined by the following statements made by members of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, to wit:

1. Former Assistant Secretary of State William Benton, addressing the first meeting of the United States National Commission for UNESCO in September 1946, said: "We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty * * *."

2. William G. Carr, member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO and executive secretary of NEA, addressing a group of educators at the UNESCO teachers' seminar on August 1, 1947, said: "It seems to me that we should, with all loyalty to the United Nations, teach that the world organization should be revised to take on some of the aspects of a system of world government and world law. Unwillingness to face this issue is perilous * * * if the United Nations is to be transformed into a limited world government, the psychological foundations for the wider loyalties that are necessary must be laid, in part, in the schools. I urge you, therefore, not only to teach about the United Nations as it is today, but also * * * to teach the attitudes which will ultimately result in the creation of world government."

3. Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the President's brother and a well-known advocate of world government, speaking in the Wichita, Kans., Arcadia Auditorium in 1949, said: "One can truly understand UNESCO only if one views it in its historical context and viewed in this way it reveals itself as one more step in our halting, painful, but I think very real progress toward a genuine world government"; and

Whereas UNESCO's advocacy of atheism is clearly outlined by the following statement made by Dr. Julian Huxley, first Director General of UNESCO, a member of the Planning Commission for UNESCO, and an avowed atheist in his book, "UNESCO—Its Purpose and Its Philosophy," to wit:

"From acceptance of certain principles or philosophies, UNESCO is obviously debarred. Thus, while fully recognizing the contribution made to thought by many of their thinkers, it cannot base its outlook on one of the competing theologies of the world as against the others, whether Islam, Roman Catholicism, Protestant Christianity, Buddhism, Unitarianism, Judaism or Hinduism. Accordingly, its outlook must, it seems, be based on some form of humanism. Further, that humanism must clearly be world humanism." (Note: Humanism rejects any belief in a supernatural God; belief is that man is God); and

Whereas the communistic nature of UNESCO is clearly indicated by the fact that UNESCO is the primary propagandizing group for adoption of the infamous "Covenant on Human Rights," support of the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights being adopted as a major UNESCO goal at UNESCO's third general conference at Beirut in 1948. (Note: After more than 400 meetings, the Human Rights Commission of the U. N. refused to approve a provision in the covenant guaranteeing the basic American right to private ownership of property); and

Whereas in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 26, 1952, page 8243 (in discussion of appropriations), appears a statement by Senator Pat McCarran, as follows:

"The subcommittee heard a great deal of testimony relative to a very clever propaganda campaign to sell the people of this country, and particularly the school children, on the doctrine of one world government and world citizenship. The subcommittee held three hearings on this matter, one hearing in which the witnesses making the charge were heard, one hearing in which officials of the State Department were heard in rebuttal, and one hearing in which both sides were present.

"It seems that there is a group in UNESCO, a United Nations organization, as well as some thinking in the Department of State, of the belief that our objective should be to set up one world government and have only one kind of citizenship—world citizenship.

"The committee had presented to it documentary proof of this insidious campaign. They feel that international cooperation is one thing, but that for us to stand idly by and appropriate funds to be used to destroy this country as a political entity is quite another"; and

Whereas the objective of UNESCO is to infiltrate schools is clearly stated in the State Department publication 3931 entitled "The UNESCO Story," which says on page 26, "If you think UNESCO and its objectives of international understanding aim only at adults, you may be interested in the following reports—and you might compare them with activities in your own schools" (see attached documentation); and

Whereas the Murphy report is contrary to the official position of the American Legion on UNESCO, and without official status, but is nevertheless being circulated by propagandists as representing the official position of the American Legion on UNESCO: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Second Division Convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas:

1. That the second division of the American Legion, department of Texas, does hereby reaffirm its concurrence with resolution No. 33 opposing the teachings of UNESCO, which resolution was adopted by the national executive committee in Indianapolis on April 29 and 30 and May 1, 1953, and with resolution No. 322, reaffirming the resolving clauses of resolution No. 33, adopted by the national convention in Washington on August 30-September 2, 1954;

2. That the second division of the American Legion, department of Texas, does hereby petition the national commander to take all actions necessary to clarify to the American Legion as well as to the general public, the status of the special committee's report on UNESCO and to prevent the release of future reports of committees of the national American Legion prior to acceptance of their findings and action on their status by the national executive committee or the national convention; and

3. That, immediately after adoption of this resolution by the second division convention of the American Legion, department of Texas, the proper American Legion officials of the second division of the American Legion, department of Texas, forward certified copies of said resolution to the following:

(a) President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the White House, Washington, D. C.

(b) National commander, American Legion.

(c) State commander, American Legion, department of Texas.

(d) All division commanders, American Legion, department of Texas.

(e) All district commanders, American Legion, department of Texas.

(f) All post commanders, second division American Legion, department of Texas.

(g) Members of the national executive committee, American Legion.

SOURCE OF REFERENCES

Benton, William, former Assistant Secretary of State, address to first meeting of United States National Commission of UNESCO, "United States National Commission for UNESCO, report on the first meeting, September 1946" (United States—United Nations Information Series 14), page 25.

Carr, William G., the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, volume 31, No. 150 (December 1947), pages 13–14.

Eisenhower, Dr. Milton, from "Story of the Bricker Amendment," by Frank E. Holman, past president of the American Bar Association, page 21.

Huxley, Julian, UNESCO—Its Purpose and Its Philosophy, page 4; published by Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C.

Humanist reference: "What Can We Believe," Harold R. Rafton, president Humanist Fellowship of Boston, Inc., and longtime member of the board of directors of the American Humanist Association, the Humanist No. 3, 1953.

Senator Pat McCarran in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 26, 1952, page 8243.

United States Department of State Publication 3931, "The UNESCO Story," International Organization and Conference Series IV, United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization 12.

Subtitle of the book is, "A Resource and Action Booklet for Organizations and Communities." That should be enough—if UNESCO is not operating in America and has no program, why an action booklet? But let's look inside. We'll try page 26. Under caption "UNESCO in the Schools," we read:

"If you think UNESCO and its objectives of international understanding aim only at adults, you may be interested in the following reports—and you might compare them with activities in your own schools."

Then follows nearly 3 pages of "reports" of UNESCO activities in schools and State councils. At the bottom of the third page is a picture of 3 young people and 1 older person, with this description: "George V. Allen, as Assistant Secretary of State, receives 3 winners of a UNESCO essay contest in 50 high schools in northern New Jersey. The contest was a feature of a UNESCO Day rally sponsored by 3,500 students and teachers from Newark and 31 surrounding communities." So, UNESCO has no program and is not in the schools, Mr. Murphy says.

Organizing the UNESCO Council is another official document. Its Department of State number is 4646. It also is series IV and its UNESCO number is 18. It is written by a Kansas educator to explain how that State attained a leading position in UNESCO organization and to urge others to "go and do likewise." For point 3 the author develops the declaration, "A UNESCO Council must not lose sight of the fact that education is the most difficult and most necessary form of action." (Past Commander Murphy please note.)

A Junior High School Looks at UNESCO is another State Department publication of series IV; it is UNESCO 15. The subtitle reads: "The Story of a Unit of School Work on UNESCO Developed at Alice Deal Junior High School, Washington, D. C."

Under the caption "What Is UNESCO Trying To Do?" the booklet named above contains the following paragraph:

"Could they (the students) evaluate UNESCO and its aims? They decided they couldn't answer that until they got into the project. The first thing was to find out what material already existed on UNESCO. They set to work to learn all they could, and the instructor taught UNESCO as though it were a regular course." (So, in a 2-year investigation a Legion committee can find no UNESCO in the schools. One might wonder where they looked.)

RESOLUTION REGARDING BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas every member of the American Legion has pledged himself to "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America"; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America is in the process of being destroyed through the medium of treaty law, as evidenced in part by the following precedent-setting United States Supreme Court decisions, towit:

1. *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416) simply pronounces the doctrine that if the Federal Government does not have power under the Constitution to legislate with respect to a particular subject, it can acquire that power by first making a treaty on the matter, in spite of the 10th amendment reserving to the States and to the people powers not delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government.

2. *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203) simply holds that an executive agreement, not even ratified by any of the Senators, has the force and effect of a formal treaty that had been ratified by the Senate and such executive agreement overrides the provisions of the fifth amendment prohibiting the taking of private property for public purposes without just compensation and without due process of law; and

Whereas treaties and executive agreements are continuously being negotiated by the President and the Secretary of State and innumerable treaties, covenants, and international compacts of all kinds have been drafted and are being drafted by numerous agencies of the United Nations, many of which expressly deal with, regulate, and control domestic matters the control of which is reserved to the States and the people by the 10th amendment; and

Whereas the Bricker amendment affords adequate protection against the insidious encroachment of dictatorial treaty law upon the Constitution of the United States, said amendment having been thoroughly reviewed and approved by the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate, the American Bar Association, and numerous lay organizations (including the American Legion), and found to be in accordance with the intent of the Constitution of the United States of America as promulgated by our Founding Fathers; and

Whereas the President of the United States of America pledged himself under oath to "faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States"; and

Whereas in the constitutional process of amending the Constitution the President of the United States has absolutely no function to perform; and

Whereas the President of the United States of America, as head of the executive branch of the Federal Government, has actively and continuously opposed the submission of the Bricker amendment to the people for ratification and in so doing has directly interfered with the powers vested in the legislative branch of the Government—and the people to amend the Constitution when experience has proved a need for such amendment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d Division Convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas:

1. That the 2d Division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention here assembled, does hereby petition the President of the United States of America to discontinue his opposition to submission of the Bricker amendment to the people for ra-

tification, and to confine his activities to the Office of President as outlined in the Constitution of the United States, in accordance with his oath of office.

2. That, immediately after adoption of this resolution by the 2d Division Convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas, the 2d division adjutant be instructed to forward certified copies of said resolution to:

(a) President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the White House, Washington, D. C.

(b) National commander, American Legion.

(c) State commander, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(d) All division commanders, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(e) All district commanders, American Legion, Department of Texas.

(f) All post commanders, 2d Division American Legion, Department of Texas.

(g) Members of the national executive committee, American Legion.

RESOLUTION ON THE PRESIDENT'S ATOMS FOR PEACE PLAN PROPOSED BY AMERICANISM COMMITTEE, EIGHTH DISTRICT

Whereas American superiority in the development and production of atomic energy is a paramount requirement for the future military security of the United States of America; and

Whereas the President of the United States recently submitted what he calls an atoms for peace plan to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the President's atoms for peace plan, the basic idea of which he presented at the United Nations meeting on December 8, 1953, at the original instigation of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, would create an international atomic laboratory—financed in large part by the United States—in which all nations of the world, including Soviet Russia, would be allowed to participate; and

Whereas it is impossible to confine the results of an international atomic energy laboratory to purely peaceful uses of fissionable material by the nations participating therein; and

Whereas said atoms for peace plan—if adopted—would accordingly endanger the security and freedom of the citizens of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, in convention assembled, does hereby oppose the adoption by the Congress of the President's atoms for peace plan; and be it further

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the adjutant be instructed to forward copies hereof to all Members of the Congress of the United States.

Report on Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of July 6, 1955:

REPORT ON BROOKLYN

Brooklyn as a borough of industries, of public improvements and of all-around civic health had a good year last year, and Borough President John Cashmore has told Mayor Wagner about it in his annual report as the Brooklyn borough head. During 1954 64 factory or loft buildings were put up in Brooklyn, an average rate of better than 1 a week. Since 1951–52 the combined assessed valuations of the borough's factories and lofts have grown from $233,114,375 to $272,030,150.

In 1954 Brooklyn continued its ability to manufacture almost everything from small articles up to the world's largest aircraft carrier, such as the new $200 million *Forrestal*-class *Saratoga*, now being built in the United States naval shipyard. In the face of efforts made to induce borough industries to move to rural or out-of-State areas, Mr. Cashmore reports, thousands of manufacturing plants have chosen to remain in Brooklyn and many new plants have opened there.

Under expansion of the borough's highway system Mr. Cashmore writes of progress in the construction of the 11-mile Brooklyn-Queens Connecting Highway, in the widening of Adams Street in the downtown district, and in the continuing work on the $26,740,000 Prospect Expressway. New Yorkers generally will share Mr. Cashmore's expressed hope that the city's largest borough will continue to grow, that its industries will continue to help support the Nation's economy and that foundations will be strengthened for Brooklyn's present and future prosperity.

Flammable Fabrics Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as one of the original sponsors of the Federal Flammable Fabrics Act, I oppose any efforts to weaken its provisions. I am against H. R. 5222 and S. 1455 and I present the views of the Textile Workers Union of America in opposition to these proposals:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., June 30, 1955.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House Office Bldg., Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: The Textile Workers Union of America has been advised that another attempt is being made to exclude plain surface fabric scarfs from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

We are unalterably opposed to H. R. 5222 and S. 1455 as we were opposed to the Purtell bill S. 3379 in 1954. The Textile Workers Union of America is of the opinion that no special consideration should be given to exempt scarfs from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

Scarfs are worn by the women of this country about the neck and head. If they are highly flammable they will constitute a serious menace and hazard to the safety and well being of the women of this country. There is no valid reason why scarfs should not meet the same safety standards set for all other type fabrics produced in this country and other countries. The only reason to exempt them would be to give special consideration to increase the importation of Japanese scarfs printed, finished and hand rolled in Japan, regardless of the danger.

The present importation of the fully printed, finished and hand rolled scarf has already deprived 3,000 workers of their jobs. These workers were formerly engaged in screen printing of silk fabrics which were made up into scarfs.

The argument of the industry, in pressing for this amendment, is that $1,250,000 worth of silk scarfs are accumulated in stock and in addition thousands of dollars of such scarfs are tied up in customs due to the unpredictability of the burning tests. These arguments are definitely improper. The industry has had ample notice of the passage of the Flammable Fabrics Act and further that scarfs were included. A great many importers did not believe in the law and therefore continued to import scarfs that did not meet the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. These converters were gambling on the law being changed. It is certainly improper to use this as an argument to change the reasonable provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act. Certainly Japan has made the necessary provisions for the production of scarfs that would meet the standards as set down by the Flammable Fabrics Act.

The Textile Workers Union of America respectfully requests you to vote against H. R. 5222 and S. 1455 not only in the best interests of textile workers but also for the protection of the consumers of this Nation.

Very truly yours,
TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
WILLIAM GORDON,
Director, Dyers and Plastics Division.

S. 2407

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, S. 2407, introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, would cut off merchant seamen from medical, surgical, and dental care they now receive at the Public Health Service hospitals and permit them only to get such help as might be available at the nearest military facility.

At a time when the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which I am a member, is hard put to find ways and means of preventing a further decline of our merchant marine strength, it is shocking to find a bill offered in the Senate that would eliminate the privileges which for many years have been accorded to those engaged in the hazardous maritime profession. We should remember that even with the few privileges they now have, comparatively few young men are turning to the sea as a profession—this in a country that once boasted the finest sailors afloat and showed its flag around the world.

The idea that the service is not needed or may be provided by makeshifts at some military facility is not supported by the facts. There is a Public Health Service hospital in my district. As of a few days ago it had 645 patients, 404 of them American merchant seamen. For more than a year it has averaged a daily load of more than 400 merchant seamen bed patients. Between July 1954 and May 1955—a period of 11 months—American merchant seamen made 42,339 outpatient visits to the Public Health Service hospital on Staten Island, in my district. Figuring this on the average of about 3 visits per patient, we have more than 14,000 American merchant seamen using the Public Health Service hospital outpatient service in 11

months. That is more than 1,200 a month—I would like to know what military facility can handle that hospital care and outpatient load.

I consider S. 2407 for a bad and dangerous bill. I shall oppose it in every possible way and I hope my colleagues who have the welfare of our merchant marine at heart—to say nothing of the Coast Guard and other Government services dependent upon the Public Health Service hospitals for medical, surgical, and dental care—will join in that opposition.

Governmental and Political Matters in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel throws some interesting sidelights upon governmental and political matters in Indiana. I think it is worth reading by any one interested in the affairs of the great Hoosier State.

The editorial follows:

Indiana's able senior Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, will be renominated by the Indiana Republican State Convention next spring without opposition and the Senator will carefull avoid getting himself in any conflicting effort to nominate a governor.

At least, that's how it appears now.

Gov. George Craig, like all Indiana Governors stymied by the Indiana constitutional ban on successive terms, has only personal friendships upon which to build a structure for influencing the choice of the Republican nominee for governor and that is not enough. Personal friendships in politics has the same standing as Confederate currency. But we still believe that George Craig is an able Governor and that he will move on to higher planes outside the State of Indiana through the friendship he has carefully cultivated with the White House.

The three possible candidates for the Republican nomination for governor at this time are: Harold Handley, Frank Millis and John Scott. Handley is lieutenant-governor; Millis is head of the State's financial department and Scott is mayor of South Bend. Handley and Mills have been around for a long time and each has acquired a lot of friends over the State.

BOTH HAVE FOLLOWINGS

Handley is an able public speaker and has built up possibly more of a following with the general public, but Millis has offset this by his ability to engender respect and friendship among Republican stalwarts. Almost everyone speaks highly of Mr. Millis.

The gentleman cast at this date in the role of a stalking horse is the young Republican mayor of South Bend, who has the distinction of having been the most decorated Marine in World War II. He is a youthful, independent, dynamic sort of man on the political make. He has been close to the friends of Governor Craig and in fact was started on his way by South Bend's Tom Bath, license bureau manager there and a Craig lieutenant. But he has carefully avoided getting himself mixed up in any extraneous matters.

As we have often said, the Governor of Indiana is only an important political power in Indiana for the first 2 years of his term. In the last 2 years he fades, because what he has to give away has already been given and a new governor is in the offing. "The king is dead, long live the king," is constantly being uttered at the State House.

BUT MINIMAL CRITICISM

I may be wrong, but I don't think any serious criticism can be made of the administration of Gov. George Craig, unless, of course, you are firmly committed against toll roads, which most persons are not. We are going to see more and more toll roads as the years go on and although it is possible that there is necessarily a large waste in the spending of the millions involved, this can be said of almost any project designed and carried out by human beings. It is my own personal conviction that the Governor is an able, honest man who has sincerely tried to do a good job, despite a certain lack of experience in dealing with professional Indiana politicians.

Whoever is nominated by the Republicans as their choice for governor next year, one of the considerations must be his vote-getting ability. Certainly Senator CAPEHART, while forced to keep aloof from the fight over the governorship, must be hoping that a candidate is selected who can keep the victory margin large.

Why the Boom Bypasses Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 25, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD a very interesting explanation of why the era of prosperity that the rest of the free world is enjoying in varying degrees has bypassed our great and good neighbor to the south. This article appeared in the U. S. News & World Report of June 17, 1955:

WHY THE BOOM BYPASSES MEXICO—BUSINESSMEN PUT THE BLAME ON SOCIALISM

Mexicans are asking: Where's the boom?

United States business—prospering and looking for new ventures—is investing little money south of the border. Mexico lags behind its neighbors, despite a wealth of resources.

Inflation is a gnawing worry, unchecked.

Why? Is socialism the bugaboo?

It looks that way to many. Government is deeply involved in business, has an influential hand in almost everything.

To find out why the boom is bypassing Mexico, U. S. News & World Report talked to businessmen, economists, officials there.

Here is what they have to say.

Question. Is Mexico having a business boom anything like that to be found to the north, in the United States and Canada?

Answer. No. There has been some economic expansion in Mexico, but mostly it is seen in relatively small-scale business and industrial projects—nothing like the big capital investment and production gains in the other countries.

Question. What is holding back Mexico's economic development?

Answer. There are many factors that slow it up. However, one of the most important factors is the attitude of Mexico's Government toward foreign investment—in fact, toward private capital in any form.

For instance, if a foreigner wants to set up a corporation to do business in Mexico, he finds that there is a law that requires majority ownership by Mexican nationals in that corporation, unless the Government grants him a special exemption.

And the Government, except in special cases, requires that at least 90 percent of the technical and unskilled workers of any company must be Mexican nationals.

On top of that, private capital—Mexican as well as foreign—is slow to invest in a country where the Government is getting deeper and deeper into business on its own account.

Question. Is Mexico, then, a socialistic country?

Answer. Not wholly. But there is much socialism mixed in with its economy. The petroleum industry that it took over from United States oil companies in 1938 is only a small part of the Government's operations.

The Government runs almost every railway. It has a monopoly on grain purchasing, and owns Mexico's biggest food-distributing firm. It owns many other companies—for instance, an aviation firm, powerplants, mines, a food-freezing plant, and so on.

Altogether, it is estimated that the Government now runs about 40 percent of Mexico's business operations.

Question. What has been the effect of that situation on Mexico's economy?

Answer. One result is continuing inflation.

When American companies were producing oil, Mexico had lots of foreign currency. Mexico, in the 1920's, was the world's second-largest petroleum producer. The peso, then, was worth about 50 cents American.

Now Mexico has an unfavorable trade balance. The state petroleum industry exports little oil, and the peso, today, is worth about 8 cents.

That is one of the big reasons why the cost-of-living index in Mexico is about five times as high as it was in 1939. Workers get wage raises from time to time. For instance, they got a 10-percent raise after last year's devaluation of the peso. But their wages, if anything, buy them less now than before.

Question. Do the various Government industries bring in any revenues?

Answer. On the contrary, the Government has to put money into its enterprises. In past year, there have been sums in the Government's annual budget amounting to 500 or 600 million pesos for investments. In American dollars, at the old rate of exchange, that would amount to about $60 million. And the Government gets no taxation revenues from its companies.

Question. Are the federally owned industries run efficiently?

Answer. Take the railroads, as an example. The biggest rail system was nationalized back in the early part of this century—during the time of the Dictator Porfirio Diaz. Other systems were nationalized from time to time after that.

During the 1930's, the Government decided on an experiment. It turned the operation of the railroads over to the labor union of railroad workers. And the railroads became such an awful problem that, in 6 weeks, they went right back into the hands of the Government. They have been operated by the Government ever since. And the cost of operating them is 120 percent of their receipts—which means that the Government takes a loss.

A very powerful union has a big voice in railroad operations. The men in the field often pay little attention to management. They pay attention to what the union officials tell them. If you go around, you see the railroads operating with nearly twice as many people as they need. Officials go by and see people loafing, and do nothing about it—the union members cannot be fired.

Question. How long has nationalization been going on in Mexico?

Answer. It really started on a large scale when Lázaro Cárdenas was President of Mexico—that means from about 1932 on.

Actually, there are not many cases of expropriation like that of the oil industry, in 1938. What happens more often is that the Government has to step in and take over a company that's in financial trouble—a company in which the Government already has a considerable interest.

This is the way it generally comes about:

A Mexican politician decides that some day he may retire from politics. Therefore he wants to start a business, just in case. Because of his political influence he can borrow a lot of the necessary capital—even all of it—from the Government investment bank, called the Nacional Financiera.

If that business does not turn out to be profitable—which is often the case—the Government bank has to take over the business to protect its loan. That, in effect, puts the business in Government hands. Then the bank puts somebody in charge. That person is supposed to pull the business out of the red. But that never happens, because usually he is a political appointee and not really qualified for the job.

Question. Does the Mexican Government ever start any business or industry of its own?

Answer. That happens, too. For instance, there is the food-distributing agency called "CEIMSA"—the export and import company. It buys all the grains from Mexico's farms, and handles all the grain imports from abroad.

CEIMSA sells staple foods at retail through its own 560 local stores—it is the largest retail merchant in Mexico. And it supplies grain at wholesale to private dealers. It also imports lard and eggs, and things of that sort.

Farmers are required to sell their grain produce to this company. They have no choice. You cannot get a truck or freight car to ship any grain in Mexico except through CEIMSA. If a farmer gets out in his own truck on the highway, he can be stopped by police because only certain groups are permitted to do trucking on the highways.

Question. What about the petroleum industry that the Mexican Government took over from United States companies? Is the government doing a good job on oil production?

Answer. There is an answer to that question right across the Rio Grande in the State of Texas.

Both Mexico and Texas have an abundance of the same subsoil structures that produce oil. So you have a basis for comparison in their oil production.

That comparison shows that Texas, just one State, is producing 10 times as much petroleum as all of Mexico.

For many years PEMEX—that is the government's oil subsidiary, Petróleos Mexicanos—put little into new properties and drillings. Then in 1949 it announced a huge development program that was to cost $470 million over a 5-year period. Oil officials promised to raise production to 132 million barrels of crude by 1953.

Far from doing that, they managed to produce only 83 million barrels of crude by 1954. They claim this figure to be almost double the amount produced by United States companies in Mexico before expropriation. What they do not point out is that production last year was less than half what it was in the early 1920's before the United States oil industries began to be hampered by Government interference.

Question. What is the real trouble with Mexico's oil industry?

Answer. Much of the Government's investment has gone into private pockets—graft. That was especially true before the present head of Pemex, Antonio Bermúdez, took over. He is a former businessman himself, a successful one. But he can do only so much before he runs into political opposition.

There are a few good men like Bermúdez in the petroleum industry, and ever since the Americans were kicked out, the industry has lost ground technologically. In Mexico today, you can see 8 to 10 men handling a drilling rig that 3 or 4 men handle in Texas.

Oilmen say the industry could trim its force by at least 10 percent without reducing the output of petroleum. But that would be politically dangerous in a socialistic enterprise. The unions would fight any such reduction, and politicians with friends and relatives holding down jobs in Pemex would also make trouble.

As a result, there is not much money left, after wastage, for capital improvements, for drillings, and so on.

And the government's investment in its oil industry does not begin to compare in volume with the hundreds of millions of dollars in private capital that are invested in the Texas oilfields.

Another difference shows up. Texas oilmen drill many dry holes; they have a saying that "gushers begin with dry holes." In Mexico, the Government is reluctant to take a chance on new areas. Many of the new fields announced by Pemex turn out to be no more than extensions of existing oilfields.

Question. Is it true that the Mexican Government in letting United States oil companies come back into the country again?

Answer. American companies are going back in, but only to a very limited extent. There are strings tied to the Government's bid for foreign capital. The private operator takes the risk of drilling for oil. If he finds it, he gets 15 percent of the production for the life of his 25-year contract with the Government in that new area. In addition, he gets 50 percent more of the production until all of the exploration costs have been repaid.

Question. Do these companies have any assurance against expropriation?

Answer. Yes; everybody has more security today. Businessmen say it is because 30 years of socialistic experiments has finally convinced even the politicians that they need to make concessions to get oil in the large quantities that México needs.

Question. Does that point to a definite change of Government policy away from federal ownership?

Answer. Not yet. The Government is still taking on other activities. For instance, it is starting up a factory to make 10-ton diesel trucks, heavy machines for which there is no real market in Mexico.

Question. How strong is the Communist Party; is it a danger in Mexico?

Answer. In Mexico Vicente Lombardo Toledano, the labor leader, makes annual trips to Moscow. He is believed to come back with large funds that the Russians give him to carry on extensive propaganda in Mexico.

The Soviet Embassy has the biggest building of any embassy in Mexico, and is said to have the largest number of employees. It has a whole printing plant, too. There is a magazine called Cultura Sovietica—Soviet Culture—telling of the trips of prominent Mexican politicians to Russia, how they are feted there and appear in public with Soviet officials.

The Communist Party of Mexico itself gets only a small vote, but it is extremely active. It has a newspaper, and for many years there has been a university called La Universidad Obrera—the Labor University—where Marxist doctrines are taught.

Question. Mexico's President, Adolfo Ruiz Cortines, is described as a conservative who is trying to encourage private enterprise. Is that impression correct?

Answer. He is regarded as a good and honest man. But businessmen say he is influenced by many leftwingers in Government and by his 30 years of contact with the left. He has said that free enterprise can pull Mexico out of its economic troubles. But little has been done so far.

Val Washington of the Republican National Committee Speaks Out on the Eisenhower Administration Before the New Century Club of Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago in Cleveland a new Republican club was born. As we have now started the second century of the Republican Party, this very alive group have called their club the New Century Republican Club.

In search of a speaker for their first annual banquet, they came to the Republican National Committee, who sent them a member of their staff with long years of loyal support of the party to his credit.

I was unable to attend the meeting but have had the most glowing accounts sent me. To have a group of our outstanding Negroes start this second century club off with a real bang is very heartening to those of us who believe that it is of importance to the future of our representative government to have two strong parties actively striving to build well in all fields of Government.

It is a great pleasure to me, Mr. Speaker, to include Mr. Val Washington's fine speech with my remarks.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF VAL J. WASHINGTON, DIRECTOR, MINORITIES DIVISION, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, BEFORE NEW CENTURY REPUBLICAN CLUB, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MAY 26, 1955

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a honor to be invited to address this dinner meeting of the New Century Republican Club. I have visited Cleveland on many occasions and feel that I have as many close friends and acquaintances here as in any other city in our great Nation, with the possible exception of Chicago, my hometown.

There are so many things that should be said, so I will do away with formalities and go into a discussion of my main subject—The Eisenhower Administration.

It is a great privilege to be a part of it, and to work with it. The full impact of this administration on our lives is not going to be fully felt for many years to come. The ease with which it is accomplishing its aims without fanfare and political ballyhoo is something new in the annals of history. I am not a historian, but when the final appraisal of this administration is made, I predict that it will be recorded as one of the most effective and outstanding of all times.

Why do I say this? The answer is simple. A very careful blueprint has been made for the security, prosperity, and general good of all of our people. In building from this blueprint President Eisenhower has not been afarid to change his course now and then when he thought it was for our best interest. He has approached his job with the welfare of this Nation in mind and not aggrandizement of himself and a chosen few.

Needless to say, there are some people who do not like this approach, and, might I say, they are not all in the Democrat Party. President Eisenhower has been against all extremists, whether they be to the extreme right or to the extreme left.

Now let's see if his strategy has been successful. For many years our President has made careful planning pay in time of war. However, his brilliant wartime record is being dwarfed by his magnificent peacetime leadership.

Frankly, what logical criticism can his opponents make of him?

Can they say he did not stop the Korean war? No; because our boys have not been under fire for nearly 2 years and most of them are back home living normal lives.

Can they say that the stopping of this war brought on a depression? No; because the best economists say that if business continues as good the rest of 1955 as it did in the first 3 months of this year, 1955 will be better than our best year—1953. Both businessmen and consumers are not hanging on to their money, but are buying. Why? Because they have confidence in President Eisenhower and our Government.

Can they say that there is great unemployment? No—because unemployment is under 2½ million and is steadily going down. More people were gainfully employed in April 1955, than in any previous April in our history.

Can they say that great inflation has set in as the "Calamity Janes" predicted? No—because cost of living has gone up less than one-half of 1 percent in the past 2 years of this administration, whereas from the end of the war in August 1945, to the end of the Truman administration the increase was 47 percent.

Can they say there have been any mink-coat scandals in this administration? No—because there have been none.

Can they say that President Eisenhower has played politics with civil-service employees? No—because this administration has filled less than 6,000 jobs out of some 2½ million.

Can they say that he has not cut down cost of government? No—because he has saved us billions of dollars and is suggesting new economies with systematic regularity.

Can they say that he does not know what he is doing in building the defenses of this country? No—because this is his strongest field. Forty years of his life were spent as a soldier, doing just this.

Can they honestly say that he does not represent labor as well as business? No—because A. F. of L. at its executive board meeting in Miami in February of this year said, "agreements were reached with fewer strikes and less worktime loss in strike action than in any year since World War II."

Can they say that he did not stabilize the dollar? No—because the A. F. of L. in that same report said "But the increases in (wages) 1954 while modest, generally provided more of a gain in real wages than increases in other postwar years, for they were almost entirely over and beyond the amount needed to compensate for the rises in the cost of living."

Can they say that President Eisenhower has not kept his promises on the civil-rights front? No—because his effort in this field has been one of his brightest and most outstanding achievements. A great believer in leadership, President Eisenhower's tact on all fronts has been to achieve all that he can through persuasion rather than through pressure.

When the President took office in January 1953 there were cases of great importance to minorities pending before the Supreme Court. But he did not let these Court cases stop him from doing what he could. Through Executive order, negotiations, aiding court procedures, and intelligent, well-planned leadership he has made significant gains for minorities which have strengthened our democratic processes both at home and abroad. Significantly, this has been done without either civil war or political revolution. I know all of you are interested in just what has been done in this sector. It would take the rest of the evening to tell the whole story. I will, however, touch the high spots in this aggressive drive.

The position which the President has taken on civil rights can be viewed under five headings—legal, economic, political, diplomatic, and social. His attitude on all these fronts has been one of equality for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. On June 5, 1952, at Abilene, Kans., he said, "* * * I have no objection whatsoever to stating my unchangeable, my unalterable support of fairness and equality among all types of American citizens. I believe that insofar as the Federal Government has any influence or any constitutional authority in this field, all of its means, all of its expenditures, all of its policies should adhere firmly and without any kind of equivocation to that principles. * * * So far as my own personal influence can extend in this country, I shall never cease to fight for it."

1. On the legal front, what has been done? He has taken great care in the selection of appointments, such as Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justice John Marshall Harlan. He has been just as meticulous, with the aid of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, in the selection of Federal judges, North, South, East, or West. Attorney General Brownell intervened on the side of minorities in both the school-segregation case and the restaurant case.

2. On the economic front, the President has strengthened and supported wholeheartedly the President's Committee on Government Contracts, thus making sure that any company or person doing business with the Federal Government does not discriminate in employment because of race or color.

He has moved the Government FEPC—now known as the President's Committee on Government Employment Policy—which deals with discrimination in employment in Government agencies from the Civil Service Commission directly under his supervision.

The surge of upgrading of Negroes in the various departments of Government in the past few months has been little short of phenomenal. For example, in the Post Office Department all types of promotions are being made. In some post offices where Negroes have not been clerks for many years, we are again on the inside sorting the mail. An administrative aid in postal transportation has been added in the New Orleans regional office.

A Special Assistant in the Office of the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration has been added to the regional office at New Orleans. In the South, Negro veterans and postal workers have not always been fairly treated.

3. On the political front, 208 appointments have been made ranging from auditors in charge, to a sub-Cabinet position. Some 10 or 12 of these jobs are at a policymaking level. Scovel Richardson, first member, and now Chairman of the United States Parole Board; E. Frederic Morrow, adviser on business affairs, Department of Commerce, and J. Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor are firsts to be found in this category.

Going further on the political front, let me quote President Eisenhower—"I pledge that if elected President of the United States I will serve all the people, irrespective of their race, their creed, their national origin, and irrespective of how they voted * * * I pledge to devote myself toward making equality of opportunity a living reality for every American. There is no room left in America for second-class citizenship for anybody. Wherever the Federal Government has responsibility, wherever it collects taxes from you, to spend money, whether it be in a contract for recreational facilities or anything else that it does for a citizen of the United States, there will be no discrimination as long as I can help it in private or public life * * * Wherever funds are used, where Federal authority extends, there will be fairness" * * * He also said "I believe we should eliminate every vestige of segregation in the District of Columbia."

Has our President done these things? I do not think anyone could speak more eloquently on this subject than the Honorable Ralph Bunche, Under Secretary of the United Nations. On March 14, 1955, when interviewed by the CIO News:

"REPORTER. You said in 1950 that you would not live in Washington, D. C., because of the discrimination prevalent there. Would you live there today?"

"Dr. BUNCHE. The answer is yes. If my work took me to Washington, I would live there. There have been some remarkable changes in Washington * * * The restaurants, theaters, hotels—and now the schools—are opening up to Negroes."

4. On the diplomatic front, rulers of three great darker nations have been the official guests of President Eisenhower at the White House in less than 1 year: Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopa, President William V. S. Tubman of Liberia, and President Paul E. Magliore of Haiti. Recognition of these friendly countries has meant renewed faith in the United States by the darker races as well as raising the prestige of these counries in their own spheres of influence.

This could not have been better displayed than at the Bangdung Conference when every attempt was made to get emotional reaction stirred up against the United States and other friendly Western countries on the basis of race. While the conference did go on record condemning Western colonialism it also exposed and condemned Communist colonialism. The United States gained in influence and had additional friends when the Conference ended.

5. We come now to an aspect of this administration that is little known: the social and human aspects. I am told by employees of the White House that more Negroes have had access to the President, through personal contact, in both his office and his home in 2 years than in any other period in history. The White House doors have remained open to those who have sought the ear of the President, his staff, or Vice President Nixon. All questions of importance to our welfare have been given careful consideration and study. This has been one of the features of this administration.

Brighter still is the position which the President and Mrs. Eisenhower have taken on the right of one to choose his own friends and associates on a social level.

On September 5, 1952, President Eisenhower said, "I think the Federal Government's role should be to take the position of leadership in holding up the facts of segregation for everyone to see." Little did those who heard this or read his statement in the daily papers realize that the President meant this in every way. But he did. Not since the great liberal President Theodore Roosevelt, also a Republican, had the immortal Booker T. Washington as a White House luncheon guest, no American Negro has

broken bread as the official guest of any President, until President and Mrs. Eisenhower took over. When Theodore Roosevelt entertained Booker T. Washington, however, it nearly started a second civil war in this country.

Negroes now are guests of the President and Mrs. Eisenhower at every type of social affair from lawn parties to state dinners. Little is said about it beyond the listing of their names among the other guests on the social pages of the daily papers.

No better summing up of the fairness of the Eisenhower administration can be made than in the words of Roy Wilkins, successor to Walter White, as Secretary of the NAACP. On February 3, 1955, in a speech to the National Youth Conference, he said: "The important advances in the civil rights field have been made through the courts, education, and through the executive branch of the Government. President Eisenhower has given personal leadership to the abolition of second-class citizenship in all areas where the Executive can act. There is in the White House a man who is steadily winning their admiration by his forthright pronouncement on civil rights and by the leadership he has given in his branch of the Government. Well, the eyes of the Negroes are on 1956, too. A growing number among them is beginning to wonder if their Federal Government, under a man like Mr. Eisenhower, might not make real progress on civil rights if there were more Republicans like the President in the Congress."

Let me say that as a college student I chose the Republican Party because historically I believed in it. As a politician I have worked tirelessly for the principles for which it was founded. In 1952 I helped elect a Republican President. In 27 short months I have seen this President, through leadership, perform miracles beyond my fondest dreams, by replacing political ballyhoo with positive action.

I am growing tired and sooner or later I hope to retire from politics and devote more time to my wife and personal business. There is no greater thrill than to have one's judgment in an ideal vindicated. I have always believed in the Republican Party and what it stands for. I believed in its candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower. They have both come through for us.

I know that as Republicans we would be derelict in our duty if we let those who have preached civil rights to us for 20 years, but did nothing about it, make a mockery and a shambles of the Eisenhower administration. For the first time civil rights is a reality. This administration has made it possible for us to at last hold our heads erect and without apology say "We are proud to be Americans."

Conference Report on S. 2090

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, attention should be called to amendment No. 20 in the conference report, dealing with surplus agricultural commodities. The House amendment required that not less than $600 million of the funds provided for fiscal year 1955 and 1956 should be for aid in the form of such surplus commodities. It developed that about $381 million worth of agricultural surpluses were used in the program in fiscal 1955. That would require only $219 million worth to be used in fiscal 1956.

It was recalled by the conferees that the executive branch did not favor my amendment which became section 550 of the 1954 act, when the amendment was offered 2 years ago to establish this whole program of using our surplus agricultural commodities in lieu of dollars and selling them to other countries for their currencies. Yet the program proved feasible and was operated most successfully by FOA, when the law required it. The authorization was increased last year from $250 million to $350 million and FOA was able to dispose of $381 million. It is recognized that some of the most acute needs have now been met, but the conference committee is confident $300 million is not too much for this next year and the conference therefore accepted that figure.

Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, for reasons unknown, oil importers have thus far given no tangible evidence of their intention to comply with the specifications inherent in H. R. 1. Congress accepted the extension to the Trade Agreements Act with the understanding and assurance that the White House would, in lieu of a legislative quota, restrict imports of residual oil commensurate with the 1954 influx as related to domestic consumption. Senate Finance Committee members, working in direct liaison with the President, removed all ambiguities from the bill with the explicit assurances that the administration would carry out this obligation if promises made to congressional committees by top officials of importing oil companies were not observed.

Although H. R. 1 did not actually become law until June 21, it would appear that importers would long ago have arranged to revise their schedules as evidence of good faith. They have known for several years that excessive imports were upsetting the economy in coal and oil producing regions of the United States. They were apprised of the findings of the President's Advisory Council on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy in late February, at which time Cabinet members and the Director of Defense Mobilization made it known that imports of oil would have to remain at 1954 levels in order to prevent interference with mobilization base requirements.

Granted that the allurement of greater profits often outweighs duty to country when grasping international financiers are involved, the importing interests should nonetheless have perceived the advent of the foreign oil curb when the Senate Finance Committee made its compromise with the White House. Even this warning was ignored, however, and total oil imports for the first 6 months of 1955 were at a record high; residual oil imports led the increases, running at about 25 percent over the corresponding months of the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, it looks to me like Congress is going to have to make clear that the legislative branch of the Government will not stand by and permit this disrespect for our laws to be continued. We all know that the amount of imports in 1954 was entirely too high. Residual oil imports alone took 31 million tons of coal from our markets deprived coal producers of $149 million of revenue, and robbed the railroads of $81 million in coal traffic. The consequent losses in Federal, State, and local taxes amounted to $39 million. This damage is to be duplicated in 1955 with the consent of the administration, but, from all appearances, even this inequitable arrangement is not satisfactory to importers.

Looking back over the record of the first 6 months of the 84th Congress, it is gratifying to realize that so many of our colleagues agreed with those of us who represent coal-producing States and stood with us in our attempt to enact a law that would place a 10-percent quota limitation on residual oil imports and on crude and other products. We have needed such a curb for the last 7 years, and we need it now. Despite the slight upturn in coal production since last January, there has been no lessening of the urgent necessity for such legislation.

Let me explain that there is still considerable want and suffering throughout the mining communities of West Virginia. Thousands of our miners and railroaders continue to search frantically for a means of survival. The surplus foods made available by the Government are helping to keep bodies alive, but they do not provide proper nourishment. Mothers and fathers are already concerned with the problem of how to clothe their children for the next school term. High-school graduates, their avenues of higher education blocked by the raging torrents of the foreign residual oil which has taken the jobs of their fathers and brothers, look in vain for an opportunity to obtain gainful employment.

Even those miners whose abbreviated workweeks have been extended as a consequence of the slightly elevated demand for coal in the past several months, have no assurance of continued employment. Equally disturbing is the fact that current production levels are still far below the point from which output could be accelerated sufficiently to meet emergency requirements. The recent exodus of high-ranking Government officials from the city of Washington in a simulated air alert was designed—at least partially—to call public attention to persisting world danger. It is ironic that responsible authorities could participate in such a drill with-

out also giving thought to a situation that threatens the Nation's emergency industrial capacity.

Assuming that prevailing international tension requires that the United States be ready for immediate mobilization, how is it possible for Government officials to be so apathetic in regard to the present debilitation of large segments of the coal industry? It has long been established that a productive capacity of 500 million tons of bituminous coal per year must be maintained if the industry is to be ready to meet the demands of a world economy. Assuming that the output for the first 6 months of 1955 will continue for the remainder of the year, our mines will remain at least 50 million tons below mobilization base stipulations. Holding oil imports at the 1954 figures would not enable the coal industry to reach the required level, but it would at least contribute to more healthful conditions. It would also prevent the trade practices of international oil companies from further impoverishing the men, women, and children in our coal areas.

Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to serve notice on importing oil companies that incoming shipments will be studied very closely during the remaining weeks of Congress, because we who represent unemployed coal miners and railroaders refuse to permit these men and their families to be betrayed in exchange for foreign silver. A positive line has been drawn on imports, and Congress must insist that it be respected.

I have read recently of a statement by a large oil company official who contends that importers have not had sufficient time to cut back shipments to the prescribed limitations. While it may seem reasonable that a company with holdings all over the world would not be able to revise shipping schedules at a moment's notice, I recall that reductions were accomplished promptly when it was to the advantage of importers to do so. At times when the influx of residual oil from foreign refineries was so exorbitant as to embarrass even the most fanatic free-trader, it appeared that Congress would act immediately in protection of the American economy and security. When this threat to international oil company profits would arise the importers would quickly and effectively reduce incoming shipments—in the manner of a law-breaking motorist who keeps his eye on the rearview mirror and takes his foot off the accelerator at the approach of a traffic policeman. The importers have known for 4 months that their activities have been detrimental to the Nation's security, as determined by a Cabinet committee. They have known since June 21, when the President placed his signature on H. R. 1, that they are breaking the law.

The Cabinet committee recommended that if imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils "exceed significantly the respective proportions that such oils bore to domestic production of crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken."

Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to look like the time for appropriate action is at hand.

Humphrey Backs Move To Halt Industry's 5-Year Writeoffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 7182, to eliminate certificates of necessity. As most everyone, knows this is the popular name given to the special tax treatment allowed certain corporations for amortizing the cost of construction deemed to be necessary for national defense or other public purposes.

Perhaps these special tax treatments were necessary at one time during emergencies to insure proper defense production, although it was recognized that such treatments were bound to permit abuses. The abuses certainly were forthcoming and regretably the privileges obtained were largely made available to big corporations as opposed to their smaller competitors.

When the Congress passed the big Tax Revision Act of 1954 one of the major provisions in the act was the liberalization of depreciation allowances to conform to actual business practices and economic reality. It was partly due to the fact that the tax treatment of depreciation was not realistic that the need for certificates of necessity became necessary in order to get corporations to build plant facilities to turn out needed war production.

Actually when the depreciation allowances were liberalized last year the Congress at the same time should have eliminated the certificates of necessity as no longer being economically necessary. Furthermore, the emergency situation has definitely receded into what is more nearly normalcy. The Defense Department has set up its procurement on a more orderly and longtime basis which obviates the danger of a plant being built for a needed production for the immediate years at hand and then left idle and unneeded for the future years.

The abuses instead of being less seem to be more. Secretary Humphrey has estimated that there is a $3 billion revenue loss through this special tax treatment. Much of this loss can be recaptured by proper administrative procedures being adopted. However, the best way to proceed is to eliminate the law which is no longer necessary and which provides the vehicle for the abuses.

I might add that anytime the Federal Government sets up procedures or regulations affecting business the larger businesses tend to benefit, because they have the accountants, the lawyers, the rest of the needed personnel and overhead to analyze and conform to these procedures. The smaller concerns are the ones who are adversely affected. It becomes most important that when Government procedures and regulations set up for war or emergency purposes have outlived their usefulness they be immediately repealed. That is why I opposed the extension of the Renegotiation Act this year. It was no longer necessary and it worked a hardship on the smaller business concerns giving a competitive advantage to their big competitors. Much of the Federal machinery we established as the result of war needs has outlived its usefulness. It is time we got back to normalcy and orderly, longtime procedures.

I am enclosing an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, July 5, 1955 which discusses the views of Secretary Humphrey on the certificate of necessity issue:

HUMPHREY BACKS MOVE TO HALT INDUSTRY'S 5-YEAR WRITEOFFS—ODM LAUNCHES QUICK STUDY OF TREASURY CHIEF'S PLAN—$3 BILLION REVENUE LOSS—DEFENSE ACT SPOON FEEDING

(By Henry Simmons and Albert Clark)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration, at the behest of Treasury Secretary Humphrey, is seriously considering cutting out or sharply curtailing the fast tax write-off—a Korean war "defense measure" which has sometimes served other purposes than defense.

This special tax advantage has helped scores of United States concerns to expand plants the past few years, by permitting them to pay lower taxes during the early years of the life of new facilities.

The fast writeoff works this way: Last week the Erie Railroad Co. was authorized to write off in 5 years 85 percent of the $4,234,565 cost of new freight cars. This means in the coming 5 years, the railroad can "write off" or subtract $3,599,380—85 percent of the cost of the cars—from its taxable income, thus lowering its tax bill. Normally, the Erie would deduct the full cost of the cars over a 28-year period. This would make each year's writeoff, and subsequent deduction, considerably smaller; so short-range taxes would be higher than under the fast write-off provision.

Behind the scenes, Mr. Humphrey is putting up a vigorous fight to end such fast tax writeoffs. He's represented as feeling the program is too costly in loss of revenue, and that the day has passed when such lures to expansion are needed.

UNEMPLOYMENT WEAPON

The program was written into the tax laws in 1950 and was put under the Office of Defense Mobilization. It was designed to spur expansion of the Nation's capacity to turn out steel, aluminum, petroleum, machinery, and dozens of other products and services for defense. But the ODM has also used it to push dispersal of new plants away from major cities that might be targets if war came. Another way the scheme has been used: To channel capital investment into areas where there is chronic unemployment.

From the time the first fast tax write-off was awarded late in 1950 through June 15, 1955, Uncle Sam handed out a grand total of 19,933 tax writeoffs on facilities estimated to cost $30.4 billion.

These special expansion incentives have cost the Treasury nearly $3 billion in revenue in 5 years, including $1 billion in the fiscal period that ended last Thursday. According to Government tax experts, the program would lose another $1 billion in the year that began on July 1 unless Mr. Humphrey succeeds in his present campaign. But even if all new fast writeoffs were stopped today, the Treasury would feel the pinch for several more years.

NO CANCELLATIONS

That's because a fast writeoff is good for 5 years, beginning on the day the facility goes into full production. This means that many "certificates" issued back in 1951 and

1952 on plants not completed until still later would have years to run. Mr. Humphrey, of course, is only asking that ODM shut off the supply of new writeoffs. He isn't suggesting cancellation of benefits already awarded.

The Treasury declined to comment on Mr. Humphrey's project, but elsewhere it was learned:

He is concerned about the dent in Treasury revenue at a time when he's having trouble balancing the budget.

But equally important, according to Mr. Humphrey's argument in administration councils, is his belief that the tax writeoffs program has outlived its purpose. To continue it further, he reasons, would be to "spoon feed" companies in relatively normal times.

Mr. Humphrey argues, according to Federal mobilizers, that the fast tax writeoff program cannot be justified when there is no emergency and the United States has not embarked on a big mobilization expansion program.

HIGH LEVEL CONFERRING

Although the Treasury wouldn't comment on Mr. Humphrey's moves, Dr. Arthur Flemming, head of ODM, confirmed he has had "several conversations" with the Treasury boss on the question of continuing the fast tax writeoff scheme.

Right now, Mr. Humphrey's proposal is under serious study and there is a note of urgency about it. F. L. Parnell, chief of ODM's finance division, was called back to his desk from his vacation, to head up the special study that Mr. Humphrey provoked.

And Mr. Parnell is working under orders from Mr. Flemming to have his paper ready for discussion by July 13, when the Defense Mobilization Board holds its next regular meeting. This Board—headed by Dr. Flemming—is made up of top officials of the Departments of Treasury, Defense, State, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

It's too early, of course, to forecast the outcome of the proposal to cut off fast tax writeoff allowances. But Mr. Humphrey is known around town as a pretty influential fellow. Even if the program isn't wiped out, it looks like a good bet that it'll taper off somewhat.

SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHT APPLICATION BACKLOG

The debate over tax writeoffs is no academic exercise. Even though the number of applications for tax deferments has already dwindled sharply since the Korean war ended 2 years ago, ODM still does a brisk business in dispensing amortization grants. As of last Wednesday, the agency had a backlog of 628 requests for rapid amortization on facilities which would cost $4.1 billion.

Among these petitioners are such well known corporate names as Bethlehem Steel, Boeing Airplane, Douglas Aircraft, Phillips Petroleum, St. Joseph Lead, Shell Oil, U. S. Steel and Boston Edison Co.

Moreover, the much discussed question of whether Uncle Sam ought to promote further expansion of primary aluminum production hinges on the decision in the tax amortization debate. The same goes for proposals in Government and industry for special tax aid to spur a boost in steel capacity. Even now the DMB is studying an ODM staff recommendation for a new aluminum expansion program supported by fast tax writeoffs. And the mobilizers are awaiting detailed figures from the Commerce Department on how much additional steel capacity would be needed if war comes.

For an example of how rapid tax amortization works, assume a company pays $20,000 for a machine that has a useful life expectancy of 20 years. Normally that company would have a choice between two principal methods of deducting the $20,000 from its taxable income. The firm could deduct 5 percent a year or $1,000 annually until the entire amount was amortized. Under an optional method, as liberalized in last year's tax revision law, the concern could writeoff up to two-thirds of the original cost in the first half of its normal life.

With a fast tax writeoff allowance for the same machine, the firm could deduct up to 100 percent of the cost during the first 5 years of its life, depending on the terms of its "certificate." In most cases, however, ODM authorizes lower percentage deductions for the first 5 years. The average runs about 60 percent of cost.

Assuming this hypothetical company got a 60 percent writeoff allowance, it could deduct $12,000 from its taxable income in 5 years. Without the certificate, the firm under the first optional method could deduct only $5,000 in 5 years. The other system would permit it to deduct $8,190 during this same period.

In either case the company would get a substantial tax advantage from its fast writeoff allowance. At the end of 5 years, it would have paid taxes on up to $7,000 less income. In the long run, of course, the firm's tax liability would be the same if tax rates remained unchanged. But already some companies have benefited long-range because of the expiration of the excess profits tax at the end of 1953.

Still more companies that have fast tax writeoff privileges would pay less in total taxes if corporate rates drop to 47 percent from the present 52 percent next April 1 as scheduled by present law. Of course it could also work the other way if the United States got into a war and taxes were raised again.

Although the actual annual revenue loss has been increasing, the number of new writeoffs ODM has been awarding has slackened sharply since the peak year of 1952. In that year ODM authorized 9,528 individual expansion projects for quick writeoffs of facilities with an estimated cost of $12.6 billion. By last year the figures had declined to 1,405 projects with a total estimated cost of $1.8 billion.

However, there have been recent signs that the tax amortization business is getting brisker. Certainly businessmen have shown a more lively interest in the scheme by stepping up their applications. Since the end of 1954, for example, the backlog of applications has jumped from 362 to 628 at the present time, and the rate of awards has if anything picked up in recent months.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Arkansas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Arkansas has more than 1,865,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Gratitude From a Reservist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following words of praise written by Capt. R. J. Savarese, of the Air Force Reserve, upon the completion of a 2-week period of active duty at Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y.:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *June 29, 1955.*

Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Recently I had the pleasure of performing a short tour of active duty for a period of 2 weeks as a Reserve officer with Headquarters First Air Force, Mitchel Air Force Base, N. Y.

May I take this opportunity to express my thanks for the splendid training and cooperation I received from Maj. Gen. Roger J. Browne, the Commander; Col. R. W. Hall, Deputy Commander; Col. R. S. Miller, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel; and his assistant, Lt. Col. W. T. Steves, and other members of the headquarters with whom I had contact.

Their interest and desire in helping a reservist was indeed gratifying. There was never a dull moment. Our time was utilized to the fullest. The training program for Reserve officers which these gentlemen have instituted is certainly in conformance with President Eisenhower's desires. They set up a schedule for us whereby we were indoctrinated with the latest changes, together with a complete understanding of the Air Force of today.

We were permitted to make comments on all that we observed and to make recommendations at any time. This is the type of an efficient Reserve program which should be brought to the attention of higher echelons.

Sincerely,

R. J. SAVARESE,
Captain, AFRES.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Lucky America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD the editorial, Lucky America, by Mr. David Lawrence, which appeared in U. S. News & World Report for July 8, 1955. The editorial follows:

LUCKY AMERICA

(By David Lawrence)

Two thousand miles of travel by train around Europe and then a trip across the United States by train, all within the last 2½ months, affords the chance for a study in contrasts.

Since America was colonized originally by Europeans, it is not a question of comparing cultures or intellectual capacities. Our forebears merely found in the United States a land of opportunity, and they had the ingenuity to utilize its resources and bring forth the richest and most powerful country in the world.

These are, primarily, personal reflections about America itself—a few notes on its present mood and a look into its heart—if only for the purpose of demonstrating how erroneous is the concept of those statesmen, members of parliaments, party leaders, newspaper editors, and commentators in various countries of Europe who have come to look upon the United States as a Nation of impulsive, hot-headed, trigger-happy people anxious to fight another world war.

When you travel across America, as I have, through city after city in State after State larger in area than whole countries in Western Europe and realize that we have millions of miles of good roads, millions of motor cars, millions of homes with electricity, telephones, and modern plumbing, comfortable trains, good hotels and motels, mammoth industries and countless retail stores with everything in them that man could desire—then you begin to wonder why on earth the United States should be accused of wanting to start a world war. You wonder why Americans should ever be willing to go 3,000 miles across the Atlantic or 5,000 miles across the Pacific to fight.

For the comparison is so favorable to America and so unfavorable to the congested life and lower standard of living in Europe, when put alongside ours, that anyone who thinks the people of the United States are war minded and want to disturb all this should have his head examined.

WHY THE WARMONGER NONSENSE?

One can understand the Soviets purpose in continuously issuing propaganda calling Americans warmongers. It is one way the dictatorship in Moscow can scare the Russian people and make them sacrifice butter for guns. But why so many persons high up in the official and business life of the principal European countries allied with us should sincerely believe that kind of nonsense is something I was unable to understand. Indeed, I argued the matter with many of them repeatedly at private dinners, conferences, and meetings at which I had an opportunity to meet truly representative men of affairs abroad.

Could it be that some leftwing correspondents in New York and Washington, writing for European newspapers, have been skillfully distorting the American viewpoint for the last few years? Could it be the result of partisan politics in Europe itself and of the debate in parliaments so often aimed at discrediting an incumbent administration with the usual appeal to nationalism and the customary twist that the home government is bowing to or accepting the dictation of a foreign power?

THE CURE—SEE AMERICA

Whatever it is, I can prescribe a cure—a trip across the United States by train, with plenty of stops. If in a hurry and pressed for time, the airplane is fine. But if you want to see and appreciate America, go by train—or, better yet, by automobile. For you can't feel the throb of this great country while skimming through the clouds at 350 miles an hour.

It is not the scenery alone—the fertile lands, the picturesque rivers and mountains of transcontinental America—that you will observe in a close-up view. You will meet a peace-loving, happy people. You will see them at play—fishing in the streams and lakes, golfing and playing tennis and baseball on municipal recreation grounds, or watching the contests of sport. And you will see them—eager, earnest, alert, and indefatigable—at work in the factories and the fields.

Wages and accumulated savings are high. Profits and accumulated reserves for further expansion are high. If the American people look healthier than Europeans, possibly it's because we are better fed. I compliment the fine cooking of Europe. It is incomparable as an art. But, fortunately, God gave us a wonderful climate and millions of acres in which to grow corn to feed animals. The corn-fed steaks and chops of our Middle West contribute to our vitality. I believe also there is no diet anywhere in the world to compare with our cereals, our abundance and variety of fresh fruits and vegetables, our canned and frozen foods—available at relatively low prices—and the good milk that we have everywhere from coast to coast.

The physical look of European communities is different, of course, from American cities and towns. They have some sykscrapers in Europe but modern elevators in only a few of their buildings. Here in an American city it is an exception to find a building with a poor elevator. On the continent of Europe, you can go up on the "lift" but you usually have to walk down.

In European cities, they don't paint their buildings or their houses as often as we do—hence they have an untidy appearance, which even the alibi of "antique finish" fails to dispel. In Paris they say this is due to rent control. Why, it is contended, should a landlord improve a building if he can't increase the rent to pay for it?

I didn't see a new taxicab in London or Paris. Most of them are 10 years old or older. The finest railroad trains, night or day, have only one toilet at each end of the car—for as many as 20 passengers. The modern bedroom car with its roomettes, so widely used now in America, is unknown abroad.

Europe with its myriads of bicycles resembles America in the 1890's. Motorcycles are increasing in number, but tractors are still rare in the rural areas. Farming is still in the horse-and-plow stage in most of Europe.

Telephones are not numerous, though increasing. Long-distance telephoning in Europe is a headache. I wondered the other day in San Francisco, as the operator dialed Washington direct for me from a pay-station telephone and I talked to my office a few seconds later, whether a European businessman wouldn't faint at the shock of such prompt service.

It would be wrong to take any of this comment as disparagement. As one who favored the Marshall Plan and who still favors economic aid of substantial proportions to Europe, both from the military and humanitarian standpoints, I have no doubt that Americans can be persuaded to continue to give generously of their tax money to help build a peaceful world. But perhaps now and then an American should be permitted a rhapsody of satisfaction over the peaceful, albeit at times luxurious, position which the average citizen here in the United States enjoys in comparison with the less fortunate citizens of the rest of the world.

NO URGE TO WORLD LEADERSHIP

Plainly, America is an independent, self-sustaining community, replete with the necessities of life, and its people unconcerned about territorial aggrandizement or colonies or even the doubtful privilege of exercising world leadership. The fact is most of us would rather pass that compliment on to one of our older allies and be divested of the burden.

To illustrate our naïvete in world affairs, I might remind Europeans that the average American would have to stop a moment to be sure how to spell Chiang Kai-shek and, before June 1950, would probably have guessed wrong as to where Korea is on the map of Asia. I doubt if today the average American could readily locate Formosa. But he does know there is a Communist menace in the world and that 40,000 American boys were killed in Korea and 110,000 wounded because our leader—the then President of the United States—urged us to fight for the ideal of collective security and said it was important to draw a line somewhere and resist Communist aggression or it would engulf us all. That is why Americans today regard Formosa as a symbol of resistance to evil.

BEWILDERED BY ALLIE'S STAND

It should be no surprise to our European friends, therefore, to find Americans still idealistic, though often bewildered by the newspaper dispatches repeatedly telling us that leaders of Britain, leaders of France, leaders of Yugoslavia, leaders of India all say we should admit the Government of Red China, a proved aggressor, into the United Nations and let bygones be bygones.

Many people in America cannot accept, for example, such unpersuasive arguments in support of continued diplomatic relations with Red China as Harold Macmillan, Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, made at San Francisco last month. He said diplomatic recognition was just a historical doctrine of accepting a government that militarily controlled its country. He forgot that back in the 1940's General Petain, Hitler's collaborationist, controlled all of France while patri-

otic General DeGaulle was sitting in London as the head of the exiled government of France but recognized by Great Britain. DeGaulle didn't even control any offshore islands, either. Nobody in America would have ventured then to suggest that the so-called rule of diplomatic recognition should be observed and Petain should be recognized.

It will be said in rebuttal to this that a war was on in the 1940's. Well, there's a cold war on today, and it is costing the American people plenty to fight it. That's why many of us don't like to see official spokesmen for our allies giving encouragement to Red China. A principle of morals is still valid, whether the war is hot or cold.

The upshot of all this could be fatal for Europe. Once convince the American people that expediency rules the roost in Europe—that international morality and idealism are to be disregarded except when the mobilization of American manpower is sought to help fight wars distant from our shores—and the attitude of Americans toward defending Europe in a future war may be far different than was manifested by our armies in 1917 and 1941. For anybody who recalls the spirit of a battlefront will tell the statesmen of today that men who are prepared to give up their lives must be dedicated to some principle they believe in—and it may be difficult to fool them next time if some of the European doctrines of today continue to prevail.

HOW TO MAKE ISOLATIONISTS

Europe should not be worried about the possibility that America might plunge the world into war. Europe should really be concerned about the possibility of another course of action which could conceivably ensue if the masses of people of America ever have a chance to take a look at Europe, listen to some of the opinions expressed there about America, and then come back home to take stock of our own good fortune. It might make isolationists here by the millions.

I write this as one who has never supported any isolationist doctrine, as one who came back from the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919 convinced that America should enter the League of Nations, as one who has supported consistently the international policies of the Roosevelt, the Truman, and the Eisenhower administrations in respect to military and economic cooperation with Europe at all times, and as one who would like to see those same policies continued.

But I cannot forget what happened when 2 million Americans went to Europe in uniform in 1917 and 1918 and how deeply they resented European attitudes when they came home. I have always felt that the isolationism of the 1920's—which I so vehemently opposed at the time—was due directly to the fact that so many American boys felt let down after World War I. They saw Europe quarreling selfishly within itself and disregarding the morality of high principle. They saw our allies in Europe seeking and getting material gains as the victorious nations acquired the territory and confiscated the investments of the conquered peoples, thus sowing the seeds of Hitlerism as ideals were cast to the winds.

Europe today, only partially recovered from the effects of World War II, has not yet learned the lessons that the war should have taught about America and Americans, for I doubt whether, if you sweep away ideals and disregard principle, you can enthuse Americans to fight again for a set of slogans that may turn out once more to mean nothing if parliamentary politicians at London and Paris decide that expediency must rule above all else.

Happy, prosperous, well-clothed, well-housed, well-fed America, with opportunities galore for the children of tomorrow, peaceful and almost pacifistic America, with high ideals and a willingness still to authorize billions of dollars to be spent abroad—even though some misguided Europeans insist we do it for selfish purposes to aid exports and benefit our investors—all of this might seem to argue for an indifference to Europe and its mess of troubles. But in every city and town from one end of the United States to the other, there are forward-looking citizens who gather in small and large groups to discuss world problems. They are better informed about Europe than Europeans are about America, and they preach the gospel of helpful internationalism.

It would be unwise, on the other hand, to overlook the many groups in America that can be converted to an isolationism of spirit overnight if European statesmen continue to base their policies on misconceptions about the average American and his reaction to things European.

Americans are critical of the judgment of governments which insist on making our country pay the toll in Korea in lives and money and then deliberately brush aside moral principle for expediency's sake, as they yield in Indochina, yield in the Far East, and yield to the terrorism of Communist imperialism on other cold-war fronts.

Americans know that there are ways—without war—to quarantine the Communists and deprive them of the opportunities to infiltrate our institutions and subvert our governments. For it takes money and agents, paid by the Communists in Moscow, to carry on the cold war inside the Western countries. The Western allies could long ago have cut all this off had they possessed the courage of their convictions and the necessary unity of purpose to hold to the ideals they so often profess but so rarely practice.

A LAND OF PLENTY AND IDEALS

Lucky America, fortunate America—far away from the overpopulated lands and shell-shocked, underprivileged people of Europe.

May the Lord spare us the atomic bombs that can come to our country only because we have said we would defend Western Europe.

Let not, however, the poisonous germs of expediency afflict the American people. Let us not assume that we can assure our own safety by avoiding entanglement in European security systems.

Happy is the American traveler who, after seeing Europe, can come back home with a prayer of gratitude on his lips for what we have but with his idealism and unselfishness unsullied by European materialism.

May God continue to bless this land of plenty, this land of opportunity—lucky America.

The Question of Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Washington Post of today's date dealing with the question of Cyprus.

This problem and its eventual disposition is of great importance to the unity of the anti-Communist nations.

It is my opinion that the most equitable solution to the problem lies in the application of the United Nations principle "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

In accordance with this principle, I introduced on March 24 of this year a House concurrent resolution providing that the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, declare it the sense of Congress that ways and means should be vigorously explored and found in order to insure the applicability of the principle of self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the island of Cyprus.

CYPRUS AGAIN

An effort to solve the problem of Cyprus, which has long been exacerbating Graeco-British relations, appears to be in the making. In Parliament last week Prime Minister Eden disclosed that invitations have been sent to both Greek and Turkish Governments to send appropriate representatives to confer with the British Foreign Secretary and Colonial Secretary on matters relating to common defense. Mr. Eden also said: "It is perfectly open to the representatives of the governments concerned to raise any points they wish. It is also a fact that nobody (will enter) this conference giving any commitment in advance."

That the Greeks will seize this opportunity to press the question of Cyprus may be taken for granted. During its agitation of the question abroad and in the United Nations the Athens government has sought to give the impression that its hand has been forced by the popular enthusiasm aroused in support of the Cypriot demand for enosis, or union with Greece, on the one side, and by the intransigent attitude of the British on the other. The significance of Mr. Eden's cautious statement to Parliament lies in the fact that until now the British have steadily refused to admit that Cyprus is a proper subject of diplomatic conversation and have steadily reiterated their determination to preserve its present status as a crown colony. The attitude of the Turkish Government, which has an obvious interest in the destiny of Cyprus, has not been made clear. The chief concern of the Turks is with the fate of the Turkish-Moslem minority on the island, said to number nearly 100,000 persons, who in all probability prefer British to Hellenic rule.

The Cypriot majority, however, which is Orthodox by religion and Hellenic by language and culture, if only doubtfully so by race, is fanatically determined upon enosis and has indicated again and again that it will be satisfied with no other solution than a plebiscite, which of course would be carried overwhelmingly in favor of union with Greece.

It is altogether unlikely that the British are prepared to accept the extreme demands of the Cypriots and to relinquish control of the island in exchange for some agreement with Athens concerning military bases there. It is also unlikely that the Turks would consent to any such arrangement. The Greek Government has never seriously pretended it has any historical or legal claim to Cyprus, which has not been under Greek rule for more than 800 years. Thus the whole case for enosis rests on the doctrine of "self-determination," and Greece—as well as Turkey, which ruled the island between A. D. 1571 and 1878—was a party to the Treaty of Lausanne whereby Cyprus was acknowledged to be part of the British Empire. At the same time it must be said that the British administration, by its bland indifference to the sensibilities of the Cypriots and its unwillingness to allow them any effective degree of self-government and political expression, has estranged a considerable part of the native population. There are increasing evidences, however, that the colonial office has seen its error and that the British are preparing to offer a program of concessions and democratic reforms. Those whose chief concern is for continued unity among the

Western allies must hope that this change of heart and of policy has not come too late.

Let us hope that the forthcoming meeting of the representatives of the British, Turkish, and Greek Governments will be guided by these principles.

My colleague, the distinguished majority leader of the House, JOHN MCCORMACK, submitted a concurrent resolution on May 31 of this year, which provided that it be declared the sense of Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world.

Retiring Colonel Tench Honored Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Col. Charlie Tench recently retired as district engineer at New Orleans and at the same time resigned his commission in the Army as a member of the Corps of Engineers.

New Orleans through the years has been most fortunate in having assigned as district engineers some of the finest officers in the Army. Charlie Tench takes his place in that lineup measured by any standard of ability and devotion to duty.

He has resigned from the Army to enter private business. That is the Army's loss and private industry's gain. Personally I believe he should have remained in the Army long enough to wear the star of a general. He certainly deserves nothing less and should have attained it already.

When Colonel Trench retired he was feted by public and civic authorities for his splendid work in New Orleans particularly in connection with the proposed construction of the bridge across the Mississippi River at New Orleans. He deserved everything said of him and more than merited the accolades tossed in his direction.

One of New Orleans' finest newspaper reporters, Tommy Sancton, of the New Orleans Item, I believe, however, has told the story of Charlie Tench better than anybody else and for that reason I am grasping this opportunity to pay feeble and inadequate tribute to Charlie Tench by calling Tommy Sancton's article to your attention.

At least, one thing is certain. The name of Charlie Tench will permanently be inscribed on the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and will be there for all to read who are inclined to do so.

I only wish the Corps of Engineers had more officers and men the caliber of Charlie Tench. It would be a better corps for their presence. It is too bad that the military must lose the services of such officers as Charlie Tench at a time when they can be so valuable to their country in the uniform.

I commend Mr. Sancton's article to you:

RETIRING COLONEL TENCH HONORED HERE

(By Thomas Sancton)

He is a Yankee colonel who lost an ancestor in the Union Army breakthrough in Virginia.

Yet he rates Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson as 1 and 2 on his all-time All-American team of military brains.

He was a Newark, N. J., kid who was hellbent on riding horses in the cavalry.

So he wound up a United States engineer building river floodwalls with WPA labor, and, later, airfields for MacArthur.

He crashed West Point by memorizing an eye chart—then the passing years, and aging eyes, corrected his nearsighted vision.

He possibly is the youngest-looking and most athletic "bird colonel" the Army's retirement examiners will look at this season.

He hates quitting the service after 32 years.

Yet he is happy as a June graduate with a cushy job over the civilian career which now begins.

He was the first United States soldier to set foot in Japan after the surrender. He is the last man on earth to brag about this, or anything else.

Ladies and gentleman, meet Col. Charles T. Tench, retiring United States district engineer.

In years to come, your children, and your grandchildren may read on a bronze plaque somewhere a city's tribute to the colonel. He played a vital part in helping make possible the new Mississippi River bridge.

Colonel Tench, 51, was honored at a testimonial luncheon today at the Roosevelt. Speakers included Mayor Morrison, Governor Kennon, and Capt. Neville Levy, chairman of the Mississippi River Bridge Authority.

The new United States district engineer, Col. William H. Lewis, takes over tomorrow—and Colonel Tench will bust-out in his civilian trousseau, as he calls it.

He will start work as assistant to globe-trotting Wayne Palmer, Sr., president of an engineering firm with projects in the United States, Sweden, Cuba, Australia, and British Columbia.

The Palmer and Baker firm will build the projected 20-mile causeway across Lake Pontchartrain.

Colonel Tench will live in Mobile, company headquarters, but will have an office also in New Orleans.

Gen. Joseph Twitty, an engineer who retired a year ago as Chief of Staff of the Fifth Army at Chicago, will be resident engineer for the causeway.

Engineer Palmer, who makes air jumps of 3 or 4 days' duration to Sweden and other lands, will teach Colonel Tench the routines for the next 3 or 4 months.

Then the latter will take over some of the supervisory load.

Colonel Tench was one of General MacArthur's bright young men. Yet being bright and young was not all it took. He had to be good; and the record shows he was.

"The campaign in the Pacific was an engineer's war," the general wrote later. "I could go only as fast as my engineers would let me."

Tench was chief of MacArthur's tactical planning staff. He drew up detailed plans for the Lingayan Gulf campaign which liberated Manila—and for other big shows in the Pacific.

"General MacArthur's staff had no knowledge of the atom bomb till 3 days before it was dropped," Colonel Tench recalled.

"Adm. Forrest Sherman, then on Nimitz' staff, was in our headquarters discussing future operations with our chief of planning, General Chamberlain. Admiral Sherman said, 'Now, General, about the atom bomb——'

"'What's that?' said Chamberlain.

"'If you don't know, it's about time someone explained things,'" said Sherman, and proceeded.

"General Chamberlain then came to me in the colonel's mess. 'Put aside those plans for the assault on Japan,' he told me—'and let's get going on plans for the occupation.'"

The bomb fell—the rest is history.

The Japanese sent a representative to Manila to carry word of unconditional surrender. General MacArthur sent Colonel Tench in command of an advance party to prepare an airstrip near Tokyo.

(After Pearl Harbor experience, this amounted also to reconnaissance against last-ditch treachery; or boobytraps set for the commander.)

Tench and his Americans flew into Atsugi Airfield near Tokyo.

A tiny Japanese lieutenant general walked up to the plane ramp, saluted. This symbolized Japan's defeat, for the first time on mainland soil—and forever.

The little general said he spoke no English. A German concert pianist, Bauer, translated.

These were tense hours. None of Tench's party, flying in, really knew what to expect. A fanatical machinegun burst—and lots of other things—could have ended the story.

But the Japanese had had it. The general cooperated. Two days later, the airstrip prepared, General MacArthur flew in for the top-level ritual of conquest, and surrender.

In 1946, Colonel Tench visited Japan.

"I found the Japanese general; we had a fine time; drank good martinis with English gin. And I found he spoke marvelous English. If he had learned it since Bauer did the translating, then I think he is one of the greatest language scholars in history. He probably always knew it.

"He told me:

"'As you know, Colonel Tench, I was director of intelligence on the Imperial General Staff before the war. In this job, I made one mistake. I visited Rome, Paris, London, but not the United States. Had I made just one trip, colonel—just one trip—I could not have failed to see the factories, the cities, the industrial power of your country. And had I seen this, there would have been no war.'"

Colonel Tench said the Japanese, despite brilliant military operations, could not win when their first great effort failed.

He sees a similarity in the Civil War. The North had industrial power that was bound to crush the Confederacy in the long run.

"We would take over islands where the Japanese had been operating 2 or 3 years. They would have a little dirt airstrip scratched out—in all that time—that our planes would have chewed up in about a day. In 2 or 3 weeks, with heavy machinery, we would have a modern airfield in full operation."

Athletes Know the Value of It—Why Not the U. N.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, under date of January 5, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 23 that stated in effect "that the President is hereby requested to instruct the United States

mission to the United Nations to take such steps as may be necessary to have each day's session of the United Nations opened with prayer."

In introducing this resolution, I was then, and am now, firmly convinced that the United Nations sessions should be opened with prayer asking for divine guidance and help in the deliberations of that organization to bring about peace in the world. The desire for peace is the greatest desire of all people, and surely it seems only right that we, a Nation believing in a supreme being, should continue to use every means possible at our command to bring about the use of prayer in the United Nations.

I have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Mike Lee, written in the Long Island Press of Sunday, July 3, 1955, with the heading "Religion Big Factor in Sports." This column details the many, many instances of our greatest athletes calling upon Almighty God to give them strength and courage and also expressing their thanks to Almighty God for his divine assistance.

I am hoping before this session adjourns that Congress will see fit to pass this resolution thereby reaffirming our faith and our belief that the United Nations can use all the divine assistance that would come through the use of prayer.

Mr. Speaker, the article referred to appears at page A4973 of the RECORD of Thursday, July 7, 1955.

"Debunking" the High Tax Cost to Other States of Western Reclamation Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, recently a great many statements have appeared in the RECORD in regard to the cost of reclamation projects, and particularly the cost per State of the upper Colorado storage project. These statements present fantastic tax figures per State, and are not in accord with the facts.

I have asked Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, to give me a correct statement of the tax costs which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD.

I call attention, particularly, to his statement that the portion of general tax funds for each State for construction of the upper Colorado project is infinitesimal. It would amount to something like $18 million a year, The critics of the upper basin fail to point out that a large portion of the funds for the upper Colorado storage project will come out of the reclamation fund, which are not general tax funds. This will be over 73 percent of the total amount when construction on the project proceeds to the year 1965, as shown by table 1.

In addition, other States making contributions through taxes to reclamation projects receive a large proportion of the expenditures for labor and material. I am attaching table No. 2 which gives the breakdown on the expenditures for labor and material on the Colorado River storage project. The plain fact is that the Eastern States do rather well. Furthermore, the general taxpayer is getting the benefit of these wealth producing projects and history has shown that many of the reclamation project areas now contribute more in Federal taxes each year than the entire Federal investment in those projects.

Commissioner Dexheimer's letter, together with the two exhibits referred to, are attached for the information of the Members of the House:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1955.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: The following information is furnished in response to your letter of July 6, 1955.

Recent articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the public press contain erroneous and misleading data on proposals for authorizing additional reclamation projects in the Western States, such as the upper Colorado storage, the Fryingpan-Arkansas, and the Trinity projects. Allegations are made that the cost of these projects would be proportionately assessed against the States of the Union with a corresponding increase in each State's tax burden. For the upper Colorado storage project, for example, it is alleged that the project will cost $4 billion and will cost the State of Massachusetts $127,600,000, Oklahoma $44,800,000, Ohio $236,000,000, and New York $493,600,000 in added taxes—to name a few. These statements are not in accord with the facts.

The upper Colorado River storage project, under consideration by the Congress for authorization, has a total estimated cost of $760 million as reported by the House committee or $1,093 million as passed by the Senate. The impression is being created that this cost, or the inflated estimated cost cited above, will require increased tax revenues from each State in proportion to its Federal taxes. The allegations made reveal that the financing of reclamation projects is deliberately misrepresented or is not understood.

Construction of complex, multiple-purpose reclamation projects must be spread over a period of years. The annual fund requirement is therefore much less than indicated by total cost data standing alone. Analyses made by the Bureau of Reclamation show that for the 10-year period from 1956 through 1965 maximum appropriations for all its activities of $240 million will allow for construction of all projects under way, on the new projects not yet authorized, and would finance the cost of investigations of future projects, operation and maintenance of completed facilities, and general administrative expenses.

The money that goes into building reclamation projects is made available by annual congressional appropriations from two sources: general funds of the Treasury and the reclamation fund. The reclamation fund was established by Congress in 1902. It receives a part of the receipts from public land sales and oil royalties out of the public land States (for fiscal year 1955, $34,500,000) and from revenues from reclamation projects. Revenues from reclamation projects include those from water sales, repayment of construction and operation and maintenance costs by irrigation farmers and revenues from the sale of hydroelectric power. These revenues were $58,500,000 in fiscal year 1955. These funds are paid into the United States Treasury as received and require appropriation by Congress before they can be spent.

The reclamation fund has carried a steadily increasing portion of the reclamation work. It will finance 53.3 percent of the fiscal year 1956 program. By the end of the decade in 1965 it will reach 73.2 percent according to Bureau estimates. The attached table (table 1) shows total annual appropriations and the portion from the reclamation fund. The estimated needs through 1965 include funds for the upper Colorado River storage project and all other projects the Bureau has recommended, or expects to recommend, to the Congress for authorization. About $100 million a year during this period is needed from the general fund of the Treasury. This money is largely reimbursable, and all power and municipal water costs will be paid back with interest.

Using the same tax distribution basis as our critics, the portion of general tax for each State for loan of construction funds for the upper Colorado River storage project is infinitesimal. For example, the $1 billion loan spread over 25 years is $40 million per year. An average of 55 percent will come from the reclamation fund and not from tax revenue. Therefore, the annual loan from the general fund of the Treasury is $18 million. The share of the States mentioned above is: Massachusetts, $575,000; Oklahoma, $202,000; Ohio, $1,060,000; and New York, $2,220,000. Eighty-one percent of the $18 million and other construction costs will be spent outside the upper Colorado River Basin and will provide employment and more business in those areas.

In addition, new taxable wealth is created by these projects. Many of the reclamation project areas now contribute more in Federal income taxes each year than the entire Federal investment.

Table 2 shows distribution of construction expenditures by States for the initial units of the Colorado River storage project, as recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

TABLE 1.—*Analysis of appropriations*

Fiscal year	Total appropriations	Portion from reclamation fund	Percent of total
HISTORICAL			
1950	$366,963,357	$44,771,257	12.20
1951	277,727,668	47,322,094	17.04
1952	240,923,610	51,582,435	21.41
1953	214,191,956	73,182,415	34.17
1952	147,454,998	74,995,244	50.86
1955	165,660,500	83,706,919	50.53
ESTIMATED			
1956	$184,308,500	$98,240,450	53.30
1957	211,000,000	107,500,000	51.00
1958	220,000,000	115,500,000	52.50
1959	225,000,000	123,500,000	55.00
1960	235,000,000	129,500,000	55.00
1961	240,000,000	132,500,000	55.20
1962	240,000,000	138,500,000	57.70
1963	240,000,000	153,500,000	64.00
1964	240,000,000	166,500,000	69.40
1965	240,000,000	175,500,000	73.20

TABLE 2.—*Distribution by States of expenditures for labor and materials—Initial units of Colorado River storage project*

State	Dollars (in thousands)	Man-years
Alabama	7,025	1,405
Arizona	37,036	7,407
Arkansas	2,145	429
California	125,248	25,050
Colorado	47,981	9,596
Connecticut	15,181	3,036
Delaware	1,429	286
District of Columbia	774	155
Florida	2,797	559
Georgia	8,157	1,631
Idaho	5,963	1,193
Illinois	53,463	10,693
Indiana	23,815	4,763
Iowa	5,357	1,071
Kansas	10,270	2,054
Kentucky	5,953	1,191
Louisiana	5,536	1,107
Maine	3,452	690
Maryland	9,108	1,822
Massachusetts	26,970	5,394
Michigan	41,556	8,311
Minnesota	8,157	1,631
Mississippi	2,382	476
Missouri	12,980	2,596
Montana	4,275	855
Nebraska	6,547	1,309
Nevada	4,667	933
New Hampshire	2,441	488
New Jersey	33,400	6,680
New Mexico	17,006	3,401
New York	77,398	15,480
North Carolina	13,158	2,632
North Dakota	1,403	281
Ohio	50,844	10,169
Oklahoma	7,809	1,562
Oregon	9,847	1,970
Pennsylvania	55,549	11,110
Rhode Island	5,240	1,048
South Carolina	6,370	1,274
South Dakota	2,056	411
Tennessee	7,681	1,536
Texas	34,575	6,915
Utah	61,716	12,343
Vermont	1,191	238
Virginia	8,395	1,679
Washington	14,631	2,926
West Virginia	5,299	1,060
Wisconsin	18,100	3,620
Wyoming	10,719	2,144
Total	923,052	184,610

Text of Scientists' Statement on Atomic War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, July 10, 1955:

TEXT OF SCIENTISTS' STATEMENT ON ATOMIC WAR

LONDON, July 9.—Here is the full text of a statement on the perils of nuclear war signed by Albert Einstein and seven other prominent scientists, issued here today by Bertrand Russell. It is preceded by a preamble by Russell.

THE PREAMBLE

"The statement which has been signed by some of the most eminent scientific authorities in different parts of the world deals with the perils of a nuclear war.

"It makes it clear that neither side can hope for victory in such a war, and that there is a very real danger of the extermination of the human race by dust and rain from radioactive clouds.

"It suggests that neither the public nor the governments of the world are adequately aware of the danger.

"It points out that an agreed prohibition of nuclear weapons, while it might be useful in lessening tension, would not afford a solution, since such weapons would certainly be manufactured and used in a great war in spite of previous agreements to the contrary.

"The only hope for mankind is the avoidance of war. To call for a way of thinking which shall make such avoidance possible is the purpose of this statement.

"The first move came as a collaboration between Einstein and myself. Einstein's signature was given in the last weeks of his life.

"Since his death I have approached men of scientific competence both in the East and in the West, for political disagreements should not influence men of science in estimating what is probable, but some of those approached have not yet replied.

"I am bringing the warning pronounced by the signatories to the notice of all the powerful governments of the world in the earnest hope that they may agree to allow their citizens to survive."

THE STATEMENT

"In the tragic situation which confronts humanity, we feel that scientists should assemble in conference to appraise the perils that have arisen as a result of the development of weapons of mass destruction, and to discuss a resolution in the spirit of the appended draft.

"Almost everybody who is politically conscious has strong feelings about one or more of these issues. But we want you, if you can, to set aside such feelings and consider yourselves only as members of a biological species which has had a remarkable history, and whose disappearance none of us can desire.

"We shall try to say no single word which should appeal to one group rather than to another. All equally, are in peril, and, if the peril is understood, there is hope that they may collectively avert it.

"We are speaking on this occasion, not as members of this or that nation, continent, or creed, but as human beings, members of the species man, whose continued existence is in doubt.

"The world is full of conflicts; and, overshadowing all minor conflicts, the titanic struggle between communism and anticommunism.

"We have to learn to think in a new way. We have to learn to ask ourselves, not what steps can be taken to give military victory to whatever group we prefer, for there no longer are such steps; the question we have to ask ourselves is: What steps can be taken to prevent a military contest of which the issue must be disastrous to all parties?

"The general public, and even many men in position of authority, have not realized what would be involved in a war with nuclear bombs.

"The general public still thinks in terms of the obliteration of cities. It is understood that the new bombs are more powerful than the old, and that, while one A-bomb could obliterate Hiroshima, one H-bomb could obliterate the largest cities, such as London, New York, and Moscow.

"No doubt in an H-bomb war great cities would be obliterated. But this is one of the minor disasters that would have to be faced.

"If everybody in London, New York, and Moscow were exterminated the world might, in the course of a few centuries, recover from the blow.

"But we now know, especially since the Bikini test, that nuclear bombs can gradually spread destruction over a very much wider area than had been supposed.

"It is stated on very good authority that a bomb can now be manufactured which will be 2,500 times as powerful as that which destroyed Hiroshima.

"Such a bomb, if exploded near the ground or under water, sends radioactive particles into the upper air. They sink gradually and reach the surface of the earth in the form of a deadly dust or rain. It was this dust which infected the Japanese fishermen and their catch of fish.

"No one knows how widely such lethal radioactive particles might be diffused, but the best authorities are unanimous in saying that a war with H-bombs might quite possibly put an end to the human race.

"It is feared that if many H-bombs are used there would be universal death—sudden only for a minority, but for the majority a slow torture of disease and disintegration.

"Many warnings have been uttered by eminent men of science and by authorities in military strategy. None of them will say that the worst results are certain. What they do say, is that these results are possible, and no one can be sure that they will not be realized.

"We have not yet found that the views of experts on this question depend in any degree upon their politics or prejudices. They depend only, so far as our researches have revealed, upon the extent of the particular expert's knowledge.

"We have found that the men who know most are the most gloomy.

"Here, then, is the problem which we present to you, stark and dreadful, and inescapable:

"Shall we put an end to the human race, or shall mankind renounce war? People will not face this alternative because it is so difficult to abolish war.

"The abolition of war will demand distasteful limitations of national sovereignty. But what perhaps impedes understanding of the situation more than anything else is that the term 'mankind' feels vague and abstract.

"People scarcely realize in imagination that the danger is to themselves and their children and their grandchildren, and not only to a dimly apprehended humanity.

"They can scarcely bring themselves to grasp that they, individually, and those whom they love, are in imminent danger of perishing agonizingly.

"And so they hope that perhaps war may be allowed to continue, provided modern weapons are prohibited.

"This hope is illusory. Whatever agreements not to use H-bombs had been reached in time of peace, they would no longer be considered binding in time of war, and both sides would set to work to manufacture H-bombs as soon as war broke out, for, if one side manufactured the bombs and the other did not, the side that manufactured them would inevitably be victorious.

"Although an agreement to renounce nuclear weapons as part of a general reduction of armaments would not afford an ultimate solution, it would serve certain important purposes.

"First. Any agreement between East and West is to the good insofar as it tends to diminish tension.

"Second. The abolition of thermonuclear weapons, if each side believed that the other had carried it out sincerely, would lessen the fear of a sudden attack in the style of Pearl Harbor, which at present keeps both sides in a state of nervous apprehension. We should therefore welcome such an agreement, though only as a first step.

"Most of us are not neutral in feeling, but, as human beings, we have to remember that, if the issues between East and West are to be decided in any manner that can give any possible satisfaction to anybody, whether Communist or anti-Communist, whether Asian or European or American, whether white or black, then these issues must not be decided by war.

"We should wish this to be understood, both in the East and in the West.

"There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge, and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death, because we cannot forget our quarrels?

"We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new paradise. If you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death.

"Resolution: We invite this Congress, and through it the scientists of the world and the general public, to subscribe to the following resolution:

"In view of the fact that in any future world war, nuclear weapons will certainly be employed, and that such weapons threaten the continued existence of mankind, we urge the governments of the world to realize, and to acknowledge publicly, that their purposes cannot be furthered by a world war, and we urge them, consequently, to find peaceful means for the settlement of all matters of dispute between them."

What Is Agricultural Land Worth Today?—Fifty Years From Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, near 100 years ago Horace Greeley said: "Go West, young man, go West." Land was free almost for the asking: That day has passed. There is no longer a western frontier. Good land can no longer be had for the asking. It has to be reclaimed. This means clearing, draining, leveling and/or applying water under irrigation in order to make it productive.

It is estimated that 20 to 25 million acres in the United States might be reclaimed by clearing and draining. Another 6 million acres of available land is subject to irrigation. When these acres are reclaimed land expansion will cease but the demand for land will go on and the price will go up.

Land without water in the arid West is worth only what it will produce as dry range land. With water it becomes highly productive and its value greatly increases. The history of 50 years of reclamation indicates that the value of land and water when first joined is only from one-half to one-fourth the value 40 years later. On the Strawberry project in Utah in 1915 water costing $120 per ace was put on land, that at that time was selling—land and water—for $50 per acre. The $120, however, was not a cash payment. It was paid over a period of 40 years. Today that same land is selling for $500 to $600 per acre.

The cost of supplying irrigation water for lands in the Colorado River storage project and participating projects is higher when considered in terms of the present but when considered in terms of the value of the land 50 years from now it is very reasonable.

For example, for the participating projects included in S. 500 the average cost per acre saved is $545. The maximum is $715 and the minimum $190. When it is recognized that these costs will be paid over a 50-year period the market value at any year in the payout period will be greater than the cost of land and water up to that year. If history repeats itself the market value of the land at the end of the payout period will be nearer four times the cost of putting water on the land.

Based on past experience an average farm is bought and paid for once every generation. This means a given farm may be bought and paid for twice during the payout period.

Wherever good land and good water are joined under good management so that the annual net return is sufficient to pay the annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs plus an increment sufficient to return the capital investment in 50 years, it is a good investment for the Government because the value of the indirect benefits will always exceed the interest cost on the investment.

The per acre irrigation costs on the Colorado River storage project are high but not excessive or unreasonable. The first cost will be fully repaid and the indirect benefits will more than offset the theoretical cost of the interest-free money.

Keep Politics Out of ASC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith a short editorial comment from the Enterprise-Courier, published by my good friend, Art Wallhausen, at Charleston, Mo.:

Most of us take the work of our Congressmen and Senators for granted. In many instances the work they accomplish affects us only indirectly. In recent weeks, however, the folks in Mississippi County have had an opportunity to see the democratic principles on which this Nation was founded in action. HENNINGS, SYMINGTON, and JONES teamed up to clarify a situation which cannot be classified as democratic—the arbitrary suspension of the duly elected ASC Committee in this county. There have been rumbles of political manipulation in other Missouri counties. More farmer-elected ASC county committeemen have been suspended or dismissed during the past 2 years in Missouri than in the preceding 20 years.

If we are going to kick the farm program into politics that's O. K., but let's have it understood.

If, however, the program is administered on the county level by farmer-elected committeemen, then let's have it understood on that basis.

The people of Missouri and of the United States owe a vote of thanks to these three gentlemen from Missouri—Senators HENNINGS and SYMINGTON and Congressman PAUL JONES.

I might add, however, that while the county committee has been reinstated, there is still much to be done to restore the confidence of the people in the agency that is responsible for the operation of the farm program. For instance, the fact that the Missouri State ASC Committee has not approved the appointment of the county office manager, selected by the Mississippi County ASC Committee, and is still carrying him on a temporary basis, does not cause the people in that community to believe the State committee is acting in good faith.

Prime Minister U Nu's Impressions Are Badly Mistaken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a press release issued on July 7, 1955, by the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations:

ANSWERING PRIME MINISTER U NU'S STATEMENTS OF JULY 6, 1955, AT A UNITED NATIONS NEWS CONFERENCE

On July 6, 1955, at a news conference in the United Nations, Prime Minister U Nu, of Burma, expressed the belief that United States policymakers were not opposed to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. Mr. Nu went on to say that he had come away from his talks in Washington * * * with the impression that "most of the responsible people are not against the entry of Peiping into the United Nations."

Facts belie Prime Minister U Nu's impressions. Because of the vast amount of misinformation on the sentiments of the American people and their leaders on the issue of the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, circulated throughout the world by both our enemies and our misinformed friends, the Committee of One Million believes that the following facts should be reiterated:

The Congress of the United States has passed four unanimous resolutions opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

One million and thirty-seven thousand Americans signed the petition against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations circulated by the Committee for One Million, the immediate predecessor of this present organization.

Millions more have endorsed the petition through the official action of all major national, fraternal, civil, women's and labor organizations.

Twenty-four Senators of both parties are members of the Committee of One Million (against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations); 97 representatives of both parties are members of the committee; 9 Governors of both parties are members of the committee; 8 former Ambassadors and 1 former Secretary of State (Gen. George C. Marshall) are members of the committee.

Warren R. Austin, honorary chairman of the committee, and first United States Ambassador to the United Nations, in a message to Dag Hammarskjold, Secretary General of the U. N., said: "We believe that such admission (of Communist China) would undermine the integrity, destroy the influence and paralyze the functions of the United Nations by giving a double permanent veto to Communist totalitarian powers on the Security Council. To so reward a government which was an open aggressor against the

United Nations itself would make a mockery of the organization as an agency to preserve peace, and break faith with the men who died on its behalf in Korea. It would amount to inviting the unrepentant criminal to sit on the judge's bench."

Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, in response to a statement on negotiations with Communist China made by the steering committee of this committee, said: "The points to which the statement calls attention are valid and timely. Our relationship with our stanch and loyal free Chinese allies must not, and I believe will not, be sacrificed in any discussions which may eventuate between us and the Chinese Communists. You may be assured that in approaching any discussions with the Chinese Communists, their record of broken pledges and violated agreements will not be overlooked."

Nelson A. Rockefeller, special assistant to the President, in response to a letter from religious leaders of all faiths opposing the admission of Communist China to the United Nations said: "The President has requested that I express to you and your associates his gratitude for your heart-warming letter of May 30 voicing your confidence in 'a policy of peace built on the strength and unity of the free world.' Peace based on strength and mutual respect has been the overriding objective of this administration. I assure you the President will never slacken in his determination to achieve it. These ends cannot be achieved, any more than can a permanent peace, by appeasement and withdrawal in the face of aggression, armed or covert. It is well to have support for this stand voiced by eminent leaders of many faiths now, as this Nation and its friends in the free world prepare for a summer of negotiations that can materially affect the course of history."

Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, said this spring: "We are opposed, in principle, to admitting the Peiping clique into the U. N. Such admission would only encourage Moscow's worldwide fifth column to step up its subversive conspiracy and civil war in other lands. It would mean rewarding the organizers of Communist civil war with international diplomatic recognition and economic and political assistance merely because they have seized power, established a totalitarian dictatorship and have thus proven that they can and do actually govern. Such a policy is not realism—unless suicide be considered realism. U. N. recognition of Red China is not the way to give faith, hope, and help to the weaker democracies of Asia and to those people behind the Iron Curtain in whom the spark of freedom has not been extinguished."

At a recent press conference Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, said: "I can see no ethical justification for admitting Red China to the United Nations. If the United Nations is to be an agency for collective security, and I have not abandoned that hope, we certainly should not admit a nation which is redhanded in aggression. If you admit Red China to the United Nations, you not only admit them to membership but also give them a seat on the Security Council, and you have two aggressive nations in that very important body. A footpad would not normally be escorted to the bench and asked to become a judge of acts of burglary or assault."

At the same press conference Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, said: "China today is a conquered country and, in my judgment, when you recognize Red China and admit her to the United Nations we accept that conquest of mainland China."

The above facts and statements are but a few indications of the true felings of the American people, and their leaders, on the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. It is necessary only to consult back newspaper files to discover categoric statements against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations made by every American leader, including both President Truman and President Eisenhower, from every walk of life. We believe it to be vital that both our friends, like Prime Minister U Nu, of Burma, and our enemies, be kept aware of the American peoples' sentiments. The dissemination of such information is one of the prime responsibilities of the Committee of One Million (against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations).

S. 2090, Technical-Assistance Program Under the Foreign-Aid Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

The Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the technical-assistance program as originally conceived was to be a people-to-people program of sharing know-how and technical skill.

We have pointed out in our minority views that helping people to help themselves brings lasting benefits, not only to the recipients but to the donors as well. It builds self-respect for peoples everywhere and independence for nations.

This technical-assistance program was originally and in some quarters still is known as the point 4 program. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson said that the program "is not and never will be a big money enterprise. It is cooperative, which means that a considerable part of the expense should be borne by the countries in which we work. It involves salaries and expenses of many, not vast purchases of machinery and raw materials. Its objective is to show other people how to meet their own needs, not to attempt to meet these needs ourselves. For this reason, the cost of technical cooperation will always be modest compared with the cost of other types of foreign-aid programs."

When Dr. Henry G. Bennett, the first director of technical cooperation, appeared before our committee, he said that he understood that the plan was a simple, down-to-earth, self-help program designed primarily to assist other peoples in increasing their food production, bettering their health conditions, and improving their educational systems. With these statements I am in accord. However, the program as it is now working goes far beyond these basic fundamentals stated by the former Secretary of State and Dr. Bennett.

Mr. Chairman, in view of this vast expansion, I cannot agree to the proposals for technical assistance as provided in this bill. There is little, if any, difference in the actual operation of technical assistance or of technical cooperation. Technical assistance is usually used to refer to such operations involving the more advanced countries or to military matters. So conceived, technical assistance especially in the fields of productivity has been a feature of our aid to Europe from the inception of the program. In recent years, we have been spending considerably more for supplies and equipment than for technicians, and there has been the feeling that it would be unwise to emphasize commodity and end-item assistance rather than technical assistance. In fact, our own committee has spoken out and advised the administrators of the technical-assistance programs to reduce the ratio of supplies and equipment to services and training even though used to support technical-assistance programs. The Hoover Commission report has stated that President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress on the Mutual Security Act for 1954, asserted that technical-cooperation programs should provide experts and know-how, rather than large amounts of funds or goods. Yet the bill before us ignores his advice.

Mr. Chairman, a witness who appeared before our committee a year ago along with several other witnesses, pointed out one of the weaknesses of the whole technical assistance operation: It is that the administrators of the program have failed to find out just how we could be most helpful in rendering assistance, along the lines of self-help and know-how. It was pointed out that the administrators apparently have labored under the concept that to insure success of the program, it was necessary to make a mass impact on the country concerned. To succeed in this mass impact, it obviously seemed desirable to put in as many people and as much money as Congress would provide.

It has always been, Mr. Chairman, the popular understanding that our technical assistance would be closely related to the needs of the masses of underprivileged people. These so-called masses are largely village people. The only country in Asia where this is not true is Japan where we have a relatively small program. On the Asian Continent, our contribution to village development is quite limited. In some countries we have barely scratched the surface of the program of getting help to the villages. In some countries like India, we have, to our detriment, claimed much more credit than we deserve. On the other hand, in Formosa the Joint Commission on Rural Rehabilitation has done an excellent job in getting help to the village people. It has been stated that in one country in Asia, according to a high Government official, conditions in the villages were so bad that an American could not be expected to live there and so, nothing has been done under the program. This country is one in which there is considerable Communist strength. The point I make is that our technical assistance has not, in any large way, been reaching the people who need it most.

Mr. Chairman, the Hoover Commission report on the United States technical assistance program points out that technical assistance has grown like Topsy

from a limited, simple, self-help, down-to-earth program offering skills and knowledge in the fields of agriculture, education, and health to the underdeveloped countries of the world. Technical assistance is now being given or has been given by our Government in a wide variety of fields encompassing a bewildering array of projects to 63 countries and dependent overseas territories. There is obviously no attempt to gear the program to this limited concept of down-to-earth programs but rather a super-duper program to provide highways, to organize industrial concern, power dams, and a whole range of activities far removed from a program offering skills and knowledge in the fields of health, agriculture, and education.

Mr. Chairman, again I refer to the so-called Hoover Commission report which clearly sets forth the only justification for foreign aid. This report states:

> There is one and only one justification for foreign aid: the economic and political security of the United States. This standard includes anything that is deemed by high policies to further such security. But the overruling motive in United States security. If this results in social and humanitarian benefits, we should be both satisfied and grateful. The important thing to remember is that foreign aid was never intended to be and should never be permitted to become an instrument for reforming the world and uplifting the living standards of more than 1 billion human beings.
>
> United States resources are limited. It is impossible for us in the field of technical assistance just as in the field of military operations to cover every base and be strong at every point. Our resources of available skilled personnel are restricted even if our financial resources seem easily equal to any prudent technical-assistance demands on them.

Mr. Chairman, again referring to this same report, it is pointed out that despite the facts that we have spent close to a half billion dollars on technical assistance, that we have operated in most countries of the world and that we have sent large numbers of skilled and respected specialists abroad in its interests, there is nothing which has emerged from our efforts which typifies and dramatizes the whole program. No single disease has been eliminated as typhoid or smallpox has been eliminated from the United States. No Jenner or Goethals stands as symbols for our work. It is difficult for anyone to point to a single technical program which has had a profound and lasting effect of real significance upon the general population of the country.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that instead of nibbling at a host of problems in the countries where we work, we should pick 1 or 2 of the most vital needs, the solution of which not only is in the interest both of the recipient country and of the United States but will also have the largest impact upon the greatest number of people. It has been well said that we must concentrate our forces and resources upon this type of project.

Mr. Chairman, I find no testimony in the record which indicates that such foresight now actuates the administrators of the technical-assistance program. We have gone far beyond the original concepts as I have stated above and there appears to be no release from the bungling that has occurred at the expense of the American taxpayer.

In effect, Mr. Chairman, we are embarked upon an international WPA program, without rhyme or reason and with no fixed termination date. For some people engaged in this program, it will go on and on and on—ad infinitum.

Red Air Might

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles by Stewart Alsop and Joseph Alsop, from the Washington Post of July 10 and 11, 1955:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 10, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT—RED AIR MIGHT DAMPENS A FAIR

(By Stewart Alsop)

Moscow.—As all the world now knows, the Red air force last Sunday staged a remarkable demonstration of Soviet airpower. It may be worth describing the Soviet air show visually as it happened. For there is a surprising difference between a Soviet intercontinental bomber, for example, as a digit on a piece of paper, and a huge Soviet bomber right over your head.

The show took place over a big grass field on the outskirts of Moscow. The scene was for all the world like a country fair, with booths where ladies in kerchiefs sold eskimo pies, tables where you could drink beer under gaily colored umbrellas, and small stages where girls sang or tumblers performed. The whole atmosphere was remarkably jolly and good natured, and the first part of the air show itself was very much in keeping with the atmosphere.

Dozens of planes which looked like Piper Cubs did stunt flying, or spelled out patriotic slogans in formation. Big, slow biplanes then released gliders over the field, and the gliders swooped lazily about. There was even one ridculous glider with wings which flapped like a sick bird's. Apparently the man inside the glider was pumping like mad with his legs.

At any rate, it all seemed very unwarlike and cheerful. This reporter was reminded of an air show he had seen in upper New York State in the thirties.

Then suddenly there was the unmistakable keening noise of a jet. A big twin-engine plane—a MIG–17, the improvement on the MIG–15—swooped across the field. The pilot stunted it expertly, waltzing it through the air with the power and grace only a jet can achieve. Then more MIG–17's stunted in perfect formation, and then came the big show.

For a few seconds you heard in the distance the buzzing, angry sound of large numbers of planes flying in formation. Then they were right overhead, hurrying purposefully along at an altitude of only a few hundred feet. At such an altitude, the big bombers and fighters, designed to perform at 40,000 feet or more, were as much out of their element as an eagle in a duck pond. The purpose was obvious. It was to let the foreigners present have a good, long, thoughtful look.

The first formation consisted of seven very large turbojets, the planes first glimpsed in one's and two's over Moscow last May. It was the big western guess then that the main purpose of these planes was to refuel the Soviet medium bomber, the Badger, to give it the range to reach the American Continent and return. But no westerner really knows.

Then with a shattering roar 12 Bisons passed overhead. They are the Soviet equivalents of our own B–52's, and they are designed to fly from continent to continent nonstop and return. Even this reporter, who has never been able to tell the difference between a Ford and a Chevrolet, recognized them instantly—they are strange, ugly looking planes with their four huge engines bunched up close around the pilots' compartment.

The accepted theory is that the Soviet engineers first built the enormous engines—believed to develop much greater power than any American jet engine—and then built the planes around the engines. As you look at these big, strange planes, the theory seems plausible.

Then came 54 Badgers—they are the Russian answer to our own B–47, and they look like little brothers to the Bison. After that, this reporter got a painful crick in his neck, and began to lose count. But there were well over 50 all-weather fighters—very big fighters, looking a lot like the Badger—and a similar number of the entirely new day fighters called the Farmer, which has worried the NATO Command. They looked worth worrying about.

Finally, as a kind of lagniappe, came the single jet transport, which no Westerner had ever seen before. It could be used commercially or for refueling. We have no plane like it.

Altogether, it was an impressive performance. No sane man who saw the big planes could conceivably retain the comfortable notion that they were "handmade prototypes" built to bemuse the foreigners. It is perfectly obvious that the Russians have simply done again what they have done so successfully before: They have found models which satisfy their real strategic requirements, including intercontinental bombing, and they have rushed these models into all-out production.

Defense Secretary Wilson is the author of the "handmade prototype theory," and also of the theory that the Soviet Air Force is wholly defensive. It might have been instructive for Wilson to have been there in person to watch the dozens of sleek Badgers and the huge Bisons thundering overhead.

About midway through the show, one foreign observer swung his binoculars over to the main reviewing stand. He found its occupants in a state of high good humor, laughing. It might even have done Wilson good to have been behind the binoculars.

At any rate, long before the big show ended, it had ceased to seem quite so much like a jolly country fair.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 11, 1955]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

THE BISON IN A HANGAR

One of the most significant and curious pieces of intelligence to come out of the Soviet Union in a long time concerns the production of the famous Bison airplane. The Bison, or T–37, is the Russian equivalent of our own intercontinental jet bomber, the B–52.

In brief, the Soviets produced the Bison prototype by gathering all the persons concerned into a single huge hangar at their

Ramenskoye base outside Moscow and keeping them there until blueprints had become aircraft. Air engineers, air force officers in charge of the project, scores of electronic and other specialists, many hundreds of mechanics and workmen—all these were held together in a kind of laborious purdah until they had done their job.

United States Air Force authorities somewhat ruefully accord full credence to this sidelight on Soviet production methods. Furthermore, they estimated that it took only 8 months from the approval of the Bison blueprints to the moment when the first Bison rolled out of Ramenskoye's special construction hangar in July 1953.

After ground testing, this Bison prototype is believed to have made its first experimental flight in the autumn of 1953. It was flown over Moscow at low altitude (and dismissed by the Pentagon leadership as of no significance) in May 1954.

By then, the Bison had reached the stage of in-line production. Flights of 10 Bisons at a time were observed over Moscow this way. The Air Force officially estimates that the Soviets are now each month producing from 15 to 20 of these bombers which can strike from Russian bases, without refueling, at the industrial heart of the United States.

In contrast, work on the American intercontinental jet bomber, the B–52, began in 1947. Blueprints were approved and the first experimental contracts were let to the Boeing Co. in 1949—the moment crudely comparable with the first rally in the Ramenskoye hangar. Construction proceeded thereafter, with the Air Staff in the Pentagon, the Air Materiel Command at Wright Field, and the Air Research and Development Command, which was then in Washington, all intervening at frequent intervals.

Two years later this majestic but dispersed process produced its grand result. The first prototype, the XB–52, which was used only for ground testing, rolled out of the Boeing plant in Seattle in November 1951. And nearly 3 years had passed from the letting of the experimental contract to the completion of the first prototype to take the air, the YB–52, in March 1952.

The YB–52 was flown that April. Thereafter, 2 further years elapsed before the B–52 went into line production in August 1954. By May 1955 when the Soviets showed their 10 Bisons over Moscow, the Air Force had approximately 30 B–52's. In sum, planning of the B–52 began 8 years ago, and actual construction began 6 years ago. Planning of the Bison probably began 4 years ago and actual construction began less than 3 years ago. The B–52 entered squadron service in June and the Bison entered squadron service this month.

Nor is this the only melancholy contrast that needs careful thinking about. By this spring, our B–52 production had reached the planned peak of 10 planes per month. Then the Moscow overflights aroused public opinion and Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson reluctantly asked for funds to finance an increase of B–52 output. Secretary Wilson's request will take some time to get results. Our B–52 production will rise to 13 planes per month, as against the estimated Soviet monthly production of 15 to 20 Bisons.

In other words, Soviet aircraft "lead time"—the all-important interval between the planting of the seed and the final harvest of finished aircraft—is about half of our lead time in America. Even in the category of aircraft on which all American strategy depends, and even after the American effort has been intensified under severe public pressure, the experts think that the Soviets are now outproducing this country by a narrow margin.

The grim efficiency of the rough and ready methods is typified by that hangar at Ramenskoye, and by our habit of pouring our resources into ermine-lined Cadillacs while the Soviets concentrate the world's second industrial economy almost fully on war production. These explain the fact that the Soviets are now seizing the lead in the air that used to belong to the United States. This is both a major scandal and a bleak threat to the survival of the Nation. It demands more detailed consideration.

Resolutions Adopted by the Republican Party of Wisconsin on June 25, 1955, at Ripon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a number of resolutions adopted by the Republican Party of Wisconsin at its annual convention held in Ripon, Wis., on June 25, 1955. Ripon is the birthplace of the Republican Party and I believe that the resolutions approved by the Republicans of Wisconsin are of interest to the Nation at large:

ENDORSEMENT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin, in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955 at Ripon, Wis., express its belief, confidence, and enthusiasm in the administration headed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and commend him for the outstanding work he is doing as the Chief Executive of this Nation; be it further

Resolved, That the President respond to the demands by his country and his party by placing his name in candidacy for the Republican nomination for President in the next general election.

FOR CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO TREATIES

Whereas the device, since 1942, of according treaty status to unratified executive agreements reposes overly absolute power in any executive and has upset the wise system of checks and balances between legislative, executive, and judicial branches which forms the essential keystone of our republican form of government, as set forth by the Constitution; and

Whereas not only Yalta, but lesser executive agreements and treaties, have impaired national interests and overridden American constitutional rights; and

Whereas treaties have been shown to be an extraordinary power liable to abuse, able to give away our constitutional rights, and also able to bestow powers specifically denied by the Constitution; and

Whereas Wisconsin's able and senior Representative, LAWRENCE SMITH, has proposed a constitutional amendment to limit treaty infringement on domestic laws by requiring enabling legislation, and this proposed amendment would also void treaties made in conflict or not in pursuance of the Constitution in his resolution, House Joint Resolution 172, which incorporates the essential features of the Bricker amendment: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled June 1955 at Ripon, Wis., earnestly petition the house Judiciary Committee to report out of committee the nonpartisan Smith Act for treaty amendment; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Wisconsin Members of Congress, to the House Judiciary Committee, and to the President, with the further request that our Members of the House and Senate work to secure passage of this vital treaty amendment.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR MCCARTHY

Be it resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin, in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955 at Ripon, Wis., views with alarm the recent censure of Senator MCCARTHY by the Senate of the United States as an unwarranted attempt to impair our sovereign power of our State of Wisconsin in choosing its elective Representatives, and be it further

Resolved, That we again commend Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY for his continued unrelenting patriotic efforts to purge the United States of communism and subversive elements.

OPPOSITION TO REVISION MCCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

Be it resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin, in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955 at Ripon, Wis., urge the President and Congress of the United States to resist pressures and measures that would alter or in any manner weaken the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

COMMENDATION OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. HALLECK

Be it resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled takes deep pride in commending Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, for his present and past leadership in the Congress of the United States and wishes to thank him sincerely for his honoring us by his presence here to deliver an inspiring address to this 1955 convention.

OPPOSITION TO NEGOTIATIONS WITH RED CHINA UNLESS AMERICANS ARE RELEASED FROM PRISONS

Whereas the Communist Chinese government is illegally holding American boys in prison camps despite the provisions of the Panmunjom Treaty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955, at Ripon, Wis., recommends no negotiations with Communist China be entered into unless these prisoners are returned.

U. N. CHARTER REVISION

Whereas United Nations Charter revision is scheduled for 1955 consideration, and efforts are being made through suggested amendments to convert the United Nations into a world government and to destroy our safeguard of the veto power against uncertain majorities: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the State Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled, June 25, 1955, petition Congress to instruct its charter revision delegates as follows:

1. Delegates to oppose any revisions designed to secure world government.

2. Delegates to oppose yielding of the veto power.

3. Delegates to reaffirm the charter provision prohibiting domestic interference by the United Nations and at the same time seek to rescind or abridge all contravening articles of the charter; and be it further

Resolved, That we petition Congress to instruct delegates to reject the current thesis that revision of the United Nations Charter can be by "informal growth and usage," since such dangerous interpretation would place United Nations practices and rules beyond any subjection to United States Senate approval or disapproval.

SUPPORT FOR WISCONSIN DAIRY FARMER

Whereas the economy of the State of Wisconsin is dependent to a large measure on the prosperity of the dairy producer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin complements the Wisconsin dairy farmers for their outstanding work and fully endorses and supports:

1. The efforts of the American Dairy Association to increase the consumption of milk and dairy products throughout the Nation.

2. Legislative action by the Congress of the United States to insure fair and equal treatment in the establishment of dairy product support levels at the same or comparable support levels as established for the so-called basic agricultural commodities.

3. Adequate dairy research facilities and an extensive research program for the development of new and increased uses of dairy products.

4. Continued leadership in brucellosis eradication.

5. Increased funds for the school lunch milk program to be used for the expanded consumption of fluid milk by all school children in our State.

COMMENDATION FOR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, WISCONSIN SENATORS, AND WISCONSIN REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATIVES

Whereas our national Republican administration has brought an end to the Korean conflict and is striving with all nations to secure a lasting peace; and

Whereas wise fiscal policies have aided our Nation in its transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy so that inflation is curbed, the purchasing power of the dollar is stabilized and our country is enjoying the highest standard of living in its history; and

Whereas our national Republican administration has turned the trend away from national socialism and has encouraged individual initiative and private enterprise; and

Whereas through constant unremitting efforts opposing the conspiracy of the Communist Party to infiltrate to destroy our Government, countless Communists and security risks have been removed from positions in our Government and in key defense industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955, commend our Republican President, our two Republican United States Senators, and our Republican Congressmen who are responsible for these accomplishments.

Whereas the Republican Party of Wisconsin is firmly committed to the principles of freedom of expression and choice by each individual; and

Whereas the use of the so-called "unit rule" is deemed to infringe on these rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin State Republican Party in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955 at Ripon, Wis., That the use of the unit rule be and it hereby is condemned; and be it further

Resolved, That action be taken to amend the constitution of the Republican Party of Wisconsin to abolish the use of the unit rule.

Whereas the Republican administration of the State of Wisconsin is most fortunate in being guided by an outstanding group of constitutional officers whose principles of government and public service entail integrity, morality, devotion to duty, and outstanding administrative ability; and

Whereas such State officers' devotion to work in behalf of the people of the State of Wisconsin is highly commendable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955 at Ripon, Wis., commends and expresses its gratitude to Hon. Walter J. Kohler, Governor; Hon. Warren P. Knowles, Lieutenant Governor; Hon. Mrs. Glenn M. Wise, secretary of state; Hon. Warren R. Smith, State treasurer; and Hon. Vernon W. Thompson, attorney general, for their leadership and public service rendered to the State of Wisconsin.

Whereas the platform adopted by the 1954 convention of the Republican Party advocated a program based on the principles of Wisconsin republicanism; and

Whereas the legislature, organized by the elected Republican members as the majority party, has made a splendid legislative record in agriculture, conservation, public education, highway safety, labor, highway construction, and other governmental functions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 1955 convention of the Republican Party of Wisconsin assembled in Ripon, Wis., commend the Republican membership of the 1955 session of the Wisconsin Legislature for a constructive, forward-looking record of legislative action for the benefit of all the people of Wisconsin.

Whereas the matters related to our Republican platform are important and require careful and serious consideration at the county level where representative views are best expressed: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Republican Party of the State of Wisconsin in convention assembled hereby authorizes and directs the formation of an interim platform committee of 10, 1 member to be selected by the district chairman from each district. The duties of the committee to be (a) to promote interest on the county level in matters of platform and policy, asking suggestions and proposals from all sections of the State, (b) assemble all suggestions and recommendations and present a proposed platform based on said county results to the 1956 convention platform committee.

Whereas Charles J. Zepp, of Alma, former chairman of the Wisconsin Federation of Young Republicans, has given 2 years of devoted service to the welfare of that organization;

Whereas Charles J. Zepp has made considerable sacrifice to achieve his goals, both in personal time and personal funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in annual convention in Ripon, Wis., this 25th day of June 1955 does hereby state publicly its acclaim and regard for Charles J. Zepp.

Be it resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled at Ripon, Wis., this 25th day of June 1955 extend to the cities of Ripon and Oshkosh, the counties of Fond du Lac and Winnebago, their officers and the convention committee, its grateful appreciation for the excellent hospitality, facilities, arrangements, and courtesies which have been extended to the delegates.

Be it resolved, That there be adopted a closed primary law, wherein the electors are required to register as members of their party prior to the primary election and to vote their party ballot: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Republican Party of Wisconsin in convention assembled this 25th day of June 1955 at Ripon, Wis., urge that the legislature adopt such legislation.

Whereas the traditional American two-party system has been the basis for our system has been the basis for our system of government; and

Whereas the outpouring of vast sums of labor union funds for political purposes can lead to the disruption and downfall of our two-party system; and

Whereas labor-union funds are poured into political activities at the direction of a few union bosses, thus depriving the wage earner of his individual control of and responsibility for his own political contributions; and

Whereas corporations and cooperatives, as economic interest groups, have been precluded by statute from using their association funds for political purposes: Be it, therefore,

Resolved, That this Republican convention at Ripon, Wis., this 25th day of June 1955 go on record commending the 1955 Wisconsin Legislature for passing bill 419–A, which bans the use of labor-union funds for political purposes, thus insuring continued free elections in the American tradition; and be it further

Resolved, That all Republican members of the legislature who supported bill 419–A and Assembly Speaker Mark Catlin, Jr., who authorized the measure, be particularly commended.

Immigration Facts: Congress Has Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the fiscal year 1955, on June 30, 1955, a surprisingly large number of immigration quotas remain open, dramatizing the fact that there is much less pressure from the outside to bring more immigrants to the United States than there is pressure from the inside to wreck our immigration laws.

From among the small and much discussed quotas for Asia and the Pacific area, the following quotas are open, meaning that visas are readily available: Afghanistan, Arabian Peninsula, Asia-Pacific Triangle, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Laos, Nepal, New Guinea, Pacific Islands—trusteeship, Pakistan, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Vietnam, and Yemen.

In Europe, the following immigration quotas remain open at the close of the fiscal year 1955: Andora, Belgium and Subquota, Danzig, Germany, Great Britain, Iceland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Monaco, San Marino, and Sweden.

Among the African territories, most of the quotas allocated to British colonies, in addition to Ethiopia, Liberia, Libya, and smaller territories, remain open.

This, however, does not complete the picture because it is of equal importance that most of the preferential portions of some of the quotas which are in high demand, are open at the present time. Such is the situation under the quotas for Austria, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, All British colonial subquotas except Jamaica, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Italy—first and second preference open—Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Rumania, Soviet Russia.

The fact that these preference portions are open means that skilled specialists whose services are needed in the United States, and relatives of United States citizens—parents, brothers, and sisters—and wives and children of aliens who are lawfully resident aliens, could be immediately admitted.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following article by E. F. Tompkins:

IMMIGRATION FACTS: CONGRESS HAS THEM

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts, asks Congress for a bipartisan commission to investigate the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

This would seem to be a needless and hazardous venture.

It seems needless because the McCarran-Walter Act is less than 3 years old, and was itself the product of a long and painstaking study. The act was written with the aid and advice of immigration experts. It was passed with the approval of the Labor Department, the State Department, and the Justice Department, overwhelmingly surviving a Presidential veto. The act ranks among the most carefully constructed laws on the Federal statute books. Furthermore, it was amended just last year to eliminate alleged hardships on certain aliens which were previously nonexistent.

TINKERING WON'T HELP

No commission is likely to discover any facts about immigration that are not already known in Congress. Consequently, there is little prospect that the McCarran-Walter Act can be improved by legislative tinkering. There is, however, a clear and present danger that our immigration policy may be sabotaged and our internal security gravely impaired.

The McCarran-Walter Act is constantly misrepresented.

Its basic principles are not new. Prior to 1952, the immigration law was a scatteration of old and recent statutes and proclamations, and of administrative rules and regulations, some of which were obscure and the mass of which was confusing. The McCarran-Walter bills revised and codified the best of these as the Immigration and National Act of 1952. The quota system of restricted and selective immigration became the core of the act. But that system had been in operation since 1924—for 28 years.

The immediate objective of the opponents of the McCarran Walter Act is to get rid of the quotas. What they really desire is, of course, unlimited immigration from some foreign areas, if not from all.

REASONS FOR QUOTA PLAN

But experience both here and abroad, has proved that unrestricted immigration entails the importation of employment and housing problems. Moreover, mass migrations—with which we were threatened before the quota system came in—could drastically alter our social and political institutions. These are the two reasons for the quota plan.

In 1952, when the McCarran-Walter bills were pending, a plea was agitated that quotas should be removed so that European displaced persons might enter America freely.

In 1953, Congress passed a supplemental law—the Refugee Relief Act. By this act, 214,000 immigrants may be admitted, outside the regular quotas, within a 3-year period ending December 31, 1956.

The Refugee Relief Act serves and was designed, to enable America to succor its share of war victims while also protecting the basic and permanent immigration law.

Under these conditions, Senator KENNEDY's proposal to open a new forum on immigration may be extremely hazardous, as well as unnecessary.

Federal Controls on Natural Gas—Mayor Views Them as Hurting Chester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chester (Pa.) Times of June 30, 1955:

FEDERAL CONTROLS ON NATURAL GAS—MAYOR VIEWS THEM AS HURTING CHESTER

If Congress fails to free natural gas from Federal price controls, the discovery and production of gas will decline to the detriment and harm of householders and workers in the industrial East, including Chester and Delaware County, Mayor Ralph F. Swarts declared today.

Swarts issued the following statement in support of the Harris-Fulbright bill pending in Congress, which would free gas producers from Federal control:

"I wish to express my agreement with a recent editorial in the Chester Times, which was captioned: 'Regulation of Natural Gas Producers Seen Threat To Free Enterprise.'

"Chester and lower Delaware County constitute one of the major industrial areas of America. If the industry located here is to continue to grow, if we are to be successful in attracting additional industry into the area, we must have adequate supplies of energy fuels for their use.

"TOP ENERGY FUEL

"Foremost among today's energy fuels is natural gas, which now supplies one-fourth of the country's energy needs. Since the end of World War II a truly magnificent job has been done in the discovery, production, and transportation of rapidly increasing supplies of natural gas for the uses of industry, the heating of homes, and for other household facilities.

"Independent producers in the southwestern States have done a particularly notable job in making abundant reserves and supplies of natural gas available to us in the industrial East. They have done so under the spur of competitive enterprise. Natural-gas production inherently is a risky, competitive business, it is not in any sense a monopoly requiring price regulation, as are the interstate pipelines and local distributors, which enjoy exclusive franchises.

"All of this is completely borne out by the rapidly increasing supply of natural gas in recent years, and by the fact that the cost of gas to the householder since 1938 has increased only one-eleventh as much as the overall cost of living.

"Congress, in 1938, specifically exempted natural-gas producers from the control of the Federal Power Commission, and in 1950 confirmed that intention. Nevertheless, a year ago the Supreme Court, in a 5-to-3 decision, found that the congressional exemption was vaguely stated and failed to apply to sales of natural gas intended for interstate shipment. So, for the first time in this country's peacetime history, a natural-resources commodity has been subjected to Federal price control.

"If the Harris-Fulbright bill to free the gas producers from Federal control, now pending in Congress, is not enacted, the discovery and production of natural gas will be markedly slowed down, to the great detriment and harm of householders and workers in the industrial East, including Chester and Delaware County.

"Continuance of Federal price control over natural-gas production will restrict the incentives to explore for and develop new reserves for the future. This will mean a smaller supply and that, in turn, will mean higher prices for gas. The natural consequence will be the movement of industry needing gas to the States producing it, and that will mean fewer jobs in the Chester area and other eastern industry centers.

"WOULD CREATE PRECEDENT

"Of equal importance, in my view, is the fact that subjecting natural-gas producers to Federal price control creates a precedent that may transform our traditional competitive enterprise economy into socialism. If the Federal Government properly can control natural-gas prices in the field, why cannot it control prices in peacetime for oil at the well, coal at the mine, lumber in the forest, cattle on the range, grain in the field—in fact, for all commodities?

"For these reasons, I hope that Congress will promptly pass the Harris-Fulbright bill, and that our Pennsylvania Members in Congress will be in the forefront of that action."

Foreign Aid Affects Our Trade Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following editorial taken from the Sioux City Journal of July 4, 1955:

FOREIGN AID AFFECTS OUR TRADE PROGRAM

According to a United Nations report, Japan and Europe, including Soviet bloc countries, are cutting into United States trade with Latin America by offering cheaper prices and easier credit terms. This is not particularly surprising. Indeed, we must expect it, not only in Latin America but elsewhere.

It is, in effect, a byproduct of our own foreign policy under which we have shipped billions of American dollars abroad in economic aid to the countries that compete with us in the world-trade markets.

What we have been doing is making things easier for our competitors through a long period of helping them rebuilt their economies after World War II. And because such countries as Britain, Japan, France, and others have wage scales far below those in the United States, in addition to substantial free aid or low-rate loans from the United States, they are in an excellent position to compete against us, not only in Latin America but in other portions of the globe as well.

Our Government, of course, through the old Marshall aid program and a series of

replacements for that plan, deliberately sought to "help other nations help themselves" in rebuilding war-torn economies. The thought was that our allies abroad would be less inclined to go for communism if they had an early return to healthy business conditions.

That theory has carried over from the Truman administration into the Eisenhower regime. Indeed, the present Democrat-controlled House of Representatives only recently authorized a $3,285,800,000 foreign-aid program for the fiscal year which began July 1. Of that sum, $2,152,800,000 was earmarked for economic assistance to foreign countries.

So the United States still is determined to push the foreign-aid program, even though the recipients may be near or above their prewar economic levels. From a practical standpoint, this leaves something to be desired, and it points to the obvious conclusion that eventually the United States must taper off its foreign aid.

When our original objective has been obtained, then the time has come for reassessment of our aid distribution program. And it looks as though such a reexamination is about due, at least as far as some of our allies are concerned.

Mrs. Thurmond Chatham Becomes Music Author

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Thurmond Chatham, the wife of our distinguished friend and colleague from North Carolina. Recently in collaboration with Barnee Breeskin, who most of us know and admire, Mrs. Chatham recorded a new song entitled "Lonely Road." The background of Mrs. Chatham's first effort in the musical field is interestingly reported by Evelyn Peyton Gordon in her column in the Washington Daily News of July 5, 1955. Since we all know and like THURMOND and his charming wife so much, I am asking unanimous consent to include the article for its interest and information to the Members of the House.

FIRST FORAY IN MUSICAL WORLD SET FOR REPRESENTATIVE CHATHAM'S WIFE

(By Evelyn Peyton Gordon)

Another feather in the cap of Mrs. Thurmond Chatham, wife of North Carolina Representative CHATHAM, who on Thursday officilly becomes the first congressional wife to hit Tin Pan Alley with a bang. At 3 p. m. Pat Chatham will be on hand in the Hecht Auditorium for an invitation reception to autograph records. Perry Como will also be among those present, and any contributions the 100 guests offer will go to the Variety Club's fund for the Children's Hospital.

The record which Mrs. Chatham will autograph is Lonely Road, a haunting melody written over a period of months—I told you a little about the new recording sometime ago—with the Shoreham's Barnee Breeskin. It's Pat Firestone Chatham's first foray into the musical world, and she insists she is still more flabbergasted by her success in producing the lyrics for Lonely Road than she's ever been shooting ducks at her husband's island lodge near Nags Head, N. C., or landing a salmon in the famous streams of Norway.

BACKGROUND

There's something of a background to this song over which Pat and Barnee have worked for so long. A year or so ago, the Chathams were on one of their frequent trips abroad. Late one evening they strolled into a Paris bistro after the place had really closed. As they sat over a glass of wine, Representative CHATHAM, who is exceptionally tunewise, said, "Listen to that violinist. He's playing just three bars of a lovely melody over and over again. Just three bars. Later talking with the violinist the Chathams learned that even the fiddler couldn't remember more of the lovely tune. He only remembered that as a small boy in Russia his grandmother and mother had sung a song to him, and only those three brief, haunting bars remained in his musical mind.

Representative CHATHAM apparently knows a good tune when he hears one. He was the first person to bring the sheet music for two wonderful, popular songs from Europe to this country—La Vie en Rose and April in Portugal, neither of which have yet been recorded here. So THURMOND CHATHAM talked with the violinist and finally bought the fragment of that long-ago song. Back in Washington the Chathams talked about the melody with their long-time friend, Barnee, and the work started. Sometime later Frank Folsom, president of RCA, heard the tune and insisted upon having it recorded for RCA-Victor with orchestral arrangement by Hugo Winterhalter. And on Thursday the finished records of the nine LaFalce Brothers singing to Winterhalter's arrangement will be autographed by Mrs. Chatham—and doubtless Barnee Breeskin.

Later that same afternoon Representative and Mrs. CHATHAM will entertain at a cocktail party for still more friends in the beautiful gardens of Prospect House, their Georgetown home, which overlooks the Virginia banks of the Potomac.

No Guaranty of Perpetual Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in a free economy it is obvious that there is no guaranty of perpetual prosperity. It would be fine if such a guaranty was possible but it is not. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a timely editorial from the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer Published in Racine, Wis., under date of July 2 on this subject:

NO GUARANTY OF PERPETUAL PROSPERITY

There will never be another depression, argue some folks. "The Government won't ever allow such a thing to happen again," they contend.

It is true that some facts are being learned about the peaks and hollows of business cycles. It is also true that any administration in power will do its best to keep the Nation prosperous.

But no government has ever proved that it can deliver perpetual prosperity. It is possible, however, to ease the pain and misery of the toughest periods.

It is people themselves who cause booms and busts. Greed and selfishness of groups and individuals are the real reason why the economy gets thrown out of kilter. We will guess that human nature being what it is, there will always be ups and downs.

Talk of no more depression sounds just like 1919 when farmers were saying, "You will never see butterfat go down to 50 cents again." It soon broke through that imaginary 50 cents and later slid to below 20 a hundred.

We may never again see 3-cent hogs and 17-cent butterfat. After all, the dollar has been devalued and no administration is likely to try to put it back where it was a generation ago.

Farmers could have some pretty tough times with hogs at 15 cents and milk where it is at around $3. If everything else keeps going up and up and farm prices stay where they are, that will be farm depression. In fact, we seem to be in another round of wage and price increases right now.

If the business machine thus gets thrown out of balance the whole thing could again come creaking to a stop like in past business cycles.

We aren't at all gloomy about the future. America's future looks bright and optimistic. There is no room for the pessimists and professional worriers.

Let's be realistic enough, however, to realize that we probably aren't smart enough to insure perpetual prosperity.

The International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address concerning the background and importance of the International Labor Organization, which was delivered by Mr. Albert L. McDermott, special assistant to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell. Mr. McDermott spoke at the 10th Annual Convention of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, in Camden, N. J., on July 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ALBERT L. MCDERMOTT, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE THE 10TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC TRADE UNIONISTS, WALT WHITMAN HOTEL, CAMDEN, N. J., JULY 4, 1955

Mr. Chairman, members of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, ladies, and gentlemen, it is my very pleasant privilege to convey to you the warmest greetings from Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell. He has asked me to extend to you his best wishes on the occasion of your 10th annual convention.

A few weeks ago I noted that the theme of this year's convention was to be "ACTU's Role in the Changing Labor Picture." While I feel certain that ardent and complete debate has been had on all phases of changing labor relations, what with so many new domestic issues entering into the field, I would like to talk to you today about the ever-changing picture on the international labor front and recommend for your consideration a renewed effort on the part of your association pointing toward a better enlighten-

ment of public opinion in this very important, sometimes unheard of, and more often neglected, area of international labor affairs. I have particular reference to United States participation in the International Labor Organization.

American labor, management, and Government have been participating in the work of the ILO since 1934. We have been in the ILO longer than in any other major international organization. Yet, it seems that there is less knowledge and understanding of the ILO in this country than of any other major international organization to which we belong. I would venture to say that 9 out of 10 people cannot tell you what the function of the ILO is, much less give you a reason why we should participate in it.

We are all aware, I believe, of the fact that the ILO was founded in 1919 as part of the Treaty of Versailles following the First World War. The Commission of the Paris Peace Conference that was responsible for developing that part of the treaty which established an International Organization on Labor Matters was headed by Samuel Gompers, then president of the American Federation of Labor. One of the factors at that time which added to the urgency of developing some kind of machinery within a democratic framework to help promote the alleviation of conditions of distress among workers, was the successful Bolshevist revolution in Russia and other attempts at revolution of this type which were taking place in other European countries.

The organization's constitution recognizes that "* * * universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice." To help achieve that social justice, the Organization is devoted to the promotion of voluntary international cooperation for the improvement of living and working conditions in all countries. The following important principles upon which the Organization is based were reaffirmed in its declaration of Philadelphia in 1944:

"(a) Labor is not a commodity.

"(b) Freedom of expression and association are essential to sustained progress.

"(c) Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere.

"(d) The war against want requires to be carried on with unrelenting vigor within each nation, and by continuous and concerted international effort in which the representatives of workers and employers, enjoying equal status with those of governments, join with them in free discussion and democratic decisions with a view to the promotion of the common welfare."

The ILO collects and disseminates information about labor and social conditions, formulates international standards and supervises their national application. It also provides technical assistance in carrying out social and economic development programs.

In its work to promote international cooperation for the improvement of working and living conditions the ILO, since its first conference in Washington in 1919, has made recommendations on many subjects including minimum wages, protective measures for women and children, the establishment of employment services, the provision of old age insurance, uneployment compensation and other types of social security, the promotion of industrial harmony, the assurance of freedom of association, the assistance of the individual through training to better realize his abilities, nondiscrimination in employment opportunties and the provision of welfare facilities to increase the health and comfort of the worker.

The work of the ILO in these fields, and particularly its development of standards for the consideration and guidance of its various member countries (which now number 70), has raised some questions in this country which are based on misunderstanding of how the ILO works and of our interests in the organization. It seems to me that the following two questions reflect the principal misunderstandings of the ILO that exist in the United States. First, if the ILO is establishing standards with respect to all these subjects, is it not infringing upon the freedom of domestic action here at home, and trying to impose foreign concepts on the United States? Second, if American labor and living standards are on the whole the best in the world, what do we have to gain from participation in the International Labor Organization?

With respect to the first question, we should understand clearly that the ILO has no power to coerce or to impose any system or standard on any country. One proposal at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 was that the ILO should be an international parliament, with power to enact labor legislation that would take effect in the member countries of the Organization. That proposal was not adopted; it was rejected. It was realized that it would constitute an encroachment on the sovereign rights of each nation to handle its own domestic affairs and that, under it, differences of approach in the handling of labor problems by the different countries would be straitjacketed. The Peace Conference decided, instead, to establish the ILO as an international agency to promote the voluntary cooperation of the nations for the improvement of working and living conditions. Its tripartite structure, with representation not only of governments but, with full participating and voting rights, of worker and employer representatives, reflects more than any other official international organization the principles of our democratic society.

It can, after full exchange and experiences between the governments, worker, and employer representatives at its Conference, develop suggestions, which at least two-thirds majority of the Conference believe represent the best that can be drawn from the diverse views and experiences that have been considered. These suggestions are then sent to the member countries for consideration. There is no obligation to take action along any of the lines suggested. Each country has complete freedom of decision and action in this matter. It has been found, however, that in many countries these suggestions have been helpful, and have served as the basis of action they wish to take, in their efforts to improve labor conditions at home.

The ILO is not a world government. It does not seek the panacea, and it recognizes the vitality of diverse methods and the necessity for differences of approach and methods, depending upon varying conditions, circumstances, and traditions. It can impose no system or standard on anybody. The basis of its operation is voluntary and cooperative, and provides complete freedom of action on the part of member countries. It relies on enlightened self-interest, rather than on compulsion, as the basis of sound and lasting progress.

The development of labor standards is only one of the many activities of the ILO, and is one—as a matter of fact—that is probably not as important now as it was in the earlier years of the organization. The ILO is now engaging in a sizeable program of operational activities which is providing technical assistance on such matters as increasing productivity, industrial and supervisory training and the like. The ILO also undertakes basic research on labor problems and has an important function in the dissemination of information through publications and meetings.

President Eisenhower, in a message read to the ILO Conference in Geneva on June 6, by Secretary of Labor Mitchell, called the ILO "* * * one of the oldest and most useful international instruments for the development of a better way of life for all people. By seeking to improve living standards through the voluntary cooperation of many nations, the International Labor Organization serves the cause of peaceful progress."

The President said further: "Particularly appealing to those who believe in the dignity of the individual is the ILO provision which permits employers and workers to sit on an equal basis with representatives of Government in the councils of the organization. In the understanding and cooperation which employers and workers develop through the ILO there is great hope for increased understanding and cooperation among the nations whose employers and workers they represent."

Recently, Pope Pius XII granted an audience to ILO delegates in Rome. The Pope praised the ILO for "its contributions to the progress of social legislation in the various countries" over the past 30 years and for "having united governments, employers and workers in brave and fruitful cooperation." He said: "The International Labor Organization has not wished to represent only one social class, nor to become the means of expression of one tendency exclusively. It welcomes everything that is constructive, everything which meets the real needs of a harmoniously constructed society and that is why our predecessor, Pius XI, did not hesitate to draw attention to the remarkable resemblance between the principles set forth in the labor code and those of the encyclical Rerum Novarum."

Now, as the second question: What do we have to gain from membership in the ILO? It is true that from the standpoint of domestic improvements we have less to gain than any other country that belongs to the Organization. Our interests in the Organization nevertheless are direct, varied and important.

First of all, and speaking on broad terms, the United States has recognized the importance of developing economic and social stability in the free world as a means of promoting the kind of a world in which we can live in peace and prosperity. This is one of the major tenets of United States foreign policy, in support of which we have expended billions of dollars and have undertaken numerous cooperative programs with other free countries of the world.

The ILO is an exceedingly important forum which can contribute to this objective. It is devoted to the improvement of conditions of work and life—of poverty, of insecurity, of exploitation, of poor working conditions—that lead to unrest and social upheaval. And it is promoting these improvements in a democratic framework with the direct participation of the bipartites directly concerned, namely the workers and the employers. It is a forum through which, therefore, we can reach directly, and influence, those whose situation we recognize it is in our interest to help. These conditions breed communism, and the work of the ILO to eliminate—or at least improve—them, deserves the support of all freedom-loving peoples.

By our participation we can influence the kind of suggestions that emanate from the ILO and can bring our concepts and methods (which have resulted in such a high standard of living here) to the attention of the rest of the world.

The ILO helps to eliminate substandard working conditions and levels of living which provide competitive advantage to other countries in the world's markets. Competitive margins based upon inadequate wages and working conditions can be reduced by voluntary action of other nations to raise the standards of their workers. This is of direct advantage to American workers and American businessmen. As the ILO stated in its Declaration of Philadelphia: "Poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere."

The unique tripartite composition of the ILO presents United States labor and management with an unusual opportunity to themselves demonstrate to the workers, employers, and governments of other countries, what has been accomplished under our economic and social system and what the motives of United States labor and management really are. American capitalism is much misunderstood in the rest of the world, and the Communists capitalize on that misunderstanding in their propaganda. Our participation in the ILO, therefore, is important as a means of countering this propaganda and bringing about a more accurate and sympathetic understanding in the rest of the world of our free-enterprise system and its objectives.

The Russians have rejoined the ILO because they know it is such an important forum, and one through they they hope they can achieve their program of world domination. Russia knows she has a rare opportunity to exert her influence in the Organization on the members of the free world. It is, because of this factor, more imperative now than ever before that the United States play a leading role in the ILO.

It is important that we not retreat from this arena which the Soviets hope to capture for their own ends or, failing this, to destroy. This is the Organization in which more can be done to expose the forced labor, the slavery, and the human degradation behind the Iron Curtain that the Russians try to pose as the "workers' paradise." It is in this forum, in which the free workers of the world are directly represented, that they can judge for themselves whether we or the Russians and their captive gang are genuinely concerned with their aspirations. We cannot afford either by indifference or withdrawal, to abandon our friends in the ILO, and with it the hope that it represents for a decent life in dignity and freedom to the Communists.

In a recent interview George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, remarked that free labor has made progress in Europe during the past few years. He stated, however, that though labor was "making fine progress in Italy and progress, although not quite as much, in France" the Communist labor organizations "still have a solid hold" in foreign labor. These words of accomplishment in Italy and France should serve to spur on the free world to make its influence felt in the ILO and similar world organizations which provide the springboard to worldwide recognition of the dignity of man.

The ILO is and can remain worthwhile if, graced by divine guidance, we in our wisdom can by cooperative effort, present to the member nations in constructive and logical form the fruits of prosperity and spiritual wealth which result from a minimum of governmental intervention and a mutual respect among men.

Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, more than 2 years after it was prepared, the Congress and the public have at long last obtained copies of the Wenzell report dealing with the plans of the administration for the future of the TVA.

That report was for many months kept as secret by the administration as if it contained the formula for making the hydrogen bomb. The very existence of the report was kept secret. The name of the author of the report was shrouded in secrecy.

At the time the Dixon-Yates controversy arose, the White House, under pressure, instructed the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission to prepare chronologies which would list all papers and meetings of the two agencies bearing on the origin of the Dixon-Yates contract. Nowhere in those chronologies was Mr. Adolphe Wenzell mentioned. Some of the meetings which he attended were mentioned, but Mr. Wenzell was not listed as having attended them. Nowhere in the Bureau of the Budget chronology was the Wenzell report so much as mentioned.

It required, Mr. Speaker, a chance mention, an accidental mention, of the name "Wenzell" in a memorandum to open the way for the ultimate disclosure of Mr. Wenzell's identity, the nature of the work he was doing for the Bureau of the Budget, and the existence of the report in which we have now discovered lay the origins of the Dixon-Yates contract.

All during the hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the Dixon-Yates contract, the activities of Mr. Wenzell and the interests of the First Boston Corp., of which he was vice president were kept secret. When his name was subsequently brought into the open and Budget Director Hughes was questioned about his activities, Mr. Hughes replied that Mr. Wenzell had been employed by the Budget Bureau for advice on the accounting and financing system of the TVA. He denied that he had anything to do with policy decisions in regard to the Dixon-Yates matter. I am afraid that Mr. Hughes misled the Congress and the public.

Mr. Wenzell, as we now know, was brought into the Bureau of the Budget within a few months after the present administration took office. He was brought in by then Budget Director Dodge. We do not know exactly what Budget Director Dodge's instructions to Mr. Wenzell were, but we know what he did.

This vice president of the Nation's greatest utility financial house prepared a report on the TVA. He made four alternative proposals for either limiting the TVA and preventing its future growth, or which called for turning all of its assets which could be made profitable over to other private utilities.

One of those proposals was for the construction of privately owned wholesale electric plants whose production would be fed into the TVA system. That is exactly what was supposed to take place under the Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. Wenzell, the New York banker, laid out the policy subsequently adopted in the Dixon-Yates plan. He attended the meeting at the Atomic Energy Commission which put this plan into motion. He attended the secret meeting at the Budget Bureau which put the administration's stamp of approval on this plan. Yet, Budget Director Hughes says that he was giving advice on some accounting systems and had nothing to do with any policy decisions on Dixon-Yates.

Mr. Wenzell has testified that in preparing his report he did not contact anyone in the Tennessee Valley Authority. He asked the TVA for no information. He asked the TVA for no opinion. He asked the opinion of no one in the TVA area who was familiar with the work of that organization. He did not ask the opinion of any people of the area.

Mr. Wenzell, the New York banker, also testified that the proposal he made which later came to fruition in the Dixon-Yates contract, was not his favorite proposal among the four he made. His favorite proposal was one under which TVA would turn over to another corporation all of its power dams, all of its steam plants, all of its transmission lines. Then that corporation would sell its securities to the public, presumably with some New York banking house making a large fee for doing the selling. The TVA would be left with flood control and navigation and nothing more.

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who have sought to permit the TVA to construct the Fulton steam plant have been stymied. For there in the Bureau of the Budget lay this master plan for dismantling the TVA. And it lay there unknown to the TVA, unknown to the Congress, and unknown to the people of the United States.

The TVA has been a success which has been copied around the world. The idea behind it is the hope of millions of people in other nations. But the policy of the Bureau of the Budget as developed by Adolphe Wenzell proposed to undo its great work and turn back the clock in the TVA area to a period of high power costs and limited power.

It is no wonder that the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the President wished to have this report kept secret. They did not desire to have their true intentions toward TVA reach the light of day.

Now we know what Dixon-Yates really was. It was the first step in dismantling the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is no wonder that the administration, now that its true purposes are revealed for what they are, is ready to abandon Dixon-Yates. But this abandonment does not mean that they will not try again with another of the alternatives which Mr. Adolphe Wenzell proposed. The people of the Tennessee Valley area must be endlessly alert to protect the future of the TVA.

Protection of the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a constituent this week which I would like to call to the attention of all of the Members.

Dr. James Griffitts, now of Miami, Fla., was formerly with the Laboratory of Biologics Control, a division of the National Institutes of Health, and because of this experience and background has presented what I believe are sound and convincing arguments concerning the need of insuring that those divisions of our Federal Government which must make the decisions as to which materials are safe in the immunization and treatment of human beings are adequately protected from outside pressures and influence. Much of Dr. Griffitts' letter deals with the Salk vaccine, a matter in which all of us not only have a personal interest, but a public responsibility.

I am proud to have a man of Dr. Griffitts' ability as a resident of the Fourth District of Florida and I am pleased for this opportunity to bring to your attention his personal comments on this serious question of proper protection of the Nation's health:

DADE REAGENTS, INC.,
Miami, Fla., June 28, 1955.

Hon. DANTE FASCELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FASCELL: In July of 1949 I resigned my commission with the United States Public Health Service where I was assigned to duty in the Laboratory of Biologics Control since 1940. I came to Miami as associate director of the Blood Bank of Dade County and of the Medical Research Foundation of Dade County where I remained until 1954. On the death of my good friend John Elliott, I assumed the presidency of Dade Reagents, Inc., a company which employs about 70 individuals and manufactures for national distribution, a number of medical specialty items. I have made Miami my home and have great pride in our area and great respect for our representatives in Congress.

Because of my background in medical research at the National Institues of Health I have been unusually close to and interested in, the handling of the biological produce which has caused so much national publicity—the antipoliomyelitis vaccine. I feel it my duty to give you certain background concerning the role of the Federal Government in regulating the manufacture and sale of products which have inherently dangerous qualities.

The control methods of the Government represented by the Laboratory of Biologics Control, a subsection of the Microbiological Institute of the National Institutes of Health, in the past have done a great service in providing safe materials for use in the immunization and treatment of human beings. There have been many instances in the past where this small group of people has been able to prevent the distribution of products of questionable safety and products which have very questionable value to the patient. The Laboratory has always been small and definitely understaffed to be able to completely test all of the products which are manufactured for distribution. They have therefore usually been ultra conservative in the review of data submitted to the Laboratory and have traditionally required the manufacturer to provide incontrovertible evidence for the safety and potency of the product to be licensed. It has been a very beautiful relationship between Government and private enterprise in that the manufacturer who stands to profit from a useful product bears the largest responsibility in proving to the Federal Government the adequacy of his product.

I would like to call to your attention that yellow fever vaccine made to immunize troops during World War II was at first made by the Rockefeller Foundation for the Armed Forces. This group did not feel that they should impart to the Laboratory of Biologics Control, certain powers to control the production of the vaccine. As a result of this fact, the Laboratory did not recommend the Rockefeller Foundation for license for this product. The vaccine was used extensively on our troops and unfortunately caused a considerable number—my recollection being over 100,000 cases—of a liver infection called hepatitis. I am not certain that the Laboratory of Biologics Control would have been able to prevent this unfortunate circumstance but at least the record is quite clear that the yellow fever vaccine at that time was not granted a license by the National Institutes of Health. (Since it was not distributed commercially in the sense of being an interstate transaction, it was able to be used on our troops even though it was not licensed.)

Another great service rendered by this Laboratory in recent years is the refusal to grant a license for a substance called "Krebiozen". This is a substance of highly secret nature which is supposed to be effective in the treatment of cancer. The Laboratory of the National Institutes of Health has consistently refused to grant a license for this product on the basis of inadequate information concerning its so-called "cancer-healing" properties. To my way of thinking this small Laboratory has been a bastion (often a lonely one) protecting the public from exposure to products having inadequate proof of efficacy as well as products of potential danger.

The Laboratory has not had an operating budget which would allow it to hire experts in every field, necessary technicians, laboratory space, animals, and other very costly items, to individually completely test every product for which a license will be required. I do not believe it would be possible for the Government to do this under any circumstance, even in proposed revision of the laboratory. While I believe that the the tax dollars spent, the Laboratory of Biologics Control has delivered more to the people of this nation than any other agency of Government, I don't believe it would be possible to assemble in the Government all of the knowledge or even the necessary minimum knowledge one agency would need to prove every product, present and future, which must be licensed. It will remain for the institutions making a new product to adequately demonstrate its safety and efficacy to a well qualified Government agency. The Government agency necessarily will be qualified in a broad general sense rather than in the specific details of each potential product.

Around 1935 there was a doctor of medicine by the name of Brodie who attempted to develop a poliomyelitis vaccine killed with formalin and designed to immunize against poliomyelitis. It is well known that some of the individuals who received this experimental vaccine developed poliomyelitis and several died. The results of the trial brought great discredit to the possibilities of making vaccine in this fashion and it is my understanding that shortly after this, Dr. Brodie took his own life as a result of the unfortunate happenings on the trial experiment. Such incidents are known by and contribute to the conservative thinking of the Biologics Control Laboratory. As I have said before, the Laboratory traditionally requires the manufacturer to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt, the safety of a product prior to its being given license for manufacture and distribution in the United States.

It is a matter of record that in the early spring of 1954 the Biologics Control Laboratory found difficulty in testing vaccines which were to be used in the mass immunization experiment of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. Since I knew of the difficulties involved in obtaining vaccine which was safe for administration to the children of citizens of this country, I took an active role in Dade County, insisting that the Foundation deliver the released vaccine to the health officer of this county at a certain time. Since the vaccine could not be delivered to Dade County by the deadline date, it was the feeling of the pediatricians and the health officer that the children of our county should not participate in the trials. We did this with no malice toward the Foundation—we could not envision the pediatricians and physicians of our county advising the parents of healthy children to take part in a program in which the vaccine to be used was not known to be completely safe. Only 1 of 1,500 children would be expected to get "polio" by natural causes. In order to protect this one child, no risk could be taken in the other 1,499 children given a vaccine. I believe that those who sought my advice thoroughly agreed with me that the children of our county were too valuable to use in an experiment in which there was some question about the safety of some of the lots of vaccine.

Fortunately, the experiment which was carried out in 1954, according to the analysis of experts, was safe for the children who received the vaccine. It is important to know that there were several large batches of the vaccine which were held for a long time because of failure to pass certain safety tests before the trials of 1954.

It is my understanding that modifications were made in the manufacture of the vaccine between the field trials in 1954 and the licensing of the vaccine in 1955. I am not informed concerning the adequacy of tests of the modifications but it would appear that converting to large scale manufacture of the vaccine of 1955 introduced new dangers and there is not even at the present time, adequate experience to know that the safety tests placed on the vaccine actually rule out all possibilities of danger.

Why was the vaccine licensed by the Public Health Service? I firmly believe that investigation will show that Dr. William G. Workman, director of the Biologics Control Laboratory, and his staff, were not urging the license of this product for manufacture and distribution in interstate commerce. I believe you will find that pressures arose from sources, which were applied on the United States Public Health Service and this laboratory in particular, to grant a license. This stemmed from what I consider unholy publicity given to the vaccine, largely by the National "Polio" Foundation's method of the announcement of the analysis of the field trials. It sickened me to see such ballyhoo applied to preventive medicine. The emotional impact on the parents of small children was evil. There were created overnight, hundreds of thousands of people who became amateur "immunologists." The commercial institutions were clamoring to sell a product to a well prepared public and the time honored method of the Laboratory of Biologics Control to require adequate evidence was thrown by the wayside. I do not believe it was the desire of the Service to abandon its conservatism. I believe adequate study of this problem would point an incriminating finger at the Foundation and the press for the hue and cry raised which forced the Public Health Service to abandon its previously effective methods of conservatism and proof before license.

In the recommendations of the Surgeon General I have noted with great pleasure the increase in budget for the Laboratory of Biologics Control. I am heartily in favor of strengthening this organization. The new Director, Dr. Carl Larson, is a very close personal friend of mine and man of great integrity and ability. Of equal stature is Dr. William G. Workman. I sincerely hope he will not be made a scapegoat for the inadequacy of testing before license was given.

I write you this to emphasize that no laboratory will ever be assembled which will know all the answers in itself. There must always be a great onus on the manufacturer to prove his product. He must have experts in the field in order to manufacture. Such men must be used to test it. The Government has an obligation to be conservative, to require adequate proof. Anything you can contribute toward keeping pressure off the Biologics Control Division will be a great contribution to the health of our people.

Suppose a construction company would invent a new type of support for building houses and as a result of radio, television, and press coverage as received by the polio vaccine, houses were constructed all over the Nation with such beams. Imagine that such supports collapse after a short while, injuring many people. Would corrective action be taken by the Federal Government? I think the citizens of our country expect their Government to protect them from being taken in by false advertising. It is, of course, far better to prevent calamities and this can be done in medicine by constructing a protective barrier around the Food and Drug Administration and the Laboratory of Biologics Control, so that its decisions are not made under public pressure, but rather on the safety and efficacy of the products which are distributed for the treatment and prevention of disease in man.

I would like to state that I am strongly in favor of preventive medicine, I am not attacking the idea of Dr. Salk. I resent the fact that ballyhoo pushed over a bulwark of protection; it must be reconstructed with reinforcements so it won't be blown over again.

I'm sorry I have taken so long to say what I wanted to; I don't know that you actually have an opportunity to perform work on these matters, but if you are concerned as I am about the need to be certain of the drugs and other products to treat human beings, you will pass this philosophy on to your colleagues and see that the necessary protection is given the loyal and competent officers of the Government who must make decisions.

I will appreciate your consideration in the coming revision of the biologics control laws.

Incidentally, my little girl Susan was among the group who visited Washington under the sponsorship of the AAA. She was very appreciative of your consideration in seeing the group. For the time you gave to this purpose I want to personally thank you.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES D. GRIFFITTS, M. D.
President, Dade Reagents, Inc., Miami, Fla.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, each and every one of us, and countless thousands of persons throughout the United States, are greatly disturbed at the illness of our dear friend, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the majority leader of the Senate. Throughout the country there is widespread regret at his condition and widespread hopes and prayers for a speedy recovery, and this is evidenced in the editorial comment of the press all over the country.

In my extension of remarks, I include two editorials—one which appeared in the Boston Post on July 5, 1955, entitled "Senator JOHNSON's Illness," and another which appeared in the Boston Daily Globe on July 5, 1955, entitled "Casualty to Duty."

The editorials follow:

[From the Boston Post of July 5, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON'S ILLNESS

The sudden illness of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON will be universally regretted. He was stricken with a heart attack on the holiday weekend.

The Democratic floor leader has made a remarkable record during the present congressional session. Under his cool leadership, the Senate has acted effectively on a great deal of legislation with a minimum of partisan friction or obstruction. Last week, the Senator had engaged in a sharp exchange of views with the President about this achievement.

Senator JOHNSON called the attention of anyone who cared to listen to the fact that the Democratic majority in the Senate had not obstructed the President's program, but had given it constructive attention. When the President quipped that there are still some bills which need urgent action, Mr. JOHNSON cooly reminded him that the Members of the Senate have "no intention of taking orders like a bunch of second lieutenants."

He is one of our few high officeholders with the capacity of serving the Nation and his party, too.

[From the Boston Daily Globe of July 5, 1955]

CASUALTY TO DUTY

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's collapse is another reminder of the heavy burdens borne by leadership of the Congress in this mid-20th century. The toll taken by physical exhaustion in the 83d Congress is still a lively recollection.

To be sure, the present session is moving down the final lap toward adjournment, possibly by July 30; but the fact that the Congress is today far ahead of its predecessors in legislative performance is in great measure due directly to the efforts of the stricken Democratic Senate leader. And so is the high level of its performance.

Senator JOHNSON's work schedule averaged a 12-hour day. His guidance of his party's policy toward the administration was perhaps the chief factor in the era of relative good feeling in present-day Washington. The unity of his party, the progress of Congress, and the national welfare owe much to him. His illness will not change Democratic Party policy, but it may cause trouble for the administration in a Senate now divided 48–47.

A Southern View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the consideration of the integrationists the views of Alonzo W. Riley, a Negro, of Bradenton, Fla. His views were voiced in a letter which appeared in the letters to the editor column of the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 7, 1955.

This is further evidence of the fact that the vast majority of southern Negroes neither seek nor want forced or voluntary integration.

The letter reads as follows:

A SOUTHERN VIEW

Would nonsegregated schools help the Southern Negro? The answer is positively no.

The solution would be to give us school buildings and furnishings equal to what the white schools have, and then give us our share of each school tax dollar each year based on school attendance. With this done, we Negroes could work out our segregation problems with our friends here at home.

I am told that the population of this county in Florida, Manatee, is about 30,000 or 35,000 and 25 percent are Negroes. We have 81 Negro school teachers in this one small county. I am told that they are paid the same as the white teachers doing the same work. We have our parent-teachers organization and every organization found in any school to help prepare our children to face the problems of life, and above all to be honest. Our children compete for high honors in their school work and all sports, including football, baseball, and other games played with other schools. We have competent colored teachers as good as any 81 white teachers in the county. These teachers are interested in the colored children only. They are available to help the children and parents with their school problem in or out of school. They are interested in every move for the interest of the colored children and the community.

With nonsegregated schools we would have no competition for high honors in school, no ball games or other sports. We would have none of the 81 colored teachers in or out of school. It would cause race hatred and confusion that we could not stand. We would lose everything with no hope of gain.

If segregated schools go, so does everything else, including segregated churches. We have 32 Negro churches in Manatee County. In my one church we have well over 100 people who take an active part in church work. They teach Sunday school, work as ushers and deacons, sing in one of our three choirs or take an active part in some church work. We sing, shout, preach, or pray as the spirit moves us. With nonsegregated churches, there would not be 25 percent of the people who attend services of these 32 colored churches in Manatee County that would go to church at all.

If the courts can force us into nonsegregated schools, surely they can force those in authority to give us school buildings equal to the white school buildings and give us our share of every tax dollar each year based on school attendance. With this, let us work out our problems here at home without paid agitators interfering.

To force us into nonsegregated schools will cause hatred and confusion and take away from us what it has taken generations for us to gain. May God forbid that the southern Negro be forced into this will be our earnest prayer.

ALONZO W. RILEY.

BRADENTON, FLA.

Poland Given Away at Yalta: Capehart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1955, the South Bend Tribune,

of South Bend, Ind., began a series of articles pertaining to an interview with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Senator from Indiana, on the subject of the sellout of Poland at Yalta and other international conferences. Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the first of this series of very timely and interesting articles:

POLAND GIVEN AWAY AT YALTA: CAPEHART

(By Francis K. Czyewski)

Poland was not sold at Yalta—it was given away, in the belief of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana.

Interviewed concerning the recent publication of the full Yalta treaty documents by the State Department, Senator CAPEHART emphasized that Poland's so-called sellout was even worse.

"I couldn't call it a sellout because when you sell something you get something in return. Poland was given away."

Joseph Stalin's position with regard to Poland was "definitely known by the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and others high in our Government before the Yalta Conference was ever held," the Senator said, and "nothing was done to help the galiant ally in World War II.

"To say the least, Mr. Stalin was quite frank in his position concerning Poland both before and during the Yalta Conference, according to the Yalta papers recently released," he said.

WORST BLOW FROM STALIN

What Mr. CAPEHART considers was the worse blow to the ally who was first struck by Adolf Hitler's blitzkreig on September 1, 1939, was that Stalin "was not opposed at all as to how and why the Polish soldiers were to die at the hands of Russian soldiers."

According to Senator CAPEHART, Stalin's position was "only meekly opposed on the Polish boundary issue and only half-heartedly opposed on the Government of Poland issue, but nobody opposed what fate was to meet Polish soldiers at the hands of the Russians."

Fifty thousand Polish army men including some 11,000 Polish commissioned officers, with generals and top-ranking military leaders were executed and their bodies found in the Katyn forest in eastern Poland during the war. The Poles accused the Russians. At the pressure of Polish-American organizations the matter finally drew the attention of the Congress. A House committee investigation was held 3 years ago.

Concerning this investigation of the death of the 50,000 Polish army men, Senator CAPEHART said that "much ballyhoo was attached to the investigation of the question who killed the Polish army officers—Germany or Russia?"

"That investigation, which proved not nearly what the Yalta papers prove—and not quite the same answer—was conducted during the 82d Congress, which was not under the control of my party," he said.

Senator CAPEHART recalled that March 19, 1948, he introduced a resolution requesting an exact explanation of the agreements and charged violations based not only on the Yalta Conference, but also agreements and violations based on the many other conferences held by the world powers during and after hostilities in Europe.

"What happened to your resolution?" Senator CAPEHART was asked.

"The resolution was sent to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee but no committee action was taken on it," he said.

But, he said, a reply from the State Department was filed with the Senate on June 2, 1948, by the late Senator Vandenberg, then chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In this reply, 10 violations were cited, but only 3 were charged against agreements reached at Yalta. The others were based on agreements reached at Potsdam, Moscow and other meeting places.

"What violations did the State Department reveal?" the Senator was quizzed.

"One of the three agreements at Yalta cited in the reply as having been violated was the agreement that free and unfettered elections be held as soon as possible in Poland. It is interesting to note in the explanations of violations cited that, in addition to charging Russian influence in the elections, the United States Government itself feared that the election would not be free," he answered.

This is how Senator CAPEHART quoted the State Department's explanation:

"On January 28, the Department of State issued a release to the press stating that reports received from our Embassy in Poland immediately prior to and subsequent to the elections, based upon the observations of American officials, confirmed the fears which this Government had expressed that the election would not be free."

MEANINGLESS AGREEMENT

"What did that reply indicate, Senator?"

"The Yalta papers prove this Government had reason to believe the election would not be free, but there is no indication that this Government feared such and by no means is there any indication that this Government expressed that fear. More important, the Yalta papers prove that Mr. Stalin's position on all points was clearly expressed by him not only at the opening of the conference but in December of 1944, more than a month before the conference," Senator CAPEHART answered.

Senator CAPEHART charges that the United States representatives at Yalta proceeded to enter into what obviously was a meaningless agreement with Russia on the boundaries, election procedures and the welfare of the Polish people.

"What makes you think, Senator, that this was the case?"

"Because the agremeent with Stalin was made despite the previous knowledge of Mr. Stalin's expressed opinion as to what he felt would be the future for our ally, Poland."

The questioning of the partitioning of Poland by Russia at Yalta, how the Polish emigre government in London was betrayed and how Poland's allies helped Russia eliminate opposition to communism in Poland will be answered in the next interview with Senator CAPEHART.

FDR Failed To Keep His Pledge To Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including the second of the series of articles from the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind., which are based on an interview with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Senator from Indiana, on the effect of the Yalta and other international conferences on Poland:

FDR FAILED TO KEEP HIS PLEDGE TO POLAND

(By Francis K. Czyzewski)

President Roosevelt had pledged the emigrant Polish Government in London to help Poland regain its prewar boundary with Russia, but helped Stalin take almost a half of Poland at the Yalta Conference, the recently published Yalta papers reveal, according to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART.

Instead of keeping his pact with the Polish allies in London, Roosevelt is quoted as saying that "most Poles, like the Chinese, want to save face," at the early sessions of the fateful Yalta Conference in December 1944, at which Poland's fifth partition in modern times was accomplished to give Stalin what he wanted, Senator CAPEHART pointed out.

(Poland was partitioned three times by Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1772, 1793, and 1795. The fourth partition was by Stalin and Hitler in September of 1939.—Editor's note.)

"What did Roosevelt refer to in comparing the Poles to the Chinese, Senator?" he was asked.

"In the Yalta papers indicating the action of the Conference on February 6, 1945, the following quotation is attributed to Roosevelt," CAPEHART answered. "Here is the quotation":

"I should like to bring up Poland. I come from a great distance and therefore have the advantage of a more distant point of view of the problem. There are six or seven million Poles in the United States. As I said in Tehran, in general, I am in favor of the Curzon line. Most Poles, like the Chinese, want to save face.'"

ON EASTERN BOUNDARIES

(The quotations and the story have to deal with Poland's eastern boundaries which were set at Tehran and then at Yalta. It should be mentioned here that the American Poles just before the general election in November of 1944 were asked by their national leaders to vote for Roosevelt, because he had promised the Polish-American Congress to fight for an independent Poland in its former boundaries as represented by the Polish emigrant Government in Great Britain.)

"The rest of the story is now history; black history for the United States." Senator CAPEHART charged as he referred to another partitioning of Poland by Russia with this Government's consent and permission by the American Government to have the Reds in Poland eliminate opposition by a puppet regime. Poland had lost almost a half of its territory in the east to Russia as a result of this action.

Senator CAPEHART, in revealing the plot, said that "during the period prior to the Yalta Conference this Government and Great Britain had been recognizing the emigrant Polish Government in London headed by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk.

DIFFER ON LIMIT

"What did the Polish emigre government ask with regard to the eastern boundary of Poland, Senator?" he was asked.

"Mikolajczyk, at the time," CAPEHART said, "had urged the United States and Great Britain to press for an eastern Polish boundary that would retain in Polish territory the city of Lwow."

"And what did Stalin want?"

"Stalin, who had been plainly favorable to the Lublin Polish Government rather than the London emigrant government," he answered, "favored the Curzon line for an eastern boundary."

(The Curzon line was an arbitrary line devised by the British Lord Curzon as Polish-Russian frontier after World War I. It was acceptable neither to Poland nor Russia, the city of Lwow, ceded to Russia at Yalta, it must be pointed out, was never a part of Russian territory, even during the three partitions of Poland in the late 18th century Lwow was in Austrian Poland.—Editor's note.)

"Did President Roosevelt promise Mikolajczyk what his government wanted?"

"The Yalta papers reveal that Mikolajczyk believed President Roosevelt had pledged his support to the emigrant government position on the boundary."

"But why Poland was robbed of its territory in the last?"

"At a conference in Moscow in October, 1944, Molotov declared in the presence of Mikolajczyk, American Ambassador Averell Harriman, and other that Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin had agreed at Teheran to establish the Curzon line as the eastern boundary. As we all know," Senator CAPEHART added, "it was the Curzon line which was agreed to at Yalta."

"WHY NO FIGHT"

"But why didn't President Roosevelt fight for Poland?"

"It is interesting to note in the Yalta papers how vigorously our President and Yalta delegates fought for the rights of Poland, our ally," the Senator answered. He said that after the Teheran conference, Roosevelt wrote to Mikolajczyk as follows: "In so far as the United States guaranty of any specific frontiers is concerned I am sure you will understand that this Government, in accordance with its traditional policy, cannot give a guaranty for any specific frontiers."

"What happened at Teheran, then?"

"This statement by Roosevelt was written after the Teheran conference at which Molotov said agreement had been reached by the three powers on the Curzon line boundary and after Mikolajczyk contended Roosevelt promised to fight against the Curzon line boundary.

"Do the Yalta papers reveal anything clearly in this respect?"

"The Yalta papers quote Roosevelt rather clearly on the boundary question and leave no doubts as to whether he told Mikolajczyk the truth of whether Molotov did," Senator CAPEHART answered.

ROOSEVELT QUOTED

"What did Roosevelt say in Yalta?"

"In the Yalta papers indicating the action of the conference on February 6, 1945, the following quotation is attributed to Roosevelt: 'I should like to bring up Poland. I come from a great distance and therefore have the advantage of a more distant point of view of the problem.'

"Was Roosevelt definitely for the Curzon line?"

"Yes, the statement made by Roosevelt was: 'As I said in Teheran, in general, I am in favor of the Curzon line.' In addition, Senator CAPEHART revealed, Roosevelt also expressed himself like this: 'Most Poles, like the Chinese, want to save face.'

"That was the extent of Roosevelt's fight for the Mikolajczyk boundary cause at Yalta—and just about the extent of the fight for any of the causes of the emigrant Government of Poland which we had been recognizing throughout the fighting," was the opinion of Senator CAPEHART.

In the third of the series of interviews, Senator CAPEHART will tell, in the light of the Yalta treaty exposé, how Poland got the "double double-cross" and how Stalin was permitted to set up the kind of government he wanted in Poland without protest from Poland's allies.

Double Double-Cross to Poland at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I am including the third of the series of articles which appeared in the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind., on an interview with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Senator from Indiana, concerning the effect on Poland of the Yalta and other international conferences:

DOUBLE DOUBLE-CROSS TO POLAND AT YALTA

(By Francis K. Czyzewski)

Poland at Yalta got what is commonly known by us as double double-cross, as far as free elections or government concerned. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, said in his third interview explaining the recent expose of the secret Yalta agreements made a little more than 10 years ago.

The papers, he said, now shed light on the subject why Poland today is ruled by a puppet government controlled by Moscow, and how the American Government helped liquidate Poles opposed to communism.

"Just in what manner?" the Senator was asked.

"Again the Yalta papers reveal that Roosevelt and our Yalta delegation knew far in advance of the conference that Stalin had no intention of doing anything else but establishing a Polish Government favorable to Russia," he replied. "That, apparently, was his conception of freedom of Poland."

But, before going further, Senator CAPEHART explained that late in 1944, before the Yalta conference, the United States and Great Britain were recognizing the emigrant Polish Government in London headed by Stanislaw Mikolajczyk.

What do the Yalta papers reveal about this?

MESSAGE REVEALED

"On October 22, 1944, the Yalta papers reveal a message from Churchill to Roosevelt in which Churchill reported on a meeting he had attended in Moscow for the purpose of discussing the Polish question, particularly the formation of a government of Poland. Attending that meeting were Mikolajczyk and Boleslaw Bierut. Bierut was at the time President of the Provisional National Council of the Lublin Polish Government which was Moscow-sponsored. Mr. Churchill wrote as follows to Mr. Roosevelt: "On our last day at Moscow Mikolajczyk saw Bierut who admitted his difficulties. Fifty of his men had been shot in the last month. Many Poles took to the woods rather than join his forces."

What connection does this have with Yalta?

"This comment by Churchill," explained Senator CAPEHART, "will lead to further serious revelations by the Yalta papers. Meanwhile, here I want to complete the story of the double double-cross in the formation of the Polish Government.

"Churchill wrote," continued the Senator, "He (Mikolajczyk) explained his plan but Stalin made it clear that the Lublin Poles must have the majority. You will note that Stalin made it clear. Well, he later made even more clear what he had in mind."

What happened in the meantime?

WINANT RELAYS WORD

On November 25, 1944, the then United States Ambassador to Great Brtain, John G. Winant, sent a message to our Secretary of State in which he said he had talked with Mikolajczyk, who informed him: "The Lublin committee was already largely Communist and those elements which were not Communist were being rapidly eliminated. It was in this same message Winant informed Roosevelt that Mikolajczyk had resigned as Premier of the emigrant Polish Government in London."

It was at this time, Senator CAPEHART said, that Roosevelt became concerned about the turn of events and sent a message to Stalin. This message, according to the Senator, while stating that "the United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free, independent and democratic Poland, disclosed again the weakness of the American representations to Stalin."

"Did Roosevelt get a reply from Stalin?"

"Yes, on December 27, 1944, the answer was sent by Stalin which gave the full and complete feeling that Stalin had determined a program for Poland, and the Yalta Conference, as far as the Polish question was concerned, would be a farce."

"What did Stalin's message say?"

TERRORISM CHARGED

"It charged the Polish Government in London with instigation of terrorists to 'lead a criminal fight against Soviet troops which are liberating Poland' and asked for support of the Polish National Committee (Beirut's group), suggesting 'an immediate exchange of representatives with the Polish National Committee, so that after a certain time it would be recognized as the lawful government of Poland.'"

"What did our Yalta delegation do about this?"

"Let us look further into the Yalta papers for these answers," replied Senator CAPEHART. "First, let us look at the full text of the Yalta agreements as released to the press on February 12, 1945. Under the chapter of Poland we find at the very beginning this claim: 'As a result of our discussions we have agreed on the conditions in which a new Polish Provisional Government of national unity may be formed in such a manner as to command recognition by the three major powers.'"

"Was anything like that done?"

"No, they did nothing of the sort," replied CAPEHART. "They established a Commission to determine conditions of establishing such a government."

QUOTES STALIN

"And where was this Commission to meet, Senator?"

"In Moscow. And am I unfair in my inference here that such a meeting in Moscow would be under Red influence?"

In this connection, Senator CAPEHART quotes Stalin from the Yalta papers as follows, "We had the opportunity in Moscow to create a Polish Government with Poles. Both London and Lublin groups met in Moscow and certain points of agreement were reached." Stalin, Senator CAPEHART pointed out "was referring to the government Russia had already recognized and which he praised in his December 27 message to Roosevelt. It is also the same government Winant cautioned Roosevelt as being communistic and which was eliminating the non-Communist elements."

"What finally developed?"

"According to what Stalin remarked at Yalta, Mikolajczyk returned to London and was kicked out of the government. All these people were against the agreement and hostile to the idea. They called the Lublin government bandits and traitors. Naturally, the Lublin government paid the same coin to the London government. It is difficult to bring them together."

"What else did Stalin have to say?"

COMPARED TO DE GAULLE

"I am prepared to call the Warsaw Poles here, or better to see them in Moscow. But frankly, the Warsaw government has as great a democratic basis in Poland as DeGaulle has in France," Stalin was quoted as saying at Yalta.

"And so they met in Moscow," Senator CAPEHART emphasized.

"I ask how in Heaven's name," the Senator exclaimed, "could our leaders return from Yalta and tell the American people a just and fair agreement had been reached on the future of Poland?"

"How in Heaven's name could any sane and sensible person believe that such an agreement on the establishment of a Polish

Government would be recognized in the face of the frankness of Stalin that he would stand only for his type of government in Poland?" continued Senator CAPEHART.

"And then our State Department in 1948 said to the United States Senate in answer to my resolution that reports from Poland 'confirmed the fears which this Government had expressed that the election would not be free.' When were those fears expressed? Not at Yalta."

In the next and the last of his interviews, Senator CAPEHART will tell how Stalin himself in the Yalta talks revealed by implication how 50,000 Polish Army men were executed in the Katyn Forest.

Yalta Exposé Points to Polish Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. S. J. CRUMPACKER, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I am including the fourth and last of the series of articles run by the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind., on an interview with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, senior Senator from Indiana. In his final interview, the Senator points to the evidence contained in the Yalta papers on the massacre of 50,000 Polish Army men in the Katyn Forest:

YALTA EXPOSÉ POINTS TO POLISH MASSACRE

(By Francis K. Czyewski)

The recent Yalta conference expose contains strong evidence as to the identity of the murderers of the 50,000 Polish army men in the forest of Katyn in eastern Poland during World War II, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, reveals in his final review of the Yalta papers.

"I already mentioned at the beginning of my series of interviews that a long investigation was conducted by a House subcommittee on that matter," he said.

"What do the Yalta papers reveal in this matter?" CAPEHART was asked.

"It probably would be a valuable addition to the House subcommittee's report to quote Mr. Stalin's remarks at Yalta, now revealed for the first time by the Yalta papers."

"In just what way, Senator?"

"Mr. Stalin said in that message: 'We cannot reconcile with such a situation when terrorists instigated by Polish emigrants kill in Poland soldiers and officers of the Red Army, lead a criminal fight against Soviet troops which are liberating Poland, and directly aid our enemies, whose allies they in fact are.' Yet this was but a mild reference," Senator CAPEHART explained. "It was a two-edged sword for his message because it was designed to make his position on government formation stronger and at the same time provide the alibi for whatever might happen to emigrant government followers."

NON-REDS ELIMINATED

"You recall, too, what Mr. Winant said, that the 'non-Communists were being eliminated.' I said earlier that Mr. Stalin made his position on Polish issues quite clear. I said he made his position clear on the fate of Polish army men. Let me quote to you again from Mr. Stalin's opening remarks at Yalta on this historic crime:

"I quote:

"'Now as a military man I must say what I demand of a country liberated by the Red Army. First, there should be peace and quiet in the wake of the army. The men of the Red Army are indifferent as to what kind of government there is in Poland, but they do want one that will maintain order behind the lines. The Lublin-Warsaw government fulfills this role not badly. There are agents of the London government connected with the so-called underground. They are called resistance forces. We have had nothing good from them, but much evil. So far their agents have killed 212 Russian military men. They have attacked supply bases for arms. If they attack the Red Army any more they will be shot. When I compare the agents of both governments I find that the Lublin ones are useful and the others the contrary. The military must have peace and quiet. The military will support such a government, and I cannot do otherwise.'"

NOTE OF SURRENDER

"What followed this statement of Stalin against the so-called Polish underground?"

"There follows this quote in the Yalta papers a note of solemn surrender to Mr. Stalin's position," Senator CAPEHART replied.

"In what manner was this surrender made?"

"That note says that as Mr. Stalin completed his statement Mr. Roosevelt called attention to the fact that it was then a quarter till 8 and that the meeting should be adjourned."

"What was wrong with this?"

"You can search the Yalta papers from that point to the conclusion of the conference and find not a single reference by a member of the United States delegation to Mr. Stalin's warning that Polish Army men, or any other persons, favorable to the London emigrant government would be shot. I bow my head in shame for those who represented this great country of ours in such a manner," Senator CAPEHART, exclaimed adding, "we have always felt that any representatives of the United States would at all times fight for what is right."

And Senator CAPEHART also added, "Our boys died in great numbers in the European theater of World War II for what they believed to be a great cause. We liberated a few countries, too, including, in my judgment, Mr. Stalin's own country, Russia."

"My thoughts return to the message by President Truman which prompted my introduction of the resolution March 19, 1948, seeking to bring before Congress the agreements which had been reached in the many secret meetings in Yalta, Teheran, and elsewhere," the Senator continued.

"What did Truman say to the Congress in that message?"

"Mr. Truman said to the Congress March 17, 1948, in that speech: 'You know of the sincere and patient attempts of the democratic nations to find a secure basis for peace through negotiation and agreement.'"

"Was the statement insincere?"

"How wrong he was. Congress knew nothing at that time of the agreements," said Senator CAPEHART. "Congress knows only little more today—but enough more to realize that sincerity did not always prevail in those conferences."

"What do we know now for sure, Senator?"

CITES ROOSEVELT DECEPTION

"We know now that Mr. Roosevelt deceived Mr. Mikolajczyk and London emigrant government of Poland. We know now that Mr. Roosevelt and all the members of the United States delegation to Yalta knew long in advance of the Yalta Conference that 'Uncle Joe' Stalin intended to run Poland his way. We know now that every possible Russian influence prevailed in the Polish issue long before the meaningless agreement of Yalta."

"And what of the Katyn Forest murders?"

"Yes, we know now the murderer of the Katyn Forest."

"What did your resolution in 1948 ask, Senator?

"Thirty-two Senators, headed by myself, wanted the American people to get a full and frank disclosure of the facts behind the changes in American policy abroad. The authors of it were interested in but one thing, and that is to ascertain what agreements, entered into between this country and Russia, have been violated, and what agreements were entered into between this Nation and Russia at Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, Casablanca, and other places. The resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations."

ASKS AIRING OF DOCUMENTS

"What should be done now that the Yalta papers have been published, Senator?"

"Every word of the secret conferences and agreements reached at those conferences should be laid before the Congress and the people of the United States," Sen CAPEHART replied.

"We have learned from the Yalta papers that misrepresentations to the Congress and the people have been made possible through the policy of hiding in secrecy decisions of such vast importance to our future well-being," he continued.

"Should other secret conferences also be brought to light Senator?"

"I commend the present administration for its decision to make the Yalta papers available to the people and to the Congress. The same action should be taken on the papers of Teheran, Potsdam, Moscow, and Casablanca. I hope the administration will follow its own good example and take such steps at the earliest opportunity," concluded Senator CAPEHART.

Address of Hon. George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, on the Program Youth Wants To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the remarks made by the Honorable George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, on the television program Youth Wants To Know on May 29, 1955.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The ANNOUNCER. Youth Wants To Know, the unrehearsed, spontaneous questions of today's young people, and here is your moderator, Stephen McCormick.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Hello, I am Stephen McCormick, welcoming you to another session of Youth Wants To Know, founded and produced by Theodore Granik. Our guest today is the Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, a key adviser in the President's Cabinet. Secretary Humphrey's impressive experience well fits his responsibility as director of the Nation's multi-billion-dollar program.

Mr. Secretary, it is very pleasant indeed to have you back on Youth Wants To Know.

Secretary HUMPHREY. It is very nice indeed to have the opportunity to be back here.

Mr. McCORMICK. The youngsters participating in the program under the auspices of the American Legion have many questions for you as you might well imagine.

QUESTION. Are you in favor of the income-tax cuts as proposed by the Democrats?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No, Roberta, I was opposed to that, and the reason I was opposed to it was because I thought that it was offered in a way and at a time that was entirely inappropriate. I don't think we can have another tax cut until we know where the money is coming from to pay it.

In other words, we must save money, save expenditures, so that we have money saved from expenditures to use to pay for the tax cut before there should be another one.

QUESTION. What are the chances of a tax cut next year?

Secretary HUMPHREY. John, that just depends on how much we are able to save in expenditures. As you know, this administration has been trying ever since we came here to reduce expenditures. We have reduced them very considerably, since we came, we are trying to continue to reduce expenditures, and when we can reduce expenditures sufficiently, then I will certainly be very much in favor of another tax cut.

QUESTION. Do you think that the fact that next year is an election year will in any way influence whether there will be a tax cut or not?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It will not make a bit of difference as far as I am concerned unless we can save money. If we can save the money I am very much in favor of a tax cut just as soon as we can do it.

QUESTION. Are you satisfied so far with the Democratic Congress' support of the administration's policy and program?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, John, in many ways they have been very helpful. In some cases we have had some pretty difficult battles. I think you are a page up there and you know. You have seen some of them going on. You know there have been some difficulties with some of the bills but by and large there are always different points of view and that is what makes America, John, it is different points of view, different people harmonizing their points of view. That is the way we get the best results. So I think, taking it by and large, we are getting along pretty well.

Question. Has the Government collected more or less in taxes this year than in fiscal year 1954?

Secretary HUMPHREY. We are collecting less than we collected the year before because taxes were reduced, but we are collecting more than the difference between the cut in taxes and the amount that we previously collected. The reason for that is because, as business improves, as individual earnings improve, we collect more taxes. Fortunately, there are more people today having more money to spend than there ever have been in the history of the United States and, of course, as the people have more money, we collect more taxes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Has moving the deadline up to April 15 from March 15 made a great deal of difference, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No; I don't think it made any. I think it was a convenience to some of the people in paying their taxes to have a little more time, but so far as the amount is concerned, it didn't make any difference.

Question. Are we to assume from your last answer that you believe there is no decrease in the purchasing power of America?

Secretary HUMPHREY. This has been known for the last 2½ years. The dollar will buy just as much today as it would 2½ years ago. It is a remarkable thing, that the economy has been so stable for so long a time. The cost of living really hasn't changed at all in 2½ years.

Question. I was wondering whether you would think the United States dollar would ever get back to where it was, say, 20 years ago?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well "ever" is a long time. When you say a thing is never going to happen you go a long way out on a limb, but I have no expectation of it returning—what that means is, you see, that the dollar will buy more—it means there will be a very severe decline in all prices and I am not at all sure that it would be a good thing if it did. I think if we can stabilize the dollar as it has been stabilized for 2½ years—which means that the cost of living doesn't rise—I think that is the ideal way to have it because, you see, if you can keep the cost of living from rising, as we have for 2½ years, now, and at the same time, people can produce more and earn more, as they are doing, then you have going on just what is happening in America today. You have people earning more money than they ever did before, even though they pay us taxes. They are having more money to spend than they ever had before, and that is the way the general scale of living of the people rises.

Now, if increases in wages or increases in earnings are accompanied by an increase in prices, it does very little good, but if prices can remain level and you can then have some increases in earnings, why then the people are better off than they ever were before and that is just the way it is now. That is what is going on every day now. People are better off than they have ever been.

Question. Did you know that Senator BYRD of Virginia stated that the multibillion-dollar roads program offered by you was the most irresponsible method of financing that has been offered in his 22 years as a Senator? Will you comment on this, please?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Yes, I will be glad to. Senator BYRD is a very dear friend of mine and he is a great American. He is an American that I respect and I respect his judgment, but we can't always think alike. As I was saying a minute ago, there are differences of opinion and the way you get to the truth of matters is by some differences of opinion and working them out and then the American people decide how it is best to do it.

Now, I feel that the road program as proposed, the Eisenhower road program is a suitable program and that it can very properly be adopted, and he disagrees with that.

The reason I feel that, Billy, is this, just to take a minute more on it: I feel that the way we propose to finance the roads is by borrowing money that will be paid by the use of the roads, as measured in gasoline taxes.

Now, I think everybody will agree that with the automobiles we have, with the crowds and the traffic and all that, everybody will agree we ought to have more roads. I don't think there is any question about that. The only question is how fast we ought to have them and how should we pay for them. And if we have to pay all cash for the roads, we cannot have them as rapidly, we can't build them as fast and have the use of them as rapidly as we can if we pay part cash and borrow part and I think it is very desirable that we borrow part, so as to get the roads sooner.

You see there is a great difference between spending more than you earn, just for fun or for pleasure or amusement or for living. But if you want to buy a tool that will help you earn more money, so that your earnings go up, it is perfectly proper to borrow to get that tool to increase your earnings. Now, that is what we are doing with the roads. If we borrow for the roads, we are borrowing to get a tool that will improve all America, that will help the earnings of America, and then that loan is paid for by the use of the road, as measured in the gasoline tax.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Secretary, I am sure the complexities in the financing of this road program are somewhat beyond the average American but they want to know when we will get the roads. Do you feel we will wind up with some sort of a program at least that will within a few years give us new roads?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Oh, yes, I do. I think more roads in this country are absolutely essential. I think we are going to get them and I think it is just a matter of harmonizing views on how it will be developed, and how rapidly we will pay.

You see, the great discussion is largely between paying all cash and getting the roads more slowly, or paying part cash and getting the roads more rapidly and that is a matter of balance that is not a—it doesn't go right to the root of the matter, it doesn't go to whether we are going to have more roads, it goes to just how we will get them and how rapidly we will get them.

Question. Mr. Secretary, how could you support the President's multibillion-dollar road bill when you have a reputation of seeking to balance the budget?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think as I said just a minute ago to you there is a lot of difference between just general spending and reduction of general expenditures, or waste in Government, and in buying and earning assets, buying a tool with which to work. It is just like a carpenter. Here is a carpenter. If he borrows money, just because he is living beyond his means, that is a bad thing. But if that carpenter wants a new box of tools to help him earn more money, it is perfectly proper for him to borrow some money to buy that new box of tools to increase his earnings and then use those earnings to pay off that debt that he got for the tools.

Now, these roads, more roads in America are of the nature of more tools for America to live with, to use, and it is a matter of safety and expansion of employment. I think it is very proper to buy that tool and then measure the earnings, the gasoline tax that is paid for the use of it, and use that money to pay back the debt that is incurred in getting it.

Question. Mr. Secretary, don't you think we are planning to spend entirely too much money on highways and not enough on schools?

Secretary HUMPHREY. No, I don't. You see, it is quite a different thing. The responsibilities are quite different. The responsibilities for schools are very largely in the local communities and that is where they ought to be. I don't think you can balance the two at all, properly. I think we need them both. We need good schools. We also need new roads and the respective responsibilities ought to furnish them.

Question. Do you think the administration can balance the budget in 1956?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't know, Richard. We are going to try. We are not too far out of balance in our estimates and if business conditions continue good, if earnings continue good, if the people still are making lots of money as they are at the present time, and businesses are doing well, and plenty of people have jobs, I think there is an outside chance that we might be able to do it by cutting expenditures sufficiently to accomplish it.

Question. When the Government went $2½ million in debt this year trying to balance the budget, where do you expect to economize for 1956?

Secretary HUMPHREY. All along the line, Richard. I think there should be economies made all along the line.

I am sure there are many ways we can render excellent service, just as good service and better service through all the departments of Government to the people than we are now rendering and still save in waste and extravagance and get more money for our dollar—get more performance for our dollar.

Question. In the 1952 campaign, President Eisenhower promised to balance the budget. If he seeks reelection, do you think it will hurt him if he doesn't balance the budget?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Of course you always want to do what you say you are going to do, as nearly as you can. He said he would try to balance the budget. I don't think there is anybody in America who doesn't believe he is trying his best to balance the budget. I think most everybody will agree to that. We still have a chance to balance it, we are still attempting and trying to balance it. It is a matter of first importance with us. I said first importance. I want to take that back. First importance is a matter of safety. It is a matter of safety in this country. Unless and until we are sure we are spending what is required for the safety of this country, to keep this country for you young people who are going to grow up in it, to keep it safe, to keep it the right kind of a country, so that you will have as good a country to live in as we older people have had. To keep this country secure is the No. 1 objective of this administration, but coupled right along with that is the desire to balance the budget, to keep the economy as safe as we keep the country from outside sources, and that is what we are trying to do, and I hope we will do it. I hope we will do both.

Question. If President Eisenhower declines the Republican nomination for President in 1956, who do you think will be nominated?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I haven't the remotest idea. I am not skilled in politics and I just don't know.

Question. Mr. Secretary, if President Eisenhower refuses, will you accept?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I will not.

Question. There has been a great deal of talk lately, sir, to the effect that Secretary Hobby is going to resign and there have also been rumors that an Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Folsom, will replace her. Would you care to comment on this, sir?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it would be inappropriate for me to comment on that. That is a rumor and it involves people other than myself. I will be delighted to answer questions about myself or about the Treasury, but I don't think it is appropriate for me to comment on matters affecting other people.

Question. With the 600,000-car backlog, who would be the effect of an auto workers' strike on the national economy?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Well, a strike is always a bad thing for everybody concerned. It is too bad when differences can't be reconciled and strikes become necessary. Occasionally, one side or the other thinks the strike is necessary, sometimes both sides. But usually, it is accompanied by losses in the whole economy and losses by everybody involved, that are not desirable. I would hope very much that there would not have to be a strike anywhere in this country. That is perhaps too much to hope for continuously, but I would hope they would be just as few as possible.

Question: I am a young man and I want to make a million dollars and you said when you came back from South America, that that is where you would go to make it. How would you do that?

Mr. MCCORMICK. We are all interested in that answer, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is a kind of a tough one.

What I meant by that—and you don't have to go to South America to do well, either, although South America is an extremely interesting place. What I meant when I said that—I was quoted in that—I don't know that I ever did say exactly that, but I was quoted as saying that. I mean that there are great opportunities in South America in many of the countries in the development of their natural resources. South America, the opportunities for development are the same sort of developments that we have had in this country over the past 50 years or more, and there is lots of opportunity for the developments of natural resources and the building up of the countries.

Now in this country, we are just filled with opportunity, too. You young people just keep this in mind: You hear people say that there is less opportunity all the time. That is just baloney. There is more opportunity in America, today, than there ever has been in its history. There are more people, there are more new things, there are more new ways of getting things, there are more chances to make and to sell things that the people want, there is more opportunity every day for you young people to get ahead and do well in this country, more so than there ever has been before in all our history put together.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Secretary, before taking the next question, it is time to announce the winner of this week's 30-volume set of the Encyclopedia Americana, America's first and oldest encyclopedia, and the winner this week is William Robertson, 221 South Washington Street, Rockville, Md. The Station of the Week, WRC in Washington, D. C. For details of the contest, listen to the announcement at the end of the program.

Now let's hear the winning question. Will you give it, please?

Question. Secretary Humphrey, how can we reconcile the fact that Britain recently rejected the opportunity to lower their tax rate for fear of jeopardizing their financial aid from this country? Aren't we in effect now paying for that portion of their taxes?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Now does that question say that Britain failed to lower her tax rate?

Question. It says she rejected.

Secretary HUMPHREY. Rejected an opportunity to lower the tax rate?

Question. Yes.

Secretary HUMPHREY. You know, that is not correct. The question proceeds on a wrong premise. Britain just did lower her tax rate. Taxes in Great Britain were lowered only a few weeks ago. Maybe it is 2 or 3 months, now, but it is a relatively short time ago. So that I think the question starts from a wrong premise. To pass that by for the moment, I don't think Britain's raising or lowering her taxes has much to do with what we do in connection with assistance to Great Britain. As a matter of fact, our aid, strictly aid, to Great Britain has been very low for some months past. It has been very greatly reduced. Conditions in Great Britain are very good, they are doing very well, and they haven't required American aid for some time. The war damage that we sought to build up has been very largely repaired so that American aid in Great Britain is a very low and declining item.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you said a few moments ago that American business was in fine shape. Yet every day we hear about mergers. Now something is wrong. What is the matter with American business?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I don't see why you say something is wrong. The fact is that there are many more small businesses today in this country than there ever were in its history. We have more new businesses, more new small businesses starting this year than have ever started in any year. So that the idea that there is nothing but big business in America is wrong. The idea that mergers are something wrong, or reprehensible, is entirely wrong. There are many, many mergers that are very much to the benefit of the people. They are very much to the benefit of not only the employees in the concern because it levels out their work—let's take a concern that has a seasonal product. That means that it has high employment in one season of the year and low in another. Here is another concern that makes another product that has another season, that works through another season. Now, how much better it is for those two things to get together, to give high season employment in one branch of the business at one time and high season employment in another time. That is very beneficial to their employees.

Another business makes a certain article where the sales would vary from time to time, in different times of the year. They can supplement that by something else that is made, and round out their program to give more constant employment, more steady employment and better earnings for the stockholders.

There are many businesses that supplement each other where mergers are very desirable.

Question. I realize that there are many small businesses but there are also those businesses that have to merge because if they don't they are going to go straight out of business. Take for instance the automobile industry. Last summer they merged and they are getting ready to merge again.

The question is this: If the mergers are not for financial reasons—you say they are for the benefit of the employees. Why does business say it is for financial reasons?

Secretary HUMPHREY. For the benefit of employees, for the benefit of stockholders and for customers.

Let's just take the automobiles that you are talking about. If you can merger several models into a single concern so that you get the interchange of parts and interchange of panels and one thing or another, you make a cheaper and a better automobile.

Now, if you can make a cheaper and a better automobile it is much to the benefit not only of the people who are working to produce it but of the people who want to buy it.

Question. Your first budget cut $5 billion out of the Air Force and made reassurances that we would have more defense money with no sacrifice in fighting strength.

Why didn't we cut $10 billion out and have twice as much defense?

Secretary HUMPHREY. You have to proceed with caution, you have to proceed slowly to be sure that you are getting more defense for less money, that your money is buying more of the things that you want, and that you are cutting out waste and not cutting out the heart of what you are trying to do. I hope the time will come when we can eliminate another $5 billion out of our Government expenditures and still give better Government and more security for that less money. I think it is possible, and I think it can be done by more efficient management, by better arrangement all along, and by getting more for our money as we spend it.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Do you feel the Hoover Commission recommendation by and large will be able to be put into effect and that you will save money there?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I can't comment on them by and large, because I haven't studied them. I am sure that there are some that I have seen that are very excellent suggestions. I think perhaps there are others that will take a great deal of study and that may not be thoroughly practical. I am, however, absolutely sure of this, and that is that they merit the greatest consideration and the most careful study by every single department affected.

Mr. MCCORMICK. I notice the question has been raised that perhaps the recommendations of the Hoover Commission might be nullified by the pressure groups they affect. At least, that was comment made by several people, Mr. Wilford May in the Financial and Commercial Chronicle, made a comment along that line.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is one of the things that is very hard to do, reduce expenditures. You have tried it at home and

you know it is pretty tough. Every time you undertake to cut down on expenditures, the people who are affected have trouble, and people who are used to something or other, hate to let it go. It may be that is better for the overall picture to have them let go but nevertheless it is pretty tough to do it.

Question. Do you think that the administration will find it necessary to request Congress to lower the national debt limit?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Not to lower it, to raise it.

Mr. MCCORMICK. It would be rather pleasant to lower it, wouldn't it?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I wish you were right, but it will be necessary that the debt limit again be raised this year.

You see what was done last year was the debt limit was temporarily raised to take care of this year. You will remember they raised it to take care of the peak, and then we were to even it out. Now, we are going to be back, as we said we could, on June 30, but then we are going to run right into another peak next fall and next winter and that peak also is going to have to be provided for.

Mr. MCCORMICK. I wish we had more time for questions but we must end today's discussion. Thank you very much, Secretary Humphrey for helping provide the answers to Youth Wants To Know.

Record of Republican Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from remarks I made at the Republican Party Workshop Meeting for the Eastern Counties of Pennsylvania, in the Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., June 25, 1955.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN AT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WORKSHOP MEETING FOR THE EASTERN COUNTIES OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN THE BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 25, 1955

In the 1956 campaign we can go before the American people proud of our Republicanism because we have a Republican administration at Washington without favoritism, without corruption, without extravagance and without Socialistic regimentation.

We have a Republican administration that is sound, trustworthy and economical serving no special interests, but working to advance the welfare of all the people.

We have an administration that believes in the Constitution of the United States and respects its limitations on the power of the central government.

We have an administration that supports the American system of free enterprise which means unlimited opportunity, progress and prosperity.

We can go before the people with a record that is outstanding—a record of achievement that reflects the basic philosophy of the Republican Party and the principles to which the Republican Party is dedicated.

Let me review briefly what has been accomplished in the 2½ years since the American people ended the scandalous years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal and placed Dwight Eisenhower at the head of our national government.

Taxes have been reduced.

When the Eisenhower administration came into power taxes were at a war time level. The Republican 83d Congress reduced taxes by $7,400,000,000 the biggest tax reduction ever made in a single year.

Government spending has been brought under control. The first step taken by the Eisenhower administration was to cut the Truman budget by $10 billion and actual spending was reduced by $8½ billion dollars.

The swollen army of more than 2½ million Federal employees was cut by nearly 300,000.

We no longer have the shocking disclosures of corruption in high Government places. The Bureau of Internal Revenue is no longer a happy hunting ground for income tax fixers. In 1953 afone there were 60 convictions of persons involved in tax evasions and bribery.

There are no red herrings in the Republican administration. Between January 1953 and June 1954, 2,400 security risks were removed from the Government; 41 Communist leaders have been convicted and another 35 have been indicted. Several hundred alien subversives have been deported.

Let us look into the unemployment situation.

A year ago the Democrats were screaming their heads off. They were making all kinds of gloomy predictions. They said our economy was ready to collapse.

But they were wrong. Right now more people are gainfully employed than ever before. In May of this year there was a gain of more than a million jobs over the preceding month and a million and a half over the same month last year.

Inflation has been checked and prices have been stabilized. The decline in the purchasing power of the dollar has been stopped.

Government is being removed from competition with private industry. Twenty-four Government-owned synthetic rubber plants have been sold to private industry.

The Inland Waterways Corp., which operated on the Mississippi River at a loss of $15 million, has been sold.

The Defense Department is giving up many activities which compete with private business such as coffee roasting, ice cream making, logging and saw mill operations and rope manufacturing.

We are no longer exposed to socialistic experimentation which would concentrate all authority in an all-powerful central Government. The socialistic advocates of a planned economy have gone into hiding, but they are ready to spring into action again with their dizzy schemes and false promises if they ever get another chance.

The Republican administration expanded social-security benefits and extended coverage to 10 million more people, the first major increase since 1935.

Under Republican prosperity construction records are being broken with more money being spent to build homes, churches, and schools than ever before. In April construction expenditures ran at the unprecedented annual rate of $41½ billion compared with the previous record set last year of $37 billion.

Under Republican Government the personal income of the American people set an alltime high last month and continues to rise. On an annual rate basis gross personal income of all citizens was computed by the Department of Commerce in April at $295½ billion, a $1 billion increase over March and $11 billion more than the rate for April a year ago.

These are all grand and glorious achievements, but the crowning glory of all is that we are at peace.

Going back to the beginning of this century in our history the Republican Party has never been in power at the start of any war.

Look over the whole Democratic record and you will find they have never been able to sustain prosperity without reckless and wasteful Government spending and without industrial production to be destroyed in battle.

For the first time in many years we have a sound, constructive, expanding economy based on peace instead of a false prosperity based on the death and destruction of war.

The Nation's School-Lunch Milk Program: A Vital National Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by myself on the subject of the Nation's school-lunch milk program, together with a news release from the National Dairy Council concerning the consumption of milk by the Nation's school youngsters.

There being no objection, the statement and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S SCHOOL LUNCH MILK PROGRAM: A VITAL NATIONAL ASSET—VENDING MACHINES ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY

One of the most welcome statistical estimates I have seen is the news coming from the National Dairy Council to the effect that during the coming 1955–56 school year, around 3 billion half pints of milk may be consumed by the Nation's school youngsters.

I feel that the school-lunch program and in particular the milk phase of that program is absolutely essential to the future health of this country.

Some short-sighted critics have occasionally questioned the advisability of the program. But their rare and isolated comments have deservedly been drowned out in the chorus of approval from all over America—approval for helping to build up sturdy young bodies for the Nation's youngsters.

It is absurd to allow milk to remain in Federal cold storage plants, when it should be distributed now to those who can best utilize it.

YOUNGSTERS SHOULD GET IN MILK-DRINKING HABIT

I may say also that it is absurd to have youngsters grow up with the habit of drinking nonnutritious beverages and eating nonnutritious, often teeth-decaying products, when instead, they should be getting into the habit of consuming nature's most important, most healthful food—to build up teeth and bone.

So, youngsters need to be encouraged to get into the milk-drinking habit and to keep that habit.

ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY—THROUGH MILK VENDORS

And, too, there ought to be vending machines readily available to the Nation's youngsters, and for that matter, to the rest of our population, where wholesome dairy products are dispensed economically and efficiently.

Indeed the development of dairy vending machines (of which there are now more than 16,000 on location) particularly ones

holding several types of dairy products—milk, butter, cheese, ice cream—offers one of the most promising channels for increased dairy consumption.

TEAMSTERS STUDYING LOWERING DISTRIBUTION COSTS

It is my purpose to be in continued contact with the National Automatic Merchandising Association, with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and other sources, private and public, toward the end of encouraging this automatic vending trend.

The Teamsters are, I may say, very commendably studying with United States industry the very significant problem of how to lower milk distribution costs. The Economics of Distribution Foundation, an organization for research along this line, will in the words of Teamster President Dave Beck, make a "fundamental contribution to the strengthening of the American economy and the public welfare. * * *"

WISCONSIN FIRST IN AMERICA ON SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Meanwhile, in the Nation's schools, the special school milk program, directly making available half-pints of milk, should be given every possible support.

The State of Wisconsin has led the way under this program. If all the other 47 States did as well under this program as Wisconsin has by its youngsters, then America would be infinitely further along in better health for our children and infinitely further along in ending the so-called dairy surplus problem once and for all.

PRESS RELEASE BY NATIONAL DAIRY COUNCIL

About 3 billion half pints of milk will be consumed by grade- and high-school students at school during the 1955–56 semesters, it is predicted by Milton Hult, president of the National Dairy Council.

Hult's announcement is based on three considerations:

1. Modifications, recently announced by USDA, which simplify procedures for schools participating in the federally sponsored $50 million special school milk program could mean this program will move 1 billion half pints of milk during the coming school year.

2. Further expansion of the national school-lunch program which in itself last year served an estimated 1,725,000,000 half pints of milk in schools. Volume could reach 2 billion during next school year.

3. Continuing expansion of National Dairy Council and affiliated Dairy Council unit activities which further the objectives of both school programs and offer teaching aids to educators for use in teaching good eating habits to all grades.

As a member of Secretary Ezra Taft Benson's National School Lunch Advisory Committee, Hult is familiar with details of the recently announced changes in the special school milk program for the school year ahead.

Major points in the modification, he said, are: (1) complicated book work by cooperating schools has been eliminated from Federal requirements, (2) a more equitable system of reimbursement has been announced, and (3) provisions will be established to insure that as a result of Federal payments, the price of milk will be lowered to children in participating schools.

Hult explained that under the 1954–55 school year system, schools which had well established national school-lunch programs were not, in the opinion of educators, offered enough incentive to serve additional half pints of milk under the new special milk program.

The new system should correct this, in Hult's opinion, by extending to State educational agencies the power to set a 4-cent maximum rate of reimbursement per additional half pint of milk served in schools already serving type A and B school lunches prescribed under the national school-lunch program, and 3 cents per half pint for all other schools.

This could also offer incentive to schools not under the national school-lunch program to take steps to acquire food service facilities to participate in that program.

Hult explained that the special school milk program was designed by Congress not simply as a stop-gap measure during a time of surplus purchases, but rather as a supplement to the national school-lunch program, and as another means of encouraging schools to recognize the importance of serving healthful meals to students. Healthier students make better pupils, Hult said.

Dairy councils located in 81 major markets in 35 States from coast to coast assist schools in launching and conducting school-lunch and special school-milk programs.

Last year 11 million school children in 55,000 schools participated in the national school-lunch program. The $50 million special school-milk program, launched late last fall by act of Congress, offered special reimbursement to these schools for additional milk served above their previous averages and to schools which had never served milk before. During the 1954–55 school year, about 47,000 schools enrolled under the special program and provided an estimated additional 400 million half pints of milk. Hult's estimate of a billion half pints of milk for the next school year amounts to an expansion of that service by 250 percent.

"The United States Congress, the Department of Agriculture, educators, parent groups, and the dairy industry all deserve commendation for promoting child health and solving the many problems of expanding milk service in schools," Hult said. "The school-lunch and special school-milk programs are important demonstrations of many community groups cooperating for a common good which they believe worthwhile."

What can dairy industrymen do about school lunch and special school milk programs where there is not a dairy council? Hult suggests the following:

1. Bring the matter up with the local milk dealers' association.

2. Initiate contacts with the superintendent of schools. He will discuss the matter from a policy standpoint as well as follow-through, or refer you to the school-lunch administrator.

3. Aim at having the new special school-milk program added to the schools which already have regular school-lunch programs.

4. Aim also at setting up arrangement for the special school-milk program in schools which have not participated previously in a school-lunch program.

There will be difficulties to be ironed out and it will take time. Whether a school has proper facilities for refrigeration may be an item. If not, they may need milk deliveries convenient to the school schedule, but not necessarily ideal from the standpoint of the milk dealer. However, procedures can and are being evolved which are satisfactory to all in many areas.

The Problem of Subversives and Communists in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Stanley J. Tracy, former assistant director of the FBI, and now chairman of the organizing committee of the Foundation for American Research, before the Manufacturers Association of Syracuse, at Syracuse, N. Y., on June 7, 1955.

The speech contains a very practical approach to the problem of subversive Communists in the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF STANLEY J. TRACY, CHAIRMAN, ORGANIZING COMMITTEE OF THE FOUNDATION FOR AMERICAN RESEARCH, WASHINGTON, D. C., BEFORE THE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF SYRACUSE, AT SYRACUSE, N. Y., JUNE 7, 1955

I want to talk to you of security and freedom. You, along with millions of other Americans, are concerned as to what kind of a country we are going to leave to our children. You are also the kind of an audience that can, and will, do something about it.

* * * * *

Few subjects in our national life have been so confused and so misrepresented as security and freedom. Ignorance, failure to face facts, complacency and fuzzy thinking, added to other factors cleverly and deliberately designed to weaken security and abolish our freedoms have each played their part. Freedom is not self-sustaining. It must be constantly nourished with vigilance and guarded with intelligence.

The world is divided and America holds in its hands the hopes, and yes, the very lives of the free half. We can't retreat.

We will not lose on the battlefield. We have the world's best fighting forces and we also have allies. Our greatest danger is political and psychological, and it is here that we are slowly but steadily losing. The free world is familiar with war in a military sense, but it is not prepared for non-military war.

* * * * *

Hitler and Mussolini as individuals are dead, but the basic totalitarian ideology in a more intelligent, yet more vicious and terrifying form—international communism—continues to live and spread like a cancer. Like Hitler, the Communist leaders have not once renounced their doctrine of world conquest and domination.

Today, communism is the greatest single threat to our future. In America it is run by a hard core of highly trained, intelligent, dedicated and fanatic revolutionaries, and our danger is increased in direct proportion to the number of sympathizers and dupes. * * * Today, the strength of communism must be measured in terms of influence, not membership.

Bear in mind that the Communists have been advertising to the world their program for world dictatorship—it is in their books, their publications, and their propaganda. The lessons of history seem to be learned the hard way. * * *

The main objective of the American Communist Party is specifically the domination of our country. In 1940 it disaffiliated from the Communist International, but only to avoid the application of legal statutes. The International itself was disbanded in 1943 purely for tactical reasons—that is, to expedite United States aid to Russia in its battle with Germany.

But, let us remember, it was only the international that was dissolved—not its Communist principles.

* * * * *

During World War II they infiltrated into all possible areas—their purpose was twofold; to gain respectability and to spy. Following the war they immediately ceased being cooperative and urged the following: (1) No cooperation with the United States

foreign policy; (2) the return of all American troops from foreign lands, and the surrender of our defense bases.

• • • • •

The above-ground organization is still operating, running the party on a day-to-day basis, and so designed as to insure that Communist ideas penetrate into every nook and cranny of American society.

The party develops its strength from six main levels: (1) the professional Communists; (2) those who deny membership or affiliation while at the same time actively assist; (3) the fellow travelers who are not Communists but who travel in the same general direction and support most of their programs; (4) the sympathizer who is likewise not a Communist but who sympathizes to some degree and hesitates to take action against them; (5) the opportunist, who also is not a Communist but who does business with them for the sake of profit or votes; and (6) the innocent dupe of the front organizations.

Lenin said that communism will be built with non-Communist hands, and it is not so much what the non-Communists do as what they don't do. Front organizational work is very important. It is their recruiting area.

Their underground organization is more dangerous than ever. It is deceptive, confusing and misleading. They are experts at exploiting all our internal tensions, injustices, and discontents. * * *

The Party infiltrates labor, management, education, religion, and the armed forces, to damage morale. In the government services, State and Federal, to subtly slant policy, and for espionage. It perfects its plans for underground sabotage when the time arrives.

Thank God that J. Edgar Hoover continues as the Director of the FBI. No single man is feared more by Communists. They have tried in every conceivable way to discredit him and cause his removal, and they will continue trying. Mr. Hoover has earned the support and the thanks of the Nation.

All America hopes that international peace is possible between all nations and all ideologies. President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles in commenting on the entry of Western Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, observed that this treaty was a step toward unity. But, with reference to preliminary arrangements for talks between the Soviet Union and the three Western Allies—France, Great Britain, and the United States—they both warned against overoptimism.

They have warned wisely. The United States and Russia have signed 52 major agreements and of those, Russia has violated all but 2 * * *

The Communists through publishing houses in Russia and in foreign countries are still flooding the world with books, pamphlets, reports, and posters. These are supplemented in almost every country of the free world with newspapers, magazines, radio and TV stations. And Moscow guides the hand.

The Communists have no rules of fair play, yet one-fourth of the world's surface and one-third of the earth's population is under their tyranny. They preach subversion by propaganda and instigate shooting wars whenever they see a possibility of local success.

The late Justice Robert H. Jackson, stated the case against communism in language that is unmistakably clear. He said, in part:

"It rejects the entire religious and cultural heritage of Western civilization, as well as the American economic and political systems. * * * "

He also stated:

"In not one of the countries it now dominates was the Communist Party chosen by a free or contestable election; in not one can it be evicted by any election. The international police state has crept over eastern Europe by deception, coercions, coup d'etat, terrorism, and assassination. Not only has it overpowered its critics and opponents, it has usually liquidated them."

Dare we lose? Communists are dedicated to winning. They prefer nonmilitary tactics because they do not endanger their own territories, manpower, industry, and above all their dictatorial power over their own people.

What are the Communists doing now to meet the challenge of America as world leader?

They stepped up their program of propaganda in 1954. In 1953 it was estimated to exceed $3 billion, both external and internal, while additional funds were spent by local and international Communist fronts, by the Cominform, the National Communist parties.

Their international broadcasting was stepped up 98 hours a week to a total of 1,675 hours per week abroad. In 1948 the total was 523 hours per week.

About a billion books were published in 1954 in a great variety of foreign languages. Communist film production was increased and new film exchange agreements were signed with a number of countries.

The number of delegations to and from Communist countries almost doubled the 1953 figure and particularly notable was the increase in delegations going from the Communist orbit into non-Communist countries.

Communist participation in international trade fairs continued to increase and is now at a level about seven times as great as that of 1950–51. International scientific contacts received increasing emphasis by the exchange of publications and in their attendance at scientific meetings abroad.

Communist international fronts were very active in 1954 particularly through a multitude of publications and through many meetings held for propaganda purposes.

They have made great and deceptive use of peace organizations. Every one wants peace and this is one place where the dues get taken in.

For example the World Peace Council has in effect become a "superfront" in its planning and coordination of the Communist "peace" campaign. It includes in its own executive bureau, officers of other Communist fronts, in a system of interlocking directorates, and sets the themes which are in turn echoed by these other organizations.

It held 3 major meetings in 1954, 1 in Berlin and 2 in Stockholm. These meetings spread the standard Communist lines with great emphasis on the peaceful coexistence theme and support every detail of Soviet policy.

The Communists try to infiltrate and draw in all important organizations whatever their nature. To show the diversity of their activities, let us look at a few organizations they so utilized in 1954.

The World Federation of Trade Unions and its various subordinate departments which held numerous meetings during the year.

The World Federation of Democratic Youth which held its annual meeting in Peiping. The Communist press claimed 68 countries were represented. This organization also sponsored an International Gathering of Rural Youth in Vienna last December and claimed 69 countries represented. Speakers contrasted the struggles and hardships of workers in the capitalist countries with the alleged benefits enjoyed by workers in Communist countries.

The International Union of Students which held its annual meeting in Moscow and also sponsored the World University Summer Games in Budapest attended by 2,000 athletes from 32 countries.

The World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students which will jointly sponsor a youth and student festival to be held in Warsaw in July and August 1955.

The Communist Party is legal in all countries of Western Europe with the exception of Ireland, Portugal, and Spain. Membership in Western Europe is estimated to be about 3 million out of a total population of some 275 million.

In national elections in Western Europe the Communists alone poll about 13 million votes, and over 16 million if the votes of the Italian Socialist Party are included.

Sustained propaganda urges that Western Europe increase its trade with the Soviet bloc. Trade, technical and cultural delegations to and from the Soviet orbit countries increased substantially with a much greater flow coming into Western Europe in 1954.

Communist pamphlets and journals are often distributed free and books are sold at a small fraction of their actual production costs.

In Latin America, the United States largest potential market of the future, Communist Party membership grew during 1954 with the bulk of the increase occurring in key countries. New publications appeared, both foreign and domestic; more Communist films were shown; more Latin Americans traveled to the Soviet bloc under Communist sponsorship; cultural delegations to Latin America increased; radio broadcasting increased; Communists blamed Yankee imperialism and exploitation for Latin America's economic problems and urged that Latin America expand its trade with the Soviet bloc.

The Communist movement has as its major immediate objective in Latin America, the location of political power in the hands of groups hostile to the United States. They support all anti-United States groups, including some formerly denounced by them as Fascists. * * *

Trade deals effected or in negotiation during 1954 between Latin America and the Soviet bloc yielded significant propaganda gains for the Communists in several countries and many Latin American governments were under increasing popular pressure to expand their foreign trade by dealing with the Soviet and its satellites.

Perhaps the most successful of the Latin American fronts was the Friends of Guatemala which was initially organized in Mexico in December 1953. This front took the lead in organizing anti-United States demonstrations in many Latin American countries during the Guatemalan crisis of last June.

We must meet the challenge at home and abroad, on the level where the Communist Party is working and winning. * * *

But what about at home? Of course we all know that communism is not Russia; that Russia is the slave of communism. But do we stop here with this knowledge? Those in slavery do not need to be taught freedom—they understand freedom.

• • • • •

It is a sad commentary that we need a security program in America.

There are many patriotic citizens and organizations throughout our Nation who are doing something about it. Leaders of organized labor have thrown out many Communist-dominated unions. They are also behind the free-enterprise system and are doing something about it. Dave Beck, of the Teamsters Union, was invited to the Press Club in Washington where I was privileged to hear him express his faith in free enterprise and to denounce communism without qualification. But what about the dominated unions—their leaders are still active in our economic life?

Many educators, businessmen, and members of the clergy are doing something about it. A few publications are devoting their entire efforts to exposing communism—but all these efforts of labor, business, education, clergy, and the press are not coordinated—there is no cooperative link.

• • • • •

Where can you get information? From one of the private libraries if you know of one. Where can leaders of religion, education, labor, management and the press go to secure past or current published information.

* * * * *

There is no place to go. Federal and State official agency and committee records are confidential and may not be made available to the general public.

The truth is our strongest weapon—the truth about the manifold lies, distortions and tactics utilized by the Communists and others seeking to influence public opinion. The truth is contained in their own books and publications and in the books and publications of those supporting their views. It is in books and in publications and writings of American and foreign scholars, authors, patriotic and other organizations devoting their time and energies trying to awaken the free world. It is in the published reports of State and Federal committees, commissions and agencies. It is in the publications of other countries of the free world. Yes, the truth is in the record—but where? Scattered around the Nation, and in its entirety available to none.

It was because of this situation that a group of lawyers, all former agents or officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, incorporated on May 12, 1955, in Washington, D. C., the Foundation for American Research. A private corporation for literary and educational purposes, nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpolitical and nongovernmental—a basic tool in the preservation of our freedom.

It would collect, thoroughly index, correlate and file as a public educational service all past published data concerning the policies, operation and nature of Nazi, Fascist, Communist and similar groups. * * *

The receipt of current published data, particularly of the Communist Party and its fronts, would be arranged for in order that current pertinent facts could be promptly distributed to every area desiring such information. Educators, clergymen, labor leaders, business executives, civic groups, patriotic organizations and others need current facts of the constantly changing Communist moves and tactics. * * *

It is imperative that such a service be provided if our social, religious and economic structure is to be able to successfully meet the totalitarian slave labor and godless structure of Communism. If America loses educationally it will lose spiritually and economically.

Only by currently following the Communists' devious and tortuous paths in the light of their past pronouncements can countermeasures be taken in time. An informed public is an alert public.

* * * * *

Dissemination of current facts not only is important, it is vital. With the facts at hand, the leaders of our complex economy can chart their various courses with knowledge, our missionaries, education, labor and business representatives both at home and abroad can better interpret trends and the meaning of events.

The Foundation for American Research proposes to make these published facts available nationally without interpretation or comment.

This is not to be a witch hunt or a vigilante movement. No confidential data will be handled. If all that has been published is brought together and completely indexed, the full facts will clear the innocent, expose the guilty, and put an end to most of the public charges and countercharges so prevalent in our national scene today.

The Bill of Rights in our Constitution has never been outraged by the truth.

A professional staff, experts in the fields of education, religion, labor, management, and the press, would do this greatly needed job. They would be assisted by the organizers who will become the trustees of the Foundation and an advisory committee of distinguished Americans.

It is late, but not too late. But it may take a full generation to undo the harm that has been done, and to this end the Foundation for American Research is dedicated.

Our Government needs public opinion behind it, an informed public opinion. If the free-enterprise system and the brotherhood of man concept of government is to survive we should leave no stone unturned.

Let us leave to the legislative and executive branches of our State and Federal governments the job of investigation and prosecution. They are doing an outstanding job. To date 134 Communist Party leaders have been indicted for violation of the Smith Act, with 83 convictions and only 3 acquittals so far.

Recall the sorry parade of fifth-amendment pleaders which is quite a change from an earlier America, where a man's word was better than his bond, and a man's convictions were worth openly fighting for with pride and courage, regardless of the consequences, and however unpopular his cause might be.

We must neutralize, isolate, reduce, and eventually eliminate Communist power and influence. The Foundation for American Research can provide the tools—a good, clear, straightforward public information service.

This is not a responsibility of government—it is the specific responsibility of the free-enterprise system itself—of individuals and organizations, corporations and the foundations created and maintained by them. * * *

The cost will be high, but our freedom is at stake.

Happy Birthday to the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column Keenotes entitled "Happy Birthday to the Marines."

The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The fabulous Marines—they even have two birthdays.

It was on July 11, 1798—just 157 years ago—that the United States Marine Corps was established by act of Congress. But nearly 23 years before then—on November 10, 1775, the official birthday—the Continental Congress by resolution had created the Continental Marines, forerunner of the present corps.

Whatever their name, whatever birthday they celebrate, wherever they stand in the hierarchy of unification, they have always packed a powerful punch. They look sharp and they are sharp. And they certainly cut an impressive swath on the capital scene.

There is something about the colorful sight of the Marine Band playing near the front door of the White House at state occasions that adds particular excitement to the already tingling sensation of entering that gorgeous mansion.

There is something about the surge of flowing power in the lines of the heroic Marine Memorial—the massive representation in bronze of Associated Press Photographer Joe Rosenthal's picture of the flag raising on Iwo Jima in World War II—that adds a throat-catching solemnity to the Washington horizon.

There is something about the leathery faces of the "old pros" in the Marines, and about the fresh-faced youngsters new to the corps that impresses each of us as we meet these men around town in Washington.

There is something about the marines, indeed—something fine and strong and dedicated to the Nation's service.

Of course, all of the boys in all of the services—and the smart looking girls in uniform, too—have our honor and respect and love. To me, serving on the House Committee on Veteran's Affairs, the problems and the needs and the future aspirations of all service people are real and personal things which I have come to know intimately by reason of the legislation which comes before my committee.

So it is with no disparagement of the other services that I say that Congress has a particularly warm spot for the marines. And, typically, Congress shows that affection with periodic votes of confidence that the Marine Corps, I am sure, finds most gratifying.

The most recent instance of that came on the last day of June when Congress—11 days early—celebrated the 157th anniversary of the formal establishment of the United States Marine Corps by voting the corps more money (a whole lot more—46 million more) than the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff had requested. This extra amount will maintain the corps at its present level of 3 combat divisions and 3 combat air wings, together with training and supporting forces for a total of 215,000 men, retaining 22,000 marines the budget had not provided for.

Much as Congress respects President Eisenhower's military knowledge, it refused to accept his projected cut of 22,000 in Marine Corps strength. In this, General Eisenhower is being treated no differently from other Presidents. President Truman, in fact, once protested the marines were superpropagandists; and the Navy privately fumed and implied the same thing when Congress insisted on giving the Commandant of the Marines coequal rank on the Joint Chiefs of Staff on any issues involving the Marine Corps.

But it is not any unusual skill at lobbying which gets the marines such special treatment from Congress unless you would call "lobbying" the work the marines have performed over many years on steaming jungles and bloody beaches and frozen mountains—on every front, in every war, in all of our Nation's history, where, as the Marine Memorial inscription recalls, "Uncommon valor was a common virtue."

Happy unofficial birthday, Marines.

Appointment to Vacancy on Federal Bench at Miami

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in October 1954 one of the two Federal judges in my district announced his intention to retire from the bench as of July 1, 1955. As of this date, no recommendation has even been made by the administration to fill this vacancy. In addition to this, it has been reported that the Attorney General has under consid-

eration the appointment of an attorney from the Tampa-St. Petersburg area to occupy this post in the Miami area.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues editorials from two of Miami's daily newspapers which point up the sentiments of the people in my district. I have already protested to the Attorney General about the delay in filling this vacancy in Miami, which has one of the heaviest dockets in the entire country. I have also pointed out to him that from among the 2,700 practicing attorneys in the Dade County Bar are many qualified attorneys, both Democrat and Republican, who are desirous and willing to serve as Federal judge. Because of their residence in Greater Miami, and their knowledge of the economic, social, and cultural background of the area, they should be preferred in considering this appointment.

The editorials follow:

[From the Miami Herald of July 1, 1955]

JUDGE SHOULD BE FROM HERE

The vacancy on the Federal bench here, caused by the retirement of Judge John W. Holland, should be filled without undue delay.

The appointment, however, should not be made under political haste and without regard for the local realities.

Pressures have been on ever since Judge Holland announced his retirement plans last October.

The Dade County Bar Association has pointed out that the Florida Republican Committee has made no recommendation of any lawyer practicing in the Miami division. Those suggested are all from the Tampa division.

There are many able and learned lawyers in this division—Republicans as well as Democrats—who could well qualify for the judgship.

Representative DANTE B. FASCELL pointed this out in a letter to United States Attorney General Herbert Brownell:

"In the Dade County bar, the administration will find highly qualified Republican attorneys who are desirous and willing to serve in the capacity. I see no sound reason to seek replacements from an area far removed from the point where the vacancy is occurring."

Yet the Republican State leadership persists in going far afield for a candidate.

The Miami division of the court has a tremendous volume of existing and prospective litigation.

A recent analysis of court conditions shows:

There are at issue and ready for trial 257 jury and 67 nonjury civil cases and 10 nonjury admiralty suits. At least 60 of the total are 2 or more years old.

On top of this, there are 65 cases with undisposed motions; 30 subject to dismissal; 50 cases here and 44 in Palm Beach set for the trial calendar which ended Thursday, June 30.

Also pending are 150 cases embracing actions under the National Housing Act; FHA and condemnation suits.

Against this docket backlog is the continuing flow of new suits. They average about 60 a month.

This case volume alone dictates that a judge, qualified by long residence in this area, could deal with them more expeditiously from his practical basic understanding.

The new judge would have background knowledge of our residents, institutions, economic, cultural and spiritual traditions, aims and problems.

There are some 2,700 practicing attorneys in Dade County. That is more than one-third of all the lawyers in Florida.

A lawyer named from some division remote from this court will be handicapped from the outset.

Everything in the situation, except brash political opportunism, argues for the naming of a local man to the bench.

[From the Miami Daily News of June 29, 1955]

MIAMI'S FEDERAL JUDGE VACANCY SHOULD BE FILLED WITHOUT DELAY

In another few hours the Miami division of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida will again have but one judge.

At midnight tomorrow night Judge John W. Holland retires after 19 years on the Federal bench. President Eisenhower has not yet appointed his successor.

This is a situation which Miamians and others in the area served by the court thought was ended with the appointment of Emett C. Choate as a second judge for the division last fall. But on the day Judge Choate was sworn in, Judge Holland announced his intention of retiring at this time.

Judge Holland richly deserves retirement after long and able service. He was eligible to retire on his 70th birthday nearly 2 years ago. He deferred stepping down from the bench until now in order to help Judge Choate become familiar with badly crowded civil and criminal calendars.

Appointment of a Federal judge is made by the President. It is usually made on recommendation of the Department of Justice after suggestions by party leaders, Members of Congress, and bar associations.

With a Republican President it is to be assumed that Judge Holland's successor will be a Republican, or at least a supporter of the administration.

That does not matter. The important thing is that this court be left with but one judge not a day longer than necessary.

This newspaper has no candidate for the position. There are any number of highly qualified lawyers in the area from whom the President might choose and who would be able to assume the duties at once.

We do believe the new judge should be a resident of the lower east coast and therefore familiar with the conditions and problems with which he will have to deal.

A judge chosen from another area would have to move to Miami since nearly all his time would be spent here.

Despite Judge Choate's fine job in cleaning up a backlog of criminal cases, there is still congestion on both calendars. When justis is delayed it often amounts to a denial of justice.

With one-third of the Federal court business in the State centered right here in Miami, we need another Federal judge—and speedily.

No Change in Plans of Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, entitled "No Change in Plans of Kremlin," published in the Washington Evening Star of July 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO CHANGE IN PLANS OF KREMLIN—BUT SOVIET'S SWEET TALK HAS APPEALED SUCCESSFULLY TO GULLIBLE PUBLIC OPINION

From all indications, 1955 may be Russia's year. Merely by dancing a genial jig instead of snarling, the Russian bear already has obtained a great propaganda success all over Europe, and to a lesser extent in this country. On the eve of the summit conference, the Kremlin leaders decided to appeal to gullible public opinion in the free world, and sweetened their contacts with other nations. However, careful analysis of their statements and policies shows no change whatsoever in the Kremlin's plans.

The opening of Moscow's gates to a number of newspaper correspondents has been huzzaed as a virtual millennium, principally by the visiting European newsmen. Non-Communist German journalists—dazzled with caviar, vodka, plush limousines and quarters in the best hotels—typed almost lyrical dispatches about the new look in Sovietland. Their talks with the Kremlin hierarchy, in which they were reminded of the happy days of the Bismarckian era, were reported to the German people as another sign that Germany could easily do business with Russia.

And if the price of German unity is foot-dragging on rearmament, these reporters and commentators say, why not? The Germans are not anxious to sacrifice their national interests for the sake of a chimerical one world or a more restricted western bloc. They feel that if there is to be eventual world disarmament, Germany might just as well set an example by creating only the slimmest police force necessary for internal security.

Only one war is in the offing, many Germans say, and that is an honest and friendly competitive war in the economic and industrial fields. And they feel that a Germany carrying only a policeman's nightstick has a better chance to win than if their nation is weighed down with combat gear.

When we consider that the whole structure of the much-vaunted but increasingly tottery western coalition depends on Germany's whole-hearted cooperation, it is easy to understand what a bright red feather in Bulganin's cap a Soviet-German understanding would be.

Our policymakers are attempting to minimize the effects of the Bulganin-Khrushchev team's visit to Belgrade, meanwhile. The spectacle of the Soviet leaders feasting on crow has been played up. Soft-pedaled was the fact that Yugoslav Dictator Tito has underwritten all of Russia's aims in the Far East.

Our present Congress, usually subservient on all matters relating to foreign affairs, was irked by the realities of Tito's attitude. It wanted to shear away a good-sized part of military and economic aid to the "independent" Communist ruler. Up popped the State Department to ask that the whole amount be granted, so as not to tie the hands of our Chief Executive. Congress obediently reversed itself.

While the State Department blandy assures the American people that nothing has happened to change the cooperation between this country and Yugoslavia, Tito and the U. S. S. R. are actually growing closer both politically and militarily. On July 1, at the special invitation of the Soviet Ministry of Defense, a Yugoslav Air Force delegation headed by General Ulepic arrived in Moscow. It was showered with the customary honors by the commander of the Soviet Air Force, Marshal Zhavoronkov. The Yugoslav officers will undoubtedly fill in their Soviet col-

leagues with whatever information they may lack about the American jets we are still sending to our Yugoslav friend.

A great rainbow of Russian-inspired emotion is aching over Europe, and Europeans everywhere have been gripped by the feeling that peace will be found at the rainbow's end—in Geneva. It is a safe bet that the statesmen who will soon gather will find it hard to buck such a sweep of public opinion. Europe, as things stand right now, is irresistibly demanding an agreement—even if it is on the Kremlin's terms. This may indeed be Russia's year—just as 1938 was Adolf Hitler's.

Presidential Primary Laws Adopted by State of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the July 8 edition of the New York Times, written by the very lucid and well-informed Arthur Krock, with respect to the new presidential primary laws which our Legislature of the State of Florida adopted recently, and which we will see in operation in the primaries of May 1956.

Mr. President, I am sure the Members of the Senate are aware that I have been pushing for nationwide primaries as being the next logical step in improving our democracy. Presidential primaries will make it possible for average voters in each of the major political parties to have an important part in the selection of the man who will run for President representing their party.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IMPROVED PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE PRIMARY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 7.—Florida's new legal system for presidential preference primaries cannot be tested until May 29 next year—the fixed date for this statewide poll. That is regrettable because the law is a great improvement over any other now in effect, including those of New Hampshire and South Dakota. If Florida were to head the primary procession next March instead of coming near the end of it the influence of its new law on the national conventions of 1956 would be greater.

Nevertheless, if the President by May 29 has not announced his attitude toward renomination, and Adlai E. Stevenson by then has been firmly challenged for a second presidential designation by the Democrats, what happens at the Florida primary will carry some weight at the two subsequent conventions of the major parties.

THE LAW'S DERIVATION

Florida's new law is derived from a five-volume study which the Brookings Institution made for the American Political Science Association. It was drafted by a committee appointed by Gov. LeRoy Collins and composed of W. A. F. Stephenson, of St. Petersburg, and Profs. Manning Dauer and Bruce Mason of the University of Florida. At the request of this committee the Brookings Institution drew up a memorandum last January, and most of its recommendations are the bases of the law. The following are its principal features and effects:

A simple ballot on which primary voters need make only a single mark, and for the first time extending the presidential preference poll to Republicans. This latter provision is expected to terminate the usual contests at Republican conventions over rival slates from Florida by making accreditation of the delegates a matter of legal record.

The Florida voter, participating only in the primary of the party in which he is registered, will choose among the delegate slates on his ballot.

ORGANIZED SLATES REQUIRED

No aspirant for delegate may run as an individual. He must appear on an organized slate. This will include a full list of candidates for delegates-at-large and a list of candidates in at least half of the State's congressional districts. The first group will be chosen in a statewide poll, the second within the districts. In each district the ballot will carry only the names of the candidates for delegates-at-large and for the immediate locality.

If an organized slate has a presidential preference, this can be indicated on the ballot occupied by that slate at the place where the voter makes his mark. The consent of the preferred citizen is not required. But if two slates with the same expressed preference are filed for inclusion on the ballot, an opportunity will be given the citizen thus preferred to choose the one to appear on the ballot. Should he refuse, the place will go to the first slate filing.

A MORAL COMMIMENT ONLY

No formal pledge of support for the candidate they favor will be required of the delegates, the implied moral commitment being taken as sufficient.

The ballot will include "no preference" organized slates, and if two or more of these meet the filing requirements all will appear.

In each group on the ballot the potential chairman must be indicated by filing his name at the head of the list and entering him for delegate at large.

The law makes no provision, as the old Florida law did, for a separate presidential preference poll in which voting for presidential candidates is direct as contrasted with voting for slates supporting particular candidates. This change is based on experience with separate preference polls not associated with the choice of candidates for delegate. For instance, in New Jersey in 1952 Senator KEFAUVER won a preference poll in which he was unopposed. But he entered no candidate in the delegate contests, and the winning slate therefore declined to concede an obligation to support him.

ADVANTAGES ASSERTED

Several other practical advantages are claimed for the new law:

1. The requirement that an organized slate need not be complete for all the congressional districts grows out of confusions in several States that followed the withdrawal of President Truman from the nomination contest in 1952.

2. The choice of district delegates by local voting rejects control of the entire delegation on the basis of the vote for delegates at large.

3. The right of delegate slates to express a presidential preference without the formal consent of their choices increases the power of a national convention to draft a nominee.

4. The opportunity afforded a presidential candidate to select, among several slates expressing a preference for him, the group to go on the ballot would prevent the recurrence of a Florida Democratic situation of 1952.

Then three different groups favoring Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia, were put before the voters.

If the results of May 29 in Florida are impressive its new law may be copied in other States before the conventions of 1960.

Flying Is Folksy on a Feeder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest have become one big community, united by the wings of West Coast Airlines. In Oregon, where distances are great and ground travel slow, West Coast Airlines has lopped hours off traveling time, uniting communities formerly separated by hours of difficult travel.

In almost 10 years of service, West Coast Airlines recently carried its millionth passenger. From many Oregon communities, such as Roseburg, Medford, and Coos Bay-North Bend, it carries more passengers in a year than the total local population.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and informative article by Leverett G. Richards from the Northwest Roto magazine of the Sunday Oregonian of July 3, 1955.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and informative article by Leverett G. Richards from the Northwest Roto Magazine of the Sunday Oregonian of July 3, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLYING IS FOLKSY ON A FEEDER

(By Leverett G. Richards, aviation editor, the Oregonian)

The State of Oregon has shrunk drastically during the past 8 years. If the people in it had shrunk in proportion, they would be about 2 feet tall. The distance from Portland to Coos Bay-North Bend has shrunk from 8 hours to 1 hour 40 minutes. The distance from Coos Bay to Medford has shrunk from 6 hours to 50 minutes

All Oregon has become one big community; all the people in it next-door neighbors. The remoter areas have retained their peace and quiet, their fracious, spacious living, but have lost their isolation.

This change has taken place gradually throughout the Northwest over the past 8 years—so gradually it escaped the notice of city slickers—and Congressmen. In the Northwest the primary reason is West Coast Airlines, with a tinge of Southwest Airlines.

Both were considered experiments, designed to feed business from the sticks to the main trunk airlines, when Congress authorized temporary subsidies in 1945. Congress dismissed the whole 14 feeder lines as expensive innovations at the 1954 session when airline subsidies were getting the ax.

The roar that rose from the boondocks shocked Congress and the Commerce Department into a realization of the revolution that had been wrought in rural America.

The feeder lines had changed the pace if not the face of America. The country had

taken them to its bosom. They had become as much a part of the suburban way of life as RFD and TV.

"I'd sooner do without my car than West Coast Airlines," one irate resident of one of Oregon's smaller towns wrote.

Congress stopped, looked, listened and exempted the feeder lines from the general ban on subsidies. It hastened to go further and pass a law directing the Civil Aeronautics Board to issue permanent certificates to all the Nation's 14 junior airlines that had proved their value in serving smaller communities.

The permanent certificate will enable West Coast to add new equipment and continue to improve its service to the 44 cities on its 2,200-mile route in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

West Coast started out as a fly-by-day airline with a half dozen Douglas DC-3 twin-engined airlines winging over 870 route miles and serving 14 cities in Oregon and 12 in Washington. Without radio ranges or other instrument aids to navigating in Oregon's unusual weather, its schedules to some points on the coast were more miss than hit during the first few months.

In 1952, West Coast merged with Empire Airlines, which served eastern Oregon, Washington, and most of Idaho. Since then, the ugly duckling of the airlines has grown into a thing of beauty and efficiency that has won top rating in the airline industry for service, load factor, and general performance of its job. WCA really came of age in April when Oregon's community airline carried its millionth passenger.

Comes next helicopter service. West Coast has applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to offer such service in the not-too-immediate future, in addition to and in conjunction with its present service.

West Coast already moves the whole population of the towns and cities it serves each year, statistically speaking. At Coos Bay-North Bend, for instance, WCA carries up to 12,000 passengers a year and will carry more than 15,000 this year at the present rate of increase. That is about equal to the total population.

The same is true for Medford and Roseburg. The "feeder" lines don't "feed," however. Eight out of 10 passengers never leave West Coast. It has proved to be a neighboring airline.

"Don't know what we would do without West Coast Airlines," said G. T. Philips, who was boarding our flight at Coos Bay. "It's the only way to get anywhere."

There used to be a passenger train, which reached Portland in 12 hours, crawling through the night from 7 p. m. to 7 a. m. But it suspended service after West Coast Airlines came to Coos Bay-North Bend with 1 hour-and-40-minute service to Portland.

"You can get to Roseburg on the bus, if you've got the 3½ to 4 hours it takes,' 'explained another passenger. "But it's only 35 minutes by air.

"You can get to Medford by bus, I guess, but it'll take you 5 or 6 hours. About the same to drive, over those winding roads. I take West Coast, 50 minutes and no strain."

H. D. Ford, Plymouth-Chrysler dealer, typical of scores of auto dealers throughout Oregon, Washington, and Idaho who use West Coast consistently, was bound from Coos Bay to Roseburg to pick up a new car. He makes about 15 flights a year.

"Doesn't pay to drive any more," he explained.

Jack Sproull, engineer for Evans Products Co., is WCA's prize passenger. Living in Portland and supervising plants at Coos Bay and Roseburg until recently, he has made more than 550 trips with West Coast during the past 4 years. He now lives at Coos Bay, but still uses WCA as a taxi to cover jobs elsewhere around the territory.

One building contractor, who lives at Corvallis, is currently commuting to Medford to supervise a job. An insurance man at Medford covers branch offices at Roseburg, North Bend, and Corvallis by air. A loan business in Medford runs its North Bend branch by air.

Another passenger turned out to be an auditor who had junked his office on wheels and taken to wings.

A group of Medford doctors keeps a car in North Bend, where they fly via West Coast every weekend and head out for a secret fishing hole. They always get their limit—so surely that they have their own private cannery to preserve the weekly catch.

A priest in Idaho uses West Coast's wings to cover his diocese. Bar pilots from Portland regularly wing their way to Astoria to bring seagoing vessels up the river. A tugboat pilot flies to North Bend to bring his boat up the coast and into Portland.

A lot of prudent private pilots use West Coast Airlines when their own wings get too wet for comfort.

But West Coast personnel figured they had really arrived when railroad salesmen began to ride their lines, although they could ride the rails for free.

Half the charm of West Coast, like Southwest Airways, is its neighborly atmosphere. Passengers and crew get to know each other. They're apt to fall into friendly conversation like neighbors at the corner grocery.

One self-styled "108 rancher" seldom boards the plane at Coos Bay without an armload of goodies for the gang. "Ma baked some bread," he will announce. "Take some up to those guys in the cockpit. They look hungry to me."

Sometimes he will unwrap a wheel of tangy, well-aged cheese and pass around slices for all the passengers.

"When you going to break down and serve coffee?" he'll demand. "How can you call this an airline when you don't even serve coffee?"

The crew can be just as neighborly. One of their favorite passengers is Tony James, 11, from Eureka, Calif., who knows just about every ground and air crewman on both southwest and west coast, which he rides almost every week, commuting between his home and Vancouver, Wash., where he attends the State school for the blind.

Another is Margaret Sue Johnson, 11, a quiet, but self-sufficient little blond girl who commutes from her home in Hoquiam to Vancouver, Wash. Airplanes were just a big, bad noise in her dark little world, until one west coast employee halted the whole complex operation of the airline long enough to take the little girl out and let her "see" the wings, tail, and propellers of the plane with her sensitive hands.

Now that she knows what it "looks" like, little Margaret Sue, blind from birth, jumps up and down with joy, quite literally, whenever she boards the plane for home.

West Coast hauls lots of blind children to and from home for vacations.

"We have to send a teacher with them on trains or buses." Superintendent Margaret Grew explains. "But not on the planes. They can't get lost, and they don't get travel weary."

Trunk airlines cannot accept young children unaccompanied, but the local service lines such as West Coast carry a number of young commuters. One girl, Barry Duffield, now 11, of Coos Bay, has been making a trip to a Eugene dental clinic every week for months. A Coos Bay girl of 13 and her 9-year-old brother fly to Roseburg every weekend unaccompanied.

The neighborly attitude of the local service lines is not reserved for children only. When Robert C. (Bob) Cansdale, one of West Coast's senior pilots, spotted an oil leak in one engine at Coos Bay, instead of stalling off the passengers with a series of cold announcements on the station loudspeaker, he took the passengers out and showed them what the trouble was.

"It probably doesn't amount to anything," he said. "But we'd rather have a look at it. It will take about an hour and a half. Why don't you all come along and have lunch while we're waiting?"

West Coast's pilots, all family men who enjoy their work, are not above a bit of badinage—like the pilot who was making a routine letdown through the lowering clouds off the coast at Astoria.

Just as the plane broke out of the overcast and the ocean loomed up close below, the cockpit door swung open. The captain glanced back, took a long look at the water below and then commented in a loud and plaintive voice: "Well, looks like the ocean all right. But which one?"

Another calls for his favorite tune while he lets down through the clouds on the commercial broadcasting station at Olympia, Wash. West Coast is the first airline ever to be authorized to use commercial broadcasting stations for this purpose.

The disc jockey's announcement gives him final assurance that he is letting down on the right station.

The tune? Home on the Range, of course.

Trial by Jury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Peter G. Schmidt and David T. Boltz, entitled "Hardly Judicial." It was published in the Hoya on September 30, 1954.

It was brought to my attention and I was requested to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARDLY JUDICIAL

(By Peter G. Schmidt and David T. Boltz)

The right to trial by jury is one of our most precious God-given possessions. This concept protects the human dignity of man by defining through law that a man is innocent until proven guilty by an impartial jury. History, of course, provides notable exceptions to every rule; and one of these exceptions came recently during the Watkins committee hearings on censure charges against Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. Time and time again Senator MCCARTHY was subjected to flagrant abuses of the right to trial by an impartial jury. Without even discussing the truth or falsity of the charges against MCCARTHY, let us look at some of the more notable violations of judicial procedure.

At the outset of the hearings, Mr. Edward Williams, counsel for the defense, moved to dismiss the charges on the ground that they were not legally sufficient. Whether they were, or were not, is not important here. The thing that is important is Senator WATKINS' answer. Speaking before a supposed judicial court, Senator WATKINS stated: "We do not care to go into a long legal argument."

By using this arbitrary ruling, Senator WATKINS was, in effect, telling the defense

how to run their case. He was limiting Senator McCarthy's method of defense—for the sake of expediency. Time, in his opinion, was more important than justice.

After banning television and radio coverage, Senator Watkins himself showed up on a major television program to smilingly tell the Nation it did not make any difference whether or not members of his committee were impartial. This was in answer to Senator McCarthy's claim that two of the "judges" had shown prejudice before the trial began. The first was Senator Johnson of Colorado, who had said: "There is not a man among the Democratic leaders of Congress who does not loathe Joe McCarthy." Senator Johnson is one of the biggest and most respected leaders of the Democratic Party. The second of the six "judges" who had shown bias was Senator Ervin, of North Carolina. On August 1, in a press interview, he stated that he had "formed an unfavorable opinion of the junior Senator from Wisconsin and that McCarthy could have him disqualified if he were appointed to the committee on censuring McCarthy."

However what is even more startling is the fact that every one of the six judges backed Senator Watkins up when before the television cameras and in the committee hearings he stated that one does not need to be impartial to judge Senator McCarthy. Continuing in the same vein, they ruled that all discussion of previous bias be stricken from the record and that it should not be considered in reaching a verdict.

In the face of our basic constitutional safeguards for defendants in the American court rooms which reject any member of a jury—or even a judge—if partisanship can be proven, this Watkins ruling was anything but judicial. It would probably result in the case against McCarthy, if any, being thrown out in a court of law.

Senator Watkins ruled that he did not wish to clutter up the record with "irrelevant and immaterial matter" about the prejudices of the "jury." Not 2 hours later, while discussing the first censure charge, Senator Watkins placed in the record a statement which he claimed showed that Senator McCarthy had shown previous bias against one of his witnesses during a regular committee hearing. Watkins ruled: "Now I call to your attention—so the record will be complete on this matter, not necessarily because it is needed but because I think it ought to be referred to—to this following statement: * * *."

Here although the matter was "not needed" and thus "irrelevant and immaterial" Watkins placed it in the record because it was offensive to McCarthy. Why then couldn't McCarthy clutter up the record with "irrelevant and immaterial" matter if it helped prove him innocent, when others could clutter up the record with "irrelevant and immaterial" matter which will help prove him guilty.

The verdict of the Watkins hearings can not be anything but guilty for McCarthy. But what is important is that the hearings were one sided and arbitrarily conducted and that Senator Watkins was arrogant. Talk about McCarthy's methods.

The Way to Peace With Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Honorable Gould Lincoln—able, experienced, and astute political writer for the Washington Evening Star and other newspapers over the Nation—recently wrote an article which appeared in the Evening Star entitled "MRA Shows Way to Peace With Justice." I hope that every Senator, and many other persons, had the opportunity of reading this very splendid article which clearly and factually describes what MRA is and how it operates.

I personally can state that I know of some of the great good which MRA has accomplished, for I have seen it in action. I know for a fact that a group of dedicated members of MRA voluntarily offered their services and brought about the settlement of what appeared to be a bitter and long, drawn out strike between the employees and management of National Airlines.

Subsequently, the same members of MRA, with the help of others, were able to bring about a settlement of the transportation strike within the city of Miami. Since that time I have seen the principals of MRA capture the mind and heart of several hard-bitten, unyielding union leaders, as well as a host of uncompromising, selfish owners of large businesses.

The power of philosophy of MRA is irresistible, and it is making itself a great factor in the fight for freedom in Europe and Asia. Strangely enough it seems to be better known there than here in our own country. Undoubtedly in time it will prove its efficacy here as people become acquainted with it through the writings of Frank Buchman and Peter Howard as well as through witnessing the simply marvelous plays which they are continually putting on.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, the article by Gould Lincoln as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MRA Shows Way to Peace With Justice

As President Eisenhower and the heads of three other great governments prepare to meet in Geneva, two forces are working toward success of this four-power meeting at the summit. First, the hunger of people everywhere for peace—and for freedom and justice which can go only with peace. This is the positive force. Second and negative, the fear that an atom- and hydrogen-bomb holocaust will consume the human race.

On the positive side, a task force that has grown with the passing years is influencing men and women in key positions and in the ranks of peoples the world around. It is MRA—Moral Rearmament. And MRA, under the leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman, is exerting a great moral and spiritual influence which has brought bitter enemies to friendship and which is showing the way to statesmen, if they will accept it, to a peaceful world.

Its principles are the strength of the movement. They are at once as soft and as gentle as the down on the breast of a dove and as rugged as the peaks of the Rocky Mountains. They call for absolute moral standards. And how have they operated? They have brought, first, individuals—men and women—to a conviction they must be honest with themselves and with other people, with a consuming faith in God.

FAR-FLUNG INFLUENCE

Today MRA is a far-flung force. It has its headquarters in Washington, in Los Angeles, and on Mackinac Island, Mich.; in Caux, Switzerland. It has spread into Asia and Africa. It has brought into its ranks statesmen, leaders in business and in labor. It has taught them to sit down and talk honestly with opponents. It has produced an ideology that can be, and is, accepted by the representatives of many races and many nations. It has brought together Germans and Frenchmen, Communists and non-Communists, labor leaders and employers—and always the results have been for peace and justice. Today MRA has sent to 15 Asian and other Far Eastern countries a group almost 200 strong which is producing MRA's latest play, The Vanishing Island. It has sent this group on the invitation of the Presidents, Prime Ministers, and other leaders of these nations.

This latest play is one of a long series which MRA has used to bring to the peoples of many nations the ideology for which it stands. It has adopted the stage and the drama as its instruments—and with great success in England, in France, in Germany, in India, in South Africa, in the United States, for example. The Vanishing Island, written by Peter Howard, a brilliant British newspaperman, and in whose production some of Hollywood's most talented men had part, was given at the National Theater here just before the cast, accompanied by leading citizens in some of the countries it is to visit, took off from Washington. Already, it has played to large audiences in Japan, in Formosa, in the Philippines, in Bangkok, Thailand, and is currently in Rangoon, Burma. Other countries and cities to which the group will take the play include Madras, Calcutta and Delhi, India; Pakistan, Teheran, Bagdad, and Cairo.

NO PLATITUDES

MRA recognizes the problems that beset the world, that divide nations. It does not believe that they can be solved by merely saying, "Let everybody be good and be kind." It does believe, however, that these problems can be dealt with realistically on a basis of fairness and good will. At the very bottom lies the honesty and fairness of the individual. Its aim is to change individuals—and when they are changed, nations change. It does not seek to set up an international church or religion. Its principles are the best of all churches and religions—and can be accepted by all. Labor leaders and heads of business management who have affiliated with MRA testify freely they have been able to obtain settlements and to win friendships through the tenets of MRA.

These principles of MRA, if carried into the Geneva meeting of the great powers, could work immeasurably in the interest of a peaceful world. They do not hold with world domination by any nation or group of nations. They do call for the great ultimate boom, which the late Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, when describing the aim of the United Nations, called "peace with justice."

Federal Aid to Schools and the Work of the White House Conference on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two very excellent editorials from Minnesota newspapers be inserted in the Record.

These editorials deal with Federal aid

to schools and also with the work of the White House Conference on Education.

The first is entitled "Absolutely Nothing?" and is from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of July 8, 1955.

The second is entitled "Aid Without Control and Deficits Forever," and is from the Duluth News-Tribune of July 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of July 8, 1955]

ABSOLUTELY NOTHING?

It seems to us that Adlai Stevenson was completely unfair to the Eisenhower administration when he accused it of doing "absolutely nothing" to solve "the critical deficiencies" of the Nation's public-school system.

The truth is that Mr. Eisenhower is greatly concerned over these deficiencies. But he is also concerned with solutions which will meet those deficiencies as they should be met, with primary emphasis on State and local action.

Stevenson advocated an ambitious program of direct Federal aid to the schools in his speech before the National Education Association in Chicago. This program would provide $1,600,000,000 for school construction over a 4-year period, as well as $50 million a year, on a matching basis, to improve teachers' salaries and provide funds for educating teachers. For the long run, Stevenson would make unrestricted cash grants to the States on a per pupil basis.

It cannot be denied that this would be "doing something" for the schools on a rather spectacular scale. But at what price?

Stevenson says that school control should remain in the hands of local authority, all this Federal aid notwithstanding. But that is mere wishful thinking. If the Federal Government were to subsidize the schools to this extent, it would increasingly control them. Let us not be misled on this point. The Federal Government tends to control what it subsidizes as surely as dawn follows night.

Furthermore, the subsidies Stevenson proposes would be paid for out of taxation. Let us not be misled here, either. This new burden of taxation would be borne by the people. The billions would not be created out of thin air. They would come from the States and communities which are already hard pressed to meet their Federal tax obligations.

It does not follow that Mr. Eisenhower is doing "absolutely nothing" for public education because he does not join with Adlai Stevenson in such proposals.

The President's emphasis, as he said in his message to Congress last February, is on State and local responsibility for public education. It is on the grassroots character of our public school system, a system which has always reflected the character and aspirations of the people of the community and which has derived its strength and individuality from those people.

Mr. Eisenhower's message recognized the need for Federal cooperation with the States in working out a school-building program. It even proposed a program of grants-in-aid, amounting to $200 million over a 3-year period, for school districts which were in real financial straits.

But the President's basic concept of public education is in the best American tradition of local responsibility. "Federal leadership," he has said, "can stir America to national action." And Mr. Eisenhower is consistently striving to provide such leadership.

While Stevenson minimizes the importance of the White House Conference on Education which will be held in Washington next November, the fact is that plans for this conference have created a great stirring in the Nation. In Minnesota we have already held our State white house conference and in Minneapolis there has been a conference even closer to the grassroots. All through the Nation, these meetings have been called to highlight school problems, to crystallize public opinion, to establish a solid groundwork for action at the climatic conference in Washington.

There has probably never been a time when so many citizens have taken such a close, hard look at public education and prepared to attack its problems on the State and local level.

We submit that this aroused interest, if intelligently sustained by leadership in Washington, can do far more for public education than any elaborate system of Federal subsidies yet proposed.

[From the Duluth News-Tribune of July 8, 1955]

AID WITHOUT CONTROL AND DEFICITS FOREVER

Adlai Stevenson finds much to deplore in the Eisenhower school-aid proposals. Last February the President recommended that local, State, and Federal Governments spend about $7 billion on school buildings in the next 3 years. Of this amount about $1,120,000,000 would come from the Federal Government. Part would be used to buy the bonds of school districts handicapped in selling these securities at a reasonable interest rate. A smaller sum would go to help pay administrative costs of State efforts to overcome financing obstacles. Another part of the plan proposed help in setting up State agencies to build schools and rent them to communities unable to build for themselves.

Mr. Stevenson does not approve of these inducements to States and localities to help themselves. He speaks of "an effective grant of only $66 million a year," referring to the $200 million for 3 years urged by the President for outright grants to districts with proved need and lack of income.

Federal aid to schools but not Federal control gets Mr. Stevenson's support. He says, which is true, that "we have reached the point where the financing of education as distinguished from its control can no longer everywhere be taken care of entirely from local or even from State and local revenues."

Undoubtedly there are places which simply cannot meet decent minimum requirements without Federal help. They probably need much more than the $200 million for 3 years suggested by the President. But many more communities, which could manage under a reasonable system of local and State taxation, would prefer Federal aid if they can get it. Many a politician or appointed official will try to obtain Federal aid if by doing so he can help local folks to escape a fair share of the burden.

Some measure of Federal control will be needed to protect the taxpayers of those States which are doing their level best. Without such control a student of the American scene can imagine a State ruled by a machine determined to take the Federal Treasury for every possible dime. Suppose the Government and State superintendent of instruction decide that the State needs 10 inspectors of high school bell systems at $10,000 a year for each. Imagine—it isn't hard to do so—that these jobs have no duties and no qualification requirements, though blood relationship to the governor or superintendent appears to help in getting an appointment.

Must the people of other States help pay for this jobbery with no protection, no means of voting against those responsible for such waste? Must these other people pay high local taxes, then pay more Federal taxes to help some State which boasts of the weakness of its State and local tax systems?

Apparently some Federal aid for ordinary education is inevitable. The only way to keep the burden within reasonable limits is to include strong controls from the very beginning. These will provide an incentive for States and localities to do their best to carry their own loads, and discourage waste and downright corruption in areas receiving large sums of Federal aid. Aid without control will insure a perpetual procession of deficits.

Misadventure Into Civil Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Misguided Award," published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Sunday Standard-Times of June 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MISGUIDED AWARD

The $5,000 gift made by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic to a Pennsylvania library which hired a "fifth amendment" librarian was a misadventure into civil liberties and a most discouraging use of the great financial and prestige powers of the foundation.

The librarian, Mrs. Mary Knowles, has a position with the library operated by the Plymouth Monthly Meeting of Friends, a Quaker group at Plymouth Meeting, Pa., near Philadelphia. Mrs. Knowles obtained the job in 1953, after her resignation had been accepted by the library trustees of Norwood, Mass., where she had been a branch librarian.

Reporting on the award, the New York Times, said Mrs. Knowles invoked the fifth amendment to avoid testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, then headed by Senator JENNER, Republican, of Indiana.

"Outside the committee, however, she freely admitted she had been a secretary in the Samuel Adams School, Boston—now on the Attorney General's list as a Communist-front organization—from 1945 to 1947," the Times stated.

The implication of this is that Mrs. Knowles' only transgression had been to be one of several secretaries in a left-wing organization. This is a delusion.

On May 8, 1953, Herbert F. Philbrick, who had been an FBI counterspy in the Communist Party, testified before the Jenner subcommittee on the Samuel Adams School, to which he had been assigned while in the party.

"Who was Mr. Harley's (Dr. Harrison L. Harley, director of the school) secretary?" he was asked.

"Mr. Harley's secretary was Mary Knowles. Mary Knowles was a member of the Communist Party, and in fact a member of my own progroup underground cell."

Philbrick said the "progroup" was "the most deeply underground section of the Communist Party in this country," being composed of "professional people, as well as professional revolutionists, white-collar people, people with education, and with income, and so forth, greater than the average rank-and-file Communists."

The school's own literature, introduced as evidence, identified Mary Knowles as secretary of the school, her authority exceeded only by the director and associate director. The school, itself, was described by Philbrick as "completely run and controlled entirely by the Communist Party," and as "its biggest educational project."

When Mrs. Knowles went to Plymouth Meeting, veterans' organizations and others asked her to take a loyalty oath. She refused. Thereafter, the Plymouth Township School Board, the governing authorities of Plymouth and Whitemarsh Townships and the Conshohocken community chest withdrew financial support of the library.

In this situation, intervention by the huge Ford Foundation activity is entirely uncalled for. Mrs. Knowles has had no rights refused her. She, to the contrary, appears to have utilized her rights to the fullest, including refuge behind the fifth amendment and refusal to take a loyalty oath.

The award for "courageous and effective defense of democratic principles" as announced by Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, makes jest of the anti-Communist principles for which so many have worked and sacrificed.

Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee began its hearings on the construction of Hells Canyon Dam, and I should like to call attention to the great interest in this project both in my State of Oregon and elsewhere, as evidenced by the following resolutions adopted by many organizations and forwarded to me:

"RESOLUTION

"*Resolved*, That we reaffirm our former resolution that we favor the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government in accord with the survey and recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to your Representatives in Congress."

Adopted at annual State convention of the Oregon State Farmers Union in Salem, Oreg., February 12, 1955.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Senate bill 1333 has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, and many other Senators from many different States of the Union for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam; and

Whereas to get the fullest benefits of the water resources of the Northwest for power, irrigation, navigation for all of the people for more industries and a fuller opportunity for work for an ever increasing army of working people, it is absolutely necessary to build the Hells Canyon Dam as soon as possible: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Carpenters Local 226, of Portland, Oreg., do earnestly and sincerely endorse Senate bill 1333 as now introduced in the United States Senate and pledge its full support of said bill; be it further

Resolved, That Carpenters Local 226, of Portland, Oreg., do hereby sincerely commend and appreciate all those Senators.

A. E. Larson, C. J. LaSalle, James W. Johnson, C. B. Fairley, H. W. Goodding, T. E. Johnson, A. T. Williams, Sr., Geo. Hann, Andrew F. Sears.

MCKINLEY GRANGE NO. 582,
Myrtle Point, Oreg.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the need for electrical power is increasing rapidly in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas we do not believe in the administration's partnership power program of the Government building dams and the private power interests collecting the lion's share of the revenue; and

Whereas we believe a high dam in Hells Canyon will utilize in the fullest the potential of this great site: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the McKinley Grange, No. 582, in regular session on the 26th day of March 1955 unanimously went on record as favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1333 at this session of Congress so that this great power site may begin contributing prime kilowatts to the Northwest power pool at the earliest possible moment.

ELMER STRODE, *Master.*
PRISCILLA MAST,
Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 15, 1955.*
Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution passed by Oregon State Grange in annual session June 6 to 10 submitted for your consideration:

"Whereas Senate bill 1333 authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress;

"Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill for the following reasons: First, that it will tie in with the Northwest power pool to insure needed power for this area and for national defense; second, that it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means; third, that it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry, and encourage industry and makes jobs for thousands and thousands of people. These added industries, this added payroll, added homes, and other benefits, all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county governments; fourth, that it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction with interest, and thereafter be a source of income for governmental operations; fifth, that we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials, all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low-cost power in the Northwest; and

"Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation is in need of home support for this measure: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Oregon State Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon Dam bill as originally outlined in Army engineers Report No. 308, and that we forward copies of this resolution to all Senators and Representatives of the Northwest States requesting their undivided support of Senate bill 1333."

ELMER MCCLURE,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

OREGON STATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Salem, Oreg., May 31, 1955.
Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: The recent annual convention of Oregon State Council of Carpenters adopted a resolution endorsing the enactment of Senate bill 1333 and House bill 4719, both providing for Federal construction of a dam at the Hells Canyon site on the Snake River.

We take this means to convey to you, on behalf of the officers and members of Oregon State Council of Carpenters, our deep appreciation of the fine effort you have made to further this worthy cause in the true best interests of all of the people, and let us hope that it has not been in vain. Please accept our sincere thanks.

Yours very truly,
OREGON STATE COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS,
IVOR T. JONES, *Executive Secretary.*

VALE GRANGE NO. 696,
Vale, Oreg., April 2, 1955.
Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: At the regular meeting of the Vale Grange No. 696 at Vale, Oreg., on April 1, 1955, a resolution was unanimously passed by the members to support the authorization of a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon.

Yours truly,
VALE GRANGE NO. 696,
D. E. CARTER,
Master.
CARRIE M. BERRY,
Secretary.

BEAVERTON, OREG., *March 28, 1955.*

Whereas in the electrical development of the Pacific Northwest the Snake River will ultimately be harnessed; and

Whereas it is our considered belief that this will be accomplished most efficiently by the construction of a single high dam by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Beaverton Grange in regular session assembled this 28th day of March 1955 go on record favoring the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Adopted.

E. G. PERKINS,
Secretary.
BERT WILSON,
Master.
BEAVERTON, OREG.

Cold Spring Grange, No. 801, urge the Federal Power Commission and the Congress of the United States to support the proposed multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam project and to oppose the alternate proposal for smaller dams.

Authorize the construction in the near future.

MERVIN R. MEINERS,
Master.
Mrs. BERT BLOOM,
Secretary.
PENDLETON, OREG.

RESOLUTION

Whereas economic future of Oregon and the Pacific Northwest depends on an adequate supply of hydroelectric power;

Whereas Army engineers' reports show that the construction of a high multiple-purpose dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River is the key to the maximum development of the Columbia River Basin: Therefore, be it

Resolved by South Benton Grange, No. 756, in session assembled March 25, To go on record as urging the adoption of Senate bill 1333 which authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River; be it further

Resolved, That copies be sent to State Grange, National Hells Canyon Dam Association, and Senators and Representatives of Oregon congressional delegation.

MILES PETERS,
Master.
EVA PETERS,
Secretary.

JUNCTION CITY, OREG.

RESOLUTION

"Whereas Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have been highly successful, contributing greatly to the winning of World War II, and have been the direct origin of the industrial expansion of the Pacific Northwest; and

"Whereas additional facilities of this type are needed in order to continue this expansion, to provide for Oregon's rapidly increasing population, and further to minimize flood levels on the Columbia River and other streams; and

"Whereas the Army engineers' 308 report has already shown that construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River is the key to the maximum development of the Columbia River system, providing the most practical upstream storage and maximum firm power at downstream dams; and

"Whereas the State granges of Oregon, Washington, and California are in favor of the United States Government erecting a high dam in Hells Canyon: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* (1) That we again affirm our previous decisions regarding construction of Hells Canyon Dam. (2) That we strongly denounce the present administration for its failure to oppose the granting of a license by the Federal Power Commission to build three low dams and to promote the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam by the Federal Government."

Submitted by Riversdale Grange No. 731, Roseburg, Oreg., Douglas County, Oreg.

NELDA NORRIS,
Master.
ANNA TROZELL,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION

UNION COUNTY POMONA GRANGE.

Whereas all electricity that can be developed in the Northwest will soon be needed; and

Whereas aid to navigation and flood control that this dam will provide is necessary for the full potential use of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; and

Whereas the building of Hells Canyon Dam would result in an outstanding recreational lake amid a locally already famous for its scenery and place to spend vacations, such addition would become part of a growing asset as a tourist resort; and

Whereas the electricity generated at Hells Canyon and the buildup at the lower dams will be much more than any other proposed plan; and

Whereas cheap electricity is needed to develop the great phosphate deposits in Idaho for fertilizer that is used more and more in the growing of farm crops: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Union County Pomona Grange this 26th day of March 1955 in regular session, That we ask our Senators and Representatives in Congress to support and pass S. 1333 as soon as possible and to appropriate funds to start the same.

HENRY WEATHERSPOON,
Master.
LAURA E. BATES, *Secretary.*

FERNHILL GRANGE, No. 592,
Rainier, Oreg., April 8, 1955.

"Whereas the Federal high Hells Canyon Dam will provide more power than the three low-head dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co.;

"Whereas there is a vast need for more power in the Pacific Northwest to promote more industries which will help solve the unemployment situation in the Pacific Northwest;

"Whereas low-cost power is needed to develop the phosphate beds of Idaho to furnish fertilizer, which is badly needed by the farmers in this area: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That Fernhill Grange, No. 592, Rainier, Oreg., go on record to petition the Insuular and Interior Affairs Committee to favor the Federal high dam in Hells Canyon; be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies be sent to the Insular and Interior Affairs Committees, the United States Senators and Representatives of Oregon, and to the Oregon State Grange."

Resolution read and adopted by Fern Hill Grange, No. 592, at a regular meeting, March 26, 1955.

W. W. KIMBLE,
Master.
LUCILLE KIMBLE,
Secretary.

OPHIR GRANGE, No. 767,
Ophir, Oreg., March 25, 1955.

EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: Ophir Grange, No. 767, went on record endorsing Senate bill 1333 at their regular meeting on the above date.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND H. STEVENS,
Master.
RUTH M. MOORE,
Secretary.

To the Oregon Senators, Congressmen, and Congresswoman representing the State of Oregon

"Whereas Senate bill 1333, recently submitted to the United States Senate, and H. R. 4719, introduced in the House, provides for a Federally constructed dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River; and

"Whereas this Carpenters Local Union No. 190 feels that it is to the best interests of all the peoples of these United States that such projects remain as an asset of the United States Government; and

"Whereas we also feel that the economy of our State and the whole Northwest area that could be served by such Federal financed high dam would materially benefit in other ways than hydroelectric power alone, through flood controls, irrigation, and recreation, all of which are very valuable assets to the district; and

"Whereas we feel that the cost of construction by the Federal Government is reimbursable from the sale of power and for which the power consumers of the area must ultimately pay, whether constructed by the Government or by private interests; and

"Whereas these facts being evident that regardless of the first cost of this project, we the people, are the most vitally interested persons in this matter and will in the end pay all bills connected therewith without hopes of future ownership, in the case of private ownership, but with the certainty of public ownership if constructed by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we the members of Carpenters Local Union No. 190, do urge upon the Oregon Senators and Congressmen and Congresswoman to use their best influence in the passage of these two bills, Senate bill 1333 and H. R. 4719, to insure to the great Northwest the future it deserves; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Oregon delegation at Washington, D. C., and copies be sent to M. A. Hutcheson, general president of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America and to George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, urging their support of this measure, also that copies be sent to the next regular conventions of the Oregon State Federation of Labor, the Oregon State Building and Construction Trades Council, and to the Oregon State Council of Carpenters for their consideration and adoption."

Approved by local union, No. 190, April 20, 1955.

Fraternally submitted,
CARPENTERS LOCAL UNION, No. 190,
C. P. MCCOLGIN, *President.*
C. D. LONG, *Secretary.*

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the State Grange of Oregon and the Linn County Pomona Grange have repeatedly announced their support of a federally constructed dam at Hells Canyon, and their opposition to the partnership plan; and

"Whereas our Senators, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, and our Congresswoman, EDITH GREEN, have worked hard to carry out the known wishes of the Grange in these matters, often in the face of hostile comment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by Linn County Pomona Grange, No. 12,* That we do appreciate and uphold our Senators and Congresswoman for their efforts in behalf of a federally erected Hells Canyon Dam, and that the Secretary of Linn County Pomona Grange be instructed to transmit this resolution to each of our Senators and Congresswoman GREEN."

Resolution adopted May 19, 1955.

LYNN COUNTY POMONA GRANGE,
G. P. TRUAX, *Master.*
WENONAH WILEY, *Secretary.*

LEBANON, OREG.

Challenge of Menon's Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article entitled "'Roving Ambassador' From Delhi," written by an eminent columnist, David Lawrence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of July 7, 1955]

ROVING AMBASSADOR FROM DELHI—MENON'S NEUTRALISM IS CHALLENGED—HE IS ACCUSED OF WORKING FOR REDS

(By David Lawrence)

Krishna Menon, described as India's roving ambassador, but who is really an instrument of Soviet policy, is getting quite a

publicity buildup in America—which is exactly what he has sought in order to enable him to carry out his mission of so-called mediation between Red China and the United States.

Not only has Menon interjected himself as a mediator and virtually demanded that President Eisenhower give him time for conversation at the summit here, but he would, if he could, continually bypass the Secretary of State. Fortunately, Mr. Eisenhower doesn't see alleged envoys of the Communist or neutralist world without Mr. Dulles being present.

Menon was given an opportunity to address the National Press Club here this week. He also obtained the limelight during the recent United Nations celebration in San Francisco. His doubletalk, however, has never been more vividly illustrated than in his answers to questions. Thus when he took issue at the Press Club with the blanket description of India as "neutralist," he said:

"We are not neutral in regard to peace and social justice * * * we are not neutral towards attempts to conciliate international differences."

But a few minutes later Menon said his country was not "concerned with who is right and who is wrong," but wanted to find a way to solve the whole problem of Americans held by Red China.

It doesn't apparently make any difference to Krishna Menon whether the Communists have violated their written pledge, given at Panmunjom, to return all prisoners of war. His idea of impartiality was revealed when he was asked whether he regarded the present "softness" of the Soviet as genuine. He replied that "we have found it better to accept people for what they say and not suspect them."

Such studied indifference to the laws of morality and justice and to the honoring of sacred pledges can be expected from a Communist regime, but Menon is trying to pose as a "neutral" and as a "mediator." He actually accepts the immorality of the Soviet policies by calling it "realism."

Menon declared that the leaders of India—one of whom he professes to be—real "realists" and that, if adopting "any particular viewpoint" at a certain time "becomes advantageous, we try it."

There's the whole case for expediency and against moral principle, as expressed by the man who is given prominence on his visits to this country and who is received with open arms in Moscow. Menon isn't influenced at all by the fact that 40,000 American boys were killed and 110,000 wounded in Korea in order to repel aggression and secure obedience to a United Nations resolution seeking to establish morality in the world.

The "roving ambassador" from New Delhi evidently isn't concerned either with the fact that the United Nations declared Red China an aggressor and that the Peiping government insulted and denounced the U. N. at Geneva last year and still refuses to allow a settlement of the Korean problem to be undertaken under the auspices of the U. N. The Red China government naturally wants its partisan, Krishna Menon, to handle this matter because of a confidence that he will achieve what the U. N. refused to do for the Communists.

Why should anyone be trusted as a "mediator" who openly champions the cause of one or the other of the parties to a dispute? This question presents no difficulty to the crafty mind of Krishna Menon but the situation makes little sense to those who respect the moral position of the United Nations and of this country in the disputes with Soviet Russia and Red China.

Menon's formula is for the United States to give up all bases and all her interests in the Far East, dissolve the Nationalist Army which is helping to defend southeast Asia and sell out the South Korean Government to the Communists. It is a mystery why they waste so much time here with a self-appointed partisan of the Communists who doesn't speak for the people of India or even the important diplomats of that country who privately say they have no illusions about Menon's meddlesome crusade.

Menon may be relying on the naivete of some Americans. Who encourages him in such ideas? Incidentally, who gave U Nu, the Prime Minister of Burma, what he says was an impression he derived during his recent visit to Washington that the United States Government really favors admission of Red China to the United Nations and that the only question to be decided was the timing? It's possible that there are left wingers here who are stimulating such erroneous thoughts but, if they ever submit the issue to the American people in any congressional or presidential election, they will find themselves much mistaken.

Swiss Watch Tariff Hike and "Defense Essentiality"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago I submitted for the RECORD a condensation of 7 artcles on the Swiss watch tariff increase and "defense essentiality," which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce from May 24 to June 2, 1955.

On June 3, 1955, the newspaper carried an editorial entitled "The Missing Link," which cogently comments upon the importance of the watch case and its implications regarding future administrative determinations of "defense essentiality" in the trade program.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSING LINK

On April 29, 1954, the Department of Defense concluded its secret report to ODM on the defense essentially of the jeweled-watch industry with the finding that "no special or preferential treatment for the industry is essential." Two months later, on June 30, Assistant Defense Secretary Thomas P. Pike told a Senate preparedness subcommittee that such treatment was highly essential.

What happened in the interim?

Jerome Oelbaum's 7-article autopsy on the watch-tariff case, which concluded in this newspaper yesterday, makes it plain that this is the real missing link in the chain of curious events leading up to President Eisenhower's decision to raise the tariff on watches last July 27.

The answer to this question should also provide an important clue to the manner in which added tariff protection may be given or withheld from other industries claiming defense essentiality under an amendment to the Trade Agreements Act which seems sure to be passed by Congress.

Defense officials take the position that nothing happened to change the Department's attitude during that period, and that, in fact, it did not change. As Mr. Pike explained it on June 30, the Department regarded the jeweled-watch industry as essential, but merely "did not feel that special treatment should be extended the jeweled-watch industry in preference to the rest of the watch industry."

But when Mr. Pike made that statement the original report was still secret. It was not until 2 months ago that release of essential portions of the report revealed a strong discrepancy between its actual findings and Mr. Pike's interpretation of them.

Watch importers and foreign traders, dismayed by the President's action raising the tariff, were not alone in noting the discrepancy. Senator SALTONSTALL, a stanch supporter of Mr. Eisenhower's action, declared flatly that the report "cannot be reconciled with Mr. Pike's testimony." We agree. It cannot be.

So it remains to be told why the Defense Department jettisoned the findings of its own survey on which it said itself "no effort had been spared" to get at the facts, and accepted views then being vigorously pushed within ODM by representatives of the Commerce Department, whom one would suppose to be somewhat less sensitive to military affairs than the Department of Defense, and certainly less acquainted with them.

What forces within ODM brought about this change of heart? What arguments proved more cogent than the results of so meticulous a survey as that which produced the "secret report"?

We do not pose these questions to rake over old coals. They bear very pointedly on the immediate future of our national foreign trade policy.

If the watch case alone were involved—and it may very well be a unique case—this would be water over the dam. But other industries are now pressing for tariff or quota protection on the grounds of defense essentiality (the Government has even received an inquiry as to the status of brassiere cups in this respect), and there will probably be more to come.

Under the new amendment to the Trade Agreements Act ODM is given a key role in handling these questions, and the President is under some compulsion to observe its recommendations. That is why the manner in which it arrives at recommendations similar to those it made in the watch case take on a good deal of importance.

When issues involving imports are weighed by the Tariff Commission under the tariff law, the public or, at any rate, all interested parties, are able to ascertain to a fair extent just what is going on.

Hearings are open, the record is public, the testimony and evidence on which the Commission act are available, and, while some of the parties may disagree with the final determination, they are acquainted at least with the basis on which it was reached.

When, however, a question of defense essentiality transfers a plea for greater tariff protection into the realm of ODM, a good part of the proceedings sink immediately from sight. Then there is no public record and the pressures which shape a final determination—as in the watch case—can only be surmised.

In these circumstances it is as incumbent on ODM to confine itself solely to the technical determination of defense essentially in such cases as it is upon the Tariff Commission to avoid the subject (something it did not do in the watch case). It must be as above suspicion as Caesar's wife.

ODM, and especially the Defense Department, should be as clean as a hound's tooth of all protectionist pressures generated for political or commercial purposes. Nothing could do the whole program much more lasting damage than widespread suspicion that "defense essentiality" is being

used as a cover for protectionists, and that those who can't get protection from the Tariff Commission can find it in the Pentagon.

If there is more than a suspicion that political pressures are loose in ODM, they can be traced to the bad start made in the watch case.

The Defense Department may have had good reasons for its change of heart. The release of the "secret report" was a forthright act, even though 11 months late. But the official "explanation" of its meaning have only fogged the issue. And the missing link is still missing.

The Christian College, Its Service to Business and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an address delivered by the Honorable Thomas W. Martin, chairman of the board of the Alabama Power Co., on April 29, 1955, at the cornerstone laying ceremonies of Howard College in Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. Martin's address well expresses the important role played by our Christian colleges in preparing the youth of our Nation for constructive living in these complicated and uncertain times. I heartily recommend its reading to each Member of this body.

Howard College has long been one of the most outstanding educational institutions in Alabama. Many of the religious leaders of the Baptist denomination in this country have received their undergraduate training at this institution. In addition, the college bears the reputation of having one of the finest liberal arts and pharmacy programs in the South. This is borne out by the number of graduates who have earned places of leadership in the business, industrial, and professional life of our country.

The college has progressed, in size and standard of courses offered, to the extent that it has outgrown the present campus site in the eastern section of Birmingham. For the past several years, Baptist ministers, laymen, and other civic leaders in the State have, through their respective churches, financed the relocation of the campus through the formation of educational trust funds. The fruits of their Christian labors are reflected in the beauty and grandeur of the new campus. It is located in one of the loveliest sections of Jefferson County, lying in the valley between Red Mountain and Shades Mountain, just outside the city of Birmingham. The beauty of its campus and the architecture of the proposed buildings will provide an ideal environment for the students of future years.

All of the people in Jefferson County, as well as the people in our entire State, are proud indeed of the service which has been rendered by Howard College in the past years. In the years ahead, Howard will mean even more to the State, the South, and the Nation. With the knowledge that our educational institutions are planning wisely for the future, we all have added confidence that our Nation will grow stronger with each generation.

Using these brief remarks for an introduction, it is a privilege for me to insert in the RECORD Mr. Martin's address, titled "The Christian College, Its Service to Business and Industry":

THE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE, ITS SERVICE TO BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

It is heartening to anyone interested in Christian education to see this great assembly of laymen from many parts of America, and of all religious faiths, come in salute to a college which is owned by the Baptist denomination.

Howard has been the ideal of men for more than a century, ideal of men made excellent not only with liberal arts but with sense of things eternal, with acceptance of right and wrong as enduring, with recognition of moral law and of man in an image.

You have asked me to speak of the contribution of the Christian college to business and industry, which I am honored to do. But I salute first—and more—the contribution of such a college not to business and industry alone but to all that makes business and industry worthwhile—to the excellencies of individual human beings which we must prize for their own sakes, for society's sake, as well as for the economy of our country.

This Republic was established and this Nation was built on foundations of Christian morality. On these it has grown to greatness; from these today we have our strength in a turbulent world.

We all agree, I believe, that colleges have a high responsibility to help preserve our democratic system of freedom and opportunity; and you are entitled to be assured of our business belief that private enterprise has an equally great responsibility to a system of education in which all subjects are open to the freely inquiring mind.

Business needs men today of ethical standards, with a broad general background, a sense of the fore and aft and all around of what they do, capable of stepping out of their own field into problems of a wide area, men who are socially conscious. To such as these we are looking for leadership.

Education exists not only to prepare men for actual jobs, but also to prepare them for effective living outside of one's job. We look to our colleges for this combination, for men with know-how conducive to material advancement and the know-how, too, that preserves traditional freedoms and ethical standards without which American business could not operate or justify itself.

A mind that is open, a mind attuned to the experimental and the new, a mind disciplined, too, and touched with the eternities, is the mind that is essential to leadership now.

A distinguished educator said recently that the first need in America today is a new generation of trained men and women who can do those things which have never before been done—leaders in thought and deed, not routine followers of tradition—men and women who are intellectually capable, morally responsible, and socially competent. With all of this I agree. We are, it seems to me, dealing here with the most basic challenge—what our youth of tomorrow will be. Will they measure up to these principles?

Wisely, Prof. Alfred North Whitehead, of Harvard, put it many years ago—

"In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories at land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated."

Since Professor Whitehead spoke, science has moved many steps. In the last hundred years the United States has changed from a preponderantly agricultural economy to an outright industrial society. Today the South is making the same change. In 1850, it took the combined efforts of 5 farm families to supply the necessary food and fiber for 1 city family. By 1950, 1 farm family was supplying the food and fiber required for 5 urban ones.

I believe, indeed, I know, that your leaders in building this great campus are aware of these and many other changes in the world and are preparing to meet them in a magnificent way without forgetting the eternal way.

Many of us believe that the last half of the 20th century belongs to the South. But our people must make certain of their promised larger share of the Nation's economic and cultural, and spiritual growth. The policy of State and Federal Government toward industry and business should deeply concern responsible heads of educational institutions as well as business and industrial heads.

Thackery, in his famous stagecoach story, referred to the passenger who liked to ride on the front seat where he could see the future as it formed, help to create it, be a part of it. All of you who are here today can ride the front seat, be a part of the magnificent future of our region. The South is rich in resources. We must make it rich and ever richer in ideas, in culture, in opportunities.

We, of business, facing up to the problems of healthy growth, have an obligation to fight for things which will build America. You, of education, have a duty to identify things which would destroy America and imperil civilization itself.

A corporation, they say, has no soul. If you're part of a corporation, as I am, it's hard to believe that. You like to think that you, yourself, have a soul, and corporations are only a lot of individuals—individuals who have pooled their savings to carry on an enterprise. I make bold to predict that corporations and business management are going to show more and more soul in the South—more and more social consciousness. Indeed, I feel that the social consciousness of the American businessman is one of the bright distinguishing marks of the American form of capitalism; it is a quality perhaps too little honored.

But where would the businesses, great and small, be today were it not for the precepts of Christian morality underlying American life?

Dr. Ralph S. Sockman, distinguished minister and Christian statesman, has put it for us:

"If we are to safeguard our freedom, we need men whose oath we can trust in court and whose word we can also trust in the market place. We need men who are responsible enough to bear their own burdens and good enough to bear one another's burdens. Church-related colleges have given godly ideals to our Nation's youth, furthered social reforms, trained our political and religious leaders."

And, Mr. Chairman, you will recognize Howard College and thousands of its sons and daughters in the beautiful thoughts of Dr. Sockman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege of appearing here today.

Thomas G. Masaryk Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by Joseph V. Lysak, president of the Masaryk Memorial Dedication Committee, of Chicago, Ill. The speech was delivered on May 29, 1955, on the occasion of the dedication of the Thomas G. Masaryk Memorial, which is located on the Midway near the University of Chicago campus.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF JOSEPH V. LYSAK, PRESIDENT, MASARYK MEMORIAL DEDICATION COMMITTEE, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 29, 1955

Dear friends, brothers and sisters, I feel honored by the request to speak in my native language about the importance of this dedication, which will go into our history as a manifestation of reverence and devotion to the principles advocated by president liberator T. J. Masaryk, whose whole life was governed by these principles.

We have gathered here under our American Stars and Stripes—4,000 miles away from our old country—we came not only from our metropolis, but also from many corners of America to honor the undying memory of one of the greatest men in the history of Czechoslovakia.

Hundreds of thousands of American Czechoslovakians and millions of our people across the ocean who remained true to Masaryk's ideals, are with us, at least in thoughts, in these memorable moments.

The glorified name of T. G. Masaryk solidifies us into one phalanx.

Such an imposing number of people has come today to Masaryk's memorial, which we dedicate as a sacred heritage to future generations, in the firm belief that this manifestation has a deep significance. Let us not consider only the formal act of dedication of this symbolic monument. The creator of this great work, the famous sculptor Albin Polasek, expressed it very well in declaring that this manifestation offers us a great opportunity to prove our hatred of communism before the whole world and before our American countrymen. In these turbulent times all of us should be Blanik knights and follow firmly Masaryk and his ideals.

The Communist rulers of Czechoslovakia try to convince the people that the Czechoslovaks in America agree with their regime. It is a lie which the Communists themselves do not believe. Our people over there refuse resolutely to believe it. At this monument of the great Warrior for Truth we firmly refute that lie and we solemnly proclaim our adherence to the heritage of Masaryk's ideals. We refute today another big lie, that is that we are against those who were forced to flee the Communist terror, the prison camps and the gallows, and who arrived in the free western countries to work for the return of Masaryk's democracy to Czechoslovakia. The presence of the delegates of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and of many members representing this important institution in exile, and their manifesto read within the shadows of this monument decidely refute even this Communist lie. The American citizens of Czechoslovakia descent refute simultaneously this lie by giving generous support to exiles who have escaped the red terror.

Why do Communists in the old country strive so diligently to destroy the memory of T. G. Masaryk? They know that in the eyes of the people the first President of Czechoslovakia is the main representative of the belief that Czechoslovakia was and will always be firmly allied with the Western democracies. It is the name of Masaryk which so vividly reminds the people in the old country of the close relationship of the American and Czechoslovak democracy.

The unity of hundreds of thousands Americans of Czechoslovak descent who proudly adhere to the heritage of Lincoln and Masaryk, who strive for liberty and democracy, should be a serious warning to the Communists that there are Czechoslovaks in this world who have not only the will but also the possibility to protest against the international Communist conspiracy.

The Communists did not succeed in eradicating the memory of T. G. Masaryk from the hearts of the people in our native country, nor will they succeed in spoiling the sincere relationship of this people to America and to Americans of Czechoslovak descent. The Communists will never succeed in camouflaging the fact that not so long ago American soldiers fought not only for the freedom of this country but also for the liberation of Czechoslovakia. They cannot deny that American soldiers lead by General Patton have liberated Pilsen and Western Bohemia.

The Communists should not forget that our sons and grandsons were also fighting in the American Army. It is possible that there is today a Czechoslovak mother whose son gave his life for the freedom of America and of our native country. No propaganda in the whole world can change such facts.

It is true that our people are suffering under the Communist dictatorship, but it is also an undeniable fact that hundreds of thousands of American Czechoslovaks who live in the free country of Washington and Lincoln will not tolerate that their native country be enslaved forever. These citizens of a free country will continue their endeavor to liberate Czechoslovakia as they did during the First and Second World War. They will not stop until all those who are suffering under the Communist yoke are free. Not only our former President Truman, but also President Eisenhower condemned resolutely the subjugation of Czechoslovakia by the Communists. Both these American Presidents declared that the people in our old country have the right to elect their government by a free election.

The Czechoslovak Nation fully deserves not to be forgotten by the western democracies. Not only all American citizens of Czechoslovak descent but also the highest representatives of the United States Government fully agree that our native country deserves freedom and democracy. The great history and the thousand years old Christian tradition of the Czechoslovak Nation prove that this nation had never a desire to subjugate other people, and that she always demanded right and justice for all.

The Slav Apostles Sts. Cyrill and Methiveins brought Christianity to our pepole and erected the first church at Nitra. The tradition of western Christianity dates since the 10th century, since the reign of St. Wenceslans. The western tradition was cultivated at the Charles University in Prague, one of the oldest universities in Europe, founded more than 6 centuries ago; learned masters and bachelors of sciences and arts graduated from it long before America was discovered. The great Czech Martyr Jan Huss was an apostle of western Christian tradition. The Czech King George of Podebrady proposed the creation of a league of European nations as early in the 15th century.

When the Czechs lost their independence after the Battle of White Mountain, the great Czech exile and teacher of nations, John Amos Comenius propagated the glory of the Czech name through the whole Western World. Here, in our United States, in Pennsylvania are still traces of the activities of Comenius in the church of the Moravian Brethren, whose roots are in the old country.

A nation with such traditions and history should not be forgotten and not be left behind the Iron Curtain.

Even in these troubled times the Czech nations can boast of many heroes who have bravely opposed the Communist tyranny, e. g., Dr. Milads Horghors, Gen. Hiliodore Pika, and many others who preferred death to Communist slavery. Among the bravest opponents of communism, let me name the archbishop of Prague, Dr. Joseph Beran, who for several years is a prisoner of the Communist regime.

It is very fortunate for our enslaved people that the voice of the free world penetrates the Iron Curtain which separates Czechoslovakia from the free world. Our people are well informed that they are not forgotten. It is the merit of the Voice of America and of the Voice of the National Committee for Free Europe. The Communists are constantly attacking those two broadcasts. However, they ought to know that the Voice of America is also our voice, the proud and determined voice of American citizens of Czechoslovak descent. Attacking the Voice of Free Europe which we help support by our dollars, means attacking us.

The significance of today's celebration would not be sufficiently clarified if we would not have addressed those words to Communists in Prague and if we should not realize that we are threatened by an international Communist conspiracy. United, and in mutual agreement, we are all fighting an irreconcilable fight for democracy and freedom in the whole world, and, above all, in our old country.

While speaking for the American broadcast shortly before his death, President T. G. Masaryk stated: "We count on your American leadership in the fight for freedom, and we know that you will not fail us." T. G. Masaryk thought of us at that time because he knew us before World War I; he befriended us during that war and followed closely our activities even as President of C. S. R. I am convinced that he would give his blessing to our decision that we intend to stand united and disciplined in defending freedom and democracy. Maybe he would say: "Dear countrymen, brothers and sisters across the ocean, I knew that you would not fail me."

The significance of this dedication and our greatest strength is in our unity under Masaryk's flag.

In this is also our pride and honor. We fully realize that the assurance of a successful fight against the Communist conspiracy rests in our unity and mutual trust.

This manifestation in the shadow of Masaryk's monument would have no significance should we split our strength, which we need urgently today, should we not stay united.

Let us all solemnly promise at this monument of T. G. Masaryk that we will maintain this unity and that we are going to do our level best in striving for the victory of truth over lie, of love over hatred, of true brotherhood over discord, so that perpetual peace may embrace the whole world.

To our dear ones in the old country we are sending an encouraging message from Masaryk's monument in Chicago assuring them that they are not forgotten.

Not even the strongest Iron Curtain can sever the ties which bind our hearts together. Our dear ones at home trust us, as our Masaryk used to trust us. We have never failed him, and we shall not fail you.

Federal-State Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as a member of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal-State Relations," which appeared in the July 8, 1955, issue of the Washington Evening Star, and a newsletter of mine dated July 5, 1955, on the subject of "An Antidote to Centralization of Government."

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 8, 1955]

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

Indicative of the general tenor of the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is the group's announced belief that the "fundamental objective of our system of government should be to keep centralization to a minimum and State-local responsibility to a maximum." Taking note of widespread concern over increased centralization of governmental authority in recent years, the Commission has sought to point a way for arresting the trend and strengthening government at the State, county, and municipal levels. Its report is a well-balanced document, representing views of a majority of the 25-man bipartisan Commission, headed by Meyer Kestnbaum, Chicago clothing manufacturer.

The Commission found that too much Federal aid to the States and local communities is apt to weaken local responsibility and initiative. This deterioration makes it difficult to effect a proper separation of Federal and local powers, for some of the States and cities are unable to assume what the Commission regards as their rightful obligations to the citizens. The Commission stressed that the main burden of strengthening local government rests on the States and local communities. But the Federal Government can help by taking care not to encroach on State domain and responsibilities.

Of special interest to the Washington metropolitan area was the Commission's comments on tax losses resulting from Federal expansion and on interjurisdictional problems in large metropolitan areas. With regard to the Federal impact on local tax-producing sources, the report urged adoption of a broad national policy to assure payments in lieu of taxes on Government real estate. Said the Commission: "Present tax immunities of Federal properties have weakened many local governments. * * * Equity as between Federal and local taxpayers requires the National Government to make appropriate payments. These should be based largely on the property-tax system, which is the main source of local revenue." Interjurisdictional planning of the type that has been undertaken here was advocated for all growing urban centers.

The Commission's inch-thick report covers a multitude of issues arising from intergovernmental relationships. It will be read with profit by administrators and legislators at all levels of government.

AN ANTIDOTE TO CENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, July 5, 1955.—One of the most meaningful reports of contemporary times was released last week when the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations concluded a comprehensive survey of "the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions to the end that these relations may be clearly defined, and the functions concerned may be allotted to their proper jurisdictions." It was my privilege, by appointment of the Vice President, to serve on this Commission.

The Commission has thus illuminated the variable scope of kinship between Federal, State, and local governments which has evolved in our country. In so doing the inherent dangers of intemperate reliance on the Federal Government have been brought into lucid and graphic perspective, and a series of plausible recommendations for the division of responsibilities in many fields of public endeavor have been advanced.

In what might be regarded by some as an understatement, the Commission has observed that "People in the United States, as elsewhere, have looked more and more to Government for assistance in solving their social and economic problems. The National Government has sometimes responded more readily than have the State and local governments." While the Commission, quite correctly, has not indulged in partisanship, this comment nonetheless capably characterizes the climate of public opinion in which the New Deal and Fair Deal became potent and fashionable.

As with the Hoover Commission recently, the recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations have likewise been the target for citicism by the still-lingering disciples, dupes, and derelicts of the New-Fair Deal. Fortunately for the stability and sanity of our Nation, however, there are even now many, many millions of persons, Republicans and Democrats alike, who fervently believe in the durable Jeffersonian doctrine of a strong State government rather than a centralized Federal Government.

In this essential campaign to rejuvenate the traditional Federal-State precept, these fundamental guides, as offered by the Commission, should govern: "We have * * * as citizens a responsibility to see to it that those legitimate needs of society that could be met by timely State and local action do not by default have to be met by the National Government" and "A realistic program of decentralization * * * depends too on the readiness and ability of the States and their subdivisions to assume their full share of the total task of government."

Hells Canyon Question: Monopoly Versus the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the letter appearing in the Public Forum column of the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times on Tuesday, May 3, 1955, addressed to the editor by W. W. Campbell, of Portland, Oreg., and entitled, "Hells Canyon Question: Monopoly Versus the People":

HELLS CANYON QUESTION: MONOPOLY VERSUS THE PEOPLE

EDITOR:

There is much more and of far greater importance in the Hells Canyon question than the height of a dam and the miscellaneous details thereof.

Foremost is a struggle between monopolistic corporate interests and the American people which may well determine for all time whether the people through their Government are to own and control the remaining natural resources of the Nation or whether these resources are to be fed into the greedy maws of private profit-hungry monopoly.

But there is not validly involved the question of "free enterprise," there being as little in common between the principle of private monopoly enterprise and private free competitive enterprise as there is between Soviet communism and American democracy. Neither is even a reasonable facsimile of the other.

As to complaint that Hells Canyon has been made "political" by MORSE and NEUBERGER, that is simply smoky baloney. However, Hells Canyon is most certainly a political issue (partisan only incidentally) and made so because the forces of monopoly sought to challenge the right of the American people to develop and use their own property without paying tribute to all powerful private monopolists, who seemingly seek a setup approximating government itself within the Government.

It has been often repeated that the people should not have done for them what they can do for themselves. At Bonneville, Grand Coulee and elsewhere it has been soundly demonstrated that when it comes to cheap and plentiful electric power, the people through their Government (of, by and for the people, under democratic rule, at any rate) can do far better for themselves than could the monoplists who in each case denounced as crack-pot, visionary, impractical and unneeded, all the great public power projects of this century.

Hells Canyon is the people against the monopolists.

W. W. CAMPBELL.

PORTLAND, OREG.

History and Meaning of the Thomas G. Masaryk Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the history and the full meaning of the Thomas G. Masaryk Memorial, which stands on Chicago's Midway near the University of Chicago, and which was dedicated on May 29, 1955, was the subject of a speech recently by Mr. R. A. Gorman, of Chicago. Because it is so ably and well written and because it expresses so excellently the spirit of the occasion and of the memorial, I ask

unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It will be of general interest that bills conferring permanent residence upon Dr. Alice Masaryk and Mrs. Olga Masaryk Revilliod, daughters of Thomas G. Masaryk, were recently approved by the Congress of the United States. It was my pleasure as a member of one of the Senate committees to lend assistance in the passage of the latter bill, which was introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL]. Both of these daughters were present at the dedication of their father's memorial.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY AND MEANING OF THOMAS G. MASARYK MEMORIAL, CHICAGO, ILL.

Ladies and gentlemen, Sunday, May 29, summoned by the exemplary ardous efforts of the Masaryk Memorial Dedication Committee, thousands of Americans of Czechoslovak birth or parentage will gather on Chicago's midway to officially dedicate the towering Masaryk memorial. Since 1949 this edifice of bronze and granite stands on the midway in close proximity to the spreading University of Chicago Campus where 50 years ago professor Masaryk delivered his first series of lectures on the Problem of the Small Nations.

The Masaryk memorial, a gift of the committee to the Chicago parks, is the work of an outstanding American sculptor of Czechoslovak origin, Albin Polasek, for years the dominant figure on America's cultural horizon. The memorial was presented to the proper authorities without elaborate ceremonies 6 years ago and for these changing years it has been standing there, without so to speak a formal introduction to the people of Chicago. It is gratifying that under the leadership of the Moravians of Chicago steps have been taken to correct this breach of etiquette and that at last the Masaryk memorial is to be properly dedicated mid all the pomp and flag waving and speech making so typical of all such occasions. Finally on May 29 the Masaryk memorial will join the distinguished company of some 130 monuments, statues, boulders, slabs, pylon, and other forms of Chicago's memorials.

Knowing Masaryk's attitude, knowing his retiring philosophy, we can understand a bit better the artists choice of symbolism, and I think that if Masaryk himself were to attend the dedication or pass the memorial he would pause in his stride and, striking his chin and shaking his beautifully modeled head, he would say, "Not bad, not bad, as long as it means something, as long as it serves a purpose," and then with an enigmatic smile he would add,"At least Polasek had sense enough to sit on a horse, my favorite mode of transportation." Then to satisfy Masaryk's demand that there be a purpose to everything let us try to explain and understand the meaning of the saintly majestic figure seated upon the powerful bronze steed atop the granite slab that bears Masaryk's portrait in sharp relief.

In its strict symbolism the Masaryk memorial is but a reenactment in bronze and stone of the great Legend of the Knights of the Blanik Mountain, the mounted warriors and St. Wenceslaus, their leader standing ever ready to ride forth in the Nation's hour of need. For some 500 years this legend has been handed down from father to son, from generation to generation, a sustaining comforting thought, that reached its realization in the personality of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk and the Czechoslovak Legionnaires the reborn Knight of the Blanik Mountain whose names and deeds are inscribed in gold letters upon the pages of the History of World War I.

But the memorial means more than the expression of a legend; it also expresses the author's conception of Masaryk's role in life, his philosophy, his attitudes. The patriarchal figure sitting high against Chicago's varying clouds is the symbol of Masaryk the teacher, the great untiring inspiring honest teacher, not only within the classroom or the college campus but a teacher in the broader sense, a spiritual and intellectual leader of a devoted people, and if I can understand Polasek's symbolism, the sturdy steed with its 4 feet planted firmly solidly in the ageless granite symbolize Masaryk's concept of interpreting life and all its problems in a realistic down-to-earth manner, devoid of flighty excursion into the realm of fancy and imagery, Masaryk the teacher, Masaryk the downright realist, Masaryk the philosopher riding astride the powerful horse symbolic of knightship and leadership. This is what I see in the Masaryk memorial besides the expressed Blanik legend. Perhaps in this powerful fashion the artist tried to convey to the world that here at least Plato's dream of a philosopher king is fully realized in the person of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia.

Earlier this evening I said that Masaryk himself would approve of the memorial and the dedicatory celebration being planned under one condition. It must serve a purpose. Will this memorial serve a purpose? Will it say something to the generations to come after us or will it slowly crumble and disintegrate and become a meaningless mass of inert materials? In itself perhaps it will not serve its purpose too long unless we the people, those who honor and respect and idolize Masaryk will go out into the world and spread his teachings, live his teachings, and use his teachings to make this our American home a better, safer place. Let us remember the Masaryk memorial is in a sense a reminder, a memorial to the undying principal of eternal vigilance in the service of humanity, and today more than ever do we need such vigilance, such readiness to act to defend, to uphold ideals, to protect our treasured rights from usurpation from without as well as undermining gnawing away from within.

Today the world is engaged in the gigantic struggle of ideologies. It cannot continue to live forever in this state of nervous indecision of constant sparring and gaging each others strengths. The democratic way of life as portrayed by Thomas Garrigue Masaryk and as exemplified by the American way cannot bargain and compromise with the Communist plan of life. The two are irreconcilable and sooner or later will come to a clash. The game of world politics is dangerous, treacherous, exhausting and we as a Nation are young and inexperienced in its complexities. I wish I could add to the Masaryk memorial more of the granite slab and inscribe into its four sides some of the pithy excerpts from the profound fountain of political and social and moral wisdom which was Masaryk's contribution to the world of thought.

I would arrange the following quotes about the base of the memorial, so that viewed from any angle it would bring a message, a profound eternal truth culled from Masaryk's mental forge:

"BE A TRUE DEMOCRAT, PRACTICE WHAT YOU PREACH

"We don't need slogans but we do need political training. As in every field of education so in the field of political upbringing we must begin with self-education. Politics as a social practice must become part and parcel of our moral convictions. We have our political credo progress, democracy. Let us practice it consistently in all we do."

"BE HONEST, SHOW YOUR TRUE COLORS AT ALL TIMES

"Firmness of conviction does not exclude concessions and compromise in mutual work. On the other hand, compromising one's principles is absolutely unthinkable. No compromise of any kind dare violate basic principles; you yield once or twice and your best convictions are gone."

"COMMUNISM AND WHY IT MUST FAIL IN THE END

"The reason for the dreadful ends to which Russian communism has decended lies in the fact that it was perpetrated upon an uneducated morally dissipated nation. True communism must be based more on the principle of brotherhood than on the principle of equality. Communism based on a strictly economic or materialistic foundation it totally impossible."

"HUMANISM—KNOW IT, PRACTICE IT

"Humanism does not mean just love thy neighbor, but it insists on, yes, demands a high degree of mental advancement. The foremost and the main problem of the humanists should be the education of the Nation, education of its people. It demands further national tolerance and in the realm of politics denounces and rejects all forms of violence and aggression."

Having inscribed these pithy excerpts, I would direct powerful floodlights at the granite slabs that form the base of the Memorial Monument so that night and day men could come, men and women of all walks of life, the students from the nearby university, the professors whose duties are to teach and prepare the sound leadership of tomorrow, the man with the pick and ax, the lawyer, the physician, the banker, the merchant, the bus driver, all of these and everyone of them would have to pause and read and meditate and say, "This means me. I too must help. I too must work for and live in democracy. I too must respect the rights of my fellow man regardless or because of his color, his religion, his national origin. If through his honest sincere devotion and work this man Masaryk could bring to life his nation after 300 years of nonexistence, if he could create and guide the newborn Czechoslovak Republic, a smaller facsimile of our own great American democracy, than I too will do my share to preserve and to improve that which we have here. Away with false prophets, away with the leering, luring voices that promise an economic haven at the loss of man's dignity, at the cost of his freedom, at the sacrifice of his very individual I." Ladies and gentlemen, if the Masaryk memorial could inspire such thoughts and cement such determination that I feel that even Thomas G. Masaryk, the servant, self critics would say "I have not lived in vain, and this memorial is well placed."

There is one more thing to be remembered. Sunday, May 29, the dedication must be more than just a formal presentation, a colorful unveiling. It must be a mass protest against the injustice which is Czechoslovakia today. It must be a voice that will be heard behind the Iron Curtain and in every nook and crannie of this continent as well, telling those unfortunates living within the promised paradise of communism that here in America, near the institution of high learning, within the shadow of the great Masaryk memorial thousands have come to pay tribute, to swear allegiance, and to find new strength, new determination to carry on. The Czechoslovaks were never warmongers, never rabblerousers, never aggressors, but they always were and always shall be on the side of justice, ready to defend the lofty principles laid down and lived by Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. Thickly massed about the base of the memorial let us affirm our loyalty to the United States of America, to

the principles of justice and freedom that it stands for, and to the lofty ideals exemplified in the bronze and granite Masaryk memorial.

Venezuela: Land of Progress and Oil and a Vital Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have a very distinguished nephew by the name of Wiley W. Souba, who is now in Venezuela. He has written an article entitled "Venezuela: Land of Progress and Oil and a Vital Neighbor," which has received considerable attention. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VENEZUELA: LAND OF PROGRESS AND OIL AND A VITAL NEIGHBOR

(By W. W. Souba, Eta chapter)

I rather imagine that most of my readers think of Venezuela as a rather small, little known, insignificant country "somewhere in South America." But let's see if this is the case.

The attention of the American people has been recently focused on Venezuela by three events. First, coverage by United States newsreel companies of the construction of the recently completed Autopista, a magnificent road-building accomplishment. Second, the much-discussed extremely important Simpson bill, which has been debated by our Congress. And, third, the visit in March of 1954 of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to the 10th Inter-American Conference in Caracas, the capital of Venezuela.

However, to petroleum engineers and other personnel who work in the fabulous world of oil, Venezuela, with its tremendous production and reserves, is far from little known or insignificant. And all engineers who have had the opportunity to read the pages of such technical journals as Engineering News-Record and Civil Engineering within the last 2 years have become familiar with the great feats of engineering and construction that have been accomplished in Venezuela.

Perhaps for some of you the newsreels, the Simpson bill, the 10th Inter-American Conference, and the recent technical writings slipped by unnoticed. Let me present some greatly condensed facts about this country called Venezuela which I believe will help you realize its significance and importance to all of us as citizens of the United States and to the world today.

Venezuela is one of the northern countries of South America bordering on the Caribbean Sea. The Rand McNally World Atlas lists the area of the country at 352,141 square miles. This is comparable in size to our States of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas combined. Thus, Venezuela is not a small country, especially by Texas standards, for any Texan will tell you that "if it's bigger than Texas, it must be big." Venezuela is sparsely populated. The population is 5,608,500 according to the latest Government estimates. Approximately 16 percent of its total population live in the city of Caracas. Percentagewise this is a tremendous concentration of population in one city.

Singularly, the thing that makes Venezuela what it is is oil. The national economy depends entirely on this natural resource. The economists will quickly point out that it is dangerous to have a national economy so completely dependent on one source of income. Their claim: Venezuela has all of its economic eggs in one basket. But most of these same economists will also admit that it is difficult to find a better basket than oil.

At present, Venezuela produces over 1,800,000 barrels of oil each day. This represents 13½ percent of the world's production. The United States receives by either direct shipment or transshipment 39 percent of Venezuela's production. Venezuela has an estimated 10 percent of the world's known oil reserves. This, then, is the story of Venezuela in a nutshell.

I mentioned earlier the Simpson bill which has been before our Congress. This bill, essentially, would restrict the importation of oil into the United States, thus necessitating the stepping up of our own internal production and the more rapid consumption of a vital military natural resource. If a restriction of oil imports became effective, Venezuela's economy would be seriously affected since we would no longer be buying almost 40 percent of the Venezuelan oil produced. Naturally the Venezuelan Government is alarmed at this possibility. But the battle cry for Venezuela is made not so much by its government as by the United States business firms which operate in Venezuela. The reasoning of the United States businessmen follows a sensible line. Venezuela is our second largest Latin American customer and fifth largest customer in the world. Venezuela is currently buying $500 million worth of goods from the United States each year. In addition to this, the profits, dividends, and funds resulting from such associated services (through American-owned firms) as shipping, banking, insurance, construction, manufacturing, and so on, are currently valued at $400 million per year.[1] Thus our relations with Venezuela are worth almost a billion dollars a year. This is an important artery in our economic bloodstream.

A breakdown of the national income of Venezuela ($700 million per year) is most interesting. About two-thirds of this income is derived directly from the petroleum operations within the country. Almost all of the remaining national income can be traced indirectly to oil. A breakdown of government expenditures is also interesting for we find that Venezuela is spending 30 percent of its national income on public works. This is a sizable percentage.

The largest public-works project to be executed by the Government so far is the Autopista, a mountain road leading from the port of La Guaira through the mountains to Caracas. This highway is only 11 miles long but it cost over $6 million per mile. The Government's Ministry of Public Works did the actual roadbuilding. The American firm of Morrison-Knudsen built the 2 tunnels, 1 of which is 5,900 feet long. The French firm of Campenon Bernard built the three prestressed concrete arch bridges. The bridge designs were prepared by the French consulting firm owned by the well-known engineer, Eugene Freyssinat.

The newest large development by foreign capital in Venezuela has been made by the Orinoco Mining Co., a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corp. This task involved the building of 2 complete towns, a complete mining operation, a railroad, and a highway each 90 miles long, a complete port for loading the ore, and vast river works to make the Orinoco River navigable for the ore carriers. United States Steel plans to ship 10 million tons of high-grade ore (about 63.5 percent iron by dry analysis) out of Venezuela each year. This vast construction program required 2 years of high-speed construction and cost the corporation some $150 million.

I have mentioned only two of the many engineering and construction accomplishments. These two have been widely publicized. There will be others for the Venezuelan Government has extensive plans for building roads and railroads throughout a country which can now be traveled conveniently only by airplane. Because of the wet season-dry season type of climate, water is a critical item, especially for the fast growing city of Caracas. More dams, reservoirs, and acqueducts will be needed. Irrigation projects are beginning now that the Government is stressing the development of agriculture in the country. Future release of oil concessions to the many oil companies operating in Venezuela will mean more pipelines, refineries, and port facilities for loading tankers. Engineering and construction should be active in Venezuela for many years to come.

Perhaps this optimistic note of activity will interest some of the younger men who still feel unsettled about their final niche in the engineering world or those who are stirred by the thought of a foreign adventure in engineering. To these men, and to all, I would like to include a few personal comments. There are engineering opportunities in Venezuela and in many other foreign countries. But most of my readers have already realized the wonderful opportunities that our own country offers to those who choose the field of engineering.

There are two groups of engineers in foreign work. First, those who make their homes in the new country, taking their families with them; and those who—with or without their families—have gone overseas to work on a specific assignment or job of known duration. Both groups are represented in Venezuela, but the former is much larger than the latter. This is due to the vast foreign oil company acitivity. These oil companies send all classifications of personnel to Venezuela to live and to occupy the more important positions in their Venezuelan subsidiaries. Those who live in Caracas live in a city as modern for the most part as any city in the United States. These same people, however, realize daily the inconveniences of living in a foreign land. Others live in the many oil camps throughout the country and are subjected to a rather confined existence simply because of their geographical location.

If you are interested in or are considering a foreign assignment, let me emphasize the importance of selecting your employer. If you are going to work overseas, especially on what I think of as a long-term basis, be sure of the company you choose as your employer. Select an organization which has proved itself in foreign work.

In my personal judgment it is equally important that you be sure of yourself. Be certain that you have the moral and spiritual standards needed for your own welfare as well as the knowledge and experience to do your job. This is a point seldom considered important by many people. Perhaps it seems strange that I mention it here. But I mention it because I have seen too many failures due to the lack of these vital standards. Wherever you go, you will be judged as an American. And it sometimes seems that it is rather difficult being an American these days since we are looked upon with such close scrutiny individually and collectively. However, if you lack a natural spirit of patriotism, remember that

[1] The largest percentage of this figure is represented by profits of the Creole Petroleum Corp., a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey. Creole has a gross plant investment in Venezuela based on cost of over $970 million.

as an individual you always have certain responsibilities to yourself.

You will find that your salary will be adjusted upward by a small percentage to compensate for the sacrifices that you will naturally make by working in a foreign land. If you establish a home in a country where high living costs prevail, you will no doubt receive additional financial assistance to counteract this situation. You might find yourself in the midst of a strange language. This will create temporary problems but will also serve to make you appreciate the importance of verbal communication. You will find that you can do things you didn't know you could do * * * and with a lot less than you realized. You might even have to live under some very trying conditions, but this, they say, will make a better man out of you. You certainly will develop patience. The entire experience will cause you to realize and appreciate the greatness of our own United States.

These, then, are the facts along with a bit of personal comment about just one foreign field for engineers. As I have said, there are many such fields. There are opportunities and challenges in all of them. To avoid disappointments, make the final decision yourself. And in the process, walk, don't run. Perhaps you will discover another land of progress—and vital neighbor.

Educational Quality and Scientific Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, science is becoming more and more important in the world in which we live. Whether it be in the home, in the factory, or even in the field, with the constant development of new machines and techniques to do jobs once done by hand, there is a constant and growing emphasis on the need for skilled scientific leaders in every area. Nowhere is this more clearly indicated than in military research and development. Unfortunately, however, we are not developing sufficient leaders in these crucial fields of knowledge and, as a result, we are slowly but surely falling behind the Soviet Union in scientific accomplishment.

Partly to meet this need, I have introduced two bills at this session of the Congress—H. R. 2211 and H. R. 5152—which would help us meet the demand for skilled leaders in the sciences as well as other fields. I am encouraged by the great interest shown in this problem by educational leaders. Most recently a copy of the annual report of the educational testing service was brought to my attention, and in it was an excellent section dealing with this very problem. This organization, which is in constant touch with universities throughout the Nation, fully realizes the importance of developing our scientific leadership. The report emphasizes the great strides being made in the Soviet Union in developing scientists not only in great quantity but with considerable ability as well, and they contrast this with our own lagging programs. In the words of the report:

The Nation's needs for highly trained technological and scientific manpower are increasing at a rate that is five times the rate of increase of the population as a whole. The manpower resources we fail to develop may cost us our survival.

Truly, this states the grave importance of the problem.

I should like to include as a part of my remarks that section of the annual report of the educational testing service which relates to this discussion:

EDUCATIONAL QUALITY AND SCIENTIFIC LEADERSHIP

There is no question but that our safety as a nation depends to a large extent on our scientific progress, and more specifically on our margin of scientific and technological superiority over the U. S. S. R. In a very interesting and far-sighted article published in the Saturday Evening Post a little over a year ago, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley puts the matter pointedly: "Guided missiles, like atomic bombs, have no human loyalties. They obey only the laws of physics and work best for the side that has the best physicists." In analyzing the prospects for our safety as a nation, it is well, however, to recognize three distinct periods in time.

At the present moment and for the next year or two (period I) our fate is being decided on the basis of the scientific and technological developments of the past and on the basis of the wisdom of our present generals and statesmen. Nothing that we as educators can do now can greatly affect the outcome of events during period I.

Our safety in the near future—say, the next five to ten years (period II)—will depend on the success of the efforts currently being made by the scientists and engineers who are now engaged in research and development, and on the wisdom of our leaders during this period. Except for stressing the necessity of giving our scientists and engineers, whether in the Government or in private industry, optimum working conditions, and of ensuring that they are utilized in their most highly skilled capacities, there is again little that we as educators can do to help matters.

But the picture with respect to the somewhat more distant future is quite different. The present stalemate is likely to continue for 20, 30, or even 50 years (period III), and what we do now can and will help to decide the eventual outcome. Certainly at no time during that period do we dare relax and assume good will equal to our own from the other side. There is nothing the Russians have done in the past 10 years that provides convincing evidence they will not attack us if they are sure they can win. Until they furnish such evidence, we let them achieve a position of superiority only at our grave peril.

Manifestly, if we are to maintain our technological superiority throughout the next quarter or half century, our educational system must produce a large number of very able scientists and engineers. Yet the future of America depends also on the quality of leadership available in Government, business, and the professions. If we are to produce more scientists, as we must, and if we are to do so without making undue inroads upon other important specialized fields, we must make fuller use of our raw intellectual resources than we have made in the past.

This is tantamount to saying that the issues will ultimately be decided by the quality of the education we make available to the youngsters now in school and those who will shortly be entering. In speaking of quality of education, I am sure it is apparent that I refer not only to the caliber of instruction provided but also to the appropriateness of this instruction to the potentialities of each individual student. In other words, to provide education of high quality implies, to my mind, that we do nothing less than lay the groundwork for fullest possible development of each individual's cabilities. Our survival in the long run depends on the extent to which we succeed in doing so.

URGENT NEED TO UNCOVER HIGH-LEVEL SCIENTIFIC TALENT

In the article mentioned earlier, General Bradley considers "what sort of safety our country can reasonably hope to achieve in the years ahead." In this connection he states:

"In both atomic defense and deliverability, we come back always to the necessity for increasing our scientific-and-technological lead over the Soviet bloc. * * * Our scientific lead depends on many factors—for example, on the relationship between scientists and the military; on the proper balance between basic research and developmental research; on scientific exchange between ourselves and our allies; and on the ability of our educational system, from junior high upward, to find and encourage scientific talent * * *.

"There is reason to believe that our schools today are tapping only a portion of this precious reservoir of talent. The basic tool of physics is mathematics. I used to teach math at West Point, and know how sketchily the subject is taught in many high schools. If a gifed boy's mathematical ability is never tested, agreat physicist may be lost. Perhaps aptitude tests can be devised which could be given to all high-school students. Those showing high promise could be encouraged in scientific studies. Personally I think the Government, when necessary, should subsidize the education of all students of proved scientific ability. Meanwhile, when scholarships are not available, public-spirited citizens and service clubs could do much to help scientific students recommended by their teachers as especially gifted. The Soviet Union is working more intensively than any other nation in history to develop the scientific talents of its young people. I am sure that Americans can do better, but we must give more thought to it."

There is considerable evidence that the Soviet Union is now training more scientists than we are. According to figures given by Howard A. Meyerhoff, head of the Scientific Manpower Commission, in an interview published in U. S. News & World Report early this year, the Russians are now or will shortly be graduating some 50,000 engineers annually—two and a half times, or more the number we graduated this year. With respect to science students other than engineers, Mr. Meyerhoff's estimate places the number of scientists and technologists graduated in Russia this year at twice the number graduated in the United States.

The day has passed when we could reassure ourselves that this superiority in numbers was being achieved at the expense of quality. Engineering training in Russia, for example, lasts 5 to 5½ years and is based on about 5,000 hours of lectures and classroom and laboratory instruction. To enter a Russian university, the student must pass examinations in as many as three languages, mathematics, physics, and chemistry, in addition to Russian language, literature, and history. The mathematics examination includes not only algebra and geometry, but also some complex number theory, theory of equations, progressions, logarithms, and the binonmial theorem.

President Eric Ashby of Queens University, Belfast, writing in the New York Times magazine (April 18, 1954), warns that it is dangerous to underestimate Russia's technological efforts. Twelve percent of Russia's total

budget in 1953 was spent on education. (Compare this with the 3 percent of our national income that we spend.) There are 33 universities and 887 higher educational establishments for training highly specialized technologists of various kinds, and each year nearly 150,000 graduates are poured into industry and the professions. And in Russia, Dr. Ashby points out, the prestige of engineering and science has been deliberately built up to immense proportions. "Newspaper headlines go to scientists, not to film stars, or football players, or thugs * * * The heroes of schoolboy stories are not spies or detectives but engineers or scientists."

In contrast with such concerted efforts on the part of the U. S. S. R., in the United States the number of engineers and scientists we graduate annually has actually been diminishing since 1949–50. The number of engineering graduates declined from 52,000 in 1949–50 to 19,000 in 1953–54. Although student enrollments in engineering have very recently begun to rise, we will still be graduating only 34,000 engineers a year by 1957. Increases in the number of graduates in chemistry (which dropped from approximately 11,000 in 1949–50 to less than 5,000 this year) will not take place for another year or two, and then only at the bachelor's level. In other fields, such as physics, undergraduate enrollments are still low, with no improvement in prospect.

The situation is even worse at the graduate level. According to Mr. Meyerhoff's figures, we are down to an alltime low with respect to graduate students who are starting careers in science. The total number of these students dropped from close to 12,000 in 1951–52 to 8,000 the following year. On top of this drop there has been what Mr. Meyerhoff refers to as a "disastrous" tightening up in the draft policy with respect to the training of scientists. (From a study of a 3-percent sample of science departments in the country's universities, the Scientific Manpower Commission estimates that since May 1953 we have had about 3,000 science students withdrawn from graduate work and assigned to military service.) The number of students beginning graduate work in science is now less than half the 1951–52 total.

The entire problem is of such grave importance that President Eisenhower has recently supported a Cabinet committee on the training of scientists and engineers. The committee includes the Secretaries of Commerce, of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, and the directors of the Atomic Energy Commission, of the National Science Foundation, and of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

It becomes increasingly urgent to recognize that as a Nation we have tended to be highly prodigal of all our intellectual resources. Less than half of those equal in ability to the average college graduate now enter college, and only about a third actually graduate from college. Even among the top 2 percent of our high-school graduates, only two-thirds are now getting all the way through college. Whereas six or more percent of the population are capable of acquiring a Ph. D. or an M. D., the number earning these degrees at present is less than half of 1 percent of the population.

The Nation's needs for highly trained technological and scientific manpower are increasing at a rate that is 5 times the rate of increase of the population as a whole. The manpower resources we fail to develop may cost us our survival. What can we do to prevent this waste? The systematic use of tests to identify our most talented youth and help insure they receive the kind of education that will enable them to make the best use of their capabilities would seem to be one important and very specific action that can be taken.

Kremlin Agents at Fort Monmouth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by myself which appeared in the National Republic for July. I believe this article will be of interest to all Members of the House and it indicates the method used by Russia to keep informed on United States military matters.

The article follows:

KREMLIN AGENTS AT FORT MONMOUTH

(By Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, United States Representative from Wisconsin)

The American people do not understand how Russia manages to keep abreast of the United States in modern airpower. The answer is suggested in a recent Senate report on subversion and espionage in the Army Signal Corps. As in the days of the atom bomb development, 1941–45, the Kremlin has managed to steal every military secret in aviation radar and electronics, principally through a carefully planned espionage ring centered upon the top secret research and development work carried on at the Army Signal Corps' Fort Monmouth, N. J., radar laboratories. During the years 1942–45, the Kremlin got every new electronic device and invention, almost as fast as it was perfected.

Senate report No. 230, published April 25, 1955, by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations (Committee on Government Operations), delineates the whole picture of Communist infiltration at Fort Monmouth.

"The responsible officials in charge of security matters were grossly negligent and incompetent in failing to take proper action in the cases of individuals where there was information that they were loyalty or security risks," the committee report concludes. "The subcommittee was unable to ascertain from the Army at which echelon the removal of security risks was disapproved."

Espionage reports from the FBI were ignored by the Army Signal Corps.

"The FBI and Army Intelligence repeatedly furnished information to the Army Signal Corps concerning individuals considered to be very dangerous to the security of this country. These loyalty and security risks were retained by the Army Signal Corps after complete facts had been furnished about them. * * * The Rosenberg spy ring successfully penetrated the Army Signal Corps and related private commercial establishments. This espionage ring took and obtained secrets from the Army Signal Corps and transmitted them to the Soviet Union. The operation of the Rosenberg ring, which had as one of its purposes the obtaining of radar secrets for the Soviet Union, may, on the basis of available evidence, still be operating."

The Senate inquiry into Communist espionage in the Army Signal Corps began early in 1953, when Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY was Chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. With organization of the new Senate in 1955 the Democrats took over control of all committees. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN of Arkansas then replaced MCCARTHY as Chairman of Government Operations. The report on subversion and espionage in the Signal Corps covers only the period of the MCCARTHY inquiry. The Democrat members of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations specifically disassociated themselves from Senate Report 230 with the statement "we cannot accept either the credit or responsibility for this report." This statement was signed by Senators MCCLELLAN, JACKSON of Washington, and SYMINGTON of Missouri.

In January 1953, Senator MCCARTHY received a confidential report naming 34 individuals, principally at the Signal Corps Radar Laboratories at Fort Monmouth. These reports were based chiefly on FBI investigations begun in 1947.

The Senate hearings began in August 1953, and continued until March 1954, with 126 witnesses examined in executive session, plus some 200 staff interviews with officials and Army officers. Of the first 126 witnesses examined, 41 invoked the fifth amendment when interrogated on subversive activities and Communist affiliations.

"It was established during the investigations that the Rosenberg spy ring obtained secrets from the Army Signal Corps and transmitted them to Russia. Julius Rosenberg and his wife, Ethel Greenglass Rosenberg, were convicted and executed for conspiracy to commit espionage. Rosenberg successfully used Signal Corps contacts in attempts to obtain contracts for two companies with which he was associated. He made frequent trips to Signal Corps officials in Philadelphia for the dual purpose of obtaining these contracts and seeing his espionage contacts. While Rosenberg was employed at the Army Signal Corps installation at the Emerson Radio Co., he stole the proximity fuse and handed it over to a Russian agent."

The committee named Joel Barr as one member of the Rosenberg spy ring. He had been employed in the radar laboratories at Fort Monmouth and later at the Sperry Gyroscope Co., which was engaged in secret military production. Barr since has fled the United States and "is reported to be living behind the Iron Curtain."

Another member of the Rosenberg spy ring and a close Barr associate was Vivian Glassman, wife of Ernest Pataki, a former employee of the Federal Telecommunications Laboratory, at Nutley, N. J. Pataki was identified as "a member of the secret Communist Party cell, which operated at the laboratories." A third civil employee identified as a member of the Rosenberg spy ring at Fort Monmouth was Alfred Sarant. He too since has fled the country and is now reported to be living behind the Iron Curtain.

Morton Sobell, a fourth member of the Rosenberg apparatus is now serving a 30-year prison sentence for conspiracy to commit espionage. He had been employed by the Reeves Instrument Corp. which was engaged in classified work for the Army Signal Corps. "It was determined that the operation of the Rosenberg spy ring, which had as its purpose the obtaining of radar secrets for Russia, never stopped and could possibly be continuing to this very day," the committee report continues (p. 3).

David Greenglass, brother of Rosenberg's wife, was interviewed by members of the McCarthy subcommittee in the penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pa., where he is now serving a 15-year term for his connection with the Rosenberg conspiracy. This interview was held on November 24, 1953. It inquired into the Kremlin conspiracy to steal the atomic-bomb secrets. At one point the committee asked Greenglass. "Did you give atomic secrets to Rosenberg and to Henry Gold for transmission to Russia?"

"Yes, when I was stationed at Los Alamos at the atomic-bomb project, I passed sketches and other information on the bomb to Rosenberg and to Gold at their request."

At another point Greenglass related that Rosenberg had admitted to him in conversation that while he was employed by the

Signal Corps at Emerson Radio Co. "he stole the proximity fuse and gave it to the Russians (p. 4).

This espionage ring later transmitted to Russia the basic secrets of the United States guided missile program.

The committee report reveals that some of these basic defense secrets were stolen as long ago as 1937–39.

The report names 18 employees of the Federal Telecommunications Laboratories at Nutley, N. J., as members of the Communist Party cell in that operation.

The report also reveals that a special unit of the Communist Party, called the Shore club, was organized in Monmouth County, N. J., "for the specific purpose of infiltrating the secret Army Signal Corps Laboratories at Fort Monmouth."

Andrew J. Reid, who had been attached to the security office at Fort Monmouth for 13 years, told the committee he had repeatedly furnished his superiors the names of many employees he considered very dangerous. But nothing happened. The suspected employees were kept on year after year.

One member of the Rosenberg group had been employed at Fort Monmouth for 15 years. His wife, when finally obtained by the Senate committee, showed that as early as 1946 he had been charged with having 43 classified documents belonging to the Army Signal Corps in his private apartment. For this gross violation of security he had been suspended for 10 days. Later he was promoted to be chief of one of the most important radar sections at Fort Monmouth.

After examining this personnel file at Fort Monmouth the Senate committee asked the Army for a complete photostatic copy of the record. Some days later when the photostats were delivered "it was discovered that the Army had removed certain documents," before transmitting the personnel file to the committee.

Aaron Coleman, the principal covered in this personnel file, was identified in the report as having attended a meeting of the Young Communist League with Julius Rosenberg in 1937.

"Who took you to the meeting of the Young Communist League?" Coleman was asked.

"Rosenberg," he responded.

Coleman and Rosenberg had been students together at the College of the City of New York, where both had been active in the Young Communist League, along with Morton Sobell, Joel Barr, Henry Nathan Sholket and Morris Savitsky.

Three employees of the Federal Telecommunications Laboratories at Nutley, N. J., testified it was common knowledge around that plant that Harry Hyman, another employee, "was connected with the Communist Party." During his examination by the committee, Hyman invoked the Fifth Amendment more than 50 times.

Another witness disclosed that Hyman had made "several hundred telephone calls" from his New Jersey base to Army Signal Corps employees in such widely scattered installations as the Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Md., Fairchild Airplane Corporation, Farmingdale, N. Y., Navy Air Rocket Testing Station, Dover, N. J., Air Force Transportation Depot, Newark, N. J., and the Electronics Research Associates, North Caldwell, N. J. In response to questions about these calls, Hyman in each case invoked the fifth amendment.

The Senate committee staff document 76 phone calls from Hyman to the Federal Telecommunications Laboratories, alone, during 1952–53.

Questioned about these numerous calls, Hyman repeatedly invoked the Fifth Amendment.

Ruth Weiner Levine, who had been employed by the Federal Telecommunications Laboratories more than ten years, appeared before the committee on December 11, 1953. She had been granted a top-secret clearance by the United States Air Force on March 29, 1950. This clearance gave her access to drawings and diagrams of all the secret projects under way at Nutley. Three witnesses identified Miss Levine as an active member of the Communist Party cell which operated in the FTL at Nutley. She invoked the fifth amendment on all questions relating to Communist activities and affiliations.

Albert Shadowitz, a former employee at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md., and the Federal Telecommunication Laboratories at Nutley, had been exempted from military service in World War II because of the importance of his classified work in radar. In invoking the fifth amendment, Shadowitz told the Senate committee he did so on the personal advice of the late Dr. Albert Einstein, who had advised him "not to cooperate with this or any other committee of a similar nature." Under Federal indictment for his refusal to answer committee questions, Shadowitz's trial now is pending.

To date 35 employees of the Army Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth have been suspended on security grounds. Eleven other workers in private-enterprise establishments engaged in top-secret military production, including General Electric, Zenith Engineering, Kay Electric, Arma Corp., and others, have been suspended, discharged, or have resigned, following publication of the subcommittee hearings. The security system at the Federal Telecommunications Laboratories has been reorganized from top to bottom.

Within 2 weeks of the beginning of the Senate committee's inquiry into Communist espionage at Fort Monmouth, a long overdue cleanup began.

While this effort apparently has not been pushed with enthusiastic vigor by the Signal Corps, the Senate report serves at least to apprise the Nation on one vital point in current history—how the Russian Air Force gained all our most prized military secrets in radar and aviation electronics.

Future historians one day will trace out precisely who was responsible for this egregious act of treason and betrayal within the Army Signal Corps.

Test of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "A Bus Strike Tests Free Enterprise."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BUS STRIKE TESTS FREE ENTERPRISE

Except for the natural sympathy that goes out to people of a city with a bus strike, it might be said that the paralysis in Washington, D. C., has a valuable side.

Everything in the case is bigger than life. Problems of public transportation, familiar to every community today, are dramatically highlighted, for this is Washington. They—and no less the essentials of free enterprise—are set, as it were, before the eyes of the world.

Nowhere else could there be voices so stentorian and far reaching to demand redress of evils which are general as well as particular. The forum is no remote and dusty city hall but the floor of Congress.

Nor has ever an object lesson in corporate irresponsibility toward the public been defined with so extraordinary sharpness. There is not even a local ogre to be anathematized, but a national celebrity of high financial operations. None other than Louis E. Wolfson, the youthful apostle of dividends first, who recently tangled with Sewell Avery over control of Montgomery Ward.

Out of all this is bound to come a sort of laboratory research that could bring some guides to a more solid future for public transportation. Already a record of private exploitation of public necessity has been paraded before the eyes of Washington. It seems pointed to the question whether bus lines are properly fields for operations in high finance or for public service as a first consideration.

What is the essential nature of the industry? Congress, which after all is the final governmental authority in the politically neuter District of Columbia, rings with talk of getting at the bottom of the matter. Proposals range from outright seizure of the system to cancelling the franchise and getting a new management.

The situation is complicated, as is the whole case of public transportation. The strike comes of the workers' demand for a pay raise and fringe benefits. The company refused, saying that current earnings will not support a raise. Strictly speaking, this may be the case. But in the revelations of management policy the matter of current operations is shoved aside. Out in the open comes evidence that the company, the Capital Transit Co., has been consistently milked since the Wolfson interests bought control in 1949.

Grant that current earnings will not support a pay raise. A study by the Washington Post and Times Herald shows that in 3 of the 5 years under Wolfson control, dividends in excess of net earnings were paid. A surplus of $6,036,666 in 1950, the reported study finds, had dwindled to $2,247,912. On an investment of $2,200,000 for stock control, the Wolfson syndicate is reported to have drawn $5,300,000 in cash and stock dividends and from sale of stock, and still owns 28 percent of stock valued at $2,700,000. Mr. Wolfson is chairman of CTC's board of directors.

Many things indeed could come out of this as to policies of regulation and a statement of principles of responsibility in this field of industrial and capital operations. There may be a question about the alertness of the District's regulatory body. But first and last the question concerns primary obligations imposed by the grant of a public franchise. The answers, which it is hoped Congress will seek out rather than resort to the unconstructive solution of seizure and operation in a vacuum of law, should have a meaning to every community in the land.

United States Fighters in Foreign Jails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of House Resolution 319, I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial en-

titled "United States Fighters in Foreign Jails," which appears in the July 11, 1955, edition of the New York Daily News, and the hearing to be held on these resolutions by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on Wednesday, July 13, 1955.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the aforementioned editorial:

UNITED STATES FIGHTERS IN FOREIGN JAILS

"Please," Mr. James K. Farr writes us from Ridgewood, N. J., "sock the status of forces treaty soon and hard."

Delighted to oblige in this instance. We're especially glad to do so because a House Foreign Affairs Commitee open hearing on a proposal concerning this treaty is scheduled for day after tomorrow.

Of that, more below. What is the Status of Forces Treaty, anyway?

It was entered into 2 years ago by the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), with President Eisenhower strongly for it and insisting that no harm would come of it. The United States, of course, is a prominent member of NATO.

What the treaty provides is that if a member of nation A's armed forces commits a nonmilitary felony or misdemeanor on nation B's territory, he can be prosecuted in B's courts under B's laws and stashed away in one of B's jails.

Since the treaty was ratified, similar agreements have been entered into by the United States with at least three non-NATO countries—Japan, Libya, and Saudi Arabia.

Things have not worked out so happily under this arrangement as General Eisenhower expected.

THE CASE OF PRIVATE KEEFE

As of last February 1, there had been 7,416 cases of United States fighting men being pinched by foreign cops on foreign-soil. In all but 178 of these, the foreign nations had waived their right to prosecute, and had let our military authorities proceed as they saw fit.

But regarding the other 178 cases, the Defense Department has stated that, as of February 10, 1955, 58 United States servicemen were sweating out sentences ranging up to 15 years in the jails of five foreign countries.

The most famous—or infamous—of these affairs is the case of Pvt. Richard T. Keefe. Private Keefe, stationed with United States forces near Orleans, France, in the fall of 1953, got tanked one night and drove off in a French taxi which wasn't his. He shouldn't have done it; true. But he was grabbed by French police, tried in a French court, and dealt the savage (from the American point of view) sentence of 5 years in a notoriously tough French jail at Orleans.

Last February 28, our own United States Supreme Court ruled that Keefe's tragedy was perfectly legal, and refused his wife's heartbroken appeal that something be done about it.

The big objection to the Status of Forces Treaty is this: Every nation's criminal laws differ from every other nation's. Our own are among the most advanced in the world, with the accused's rights safeguarded at every turn—some say too much so.

JAPANESE JUSTICE

When the United States bought the status of forces treaty, it sold out some of the constitutional rights of its fighting men when they are on the territory of any nation party to this or similar agreements.

So, in Japan, for example, when one of our boys goes on trial in a local court, he runs into such treatment as this: Over-long trial, charges made known to him on day of trial, not before, court-appointed defense lawyer unable to speak English, His Honor the Japanese judge sleeping soundly during the trial.

Any one of these things, under United States laws, would be a violation of the accused's lawful rights. He doesn't even rate an apology for them in the Japanese courts.

LET'S TORPEDO THIS INJUSTICE

About the abovementioned Foreign Affairs Committee hearing set for Wednesday: It is to be on a resolution, sponsored by Representatives FRANK T. BOW, Republican of Ohio, and HAMER H. BUDGE, Republican of Idaho, which would direct President Eisenhower to start negotiations with the other NATO nations for radical changes in the status of forces treaty.

Failing to get such changes, the President would be empowered to pull the United States out of NATO.

To Representatives Bow and BUDGE, we wish good hunting; also to those expected to speak for the resolution at this hearing—among them, representatives of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

In our opinion, the sooner this treaty is torpedoed the better, and we don't much care how the torpedo job is accomplished.

The Aztec Land & Cattle Co. Case—A National Forestry Issue at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article contained in the June 16 issue of What's Happening in Forestry, published by Albert G. Hall of Washington, D. C. This article is a discussion of the issues at stake in the Aztec Land & Cattle Co. case. I feel, as does Mr. Hall, that the proposed legislation authorizing the Federal Government to purchase land from the Aztec Land & Cattle Co. is unjustified and represents an unwarranted Federal acquisition of private forest lands. The article reads as follows:

A NATIONAL FORESTRY ISCUE AT STAKE IN THE AZTEC LAND & CATTLE CO. CASE?

In 1866 the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad (now the Santa Fe) received a Federal land grant for the construction of a railroad from Missouri to the Pacific. Twenty years later the Aztec Land & Cattle Co. purchased rights to a million acres of this land grant in Arizona and New Mexico. Purchase price was $500,000. In 1898 the Federal Government withdrew certain lands in Arizona which became the Sitgreaves and Coconino National Forests. Included in the withdrawal were 98,690 acres claimed by Aztec. But it was not until 1940 that these lands were surveyed, making it poossible for Aztec to lay legal claim to its land. The Federal Government repeatedly contested this claim in the courts, but in 1952, by a ruling of the United States Supreme Court, title was lodged with Aztec. Land patents are now being issued. Aztec has expressed its willingness to sell the lands.

Senators HAYDEN and GOLDWATER and Representative RHODES and UDALL, all of Arizona, have introduced legislation to authorize the Federal Government to purchase the 98,690 acres for $7,400,000. The lands are intermingled with national forest lands, and have over a half-billion feet of the best ponderosa pine timber in Arizona, plus a valuable grazing range. The Senate has passed the Hayden-Goldwater bill, with an amendment, and a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported favorably on the companion measure.

There are those, however, who believe a national issue is at stake and who are opposing the measure. They point out that 84 percent of Arizona is owned or controlled by government—Federal and State; that the Federal Government has a virtual monopoly on the timber-growing business there; that the lands can be managed as well or better by private enterprise; that if the lands really need to be consolidated with other Federal lands this should be done through a land exchange or other alternatives rather than by direct purchase. They say that if the people of Arizona want public ownership let the State acquire the lands; that the Federal purchase of private commercial forest land should stop.

What of the administration? This administration has repeatedly opposed enlargement of the Federal estate. It went on record in both 1954 and 1955 against further appropriations for national forest land acquisition. However, the administration now says that it has no objection to the proposed legislation because of special circumstances involved.

How does it look to What's Happening? A spokesman for the administration at the hearings on the measure stated that if the lands were to remain in private ownership they would be cutover, the timber liquidated, and eventually would revert to public ownership. Is this one of the special circumstances? It appears to us to be prejudgement unworthy of an administration that takes pride in its faith in private enterprise. Is this a new argument which may be used in other areas for special legislation or to get around stated administration policy? If the Aztec land disposition is a local or State problem, should the Federal Government come in to buy up a local problem; and if so, how far-reaching will such a policy be? Private forestry enterterprise may suffer a decided defeat and the door may be opened for more acquisitions under similar "special circumstances" if the Aztec bill becomes law.

Refugees Wait and Hope and Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article by Daniel L. Schorr in the Christian Science Monitor on July 6. The refugee problem is brought into sharp focus here and deserves the attention of every Member of this body. There is no need to belabor the point that our refugee relief program needs drastic overhauling and revising. For that reason, I, along with other Members of the Congress, have sought these changes. The problems of broken families separated by our strict, unrealistic and unyielding immigration laws is an everyday occurence in my district. It is, therefore, easy to understand why I, or any other elected Representative from that great constituency, take to heart the human misery and loneliness

of the world's refugees. As a leader in the free world's struggle for universal expression of the principles of humanitarianism and freedom, we, as Americans, owe it to our heritage and our conscience to extend a helping hand to those who have been expelled by the horrors of war and the threats of totalitarianism.

The article follows:

REFUGEES WAIT AND HOPE AND WAIT

(By Daniel L. Schorr)

ATHENS.—The men and women who brave minefields and barbed wire, trek through mountain passes, hide in freight cars or seize airplanes in midair to break through the Iron Curtain get headlines and heroes' welcomes—deservedly. But the glare of publicity thrown on the escapees tends to obscure, for Americans, the real nature of the European refugee problem.

Recently we toured refugee centers in four countries—Germany, Austria, Turkey, and Greece—ending up here in Athens, in the shadow of the Acropolis, whose ruins compare favorably with some of the refugee habitations we saw.

The escapees are, in a sense, the aristocrats of the refugee camps. They get the glad-hand, the toilet kits, the food parcels. They are lodged in the best-appointed of the camps—those operated by the United States escapee program, which are luxurious in comparison with others we saw. They get aid and counsel and first call on emigration.

But these USEP cases, persons who left Communist countries for political reasons since January 1, 1948, are a minute part of the refugee problem. Only a trickle of a few hundred monthly now seeps through the Iron Curtain. The escapees, usually young and fit, integrate easily or are readily absorbed as emigrants.

But in Athens we were told of a shipload of fugitives from Albania who reached Corfu on December 29, 1947. And because they were 3 drays too early to quality as escapees under the American law, they get no special treatment. They are among the hundreds of thousands of other refugees. They missed the boat; or, more accurately, they would have been better off had they missed that particular boat.

We cite this case only to dramatize the deadline set by United States law. The heart of the refugee problem is not the fugitives in the cold war, but the orphans of older storms—the backwash of World War II, and some who even date back to the Bolshevist revolution of 1917.

A MILLION REFUGEES

There are today about a million refugees on the Continent. (This does not include Germans fleeing from the Soviet zone to West Germany and others who receive citizenship rights.) Of the million, the refugee problem narrows down to about 300,000 who still lack adequate housing or jobs. Of these about 80,000 live in camps. Some of the camps are unbelievably squalid. The best of them are still camps.

Many of these people have lived as refugees for as long as 10 years. The time element is important, for as time passes the feeling of homelessness and unwantedness grows. The refugee has seen others emigrate or get jobs in the countries of asylum and settle down. As application after application is turned down, as year after year passes in idleness, the refugee mentality takes hold—a deep sense of rejection.

Some are treated almost as pariahs. Turkey, for instance, refuses to take any official notice of the 1,000 foreign refugees within its borders because its Government is already burdened with a quarter-million persons of Turkish extraction expelled from Soviet Turkestan and Greece. The exile has no official right there to work, or even to marry. Some work illegally at starvation wages—black labor, it is called.

At Camp Valka, West German transit camp at Nuremburg, where refugees are supposed to be screened before being sent on to other camps, we found 300 Eastern Europeans who have been refused official refugee status for various technical reasons. Some came through Austria; thus, Germany is not the country of first asylum and need not extend recognition. Some, on interrogation, made the fatal error of indicating hopes for better jobs than they had behind the Iron Curtain; thus, the West German authorities can say they are economic, not political, fugitives.

But these fugitives who do not even make the grade as refugees are not allowed to work. They have no official existence at all. They are simply stuck in Camp Valka until some country will accept them. Or until, out of anger and despair, they will commit some offense that lands them in jail.

The refugee problem is a variety of different situations, bewildering in their complexity—some with old roots, a few with roots that are ancient, indeed.

Near Athens live several hundred Assyrians resisting integration, refusing emigration. For them Greece is the end of a long, tortured line of history that finally cast them up in this country from behind the Iron Curtain. They live in thoughts of the ancient glory of Nineveh, and their patriarch, who shines shoes for a living, says their aim is a rebirth of the Assyrian State.

In Ingolstadt, a dilapidated former army barracks in southern Bavaria, live a handful of Kalmucks, last remnants of the Tartar hordes of Genghis Khan. Buffeted by history and oppressed by Soviet communism, they have now found a haven in Germany. And at Ingolstadt, an object of curiosity of the other refugees, they turn their Buddhist prayer wheels, close their eyes, and shut out this world they do not understand.

FITTEST EMIGRATE

Slowly, the refugee problem narrows down. The population of the camps has been reduced by some 25,000 in the past 3 years. The fittest and most useful are chosen—for jobs in Germany, in Austria, or for emigration. The others wait in various states of anxiety and numb resignation. And the longer they wait, the more difficult they become as cases.

After some more culling and sifting, it is likely that many thousands will be left—the rejected and unwanted, on grounds of age, health, inability to integrate, suspicion of being a security risk, or any of the countless disabilities that can serve to tie a refugee to his present surroundings.

The countries of asylum are anxious to be rid of these refugees who are considered economically not useful. After all, the authorities argue, why should West Germany and Austria be penalized for being on the front line of the cold war? Shouldn't this problem be one for all the Western nations, perhaps a parceling out of the refugees on an agreed ratio?

Another viewpoint is that these refugees were mostly created by the results of Nazi aggression, and so the problem should be solved by those who created it.

But, while the buck is passed back and forth, the refugee continues to wait—amid squalor and hopelessness, barely kept alive. (In Greece, we were told that distribution of American surplus food parcels was held up because the Greek authorities felt that any too great improvement in the refugees' diet might encourage them to stay. Representatives of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees were taking vigorous action to get the parcels released.)

As the hard core of the refugee problem is approached, it becomes increasingly clear that it will have to be confronted almost as a direct humanitarian problem. After the cream is skimmed off by the overseas countries looking for fit young people, there will still be the others. And it may be dangerous to ignore the others, for things are not standing still in Europe today—not even in the refugee camps.

The Third Anniversary of Eisenhower's Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning a statement was presented to President Eisenhower citing the outstanding accomplishments of his administration, and urging him to run for a second term. As many of us know, today marks the third anniversary of his nomination to the Presidency.

This statement was signed by 54 Republican Members of the House representing all those first elected in the 83d or 84th Congresses. They come from 25 different States, representing 294 electoral votes. Without doubt, virtually all Republicans presently serving in the Congress—and millions of Americans throughout the Nation—subscribe to these views.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statement which was presented to the President, together with the names of those who signed:

UNANIMOUS STATEMENT BY 54 REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, ELECTED IN OR SINCE 1952, ISSUED ON THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S NOMINATION BY THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, JULY 11, 1955

The undersigned, Republican Members of the House of Representatives, wish to take this occasion—the third anniversary of Dwight D. Eisenhower's nomination to the Presidency—to call attention to the outstanding accomplishments of his administration, and urge that he seek a second term of office.

All of us were elected to office at the time of, or after, the election of President Eisenhower in November 1952. We are confident that our views reflect the sentiment of virtually all Republican Members of Congress.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected President in 1952 by an overwhelming majority of the American people because they believed him to be uniquely qualified to lead our country in a time of crisis. Under his leadership the Republican Party has brought peace and prosperity to the United States, and hope and confidence to our people.

These are tremendous accomplishments, but the job President Eisenhower agreed to undertake is not yet finished. To solidify our gains and complete our program, we Republican Members of Congress believe President Eisenhower should remain in office for a second term.

In the atomic age, when one faulty decision could prove disastrous, it is vital that our Nation be led by a man with great experience in the international field and one who possesses patience, firmness, understanding, and courage.

Under President Eisenhower's great leadership America's defenses have been strenthened and the cause of world peace has been advanced.

At home, the Republican Party under President Eisenhower has advanced a pro-

gram which has brought America unprecedented economic stability and prosperity. American workers have more jobs, at better pay, than at any time in our history.

Because of this exceptional progress, and the promise which continuation of his leadership holds for our people and the free world, we most earnestly hope that President Eisenhower will seek reelection. We are confident that upon consideration of all the factors he will not refuse his country's call.

ALGER, Texas; AVERY, Kansas; BALDWIN, California; BASS, New Hampshire; BAUMHART, Ohio; BECKER, New York; BENTLEY, Michigan; BOLTON, O., Ohio; BOSCH, New York; BROYHILL, Virginia; CEDERBERG, Michigan; CHASE, Nebraska; COON, Oregon; CRAMER, Florida; CRETELLA, Connecticut; CURTIS, Massachusetts; DEROUNIAN, New York; DIXON, Utah; DORN, New York; FINO, New York; FJARE, Montana; FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey; GUBSER, California; HENDERSON, Ohio; HIESTAND, California; HOLT, California; HOSMER, California; HYDE, Maryland; JOHANSEN, Michigan; JONAS, North Carolina; KNOX, Michigan; KRUEGER, North Dakota; LAIRD, Wisconsin; LIPSCOMB, California; MAILLIARD, California; MINSHALL, Ohio; PELLY, Washington; PILLION, New York; POFF, Virginia; RAY, New York; RHODES, Arizona; ROBSION, Kentucky; SCHERER, Ohio; SCHWENGEL, Iowa; SILER, Kentucky; TEAGUE, California; THOMSON, Wyoming; UTT, California; WAINWRIGHT, New York, WEAVER, Nebraska; WESTLAND, Washington; WILSON, California; YOUNG, Nevada; YOUNGER, California.

Out of Bondage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared today in the New York Times. It deals with the three American soldiers who were prisoners of war, apparently embraced Chinese Communist philosophy, and then appear to have changed their minds again.

In view of the many reports of the brainwashing of prisoners of war by the Communists, it is my considered opinion that the time has come for us to reappraise our approach to the vexing problem of combatting this attack on our American prisoners of war, and of the punishment of our soldiers when they return.

In line with the foregoing, I am accordingly writing today to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, urging a full and comprehensive study of this disturbing situation:

The editorial follows:

OUT OF BONDAGE

Three Americans who were prisoners of the Chinese Communists and first chose to remain with the Reds have changed their minds and are on their way back to the United States. They face trial and possible punishment. They know that this is the case, but state that even this is better than life under the Communists.

In their actions and in their statements, however, there is the constant sign of deep inner confusion. These young men may never willfully have done anything they thought wrong. They obviously did something that they now believe to have been mistaken if not downright stupid. They may have to pay a not inconsiderable price for this blundering.

At the same time they pose another aspect of the whole prisoner problem to us. Our old conceptions of the prisoner of war are manifestly outdated, and we are in need of new techniques to meet a new situation. The Communists make war not merely on men's bodies but on their minds. These three young men were, for a time at least, not merely physical prisoners but mental prisoners. Some of that imprisonment probably started before they were actually taken captive. They were obviously susceptible.

Something might have been done to prevent that susceptibility. Something can be done now to prevent its repetition.

Our attitude toward these confused young men who are trying to get themselves straightened out should certainly not be vengeful. If they are guilty of crimes they should be punished for them just as any other criminal should be punished.

At the same time we should make an unusual effort to study them and their case. Perhaps they can help us. We need to know not merely what they did but why they did it. We need to know what made them make the first decision as well as to know what made them change their minds. This calls for thorough and thoughtful and sympathetic investigation and not merely for vigorous prosecution.

Prosperity for 1956, Too?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article by William H. Stringer from the July 6 Christian Science Monitor. I ask that particular attention to these comments be paid by the peddlers of gloom and doom who were so prevalent before inadvertently finding their hollow works echoed painfully in a year of unparalleled peacetime prosperity.

Let the Democrat propagandists try to keep alive their incoherent babblings over the so-called special interest Eisenhower administration and the party of economic royalists. It will be difficult for them to find a weapon to counteract the prevailing high employment figures, increasing wages, unprecedented consumer spending and a virtually stable cost of living index all which point to better living for more Americans and a sunny outlook for 1956.

The article follows:

PROSPERITY FOR 1956, TOO?

(By William H. Stringer)

Washington.—Stand back and have a look at the bom year of 1955.

The official forecast from the Commerce Department now confirms economists' forecasts: that the American economy which has been smashing a goodly number of peacetime records in the first half of 1955 will carry right on through the second half to make this the Nation's top year in production, sales, and general prosperity.

The question which politicians, and particularly the Republicans of this businessman's administration, are asking is: How long will the boom last? Will it continue full-steam through November, 1956? To which the economists, in these days of unprecedented production, spending, borrowing, automation, stock market advances, and steadily kiting standards of living, cannot give a full and documented reply. It is almost as if we had run off the map of the old boom-and-bust business charts.

Certainly the prosperity is evident. Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks estimates that auto production, the pace setter, will exceed in 1955 the production record of 1950, which was more than 6.6 million cars. Construction will reach a dollar volume of $41.8 billion. Two billion dollars ahead of 1954 forecasts. The steel mills poured some 57.3 million tons of metal in the first 6 months, close to another record. Gross national product—the total national output in goods and services—climbed to an annual rate of $375 billion at the end of the half year, as compared with the previous high of 371 billions in the second quarter of 1953.

This is prosperity without war spending. It is widely dispersed properity. The average citizen could stand having more of the gains from increased mechanization passed to him in lower prices, instead of being passed to the workers in the form of higher wages. Even so, consumers are buying most everything faster than ever. Two major strike threats, in autos and steel, have been settled with hardly a break in production. There is plenty of vitality in the free-enterprise system, enough to convince any doubters but the Communists.

Indeed it might be a useful thing if, after the contingent of Soviet farmers has made its visit to Iowa to study corn production, a group of Soviet economists should be invited to the United States to see for themselves the operation of the free-enterprise system. The group might include the Hungarian-born Eugene Varga, the celebrated Soviet economist, who was censured for the independent belief that perhaps the capitalist system wasn't going to collapse after all—and eventually was reinstated in favor.

This prosperity looks awfully good. Most economists, though, are keeping watch of three factors, any of which could pose special dangers:

1. The ballooning credit picture. Installment buying has rolled up over $24.1 billion worth of debt. Mortgage debt has climbed to between $75 and $80 billion. Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey has warned everyone, Government included, against this exuberant credit mania. A slight recession and reduced income would be drastic for many of those deeply in installment debt.

2. The possible inflationary impact of the strike settlements in autos, steel, and elsewhere. Will the "20 cents an hour plus" gained by the auto workers be reflected in the price of new cars—and will this cut into car sales appreciably and set back production? Or will the increased costs be absorbed by increased mechanization?

3. The stock market's steady advance, despite increased margin requirements. What does this climb, beyond the heights of 1929, really mean? Is it merely a reflection of confidence in the prosperity picture? How tender a plant is the booming market?

There are bold forecasters who say the 1955 boom will carry right on through 1956 without letup. There are others who won't predict. Perhaps a key factor is the remarkable ability which the American economy has displayed for absorbing successive wage increases without pushing up prices too dras-

tically. Factor wages have risen 71 percent since 1946, yet the cost of living for the moderate-income city family has gone up only half as much.

In short, there has been boom with controlled inflation. For 2 years now the cost-of-living index has remained virtually stable on its high plateau. If this happy situation would only be made to continue amid the wage increases, then the Republicans would indeed get their wish: a superprosperous 1956.

Relief for Schoolteachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made on Senate bill 1505 before the District of Columbia Committee earlier this year when that bill was before the committee for consideration. I wish very frankly to state my reasons for asking its insertion in the RECORD. A group of persons very much interested in the principles which I supported on that occasion and in the objectives of my bill would like to have the statement I made in committee more widely distributed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE ON S. 1505

I have a speech to make on the Senate floor, and I would like to take about 5 minutes to testify in behalf of my bill, and discuss it on the floor of the Senate.

I have only a few points I want to make in support of S. 1505.

Let me make very clear, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, that the objectives of S. 1093 find no opposition from me.

I try, however, to be a legislative realist, and you develop on this job somewhat of a legislative intuition or hunch, and I would like to have the next few weeks prove me wrong on this hunch.

It is my judgment that you are not going to get S. 1093 through this session of Congress, because when you come in with a bill as complex as S. 1093, and it goes into the whole question of classification, you do not do that the first time you step up to bat, and we have an emergency problem in regard to the teacher situation in the District of Columbia, in my judgment.

That is why I introduced S. 1505, and there is nothing about S. 1505 that cannot go along with the longtime objective of S. 1093.

But we need some immediate relief for these teachers. I testify, gentlemen, in several capacities; not only as a Member of the Senate, but as a past president of a parent-teachers group, and as one who taught for 21 years, and I want to call attention to what I think is a very great teacher problem in the United States.

We need not only in the District of Columbia but we need in other parts of the country some stopgap action, in order to stop the present loss of teacher personnel and in order to provide a greater inducement for able people to come into the teaching profession.

The morale of the teachers is not high—and why should it be—because we are not paying, in my judgment, the salaries that ought to be paid.

I think the salary situation in the District of Columbia has become so notorious that the first stopgap action we ought to take immediately is to simply say, "Listen, we are going to give you the preparation for your next year's pay check, a blanket $600 increase; not that we think that is enough, not that we think, that is the final answer, but we are going to give that to you immediately, and then we are going to continue to consider other needs of improvement in the educational system in the District so that we can make it a model setup or somewhere near a model setup for the Nation."

I think, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, that you are just confronted with that emergency situation in the District.

Furthermore, let me say that in my bill it closes somewhat the gap between the salaries of the administrative officers and teachers, and I think that needs to be done. I do not think we need the teachers to say that, and the administrators will not say that and, of course, the whole trend is the other way.

Yet the educational job is not being done by the administrators primarily; it is being done by the man and the woman in the classroom. They are the ones who are performing the fundamental educational service for the parents of America.

I think it is a mistake to let this disparity between so-called administrator salaries and teacher salaries continue to widen.

I was an administrator in an institution of higher learning, but I took the position in the operation of the college of which I was dean that that should not be this disparity between the teachers and the administrative officers.

I think it is a mistake that is being made in the American educational system. I do not think that administrators need a great bracket of difference between their salaries and teachers in order to maintain their prestige, and I do not think the service they render is worth at least as great a difference as we are paying them.

I think the money ought to go in greater amounts to the teachers who are the ones that are really giving our boys and girls the education they need.

I want to stress, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, the importance of spending money on teachers' salaries. To use an argument with an analogy, I want to stress it as a sound expenditure of defense dollars.

We do not think anything about paying $200 million for a Forrestal carrier. We do not think anything about paying $1 million for a jet bomber. We do not think anything about paying a good many millions of dollars by way of military aid to some ally. I am for those expenditures; I have voted for them. I have never, and never will as long as the world situation is what it is, vote to cut expenditures in the national defense. I think we ought to be spending more, not less, if we are going to protect our country.

What I want to emphasize is that we also need to keep our eyes on some other ideals, and that is we are going to keep ahead of Russia only to the extent that we keep ahead of her in brainpower; and you cannot put a dollar value on a nuclear physicist.

You cannot put a dollar value on a biochemist. You cannot put a dollar value on any trained mind in any discipline. But the fact is we are wasting brainpower in this country.

We, Mr. Chairman and Senator BEALL, are denying right today in America thousands of American boys and girls a college education. There are thousands of American boys and girls—this has been going on for some years past—who are not getting a college education because we are not qualifying them for a college education. We are not giving them the training in grade schools and high schools that make it possible in many parts of this country to meet the capacity tests for college training.

That is an inexcusable waste of American brainpower. The cause of it, the chief cause of it, is that we are not giving the support to the schools and to the teachers to which they are entitled in order to train this brainpower.

When you, in various parts of the country, have boys and girls in grade schools going a short half day in school, in many high schools in this country, going a short half day to high school, and with all of your supplementary techniques of homework, and so on, the fact is they are getting discouraged as far as pursuing a higher education is concerned, and I do not know how many nuclear physicists we are losing.

I do not know how many biochemists we are losing; but we are losing a great number of trained minds, and we need them.

I think it is a parsimonious policy on the part of our country to fail to recognize that when you spend dollars for teachers' salaries, you are spending defense dollars.

I think those dollars will probably develop as much for the defense of our country as a *Forrestal* carrier will.

But, you see, the difficulty is to get the people to understand that. When you talk the way I am talking now, you are talking in the abstract; you are talking in terms of idealism, and many people do not see that the only practicalities we have, after all, are putting those ideals to work.

It seems to me the only answer to my bill on the negative side deserving of attention is the answer to the question, is there a need in the District of Columbia today for an increase in the salaries of our teachers in order to hold those that we have got, in order to induce those that we need.

If anybody can argue there is not, then they ought to vote against my bill. But if they admit my major premise then let us start with this as a stopgap.

We simply say just as an inducement, as an employment inducement, as a good employer relationship, "We offer you $600 for this next year, and we do not want you to feel that we are stopping with that. But we are going to hand out this $600 as a bonus inducement to get you to stay on the payroll or to come in, if we are trying to get you under contract," and we need that in this District.

We can go on, and you will find me in your corner when you come to wanting to get bills through for other improvements in the educational system of the District of Columbia.

I did not serve for 2 years out here at the Alice Deal High School as president of that parent-teacher group, not to learn something about the situation in our District schools.

It is not good; and this Congress has not anything particularly to be proud about in regard to the District of Columbia school system at the present time, and it is not the fault of the administrators. It is the fault of Congress.

We are the school board really, and simply suggest as a school-board member that we start out here with a $600 bonus, so-called, and then we move on to the next problem.

I close, Mr. Chairman, because I have got to go in and fight for another matter on the floor of the Senate, I close with a plea on my lips that we recognize the relationship between the defense of our country and the development of brainpower. You do not develop this brainpower unless you have got the teachers, and teachers with high morale, teachers well trained, teachers that can really see a future, and dedicating themselves to this very great public service.

I think it is about time that, as parent and as Congressmen, we stop letting our teachers down.

Two Hundredth Anniversary of Braddock's Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to take the opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues that an important event in American history passed with little or no notice last Saturday. I refer to the defeat of the British general, Braddock, near Fort Duquesne, on July 9, 1755. To me this is an important turning point in our history and in the history of free men everywhere. This defeat gave the colonists confidence to rise up and throw off the shackles of colonialism. They saw that the British regulars could be defeated. They saw evidences of strong leadership among their own people when Colonel Washington was called to take over in an emergency. These factors played a role in the development of the spirit of the colonists which was to manifest itself later in the Declaration of Independence and the Revolutionary War. I think it is an event worthy of annual recognition, and so that all of us can be apprised of the significance of that day, I want to make the following remarks a part of the RECORD.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BRADDOCK'S DEFEAT

Saturday, July 9, 1955, marked the 200th occurrence of the anniversary of a disaster. As we learned in our history books as children, it was on July 9, 1755, that the troops under Gen. Edward Braddoek were defeated and routed by the French and Indians in the Battle of the Wilderness, near Fort Duquesne. Braddock, a courageous general and a skilled strategist in the traditional European style, fell a victim to the unaccustomed hazards of Indian warfare, and to his own stubborn conceit. He had refused to take, or even to listen to, the advice of his subordinate officers, both British and Colonial, and the advice of such astute civilian critics as Benjamin Franklin.

Franklin himself, in his Autobiography, has left us an account of his conversation with Braddock shortly before the beginning of the expedition which well illustrates that Biblical proverb:

> Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall.

Franklin had warned the general of the dangers he was about to encounter in these words:

> To be sure, sir, if you arrive well before Duquesne with these fine troops, so well provided with artillery, that place, not yet completely fortified, and, as we hear, with no very strong garrison, can probably make but a short resistance. The only danger I apprehend of obstruction to your march is from ambuscades of Indians, who, by constant practice, are dexterous in laying and executing them; and the slender line, near four miles long, which your army must make, may expose it to be attacked by surprise in its flanks, and to be cut like a thread into several pieces, which, from their distance, cannot come up in time to support each other.

"He smiled at my ignorance," Franklin remarks, "and replied: 'These savages may, indeed, be a formidable enemy to your raw American militia, but upon the King's regular and disciplined troops, sir, it is impossible they should make any impression.' "

The attack, when it came, did not take the form envisioned by Ben Franklin, but it is evident that such a "cutting of the thread" of the line of British regulars would have been possible almost anywhere along the route. Overconfidence had prevented Braddock from keeping sufficient scouting parties out along his flanks, from using to full advantage the Indians and frontiersmen available to him for this service, and from interpreting correctly the signs of the presence of many Indians that should have caused him to take extra precautions as the army drew near Fort Duquesne. To quote from Franklin's dramatic account of the attack:

> The enemy, however, did not take the advantage of his army which I apprehended its long line of march exposed it to, but let it advance without interruption till within 9 miles of the place, and then, when more in a body (for it had just passed a river where the front had halted till all had come over), and in a more open part of the woods than any it had passed, attacked its advance guard by a heavy fire from behind trees and bushes, which was the first intelligence the general had of an enemy's being near him. This guard being disordered, the general hurried the troops up to their assistance, which was done in great confusion, through wagons, baggage, and cattle, and presently the fire came upon their flank. The officers, being on horseback, were more easily distinguished, picked out as marks, and fell very fast; and the soldiers were crowded together in a huddle, having or hearing no orders, and standing to be shot at till two-thirds of them were killed; and then, being seized with a panic, the whole fled with precipitation.

After further description of the defeat, including the wounding of Braddock himself, the wounding or killing of numerous officers and men, and the panic flight of one contingent of the army after another, Franklin concludes:

> This whole transaction gave us Americans the first suspicion that our exalted ideas of the prowess of British regulars had not been well founded.

Thus was laid one of the seeds that later grew in the Revolutionary War. Braddock's defeat showed not only that British regulars could be thoroughly trounced by an army no more than equal to them in numbers, but also that the military methods familiar to the colonial troops in their Indian warfare were superior, in this terrain, to the traditional British methods. For this reason, we celebrate Braddock's defeat, even though our own troops were involved in it, as a forerunner of the American Revolution.

Another reason why we, as American, rejoice at this defeat, is that on this occasion the colonial militia showed to advantage in comparison with veteran British troops, their leaders in many cases acting with conspicuous gallantry as well as cool efficiency to retrieve whatever of men and supplies could be salvaged from this disaster. Outstanding among the colonial militia officers was the young Virginia Colonel, George Washington, who, acting as aide to General Braddock, and, upon his receiving his mortal wound, as aide to Colonel Dunbar, contributed enormously to the restoring of order and the retreat without further loss from the field of battle. Washington, despite the fact that he was just recovering from a long and wasting siege of fever, so that he could barely sit his horse, earned on this day the gratitude of the British regulars and the admiration of his colonial countrymen.

The part George Washington played is well illustrated by Douglas Southall Freeman's description of one of the crises of the battle:

> Braddock at last realized that the hill must be wrested from the savages and that the two 6-pounders must be recaptured before they were turned against the bleeding British crowded in the road. He sent George off to find officers and to tell them to organize one party of 150 to charge up the hill and another party of like size to recover the cannon. In delivering these orders, George managed to stay in his saddle despite his weakness. During the action he had two horses shot under him, but he found another and skillfully made his way through the woods. His tall figure was a mark for hidden riflemen. One of them sent a bullet through his hat, another, a third, and still another slit his uniform with hot lead. He was conspicuous, in the generous words of the wounded Orme, for "the greatest courage and resolution," and, happily, thus far was unscathed.

It was Washington who, with Robert Stewart's assistance, got the wounded General Braddock safely across the river under fire and in danger from the crowding of terrorized fugitives. Washington then, as the only officer who both knew the country and was qualified to speak for General Braddock, had to ride back through the forest to carry to Colonel Dunbar the news of the defeat, and of Braddock's wound, and to give orders for the preservation of what remained of the Army. So far back was Dunbar with his supply wagons and his inadequate number of horses that Washington was not able to reach his position until 10 the morning of July 10. After the rest which his exhausted body could no longer forego, Washington took an active part in assisting the reunion of the retreating Braddock and Dunbar and in carrying out the further orders of Braddock for the destruction of supplies and the organization of the continued retreat. When Braddock died of his wound on the evening of July 13, George Washington was entrusted with the duty of burying him. After directing the general's burial with all the military honors that circumstances permitted, Washington then had the wagons and the men on foot all pass over the grave so that its place could not be discovered by the enemy and Braddock's body mutilated and desecrated by the Indians. This device was successful, and Braddock's body was not found until in 1824 some men repairing a road discovered a skeleton which, from insignia of rank

found with it, was taken to be that of General Braddock.

Washington's words about Braddock, written in 1786, seem a fair appraisal of his character from a man in the best position to judge:

Thus died a man whose good and bad qualities were intimately blended. He was brave even to a fault and in regular service would have done honor to his profession. His attachments were warm, his enmities were strong, and having no disguise, both appeared in full force. He was generous and disinterested, but plain and blunt in his manner even to rudeness.

And thus rose, into the full light of early fame and honor in this country, a man whose full height of character can hardly be measured even yet, the brave and efficient young soldier who was to earn the title, "the Father of his Country."

The Austrian Peace Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert the following resolution of the Committee for Hungarian Liberation concerning the Austrian Peace Treaty:

COMMITTEE FOR HUNGARIAN LIBERATION,
Pekin, Ill., July 6, 1955.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. REPRESENTATIVE: The Committee for Hungarian Liberation, at its meeting in New York on May 28, adopted a resolution commending the magnificent victory achieved by the successful conclusion of the Austrian Peace Treaty, and wholeheartedly endorsed the effective policy pursued by President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles.

The Austrian Treaty was an event of great importance for Hungary as, under the Hungarian Treaty of Paris, the Russians must leave Hungary within 90 days after evacuation of their troops from Austria.

Unfortunately, this provision has not been emphasized, or even mentioned in the Austrian Treaty. In addition, we are alarmed by, and view with anxiety, the Warsaw agreement recently concluded between Russia and the satellite countries, lest this agreement will be used as a subterfuge for the retention of Soviet troops in Hungary.

We wish to call your attention most emphatically to the fact that the Warsaw agreement was not concluded by true representatives of the Hungarian people. Consequently, we respectfully ask that the Russians be compelled to withdraw their troops from Hungary in compliance with the Paris Treaty.

Otherwise, the oppression of the Hungarian people by the Russian armed forces will continue indefinitely, and a government by freely elected representatives will be impossible.

We Hungarians and Americans of Hungarian descent, living in this free country, feel that it is our duty to raise our voices in behalf of the Hungarian nation which, oppressed and dismembered, cannot effectively defend her interests.

There is no doubt that the forthcoming Geneva Conference on July 18 will be an historic event and will have consequences of vital importance. The eyes of the captive nations and of the whole world will be focused on it, and its decisions will be interpreted as the real intent of the United States. Should there be an adverse decision, for the sake of expediency, the disillusioned, oppressed nations will be thrown into utter despair.

We hope and pray that our leaders, under divine guidance, will achieve a major victory, which will bring freedom to the Hungarians and other enslaved peoples.

Respectfully yours,
DR. BELA SZILASSY,
Chairman.

A Bill to Relieve Burden on Federal District Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill which, if passed, will do much to relieve the burden of case work with which our Federal district courts are now confronted. This bill contains two provisions which will put the requirements on a more realistic basis for presenting a case in a Federal district court.

AMOUNT SET IN 1911

In order for a plaintiff to bring a civil action in a Federal district court at the present time, Mr. Speaker, the amount in controversy must be at least $3,000. This so-called jurisdictional amount was raised to $3,000 in 1911 in order to clear from Federal dockets many thousands of minor cases involving lesser amounts. I think it is clear, in terms of the value of today's dollar that this $3,000 figure has lost the meaning which it had nearly 45 years ago. By raising the sum in controversy to $10,000, an important step will be taken to modernize the Federal court procedure and to make it possible for these tribunals to focus attention on the more pressing cases. Not long ago Congress recognized the tremendous workload on the Federal courts and passed legislation providing for additional Federal judgeships. It seems to me that this provision in my bill would be another healthy step in the same direction.

WOULD CHANGE CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

The second provision in my bill provides, for purposes of obtaining jurisdiction in Federal courts, that a corporation shall be deemed a citizen of the State where it has its principal place of business, as well as a citizen of the State in which it has been incorporated. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, a corporation is deemed to be a citizen only of the State in which it has been incorporated. It thus becomes possible for a corporation which is sued in the courts of the State in which it is located to get the action removed to a Federal district court in the State in which it has been incorporated. Very often, of course, this step is purely a dilatory tactic having the purpose of achieving some sort of favorable settlement. One can imagine how much chance a private individual has in such a situation when faced with a battery of top legal brains and the necessity of engaging in a suit perhaps thousands of miles from the place where the cause of action has arisen.

I do not believe that it is either fair or proper for a corporation to avoid trial in the State in which is operates its business by employing a legal device which is not available to the individual citizen.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is based on the necessity for relief of congested Federal dockets, especially in our larger metropolitan communities, and to reduce the number of cases which come into Federal district courts on the fictional premise that a diversity of citizenship exists.

I very much hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will support the provisions of this bill which seek to bring our American judicial system into line with the growing needs of our Nation.

The Immigration Picture Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I wish to include the following address I delivered over station WORL, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, July 9, 1955:

Just a few hundred years ago, the country now known as the United States had the same rivers and mountains and plains and geographical outlines that it has today. Plus a few scattered Indian tribes.

No one else.

Now it has 166 million people. Where did they come from? Over 99 percent of them are immigrants or the descendants of immigrants.

They came in great waves, between the Civil War and World War I—hopeful and hard-working—spreading the energy of freedom across the land—developing the farms and building the cities.

What has happened to this liberating process; to the immigration that has made America?

The stream has been reduced to a trickle of 200,000 a year.

Of course we cannot throw away the gates and permit everyone to enter the United States, because we would be suffocated by the rush of those who know our country to be a paradise on earth. We could not provide accommodations and employment fast enough for them.

Everyone is agreed that immigration must be regulated in fairness to ourselves and the newcomers.

The method of regulation, however, is the subject of serious criticism.

Back in 1924 Congress established the quota system. Under this formula, each country was assigned a certain percentage of the total number of immigrants coming to the United States each year, based on

that nationality's percentage of the United States population in 1920.

These ratios, while mathematically fair, indirectly favored the racial groups that first came to this country. That quota system is still the basic immigration law. Under it more than two-thirds preference is given to the nationals of northern and western Europe. Great Britain and Ireland are assigned 55 percent of the whole. Countries like China, India, and Japan, whose people were once excluded from entry, now have quotas permitting 100 to 185 of their nationals to emigrate to our country each year.

There are some exceptions.

People from Canada, and the Republics of Latin-America, can come in any number. Wives, husbands, and children of American citizens are also free to enter.

The quota system is riddled by contradictions. Great Britain and Ireland use only one-third of their quota, while other countries have long waiting lists.

The latest figures show that 65,000 can come from Great Britain and Northern Ireland each year, but only 21,000 avail themselves of the privilege. The Irish Republic has a quota of 17,000, but only 5,000 are admitted. The Scandinavian quota is 6,000. That of France is 3,000, Poland 6,000, and Italy 5,000. Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany are permitted to send over 108,000—out of a world quota of 154,000.

Canada and South America, unlimited, send 80,000.

Families of United States citizens account for 30,000.

Total admissions, under these categories, total 208,000 each year.

The system of quotas by national origin is weighted heavily in favor of Anglo-Saxons and Northern Europeans. Other Europeans, as well as the Asian races, have a very slim chance of coming to the United States as permanent residents.

Between 1945 and 1948 several laws were passed that allowed 500,000 refugees, war brides of American military personnel, and others to enter the United States outside of the quota system.

Two additional laws have led to considerable controversy.

The first, known as the McCarran-Walter Act, passed in 1952, reaffirmed the quota system, setting a limit of 154,657 on the number of immigrants who may come from Europe, Africa, and Asia each year.

The second piece of legislation was the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

It permits 209,000 refugees to enter the United States over and above regular quotas, and before December 31, 1956. In addition, it provides visas for 5,000 refugees who are presently in the country.

The law allows 102,000 refugees from communism who are temporarily living in Western Europe, the NATO nations, and Iran to find sanctuary here. Provision is made for 2,000 refugees from Palestine, 7,000 from the Far East, and 94,000 Italians, Greeks, and Dutch, as well as 4,000 orphans. Of this total of 209,000, only 16,000 had been admitted up to April 8 of this year.

The delay in carrying out this program has caused considerable dissatisfaction, especially among the refugees themselves, who are discouraged by some of the unreasonable requirements.

To get a visa he must give satisfactory personal history for 2 years preceding his application. In our strict efforts to screen these people in order to prevent subversive elements from being smuggled into the United States under the refugee law, we are penalizing good and innocent people. In many cases, due to the fact that they have fled from Soviet-occupied countries, it is impossible for them to prove their personal history for the 2 years preceding their application.

Oftentimes because they have no relatives or friends in the United States, they cannot obtain guaranties of jobs and homes from a United States citizen.

Religious and charitable organizations are doing their best to assist these people, but Government redtape continues to "foul up" the implementation of the Refugee Relief Act.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act was passed over President Truman's opposition and his veto.

The Refugee Relief Act was later passed to ease its severity, which was causing us to lose goodwill among our friends and allies abroad. Relief was turning out to be repressive.

In January 1955, Edward Corsi, of New York, prominent Republican, was hired to get the Refugee Relief Act going. After 3 months he was fired by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. This touched off a storm of charges and countercharges.

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, Democrat, of New York, introduced a bill to correct deficiencies in the act.

President Eisenhower recommended a similar bill.

The Democratic and Republican bills agree that religious and welfare organizations in the United States should be given more opportunity to sponsor immigrants, and that the requirement of a detailed 2-year personal history prior to application should be repealed.

Summing up this new approach to the problem, the President observed on May 27, and I quote: "This 2-year history in the case of recent escapees is often impossible to obtain. Yet these are the very people who have been actively stimulated to risk the perils of escape by our own information program broadcast throughout the Iron Curtain. I have faith in the competence of our security personnel, and I recommend that this inflexible requirement be eliminated from the law, leaving it to the sound discretion of the security officer to make his recommendations on the basis of all the facts available."

Previously, on January 2, 1953, President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization advised that the McCarran-Walter Act should be completely revised because it was "an arrogant, brazen instrument of discrimination based on race, creed, color, and national origin."

To me, as a Congressman, it seems a cruel breach of faith that we should urge people to escape from Communist-controlled countries, and then permit them no opportunity to come to a free country.

Or to turn our backs upon such good friends as the Italian and Greek peoples, who have sacrificed so much for freedom's cause, only to find that they are less welcome as immigrants than others who have less desire to come to the United States.

The McCarran-Walter Act increased the 1924 quotas by only 657, even though immigration has been scanty since 1924, and even though our country is much stronger economically and in a position to accommodate more refugees from tyranny, poverty, and despair.

We could at least double the quotas to 300,000 and easily assimilate the newcomers.

Commonsense would declare that we should pool unused quotas, and assign them, at least temporarily, to those people who must presently wait for years before they can ever hope to be admitted to the United States.

Leading clergymen of all faiths and officials of our labor unions strongly support a more liberal immigration policy in keeping with our traditions and our growth.

No wonder that other nations find it difficult to understand us when we preach freedom on one hand and become unduly suspicious of others by some of our actions.

People rightfully resent the lopsided quota system which, in effect, grades the nationals of the various nations, tabbing some as preferred candidates and others as unwanted.

They are inclined to believe that we talk a great game of freedom, but fail to play it on the level.

Evidence of this is found in the law which treats naturalized citizens as inferior to those who were born in this country. You and I believe that all citizens are equal, but the law makes unfair distinctions. Under it naturalized immigrants can be deprived of their citizenship and evicted from the country, whereas native-born citizens are not subject to these fears and anxieties.

We must be guided, of course, by certain measures necessary to our security, but that is no justification for a narrow and rigid immigration policy which betrays the fact that we are not sure of ourselves.

Nor is it any excuse for a Refugee Relief Act whose clear intent is being sabotaged by the State Department.

Snobbishness is alien to the true American spirit.

Up to this strange cold war era, the assumption has been that a person wanting to come to the United States, being of good health and good character, would respond to the opportunity and become an asset to himself and to the country of his adoption.

That faith has been vindicated in so many tens of millions of individual cases, making our great Nation what it is today, that it is difficult to understand how any American can distrust it now.

The present immigration curtain bears an odious resemblance to the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

It is a betrayal of fundamental American principles, and is an insult to our friends abroad.

The sooner we unbend and take the wraps off the Statue of Liberty the better will be our leadership of the free world.

The United States can never afford to become isolationist or sufficient unto itself.

Let us welcome more of the oppressed and hopeful to our land.

Proving our faith in freedom and humanity.

A Forward Step in Outlawing Compulsory Racial Segregation in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a significant editorial, entitled "The Triumph of Gradualism," appearing in the June 2 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, explaining the implementation of the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, abolishing compulsory racial segregation in the public schools through enforcement by the Federal district courts nearest the local situations. The article follows:

THE TRIUMPH OF GRADUALISM

The Supreme Court has directed Federal district courts to carry out its May 17, 1954, decision outlawing compulsory racial segregation in the public schools. These local courts it admonishes to proceed "with all deliberate speed" (a significantly precise and deliberate choice of words).

A month ago the Macon (Ga.) News said in a strong but dignified prosegregation editorial:

"Southern whites are unwilling at the present time to permit forced mixing of the races in the public schools. The only wise move

the Court can make in this situation is to turn the segregation problem over to the Federal district courts."

That is exactly what the Supreme Court has done—with certain salient amplifications.

Says WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, the respected dean of the Senate, on the Court's action: "It is intended to appeal to the States to help work out this problem."

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People declares: "We are gratified. * * *"

We believe such expressions represent the heart of American opinion far more accurately than does Senator EASTLAND'S reference to "this monstrous proposition," or, on the other side, Senator HUMPHREY'S disappointed comment: "I had expected more—much more. * * *"

We believe, also, that the Supreme Court has evidenced that flexibility and firmness which spell statesmanship in such a situation. On the count of flexibility, it has entrusted enforcement to the Federal courts nearest the local situations. It has specifically empowered them to act under equity principles which place large discretion in the hands of each judge. It has directed them to reconcile "public and private needs," and to take account of local problems.

On the side of firmness, the Court makes it explicitly clear school officials must make a prompt and reasonable start toward full compliance, although once the start has been made they may ask for additional time. It orders courts during this period of transition * * * to retain jurisdiction. And the High Tribunal meaningfully observes: "Constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them."

In weighing the effect of this long-awaited opinion two facts should be kept in mind: On the one hand, enforcement of constitutional interpretation has not been relinquished irrevocably to possibly unsympathetic local judges. The Negro, ably represented by the NAACP, can challenge their action (or lack of it) and appeal such challenges right back to the Supreme Court, which, too, retains jurisdiction.

And, on the other hand, it cannot be stated too often that neither the basic decision nor these implementing decrees place any legal compulsions behind integration; they have but removed legal compulsions from segregation—and only in the public schools. There is not, nor likely ever to be, any law against voluntary separation of the races by the races in any association they may choose (and we do not mean voluntary by intimidation).

Surely within this freedom and within the flexibilities charted by the Supreme Court men of good will can work out decent solutions, and these in not too long a time.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Eagle Divide Irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Eagle Divide project is a part of the multi-billion dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Federal Aid to National Educational Needs Is Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to include a very timely editorial, entitled "Grants for Education," which appeared in the June 1, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

In response to the inspiration and example of so many patriotic private foundations, I earnestly hope the Congress will promptly awaken to the urgency of the educational problem in the country and enact appropriate legislation before the end of this session. The article follows:

GRANTS FOR EDUCATION

Since the Ford Foundation in 1954 granted $25 million to the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the foundation has been dedicated to five basic educational objectives. These are: clarification of the aims and functions of educational institutions; improved teaching, curriculum, and educational management; and reducing the inequalities of educational opportunity.

The latest annual report of the Ford Foundation emphasizes the foundation's continued devotion to these ideals. Of grants totaling $49,438,558 in 1 year, more than two-thirds were given to aid American educational development.

H. Rowan Gaither, Jr., president of the foundation, said the group was impressed with the need for "greater and broader support" for educational institutions "in the face of rising enrollments, teacher shortages, and inadequate physical facilities." He emphasized that the future of the country is dependent "upon the adequacy and quality" of its education.

The Ford Foundation's substantial financial contributions to education are made all the more impressive by the fact that the Nation generally is spending relatively little to educate its people. Support for education amounts to "an inadequate 2½0 percent of the gross national product at the very time the Nation's educational needs are approaching a new peak," said Mr. Gaither.

It is a healthy trend that the well-financed private foundations—and corporations—are awakening to the urgency of the educational problem. Two weeks ago, the Carnegie Corp. warned that an earnest reappraisal of the Nation's educational system is needed. It called for answers to the financial problems besetting educational centers, and raised the specter of more Federal aid—and control—in education if the right answers were not soon found.

The more interest that private groups take in improving American education and in extending its benefits to more people, the less danger of Federal regulation.

Memorandum by Roger D. Lapham Concerning Formosa and the Economic and Political Situation in India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum which I have received from a very close friend who I think is a great citizen, a man with whom I do not always agree, as I do not agree with the entire contents of the memorandum to which I refer. Nevertheless, it contains a point of view which certainly deserves very careful consideration.

The memorandum is in two parts, the first part entitled "Present Thoughts on the Problem of Formosa." The second part is entitled "Comments on the Economic and Political Situation in India, by an American Observer Who Has Lived There More Than a Year."

Mr. Lapham has just completed an extended trip to various parts of the world, and, with his very brilliant mind, has come back with some definite conclusions as to what American foreign policy should be with respect to some of the most perplexing issues which confront us. I think his points of view should be in the RECORD so that all can read and have the benefit of them.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT THOUGHTS ON THE PROBLEM OF FORMOSA

(By Roger D. Lapham)

Late last January President Eisenhower recommended to Congress that we defend Formosa and the Pescadores from any attack by an aggressor. Congress almost unanimously endorsed that recommendation—so the world has been given definite notice of our intentions.

Congress agreed to leave to the Persident the decision of whether to back Chiang in defending Quemoy and Matsu. He alone, as Commander of our Armed Forces, will have to bear the responsibility of that decision—truly a grave one not only as affecting our relations with many other nations, but as affecting the American people themselves.

Red China has repeatedly declared its intentions to take Formosa. It considers it an important sector of its own country and that as long as the Nationalists hold that Island, it can be used as a military base to attack the mainland.

Chiang also has repeatedly announced his intention of regaining control of the mainland. Plainly he has little hope of attaining that objective without active American support. But we have made it clear that while we have declared our intention of protecting Formosa, wo do not propose to let Chiang use it as a base for aggressive action. The Gimo and the Nationalists know that time is running against them. Chiang's hopes for regaining the mainland are centered in war's breaking out between the United States and the Chinese Reds, or Russia—or both. If that should happen he figures on our backing him to the limit whether we approve his

government and its totalitarian methods or not.

If Chiang refuses to abandon Quemoy and Matsu in the same way as we persuaded him to quit the Tachens, the United States is put in a very difficult spot. The Gimo knows that better than anyone else and will embarrass us plenty if we try to impose our will.

Ever since we declared our policy to defend Formosa last January, Washington has made every effort to secure a cease-fire agreement with Peiping. Both the United Kingdom and India have backed our efforts and are still trying to bring their influence to bear on both Moscow and Peiping to effect an armistice. We hope that if this can be brought about, it will be possible to negotiate some kind of a peaceful, even if only temporary, settlement.

So far Red China has flaunted any thought of a cease fire and apparently is getting ready to launch an all-out attack on Quemoy and Matsu.

Both London and New Delhi have been and are urging these two small islands so close to the mainland be turned over to Red China. They hope Chiang can be persuaded to evacuate them voluntarily and would like Washington to exert its influence to bring that about. If these islands are given up, it would make it easier for London and New Delhi to back our policy of protecting Formosa itself. They believe abandonment would give proof to the world that the United States has no intention of helping Chiang to regain the mainland, and make a cease fire more possible.

It is of course apparent that the United Kingdom does not want the United States to risk any kind of a war in Asia, fearing an outbreak of hostilities in Western Europe.

The position of India is not so comprehensible to most Americans who cannot understand why Nehru does not take a more open anti-Communist stand, and line up with the so-called democracies against the threat of Communist totalitarian aggression or infiltration.

Personally, I am convinced that India has no sympathy with communism, whether it be the Moscow or the Peiping brand. I believe we in the States don't appreciate the fact that the Government of India is a democracy as we understand that word. It is a new-born nation which learned with the British what a democratic form of government is. It has universal suffrage and honest secret elections. Its rulers don't look upon its citizens as slaves of the state. While it has its state-owned railways, air services, etc., capitalism is encouraged and thrives. Law, order, and government discipline as we know them prevail to a much greater extent than elsewhere in southeast Asia.

Nehru—a disciple of Gandhi, that remarkable man who preached and practiced passive resistance and worked for the abolition of the caste system—will go to extreme lengths to avoid another world war. He fears the use of atomic weapons; and remember, America made no friends in this part of the world when we dropped the first bomb on Hiroshima. India has just freed itself from colonialism, and like George Washington, looks with suspicion on foreign entanglements or commitments. India doesn't want our aid, even economic aid, if it is given with strings attached. And I think Nehru has ambitions to make India the real leader of Asia.

All this points to the fundamental difference between India and Red China. The latter is striving to impose its ideologies on all Asia and beyond; and seeks power and influence to do so. Its methods are those of Moscow; but Red China is no such satellite of Russia as Poland or those Balkan States taken over by Stalin. I believe as time passes the bonds between Moscow and Peiping will be loosened rather than tightened. So far the Russians have been wise in not trying to tell Mao just what to do, or how to do it. Red China, I am certain, will not submit to Moscow domination.

I have just finished reading a book entitled "Window on China" by an Indian newspaperman, Raja Hutheesing. It was first published in 1953 by the Casement Publications, Ltd., of Bombay and London. I was told after I read it that the author was a brother-in-law of Nehru—had married Nehru's sister. He first visited China in November 1951 as a member of an unofficial Indian group. Eight months later he visited China again, this time as a member of an official Indian cultural delegation. As usual, their movements in China were restricted and the group shown only what the Government wanted it to see, and fed the propaganda line. However, as a newspaperman, he asked questions which annoyed and bothered his hosts. His book can in no way be classed as pro-Western, but it leaves no doubt as to what he thinks of communism as practiced by Red China. He has no use for it. Nehru, I am sure, has no illusions about communism either, and if he differs with the American approach toward Red China, it's only in our methods and tactics. Perhaps he can't understand our politics any more than most Americans can fathom why India takes such an apparently neutral position.

Only last week Nehru spoke strongly against America's defending Chiang if Quemoy and Matsu were attacked. A leading American here told me that he interpreted Nehru's remarks as meaning he had information Mao really intended to move shortly, and hoped we would persuade Chiang to evacuate those islands as he did the Tachens before the shooting started.

One question I've asked many people since I left San Francisco February 21 last: "Leaving Quemoy and Matsu aside or assuming Chiang evacuates them: will Red China actually attempt invasion of Formosa itself?" Most all of them said "No; Mao is too wise to attempt it with our fleet and Air Force committed to defend the big Island. Besides which he can afford to wait." And most of those I have questioned (both foreigners and Americans) believe we should make no effort to protect Quemoy and Matsu.

While I was in Manila President Magsaysay granted me a short interview. I said something about the eyes of the world being focused on his area these days. He promptly volunteered this comment: "Red China will launch an attack on Formosa; they will do so whether Moscow gives them the nod or not." And then he added, "Moscow won't mind if they do. If Mao gets a setback the Russians won't be displeased." The inference, of course, is that Moscow thinks Red China is getting too big for its britches right now, too damn cocky and independent.

Another man I met in Hong Kong, an American not in Government but one who knows China well, said it was a tossup but he thought the chances were that Peiping would go all-out to take Formosa.

Yet another Hong Kong man, a leading newspaperman, offered this observation: "The Chinese are good traders; you want a 'cease-fire'; if so don't start to give up Quemoy and Matsu before making your trade—that doesn't make sense."

"Once Red China has those Islands without a fight they will only demand more. So far the United States has been on the losing side. We backed Chiang on the mainland and lost; we asked for a 'cease-fire' in Korea and got it, but in the eyes of Red China a victory for them; we went along with the French when they agreed to quit North Vietnam. All Asia is watching and waiting to see who is coming out on top. Most of them like to be on the winning side, and to date America hasn't looked like any winner. But if we are to help Chiang defend Quemoy and Matsu, let us say so openly, plainly, and give our reasons why; otherwise we only compound confusion."

That was the gist of his remarks and it made sense to me.

So the hot potato is now on the steps of the White House. The President knows that if we go all out to protect those two little islets we do so contrary to the openly expressed wishes of the United Kingdom and India, as well as other countries who were with us when we resisted the North Korean aggressors. The chances are the United States will have to go it alone and if another world war results, the President alone will be held responsible.

Yet with our announced policy of defending Formosa, can the President as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces afford to wait until the enemy is sighted from the beaches of that island? He has gone all out for a "cease-fire" and a negotiated settlement. No response but a horse laugh, maybe Quemoy and Matsu are of little military value, but what about the morale of the Nationalist Army if compelled to evacuate or surrender those islands with the United States looking the other way? And what about our friends in the Philippines? And how will Seoul and Tokio regard it? And can words of explanation etc., counteract the overall effect of negative action?

Admittedly we are handicapped by having to back Chiang, a man with a record of recent failures and one whom many in southeast Asia regard as a tool of reactionary imperialism. But if we fail to stand firm on the Quemoy-Matsu issue, will we not be only postponing the evil day? Are we not now, relatively speaking, better prepared than Peiping and maybe Moscow, to meet the challenge rather than face it later on?

Only the man in the White House has all the information available to make an intelligent decision—newspapers and commentators to the contrary. Sitting on the sidelines and without any inside dope one can only play hunches, and my hunch is that the President after weighing all the pros and cons will take the calculated risk and say "If you won't talk cease-fire we will defend Quemoy and Matsu."

He will do so with the full knowledge that our Air Forces may be required to drop bombs on military targets (broadly interpreted) on China mainland. He will realize that once the die is cast and the Rubicon crossed there can be no halfway spot to turn back. But he can hope that somewhere along the line Mao can be persuaded that discretion is the better part of valor and a cease-fire an acceptable face saver.

If he takes such a definite decision the President must convince the American people that it is the right one. There can be no reverse gear; he either sinks or swims; he will end up as a greater hero than ever before—a guy who called a bluff—or as a damn dumbbell who ought to have known better.

Few Presidents of the United States have ever had to make as tough a decision—one which will not only affect all Americans but the great mass who live in the world we know today.

So here's a toast to Dwight D. Eisenhower—More power to him.

COMMENTS ON THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN INDIA, BY AN AMERICAN OBSEVER WHO HAS LIVED THERE MORE THAN A YEAR

India, with half the population of free Asia, is in a much more favorable position than any of the other Asian countries, with the possible exception of Japan, Turkey, and 1 or 2 of the small nations of the Middle East, to develop an economically strong and

democratic society. The reasons for this are several.

First, the extremely competent top civil service group (albeit less than a thousand) which is available for administration. I very much doubt whether it has its equal in Asia or even in many European countries. The Indians now appear to have devised methods for bridging the gap between the British trained ICS and the need for replenishment and expansion of this group. I would say that insofar as this small group are concerned it is equal to its counterpart group in the United States. The governmental employees at the medium and lower levels vary as to quality but are not too bad.

Second, unlike most of Asia, India has had no warfare within its borders for nearly a century. India has not had the economic and political dislocations which have and still are cursing such countries as Indonesia, Burma, and Formosa, i. e., the Government of India took over a running machinery and not just shambles. This is a tremendous advantage in view of the low recuperative capacity of most Asian countries.

Third, India has the beginnings of an understanding that great changes can be wrought through peaceful means and the beginnings of a democratic parliamentary structure. Independence was achieved from the British without substantial violence. Under the British and since independence the Indians have made a start toward the application of the industrial revolution to India, again without violence. With real assistance under the United States technical cooperation program, great changes are underway in ever larger sections of the countryside. Among the educated class (other than a fair sized portion of the educated youth) there is substantial confidence in the effectiveness of the democratic process as the tool through which advances can be made.

Four, India has a substantial indigneous middle and upper entrepreneurial class. This class is relatively larger in India today than it was in China, and it is an asset that is almost entirely missing in middle eastern countries which have virtually no modern middle class and in southeast Asian countries where the middle class, to the extent it exists, is largely of Chinese or Indian origin.

Five, India has largely overcome the immediate political problems accompanying the transition from colonial to independent status. This is one great avantage that India has over Pakistan where the Pakistanis have not yet agreed upon a constitution, decided upon the nature of their political structure, e. g., the relationship between the central government and the states or even the number of states there should be or held their first national elections. It is extremely difficult for a country to embark on a serious plan of economic development at a time when such basic political problems require most of the energy of the government.

Six, India is now in the 4th year of its first 5-year plan. The plan itself was modest and progress has been only moderately successful in certain fields. But most Indians now consider the plan a success and there is a strong feeling of confidence in their own ability to master their environment, given sufficient resources. Probably of equal importance, the Indians have begun to learn the difference between practice and theory.

Seven, much as Nehru may be an irritant in terms of our foreign policy he is a tremendously popular figure in India. His popularity far transcends that of the Congress Party and I have met few people who believe that the Congress Party will lose parliamentary control in India while he is politically active.

Of course the problems which confront India are tremendous. India has a working party, in effect, in the 20th Century while the main part of the population is still several hundred years behind it. Barriers of caste, feudal political concepts, and tremendous poverty must be overcome before the bulk of the population achieves satisfactory progress. India's resources for lifting her economy by the bootstraps are extremely limited. India's present rate of saving is estimated at approximately 5 percent, which is barely enough to take care of the annual increase in population. The $4.5 billion first 5-year plan will only raise the standard of living by 1 percent, its principal objective being to stop the steady decline in the standard of living which has been the pattern in India for the past 25 years.

Frankly, I believe there is little danger that India, unlike so many other countries in Asia, will turn Communist in the next 5-year period. There are too many immediate factors which tie India to the Western political system. However, I believe such a turn to be a distinct possibility in the next 10 to 15 years, even if the present favorable factors to the West continue. This is because forces have been set to work in both the cities and the countryside, the latter especially, which are giving rise to greatly increased expectations among the populace. Unless the GOI can achieve a recognizable periodic increase and improvement in the standard of living generally the attitude now found among a substantial portion of the educated but unemployed youth can be expected to spread rapidly. This feeling is that while a democratic political structure provides many advantages over a totalitarian system, improvement in the standard of living takes first priority. A totalitarian system has an ability to direct organized activity and to secure compulsory savings, but a democratic political system is a luxury which underdeveloped countries cannot afford. This attitude receives considerable support from the Indian visitors to China who are given a guided tour under controlled conditions and return with glowing reports.

If India turns Communist it seems to me that it can only result in bringing down the curtain on the rest of South and Southeast Asia. India dominates the Indian Ocean in almost every sense, including geographic location and physical resources. Furthermore, if India with all its initial advantages favoring democratic development turns Communist, it will greatly discourage those prodemocratic groups fighting an uphill fight in the Southeast Asian countries. The reverse is not necessarily true if any of the other countries in the area turn Communist.

It seems to me that now is the time for some very imaginative and long-range thinking as to the role that external assistance can play in a country like India. Properly utilized with respect to a relatively well organized and stable country like India there is no reason why it should not make all the difference between success and failure of domestic development efforts even if available only in moderate amounts. As you know from our China experience, our two principal curses usually are lack of an efficient mechanism to utilize aid effectively in a recipient country and time in which we can work out the most effective mechanism for a given scene. This is not the case with respect to India at the present time.

The principal obstacle to such a program of long-range assistance to India would appear to be the remarkable facility which the United States and India have developed for constantly getting in each others' hair and thereby irritating the relations between the two. On our part we, at least in the political and press forums, seem to forget that India is now going through very much the same process that we went through after our independence was achieved. Just as we did not want to become entangled in the wars of Europe, there is a strong feeling that India should not become entangled in the cold war. This is greatly reinforced by the fact that many Indians believe their present precarious society could not survive participation in another world war, even though one side is clearly in the right. One can argue against it with Indians, but the emotional basis appears to be very strong. On the Indian side, they have difficulty in breaking away from their preindependence concept that the white world and capitalism signify colonialism. Furthermore, they have great difficulty in understanding the American scene and the extreme statements and attitudes expressed by many of the congressional members of the party in power. With their own background of parliamentary responsibility, they have difficulty in understanding how a man like McCarthy can exist without the blessing of the President. Also, many Indians consider South and Southeast Asia as within their sphere of leadership and there is considerable resentment when we, under the necessities occasioned by the Communist threat, intervene in the area with support for those countries which share our concern as to the immediacy of the external Communist threat.

Women Join Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a considerable volume of the mail I receive opposing authorization of the proposed upper Colorado storage project comes from the women of America. The following excellent letter, written by Ethel L. Miess, of Los Angeles, Calif., is illustrative of the low regard which America's women hold for the proposal:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 6, 1955.*
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOSMER: You are to be commended on your vigorous opposition to the upper Colorado River project, Senate bill 500, during the debates in the House Interior Committee meetings.

If the bill reaches the floor of the House, it is hoped that your further arguments will convince your colleagues that the project is economically unfeasible.

Since the Hoover Commission has detected such facts as to cause it to report that Federal water and power bureaus are inefficiently managed, that their projects have benefited a few at the expense of many, and that they have a record of fantastically underestimating the cost of water projects which have been undertaken, it does seem to follow that S. 500 should not be approved.

It is my impression that S. 500 was rushed through the Senate without giving the matter due consideration. Their haste causes me to ask the question, "Why?"

In addition to being unsound economically, I object to the passage of S. 500, even though the Echo Park Storage Dam apparently has been deleted, because it also includes the construction of a storage dam in Glen Canyon, which dam would result in the drowning of some of the most spectacular scenery of our Southwest.

An alert public has risen to the defense of Dinosaur National Monument, which movement I heartily endorse. However, I am not aware that anyone has voiced a plea

to also save Glen Canyon from destruction, except, indirectly, in that you pointed out that the geological formation of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam site is such that it is questionable whether or not the site is proper or suitable for a high dam.

Although this may not be the proper time, may I raise my earnest voice in defense of Dinosaur National Monument and Glen Canyon, in particular.

During the summer of 1954 I floated down the Yampa and Green Rivers, including Ledore Canyon of the Green, in Dinosaur National Monument. In May of this year I toured the Colorado River from Hite, Utah, to Lees Ferry, Ariz., a distance of approximately 170 miles, through Glen Canyon. As a result of these trips I can state, without reservation, that to drown any part of these marvelous regions would demonstrate our lack of responsibility to preserve our most outstanding natural scenery for the enjoyment of our present generation as well as those of the future.

It cannot be said that these regions are too remote or too dangerous for recreational purposes. Too many have made the tours in complete safety, and, in fact, this year our party met about 100 boy scouts floating through Glen Canyon.

Opinions have been expressed that the waters of the Colorado River Basin can be conserved without the construction of Echo Park and Glen Canyon storage dams. I believe that if our legislators would personally view these areas they would be convinced that, if storage dams are an essential part of water conservation, all possible alternate sites must be explored before rashly drowning Dinosaur and Glen Canyon. I personally would not want to bear the stigma of having had any part in the destruction of either of these scenic waterways.

You may be sure that your efforts to protect the public interest are greatly appreciated, and I, personally, am grateful.

Respectfully yours,

ETHEL L. MIERS.

Resolutions Passed by Minor Local of the North Dakota Farmers Union, No. 1127

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here some resolutions passed by Minor Local of the North Dakota Farmers Union, No. 1127. These pertain to soil conservation, the national sales tax, credit, low interest rates, and price supports on beef and cattle, and should be of interest to all segments of our economy:

"Whereas the idle acres are actually a loss to the farmer and Nation, we, therefore, ask that the Federal Government appropriate money for payment to aid farmers in soil-building purposes, for the purpose of building and maintaining fertility of the soil for future generations, at the rate of $10 per acre, in accordance with the bill of Minnesota Congressmen MARSHALL and H. CARL ANDERSON."

Passed by the Minor Local of the North Dakota Farmers Union, No. 1127, on February 17, 1954.

ALVIN CAMPBELL,
Secretary.

MORRISTOWN, S. DAK.

We, the members of the Minor Local, No. 1127, of the North Dakota Farmers Union, meeting this February 17, 1954, do hereby strongly and vigorously oppose a national sales tax or a so-called manufacture tax.

ALVIN CAMPBELL,
Secretary.

MORRISTOWN, S. DAK.

Whereas it appears that there wasn't enough credit available at reasonable rates for North Dakota farmers last year; and

Whereas there will be more credit needed this year, because of the wheat rust and falling prices: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Minor Local, No. 1127, of the North Dakota Farmers Union this February 17, 1954, That the present session of Congress make more money available in this year of 1954 at low-interest rates through the Farmers Home Administration for more and larger production loans this year.

ALVIN CAMPBELL,
Secretary.

MORRISTOWN, S. DAK.

Whereas the beef cattle prices to the farmer and/or rancher is at so low a level that the farmer and/or rancher is operating at a loss; and

Whereas the present beef-buying program is not helping the producer, but the packers are making a large profit on this program; Be it therefore

Resolved by the Minor Local, No. 1127, of the North Dakota Farmers Union this February 17, 1954, That the United States Department of Agriculture, through the CCC, make loans to the producer similar to the loans on wheat now being made or some other program that will be of assistance to the producer.

ALVIN CAMPBELL,
Secretary.

MORRISTOWN, S. DAK.

"Whereas the price support program is due to expire December 31, 1954; and

"Whereas this program is necessary to the wheat grower; and

"Whereas the farmers' share of the national income has dropped to a lower level than it has been for a number of years; and

"Whereas the farm income is too low for the successful operation of the Nation's small or family-type farms: Be it therefore

"*Resolved by the Minor Local, No. 1127, of the North Dakota Farmers Union,* That this program be continued and strengthened to 100 percent of parity and we vigorously oppose the two-price or sliding-scale plan of wheat price supports."

Passed by the Minor Local of the Farmers Union No. 1127, February 17, 1954.

ALVIN CAMPBELL,
Secretary.

MORRISTOWN, S. DAK.

Communist Propaganda Fuels Unrest in Refugee Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a story by Daniel Schorr in the Christian Science Monitor of July 6. It is not hard to imagine the importance the Communists attach to the resettling of refugees and displaced persons behind the Iron Curtain. As refugee discontent grows in the free countries so there is liable to occur a proportionate attraction to the propaganda tactics of the Communists to "come home to Czechoslovakia or Rumania." We are in the grips of a very cold, very harsh psychological war and this is the crux of it. An ineffectual refugee program on the part of the United States means a sure and decisive victory for the Communists and a valuable loss of esteem and prestige for us by the people in the satellite nations.

The article follows:

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA FUELS UNREST IN REFUGEE CAMPS

SALZBURG, AUSTRIA.—Refugees are not avid followers of the news. On their meager doles and the wages of occasional labor, they can rarely buy newspapers. Nor is the atmosphere of the camp, with its usual pall of discouragement and resignation, conducive to keeping up with the times.

Though refugees are not confined in the camps, many of which are located in large towns (there are four in Salzburg), there is still a sense of isolation, and refugees tend to be only dimly aware of events around them—even those which may govern their own future, such as the United States refugee policy now under debate in Washington.

Yet some events do penetrate the veil of listlessness. The news which has shaken the refugees more than anything in many months is the Austrian state treaty and the Soviet diplomatic offensive for a neutral belt through the center of Europe. It has given rise to a wave of anxiety, in some cases approaching terror.

The current of apprehension is strongest, at the moment, in Austria, but it is not limited to Austria. And it has hardly been allayed by the elimination from the Austrian treaty of the provisions concerning repatriation of refugees.

AUSTRIAN PLEDGE

Austria has pledged that there will be no forcible repatriation. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees says it will be vigilant in protecting their status. But the refugees feel not at all reassured.

As they see it, a neutral Austria, unguarded by Western troops, will be too weak to withstand Soviet pressure. And if there is pressure to turn over expatriates from the Soviet Union or satellite countries, it will happen.

Austria, as a signatory of the Geneva convention on refugees, is committed not to expel anyone. But there are ways to get around that. Under Austrian law any foreigner sentenced to prison is also subject to possible expulsion.

Officials of refugee-assistance agencies doubt that there will be any change in current Austrian policy on refugees, although the United States escapee program will probably not be able to continue in its present form under conditions of neutrality.

But, however unjustified, the refugees' apprehensions are sharp and they must be reckoned with. Some refugees talk of a mass flight into Germany when the Allied forces pull out of Austria. Undoubtedly such talk is exaggerated and, in any event, the refugees would have trouble getting through the German frontier guards. But that is the kind of talk one hears.

COMMUNIST PURSUIT

In milder form, the apprehensions of the refugees in Austria are echoed in camps in Germany, and even heard in Greece and Turkey, as Moscow presses its diplomatic offensive. In the refugee's one-sided, distorted view of the world, all this has only one meaning—that the Communist hand

from which he fled is stretching closer to him.

To the thousands of refugees who have felt trapped in the countries along the Iron Curtain by red tape and lack of emigration opportunities, the recent political events have added a new element of urgency to what was previously discouragement, gloom, and bitterness. A new note of desperation is felt as one interviews refugees.

And there is evidence now that the Soviet Union and its satellites are taking concerted action to exploit that desperation. As though aware that this is the strategic moment, they have opened all the stops in a campaign to lure the refugees home.

The repatriation drive started quietly several months ago—a handful of letters from Poland and Czechoslovakia inviting refugees to come home. There were promises of forgiveness and better jobs.

Gradually the campaign grew—leaflets and pamphlets mailed from East Berlin and Vienna. Hungary proclaimed an amnesty for refugees on April 17, Czechoslovakia on May 8, and Romania on June 26. Propaganda literature poured into the camps. Many envelopes were precisely addressed, by barracks and room number—a disturbing sign that agents in the camps had compiled catalogs, that "Big Brother" was watching.

CHAIN LETTERS

One device was the chain letter, which a refugee was asked to copy three times and pass on. Here is a typical letter received by a Czech refugee:

"The Association of Exiles for Repatriation has found a good response among the mass of our people. Enemies are trying to block our aim—the repatriation of Czech exiles to the homeland. The enemy propaganda tells lies. It fails to say that nobody who returns suffers any reprisal. We will undertake every step to provide good conditions to those who return.

"The day of repatriation is in sight. Enter our lines. We are joined in one solid front to achieve our goal.

"There need not be one exile who does not know about the HEPND (the repatriation organization). Increase the distribution of these letters. Give them to your relatives and friends.

"HEPND says the time has come to fill out forms at the Czechoslovak Consulate for repatriation. Your application is the sign of your wish to end your present life in exile and to return to your homeland. Your relatives in Czechoslovakia can help you if you write them.

"Appeal to the Czechoslovak consulate. The day of repatriation is in the near future. We will be happy to welcome you.

"Copy this three time and send it to your friends. Do not sign it."

Lately, mimeographed newspapers have been circulated through the mail. A recent one opens with an idyllic account of springtime in Czechoslovakia; stresses the lack of emigration opportunity for Czech refugees ("At this rate the emigration from Western Germany would take 20 years"), and then gets down to the business of instructing exiles how to organize cells to promote the repatriation movement—no one to be known to more than two others, nothing to be put in writing.

The last words are "You sing always the same song: There will be no visas to the United States of America."

MOSCOW PROPAGANDA

Similar propaganda is now being circulated by other Soviet satellites, and even by Moscow. The letters come not only from Vienna and Berlin, but, in some cases, with New York and London postmarks.

So far only a handful of exiles have responded to the "come home" campaign, but those who did were promptly put on the radio to denounce the West and to say that the democracy which the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe vaunted were in reality misery and concentration camps.

Those going home—ever-inventive bureauracy has coined the word "redefection"—have so far been only a handful, but Western officials think that the number may increase as desperation increases if opportunities for emigration remain inadequate.

Michael A. Farrell, of Philadelphia, representative of the American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, who keeps close watch from his headquarters at Camp Galsenbach, said that in coming months the West may be engaged in a race against repatriation. A mass return of refugees thus could be a disaster for the West in the psychological cold war. One cannot calculate how far it would set the West back in trying to win the loyalty and trust of the people behind the Iron Curtain, he said.

The answer may be to provide the exiles with the hope of emigration that first prompted them to leave. The operation of the United States refugee relief program is now stepping up, but not fast enough, by present signs, to win the race.

The Wenzell Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times contained a very interesting editorial on the Wenzell report, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including, herewith, a copy of that editorial, which should be read by each and every Member of the House:

THE WENZELL REPORT

From Washington on Saturday came the overdue news of where the Federal Government seems to have got its new Tennessee Valley Authority policy. It got it, presumably, from a report drawn up for the Budget Bureau in 1953 by Adolphe M. Wenzell, an investment banker, who had been called in as consultant.

Mr. Wenzell's opinion, at the time the report was made, was, in effect, that the Government should get out of the power business in the Tennessee Valley, turning that business over, by degrees, to private enterprise. The Government, under this plan, would remain in the flood control and navigation businesses, which are not directly remunerative. The Nation would thus be preserved from socialism of either the creeping or the galloping kind.

Mr. Wenzell is entitled to his opinions, past and present. TVA had had to resort increasingly to steam in order to firm up its waterpower. A private corporation would do the same. Honest men may and do differ as to where public power should stop. Congress might well debate the issue. It might even choose to modify the policy under which TVA has developed and by means of which a wave of prosperity has flowed down a long-neglected river channel.

But Mr. Wenzell, however pure his integrity, was associated with parties interested in expanding private power, for private profit. The Budget Bureau is an executive, not a legislative, agency. Finally, this whole enterprise of hamstringing TVA was undertaken in a left-handed, side-winding way which indicated a desire to avoid, not promote, full and informed discussion.

The Wenzell 1953 report, now available, sheds some light on the thinking that produced the Dixon-Yates power plan. But a little more light is needed.

In addition, I would like to include in my remarks a copy of the letter I have today addressed to the editor of the New York Times, setting forth certain specific questions raised in connection with the handling of the situation.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1955.

EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: I read with much interest your excellent editorial on "The Wenzell Report," in this morning's New York Times.

I feel that a great deal more light is needed in this very important matter.

1. Was Mr. Wenzell's report the basis for President Eisenhower's statement that TVA is "creeping socialism," in spite of the support he voiced for TVA during his crusade?

2. Did the President know of this report in 1953, and if he did not, is he not chargeable with knowledge of it?

3. Was Mr. Eisenhower aware of the fact that Mr. Wenzell was associated with the First Boston Corp., a company necessarily and completely dedicated to private enterprise and big business?

4. Could Mr. Wenzell properly reflect the interests of the First Boston Corp., and the people of the country at the same time?

5. Were the statements that the Dixon-Yates contract would help TVA just so many platitudes for public sale and consumption?

6. Should not our Chief Executive have been more circumspect in ordering this private power contract in view of the Wenzell report, the circumstances surrounding same, and the rejection of the contract by a majority of the Atomic Energy Commission?

As an individual Member of Congress, I am deeply disturbed by all of these questions which as yet remain unanswered. In the midst of a great hue and cry, of much thunder and lightning of the need to get Government out of business, I have come to the conclusion that the sooner we get business out of Government the better off we will be.

I have seen no real benefits to the people in the continuation in public office of officials of General Motors, Quaker Oats, or even the First Boston Corp.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER HOLTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Florida?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Florida has more than 1,970,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production—when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Mapleton Operator for 37 Years Finds Doctor, People, Saves Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the following is a human interest story about a beloved community servant, the late Miss Helen Fiyol, who for 37 years served as the telephone operator at Mapleton, Minn. How grateful the community is to Miss Fiyol is illustrated in the columns of the Mankato Free Press of June 28 and is a tribute so well deserved. The article follows:

MAPLETON OPERATOR FOR 37 YEARS FINDS DOCTOR, PEOPLE, SAVES LIVES

When Mapleton dedicates its new telephone building ushering in the dial system, everyone will turn their thoughts to a beloved community servant who didn't live to see her dream become a reality.

They called her Helen (Helen Fiyol) and the citizens had already made plans to honor her for the unselfish service she had rendered to them for 37 years. Miss Fiyol died June 10.

Everyone in Mapleton will remember Helen, whose service kept the lines open. No call was too great and no demand too heavy for this stout operator who devoted her life to serving others.

Mapleton residents didn't call by number, they said, "Helen get me Dr. Vezina, give me the garage." She had the switchboard memorized and immediately plugged in the call. If the person wasn't at home, she made every effort to find them.

She didn't discriminate, as she was a servant to every caller whether she knew them or not.

Let the Mapleton residents tell what they thought of Helen.

Dr. J. C. Vezina will miss her service the most. Comments the doctor, "I don't know if there is a person in this community, who in my 25 years here, has been such a tremendous help to me and Mapleton as Helen; her sistor, Mrs. Trealor, Barbara Fiyol, and one niece, Mary Stenzel."

The stout, white-haired doctor recalls that Helen's devotion to her duty was responsible for saving at least three lives.

He recalls the November 11, 1940 Armistice Day blizzard. The doctor was 4 miles out of town serving a confinement case when the call came through Helen's switchboard for the doctor. A mother in Waseca county was about to have a child.

The storm was brewing and Helen realizing the situation called the neighbors near the place where the doctor was administering. They notified him of the emergency. Meanwhile with the storm whistling through the town, Helen notiffed the Waseca County couple to send a bobsled to meet the doctor. She stayed at the switchboard, called neighbors along the mercy route to find out the condition of the roads and relayed the information to the doctor.

Dr. Vezina met the bobsled and raced to the home. He gave the mother immediate medical attention. Because of Helen's efforts, 2 to 4 hours were saved.

Comments the doctor, "In that case, the baby would have died because the case needed immediate medical attention." Somewhere in Easton there is a strapping 14-year-old youth, alive because of Helen.

A mother and a child owe their lives to Helen. This time a Pemberton woman was prehemorrhaging and needed a doctor. The call came through Helen's "mercy board." The doctor was on a case where no phone was available.

Once again, Helen rang neighbors in the area who notified the doctor. Dr. Vezina raced to the Pemberton woman's home, arrested the hemorrhage and called for an ambulance.

Had it not been for Helen's quick efforts, the mother and the baby would have both died because the case needed urgent emergency attention.

Mapleton townspeople recall a case where a woman, feeling sick, signaled the operator. Before she could speak, she collapsed. Helen heard her heavy breathing and notified the doctor. The woman, who had suffered a stroke, lived.

A. G. Cronen of the Mapleton funeral home, too, had nothing but praise for Helen and her sisters. "I couldn't begin to tell you the number of times she helped me," he comments. He remembers particularly a man dying in Mapleton leaving no clues to his relatives. Cronen gave Helen the case.

She worked all day and finally found his relatives—in Massachusetts. Another time, Cronen was out of town and his sister in Minneapolis died. But Helen found Cronen and told him of the death.

They all remember Helen. L. J. Will of the Will Auto Co. says, "She was a private secretary to all the businessmen in the town." He explained, "If you wanted that person, she would continue calling until she located him. Everything was an emergency to her."

George Bissonette, a Mapleton grocer, and a pallbearer at the funeral, will be forever grateful. During 1947, there was a long-distance-phone strike. Bissonette's wife was in the hospital. However, thanks to Helen and her efforts, Bissonette talked to his wife every day of the strike.

"She was a friend to the farmers," comments Roy Mullin of rural Mapleton. "She always knew where you were—never had to ask you your name."

Perhaps no one knew Helen better than her sister Barbara. "Helen never talked about the things she did," comments Barbara. One day she discovered smoke coming up the switchboard which is located on the second floor above the municipal liquor store.

Quickly, she called Al's Grocery Store, turned in the alarm, and barely escaped through the second-story window. "Helen could reach out," recalls her sister. "She never stopped trying a call until she finished it, despite the time."

A. D. Borchert, a Mapleton businessman, comments: "She performed these extra services because she wanted to. There was no grandstanding. She was grateful to so many and many showed their appreciation to her by giving her gifts of appreciation at Christmas time. You couldn't get gruff with her," concluded Borchert.

Speaking for her employer, the Mankato Citizens Telephone Co., P. M. Ferguson, Jr., of Mankato, says: "We never had a major trouble with our Mapleton subscribers. She would fight for her subscribers." He remembers especially when they were without telephone service in an emergency.

Wherever you go on the Mapleton streets people echo the same comments. "She was great." "Nothing was too big for her to tackle."

Yes; there is a new brick, modern building in Mapleton containing the new dial system equipment which will be dedicated in August. They had hoped Helen could work part time in a system to which she has been so loyal.

The old switchboard which had been so skillfully manipulated by the deft fingers of the three sisters, will be torn out. With it will go an individual service of help, information, and guidance so graciously extended by Helen and her two sisters—a service taken so much for granted.

Perhaps Borchert sums it up best in talking to Ferguson: "You can build the finest automatic, Pete, but you will never be able to equal that service. We are all going to miss her."

Use of FBI in Dixon-Yates Investigation Called Proper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I greatly admire the work done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its untarnished record. There has been much criticism in both Houses of the Congress with regard to the use of the FBI in collecting the facts on the so-called Dixon-Yates contract.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the July 8, 1955, edition of the New York Herald Tribune:

USE OF FBI IN DIXON-YATES INVESTIGATION CALLED PROPER

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, July 7.—Attacks on the proper functioning of the executive branch of the Government by a certain Senator from Wisconsin were widely condemned by the Democrats, but now they are doing the very things which they themselves criticized.

For the attack by several Democratic Senators on the Attorney General as having done something improper or unusual when he ordered the Federal Bureau of Investigation to send its agents on a fact-finding mission related to a possible cancellation of a Government contract is perhaps the most conspicuous exhibition of interference with Executive functions by legislators that has been recorded in recent years.

FUNCTION OF FBI

The fact that the attacks were obviously launched for political purposes doesn't excuse them. What is regrettable is that men elected to the high office of Senator are revealed as totally unfamiliar with some of the laws they themselves have passed, under which the FBI for years has carried on certain functions of fact-finding essential to the carrying out of the legal obligations of the executive branch of the Government.

The common impression about the FBI is that it only tracks down criminals or roots out suspected violators of the law on the criminal side. Actually, this is but one of many duties imposed by Congress on the FBI. Businessmen, for example, have long been accustomed to the daily visits of FBI agents who seek information needed by the

Department of Justice in the inquiries prior to the filing of civil suits under the antitrust laws.

CHECKING CONTRACTS

It was the Democratic administration which delegated to the FBI the task of getting legal information with respect to the existing contract-renegotiation laws. This involves a checkup of the contents of contracts and a verification of a variety of items that can be the basis for dispute between the Government and private contractors.

But the main reason for the FBI being called in to get the facts now about the proposal of the city of Memphis to build a powerplant is that, because of this action, the executive branch of the Federal Government has under consideration the possible cancellation of a $106 million contract with the Dixon-Yates organization. If the contract is canceled, the Government may be the defendant in a civil suit for damages. The Department of Justice, which gives legal advice to the President, is obligated to advise upon the liability of the Government for any cancellation that is made. Every statement on which any action is predicated must be verified in advance from a legal standpoint.

It is not adequate, therefore, to send a messenger boy to Memphis to collect the documents. The Government must send its authorized investigators, who must get certified copies of every piece of evidence which could possibly become the basis for litigation later on. The Federal Government must be prepared to show it acted in good faith and didn't play politics in canceling the Dixon-Yates agreement, if cancellation should be decided upon as the best course.

The law is clear. Section 1089 of title V of the United States Code says:

"For investigations regarding official matters under control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State, as may be directed by the Attorney General, the Attorney General is authorized to appoint officials who shall be vested with the authority necessary for the execution of such duties."

APPROPRIATION LAWS

In the appropriation laws governing FBI funds is to be found a provision which says the FBI is to handle "such other matters under the control of the Department of Justice as may be directed by the Attorney General."

Under these grants of power the FBI, for many years, has investigated all the facts connected with cases that the Department of Justice has to defend in the United States Court of Claims. Likewise, after the Texas City disaster, the FBI made an extensive fact-finding inquiry so as to advise the Department on possible claims that might arise.

The Democrats certainly went to town with their political demagoguery. Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama, said the use of the FBI in the matter is "utterly ridiculous." Senator GORE, of Tennessee, called it an outrage and said the FBI was created "to guard the Nation's security and apprehend criminals" and not to be used as a "gestapo or political shock troops." Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, called it a "violation of intergovernmental relationships of the worst sort." House Leader MCCORMACK said it is "what would be expected in a police state." Senator KEFAUVER denounced it as an unwarranted use of the FBI by the Attorney General.

ANTITRUST MATTERS

But not one of these Members of Congress would be willing today to sponsor legislation to prohibit the FBI from using its agents—as it is now doing in consequence of orders first issued by a Democratic Attorney General—to investigate mergers, monopolies, and antitrust matters generally, which is all on the civil side and usually has no relation whatsoever to national security or the apprehension of criminals.

Mayor Tobey, of Memphis, however, sees the point. He has said publicly that he doesn't object to the inquiries by the FBI men. He has promised them every cooperation as they seek data on the legislative and executive powers of the city of Memphis. It is, of course, essential to analyze all of this before the Federal Government starts canceling a contract that could involve American taxpayers in the loss of many millions of dollars through suits for damages.

Sugar Act Extension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, much misleading information has been put out concerning the proposal to extend and revise the Sugar Act of 1948 this year. Because I think it is of great importance, not only to our domestic sugar producing areas, but to the country as a whole, that this should be done, I would like to address myself primarily to some of the arguments which have been used against the proposal. Last week I appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture and filed a statement on this same subject. In the remarks to appear herewith, I will follow that statement almost verbatim.

I appear in support of H. R. 5406, having introduced an identical bill, H. R. 5443. Of course, the State which it is my privilege to represent has vested interest in this legislation. We are not one of the largest producing States in the Nation, but the sugar-beet industry is very important to our economy. Sugar beets represented 20 percent of the cash income crop in Wyoming in 1954, according to Department of Agriculture figures. It is not only important to us as farming commodity, but affects practically every other segment of our economy, including labor and business, which is practically all small business in Wyoming. Just to give you some idea of this, the farmer received approximately $6½ million for his crop. Payrolls of the sugar factories in 1954 represented $2 million. Freight payments by truck and railroad amounted to $1½ million. Two and one-half million were accounted for by sugar-refinery purchases of coal and various other industrial supplies. This totals $12½ million, but is really only a fraction of what could be developed, and if we were to arrive at the true realistic total, we would have to take into account the equipment purchased by the farmer and the food and other items purchased by farmers and factory workers, and those indirectly concerned. This will give you some idea of the importance of this to our economy.

I am not here, however, to make an appeal for special consideration for my State, nor any other State. I think this is good sound legislation, for the best interest of the country as a whole, and when I say the country as a whole, I mean of the farmers, businessmen, laborers, and the consumers.

Although the statement has apparently been criticised, I still think the question before this committee and the Congress can be simply boiled down to the proposition of, is the American farmer to be allowed to share in the growth and progress of America. No matter how one attempts to sidestep the issue, that is what must be decided.

I have attended a good portion of the hearings and have had a representative present at almost all others. We have attempted to secure copies of those statements made available to us. Speaking of facts, I think that most of the pertinent facts are in the record, and have been presented very fairly and ably by representatives of the growers and the domestic industry. I see nothing to be accomplished by reviewing these facts. I am confident that if they are weighed on the basis of fairness and historical evidence, and what is best for the overall American citizen, then this legislation is certain to be passed by the committee and by the Congress.

As we have followed these hearings, however, we have noted that some questions have come up which seem to be left more or less hanging in the air. It is my opinion that the time allotted to me could best be used in touching briefly on some of these points which more frequently appeared.

In the first place, there seems to be some effort made to tie this program to the issue of high rigid versus flexible price supports. I think it is obvious on the surface, that the situation pertaining to the principal basic commodities and the situation that pertains to sugar in the United States are not comparable for the simple reason that in the case of most of the basics, we have a surplus raised in the United States over what is consumed in the United States; whereas in the case of sugar, we are dealing with a commodity where our domestic production is approximately one-half of our consumption. I voted in favor of flexible price supports. Before doing so, I tried to give honest consideration to the other proposals. My vote was based on what I believe to be in the best interest of the American farmer and the American economy in general. I am confident that others, who voted otherwise, to a large measure, voted because of similar convictions. I certainly respect the opinions of those who disagree with me, and only time will tell which of us is correct. Certainly this committee should and will consider this legislation on its merits, and on the basis of what is best for the American farmer, the American economy, and the overall American otherwise, without permitting the legislation to be prejudiced by side issues.

Let me state that my constituents and myself are extremely interested in a selfish way in the basic crop which is a matter of greatest concern. Of course, I refer to wheat. Reference has been made to the living-room approach in connection with the restrictions on im-

ports by quotas. If the approach with regard to sugar is a living room, then certainly our policy as to wheat, in which my constituents are also directly interested, and most of the other basic commodities, is that of a closed-door policy. With certain limited exceptions, we permit no importations, and this is as it should be, for we are raising presently in the United States, more of these commodities than we can consume.

Considerable comment has been made about the awful subsidy attached to this program. This, in my humble opinion, is not a subsidy in the sense that the word is commonly used in America today, but is a production payment made to the American producer in lieu of tariff. I think all of us must agree that the American producer cannot pay high wages or other high costs of production, nor can we in America continue to advance our standard of living, and still compete with foreign producers, whether we produce sugar, automobiles, bicycles, textiles, cotton, wool, livestock, toys, oil, coal, or almost any other commodity that you can think of. The Sugar Act took us from high tariffs to the quota procedure, with payments to growers, primarily to benefit Cuba. The whole sugar problem is a tariff problem and not a price support problem. Just as a further example, some members of this committee and myself have common interests in the livestock industry. We take great pride that our livestock producers have refused to seek price supports. On the other hand, if we were to suddenly throw open the Mexican border and drop all barriers to importation of Argentine beef, it would be but a short time before domestic industry was completely demoralized. I can continue to draw similar parallels with other commodities. The facts showed that the sugar program has not operated to the detriment of the consumer, but rather to his benefit.

In connection with the problem as to basic commodities, may I also point out that this revision of the Sugar Act will help to solve some of the problems pertaining to acreage cuts on the basic commodities. I know of instances in my own State where the reason that some of our veterans, who have been on projects for long enough to have acquired a sugar history since World War II, but have not, is caused mainly because they could grow certain basic commodities, at a guaranteed price, with less investment and less work. By permitting them to grow sugar beets now, we will ease the pain as far as the acreage restrictions are concerned on wheat; not only on them, but on other wheat growers.

It has been inferred that we cannot ease off on acreage controls every time we feel a pinch, or we will have a chaotic farm program. This might be true generally, but we certainly can increase the acreage allotments on sugar when we have a crop which we do not domestically produce in surplus, and when we can do so without taking it away from anyone else, as I will subsequently point out. I should also like to mention that during my short service in Congress, I have had occasion to vote for acreage increases for the small tobacco producer, rice producer, cotton farmer, and, I believe, peanut farmer, even though these are crops in which there is a domestic surplus. Certainly it is not fair to infer that there is no compassion in our souls for others while we ask special privileges, when all we are asking is for a share in the growth of America for our sugar producer and are willing to give and pay higher domestic prices in order to maintain our American standard of living, et cetera, with regard to the entire domestic consumption of other commodities.

I was somewhat amazed by the sweeping statements made on the part of some domestic industries, who apparently felt that they were best serving their own interests by suggesting that everything should be given to the foreign interests. In connection with this, I should like to compliment and thank the representatives of foreign interests other than Cuba for the very fair and fine statements which they have made. I certainly hope that they shall be given favorable consideration for a greater share in the foreign quota. As concerns domestic interests, who made statements to the opposite effect, I would again like to point out that they cannot, over the long haul, compete with lower labor and other production costs in foreign countries any better than can the American sugar producers. Within the last week, I have received a letter from one of my constituents wanting to know why he could not buy truck tractors from Canada without paying a 10 percent duty. I could very well use a new car. I might very well be driving an Italian Fiat, or a German Volkswagon, or a British Austin, if we were to remove the 10 percent duty. I am not suggesting that this be done, because I believe in preserving the American standard of living and protecting the American worker and businessman, but I might suggest that the same consideration be given our sugar farmers, laborers, and businessmen. I have some figures available, if anyone is interested, on what the small population in Wyoming alone buys in some of these commodities. Certainly if our economy is strong, the ability of the domestic market to purchase must be preserved. It is rather interesting to note that one of the companies whose representative appeared before this committee minimizing the importance of the domestic producer only very recently contacted me in an entirely different vein. The State which I represent was thinking of going into a machine accounting system. The Wyoming representative of this company approached me with the request that I speak to the Governor about giving his company an opportunity to be considered. At that time, I was led to believe that this was a very important piece of business to the company generally. May I remind this company that a good portion of the taxes that must be raised to pay for these machines, when and if they are bought, must come from Wyoming sugar beet producers and others directly and indirectly connected with the industry. The main argument seems to be centered around the obligation we have to Cuba. I think that it is established beyond contradiction that we have no legal obligation, which this bill seeks to controvert. Cuba will be left with her full quota before World War II, plus virtually all the increased consumption up to the present date, plus whatever share of the historic 45 percent foreign production that is eventually allotted to her by this committee and this Congress. The argument that we are cutting down on her is simply without basis or fact. We cannot be charged with disrupting her economy, for we do not propose to buy less from her, but continually more. The records of previous hearings and committee reports have been quoted for this record, and certainly established that Cuba had a right to expect that the domestic producers would reenter the market for their historic share as soon as they had recovered from the various effects of wartime dislocations. Cuba entered the market during wartime and supplied us over and beyond her historic quotas. Naturally we were gratified at this. On the other hand, they have been repaid well, and to say that they are entitled to more consideration is to completely overlook the primary fact that we fought and financed a war that benefited Cuba just as well as the rest of the world. I remember a Puerto Rican regiment in North Africa, and a Brazilian division in Italy, but to the best of my knowledge, no Cuban blood was spilled on foreign soil. I think we cannot disregard the interest of the American farmer, and particularly the debt that we owe to the veteran who took one of our reclamation farms in Wyoming and other Western States, and is now denied any sugar beet production under the present law.

Yes, Cuba was well repaid for contributing to our war effort by producing sugar—at a profit—while we fought a war—at a loss. Cuba has had all our increase in domestic consumption since the beginning of World War II, added to their basic quota at that time. The Cuban import quota increased from roughly 1,900,000 tons in 1940 to 2,668,000 tons in 1955. Under our bills we would take 188,000 tons out of the 200,000 estimated increase in consumption this year, and share the balance. Therefore, Cuba's quota for 1955 might well be as high as 2,673,000 tons. The argument that we would be taking something away from Cuba this year does not stand up in this light.

As far as I am concerned, the argument fails that we even have a moral obligation to Cuba in connection with this. If this Government, and this Congress, has a moral obligation to anyone, it is to these veterans, who are suddenly denied a right to produce. They have obligated themselves to pay for the expensive machinery now used on a sugar-beet farm. Unless we do something about this law and do it now, we are saying to them, "We made available to you a small 160-acre farm. We encouraged you to sign the repayment contract to pay back the cost of irrigation. We stood by while you invested in this machinery and gave a boost to the American factory worker. Now we are no longer interested in you. You cannot grow a cash crop. For all we care you can lose your machinery. You can lose your farm, and your family can go begging."

If there is any moral obligation in-

volved in this legislation, in my humble opinion, it is to these veterans.

Let us look at the moral obligation statements from yet another angle. Throughout these hearings it has been pointed up that the reason for the 1948 Sugar Act amendments was to give the American farmer a chance to build back his production curtailed by the war, and to allow Cuba to scale down her production gradually to gear it to a postwar economy over a period of 5 years rather than take an abrupt drop in quota. There lies a moral obligation on the part of Cuba. Cuba has not lived up to the spirit of the agreement, nor made any recognizable attempt to live up to it. She has each year increased her acreage, and each year increased her production. Cuba, then, is in the peculiar position of charging the wronged party with a moral obligation that cannot exist in the light of her refusal to comply with the spirit of the agreement made possible by the generosity and understanding of the domestic producers and the Philippine producers.

I have one more salient point. I have always tried, throughout my legislative experience, to decide issues on the basis of principle. The principle involved here is that the American citizen, whether he be a farmer, laborer, a shipowner, or a lawyer, is certainly entitled to benefit from his own enterprise and his own initiative—he is certainly entitled to a share in the growth of America. This is the principle involved in the 50–50 provision of S. 2090 adopted on the floor of the House last week, to give the American shipowner a chance to take a half share of the shipping of American products abroad. When my Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation wired me to oppose this proposal, I immediately contacted them by telephone to tell them that I considered the principle involved—exactly the same principle we are fighting for in attempting to get the sugar bill passed—the right of the American to participate in the growth of America. I supported the 50–50 provision for American shipowners and sailors. It was adopted by an overwhelming division vote. I think the House will follow the same principle as applied to our sugar industry if allowed an opportunity.

I urge that H. R. 5406 be given prompt and favorable consideration in the interests of the American farmer, the American economy, and the overall general American interest, both with regard to domestic and foreign relations.

A Kind Word for Tom O'Brien

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of July 11, 1955:

A KIND WORD FOR TOM O'BRIEN

In his 18 years in Congress, Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois, seldom has raised his voice or sponsored a bill. But he has the professional politicians' way of making friends, even with those who are on the other side of the political fence.

O'BRIEN is the sponsor of a measure to permit more Lake Michigan water to be diverted through the Illinois waterway. He sponsored the measure as the ranking member of the Chicago delegation. And it turned out that quiet TOM could be persuasive and eloquent as the occasion demanded. His ability to make friends paid off when an effort to kill the bill failed 316 to 74.

More water is needed in the Illinois waterway to speed the flow of sewage and provide a cleaner river downstate. Opposition usually comes from Congressmen from other lake States who argue that increasing the flow will lower the lake levels.

O'BRIEN's measure would increase the flow from 1,500 to 2,500 feet per second for a 3-year experimental period. During this time, he argued, it would be possible to reassess all the problems caused when Chicago turned the Chicago River around and caused it to flow backward earlier this century.

The measure now goes to the Senate, where it should get bipartisan support from Senator DOUGLAS and Senator DIRKSEN.

Anthony Olis, president of the sanitary district, tells us that O'BRIEN deserves a good hand for the way he handled the matter. This is probably the nicest thing ever said about O'BRIEN by a Republican in all his 77 years.

Shocking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a pertinent editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 7, 1955:

SMOKESCREEN FOR A RETREAT

One of the most pertinent and shocking facts now emerges through the smokescreen with which the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower is covering its retreat on the ill-starred Dixon-Yates power contract.

That fact is the full measure of the impropriety of Adolphe H. Wenzell's serving the Government at the same time that his investment house was arranging financing for Dixon-Yates.

Paul H. Miller, an official of First Boston Corp., as was Wenzell at the time, testified Wednesday to the Senate antimonopoly subcommittee that Wenzell drafted the Dixon-Yates financing plan while serving as a consultant to the President's Bureau of the Budget.

He testified that one reason First Boston waived its usual fee for the service—amounting to $150,000—was that it wanted to avoid charges that the bank profited from Wenzell's work with the Budget Bureau.

Yet as late as June 30 President Eisenhower told his press conference:

"Mr. Wenzell never was called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract. He was brought in * * * before the contract was ever proposed. My understanding is that quickly as the Dixon-Yates thing came up he resigned."

Senator KEFAUVER proposes to call Budget Director Hughes to explain why no mention of First Boston Corp. was made in the administration's official documentation of Dixon-Yates. The committee might also inquire why the President has been so sadly misinformed and noninformed about Mr. Wenzell's role.

Senator KEFAUVER's committee is hot on the scent of the charge that Mr. Wenzell violated the conflict-of-interest law. This part of the Criminal Code forbids Government employees outside interests which conflict with their interests as Government servants.

Meanwhile, the administration continues to send up new puffs of smoke. General Vogel, Chairman of TVA, reports, as everyone already knew, that the Dixon-Yates plant is no longer needed. Budget Director Hughes reexamines the project at the President's behest. Attorney General Brownell assigns FBI agents to find out if Memphis can really go ahead and build its own steam plant.

Whatever the fate of the Dixon-Yates project—and its future does not appear bright—there should be no letup in the investigation of the Wenzell double role and of the apparent favoring of special interests which has characterized the whole unbusinesslike business.

Herbert Hoover, Respected, Distinguished Elder Statesman of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, all too often the greatness of a patriot is ignored during his lifetime, and only becomes apparent many years later as history is reviewed in retrospect. Because the patriotic leader must essentially be a man of foresight and great vision, he is ahead of the time in which he lives, always looking to the future and striving to learn from the past so that he may use his leadership to guide the nation to a peaceful and prosperous future and to turn aside from the pitfalls of the present which would destroy the very principles upon which the nation survives.

Today we are fortunate as Americans to have recognized the true greatness of one of our most distinguished statesmen, and to pay tribute during his lifetime to one who has dedicated his entire life to the service of the people. And it is with genuine regret that we see this man, now 80 years of age, retire from public life to take a well-earned rest.

I am referring, of course, to none other than Herbert Hoover. His story is typically American—born in Iowa in 1874—the son of a humble blacksmith—orphaned at the age of 7—educated in the public schools—and from this beginning finally reaching the highest position in the land as 31st President of the United States.

For the past 8 years, Mr. Hoover has served as Chairman of the Hoover Commission, and the value of the findings of this Commission are known to every American in our Nation.

During his term as Chairman, under two administrations, both Republican and Democratic, about 70 percent of the

recommendations of his Commission have been accepted either in whole or in some degree, a record which attests to the outstanding quality of his leadership and sound judgment.

Already the recommendations of the Hoover Commission have saved the American taxpayers millions of dollars, and the total savings over the years will multiply again and again.

Herbert Hoover has earned the respect and the deep admiration and affection of the American people by the selfless service he has rendered during his more than 41 years of public service, and the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times expresses the sentiment of the American public on his retirement.

MR. HOOVER RETIRES

When the Hoover Commission officially expires this week, Herbert Hoover, its Chairman for the past 8 years, will retire to private life, ending a career of more than 41 years in public services. Few men in our history have devoted themselves so energetically and unselfishly in the cause of the public good.

The Commission which he has headed has been engaged on a monumental task in ferreting out the waste and inefficiency that are inevitable accompaniments to big government. That this task has been performed with diligence and thoroughness is a tribute to its leader the 31st President of the United States.

If any man has earned his retirement, Mr. Hoover has. He took over the job at an age when most men are already enjoying retirement and he has followed it through with indefatigable persistence. He has served as Commission Chairman under two administrations, Democratic and Republican, and he has seen about 70 percent of the Commission recommendations accepted either wholly or in some degree.

The Commission's original purpose, as explained by Mr. Hoover, was "to save the taxpayers money." But its investigation revealed something which he considers even more important: "the realization that the whole social and economic foundation is based on private enterprise."

His services to his country are an inspiration to all those who must carry on.

Mr. Hoover believes in America and its destiny. He also believes that our Nation cannot survive unless we keep alive the spirit of liberty, freedom, and individual enterprise.

On his 80th birthday, Herbert Hoover delivered the following address which expresses his own philosophy which I believe should be read by every American. It is the philosophy of a man who realizes from the pinnacle of a long and distinguished career that the real values are spiritual, the antithesis of the materialism of Marxian socialism, and that America's greatest heritage is still the Bible, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States:

THE PHILOSOPHY OF AN AMERICAN

Eighty years is a long time for a man to live. Mine has been a life of work in many lands under many kinds of governments, both good and bad. I have been honored by my countrymen in many public offices and with may opportunities to serve outside the Government.

I have watched the two great world wars with their holocausts of death, destruction, and famine. I have taken some part in the remedy of their terrible aftermaths. I have participated in the search for a healing peace.

I have witnessed the legacy of war in doubting minds, brutality, crime and debased morals. Moreover, I have witnessed on the ground in 20 nations the workings of the philosophy of that anti-Christ, Karl Marx.

After these long years and from all these experiences there rises constantly in my mind the forces which make for progress and those which may corrode away the safeguards of freedom in America. I want to say something about these forces, but I shall endeavor to do so, not in the tones of Jeremiah, but in the spirit of Saint Paul.

New forces from science and new ideas, both good and bad, constantly arise in the world. We welcome changes which advance the welfare of our people. Our system always needs repairs.

Also we have to clean up the vast wreckage and disorders of two devastating tornadoes of wars which have swept over mankind during the past 40 years.

And above all, we have need to remedy constant corruption of the safeguards of free men.

SOUND AT HEART

The remedies in America are not revolution. They are, except for peace and war, mostly jobs of marginal repairs around a sound philosophy and a stout heart.

Our Founding Fathers did not invent the priceless boon of individual freedom and respect for the dignity of men. That great gift to mankind sprang from the Creator and not from governments.

The Founding Fathers, with superb genius, welded together the safeguards of these freedoms.

They were mostly concerned with the dangers of political tyranny. With the coming of the industrial age our people welded in new safeguards. We could no more have economic tyranny than political tyranny.

And with these safeguards our people were at one time closer to the goals of human welfare than any other civilization in all history.

The progress of freedom is a never-ending struggle to prevent the abuse of power whether by individuals, by groups, or by government or nations.

Our Founding Fathers created unique restraints on power by the Bill of Rights and a structure of built-in checks and balances. Among these new concepts was a division of power between the Federal and State Governments and between the three branches of Government. I do not need to tell you that.

But what I have to tell you is that these separations of power became seriously confused, corroded, and weakened during the 20 years before this administration.

These confusions have included Executive encroachment on the legislative and judicial branches. There has been judicial encroachment on the States' rights. There has been congressional encroachment on the Executive. The Federal Government has grasped many of the vital functions of State and local government.

Some of the corrosions of our division of power are the aftermaths of our wars. Some of them come from the various infections of socialism. I will tell you more of that later.

PERILOUS MAGIC

Some of the corrosions come from the discovery that it is easy for the Federal Government to light the magic power of Federal credit. But the flame that warms can also consume the safeguards of freemen.

Some of these encroachments come from a long era of beguilement by pressure groups and local government for subsidies from the Federal Government.

One of the end results of all this is the growth of a huge centralized Federal bureaucracy. It has expanded in 20 years from 600,000 to 2,300,000. Some increase is necessary. Most of them are fine men and women.

But innate in bureaucracy are three implacable spirits. They are self-perpetuation, expansion of their empires, and demand for more power. Bureaucracy rushes headlong into the visions of the millennium and sends the bills to the Treasury.

Today we have more Federal employees in nearly every State than all the local officials, including constables. They penetrate every part of local government. The produce great waste of the taxpayers' money. They create a vested interest of a vested habit for some pressure group. They interfere in politics and too often are infected with corruption.

Their magics invade personal freedom of every citizen, every moment of every hour.

The remedy is to restore the checks and balances of power, to reinvigorate State and local governments, and to deflate the bureaucratic empires.

Many of these confusions of power are today under vigorous investigation in which I have some part.

OPEN TO TREASON

My countrymen, all these corrosions of the checks and balances of power call for constant battle from you, the people. They must be wiped out if you would stay fully free.

In our foreign relations there are great dangers and also vital safeguards to freemen. During the last war we witnessed a special encroachment of the Executive upon the legislative branch. This has been through a new type of commitment of the United States to other nations. I am not going to argue legalisms, for they do not go to the center of the issue.

The real issue is whether the President, through declaration or implication or by appeasement or by acquiescence or by joint statements with foreign officials, can commit the American people to foreign nations without the specific consent of the elected representatives of the people.

There has been a grievous list of such commitments. They include international agreements which shackle our economy by limiting a free market.

But more terrible were such executive agreements as our recognition of Soviet Russia which opened the headgates for a torrent of traitors. Our tacit alliance with Soviet Russia spread communism over the earth.

Our acquiesence in the annexation by Russia of the Baltic States at Moscow and the partition of Poland at Teheran extinguished the liberties of tens of millions of people.

Worse still was the appeasement and surrender at Yalta of 10 nations to slavery. And there was the secret agreement with respect to China which set in train the communization of Mongolia, North Korea, and all of China.

WHERE IS PEACE?

These unrestrained Presidential actions have resulted in a shrinking of human freedom over the whole world. From these actions came the jeopardies of the cold war. As a byproduct these actions have shrunk our freedoms by crushing taxes, huge defense costs, inflation, and compulsory military service.

We must make such misuse of power forever impossible.

And let me say, I have no fears of this evil from President Eisenhower, but he will not always be President.

Our dangers from the Communist source of gigantic evil in the world are unending. All of the peace agencies we have created and all of the repeated conferences we have held have failed to find even a whisper of real peace.

Amid these malign forces, our haunting anxiety and our paramount necessity is the defense of our country.

It is not my purpose to define the foreign policies of our Government.

Sooner or later a new line of action will become imperative.

I have disagreed with, and protested against, the most dangerous of our foreign policies during the whole of the 20 years prior to the last presidential election. I opposed and protested every step in the policies which led us into the Second World War.

Especially in June 1941, When Britain was safe from a German invasion due to Hitler's diversion to attack Stalin, I urged that the gargantuan jest of all history would be our giving aid to the Soviet Government. I urged we should allow those two dictators to exhaust each other.

I stated that the result of our assistance would be to spread communism over the whole world. I urged that if we stood aside the time would come when we could bring lasting peace to the world.

I WAS RIGHT

I have no regrets. The consequences have proved that I was right.

Today the socialist virus and poison gas generated by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels have spread into every nation on the earth. Their dogma is absolute materialism which defies truth and religious faith.

Their poisons are of many sorts. The preservation of the safeguards of liberty makes it imperative that we give heed to their every variety.

The bloody virus type, radiating from Communist Russia, is today rotting the souls of two-fifths of all mankind which it has enslaved.

From the day Lenin rose to power in Moscow, the Communists have carried on an underground conspiracy against every other nation. The rank and file of our people are immune from this infection. The recruiting grounds for their agents are from our minority of fuzzy-minded intellectuals and labor leaders.

Over a thousand such Communist agents have already been rooted out of responsible positions in our Government and other spots of influence.

Many of these spies and traitors when exposed sought sanctuary for their infamies in the fifth amendment. Such a plea of immunity is an implication of guilt.

Surely these people should not have the right to vote or to hold office, for thereby they use these privileges of free men against the safeguards of freedom.

Despite the clamor over ferreting out these persons, you must not be led into the mistake that Moscow has closed down its recuiting offices for American agents. Or that continued action of the FBI and congressional committees is not equally imperative.

I have little fear that these Communist agents can destroy the Republic if we continue to ferret them out. Our greater concern should be the other varieties of Karl Marx virus.

Among them are the Socialists. They assert they would proceed only by constitutional means.

EXORBITANT TAXES

The Socialists prowl on many fronts. They promote the centralized Federal Government, with its huge bureaucracy. They drive to absorb the income of the people by unnecessary Government spending and exorbitant taxes.

They have pushed our Government deep into enterprises which compete with the rights of free men. These enterprises are endowed with exemption from control of State and local governments.

Congressional committees have listed hundreds of these Federal activities. But only a drop of typhoid in a barrel of drinking water sickens a whole village.

Every step of these programs somewhere, somehow, stultifies the freedom, the incentives, the courage, and the creative impulses of our people.

Beyond all this, there is proof in the world that the end result of socialism can be bloody communism.

In the Iron Curtain States, it was the Socialist intellectuals who weakened the freedom of men by destroying free enterprise.

Thus they have furnished the boarding ladders by which the Communists captured the ship of state.

One of the postwar cousins of socialism is the so-called welfare state. This poison gas is generated by the same sort of fuzzy-minded intellectuals. Its slogan is "planned economy."

The phrase itself was borrowed from totalitarian governments. The end of it would at least be a government wherein whatever is not forbidden would be compulsory.

One of the annoyances of this cult is its false assumption that our nation has never been heedful of the welfare of our people. That we are our brother's keeper was rooted in religious faith long before these fuzzy-minded men were born. Since the foundation of the republic, we have recognized and practiced both private and governmental responsibility for the unfortunate and the aged; for the education of our youth and the health of our people.

ENTERPRISE IS VITAL

Moreover, this cult has a host of gimmicks for giving away the people's money. Among their ideas is that government should guarantee every citizen security from the cradle to the grave.

But it is solely the initiative and the labor of the physically able in the prime of life that can support the aged, the young, the sick—and the bureaucracy.

And this active earning group requires the pressures of competition, the rewards of enterprise and new adventure to keep it on the job.

Even if security from the cradle to the grave could eliminate the risks of life, it would be a dead hand on the creative spirit of our people. Also, the judgement of the Lord to Adam about sweat has not been repealed.

When we flirt with the Delilah of security for our productive group, we had better watch out, lest in our blindness we pull down the pillars of the temple of free men.

The British under a Socialist government tried it. Its result was a level of poverty which British Socialists sought to obscure with the term "austerity." Britain is now in retreat from it.

Among the delusions offered us by fuzzy-minded people in that imaginary creature, the common man. It is dinned into us that this is the century of the common man.

The whole idea is another cousin of the Soviet proletariat. The uncommon man is to be whittled down to size. It is the negation of individual dignity and a slogan of mediocrity and uniformity.

The common man dogma may be of use as a vote-getting apparatus. It supposedly proves the humility of demagogues. The greatest strides of human progress have come from uncommon men and women.

You have perhaps heard of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, or Thomas Edison. They were humble in origin, but that was not their greatness.

The humor of it is that when we get sick we want an uncommon doctor. When we go to war, we yearn for an uncommon general or admiral. When we choose the president of a university, we want an uncommon educator.

ERA OF UNCOMMON MAN

The imperative need of this Nation at all times is the leadership of the uncommon men or women. We need men and women who cannot be intimidated, who are not concerned with applause meters, not those who sell tomorrow for cheers today.

Such leaders are not to be made like queen bees. They must rise by their own merits. America recognizes no frozen social stratifications which prevent this free rise of every individual.

They rise by merit from our shops and farms. They rise from the 35 million boys and girls in our schools and colleges. That they have the determination to rise is the glorious promise of leadership among free men.

A nation is strong or weak, it thrives or perishes upon what it believes to be true. If our youth is rightly instructed in the faith of our fathers; in the tradition of our country; in the dignity of each individual man, then our power will be stronger than any weapon of destruction that man can devise.

And now as to this whole gamut of Socialist infections, I say to you, the neighbors of my childhood, the sons and daughters of my native State, God has blessed us with another wonderful word—heritage.

The great documents of that heritage are not from Karl Marx. They are the Bible, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States.

Within them alone can the safeguards of freedom survive. Safeguard the true spirit of these guaranties for your children, that they may not become the prisoners of a hydra-headed socialism.

If anyone rises to say that all this is reactionary, you may class him as either fuzzy-minded or an ignorant enemy of free men.

Amid this recitation of our problems, I would not have you think that there are not great fields of promise for the future if we can keep out of war.

NATION NOT DYING

The last few years have seen advances in science and technology which amount almost to revolution in our life and world relations.

If we maintain free minds, free spirits, and direct our steps aright, still other new horizons and new frontiers are open to us. New inventions and new applications of old knowledge will come to us daily.

These new frontiers give us other blessings. Not only do they expand our living but also they open new opportunities and new areas of adventure and enterprise. They open new vistas of beauty.

They unfold the wonders of the atom and the heavens. Daily they prove the reality of an allwise Supreme Giver of law.

There are voices in our country who daily sound alarms that our civilization is on the way out. Concentrated on the difficulties of our times, they see an early and dour end for us. But civilization does not decline and fall while the people still possess dynamic creative faculties, devotion to religious faith and to liberty.

The American people still possess these qualities. We are not at the bedside of a naton in death's agony.

Eighty years is a long time for a man to live. As the shadows lengthen over my years, my confidence, my hopes and dreams for my countrymen are undimmed.

This confidence is that with advancing knowledge, toil will grow less exacting; that fear, hatred, pain, and tears may subside; that the regenerating sun of creative ability and religious devotion will refresh each morning the strength and progress of my country.

The Hoover Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, herewith, the following article by W. V. Eckardt, from the current issue of the New Leader:

THE HOOVER REPORTS

(By W. V. Eckardt)

On June 30, the busy life of the second Hoover Commission—which is giving us advice on governmental and military management, foreign policy, lending, housing, transportation, water resources, and electric power—officially expired. Now a small staff of ex-President Herbert's Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, appropriately housed in the new building of the Government Accounting Office here, has another 90 days to complete its reports.

Public discussion, mostly critical, of the Commission's work has just begun. "So far at least we have not replied," says Hoover. "That may come later." But Hoover makes no bones about the political intent of his efforts.

The first Hoover Commission, which operated from 1947 to 1949, was in Hoover's words "for various reasons unable to deal with policy questions." It was a bipartisan group which counted Dean Acheson among its members; 196 of its 273 specific recommendations have been adopted. Nevertheless, in the 1952 campaign, General Eisenhower talked a lot about dusting off the Hoover reports which then would restore efficiency and honesty in government, and save us literally millions of dollars.

In the flush of his victory, the second Hoover Commission was set up. One of its godfathers, Senator Homer Ferguson, Republican, Michigan, declared: "This will give us an opportunity at last to reverse the trend of the last 20 years." The second Commission consists of 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats. The 83d Congress gave it "authority to propose constitutional amendments, legislative enactments, and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations." Hoover has interpreted this to mean that his powers are wide open to examine not just the operation but the very functions of the executive.

He has done so with obvious gusto, personally devoting as much as 16 hours a day to directing and sifting every 1 of the 3 million words the Commission has produced to date. Except for brief introductions, each report is written by one of Hoover's various task forces, which are headed by chairmen whom he personally has selected or approved.

In practically all cases, the task-force commanders and their recruits are business executives or professionals with business or business-endowed university connections. The other commissioners have little control over the studies and investigations. The task force on water resources and power, for instance, has 26 members and a staff of 46 people; it labored more than a year to produce a report of almost 1,800 printed pages. According to Commissioner CHET HOLIFIELD, Democratic Congressman from California, a boiled-down version of these findings "was discussed and approved by the Commission in the space of 2 hours."

It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. HOLIFIELD's lucid dissents adorn almost every one of the final products. It is surprising, however, that the other Democrats—James A. Farley, Robert G. Storey, a law school dean, and Senators John McClellan and John F. Kennedy—have had so little to say about these documents. KENNEDY's silence is probably due to the long illness from which he only recently recovered.

The dozen or so reports published to date can each be had for about 45 cents from the Public Printer. "Provided they do not raise your temperature," Mr. Hoover says, they "are a better sleeping pill than a first-class novel." They are, of course, filled with a lot of charts and statistics and abound in technical managerial lingo. Property management, paperwork management, traffic management, supply management are the favored nouns of the task-force commandos; curtail, reduce, and abolish their favorite verbs. Specific administrative recommendations, however are quite scarce. Instead, operational recommendations are usually confined to pointing up the need for further study, undefined steps to be taken and—surprisingly—a further centralization of various and sundry administrative functions in the hands of the General Services Administration, an agency created by the first Hoover Commission.

However tedious, the Hoover Commission reports, like a novel, reveal quite a bit about their authors. They are, as we pointed out, predominantly representatives of business—not big, big business so much as the medium-size enterprises which made the NAM and the chambers of commerce tick. They are drawn from the pullman smoking-car crowd rather than from the private plane executives. The difference seems important; it is, to some extent, the difference between the two Republican parties.

Big, big business, if a sweeping generalization be permitted, has changed its outlook considerably since its robber-baron beginnigs—at least if men like Nelson Rockefeller, Henry Ford II, Paul Hoffman, or John J. McCloy are any indication. For whatever reasons, it seems to have adjusted to the changed world of jet planes and the guaranteed annual wage.

The vociferous Don Quixotes of free enterprise who wrote the Hoover reports, on the other hand, still fight their windmills of socialism, creeping and otherwise. Their horizons are clouded by nostalgia for the good old boom-and-bust days of strictly limited taxes and strictly unlimited profits.

The chief impression their reports create is one of overwhelming pettiness. Perhaps these good people do such a poor job of trying to improve our Government because they are inherently against any Government at all. Commenting on the Washington civil-defense tests last month, the Wall Street Journal editorialized: "The big trouble with the evacuation is that all of the agencies will be right back in Washington by noon today." And Herbert Hoover apologizes: "In a few cases, having no hope of completely recovering our national philosophy of life, we recommend that the Government competitor at least be put on a self-supporting basis."

It is the Government competitor who primarily disturbs the Hoover Commission. There are, says Hoover, anywhere from 2,000 to 3,000 Federal Government business enterprises which were created in wars and emergencies. When their task was completed, "each had aboard it an empire-seeking bureaucracy," and that's why they are still around. Some of them, one of the reports grants "are essentially parts of our military service"; some of them are tolerated as noncompetitive. But most of them are judged unfair, and the Commission wants them sold forthwith to the highest private bidder.

Among this group is any Army PX or commissary within an unspecified number of miles from the nearest drugstore or supermarket. Among them is the United States Post Office's parcel-post service, which competes with Railway Express. The purge list further includes all dental, military, orthopedic, pharmaceutical, surgical, and medical instrument and supply facilities, except those needed for training purposes. It also includes TVA's chemical research and fertilizer production.

Federal medical services, too, are beset by unfair competition, extravagance, and threats to our national philosophy of life, according to the task force headed by Dr. Theodore G. Klumpp, a pharmaceutical industries executive. His report complains that (1) too many people are receiving medical (particularly hospital) care at Federal expense; (2) they are receiving more care than is necessary; and (3) the Federal Government is maintaining more facilities than needed to take care of present patient load.

Ergo, concludes the report, cut out Veterans' Administration hospitals, reduce veterans care, close all Public Health general hospitals, and reduce military hospitals. These conclusions are mostly based on a statistical analysis of hospital beds occupied at a given time in three metropolitan areas. At that particular time, there was, fortunately, no emergency such as a flu epidemic or radioactive fallout. Hospital space was therefore wasted and so, say Dr. Klumpp and his colleagues, are most other Government medical facilities and services. The waste of human life resulting from inadequate medical care was not investigated.

But the Commission does not claim to save the taxpayers' money in all these cases. "Far more important than dollar savings," its report on business enterprises states, "are the beneficial results to our economy from eliminating Government competition to the greatest practicable extent." "The loss," Mr. Hoover says, "is not wholly the taxpayers' money. It is also a loss by injury to the vitality of the free-enterprise system. It is a destruction of freedoms."

On the basis of this "simple formula that Government enterprise is inherently bad and private enterprise is inherently good," as CHET HOLIFIELD puts it, "any Government function becomes 'nonessential' if a Commission majority is opposed to it."

"Nonsense," says CHET HOLIFIELD. His dissents patiently point to numerous recent examples where contracting with private firms for services has considerably increased Government cost. Most of all, he raises the important question of "cui bono?" No doubt some fertilizer firms will benefit if TVA's fertilizer plants are closed. There is also no doubt that it will definitely hurt the farmer. An increase in the parcel-post rates, HOLIFIELD says, might benefit the Railway Express Agency, but not the businessmen who use parcel post extensively and the consumers who benefit by cheaper rates.

The recommendations on Government lending agencies and subsidies, submitted by a group dominated by the accounting firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co., are no less summary, mechanical and arbitrary. Price, Waterhouse & Co. has once before, through the first Hoover Commission, given the Republic the benefit of its accounting views. Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN (Republican, Vermont), found at the time that its approach to Government lending agencies "does not adequately represent the broad public-interest viewpoint which motivated the establishment of these agencies."

This report concerns itself with just about everything our Federal Government does to help people raise their standard of living by advancing money at reasonable rates, or by guaranteeing or insuring loans for them. And that, Price, Waterhouse & Co. says, is bad. It's Government subsidy and it goes on in 104 activities at an investment of about $16 billion. The Commission therefore moves that we abolish Government crop loans to Farmers, loans to colleges for student and faculty housing, loans to veterans for home and farm improvements, loans to build low-cost public-housing projects, and loans to rural electric cooperatives. Other

lending activities should be curtailed and interest rates raised high enough so that people will find it more advantageous to go to a bank for their money.

Commissioner Holifield replies: "The subsidies involved in the administration of Government programs which help homeowners, farmers, small-business men, veterans, and others of modest means pale into insignificance when compared with the subsidies that are doled out to big manufacturers, publishing firms, ship operators, airline companies, and the like. * * * The Commission made no systematic study on the whole subject of subsidies, nor does it recommend their elimination in all fields. The ones complained of in this report appear to be, in the main, those which bring widespread benefits to the whole population."

Not all the dozen or so Commission reports already published would repeal the New Deal and its accomplishments with a magic whisk of a task-force report, however. A number of technical studies on the enormous logistic problems of our Defense Establishment are undoubtedly meritorious. Each one of them is prefaced with an almost identical pat on the back for our military. "Our country enjoys a magnificent military personnel and the civilian heads of the services are of great ability and fine devotion," they say. This is followed by often rather technical advice, some of which doesn't seem to sit too well with the Pentagon.

Transportation and traffic management are dealt with by railroad executive Perry M. Shoemaker's task force. Stop shipping the private cars of military personnel and their dependents overseas, it recommends among other things. Suggestions on how to dispose of surplus property are made by a task force commanded by the late Colonel McCormick's political agent, Gen. Robert E. Wood.

Advice on how to feed and clothe our GI's covers 67 printed pages prepared by a committee of 15 restaurant, food, and clothing industry executives, headed by Joseph P. Binns, vice president of the Hilton Hotels. This is the one which brought out that the Navy nestled away 886,020 pounds of canned hamburger to fall back on in some 719 rainy months of average consumption. It is also the report which urges that competitive bidding for military food and clothing orders be abolished. A detailed report on "depot utilization" would tidy up the Government storage facilities which, it says, take up about twice as much space as Manhattan Island.

The Hoover Commission itself, according to its staff director of publications, Neil McNeil, regards its recommendations in the fields of legal services and Government personnel as its most important contribution. This, Mr. McNeil said, is because some of the 52 involved recommendations on reorganizing the work of the 5,300 lawyers in our Government agencies would also set up special administrative tax, trade and labor courts. These administrative courts, he explained, would give the average citizen a chance to argue about administrative rulings and interpretations on which he now has no recourse. "This would be a tremendous improvement" he said, "because for the first time it will give people some protection against arbitrary Government action."

The civil service reforms, according to McNeil, would give us a more efficient and professional civil service. This would be accomplished by setting up a special Senior Civil Service Corps—managerial staff officers, as it were, who would be better paid, given higher privileges, and would therefore be expected to be "more competent" than the junior variety. CHET HOLIFIELD calls this proposal "somewhat fanciful," mostly because good managers of the Post Office Department, for instance, will not necessarily make good managers of the Soil Conservation Service, as the personnel task force seems to assume.

Congressman HOLIFIELD also complains that the civil service task force failed to look into the effect of the security program on Government personnel. "I believe," he says, "that there is enough intelligence in the Nation to devise adequate security safeguards without subjecting individuals to the unjust treatment that is now a matter of common knowledge." A Commission spokesman, however, called the rising complaints about the injustice of the loyalty-security operation the biggest red herring ever perpetrated on the American public.

In contrast to the 5-pound Federal budget "which you cannot read in bed," Hoover points out, his Commisison reports are set up quite attractively in pocket form "for your easier homework." "There is now, however, one exception: the report on Overseas Economic Operations. This one Mr. Hoover apparently did not consider bedtime reading material, for he had it hastily mimeographed and rushed out in the more awkward, conventional 8½- by 11-inch format to awaken Congress to the dangers of President Eisenhower's $3.5 billion foreign-aid program.

"Surely after almost 10 years, the time has come to apply some brakes to this overseas spending program," the report says. It then proceeds to add up the $50 billion already spent, of which three-quarters, according to a recent reminder by President Eisenhower, stayed in this country for goods and services. There is some confusion about just which Commission members agree with the report's recommendations on how and where foreign aid ought to be spent. But only Commissioners Farley and HOLIFIELD seem to disagree that the program be scattered among the various departments of government (aid to business abroad to be administered by the Department of Commerce, foreign health and welfare operations by Mrs. Hobby's department, etc.). This, too, is in direct contrast to President Eisenhower's recent recommendation that "responsibility * * * continue unified."

Just the other way Commissioner John C. Hollister, whose signature also graces the report, was appointed by the President to head the unified, presumably $3.5 billion foreign-aid program which was transferred back to the Department of State. In reply to a question, the President told his news conference that he was not—not personally at any rate—informed of Mr. Hollister's attitude toward the administration's foreign aid program.

Publication of the Commission's findings on water resources and power surprised no one last week. Hoover has labored long and hard for this ever since he vetoed the Norris Muscle Shoals bill and thus blocked the Tennessee Valley development back in 1931. He also advised getting the Federal Government "out of the business of generating and distributing power as soon as possible" as head of the Eisenhower-appointed Commission to Reorganize Federal Power Agencies and Policies in 1953.

He hasn't changed his mind, and the task force he picked, under the command of Adm. Ben Moreell, president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., went even further in the direction of disposing of public power. Hoover's Commission would not follow its task force all the way, but it does endorse repeal of the preference provisions, halting the construction of Government transmission lines, and raising public power rates in the South and West to the level of New England's high private-utility rates.

It seems the poor taxpayer is losing a lot of money on the TVA and Bonneville and even Hoover Dam—if you credit Ben Moreell's figures, which are often 20 years old and which ignore the fact that all these Federal projects, taken together, have paid their own way, plus 16 percent in revenues above operating and other outlays.

It took 26 tack force members and $430,000 to amass all the misinformation. But the water resources and power report fails to recognize the lessons of the past (as, for example, the success of unified river-basin development) or the requirements of the future (there is no mention of atomic energy as a source of new power).

If Congress and the Executive buy all of his recommendations, Mr. Hoover says, "an aggregate of $6 billions of savings could be made to the taxpayer." It is a safe bet that both will find the price of this saving far too high.

The Eisenhower administration, while dominated by big business, is showing increasing signs of disregarding the advice of the free-enterprise Don Quixotes in medium-size business. It still wants prosperity to trickle down, but it also wants votes. It seems to recognize at last that its mandate was not to repeal the New Deal but, more likely, to give the Nation a period of tranquillity in which to consolidate and enjoy Roosevelt's and Truman's accomplishments.

Also, no doubt, like every opposition in history, that wing of the Republican Party which controls the administration has greatly changed its outlook since it had to assume responsibility. A crusader like Albert M. Cole, for instance, took over the Housing Administration in 1953 in the hope of handing public housing over to the real-estate lobby. A man like Ancher Nelson vowed to sell every transmission line to the private utilities when he took over the Rural Electrification Administration. Both have now seen these things from the inside. Both have changed their views and now do a fair job of preserving the programs they attacked 3 years ago. The President, of course, continues to heap lavish praise on Mr. Hoover and his Commission. But his administration has not, so far at least, taken any major step to implement any of its recommendations.

Neither has Congress. A few bills along Hoover Commission lines have been introduced. But in its present mood Congress is not inclined to take any radical steps in either direction. Turning the clock back by twenty-odd years, abolishing the reforms approved by the overwhelming majority of the voters of this country, would be far more radical than anything the CIO or ADA ever proposed.

This does not mean that we will not hear quite a bit about the labors of the Hoover Commission. Come 1956, the story of the 886,020 pounds of canned hamburger, the 104 lending agencies of Government, all the illustrations of the waste and mismanagement of the Government competitor will no doubt echo and reecho through the land. It will be merchandised by the political hucksters and packaged by Mr. Hoover's national philosophy. For a lot of painstaking research went into these reports—three million words for a mere $2,750,000. That is pretty cheap for such useful campaign propaganda, considering that every cent was appropriated by Congress.

Duty of Christian Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Council of Catholic Men began a series of radio addresses on current

topics. The first speaker in the series was our colleague from Minnesota, Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY. The Congressman's remarks were timely and significant, and might well serve as a guide to those of us who must make decisions for our Nation in these critical times. I should like to quote here some excerpts from Congressman MCCARTHY's talk, taken from an article in a recent issue of the Milwaukee Catholic Herald Citizen:

DUTY OF CHRISTIAN POLITICIAN CLEAR—MUST BE GUIDED BY MORAL LAW, SAYS SOLON IN CATHOLIC HOUR TALK

NEW YORK.—"The Christian politician must hold fast to the moral law," Representative EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, declared Sunday in the first of a new series of radio addresses on current topics sponsored by the National Council of Catholic Men and featured on the Catholic Hour carried by the National Broadcasting Co. "In the course of history," he said, "we have learned something of the great danger in rendering to religion the things that are Caesar's, namely, political authority and political power, and of the danger of rendering to Caesar the things that are God's—faith, worship, and absolute obedience."

The legislator, who formerly taught sociology at St. Thomas College in St. Paul, declared that the power of the absolute state has been forcefully demonstrated and constitutes a lesson that should not soon be forgotten.

"We must at all times be alert to the danger of intrusion by the state into areas of culture and into areas in the social and private life of man which are beyond the authority of the state. In our alertness and vigilance, however, we should not be led to accept unsound theories concerning the origin, nature, functions, and purposes of the state. What is called for is careful examination, distinction, and reordination."

MCCARTHY said that while the state has the right to suppress certain moral teachings, such as forbidding the practice of bigamy by certain religious sects, it has no right to deny or interfere with man in his effort to attain moral perfection. On the contrary, he added, the state has the obligation to assist man in achieving this goal.

He reminded that recognition of Christianity by a state does not make that state Christian. He said that the calling of a Christian is not to judge the world, but rather to save it, and in approaching politics the Christian must be realistic since politics is part of the real world.

"The Christian in politics should be judged by the standards of whether through his decisions and actions he has advanced the cause of justice and helped, at least, to achieve the highest degree of perfection possible in the temporal order," MCCARTHY said.

He pointed out that when a political problem can be reduced to the simple question of feeding the hungry or not feeding them, ransoming or refusing to ransome the captive, of harboring the harborless or leaving him homeless, there should be no uncertainty as to the Christian position.

But, MCCARTHY reminded, problems of overpopulation, of displaced and expelled persons, of political refugees and the like are in reality not always reducible to simple choices. He added: "As a general rule the inclination of the Christian should be to liberality.

"His mistakes and failures on problems of this kind should be as a consequence of leniency rather than of a fearful self-interest; of excess of trust, rather than of excess of doubt and anxiety."

The Christian politician, MCCARTHY said, "must, of course, hold fast to the moral law, remembering that the precepts of morality do not themselves change, even though the way in which they are applied to concrete acts may be modified as society regresses or is perverted." He said the Christian in politics should be distinguished by his alertness to protect the rights of individuals, of religious and other institutions from violations by the state or individuals.

Should Social Security Coverage Be Extended?—Physicians, Dentists, and Lawyers Speak on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has been studying possible revision of the Social Security Act. The question of extending the coverage of the act has been considered in these deliberations.

In order to aid the committee, and the full House, in these debates, I conducted a poll among the physicians, lawyers, and dentists who reside or practice in the Fourth District of Wisconsin. It was my intent to ascertain to what extent do the members of these professions favor the inclusion of their groups in the Social Security Insurance System.

The results of this survey are very interesting and enlightening. Before I proceed to discuss them, however, I want to say a few words about the very fine cooperation which I received in this undertaking from the professional people in Milwaukee.

Sixty-three percent of the dentists contacted during the survey replied promptly to the questionnaire, and the returns from lawyers and physicians were 56 and 50 percent in that order.

This is a remarkable record as polls go, and it speaks highly of our people's deep and active interest in legislative issues. It also makes the results of the survey very meaningful and reliable as an indication of the thinking of the members of the three professions in my district.

My questionnaire contained the following three questions:

Should social-security coverage be extended to the members of your profession?

Should the members of your profession be polled to determine whether your group should be included in the Social Security System before the coverage is so extended?

If two-third of your membership vote for social-security coverage, should their decision be binding on the entire group?

Of the 215 dentists who sent in their views, 177—82 percent—favored social-security coverage, 29—14 percent—opposed it, and 9—4 percent—had no comment.

Further, 149—69 percent—dentists felt that the members of their profession ought to be polled before the coverage is extended to the group; 45—21 percent—were against the referendum principle; and 21—10 percent—were noncommittal.

Among the 1,078 lawyers polled, replies were received from 602. Of these, 480—80 percent—were for social security coverage, 96—16 percent—were against it, and 26—4 percent—indicated no preference.

Three hundred and eighteen—53 percent—lawyers favored the referendum, 218—36 percent—opposed it, and 66—11 percent—were noncommittal.

Three hundred and fifty-seven—59 percent—attorneys want the decision of the referendum to be binding on the entire profession, 168—28 percent—disagree with this approach, and 77—13 percent—have no opinion on this question.

Percentagewise, the physicians sent in least replies to the questionnaires. Nevertheless, 233—65 percent—physicians who replied favored coverage, while 107—30 percent—opposed it, and 20—5 percent—gave no indication of their feelings.

More physicians favored a referendum than an outright inclusion in the Social Security System; 265—73 percent—replies from this group contained a yes answer to the second question; 60—17 percent—physicians said no, and 35—10 percent—said nothing.

Finally, 213—59 percent—physicians felt that the referendum should be binding on the entire profession, while 112—31 percent—were of the opposing opinion; 35—10 percent—had no comment to offer.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the results of the survey which I have just described will receive careful and close scrutiny. I want to commend them urgently to the attention of the membership of this body.

From Big to Bigger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colelagues to the article, written by Walter Adams, professor of economics at Michigan State College, which appeared in the July 4, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine.

Professor Adams is a member of Attorney General Brownell's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws and the author of Monopoly in America.

The article follows:

FROM BIG TO BIGGER
(By Walter Adams)

In 1950 Congress passed the Celler-Kefauver Act prohibiting mergers whose effect may be "substantially to lessen competition * * * or tend to create a monopoly." Since then some 2,100 mergers have been consummated—in apparent disregard of the new law. The Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission who might be expected to enforce the law assures us instead that mergers are not necessarily injurious to the

public interest. The Brownell Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws has maintained silence on the need for intensified antimerger action.

In 1954, according to the FTC, there were 3 times as many mergers as in 1949—almost as many as during the postwar peak of 1946. Nearly two-thirds of the acquisitions reported in the last 6 years were made by large companies (those with assets of $10 million or more). By contrast, only 8 percent of the acquisitions were made by small companies (those with assets of $1 million or less). Notable among the larger mergers is the consolidation of Olin ($232 million assets) and Mathieson ($339 million assets) which followed by only 2 years Mathieson's purchase of E. R. Squibb, the giant pharmaceutical house. Equally important are the changes wrought by mergers in the textile industry: The $428 million marriage between Burlington Mills, Pacific Mills, and Goodall-Sanford; the $200 million consolidation of American Woolen, Textron, and Robbins Mills; and the smaller, but nonetheless important, mergers between Lowenstein and Wamsutta, Botany Mills, and Princeton Worsted, United Merchants, and A. D. Juilliard, J. P. Stevens, and John P. Maguire. All these foreshadow a transformation of a once highly competitive industry.

Why do these corporations combine into larger units? According to the FTC, businessmen hope to achieve the following advantages by merger: additional capacity, product diversification, backward integration (acquiring a raw material supplier), forward integration (acquiring distribution outlets), and additional capacity located in new markets. Other factors are surplus cash available to acquiring companies, lack of financial resources needed for expansion and modernization, and tax savings available to companies which buy out distressed concerns.

But these motives have no standing in the law. Its only criterion is the effect on competition. And if a particular merger is likely to result in a substantial lessening of competition it is clearly illegal.

The rationale of the law is simple. It permits the expansion and growth, the forward and backward integration, the product and market diversification of any given corporation. At the same time, it recognizes that a growing enterprise has the alternative of building or buying. If the corporation builds, it creates additional capacity and may increase competition. If it buys, it only destroys a competitior. And the destruction of competition is not in the best interests of free enterprise.

For these reasons the Celler-Kefauver Act sets up a presumption against mergers. Accordingly the Justice Department withheld its blessings from the proposed union of the Bethlehem and Youngstown Steel Companies. Bethlehem's president had argued that the merger would increase competition (by enabling Bethlehem to invade the Midwestern market) and that the combined company would still be smaller than the giant United States Steel Corp. But antitrust chief Stanley Barnes was not impressed with this reasoning. If, he said, the Bethlehem-Youngstown marriage were permitted, "where would we stop mergers in the steel industry?"

If we permit small companies to merge so as to compete more effectively with the large ones, if we allow the large companies to merge so as to compete more effectively with the giants, the end result will be the dominance over our economy by the Big Three's, the Big Four's, the Big Five's.

Bethlehem apart, the enforcement record is far from encouraging. Out of 2,135 mergers, the Justice Department has prosecuted only those attempted by Schenley, General Shoe, and the Hilton-Statler Hotels. Three more, pressed by Pillsbury, Luria Bros., and Crown-Zellerbach were opposed by the FTC. Congress, for its part, has made little use of its investigative role. The only antimerger legislation introduced is the Sparkman-Celler bill to bring banks under the Clayton Act.

In support of this bill, Representative CELLER points to the Chase National Bank of Manhattan merger and the disappearance of more than 600 commercial banks since World War II. He observes that the 10 largest banks now hold 46 percent of the Nation's bank deposits and that such concentration restricts the borrower's alternative choice. "No matter how many branches exist," says Mr. CELLER, "the borrower faces the same borrowing conditions set by the home office." The Sparkman-Celler bill would also require corporations to notify the antitrust agencies before consummating any merger. Even if this bill should be enacted, the crucial problem would still be in enforcement. As long as the FTC is dominated by men like Mr. Howrey, as long as the Government itself promotes monopoly through privilege-creating legislation as in atomic energy and synthetic rubber and undermines regulation as in the trucking and airlines services, the outlook for competition is dim.

Memorandum re Foreign Airlines Operating to Points in the United States and Attempting To Avoid Jurisdiction of United States Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD, the following statement regarding foreign airlines operating to points in the United States and attempting to avoid jurisdiction of the United States courts:

MEMORANDUM RE FOREIGN AIRLINES OPERATING TO POINTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND ATTEMPTING TO AVOID JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES COURTS

British Commonwealth Pacific Airlines, Ltd., had an air permit to carry passengers between the United States and Australia. On a regular flight scheduled from Sydney, Australia, to San Francisco, Calif., in October 1953, an aircraft owned and operated by BCPA, Ltd., crashed near Kings Mountain, county of San Mateo, State of California. All persons aboard, including some American citizens, perished in the crash.

BCPA, Ltd., was dissolved in about May 1954, at which time Quantas Empire Aviation, Ltd., acquired the former's air permit between Australia and the United States.

Litigation has been instituted in the United States District Court in California and the New York State Supreme Court against BCPA, Ltd., and Quantas Empire Aviation, Ltd., arising out of the October 1953 plane crash. The defendants have taken the position that they are not subject to the jurisdiction of the courts above mentioned. In short, since defendants have been sued in the only two courts likely to have jurisdiction over them in the United States, their position is that, for purposes of being sued, they are not subject to the jurisdiction of United States courts.

Such a position is outrageous. The United States Government has granted these foreign airlines the privilege of doing business in the United States and reaping the many benefits that flow therefrom. In return, these foreign airlines have attempted to shirk their responsibilities by evading the jurisdiction of the United States courts. Such conduct is directly contrary to the basic policies of jurisdiction maintained in all the courts of our country.

For the aforesaid reasons these airlines should be required to submit to the jurisdiction of United States courts or be forced to relinquish their air permits granted by our Government.

The Defenseless Man—The Union Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter from one who characterizes himself as a "defenseless man," reads as follows:

It seems to me that in addition to Walter Reuther, since the days of Franklin Roosevelt and Frank Murphy, the Congress of the United States has represented no one else but Walter Reuther and the men and women he represents.

I am getting a little sick of this constant growth of the protective wing which Congress is wrapping around the so-called defenseless common man who belongs to a special privileged group. Let's see what the Congress has done.

1. It has made it impossible for a man to work at his trade unless he joins the union and pays Walter Reuther for his right to furnish food and shelter for his family. He must accept Walter Reuther's decision on how much he will get, when he will get it, how much he will do for what he gets, when he will do it, when he will not do it, when he will do picket duty for free all of which whether he likes it or not. Up until recently I believed if this were tested in court it would be found unconstitutional because it interfered with a man's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Not so. The New York supreme court recently ruled in a test case that the nonunion (by preference) defendant had no right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, because the union represented by Walter Ruether had now become an accepted way of American life and that anyone who did not choose to accept that way of life could not have the right to work at his trade in order to make the wherewithal to sustain life. There are a great many more of us in this latter category, in case you are not aware of it, than there are in the former category.

2. Congress has by its protection of unionism, made it impossible for industry to operate without paying Walter Ruether and his people huge sums for not working. Fifty-five million dollars is not chicken feed. No business, no matter how large, can absorb such cost for very long. This is only the beginning. When small business is reached by the long arms of Walter Ruether, as it will be in the not too for distant future, small business will fold. In collective bargaining, you say business has the right to refuse this tribute, don't they? That's a laugh. Business, to operate, needs manpower. Ruether's men have found that here is the way to get something for nothing. Business can't use any men except Ruether's men. Ruether says, "Take it or else you don't operate." The Government loves Ruether. So business submits to a $55 million shakedown and passes it, or will try to pass it, on to the dear darling consuming public. Who guarantees the rest

of us that we can get 3 square meals a day, 365 days of the year, and still have anything left to buy the products of business with a $55 million shakedown price added to the commodity cost? Who guarantees business that they will be able to sell this product with its artificially bumped-up price to us so they can stay in business?

Why don't you Congressmen come down out of your rosy-hued clouds and see what you are doing to the rest of us who also hold the once proud title of Americans? Do you actually want to destroy the American competitive system? Do you actually believe that giving such power of life and death to Walter Reuther or anyone else will do anything but destroy our free way of life, our initiative, our ability to better ourselves, our right to choose, our freedom to express an opinion, or our freedom in anything, period?

It can be argued that this is the progressive age and that all else that has gone before was the horse-and-buggy period. But progress, to me at least, does not include the destruction of freedom and the acceptance of one-man rule such as has been tried time and again over the centuries, and is still being tried in some countries and found wanting. Keep on in your present attitude and one day your house of cards will come tumbling down around your ears. When it does you will be the loudest to cry, "Why doesn't somebody do something?"

Let's call a spade a spade. Legislation to protect one or more groups of people at the expense of any other group or groups of people is not only un-American but it will destroy America. The only kind of legislative yardstick for America is that which keeps any group from controlling the lives and peaceful actions of another group in America to the end that each group has an equal opportunity to prosper and live in peace with the other.

Without this we shall surely and ultimately have no business, no unions, no freedom, no prosperity, no America as we hope to keep it.

Poland and the Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a letter recently received from the Polish American Congress, Inc., Division of Michigan, and my reply thereto. It expresses my views in regard to the proposals President Eisenhower should make concerning the nations behind the Iron Curtain at the forthcoming conference at Geneva.

The letters follow:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
DIVISION OF MICHIGAN,
Detroit, Mich., July 1, 1955.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: On Tuesday, July 12, 1955, representatives of organizations composed of Americans of Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Czechoslovakian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, and Slovakian extraction will convene at the Veterans' Memorial Building in Detroit at 7:30 p. m.

To our knowledge, this is the first time that these nationality groups will meet jointly in the cause of freedom and liberation of the countries of their forefathers presently enslaved by communism.

A resolution will be adopted, to be transmitted to President Eisenhower, requesting that he champion the cause of freedom of all nations behind the Iron Curtain at the conference of the Big Four in Geneva, and hasten the day of liberation of the peoples who today are subjugated and living under a tyrannical communistic regime.

We respectfully request the honor of your presence at this historical meeting and permission to introduce you to the groups assembled. You will not be required to speak.

Very truly yours,
INVITATIONS COMMITTEE,
MICHAEL G. BIDA,
ANTON BENESZ,
MITCHELL S. JACHIMSKI,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 8, 1955.

Mr. MITCHELL S. JACHIMSKI,
Chairman, Invitations Committee,
Polish American Congress, Inc.,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. JACHIMSKI: Pressing and important official business makes it impossible for me to be present on the occasion of the meeting on July 12 at the Veterans' Memorial Building, but, however, it must be generally known that I stand in the forefront among those who demand restoration of full sovereignty to all of the nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Russia should be made to pay not only actual but punitive indemnities in cash, machinery, raw materials, and the restoration of every foot of terrain which she has treacherously taken from her defenseless neighbors. Poland's obliterated boundary with Rumania should be fully restored for the reestablishment of the friendly intercourse between these two nations. Poland's eastern boundaries should not only be restored to prewar status, but your conference should also go on record for securing forever the Oder-Neisse western boundary of a reconstituted Poland with absolute guaranties for Poland's retention of the mineral-rich Silesian territory, the Sudetland, and such other mutilations of Czechoslovakian territory should be restored and guaranteed inviolate by the Big Four and NATO. I repeat, the perpetrators of World War II, both Germany and Russia, should be compelled to rebuild, restore, and replace all destruction and plunder.

Germany and Austria, two enemy countries, ironically, are recognized as free and sovereign, except for the part known as East Germany, which is dominated by the Russians. Relations between our former enemies and ourselves have been established from the highest level of the diplomatic and consular functions, all to the great advantage of our former enemies and to the detriment of our allies, such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and others.

Your conference should boldly and formally demand that if and when the satellite nations are freed they should, as a matter of common honesty, decency, and fair dealing, be entitled to the same assistance dollar for dollar which we, particularly of the United States, have granted to Germany, who, as the perpetrator of the greatest crime in history, now seems destined to be the greatest beneficiary.

These views apply with equal force and favor to Ukrania, where in 1 year, for liberty's sake, more than 6 million people, mostly farmers and producers, were murdered by the Russian Communists or were systematically starved to death by and for communism. But this mass-murder plan failed. It was without effect, except to harden the determination among the patriotic, liberty-loving Ukranian people to become democratic, free, and independent. There are more than 40 million souls in the Ukraine who yearn for liberation and are ready to lay down their lives in proof of their determination. Their differences with their neighbors are relatively small by comparison to liberty and can be reconciled for the main objectives and the good of all.

Russia and communism are decidedly weakened instead of being strengthened by the Iron Curtain shroud placed around their smoldering, resentful satellites. Russia's treachery and consistent betrayal of her Slavic neighbors for 1,000 years makes her the undying and everlasting enemy of her neighbors and the foe of Slavdom, Christianity and democracy forever. Add to this the godless Marxian socialism we know as Communism, which Russia has foisted upon her Christian God-fearing neighbors, and she must find a means of insulating herself against the western world, that is exclusive of Germany with whom she will always find a way to deal and collaborate or more properly stated conspire to prepare another blood bath for civilization. Russia will always try to retain enough pawns like a subjugated Poland, Czechoslvakia, or other countries, with the ignorant approval of the West, to save herself for future and more heinous crimes. "Defense in depth" for Russia was abandoned at Stalingrad on the long breathless marathon run toward Vladivstok and the far-off Pacific where more Russian soldiers died because of loss of breath and exhaustion than were ever killed by German gunfire. In fact the Germans lost contact with the Russian rear until they reached Stalingrad where American beans, butter, and bread, along with buckshot, barbed wire, and baled hell piled mountain high stalled the onslaught of the Hun juggernaut. The Russian armies were saved from extermination by exhaustion over the wastes of Siberia or ultimate drowning in the far-off Pacific Ocean by American food and war materiel which reached them in time, but they were not helped by the theory of "defense in depth."

Now the Russian Communist plan is to seal off a tier of subjugated satellite states by insulation with another tier of so-called neutral states, as she succeeded in doing recently under the Austrian Treaty, to make permanent and secure the communism which is not as yet the dominant factor in the world of today or even in the Eastern Hemisphere. The plan of insulation, added to the Iron Curtain move to which the western world pays little or no heed, might well be the death knell of Christianity, democracy, and civilization.

These subjects must be fully covered in your conference action, for I believe the views expressed in this communication are of vital importance, and should concern the conference in its deliberations and final decision. The administration and President Eisenhower should be forthright, fearless, and fair in determining a policy and future course which for a certainty will lead to the liberation of 100 million or more enslaved Europeans, most of whom are your brethren and mine of Slavic antecedents.

Your conference should finally and fully go on record for a positive and unequivocal stand initiated and sponsored by President Eisenhower at the Geneva Conference to build a strong tier of nations beginning with Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Romania, and possibly Austria, as a tier of insulation between the two arch conspirators, Germany and Russia, and thus preserve peace and prosperity as long as such a central European barricade can be kept friendly and active.

I am attaching a copy of my speech delivered on the floor of the House on May 3, 1944, Polish Constitution Day. I respectfully call your attention to my views therein relating to the western boundary of Poland and to Germany's responsibility, but this has now been expanded to include the Russians for their bloody depredations.

If President Eisenhower is anxious about the safety, security, and future of the countries behin dthe Iron Curtain the suggested proposals are the least he can do.

With best wishes for a fruitful conference, I subscribe myself,

Cordially and sincerely yours.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the adoption of the document known as the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May, an instrument which ranks as a historic document along with the Magna Carta and the American Constitution, as a bill designed to safeguard the interests, the happiness, and the freedom of its people. A great deal has already been said of the intent and the far-reaching effect of the Polish Constitution, so I shall not go into further treatment of this subject.

I might state in passing on to the subject matter of my discourse, that I am happy in the thought that the inauguration by me of the Polish Constitution Day program of the House of Representatives has become an accepted and an annual event with an ever-growing interest among the Members. The popularity of the program, intended to bring to the mind of America the glory and the greatness of Poland, is established by the ever-increasing number of speakers on these occasions.

The subject of Poland and her welfare as it may bear upon the future peace of the world is something in which we Americans are deeply interested. The errors of the reestablishment of Poland after the last war must not be repeated again. Poland must not only be reestablished and revitalized but she must be made strong and independent with a democratic government which will assure to her all the rights and privileges which we in America hold as God-given and inalienable. For Poland to be independent rather than dependent, for Poland to be made strong rather than weak, for Poland to be made democratic rather than despotic or bureaucratic, she must of necessity have the right to choose her own government in a free and a democratic way. She must be permitted not only to retain every inch of her 1939 territory, but she must likewise acquire additional liberated and traditionally Polish territory which has been taken from her by a treacherous and a persistent foe over the centuries.

Poland's boundary should be extended to the west at the expense of the aggressor Germans. Her western boundary should begin at the eastern bank of the Oder River and should run due south from and including the port of Stettin to a point which touches the old Czechoslovakian border. On the western side of the river there should be provided a demilitarized zone for a depth of 50 miles paralleling the Polish and Czechoslovakian littoral and policed at Germany's expense by a Polish-Czechoslovakian Army for a period of at least two generations. All of East Prussia, historically Polish and peopled by a great number of Poles, should promptly revert to a reconstituted Poland. Over and above that, the aggressor Germans should be compelled to pay an indemnity sufficient to restore all of the destruction within this unfortunate country. The aggressors should be obliged to pay in addition a punitive indemnity which would permit the Poles to reestablish themselves at or about the level which they might have enjoyed were it not for these periodic and unwarranted incursions by a plunderbund bent on rapine, destruction, plunder, and enslavement of a people whose history antedates in that part of Europe the history of their traditional enemies.

Germany must be made to restore and return all that she has destroyed and stolen even if it takes a hundred years of compulsory labor of her blustering and bloated militarists. If needs be, this element within Germany should be chained to a wheelbarrow and made to return not only the stolen gold, art treasures, and literary works, but also the sacred wares pilfered from the altars and the bells stolen from the churches and shrines of her neighbors. The fiendish and almost inconceivable thievery by the Germans of the fertile topsoil of the subjugated countries should make an endless and a timeless parade of wheelbarrows radiating in all directions from Germany as it is being returned to the nations which were so despoiled.

The concessions to be made to Poland in the west should not depend upon the pleasure of the Soviet Government. Poland is entitled to proper recompense without consulting her eastern ally. She expects no more and she is entitled to, no less than the moral and the wholehearted support of Russia in this matter. As to the eastern boundary, the 1939 Polish boundary should be maintained inviolate. It should have been sacred and inviolate. The boundary was protected not only by pre-1939 treaties but also by a post-1939 agreement. It is moreover sustained by history as just and proper. It is Polish historically and to a great extent ethnographically. The greatest single element all through this disputed territory is Polish in language, religion, and custom. There are relatively few Russians to be found in this section. It is incomprehensible to me, as it is to millions of Americans, that Russia would insist upon what she acquired by a direct violation of her pledged word. After administering to Poland what America should remember as the original and the all-important stab in the back—for it was following the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement that Germany attacked Poland and was shortly thereafter similarly treated by her Russian neighbor—to think that today Russia finds fault with the Polish Government in exile when, as a matter of fact, that government ought to object to the unfriendly Government at Moscow. Russia seems to have a distorted concept about who is the aggrieved party.

Russia is today treating Poland as an enemy, not as an ally. Russia, in fact, shows a disposition to be more temperate with her outright enemies who attacked her. Certainly Poland, attacked by Russia after a Russian agreement with Germany, and which it must forever be borne in mind precipitated the bloodbath for the whole world, cannot now be expected to cede territory to her aggressor neighbor to the east. If there are to be any concessions, and as yet I do not believe that Poland has demanded any, the Soviet Government should be prepared to yield territory and substantial indemnities. The so-called liberation of Poland by the Russian armies is a mockery. Poland would not have needed Russian liberation if it were not for Russian betrayal of not only Poland but all of the Slavic countries. If the demands of the Soviet Government, unjustified and sinful as they are, are forced upon her traduced neighbor, the Polish people will be impoverished to the point of total dependency.

The Poles are a proud and an intelligent people. They do not ask charity. They will not eat humble pie. They naturally will resent such proffers from a country which they cannot trust. Poland will die; she will be obliterated from the face of the earth if needs be, but she will not surrender principle and we in America can understand her attitude. She will live or die as a freeman, not as a slave or a satellite. The addition of the disputed Polish provinces mean everything to Poland and her future. The great bulk of her wealth and of natural resources, such as timber, minerals, and oil, lie to the east. She cannot subsist without them for to her they are indispensable, they mean strength and vitality, freedom and permanence. In area it approximates 50 percent of her 1939 terrain. To Russia, on the other hand, the acquisition of the territory means in depth or in area but a mere fraction of what Russia already possesses, as in this war it was proven that the additional terrain does not mean additional safety for the Soviet. Russia will derive far more benefit economically and from the standpoint of safety by aiding in the reestablishment of a stronger, self-sufficient, and independent Poland than she would by a land grab and the acquisition at the expense of Poland of the natural resources in the disputed area.

If America and Great Britain, and their allies, permit Poland's further despoilment, it will mean for a certainty another war at some time in the future. The Poles will not be subjugated, they will not be enslaved, and Poland some day will live once again. That Poland is the key to the future peace and security of all Europe was proven in this war. Had Poland been sustained and supported, had she been given proper aid within boundaries that were extended to include millions of additional Poles, and had East Prussia been ceded to the newly created Polish Republic, the story might have been entirely different. Even so, the world will forever remember, and we in America will always appreciate and recognize the fact that Poland was the first to challenge the foe, that she laid down her life to save civilization, Christianity, and perhaps all mankind from German enslavement. This she has done, as history records, on more than one occasion. Concededly she is the bulwark of Christianity and in Europe the keystone in the arch of peace. Poland desires to live in peace and harmony with her neighbors. That includes Russia, her Slavic sister, who has betrayed her into the hands of her enemies, but she cannot do so at the price of servile submission and permanent subjection.

Poland knows only too well that the terms and the conditions offered by Russia mean positive and absolute conversion to Godless Communist despotism. Freedom, independence, and Christianity—these she cannot forsake and these she will not give up even if she must once again become a martyr to the cause for which she fought so valiantly. More than once before she was bruised, battered, and beaten, and her boundaries were rubbed out by a combination of her enemies who could not dominate her, who were jealous of her progress, and she has, like the good Lord whom the people of Poland have served so well and faithfully, risen from her grave and taken her place among the nations of the world.

The proof of Poland's vitality and faithfulness to an ideal, even while she is enslaved and in chains, can be proved in a thousand and one instances in her sorrows and suffering, but practically and particularly in the fact that to date she has not weakened, has not faltered or produced a single Quisling. Similarly, she has repudiated the pro-Russian expatriate, Warda Wasielewskaya. The doubtful and subservient Soviet sympathizers, Prof. Oscar Lange and the Reverend Stanislaws Orlemanski, who soiled his sacerdotal robes of priesthood to kowtow to Stalin and the others who betrayed the Polish people and the Roman Catholic Church into the hands of their enemies.

The unbroken authority of the Polish Government in exile will withstand the sinister and unwarranted challenge of the Communist regime at Moscow. The recognized Government of Poland, functioning on English soil, deserves the wholehearted support of the entire civilized world. It is not an-

tagonistic to any other government. It can only be, and positively is pro-Polish and that is precisely what is wrong with the officials in the eyes of Stalin and Molotov. Russia's desire is to implant within the borders of Poland a pro-Soviet Communist government subservient to the views and wishes of Moscow, but the average intelligent Pole, wherever he might be found, would prefer martyrdom and death of his country to the sacrifice of an ideal, of a sacred principle.

America, and I trust the world, will understand the noble aspirations of the Poles and, at the proper time, will sustain them. The best evidence of the caliber and character of Poland and her valiant sons and daughters are to be found in the glorious pages of her past history, and more especially, in the brilliant defense of her terrain which was a true symbol of her defense of all that we in this country, in our hearts, hold near and dear, and for which millions of our young men and women have undertaken to bare their breasts to the fire of the same common enemy.

Poland was always an ally of the United States of America. In this role she has never permitted a break. Russia is an ally of the United States today only because she has fallen out with her esrtwhile German ally, who with violent treachery turned upon her as the Soviet Government turned upon an unsuspecting and innocent Poland. Were it not for the German attack upon Russia, the Communists here and abroad would still be shouting that this is an imperialist war. Our American people are too intelligent and the world is too well civilized to accept Russian propaganda.

Hope of the Southland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the February 1955 issue of Extension, published by the Catholic Church Extension Society, there appears a short article entitled "Hope of the Southland." It is written by the Most Reverend James J. Navagh, D. D., Auxiliary Bishop of Raleigh, N. C. In it he discusses the work of the Catholic Church in North Carolina.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to insert this article into the RECORD. It reads as follows:

HOPE OF THE SOUTHLAND—HOPE SYMBOLIZES THE WORK OF THE CHURCH IN NORTH CAROLINA—BUT, FAITH AS WELL AS CHARITY, ARE NECESSARY INGREDIENTS FOR THE SPREAD OF CATHOLICISM IN THE TAR HEEL STATE

They tell the story of a missionary Bishop in the South who was asked by an interested person, "Bishop, just what do you need?" The bishop summed up the answer of the bishops of North Carolina in one word, "everything."

Since the diocese of Raleigh was established in 1924 it has had three bishops. The late Bishop William J. Hafey, on arriving, found scarcely a dozen secular priests and a few churches scattered across the 52,000 square miles of his diocese, serving about 5,000 known Catholics in the State. He worked with zeal and energy until he was promoted to Scranton. Then in 1937, Bishop Eugene McGuinness arrived as one of the best gifts of extension to North Carolina. I am told that Bishop McGuinness' remark after his first tour of the State (the great depression was just coming to an end) was, "What North Carolina needs is a good coat of paint." Under his able direction the diocese grew in importance and size so that when he left the State to assume his duties in the See of Oklahoma City and Tulsa in 1945, the known Catholic population was over 13,000 and, with Extension's help, new churches had been built in many parts of the diocese. The present bishop, Most Rev. Vincent S. Waters, former chancellor of the diocese of Richmond, Va., came in June 1945 and built with energy and zeal upon the foundations so firmly established by his predecessors.

North Carolina is a very important State. Stretching from east to west nearly 700 miles, it contains 52,349 square miles of territory. Its population, according to the 1950 census, was 4,610,929. Of these, about one quarter are Negro. Its birth rate is very high, one of the highest of the Nation, 27.4 average annual births per 1,000 population. Last year over half as many babies were born in North Carolina as in the 6 New England States combined. In reference to population, it is the 10th largest State in the Union.

When we look at North Carolina from the Catholic point of view, however, we can see why it is referred to as "The China of America." Its Catholic population is even now only seven-tenths of 1 percent. There were 32,831 known Catholics at the end of 1952. The tragedy of North Carolina through the years has been the scarcity of priests. In Bishop John England's day, he estimated that there were then 20,000 fallen-away Catholics among the people of the 3 States over which he was the ecclesiastical leader, that is to say, in North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. How many there are now is an almost unanswerable question. But as one passes through the cities and countryside of North Carolina and sees the Irish faces and reads the Irish names, he realizes that they run into the hundreds of thousands. He sometimes wonders what the story of North Carolina would be, if an adequate number of priests had served its population from the beginning. Perhaps all the O'Gradys and the Sullivans and the Kellys and the Murphys and all the rest would still bear the Catholic name.

In my 2 years in the South, I have seen much of the needs of missionary bishops and also the manner in which extension steps into the picture to help supply these needs. The first need of a missionery bishop in the South is, of course, priests. Sometimes he can find them among the people of his own diocese; most of the time he is obliged to look outside the boundaries of his own diocese for young men who wish to live a missionary life in the South. Yet, each time he accepts a student for the priesthood, he obligates himself to an expenditure of at least $6,000 for that young man's education, and he does so with the knowledge that he will be able to obtain very little of that $6,000 in his own diocese. Extension has granted a very generous allotment each year to the bishops of the Diocese of Raleigh to assist in the education of their seminarians.

Once the priest is ordained, another problem meets the bishop. The handful of people in the parish to which the new priest is assigned, generous as they are, will be unable to support him fully. On the other hand, the bishop knows that if he does not assign pastors to every town just as rapidly as he can, these small groups of Catholics living in the town will grow weaker and weaker in the faith, and their children will quite probably slip away from the faith of their fathers. So, the bishop knows that when he assigns a priest to a new parish, he will have to support him for a few years until the priest, quickening the faith of his Catholics, bringing back the fallen-aways, spreading the faith among the non-Catholics, is able to gather together a sufficiently large congregation so that it can be self-supporting. Faithfully each year, the Catholic Church Extension Society has granted subsidies through the bishops to a number of pastors in these circumstances, so that they may have the bare necessities of life and be able to live and do their work. It is interesting to note that of the 397 towns, cities, and villages of North Carolina, the Catholic Church is now established in 121. From this can be gathered the magnitude of the task before the ordinary of the Raleigh diocese and the need of continual assistance from the Catholic Church Extension Society, so that the Gospel may be preached to every living creature within the boundaries of the State.

POVERTY AND CHURCH BUILDING

Another need, of course, of a missionary diocese, is churches. It has been true of North Carolina that a whole generation of Catholics in various towns have been born, baptized, received their first holy communion, been confirmed, entered into marriage, and finally died, without even scarcely once putting their foot inside a Catholic Church. Their town had no church and they were too poor to build one. The story of these missionary circuits, cared for by zealous priests, however, is not one that can be looked back upon with satisfaction for the simple reason that many of the people served in this way lapsed from the church. One thing that has impressed itself upon me during my 2 years in North Carolina has been the number of churches which bear the bronze plaque telling the story of the generosity of the Catholic Church Extension Society. Churches dot the landscape of North Carolina whose existence is due to the generosity of those who support extension. The churches are the monuments to the zeal and forethought of the officers, past and present, of the Catholic Church Extension Society.

I notice on the records, for example, that in 1914, the Catholic Church Extension Society made a donation of $1,000 for the little church erected in Castle Hayne, N. C. In 1952, when a new church was necessary in the same place, the Catholic Church Extension Society made a donation of $1,500 toward the building of this second church. Extension has helped with rectories, convents, and schools. It has sent church equipment such as stations of the cross, crucifixes, tabernacles, candlesticks, Mass vestments, altar cloths and linens, almost without number, to many of the churches of this State. Over 40 parishes out of the 99 in the Diocese of Raleigh have been assisted in some way during the years of the existence of the diocese.

If I were to use just one word to characterize the work of the church in North Carolina during these years it would be "hope." For the first time since our Nation was established, the church is growing in the South. In North Carolina we have seen the growth from about 5,000 in 1924 to 32,831 in 1953. The number of priests is considerably increased, as are the number of churches and schools. Moreover, a great number of the parishes are becoming self-supporting, so that what has been given to North Carolina has not been merely spent. Gifts to North Carolina have been a wonderful investment. Small but vigorous and growing parishes are now able to carry their own financial burdens and are even beginning to assist smaller places. This does not mean that within the foreseeable future, North Carolina will be able to dispense with the help that the Catholic Church Extension Society gives, but it does mean that those who support extension and the officers and staff of extension can look with legitimate pride upon the growth of the church as they have fostered it in this great State.

The Superficial Aspect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson which appeared in the July 4, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine:

THE SUPERFICIAL ASPECT—POLIO AND PRINCIPLES

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

All Danish children in the first age group have now received antipolio shots without incident, according to the official report. If the stuff is any good, this means that some Danish children who would have been doomed will not die of polio this year; but Denmark is afflicted with more or less socialized medicine, which some Americans seem to regard as a worse calamity than the deaths of a few children.

All Canadian children in the first age group have also received the vaccine, the Government footing the bill without ever requiring a pauper's oath of the parents. But that is creeping socialism and the fact that, theoretically, some Canadian children will survive, instead of dying or being crippled by polio, seems to be lightly regarded by our humanitarians.

Only a small proportion of American children in the same age group have been given the vaccine, but the American medical profession is free of the threat of socialism, creeping of galloping, so let us thank God that we are not as other men. Theoretically, American children will die for lack of the protection—

"But things like that, you know, must be
At every famous victory.".

The mortality is regrettable, of course, but at least it will stimulate business in the coffin trade, and coffinmaking is free private enterprise. Then among those who don't die some presumably will be permanently crippled and will have the privilege of paying for unsocialized medical services during the remainder of their lives. But the important thing is that the United States Government has escaped taking control of this vast problem, and you can see the marvelous results.

If the results at which you marvel are the prevailing confusion, suspicion, dissension and rapidly mounting distrust of medical science, that is because you are perversely fixing your eyes on the wrong things. You should take note of the facts, first, that the Administration has avoided being saddled with any additional responsibility for the health of the Nation's children and, second, that no member of the American Medical Association will be subjected to the humiliation of receiving his pay-check from the Federal Government instead of from an individual patient.

True, some members of the AMA seem to be a little doubtful of the value of the latter triumph. As regards the Government's checks, two things must be admitted—they come in promptly and they don't bounce, which is more than can be said of all those drawn on private accounts. But the bulk of the doctors seem disposed to yield that personal advantage in order to secure to their patients the immense moral benefit that comes from paying $15 for the vaccine themselves instead of being pauperized by having the Government pay it. This solicitude of the medical men for our moral as well as physical health is really more than the laity ever expected.

This is, however, subsidiary. The memorable achievement of the Salk vaccine affair is its demonstration of the granitic firmness of the administration in resisting the advance of creeping socialism. If the Government had moved swiftly and resolutely to take control of the distribution of this new remedy, at least until the supply catches up with demand, it would have set a precedent horrible to rugged individualists.

It is no answer to say that this was an unprecedented situation requiring unprecedented action. It may be that no comparable discovery will be made for the next hundred years, but you can't put any reliance in research scientists; one may pop up tomorrow with a preventative of cancer, or tuberculosis or heart disease. If that should occur, and if the precedent had been established in the Salk case, then the public would expect prompt, intelligent, and effective action on the part of the Government again; and if you teach the public to expect the Government to act promptly, intelligently and effectively, where will the American way of life be? The prudent thing was to establish no precedent.

This the salk vaccine affair has accomplished to a marvel. The Secretary of Health et cetera is now on record as disavowing any direct responsibility except through the Surgeon General, and the Surgeon General has no responsibility except through the law, and the law as he knows it is the interpretation given it by the Secretary of Health et cetera, and if in that runaround you can fix responsibility you are sharper than I am.

In short, the Secretary of Health, et cetera, and the Surgeon General propose to hold the offices but not to hold themselves responsible for prompt and intelligent action when any new condition arises affecting health. Theirs is the charmingly simple policy attributed to Giovanni de Medici: "Since God has given up the papacy, let us enjoy it." President Eisenhower, indeed, in his San Francisco speech revealed a vague impression that something ought to be done by somebody sometime about something, but no such uneasiness troubles his campfollowers in Washington. They are for enjoyment, and they hold to the purpose with zeal and immense tenacity.

All Concerned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits has reported H. R. 7089, and the measure is to receive attention of the House this week.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared in the June 28 edition of the Disabled American Veterans newspaper and urge that you carefully peruse its contents:

ALL CONCERNED

We have read a great deal about the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits and their work and efforts to produce a bill that would be fair and equitable to all concerned. Perhaps an attempt to define or explain the phrase "all concerned" as used here might illustrate or emphasize the importance of the proposed legislation even though it might not answer all the questions we receive as to why all this interest in survivor benefits at this time.

"All concerned" includes every widow, child, dependent parent or parents now drawing death compensation or Government insurance benefits based on the death in service of a former soldier, sailor, air corpsman or marine—or on the death of such serviceman who died as the result of his war incurred disabilities. It includes, of course, the Government of the United States and that means the people of the United States. It should concern every man or woman now in the Armed Forces of the United States—if they are at all interested in the future welfare of their loved ones.

However, as we review the proposed legislation and we read the testimony offered for and against the legislation we are impressed with the fact that those who should be most vitally concerned are the living veterans of America's wars now drawing compensation for service-connected disabilities and whose service connected disability or disabilities may cause or contribute to the cause of their early demise.

It has been emphasized again and again that no person now drawing benefits under existing laws would be adversely affected by its passage—in fact, that many would be given the opportunity to secure additional benefits proposed in the new bill. It should be made clear, however, that the survivors of the veteran who dies after January 1, 1956 will enjoy no such protection of greater awards which may be available under existing laws and which would be paid to his survivors if he died on or before December 31, 1955.

What must be kept in mind is the fact that the work of the Select Committee was intended to produce legislation satisfactory and acceptable to the Regular Establishment—and that means the career serviceman. Social security benefits will be extended on a contributory basis and grade and rank held in service is to be a most important factor in determining benefits payable to widows and some children. If social-security benefits on a contributory basis does not now or in the future detract from existing retirement benefits available to the career serviceman—fine. If it is intended to reduce such retirement benefits or take the place of death compensation due to survivors then the Regular services should want no part in it.

The DAV has no quarrel with the Regular Establishment. We believe and have stated that legislation providing for some form of adequate protection for the survivors of the career serviceman is long, long overdue. But our main interest is the man or woman who went into service during time of war and who died or became disabled as a result of that service—the citizen soldier who has won all of our wars to date and the survivors of these same citizen soldiers have certain rights which should and must be protected. And, the DAV intends to continue to protect them. Certainly no great interest in the welfare of the former serviceman has been evidenced in the past by the officials of the Regular Establishment. On the other hand DAV has done much to improve the status of the career serviceman and we shall continue to promote any legislation that will make the military career more attractive to the youth of this Nation. But this must be done without prejudice to the disabled veteran or his survivors—whether he fall within the category of career, volunteer or drafted personnel.

The payment of death compensation and insurance or indemnity insurance payable to widows and children of our war dead or of veterans who die of their service-connected disabilities should not be reduced because of the receipt by the widow or children of social-security payments acquired by the husband or father in the service or in

private life. Death compensation to the widow and/or children has been earned. Government life insurance has been bought and paid for. Indemnity insurance is still and was issued to the veteran in service in lieu of other insurance at a saving to the Government. To consider it a gratuity or as a payment in lieu of death compensation after the serviceman's death is little less than stealing from the blind or the dead.

Throughout the hearings and from those in high places we have been amazed if not disturbed over the open assault against the payment of death compensation to the parent or parents of men killed in action. Spokesmen from the Pentagon Building and the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office, as well as others, expressed their grave concern over the number of parents whose son or sons have been killed in action or who died of their service incurred disabilities and who are drawing compensation as dependent parents under existing laws. It has been openly stated that huge savings could be made if these payments could be markedly reduced—and further that they should be reduced.

The DAV is wholly familiar with existing law and regulations which require proof of dependency on the part of a surviving parent or parents in order to receive death benefits. We do not believe there is any appreciable number of parents drawing death benefits who are not entitled under the already strict regulations of the Veterans' Administration. We just cannot understand all this concern over the payment of death benefits to the parents of the men who never returned from our wars. If we recall, we heard no such voluble protest over the spending of billions of dollars toward the educational program of our returning able-bodied soldiers—and in not one instance was the beneficiary asked if he or his parents were financially able to provide for his education.

It would seem to the DAV that questioning of the payment of benefits to the Gold Star Mothers and Fathers of our Wars could well await the day when Congress no longer felt the need of sending further billions to care for our European and Asiatic neighbors—friend and foe alike.

The proposed bill offers a widowed mother whose annual income is in excess of $1,750 not a dime. An aging couple whose son or sons were killed in action but whose total income, including social security benefits and any Government insurance benefits exceeds $2,400 will receive no further aid from a grateful Government because they are not in need. The bill further provides that, "(e) the Administistrator shall require as a condition of granting or continuing dependency and indemnity compensation to a dependent parent that such dependent parent file each year with him (on the form prescribed by him) a report showing the total income which such dependent parent expects to receive in that year and the total income which such dependent parent received in the preceding year. The dependent parent shall file with the Administrator a revised report whenever there is a material change in the estimated annual income."

Because we feel it has a healthier if sadder tone, and in order to call it to the attention of men in high places who may never have heard of it, may we quote in full President Lincoln's famous letter to Mrs. Bixby sent from the Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C., November 21, 1864:

"DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the Adjutant-General of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

"Yours very sincerely and respectfully,

"ABRAHAM LINCOLN."

The material blessings we enjoy at home and our power and prestige abroad will continue as long as this Nation is ever willing to tended to the survivors of our war dead "the consolation that might be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save."

Let Us Be Reasonably Encouraged by Events Leading to the Meeting at the Summit But Realistically Reserved About Optimistic Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 2, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include an excellent summary, appearing in the May 28, 1955, issue of the magazine America, describing the events leading to the proposed meeting at the summit and at the same time warning us not to expect anything to develop out of that Conference except approaches to problems. The editorial follows:

TOWARD BIG FOUR TALKS

The Secretary of State's televised report to the President on May 17, showed the American eagle justifiably preening its feathers a bit over the events which took place in Paris and Vienna the preceding week. For Mr. Dulles' air flight to Europe was signalized by a series of historic developments in postwar diplomacy.

The Secretary began his Paris visit by holding timely and urgent conversations with the British and particularly the French over our China and Indochina policies. Over the air he gave the impression of feeling that he had succeeded in winning better understanding of both. He then participated in the ceremonies marking West Germany's epoch-making entry into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the culmination of 5 years of American initiative.

He flew to Vienna to sign the documents which restored to Austria its independence after 17 years of first Nazi and then Four Power occupation. He witnessed firsthand the joyful celebrations of the Austrian people as they danced in the streets in the land they can again call their own. Finally, Mr. Dulles met Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov and arranged, together with their British and French counterparts, for top-level Big Four talks to take place this summer.

All this drew the curtain on the immediate postwar era. In its place has come what might be called a post-postwar phase of international diplomacy. Both the President and his Secretary of State in their TV broadcast expressed confidence that the American people are mature enough—Mr. Dulles used the term "sophisticated"—to realize that the Kremlin's apparent relaxation of the rigid Stalinist policy of incessant harassment gives no ground for excessive optimism or for basic changes in United States foreign policies. Mr. Dulles, confessing ignorance of why the U. S. S. R. had shifted gears, guessed that the failure of its stubborn attempts to prevent German integration with the West might have led to the adoption of a more convenient Soviet policy.

The truth, of course, is that strong American leadership of the free world, which dates primarily from the Truman doctrine of March 1947, has scored more successes than we are aware of in the midst of our partisan charges and countercharges about our "failures" abroad. Mr. Dulles would probably be asked to resign if he went so far as to give Dean Acheson any credit for planting the harvest which the Eisenhower administration is reaping, though he did credit our bipartisan foreign policy for the successes we have achieved. The Secretary was right, we believe, in dividing honors between the moral principles to which we have been loyal and the specific foreign policies through which we have tried to implement them.

What are the outstanding problems to be met in the post-postwar phase of world politics? Mr. Dulles enumerated them as German reunification, mitigation of the atomic-arms race, the liberation of satellite peoples still held captive by the U. S. S. R., and control of the subversive operations of international communism. The agenda in the Far East, we might add, is not quite that neat.

It seems as if the Communists powers have learned that they cannot afford to risk war by crude acts of aggrandizement. They will therefore play for position for a while. Nothing will be decided at the Big Four talks, except "approaches" to problems. For the nonce the competition will be along nonmilitary lines, where we have a lot to learn. Let's hope we learn it fast.

Federal Foulup on Surplus Adams Township Land Stalls New Grade School Project 6 Months

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an excellent article by G. D. Welles, Jr., entitled, "Federal Foulup on Surplus Adams Township Land Stalls New Grade School Project 6 Months," which was published on July 7, 1955, in the Sentinel Herald of Sylvania, Ohio. This article, subtitled, "Government Redtape Results in Half Year Negotiations," describes the difficulties encountered by Adams Township, Ohio, in obtaining certain Federal surplus property for the construction of a much-needed elementary school. It was the policy conflict within the present administration on the donable property program which caused me to introduce H. R. 7007, a bill to direct the transfer of certain surplus property to Adams Township and to another school group.

A drawing of the proposed school site is printed in the Sentinel Herald over the following statement:

So far, the site for the school pictured above is "up in the air" due to an indecisive Federal policy on surplus lands. In an effort to save local taxpayers the expense of purchasing valuable property, the Adams Township School Board has been in continued

negotiation with the Government for a hectic year in an effort to comply with a host of requirements. Recently, Congressman THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY carried the Federal "foulup" to the floor of the legislature.

In the meantime, Adams Township has money in the bank, plans on the drawing board, kids growing up—but no school.

The article follows:

FEDERAL FOULUP ON SURPLUS ADAMS TOWNSHIP LAND STALLS NEW GRADE SCHOOL PROJECT 6 MONTHS—GOVERNMENT RED TAPE RESULTS IN HALF YEAR NEGOTIATION

(By G. D. Welles, Jr.)

If it had not been for a foulup in the United State Government's policy on surplus properties, Adams Township now would have its much-needed new elementary school half finished, it was learned Friday in an interview with Stanley Reynolds, Adams school board president, and Adam Markowski, board member.

As it is, the school project has hit a temporary dead end, with the Government's April 12 freeze order on surplus properties, involving its promise a year ago this month to donate to Adams Township for the school before January 1, 1955, 22 acres of land on the abandoned site of a proposed Veterans' Administration hosiptal at Hill Avenue and Byrne Road.

Adams Township residents are paying 1 percent interest on the $350,000 set aside for the project out of the $2,200,000 school bond issue of June 1954. The interest would be slightly more than 2½ percent, according to Toledo Trust Co. officials who handled the transactions, had not Adams Township wisely reinvested its money in short-term Government securities, paying 1½ percent interest, in the interim.

ASHLEY SUBMITS BILL

A bill submitted to Congress last month by Representative THOMAS LUDLOW ASHLEY of the Ninth Ohio District (Todelo) to authorize and direct, among other things, the transfer of the property to Adams Township, may be a little late, even though it should quickly cut through the tangle of Washington redtape. According to Mr. Reynolds, the school board, which already had set a deadline of April 1 for confirmation of the Government's promise and transfer of the property, has been looking for another site. Mr. Markowski believes with Mr. Reynolds that 6 months is far too long to wait for anything as vital to the township as the new elementary school.

HIGH SCHOOL HALFWAY HOME

"The new Adams Township High School, for which the same bonds were issued, now is about half finished," Markowski said. "And the new elementary school would be in the same shape, had not this change in Federal policy entered the picture."

"The Government has really given Adams Township the old run-around," said Mr. Reynolds. "Briefly, here's what happened. We first had a meeting with Walter Rhoten, director of the division of property utilization in Columbus, Ohio, who explained how we should make it known that we wanted the property. Out of that meeting came our application, written according to his instructions. This was way back in the early part of last year. From Columbus, our application went to the second district office of the HEW, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Chicago. From there, it went back to Columbus. Chicago wanted more information. From Columbus it came back to us. From us—back to Columbus and Chicago. We made several trips to Chicago and finally got our need through to them."

"From Chicago," he continued, "our application went to Washington. A year ago in June we were notified that HEW had granted our request, and we were given every reason to believe that the property would be transferred to us by January 1, 1955."

When the property was not transferred within the allotted time, they went to Columbus again, where they heard about the conflict between the HEW, which wanted to practically give them the property, and the GSA (General Services Administration), which wanted to put it up for sale on a bid basis. So they were left with $350,000 in 2½ percent Government bonds, plans all completed and contracts pending.

"Mr. Rhoten came to Toledo in May to explain how his hands were tied until it was decided which department of the Government had jurisdiction. Mr. Ashley attended the meeting. Both men have been right behind us from the start. As a result of this meeting, Mr. Ashley introduced his bill in Congress June 27," said Reynolds.

"Personally, I am tired of waiting for the Government to keep its promise," he concluded. "We need that school next fall. But that's an impossibility at this late date. We, of course, want to start building immediately to have it just as close to next fall as possible. As much as I appreciate Mr. Ashley's efforts, we're still going to keep looking for other property, in case this latest turn of events gets snarled somewhere, too."

In Congressman LUD ASHLEY'S Reports from Washington of June 30, he briefly explains the situation as follows:

"Sometime ago, Congress set up the procedure by which surplus Government-owned property should be made available to health and educational institutions. But the program has never gotten off the ground—and two Toledo area schools are still marking time even though their applications have been approved and the need is urgent. Reason: there is a fight within the administration between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on one side and the General Services Administration on the other. Result, a freeze has been put on transfers of surplus property throughout the Nation. That's why I introduced my bill, in line with the expressed intent of Congress, directing the Health, Education, and Welfare Department to transfer the 37 acres to those Lucas County groups. The schoolchildren can't wait for a freeze to thaw."

United States Air Force Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today, July 11, 1955, marks a historical day for the United States Air Force. For this is the day that the newly created United States Air Force Academy opens its doors and welcomes the first class. I know I bespeak the sentiments of the entire Congress as I extend congratulations and best wishes to the staff and student body. The success of this great new service school can well determine the continued leadership of our Nation in the skyways of the world.

Mr. Speaker, to commemorate this milestone in the history of the United States Air Force, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article "The Air Academy Takes the Salute" from the New York Times magazine of July 10, 1955. It was authored by a very distinguished reporter and one of the foremost military editors of the world, Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin.

The article follows:

THE AIR ACADEMY TAKES THE SALUTE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

An institution representing a service with a short past but boundless future opens its doors in Denver, Colo., tomorrow—dedicated to the proposition that men, not machines, win wars. Three hundred and five young men from all over the United States, aged 17 to 22—the opening class in the new United States Air Force Academy—will converge on the Academy's temporary site at Lowry Air Force Base to initiate a new chapter in military education.

By 1957, the school will be moved to its permanent 17,500-acre site at Colorado Springs, beneath the rampart of the Rockies. And 5 or 6 years hence, with a full enrollment of some 2,500 students, the Air Force Academy will join its established sisters—West Point and Annapolis—as an integrated part of the Nation's system for the training of professional officers.

The Air Force Academy starts life with none of the vested interests, none of the encumbrances of established custom, none of the proprietary influence of alumni that influence the United States Military and Naval Academies. Unlike West Point, it has no "long gray line" of officers long gone—Lee and Grant; Pershing and March; Bradley and Eisenhower—to stand shoulder by shoulder behind the young novitiates of today.

Unlike the Naval Academy, it does not have the moral strength, the sense of pride, the feeling of history, the disciplinary force which the link with a great past bestows. It has no battle flag—"Don't Give Up the Ship"—similar to the one that first meets the young midshipman's eye as he climbs the steps to Memorial Hall in Annapolis; it has no battle monument, as at West Point, inscribed with the names of soldiers who died for their country.

The "wild blue yonder"—not only the skies of earth but interplanetary space and the inscrutable horizons of the nuclear age—are the challenging dimensions against which the Air Force Academy must be measured. Its past is the future; its objectives tomorrow's, its feeling modern—even to the unconventional and controversial architectural models of its permanent buildings.

In one sense, it is incongruous that the services' newest school is being born at the dawn of the missile age, at a time when the mechanistic aspect of warfare seems to threaten the dominance of man as king of battle. The late General H. S. (Hap) Arnold, one of the founders of the modern Air Force, somewhat prematurely described World War II as "the last war of the pilots"; yet today, 10 years afterward, a school for potential pilot-commanders of the Air Force of today is just being founded.

And there are other elements of incongruity—the dedication of another academy to service goals in an era when the indivisible national nature of military power is emphasized; the opening of another school to train military leaders in the art of war at the very time when war itself has become so terrible that its practice—at least in all-out form—can no longer be described as rational, or subject to reasoned instruction.

Yet the reasons for a third service academy are compelling. For some years now, West Point and Annapolis have been assigning about one-fourth of their classes to the Air Force—a makeshift and unsatisfactory arrangement which necessitates considerable additional training for the graduates of these older service academies. And in any case, ever since the war the maximum output of Annapolis and West Point has supplied only a very small fraction of the services' needs for new junior officers.

The long-term "hard core"—the professional officers who are the heart and soul

of any military organization—are too few; too many of the services' officers have no common background, no common "band of brothers" concept, no real interest in long-term professional careers. This need for for more professionally trained officers is one of the major reasons for Colorado Springs.

Another compelling reason is the very lack of tradition, of background, of history—which at one and the same time frees and fetters the Air Force Academy. For it is no secret that during World War II the tradition of sticking by the ship, of continuing to objective, was hard to implant in an Air Force with few regulars. Air Force officers were the first to proclaim the need for a peculiarly air service academy—which would inculcate in its students the traditions and discipline essential to greatness in air combat.

To a major degree, the broad aims and objectives of West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs are identical; the academies differ in approach and method.

All 3 schools are 4-year undergraduate, college level institutions bestowing bachelor of science degrees. Their students are uniformed, and subject to discipline, their daily lives controlled by the clock, although the Air Force Academy routine may be more flexible in this respect than the somewhat cloistered regimens of the older academies.

The service academies graduate commissioned officers—second lieutenants at West Point and Denver, ensigns or second lieutenants (Marines and temporarily Air Force) at Annapolis. The Air Force Academy will also gradaute its students as aircraft observers and rated navigators, with some 684 hours of flying training (including 186 hours of actual flying time) behind them—but not pilots. Colorado Springs will not be a flying school; its aim is to develop officers first rather than "plane jockeys." The objectives of all the service schools is the preparation of candidates to be long-term professional officers. Each midshipman and cadet must agree to serve a minimum of 3 years in the Regular services after graduation. And each academy elevates its sights; it aims not so much at the production of "finished" second lieutenants or ensigns as at the production of future generals and admirals.

An officer's education is, of course, never finished; the system of single and joint service schools takes the average officer up the ladder of promotion all the way to the stars of rank—from the service academies through many intermediate schools to the service, and National War Colleges.

But, basically, all of the academies are trying to produce the "hard core" of the future services. By no means do they turn out all of the junior officers the services need. If the Air Force remains at approximately the present size, the Air Force Academy will eventually produce about half—no more, perhaps less—of the junior officers the service will require each year; the rest will come from the air cadet program, college ROTC's, etc.

There is another common denominator in the objectives of all the service academies. They aim to produce not merely the Army officer, the Navy officer, the Air officer, but (like all colleges) the whole man—broad enough to speak to congressional committees, to take his place at the conference table, to comprehend the intricacies of diplomacy and geopolitics, to handle small talk at tea parties and large actions in war.

These more or less identical objectives are approached by somewhat variant methods. The Air Academy's plans and programs are as yet just that; they are subject to change with development and experience. But the methods to be used at Denver and Colorado Springs are frankly based upon the experience of the older academies although they follow more closely the pattern of West Point than of Annapolis.

The entire Air Academy program—planned and developed ever since 1948 with the help of West Point, Annapolis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia University, and educators and experts from numerous other institutions—is to be administered and directed by a combat Air Force veteran. Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, who graduated from West Point with President Eisenhower in the class of 1915.

Lieutenant General Harmon, who has been flying since 1916, was recalled from retirement by the President to initiate the Air Academy and to be its first Superintendent. He will be one of the few representatives of the older generation connected with its staff.

The four-year period of instruction will include an academic and an airmanship program. In its academic program the Air Academy will emphasize the so called social humanistic studies—English, history, philosophy, geography, psychology, law, economics, government, and international relations—more strongly than does West Point or Annapolis.

The air cadet will spend from 45 to 53 percent of his classroom hours in social-humanistic studies, the rest of his academic time in scientific and engineering studies. This compares with about 38 percent devoted to social-humanistic studies at West Point, and approximately 24 percent at Annapolis.

Although the Air Force Academy will emphasize scientific and engineering subjects to a lesser degree than Annapolis or West Point, a graduate, the Air Force believes, will be able to earn a degree in aeronautical engineering at one of the top civilian universities with one additional post-graduate summer and one additional post-graduate year of study.

The professors and instructors will be Air Force officers on active duty—most of them with Ph. D. or master's degrees in their subjects, and with West Point, Annapolis or college teaching experience and service overseas.

A few civilian instructors will augment the professional faculty. But, following the example of West Point (which differs from Annapolis in this respect), the Air Force Academy believes that a good officer, as an instructor, helps to inculcate motivation in the cadets and also aids in leadership training.

In addition to his academic studies the air cadet—guided by the commandant of cadets—will spend an almost equal amount of his crowded life in the airmanship program. This will include not only flying training (including 4 years of aerial navigation and primary pilot training in light planes) but military and physical training.

An extensive intramural sports program (as at West Point) is scheduled, with required participation by every cadet. The Air Force Academy also has great plans for extensive intercollegiate sports competition, and the famous Army-Navy football rivalry will eventually become a triangular competition. The "will to win" is one of the desired objectives in men trained to fight, and highly competitive intercollegiate sports are considered one means to that end.

The military phase of the training will—initially, at least—deemphasize close-order drill, but will stress military organization (of all the services), weapons familiarization and the duties and responsibilities of officers.

Finally, besides the formal academic and airmanship programs, there will be a third less tangible but equally important phase of cadet life. The "unwritten law" and the great influence of tradition and custom play an important role at West Point and Annapolis in shaping a youngster's character and in developing his leadership. Student government, the honor system, "first class (senior) rates," the rigid requirements of plebe year—all are part and parcel of the older academies, and the responsibility of the first class of each institution in these matters of discipline and indoctrination is great.

The students' own treatment of their fellows who transgress the standards which midshipmen and cadets themselves shape—"a cadet's word is his bond," "an officer must take care of his men"—is important in the service academy system.

In this phase of cadet life, the Air Force Academy will be handicapped. It will be half-directing, half-encouraging the 305 entering youngsters to develop their own cadet mores and traditions, their own high standards. There will be no upper classmen to set the new "plebes" straight, to guide them on the "path to promotion and pay," to teach them the language and the customs of the services, to ask them (as at Annapolis), Who is the King of Siam? What is a mail buoy?

The Air Force recognizes this handicap, and as a sort of substitute for upper classmen it has ordered to Lowry some 66 first and second lieutenants—graduates of West Point, Annapolis and other colleges—who are called "Air Training Officers" and who will live in barracks and the entering cadets to guide and counsel them.

These, then, are the guide lines—the general plans—for a national institution new to the American scene, bold in its approach, hopeful in its future. Its plans are subject to change; there are some frank trial-and-error approaches in its architecture, its uniforms, its curriculum, its training.

And there are some frank misgivings—both general and specific—among both military men and educators who are familiar with the service academies. Some fear that service rivalries will be increased rather than diminished, and that the institution of another academy may increase separtism rather than promote unification. This is a contention open to question, but certainly there still exists a major gap in the service system of education.

There is no common service school for young officers just starting their careers, no school where the "hard core" of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines receive common instruction in their common purpose—preservation and defense of the Nation; no school where the indivisibility of military force is stressed; no school where Clausewitz and Mahan and Douhet share equal billing.

There are joint service schools only at a higher level, not at the beginning of an officer's career. And the Air Force Academy—devoted, rightly, to the secularity of the Air Force—can do little to fill this gap.

Many educators, who have deplored the underemphasis placed on social-humanistic studies, welcome the Colorado Springs curriculum. But there are a few who fear it may turn out neither fish nor fowl—neither well-trained engineers nor good social-humanists. Some, who remember the West Point football scandals, fear too great an emphasis on intercollegiate athletics.

And most—including the military—would agree that the system of appointments to all the service academies could well be modified to permit greater selectivity among the candidates by the academic boards and the superintendents. For its first few years, the Air Force Acdamey will enjoy a more liberal system—but this will end as it reaches full strength, and then the wide selection it now has among its candidates will not be possible.

Above all, what is most needed is a system that will permit a better test for potential leaders, that will cull out the lower 10 or 15 percent of the successful applicants, and that will provide better evaluation of character. As for the rest—the physical construction of the academy, the curriculum itself, the training—these will have to adapt, to change, to progress with the changing world of airpower.

No one knows what part the Air Force Academy will play in the conquest of the

skies of earth and in man's coming adventures in interstellar space. But if in future years Colorado Springs produces military leaders fit to join the "long gray line" of West Point and the admirals of Annapolis, if—as has been said of West Point—it proves capable of producing a man to meet every national emergency that has ever confronted the country, then the Nation's $126 million investment in a third service academy will be cheap indeed.

Postal Union Newsletter Urges Fight Against Summerfield's "Poisonous Propagandized Panaceas for Post Office People" After Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 7, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of Fed Facts, a mimeographed publication of Local 130 of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks of Indianapolis, Ind., contains in its President's Column an article by Harlan E. Hicks which should be of interest to Members of the House who may wonder at the reaction of union leaders to the recent pay raise legislation:

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN
(By Harlan E. Hicks)

Usually, when a salary increase is finally enacted into law, it is received with wide-spread arms and a sigh of relief that the campaign is over. This time, however, even those who were for H. R. 2061 are wondering just what they have. The answer, apparently, will not be available before December 1. We do know that all of the newspaper, radio, and TV publicity about an 8 percent increase—now—is false at this time, and for too many, it will continue to be after December 1. Even the retroactive feature is being taken away to provide a sufficient time-lag to change over to a biweekly pay period. Of course, the other civil service employees deserve 7½ percent now but—so do we. It is a shame that the postal people must pay the freight out of their salaries so that the second-class matter (and third class) can be handled at a fraction of cost. Over $230 million deficit per year for second class alone.

Now is the time to begin thinking of the future—legislatively. There is little time left this session of Congress but union recognition and retirement are in the hopper and should receive all the support possible as directed by our national legislative director, E. C. Hallbeck.

After many long years of dust, dirt, and unsanitary conditions against which local 130 has protested time and again, we have support for our contentions in a report by Mr. E. J. Herringer, senior sanitary engineer, United States Public Health Service, who inspected the workroom recently along with Assistant Postmaster E. O. Renard, Mr. W. F. Ylitalo, GSA, and your president. Mr. Herringer reported conditions to be as bad or worse than we have claimed and recommended certain corrective measures.

Last January local 130 submitted a request for additional regular clerk tours, based upon a survey conducted by it throughout the office and the reduction of restrictions under the Whitten rider. Acting Postmaster Walter A. Smith and the supervision of the office concurred in the need and 50 additional regular clerks have been granted as of July 1, 1955.

Tours were posted July 1 and will be reposted as rapidly as possible until the vacant tours are filled or until the next regular quarterly posting in October. A number of new station tours are to be included as quickly at the new Assistant General Superintendent of Mails is able to establish the hours of assignment with the various station superintendents.

It was good to have a small part in the retirement ceremonies of General Superintendent of Mails Avery W. Leary and Assistant Superintendent of Mails Erven E. Rumple. One part of Mr. Leary's remarks was especially appreciated and merits the attention of every clerk, "I have been a "Fed" for 39½ years and I think every one of you should be a member of your organization." May I extend the congratulations of local 130 to Mr. Leary—past president of the local, and Mr. Deery and Mr. Rumple.

The congratulations of the local are also extended to Mr. Norman Lansford, Mr. Dewey R. Morgan and Mr. Ralph Weedman who have been promoted to the positions of General Superintendent of Mails, Assistant General Superintendent of Mails and Senior Assistant Superintendent, respectively.

In the same issue of the same publication, the column "Stand Up and Fight! For What?" expresses the feelings of its writer, and possibly to an extent of the publication and the officers of the union, who selected it for publication, toward the Postmaster General, an office of the Cabinet of the President of the United States:

STAND UP AND FIGHT! FOR WHAT?

Fight for your union—the only platform the postal employees have to stand upon. Fight against Dr. Summerfield's "poisonous propagandized panaceas for post office people." I use the prefix "Dr." here in profound respect to the PMG. Has he not in the short time that he has been in office learned the "technicalities" of the entire "postal system"? Even down to the "corporationized details"? Even down to his "damnable conception" of reclassification? Even to being able to "hamstring" the President of the United States into holding up all bills, until the "Dr. Summerfield special edition" got out?

From the time I was a lad, my parents were of the opinion that if one had something to say on a worthwhile subject, and that what the person had to say was truth, that it should be said without fear or favor. Well—I have a message for the postal employees of this United States. And even though the means I have of delivering it consists of just a small monthly paper—I shall this day tell you what is in my mind and heart—if the local here sees fit to print it. At the outset, let me say it cannot be written without mentioning names, as I have already done and shall continue to do. So, if this article strikes to the quick anywhere along the line, I have no punches to pull and no sweet soothing words of apology to act as a balm.

The postal employees of this Nation are today facing the most critical point in their haphazard careers. Haphazard because of many conditions. A few: (1) Victims of political appointees such as Dr. Summerfield—whose "pet whims" about a service of which he knew nothing a short time ago, allows him czaristic powers such as were never given even appointees, from the ranks (I refer specifically to sec. 501—Public Law No. 68) and can mean comfort or disaster for approximately 500,000 employees and their families; (2) lack of interest among the masses of Congressmen who have little or no time to study or think for themselves on legislation such as was enacted by the propaganda and tom-tom beating of Dr. Summerfield; (2) victims of a much publicized deficit, caused by loss of millions in revenues on second-class matter, and postage free mailings by the thousands of tons, handled by employees the Nation over without one penny revenue to apply on handling costs; (4) unfair adjustments in wages and related benefits, when catastrophe strikes in the Nation—and the years following adjustment of such catastrophes. And as to power—one able Congressman said it so superbly: "Summerfield seeks power that a good man wouldn't want and a bad man shouldn't have."

You, who are older in the service will remember when your boss used to say at Christmas time (after you had worked 8 hours), "Give me 5 hours overtime on the letter cases." Remember the number of years that that overtime paid you less per hour than your regular time? This condition existed in the Postal Service for 10 or more years after sweepers in factories were receiving time and one-half for overtime. If that condition existed today, who do you think would fight the hardest to correct it—the union, or Dr. Summerfield? Remember when, if you were scheduled to work on a Sunday it was just your bad luck? Compensation—ha ha. Who got us the 5-day week? Was it someone "inspired" by a Dr. Summerfield type? But brother Postal Worker, you are confronted today with issues that deal with the very life of the good things that you enjoy in the service. Remembering who made it possible in years past for you to enjoy these good things now, are we going to turn yellowbelly and sell our our birthright for a mess of Dr. Summerfield's pottage? What about the boys to follow us—are we going to sell them out? Their future is only started—and what a start. That's exactly the attitude some groups took during the recent salary campaign. Taken at the most disadvantageous time in our economy, these turncoats seemed to feel that they were as the graveyard and must take anything. Even Dr. Summerfield's dictatorial power.

Let's look at the President's words for the last two sessions of Congress: (1) "I shall look with grave concern upon any bill that goes beyond 7.6 percent increase in pay for postal workers, and I want it accompanied by a rate increase." You all know the story, how Congressmen played with our family budget through the 1954 session of Congress—passed a bill, threw it in the President's lap on the last day of the session—then went home. When the 1955 session of Congress convened again we hear: "I shall view with grave concern any bill that goes beyond 7.6 percent. The Senate passed a 10-percent bill. Not a chance. Then the Congress passed H. R. 4644 and sent it to the President. It was at this stage of the game that the curtain came back and one could view the "little animal with the ill smell that had been hiding in the closet all the time." It was here, too, that turncoats and yellowbellies began to become conspicuous. Well, you remember the President's message in the Postal Bulletin dated May 24, as he veoted the H. R. 4644 bill: "It was mostly in the interest of the taxpayer that he done so."

Let's look a little closer and see if it wasn't in the interest of Dr. Summerfield that he did so. The bill he did sign was not 7.6 (although a good one right on that percentage was brought forth by Congressman FLOOD of Pennsylvania; the bill he signed was an 8 percent deal. There was no mention of rate increases, but the bill he signed did include some more clauses that received the blessing of Dr. Summerfield.

I repeat: The bill S. 2061, which was signed into law, is the most damnable piece

of legislation ever to darken the postal picture. After it is in full operation you shall see, and along with it watch out for the new retirement propaganda that is coming up soon.

What then, are Dr. Summerfield's ultimate objectives? My opinion: (1) To pull the Post Office Department out of the red by draining the life blood of employees to pay a deficit which they did not create; (2) to cause dissension in any and all unions, so that their power is obliterated; (3) to get a shining portrait of himself placed on covers of current magazines—under the caption: "The man who pulled the Post Office Department out of the red." I do not think he will last through this accomplishment. Wanta bet?

Finally, since we, under the present setup must endure reclassification, I should like to see Dr. Summerfield reclassified (salary) on the basis of popularity (with the last five Postmaster Generals). My opinion is that he would go crawling back to General Motors for his bacon and eggs. In closing, I would like you to remember these few lines, taken from Oliver Goldsmith's the Deserted Village:

"Lands he could measure, terms and tides presage,
And even the story ran that he could gauge
But still they gazed and still the wonder grew
How one small head could carry all he knew."

Thank God for men like Hallbeck, who stood by their guns to the end.

RUFE.

I choose to believe that there are some postal employees whose viewpoint is not adequately represented by this letter, people who realize that distortion of facts does not help establish a case in favor of adequate compensation. The fact that the cost of living index was 190.4 in January 1953 and 190.9 in May of 1955, a variation of about one-half of 1 percent over a period of 28 months under the Eisenhower administration as compared to an increase from 186.6 in September 1951 to 190.4 in January 1953, an increase of 3.8 percent during the last 28 months of the Truman administration indicates that there is more to maintaining the buying power of the postal employee than raising his pay alone.

This anonymous columnist Rufe says he has a message for the postal employees of the United States, even though the means he has of delivering it consists of just a small local monthly paper. It is my earnest desire to help him reach not only the postal employees but the Congress which he discusses so glibly, the Postmaster General, the President, and the taxpayers as I insert his partisan diatribe in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD taking issue with his logic, his sense of fair play, his regard for his fellow citizens, his courtesy, and his facts, but respecting his right to be heard regardless of his opinion.

Israel's Epic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the June 27, 1955, edition of the New York Journal-American is deserving of our attention:

ISRAEL'S EPIC

Appearing last week in these pages were some articles from Israel, contributed by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, who has been studying within the territory itself the problems and prospects of the Near East.

After his survey of the youngest of free lands, it was Mr. Hearst's forecast that Israel, if given a few years more of peace and cooperation, will emerge as the leading nation of this area.

Mr. Hearst's observation should interest America's policymakers, since the Near East is one of the world's strategic regions. It will surely interest a multitude of our own readers, for the making of Israel has been one of our causes over a period of nearly two generations.

America's political interest began at the time of World War I, when liberation of the Holy Land from Turkish rule became an objective of the Allied Powers.

BALFOUR'S PLEDGE

At that time, the late Dr. Chaim Weizmann was brilliantly leading the Zionist movement for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. On November 2, 1917, the British Government issued the famous Balfour Declaration, a pledge to carry out the Zionist aspirations, and after the war Palestine was assigned to temporary British custody under a mandate of the League of Nations.

But many difficulties lay ahead. Palestine had been neglected, much of it had reverted to desert conditions during long centuries of subjection. Immigration was needed to populate the country; agriculture needed to be vitalized; industries needed to be established; and towns needed to be built.

On January 13, 1922, the late Lord Balfour, British Foreign Secretary, wrote to Secretary of State Hughes, pointing out that the Palestinian task was one of extreme difficulty and delicacy, and asking the United States Government to share the responsibility.

This occurred on December 3, 1924, when an American-British Palestine Mandate Convention was signed by Frank B. Kellogg, United States Ambassador to Great Britain, and Joseph Austen Chamberlain, then British Foreign Secretary.

The redevelopment of Palestine lagged thereafter, due in part to racial and religious guerrilla warfare in the area, some persecutions, and indifference on the part of friendly nations.

Accordingly, in 1936 these newspapers sent to the Near East the Hearst Unofficial Senatorial Commission to make a study and report.

The commission was composed of three distinguished Senators—Royal S. Copeland, of New York; Warren R. Austin, of Vermont; and Daniel O. Hastings, of Delaware. On arrival in the Holy Land they issued a joint statement, published on August 23, 1936, in the Palestine Post. It said:

"Mr. William Randolph Hearst, the publisher of many newspapers in America, expressed to us the desire to get accurate and unbiased information concerning the situation in Palestine. We agreed to come here for that purpose.

"We are mindful of the fact that the information we hope to get will be of value to us as United States Senators."

On their return, the three Senators wrote serialized separate reports, which were published in the Hearst newspapers. In a joint article, they said:

"The members of our group will do whatever possible to impress our Government with what appears to us to be its manifest duty. To this end, we shall do all we can to fulfill the international obligation, to which our Government is a party, to establish the Jewish National Home in Palestine, with full justice to Moslem and Christian in the Holy Land.

"ROYAL S. COPELAND.
"DANIEL O. HASTINGS.
"WARREN R. AUSTIN."

In their reports, the Senators said:

"We found Palestine in a state of terror."

They declared that the United States could not be held blameless for the chaos.

A few months later, a British Royal Commission headed by Lord Peel, held hearings in Palestine which confirmed the salient findings of the Hearst commission.

With these events, the governments were awakened and the establishment of the Jewish homeland was assured.

BECOMES FREE STATE

Some years were still to elapse with Palestine under a mandate and with British troops on guard. But that transitory condition ended on May 14, 1948, when the free state of Israel was proclaimed, a British evacuation was begun, and the United States formally recognized the new nation.

In one of his recent articles, Mr. Hearst recounted a conversation with David Ben-Gurion, one of the founders of the Republic, now its defense minister. Mr. Ben-Gurion recalled his reading of the late Arthur Brisbane's editorials and page 1 columns in the Hearst press.

We happen to know also that the valuable and history-making work of the Hearst unofficial senatorial commission is not forgotten in Israel. David Ben-Gurion remembered it not so very long ago on one of his missions to this country.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Research on Tornado Identification and Tracking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, when the Senate recently debated the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, it was evident that there was a genuine interest in the research being done in the field of detecting, identifying, and tracking tornadoes, hurricanes, and other severe weather disturbances.

A significant contribution to this important research is being made by the Tornado Laboratory at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater, Okla., through the use of radar and the high-frequency direction finder.

I request permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a description of the project being carried on at Oklahoma A. and M. College, the results thereof, and acknowledgment of the assistance which has been furnished by various governmental groups.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH ON TORNADO IDENTIFICATION AND TRACKING AT TORNADO LABORATORY, OKLAHOMA A. AND M. COLLEGE, STILLWATER, OKLA.

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RESULTS

Research work on the electrical nature of tornadoes was initiated at Oklahoma A. and M. College immediately after the Woodward disaster in the spring of 1947. The tornado research laboratory and tornado research problem has been developed by Dr. Herbert L. Jones, professor of electrical engineering, under the sponsorship of the School of Electrical Engineering and Division of Engineering Research. The research work developed into a study of the electrical characteristics of severe thunderstorms with particular emphasis on those that produce tornadoes and hail.

Since January 1, 1952, the United States Signal Corps has furnished financial and advisory assistance and equipment to aid in the solution of the tornado problem. The solution to the problem involves the use of two instruments, the radar and the high frequency direction finder. The location of a squall line and possible additional water-bearing storm clouds is easily determined by common radar methods. However, severe thunderstorms that may be tornado prone can be present at any point on a long squall line or in any one or more of the precipitation echoes that appear in the radar presentation of scattered storm cloud situations. It is necessary to have some method for locating these severe thunderstorm cells on the plot of the radar information. A solution to this problem has been developed at the tornado laboratory at Oklahoma A. and M. College.

The high frequency direction finder makes it possible to determine the angle of azimuth from which an atmospheric radiated by a bolt of lightning arrives. For example, a lightning stroke from the Blackwell tornado was registered as arriving at an azimuth of 346 degrees, or 14 degrees west of north at the tornado laboratory.

It has been tentatively established that there is a relationship between the intensity of a severe thunderstorm and the amount of lightning produced by that thunderstorm. As the intensity of a thunderstorm increases, the number and intensity of the lightning strokes appear to also increase. Consequently, it is now possible to obtain a rough estimate of the severity of a storm by its lightning content. This information, together with the direction of arrival of each lightning stroke makes it possible in most cases to determine the exact location and approximate intensity of each thunderstorm as viewed on the radar. For example, the squall line that moved into Oklahoma from Kansas on the night of May 27, 1955, was traveling toward the southeast. There were 7 and sometimes 8 thunderstorm locations along this squall line, 2 of which were of sufficient intensity as to be considered dangerous. As the squall line moved into the State in a southeasterly direction, it became immediately evident that the individual thunderstorm cells were moving due east. Due to the intense amount of apprehension existing in the area around Blackwell, because of the disastrous storm on May 25, 1955, there was quite a demand for exact information concerning the movements of any storm that might even possibly be considered as dangerous. Consequently it was possible to relay information to the local police department and to other police departments in cities and towns that were in the path of the severe thunderstorms.

This method for the tracking and evaluation of severe storms that has been developed at the tornado laboratory of Oklahoma A. and M. College is, as as far as we know, the only successful and practical operational scheme in existence. We have the only high frequency lightning equipment that is capable of supplementing the radar for the purpose of tracking severe storms. We believe that it is not possible to evaluate and track severe storms without this equipment. We must state, however, that while we can now track and evaluate severe storms as such, it is still not as yet established that we can determine whether a severe storm is developing into a tornado.

The ultimate goal of the tornado research project of Oklahoma A. and M. College is to identify a severe thunderstorm cell as tornado prone, and in addition, to determine the exact time the funnel forms and its location. This type of tornado research has not been developed at any other institution in the United States. Consequently, it appears to be logical and desirable that the facilities for the identification and tracking of tornadoes be continued at this institution.

In order to accelertate the rate of development at this critical time, additional engineers, money, and other facilities are required. The present laboratory, with some $25,000 worth of equipment, is located in a single-room plywood quonset that was purchased in 1951 for $150. It is desirable that this building be replaced by a structure designed to protect the research workers and the equipment.

B. ASSISTANCE FURNISHED BY GOVERNMENTAL GROUPS

1. United States Signal Corps

On January 1, 1952, the United States Signal Corps assumed actual sponsorship of the research project under Contract No. DA 36–039 SC–15453, United States Signal Corps at Evans Signal Laboratories. This sponsorship has been continued to the present date and has been responsible for the financial assistance that has made possible the successful tracking of severe thunderstorms in 1955. In addition to the financial support and the loan of vital radar and atmospheric equipment, the meteorological branch of Evans Signal Laboratories has provided generous consulting assistance. By 1952 the meteorological branch of the Evans Signal Laboratories was in the unique position of having successfully developed over a period of years a series of research techniques that resulted in the better understanding of atmospheric phenomena, together with its relationship to the associated meteorological conditions. This extremely valuable background materially accelerated the research on the tornadic-type of storm. Mr. Lawrence A. Pick, Mr. John D. Hixson, and Dr. Helmut Weickmann gave generously of their time during the various phases of the research.

2. Air Weather Service

The severe-storm center of the Air Weather Service is located at Tinker Air Base, some 60 miles from the tornado laboratory. Col. E. J. Fawbush and Maj. R. C. Miller of the severe-storm center developed a meteorological method for the forecasting of tornado areas that has proved to be very successful. These scientists have given generously of their time in a cooperative study of severe storms with the staff of the tornado laboratory for the past 5 years. The meteorological information supplied to the tornado laboratory has materially aided and accelerated the progress of the research.

In addition to meteorological information the Air Weather Service established a sferic network in 1954 as a cooperative effort to obtain the practical utilization of the sferic method for the identification of severe storms. This project has likewise materially aided the investigation at the tornado laboratory.

3. United States Weather Bureau

The United States Weather Bureau has demonstrated interest in the project since its inception. As a result of conferences held during the summer of 1954 between representatives of the college, the United States Signal Corps, and the United States Weather Bureau, it was resolved that the most expeditious way for the Bureau to participate in the project was to assign personnel to assist with the research. Accordingly the Weather Bureau assigned Mr. Wayne F. Staats, research meteorologist, to Stillwater on November 1, 1954, to work with college personnel on the project. Since that time Mr. Staats has been actively engaged in assisting with the collection and analysis of data and in the preparation of reports. Many of the accomplishments in these fields have been due to the determined efforts of Mr. Staats.

C. PUBLICATIONS

1. Most Interesting People Section, American magazine, August 1953.
2. Coronet, February 1950.
3. Disaster (Red Cross publication), March 1950.
4. Newsweek, August 15, 1949.
5. Popular Mechanics, May 1951.
6. Bulletin No. 82, Oklahoma A. & M. Engineering Experiment Station, January 1952.
7. Tornadoes in the United States; by Snowden D. Flora, 1953, University of Oklahoma Press.
8. A Sferic Method of Tornado Identification and Tracking, by Herbert L. Jones, Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, pages 380–385, volume 32, No. 10, December 1951.
9. Identification of Tornadoes by Observation of Waveform Atmospherics, by Herbert L. Jones and Philip N. Hess, proceedings of the Institute of Radio Engineers, pages 1049–1052, volume 40, No. 9, September 1952.

Commencement Day Address by J. H. Carmichael at Leesburg, Va., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, under unanimous consent, it is my privilege to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. J. H. Carmichael, president of Capital Airlines. This splendid speech of counsel and challenge was given to the graduates and their more than 1,500 friends at the Loudon County High School commencement exercises in Leesburg, Va., on June 6, 1955. Mr. Carmichael, one of the leaders in air transportation and in American business, lives with his family near Leesburg.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Principal G. D. Grove, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, I suppose that it is customary for a commencement speaker to hold forth on the platform with a major address if not a profound oration. But this evening, I am going to deviate from that custom and not make a speech but rather chat with you just as though we were gathered together in a living room. And my remarks are going to be directed to you, the graduating class. This is a discussion with you although we are most happy to have your parents, relatives, and friend eavesdrop on us.

I know that all of you are looking upon this event tonight as a very major milestone in your lives. And I know that all of you are eager to be on your way toward the things you have planned for your future. Each of you, I'm sure, has given a lot of thought to your plans for the days ahead and each of you undoubtedly has a different goal and different plans from the others.

But no matter how varied your blueprints for the future may be, I hope that all of you are optimistic in your thinking. There's a lot of pessimism going around these days to district us and many people are inclined to look at our world today with an urge to surrender.

That is probably a natural reaction when one considers the atomic and hydrogen bombs, the Iron Curtain, the turmoil in the Far East, the growth of enemy air power and all the other problems which frustrate and discourage so many people. Optimism is difficult to come by and is no longer an emotion but rather a trait of character.

Yet, in a long-range view, this world of ours has always been beset with troubles. The future has always looked dark and almost hopeless during the many crises which have accompanied our history. During the days of the American Revolution, when Washington and his small army were defeated at almost every turn, it must have been difficult for those early Americans to visualize a strong, growing country with a position of respect among other nations.

We weathered not only that crisis but many others as well and we have probably been a better nation for them. Throughout our entire history, we have grown and progressed and realized many achievements. The future has been bright no matter how dim it may have appeared to the pessimists.

The future today looks to me to be brighter than I have ever known it to be. And I am not looking ahead as a visionary but rather from the standpoint of the hard-headed, practical businessman. There is no room for daydreaming in projecting business plans for the future. Planning must be realistic.

Certainly, we at Capital Airlines would not at this moment be planning to spend millions of dollars on a fleet of advanced airplanes if we believed for a moment that we were to be wiped out by a hydrogen bomb or that our economy was about to collapse or that we were soon to be ruled by Communists or that there was no future for aviation and air transportation.

Quite to the contrary. We are convinced that more opportunities will arise for everyone and that there always will be new fields to explore and conquer as long as we hold a realistic faith in the future.

Perhaps you may have wished to yourselves on occasion that you had lived in the good old days when there were many more opportunities than there are in our modern world; when there was the North Pole to be discovered, unchartered continents to explore, or at least one wilderness to conquer. That's a perfectly natural reaction and is probably a result of America's love of adventure.

But consider the case of the Director of the United States Bureau of Patents, who back in the year 1851 suggested that the Patent Office be closed since "everything worthwhile has been invented." It's just as well that there was no action taken on his suggestion because since that time, over 3 million patents have been issued. It's interesting, I think, to realize that 100 years ago before America was half settled, before the western plains were civilized, and when adventure was there for the asking, that pessimism was prevalent and that some people thought that progress had reached an acme.

We have achieved so much during the first half of the 20th century that it is probably easy today to agree with this Patent Office official. On the surface, we are fairly comfortable with the many modern conveniences which help make life easier. Yet we haven't by the wildest stretch of the imagination reached a saturation point. Ingenuity and initiative and skill are in evidence everywhere on the American scene. I suspect that someday, many years from now, you in this graduating class will describe in great detail to your grandchildren, the very hard life forced upon you way back in 1955 when you were encumbered with such outmoded articles of televisions, automobiles, deep freezers, and washing machines.

You represent one of the first generations to reach adulthood in the atomic world. That fact alone should be encouraging to you because atomic power should not imply destruction to anyone but the defeatist. While the atomic bomb is a frightening weapon, it is only one facet of the whole field of atomic energy. It can be compared to the airplane which is a very potent weapon in time of war but in normal times is a major contribution to our economy and industry.

Atomic energy is a tremendous potential source of power and can very well change our concept of life. And you will be the principle beneficiaries of the progress which will result from atomic energy because you stand on the very threshold of this new age which is an age full of promise for all of us. You will be participants in an age of so many miracles that it now all but staggers the imagination.

There will be advances in aviation, electronics, chemistry, agriculture, engineering, and mechanics. Industrial capacity will increase, production of goods and services will be expanded and farm output will grow. New markets will open in this atomic world and there will be more consumers as our population grows and personal income increases.

Experts now forecast that in 5 years we will be producing goods and services at the rate of $500 billion a year and that our standard of living will be raised on the average by more than one-third. Put to practical tests, our atomic-age world will have a good start toward becoming a golden age.

But all these great accomplishments which our economists predict with realistic assurance are not to be had just for the asking. They will not appear on the scene magically at the flip of a wand nor will they grow until ripe for picking. The groundwork has been laid, it is true, but only the hand and mind of man can make our productive atomic world a reality.

This is the challenge to you. Your diploma is not a ticket of free admission to the full enjoyment of the age ahead of us. Your diploma, rather, is your first assurance that you are prepared to accept the many responsibilities which accompany progress.

Fortunately for you, the assumption of these responsibilities should pose no problems because they are part of your heritage. It is a trait that is ingrained in you and is a living part of you. The atomic world has not come about accidentally but instead is the direct result of years of hard work, initiative, and a determination to maintain progress despite the obstacles. You, through your birthright, have inherited these qualities.

This is an inheritance that you must protect and the best protection that you can give it is to make certain that it is continued and passed down to generations which will follow you. There is a great temptation, once you have a diploma in your hands, to burn your textbooks and turn your backs on your high-school days. The 4 years which you have spent in this school are now a closed chapter in your lives and it is easy to put this school out of your minds as something to be forgotten.

But this school remains a part of your responsibility as you begin another stage of your careers. It is a part of the challenge to you in the atomic world. For the generations which follow you are as important to a successful and full life as those generations which preceded you. As this school was built and maintained for you, it is your responsibility to expand it and guide it so that it will fulfill its obligations to a changing and growing world in the future.

Furthermore, graduation from high school does not mean the end of your education whether you plan to go to college or not. No matter what your goal in life may be, you will find that there is yet a lot to be learned. Technological advances alone are so rapid that it is almost impossible to keep astride of them. The person who thinks he has learned all he or she needs to know is

very likely to be left behind as we move into the atomic age.

On the farm, in the factory, or in the professional office, you will find that you are confronted with stiff competition. Competition is a bright factor in the American way of life and is one of the chief reasons that we have been prompted to achieve as much as we have. But competition is unforgiving and allows no period of grace for the person who is not interested in maintaining at least the average pace of progress. A knowledge of fundamentals, alertness to new ideas, and a constant study of the changes which take place in your chosen fields are essential to success and happiness.

The days and years ahead will not be easy ones if a sincere attempt is made to continue learning. But they will be exciting and prosperous days and years to the person who anticipates the miracles ahead and who prepares himself or herself to put these miracles to practical use. If you want to be an active part of our atomic world, please don't frame your diploma, tack it on the wall, and say to yourselves "There, I've learned all I need to know. And now to enjoy the fun of life." I promise you that you will eventually discover that you are missing all the fun of life if you start tomorrow with that attitude.

Let me cite an example: If an expert airline pilot had given up his career 15 years ago and decided this year to return to his profession, he would be completely lost. In that short span of time, aviation has so progressed that even the navigational principles our theoretical pilot once knew would now be outmoded and of no use today. He would find that many instruments had been added to the instrument panel of the modern airplane which would be meaningless to him if he had not attempted to learn as aviation advanced.

This is only an isolated instance in aviation but you will find similar cases multiplied many times in almost every field of endeavor. Progress and mental laziness are not compatible. And only through progress will our atomic world materialize to its full expectations.

Thus in your individual planning for the future, you should always adopt the long-range view. The fact that one job offer pays better than a second is not necessarily a good reason for accepting the first. This is the short-range view. Your aim must be high and to be worthy it must be big. Your ultimate goal, as you see it now, should stretch as far as your imagination and your faith will permit. A good-paying job which requires no initiative, no industry, and no skill has no future and is a dead end in itself no matter how attractive the initial income may be.

You must first of all weed out those fields in which you do not feel qualified and then you must choose the work in which you are most interested deciding at once that you will learn all there is to know about that work with a determination that, as you learn, you will use that knowledge to contribute to the progress and growth of your organization. That, in part, is your responsibility to the atomic world—a world which challenges the best in you and one which will work successfully only if it receives the best in you.

In the meantime, you will be asked to accept other responsibilities. Many of the boys here tonight will be called upon to perform military duty. This may pull you away from your advanced educational programs or from jobs in which you have become established or from the farms just before a harvest. But military service is another part of the responsibility which will guide the atomic world in peaceful channels and which will allow you to share in the fruits of atomic energy.

Nuclear fission cannot make citizens. We will never have robots which can be trusted with the work of keeping the world intact. Our responsibilities as citizens do not change with progress. They are the same today and will be the same tomorrow as they were before machinery taught us mass production and enabled us to expand our economy. All the great sources of power which are available to us now and in the future must be held securely in the hands of men and women who know and understand and are willing to fight for their responsibilities as citizens.

I can't honestly say that possessing a sense of citizenship is an insurance against a national crisis. Without being foreboding, I'm almost sure that we will face some pretty dismal times throughout our future. But I do believe this sense of citizenship can alleviate the impact of any dismal times and can prevent total catastrophe in the event of a national crisis.

The world is at odds with itself right now even though actual fighting has been stopped on the various battlefronts. But there is still a cold war to combat and there are many areas which are as sensitive as a hair-trigger. But these threats are not hindering progress. We keep moving ahead while being intelligently alert to their presence. And I'm certain that should these threats suddenly materialize into very serious trouble that we will be able to withstand any enduring damage to our way of life as long as we cling to our responsibilities as private citizens.

We have been forced to struggle through many a bleak and difficult situation in the past and I don't believe it fair to say that we won't again in the future be forced to bridge another gap in the peaceful progression of civilization.

It is wise to be prepared for any and all contingencies. That is the same intelligent approach which applies to individuals as well as nations. But there is no reason why such preparation should squelch optimism.

I hope that you will leave here tonight as optimistic about the future as I am. And I am particularly optimistic about the future for you. As a matter of fact, I should like to close this chat by saying that I envy each and every one of you who is a member of this graduating class.

I envy you because I wish I too were beginning my career in a world which is so full of promise as this one equipped, as you are, with a good education and a deep and strong sense of responsibility to your jobs as citizens.

Taxation on Gasoline Used in Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on March 8, 1955, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I introduced S. 1336, a bill to provide a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the American Farm Bureau Federation News Letter of July 11, 1955, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This editorial is most pertinent and further clarifies the question and the need for this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Members of the House of Representatives:

The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully but urgently recommends that the House of Representatives take action to end at an early date the continued discriminatory taxation of gasoline used in farm tractors and other farm implements.

The Federal gasoline tax was originally enacted for purposes of general revenue. The American Farm Bureau has not heretofore sought to obtain an exemption of farm-used gasoline from Federal taxation because we have considered the tax to be a temporary measure. We have sought its termination on numerous occasions. We have recommended that this source of tax revenue should be reserved to the States.

However, now that the Congress is giving consideration to various proposals involving indefinite extension of the Federal tax on gasoline, we can no longer be silent with respect to the inequity of taxing gasoline used for the production of agricultural commodities.

In the current consideration of highway legislation, continuous reference and consideration has been given to the use of gasoline revenues to finance the highway program. It currently is proposed that the gasoline tax be increased to partially finance the expanded highway program under consideration.

The use of gasoline in tractors and other farm equipment has no relationship to the use of highways. It is a production supply. Agriculture is the only industry on which is imposed a substantial tax burden on a major production supply. It would be equally as logical (or illogical) to tax iron ore used in making steel or copper used in making wire or lumber used to build houses or make furniture, as it is to tax gasoline used on farms.

Looked at in another way, gasoline is the major source of power in agriculture. Agriculture is the only industry on which is imposed a substantial tax burden on power used in production. It would be equally as equitable (or inequitable) to tax coal used in making steel, or electricity used in making aluminum, or diesel fuel used by railroads, as it is to tax power in the form of gasoline used in farm production.

The continued taxation of gasoline used in farm implements even involves discrimination between farmers. To an increasing extent many farmers are using diesel fuel, butane, propane, and other special fuels in farm implements. These farmers are not subject to tax on their fuel, and properly so. But most farmers cannot afford the more costly equipment required for efficient use of these fuels. Thus the taxation of gasoline discriminates against the small and medium sized farmer as compared with larger farmers.

We respectfully urge your vigorous and active support of early action to provide an exemption, or refund, from continued Federal taxation of gasoline used in tractors and other farm implements.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

JULY 5, 1955.

The Tide of Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I

include an article from the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, which is, in turn, a reprint from the Progressive, by Eric Sevareid, one of the clearest commentators on the scene today.

The entire article is worthwhile and thought provoking. I have deleted several short portions of the article; phrases which refer to the other body and which are deleted in respect to congressional courtesy.

I particularly invite the attention of my colleagues to the following paragraph:

I recommend to you the exhaustive study of public attitudes directed by a distinguished group and analyzed by Professor Stouffer of Harvard. Its profound and major lesson is this: that tolerance, understanding of civil liberties exist in America in direct ratio to formal education. The enemy is simply, unmistakably—ignorance.

This paragraph is one which should spur the House to act on bills designed to improve our educational system. The Honorable Adlai Stevenson, speaking before the National Education Association annual delegate assembly, said the children cannot wait while we pass a miracle; he said the children cannot wait until we have a great talk-fest next year.

Mr. Speaker, not only the children but all America cannot afford to wait: While we debate the issue of where responsibility lies for our school system, we encourage the one enemy we have—ignorance. Whether the States and/or local districts have the means—and surveys show they have not—or are just unwilling to act, the fact remains that today we do not have enough classrooms; the teaching profession is underpaid; and too many of our children find it difficult to get to school and to purchase textbooks once they reach the classroom.

In view of the urgent need—and especially in view of the alarming implication pointed up by Mr. Sevareid—we cannot afford the luxury of academic debate; we must act and act quickly.

Mr. Sevareid's article follows:

THE TIDE OF IGNORANCE

(By Eric Sevareid)

We all thought that the word "liberal" related to liberty. We thought it had a long, precise American genealogy, going back at least to Thomas Jefferson, if not, indeed, to Roger Williams, long before Marx was ever born. We thought, in fact, it was the most thoroughly traditional appellation in the American political lexicon. We must have been wrong; otherwise, I'm sure, from monitors of the national virtue like the editors of Time would not handle the word with sterilized tweezers, fencing it off from respectable words with barbed quotation marks.

Still, I think the word will shed these barnacles. I even think it may be popular again, as well as merely noble. The behavior of its enemies is insuring that; every day that passes, they make it more clear to the people that what they hate about liberalism it not its constant calling onward to newness, to fresh experimentation in our economic relationships; what they really hate and cannot tolerate is its conservatism, its constant harking back, to hoary ethics of tolerance, equality, of man, dignity of the individual, to the Bill of Rights, the meaning of the great American Revolution in this world, to the original vision of our country; it is because liberalism wishes to conserve these ancient traditions that its enemies hate it; and because its enemies are both the enemies of the radical right and the radical left, the people will learn again who it is that is really protecting America from subversion; they will learn again that it is the spirit of liberalism—and it is a spirit, not an ideology—that is, the true governor, the gyroscope and compass that always brings a plunging ship of state back into balance, back upon its course.

On the whole, so far as Washington is concerned, I do think the ship of state is plunging and wrenching a little less each day along these latitudes of civil liberties and common decency. At least I notice in myself, after greeting each morning's sun and news, less and less intestinal compulsion to rush to the rail. I do not see how one can credit this to positive acts of the administration (I am not partisan here; after all, it was the previous regime that began the preposterously wholesale and mechanistic security program). Time has done it. Human psychology can remain in a state of fear only so long; the public can observe daily, deafening fusillades which bring down no game, only so long before losing interest.

I see few positive administrative acts on the credit side of the ledger, save the act of fighting back in the Army-McCarthy hearings, but that was an act more of self-preservation than of courage and conviction. Anyone will fight back when constant retreats have forced him into the final corner where defeat would mean absolute abdication, but the result was no less beneficent, for all of that. In any case, we've all been much too weary and sore of foot to look a gift horse in the mouth.

No, things are better in the Capital. They are better, at least, in the short run. We have seen the historic court decision on the schools; we have seen a political assault on the great foundations die of its own poisons; we are seeing the morale of the vital Foreign Service begin to rise again, new blood flowing into it again from the colleges; we have seen a leading Republican, former Senator Harry Cain, illuminate the real nature of the security program from within; and I think we may soon see high court decisions that will go a long way to rescue the public servant from his moral abyss as a second-class citizen on permanent probation.

But no Capital can indulge in years of legalized brutality and cleanse itself overnight. We have been going through a period that has exalted the soldier over the statesman, the policeman over the lawgiver, the prosecutor over the judge. When sublimation is to be had even by the unsublime, they will seek it. They have sought it, have enjoyed its sensations, and still enjoy its positions. Former Senator Cain was courageously correct in pointing out that a major cancer in the security program is the low intellectual caliber of some of the security personnel. They are still there. One has only to think of the shoddy handling of the Davies case, the Ladejinsky case; the fantastic Justice Department behavior in the Lattimore case; its blind, self-serving defenses arising out of the messy business of the wretched Matusow—to realize that men of limited qualities remain entrenched in positions of much less limited power over the liberties of the people.

Just once in these years have I been really frightened, right to my marrow. That was the day the minister of justice himself made a speech in Chicago. In that short speech, he did three things never done before to my knowledge. He accused a former chief executive of knowingly abetting treason; he broke the seals on the secret police files; he found an American citizen, dead and unable to defend his name, guilty of the high crime of treason by simple administrative fiat. And he did all these things for partisan, political purpose.

I know that had the Minister of Justice in a British Cabinet, let's say, done any of these three things he would have been obliged to surrender his seals of office within 24 hours. That was when I was really frightened. That, I think, was the nadir of our official sense of honor. From that point, perhaps it was not possible to go in any direction but up, and upwards, I think, we have been going.

But, what of the long run? I feel, I must reluctantly confess, no certainty at all, and some foreboding.

But I think I know where the major effort, the permanent effort, must be made. I mean our schools.

I recommend to you the exhaustive study of public attitudes directed by a distinguished group and analyzed by Professor Stouffer of Harvard. Its profound and major lesson is this: that tolerance, understanding of civil liberties exists in America in direct ratio to formal education. The enemy is simply, unmistakably—ignorance.

There is inherent in all this a slow, creeping corroding flood tide of massive, established, respectable ignorance that can choke away our freedoms almost without our knowing what is going on—unless we turn back this tide, beginning now. There, I should think, lies the fundamental task of all Americans who really comprehend the nature of liberty.

"It is still in the lap of the Gods," said Judge Learned Hand, "whether a society can succeed, based on 'civil liberties and human rights' * * * but of one thing at least we may be sure: the alternatives that have so far appeared, have been immeasurably worse; and so, whatever the outcome, I submit to you that we must press along. Borrowing from Epictetus, let us say to ourselves: 'since we are men, we will play the part of a man'."

Improvement of the Delaware River Channel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Delaware Channel Murder Case," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of July 10, 1955, relative to the improvement of the Delaware River channel.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DELAWARE CHANNEL MURDER CASE

Swinging a partisan ax, the Democratic Party in Congress has killed the $6 million appropriation for a start on the deeper Delaware River channel.

Most of the numerous rivers and harbors projects in the $3,711 million appropriation bill were approved by the Senate-House Conference Committee. Delaware Valley's channel appropriation was singled out for murder.

National Democratic leaders are said to consider this "smart politics." Since Senator DUFF will be running for reelection next year, they boast that now he won't be able to take any credit for victory on the Delaware channel. Even before the Senate-House conferees met it was widely reported that the Democratic National Committee had told its members on that group that if they supported the Delaware Valley project, they would be building up both President Eisenhower and Senator DUFF.

How stupid can some politicians get?

If this is "smart politics," then the Democratic ax-swingers have outsmarted themselves. They have laid it on the line that the Democratic Party as an organization—and no one else—is responsible for punishing Delaware Valley, U. S. A. And punishing its Democrats and Republicans alike.

Those Democratic masterminds have notified the Nation that, for the most selfish of partisan motives, they would block the progress of a great tri-State area with crude disregard for the continued employment of the wage earners among its 4,000,000 people—Democratic as well as Republican wage-earners.

What makes this political murder doubly regrettable is that up to now the Delaware channel was strictly a bipartisan proposition. Actually, in dealing the low blow they have, the Congressional Democrats have taken a swing at two Democratic Governors—Leader and Meyner—who have fought for the channel right down the line. They have hurt, too, Mayor Clark of Philadelphia, and Mayor Brunner, of Camden—both Democrats—who likewise have been in the forefront of the channel battle.

It will be interesting to hear what these distinguished Democrats have to say of the hatchet work done in their party's name—and for which their party, unfortunately, cannot escape responsibility. We cannot believe that they were consulted—or even informed—or we are sure they would have counseled against such ineptitude:

Hitting at 4 million people to "get" two—President Eisenhower and Senator DUFF.

Yet it is this same sort of national leadership—this same brand of smart politics—which hurt the Democratic Party and helped turn it out of office in 1952, and resulted in an unexpectedly poor showing in 1954, which by the percentages was a Democratic year. Now they apparently think that a butcher-block job like this will win friends and influence people for 1950.

The Delaware Channel may be blockaded. It is not dead. The fight will be waged harder than ever. If not in this Congress, then in the next. And it will be a fight to win.

For ourselves we would prefer to see that fight waged as it has been: on a broad, nonpolitical communitywide basis. Too many members of both parties have too much at stake in the development of Delaware Valley to waste strength in interparty bickering and bitterness. For when the channel is dug there will be so much credit for all concerned that this Democratic murder on Capitol Hill will seem more wanton, more petty, more unconscionable as each month goes by.

But the fight will be waged. If national Democratic leaders insist on a political fight, they will surely get one. If they want to campaign in 1956 on a platform of obstructing the progress of three States and 4 million people—no Republican in his right mind will make any effort to stop them.

United States Airlines in Latin America Having Tough Struggle To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has long been impressed with the amount of competition our international air carriers face in Latin America.

Each year competition increases and each year the Civil Aeronautics Board seems to cut subsidy requirements necessary for the survival of our international carriers operating in the Latin American area.

There is no American journalist more qualified to speak on Latin American problems than the distinguished representative of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, Mr. Edward Tomlinson. In the issue of the Washington Daily News of Monday, July 11, Mr. Tomlinson has written a provocative article concerning the problems of United States airlines in Latin America which is worthy of the consideration of every Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. Tomlinson entitled "United States Airlines in Latin America Having Tough Struggle To Survive":

OPERATE AGAINST GREATEST COMPETITION IN THE WORLD—UNITED STATES AIRLINES IN LATIN AMERICA HAVING TOUGH STRUGGLE TO SURVIVE

(By Edward Tomlinson)

Recent Senate criticism of the State Department's agreement with West Germany, which would enable the former Nazi airline, Lufthansa, to resume flying most of its prewar routes throughout Latin America, and across the Atlantic, in direct competition with United States services, reminds us once more of the way Uncle Sam has long treated his own airways and other business interests that operate in the other nations of this hemisphere.

The Government, and Congress itself, whether Republican or Democratic, has always insisted up and often helped to foster competition for American firms wherever they operate.

They must all battle against government-backed British, French, German, and Japanese firms, and now those of the Soviet-controlled countries, which are wagering the greatest campaign in history to dominate South American industry, trade, and transportation.

A United Nations commission has just pointed out that the Russian bloc alone did more than $300 million worth of business in these countries in 1954.

When you consider all these competitors of ours are free to form any kind of a monopoly, merger, or combine that suits their purposes or fancy, it is a wonder that any private United States investor is able to stay in the field at all.

CONTINUALLY ACCUSED

No American concerns in Latin America are having a harder struggle to survive than our United States airlines, including the vast Pan American system and its affiliate, Panagra, or Pan American Grace Airways. Together these 2 companies operate to all the 20 countries and various islands of the West Indies. Yet they are continually accused of monopolistic practices and even harassed by their own Government.

Far from being monopolies, they operate against greater competition than exists anywhere else in the world, including inside, the United States itself. They pioneered the field, surveyed the first routes, built airfields, recruited and trained ground forces, turned native peasants and peons into mechanics, engineers and even pilots. They brought aviation know-how to the whole vast world next door a quarter of a century ago.

Today they still do not have any domestic services at home, and must share the most profitable Latin American routes with seven other United States companies, several of which have the advantage of extensive domestic lines from which to draw traffic.

But this purely domestic competition, serious as it happens to be, is the least of the odds confronting Pan-Am and Panagra.

They and the other 7 companies must compete with 22 foreign-owned lines for the traffic between this country and Latin America, including various Latin American, British, French, Dutch and a Canadian lines and now the German Lufthansa, if present arrangements go through.

FORTY-ONE OTHER LINES

Within Latin America, the United States lines must run a gantlet of exactly 41 different other international lines that connect every one of the important cities with practically all the populous centers of the world. Even the Japanese are now organizing a line direct from Tokyo to Rio and São Paulo, Brazil.

Except for the two British companies that operate to the Caribbean and to South America, none of the others is called upon to conform to any antitrust laws at home.

Each not only has the political and diplomatic backing of its own government, but huge subsidies from the public treasury. Most of them are owned by the respective governments.

Whether it is a United States airline, a mine, factory, farm or any other business concern operating in Latin America, it must not only operate under our own strict domestic laws and regulations and frequent double taxation, but under the conflicting and often archaic production and transportation laws of each of the 20 republics and the various islands. They must not only pay exorbitant taxes on operation and income in each of the nations and territories, but must also pay full income taxes in the United States, Federal, State and municipal, before any stockholder receives a cent in dividends. Finally, the stockholder must divvy up with all these same entities on what few dollars he receives from his investment, if any.

Seventy-fifth Birthday Anniversary of C. R. Hook, Armco Board Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. SCHENCK. The Third District of Ohio, which district I have the high honor and great privilege to represent here in the Congress of the United States, has many outstanding great men and women, all of whom have made significant contributions to our American way of life. It is most difficult, because of the very large number, to single out any one person for any special recognition.

Today, however, Charles R. Hook, one of our illustrious citizens, celebrates the 75th anniversary of his birth. Mr. Hook is known far and wide, not only for his great ability as a business executive, but also for his innumerable contributions to the civic, cultural, and governmental life of his community and our entire Nation. Every one who knows him is proud of that privilege and cherishes him as a friend. Mr. Hook has great capacity, and, in spite of the demand on his time by his duties as chairman of the board of Armco Steel Corp., he has

found time to take a personal interest and work in many civic activities in his home city of Middletown, Ohio, and, at the same time, has performed outstanding services as a member of many committees, commissions, and boards for our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my sincere congratulations to Charles R. Hook today on the 75th anniversary of his birth, my very deep appreciation for all the many public services he has rendered, and the very sincere hope that he will have many more healthful and happy years in which to continue the use of his outstanding ability of service to his fellowmen.

Middletown, Ohio, is the third largest city in the Third District of Ohio and is the home of Armco Steel. Middletown has a very unusual civic spirit as is shown by its fine municipal government, its schools, its parks, and its many industries. The employees of Armco are a wonderful group of highly skilled men and women who are proud not only of their company, but also the community in which they live. Middletown High School students, on the average, have attained very high scholastic standings. Their athletic teams are known far and wide not only for the many championships they have won but also for the way they have played the game.

Midldetown is a part of Charles R. Hook and Charles R. Hook enjoys a very warm spot in the heart and thoughts of every Middletonian.

A recent newspaper story tells many interesting facts about the life of Mr. Hook and I ask unanimous consent to have it made a part of these remarks.

The article follows:

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY NEAR—C. R. HOOK, ARMCO BOARD CHIEF, HAS NO PLANS FOR RETIREMENT

MIDDLETOWN, June 25.—It usually figures that a man ready to observe his 75th birthday, and who has risen from a $2-a-week office boy to become one of the Nation's leaders in his business, is beginning to think about retirement.

But that sort of figuring does not apply to Charles R. Hook, chairman of the board of the Armco Steel Corp. He will be 75 on July 12.

Hook, whose energy and appearance belie his 75 years and the fact he has worked to make his own way ever since he was a student in Cincinnati's Walnut Hills high school, chuckled when asked if he had any thoughts of retirement.

"Not as long as the board (of Armco) wants me to stay," he said. "And so far they have indicated they want me here. And besides, too often a man loses his energy and his interest in life when he retires."

There certainly is no indication of any decline in Charles Hook's energy.

In addition to his duties with Armco, he is a director of several other corporations, active in Boy Scout work, the junior achievement youth program, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, the National Association of Manufacturers and other business and engineering groups. Since 1938 he has had almost a continuous record of service with various Government agencies covering industry, labor-management problems, wartime steel production, and foreign industrial problems.

At present, he is working as chairman of the committee on business organization of the Department of Defense for the Hoover Commission.

Only a few weeks ago, the Iron and Steel Institute honored him for outstanding contributions to the steel industry.

The story of Charles Hook's rise from office boy in a tinplate plant to his position as one of the leaders in the steel industry sounds as if it were right out of a fictionized American success story.

And his story is also that of Armco, a firm which barely was staying ahead of the sheriff and its unpaid bills when he joined it in 1902. It now is the Nation's seventh largest producer of steel, with 30,000 employees scattered over the world.

Hook took that office boy's job in 1898, and used his first money to take a correspondence course in engineering. The company, the Cincinnati Rolling Mill & Tinplate Co., was taken over by the American Tinplate Co. Hook worked for that firm in Chicago and New York, and then, at his own urging, went to work in its steel mill at Gas City, Ind.

Then came an offer to join Armco, a struggling little concern with only 325 employees. He received $100 a month as a night superintendent.

Armco grew by developing products which were not common in the steel industry. It hooked up with Westinghouse by developing a better electrical train. It developed a pure iron. It created the continuous method of rolling steel.

And this veteran of the steel industry is optimistic about its future despite the development of substitute products.

"The history of the steel industry is shown in its development of new products," he said. "Steel goes into everything either directly or indirectly, and it is the cheapest product you can buy.

"I see no stop to the steel industry. As costs go down through new methods steel will be used even more."

The products, Hook believes, go to make up a better way of living.

"I define the higher standard of living," he said, "as the ability of man to buy more of the things he wants and needs with a day's work. And a way to do that is to reduce production costs."

From his job as a night superintendent at Armco, Hook has risen steadily. He was president of the firm from 1930 to 1948 and has been chairman of the board since 1948.

The top of his big desk is covered with pictures of his two sons, his daughter, and some of his grandchildren. One son is in Paris with Armco International and the other is a Deputy Postmaster General. The daughter lives in Baltimore.

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, in the dry country of the West, the most important piece of equipment of the desert traveler is his canteen. It contains the meager water supply which may mean the difference between life and death.

In a larger sense, the Colorado River system is the canteen—the only source of water—for large portions of seven Western States.

Southern California has drunk deeply from that canteen, and the effects of that life-giving water are everywhere to be seen. In the 1930–40 decade, as Hoover Dam made large quantities of Colorado River water available to the lower basin of the river, this area increased its population by 21.2 percent, a rate of growth double that of the 11 Western States and triple that of the Nation as a whole.

In the 1940–50 decade, as the lower basin put more and more Colorado River water to use, its population increse was a tremendous 52.9 percent, compared to 22.8 percent for other Western States and 14.5 percent for the Nation.

Now that the thirsty upper-basin States are reaching for the canteen, southern California is protesting and trying in every way to keep the vital water from us. And if we are not permitted to use our share of the water—by developing it through the Colorado River storage project—our upper-basin States will be unable to grow and develop.

Why does southern California begrudge a neighbor a sip from their joint canteen—especially when the neighbor has furnished more than 90 percent of the water to fill it?

Does southern California want all the water?

Aid for Rural Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, considerable support has arisen in recent months from many parts of the country for legislation to extend and expand library service to rural areas.

From the score of bills introduced by Members of the House, including my own, a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor has recently recommended H. R. 2840 to the full committee.

A great forward step in education and public enlightenment can be taken with passage of this legislation, and it is my hope the committee will find it possible in the near future to bring this bill before us.

In this connection, I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to recent editorial support for this legislation by the Toledo Blade. The editorial, published June 28, 1955, follows:

AID FOR RURAL LIBRARIES

Making useful books and manuals available to rural areas through an extension of public library service is something which States and localities are able to do, and should do, on their own. But the sad fact is that many are remiss in this regard. There is so much more pressure for so many other sorts of spending that bookmobiles to spread knowledge through the countryside have a low priority with beset politicians.

And this is why there seems to be ample justification for a bill designed to give a moderate amount of United States aid as a

pump primer for more adequate rural libraries.

The amounts of money involved is relatively small—$7.5 million a year for 5 years to go to the States on a matching basis and in proportion to the size of their rural populations. The American Library Association contends—perhaps the better word would be hopes—that at the end of that time the States and localities would have become so attached to good library service they would take on the chore for themselves.

The administration may argue in principle against such an extension of Federal aid; but we do not share its fear, as expressed by United States Commissioner of Education Samuel M. Brownell, that in practice the grants would "be frittered away in activities yielding no permanent results." No other investment so small is likely to yield greater or more lasting results than one in books.

Portrait of a Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the Louisville Courier-Journal recently carried an excellent article discussing the polio vaccine botch and the remarkable career of the Surgeon General, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, who has been the victim of several attempts to make him the scapegoat.

These attempts have not succeeded, because too many newspapers—including some which are Republican by inclination—have repudiated the sly, almost indecent effort to transfer the blame to Dr. Scheele, who after all is a subordinate to the Secretary of what has been branded the Department of Not-Too-Much Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I offer the article on Surgeon General Scheele:

(By Robert L. Riggs)

It has been comforting to Republican Senators to issue frequent reminders that the Salk vaccine program has been in the hands of a Surgeon General selected twice by Oscar W. Ewing and Harry S. Truman.

For as the fight grows warmer over the Democratic proposal to have the Federal Government provide free antipolio inoculations for all up to the age of 29, it has been a morale booster for Republicans to be able to call on this Democratic appointee for ammunition.

And as criticism mounts against the Eisenhower administration for the way it has handled the Salk program, Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby has regarded it as beneficial to emphasize that the law puts the responsibility for all vaccines upon the Surgeon General. None is quicker to concede that it is his responsibility than 47-year-old Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, who has for 7 years presided over the vast empire which comprises the United States Public Health Service.

If he has not availed himself of the opportunity to follow Mrs. Hobby's example and single out his own subordinates to be the goats, there are those who say he thus is illustrating the difference between the dedicated, permanent career Government servant and the temporary political appointee, even though of Cabinet rank.

For neither praise nor blame, buckpassing, nor castigation has any visible effect upon the Surgeon General, who assumed office as the choice of men battling for what was then denounced as socialized medicine, and who continues to serve an administration whose woman Cabinet officer is fighting what she calls an attempt to bring socialized medicine in by the back door.

If the word "imperturbable" fits anyone, it fits all of the 6 feet 2 inches and 195 pounds of this easygoing, soft-spoken, apparently never-tiring man who has spent his entire professional career in the Public Health Service. If it ever is safe to label a man "dedicated," you would be tempted to apply the term to Dr. Scheele.

The people who have spent their adult lives in the Health Service find nothing strange about Dr. Scheele's being able to backstop such Fair Dealers as Ewing and Truman and such No Dealers as Mrs. Hobby. They regard themselves as much the same sort of people as officers in the Army and Navy who go directly from West Point or Annapolis into professional careers.

There is, in fact, a great similarity between the Health Service and the military forces. Scheele himself has the same rank as a major general in the Army, although, oddly enough, when he puts on an official uniform, it is the Navy's blue or tan.

The more than 3,500 Health Service officers are composed of doctors, dentists, scientists, nurses, and laboratory workers. Although they live in a world apart, they have to become more proficient than do either Army or Navy officers in the art of persuasion, in the art of getting people to do what they cannot be forced to do.

For, although epidemics know nothing of State boundaries, the Federal Public Health Service has no authority to ride over the wishes of a sovereign State. If a State health department doesn't want to cooperate in cleaning up a source of stream pollution, in heading off an epidemic of typhoid, there is little the Federal service can do to compel it to perform its duty.

Likewise, the Public Health Service has accomplished many of its goals by working with volunteer civic bodies which have only quasi-public standing. Prominent among them is the National Infantile Paralysis Foundation.

Others less well known are engaged in combating heart disease, cancer, arthritis, and other chronic diseases.

It is doubly easy for Dr. Scheele to deal with these groups, because his chief professional interest lies in the fight against chronic diseases.

Dr. Scheele feels that if more were known about the relationship between the Health Service and the Infantile Paralysis Foundation, there would be less temptation to compare the United States vaccine program unfavorably with that followed by Canada.

Much has been made, he says, of the fact that Canada has supplied the first rounds of inoculations to young children free of charge. Virtually the same thing has been done in this country, he says, the only difference being that the free vaccine for first graders and second graders came from the foundation, which got the money from public donations instead of from taxes.

So far as future inoculation plans go for this country, Dr. Scheele is giving his loyalty to the program advocated by his superior, Mrs. Hobby.

Her plan envisions inoculations given by private physicians for a fee. To take care of those who cannot afford to pay, she would have the Federal Government spend something like $35 million.

The Democrats, on the other hand, are giving their support to a bill offered by Senator LISTER HILL which would provide $135 million so that all from the age of 9 on down would receive free inoculation.

You get the impression that if Ewing and Truman were still on the job, instead of Mrs. Hobby and Eisenhower, Scheele would be just as diligent in providing them with material to help enact the Hill bill as he is in providing Mrs. Hobby and Republican Senators with assistance against it.

Scheele's present term expires in April 1956, just before the opening of the presidential campaign. Whether he is reappointed or not, he certainly will be, because of the polio vaccine controversy, one of the few Surgeons General whose name is known to the people.

Dr. Scheele's father was a dentist in Fort Wayne, Ind. After getting an A. B. degree from the University of Michigan, in 1931, Scheele attended Wayne University Medical School in Detroit, getting his medical degree cum laude in 1933. He went immediately into the Public Health Service.

While still at the University of Michigan, he married Frances K. McCormick of Detroit, who was a dental student.

They have three children, Alexandra, 18, is a sophomore at Wellesley College. Maria is 14, and Leonard, Jr., is 8. Known as Bo-Bo, Leonard achieved national notice when, as evidence of his father's faith in the Salk vaccine, he was given an inoculation.

"Honest Ave" Splits Democrats on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats proclaim their love for the President's foreign policy. The following editorial in the Washington Daily News of July 9 is another instance of how they obstruct the President's policy:

"HONEST AVE"

Averell Harriman used to be a diplomat. He apparently has given that up in toto to be a politician—one with a long-range bead on the Democratic presidential nomination.

We don't know what prompted him to sound off in London about American domestic politics. Maybe he was just asked honest questions by reporters and gave what he thought were honest answers.

However, it does seem that what he said—away from home—was undiplomatic and not very good politics, either, since the British can't vote over here.

On the eve of the first top-level Big Four conference in 10 years—a conference which may stand or fall on whether the Western Powers, individually and collectively, can show a remarkable degree of unity—the Governor of the biggest State, who once was Ambassador to Russia, lands in Europe to say that the American people are disillusioned with President Eisenhower's policies.

He may have meant the Republican Party's domestic politics. But there is no evidence that the Governor specified that there seems to be pretty unanimous support—Democratic and Republican—for the President's foreign policies.

Governor Harriman is not serving his country well by starting a foreign tour with an effort to peddle partisan politics of this kind. We hope "Honest Ave" corrects this kind of mischief in his next bout with reporters abroad, or, better still, remembers that domestic politics should end at the water's edge.

One Man's India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, India is a country of great importance to the United States and the free world. Events in India can have a large effect on the course of the world's history. Obviously, it is important for Americans to understand India and its people. For most of us greater understanding must come through reading. The review of the book, One Man's India, by Arthur Stratton, which follows, appeared in the New York Times today. Mr. Stratton is my brother-in-law:

BOOKS OF THE TIMES
(By Orville Prescott)

Seldom is a book more accurately titled than is One Man's India, by Arthur Stratton. Many books about India have been unsuccessful efforts to fit many men's Indias into one volume—the India of the peasant villagers, the India of Jawaharlal Nehru, the Congress Party and world politics, the India of Mohandas Gandhi and the India of the Bhagavad-Gita. With commendable modesty and sound commonsense Mr. Stratton has not tried to explain all the paradoxes and complexities of India. Instead he has written a clear, lively, and interesting book about what he saw during a visit there and what he was prompted to think by his experience.

Arthur Stratton was in India briefly in 1942 and did not like the country. In November of 1952 he returned and remained for about 5 months and liked India and the Indians very much. He had no introductions to very important persons. He met no celebrities. He did not investigate social conditions or the state of agriculture. Traveling as a tourist, inspired only by his curiosity, his lively sympathies and his interest in a hundred subjects, he poked around and asked himself questions: "What is this place? Who are these people? What is life like here?"

RARE MIND FOR VISUALIZING

Such an approach makes his book extremely personal. And a personal book depends for its quality on the mind and personality of its author. Mr. Stratton's mind is speculative, contemplative, cultivated, and unpretentious. He likes to draw tentative generalizations about life and death, history and religion, morality and art, sexuality and architecture. When he digresses, thinking aloud as it were, he does so with no dogmatic certainty, and frequently and engagingly he admits that he doesn't know something about India or doesn't understand something about Indian religion. These thoughts are just the way matters struck him at the time.

"One Man's India" covers many of the usual places a traveler would be expected to visit and some which he would not: Darjeeling, beautiful as always but in a condition of shabby decline; Calcutta, "the worst place in India" with its appalling poverty, its hunger-inspired vice, and its blood-smeared temple of Kali; Bhuvaneswar, where of 7,000 temples 500 still stand, and Konarak, whose great ruined temple is adorned with hundreds of erotic statues; Benares on the holy Ganges; Agra with the Taj Mahal; Fatehpur Sikri, the palace city built in red sandstone by the great Mogul Emperor Akbar and then mysteriously deserted by him; Delhi and Bombay; the Rajput desert cities of Jodhpur and Jaipur, and the great caves of Ajanta and Ellora with their fabulous paintings and statues.

"It seemed to me that India was worth looking at," Mr. Stratton remarks early in his book. The more he looked the more convinced he became. In a few months he was persuaded "that there is no more beautiful race on earth" than the Indians. His enthusiasm is born of friendliness and esthetic appreciation. He is too well balanced to succumb to the legend of the greater moral virtue of the mysterious East.

CANDID IN HIS APPRAISALS

A westerner, Mr. Stratton looks at all things Indian with sympathetic interest, but without illusions. He sees abuses and suffering and is not shocked, recognizing that abuses and suffering are universal, that these are only their local manifestations. And, writing for potential travelers and not for scholars, he provides capsule essays on many Indian subjects.

So in the course of "One Man's India" one acquires a smattering of interesting facts about Anglo-Indians, the architecture of Indian temples, the Mogul Dynasty, the Sepoy Rebellion, Hindu theology, Indian trains, hotels, servants, newspapers, weather and curio dealers. Whether such facts are more interesting than Mr. Stratton's casual meditations is a matter of taste. But the meditations can be as surprising as the facts. Mr. Stratton is the first writer I ever encountered who was not struck all of a heap by the Taj Mahal:

"The Mogul lady's tomb is soft, extravagant, overdecorated, and dead; it is the product of a luxuriant and rich love of a self-indulgent man. * * * The Taj Mahal is sterile, but it is superb. It is not tragic; it is sentimental. * * * I don't much like it. * * * Its details are all perfect, but the idea seems to be off balance. What possesses a man or a woman to build a stupendous mausoleum? The more I looked at the tomb in the cold light of a gray day, the more foreign (to me) it became. It is beautiful. Its setting of flat gardens patterned with walks and ornamental waters is lovely. The red sandstone frame is magnificent—a masculine protection for a feminine ideal. The muddy Jumma River is as full of life as the tomb is deadly. But I do not like it."

The Wrecking of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Havana Post English language newspaper, Havana, Cuba, in which this newspaper goes on record as advocating the abandonment of the Panama Canal Corporation, the same Corporation which Congressman FLOOD characterized as a "Frankenstein."

The editorial follows:

THE WRECKING OF THE CANAL

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, is reported on Friday's front page as having told the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that the Panama Canal Company, a United States Government-owned corporation, "has become a Frankenstein" and should be abolished.

The meeting was considering a proposal to abandon the Panama railroad as an outmoded operation, losing money. FLOOD declared, "What should be abandoned is not the railroad, but the Panama Canal Corporation."

What is happening to the Panama Canal and its ancillary operations is typical of what occurs when the builders, who love the project and can feel the beating of its heart, move out, and in come the bureaucrats, statisticians, efficiency experts, and other latter-day marvels.

The Panama Canal still is the greatest monument in the world to American courage, ingenuity and refusal to admit that there is any situation which is without remedy. It was because of the revolutionary discovery by a Cuban scientist, Dr. Carlos J. Finlay, that the construction of the canal was made possible, it being Finlay who found that the transmitting agent of yellow fever is the Aedes egyptii mosquito. The ravages of the "Yellow Jack" had forced the French to abandon the building of the Panama Canal, but with Finlay's discovery, it became possible to sanitate the Canal Zone and make it habitable for human beings.

On August 15, 1914, only 2 weeks after the outbreak in Europe of World War I, the first vessel sailed through the Panama Canal. Thereafter the big ditch was of tremendous service to the allied cause, as it was again in World War II. At the conclusion of the second global conflict, some theorists argued that the canal had lost its usefulness because of the great advantages which had been made in aviation. Then in 1950 came the fighting in Korea and traffic through the Panama Canal was multiplied by five.

The worst thing that ever happened to the canal was the formation of the Panama Canal Company, which was denounced in Washington on Friday by United States Representative FLOOD. Previously the canal was under the War Department and when it was run by the United States Armed Forces, it was a successful operation. Strangely enough the plan to have the canal organized as a private company came in the immediate post-World War II period when there was Communist influence in the Canal Zone, as well as in Washington, D. C.

In one particular instance, this Red influence reached to a very high level. Communists from the United States were permitted to organize the 17,000 non-American employees of the canal into a pro-Communist union, affiliated with the Red UPW-CIO. Then came the Panama Canal Company, and the betrayal of the children of the men who had built the canal, believing that they were founding a new frontier for the United States. The privileges which had been guaranteed the canal diggers were taken from them, and intellectuals and bureaucrats took over control of the big ditch.

We think Representative FLOOD knows whereof he speaks when he says that what is wrong with the Panama Canal is not the railroad running along its banks, but the Government-owned company which is running it. Maybe the time has arrived when something can be done about this bureaucratic Frankenstein.

Dixon-Yates Was a Secret Inside Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article written by

Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the July 12 issue of the Washington Evening Star. The article, entitled "Dixon-Yates as a National Issue," follows:

DIXON-YATES AS A NATIONAL ISSUE—RECENT REVELATIONS SHOW THIS QUESTION, COMPLICATED AS IT IS, HAS SOME APPEAL

In this politically minded city when a matter affecting Government begins to get concentrated attention and consequent wide publicity it is inevitable that it is discussed in terms of its potency as a political issue in the next election.

That is happening with the now-canceled Dixon-Yates contract as the persistent Senator ESTES KEFAUVER doggedly explores it day by day.

The Tennessee Senator, who capitalized a crime investigation into a really formidable challenge for the 1952 Democratic Presidential nomination, certainly thinks there's political power in Dixon-Yates, despite cancellation, not only in Tennessee but nationally. So do other Democrats, including a couple of other young and ambitious political leaders in Tennessee. They would be Senator ALBERT GORE, and Gov. Frank G. Clement.

While the Tennesseans are so hard-hitting on this issue because it affects something so close to their constituents—TVA—they and other Democrats are proceeding now on the theory that it will be a political issue far beyond Tennessee because it has in the last few days acquired the necessary ingredients. These are simplification and the human element which, you will recall, was what got Republicans so much political mileage out of such items as gifts of deep freezes and mink coats in the RFC scandals of the Truman administration.

Everybody could understand that. So now with Dixon-Yates, once to most people a complicated financial maze.

It is now simplified in one human being, a gentleman by the name of Adolphe Wenzell, formerly assistant vice president and director of First Boston Corp., a New York investment company which is the biggest underwriter of private utilities and naturally with little sympathy for TVA.

Mr. Wenzell's story begins when he was brought down here in 1953 by the Budget Bureau as a consultant for the Bureau on power matters, including TVA. He drew up a report, secret until now, recommending turning over TVA's electric power facilities to private hands eventually, which Senator KEFAUVER said "is a plain presentation of thinking within the Budget Bureau at the time, and shows how TVA was attacked in the dark, behind its back, and with no chance to reply."

Some months later, out of the Budget Bureau and the Atomic Energy Commission, there came the Dixon-Yates scheme. Under this two utility companies—Middle South Utilities, headed by Edgar H. Dixon, and Southern Co., headed by Eugene A. Yates, both of New Jersey with offices at 2 Rector Street, New York—formed a combine to build a plant in Arkansas to deliver power into Memphis to replace TVA power, with which Memphis had long been served, which would go now instead to an AEC installation at Paducah, Ky.

This was interpreted by Members of Congress from the TVA area as an attempt to cut into TVA and eventually strangle it. Now it turns out that Mr. Wenzell, who had recommended the dismantling of TVA as a public agency, also was a consultant for the Budget Bureau on the Dixon-Yates contract later, and so the pieces begin to fit together in a pattern. He was assigned early in 1954 to advise the Budget Bureau about financing the Dixon-Yates deal. He was still with the First Boston Corp., which subsequently got the contract for financing Dixon-Yates. The investment house announced after the deal got into the open that it had waived a fee because of the public-interest character of its services.

Here we have the simple and understandable fact of an inside job, with the representative of a big investment house, representing utility clients, sitting in at the same time as an adviser on Government policy in which the company and those clients were interested.

Not only do we have here an inside job, but one done in secrecy. For, when the Budget Bureau at President Eisenhower's order made public papers and documents dealing with the Dixon-Yates contract, it withheld all information about Mr. Wenzell's activities, which were finally and first revealed by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, in a Senate speech in March.

Democrats are capitalizing upon the Dixon-Yates affair to drive home charges they are beginning to make that the President is not kept properly informed by subordinates on important matters about which he should know. He was misled, in the first instance, that the Budget Bureau had given out all pertinent facts about the Dixon-Yates deal as he had instructed. At a June 30 news conference, he insisted that Mr. Wenzell "was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract," which was on the basis of a conference he had with Budget Director Rowland Hughes just prior to the press conference. At his most recent press conference he defended Mr. Wenzell's actions as entirely proper, when it was evident he had not been given a complete fill-in.

Despite the simplification of the issue, there are those who argue that Dixon-Yates will not be politically potent except in Tennessee and perhaps in other areas interested in public-resource development. But Democrats, nevertheless, are proceeding on the thesis that they have an issue of some consequence.

The Communist Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by Senator KNOWLAND before the Foundation To Defeat Communism at their recent meeting in Washington are timely and of deep import and interest.

We must not forget that the Communist menace is still abroad in the world and in our own land, even though the Russians are cooing and purring to make us forget its existence.

We must be on guard and we must also remember the American prisoners still held illegally in Communist China.

Senator KNOWLAND's address follows:

Two and one-half billion people who populate the earth today ponder the future fate of mankind. Although boundary lines presently divide these people in two opposing camps, the great majority are unified in their hopes and prayers for an honorable and enduring peace.

Today, for the first time in recorded history, a total conflict in peacetime has evolved with its theater of operations worldwide in scope. The headquarters of this conspiracy against mankind is located in Moscow and its chief instrument is international communism.

Over 30 years ago, Lenin expounded the eternal philosophy of communism's irreconcilability with our free system and no Communist has deviated from that platform to the present date. "It is inconceivable," Lenin said, "that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."

In 1952 Stalin wrote, "It is possible that in a definite conjecture of circumstances, the fight for peace will develop here or there into a fight for socialism. But then, it will no longer be the present peace movement; it will be a movement for the overthrow of capitalism." In any analysis, the words that promise our future must be evaluated by past performances and deeds.

From the beginning of the revolution in Russia in 1917, international communism has been able to spread over the lives of 40 percent of the earth's inhabitants. Most of these gains have occurred in the 15-year period since the start of World War II.

Perhaps it might clarify the problems of the present to recall these events of the past when the Communists, by invasion or subversion, took over once-proud countries and peoples. The casualties read as follows:

In 1940, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

In 1939 and 1949, Poland; in 1945, Rumania, Bulgaria and Albania, and North Korea. In 1947, Hungary; in 1948, Czechoslovakia; in 1949, China; in 1954, North Vietnam. Present threats exist today against Formosa and South Vietnam.

I am convinced that there will never be a real and lasting relief of world tensions until the last vestige of slavery has been eliminated from the earth. As long as there exists suppression in Russia or in China or North Vietnam or in Poland, Hungary, or Rumania, there will be no real peace in England, in France, or in the United States.

The Chinese Communists, in violation of the armistice, admit they still hold 11 American airmen who have been sentenced to Communist prisons. There is strong reason to believe they hold several hundred other United States and United Nations military prisoners. We know they hold over 30 American civilians who have been in jail for several years.

As long as one American in the armed services or in civilian life is unjustly held I shall not remain silent.

The Chinese Communists have released four American jet fliers that had been held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice. All Americans will, of course, rejoice with the families of these men that they have been returned to their loved ones and their country.

However, we must not lose sight of the other Americans who are still held. The fact that only four have been released may well indicate that the Chinese Communists are going to use the balance in negotiating Formosa and Far Eastern area problems with us.

This would be the role of an extortionist nation and not of a civilized one. The Chinese Communists should be told that we will not permit them to use our men in such a fashion. Both the United States and the United Nations should make it clear that before any discussions are entered into relative to tensions in the Pacific all Americans, military and civilians, who are being illegally held should be freed.

For the entire life of our Republic, Americans have been indoctrinated with the belief that every citizen owes an obligation to his flag and to his country which included service in the Armed Forces when required. The Government must not lose sight of the fact that by the same token the Nation has an obligation to the men in uniform who serve it.

Have we forgotten the Biblical injunction in Second Corinthians: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for

what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion has light with darkness?"

As for me, as long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States I shall oppose the admission of Communist China.

We must always distinguish between the people of Russia and their Kremlin masters. The Russian people were the first victims of the godless Marxian tyranny of Lenin and Stalin.

The struggle for power goes on in the Kremlin. The tactics may change with the faction temporarily in power. The long-term strategy for the destruction of human freedom continues throughout the world by Communist aggression from without or by subversion from within.

The meetings have recently been concluded between the Soviet and the Yugoslav representatives.

Despite all efforts to sugar-coat the results, it has been a substantial setback for the free nations of the world.

It is a demonstration that Communist birds of a feather still flock together.

Communist Yugoslavia under Tito, after having received substantial economic aid and military equipment from the United States, has now moved into an even more neutralist position than it has taken for the last year. Tito has fully subscribed to the Soviet line that Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations despite the fact that it committed aggression against that organization, that it should have Formosa despite the fact that it would mean enslavement of 9½ million free Chinese; and, that the atomic weapon should be barred though he and the Soviet representatives know, as does the Western world, that without the superiority in this weapon in the hands of the West it would have been possible for Communist manpower with their standard weapons to have overwhelmed all of Europe long before now.

We might as well be frank about it and not deceive ourselves. Communist Yugoslavia under Tito is engaged in playing both ends against the middle. This is not an admirable characteristic in private life any more than it is among nations. It's time that Yugoslavia's Tito and others of a like mind understand this fact.

Certainly we have no desire to use our resources to impinge upon the sovereignty of any nation.

However, I doubt very much whether we do have the resources to assist the nations that are alert to the dangers of communism and are prepared to do the utmost to help themselves and their neighbors in resisting overt aggression and at the same time to aid and assist those nations which, by their diplomatic and other efforts, are attempting to break down the system of collective security without which we would not be able to preserve the free world.

Yesterday, the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Molotov, addressed the United Nations ceremonies in San Francisco and stated that the United Nations has no greater purpose than to secure peace, friendship, and cooperation among the peoples. Mr. Molotov then went on to describe the Soviet Union's conditions of communism's program for "peaceful coexistence." This included admission of Red China into the United Nations, the return of Formosa, Quemoy, and Matsu to Peiping, the dismantling of this country's overseas bases; withdrawal of all United States forces back to this country, and the elimination of all trade restrictions with the Soviet Union, Communist China, and its satellites.

At the same time that Mr. Molotov's program for peaceful coexistence was unveiled for the United Nations, a joint declaration was being signed by Mr. Nehru and the Soviet Premier Bulganin in Moscow. This declaration also called for the admission of Red China into the United Nations and the giving up of Formosa and surrounding territories to Red China.

It is strange to me that Mr. Nehru, a self-styled neutralist, generally takes a position in support of the Soviet Union's objectives and against the interest of the free world.

It is inconceivable to me how Nehru and his so-called Ambassador of Peace, Mr. Mennon, can support a tyrannical force like Red China that has been condemned by the United Nations, itself as an aggressor, and as Mr. Nehru knows, Red China to this date continues to flaunt the will and edicts of the United Nations.

The President of the United States is about to embark on some highly important conferences. Although these top-level conferences are designed to be purely exploratory in nature, in my judgment, there is nothing to foreclose our representatives in such conferences to raise any or all problems and issues of existing tensions. I do not believe the President of the United States, who is a great American, will forget Mr. Molotov's statement in February of 1955—the same Mr. Molotov who called for the Soviet type peaceful coexistence yesterday in the United Nations—who said:

"It is quite natural that in connection with the changes that have taken place in the world situation the corelation of forces between social systems, especially during the past 10 years, has definitely changed to the advantage of socialism."

This is the same Mr. Molotov who in 1947 wrote:

"We live in an era in which all roads lead to communism."

When the Austrian State Treaty was before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I questioned the Secretary of State whether the Soviet Union would be asked to live up to its agreement to withdraw its forces from Hungary and Rumania. In my judgment, since this country was a signatory to the treaty with those countries, we have a moral obligation to insist on Soviet compliance with those conditions.

Arrival of 1,200 Immigrants Welcome, but Program Lags Behind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today 1,200 persons from Germany and Austria will arrive in New York under provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. This is good news for the 1,200. It is not good enough for the thousands left behind who, through maladministration of the act and the unnecessary restrictive provisions, may never be given the chance to find a new life and new hope in the United States.

The ceremonies on Tuesday are presumably to dramatize the success of the Refugee Relief Act, yet to me it appears to be like a man who, when climbing a hill, boasts he has scaled Mt. Everest. The refugee program is still far from a success.

I am pleased with the arrival of the 1,200 immigrants. There is no gainsaying the importance of these arrivals to them and to us. Lest we, however, conclude that all is well, let us examine the record.

As of July 1 only 37,642 visas had been granted out of the permitted total of 209,000. That is 17 percent of the authorized total, although two-thirds of the life of the act has gone by. Of these, only 11,567 visas went to refugees. The remainder went to aliens with relatives in the United States. The need for changes in the act is paramount. How much the administration of the act has improved with the arrival of Mr. Gerety remains to be seen. It took 2 years to issue visas up to 17 percent of the authorized total. There is only 1 year left to reach the remaining 83 percent, or five times the number of people issued visas in the 2-year period.

The record is not good. Unless changes are made, I see very little chance that the program can be completed.

Creeping Inflation Is Called Biggest News Story in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we would do well to look ahead and try to steer clear of the dangers of inflation that may well spell ruin.

It is so easy to dismiss the dangers of inflation when money is plentiful, but if the time comes when all these paper bills are just paper, we may well be blamed for having ignored the red lights that flashed rather dimly along the road to the abyss.

The following article by David Lawrence, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of July 11, is one we should study with care:

CREEPING INFLATION IS CALLED BIGGEST NEWS STORY IN UNITED STATES

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Sometimes there's a big news story developing right in front of our eyes but, because there's no single dramatic climax, it escapes headlines.

Today the biggest story in America is the creeping inflation that has set in. It may eventually bring the value of the dollar down from around 50 cents, where it is at present, to 20 cents or even lower in the next 2 decades.

People wonder why the stock market is booming, but it should be no mystery. The stock market senses inflation faster nowadays than it does any other influence, and security values jump upward accordingly.

The most sensational piece of inflation news happened a fortnight ago. Just as soon as the CIO Steelworkers Union held up the steel industry and forced it to pay a wage increase of around 15 cents an hour, the steel companies turned around and increased the price of steel by $7.50 a ton. That's about a 5 percent increase and anybody who thinks you can put into effect a 5 percent increase in steel prices without affecting almost the entire manufacturing economy of America isn't looking facts in the face.

Big wage increases have just been forced on the auto and copper industries, too.

Nobody begrudges American labor the enjoyment of high wages, but there comes a time when stability is more important than selfishness and greed. The union leaders are in a contest to get the most they can each year, and they are forcing wage increases in reckless disregard of their own labor-union members. For when inflation reaches its peak, the workers who have accumulated savings in the banks or in the form of pensions will suffer the greatest hardship. The dollars of today look good at the time but, when they will buy only 20 cents' worth of goods, they will not look so good.

NEW MONOPOLY SEEN

Time was when the free-enterprise system in America functioned effectively because the Government protected the public interest. It stepped in when the corporations fixed prices or engaged in monopolistic practices to stifle competition. Today the government is faced with a dangerous monopoly—labor-union control of entire industries. Today price-fixing is being brought about by labor-union manipulation of wake rates. The Government is afraid to act because the labor unions control the Democratic Party and, with their huge campaign funds, can control the election of many Member of Congress in both parties.

So, being fearful of political reprisals, the Government takes no action to protect the public interest, while the labor unions, on the one hand, and the corporations on the other, fix the prices. The smaller units in business which used to cut prices because they didn't need to pay as high wages as their big competitors now are being gradually forced out of business. Monopolies and quasi-monopolies today are in command of the Nation's economy.

In Europe, in order to hold labor unions and corporations at bay, either the corporate state of fascism or the state-controlled mechanism of communism is introduced. Both are instruments of totalitarianism and offer no solution for America.

Revision of the antitrust laws is often talked about in Washington, but nothing is done about it. The labor unions are today engaged in a restraint of trade in much the same way that the corporations operated in the 1890's, when the Sherman antitrust law was born. But there's no sentiment on Capitol Hill today to put through any important changes in the antitrust laws.

MORE DEVALUATION FORECAST

So the outlook is for more and more inflation, and, of course, more and more devaluation in the purchasing power of the dollar, higher and higher prices, and a gradual depreciation of the value of pensions and retirement benefits. Labor-union leaders are forgetting tomorrow and living only in today's atmosphere of rivalry in which one labor chief vies with another to get the maximum. Strikes are too costly to be endured, so management gives in without a struggle. Then, as if convinced that the public will not mind, the price increases are announced almost immediately after the termination of the wage controversies with the unions.

Another cycle of price increases generally now is in the offing.

If profits of corporations are too high, the answer doesn't lie in turning the excess over to one industry, but in sharing it with the entire public in the form of price decreases. Today's system is a triumph for special privilege—the monopolistic unions and corporations.

The end result—economic depression—will not be apparent till it comes. For economic laws are never repealed. The inevitability of a price spiral and a consequent reduction in the dollar's value are as plain to see today as they have been in similar periods in the economic history of the world. Bad economic practices do not always make headlines, but they can make breadlines.

Statement on Technical Cooperation Issued by the National Planning Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on technical cooperation issued by the National Planning Association Special Policy Committee on this subject. This report is an effort to outline the reasons why public and private programs in technical cooperation should be continued. It recommends a series of steps which warrant immediate attention for improving them.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECHNICAL COOPERATION SOWING THE SEEDS OF PROGRESS

WHAT IS TECHNICAL COOPERATION?

Technical cooperation is the sharing of scientific and technical knowledge and skills among peoples—helping each other adapt and use such knowledge and skills to achieve greater productivity and better utilization of resources, increase incomes, and raise levels of living. It spurs the accumulation of new knowledge and the invention of new techniques for translating knowledge into action. Fields for cooperation include health, education, government organization and administration, as well as such directly productive fields as agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and transportation. Technical assistance flows through both public and private channels—the latter being the older, with larger volume.

Technical cooperation does not include economic aid or developmental assistance in the form of private investment or public loans or grants, nor grants of armament material and other forms of military assistance. However, technical cooperation usually increases the effectiveness of economic aid, and frequently accompanies it. Military assistance is an important phase of the cold war, but it seldom has a direct relationship to technical cooperation programs.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION IS NOT NEW TO THE UNITED STATES

Whether a nation needs technical cooperation is largely an accident of time.

The United States has received great quantities of technical assistance from abroad—especially Europe—in colonial days, in the early period of our industrial development, and more recently as basic research for such uses as the application of atomic energy. With a few exceptions, this flow to us now comes through the universities, private enterprise, and technical publications. The United States has also been giving technical assistance to other countries for many years.

Religious groups in the United States began technical cooperation in health and education in other countries a century or more ago. Foundations and other philanthropic organizations have been participating in technical cooperation activities with institutions and people in other countries for many years. Private firms operating abroad have long been carrying technical knowledge to other countries and training workers in many fields. Some governments and private firms in the lesser developed areas have "hired" United States firms and individuals to bring technical knowledge to them and help them apply it. The total contribution over the years of private agencies and individuals of the United States to technical cooperation has been much greater than that of the Government, whose programs are relatively recent.

WHAT IS NEW IN TECHNICAL COOPERATION IS THE FORMAL ORGANIZATION AND RAPID EXPANSION OF TECHNICAL-ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

The United States bilateral program of technical cooperation had its beginning in Latin America during World War II. The primary objective was to increase the production of war materials. The 1950 Act of International Development broadened the objective of the program to cover "the international interchange of technical knowledge and skills designed to contribute to the balance and integrated development of the economic resources and productive capacities of the economically underdeveloped areas."

The bilteral programs have been launched in some 40 countries in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, and in a number of dependent territories as well. Expenditures of the United States Government for technical cooperation programs during the current fiscal year will approximate $100 million, something like $20 million in Latin America. Expenditures for technical cooperation by the governments of Latin America are greater than those of the United States Government there. In addition, the United States is making modest contributions to the multilateral programs of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the Organization of American States. The public programs are concentrated in health, education, agriculture, and public administration.

During this same period, private agencies have been expanding and formalizing their programs of technical cooperation in the less developed areas of the world. Business firms have been placing increased emphasis on the transfer and adaptation of techniques to their operations in these areas. Many now have organized programs of education and training to improve skills and productivity so that nationals of the countries in which operations are located can be employed in greater numbers at all levels. There has been a remarkable increase in the participation of United States universities in both private and public programs. The foundations and other philanthropic organizations have enlarged their activities in this field and placed them on an organized and continuing basis. Religious agencies are continuing their programs and gearing their secular activities more closely to the economic and social problems of the areas in which they operate.

PUBLIC TECHNICAL COOPERATION PROGRAMS ARE ESSENTIAL TO EXPEDITE AND ACHIEVE NECESSARY BALANCE IN THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF MANY COUNTRIES

Some countries do not need organized programs of public assistance from abroad to achieve the levels of health, agriculture, education, and public administration which will provide the necessary environment for promoting economic development and for making healthy social adjustments thereto. Some countries, like Japan, which have had to import advanced techniques and skills in these fields, have been able to pay for them and to finance, either from public

or private sources, training abroad for leaders and technicians where the requisite training was not available at home. But most of the lesser developed countries of the free world, such as Ecuador and Bolivia, are not so fortunate. They need public programs of technical cooperation to speed up development and bring about more rapid improvements in levels of living.

We believe there are few doubts in the minds of most people in the United States as to the desirability of private programs of technical cooperation. Such doubts as there are relate primarily to public programs, bilateral and multilateral. We believe that these doubts will tend to disappear with the fuller appreciation of the fact that the public programs are increasingly limited to activities which private agencies are not likely to undertake, but which are needed in the cooperating countries and which serve to make private programs more fully effective. Without concurrent public programs in these fields, rapid industrial development may cause economic imbalance and social unrest. Similarly, doubts of those in host countries will tend to disappear as they learn that the public, as well as the private, programs are designed to help them help themselves to achieve a better life; that the programs are not a disguised effort to impose upon them strange institutions and a foreign way of life, and to reap for a foreign country all of the benefits achieved.

THE COOPERATING COUNTRIES, PRIVATE AGENCIES, AND PRIVATE GROUPS ARE BENEFITING FROM THE INCREASING INTERLOCKING OF THEIR PROGRAMS

Some phases of technical cooperation require government-to-government action and other phases operate best on a wholly private basis. But more and more the public and private programs supplement each other in combined or related operations. For example, the United States universities are undertaking programs on contract for the United States Government; foundations and other philanthropic organizations are joining with government agencies of the host countries in the sponsorship of some programs; public-health programs are decreasing the need for company-sponsored programs and improving the health of workers; managerial and technical know-how imported by business firms help fill the gaps in managerial and technical training found in most underdeveloped countries.

The pace of technical assistance and the benefits to the participating groups could increase if each group, public or private, would engage in those particular phases of the program for which it is best suited; if each planned and conducted its programs so that, insofar as possible, they complemented and supplemented other on-going programs; and if closer working relationships between the various programs were maintained. Technical cooperation is a two-way street from which both the United States and the host countries reap many benefits, tangible as well as intangible. The United States has long been importing knowledge, techniques, and skills. Many examples can be cited. Much is known in underdeveloped areas concerning such subjects as human diseases, and animal and vegetable diseases and pests, which would be useful in this country. Some industrial techniques and skills in cooperating countries can be adapted to conditions in the United States and utilized profitably. The people of the United States will gain from technical cooperation a more intimate knowledge of the culture and characteristics of the people of other countries, and a better understanding of the history, objectives and goals of their governmental institutions. In short, technical cooperation brings about a pooling of knowledge and talents, which is useful to all cooperating countries and agencies.

THE NPA POLICY COMMITTEE BELIEVES THAT PUBLIC AND PRIVATE TECHNICAL COOPERATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE CONTINUED FOR MANY IMPORTANT REASONS

In most less developed countries there is a much stronger determination than ever before to achieve, by one route or another, economic development and better standards of living. Technical cooperation—public and private—is democracy's route for expediting in these countries economic growth accompanied by social improvement and political independence—the exact opposite of the economic dictation, social repression, and political slavery of the police state. As a cooperative effort among the governments and peoples of independent countries, the technical cooperation programs stand in sharp contrast to the ideological and military aggression of international communism. In various ways, technical cooperation in the less developed countries strengthens resistance to Communist infiltration and helps build in them the will and power to be free and independent.

Technical cooperation is a spur to international trade. By accelerating industrial development, increasing the production of food and raw materials, improving productivity, and enhancing purchasing power, it helps cooperating countries to make larger amounts of goods and services available for export, and to increase their ability to purchase imports. This benefits all the cooperating countries.

Technical cooperation contributes to international understanding. The people and governments of the cooperating countries learn more about each other's motivations and the underlying reasons for different approaches to common problems. "Iron curtains" cannot tolerate the penetration of two-way technical cooperation.

Technical cooperation directly benefits the United States as well as other countries. These benefits are especially welcome to the United States in this period when it is considered to be the international leader of the free world. Technical cooperation gives United States nationals a better understanding of the political, economic, and social conditions and problems in the cooperating countries; leads them to reappraise and improve their attitudes toward, and ways of working with, other peoples; and helps to set a higher standard of international behavior.

Technical cooperation increases the rate of growth of knowledge and its utilization in all cooperating countries. It brings the benefits of cross-fertilization to basic technological concepts and to methods for their application. This process enriches and enlarges the reservoir of know-how available to the democratic nations.

Technical cooperation provides an unusually large return for a relatively small monetary investment. It is essentially a "seeding" operation. The seeds are not basically capital or material, but are new ways of doing things, new methods and programs. Usually these are on a demonstration basis. They spread—at decreasing cost—because they are improvements, and they become embedded in the culture and economy of the host country. Results in terms of increased goods, services, and satisfactions are great in comparison to the cost of the initial programs, public or private.

THE NPA POLICY COMMITTEE BELIEVES THAT ACCEPTANCE OF THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS WILL INCREASE THE YIELD FROM TECHNICAL COOPERATION

For the foreseeable future, the public programs of technical cooperation should be accepted as an important long-term activity of the United States Government, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and the Organization of American States.

These agencies should be enabled to expand their cooperation with any country where the programs are needed, if that country demonstrates initiative in planning and launching the programs and stands ready to help support them wholeheartedly from its own resources. Especially needed in many countries are programs that will stimulate initiative and enterprise in the wider application of improved technologies and skills.

Legislative, administrative, and financial continuity should be established for the public programs without further delay. (Specific recommendations concerning administrative continuity for the United States bilateral programs were made in our statement, Organization of the United States Government for Technical Cooperation.[1])

Foundations and other philanthropic organizations, religious groups, and business firms operating abroad should plan their technical cooperation activities on a long-term basis, and expand them where they can make an important contribution to economic and social development.

The private and public agencies and groups engaged in technical cooperation should work more closely with each other in determining the respective roles which each can perform most effectively; continuously exchange information; and cooperate in planning and launching their respective programs, and in appraising their effectiveness.

---

[1] Organization of the U. S. Government for Technical Cooperation, a statement by the NPA Special Policy Committee on Technical Cooperation. NPA, May 1955.

The Birth of a Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a speech written and delivered by young Mr. Oscar Jones, Jr., of Prattville, Ala. Mr. Jones' speech, the Birth of a Nation, won for him the FFA State public speaking championship at the Alabama State convention of the Future Farmers of America. Mr. Jones' speech vividly portrays the important role agriculture has played in the growth of our strong Nation.

THE BIRTH OF A NATION

America now stands as a symbol of power, of power tempered with a feeling of Christian compassion for the downtrodden and underprivileged. We are the recognized leader of the free world. Yet in very recent history we find that America itself was conceived and born in an atmosphere of tyranny and oppression. The people who settled this great country were those who were trying to escape from the yoke of the tyrant and to settle in a land where they were free to worship their God as they saw fit, and where they might live as all men have a right to live—free and equal under God and law.

Yes, our forefathers settled here with the flame of freedom burning brightly in their breasts. In harmony of purpose they banded together to overcome the forces of nature and to subdue the red man who resented the invasion of his hunting grounds. In this early period of our history, the industries which

are now so much a part of our great country were virtually unheard of and certainly none existed in the Western Hemisphere. The early settlers of our country had to depend upon the products of nature, upon the products of the soil if you please, for sustenance. Yes, they turned to tilling the soil in an effort to enrich the existence which they were to have here. Then, as now, agriculture was the foundation upon which the castle of progress was built.

In truth, my friends, it can be said that without the stamina and ingenuity of the American farmer, this great country of ours might still be an unexplored wilderness inhabited only by roving bands of Indian hunters. The words of that great statesman and past President of these United States of America, Teddy Roosevelt, are more eloquent than any I could hope to utter on this point. He said, "We are founded as a nation of farmers and in spite of the growth of our industrial life, it still remains true that the whole system rests on the farm, that the welfare of the whole community depends upon the welfare of the farmer, the strengthening of country life is the strengthening of the Nation as a whole."

Yes; without a prosperous and healthy agriculture this country could never have risen to the place of prominence among the nations of the earth that we now occupy. Without the products of the farm the giant industrial machine that is America might never have been assembled, and as a result the Kaisers, the Hitlers, the Tojos, and the Stalins might have succeeded in achieving their devious objectives.

Let us look momentarily at the accomplishments of the American farmer in years past. In the early colonial period the soil provided the only means of sustenance to the colonists. With nothing more than raw courage and a strong faith in the future, our forefathers first conquered nature and then gradually harnessed her to work for them. No machinery was then available with which to till the soil; so with typical American ingenuity the farmers of that early day took what nature could afford in the way of tools and began to hack away at the jungle walls. Beset on every hand by an Indian populace hostile to his every move, the farmer of that early day had to go prepared to farm and to fight at the same time.

I won't attempt to recite each step in the development of American agriculture. Instead, let us compare the agriculture of today with that practiced in the early days of our history.

In the Midwestern States we now find the rolling, fertile soils of the Corn Belt, where the roar of mechanized farm machinery has replaced the trumpet calls of buffalo herds and the blast of long rifles. Where once we found small patches of maize cultivated by Indian squaws we now find acres upon acres of scientifically bred and developed hybrid corn cultivated by the most modern means of cultivation known to man. The Mississippi River which once served only as a means of navigation for Indian canoes and as a watering place for herds of wild animals now has been harnessed to provide electrical power for the farmers living in that vacinity. The squalid teepees of the Indian families have been replaced by gleaming, sanitary, comfortable houses inhabited by a people dedicated to the task of making the best of their lot and bettering the lot of their fellow man. In this area we find agriculture developed to an extent not experienced by any other region of the world.

While it is true that probably the Corn Belt is the best balanced of all our agricultural areas, other areas are now making rapid strides toward challenging the agricultural supremacy of the Midwestern States. The South, for example, for many years has been moving steadily forward on the road of agricultural progress. We of the South have switched from the agriculture known to our ancestors to a program of more balanced agricultural production. No longer is king cotton the sole cash crop upon which we depend, but joining him in becoming a part of our southern agriculture are beef cattle, dairy cattle, poultry, hogs, and in recent years, sheep. We have learned also that the forest is more than just a habitat for wildlife, but is also a very important cash and soil-conserving crop.

Along with the change in emphasis on crops produced, we have undergone a change in methods of production. Machines have replaced hand tools; volume production is stressed; fertilizer is used liberally; and cultivation practices have been altered. All of these changes are serving to alert the world to the fact that the South is awakening and will soon be ready to take her place among the great agricultural-producing areas of the world.

Yes, friends, we in agriculture have a heritage of which we can justly be proud. We embraced this great Nation when she was but a mere child. We have nurtured her through her most trying times, and now we stand with her in her moments of glory. Yet let us take warning against being content to rest upon laurels already won as even now our great Nation is faced with what may be the greatest menace in all of her history. Our country needs us, and we shall supply that need if it be in our power to do so, and then we can say with the poet, Harry Kemp:

"It was I who raised from famine all the hordes of tribes of man
I have never ceased nor faltered since the tilth of field began."

This Man Is Not Expendable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following article written by Mrs. Myrtle B. MacArthur, box 220, rural route 2, Morrow, Ohio:

THIS MAN IS NOT EXPENDABLE

(By Myrtle MacArthur)

For years there has been a policy in industry of refusing employment to applicants over 40, and, in some instances, even over 35 years of age. Preference has been given to inexperienced youth over mature and experienced workers, the majority of whom are heads of families at the most critical period of married life, when their children need support and guidance most urgently.

According to the Director of the Census Bureau, the average age of married men in the United States is 43.2 years.

When the family man reaches the age of 40, he has but partially fulfilled his responsibilities as a husband, father, and homemaker. Not all men of 40 are blessed with children, but, if so, the ages of the children will range from the formative years of childhood to teen age. Even a casual check in your own community will reveal information which will correspond closely with the results of a survey made by the writer.

A questionnaire was given to pupils of the high-school age. The parents of 3,348 children were considered in this survey, including younger and older children than those attending high school. The answers came from the entire enrollment of one vocational high school (346); the enrollment of a small suburban high school (119); and pupils attending a cosmopolitan high school (544).

The ages of the 1009 fathers are grouped as follows: under 40, 135; 40, 42; 41 to 45 (inclusive), 267; 46 to 50, 279; 51 to 55, 155; 56 to 60, 83; 61 to 65, 33; 66 to 73, 15. The average age in this particular group is 46.9 years.

Compare the figures above and note that the fathers under 40 represent but 13 percent of the family men in this survey. In this group the marriages were at a very early age, indicated by the age of the eldest child as given by pupils. More than 58 percent are from 40 to 50; the parents 51 to 55 exceed in number those under 40. A pupil whose father was 73 was born when the father was 57 years of age.

The number of children in each family ranged from 1 to 14 (inclusive); the ages of the 3,348 children were from 1 week to high school age, and older. The father of the 1-week-old baby was 40 years of age.

If the usefulness in industry of a man ends at the age of 40, what will happen to the family unit, the fundamental basis of our Government? Shall Government agencies, welfare organizations, and private charity replace the father, whom nature intended to be the provider and the guardian of his children's right to normal life and development. Shall the children be state-reared?

No minor reason or excuse will suffice for the major blunder of such a policy. Usefulness in industry cannot be classified by age; each age has its share of competents and incompetents. There are different levels of ability at all ages and different levels of character. The determining factor should be ability and physical and mental condition. Is it possible that the men of today are inferior in these qualities to their forefathers who worked until later years in life and reared their families, met all responsibilities, and at the same time built up a great Nation? Our standards are supposed to be higher, and science is credited with having achieved much towards physical improvement and prolongation of life. A man between 40 and 50 should be in his prime, and maturity and experience are valuable assets to industry.

Since the discrimination against men over 40, social problems have multiplied. Public and private social agencies have increased and are numerous and varied. Family life has been disrupted and many homes broken. Case workers must find foster homes for more and more children. Children for whom no provision can be made are left to live in want. Delinquency of youth has become a national problem. Of course, there are other causes for these conditions, but unemployment of the 40-plus family man has made its contribution. Social agencies are inadequate to meet the needs.

Uncertainty and insecurity are seeds of crime and of delinquency. The spirit of youth is misled. The guidance of a father can overcome many evil influences that could affect his children.

Our precious youth must have parental support and guidance until prepared for a career. They must have the necessary period to train for a field of employment. The young man must visualize a life of usefulness for the years ahead to feel encouraged to plan a home of his own.

The 40-plus man is very important to industry and to our Nation. Our whole social structure is threatened when he is refused his rightful place in the economic life of our country. If the family unit is not protected, our American way of life is endangered.

If pension regulations, rules, or laws of the present day are reasons offered for the discrimination against the 40-plus man, they should be adjusted, changed, or abolished. The cost of adjustment of pension systems will not equal the cost to the Nation of the sacrifice of the basic family unit.

Tax Informers May Be Watching You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, there are many unpleasant things about income taxes, but one of the worst is the fact that through the ferreting out of irregularities in tax returns people can be punished for other and entirely unrelated crimes.

The role of the informer is also a pretty sordid and ugly one and the idea that a spiteful neighbor or angry business competitor can turn you in and give state's evidence without ever being seen or heard smacks a little too much of the Gestapo to be welcome in the United States of America.

The following article shows that perhaps the role of an informer is at times dangerous. Let us hope that our Government will soon be able to dispense with their services altogether. There never was a partially good egg, and there never will be a partially good snooper:

TAX INFORMERS MAY BE WATCHING YOU

(By Martin Abramson)

The young model was addressing the last batch of wedding invitations when the postman buzzed her front door with a special delivery letter. The handwritten scrawl exploded in her face like a time bomb: "Guess this makes me seem like a heel, but I've decided that marriage just wouldn't be right for us, after all."

Since breach of promise suits were outlawed in most States, few jilted females have been able to salve a broken heart with financial balm, but this case was an exception. The model promptly talked a blue streak to the local internal revenue office about her exfiance's habit of juggling the books of his meatpacking firm and charging social expenses off as business deductions. The tax men tagged him for $40,000 in back taxes and penalties and handed the girl a $3,000 reward for "information services rendered."

Tax informing, a quaint American sport, seems to grow in popularity every time an income-tax instalment is due. Internal revenue offices in big cities like New York, Chicago, St. Louis, and Los Angeles are deluged by as many as 250 mail and phone tips every day. Like the stoolpigeons who operate behind the scenes to solve crimes for police and district attorneys, the tax informer is internal revenue's most lethal secret weapon and a prime reason why it pays to be honest with your Uncle Sam. Tax informing pays off for the Government—over the years, Uncle Sam has collected $65 million as a result of tips. It also pays off for the tattle-tale—the Government appropriates $500,000 each year as reward money.

An informer can get up to 10 percent of the taxes collected. The biggest such reward in history—$79,999.90—was paid out to a foursome of exemployees of a large corporation which had set up phony holding companies to evade millions in taxes. The smallest—$2.29—went to a woman who didn't like her plumber and discovered he'd secretly sold a few pipes for cash.

Who are the tax informers? They are neighbors, maids, butlers, bookkeepers, accountants, lawyers, exwives, jilted sweethearts, tenants, business competitors, inlaws, and waiters with big ears. Their motives run the gamut of human emotions—revenge, jealousy, greed, spite, and dozens of others.

A bridegroom who was made an executive of his father-in-law's taxicab firm got sore when he couldn't get a partnership and blew the whistle on his pa-in-law's undeclared income. A waiter, irate over the grubby tips a noted financier doled out to him, heard the man talking about secret cash deposits and ran to the nearest internal revenue office.

A lovelorn dental assistant who had remained loyal to her dentist employer even when he married and divorced four other women finally decided she'd had it when she saw his will and discovered she was in for only $200. She trilled a loud carol about bank accounts maintained under false names and the tax men moved in for a $20,000 kill.

A woman who felt her doctor had failed to treat her properly for an intestinal disorder kept watch outside his office for weeks and made a careful count of his patients. She then turned in her report to the Tax Bureau which discovered the physician had seriously belittled his practice on his annual return.

Alcohol is an important ally of the informer and the tax collector. "The fellow who's had one too many and starts bragging about how he's fooled the Government doesn't realize there may be a lot of amateur collectors listening," a veteran tax agent points out.

Not all of these "collectors" are looking for rewards. Some turn in reports for reasons of patriotism or simply because they feel, "I paid my taxes, so why should he get away with it?"

The Treasury, of course, doesn't bother to analyze motives, good or bad, for informing. "People who bring in valid information about tax evaders are helping the country and that's all we're interested in," says T. Coleman Andrews, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Tax officials make it clear, however, that informers can't use them to settle personal feuds or serve as a private detective agency. One woman dropped into the Seattle office ostensibly to inform on her tax-dodging husband.

"When you catch up to him, let me know, because I want to slap him with a summons," she said. When she was told that tax investigations are conducted in secret and that even if her missing spouse were found she wouldn't be given his address, she stalked out in a huff.

From time to time people have tried—unsuccessfully—to make tax-informing a profession. A bookkeeper got so enthused over a $500 reward he began changing jobs every few months, staying just long enough in each place to rifle through back accounts, vouchers, and petty-cash books. Instead of getting more rewards, he nearly went to jail.

One man spent months hanging around the race tracks on the theory that he'd find schemers and evaders in every stall. He filed reams of information about famous horsemen, breeders and jockeys but when the tax men found he was simply lifting and distorting gossip items from the racing sheets he was told to peddle his papers elsewhere.

Every year all the prominent names of society—the Vanderbilts, the Astors, the Whitneys—and virtually all important stars of sports and show business are turned in by overeager informers. They blithely assume that successful, well-publicized individuals always cheat on their taxes. But the Treasury doesn't recognize such vague tips. There's no payoff unless you supply specific information and details.

Rewards for legitimate informers' tips sometimes carry their own curse. A payroll clerk who collected $2,000 for tattling on his boss not only got fired but couldn't get steady work again. The boss followed him from job to job, notifying each new employer they were hiring a sneak.

The prize example, however, is a woman who worked for many years as bookkeeper in a large electrical company. She quit when she couldn't get a raise, tattled about the double set of books the company maintained and got a $15,000 reward.

Two years later, she herself was haled into court. She had neglected to report a substantial private income on her own tax returns and had failed to report her reward money as income. Fines and penalties cost her more than the $15,000 Uncle Sam had given her and she had to spend 90 days in jail.

The moral of all this seems to be: If you're an informer who really wants to help your Government, Uncle Sam will be grateful and generous. But if you're completely without principle and try to play both ends against the middle, sooner or later you'll be caught in a squeeze.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, since the fateful day when our beloved friend and colleague, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was stricken with a heart ailment and taken to Bethesda Naval Hospital, many editorials have been written about this great leader and statesman.

Of the hundreds of articles I have read, none touched me so deeply as that written by a mutual friend of ours, Mr. Tom S. Whitehead, publisher of the Brenham-Banner Press, of Brenham, Tex., in his column, the Spectator. Mr. Whitehead's tribute to and concern for Senator JOHNSON is so simply and beautifully expressed that I believe every Member of Congress would want to read it.

I therefore, under unanimous consent, include the article by Mr. Whitehead in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SPECTATOR—PRAYERS FOR LYNDON—THE PACE THAT KILLS—TRIBUTE TO HIS FRIENDS—HIS GREATEST FIGHT

Many Brenham and Washington County friends of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON are responding to the appeal of his colleague, Senator PRICE DANIEL, and are praying for recovery of the senior Senator of Texas. He lies critically ill in a naval hospital at Bethesda, Md., after a heart attack suffered last Saturday. He is definitely unable to resume his duties as majority leader in the United States Senate until next January. The future course of his political career hinges upon how complete a recovery he is able to gain.

Those of us who have known LYNDON JOHNSON for the last 18 or 20 years are shocked at his sudden collapse but not too surprised. A man cannot keep up the driving pace he has maintained during those years without suffering consequences. We first became acquainted with JOHNSON in 1937 when, upon the death of Congressman J. P. Buchanan, he resigned his position as NYA Administrator for Texas to enter the scramble for his seat in a special election. We observed the whirlwind tactics of the young political aspirant then. He lost no time in announcing for the job as a 100-percent supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He would get up at the crack of dawn, campaign all day and as far into the night as feasible, and then come by the Austin American office, where we worked, to check up on the news and the progress of the campaign. We recall one time when he started at the Congress Avenue bridge and made his way door to door all the way up to the capitol, shaking hands with every storekeeper and every clerk and helper he could find. As a matter of fact his ability to shake hands and get away with good grace was one of JOHNSON'S political strong points. It enabled him to see hundreds if not thousands of voters in a day whereas a less able campaigner would get stuck with long-winded conversationalists and could count a day's contacts only in the scores.

That first campaign for Congress was a dilly. There were 8 or 9 candidates for the office, many of them already well known. On the other hand, JOHNSON was not too well known to the voters and he had to become acquainted with them within the 30-day campaign. He did such a good job, however, that a week before the election we made a tour of the district, asking people whom they thought would win, and found the weight of public opinion favored JOHNSON. We predicted his election over the field. Although he finished the campaign in the hospital, having to undergo an appendix operation, he won handily and started his meteoric rise in the political world.

Although JOHNSON is only 46, tall, dark, and handsome, he has been plagued with ailments at crucial points in his career. We recall one campaign for reelection to Congress when JOHNSON was laid low with gallstones. His faithful wife, Ladybird, took the stump in his behalf and made a very favorable impression on the voters. He was, of course, reelected. He has had recurrent trouble from the stones, but a checkup at Mayo Clinic early this year revealed he was in good physical condition.

However, JOHNSON'S enthusiasm for his job and his desire to do all he can for his constituents have led him to overtax his physical makeup. Dutch Hohn can testify to that. We recall when Dutch was Washington County agent. He invited LYNDON down to tour the county and explain the newly enacted cotton allotment program. The two made a community-by-community tour of the entire county, speaking to groups wherever they could be found. The day was hot as blazes, but that didn't slow up the Congressman. He even stopped on the roadside to help a woman repair a flat tire. By nightfall, Dutch was pooped, but LYNDON was still going strong. Of course, since JOHNSON has become United States Senator, his duties have greatly increased. His responsibilities have been tremendous, but he has discharged them well, even at the possible cost of his own life.

Senator JOHNSON has always been wise in the choice of his aids and fortunate in the number and devotion of his friends. Many of them have worked incessantly in his behalf, paced by the Senator himself. We recently wrote about this in our column, commenting on the possibility of his being the next Democratic nominee for President. Only last week we received a letter from the Senator in which he said: "I appreciate what you said about me in your column on June 20 and I appreciate even more what you said about my friends. It is certainly true that my greatest strength is in my friends. I am the most fortunate man in the world in this respect."

But now, LYNDON JOHNSON has reached a point where he is beyond the help of his friends, anxious as they are to do whatever they can. They can only offer their prayers and hope for the best. It is up to LYNDON himself, the skill of the doctors, and providence. But knowing LYNDON as we do—his joy of living, his desire to keep on helping his country and his friends, his determined will—we predict he will win this greatest fight of his life and return once more to the position of power and greatness to which his ability, his efforts, and destiny have brought him. At least, that is our sincere hope.

Foreign Aid Money for Tito in Mutual Security Program Is of Questionable Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in consideration of both the authorization and the appropriation bill relating to the mutual security program for 1956 there has been considerable discussion regarding the advisability of furnishing military and economic aid to Communist Tito.

As part of my remarks I am inserting a letter received from a man who knows the dangers that exist in doing business with Tito. Mr. William H. Smyth, of New York City, is an authority on this subject and I commend to Members of this House his detailed statement on the dangers that exist in authorizing and appropriating money for assistance to this Communist leader and his cohorts:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 10, 1955.*

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Representative from the First District Wisconsin, Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Your membership in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs makes you, it seems to me, in what concerns our Foreign Affairs, a representative of all Americans, not merely of those from your own Wisconsin First District.

Therefore, and knowing your special interest in the generally misunderstood Tito-Communist Yugoslavia situation, and having had 35 years contact with the Yugoslavs myself, I'd like to exercise my right as a citizen of our great Republic to send you, as one of my representatives on Foreign Affairs, my ideas on the present unhealthy situation for the United States in financing Tito, and on the recently highly successful visit of top Soviet leaders to Yugoslavia.

My reason for writing is simple. It's from a desire to try to help save American lives in world war III, which, as everyone who really is acquainted with world communism knows, will start the day the Soviets feel sure of victory in it. Naturally we will lose a lot of our good American lives in that war, but why lose more than necessary? Why follow the suicidal policy of financing Tito's Communists and thereby lose the trust of the enslaved peoples of the world, whose help in sabotage and fighting may be the very addition to our assumed technical superiority which will be needed to ensure our victory in that war, and with a minimum loss of American lives?

If the women of America, the mothers, wives, daughters, sisters and sweethearts of the men who will be candidates for death in world war III would have any idea of what our aid to Tito has meant, and today means, in building Communist potential for making war against us, don't you imagine they would ask why our supposedly anti-Communist government insists on financing the Yugoslav Communists who their men will have to fight in world war III?

Continuation of our aid to Tito, especially after Kruschev, Bulganin and Mikoyan's visit to Yugoslavia, will cause the enslaved peoples of the world to wonder still more whether the United States actually is anti-Communist. It will decrease their already shaky trust in us, and could cause them in world war III to watch from the sidelines in an indifference based on their appraisal of our hard-cash policy of aiding Tito as indicating our real approval of world communism, which they hate.

Mr. Smith, my reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30 shows that the Members of our House know that Tito is an international Communist, that he has received a staggering amount of aid from us, that he has not kept his side of agreements made with us, and that he is a murderous, dictatorial Communist, whose regime, completely Communist, is openly opposed by its principles to our own United States.

Therefore, instead of giving further confirmation of that, which it seems to me, you and your colleagues already know, I'd like to call your attention to a few points, vital and of actual, present day interest, which appear to have been overlooked by the newspapers and our administration which serves you and us.

The New York Times of July 9, 1955, under headline, "Belgrade Favors Europe Council Bid," reported that Yugoslavia "would 'consider' an invitation to join the Council of Europe if it were extended," while today's Times reports under headline, "New Yugoslav Ties to West Indicated," states: "An extraordinary luncheon meeting of French Cabinet ministers with Ales Bebler, Yugoslav envoy to France, today oiled the hinges of the Council of Europe for Belgrade's entry into Western European organizations."

It's always well to know with whom one does business. Therefore, and to help you gentlemen to weigh such reports properly, the following information, which I believe is correct, about Ales Bebler, is submitted to you:

(a) Bebler is a dyed-in-the-wool international Communist, who for his services to the revolution and to the Yugoslav Communists in World War II, was proclaimed a national hero, the highest award granted by the Yugoslav Communists and only to their most loyal and trusted members. During part of World War II, Bebler was a colonel in their dreaded secret police, the UDBA. In December he was given the rank of colonel-general in the reserve, obviously another recognition for services to communism well performed.

(b) Bebler has been one of the principal pleaders in the Yugoslav Communist Government for the interests of the Spanish Socialist (Communist) Party in Exile, which has its Embassy in Belgrade. You of course must know that many of Tito's top men served with the Spanish Communists against Franco in the Spanish Civil War, through which General Franco expelled the Communists from Spain.

Early this year the Belgrade Ambassador of the Spanish Socialist (Communist) Party in Exile asked a loan of the Yugoslav Communist Party, doing this through his intimate friend Ales Bebler. The loan, $50,000, was granted, and paid February 15, 1955, to the Ambassador, by the Central Committee of the Yugoslav Communist Party. Possibly some of those dollars came from American grants to Tito.

The Spanish Socialist (Communist) Party in Exile serves world communism well, as its intelligence service, which until recently operated in France (possibly still does) turns all its information over to the Communist Yugoslav Intelligence Service, not directly

but through its Embassy in Belgrade * * * and in all probability for transmission as required on to Moscow. Isn't it strange for us to finance Tito and thus enable him to finance the Spanish Communist in Exile whose main purpose must be to work for the overthrow of Franco's government?

(c) Bebler, a capable man, is considered by the Yugoslav Communists to be an expert on the Far East, especially for India and Indochina, and for some important far-eastern problems. They feel that in him they have a man suitable for handling far-eastern matters connected with United States and French policy. But when you consider that Yugoslavia, outside of buying some jute for making sacks, has practically speaking no connection with the Far East, one realizes that the sole Yugoslav inteerst in the Far East is in the furtherance of world communism, one of the aims of which is the destruction of our United States Government, and the taking over of our people.

Mr. SMITH, surely you and most Members of the House remember the lines from that immortal American ballad, Frankie and Johnny, running:

"Now Frankie she went to the corner
But she didn't go there for no fun
For under her dirty kimono
She carried a forty-four gun
She was a looking for the man who done her wrong."

Doesn't it strike you that when a Communist government like Tito's pledged to the advancement of the world revolution, which means to the destruction of our country, and all other free countries, states that it is willing to consider entering several European organizations of free countries, that they too are not doing it "for no fun"?

Under their dirty kimono of communism they will be sitting in those organizations as agents for world communism, and judging by their known record of voting in the United Nations, and on their formal statements regarding policy, they'll vote as Moscow would vote, could Moscow be there. They will do Moscow's business, and knowing our plans in advance, the man they'll be looking for, and to kill, will be the United States in particular, for the United States is the only power which can stop world communism—and they've got to knock us off.

Surely you've noticed that since that highly successful visit of Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Mikoyan to Yugoslavia (while General Zukov kept the home fires burning), the Soviets have developed a genial, almost an American "greeter" spirit, shown publicly from San Francisco to Moscow.

Possibly I'm wrong, but I can't help thinking this may be just another of Tito's real contributions to the Soviets. It's my opinion that while entertaining the Soviet leaders on his private island of Brioni, formerly open to the public, he could have quoted the Yugoslav peasant proverb, "A bird is not caught with a closed hand," and added, "Gentlemen, be open-handed, more genial. It's easy to fool the Americans. Just tell them what they want to hear. You don't have to do what you promise, but promise anyhow. They love promises."

The bird in this case is of course to put over the idea of coexistence, of neutrality, of peace-and-goodwill, all to get the United States of America out of Europe and encircling bases, and to get consumer goods from us to enable them to keep their peoples quiet while they concentrate all their own production on war production. They can pay for those consumer goods with their gold, produced with slave labor at about $7 per ounce, and thus have time for their excellent engineers and scientists to go ahead on their jets, missiles, or what they need, to enable them, when the time suits them, to conquer us.

That Soviet visit to Yugoslavio increased Tito's prestige in the whole Communist world, and will give him more weight with the blind West. He was confirmed again as head of the Yugoslav Communist Party, which never would have been the case had he not been 100 percent loyal to world communism in actual policy and deed during the past 7 years in which our western policy-makers have kept themselves happy thinking that he would come over to our side. Apparently the Communists have gone back to the basic Lenin doctrine of "collective leadership," from which, for so many years, Stalin deviated as an absolute dictator. This should mean better teamwork among the Communists, and far greater danger for us. And as they are working toward a long-view goal, if they find one strategy won't work, they'll change at once to another—but policy will remain.

Mr. SMITH, why must we finance our own destruction? That is what the financing of any Communist government means, as I see it. Our help sent to Soviet Russia in 1920–21, saved the lives of a few million good Russians, but saved the Soviet Government, and enabled it to keep in slavery all the Russians, and to kill many more millions during the past 35 years. Our help given to Tito, may have saved some Yugoslavs, but not too many judging by reports, that is people outside of the party and the military, but it enabled Tito to hold the 17 million Yugoslavs in slavery with no chance for regaining their freedom. Why must we do it?

In closing, I'd like to repeat that we must do something to hold the trust of the enslaved peoples in us, to have their help in world war III. One of the best ways to do that, in my opinion, will be to stop at once all aid to Communist Yugoslavia, and simultaneously to make a declaration to the Soviets and their satellites that we expect them to respect the "independence" which Tito claims. Hence we will consider the crossing of the Yugoslav frontier by 1 Soviet or 1 satellite soldier as the unfriendly invasion of a free country, which we will consider as their declaration of world war III, to which we immediately will react against them with all the means at our disposal.

It is highly unlikely that the Soviets will risk starting such a war, hence the Yugoslavs, not having to worry about intervention against them from outside, would find their own way to rid themselves of Tito and his Communist slavemasters, to regain their freedom, and to set up a government genuinely friendly and loyal to us and to the free world.

Such positive action would electrify the enslaved peoples of the world, give them hope again, in all probability start the breaking up of the present world Communist bloc, and give the world at long last a chance of going about its business of living in peace.

Finally, I ask again, why must we continue to finance Tito and his murderous band, people opposed to practically everything we hold dear, and who according to the tenets of their communism are working for our destruction?

In view of this, may I suggest for you and your colleagues guidance in reaching your decision regarding the continuation or cessation of our aid to the world Communist Tito and his murderous government, that you consider the words of Jesus Christ, quoted in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, seventh chapter and sixth verse: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you."

Hoping that Congress wil stop all aid to Communist Yugoslavia and consider the proposed policy suggested above as a means of giving to our Yugoslav friends the chance to regain again their freedom.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. SMYTH.

The Mutual Security Appropriation Bill for 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, once again the people of this United States are being asked to buy friends and friendship. Perhaps that is a bit brutal, but if we are to be realistic, that is just what we are doing if we approve the mutual security appropriation bill for 1956.

Certainly we should be realistic; in fact, this appropriation bill might well be termed a question of realities versus dreams. While we all like to have pleasant dreams, although that might be a major task during this humid, hot weather with which we are plagued, nevertheless these dreams must be kept out of the Halls of Congress, or they may turn out to be nightmares.

I, personally, like to face reality. It is a reality that the avowed aim of the Communist world is to bankrupt the United States through wild spending. This was stated very clearly by Lenin in an interview with the New York Telegram in 1924 when he said:

Some day the Soviet Union will compel the United States to spend itself to destruction.

It is a dream that we can continue to pour billion after billions of dollars overseas without seriously weakening the economic structure of this Nation and thereby the free world.

It is a reality no friend who was bought and paid for ever equaled a friend who was that for friendship's sake and because of mutual trust and agreement. I very definitely would not depend on loyalty that can be easily bought and sold. The "Go home, you dirty Yank" signs show the results of this friendship.

It is a dream that foreign-aid billions will buy a strong free world in which all is peace and light. Yet this dream persists despite the fact that much of our foreign aid has resulted in nations which are weaker, more dependent, and more anti-Western than before.

It is a reality that much foreign aid has been eaten up, as former Ambassador Chester Bowles had said, by "Cadillacs and French perfume, champagne, and evening gowns."

It is a dream that this money is giving people needed "bulldozers, fertilizer, electric motors and penicillin," to quote Mr. Bowles again.

It is a reality that the Foreign Operations Administration, now the International Cooperation Administration, has $8.7 billion dollars in unexpended but authorized funds. Therefore, this new appropriation would give more than $12 billion dollars for spending.

It is a dream that this authorization is the major defense against communism. We need to be strong economically, militarily and spirtually—"We" that is, not some other nation which cannot be counted on when needed. Not some nation that sells its friendship and

loyalty. I believe in technical assistance for nations on whom we can count, but $12 billion in foreign-aid spending is going too far.

There are many more realities and dreams in this bubble of foreign-aid spending. And this bubble must be burst. Let the authorization be used up and then include foreign aid as a regular part of our annual budget, letting all funds be accounted for each time a new appropriation is made.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to awake from this dream of spending our way to glory and face the realities of a world divided into two camps—one dedicated to slavery and the other to freedom.

Hope in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article, written by Daniel A. Poling.

Dr. Poling is the editor of the Christian Herald and chaplain of the Chapel of Four Chaplains:

HOPE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(By Daniel A. Poling)

Within the past few months there has been a remarkable change for the better in the moral climate and political geography of the Middle East. Until recently this strategic corner of Asia seemed doomed to slide steeply into chaos and to fall eventually an easy prey to Communist aggression. This outcome would have been a major disaster to the free world, for the Middle East is the reservoir for more than half the world's supply of oil and commands the land bridge to the teeming millions and incalculable wealth of Africa.

The Middle East was rife with bitter internal feuds and external resentments against the old colonial powers, Britain and France, which still maintained a precarious foothold of empire in the area. Some of these fears and hatreds had been transferred in post-World War II years to our own country. Our historic part in the liberation and re-establishment of ancient Israel had been sadly misconstrued by honest but misguided men, and wilfully distorted by malicious troublemakers.

Israel's rebirth, however, was not the sole or in my view the most indigestible bone of contention between the Arab world and the West. I am one of those who maintain that God's will has been done through the miracle of Israel's restoration, and I have pride in the fact that our country was the first of the nations to recognize His purpose in the renewal of Zion.

But whether we like it or not, America had inherited the burden of leadership in the Middle East from the weary shoulders of the British and packed in that knapsack of responsibility was a fair share of odium and suspicion.

What has happened in recent months to help remove in part the causes of hatred and fear of America? First of all, our policy—and it is a bipartisan policy—of strengthening Turkey as our main bulwark of defense against overt Communist attack has begun to pay substantial dividends. The Turks are now our friends and allies. They fought bravely at our side in Korea in spite of all the threats of their truculent neighbor to the north. I think we can fairly claim that we are the first Western nation in history to enjoy a relationship of real friendship with Turkey, which sturdily resisted for centuries the blandishments and pressures of European powers.

The reason for Turkish trust and faith in the United States, so clearly demonstrated by the good-will visit of President Celal Bayar earlier this year, is not only because we have helped the Turks build up their military strength, but even more important, given them economic assistance which has enabled them to raise their standard of living and remove the danger of communism from within. There is a moral in this which we should not be slow to appreciate, and which should be continued and passed on to yet other countries and peoples.

By making friends with Turkey we have begun to forge a chain of defensive alliances along the southern flank of the Soviet Union from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean. Turkey, Greece, and Pakistan are the pivots of this line of defense. This again is an American first. Never before in recorded history has an alliance of this kind to bar barbarian aggression against the Middle East been attempted. And a larger unity to bar such aggression, a unity of all nations and peoples who have a common monotheistic faith, begins to appear. At the recently held plenary session of the World Council of Churches, Muslim observers were in attendance. In a statement issued to the council and released to the press, these dramatic and prophetic words appear:

"It is the prime duty of the leaders of our two monotheistic faiths to establish real and abiding friendship not only among their own adherents, but also between themselves and the followers of other faiths as well. We should collaborate as believers in the one God in defending the world against the menaces of atheism and materialism."

But immediately we are on the eve of winning, in Iran, a new and willing partner to this already formed alliance. Iran is slowly but surely overcoming its suspicions of American motives. How sharp the contrast between the situation today and that of a year or so ago, when the crypto-Communist Tudeh Party was about to seize power from the faltering hands of the fanatical Mossadegh. Happily, the new Iranian Prime Minister, General Zahedi, recognized where the true interests of his country lay. And what is more, an American Presidential envoy, Herbert Hoover, Jr., now Under Secretary of State, played a leading role in solving the knotty problem of the Iranian oil fields, thus removing one of the chief obstacles to Iran's participation in alliance with the West. For the first time the Iranians feel, and are justified in feeling, that they are getting a square deal from the West and that they are sharing more adequately in the benefits of their own natural resources.

Now let us turn farther south to Egypt, a country of immense strategic importance because of its control of the Suez waterway and the land route from Asia to Africa. Here again another honest stateman of the emerging American foreign policy, Ambassador Jefferson Caffrey, has scored a signal triumph by umpiring to a successful conclusion the long-drawn-out negotiations between Britain and Egypt for the evacuation of British troops from the Suez Canal zone. And in this we have also well served our ally, Britain.

Egypt has chafed at British control for the past 75 years. She was, under Farouk, first an uncertain neutral and then an unwilling partner in the war against Hitler and Mussolini. Now at last she is on her own without foreign entanglements and it is to be hoped that she will use her new freedom wisely and well.

That's the credit side of the ledger of American diplomacy in the Middle East. It shows a profit that few believed possible little more than a year ago. What remains to be done?

First of all, I believe, we have now reached the point at which American diplomacy must make a forthright effort to convince the great Arab countries that Israel is in the Middle East to stay and to stay as a good neighbor and friend. Surely on our record we are entitled to advance this point of view without being subjected to abuse and recrimination. Or at least we can hope that such abuse and recrimination will not deceive our Arab friends.

It will avail us little if in the rear of our position of strength from Turkey to Pakistan, we simply tolerate the continuation of the present hot-and-cold war on the Arab-Israel frontiers. I believe we should take steps to make it possible for both the Arab States and Israel to play their part in the defense of the Middle East by supplying them with arms and technical military assistance. But it would be criminal folly to do so before the uneasy armistice along these borders has been replaced by a genuine peace. You don't give a gun license to a man who keeps on saying he's going to shoot his neighbor before he has a go at the burglar.

If we have greatly aided Israel, we have also given Nasser a great diplomatic prize in the British evacuation of Suez. We can help him in his high purpose to turn the Valley of the Nile into an earthly paradise for its up-to-now impoverished and diseased peasantry. On the other hand, we must not risk making it possible for Egypt or any other country to engage in military adventures at the price of both Egypt's welfare and the security of the Middle East.

At this stage of our relations with Egypt, I am convinced that we have every right to seek the termination of the Egyptian blockade of the Suez Canal and the sea approaches to Israel, and to secure the restoration of the freedom of shipping which has been a cardinal feature of American policy since our own War of Independence. It is quite intolerable that any government should maintain a blacklist of American shippers and traders whose vessels have called at Israel ports, and deny them the international right of free passage of the Suez Canal.

Next on our agenda should be a patient but determined attempt to get to the roots of the tensions between the Arab states and Israel and to persuade them, as we did in the case of Britain and Egypt, to remove these tensions themselves.

At the present time, the major issue between the Arabs and Israel is the plight of 800,000 refugees from Palestine. Sometimes it is not understood that these unhappy folk are the victims of a war of aggression against Israel at Israel's very hour of birth, a war which had as its aim driving the people of Israel into the sea. Memories are short and it is sometimes convenient to forget the facts of history, even recent history. We surely cannot accept a rewritten version of history, which makes the Jews the villains of the piece.

But also we must not ignore the acute problem which centers in the Christian refugee whose condition has steadily deteriorated or who has found asylum chiefly in Lebanon. And this Lebanon is another small land of vast intellectual and spiritual proportions. With a population of 1 million, its government is the only Christian government in the Middle East, but with all the freedoms that we enjoy in the United States and with these freedoms open to all. The story of Lebanon, through 50 years and particularly since complete independence was established, is worthy of presenta-

tion in the history books of any time. Her Ambassador in Washington, Charles Malik, who has been also Lebanon's chief representative in the United Nations, is a former President of the General Assembly. He ranks today among the first statesmen of the free nations.

For their part, the Jews of Israel have gathered to their bosom more than three-quarters of a million widows and orphans, destitute and homeless, aged and sick, all the sad remnant of Hitler's gas chambers and of Communist pogroms in Eastern Europe. They have ransomed tens of thousands from North Africa. What is more, besides a haven they have given these displaced persons the opportunity of productive life in a community of brotherhood. Is it too much to expect that the Arab governments should now, and with United Nations assistance, do likewise for tens of thousands of Palestine refugees, who were lured away from their homes and fields by promise of speedy victory and the spoils of triumph?

The population of Israel is 1,750,000; that of the Arab States 45 million. The area of Israel is 8,000 square miles; that of the Arab States nearly 3 million. The figures speak for themselves. I find it difficult to believe that this tiny minority can really challenge the existence of nations so much vaster than itself.

In this dilemma of fear and suspicion between the Arab countries and Israel, both sides hit out at each other from time to time angrily but indecisively. It is the duty of a good friend, as I believe America is entitled to be regarded by Arab and Jew alike, to step in and assuage the quarrel. To begin with, we may catch a few random sideswipes, but in the long run we shall be respected for our intervention. The least we can do is to say, "Why can't you two sit down together and work the problem out by yourselves?"

In late September of 1954 the announcement that Israel would release unconditionally to Arab refugees all funds they had on deposit in the banks of Israel spells out hope of peace across the fear-darkened sky of the Middle East. The total amounts to $8,500,000. The agreement, for it is that, has been concluded by the Israeli Government through the Palestine Conciliation Commission. One-third of this total amount had been released earlier.

Previous to this announcement it had been said that accounts should not be paid unless there were payment by Arab nations on property left by Jews who had migrated to Israel. Now it appears that other measures of a conciliatory nature are to follow.

Immediate reaction from Jordan indicated that the whole situation was considered of major importance in the Arab world. Leading Arab newspapers in Jerusalem had banner headlines on the subject. Editorial comments were critical but complete reports were given—reports that were eminently fair.

Preceding Israel's freeing of the cash of Arab refugees, there was an Arabic-language broadcast on the Israeli Government radio. This was an interview with Gideon Rafael, who heads the middle eastern desk of the Foreign Ministry. In addition to what he said about the freeing of cash, Rafael stated that Israel would find a practical plan for interregional communication across the Negev and also that she was prepared to grant Jordan facilities in the harbor of Haifa, with transit rights for goods through Israeli territory.

Let the free world pray that all of this sums up to definite progress toward peace in the Middle East.

Reconciliation is the imperative of this troubled but high hour in the Middle East.

Let us try to show these ancient peoples to whom our civilization owes so much how with our help, which in the long run means helping ourselves, they may restore the blessed corner of God's earth which they are privileged to call their home.

Take the Arabs first. The markets for their vast resources of oil lie in the western world. They cannot possibly absorb this vast product by themselves. But they are the beneficiaries of hundreds of millions of dollars in royalties each year, which fruitfully invested in national development could make the whole Middle East a land of comfort and progress. And with the establishment of peace, millions of dollars would be available from the private capital of the West.

The Middle East has great unexploited areas of land and water, which have not been properly employed since Roman days. The valleys of the Nile, Tigris, Euphrates, Orontes could support populations many times larger than they now have. All that is needed is to end the sterile feud along the borders of ancient Palestine and to cultivate these Edenic gardens with the energy and industry which, in other times, have made the Arab nations the leaders of civilization.

As for Israel, I cannot take seriously the view, sometimes too readily accepted by some westerners, that she will eventually expand beyond the frontiers achieved during her war of liberation. But we must also see to it that every justified fear of such aggression is removed.

Israel cannot afford to make war upon her neighbors. She needs time and peace to develop her economic strength. Five times in the past 10 years I have visited Israel and three times since 1949 I have visited the Arab countries. I have intimate friends and associations in all these lands. Particularly, organizations with which I am connected have contributed to the support of orphanges and of refugee children in Lebanon and Jordan. Also I have watched the amazing economic, industrial and social development within Israel that has literally made the desert blossom as the rose.

I believe that Israel's leaders see her future not as an empire, but as another Switzerland, small in area, but rich in self-reliance, able to make her way in the world through development in the arts of peace and thus renewing her great ancestral contribution to the world's welfare.

We must never allow Israel to feel that she has been abandoned to her fate. Beyond all else Israel has something priceless to offer the world—faith in resurrection. I do not believe that history is always on the side of the biggest battalions. Otherwise all our principles and values would long since have succumbed to the pressure of the barbarians. In adversity, we do not think of abandoning Chiang Kai-shek, who fought at our side in the most desperate struggle in our history. Similarly with Israel, whose citizens, then the Jews of Palestine, were numbered among our faithful allies.

I do not agree with those doleful souls who pessimistically think that the Arab-Israel quarrel is here to stay till doomsday. The history of the Middle East flatly contradicts that fatalistic assumption. Turk and Arab now live peaceably as neighbors after centuries of Ottoman rule. I see no reason why Jew and Arab cannot do the same after time has healed the rancors and wounds of the recent past.

For the defense of the Middle East we need the cooperation of all its peoples. Next to the Turks, Israel's capacity for self-defense has already been amply demonstrated in time of war, and simple concepts of geography dictate her participation in the overall alliance. We can, I believe, through a system of mutual guaranties, eradicate Arab fears of Israeli aggression. But, first of all, we must persuade all concerned that we do mean business, that we won't play favorites, and that we believe our record in the Middle East is clean and fair.

Admiral Radford, in Take-It-or-Leave-It Stand, Prefers No New Legislation to House Reserve Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, as the House passed the Reserve bill without a rollcall vote, I expressed my disappointment at this procedure, which, in my considered opinion, might well be deemed irresponsible by the young men whose lives and liberties will be directly affected. I also expressed an apprehension—voicing a feeling quite prevalent on the floor last week—that the House was willing to settle on almost any provisions in order to pass a number, a title, and an enacting clause to serve as a vehicle for a UMT bill to be drafted on the other side of the Capitol and submitted to the House only for approval of a conference report in the closing days of this session.

This morning I read in the Washington Post and Times Herald an article by John W. Finney, of the United Press. This piece quotes Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as joining with Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps officials who stated they would rather have no new Reserve legislation than the bill approved by the House. "I feel the same way," Admiral Radford is quoted as saying. "Unless we get a workable bill in its entirety, we would be better off to utilize the present law," he continued.

In other words, unless the Pentagon is given full authority to dictate to the Congress a UMT bill and unless the Congress agrees to rubber-stamp the measure exactly as the empire builders in the armed services want it, they will, at long last, utilize the present law. I say it is about time they did just that; about time to stop the sabotage of the voluntary Reserve system which has always worked well in the past; and time to utilize existing legislation which the military admits by implication it has not done in the past.

Let them reexamine the whole problem realistically asking: "For what exact purpose do we require new, younger defense manpower? What combat or logistic function will they perform? How many do we really need? Should they be in uniform or could they better be civilian technicians? If they should be in uniform, what training course will best prepare them to assume their functional role in their defense mission? Who can best give each phase of that training, the military or civilian educators? Where? What effect will the taking of this manpower have on other branches of the armed services, on the training and supply of professional and technical personnel and, in time of emergency, on our labor force?"

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the United Press article as carried in this morning's Post and

Times Herald in the RECORD at this point. I shall read as much of it as time permits. I trust that any conflicts or inconsistencies between the statements in this article and the statements of the leadership and of proponents of UMT on the floor of the House will be forgiven by a charitable membership:

RADFORD BACKS IKE ON RESERVES

(By John W. Finney)

Adm. Arthur W. Radford told Congress yesterday the Defense Department would rather do without a new Reserve program than accept major changes in the one President Eisenhower proposed.

The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff took a strong take-it-or-leave-it stand in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee about the need for compulsory Reserve training.

He and other top defense officials opposed a move by Committee Chairman RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, to replace the compulsory features of the administration's program with a voluntary, bonus-incentive approach.

They likewise branded as unacceptable a bill passed by the House which included compulsory training but eliminated Mr. Eisenhower's proposals for National Guard participation and overhauled some other provisions.

The testimony closed out 3 days of public hearings on Reserve proposals. RUSSELL said the committee will meet Wednesday to start drafting a bill.

Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps officials all said they would rather have no new Reserve legislation than the bill approved by the House.

WOULD BE BETTER OFF

Asked for his views, Radford said "I feel the same way." He said that unless "we get a workable bill in its entirety, we would be better off to utilize the present law."

His remarks were sharply criticized by RUSSELL, who said Radford was saying in effect that "you don't think theh Pentagon is capable of making a mistake."

In another highlight of the hearing, Gen. Maxwell B. Taylor warned that the Army will need more men than Mr. Eisenhower's cutback program authorizes if it undertakes the training of reservists.

The new Army Chief of Staff said adoption of the administration's Reserve program would put an extra load on the Army but so far "no provision has been made" for increasing its strength.

ALL-OUT FIGHT

Making an all-out, but apparently uphill, fight to win approval of the original Reserve plan, the Defense Department sent its highest brass before the Senate committee. Their testimony included these points:

Radford said that if the plan is not approved "we will have to make a complete review and reorientation of all our defense planning."

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson said in a statement compulsory training is the only way to insure fully qualified men will be available. But he said it will only be used when valid defense requirements are not met by voluntary means.

Assistant Defense Secretary Carter L. Burgess said the volunteer approach has not succeeded in the past. He said the compulsory feature would spur Reserve training in the way that the draft spurs enlistments.

Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, retiring president of the Reserve Officers Association, said the compulsory feature is the heart of the bill.

Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, Chairman of the National Security Training Commission and general manager of the New York Times, said "it is foolish to delude ourselves" that voluntary methods would build the Ready Reserves to the 2,900,000-man level contemplated by mid-1959.

Mr. Speaker, the voices of veterans and servicemen are beginning to be heard. While I cannot completely agree with the writer of the letter to the editor carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 8, 1955, especially in his view that the Powell amendment is extraneous, I believe his analysis of the Reserve compromise is thought-provoking, and include it in the RECORD at this point:

RESERVE COMPROMISE

It would be serious indeed if the national Reserve plan—to be pushed through the Senate this week—should pass without some examination of the uncritical assumption that it is, in fact, likely to make a contribution to our national security which will outweigh the burden it will lay on the men compelled to serve in it.

At its present stage, the plan calls for 48 weekly meetings and 2 weeks of summer training a year. It thus makes demands upon all but 2 weeks of an individual's year, and this makes it perhaps the military's deepest penetration yet into the body of individual liberties in this country. I do not see how one can escape the conclusion that the traditional freedoms to move, to travel, to vacation away from one's home if one's personal situation should make that necessary or possible, will be seriously invaded.

As one now in service I recognize the need for a Reserve, will give my time to it, and will not complain that others of my generation stand to escape military obligation altogether. But those of us who have given 2 years of our lives to the military already deserve something better, I think, than for the succeeding 4 years to be nothing but a series of 6-day passes from our local units of the military Reserve.

It seems to me that an acceptable compromise between the requirements of security and the rights of the individual could be struck by reducing the number of weeks of required training from 50 to 36 or 30. None with a realistic knowledge of the caliber of military training can argue that this would seriously lower the effectiveness of the program. The change would, I suspect, work to eliminate a great deal of the evasion which, otherwise, would inevitably accompany the program.

The Powell and Bow amendments are extraneous, of course. But there are compelling reasons for the country to think seriously about the implications of the military Reserve plan. I hope we have not yet lived so long in a defense society that we cannot see that the issue of personal liberty is quite intimately involved here, and that it needs to be defended more passionately than it has been defended so far in the editorial columns of the Nation's leading newspapers.

SILVER SPRING, MD.

Mr. Speaker, compulsory military service is a deliberate confiscation of both individual liberty and leisure time. The obligation is on the Pentagon to explain the actual need, the real purpose, and the exact scope of the measure they propose. With 2,400,000 Reserves in existence today, why must we train 100,000 to 400,000 more every year to reach a total of 2,950,000 men by 1959? What is sacred about the figure of 2,950,000? How was it arrived at; what are these men needed for, and how are they to be trained to make them more effective than the 2,400,000 reservists on the rolls today? And, if today's reservists are so ineffective as the military claim, why have not some general officers been reclassified for this training failure?

How effectively do the Pentagon proposals result in the equitable sharing of Reserve obligations? Is it true, as Walter Millis, editor of the Forrestal Diaries, states, "the basic purpose is not to draft men in order to create a needed Reserve, but to create a Reserve in order to draft men"?

The Fast Writeoff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the July 12, 1955, edition of the New York Times:

THE FAST WRITEOFF

Has the fast tax write-off outlived the emergency for which it was created; and should it be abandoned, or its use be substantially restricted?

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey is said to have felt for some time that this was the case; and to have convinced Dr. Arthur Flemming, head of the Office of Defense Mobilization, that the question should be subjected to review by his department. The Defense Mobilization Board is scheduled to hold its regular meeting tomorrow, and the results of its studies may be presented to the board at that time.

We have no wish to anticipate the conclusions of this report. However, that there is a strong prima facie case for Mr. Humphrey's position seems to us hardly open to question. The fast tax write-off plan was introduced in 1950, with the launching of the rearmament program of that year. At that time it was vitally important that the Nation's productive capacity be speeded up in steel, aluminum, petroleum and a number of other key areas that were basis to the defense effort. Since both experience and public opinion supported the view that the program should be carried out by private interests, rather than by the Government, the device of the fast tax write-off had a strong appeal, and proved genuinely successful.

The way the fast writeoff, or speedup of investment amortization for tax purposes, works is this: Assume a machine needed as part of the defense effort is installed at a cost of $100,000 and assume that it had a life expectancy of 20 years. Under the revenue laws as they stood in 1950 the firm would have had to spread its deductions for amortization over the entire 20 years, or at the rate of 5 percent a year. Under the fast writeoff it would be permitted to deduct up to 100 percent within the first 5 years (though the actual average allowed was nearer 60 percent). In addition to using the fast writeoff for a speedup of plant expansion, the ODM has also used it, on a more limited scale, in other situations when a similar incentive seemed desirable, such as pushing the program of plant dispersal or to encourage the flow of capital into areas characterized by chronic unemployment.

Since the fast writeoff was first introduced 5 years ago writeoff certificates have been issued covering facilities valued at more than $30 billion. Considered on a short-term basis the theoretical loss to the Treasury of

revenue in this period is estimated to have been $3 billion.

The fast writeoff has proved its value as an emergency revenue device, but it is like many other emergency devices in that it has created a potential vested interest in its continuance. Mr. HUMPHREY is on solid ground, therefore, it seems to us, in raising the question of whether we are not in danger of falling into the habit of spoon feeding industry. His position is fortified, moreover, by the fact that business can no longer complain that the amortization provisions of the revenue laws are unreasonably inflexible. When the tax code was revised in 1954 the amortization feature was liberalized so as to permit a firm, if it elected to do so, to write off two-thirds of the cost of an investment in the first half of its normal life.

Bananas in the Gulf of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Bananas in the Gulf of California," on the upper Colorado River storage project:

Southern California propaganda specialists have been undaunted in their efforts to throw out one smoke screen after another in their campaign to confuse the minds of Congressmen about the Colorado River storage project. They have cast themselves as saviours of the long extinct dinosaurs. They have expressed fears that bananas would be grown on Pike's Peak. They have produced a new type of southern Californio slide rule which, when they use it, enormously increases the cost of any reclamation project which would permit beneficial use of Colorado River water above the California border.

The intended effect of these cries of alarm is to lead the American people to believe that the construction of the Colorado River storage project would leave southern California faucets dry and their canteens empty. But this is far from the truth.

In the arid western States, water is the key to the future development of an untold wealth of natural resources. The Colorado River accumulates this life-giving liquid from an area which is larger than that of any river system in North America other than the Mississippi. Every bucketful of this water represents potential wealth to the people of this region and potential wealth to the Nation.

The four States in the upper basin—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming—were allotted the use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of this water by the Colorado River Compact of 1922, which was agreed to by the State of California as well as by the United States Government. Those four States to date have had the benefit of only minor reclamation projects sponsored by the United States Government. Consequently, they have been able to make use of only about one-third of their allotted share of Colorado River water. The proposed Colorado River storage project is designed to enable those States to utilize an additional 1,700,000 acre-feet of their allotted share of Colorado River water, bringing the total use in the upper basin States to approximately 4,200,000 acre-feet, which is well within the 7,500,000 acre-feet to which they are entitled under the Colorado River compact.

The lower basin States of California, Arizona, and Nevada were likewise allotted 7,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water by the 1922 compact. To date, they have put approximately 5,350,000 acre-feet of this water to beneficial uses. This was made possible through the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars by the Federal Government in such major projects as Hoover Dam, Davis Dam, Parker Dam, and the All-American Canal.

Those projects which benefited southern California may have produced sour grapes in California vineyards, but they were not used to grow bananas on their mountain peaks. The concern of southern California citizens at the time those projects were authorized was not over the bones of extinct animals, but over the welfare of living and future generations in that area. Furthermore, the distorted slide rule recently put into use by southern California propaganda artists was unheard of during the congressional debates on those projects for the simple reason that those projects, like the Colorado River storage project, were designed as self-reimbursable units.

The best indication of how nearly dry southern California faucets would be if the Colorado River storage project is authorized may be found in the following figures showing how much Colorado River water flows annually from this country into Mexico after all existing uses, both in the upper basin and the lower basin, are satisfied. It should be noted that by treaty between the United States and Mexico, this country is obligated to deliver to Mexico a maximum of 1,500,000 acre-feet in any 1 year. It should be noted further that the amounts of water shown below in excess of 1,500,000 acre-feet annually have not been used to grow bananas in Mexico, but rather largely have been allowed to flow into the Gulf of California; forever lost.

Flow of Colorado River at international boundary

	Acre-feet
1941	8,390,000
1942	13,985,000
1943	7,918,000
1944	10,283,000
1945	8,653,000
1946	6,700,000
1947	6,259,000
1948	8,160,000
1949	8,697,000
1950	7,604,000
1951	3,502,000
1952	10,146,000
1953	5,224,000
1954	4,346,000
1941–54, average	7,847,000
1914–54, average	9,555,000

Bananas on Pike's Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Bluestone irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Bluestone project is a part of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Los Angeles Gas Consumers Protected by the Harris-Hinshaw Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of July 7, 1955:

SAVING GAS FROM REGULATION

Half of the gas consumed in Los Angeles is piped in from outside the State, and as consumers we have a cash interest in any Federal measure to control it.

EXEMPTION BILLS

The United States Supreme Court ruled a year ago that the Federal Power Commission should take jurisdiction over the gas industry, although the Commission itself expressed reluctance to do so. As a result there have been bills in both Houses of Congress to exempt the gas producers from regulation.

Chairman PRIEST of the House Commerce Committee has just filed its report on the amended Harris bill which would exempt the producers from regulation as public utilities but which would at the same time protect consumers against excessive prices and assure a long-range supply of gas as fuel.

The Commerce Committee's report notes that the bill carries out all the major recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. The report holds that it is neither in the consumer or the public interest to regulate gas producers as public utilities nor was it the intent of Congress to do so when it passed the Natural Gas Act of 1938. Except for the additional controls given to the Federal Power Commission to protect consumer prices, the bill would restore the law to what it generally was believed to be before the Supreme Court decision.

COMPETITIVE PRICES

The safeguard on consumer prices is not an essential part of the bill, for gas production is a highly competitive industry with companies of all sizes. It is not likely that the FPC would have to exercise its power to keep prices reasonable. The committee report pointed out that competition had kept prices at a reasonable level in the 16 years under which the old law was operative.

As a matter of fact, the cost of natural gas to the consumer is largely the cost of transportation and distribution. For example, a New Yorker, far from the natural gas fields, pays $2.42 for a quantity of gas for which the producer at the well gets less than 8 cents. A Milwaukeean, closer to the source, pays $1.26 for the gas which the producer puts into the pipeline for less than 10 cents.

In connection with the transportation cost of gas, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce heard a proposal last month to make the pipeline common car-

riers "with the same privileges, rights and duties that the railroads have to the shippers and receivers of goods by rail."

ANALOGY IN COAL

The proponent is James D. Francis, president of a West Virginia coal company. If Federal control were limited to the interstate pipelines, he said, "a tremendous amount of Federal interference in private business" would be eliminated. He finds a parallel in the liberation of the coal industry from the railroads, accomplished by the Elkins and Hepburn Acts of 1906 which "took the American railroads out of the coal-producing business to the substantial advantage of the railroads, the coal producers and the coal consumers."

Mr. Francis would have no Federal gas-price regulation at all. The Harris bill's reasonable-price clause promises a minimum of interference with the producer, and Mr. Francis may not have known the language of the amended House bill when he spoke to the Senators. But he was correct and the House committee was correct when they said that if gas producers were given a public utility status in Federal law the incentive to explore for and develop new gas reserves for the interstate market would be destroyed.

The continuing search for new gas fields is vital to Los Angeles. The supply within the State is diminishing and there has been talk of going as far as the Canadian fields for assured supplies. The community's fuel economy is founded on gas and every encouragement given to the explorers should be as welcome to us almost as water.

New York State Dentists Favor Coverage Under OASI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the dentists of New York State, like their colleagues throughout the country, are overwhelmingly in favor of coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance system. The legislation necessary to extend such coverage is before the Ways and Means Committee. What are we waiting for?

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following telegram:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *July 7, 1955.*

Hon. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge your support of amendments to social-security law which provide OASI coverage for self-employed dentists. At its 87th annual meeting on May 18, 1955, the Dental Society of the State of New York unanimously adopted resolution favoring inclusion of dentists in the Federal OASI program after submission of State society committee report showing of 10,812 questionnaires mailed to membership. Returned ballots were: 6,173 for OASI, 878 against. The dental profession of New York State overwhelmingly favors OASI coverage.

NEW YORK STATE CHAPTER, CONGRESS OF AMERICAN DENTISTS FOR OASI,
DR. B. A. GREIPER, *President.*
DR. NATHAN KOBRIN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Labor "Never Had It So Good," Even Union Chieftains Admit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Victor Riesel:

LABOR "NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD," EVEN UNION CHIEFTAIN'S ADMIT

Certainly the Nation's labor leaders believe this is one of the best years of our lives.

Dave Beck's Teamsters Union headquarters has just opened in Washington—equipped with a lovely theater, complete with cinemascope.

Dave McDonald's Steelworkers Union has just picked up one of the choicest pieces of Washington real estate—"for investment purposes"—near the White House. It's made up of four lots at 17th Street and New York Avenue.

The still unpublicized A. Scott Milne, head of the AFL Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, who some day may lead the entire labor movement, reported recently that his union now has a pension fund of $43 million. Much of it is in the stock market "based on the proper diversification between bonds, preferred stock, and common stocks * * *"

Virtually all big unions today are swinging into the stock market. There are no gloom and doom prophets among them—just experts on profits.

That's the big news from deep inside the labor sanctums today—sharp amazement over the strength of the boom everywhere except in the coal fields. And John Lewis himself now believes the time has come to get up a new contract for the pits—setting up either a shorter workday or a 4-day week. But the aging cynic believes that even the unfortunate coal diggers are in for better times.

What is exciting labor leaders most these days has nothing to do with power plays or national politics. What astounds them is that more and more of their people are working on fewer and fewer defense orders.

In other words, capitalism is surviving without depending on war production, an international crisis or the stockpiling of superbombs. Everything is booming on the peace production front—from construction of drive-in-theaters to the new cars and new roads along which America travels.

Typical of all this is the General Motors decision to split its stock 3 for 1. I checked the office of the men who advise union officials on the investment of millions annually. There was as much optimism inside labor as there was inside financial circles when the split was announced.

To the labor leaders it means that GM believes it can maintain in the next 5 years the prosperity of the past five years—and that means creating thousands of new jobs all over the Nation.

GM President Harlow Curtice put it this way the other day:

"During the 5-year period of our labor agreement which expired last May 29, General Motors achieved record sales and a record volume of production. Also we undertook the greatest expansion program in GM history. As a result 141,000 new jobs were created in the United States by GM, an increase of 37 percent in GM's total United States employment in 5 years.

"This was accomplished despite a steady decline in defense work during the last 2 years."

General Motors allocated $2 billion for expansion in the past 18 months. This must be added to the scores of millions the Ford Co. is spending or has spent on new plants in California, Texas, Ohio, and Kentucky. Ford completed 28 major projects last year and began work on 17 new ones in 1955.

Everywhere production, like the weather, is toppling records. This country is at the peak. We're making more steel than virtually the entire Western World put together. The construction figures are so vast, they numb you. Over $41,800,000,000 will be spent on construction and building this year by the Government and private businesses.

More than 64 million people are at work.

Small wonder AFL president George Meany told the National Press Club the other day that "Labor never had it so good."

Its take-home pay is at an all-time high—not only outpacing the workers of the rest of the world but now passing the income earned by many professional and executive classes abroad. We now have thousands of steel and auto workers making more than British, French and Italian governmental leaders.

Attention, Karl Marx. The workers of the Western World have disappointed you—and all other prophets of doom. What we need is a new edition of Das Kapital. It isn't collapsing, after all.

Thank You, Mr. Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of appreciation from an American now residing in Panama who thanks Congressman FLOOD for his interest in the problems affecting the Panama Canal Zone:

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your interest in matters pertaining to the Panama Canal is greatly appreciated. There are times when we, the American residents here, feel as though we had been orphaned by our Government's officials. Then there appears on the scene a public-spirited Congressman, like yourself, whose interests transcend the limits of a single congressional district. When that happens, we of the Canal Zone feel that we have gained a Representative in Congress.

Because you have shown this interest I would like to call your attention to an error that crept into testimony of the Governor of the Canal Zone at a hearing before your committee. The newspapers report that the Governor attempted to justify his Washington office payroll by claiming that the Panama Canal Company is required to do the hiring of civilians for the Army as well as his own agencies. That is not true.

The Army has its own civilian personnel office and processes both locally hired and States recruited personnel. The canal people maintain a central labor office, which is the surviving remnant of a wartime labor-clearance operation. This office does nothing for the Army except to issue credentials al-

lowing locally hired personnel to work in the Canal Zone, and performs the entrance physical examination for this class of employees. It is no longer a labor-procurement office. The Army pays for this service at the rate of $6 a year for every employee on its payroll and without regard to how many years the employee may remain in the service—and gets no further service from the Canal Zone. The duties of the labor-clearance office seem to consist in certifying to the employability or nonemployability of the individual and does not include record-keeping in reference to Army employees referred to the agency in question.

In conclusion, let me again refer to the appreciation virtually all Canal Zone people feel for your interest in the enterprise located here.

The Honorable Burton E. Sweet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1955, Federal Judge Henry N. Graven convened a special session of the United States District Court, Northern Division, at Waterloo, Iowa, at which fitting tributes were paid to the Honorable Burton E. Sweet, of Waverly, Iowa, a distinguished former Member of the United States House of Representatives.

For more than 60 years Mr. Sweet has practiced law in the Federal and State courts of Iowa, and now, at the age of 87, he is still engaged in the daily practice of his profession as senior member of the law firm of Sweet, Sager & Engelbrecht.

Some 150 attorneys, their wives, and friends of this veteran lawmaker and lawyer attended the special session of the court at Waterloo. I have been able to obtain a transcript of the remarks made by Mr. Sweet on that occasion and it is a pleasure to insert these remarks in the RECORD at this point:

May it please the court, members of the bar, ladies and gentlemen, I will say at the outset, I wish to express to you my profound appreciation for the compliment that you have paid me today in coming here on this occasion. I may say, it is true I am 87 years of age. It is also true that I was admitted to this court to practice law on June 12, 1895; some 60 years and 9 days have passed since then. When I was admitted to this court A. J. Van Duzee was clerk. At that time Judge Shiras was the presiding judge. I remember very well the first case that I was connected with in Federal Court—the Anti Kamnia Chemical Co. had brought suit against the CaPhenin Chemical Co. of Waverly, Iowa, for $50,000. It was a patent case—an infringement case—and they had asked for a temporary injunction, and they were supporting their application for the temporary injunction by affidavits. After looking their affidavits over, I realized that it was necessary for me to have time in which to prepare counteraffidavits, so I went before Judge Shiras at Dubuque, Iowa, and said to him, rather timidly, I would like to have time in which to file counteraffidavits. He looked up and smiled and said, "My young man, you shall have all the time you want." He said, "I am going to have a vacation, and I am going to Lake Minnetonka, in Minnesota, and I will set this case down for hearing some 60 days in advance at the Federal Court Building in St. Paul." When the day came for the hearing I was very much in doubt as to the situation, and so was my client. But when he got through the hearing he smilingly said, "I don't believe the people at Waverly will consume too many of the pills, at least not enough to hurt them. The temporary injunction is denied. Those words were like music to my ears and to my client's ears.

I also practiced law before Judge Reed. Judge Reed as I remember him, was a man whose mental processes were not very fast, but were very accurate.

I also practiced before Judge Scott. I was well acquainted with Scott before he was judge. He served upon the State central committee from the 11th District and I served on the same committee from the 3d District. We served together for a period of 4 years. Judge Scott afterward served with me as a Member of Congress. Some of the attorneys who practiced before him thought that he was rather austere at times, but I may say to you, he never was austere with me, and in addition to that I believed him to be an honest, upright and painstaking judge.

These three judges played their part well in their day and generation. Their lives were like a cloudless sky—their memories like a sea at rest.

I remember meeting my good friend Lee McNeely way back in the days when he was secretary to David B. Henderson. David B. Henderson at that time, as I remember it, or about that time, was Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a little after that time Uncle Joe Cannon, of Illinois, was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, and my good friend McNeely was his clerk—his parliamentary adviser—and then again I remember that McNeely was secretary to Senator Allison. And I may pause a moment to state here, that at the time or about the time he was secretary to David B. Henderson, Speaker of the House, and Senator Allison, leader of the Senate, Iowa, was in those days a powerful influence in the affairs of this Nation. Lee McNeely, as he has said, has been a friend of mine for all of these years. Friendship is that gentle salutation of the heart that lives in all the languages of men. It is a little less than love—a little more than comrade—and winds and turns its way through all the affairs of men, their thoughts, their deeds, and runs through song and toil and battlefield. McNeely was my friend, is my friend now. Can I say more, can I say less?

I listened this afternoon to my good friend Swisher, and as usual he delivered, what I would say, at least on this occasion, an excellent speed. [Laughter.]

My good friend Arben L. Young, gave a short history of my life. The only criticism I have of it, it is a little bit overdrawn, but I may say to you at the present time, I have forgiven him and I ask the court to pardon him.

Now, on this occasion, I am not going to say much about myself, but I am going to mention the fact that my mother was born in the State of Vermont, my father in the State of Ohio. My father's ancestors came from Massachusetts, they were there before the Revolutionary War, and took part in that war. They took part in that great western movement which followed the war, and their pathway led them from Massachusetts to New York, to Ohio, to Indiana, to Illinois, and to Iowa, and their tombstones are like milestones along the highway of our national development, as the mighty tide of immigration rolled westward toward the setting sun, and our Nation swept on to empire and to greatness. My parents came into Iowa and settled on the broad prairies of Bremer County. They settled there in 1867, where I was born. I was not born in a log cabin, but I was born in the successor to the log cabin—a cabin built of native sawed lumber. I was born at a time when the rank thistle nodded in the wind and the wild fox dug its hole unscared.

By good fortune I was directed to the law practice, and I want to say to you that I consider the practice of law one of the greatest professions on earth. Out of the members of the bar we select the judges of our district courts; we select the judges of our United States courts. I want to say to you ladies and gentlemen that our courts are the bulwark of our liberty and the foundation of our feedom. Abandon the courts, and we would be the same as they are in South America, with inadequate courts, and anarchy would prevail. We would not be the great Nation we are today. Our courts are the home of liberty, where freedom exists, where our rights are determined. Our Constitution would be a worthless piece of paper if it were not properly construed. I will say to you that the judges of the United States courts since the days of John Marshall, 173 years ago, have caught the inspiration of the founders of this Government, and today the United States courts are the citadel of our liberties and of our rights. I sometimes feel that we do not realize what the courts of this country mean to us. Our Federal courts, our State courts, are the great balance wheel that keep this Republic within its proper orbit. I want to say to you that our Americanism is in reality founded upon our Federal courts and our States courts, and that our American jurisprudence is the most splendid specimen of the workings of American liberty, and of American rights and of American justice. In fact, we don't seem to know it, but we live and have our being in this country and in this Government because of our courts. The courts of this country and our American jurisprudence is in fact our Americanism.

Americanism is one of the grandest words in the English language. It has become symbolical of civil and religious liberty on the western continent. It represents the shining goal toward which the human race has been tending since time began.

We find epitomized in it the struggles, the hopes, the dreams, the aspirations of man for better days and better things, since the time when he cringed and crawled in the dens and caverns of barbarism, and groped and felt his way through the long night of the stagnant centuries toward the dawn of a grander day, up to the present hour, when we behold him revealed, standing upright, with the sunlight of heaven in his face, or walking with uncovered head beneath the silent stars, contemplating as to the handiwork of the Creator and the betterment of the human race.

The true fundamentals of Americanism are based upon the teachings of the lowly Nazarene.

When Christ proclaimed to the world the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and the priceless value of the humblest human soul, He made tyrants and despots tremble on their thrones.

He laid the foundation of democratic, self-government, and the sovereignty of the people. From His teachings have come the emancipation of childhood, the elevation of woman, and our rich and splendid heritage of religious, civil, and constitutional liberty.

Americanism is the new civilization.

Americanism has become synonymous with the spirit of civil and religious freedom throughout the world. With us and all thinking men, Americanism has become like a mighty and everwidening stream.

At its touch parched areas blossom and become fertile again. Upon its borders grow every flower that graces a true Christian civilization; and there, too, may be found the full fruitage of every plant and shrub

and tree which springs spontaneously from the soils of equal opportunity and individual effort.

On its broad bosom float a thousand barks. There genius spreads its ever-purpling sails. There poetry dips its silver oar. There opportunity sparkles from the crest of every wave. There art, invention, discovery, science, morality, and religion may safely and securely float.

On its surface serenely rides our ship of state, amid the storms of war, unchecked by devious currents or adverse winds that blow. The hopes of humanity are hanging breathless on its fate. The waters at times seem troubled, but our course is plain. An enlightened public opinion is our pilot and our grand Constitution is our chart and compass. I trust that the fine conception of the great poet may be realized:

"Thou, too, sail on, O ship of State!
Sail on, O Union strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!

"We know what master laid the keel;
What workman wrought thy ribs of steel!
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!"

Let me say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that is what Americanism means, and that is all found within our Federal Courts, our State courts, and in the Constitution of the United States of America.

The American bar, the lawyers, have been instrumental in building this splendid structure of American jurisprudence. In short I may say that the courts are the conscience of this Nation. Let us go forward then in the future, as we have in the past. We should have a patriotism which comports with the great land in which we live. Let our patriotism be as shoreless as the air we breathe, as ceaseless as the flow of our inland rivers, as majestic as our snow-capped mountain ranges, as sublime as the two great oceans which lash our borders, as exalted as the canopied heavens above.

I may say to you at the present time—

"We are living, we are dwelling,
In a grand and awful time.
In an age on ages telling,
To be living is sublime."

At the present time this Nation is in a death struggle with another nation. On the one hand we have Americanism. On the other we have communism. On the one hand we have freedom and liberty, and on the other hand we have slavery and tyranny. On the one hand we have a government that is founded upon the principles, and precepts, and teachings of the lowly Nazarene. On the other hand we have atheism, agnosticism, Marxism, and even feudalism mixed with socialism. In fact their form of government is difficult of analysis because of the conflicts and contradictions and paradoxes that exist therein. This is the first time in all history that the whole world, more or less, has been in a conflict of this kind and character.

I want to say to you people this afternoon, that there will always be a United States of America. Why do I say that? Because I believe it is the will of the infinite. Men and women who have once tasted the sweets of liberty and freedom can never be dominated and ruled by a tyrant or despot. Men and women who have once tasted the sweets of liberty and freedom can never be subjugated by Russia. I don't know whether we are going to have war or not. I hope not. I sometimes have thought, and I have been reflecting about this for some time, that perhaps if it goes on the way it is now going, that it will wear itself out. They will get tired of the present tense situation. It may be settled by diplomacy—the federation of the world, the parliaments of man. One thing I do know—the shallows murmur but the mighty deeps of the human heart resound.

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart.
Still stands, thine ancient sacrifice,
A humble and a contrite heart,
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Now, I realize that I am getting to be an old man. I am journeying toward the last sunset. But yet, I want to say to you that I expect to meet the end tranquilly, serenely, as the stars meet the dawn. May I read in it all a hidden meaning, which only the rapt and parting soul may know, as he hears the waves pounding and beating upon a distant shore beyond the habitation of man. I don't mean by that that this is my farewell by any means. Simply the dawn of a grander day.

Now, I want to thank everyone of you for your kind attention, especially the judge, who has taken such an active part in the whole drama of events which led up to this day. The memory of your kindness will abide with me forever. Thank you.

Brannan Plan May Haunt GOP in Tussle With Farm Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Minneapolis, Minn., Sunday Tribune of July 10, by Charles Bailey, Washington staff correspondent, entitled "Brannan Plan May Haunt GOP in Tussle With Farm Supports":

BRANNAN PLAN MAY HAUNT GOP IN TUSSLE WITH FARM SUPPORTS

(By Charles Bailey)

WASHINGTON.—The shade of Charles F. Brannan, former Secretary of Agriculture, may yet return to haunt his successors here.

Brannan, whose agricultural plan was the subject of as concentrated a blast as has been received by any farm proposal in years, is far away practicing law and prospering in the breezy environs of Denver, Colo.

He has been replaced by Ezra Taft Benson, whose reaction to the mere mention of Brannan's name is an ill-disguised shudder.

But there must be times when Benson—like others who were among the opponents of Brannan's ideas—wonders whether his predecessor has put the whammy on him.

If Benson, for example, should read through Brannan's testimony before the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, April 7, 1949, he would find some strangely Bensonlike remarks.

Benson, who argues that prices alone cannot determine farm prosperity since total income is based on "price times volume," would find Brannan saying:

"Farm people and all those who do business with them are concerned with price as a means to an end, that end being a good income."

Again, Benson criticizes present price-support programs because they aid the big corporation farmer more than the smaller operator.

Brannan apparently was worried about the same thing, for he urged the legislators to limit support payments "to a volume high enough to benefit most farms but one which will not encourage the development of extremely large industrialized farming."

In this connection, incidentally, Brannon seemed to be more worried than Benson—Brannan recommended setting some kind of limit, while Benson, though deploring the present situation, has not asked Congress to do anything about it.

A third apparent similarity of thinking shows up in this Brannan comment:

"The price and income supports I have suggested, in common with all other price-supported systems, fall short of meeting the needs of those operators who lack enough good land and enough capital to produce the necessary volume with the necessary efficiency for a good standard of living."

This could have been Benson talking—the Benson who has argued that price supports do not help the little fellow and one of whose chief Senate backers last month read a list of the biggest price-support loans, by States, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Obviously, comparisons like these are not completely fair.

Neither Benson nor Brannan would be likely to admit the present Secretary and the former Secretary agree on much.

But comparisons do point up one fact: That there is much undisputed ground in the farm-law struggle—and very little action to cover that ground.

One of the most easily understood facts about present price supports is the way in which they provide more money for the big, efficient operator than they do for the small, less efficient farmer.

But neither Benson nor the Republican 83d Congress tried to do anything about it in rewriting the farm-price laws.

The Democratic 84th Congress has shown little, if any, enthusiasm for proposals by Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, in the Senate and several Members in the House to set an upper limit on support aid.

The horror figures recited from time to time—showing that some big cotton farms, for example, may get over $1,000,000 a year in supports—certainly are not conducive to keeping city Congressmen on the side of price-support legislation.

Yet Congress and the administration have done nothing to meet this admitted problem except deplore it.

Here are some of the fundamental questions faced by Congress:

Is there some way to discourage the production of low quality crops and encourage the production of high-quality products that are in demand or even shortage?

Is there some way to make sure that farmers who take price-support payments hold up their end by observing sound farming practices and undertaking soil conservation methods?

Is there any way to arrive at a program that will restore some of the land now being cultivated to the grass cover that is required to prevent continuing erosion and dustbowl conditions?

Brannan pulled many of these elements together. He was practically tarred and feathered for coming up with a socialistic proposal—although had it been offered to Congress in little chunks, it would probably have looked a lot less objectionable.

One measure of the present congressional farm leaders will be their ability to pull together these problems, to present unified solutions, without making their product look like a giant package deal that could be the target of opposing groups.

If they fail in this attempt, they will have done no worse than almost every congressional group that tried before.

If they succeed, they will deserve credit not only from farmers but also from the rest of the Nation's taxpayers.

Passport Division Outgrows Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, July 3, relative to housing conditions which affect the Passport Division of the State Department:

PASSPORT DIVISION OUTGROWS OFFICE—WINDER BUILDING, WITH CIVIL WAR CELLS BELOW, CALLED INADEQUATE BY NEW CHIEF

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON, June 25.—The new Chief of the Passport Division thinks her office has outgrown the 1848 Winder Building with a Civil War dungeon in its depths.

Few of the hundreds of persons trooping through its front door to get passports know of the windowless cell in one corner of the basement that has a covered hole in the ceiling through which food was let down to whoever languished there.

The remainder of the basement is a labyrinth of cells with windows, a little less dank. The theory is that Confederate officer prisoners waited there to be exchanged.

Miss Frances Knight, new Passport Chief, today said that this unquestionably historic building close to the White House should be made into a very fine museum of the Civil War era.

"But it's just not adequate," she added, "to serve the jet travel age that will soon be upon us."

SPEEDUP CALLED VITAL

"When people planned months ahead to go overseas," she said, "they didn't mind waiting 3 weeks for a passport. Today London and Paris are an overnight hop. The processing of passports should be streamlined, mechanized, and speeded up."

Now mailbags that arrive by the truckload are lugged across the floor by women workers. Miss Knight wants a mechanized operation, as in modern post offices. Photographs are hand pasted on each passport with glue from an ancient pot, and are then hand ironed with an ordinary electric iron to seal them in place. Miss Knight said that surely this process could be done by a machine.

Since the granting of passports is one of the oldest operations in Government, the Passport Division has accumulated down the years more than its share of obsolete equipment.

Invaluable information reposes in overstuffed wooden files that require back-breaking effort to manipulate. Safes are not safe in the Winder Building—they might fall through the floors and wreck the place. Miss Knight estimated that fully 50 percent of the equipment of the Passport Division badly needs modernizing.

To that end she asked the House Appropriations Committee last week for a supplemental appropriation which would include rental of another locale.

The statistics she submitted there have not been released for publication. But she gave typical figures on the sharp recent rise in travel in this record-smashing tourist season.

THE CURVE MOVES UP

A week ago Saturday, 121 persons were at work on passports in the Winder Building. A total of 3,100 passports were written, 4,000 passports were checked, and 4,000 passports were dispatched.

Air and ship passenger travel overseas, less than 500,000 persons in 1945, passed the 1,500,000 mark in 1947, and by 1953 had passed the 2½ million mark. The curve since has been upward.

In 1945 the Passport Division, operating on a budget of $426,954, took in $454,954 in fees. In 1950, operating on a budget of $730,165, it took in $2,390,000 in passport fees. In 1955, operating on a budget of $876,915, the Division had estimated at $3½ million take in fees. However, the passport business this year has been so heavy that this sum may reach $4 million.

The chief claim to fame of the Winder Building, and the one which would entitle it to become a museum, is that it was the Civil War communications center.

President Lincoln, according to a plaque at the entrance, was a constant visitor during the war and received here the latest dispatches by wire from the Army of the West and by courier from the southern front in addition to conferences with his military commanders. It is recorded that he often came at night to talk to prisoners held in the cells. There is no more familiar chapter of Civil War history than these nocturnal vigils of Abraham Lincoln.

Gen. Ulysses S. Grant 3d, grandson of the Civil War general who later became President, gave another historic laurel to the old place. Since it was also the office of the Judge Advocate General during the Civil War, he said, it is logical to assume that General Order No. 100, which first put into official language how to treat prisoners of war and people in occupied territory, was executed there. This was the foundation on which International Red Cross agreements later were built.

Mrs. Ruth Shipley, recently retired passport chief, gathered for the Winder Building a fine collection of historic prints of its period. They line its first floor corridors.

The Passport Division was moved into it during World War II. Mrs. Shipley found "rats fat and insolent" there. She told in the Foreign Service Journal of trying to clean up in advance of a promised official visit of the Duke of Windsor, only to have him take a different way in to await "the old, limping elevator between two walls adorned with the biggest, blackest grease spots in Washington."

Mrs. Shipley said then that the prison cells would disappear in the restoration then in progress, leaving only "the rich dignity" of the rest of the building. But the rats still run through the Winder basement, and the termite wings pile high there in springtime.

Gen. W. H. Winder, the War of 1812 hero who built it the year before the gold rush, rented it immediately to the Government, which in 1854 bought it for $100,000 by act of Congress.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Illinois?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Illinois has more than 69,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision. On June 7, 1955, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyrights, appeared before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations and described the Copyright Act of 1909 as archaic. At that time they requested the creation of a number of new positions in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress to undertake a 3-year study looking toward the revision of the domestic law. The Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives included a recommendation of $20,000 for the initiation of studies relating to the revision of the copyright laws in its report on H. R. 7117 in House Report No. 1036. By a voice vote the House on July 1 passed H. R. 7117, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal year 1956, without amendment. This bill, containing an appropriation of $20,000 for the special study of the copyright laws, is now under consideration by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee is Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona.

I include as part of my remarks excerpts from a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909.

VII. THE NEW BEGINNING, 1932

In the early days of the 72d Congress S. 176 by Mr. Hébert, S. 3985 by Mr. Dill, and H. R. 139 by Mr. Vestal, were introduced. No action, however was ever taken on any of these bills. Representative William I. Sirovich, the new chairman of the House Committee on Patents, struck out in a new direction by calling for hearings on the subject of a general revision of the copyright law without considering any particular bill. These hearings were held on February 1, 2, 3, 12, 15, 23, 24, 26, 29, of 1932, and March 1, 2, 7, 10, and 14 of the year 1932. The committee invited all the various groups and interest concerned with copyright to appear and state their views. The objective seems to have been to attempt to get a

definite statement from each with respect to what should be in a major revision.

No attempt has been made, while covering the hearings held in preceding Congresses, to indicate the specific arguments offered in support of or in opposition to the bills with which those hearings dealt. In order, however, to present a true picture of the complications, and difficulties with which congressional committees were faced in attempting a major revision of the copyright law, some of the arguments and contentions advocated during this hearing by the various special interests are set out below.[1]

Mr. Richard C. DeWolf, Acting Assistant Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress, commented on some of the legal aspects of the subject. Briefly summarized, he stated:

"First, as to the nature of the right itself. It was pointed out in hearings before the Senate committee that there are two schools of though in relation to the nature of copyright. One holding that it is a natural right of the author, the other holding that it is a purely statutory right granted so to speak on the balance of convenience between the author and the public." [2]

During the course of his testimony Mr. DeWolf was questioned as to his opinion with respect to certain controversial matters. He pointed out "that it is a highly controversial matter and we feel in the Copyright Office that we should remain neutral in regard to these controversies."

Mr. Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights, then commented upon the present situation and the contents of some of the bills that had been introduced in recent years. In the course of his remarks he stated:

"It seems futile to hope for the enactment of a general revision bill during this session, but it may be possible to pass a brief bill for this one purpose with no proposals for copyright amendment except such as are required to bring our copyright law into accord with the articles of convention." [3]

He was speaking with respect to our entry into the International Copyright Union. Mr. Karl Fenning, professor of patent laws, then testified with respect to the 2-cent royalty on the production of phonograph records, stating that it was unconstitutional, and, in addition, opposed the destruction of copyright material at the Library of Congress.[4]

During the course of the testimony of the succeeding witnesses, the chairman of the committee requested that they state whether they were in favor of 3 or 4 points which he put thusly:

"First, copyright of the author's product of his mind in his own name. Second, the privilege to him to assign that copyright to whomever he wishes provided it is registered in a copyright office. Third, the right to license to any individual that the author may wish his copyrighted product, either in whole or in part, provided that it is registered in the copyright office in Washington, which will be an emancipation of the authors of America." [5]

The following witnesses endorsed these principles: Mr. Joseph B. Bickerton, Jr., Authors' League; Mrs. Inez Haynes Irwin, president, Authors' League; Edward Childs Carpenter, president, Dramatists' Guild; Chester Crowell, Authors' League; Miss Fannie Hurst; Will Irwin; Silas Bent; Miss Thyra Samter Winslow; Lodewidk Broom; Arthur Guiterman; Sigmund Romberg (he was also in favor of removing the 2-cent price fixing clause) (he was opposed to automatic copyright however); Rupert Hughes (opposed to automatic copyright); William Hamilton Osborne, council, Authors' League; John Schulman, Songwriters' Protective Association; Miss Margaret Widdemer; Mrs. Mateel Howe Farnham; M. Koenigsberg; Lyman Beecher Stowe; Joseph Wharton Lippincott, the Book Publishers' Association; W. T. Bisell, the National Association of Publishers; William O. Tufts, Rand McNally & Co., map publishers; Mrs. Verma P. Taylor, the American Pen Women; Miss Mary Meek Atkinson, District of Columbia Chapter, the American Pen Women; Wallace McClure, State Department.

In addition to endorsing the three principles enunciated by the chairman of the committee, Mr. William O. Tufts, listed above, points out in a written brief that with respect to publishers who were in fact employers of authors something additional was needed. He stated:

"There are three important points to be kept in mind by your committee while framing copyright legislation. These are briefly as follows: (1) The right of protection and the copyright title must in many cases rest with the publishing firm as technically the authors of maps, atlases, or reference books in question, (2) there should be no difference in the protection granted to maps and atlases as distinguished from books and periodicals. The maps and atlases are literary property in the same sense as printed books and magazines, (3) any change in the present copyright act should not be framed so as to invalidate the protection now resting in the common law during the process of production and before publication has taken place." [6]

The testimony of Frederick G. Melcher, Book Publishers Association, reflected the consistent advocacy of entering into the Bern Convention by the Register of Copyrights, and the consistent opposition on the part of the printers and book publishers.[7]

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, State Department, in the course of his testimony with respect to the protection of the producers of literary artistic work in other countries stated:

"The Department of State believes that we can do that best by becoming a party to what is known as the Bern Convention for the protection of literary and artistic works, as several times revised since its original inauguration at Bern in 1886. Now we have the latest revision before us, that of Rome, made in 1928." [8]

He stated further:

"At the last session of Congress, copyright bills were before Congress, and one passed the House of Representatives. The Department of State thereupon sent to the President and he to the Senate where it was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, asking advice and consent of the Senate that the President might adhere to the treaty on the part of the United States the copyright convention as revised at Berlin in 1908 together with a protocol of 1914. The revision of Rome had not come into force at that time. Now the revision of Rome is in operation and consequently if the contemplated bill should pass the House of Representatives we feel certain that the Department of State would recommend that the President send the Rome Convention to the Senate for the same purpose in order that the Senate might take up a new treaty and the new bill at the same time. I do not think there was ever any direct offer to the United States of conditional membership." [9]

The Bar Association of the City of New York, committee on copyright, stated its views on the subject of a general revision of the copyright law in part as follows:

"First, the association believes that such a general revision is necessary at this time in order to adapt a copyright law into the many changes which have taken place in modes of communications of intellectual and artistic creations since the act of 1909. Second, the association favored the adherence of the United States to the convention creating an international union for the protection of literary and artistic works. * * * Third, as a necessary corollary to the foregoing, the association favors the principle of so-called automatic copyright, that is to say of securing to authors from the creation of their works full statutory copyright protection without compliance with any formalities or conditions. * * * Four, the association favors a change in the copyright term from the present 28 years with a renewal for a like period, and it believes that the provision for a term measured by the life of the author plus a fixed number of years, after his death, is the most workable. We are not wedded to any particular number of years and there is ground for reasonable objection to so long a period as 50 years [after the death of the author] * * * Fifth, the association of the bar and this committee favor the principle of divisible copyright." [10]

A minority of the committee, although signing the report, submitted their views in a memorandum attached thereto. They opposed two features, that of extending the time of protection to 50 years after the death of the author, and the loss of common law copyright protection but a substitution of automatic copyright.

H. H. B. Meyer, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.[11] Dr. Meyer stated that he was appearing as a private individual and also as spokesman for the American Council of Learned Societies. He advocated that the present copyright law (1909) be not changed with respect to the importation of single copies of books by scholars for their own use and not for sale.

John G. Paine, the Music Publishers' Protective Association,[12] endorsed the three points made by the chairman of the committee with respect to the authors; however he stated that before completely and fully endorsing it he wanted to see the language. He also testified as to the general similarity of interest between the Music Publishers' Protective Association and the American Society of Authors, Composers, and Publishers, pointing out that in some cases individuals were members of the board of both organizations. He felt, however, that copyright should be assigned as a whole and stated that he had never been in favor of the divisibility of copyright.

Carl L. Cannon, book-buying committee, American Library Association, testifying with respect to the importation provisions of the present law, stated:

"The American Library Association desires to see, in any legislation that may be enacted, the present right of American libraries to import any book duty free, in other words to retain the same provision, the same clause as in effect at present." [13]

Harry Shaw, president, National Association of Broadcasters, appeared before the committee to oppose the passage of the Vestal copyright bill, H. R. 12549, and any other copyright legislation which in the judgment of the organizations' copyright committee was inimical to the best interest of broadcasting stations.[14]

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings, General Revision of the Copyright Law, 72d Cong., 1st sess.
[2] Hearings, op. cit., p. 9.
[3] Hearings, op. cit., p. 28.
[4] Hearings, op. cit., p. 29, et. seq.
[5] Hearings, op. cit., p. 41.
[6] Hearings, op. cit., p. 109.
[7] Hearings, op. cit., p. 111.
[8] Hearings, op. cit., p. 125.
[9] Hearings, op. cit., p. 128.
[10] Hearings, op. cit., p. 137–138.
[11] Hearings, op. cit., p. 141.
[12] Hearings, op. cit., p. 144.
[13] Hearings, op. cit., p. 155.
[14] Hearings, op. cit., p. 161.

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include an excerpt from a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the Copyright Law of 1909:

Louis G. Caldwell, National Brodacasters Association, endorsed in behalf of the association the three points made by the chairman of the committee. He pointed out that a majority of the broadcast time of radio stations concerns musical compositions rather than literary works. He reviewed briefly the interpretation placed by courts upon the present copyright act with respect thereto as follows:

"The courts have so far held (1) that a broadcaster who broadcasts a copyrighted musical composition performed in his studio is engaged in a public performance for profit of that composition and is liable for infringement, if he is not authorized by the copyright owner; (2) that a broadcaster who broadcasts copyrighted musical compositions performed elsewhere than in his studio, that is, by a hotel orchestra connected with the station by remote control, is likewise engaged in a public performance for profit of that composition, and is liable if neither he nor the person actually performing the composition, that is, the hotel proprietor, is authorized by the copyright owner; (3) that a hotel proprietor who operates a receiving set and loudspeaker for the entertainment of hotel guests is likewise engaged in the public performance for profit of that same musical composition and is liable for infringement if neither he nor the broadcaster is authorized by the copyright owner. The questions which are not yet settled are the following:

"1. Is the hotel proprietor in the case last mentioned liable if he does not have a license, but the broadcasting station to which the receiving set is tuned does have a license?

"2. Is the broadcaster liable for a program which he receives by remote control from a hotel dining room or a dance hall where the broadcaster does not have a license but the hotel or dancehall proprietor does have a license?" [15]

In the light of this Mr. Caldwell stated:

"The sort of case I had described leads us to advocate the principle which we have come to call the single-performance principle. We urge that the man who has no control over what music is played and who cannot possibly protect himself against infringement no matter what precautions he takes and no matter how many license fees he paid should not be held liable under sound copyright legislation." [16]

Mr. Caldwell pointed out the various problems with which radio stations both rich and poor were confronted in trying to avoid infringing copyright with respect to music. Even if the technical problems within the radio station itself were solved, the broadcasting station is not protected:

"The American society does not control all of the American music by any means and only controls a portion of foreign music. There is another organization in this country known as Associated Music Publishers, Inc., which claims to control some 600,000 foreign titles, about 10 percent of which are registered in the United States and have copyright protection. A large number of stations have felt it necessary to take out a license from this organization which has made a demand upon virtually all of them. There is still a third organization which during the past 18 months has appeared on the scene, Elkin-Vogel Co. of Philadelphia, which claims to have the grand performing rights of French music. So far as foreign music is concerned, the license of the American society gives protection or is supposed to give protection on music controlled by similar organizations in Brazil, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Hungary, and Sweden." [17]

After a brief interruption, Mr. Caldwell continued:

"This, however, does not cover all the music in all these countries; for example, three important publishing houses do not belong to the English society: Stainer & Bell, Novello & Co., and Gould & Co. The very important music of Germany and Austria is in an unsettled state. A few German and Austrian publishers are represented by this second organization, the Associated Music Publishers. There is still another organization known as the Society of European State Authors and Composers, which controls music which is not covered by the license of the American society, including the Society of Spanish Authors and Composers, the Society of German Stage Authors and Miscellaneous Publishers. You will note that the Italian music is not included in the list I have mentioned. You can readily see what would happen if all foreign music were given automatic copyright protection in this country and the number of new organizations broadcasters might have to deal with." [18]

Later he stated:

"This leads directly into a question upon which we can be somewhat more specific in our position. From what I have already said, you will readily see the importance to the broadcaster of being able to ascertain what musical compositions are protected by copyright and what are in the public domain. This is why we have so vigorously urged that when copyrighted works are published they must be accompanied by a printed notice to copyright, and also that they must be registered in a central office of such as is now done under the present copyright act. The term of copyright protection must also be a definite term of years so that the broadcaster or other user can tell when the work passes into the public domain and is free for use by anyone." [19]

Still later on, he stated:

"The floodgates are completely open with automatic copyright in the sense which it is enforced in Europe, together with a copyright term consisting of the life of the author plus 50 years, so that no one can tell when the term ends there will hardly be any public domain, and there will in reality be almost perpetual copyright." [20]

Mr. Caldwell concluded:

"The points in which the broadcasters are interested may be summarized as follows: (1) A trustworthy and practical means by which copyrighted works can be distinguished from works that are in the public domain. In the present state of our knowledge we believe that copyright notice, registration, and definite term of copyright protection are all necessary for this purpose. But we shall maintain ourselves open-minded and receptive to any substitute which might adequately accomplish the same purpose; (2) protection against penalties, particularly for innocent infringement. This means (a) that the minimum damage clause should either be made to correspond with the actual damages suffered or be eliminated. Penalties as distinguished from damages should be payable to the United States Government not to private parties, (b) that the single performance principle should be recognized so that only the person orginating the performance will be liable and no person who does not have control over what music will be played can be held; (3) protection against abuses of power on the part of combinations of copyright owners; (4) if the author's so-called moral right is to be recognized, protection against the exercise of it against the usual incidents of broadcasting; (5) that ordinary commercial phonograph records shall not be given copyright protection as such; (6) protection of broadcast programs from piracy." [21]

Erwin M. Treusch, the Automatic Music Industries, presented the views of the manufacturers of coin-operated machines:

"It is our purpose in discussing the freedom of bargaining that a person whose genius has made possible the production of a musical work, shall have a right to say how much he shall receive for any particular use of that work provided he treats it as a union; in other words that he may be permitted to separately bargain either for the entire right, or for the rights as they apply to sheet music, or as they apply to phonograph records, or as they apply to piano rolls but having done that once he is not permitted to follow it down through the course of use and collect multiple royalties." [22]

Mr. Treusch further explained:

"If admission is charged to the place where the reproduction or rendition occurred, then, obviously the purpose of the business is being served by the use of that record and royalty further should be paid, but that right should not accrue unless it is a direct part of the business and unless a profit accrues directly which is the result of the admission or the cover charges which the chairman has pointed out. It is in other words, Mr. Chairman, the desire of this association to avoid a multiplicity of royalties. That is stating the proposition in a comparatively few words." [23]

[4] HOMER E. CAPEHART, vice president, the Automatic Music Industries, pointed out the crux of the argument:

"There are two ways it can be done. One is that he can get a royalty on every record. That is the 1909 law, that he is only entitled to a royalty on those records. Now he comes along he not only wants a royalty on those records but he likewise wants another royalty or fee when those records are played in the field." [24]

Mr. CAPEHART pointed out that the music industries have no quarrel with the second fee where admission is charged to the place of business and they feel that he is entitled then to an additional royalty.

Willis D. Nance, the Mills Novelty Co., and the Seeburg Piano Corp.,[25] indicated that they also favored one royalty and one royalty at the source. They were completely opposed to a multiplicity of royalties particularly where such multiplicity of royalties comes from owners of candy kitchens, drug stores, and small town merchants.

Louis Swarts, chairman, copyright committee, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, stated that the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America had not as yet taken official action as to what their attitude would be and that he was therefore speaking generally for Paramount-Publix Corp., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Universal Pictures, RKO Pictures, Fox and Fox Films. During the course of his testimony Mr. Swarts pointed out:

"The United States, because of its copyright laws which granted copyrights to foreigners on certain conditions and formalities, enjoyed a very large public domain; that is, there were many, many works free in this country which were protected not

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

only in the country of origin but frequently throughout the convention at Berne. To deprive this country of that public domain and those engaged in the utilization of copyrighted material, seemed to be out of the minds of most people and Members of Congress whom I have contacted in the past, and so it seems that the direct approach to the copyright through the convention of Rome is not possible at this time." [26]

The chairman of the committee then stated the three points upon which many previous witnesses had agreed, adding a fourth and a fifth:

"That where an author assigns a license of any particular part of his copyrighted material to 2 or 3 people at the same time and for the same thing, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment, fine, or both; and a fifth, that where one is copyrighted and licenses in whole or in part to any particular individual and receives money therefrom and in the end it proves that this material has been plagiarized or is not his own, he shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be subject to imprisonment, fine, or both.[27]

The chairman then requested Mr. Swarts to state whether his principal favored these five points. Mr. Swarts replied:

"In part, yes, sir. Of course, we reserve our opinion with reference to what you have said until we see how it will be accomplished." [28]

Mr. Swarts then advocated the principle that a licensee or assignee should have the right to sue in his own name, and further stated that he felt that some provision should be made for the protection of an innocent infringer.

Gabriel L. Hess, general attorney, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America,[29] stated that they were also interested in preserving the so-called penalty provisions in the existing copyright act. Mr. Hess pointed out several abuses which these penalties were designed to prevent, "holding over and bicycling." Holding over, is where an exhibitor purchases a show to show in his theater for 2 days and holds it over for 3. Bicycling, is where an exhibitor purchases a show or picture to be exhibited at a particular theater and then exhibits it at a different theater. He pointed out that the market of the distributors of motion pictures is limited to the playing time of the theaters. In other words they charge a greater fee for exhibiting a motion picture for 3 days rather than 2, and for exhibiting the film in a larger theater rather than a smaller.

Gene Buck, president, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, endorsed the 5 principles enunciated by the chairman.[30] During the course of the testimony of the succeeding witness the chairman of the committee referred back to Mr. Buck and questioned him with respect to the Society's attitude with regard to the 2-cent fee put upon mechanical records requesting whether they took the position that the law should be changed. Mr. Buck replied that that particular 2-cent clause was the most iniquitous piece of legislation ever passed in Washington.[31]

[16] Hearings, op. cit., p. 174.
[17] Hearings, op. cit., p. 175.
[18] Hearings, op. cit., p. 186.
[19] Hearings, op. cit., p. 187.
[20, 26] Hearings, op. cit., p. 191.
[21] Hearings, op. cit., p. 191.
[22] Hearings, op. cit., p. 196.
[23] Hearings, op. cit., p. 200.
[24] Hearings, op. cit., p. 201.
[25] Hearings, op. cit., p. 209.
[26] Hearings, op. cit., p. 213.
[27] Hearings, op. cit., p. 242.
[28] Hearings, op. cit., p. 243.
[29] Hearings, op. cit., p. 244.
[30] Hearings, op. cit., p. 246 et seq.
[31] Hearings, op. cit., pp. 298–299.
[32] Hearings, op. cit., p. 307.

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include a section of a major study prepared for me by the Library of Congress of the many attempts to modernize the Copyright Law of 1909:

The hearings on the morning of February 29, 1932, had been designed to afford the theatrical producers an opportunity to present their views. The chairman announced:

"Apparently the theatrical interests, so far as I can see, are shot to pieces. The Shuberts are in the hands of receivers, they are practically bankrupt. Al Woods is another, Hammerstein is bankrupt. I predicted 4 or 5 years ago at the meeting of the Committee on Patents, if conditions continued as they have these legitimate interests would be bankrupt. Since we have no representative of that great organization, I am going to call on Mr. Solberg, the former register of copyrights, to say whatever he may, regarding the subject of copyright." [32]

Mr. Solberg then gave extensive testimony to the effect that he was in favor of a copyright for life and 50 years after the death of the author. He also testified that he was in favor of automatic copyright and of entering the convention of Berne. Louis G. Caldwell, former counsel, Radio Commission, Washington, D. C., when asked by the chairman as to which he preferred, automatic copyright or registration and recordation, he stated that he was in favor of registration.

"The broadcasters are interested in having sufficient registration and copyright notice so that they will be able to tell what material is protected by copyright and what material is in the public domain. So far as automatic copyright goes broadcasters have no quarrel with it if the requirements of notice and registration are preserved." [33]

Stephen L. Newman, representing the Association of Picture Publishers, the American Art Bureau, the Association of Artists and Art Dealers, the American Federation of Art in Washington, the American Homes Bureau,[34] appeared before the committee and made a special plea for a separate fine arts section such as that contained in the British copyright law, and in the copyright law of every member of the Berne convention. He pointed out the abuses to which artists and their works are subjected, especially in the field of imitation and near imitation. The British act concludes that near imitation is copyright infringement.

George C. Lucas, executive secretary, and William B. Warner, president of McCall Co., chairman of the copyright committee, National Publishers Association (magazines and periodicals),[35] appeared in behalf of their organization. They were in favor of the five points made by the committee. They made a special plea, however, in behalf of provisions protecting the innocent infringer against injunction because of the terrific investment a magazine has in a particular issue covering many, many pieces of advertising and other material, whereas the innocent infringement may be a small item. An injunction would prevent the issuance of the particular edition, involving the publishers in terrific financial losses, although the infringement may be in matter submitted to the magazine in advertising over which they have no control.

Sidney E. Samuelson, president, Allied Theater Owners of New Jersey,[36] testified respecting the campaign of terror and abuse to which theater owners had been subjected by certain organizations which constituted themselves middlemen and who stand between the producers and the creators, on the one side, and the public, on the other. He offered written letters, photostats of checks, and other things. George P. Aarons, Motion Picture Theater Owners of Eastern Pennsylvania, Southern New Jersey, and Delaware, testified, in part:

"My objection to the copyright law in that it does not apply to the holdover situation is this: we have 10 decisions on that subject in the lower courts; 8 of which have established that the holding over is a violation of the copyright law, and I hold that it is a violation of contract." [37]

Later, the following interchange took place between Mr. Aarons and the chairman:

"The CHAIRMAN. To summarize the views of those here today who have spoken, you are in favor of giving to every author and composer the right which he is given by article I, sections 8, 9 of the Constitution, which gives him the exclusive right for a number of years to his work. We can not deprive the author of that. You have no sympathy as I gathered with the deliberate and willful infringer who goes out and steals?

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. But what you want is some legislation that will protect the innocent man who through a high pressure salesman or inadvertently, becomes a victim of a misunderstanding, and who, because of the limited amount of damages that can be claimed under the statute which may be claimed, is put at the mercy of this group; whereas he might nightly have taken in $250 at his theater? Is that correct?

"Mr. AARONS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is that right?

"Mr. AARONS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Suppose in writing the new copyright law which I intend to frame and submit to our committee I insert a provision wherein an infringement has been done in an innocent way, there shall be no collection of infringement damages. But where you get proof of willful infringement or where there is a question of doubt or a matter of opinion, it must go to the court where the minimum damage shall be from $50 to $5,000 depending upon the discretion of the court. Would that, in your opinion, be just?

"Mr. AARONS. Yes. That would be more just than the present law. I am in favor of the Federal court having jurisdiction of the violations of the Federal copyright law. But I think that the new law which is to be written should differentiate clearly just what is a violation of Federal copyright law in the holding-over of pictures; so that in holding-over you will not have that question to be determined by the Federal court, as it would be determined before hand.

"The CHAIRMAN. But how about the man who takes his motion picture and plays it in different theaters?

"Mr. AARONS. He should be taken into court; the State court or the Federal court. We have no sympathy with that man and do not care what you do with him." [38]

Alfred T. Reid, chairman, the legislative committee, American Artists' Professional League,[39] entered a plea for a special provision protecting the artistic works of artists. With respect to the points enumerated by the chairman to the other witnesses, Mr. Reid was in agreement.

C. E. Chambers, the Artists' Guild (freelance artists),[40] discussed the pirating of pictures, cartoons, etc., produced by artists, and

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

requested special protection in the copyright bill.

M. L. Raney, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and personal book buyers generally,[41] attacked the manufacturing provisions of the statute and desired liberalization with respect to the importation of single copies for use and not for sale.

Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights,[42] again testified in support of the statements of Mr. Raney. He stated that "when it comes to proposed legislation, however, we find that the restrictions of the existing law have been increased [in relation to importation], and it is there where the strongest protest, in our opinion, should be made."

Dr. W. G. Leland, director, American Council of Learned Societies, testified as follows:

"The point I wish to speak about is the last one brought up by Mr. Raney and the one Mr. Solberg spoke of, namely, the threatened limitation of the right of the individual to purchase authorized editions for his own use. Under the present copyright law, with which we are satisfied so far as that provision is concerned, scholars are allowed to purchase such books as they may need for their own use and to bring them in subject to the payment of duty. This provision under the new law would seriously limit that privilege which we have at present."[43]

Dr. Charles R. Mann, director of American Council of Education,[44] also testified in support of Mr. Raney's and Mr. Solberg's statements.

Harry H. Hershfield, journalist, as representing drama critics, testified with respect to destructive dramatic criticism:

"I think the biggest danger to the legitimate drama and amusement in general is not the destructive criticism as we know destructive criticism; but the critic boosting a show is in my opinion more dangerous than the deliberate destructive criticism. Well, there may be cases of desire to favor some individual fan who might be a producer or author. Even a city like New York can stand no more than 10 hits at one time; the rest must go by the board, and if these shows are what are called built up by continual praise which often happens, the effect on the public is destructive in this way if the show did not merit that praise. They naturally go to the shows that they have read most about and that have been praised most. They are often very much disappointed and they have been disgusted with the general idea of show business." [45]

Hatcher Hughes, professor of dramatic art, Columbia University, stated:

"And I agree with the sanity of Mr. Hershfield's statements to this extent that the condition of criticism is such that it would be extremely difficult for me to conceive of the thing being done in the way that I should like to have it done under present conditions.

"Dramatic critics on the daily papers in New York—I do not know so much about the conditions outside of New York—they have to be first journalist, that is they must report the play the next morning for their paper because I have talked with editors about just that point. The editor thinks that however bad it may be for dramatic criticism it is good newspaper journalism—good journalism to have that report the next morning for the public to read." [46]

Saul Rogers, general counsel, Fox Film Corp., stated:

"The position I take with reference to dramatic criticism is this. Dramatic criticism after all should be an analytical expression on the part of the reviewer of the achievements of the artist who I may call the dramatist, who has written the play and the artist who has interpreted this play. It may be commendatory, it may be adverse, I am not opposed to adverse criticism if it is honest adverse criticism." [47]

Robert Bruce Coleman, Jr., dramatic critic, Daily Mirror:

"I have made a few notes, for instance my idea of criticism is that criticism should analyze. It should get at the facts. I think that today criticism has a social as well as an artistic aspect and by that I mean that it should criticize a play from the standpoint of art, at the same time it must be a report to the public, to the reader of a paper." [48]

Later the chairman quesioned him stating:

"All right. We go to the second question, which is, should there be any limitation imposed by law upon the exercise of this function of criticism?

"Mr. COLEMAN. No. Most certainly not."[49]

The hearings concluded on March 14, 1932. Thereafter, Congressman Sirovich introduced H. R. 10976, 10364, and 10740, providing for a general revision of the copyright law.[50] On March 21 the committee began hearings on H. R. 10976. Once again the various interests took sides as follows:

Those in favor of the bill were:

Will Irwin, chairman, copyright committee, Authors' League.

Mrs. Manteel.

Harold Farnham, Authors' League.

William Hamilton Osborne, council, Authors' League.

William B. Warner, president, National Publishers Association.

Robert C. Coulson, counsel, National Publishers Association.

Frederick G. Melcher, National Association of Book Publishers.

Albert T. Reid, American Artist Professional League, the Artist Guild, the Society of Illustrators.

George W. Harris, Harris & Ewing, Washington, D. C.

Frank A. K. Boland, the American Hotel Association.

Those either opposing the bill outright or certain features of it or proposing amendments were:

Milton Danziger, International Association of Fairs and Expositions.

R. S. Ould, patent attorney.

William O. Tufts, Rand McNally Co.

John H. McCracken, American Council on Education.

Thorvald Solberg, former Register of Copyrights.

Karl Fenning, professor of patent law, Georgetown University.

Gabriel L. Hess, motion picture producer and distributor of America.

Samuel Spring, counsel, Metro Goldwyn and Paramount Pictures Corp.

George E. MacClean, former professor, the University of Minnesota, former chancellor, University of Nebraska, former president, University of the State of Iowa.

Abram F. Myers, general counsel, Allied States Association of Motion Picture Exhibitors.

Arthur E. Garmaize, Columbia Phonograph Co.

Henry A. Bellows, National Association of Broadcasters.

Henry Grattan Doyle, George Washington University.

Nathan Burkan, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Music Publishers.

Louis E. Swarts, attorney, Paramount Corp.

Julian Brylawski, Motion Picture Theater Owners of America, District of Columbia Theater Owners.

[41] Hearings op. cit. p. 321.
[42] Hearings op. cit., p. 335.
[43] Hearings, op. cit., p. 340.
[44] Hearings, op. cit., p. 344 et seq.
[45] Hearings, op. cit., p. 393 et seq.
[46] Hearings, op. cit., p. 405 et seq.
[47] Hearings, op. cit., p. 407.
[48] Hearings, op. cit., p. 412.
[49] Hearings, op. cit., p. 418.
[50] Hearings, op. cit., p. 461.
[51] Hearings, op. cit., p. 488.
[52] Hearings, op. cit., p. 488.
[53] Hearings, op. cit., p. 500.
[54] Hearings, op. cit., p. 506.
[55] Hearings, op. cit., p. 510.
[56] Hearings, op. cit., p. 524.
[57] Hearings, op. cit., p. 536.
[58] U. S. Congress. House Committee on Patents, hearings on H. R. 10976, pp. 1–32.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Copyright Office Given $20,000 for the Initiation of Studies Relating to the Revision of the Copyright Laws—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, great interest has been expressed in a study prepared for me by the Library of Congress of the many attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909. A portion of that study is included here:

The hearings on H. R. 10976 were concluded on March 25, 1932, and thereafter the House Committee on Patents reported the bill on April 5, 1932 (H. Rept. 1008, 72d Cong., 1st sess.), but no further action was taken upon it. After several changes Congressman Sirovich reintroduced the bill as H. R. 11948. Hearings were again called on May 12, 1932, on the revised bill. At the beginning of the hearings Congressman Sirovich stated:

"I would like to make the following statement. For almost 3 months the Committee on Patents and Copyrights have held hearings for the purpose of perfecting a copyright bill. At these hearings we gave permission to every industry, to every enterprise that would be affected through the principal of copyright; every organization that I thought was interested in the copyright legislation was invited to appear before the committee and give its views.

"A bill was then written upon which hearings were held, at which every interest that appeared, before the bill was written, was invited to appear before the committee. So far as the chairman of this committee knows, everybody was permitted to give their opinion about the bill, either for or against it. We then had a hearing on the bill in the executive session; the bill was reported out. It was reported out unanimously, with a permission given to Mr. Lanham and Mr. McLeod to make any amendments or any revisions that they may wish, or any changes, on the floor of the House, and we went before the Rules Committee and tried to get a rule to bring the bill up.

"Last week we were told that there were 2 or 3 interests who claimed that they had had no hearing on this bill. One is the map people, the other is the exhibitors, and the other was the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. In order that this bill that the committee reported should not lose its position a new bill was introduced in which two modifications to meet objections raised by the map people and exhibitors were made in the bill. Otherwise the bill is absolutely identical with the bill H. R. 10976 as it was." [58]

The hearing then proceeded. Those in favor were William O. Tufts and Abraham

Footnotes at end of speech.

P. Myers, while those opposed to the bill or some of its features were: Gabriel L. Hess, national distributors of motion pictures; Samuel Spring, motion picture producers and distributors; Natan Burkan, counsel, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; Ray T. Ernst; A. Julian Brylawski.

At the conclusion of the hearings on H. R. 11948, the committee reported the bill to the House (House Rept. No. 1361, 72d Cong., 1st sess.) and a special order was applied for (H. Res. 229). In the floor debate on the order Congressman SIROVICH described his efforts to bring harmony and obtain a general agreement:

"When the Committee on Patents was organized at the first session of the Seventy-second Congress, 19 members being present, it was unanimously decided to hold hearings on the subject of copyright legislation. Every industry interested in copyright was invited to be present.

"This novel method was used in inaugurating and continuing the hearings of the Committee on Patents. These hearings, starting in January 1932, were in the beginning held with no formal bill before the committee. I had extended invitations to all persons, associations, companies, concerns, and counsel interested in and affected by copyright to come before the committee and express their ideas and convictions as to what might be done to improve the copyright law of 1909 in view of the great changes brought about since then in all lines of communication, presentation, and publishing.

"In doing this it was my intention to get across section of opinion from those most competent to give it of what should be incorporated in the proposed bill, so that all those entitled to it should have fair and equal representation and be given ample time to present their views. Authors, dramatists, composers, publishers of periodicals, magazines, books, maps, and charts; motion-picture authors, scenarists, directors, and producers: radio organizations: phonograph, music-roll, and record makers, their counsel or organization representatives were urged to appear before the Committee on Patents and state their views. No one was denied hearing or full opportunity to present his or her views on the rights of authors and others to copyright.

"After a series of hearings had been held and the statements of those present and those communicating had been considered, a bill was drawn up and introduced in the House of Representatives in order to have a definite document corrected to the moment before the committee. This and other bills were amended and introduced until the final bill, H. R. 12094, was laid before an executive meeting of the committee, favorably reported out to the House, a rule obtained, and the bill given a place on the calendar." [51]

On the other side Congressman LANHAM gave a different picture of the situation:

"Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, most of the Members of the House are familiar with the fact that for many years I have been very much interested in copyright legislation, and working in an effort to get upon our statute books some proper provisions to supersede the very archaic and obsolete law of 1909, under which we are now operating.

"Today, with this copyright measure pending, many pleasant memories of this service come to me, but they are tinged also with sadness. In my judgment, no man in this country has done or will do as much to make desirable copyright legislation possible as our late and lamented friend, Albert H. Vestal, of Indiana. [Applause.] For 8 years he labored faithfully, diligently, and efficiently in an effort to reconcile and harmonize the divergent interests affected by copyright legislation. At first these various interests were at one another's throats, but through the patience and persistence of our former colleague he so oiled the troubled waters that in the last session of Congress he was able to bring before this body and to pass a copyright bill. It passed the House of Representatives with only one amendment and that is a tribute to his skill and to his industry and to his intelligence.

"Through those years it was my pleasure in a very modest way to cooperate with Mr. Vestal, and I value that association with him. It is out of the depth of that experience that I am enabled to make this statement and pay this tribute.

"As is generally known, last year the Vestal bill failed of passage in another body largely by reason of certain filibustering tactics, which prevented many measures from being considered. When we came back for this session, Mr. Vestal, who had labored so long and so faithfully with the committee in the forming of his bill and in preparing the way to make a consideration of copyright matters feasible, introduced on the 8th day of last December H. R. 139. This bill, in the main, is the bill which the House passed last year. That bill, introduced by this man who had given so many years of study to the measure and who had made it possible to consider copyright legislation in this body, was never considered for 1 minute by the Committee on Patents.

"Now, what is the situation this year? I am familiar with the terms of the Vestal bill. I worked on it for 8 years. In collaboration with Mr. Vestal during the last session, I explained its various provisions when it was before the House. I know something about it. Casting aside this bill that was the result of these years of labor and study, we have had introduced this year several copyright bills.

"I wish to be entirely fair to the chairman of the committee; and if I make any statement which is inaccurate, I should like to be corrected. Three copyright bills were introduced by the chairman of the committee. One was introduced on the 10th of March, one on the 22d of March, and one on the 30th of March 1932. He has introduced two or three bills since then, but they have been more or less modifications or amendments of the three bills cited.

"What about the hearings on this measure? Hearings began early in February, but they were quite general in their nature. The chairman had an idea, very much the English idea, and perhaps it is a good one, of conducting a school for the benefit of the committee and having men interested in various features of copyright legislation appear and give their views without reference to any particular bill, for no bill had then been introduced except the Vestal bill, and it was not considered or made the basis of hearings.

"After the bill of March 30 was introduced—and it was upon this bill that a rule was originally asked—we had, I think, 2 days of hearings. I attended them. I did not attend the school during February, because I had had 8 years of study on this subject, was very busy with many official matters, and wanted to reserve my strength for the time when we should actually have a bill before us. All the hearings, which were held prior to the application for a rule, were held prior to the introduction of the bill on which the rule was asked. The Committee on Rules suggested that the Committee on Patents should hold further hearings and give those who desired an opportunity to be heard, and such a hearing was held on May 12.

"The bill this year is different in many particulars from the one we had before us last year. This bill was not drawn by the Committee on Patents, and I think I may say, and I hope members of the committee will correct me if I am wrong, that the committee did not share in drafting the provisions of this bill. I had heard the rumor that the bill had been drawn by a young lawyer in New York in the office of some attorneys who are of counsel for certain concerns which would be affected by copyright legislation. If it is a good bill, I take no exception to that, if, indeed, that be true. It happened that on May 12, the last day on which hearings were held, this young gentleman was present and rose to interpolate some statement in the testimony of a witness before the committee. That was a rainy day, the House was not in session, and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GOODWIN], and I were the only committee members present. We devoted the entire day to the hearing. I incorporate an extract from this hearing of May 12, pages 115 and 116:

" 'The CHAIRMAN. Read the bill. The sky is the limit. Mr. Jaffe, where wilful infringement takes place after registration, the sky is the limit?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. After registration.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. What interest do you represent, Mr. Jaffe?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. I am associated with the counsel for the National Publishers' Association.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. May I ask him this question?

" 'The CHAIRMAN. Any question you want.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. I have understood that this bill, not those features we are discussing, was drawn by you. Is that correct?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. No. I sat in with a number of other people with various interests, with a number of other attorneys who took part in drafting the provisions.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. Was it drawn by attorneys in New York?

" 'Mr. JAFFE. No.

" 'Mr. LANHAM. Who did draw this bill?

" 'The CHAIRMAN. I drew the bill. I took the bill that was given to me by Mr. Dill, redrafted his bill, took his bill, and I did not like every word of it, and I rewrote it and redrafted it and called in various representatives of different organizations that were responsible to help along with the particular interest that they represented.'

"It seems clear from this excerpt that the Committee on Patents has had little or nothing to do with the preparation of this measure.

"Now, gentlemen, reflect upon the situation. After the committee had worked for 8 years in drafting a bill which the committee understood, this year we have had 3 different bills introduced in rapid succession, prior to the subsequent ones which have been amendatory of certain provisions, and these bills have had the careful consideration, it seems, of various persons but not of your Committee on Patents.

"I want a copyright measure that will protect everybody that is entitled to protection." [52]

At the conclusion of the debate the bill was recommitted to the committee.[53] Congressman Sirovich made one further effort toward a major copyright revision by the introduction on June 2, 1932, of one more bill, H. R. 12425. However, no action was taken on the bill. This concluded efforts at a major revision of the copyright law in the 72d Congress. The new beginning had failed.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[50] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings on H. R. 11948, p. 1.

[51] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, p. 11062.

[52] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, pp. 11065–11066.

[53] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 75, p. 11072.

Fixing Puerto Rican Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter written to the editor of the New York Times by Edward G. Miller, Jr., chairman of the Mayor's Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs, in New York City, is deserving of our attention; it appeared in the July 11, 1955, edition of the New York Times:

FIXING PUERTO RICAN WAGES—BILL TO RAISE MINIMUMS CONSIDERED THREAT TO ISLAND INDUSTRY

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York Times for June 30 published a letter by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS commenting upon the proposed minimum-wage regulation for Puerto Rico contained in S. 2168.

As chairman of the Mayor's Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs I am concerned with legislation which may increase unemployment in the island and add to the migration to the States.

In my present work, and previously as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, I have observed the remarkable progress in Puerto Rico. It is important to the United States that this progress continue. Puerto Rico is the showcase for the United States in Latin America and elsewhere. Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States whose welfare is of concern to us.

The Senate bill improves existing machinery for fixing minimum wages for most of Puerto Rico's industrial labor on an industry-by-industry basis. This flexible system replaced a former attempt to set a fixed minimum in 1940, after 2 years of disastrous experience. A requirement has also been added for across-the-board increases in all of Puerto Rican industry to become effective January 1, 1956, with further increases on January 1, 1958.

PRESENT PAY SYSTEM

The Senate bill fails to take into account the following facts which distinguish the Puerto Rican situation from that in the mainland:

Wages fixed under the Fair Labor Standards Act for Puerto Rico are, with a few exceptions, not minimum wages. They are the actual, prevailing wages. Puerto Rico's unemployment is in excess of 15 percent of its labor supply. The raising of prevailing wages in an industrial democracy is a function of labor and management through collective bargaining. The Government's role is to set minimum standards.

A surplus of labor and the youth of the Puerto Rican labor movement have effectively prevented strong collective bargaining. But even so, average wages in Puerto Rico are higher than those throughout Latin America and even in England, France and Italy.

Minimum wages in Puerto Rico under the existing law are determined by the United States Secretary of Labor. They are not determined by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. They are recommended by industry committees, composed of representatives of management, labor and the public, both Puerto Ricans and mainlanders appointed by the United States Secretary of Labor. Presumably the Secretary of Labor has been and will continue to be aware of the impact of wage levels in Puerto Rico upon mainland labor and industry.

MAINLAND INDUSTRIES

The increase of 25 cents an hour in the Senate bill is an increase above the minimum 75-cent level for the mainland which was fixed in 1950. The increases proposed for Puerto Rico operate on wage levels which have been successively raised since 1950 by the flexible machinery provided in the law. Some of these increases have become effective as recently as June 6 of this year.

The purpose of the increases in the Senate bill for Puerto Rico has been frankly stated to be to protect mainland industry. This is not the function of governmental fixing of minimum wages. There is no evidence that Puerto Rican industrialization has noticeably damaged industry in the United States.

The location of plants in Puerto Rico, while it has been of vital importance to that small island, has been inconsequential to the mainland economy. The aid-to-industry program, including tax exemption, has created 25,000 new industrial jobs in the past 10 years compared with the 8 million new nonfarm jobs created in the United States in the same period.

This tiny percentage (.0031 percent) does not menace the industrial system of continental United States. There is no justification for a protective tariff against our own fellow citizens in Puerto Rico. The resulting damage would injure the prestige that the United States has derived throughout Latin America from the recent spectacular advances in Puerto Rico.

FLAT INCREASES REPORTED

The proposal in the Senate bill is for flat increases in actual, and not merely minimum wages in Puerto Rico. This increase by fiat represents dubious government policy. If it were suggested that all wages—and not just minimum wages—in the United States be arbitrarily increased by 33⅓ percent, I doubt that the suggestion would receive serious consideration.

Congress should proceed with extreme caution in the case of Puerto Rico. The benefits to be conferred by precipitate action are difficult to see, and the damage that could be done may be irreparable.

The Senate bill contains provisions which will enable the Federal Secretary of Labor to operate the flexible procedure of outstanding law more effectively. In this he will have the cooperation of the excellent Government of the commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which has in the past voluntarily appropriated funds and offered them to the Federal Government because of its desire to encourage the effective application of the flexible provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

EDWARD G. MILLER, Jr.,
Chairman, Mayor's Committee on Puerto Rican Affairs.
NEW YORK, *July 2, 1955.*

Mutual Security Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7224) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have sat through all of the debate on this foreign aid appropriation bill, H. R. 7224, which implements the authorization bill, S. 2090.

The record made here today by the statements of those who support this legislation will add confusion to a program that is in a chaotic state. Under the circumstances, it is difficult for me to understand how the Members of this House can vote for passage of this bill. I shall vote aginst it even though there are some provisions that I could support.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to detract, in any way, from the fine work which the Appropriations Committee has done in cutting the request by more than $625 million. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PASSMAN, for his diligence and determination in attempting to write a reasonable bill in the face of administrative conduct which clearly has confused not only the Appropriations Subcommittee but also members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who have listened to this debate. However, in view of the fact that there is on hand unexpended funds as of July 1 of almost $10 billions, excluding the amount authorized in this bill, it is my firm conviction that it is absolutely unnecessary to appropriate one penny in addition to the amount now on hand.

Mr. Chairman, again I call your attention to the fact that this administration and the previous one have, at no time in any fiscal year since 1952, been able to expend in excess of $5 billion, except for fiscal 1953 when $5,700,000,000 was expended. With the large sum on hand as of July 1, the mutual security program or foreign aid, as we speak of it, had sufficient funds on hand to operate for at least 2 full fiscal years without adversely affecting the program in any way.

The carryover as of June 30, according to official reports, was $8,717,100,000. The amount on hand in counterpart funds in countries abroad was $973 million. If the bill before us is passed, it will carry an authorization of $2,701,275,000; or a total for fiscal 1956 of $12,391,375,000. Just how proponents of this legislation can justify their position before the people of this country, in view of the tremendous amount on hand, is a deep, dark mystery to me. I have heard no one justify their positions today nor last week when we considered the authorization bill.

There is another matter that should have the attention of the Congress and that is the manner in which the executive department plays fast and loose in its attitude and conduct toward the Congress. The sleight-of-hand performance and the juggling of amounts by the Department of Defense in the final hours of the 1955 fiscal year is indefensible, in fact, it is an insult to every Member of the Congress of the United States. Some one should be made to account to the proper committee of this House for that unconscionable conduct.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? On June 28, according to the statement by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. PASSMAN, FOA officials found that they had $932 million of unobligated and unreserved funds. Just what "unreserved" means, nobody seems to know, at least it is a new term used to confuse and deceive Members of the Congress.

Under the Mutual Security Act, the Defense Department may obligate only 25 percent of the total appropriations during the last 60 days of the fiscal year. The Department was in a dilemma, for it had on hand $932 million. What should they do? They hastily appeared before the Appropriations Committee and made the boast that they had saved some extra money and then requested that they be permitted to obligate $312 million of that amount and promised that the $420 million should not be "reserved" or obligated. This offer was made because they were aware that the authorizing legislation provided a carryover of only $200 million. It seems obvious to me that if they could get the $312 million, they were willing to give up the $420 million. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] expressed it as his opinion that the Department had a ruling from someone to the effect that "reserved" need not be construed as obligated. Upon receipt of that ruling, according to the chairman of the subcommittee, there was a rush to "reserve" several hundred million dollars during the final hours of the last day of the 1955 fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, attention must be called to the fact that when such action occurred, the Department obligated in excess of 42 percent of the entire fiscal year's appropriation in the last 60 days of the fiscal year. It was obvious that the Department was determined to obligate every penny, notwithstanding the legal limitation which I have mentioned.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this is reprehensible conduct and this Congress should deal with it. What actually happened was that they claimed all of the amount unobligated because of the ruling that a "reserve" is not an obligation. Again, as I have said, the proposition was made that—you give us $312 million, the legislation gives us $200 million, and then we will be happy to release $420 million.

This Congress, through the Appropriations Committee of the House, notwithstanding its honest effort to reduce the amount of the request in the bill before us, has a responsibility that it cannot avoid. Its hands are not clean in this transaction, for it has ignored the limitations of the law by permitting the Department to commit in excess of the amount allowed in the last 60 days of the last fiscal year.

My colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], has pointed out that there was testimony to the effect that $75 million was to be obligated for the so-called infrastructure program in the last 60 days. This amounts to 73 percent of last year's appropriation, which is well over the 50 percent of the carryover plus the appropriation, which on its face shows a violation of that 25 percent provision. According to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] the committee took no cognizance of that admitted violation of the 25 percent provision in the markup of the bill. Why not? Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, this House should not be too happy about what has transpired on this floor today.

The need to scrutinize and evaluate this entire program is more urgent today than ever before and I, for one, hope that both the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, and the House Appropriations Committee will consider in the near future, the problems that confront House committees in dealing with the executive department, under circumstances that have confronted us in the present session.

Mr. Chairman, when the authorization bill, S. 2090, was before this House, I offered an amendment to reduce the President's Special Fund for Asian Economic Development by $100 million. The amendment was defeated. I point out, however, that the Appropriations Committee has cut that same fund by the amount contained in my own amendment, and hence I feel justly proud that this committee has confirmed my efforts, in the bill that is before us. I commend the Appropriations Committee on the action that it took on this item.

Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 6, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 making temporary provision for payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

My bill is designed to assist municipalities to overcome what has become one of their major problems—that of the Federal Government taking away tax revenue from the municipalities which had been paid on large amounts of real property.

My bill prevents this great inequity created in all our many municipalities when the Federal Government moves in and takes off the local tax rolls billions of dollars of assessed valuations that have heretofore been subject to local taxation.

This inequity is clearly illustrated, in capsule form, by the plight of my own Massachusetts Eighth Congressional District of a serious tax problem created in the city of Everett by the General Electric Corp. operation of a plant for the United States Air Force. This plant is known as Air Force plant No. 28. The whole area of which I speak was owned by the General Electric Corp. from 1911 to 1941. Local taxes were paid to the city of Everett on this area by the General Electric Corp. On March 13, 1941, the area was acquired by the Defense Plant Corporation. Air Force plant No. 28 was built in Everett by the Defense Plant Corporation and leased to the General Electric Corp. during World War II and was then known as Plancor 46. It is to be noted that the Defense Plant Corporation during World War II paid taxes to the city of Everett during the fiscal years of 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945.

The Defense Plant Corporation was dissolved July 1, 1945. The same day, July 1, 1945, the property in question was then acquired by another governmental agency, namely, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Once again taxes were paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the city of Everett for the fiscal years of 1946, 1947, and 1948. In 1948 the property was assessed to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the amount of $1,905,000.

This property was then conveyed to the Air Force of the United States by the purely paper sale under the provisions of Public Law 364, 80th Congress, on a nonreimbursable basis. Approximately $50,000 of new construction has been added and approximately $125,000 has been required for rehabilitation. However, Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention that from September 7, 1948, up until the present time not 1 cent of taxes has been paid to the city of Everett for this very valuable property. This has resulted in an unfair tax loss to the city of Everett of approximately $90,000 annually. In view of the mounting cost of welfare, fire, police, and other services afforded by Everett to its citizens and taxpayers this tax loss has become a severe hardship on the people of that hard working community. What is more amazing, Mr. Speaker, is that during this period and despite the fact that the city of Everett has not received 1 cent of tax from any source on that valuable property, there has been no hesitation to demand from the city of Everett that this factory be supplied water, fire and police protection, and adequate sewerage facilities. What is even more astonishing is the fact that during the summer of 1953 when the duly accredited collective bargaining agency was out on strike at this General Electric operation the officials of that company demanded that the city of Everett furnish police coverage at the plant with no expense to be charged to the General Electric plant.

It is pointed out that police coverage was furnished. Who paid the cost? The long-suffering taxpayers of the city of Everett. It is interesting to note that at the time of the request for police protection no request was made for same by the Federal Government who are supposedly owners of the plant. Here we have a Government-owned plant which is operated by a private corporation for one purpose and one purpose only—that of making a profit for the stockholders of the company. While it is perfectly clear that this is a legitimate ambition and one to be encouraged under our free enterprise system, it also seems to me that such a company which is privately operated should not be operated at the expense of the long-suffering local taxpayers of the city of Everett.

It is clearly not fair nor in keeping with the best tradition of the free enterprise system to have property of this

nature tax free while other similarly located plants pay their fair share of costs to the city from whence their necessary local services flow.

I ask the question, Why should the Army Air Force be the first of a number of Government agencies to refuse to pay taxes when in fact the Army Air Force does not run the factory but merely is the fee holder of ownership papers? It is perfectly clear that the General Electric Corp. runs and operates this factory and it is equally clear that General Electric along with the other industries of the city of Everett should pay their fair share of the tax-poor city.

The city of Everett has a population of some 46,000 but an area of only 3.61 square miles, so you can readily see that available land is at a premium and that the city of Everett can ill afford to lose any valuation. Their assessed valuation, both real and personal approximates some $99 million. There are in the city of Everett 6 major industries, 5 of which pay taxes and the sixth of which I speak does not, yet receives the same benefits and privileges as the other 5 major industries including access to a highly skilled labor market.

I say to the Members of this House that this situation in Everett cannot be permitted to go on year after year. It is clearly not fair that this transfer of property from one Government agency to another Government agency should change the tax rights. The first Government agency paid taxes to the city of Everett; why should the second Government agency, acting merely in its capacity as landlord, not pay? The inhabitants of the city of Everett as a majority are a working class ranging in salary from $3,000 to about $6,000 per year, with the average home being assessed in the neighborhood of $5,000. The good people of Everett can no longer afford to carry the United States Government or the General Electric Co. on their back to the tune of a $2 million valuation free ride.

It is to meet situations of that character that I have introduced this proposed legislation.

Some 60 other properties, largely industrial in nature, in 20 States would also be affected by my bill, according to a list furnished by the Bureau of the Budget. I would like to point out that the payments assured by my bill will provide badly needed revenue for State and local governments and school districts in which those plants are located. In my home State of Massachusetts there are at least four such plants receiving services such as sewage disposal and water without reimbursing localities in like proportion to other similar plants. It has also been brought to my attention that school districts throughout the Nation have been educating children of parents employed in many of those federally owned plants also without paying for those services in like proportion to other school taxpayers.

The President has recognized the plight of local units of governments and their difficulty in obtaining adequate revenue to provide necessary local services, particularly in the light of heavy Federal taxation and extensive real property holdings by Federal agencies. In fact, on March 30, 1953, he requested the establishment of a commission to study and make recommendations with respect to the Federal Government programs as they affect States and their political subdivisions. This Commission, better known as the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, after 2 years of study, has recently filed its comprehensive report. On the subject of payment in lieu of taxes the Commission said in part:

> The Commission recommends that the National Government inaugurate a broad system of payments in lieu of property taxes to State and local governments. The most important class of properties on which such payments should be made is commercial or industrial properties. Special assessment payments and transitional payments in lieu of taxes should be made in certain cases.
>
> The Commission believes that these payments are necessary to help preserve financially healthy local governments. Present tax immunities of Federal property have weakened many local governments. The States and the National Government share in the responsibility for avoiding actions which impair the financial ability of local governments. Equity as between Federal and local taxpayers requires the National Government to make appropriate payments. These should be based largely on the property tax system, which is the main source of local revenue.

I am happy that the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations endorses the objective of my bill. I am firmly of the opinion that the Federal Government does have an obligation and a positive duty to correct situations that arise through no fault of the local governments whose tax base is being whittled away through exemption rights possessed by the Federal Government.

Bananas on Pike's Peak or Good Land in Georgia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Georgia has more than 1,721,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Facts Versus Fiction on Surplus Crops From the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1955, the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] spoke in opposition to the upper Colorado River storage project. Because his talk conveyed many misimpressions, I requested the opportunity to replying so that the facts can be bought to light.

He began his attack upon the Colorado River storage project with this statement:

> Here we are confronted with two conflicting policies both endorsed by the President. One policy calls for sharp reductions in farm price supports and a decrease in agricultural acreage. The other calls for spending enormous sums of public money to build two extremely costly desert reclamation projects which would produce more farm products to be supported by the Nation's taxpayers.
>
> I feel sure that the administration leaders realize they have created a dilemma that can lead to serious difficulties for them. I also feel that the Nation is entitled to an explanation as to how this conflict is to be resolved. (RECORD, May 19, p. 5687.)

In essence, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from southern California says: Why build the upper Colorado River storage project, which will bring more land into production when we already have staggering surpluses?

These two major policies on the surface do appear perhaps to be in conflict; however, when certain specific factors are considered in detail they make it abundantly clear that there exists no conflict between our agricultural and reclamation programs, at least insofar as the upper Colorado River storage project is concerned. Such factors include:

First. The nature of agriculture and the type of crops grown in the upper basin States of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, and their relationship to the current problem of agricultural surpluses.

Second. The anticipated elimination of the present surpluses by the Department of Agriculture by 1962.

Third. Anticipated population changes and projected food and fiber requirements by 1975.

Fourth. Our ability to meet the projected food and fiber requirements in light of the anticipated increase in population growth by 1975.

Detailed consideration of and elaboration with respect to the facts concerning these four items and their inter-relationships, will provide the explanation to which the gentleman from Southern California rightly says the Nation is entitled. However, such detailed consideration must necessarily be lengthy. So, Mr. Speaker, rather than replying in the

manner in which the gentleman from Southern California made his attack upon the Colorado River project, I shall present only part of the true facts today with the other parts to follow on consecutive legislative days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first let us examine the present status of the price support program and Mr. HOLIFIELD'S remarks thereto. As he put it:

The flood from the farms continues to pour in on the Commodity Credit Corporation. (RECORD, May 19, p. 5687.)

As of April 30, 1955, according to a news release dated June 7, 1955 from the Department of Agriculture, the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support commodities amounted to $7,261,338,000. This was made up of loans outstanding in the amount of $2,692,553,000 and the net value of inventories in the amount of $4,568,785,000.

The interesting thing which this press release reports though, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that four basic commodities—cotton, corn, tobacco, and wheat—accounted for all but a small portion of the non-recourse commodity loans made by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Of the loans outstanding, these four commodities, supported under the rigid 90 percent price support program amount to $2,295,127,235 in the following amounts:

Cotton, upland, 6,639,106 bales	$1,134,908,935
Corn, 273,276,386 bushels	427,157,476
Tobacco, 804,857,653 pounds	404,968,344
Wheat, 145,269,213 bushels	328,092,477
Total CCC loans	2,295,127,235

With respect to the cost of these price-support programs on the basic commodities wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice, Secretary Benson told the House Agriculture Committee, of which I am a member, during the hearings on H. R. 12 that—

The total realized cost directly chargeable to the basic commodities during the period 1932–54) is ($5,077,100,000) for all programs primarily for the stabilization of farm prices and income attributable to the basic commodities as follows:

	Millions
Corn	$1,228.2
Cotton	1,581.4
Peanuts	163.0
Rice	35.3
Tobacco	97.0
Wheat	1,972.2
Total	5,077.1

These realized costs for basic commodities are attributable to the following programs:

	Millions
CCC nonrecourse loan purchase and payment programs	$198.1
CCC supply, commodity export, and other activities	59.6
International Wheat Agreement	602.4
Emergency assistance to Pakistan and other friendly peoples	73.1
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	556.3
Federal Crop Insurance	71.6
Acreage allotment payments under the Agricultural Conservation program	1,666.3
Agricultural Adjustment programs (principally acreage allotments and marketing quotas)	76.7
Parity payments	967.1
Retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates	1.3
Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and related acts	505.6
Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund and payments stabilization corporations for loans incurred	286.4
Distribution costs on CCC stocks for emergency feed program	12.6
Total	5,077.1

(Hearings on H. R. 12, pp. 47 and 50.)

Now let us next examine the relationship between the surpluses of basic commodities and the type of agriculture pursued in the four Upper Basin States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming and New Mexico. The outstanding fact, Mr. Speaker, is that there is very little connection between these present surpluses on basic commodities, which I described in detail a moment ago, and the type of agricultural products which primarily are now produced in these four States and which will continue, by and large, to be produced on the lands irrigated by Colorado River water when the participating projects are built. Why? Simply because the primary crops grown in the four Upper Basin States in question are not in surplus and are not likely to be in surplus. Also I might add that the primary commodities produced are not now enjoying the benefits of the Department of Agriculture's price support program.

In Utah, only 7 percent of the cash receipts of farmers in 1953 came from the sale of basic commodities—notably wheat. But 99 percent of this wheat not only is nonirrigated, but also is grown in those parts of the State which will not benefit from Colorado River water brought into the States through any of the proposed participating projects.

In Colorado, farmers received about 18 percent of their income in 1953 from the sale of basic commodities, of which 17.6 percent is derived from wheat. But, and this is important to remember, this Colorado wheat is grown mostly in Eastern Colorado on "dry-farmed" land. This area also will not receive or be the beneficiary of Colorado River water. Wyoming farmers received 8 percent of their 1953 income from the sale of basic commodities. Now New Mexico farmers received 38 percent of their income in 1953 from basic commodities. It is true that 37 percent of this was derived from the sale of cotton produced in southern New Mexico. But this cotton will be grown whether the Colorado River project becomes law or not. Only one proposed participating project is located in New Mexico—the San Juan Chama—but even if it were constructed, none of its waters would find its way to this area.

It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that the type of crops grown in these four upper basin States on land which will receive water diverted from the Colorado River are not in surplus. But then the logical question arises: What is the nature of agricultural production in these upper basin States? The answer is that cattle and sheep and dairy products comprise the main commodities produced in these 4 States. For example, in 1952 according to the United States Bureau of the Census, 70 percent of the income which Utah farmers received was derived from the sale of livestock. Nor has the situation altered very much since that time. The publication, Statistical Summary, published in May 1955, by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture, indicates that Utah farmers for the month of March 1955 derived 84 percent of their income from livestock and its products, and 82 percent in April 1955 according to the Statistical Summary just released. Thus it is evident that agriculture in the upper basin States is fairly well limited to the type of commodities that can be grown and raised on mountain and desert ranges and in our high altitude valley. For diversification it does not compare with California, which is perhaps the greatest diversified agricultural area in the world.

The nature of agricultural production and its dependence upon water development such as the Colorado River storage project in the Colorado Basin has been very ably described by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950 as follows:

Range use and irrigation developments are somewhat complementary in the Colorado Basin. Although the range is used by a large proportion of the livestock year-long, the production of hay for feed and the use of irrigated lands for pasture contribute an important farm use. In the upper basin, livestock farms predominate, averaging nearly 40 percent of all farms, and ranging from 78 percent in Wyoming to 26 percent in New Mexico. In the lower basin almost 37 percent of the farms are livestock and dairy farms. * * *

Cropland is a necessary adjunct to the range because of the need for providing supplemental feed to carry stock through severe winters and dry summers. Effective use of the range is not possible without forage from croplands, and many croplands would have little value except in connection with the use of rangeland.

Unquestionably as additional water is made available for irrigation, there will be an expansion in pasture feeding, permitting greater integration of range and pasture use. As population in nearby States increases, the percentage of finished stock is almost certain to increase. (Ten Rivers in America's Future: No. 5 Colorado River, vol. 2, pp. 80–81.)

This conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is also borne out by the 1954 Agricultural Census of Emery County, Utah, which was just released by the United States Census Bureau. Now, I should like to call to your attention the fact that the participating project known as the Emery County project will provide water for 3,630 acres of new land and supplemental water for 20,080 acres of land which now has only a partial supply in Emery County, Utah.

The 1954 census figures for Emery County indicate that there are in Emery County, Utah: 725 farms or ranches, of which 403 produce only cattle; only 20 produce grains—wheat, barley and oats; only 51 are dairy farms; only 36 are poultry farms; only 5 are fruit farms; only 30 are diversified or general farms; and 180 are classified as miscellaneous, most of which are not producing crops for sale.

It is evident, therefore, that the lands which will receive project water will not

be used in the production of the crops, vast amounts of which the Commodity Credit Corporation has acquired.

This concludes my remarks today Mr. Speaker, in reply to Mr. HOLIFIELD'S May 19, 1955, attack upon the upper Colorado River storage project. Tomorrow, I shall continue my reply by discussing another aspect of his unwarranted attack relating to the type and quantities of agricultural commodities to be grown on Colorado River project lands.

Natural Gas: Is It To Be a Dwindling Fuel?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I am including a statement published in a recent issue of the magazine of the Kansas Independent Oil and Gas Association.

This statement is written by a former Member of Congress, the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill. It contains pertinent information that should be helpful to Members of Congress in consideration of H. R. 6645, known as the natural-gas bill, of which the Honorable OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, is author.

I believe the Members of the House will find the information in this statement to be helpful in consideration of this proposed legislation:

NATURAL GAS: IS IT TO BE A DWINDLING FUEL?
(By Hon. Samuel B. Pettingill)

The practical question before us is whether the supply of natural gas, in Northern and Eastern States, will be allowed to dwindle away gradually—not because of the exhaustion of this great natural resource—but because of a wrong decision by the United States Supreme Court. The consumers of natural gas are as deeply concerned as the producers in the gas fields in the question: Is natural gas to become a dwindling fuel?

How did this question arise? The gas industry, like ancient Gaul, is divided into three parts. First is the local distribution of gas. This is a public utility regulated by State governments. Second, the interstate pipelines, another public utility regulated, since 1938, by the Federal Government; and third, the exploration and drilling for gas and its production, when found.

The business of transporting and distributing gas takes about 90 cents of the consumer's dollar and is regulated, as to price, by either the State or Federal Government. Only one-tenth of the dollar goes to the producers. If the Federal Government forced a reduction of 20 percent in the average price now received by the producers, it would save the average homeowner only a dime a month. But if this were done, what would happen to your future supply? And then what would gas eventually cost the residential consumer? There is actually a shortage of gas right now in many places—not enough to supply potential new customers now on the waiting list.

In 1938, Congress passed the Natural Gas Act which brought the public-utility business of interstate pipelines under Federal regulation. I was a member of the committee of the House of Representatives which held hearings on that bill and recommended its passage. I assure you that it was not our intent to subject the independent gas producers to Federal control. We wrote into the act that it should not apply to the production and gathering of natural gas.

This was done in the interest of the consumers equally with that of the producers. The four to five thousand producers, mostly located in half a dozen States, did not and do not have enough political influence to obtain favors from Congress that are adverse to the interests of the 21 million consumers of gas now served in 43 States in the Union. The bill became law only because Congressmen and Senators from consuming States voted for it.

Congress left the producers free, as they had always been, from Federal regulation and control. This was done because they were and are in a highly competitive business which is subject to great risks. This differentiates them from public utilities which have assured markets, a certain return on their investments, and freedom from direct competition. We had faith that the competition and incentives of a free market for gas producers would assure the consumers of an ample supply of this fine clean fuel at a reasonable cost.

Has that faith been justified? Let's look at the record. From 1938 to the end of 1953, 84,000 wildcat wells were drilled, of which 74,000 were dry holes, a total loss. Nevertheless, net production increased from 3 trillion cubic feet a year to 9.5 trillion, the number of customers served increased from 6.7 million to 21 million, and the cost to the residential customer increased only 9 percent during this inflationary period, whereas the cost-of-living price index, for all commodities, went up 90 percent, or 10 times as much as the cost of gas. Moreover except in a few sections of the country, natural gas, in heat content, or B. t. u.'s of energy, is cheaper than coal or residential heating oils.

All this was accomplished under free market prices for gas at the wellhead. Freedom to produce has proved itself. This is further shown by the fact that the use of natural gas has increased faster since 1938 than any other major industry except television and electronics.

Despite this record of service, the United States Supreme Court, in deciding the famous Phillips case last June, held by a 5 to 3 vote that the Natural Gas Act of 1938 did not exempt "the production and gathering of natural gas" from Federal regulations and control. This decision included the power to fix, in the producing fields, the price of gas that is sold to the interstate pipelines.

This decision, in effect, made the competitive and risky business of producing gas a public utility. It is a return in times of peace, not war, to the philosophy of governmental price fixing. Those of you who recall how meat practically disappeared from the market when OPA price fixing of meat was continued after the war ended, will understand why we are certain that this 5 to 3 decision is not in the interests of the consumers of gas. We must now ask Congress to amend the Natural Gas Act in terms so plain that no court can question its original intention to leave the production of gas to the operation of competitive forces in a free market.

From the beginning of our Nation, we have relied on competition to govern market prices. Under this principle we have attained the highest level of living in the history of the world. With only a few exceptions, occurring in time of war, or in connection with public utilities, have we attempted to regulate prices by Government authority. Freedom to compete has been the great regulator of prices and we have made competition mandatory with Federal and State laws prohibiting monopolies, trusts, and combines to charge prices higher than a free market would permit.

To illustrate how well our system has worked, automobile tires in 1910 cost 87 cents per 100 miles of service; in 1947, they cost 5 cents per 100 miles. Everyone old enough to remember how often we had to stop to patch tires and tubes will appreciate this. Tires used to run 3,000 miles; today they last for 25,000 to 50,000 miles. Another example of free enterprise is the gasoline that turns the driving wheels of your automobile. It costs less today, excluding the tax collected at the pump, than it did in 1926. This is what a competitive free market has done. Because competition has held prices down, and improved quality, the scales of living of all of us have gone up.

The United States Government itself, when it makes leases to oil or gas prospectors on its public lands, insists that rentals be fixed by competitive bidding, that is, it gets the free market price. But if this Supreme Court decision remains the permanent law of the land, this same Government will try to compel well drillers to sell their gas at something less than the free market price. The history of 2,000 years of attempted price-fixing under all kinds of governments proves that any such effort will have very unfortunate results. Similar controls in Russia, applied to her agricultural producers, have reduced that country's supply of food below what it was under the Czars. Men will always produce more under a free market than under a controlled market.

The production of natural gas is not a monopoly. Five thousand producers are getting your gas from 71,000 wells in 28 States, although 88 percent of the Nation's total supply comes from the 5 States of Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Kansas.

Not one of the 5,000 producers turns out as much as 5 percent of the total supply. The 37 largest companies produce less than half the total. Compare these figures with the 3 automobile manufacturers, which make 90 percent of the Nation's cars. Yet no one is seriously demanding governmental regulation and price-fixing of automobiles in their highly competitive market.

Nor should it. To say nothing of luxury performance, today's cars in lifetime mileage are a better bargain than the 1925 car, despite the increase in dollar price, which includes about $600 in taxes per car. The 1925 car had a life of about 26,000 miles, and was scrapped when 7 years old. Today's car has a life of 125,000 miles and is 14 years old when scrapped. Tires, gasoline, and automobiles have all operated in a competitive market, without price controls laid down by Government.

Today, 52 percent of the Nation's gas is sold in interstate commerce, to consumers in distant States, as far from the gas wells as Texas is from New Hampshire. If the Supreme Court ruling stands, the field price of this gas will be controlled by the Federal Government as a public utility. The other 48 percent is sold in the States in which the gas is produced, where it is free from Federal price controls.

If the decision stands, the inevitable trend will be to divert gas from the interstate markets to those located in the States where the gas is produced, chiefly in the Southwest. There will be an accelerated movement of northern industry and capital to the producing States where industry can be sure of an ample supply of this prime source of energy from nearby fields.

A chemical plant in Texas and an aluminum plant in Louisiana already consume half again as much gas as all household users in Detroit, Milwaukee, and Kansas City combined. The incentive to drill more wells and to build more interstate pipelines to supply our rapidly increasing population in the

North and East will diminish. That is why we say that this great natural resource is in jeopardy, at least, so far as northern consumers are concerned.

I will not go into the problems of the producers except as they concern you, all consumers and the general public. But let me mention one that certainly does concern all these. The rates permitted to be charged by a public utility have historically been limited to a 5 or 6 percent return on the depreciated cost of the investment actually used in the business. Now let us look at the devastating effect of applying public utility principles to the exploration and production of gas in the field. The average cost of drilling a well is around $75,000. But on the average, only 1 well in 9, in new wildcat territory, is a producer. The wildcatter plays with a stacked deck. The other eight are dry holes, a total loss.

However, under the usual practice, their cost cannot be included in a rate base because dry holes supply no gas. A prospector can easily sink, say, $750,000 in drilling 10 wells, only 1 of which finds gas. How can he continue in business if he is limited to a 6 percent return on his drilling investment of $75,000 in the 1 successful well? Moreover, he cannot know what price the Government will let him receive until after he has found gas; and even after that, the Government has said it will not be bound by any contract the producer makes. Will banks loan him the money to drill 10 wildcats on any such setup? Would you loan or invest your own money in such a setup?

If the supply of gas dwindles away in interstate markets, the unit cost of distributing the gas that may still come into these markets will go up, resulting in applications by the distributing companies for higher rates. While the northern consumer might possibly, under Federal control, get gas for a short time at a cent or two cheaper per thousand cubic feet, the long-term cost to the consumer would almost certainly go up, as it did with respect to meat and other commodities under OPA. As supply goes down, price goes up. That law has never been repealed. Consumers are interested in both an ample supply and a reasonable price.

Gas is not the only commodity a local gas company buys. It buys heavy and expensive machinery and equipment, which much finally be paid for in the price of gas. If the price of gas in the producing field can properly be held down below the free-market price, then why should not the Government reduce the prices received by all manufacturers of equipment who sell to the gas companies? And why then should not the Government reduce the price received by the manufacturer for the housewife's gas range in the kitchen? Why not control all prices and wages and everybody?

The best chance of consumers to have an ample supply of this fine fuel for years to come is to rely on prices fixed by the competition for customers in a free market, rather than on bureaucratic fixing by the Federal Government.

CIO Officers Oppose Harris Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the extent to which the consumers of natural gas are alert to the dangers inherent in a repeal of regulatory powers over the production, transmission, distribution, and sale of natural gas.

Labor unions as representatives of workers are active in their opposition to the Harris bill on the basis that it does not give the required protection to the consumers of natural gas.

As evidence of this interest, I include as part of my remarks the following telegrams:

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge you vote against Harris natural gas bill which will gouge New Jersey families of millions of dollars a year in extra gas charges and render thousands of gas heaters economically obsolete. Would appreciate your statement on this important bill for report to 60,000 UAW families in New Jersey.

MARTIN GERBER,
Regional Director, UAW, CIO.

NEWARK, N. J.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge you to oppose Harris bill, H. R. 6645.

PAUL KREBS,
President, New Jersey State CIO Council 772.

Air Force Academy Opens—Secretary Talbot Stresses Peace Aims—Valmore William Bourque, of South Hadley Falls, Mass., First Cadet To Enroll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an account printed in this morning's New York Times by Hanson W. Baldwin, detailing the opening of the United States Air Force Academy, be printed in the RECORD.

The first cadet to be enrolled at the new service Academy was Valmore William Bourque, of South Hadley Falls, Mass. Mr. Speaker, Cadet Bourque is a resident of my congressional district and it was my honor to nominate him, after competitive examination, for admission to the Academy. He was selected by the Air Force Academy appointment branch as 1 of the 8 successful nominees from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The article follows:

AIR FORCE ACADEMY OPENS; TALBOTT STRESSES PEACE AIM

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

DENVER, July 11.—The past looked to the future today as a dream of three decades was realized. Three hundred and six young men, awkwardly earnest in their new khaki uniforms with blue caps and blue shoulderboards, swore to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic," and became the first cadets at the new Air Force Academy.

The dedication ceremonies for the Nation's third service academy centered on the new cadets, lads between 17 and 22 years of age from all walks of life from all parts of the country.

But the cadets' civilian chief, Secretary of the Air Force Harold E. Talbott, took the opportunity to tell the audience and the world that the United States still possessed "air supremacy," and "we not only want peace," but that "we mean to have it."

Mr. Talbott declared that "the United States Air Force is ready this minute, this hour, this day, and every hour of every day to destroy its enemies should they take the part of aggression."

AIR LEADERS ATTEND

Leaders in aviation's brief but dramatic past gathered for the simple ceremonies this afternoon at the Air Force Academy's temporary site at Lowry Air Force Base, near Denver. They heard Secretary Talbott, and Gen. Nathan F. Twinning, chief of staff, commit the new academy to the mission of creating a hard core of leaders dedicated to serving their country.

Mrs. H. H. Arnold, widow of the wartime leader of the Army Air Forces, "Hap" Arnold; Gen. Cary Spaatz; Maj. Gen. Ralph Royce, and many others famed in war or peace, whose memories reach back to the birth of flight, were among the honored guests. In person, or in ghostly assemblage, were Air Force leaders of yesterday, who had long held dear the vision of an Air Force Academy. They joined with Air Force chiefs of today, with the Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens, with the superintendent of the United States Military Academy, Lt. Gen. B. M. Bryan, and with the United States Naval Academy's commandant, Capt. Robert T. S. Keith, in tribute to the new chapter now opening in American military history and in the history of flight.

Flanking the new cadets were honor guards from the older sister academies—60 cadets from West Point and 40 midshipmen from Annapolis.

But the nostalgic link with the past of today's ceremonies did not obscure the future. The United States Air Force—a young service is dynamic in its hopes and aspirations, its plans and programs. Today its present leaders spoke of tomorrow to the leaders of tomorrow.

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT

Mr. Talbott, surrounded by high Air Force officers, by numerous civilian and military leaders from the Pentagon, by a congressional delegation and State and city officials from Colorado and Denver, read the following letter from President Eisenhower:

"In taking its place beside West Point and Annapolis the Air Force Academy joins a proud company. The honored histories of the two older institutions provide a standard against which, in future years, the excellence of the new academy will be measured. I know it will be found worthy.

"In behalf of the American people, I wish the Air Force Academy brilliant success."

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a member of the class of 1915 at West Point with Hubert R. Harmon, who is known to the President as "doodles." Lieutenant General Harmon is the first superintendent of the academy.

Mr. Talbott spoke today of the debt owed to the older service academies and of the links of tradition that tied the new to the old.

"Graduates of West Point and Annapolis," he said, "have been leaders of our Armed Forces for 150 years. What calamities might have befallen our country had we not been able to call upon them in time of need."

The Secretary recalled great air battles of World War II, the Berlin airlift and triumphs in Korea. Then he said:

"We salute all these airmen who made Air Force history. Let no man imagine that the United States Air Force lacks tradition. We have a tradition of triumph, a custom of victory.

"Today, we stand on one of the crests of our upward climb. The struggle for recognition has given way to success. The Air Force has come of age."

Mr. Talbott noted that today 1 jet bomber manned by 3 men carries more destructive power than a fleet of 10,000 World War II bombers, manned by 110,000 airmen.

"This unusual concentration of destructive power requires unusual men to handle it successfully * * *."

CITES PEACE AIM

The Secretary declared that peace—the prevention of war—was the great purpose of the United States. He told the cadets that "it is to the maintenance of peace that you are dedicating your lives. * * *"

General Twining echoed Mr. Talbott's emphasis upon the human element. He told the new cadets that a special responsibility, which requires a special discipline, rests upon each of them. For one mistake in the modern Air Force could easily cost millions of lives.

The Chief of Staff looked to the new Air Force Academy, he said, "to produce that solid center section of dedicated, devoted, duty-conscious officers that the whole Air Force needs if it is going to be able to do its job."

The dedication ceremonies were held under a hot Colorado sun at Lowry, a training base—near the 62 buildings that have been renovated at a cost of about $1 million into the temporary home for the academy. The Air Force Academy expects to remain here, at least until 1957, pending completion of its permanent buildings near Colorado Springs.

The ceremonies had the distinctive trappings of the new and dynamic third service, tempered by the ties of tradition. The 306 new cadets, who reported to the academy only this morning and had 2 to 4 hours of intensive close-order drill before the ceremony, did a minimum of marching. The Air Force band and the West Point cadet contingent and Annapolis midshipmen who formed the honor guards for the ceremony passed in review as the Air Force cadets watched.

Then, for 4 minutes, 51 aircraft—planes such as the late "Hap" Arnold probably never dreamed of—flew over the stands. There were 9 giant Convair B–36's, with jets and propellers; 18 Boeing B–47 medium jet bombers, and 24 Republic F–84 Thunderjets.

A LONG, HARD DAY

The noise of their passage had scarcely died when General Harmon called upon the Air Force chaplain—Maj. Gen. Charles I. Carpenter, to pronounce the invocation. Then, after Mr. Talbott's talk, the Air Force cadets rose, and as a group again took the oath of allegiance that they had taken individually or in small groups when they reported in the morning. An aerial demonstration by an Air Force stunt team flying F–84's followed; General Twining spoke, the chaplain delivered the benediction, and the strains of the national anthem rang out as the sun caught the distant snow-tipped peaks of the Rockies.

When the Air Force cadets marched off after the ceremony, it was for them, the end of a hard day and the start of a harder summer.

Most of them reported today between 6 and 9:30 a. m. Most wore civilian clothes, but brought with them 2 pairs of khaki trousers and 2 khaki shirts, which had been sent to them by the Air Force Academy. Upon reporting, the cadets passed through six stations, where their orders were checked and recorded. They stood in line for the first of many times in their military career; emptied their pockets of money and valuables; got back from the Academy $3 spending money for the month of July, signed a certificate stating they were unmarried and undertook to serve a minimum 3 years after completion of their 4-year Academy course. They took the oath of allegiance and were assigned serial numbers, squadrons, barracks, and rooms. Then, as relatives watched, they were marched off, wearing their "civies" for the last time.

They were issued uniforms, many different kinds of footgear, white and blue and khaki shirts and other military equipment. Both the summer and winter uniforms they were issued are temporary; the design for the permanent uniform of the Air Force Academy has not yet been completed by Cecil B. DeMille, the movie director, and his designers.

Drill, with a break for luncheon, occupied most of the rest of the long, hot day, for the new cadets, who are to be known officially as fourth classmen, or freshmen.

The new cadets come from a catholic background with more than a score from the armed services. In the group, too, are lads who never before had been away from home and whose mothers worried audibly about the kind of soap their sons would have to use.

This summer their entire schedule will be military training, including a field bivouac and physical conditioning. The academic year does not start until September. The new cadets are being trained as leaders—not merely as plane jockeys, and some long, hard weeks lie ahead.

They realized this tonight, as they were cloistered in their barracks while the visiting West Point cadets and Annapolis midshipmen were entertained by General Harmon.

This was, perhaps, their first lesson in military protocol, that the entering cadets were merely the "lowest form of flying life." For their associates from the older Academies, "rank has its privileges."

The first to enroll was Valmore William Bourque, South Hadley Falls, Mass. He said he wants to be a fighter pilot and acknowledged he was pretty nervous about registering as the first cadet in the Academy. He was followed by Lee Roy Dorey, route 6, Henrico County, Va., and Zachary Anderson Coles, Jr., Nashville, Tenn.

Mayors' Committee Opposes Termination of Federal Regulation of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the messages being received in opposition to the Harris bill (H. R. 6645) as reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce leaves no doubt that there is general dissatisfaction upon the part of consumers with its provisions.

The following telegrams are an indication of the opposition that is being expressed by the mayors of large cities in their individual capacity as well as representatives of the National Committee of Mayors.

I include the following telegrams as part of my remarks:

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Mayor's committee opposing the termination of Federal regulation of field price of natural gas. Was very pleased to see your well written minority report on the amended Harris bill issued on June 28. Your report indicates a full appreciation of the seriously adverse effect which this legislation can have on America's natural gas consumers throughout the United States. Representing 258 cities with a total population of 31,600,000, we hope you will do everything possible to prevent passage of this legislation by the full House.

JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr.,
Mayor of Philadelaphia.
DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
Mayor of Pittsburgh.
ROBERT F. WAGNER, Jr.
Mayor of New York.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you vigorously resist any action on amended Harris bill (H. R. 6645) this session of Congress. This measure can cost natural gas consumers hundreds of millions annually. Bill as stands exempts natural gas sales in field from regulation. May be unconstitutional. Reserves further careful study.

GEORGE E. BRUNNER,
Mayor, City of Camden, N. J.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has completed work on the preparation of the Social Security Act amendments of 1955, H. R. 7225. This legislation was ordered favorably reported with technical amendments by the committee yesterday afternoon. It is expected that the committee's report will be filed Thursday, July 14, 1955, and be available to the House membership Friday morning.

As a result of conferences that I have had with the House leadership, it is my expectation that this legislation will be called up for floor consideraiton early next week. So that the House membership can be informed on the improvements that this meritorious legislation would make in our social-security law, I will include a brief summary of H. R. 7225 at this point in the RECORD.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS TO THE OASI PROVISIONS OF THE SOCIAL-SECURITY LAWS AS PROPOSED IN H. R. 7225—DISABILITY INSURANCE BENEFITS

Disability insurance benefits would be provided for covered workers who are aged 50, who have 1½ years of coverage in the 3-year period ending with disability plus 5 years of coverage in the 10-year period ending with such disability, and are fully insured.

It is estimated that in the first year disability insurance benefits would be payable to about 250,000 workers—at a cost of one-tenth of 1 percent of payroll—amounting to $200 million in benefits and that in 25 years 1 million workers would receive disability benefits—at a cost of four-tenths of 1 percent of payroll—amounting to about $850 million in benefits a year.

It is estimated that this provision would put into effect disability income protection amounting to $2,400,000,000 a month. Of this amount, $500 million would be immediate protection which would be available to workers now between the ages of 50 and 65, and the remaining $1,900,000,000 represents protection for younger workers in the form of monthly disability benefits beginning at age 50.

The procedures for determining and for defining disability would be those now contained in present law for purposes of determining a disability "freeze." This means, of course, that disability determinations would be made by State agencies.

It will be recalled that the Advisory Council appointed by the Senate in the 80th Congress recommended disability insurance payments by a vote of 15 to 2.

RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN BENEFICIARIES

The age of eligibility for all women beneficiaries—widows, wives, and women workers—would be lowered from 65 to 62. The Advisory Council to the Senate in the 80th Congress unanimously recommended that the eligibility age for women be lowered to 60 years.

It is estimated that in the first year benefits would be paid to almost 800,000 additional women—at a cost of one-fourth of 1 percent of payroll—amounting to about $400 million in benefits and that in about 25 years 1,800,000 additional women would be receiving benefits—at a cost of one-half percent of payroll—amounting to about $1,300,000,000.

Insured workers now have the equivalent of some $70 billion in life insurance protection for their widows, with the present qualifying age of 65. Reduction in the qualifying age for widows from 65 to 62 means the immediate addition of about $15 billion in survivors' protection for these insured workers.

DISABLED CHILDREN OVER AGE 18

Disabled children who are disabled before they are aged 18 would continue to receive benefits after age 18. In addition, disabled children who reached 18 in 1954 and 1955 would receive benefits provided they were disabled at the time they reached age 18.

It is estimated that eventually 5,000 children and their mothers will receive benefits totaling $2 to $3 million per year.

EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

Coverage would be extended to lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, naturopaths, optometrists, Tennessee Valley Authority and Federal home loan bank employees, and gum naval store employees.

SHARECROPPERS

The bill enacts existing regulations so as to clarify present law whereby persons who undertake, under the ordinary crop-sharing arrangement, to produce a crop or livestock on land belonging to another for a proportionate share of the crop or livestock produced, or the proceeds thereof, would be considered to be independent contractors and covered as self-employed persons. Like all other self-employed persons, a sharecropper's net earnings from self-employment would have to amount to $400 a year either from his farming operations or in combination with earnings from other covered employment, before he would be subject to the self-employment tax and before he would receive credit for social security purposes.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

The bill provides that at least 2 years before social-security taxes are scheduled to increase, an Advisory Council would be apointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to examine the financing of the system and make recommendations thereon.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The new benefits, coverage provisions, and a tax increase of one-half percent on both the employer and employee—a total of 1 percent—and three-fourths percent on self-employed persons would be effective January 1, 1956.

At present, social-security taxes are scheduled to increase in 1960, 1965, 1970, and 1975. The effect of the 1 percent total increase on January 1, 1956, is to increase each of the presently scheduled employer-employee increases by a total of 1 percent on these same dates and the self-employment tax by three-fourths percent. This means that the rates would be:

Years	Employee	Employer	Self-employed
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1956–59	2½	2½	3¾
1960–64	3	3	4½
1965–69	3½	3½	5¼
1970–74	4	4	6
1975 and thereafter	4½	4½	6¾

TABLE 1.—*Estimated number of additional persons who will be benefited by the proposed revisions, their benefits (and cost [1] to the system), and additional cost as a percent of payroll—listed by proposed changes*

Calendar year	Proposed revisions: Reducing retirement age for women to age 62		
	Benefits	Number of beneficiaries	Cost in percent of payroll [2]
	Millions		
1956	$389	780,000	0.23
1957	455	840,000	.26
1958	519	890,000	.30
1959	584	950,000	.33
1960	650	1,000,000	.36
1970	1,006	1,340,000	.50
1980	1,292	1,770,000	.59
1990	1,399	1,950,000	.59
2000	1,362	1,880,000	.53
2020	1,840	2,560,000	.64
Level-premium [3]	----------	----------	.56

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1—Continued

Calendar year	Proposed revision: Monthly disability benefits after age 50		
	Benefits	Number of beneficiaries	Cost in percent of payroll [3]
	Millions		
1956	$200	250,000	0.11
1957	278	350,000	.16
1958	355	440,000	.20
1959	433	530,000	.25
1960	511	620,000	.29
1970	742	890,000	.37
1980	859	1,020,000	.39
1990	888	1,050,000	.37
2000	1,012	1,180,000	.39
2020	1,044	1,210,000	.36
Level-premium [4]			.37

[1] Not shown here is the relatively small increase in cost for continuation of child's benefits beyond age 18 when disabled (about 2 to 3 million dollars a year, after the first few years of operation).

[2] Taking into account lower contribution rate for self-employed as compared with employer-employee rate.

[3] Based on 2.4 percent interest. Level-premium contribution rate for benefit payments after 1955 and into perpetuity, not taking into account (*a*) existing trust fund, and (*b*) administrative expenses. These level-premium rates assume that benefits and payrolls remain level after the year 2050.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated progress of old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, 2.4 percent interest—present law*

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions [1]	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Interest on fund	Fund at end of year
	Actual data				
1953 [2]	$3,945	$3,006	$88	$414	$18,707
1953 [3]	4,105	3,236	92	424	19,102
1954 [2]	5,163	3,670	92	468	20,576
1954 [3]	5,373	3,920	96	477	20,936
	Intermediate-cost estimate				
1960	$8,482	$7,540	$135	$616	$26,716
1970	13,598	11,931	172	931	40,473
1980	17,498	16,050	206	1,624	69,936
1990	18,744	19,565	238	2,080	88,239
2000	20,459	21,129	258	2,334	99,126

[1] Combined employer, employee, and self-employed contributions. The combined employer-employee rate is 4 percent for 1954–59, 5 percent for 1960–64, 6 percent for 1965–69, 7 percent for 1970–74, and 8 percent for 1975 and after. The self-employed pay ¾ of these rates.

[2] Excluding effect of railroad coverage under financial interchange provision.

[3] Including effect of railroad coverage under financial interchange provision (as is also the case for future estimates shown below). Preliminary; partially estimated.

NOTE.—The estimated figures in this table are based on high-employment assumptions.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated progress of trust fund under proposed revisions, intermediate-cost estimate, high-employment assumptions, 2.4 percent interest*

[In millions]

Calendar year	Contributions	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses	Interest on fund	Balance in fund
1955 [1]	$5,970	$5,434	$130	$508	$21,850
1956	8,198	6,446	135	544	24,011
1957	8,630	7,028	140	594	26,067
1958	8,702	7,594	146	637	27,667
1959	8,774	8,159	151	670	28,800
1960	10,278	8,725	156	708	30,906
1970	15,643	13,713	197	1,160	50,376
1980	19,744	18,247	235	1,948	83,709
1990	21,154	21,903	267	2,489	105,695
2000	23,092	23,561	287	2,892	123,050
2020	25,651	30,478	348	3,572	149,820

[1] Estimated operations under present law since bill is not effective as to benefit disbursements until 1956.

Juvenile Delinquency and the American Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following excerpts from a striking address on juvenile delinquency and the American clergy delivered by Judge Julius H. Miner, circuit court, Cook County, Ill., on June 15, at the Fourth Presbyterian Church in Chicago:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND THE AMERICAN CLERGY

(Excerpts from an address delivered by Judge Julius H. Miner, circuit court, Cook County, Ill., Wednesday evening, June 15, 1955, 8 p. m., at the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Michigan and Chestnut, Chicago)

"The Nation is losing its fight against juvenile delinquency," is the tragic admission of a United States Senate subcommittee investigating crime. It is idle to pretend that this situation is not fraught with grave consequences.

Crime in our country is perilously on the upswing year after year without a letup. We read daily of teenage sluggings, auto thefts, mob riots, sex orgies, narcotic addictions and murders. Juvenile crime appears no longer confined to any social class, type of neighborhood, or to big cities.

Attorney General Brownell reported recently that more serious crimes were committed in 1954 than in any previous year in the Nation's history, and that the criminal of today is far more dangerous than the criminal of the Dillinger-Barker-Karpis era of 20 years ago.

Mr. Bertram B. Beck, director of the special juvenile project in the United States, said, "The problem of juvenile delinquency has been underestimated, not overestimated. The juvenile crime rate is one of the most alarming threats in our Nation today." He likened it to "cancerous cells on the social organism which unless combatted, can spell destruction for the entire being."

Mr. John Meegan, superintendent of the Chicago Parental School, reports that local juvenile delinquents today are comparatively younger and are committing acts of greater violence than ever before. According to FBI records this is true everywhere. In New York City, crime under 16 had increased 46 percent in 1955, and the 1954 rate was 17 percent over 1953. In Washington, D. C., juvenile delinquency has risen 60 percent last year. The Cook County Family Court showed in 1954 an increase of 37 percent in juvenile sex cases, the highest rate since 1949.

The Illinois State Bureau of Identification reported that out of a total of 80,772 crimes, juveniles committed 36 percent of the murders, 67 percent of the robberies, and 69.5 percent of the burglaries. FBI records show that out of 225,000 automobiles stolen in 1953, more than 150,000 youngsters participated in the thefts. Sex problems are now found in the seventh and eighth grades. A youngster recently arrested in Manhattan was asked how many of his young friends were using drugs. He replied, "40 or 50, about half girls." The number of young unwed mothers has increased 88 percent since 1945. Over 1 million of our children between the ages of 10 to 17 got into trouble with the police in 1954.

At a Mid-Atlantic Conference on Correction held in New York, it was declared that this country leads the world in crime. United States Solicitor General Simon E. Sobeloff wrote in the January 1955 issue of the American Bar Journal, "We have 2½ times the number of prisoners they have in England per 100,000 population." Alberta, Canada, with a population of a million, has less than 500 prisoners, while the District of Columbia, with a population of slightly more than 800,000 has some 4,000 prisoners, more than 8 times as many.

The apathy and indifference of many of our leading citizens, including members of the clergy, in the light of these terrifying official figures, is most discouraging. Until we all realize how serious the problem has become, and until we find a sensible approach to correct it, it will get worse and worse.

With all the well intentioned committee investigations, with all the genuine efforts by schools, civic and social agencies, crime continues to skyrocket. Laws alone will not check teenage crime. We cannot investigate, legislate, or adjudicate crime out of existence. The solution, if there is one, lies in the home and with the churches. Its prevention looms up as a religious enterprise. America desperately needs a great religious revival to combat both adult and juvenile crime.

Criminals are not born. They are reared in an era which has discarded morality. They are fugitives from God. They are victims of spiritual starvation. All their evils are violations of His fundamental principles. The laws of God and man are inextricably entwined, consequently they flaunt His commandments and offend our codes. Irreligion has obviously become the major contributing factor to our national juvenile crisis.

Having sat in judgment on thousands of defendants in the criminal court, I have observed that over 85 percent of the offenders were nonchurchgoers. Six of them made peace with God as they murmured prayers on their way to the electric chair. I have also presided over the divorce court for 5 consecutive years and have commiserated with more than 120,000 litigants over their domestic difficulties and those of their children. Here, too, I have found the same high percentage of nonchurchgoers. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, our greatest authority on crime, reports even a higher rate. Out of 8,000 delinquent children called to his attention, only 42 attended Sunday school regularly. According to the yearbook of American churches for 1954, although 99 percent of the American people believe in God, 41 percent of 160 million have no church affiliations, and 27 million youths receive little or no religious training.

We have not devoted to the search for a better human race nearly as much time, money, energy and vitality as we have given to scientific research. While our economy is busily attuned to the art of mass production, we are permitting mass youth destruction. We spend billions for defense against outside aggression, but inside we have created a force far more threatening to the security of our homes, our families, our churches.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover informs us that law enforcement and all phases of crime costs our Nation $20 billion annually, an average of $495 yearly per family. That for every dollar we pay for education, we spend $1.82 to combat lawlessness. That for every dollar contributed to churches, $10 goes to fight crime.

The clergy must help equip and inspire parents for their crucial role. Too many children are neglected and deserted by incompetent or overengaged parents. There are 19 million working mothers in the United States and many of their children are exposed to temptations toward delinquency and crime. More divorces are granted per

capita in the United States than in any other country on earth. About 380,000 youngsters are orphaned annually by our obsolete and brutal divorce laws which have not been changed materially in a century. More than 50 percent of them become delinquent sooner or later. We have lost our concept of the family as the basic unit of society.

Religion is a vital factor in happy homes. Love of God holds the family steadfast. A home built on religious concepts is a fortress against crime. Religion demands stability in marriage. In the church the members of families generate love, character, sacrificial service and self-discipline. There we find an inward reinforcement, a clearer vision of duty, a fresh faith and renewed courage. We go into church wavering and go out strengthened and inspired. Home training can never offer an adequate substitute in the religious education of a child for the planned instruction of the Sunday school.

Communism has definitely sought a total demoralization of our youth. Its evil aim is to destroy the moral and spiritual fiber of our younger generation. It incites them to gross immorality, to practice sabotage and to establish a revolutionary system. It encourages them to repudiate authority and directs them to renounce their patriotism. The obliteration of religion is its ultimate goal.

There is a woeful lack of constructive direction in family and youth problems. What an opportunity for all faiths to launch a crusade on a nationwide scale to lead all our people to God and prayer. On this fundamental principle we all can and should cooperate.

It is momentous to organize the American clergy to inspire our people and to influence their thinking in a world saturated with a distortion of truth, demagogy, and rampant crime. It is also the only sure weapon against communism. A spiritual resurgence is our best hope to preserve America.

President Eisenhower said, "We are firm in the belief that faith is the mightiest force that man has at his command." History has proved that over a long period of time, a people's vitality and strength are in direct proportion to their morality and religious practices. Many nations have recovered from economic depressions, but none have survived moral disintegration. As long as the teachings of the Bible are practiced by our people, we can be confident of our future.

MRA Shows Way to Peace With Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress as well as people generally are interested in the moral rearmament program. The following article by Mr. Gould Lincoln is informative upon this subject:

MRA SHOWS WAY TO PEACE WITH JUSTICE

(By Gould Lincoln)

As President Eisenhower and the heads of 3 other great governments prepare to meet in Geneva, 2 forces are working towards success of this 4-power meeting "at the summit." First, the hunger of people everywhere for peace—and for freedom and justice which can go only with peace. This is the positive force. Second and negative, the fear that an atom and hydrogen bomb holocaust will consume the human race.

On the positive side, a task force that has grown with the passing years is influencing men and women in key positions, and in the ranks of peoples the world around. It is MRA—Moral Rearmament. And MRA, under the leadership of Dr. Frank Buchman, is exerting a great moral and spiritual influence, which has brought bitter enemies to friendship, and which is showing the way, to statesmen, if they will accept it, to a peaceful world.

Its principles are the strength of the movement. They are at once as soft and as gentle as the down on the breast of a dove and as rugged as the peaks of the Rocky Mountains. They call for absolute moral standards. And how have they operated? They have brought, first, individauls—men and women—to a conviction they must be honest with themselves and with other people, with a consuming faith in God.

FARFLUNG INFLUENCE

Today MRA is a far-flung force. It has its headquarters in Washington, in Los Angeles, and on Mackinac Island, Mich.; in Caux, Switzerland. It has spread into Asia and Africa. It has brought into its ranks statesmen, leaders in business and in labor. It has taught them to sit down and talk honestly with opponents. It has produced an ideology that can be, and is, accepted by the representatives of many races and many nations. It has brought together Germans and Frenchmen, Communists and non-Communists, labor leaders and employers—and always the results have been for peace and justice. Today, MRA has sent to 15 Asian and other Far Eastern countries a group almost 200 strong, which is producing MRA's latest play, The Vanishing Island. It has sent this group on the invitation of the Presidents, Prime Ministers, and other leaders of these nations.

This latest play is one of a long series which MRA has used to bring to the peoples of many nations the ideology for which it stands. It has adopted the stage and the drama as its instruments—and with great success in England, in France, in Germany, in India, in South Africa, in the United States, for example, The Vanishing Island, written by Peter Howard, a brilliant British newspaperman, and in whose production some of Hollywood's most talented men had part, was given at the National Theater here just before the cast, accompanied by leading citizens in some of the countries it is to visit, took off from Washington. Already, it has played to large audiences in Japan, in Formosa, in the Philippines, in Bangkok, Thailand, and is currently in Rangoon, Burma. Other countries and cities to which the group will take the play include Madras, Calcutta, and Delhi, India; Pakistan, Teheran, Baghdad, and Cairo.

NO PLATITUDES

MRA recognizes the problems that beset the world, that divide nations. It does not believe that they can be solved by merely saying, "Let everybody be good and be kind." It does believe, however, that these problems can be dealt with realistically on a basis of fairness and good will. At the very bottom lies the honesty and fairness of the individual. Its aim is to change individuals—and when they are changed, nations change. It does not seek to set up an international church or religion. Its principles are the best of all churches and religions—and can be accepted by all. Labor leaders and heads of business management who have affiliated with MRA testify freely they have been able to obtain settlements and to win friendships through the tenets of MRA.

These principles of MRA, if carried into the Geneva meeting of the great powers, could work immeasurably in the interest of a peaceful world. They do not hold with world domination by any nation or group of nations. They do call for that great ultimate boon, which the late Senator Vanderberg of Michigan, when describing the aim of the United Nations, called "peace with justice."

Natural Gas and Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following editorial from the Peoria Journal, Peoria, Ill., which strongly supports legislation pending in the House—the Harris bill—which would remove Federal controls and regulation of natural gas at the wellhead:

NATURAL GAS AND CONTROLS

Natural gas probably is the most popular type of fuel for heating and cooking used in the Peoria area. The reason it has become so popular is that it not only is efficient and easy to use, its price has remained comparably low.

One reason the price has remained at its present level is that there has been an ample supply of natural gas. The reason for this has been that many companies have been engaged in its production, no less than 8,000 of them in the United States. This means there is great competition in the production of natural gas and its sale to the pipeline companies which carry it to the areas where it is distributed through local distributors. Competition, we always have understood, helps to keep prices low.

The production of natural gas always has been a competitive field, independent of Federal regulation. The Federal Government has controlled the marketing and transmission of natural gas but it kept its hands off the production, which essentially is not an interstate proposition. That was the situation until last year when the Supreme Court ruled that natural-gas production should come under jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. This ruling was made despite the fact that the Natural Gas Act of 1938 specifically provided that it did not apply to production and despite 11 findings by the Federal Power Commission that it had no jurisdiction over production.

A Presidential advisory commission, early this year, recommended that in the interests of assuring a continued exploration for natural-gas reserves, there should be no control of gas before its entry into the interstate pipelines.

A bill to this effect is pending in the House of Representatives. It should be passed. Federal control and regulation cannot help but have a restrictive effect on the continued search of producers for natural gas.

In a land of free enterprise where private endeavor is supposed to be encouraged, we should try to keep as many operations as possible out of the governmental control. The production of natural gas (not its transmission or distribution) is one field where this can be done. It will be to the best interests of the country to assure independence of action in the discovery and production of natural gas.

Mayor's Commission on Group Relations Annual Report, 1954, Leo P. Carlin, Mayor, Newark, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the question of securing civil rights for all our citizens is foremost among our national problems, I should like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the Mayor's Commission on Group Relations Annual Report 1954, city of Newark, N. J. Other cities can profit from the intelligent and constructive program carried on in Newark to eliminate discrimination and prejudice and promote understanding and good will.

The report follows:

MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON GROUP RELATIONS ANNUAL REPORT, 1954

FOREWORD

This second annual report of the mayor's commission on group relations is a brief summary of our continuing efforts to resolve the misunderstandings and relieve the tensions which result from prejudice and discrimination.

It is our attempt to give further meaning to the concepts of group relations, human rights and brotherhood. It is a partial expression of our goal: to shorten the gap between our future hopes and our present realizations. The 1954 Supreme Court decision to desegregate the Nation's schools signified the high-water mark in the ever widening stream of progress toward a more unified country. What results from that unanimous vote of the highest Court in our land should help immeasurably to complete the unfinished business of American democracy.

It should be noted that the commission was disbanded on July 1, 1954. All educational, consultative, and survey activities which occurred from that time to the end of the year were carried on by the staff of the commission.

DANIEL S. ANTHONY,
Executive Director.
IRA A. GISSEN,
Assistant Director.

(The commission was officially reactivated by Mayor Leo P. Carlin on March 1, 1955.)

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES WEEK

In keeping with the policy established during the first year of the commission's operation, Newark gave pungent meaning to its annual Brotherhood Week by highlighting fair employment practices.

Unless all people know and understand the antidiscrimination law of this State, some individuals will suffer. For that reason, the commission uses every available means to publicize and dramatize the law during this memorial week of Washington's birthday.

The distribution of thousands of pamphlets in the concourse of the public service building and the rotunda of city hall was done by volunteer workers from 30 Newark organizations. Five of the leading department stores gave prominent placement to window displays. Boy scouts got in on the celebration by distributing posters to 100 smaller neighborhood stores. The daily and weekly newspapers cooperated with editorials and feature stories. Programs in clubs and organizations were given over to a discussion of "Fair Employment Practices—Making Brotherhood Count."

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT SPEAKS

One of the major functions of the commission is to coordinate the human relations activities of other community groups. The Eleanor Roosevelt dinner was this year's prime example of this kind of joint educational event.

With the generous aid of the Newark chapter of the American Association for the United Nations, the commission involved 60 of Newark's largest organizations in the planning and execution of this dinner and town meeting.

Although the Elizabethan Room of the Essex House was chosen the place of meeting, and although every other available space in the hotel was jammed with chairs to accommodate the overflow crowd, more than 500 persons were turned away.

This was truly the united peoples of Newark assembling to do honor to a great woman and to hear her speak words of wisdom on human relations and the United Nations.

FAITH IN FREEDOM

On July 4, Mayor Leo P. Carlin proclaimed freedom month as a period of rededication to the fundamentals of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. He called upon every American citizen to use and implement the freedoms which are our heritage * * * to defend and pass on to succeeding generations the faith of our founding feathers.

The leaders of 14 Newark religious, civic, and labor organizations drew up the reaffirmation of faith which became the theme for the observance in this community. The mayor's commission cooperated in the planning of this observance and coordinated the work of the other group relations agencies.

The Newark Evening News, in its editorial comment on this event said in part, "Even in the United States, despite the Constitution, despite tradition, liberty can be eroded. Its preservation depends on public conviction and on its support for the principles of freedom, even when that means the tolerance of unpopular points of view. Liberty includes the right to be wrong. By reaffirming their own faith, the Newark leaders have set an example that ought to have wide and wholesome influence."

ANTIDISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

David M. Litwin, chairman of the Mayor's Commission on Group Relations, testified before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Civil Rights, on March 3, 1954. He was invited to describe the experiences of Newark and of New Jersey under the State antidiscrimination law and the city fair practices ordinance. The subject of his testimony was a proposed Federal bill (S. 692) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

Our chairman, in his testimony, stated "Newark, along with other cities, knows that the establishment of democratic employment patterns are helpful and can prove vital to the national security, in that they give to all citizens an equal opportunity for advancement." In conclusion, he said, "The peoples of the city of Newark and the State of New Jersey have learned to live with such a law and to truly like it."

Senator IVES, chairman of the Senate subcommittee, remarked at the end of the formal statement, "I want to compliment you upon your presentation. It has been very valuable and very helpful to us."

The mayor's commission on group relations reproduced the testimony in an illustrated pamphlet, Newark Points the Way to National FEP (Fair Employment Practices). Of the 3,500 copies published, 2,500 have been distributed through the mail and at conventions, conferences, and meetings of interested organizations.

ADVANCED WORKSHOP IN HUMAN RELATIONS

In the spring term of 1954, a series of 10 classes were sponsored at the West Side Adult School by the mayor's commission on group relations. This Advanced Workshop in Human Relations was the first course of its type offered at any adult school in the United States. Students were selected on the basis of their previous education in human relations and participation in human relations organizations. Registration was limited to 25 persons so that the classes could be conducted on a group discussion basis.

Guest consultants served as resource persons for each session. These consultants consisted of 6 university professors in human relations, 3 executives from nationally known private agencies in human relations, and 3 officials of governmental human relations agencies.

Included in the student body were local representatives of both governmental and private agencies in human relations. The content of the course was concerned with the latest thinking and professional techniques in the field, including such subjects as: Community audits and self-surveys, conflict-episode analysis, and the theory and practice of group dynamics.

UNITED NATIONS ANNIVERSARY

Mayor Leo P. Carlin designated the mayor's commission on group relations as the government's official agency to coordinate the city's observance of the United Nation's ninth aniversary. In cooperation with the Newark chapter of the American Association for the United Nations, a special program was presented at Arts High School on the evening of October 21, 1954.

The featured speaker was India's alternate delegate to the United Nations, Madame Lakshmi Nandan Menon. Organizations participating in the program included: Attucks Guard Post 152 of the American Legion, the doctors chorus of the Essex County Medical Society, the Junior Leaguers, and the Arts High School orchestra. The affair was attended by approximately 275 people.

POLICE TRAINING IN HUMAN RELATIONS

At the invitation of the chief of police, the mayor's commission on group relations was requested to conduct a series of classes for patrolmen taking refresher courses at the Newark police academy.

Each week a new group of 18 to 20 patrolmen attended a 50-minute class in community and group relations. After a 10-minute lecture on the importance of human relations in police work, the remaining 40 minutes were devoted to a group discussion of problems in human relations encountered by policemen in their daily work.

Following every discussion, unsigned evaluation forms were completed by the patrolmen in which they indicated their reactions to the class. Of the 165 patrolmen who attended the classes, the majority rated these sessions as very fine, or good. A recommendation that more time be devoted to this subject appeared most often on the patrolmen's evaluation forms.

FAIR ELECTION CAMPAIGN PLEDGE

The year 1954 was a critical one for the citizen in politics. Newark voted yes on a referendum to change to the mayor-council form of government. During the subsequent campaign for mayor and council positions, the commission on group relations, anticipating a hard-fought contest, distributed fair election pledges to all candidates.

We were happy to report that every candidate signed and returned the pledges. There were reported a few incidents of appeals to racial, religious, and nationality groups but

considering the heat of the campaign, they did not appear to reach the proportions of past election years. The pledge reads as follows:

"PLEDGE

"I believe in the principles set forth in the Constitution's Bill of Rights, the provisions of the New Jersey State law against discrimination, and the Newark fair practices ordinance.

"Therefore, as a candidate for office in the coming election, I hereby pledge to conduct my campaign in an unbiased, honorable manner.

"I further pledge that I shall not seek to discredit other candidates because of their race, religion, or national origin; that I shall appeal to the people only as voters of Newark; and finally, I shall not falsely accuse another candidate of discriminatory acts or statements against any minority.

"Signed ----------."

COMMISSION SCHOLARSHIPS TO THE RUTGERS UNIVERSITY WORKSHOP IN HUMAN RELATIONS FOR COMMUNITY LEADERS

For the past 4 years, the Commission has cooperated with Rutgers University, the division against discrimination of the State department of education and the National Conference of Christians and Jews in awarding scholarships to qualified Newark residents who are selected to attend the summer session.

This year, eight employees of the city of Newark were awarded scholarships by the commission. The board of education and the Newark Housing Authority were given 2 each, while the police, fire, and health departments each received 1. For the first time, a member of the Mayor's Commission on Group Relations, Mrs. Ann Nugent, was included in the team of community leaders to be so honored.

GETTING TO KNOW OUR PUERTO RICANS

The staff of the Mayor's Commission on Group Relations considers itself professionally obligated to act not only when a complaint is made or when a crisis occurs, but also to anticipate the possible difficulties that lie in the immediate future of human relations for Newark and therefore be able to take immediate preventive action.

Consequently, during the past year, the staff has made a pioneering effort in obtaining the human relations facts concerning our growing Puerto Rican community. Particular attention has been devoted to the recognition of adjustment difficulties attendant to the settling of a new population. Great effort was expended in identifying the leaders of the Puerto Rican community, and in establishing communications with certain key individuals for purposes of effective liaison.

Extensive interviews were held with these leaders and also with officials from the Department of Labor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Whenever an exchange of information with other city and State agencies was deemed desirable, such conferences were held.

The result of this effort has been the creation of a repository of information, concerning our Puerto Rican population, second to none in the city. Both preventive and remedial techniques in human relations, based on this information, are either already underway or are being prepared for immediate application.

SURVEY OF INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

During the months of September and October 1954, the staff of the Mayor's Commission on Group Relations visited all public and private offices in the city where one or more persons are employed full or part-time in "intercultural education."

In each visit, an interview was conducted with responses being recorded on a standard form (developed by the staff of the commission). Two major facts were produced through this study. First, little or nothing is being done in intercultural education for our aging population. Second, field trips, one of the better known techniques in intercultural education, are being used by very few agencies.

Some other information was also developed in this survey. A number of agencies expressed a desire for closer, continuous liaison. Several suggested that their work would be facilitated if the Mayor's Commission on Group Relations could obtain funds to establish a central clearinghouse service on new audio-visual aids and literature in the field of human relations. Several also suggested that the Commission issue a regular newsletter as a means of establishing closer liaison among the city's public and private agencies.

These findings and recommendations will be brought to the attention of the new commission for action.

THE DAY-TO-DAY JOB

The foregoing special events and activities are the more dramatic high spots of the past year's educational effort. But the routine functioning of the Commission can be understood only when the day-to-day job is spelled out in greater detail, because the major portion of staff time is consumed in direct services to individuals and organizations.

These services fall into four categories:

104: Investigations of complaints not covered by the anti-discrimination laws of the State of New Jersey. Also referrals from the division against discrimination of complaints they could not process.

1,089: Consultations and advisory sessions with organizations and individuals on matters pertaining to the elimination of prejudice and discrimination, as well as the improvement of group relations.

73: Conferences with civic and social agencies on matters which relate to the peace and welfare of the city of Newark: Juvenile delinquency, recreation, housing, health, unemployment, etc.

184: Programs planned, speeches delivered or discussions conducted by the staff and speakers bureau of the Commission.

Topics most frequently used were:

1. The work of the mayor's commission on group relations.
2. The psychology of prejudice.
3. Human rights in the United States today—a balance sheet.
4. Where do we go from here in the field of human relations.
5. Newark takes the lead toward a national fair employment practices act.

In addition to the above areas of specialization, the staff of the Commission is prepared to give advice on setting up courses in leadership development, group dynamics and the training of discussion leaders.

Educational activities—Public addresses by staff and speakers bureau

Nature of group	Number of groups	Approximate audience
Religious groups	19	2,120
General conferences and forums	44	1,825
Elementary and high school groups	4	1,950
Teachers meetings	3	350
Mayor's commissions	4	72
Adult education courses	4	150
Parent-teacher associations	6	520
Women's organizations	27	1,700
Commission meetings	10	200
College students	1	540
Service clubs	2	100
Public celebrations	3	4,275
Total of all groups	127	13,892

OUR FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

In the month of February 1954, the mayor's commission published its first annual report, covering the year 1953. Of the 5,000 copies printed, approximately 4,400 have been distributed at meetings, conferences and conventions and through the mail.

All physicians, dentists, barbers, and beauticians in the city of Newark received a copy with a request that it be placed on their literature stands. This was done in order to achieve the widest possible readership per copy.

The annual report was also mailed to all clergymen in the city, with a request that they examine the text for possible ideas which might be used in sermons. The response of the clergy to the report was overwhelmingly enthusiastic.

In the mail distribution, return post cards were included with each copy. Of the 1,014 cards returned, 763 recipients rated the report as excellent, 208 responded with a mark of good, 36 said it was fair, while only 7 persons felt it was in bad taste.

Twenty volunteers workers from the city of Newark and its environs assisted the office staff in the addressing and mailing of the report.

Paul M. Butler's Speech to the Indiana Order of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 3, 1955, Paul M. Butler, Democratic national chairman, delivered the address at the Indiana State Convention of the Order of Ahepa at South Bend, Ind.

I am hereby submitting the message which he gave the Ahepa membership on that occasion:

AHEPA AND FREEDOM

You have done me a great honor in extending to me the fraternal oportunities of membership in Ahepa. I am aware that as a member of your splendid organization my name has been added to the roster of courageous people whose dedication to an idea began in the hearts of eight men in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922. This month you celebrate the 33d anniversary of Ahepa's founding.

I am indeed grateful for the opportunity to become a member of Ahepa through the South Bend chapter 100, in my home town. For the idea of understanding which Ahepa symbolizes must have its beginning and its essential strength in the day-to-day relations among men. These we experience in our local communities.

The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association was launched during a period of exhausted tolerance which followed World War I. Curiously enough, the Ahepan idea of brotherhood and understanding among peoples of diverse national origins was born in the shadow of America's decision to refrain from joining with other people of the world in the establishment of Woodrow Wilson's vision of international cooperation—the League of Nations. The name of Eleftherios Venizelos stands high on the list of the world's statesmen who saw in the future what President Wilson saw.

As Ahepa gave strength to the practice of Christian ideals in Atlanta, Ga., United

States of America, during the summer of 1922, anti-Christian shapes were gathering strength in Eurasia. A new tyranny over men's minds was consolidating its initial conquests in Russia. Shortly thereafter, other dogmas of brutality appeared in Europe. Fascism engulfed first Italy, then Germany.

Yet it should surprise no one that as these new menaces to democracy arose in the world, the Greek people in America, through Ahepa, would contribute the Hellenic spirit of freedom and brotherhood—the backbones of democracy—to the cause of unity among Americans. By the addition of such devotion, America has been materially strengthened in the task of holding aloft the torch of freedom—lighting the way of all freedom-loving men everywhere in the world.

Such contributions are not new to Hellenes. They only serve to underscore the courage with which the Greek people have fought for countless centuries to keep alive and strong the spirit of Christian freedom. It was this patient courage which developed centuries ago in ancient Greece the institutions of democracy which were unrivaled. It was during the 10 centuries B. C. that the humanitarianism of Hellenic civilization flowered.

The same indomitable spirit of tolerance, independence, reason, and love of beauty that produced such enduring forms of statecraft expressed itself, too, in art, literature, music, and military exploits.

The names of Plato and Aristotle in philosophy, Homer and Sophocles in literature, Phidias in architecture, Scopas in sculpturing, Euclid in science, and Pericles in politics recall only a few of the contributions to the enrichment of human experience made by Hellenes. The heroism with which Marathon, Thermopylae, and Salamis are inscribed stands as a monument to the entire Greek people.

The klephts and evzones have forged a brand of courage among men that has been rarely equaled and never surpassed.

This courage, this spirit of independence has sustained Hellenes for centuries. Without it they might never have endured as a people. For Greece, with the longest history of any nation of Europe, has experienced the searing brand of tyranny perhaps more often than any other civilized people.

It was only the fusion of strength drawn from the hardy souls among her mountains, her islands, and along her coasts, that enabled Greece, during the Middle Ages, to keep alive, for inheritance by Western civilization, the traditions of democracy which she had achieved.

It was only the independent spirit, devotion to traditions, and spiritual grace which bore Hellenic citizens through the four centuries of Ottoman rule from 1453 to 1821.

Hellenic purpose and courage, whetted by adversity, burst from the bonds of tyranny on March 25, 1821, and allowed Greece to regain her complete independence in 1830.

But in the long struggle toward the democratic ideal Greeks have had still other enemies to combat. In World War I Greek victory in the Balkans contributed greatly to Allied defeat of Prussian imperialism.

In the winter of 1940–41, the Greek people once again felt the chilling threat of tyranny. Mussolini demanded admittance of his fascist hordes. The free world watched with breathless admiration to the display of naked courage with which Hellenes answered the tyrant. Back from their borders they swept his legions. Deep into Albania this little band of dauntless defenders hurled his armies. For 7 months Greeks held the enemy in check. Only the overpowering numbers and might of a new foe—the Nazis—laid the pall of defeat upon Greece's gallant heroes.

But by this time—1941—free men realized the virtue of the Greek maxim—"Better live an hour of freedom than 40 years of slavery." The fight for freedom became the common property of all free men.

The end of World War II restored to Greece her independence once again, though the pulse of freedom had never ceased to throb in the breast of every Hellene.

America, at the end of World War II, was presented with opportunities of leadership among the free peoples in the Western World comparable in some major respects to those Greece faced centuries ago. Universally, men nursed the hope that the world would be one composed of free nations of free peoples living harmoniously in a world wherein aggressive force would no longer be used by one nation against another.

This universal desire was translated into the instrument of cooperation known as the United Nations. Both Greece and the United States were charter members of the U. N., together with 49 other countries. When representatives from the nations now sharing membership in the U. N. met last month in San Francisco to celebrate the 10th anniversary of its founding, many remembered that the creation of this symbol of hope among free men was one of the major objectives of a great American President—Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the first tests of American leadership of the Free World—a test which called for acknowledgment of the moral obligations among nations—occurred in 1947. In that year, Greece, after being racked by the torments of alien invasion and occupation for nearly 4 years—during which more than 400,000 died of starvation—found herself faced with an even more deadly peril—the insidious infiltration of the numbing darkness of communism. Striking from beyond the Greek border with the weapons of incitement to treachery and revolution, this new enemy of Christian freedom sought to extinguish it in Greece.

In March, 1947, the Greek Government sent an urgent appeal for assistance to the United States. Without hesitation, President Truman responded by initiating what is now known as the Truman Doctrine. Here, displayed for friend and foe alike to witness, was courageous acknowledgment of the obligations free nations owed one another in the interest of all free peoples. Thereafter, the Truman Doctrine was followed by the Marshall plan, which extended the friendly hand of America's great strength to help the peoples of wartorn countries help themselves.

In June 1950 American leadership, together with the obligations of the U. N. Charter, faced the challenge of aggressive force when the Communists invaded South Korea. Courageously, President Truman responded to the U. N.'s call for measures by which to give effect to the principle of collective security.

Into that conflict, shoulder to shoulder with men from many other nations, went over 5,000 gallant Hellenes. Their bravery during the months of hardship in Korea caused one observer to coin this meaningful phrase: "Greeks know how to die."

Had he but known of the patient and persistent efforts of Ahepa, he might also have added: "The Greeks know how to live." For here in America our citizens of Hellenic origin, through Ahepa, freely contribute the spirit of Christian freedom which has characterized Greece for centuries. Ahepa symbolizes the concept of citizenship which western civilization originally borrowed so liberally from Greece. It is, therefore, particularly appropriate that Ahepa should sponsor the idea of understanding and brotherhood so necessary to a democracy.

The concrete expressions of this noble idea extend from flood relief in Florida to aid rendered to victims of earthquakes in Turkey; from establishing health centers to aid for war orphans—the list is truly impressive.

Yet the noble simplicity of the two articles of Ahepa's constitution translates the substance of Hellenic tradition into a code of conduct which is admirable beyond words. I would like to read the preamble to our order's constitution: "We, Americans of Hellenic descent, desiring to form, institute, and perpetuate a fraternal order and promote its objects and principles; to effect a perfected harmonious understanding between ourselves and others; to inculcate loyalty and patriotism to and for the country in which we live; to stimulate the spirit of good fellowship and cooperation; and to aid in the solution of social and civic problems, do hereby establish and ordain this constitution."

This spirit symbolizes the heart of America's strength. The greatest experiment that America has made has been a social and political experiment—an adventure in living together. I am convinced that one of the central reasons for the success of this adventure has been the contributions, cultural and economic, to the American pattern of living made by persons of other lands who have come here to make their home.

These contributions cannot be measured in the unsympathetic columns of statistics; nor does an honor roll of prominent foreign-born Americans tell us the fundamental fact about the immigrant in American life. That fundamental fact is, as one writer has stated it, that "The glory lies not in the occasional man or woman of eminence but in the myriads of sturdy men and women who have done their part as useful, progressive, constructive citizens."

I am proud to be able to say that the political party of which I have the high honor to be the chairman has acknowledged its awareness of this fact for over a century. I deeply believe that today it is within the Democratic Party that Americans whose origins may be in other lands are most at home—at home with the truest of American traditions. For just as the American Nation evolved from the rich experience contributed by peoples of diverse origins, so, too, the Democratic Party is in a very real sense a mirror of this great country.

At this point, let me say that the Defense Department made a commendable decision recently when it authorized the recognition of the Eastern Orthodox Church by permitting the designation "EO" to appear when asked on identification disks worn by the members of our Armed Forces. Many of us, however, are seriously disturbed by the discriminatory features of our immigration laws aimed at insuring some supposed homogeniety of our Nation's population. I was shocked to find that the number of Hellenes admitted to the United States during the past 2 years is less than one-third of the 11,500 which came to America during the 2 years, 1951–52.

The effect of existing limitations, as Supreme President Scopas pointed out in his letter to President Eisenhower in January, is that "People from countries such as Greece were virtually deprived of coming to the United States * * *."

It is to be hoped that the President will exert the leadership which his office affords to removing the discriminations which now exist.

We all recall the words of salutation with which President Franklin Roosevelt greeted an American audience some years ago—"My fellow Immigrants * * *."

We might well remember, too, that Will Rogers, a devoted Democrat as well as part Indian, often said: "My ancestors went down to the shore to meet the Pilgrims."

We might all take careful note of an another lesson in analogous form that has been left to us in the legacy of rich Hellenic experience. It is recorded that "* * * the fate of the (Athenian) empire was sealed by (a

law in 451 B. C.) by which the franchise was restricted to those who could establish Athenian descent on both sides."

Purity appears to have been achieved but at the expense of essential vitality.

Yet, the spirit of Greece remains. You are the living embodiment of it. It is the vital force of the idea to which Ahepa is dedicated. Plutarch had this in mind when he referred to "* * * the unfaltering breath of an ageless spirit."

Sas efharisto para poli.

Zeto Hellas.

Water-Mad Southern California Taunts Upper Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article from the Pueblo Chieftain, of Pueblo, Colo., which appeared in that paper on June 21, 1955.

This examination of the attitude and outlook of southern California by the Washington bureau of the Chieftain should be of particular value at this time when the RECORD is loaded with loaded articles originating in southern California concerning the Colorado storage project. It has always been my thought that when opposition becomes shrill and emotional in tone, it is a good time to dig down and see what the real, as opposed to the nominal, opposition is. This article makes a careful evaluation of the current situation and explains clearly the motivating force behind southern California's opposition. It is found to differ materially from the pious protestations that appear in such abundance in the RECORD.

May I say in closing that this very drive by southern California to reserve to herself the use of the waters of the Colorado River is the best testimonial I know of to the value of developments utilizing such water. If the water and construction necessary to its development had no particular value or long-term gain attached, then southern California would not be trying so hard to keep it from being used by its legitimate allottees. I recommend this evaluation to the Members so that they may better understand the reasons for southern California's opposition to this long-planned and necessary development:

WATER-MAD SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TAUNTS UPPER BASIN

WASHINGTON.—"You are after gigantic Federal subsidies to grow bananas on Pikes Peak." That is the taunt southern Californians currently are hurling at the upper Colorado Basin States now seeking Federal aid to develop their water resources through the Fryingpan and upper Colorado storage projects.

The upper basin States—Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico—are amazed at southern California's gigantic gall in making the charge since water users in southern California have gotten $400 million in Federal aid during the past quarter century to develop their own water and power resources along the Colorado River. That amount was spent when costs of construction were about half what they are today.

To listen to the southern Californians, you would think they had built their waterworks with their bare hands. Raymond Moley, a writer who bitterly opposes the Fryingpan project and the upper Colorado storage project, dotes on reclamation in southern California because he says it was developed through private initiative and local public authority. In his view southern California projects are not only notable examples of vision governed by financial perspicacity but are designed to avoid any suggestion that the Federal Government was to get into competition with or subsidize local agencies.

MOLEY'S PERSPICACITY

No one questions southern California's perspicacity—in this instance we mean shrewdness in water deals. Its water users have proved adept not only at obtaining big outlays from Uncle Sam for big projects but lesser amounts to put frosting on the top of their water and power facilities.

They didn't do so well before they sought Uncle Sam's aid. They used to suffer water shortages 1 year out of every 6 where they did irrigate, and their waterworks wern't extensive enough to make much of the southern California's desert productive. It was costly to maintain their own private canal works down around the Mexican border, on both sides of the international boundary line. Several irrigation companies went broke, and found it particularly tough sledding after a break along the Colorado River works in 1905 resulted in a flood that threatened permanently to inundate the Imperial Valley, just above the border.

Even Moley notes that early in the century the Southern Pacific Railroad pumped about $6 million into the irrigation works in the Imperial Valley to try to keep irrigation going there.

After the Colorado River Basin Compact was signed in 1922, the southern California congressional delegation took its water problems to the Federal Government for solution. Six years later Congress authorized the development of the lower Colorado Basin, which means largely southern California, under the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

HOOVER DAM

With Federal financing, under the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of Interior, the southern California desert burst into full bloom and became one of the most productive areas in the entire world, as major reclamation works came into being. The Bureau built Hoover Dam, at a cost of $173,100,000; Davis Dam, $117,754,351; Parker Dam, $26,085,637 (the Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles paid half of the cost of Parker, largely through RFC financing, however); the All-American Canal System, $67,544,046; and the Colorado riverfront work and levee system, $10,191,433.

These works regulated the flow of the Colorado River for about 300 miles below Hoover Dam; provided storage water for irrigation; made hydroelectric power available—at low cost, too—for the first time; and provided desilting works, flood control, and a constant flow of water not only for irrigation but also for municipal and industrial use.

WATER FOR POWER

One of the reasons why southern California has fought upper Colorado basin development so hard is that upper-basin water is now turning the wheels of lower-basin turbines at Hoover Dam and below to produce low-cost power. At Hoover Dam the Bureau of Reclamation currently sells falling water at a cost of 1.325 mills for firm power and 0.443 mills for secondary power. Generating costs are added to this cost and vary between contractors.

Firm energy from Hoover Dam is allocated as follows: 35 percent to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California at Los Angeles; 17.5 percent to the city of Los Angeles; 17.6 percent to Nevada; 17.6 percent to Arizona; 7 percent to Southern California Edison Co., of Los Angeles; and the remainder to the California Electric Power Co., of Riverside, Calif., and to the California cities of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena. A total of 6,803,745,486 kilowatt-hours of firm and secondary energy was sold during the 1953 fiscal year. A total of $5,575,740 was paid for firm energy and $1,159,290 for secondary energy. Many contracts provide for a reduction of firm power annually in anticipation of upper-basin development. Since such development has not materialized, an increasing amount of power is being sold annually in the lower basin at the "dump" rate.

ALL-AMERICAN CANAL

The All-American Canal, completed in 1940, replaced the private canal works that had been so expensive to operate in southern California and Mexico. After it was built the Imperial Irrigation District, largest and one of the wealthiest irrigation districts in the country, received a $3 million writeoff at current prices, for its levee system in Mexico.

The All-American Canal was built to hold 3,000 second-feet of water more than needed for irrigation to provide for the generation of power at the Pilot Knob turnout. The additional capacity of All-American Canal allocated to power is repayable without interest to the Federal Government. Five power drops were built along the canal, and the Imperial Irrigation District persuaded Uncle Sam to build the foundations of all of the power drops at a cost of $1 million. All the drops and foundations are repayable without interest.

IMPERIAL BENEFITS

All of the water available in the Colorado River at Imperial Dam, above the All-American Canal, to the extent of capacity there available, can be put through the Pilot Knob powerplant to generate hydroelectric power for the exclusive benefit of the Imperial Irrigation Ditch. Pilot Knob can use water belonging to the lower basin, water allocated to Mexico under the Mexican water treaty, "wild water" in the river, as well as water that would be used in the upper basin were that area able to use its share of Colorado River water. Power users along the All-American Canal and elsewhere in the lower basin naturally do not want to lose any of the water they now have available for the generation of power. That is one reason why they have fought upper Colorado Basin development so hard.

From the All-American Canal a distribution system was built to Coachella Valley, north of Imperial Valley. With water from the Colorado River, Coachella Valley is one of the most fertile areas in the world. Land values run as high as $5,000 an acre. The farmers in the valley are not only blessed with a year-long growing season, use of low-cost Mexican labor and a dependable water supply, but their land grows some of the most lucrative cash crops in the country, such as grapes, figs, and dates.

DEFAULT BY LANDOWNERS

Yet these landowners, many of whom are Hollywood stars and gentlemen farmers, did not make full repayment on their distribution system. It was first thought that the system could be built for $18 million. When it appeared that the cost would be higher, the southern California congressional delegation got a bill through Congress ordering the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the system at whatever cost. But the farmers repay only $13,500,000 without interest while $4,500,000 of the distribution system works was charged off to flood control without cost to the farmers, although Coachella Valley is one of the driest areas in the country, and an

additional $3 million was made nonreimbursable at the request of southern California by congressional action in the 1951 and 1952 Interior Department appropriations measures.

Although Coachella land values run higher than those in Imperial Valley, Imperial Valley is not subject to the 160-acre provision in the reclamation law even though it receives its water through Bureau of Reclamation water works. Secretary of Interior Ray Lyman Wilbur, who hailed from Palo Alto, decided in 1932 that the 160-acre limitation did not apply in the Imperial Valley.

INSATIABLE APPETITE FOR WATER

East of Imperial lies an extensive stretch—some 200,000 acres—of sandy desert land called East Mesa. Much of the land is in Federal ownership, and all of is is hungrily eyed by farmers and others in the vicinity who want the Bureau of Reclamation to provide water at East Mesa under a waiver of the 160-acre limitation. To date, the Bureau has balked because evidence shows it would take 20 to 30 feet of water to grow alfalfa on East Mesa's sandy land and because it is opposed to waiving the acreage limtiation. Of course, if East Mesa were opened to cultivation through irrigation, this would increase the burden of the Colorado River to serve southern California.

Other southern California water users have received great benefits from Federal reclamation works. Below Hoover Dam and just below the Colorado River Indian Reservation lies the Palo Verde Valley in California. The farmers in this area for many years operated their own headworks in the Colorado River to divert water to their own canal system. They had to move the headworks upstream and downstream to meet the variations in the river as it switched its channel, and they bore this considerable cost out of their own pockets.

MORE INTEREST-FREE MONEY AND FLOOD CONTROL

After Hoover Dam was built, the water level dropped as the Colorado River started to back up into Lake Mead and clear water release scoured the river downstream. So the Federal Government installed a rock weir in the river to keep the water at a level where it could be diverted into the Palo Verde Canal system, and it also maintained the rock weir from year to year.

Then Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, Republican, of California, put a bill through Congress providing for a permanent concrete and steel weir, or dam, and a levee and dike system to replace the rock weir. The Phillips measure authorizes the Federal Government to put out $4,538,000 for the construction of the permanent weir and $500,000 for an interest-free loan to the Palo Verde Irrigation District to modify its own waterworks to key in with the new weir. Although the Federal investment will be $5,038,000, only $1,675,000 will be repaid without interest to Uncle Sam over a 50-year period. The rest of the cost is being written off as a flood-control item and as a benefit to the Indians upstream.

Moreover, the Palo Verde farmers now benefit from a higher flow of the river than the historic flow at that point, the new dam increased the amount of irrigable land that can be reached by the canal system, and their costs are far below what they would have had to pay for water if a pumping system had been installed (although a pumping system would have been cheaper for Uncle Sam to build).

FREE LEVEE

Water users downstream also got some flood-control benefits without charge because the $10,191,433 Colorado River front works and levee system is being built and maintained at a cost of from $500,000 to $600,000 a year, with Uncle Sam picking up the entire check.

This levee system salvages from 300,000 to 400,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water annually which otherwise would be lost. The lower basin wants to be credited with the salvaged water, although the water is contributed by both the upper and the lower basin States. The Federal Government bears the cost of the operation and maintenance of the system.

This levee system is being built to correct present damage and prevent future damage caused by the construction and operation of Parker Dam. In the contract for repaying the cost of Parker Dam, the Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles agreed that the United States Government was not to be liable for damages. This provision no longer obtains; Uncle Sam is paying for the damages.

SAN DIEGO BENEFITS

And down in San Diego they got Uncle Sam to start construction, without congressional authorization, of a $32.5 million 71-mile aqueduct to provide for a municipal water supply from the Colorado River. The aqueduct was authorized only after the legality of the expenditure for the project was questioned.

The Colorado River Storage Project and the Navahos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River storage project has values—real, human values—which too many people overlook.

Opponents of the project make a big show of twisted arithmetic and profound double-talk about economics. Their specious arguments have been authoritatively answered, as anyone who will study the whole picture—not the distorted half-picture presented by our opponents—will find. But our opponents say nothing at all about the bigger, human values involved.

In my State of New Mexico, and in our sister State of Arizona, live thousands of Navaho Indians. Perhaps I should not say "live"—rather, they barely exist. I should like to enter into the RECORD, as an extension of my remarks, a statement recently made by Mr. Paul Jones, Chairman of the Navaho Tribal Council, on the subject of the Colorado River storage project and what it means to his people:

We Navahos do not pretend to know much about interest rates, but I can say on behalf of my people that the authors of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce report are even more remote from the basic human values at issue in the upper Colorado River project.

Has anyone of this purported body of businessmen ever known what it is to wrest a living from the soil through growing of crops or the raising of sheep and cattle? Has any one of them ever gone without washing in order to spare every drop of water for thirsty sheep and goats? We Navahos have.

The authors of the chambers of commerce report would consider it a hardship to go without a shower bath for a day, and a major crisis if water for ordinary sanitary purposes were cut off for a few hours. We Navahos are fortunate if we have enough water to drink each day in many areas of our reservation. Businessmen may be able to drag the upper Colorado River project through an International Business Machine calculator and come up with an answer satisfactory to them, but we cannot process our Navaho children, or our sheep, through such a calculator. Our arithmetic is simpler, but more sound. We know that with our share of water from the Navaho dam, one unit of the project, we can farm about 109,000 acres of land on our reservation. On this land, approximately 1,110 Navaho families—of 5 to 6 members each—can live and support themselves. When we add those Navahos who earn a living in the supporting services created by such an irrigation project, over 21,000 individual Navahos, or more than a quarter of our entire tribe, will find a living from the added water supply of the San Juan River.

In 1868 the United States Government promised us in a treaty ratified by the United States Senate that if we would live on a reservation (representing a small portion of our original holdings in what later became the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah) that every head of a Navaho family would be given 160 acres of farming land and every single person who desired to farm, 80 acres. The Government should have known, as our people did not, that there were no such agricultural lands available. By constructing the Navaho project, the United States Government could for the first time in history substantially fulfill the promise made to the Navahos.

Our need today is more grave than it was in 1868. With our flocks cut in half by drought and soil erosion, our grazing economy is largely broken. Our children carry water in buckets to the sheep on which the family depends for a living, they carry lambs into the hogans in which we live, to nurse them back to life—but it is not enough. We desperately need the rehabilitation in agriculture for thousands of our people who have always proved to be good farmers when given access to cultivable land and to water.

Can the council of State chambers of commerce figure the interest rate on the historic, moral, and legal obligations of the United States to the Navahos?

These human and natural resource values do not lend themselves to the calculating machines, but in the calculator of reason and common sense they dictate that the upper Colorado River project should be built.

Those Who Hire the Piper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I enclose an editorial from the Indianapolis Star under date of July 12.

Incidentally, this editorial was written before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported out a bill to give free polio vaccine to everybody in certain age groups:

THOSE WHO HIRE THE PIPER

The strongly documented recommendation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations that the total level of taxes should be reduced is hedged with statements that "demands for services" make this difficult. "All levels of government," the Commission reported, "are confronted with great demands for services. * * * The cumulative

costs of all public services demanded of the National, State, and local governments are far in excess of the total amount of taxes the taxpaying public appears willing to place at the disposal of government."

Whence come all these demands for services?

Just a few weeks ago there was a great hue about a "demand" that the Federal Government take over the distribution and use of the Salk polio vaccine. What was the source of this "demand"? Did it come from an agitated public, gathered in meetings to petition Congress and make public declarations of need? We saw no evidence of any such public demand. The "demand" came mostly from a few strident voices in Congress, a handful of socialistically minded newspapers in New York City and elsewhere in the East, and a spattering of New Dealish groups of various sorts. Carefully examined, the demand was found to have no substantial public backing.

Similarly, it has been said this spring that there was a "demand" for Federal aid for school construction. Where did this demand originate? The reports and statistics on which it was based have been examined, in part by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations itself, and have been found to be inconsistent and thinly documented, based largely on casual methods of estimation. The demand was not really based on these "need" figures; instead the figures were gathered together in an effort to give substance to the demand. The demand came chiefly from a few Members of Congress, the New Deal element in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which would get control of the funds for such a project, such personally interested groups as the National Educational Association, and spokesmen in a few States which would expect to benefit heavily. The investigation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations found no foundation of demonstrated need. Congressional committees considering the project have not turned up any strong and widespread public backing. The demand has come principally from those with an ax to grind.

The Commission itself has engaged in some demand building. Its report proposed that Civil Defense be taken over entirely by the Federal Government. This is just the kind of proposal which, repeated a few times, gets to be called a demand. It added its voice to those calling for a greatly increased Federal program of highway building. In some of its other recommendations on specific fields it called for expanded Federal spending.

It is the fashion to urge that the Federal Government do more things, or do things on a broader scale. Even the Hoover Commission, charged with finding governmental activities which could be reduced or eliminated, felt impelled also to find some areas in which it could propose increased Federal activity. Apparently you just don't count in Washington these days unless you have an idea for spending more tax money. It is this fashion which produces the continuous demand for more Federal services.

We'll just have to be out of style. We don't see any reason why the Federal Government needs to take over Civil Defense. We don't see why it is necessary for the Federal Government to embark on a big new highway program. On the contrary, we think the Federal Government should repeal its gasoline tax and leave highway building to the States.

That would be right in line with the basic conclusion of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This was that "the best chance of reducing tax overlapping probably lies in a major reduction of the overall level of taxation, since this may result in the full repeal of certain taxes by one jurisdiction or another." Well, here's a specific example right in front of the Commission's nose. Here's where the Federal Government could provide the full repeal of a tax, leaving that area of taxation to the States. The ultimate result would be more and better roads for the gasoline tax dollar.

The Commission made another provocative statement. It said: "In the long run there is no more reliable guide to the economic justification of governmental expenditures than the willingness of the people to pay for them in the form of taxes." That certainly sounds good. How about applying it to these demands for Federal services?

The Federal Government has consistently violated that guide to spending for more than 20 years. Instead of restricting itself to activities which the people wanted sufficiently to pay for them in taxes, the Government has established the firm habit of spending billions every year in excess of taxes. These billions of excess it calls deficits. They have now accumulated, year after year, to a debt greater than the total assessed valuation of all taxable property in the country.

Let the guide of willingness to pay be applied firmly to all proposals, whether new or continuing, for Federal activity. Then we can learn the true substance of these great demands for services.

H. R. 6766, Public Works Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the conference committee report just concurred in regarding the public-works appropriation bill for fiscal 1956, I greatly appreciate the attitude of the committee in providing $500,000 in initial construction funds for the Coyote Valley Reservoir of the Russian River project in Sonoma and Mendocino Counties, Calif.

The people of the district, by a vote of 3 to 1, on May 10, 1955, bonded themselves to raise local participating funds. The moneys appropriated in the public-works bill for fiscal 1956, along with that raised by local interests, will make it possible for the Army Corps of Engineers to get started on construction this year.

I would like to insert with my remarks the following letters from the Office of Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C., and from the district engineer, San Francisco, which attest to the worthiness of this project:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1955.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Western Section, Public Works Subcommitee, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Representative SCUDDER has informed me of your suggestion that a letter be furnished you outlining the latest information on the Coyote Dam project. On June 6, Mr. SCUDDER conferred with Mr. D. R. Belcher, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget and with Colonel Starbird of my staff. It was agreed in the conference that I would write to you giving the information needed by you.

The Coyote Dam project was outhorized by Public Law 516 of the 81st Congress. The authorization called for a reservoir of 122,000 acre-feet of which 52,000 acre-feet would be allocated to flood control and sedimentation, while 70,000 acre-feet would be allocated to conservation. The annual benefits were estimated in the project document as flood control $301,000, increased land use $40,000, improved recreation development $857,000, improved domestic and irrigation water supply $496,000 giving a grand total then of $1,694,000.

Fund allocations for planning of this project totaling $586,000 have been made during fiscal years 1953–55, inclusive. Some additional planning would be necessary prior to the start of the first construction contract. However, the planning has been brought to a status where construtcion could be initiated during the fiscal year in which first construction funds are available. Real-estate acquisition could be initiated within 3 months after the beginning of the fiscal year and a construction contract could be awarded about April 1. It is planned that a major portion of the construction of the dam would be accomplished under one continuing contract. A total of $2 million could be expended in the fiscal year of which $1 million would be on real estate, $400,000 would be on relocations and $600,000 on the dam's construction.

The authorization for this project contains a provision that "prior to starting construction, local interests shall contribute the sum of $5,598,000 in cash in full repayment of the conservation benefits. * * *" At the time that budget recommendations for fiscal year 1956 were formulated local interests could give no assurance that they would be able to make the necessary advance payment. On May 10, 1955, however, after submission of the President's budget, a successful election was held and authority was granted thereby to the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to bond itself in the amount necessary for the advance contribution. County commissioners have informed the district engineer that bonding companies will accept the bonds and that the contribution can be advanced within 60 days after Federal approval is given to proceed with construction. The present estimated Federal cost of the project is $16,600,000.

Local interests, during preelection negotiations, agreed on a modified use for their conservation storage to increase municipal and irrigation usage and to compensate by a decrease of minimum flow for recreational areas. We are now reevaluating that proposed usage and it appears that the revised estimate of benefits will show flood control as approximately $400,000 annually and improved municipal water supply something over $500,000 annually. Other benefits for irrigation, land enhancement, and recreational usage will bring the total annual figure to approximately $1,800,000 annually. The annual charges will be approximately $850,000, giving a benefit-to-cost ratio approximating 2.2 to 1.

I trust that the above information will be satisfactory to your committee's needs. Should it not I hope you will call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

WM. WHIPPLE,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
(For E. C. Itschner, brigadier general, USA, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works).

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT,
San Francisco, Calif., June 27, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT B. SCUDDER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCUDDER: I have your letter of June 24, 1955, requesting information on recent events pertinent to the Coyote Valley

Reservoir, Russian River, Calif., which emphasizes the urgency of initiating immediate construction of this project. Following are some items I believe of importance in this category.

Since the passing of the bond issue on May 10, 1955, many of the local people have anticipated an expedited construction program by the Corps of Engineers, including the purchase of rights-of-way. Consequently, numerous inquiries have been received in this office from people residing in the reservoir area in regard to when they will be required to move. The discomfort and inconveniences of being held in a state of suspense have been emphasized by these people. Since it is now a foregone conclusion that their removal is only a matter of time, they are anxious to be resettled in order that their normal living conditions and plans might be restored.

Recently the State of California completed the preliminary plans for realinement of State Highway No. 20, which is now located in the reservoir area. The State is now ready to complete the final engineering as well as plans and specifications for this relocation. It would be advantageous and economical to have this new road completed as soon as possible in order to route auto traffic out of the construction area of the dam.

Prior to the bond issue the board of directors of the Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District had a firm of municipal financing consultants prepare a financial and economic report on the control and use of Russian River water. As a result of this report and other pertinent data, it was decided to establish a special zone in the recreational area along the lower reaches of the river in order to make the tax burden more comparable to the benefits to be received. The additional tax in this zone was based on the amount of water required to maintain an adequate stream flow through this area. A careful study by the people directly concerned with this stream flow and additional tax resulted in the conclusion that 125 cubic feet per second would maintain adequate flow to support all recreational requirements.

The foregoing decision substantially changed the benefits analysis. A restudy of all benefits was directed by the Bureau of the Budget at the time the project was authorized in 1950. This restudy, including the effect of changing the requirement in the recreational area from 200 c. f. s. to 125 c. f. s., indicates that the following annual benefits may be expected to accrue from construction of the Coyote Valley project.

Type of benefit	Project document	Current estimate
Flood damage reduction	$301,000	$400,000
Higher land utilization due to flood control	40,000	40,000
Municipal water use	(1)	600,000
Agricultural water use	496,000	425,000
Stabilizing low flow through recreational areas	857,000	[2] 400,000
Total annual benefits	1,694,000	1,865,000
Total annual costs	$738,750	$850,700
Benefit/cost ratio	2.3/1	2.2/1

[1] Considered all agricultural uses.
[2] An estimate of a minimum figure for this benefit. Final figure will probably be larger.

I would like to point out that under current conditions it appears that flood control and water conservation benefits comprise the major part of the total and these benefits alone would yield a benefit-cost ratio of about 1.7 to 1. This is in contrast to the survey report in which the greater part of the benefits resulted from sustaining values in the recreational area.

Representatives from Mendocino County and the city of Ukiah have visited this office recently to obtain basic data relative to the project. They stated that Mendocino County is planning to hold a bond election in October to determine the extent and possibility of sharing in the local cost of the project. A zone of benefits will be delineated in order to direct the tax responsibilities of those who will receive the major benefits.

On May 25, 1955, the board of directors of Sonoma County Flood Control and Water Conservation District passed a resolution which agreed to provide and guaranteed the United States of America and the Corps of Engineers the required local cooperation including the contribution of $5,598,000 in cash, in whole or in part as required, for the reservoir construction cost prior to the initiation of said construction by the Corps of Engineers.

This office has advanced the detailed planning with over $600,000 of Federal funds already made available for that purpose to the point where construction could be started within a few months. We are prepared, therefore, to complete the planning work and subsequently initiate construction when funds are appropriated for those purposes, subject of course to fulfillment of the requirements of local cooperation, including the above-mentioned cash contribution of $5,598,000.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. GRAF,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
District Engineer.

On to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the following address On to Washington, which was delivered 61 years ago by Mr. M. D. "Mike" Teter, of 147 East Main Street, Bridgeport, W. Va., at the time of his graduation from Glenville College, Glenville, W. Va., June 20, 1894.

Mr. Teter, now 86 years of age, is still quite active and deeply interested in national affairs.

The address is as follows:

ON TO WASHINGTON

Turning rapidly the pages of past history, and sketching the political characters thereon, we behold our form of government born of necessity, nurtured and made strong, pruned and made perfect by those men whose far-seeing intelligence adorns the pages of past political history, as the brilliant stars do the azure sky. When the eastern sky begins to grow radiant we can safely say that the sun will soon show his dazzling brightness over yon eastern mountain; and as he disappears behind the western horizon—it will leave to us a glorious spectacle by shedding its rays on the eastern hilltops.

The rising sun of liberty, freedom, and equality shed its first gentle rays upon us when our forefathers said a long farewell to their native homes and by crossing the broad Atlantic showed to the people of the world that these principles were theirs as men, given by the hand of Almighty God, and born of heavenly virtue. Every act of their lives only foretold the coming luminary which was to make us radiant lights and such as would shine to all future generations.

Nor did the gentle rays far precede the might and power of the everadvancing political sun which gave us rights as a nation, pride as a people, and placed us preeminent among the nations of the world. Its brilliant rays fell full upon us July 4, 1776, and its appearance was hailed as glad tidings of great joy. The old Liberty Bell sent forth peal on peal—a joyous strain—proclaiming the birth of a new nation, a new system which gave equal rights to all without the fear of a royal hand.

Those giant-minded artisans and architects in government fully understood the foundation upon which the most magnificent political structure that adorns the pages of history should rest. The proportions and relations were understood in all their minutia before they gave the specifications to the people. The plan was laid, and when the last nail was driven—it stood before the world a perfect structure—in every part complete, and the critics could only stand and exclaim: "Behold a perfect government."

Sages tell us that "wisdom is to be gained by experience" and the experience in government of past ages is an object lesson that merits our careful study in order that we may guide the ship of state successfully by the rocks and boulders, the shoals and quicksands that have caused other governments to hopelessly fail in the attainment of the desired end for which they were created.

Our Government was founded on principles that would tend to perpetuate the Union, and to keep us forever the proud and expectant Nation that we were in the days of honest government. None realize this more than the people of the present generation. A great American poet has said, "The Star-Spangled Banner forever shall wave o'er the land of the free, o'er the home of the brave." These words were spoken at a time when they seemed to be true. To the people of that time they seemed doubly so. But since the days of the declaration, many changes have taken place.

Many of you, perhaps, will class me with the pessimist, but listen, we entreat you, for a short time—and then see if we have everything to hope and nothing to fear. In dealing with this matter, we wish to do so in an unbiased, unprejudiced manner. There are dangers and perils today existing that are antagonistic to pure democracy—and the structure of our Government will fall as surely as did ancient Greece and Rome—unless some means can be brought to bear upon them that will transfer them to the regions of eternal woe. The good seed was sown when the fathers of our liberties framed the Constitution which we now enjoy. It has brought forth fruit. But the enemies have come and scattered tares among it, and they are slowly but surely dwarfing the grain. It must be winnowed or else it will yield to us a harvest of want and woe.

Many are the questions that today are demanding our attention in order that we may see our country prosper, and our Government perpetuated. We will briefly notice the most vital questions that merit the attention of all true American people. The perils attending our national elections are too manifest to pass by without engaging our attention.

Alone in the honesty of politics, and pure principles in the management of our Government and public affairs, rests the future of our country. We contended in 1776 for the rights which we now enjoy. In 1812 we again marched forth to do or die on the field of battle. All these have been successfully met and passed—though not without the sacrificing of thousands of noble men.

Our fertile valleys have been made to flow as rivers of blood. And all on account of mistaken ideas. But a crisis is today ap-

proaching which though it may lack the dramatical character of the preceding ones, yet it will be none the less difficult or important. Nations have stood amid the terrors of foreign invasion and yet have fallen by their own misdeeds.

• • • • •

We see practices that were rare or unknown in the earlier days of our Republic, becoming more and more apparent each year—acts by which injustice is done and advantages gained which are wholly unrepublican. And yet our so-called best men in both parties will stand and gave and even dare to smile. When these principles have been so long practiced as to become poisonous habits, then will our true liberties end—legal as well as moral—for true liberty is as absolutely opposed to fraud and injustice as truth is to falsehood.

• • • • •

If we could first know where we are and whither we are drifting, we could then better know and judge what to do to avert disaster. This matter of dishonesty is not confined to any political party. It is alarmingly imminent in all.

The Republican Party ruled the country from the days of James Buchanan to those of Grover Cleveland. They had their faults—they defrauded and did many things which were not in accordance with our democratic form of government. The Democratic Party stood by and gazed with critical eye, crying aloud, "Robber tariff, pauper pensioners, billion dollar Congress." The great men of their party marched up and down the line demanding "tariff for revenue only," while others not satisfied with this cried aloud for free trade, telling the people that in these principles alone rested the preservation of our people as a nation.

• • • • •

But let the future administration of our Government be as it may, one thing is now self-evident to all, and that is that there are certain evils sapping the foundations of our Government, weakening the fabric out of which it is made, and if these are not removed, in a few years our great structure which has been builded at the cost of so many noble lives, will fall an unrecognizable mass never to be reconstructed.

It has been said that human experience teaches us that brave men will right all wrongs and cause all things to work together for good. But while so many evils beset our way, we can see no possible application of this truth, if such it may be called. But deplorable as is the condition of our affairs today, we are not mere floating wrecks with no possible power of direction and no possibility of escape from the dangers which beset our political pathway. The grand old ship of state is firm and strong. Her sails are spread. Her banner is unfurled. Not a mark is to be seen upon her sides to indicate that she is sinking. Her danger lies in the crew that is guiding her in her onward course. To let her go on run as she is by rings and cliques means the sinking of the vessel in a great whirlpool of disaster.

We may differ in our views of religion. Upon technical questions of law we may vary, but the question which appeals directly to us all is, Shall we, blinded to our own interest and biased by partisanship, rush madly on as the unthinking horse until we have by our very acts and lives put beyond our reach all the freedom, liberty, and happiness which we now enjoy? Time only can tell. Experience only can solve the mystery.

But, let the matter end as it may, one thing is certain, and that is that to the people of this century will belong the honor or disgrace of its termination. The Revolutionary fathers gave it to us pure and unspotted, the ideal Government of the world, and its condition when it enters the 20th century will only reflect the character of the present generation. We cannot exhibit too great a degree of carefulness along this line. The pathway is a dangerous one. The shoals and quicksands are seen on every hand. The birds of political prey are gleaning the field, seeking to destroy.

Then men of the free hearts and home, for the flag that floats over us all, which has been sprinkled and made sacred by the blood of countless thousands who have fallen for its preservation—let us not darken the fair names of those gone before. They gave it to us in all its purity. They handed it down to us, and said, "Preserve it to future generations as we have given it to you." Let us then fulfill their request as men of judgment. The blood of our forefathers—let it not have been shed in vain. Let us lay aside all partisan feelings and march on to Washington and labor side by side to root out those evils that are sapping the foundation of our Government—that are slowly but surely removing the great cornerstone of liberty and freedom.

Then when our mission is ended—when we deliver the old battle-scarred vessel to those who will next be seen guiding her in her onward course, we can say with a proud triumphant smile, "Into your keeping we consign in all its purity the old ship of state." We ask of you, as our forefathers asked of us, to keep it spotless. To so care for it that posterity will ever recognize it as being truly a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people."

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River compact was signed in 1922 and later ratified by the Congress. Its purpose was to divide the waters of the Colorado River system betwen the upper basin States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico and the lower basin States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

In paragraph III (a) of that compact it is stated:

There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River system in perpetuity to the upper basin and the lower basin, respectively, the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre-feet of water per annum.

From this language it is readily apparent that shares of water are apportioned to the upper basin and to the lower basin on exactly the same terms. The upper basin has precisely the same right to its water as has the lower basin to its share. And, conversely, the lower basin has every right which the upper basin can claim.

Now that the upper basin is proposing use of its share of water, through construction of the Colorado River storage project, some lower basin spokesmen are making some astounding statements.

They are saying that the upper basin States have no right to store their share of water—even though it is obvious they cannot develop and use the water without major storage facilities. If this ridiculous contention were true—which it is not—it should logically follow that the lower basin also would be prohibited from storing water. Does the lower basin believe that?

The answer is found in the tremendous structures of Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, Imperial Dam—all of them built to store water for the lower basin, particularly southern California.

The campaign against the upper Colorado River storage project has reached the nasty stage. Misinformation is being broadcast throughout the country at an expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars. Opponents of the project blandly misstate the facts, inflate cost figures, and repeat the false statements that the development would add to our agricultural surpluses.

How much credence should Members of Congress give to these statements?

Arizona has tangled with the southern California lobby before. Outmanned and outfinanced it finally assented to a court test on water rights. Before consenting, assurances were given that the case would be expedited and it would not be used to delay development in the upper basin States. Were those assurances kept? Thanks to my colleague, Representative STEWART UDALL, of Arizona, we have an answer to that question. Here is his review of the promises and the subsequent violations of those promises:

1. Promises that upper basin development would not be delayed by litigation.

Colloquy between Representative FRANK A. BARRETT, and Alvin B. Shaw, jr., assistant attorney general of California, House hearings on H. R. 934 and H. R. 935, May 1949, at page 738 thereof:

"Mr. SHAW. • • • it is recognized right now, and has been for many years, that the share of the waters of the Colorado River belonging to the upper basin is ample for its needs, and therefore we do not come to any question of conflict until you approach right close to the 7,500,000 acre-feet limit.

• • • • •

"Mr. BARRETT. As a practical matter, if we should get involved in your lawsuit, if you were successful in getting Congress to authorize a lawsuit, then, of course, the Congress would say, 'We cannot authorize any project of all in the entire basin until the lawsuit is settled'.

"Mr. SHAW. • • • This lawsuit (*Arizona* v. *California*) so far as the upper basin is concerned, can only concern this last 800,000 acre-feet, or whatever it is that they want to add to the 7,500,000 acre-feet allotment by the device of this depletion theory.

"I do not think there is any reason to believe that Congress would hesitate to authorize projects or appropriate money for projects up to the 7,500,000 acre-feet."

VIOLATION OF THESE ASSURANCES

On July 15, 1954, counsel for California filed a motion to join the upper basin States as parties in the *Arizona* v. *California* litigation on the ground that the upper-basin States are necessary parties in this lawsuit. This motion is still pending before the Supreme Court.

2. Promises that action would not be delayed by appointment of master.

Statement in memorandum by the attorney general of Nevada, the attorney general of California, and Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., assistant attorney general of California, filed as part of the hearings on H. R. 1500 and 1501 in April 1952, at page 846 thereof:

"From the foregoing review of major issues, it is plain that the matters in controversy

between Arizona and California are characteristically legal issues, being matters of interpretation of statutes and other documents. The ordinary factual elements, relating to quantities and time of flow and use, which characterize most water litigation are not to any substantial extent critical factors.

"It is true that some of the classic interstate water cases, such as *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (206 U. S. 46), *Wyoming* v. *Colorado* (259 U. S. 419), and *Nebraska* v. *Wyoming and Colorado* (325 U. S. 589), have required 10 years or more to reach adjudication. This has occurred because in each of these cases it was necessary for the Court to appoint a master to take voluminous testimony relative to factual issues. In the case at bar it is not considered that a master need be appointed, nor that factual testimony be taken. The issues which are significant as between California and Arizona can be adjudicated upon briefs and oral argument within a reasonable time, not to exceed 2 or 3 years."

VIOLATION OF THESE ASSURANCES

On April 5, 1954, California counsel demanded the appointment of a special master and subsequently the Supreme Court appointed a special master and referred the case to him.

3. Promises that litigation would be expedited.

Mr. Northcutt Ely, assistant attorney general, appearing for defendant, State of California, in testifying in hearings before subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolutions 225, 226, 236, and H. R. 4097 in May of 1948, as page 93 thereof said:

"We feel that the decision can be obtained within a reasonable time, within 1 or 2 years at the most; that the taking of protracted testimony will not be required and that the submission of this case to the Court will advance the cause of the development of the Colorado River. We see no advantage in delay."

VIOLATION OF THESE PROMISES

According to a United Press dispatch on March 7, 1955, Mr. Ely testified for the Ways and Means Committee of the California State Assembly and stated the Arizona-California lawsuits: "May take 6 to 8 years to resolve." At the time this statement was made the lawsuit had already consumed 2½ years.

4. Promise that facts would be stipulated to.

Excerpt from letter dated April 16, 1949, sent by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, to Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, and placed in record of hearings on H. R. 934 and H. R. 935 by Arvin B. Shaw, Jr., May 12, 1949, at page 707 thereof:

"Since the major issues of the controversy are matters of law and not of fact, it is probable that within a comparatively short time the Court could hear legal arguments, without the necessity of taking extended evidence regarding facts, and adjudicate the rights of the affected States promptly. I believe the case could be presented to the Court on an agreed statement of facts. Each year that the settlement of the controversy is delayed means additional years of delay in the development of the areas affected by the use of Colorado River water."

Testimony of James H. Howard, general counsel, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, House hearings, April of 1951, at page 1244:

"I think pleadings would have to be filed and answers, probably cross-complaints, and the issues of law would be clearly framed. If there are any issues of fact so far as California is concerned, you would find a disposition to agree upon the facts to the extent that facts are necessary in the case. We would not run into any 20- or 30-year litigation, you can be assured of that. It might take 2 years * * *."

VIOLATION OF THESE PROMISES

To date, California counsel have bluntly refused to enter into any stipulations regarding the facts.

I would like to say emphatically at this point that I do not mean to imply the slightest criticism of Chief Justice Warren. He is a man whose word is unimpeachable; and if he were still Governor of California, I am certain the *Arizona* v. *California* lawsuit would already be history.

DRAW YOUR OWN CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing violated promises were perpetrated by the same group of southern California interests that are attacking the Upper Colorado River storage project.

Before accepting as fact statements that originate from these sources, I urge Members of Congress to ask themselves why this project—of all reclamation projects—has been so attacked.

Does California want all the water?

Back Door to Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in reporting H. R. 7126, it is important that the implications involved be considered.

The following editorial from the Indianapolis (Ind.) News of June 16 expressed an appropriate alarm:

BACK DOOR TO SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

We heartily agree with the much-abused Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby in her stout opposition to a polio vaccine plan advanced by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, Alabama.

Mr. HILL would have the Federal Government furnish free vaccine to all children in the Nation up to the age of 19. The Secretary of Welfare said this could lead to "socialized medicine by the back door." It certainly could.

If the Government were to administer free polio shots to all children, why shouldn't it logically give free preventive treatment for other diseases too, some of which represent a considerably greater menace than polio?

Why shouldn't it provide free care for all crippled children and for the mentally ill?

In fact—if it were to give free polio shots to all—why shouldn't it just take over all medical care, with the taxpayers naturally footing the bill for regimented, second-rate treatment while an army of meddlesome bureaucrats drained off a sizable chunk of the socialized medicine tax in return for their alleged services?

Why, indeed, does Senator HILL think families which can afford to pay for polio shots should get them free at the expense of the whole taxpaying public?

The matter of those who can't pay for the shots is a different one. The Eisenhower administration proposes to contribute Federal money to the effort to see that all needy children get shots.

True, this also smacks of Federal paternalism. It is difficult, however, to argue very strongly against it when veterans with nonservice-connected disabilities get elaborate free medical care.

But the Hill proposal is entirely out of line. In fact, most Americans must be getting awfully sick of the way the polio vaccine program has been made a political football.

Proposed Revenue Revisions in Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the House Public Works Committee on July 12, 1955, on the subject, Proposed Revenue Revisions in Highway Legislation:

PROPOSED REVENUE REVISIONS IN HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

(Statement of George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, before the House Public Works Committee, July 12, 1955)

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

Mr. Chairman, no officer or group of officers is permitted to speak for the federation prior to the direct nationwide vote of our entire membership. I make this statement so that I will qualify under the mandate of our nationwide membership.

I am also appearing in behalf of the Burger Tire Consultant Service, a national group comprising exclusively independent tire sales and servicing institutions.

Mr. Chairman, in behalf of both the National Federation of Independent Business and the Burger Tire Consultant Service, I am appearing here today in opposition to the proposed revenue revisions to be included in the highway legislation.

In behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business, our entire membership has repeatedly voted for a decreased tax rather than the increase which would result from the legislation now being considered before your committee.

In behalf of the Burger Tire Consultant Service, speaking for the independents in the tire sales and servicing field nationwide, due to the malpractices now recognized within the rubber-tire industry, that group can ill afford to be saddled with an increased tax load which could result in reducing their position in which they exclusively pioneered, namely tire rebuilding.

I might add that it was significant and important to note the position held by the independents in the tire sales and servicing field during the World War II period as ably brought out by the late William M. Jeffers, then Rubber Administrator, when he warned the Congress of the importance of this segment of the rubber-tire industry being maintained, as he said if this segment of the rubber-tire industry ceased to operate who could foretell what might happen in the event this Nation should again be confronted by a war crisis. He was referring to the magnificent job done by that segment of the tire industry to keep the wheels in motion during the war period.

Mr. Chairman, as we reviewed the original legislation, the tax to be borne by recappers was 40 percent of the proposed tax on new tires. In the legislation as recommended by the Subcommittee of Public Works the members of the recapping industry would now be penalized. An additional 10 percent of their tax would now be 50 percent of the tax proposed for new tires. Of course this is go-

ing to work an additional hardship because of the heavy financial load the members of that segment of the industry are still carrying.

It is to be noted that some members of your committee are fully aware of the financial burden already being carried by independent tire sales and servicing institutions in the present excise tax levy where their stocks of tires and tubes are subject to payment of the excise tax as soon as the tires and tubes are placed in possession of the dealer, where—on the other hand, the stocks of tires and tubes in the tire manufacturers retail stores are exempt from payment of the tax until the tire and tube is sold to the ultimate consumer.

With the proposed legislation being considered by your committee, this would place a further financial burden on the shoulders of the independents—those least able to carry it.

If the legislation which is now proposed in the highway bill as to the tax levy on tires and tubes and recapping should be approved by the Congress, it is our hope and trust that definite provision will be incorporated in that legislation to correct the present excise tax levy inequity.

It is our belief that should the tax as recommended in this legislation as it applies to tire recapping be approved by the Congress, such taxation would be in violation of original taxing measures as set up during the early history of this Nation, as this proposed tax on tire rebuilding can only be classed as double taxation. The excise taxes now levied by the Federal Government are not now levied on "used" materials.

The even more serious aspect, should this legislation be approved by the Congress, is that it could and will result in an increased spiral of inflation all along the line, nationwide as those upon whom the tax is placed, will without any question of doubt pass that tax along to John Q. Public, the working segment of which of course will again come back for increased wages, etc., etc.

The recapping segment of the rubber tire industry today is the only segment of that industry which remains in the hands of small independent business, and our concern, since our obligation is to independents in all lines of endeavor, is whether the big rubber interests, who have now gained nearly a 100 percent monopoly are on the march to get this remaining slice of the business.

I have spent close to 50 years as an independent member of the rubber tire industry and have nationwide acquaintances in all segments of that industry and I well know the problems faced by the independent tire trade to maintain what foothold they now have in that industry, and it is hard to believe that the Congress would place further hardships which would eventually close the door for these efficient progressive independents, your neighbors and mine.

Mr. Chairman, it would be our recommendation, that the original program as recommended by President Eisenhower be approved, as that would be the only fair way to proceed. No one segment of the economy should be expected to carry the financial load necessary to further the highway program of the Nation.

Dentists Want Social Security Coverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, there are few groups in our country more united on any issue than the dentists in their efforts to secure coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program. In poll after poll they have voted overwhelmingly for coverage. Other proposals to modify or expand the social security program are subject to reservations of many kinds which deserve careful study and analysis. But coverage of dentists—and, I might add, lawyers—is not in this category. It can and should be extended by this Congress and without being linked with proposals of a controversial or questionable nature.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a telegram I have received today from the Congress of American Dentists for OASI:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 12, 1955.*

Hon. HAROLD D. OSTERTAG,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The majority of the Nation's dentists urgently need your support on dental OASI legislation. Widows and children of deceased dentists are suffering because dentists were excluded from security. Older dentists must continue working because of inadequate retirement funds. In all official State dental society polls the membership has consistently voted overwhelmingly in favor of OASI. Examples are: Illinois, 2,983 for, 469 against; Iowa, 817 to 148; Massachusetts, 1,172 to 52; Minnesota, 927 to 325; New York, 6,117 to 863; Ohio, 881 to 581; Oregon, 397 to 140; Washington, 540 to 242; Wisconsin, 956 to 505. Other polls in Florida, Colorado, Missouri, Kansas, South Dakota, Montana, New Jersey, etc., all favor OASI. The dentists are pulling for your support now. Don't let them down.

EARL S. ELMAN,
Secretary, Congress of American Dentists for OASI.

I Like To Live in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, May 15 to May 21, 1955 was proclaimed as Michigan Week by the Michigan Legislature. For this celebration the Michigan Railroads Association sponsored a statewide essay contest on the subject Why Do You Like Michigan?

Dawn Ostrander, of Grand Marais, Mich., submitted an essay, which to me truly expresses the feelings of Michiganders toward our great and wonderful State.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the essay written by my young constituent:

I LIKE TO LIVE IN MICHIGAN

(By Dawn Ostrander, Grand Marais)

I, a young citizen of the United States of America, have the opportunity of living in a wonderful little community in the upper peninsula of the great State of Michigan.

Many inspiring things have been said and written about my home State by many people who love it as I do. Its scenic beauty has been expressed in poems, books, and stories, but only its citizens as I, young and old alike, truly know their State.

There are many reasons why I like my home State. To me it is more than just a place where I live, go to school, and will grow up in. It means much more to me than this and I know I speak for thousands of other Michigan youth as well.

Sports and outdoor recreation are something every young boy and girls like myself love. Here in Michigan we have the opportunity to enjoy them the year-round. Our State has provided us with 3 million acres of State and National forest lands. Thousands of rivers, lakes, streams, and pine forests are nature's gifts to our State.

I have been able to go to an uncrowded beach and picnic grounds, to hike through a fragrant pine forest and enjoy seeing abundant wildlife along a woodland road in northern Michigan. I feel that I truly have nature at my back door the year round, and I know that every experience I've had in "Michigan's Wonderland," is something I will never forget.

Fishing, swimming, boating, and relaxing at the many summer resorts and woodland camps are our tourist attractions. To see the thousands of vacationers visit our State makes me proud to be a part of a State whose scenic beauty and natural wonders attracts people from all over the country. Skiing, skating, and tobogganing make a snowy winter fun and healthful for all Michigan boys and girls.

My home State is the most naturally air-conditioned State in the Union, and has one of the most healthful climates, because of the Great Lakes which wash its shores.

Michigan's industrial development is proof of her greatness. I, as well as all of Michigan's youth, have the open opportunity and assurance of being able to enter into many different enterprises, both offering skilled and unskilled labor.

Yes, I live in a State I can be proud of. I have told of its scenic beauty, its industrial development, and its many opportunities. I have grown up in Michigan, my home State. Each summer of my life I have spent in its outdoor wonderland, swimming, hiking, and having fun with other boys and girls. Each fall I return to a typical small-town school. In the snowy winters, skiing, skating, and tobaggoning are my favorite sports.

I intend to study and make my career in Michigan, and after I am old enough, to take part in its government as a Michigan citizen, for its betterment as my ancestors did, for I feel I owe much to them for making my home State as it is today, growing and flourishing.

I am only one of the many boys and girls of Michigan, but to me, my home State is truly ideal, a State I like to live in.

Inviting Suspicion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, administration leaders are attempting to brush off as inconsequential activities of Adolphe Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates deal. It is not that simple, as the following editorial indicates. This editorial appeared in the Evening Star of July 12, 1955. It follows:

INVITING SUSPICION

Despite the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract, Senator KEFAUVER and other Democrats of like mind apparently are determined to keep on delving into the story

of that contract and the part played in it by Adolphe H. Wenzell and the First Boston Corp. of New York.

In pursuing this line of inquiry, Mr. KEFAUVER and his group have succeeded in creating the impression that they are hot on the trail of a big scandal. However that may be, their effort has raised certain questions that call for better or more effective answers than the administration has yet given.

The story begins in 1953. At that time Mr. Wenzell—then an officer of First Boston, a big investment banking firm—undertook for the Budget Director a special study in which he drafted proposals to curtail the power functions of the Tennessee Valley Authority. And one of those proposals envisioned the building of a plant essentially the same as the Dixon-Yates project.

Next, on January 16, 1954, Mr. Wenzell—still with the New York firm—was again called upon to serve as a consultant to the Budget Director. This time his job had to do with working out technical recommendations later incorporated into the Dixon-Yates contract. Then, although he claims to have had nothing to do with the matter, his company—from which he retired in June of last year to join the World Bank—emerged as financial agent for the Dixon-Yates enterprise. But some time afterward—just when is not clear—First Boston officials decided to carry out this responsibility free of charge as a service to the public interest.

Actually, all this may be much more innocent than men like Mr. KEFAUVER suggest. Certainly the New York firm is a very reputable one, and it has done free jobs before as a public service. As for Mr. Wenzell, his uprightness has not been challenged. But still the fact remains that First Boston—which was then his employer—became financial agent for the project on which he worked as a Government consultant, and this readily lends itself to charges of impropriety, or worse. Nor has the administration done itself any good in failing to mention either his name or First Boston's in the report it issued last August as a full record of developments leading to the Dixon-Yates contract.

Accordingly, what we have here is a situation that invites suspicions because it gives at least the appearance of involving shenanigans of some sort. True, President Eisenhower has unhesitatingly affirmed that the whole business has been perfectly proper. But his administration will have to present its case more fully and effectively than in the past if it is to wipe out the doubts already raised.

Need Is for Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a clipping from the Chicago Daily News which I believe will be of particular interest to the Members of Congress in considering the Harris bill, which would remove Federal control from the gathering and sale of natural gas at the wellhead:

NEED IS FOR GAS

In 1938 Congress passed the Natural Gas Act primarily to regulate the rates at which pipeline companies sold the gas which they collected and transported to local distributors. Last year the United States Supreme Court held that the act also gave the Federal Power Commission authority to fix the prices at which producers—those who own the gas wells—sell to the pipeline companies.

In that 16-year interval competition among the 8,000 or more producers kept the field price of gas at levels that brought no complaint.

There is now before Congress the Harris-Fulbright bill. It would in effect nullify the Supreme Court's split decision and exempt the producers from FPC control. Its premise is that competition will continue to regulate prices, and that a tight lid on producers' return would stifle the incentive to take the risks involved in exploring for new supplies of gas.

The Harris bill has drawn impassioned opposition from those who instinctively and emotionally favor Government regulation of business. Among them is Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

Like-minded individuals are referring to the Harris bill as price-gouging legislation and proclaiming that it will cost consumers millions upon millions of dollars. They do not explain why the producers should have waited all this time to begin their gouge.

Industry sources assert that field prices for 1,000 cubic feet of gas average about 7.8 cents. It costs about three times as much to move it through the pipelines to the Chicago area. The balance of the price to local consumers represents the cost of distributing, servicing, billing, etc. Field prices are thus less than 10 percent of delivered prices.

Whatever case there is for regulation, it seems to us, rests upon the extent to which a monopoly exists in the production of gas and its sale to the pipelines. The question is, whether, when a pipeline becomes dependent upon a supplier for the gas it must have, it can then bargain at arm's length over prices, as it must if competitive forces are to work.

This situation does not seem to us any different from that of an electric company that contracts to buy coal from a particular mine. It signs a contract, but before its renewal, the company is free to seek other sources of supply. Nobody argues that the Government should regulate the price of coal at the mine.

Gas prices have assuredly risen since 1945, but so has everything else. Proponents of regulation speak of the millions that price hikes would cost consumers.

An increase of 1 cent per 1,000 cubic feet for the approximately 9,000 billion cubic feet of gas consumed last year reaches the vast sum of $90 million. In other words, a negligible price hike adds up to an impressive total.

The evidence that gas production is not a monopoly is the large number of those in the business, the fact that anybody is free to enter, and the fact that prices vary widely both within and between the various gas fields.

On principle, we are opposed to Government regulation of business unless it is clearly necessary in the public interest. No such showing has been made in the case of gas. Moreover, regulation would be enormously difficult and expensive. How much of the cost of dry holes, for instance, is a producer to be allowed to capitalize in fixing his rates?

The controversy is of particular interest to Chicago. There are some 300,000 homes here that would like to have gas for space heating if supplies were available. Our local interest, therefore, is in promoting new discoveries and proved reserves.

If there is any decline in supply as a result of regulation, the consequence will be higher prices instead of lower. And it must be remembered that there are other uses for gas beyond selling it to the pipelines. It can be sold within the State where produced, to local industries, or utilized in one of several conversion industries.

In our opinion, competitive forces in exploration and discovery have worked acceptably to keep gas prices reasonable. We see no reason why this condition should deteriorate merely because Congress decided to keep the situation as it has been.

The pressing need for more gas, and fairness to the producers, both lead to the conclusion that Congress should pass the Harris bill and leave this activity free from FPC regulation.

Trademarks That Win Friends for the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include in the RECORD the following comment on an address recently given by the Honorable James A. Farley before the United States Trademark Association. This editorial appeared in the Yonkers (N. Y.) Herald Statesman on June 27, 1955:

TRADEMARKS THAT WIN FRIENDS FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

One of America's top, unofficial, good will ambassadors reminds us of an important fact: That the American label, designating quality is one of our proudest possessions, and that it makes more friends and influences more people for the United States of America abroad than almost any other factor.

This topflight ambassador, if you have not already guessed, is former Postmaster General James A. Farley. He was speaking to a group which holds the trademark in exceedingly high esteem—the United States Trademark Association.

Brand names have come to be a hallmark of quality for so many of us and for so many of our friends and neighbors in other lands that we have come to take them for granted. We need some occasional finger pointing, like Mr. Farley's, to make us doubly proud of our own precious treasure.

Mr. Farley looked back at the weird economic philosophy of some of the brain-trusters association in the New Deal administration with which he was forced to break.

That was the time when frontier thinkers wanted to do away with all trademarks. Instead, they would label products only as to grade, and without identification as to manufacture or sponsorship.

Fortunately, that threat passed from both the economic and the political scenes. Because, as Mr. Farley said, not only is the trademark of inestimable value to us here in the United States of America. It is also making innumerable friends for the United States of America abroad.

Words don't mean much by themselves, said Mr. Farley. Too many people in too many places around the globe have found out, usually to their distress, that promises aren't always kept.

What counts in those places is performance. A person or a nation—or a manufacturer—is judged by what is produced.

That is where the value of the trademark comes in. When the label on the can says something which is borne out by the product itself then there is renewed, increased confi-

dence not only in the manufacturer but in the country he represents in the consumer's mind. That is why the American trademark helps America.

"Let us be particularly wary of any proposal or plan," warned Mr. Farley, "which would limit or subordinate the influence of a trademark on our economic system. For that kind of proposal makes the best kind of example of a price that is too high for the merchandise."

He was referring not only to commercial products but also to ideology. Too often a catchy tag is put on some new socialistic gadget for Government.

For example, Mr. Farley mentioned security. Sounds fine, doesn't it? Yet, as he pointed out, time and experience have taught that total security is merely the forerunner of regimentation. For every benefit, a price must be paid. But the price, as in commerce, can be entirely too high.

So, let us watch for the trademark, whether on the shelf or in the campaign speech.

If the article itself doesn't live up to the label on the outside, push down on the cash-register key reading: "No sale."

Minimum Wage Issue Defined as Economic Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article published in the June 1955 issue of Economic Justice, the bulletin of the National Religion and Labor Foundation. The statement, written by Robert Oliver, assistant to the president and director of the legislative committee of the CIO, is of particular interest at this time because it discusses the necessity for an increase in the minimum wage, a very important issue on which Members of this House will soon vote.

The article follows:

STATEMENT FOR ECONOMIC JUSTICE—RAISE AND EXTEND THE MINIMUM WAGE

(By Robert Oliver)

There is no better phrase to define the minimum wage issue than economic justice. Raising the Federal minimum from its present, unrealistic 75 cents to $1.25 and extending its application to millions of additional workers is a matter of economic justice because:

1. It will contribute towards the elimination of poverty by requiring the payment of wages more closely approximating decent living standards;

2. It will help safeguard the humane wage standards achieved by organized labor and which are now threatened by "sweatshop" competition;

3. It will provide protection for those enlightened employers who have seen the need and the wisdom in paying decent wages; and

4. It will play an important role in assuring an expanding economy in which ever-rising standards of living may be provided for all American families.

In his recent testimony before the Senate Labor Committee, CIO President Walter Reuther summed up the whole case in these few words:

"CIO supports the proposal because it is morally right and because it is economically sound.

"It is morally right because there is no excuse for the payment of sweatshop wages in an era of atomic energy and automation. It is economically sound because an expanding economy requires an ever-rising consumer income to match our ever-rising productive power."

There is, happily, almost universal agreement that the time has come to do something about the minimum wage. The McKinley-era advocates are still with us, however; the spokesman for the NAM testified last month that he personally would like to see the whole law scrapped, let alone raising the minimum above 75 cents.

Agreement in principle is not enough; there must be determination to move ahead realistically and fearlessly. It is in this area of action—not words—that the national administration has once again failed to come through. Early this year, President Eisenhower finally requested "action" on minimum wages. But the action he requested was for a rise from 75 cents to 90 cents. He had some pretty words to say about extending the act to more people, but made no specific recommendations.

The CIO has been compelled to describe this program as "too little and too late."

The present 75 cents minimum was established in 1949, and it was then already out of date. Since then the cost of living has risen substantially, productivity has risen by at least 20 percent, wages generally have increased by about 40 to 50 cents, and our total national product has risen tremendously. To raise the minimum to 90 cents is to stand still. Such a figure would do no more than compensate for increased living costs. It would make no improvement whatsoever in the living standards of those compelled to work at the minimum wage.

Fortunately, the President seems to have very little support even in his own party for his very timid program. More than 40 bills have been introduced in both Houses of Congress. All but 2 of these call for a minimum higher than 90 cents. A few call for $1, the great bulk call for $1.25, and 1 bill would set the minimum at $1.35.

Just how much above 90 cents the Congress will be willing to go will depend upon the amount of interest demonstrated throughout the country in this vital question. Although the press has generally been ignoring this campaign until very recently, there are signs of really strong interest developing. Proof of this came only last week when the chairman of the House Labor Committee, GRAHAM BARDEN, of North Carolina, told his committee that "it is obvious the country wants action on minimum wages, and this chairman will not stand in the way of such action." Earlier he had been widely accused of stalling. House hearings were set to commence on May 31.

No less important than raising the level of the minimum wage is the need to expand its applicability. The CIO and A. F. of L. have endorsed extension of coverage to millions more. Both the President and the Secretary of Labor have talked generally about extension. On the first day of the recent Senate hearings, the Secretary of Labor recommended extension to about 2 million retail and service employees. On the last day of these same hearings, the Secretary's representative withdrew the recommendations and requested merely that the matter be studied. The pressures from the retail lobby had been too great.

Readers of Economic Justice can play their part in this campaign to raise and extend the minimum wage. A Citizens Committee on the Fair Labor Standards Act, with headquarters at 1751 N Street NW. in Washington, D. C., has been formed by more than a hundred outstanding community and religious leaders. Further support is being solicited by the committee.

In the recently concluded hearings before the Senate subcommittee headed by PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, thousands of pages of impressive and professional testimony was presented. Economic argumentation on the question has been exhaustive. But perhaps the most telling testimony came not from economists, not from labor leaders, not from government experts, it came from three women. These were working mothers employed in three different clothing factories. They knew what it meant to try to feed and clothe and house a family on 96 cents or $1.05 or even $1.30 a hour.

One of the women told the Senators: "You know how boys eat. And when I have to take $6 out of my pay to buy one of the boys shoes, well, something else doesn't get paid for."

Another mother remarked: "Every day you keep saying to yourself, 'How in the world am I ever going to manage?"

And the third told about how she has to shop always for the cheapest things. "The cheapest food may take care of hunger, but it doesn't give much nourishment. It's the children—they're the ones that suffer."

As he concluded his presentation before the Senate committee, President Reuther quoted the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

"The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

The Struggle for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have entered in the RECORD a group of unusual articles originated by and printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under the general title, "The Struggle for Peace."

Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I now offer another article in the Post-Dispatch series, written by the historian Arnold J. Toynbee.

The article follows:

(By Arnold J. Toynbee)

It is easier to make an opportunity than to use it. In the West, we believe that it is we who have made the present opportunity by rearming; but, in saying even just this much aloud, we may be blunting the opportunity's edge. It might sound as if we were claiming to have scored a victory over an opponent, when the only victory that can win the struggle for peace is one in which both sides can take satisfaction.

In the West, we have rearmed as a precaution and as a deterrent. We wanted to make sure that we could hold our own if we were attacked, and we wanted to convince the Russians that aggressiveness does not pay. We seem to have convinced them.

OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS

And now, what next? The rearmament that has brought the opportunity within our reach is not going to help us to seize this opportunity now that it is there. Opportunities can be seized only by taking risks. What are going to be the most promising risks to take? And, if we do take them, how far dare we go?

This problem is not ours only; it is the Russians' problem too. We and they are

in the same boat. A recognition of our common plight might create the fellow feeling that is the seed of mutual confidence.

Peace is endangered so long as great powers are holding down smaller peoples for strategic reasons. Represented satellites and repressed colonies are more dangerous than H-bombs, because they are detonators that can make the bombs explode.

One long step toward peace would have been taken if we could arrange for these repressed peoples to be liberated; and it is easy to demonstrate that a contented and therefore friendly people is better security for an apprehensive great power that a river line or bombing base that is being held at the price of the local population's hostility.

But it is easier to see reason than to act on it. If one is to retreat from strategic positions, one needs a golden bridge, even if one has recognized that these positions are precarious; and, even when the bridge has been provided, one may hesitate to cross it without having first become convinced that this military retreat is going to earn political rewards that are likely to yield at least an equivalent amount of security.

WHAT INDUCEMENTS?

What facilities and inducements can the West offer to Russia for retreating from the Oder-Neisse line? These are the terms in which the problem is puzzling Western heads.

But, in other terms, the same problem must be puzzling Russian and Chinese heads, too. How can they induce the Western Powers to retreat from Formosa and perhaps from southern Vietnam?

If strategic retreats are, in truth, required on both sides, and not merely on one side, this is fortunate. It makes the problem easier to solve. Retreats are less unpalatable when they are being made simultaneously on both sides.

The building of the golden bridges is the simpler part of the common task. We can build them by each taking care not to humiliate the other party. If he and we both know that he is in an untenable position, it is in our interest, as well as his, that we should help him voluntarily to evacuate it, instead of using our own local and temporary advantage to push him out by force.

If he loses face and nurses resentment, the peace which we both need will not have been attained; but, if we can bring him to retreat of his own accord with discreet assistance from us, the first step toward real peace will have been taken. It will be harder to achieve the second step of finding a satisfactory equivalent for the strategic security that the retreating power will be relinquishing.

Take the classic case of the Oder-Neisse line. Even before the Third German Reich had been liquidated, the Russians had begun to risk a breach with their Western Allies for the sake of securing their hold on this strategic frontier. For the sake of securing it, they destroyed the freedom of Poland and lopped off huge slices of Eastern Germany; and, in consequence, their breach with their recent Western Allies was complete before the end of 1946.

Their willingness to pay this tremendous price for holding the Oder-Neisse line indicates the value that they place on it; and one can see why they value it so high. It is the shortest north-and-south line between the Baltic Sea and central European mountains. At this line the Great North European Plain contracts to a slim waist, while east of the Oder-Neisse line the plain fans out into a vast expanse extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

Twice in our lifetime, Russia has been invaded overland from Germany. If a western invader were to come marching east again, the Oder-Neisse line would be the shortest front to hold against him. This is what the line means to the Russians, and it is probably no use telling them that, if a western invader did come again, he would, this time, come flying.

Our fears for the future are always clothed in our experience of the past. For the living generation of Russians, a western invader means a German invader on the ground. So how are the Russians to be induced to evacuate the Oder-Neisse line, and not only that, but to let Eastern Germany rejoin Western Germany and to let Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Russia's other east European satellites go free as well?

Perhaps the key to a solution is to be found in the change in the East European peoples' point of view which is likely to be the Russians' reward if only the Russians can be induced to take the considerable risk of making all these concessions at once.

If the east European countries are liberated and Germany is reunited, then Germany, instead of Russia, will be the great power which the east European peoples will fear. Poland and Czechoslovakia, at any rate, might then look to Russia for protection against the risk of a German "revanche." And, if the entente between the east European countries and Russia did thus become a reality instead of a pretense, the Western Powers, on their side, might feel some concern for the security even of a reunited Germany against a Slav bloc cemented together by a common fear of Germany and not by Russian force.

SOMETHING LIKE NEW LOCARNO?

Might not such a change in the European situation open up the possibility of negotiating something like a new Locarno Pact? Could not the three Western Powers and Russia agree to give a joint guarantee both to a liberated and reunited Germany and to a liberated eastern Europe?

Such a joint guarantee could be given without this requiring a simultaneous dissolution of existing alliances. A jointly guaranteed free Germany would be at liberty to remain in alliance with the Western Powers, and a jointly guaranteed free Poland and Czechoslovakia to remain in alliance with Russia.

Meanwhile, the two remedial measures—the liberation and the guaranty—would, one might hope, work together to reduce the feeling of tension and insecurity; and this, in turn, would make it easier for both camps gradually to disarm pari passu on an agreed plan.

If there is anything in this suggestion for a first move toward peace in Europe, a corresponding plan might be worked out for eastern Asia.

It has already been agreed that, after a cooling-off period, the people of southern Vietnam shall freely decide their own future for themselves. Why should not the same freedom be given to the people of Formosa?

The West would have to face the risk that the Formosans might then vote for getting rid of the Kuomintang, and Communist China that they might vote for still holding aloof from communism. The Formosan Chinese must be longing, not, of course, for a restoration of Japanese rule, but for a recovery of the material efficiency and well being that was the bonus of half a century of Japanese domination.

An East Asian Locarno Pact between Communist China and Russia on the one side and the Western Powers on the other might extend the joint guaranties to all the smaller countries of eastern Asia. Both North and South Korea, as well as both North and South Vietnam, could be brought under the Locarno umbrella.

The purpose of a new Locarno, in eastern Asia and in Europe alike, would be to allow the smaller countries to make a genuinely free choice of regimes, ideologies, and alliances. They cannot be genuinely free unless the great powers refrain from putting pressure on them; and the great powers will be tempted to curb the small countries' freedom so long as they have reason to fear that it may prejudice their own security.

The path is, of course, beset with difficulties. Germany has not renounced her lost territories east of the Oder-Neisse line. Can we find an eastern frontier for Germany that will be acceptable to Germany, Poland, and Russia alike?

And what alternative asylum could we find for President Chiang Kai-shek's government and army if the Formosans were to tell us that they did not want to keep them?

Such obstacles are formidable, but the prospect of them must not intimidate us. The snags will be less difficult to deal with if once we can get on the move. We can then grapple with them as we come to them, one by one.

Meanwhile, our objective is clear. We are in quest of a victory for peace which will be a common victory for all mankind.

The National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able speech by our colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], recently delivered, concerning the condition of our national defense. I think it deserves the attention of all Members.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY M. JACKSON, DEMOCRAT, OF WASHINGTON, BEFORE THE ANNUAL FELLOWSHIP DINNER OF THE GRAND LODGE OF MASONS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AT OLYMPIA, WASH., JUNE 21, 1955

In the past 3 months, Soviet foreign policy has made the most striking series of shifts since the beginning of the "cold" war in 1946. In no less than nine different cases, the iron fist of Stalin has been supplanted by the disarming diplomacy of Moscow and Peiping.

To underline this change, let us review these unexpected reversals of the Communist position.

In the Far East, Communist China has concurred in a de facto cease-fire in the Formosa region and indicated a willingness to discuss a settlement. Four American fliers held in Chinese prisons for more than 2 years have been released. Russia, having refused to sign the original treaty of peace with Japan, is now discussing a bilateral agreement. The Kremlin has begun a concerted campaign to win favor with Nehru—the leader of the neutralist bloc.

In Europe, an effort is being made to heal the breach with Tito, who not long ago was being denounced from Moscow as a heretic. Concessions to the West's position on the reduction of conventional armaments have been indicated. Chancellor Adenauer has been invited to discuss resuming diplomatic relations after Russia's initial refusal to recognize Bonn. And following 7 years of obstruction, the Soviet signature has been placed on the Austrian Treaty.

On top of these events must be added the Russian agreement to join a four-power conference at Geneva next month.

The American people would be less than human if they did not take heart at this turn of events.

As always, however, there is another side to the coin. I am frank to question whether the current optimism can be justified by the realities of the situation.

The simple fact is that with Stalin's death there has come to power in Russia a group that is subtle, clever, and flexible—as opposed to the bluntness, rigidity, sometimes stupidity of the Stalin regime. Where Stalin was obvious, Khrushchev is devious.

Most of Stalin's failures stemmed from the clarity of the threat he posed to the free world. Recall for a moment our reactions at home to Soviet moves in Iran, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Berlin, and Korea. It was these threats that pushed us into a program of alliances, a military buildup, and a determined attempt to shore up the defenses of the free world.

The Russians' "good neighbor" policy of recent weeks, by apparently diminishing this threat, has placed us in a difficult position. On the surface, we are faced with a new, disarming and conciliatory Communist approach. Behind this front the basic aims of communism remain unchanged.

It is a front because the Khrushchev regime is building the greatest military machine in Soviet history. As they talk peace, their preparations for war exceed our greatest estimates of their military capabilities. Never, in fact, has any country boasted of peaceful intentions with such a large portion of its economy dedicated to armaments.

Let me document this point with a brief look at recent history. Six years ago, in the spring of 1949, our conventional forces were vastly outnumbered by those of the Communist world. As a matter of fact, they still are. But, as against this, in 1949 our air-atomic power was incontestable. We possessed the B–36, then the world's only true long-range bomber. We had already flight tested the B–47, the world's first strategic jet bomber. And, above all—6 years ago—we had a monopoly of atomic weapons.

Intelligence reports told us then that our atomic monopoly would be long lived. Some responsible officials declared that 10 or 20 years might pass before the Soviets mastered the riddle of atomic energy. The matter of stockpiling nuclear weapons in large numbers was even more remote. As for delivery aircraft, we were informed that Soviet jet bombers were many years in the future. In short, most of us believed in the spring of 1949 that America's trump card—our industrial and scientific supremacy—would indefinitely cancel out Moscow's superiority in conventional forces.

Today we know, or should know, otherwise. Far from requiring decades to split the atom, the Soviets achieved their first atomic bomb in 1949—years before the expected date. Their first hydrogen explosion occurred in the summer of 1953—only 9 months after our own first full-scale hydrogen test.

Had we been realistic, we should have assumed that a nation capable of mastering atomic energy so quickly would also soon have air fleets with long-range jet bombers. Yet, even after the Soviet hydrogen test, confident officials soothingly declared that nuclear bombs were of no use unless they could be delivered against targets. As far as ability to deliver these bombs went, they said, our lead was clear and permanent.

Then came the Russians' air demonstration of May Day, 1954. This revealed the existence of Soviet jet bombers comparable to our own medium-range B–47 and our long-range B–52. The intelligence communities of the free world were shocked. The Russian planes had been flown well before the expected date. In certain important respects—in the size of their jet engines, for instance—they were more advanced than our own bombers.

Despite these facts, the soothing voices were heard again. They said the Soviet planes were doubtless hand-tooled prototypes. They predicted that years would elapse before these first models could be mass produced. The implication was clear that mass production was unique to the United States.

Six weeks ago we learned the truth. In their 1955 practice May Day displays, the Soviets flew both their medium- and long-range jet bombers in operational numbers. Furthermore, they flew large numbers of a new day fighter. Performancewise, this is a better plane than any we ourselves are now flying in other than limited flight tests. In addition, they flew operational numbers of all-weather interceptors which are superior to any plane we ourselves have in combat units today.

Again our defense planners were caught by surprise—just as they were surprised when thousands of MIG's flew in Korea at a time when the Soviets theoretically could not mass produce fighters.

The American people are now being told that, as of today, we are still superior to the Soviets in long-range airpower. Those who issue these statements, however, do not say how we stand in relation to the Soviets in fighter aircraft. Neither do they say how we will stand in strategic airpower a few years from now.

Speaking as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, my own estimate of the present balance of airpower is this:

Long-range jet bombers. We are now in a neck-and-neck race with the Soviets. They may well be ahead of us.

Medium-range jet bombers. As of now, it is likely that we have more medium-range jet bombers than the Soviets possess. But they may well overtake and surpass us in a year or two.

Fighter aircraft. We are now vastly inferior to the Soviets in terms of numbers of high performance fighters. As a matter of fact they are thousands ahead of us. Qualitatively, the latest Soviet fighters are at least the equal of our best planes—and they may be better.

The intercontinental ballistic missile. The race for this absolute weapon is now nip and tuck. We should not be surprised if the Soviets get it first.

What a shocking distance the Russians have travelled in 6 years. In 1949 our airpower lead was incontestable. Today our only comfort lies in the fact that—in certain types of planes—we still appear to be ahead of the Russians. To put it bluntly, we find ourselves for the first time simply trying to keep up with Soviet progress in delivery vehicles—rather than being decisively ahead.

Nor is this all. All the evidence indicates that the Russians have been able to move from the design of prototype aircraft to mass-production models more quickly than we have. In other words, they now appear to be our superiors in the very techniques for which America has always been famous—quickly tooling up for mass production.

To cite an example. Our work on the B–52 bomber began in 1948. It was first tested in 1952. First production started in the spring of 1954. The comparable Soviet plane—the type 37—was apparently designed in 1950. It was tested in 1953 and produced in quantity in 1954. Although the United States had production facilities for a jet bomber that the Soviet lacked, they gained at least 2 years on us in this race.

The growth of Soviet technology is documented in a recent speech by Allen Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. "Military needs dominate their research programs," he said. And he added: "We who are in intelligence work have learned by now that it is rarely safe to assume that the Soviets do not have the basic skill, both theoretical and technical, to do in these fields what we can do." As an ominous footnote, Mr. Dulles reported that the Russians would graduate 1.2 million in the sciences in the decade from 1950 to 1960 compared to only 900,000 in the United States.

The meaning of these facts for the future is clear. What is past is prologue. In 1949 we led decisively in the contest for air-atomic supremacy. Today, this some contest hangs in the balance. If the present trend continues, I put it to you as a fact that by 1960 the Soviets will be unquestionably ahead of us in airpower. When that day arrives—as it surely will if we do not change course—our historic trump card of technological supremacy will be nullified. To their present superiority in conventional forces our enemies will add superiority in advanced weapons systems—with fateful consequences for the future of the world.

What are we going to do about this challenge?

Certain things seem clear. We are now engaged in a struggle for our national survival. In this struggle, our foes are working around the clock. We cannot hope to win this contest if we ourselves work 1 shift on a 5-day basis.

More specifically, I propose the following six-point program:

First, I propose that our production of jet bombers and fighters be placed on a crash basis at once—on a wartime footing.

Second, I propose that there be an expansion of our present aircraft industrial capacity. Existing aircraft plants should now operate around the clock, 7 days a week.

Third, I propose that we immediately convene a board of top industrial experts to determine why we are now slower than the Soviets in tooling up for the mass production of aircraft. We cannot prevent wars with models sketched on drawing boards.

Fourth, I propose that we immediately assign supreme and overriding importance in our defense effort to the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. This project must be tackled with the resources, the skills, the moneys, the urgency, and the priority given our wartime atomic effort. The question of war or peace may depend on our getting this ultimate weapon first.

Fifth, I propose that, as an absolute minimum, our ground forces be kept at their present level. Proposed cuts could be disastrous.

Sixth, I propse that we immediately undertake to expand our atomic weapons program.

The Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is now completing an extended 3-month series of secret hearings on the general subject of our atomic preparedness. During these meetings, we haye heard from the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman and Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the three services, from the Strategic Air Command, the Continental Air Defense Command, the Commander of NATO, and from ranking scientists.

These hearings have made it clear to me that our existing and planned atomic production facilities will be inadequate to meet the real needs of our Armed Forces for nuclear weapons. This is particularly the case with small weapons of relatively low destructive power which could be used for antiaircraft defense and against troops in the field. Accordingly it is my earnest hope that the members of the joint committte will soon see fit to recommend to the President a major step-up in our atomic weapons output.

Yet atomic weapons in themselves can furnish us with no military protection unless we can deliver them against enemy targets. In all sincerity, I regard the recently announced acceleration of 35 percent in our B–52 production schedules as completely in-

adequate. I believe these schedules must be revised drastically upward. It is my fervent hope that we will not need another Russian May Day demonstration to jolt us into stepping up our military programs along the lines I have suggested, which surely represents the minimum price of national survival.

Will larger military budgets be required to strengthen our Air Force and to expand our atomic production? Of course they will. But defense in this atomic age cannot be purchased in bargain basements. Any peacetime military budget is small, and bearable, when compared with the incalculable cost and horror of the atomic war which may well befall us if our preparations are so weak as to invite attack. Our military preparations cannot and must not be budget-limited. Instead, they must be based upon the needs of our Armed Forces and the requirements of our national survival.

Our top military leaders, testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, have made it clear that we could not begin to mobilize our resources and step up arms production after an all-out atomic war had started. In such a war, our entire economy could be prostrated in a few days. This fact represents an historic change in our Nation's military position. In previous wars we have been spared direct attack. With the impetus of a Pearl Harbor, we have had a period of grace to mobilize and produce the goods of war. Today, however, our industries are only a few hours away from the fields of the long-range Russian Air Force. The period of grace is a thing of the past. As a result we must now build up our armed strength to wartime footing in time of peace.

Some of you may feel that what I have said tonight is too much in the realm of sabre-rattling. I have made this speech for the purpose of letting people know the military steps which must be taken to prevent war. In our present peacetime situation, the only rallying force we can use to speed our production and defense buildup is the device of honest information conveyed to the American people by their elected and appointed officials. I believe that an American public fully informed of the clear and present danger to our security will support an effective defense program now with the same vigor they showed in our mobilization effort after Pearl Harbor.

I should add that this is not a partisan speech or a partisan issue. Both the present administration and its Democratic predecessor have underestimated the strength and potential of the Soviets. This national shortcoming can be remedied only through national support for a new and vigorous defense program.

In light of this critical Russian threat, what can we expect from the forthcoming Four-Power Conference? I hope you will agree that the Soviet military buildup drawfs in significance the recent shifts in Soviet foreign policy. The real issue at this Conference, and in the months of discussions ahead, is whether or not the Russians are prepared to show good faith in their dealings with the free world. The American people will not put much stock in Russian signatures on agreements. But assurance that Russia was genuinely interested in living up to commitments would be warmly received.

What could we regard in days ahead then as a show of good faith from the Soviets—a genuine change of heart? Three things, I suggest, Russia must do to reestablish her credit with the free world.

First, she must lift the Iron Curtain to allow the free flow of people and ideas between Russia and the non-Communist nations.

Second, she must withdraw her troops from the satellite countries occupied at the end of World War II.

Third, she must stop the activities of the Cominform—the agency devoted to the spread of international communism.

Unless the Russian attitude on these questions is changed, we cannot assume that the basic aims of the Kremlin are directed toward a real solution to the cold war conflict. When the Kremlin moves to lift the Iron Curtain, free the satellites and abandon the Cominform, this will be the essential demonstration of good faith.

Until this time, we must remain hopeful but pessimistic as to Soviet intentions. And we must move promptly to meet the ominous challenge of the Russian military buildup.

Toledo Labor Pioneers in Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the New York Times concerning a new diagnostic clinic which has just been opened in Toledo, Ohio, under the sponsorship of Willys Unit, Local 12, of the United Auto Workers, CIO. The officers and members of the UAW–CIO are to be commended for their social vision and sense of community responsibility. This clinic is a splendid contribution to the Toledo community and certainly justifies the description, a "pilot experiment in the field of medical care."

The article follows:

AUTO UNION OPENS DIAGNOSTIC CLINIC—WILLYS UNIT IN AN EXPERIMENT TO AID HEALTH OF 4,500 WORKERS AND FAMILIES

TOLEDO, OHIO, July 9.—The diagnostic clinic of Willys unit, local 12, of the United Auto Workers, CIO, described as a pilot experiment in the field of medical care, will open here officially tomorrow.

The clinic was founded to serve the 4,500 members employed at Willy Motors, Inc., and their families. It has been endorsed by the Toledo Academy of Medicine and the management of the company. On its 21-member board of governors are civic, religious, business, legal, and educational leaders. Among them are Edgar Kaiser, Willys president, and Richard T. Gosser, international vice president of the union and founder of the clinic.

The clinic's first task will be to determine the present state of health of each Willys member. About 10 will be examined daily at the $387,500 clinic. No diagnosis will be turned over to the patient, the director, Dr. Harry B. Friedgood, said. Reports are in "a strange language, reveal findings about technical things and might actually arouse the patient's anxiety."

The diagnostic clinic has these features:

It will provide union members and their families low-cost diagnostic medical and dental care. However, they will be referred to the family physician for treatment or advised to seek a family physician through the Toledo Academy of Medicine. There will be no treatment at the clinic, although clinic doctors will be available to be of service to the family physician in diagnosis.

It has a full-time staff of five specialists, all trained in internal medicine and each with a secondary specialty.

Commenting on the establishments, Dr. Friedgood said:

"It is fortunate for the citizens of Toledo that a triad of powerful organizations—labor, industry, and medicine—have joined forces administratively to solve a mutually vexing problem: the cost and distribution of medical care."

The theme for the dedication exercises is "The Constructive Answer to a Community Problem Is Community Action." That was the basis of speeches by Dr. Walter Bauer, Jackson, professor of clinical medicine at Harvard University and chief of medical services at the Massachusetts General Hospital; and by Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, vice president of the University of Texas and dean of the university's school of medicine.

Tribute was paid to Mr. Gosser in a 28-page illustrated booklet being distributed this week to visitors at the 1-story, 16-room building that has a half-acre site.

Mr. Gosser formulated the diagnostic clinic plan 5 years ago, when he was Willys unit chairman. It was during his leadership that money from a retroactive wage settlement was placed into a fund to finance the venture.

The Struggle for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the final article in the series, The Struggle for Peace, which was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was written by Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago. It is a distinguished final chapter in an unusual group of newspaper articles, and I offer it for inclusion in the RECORD:

(By Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop, Chicago Archdiocese of Catholic Church)

It is becoming increasingly evident that most people in the world are desperately desirous of peace. More than ever before, people are conscious that peace is the one indispensable condition for living a human and humane existence. More than ever before people are aware of the incalculable price that we all pay for war. This price is not only measured in terms of the past; it is being measured more and more within the framework of the future.

War, like so many things in our modern world, has radically changed. Total warfare implies as a necessary consequence that no one, neither man, woman, nor child, can escape its devastating effects. By a strange and ironical twist, modern war has pinpointed the truth, long neglected, that we are all committed inescapably to the total human venture; that if we refuse freely to join together in peace, then we must of necessity join together in war.

There is no longer the possibility of observing war from a safe distance. Our cities, our neighborhoods, our very homes are now part of the battlefield. The sound of the siren is not so much a call to battle as it is a warning that war has come to us and that there is no escape.

PEACE SURVIVAL SYNONYMOUS

Is it any wonder that mankind is so concerned with the question of peace? Peace, in terms of modern warfare, has become synonymous with survival. The scientists who have made nuclear warfare possible have warned us repeatedly of this truth. Recently a high-ranking military man has bluntly told the world that, if life is to be preserved, war must be abolished. This is a completely

honest statement of a bitter, but salutary, truth.

Faced with such a situation, everyone feels inadequate. Everyone wishes he could present a simple, workable formula that would insure peace on earth. Unfortunately, our given situation is not a simple one, and thus not amenable to simple solutions. Rather is it woven out of a number of conflicting strands. Complexity is characteristic of our age. Any attempt to deal with it in simple fashion is doomed to failure.

Perhaps the best one can do is to offer some principles that may serve as an approach to peace, that may help to create what has been termed the climate for peace.

Peace is not a negative thing; it is not merely the absence of war. Peace is something positive, and it implies of its very nature that man has the moral responsibility to strive after it.

Peace is the fruit of justice. For mankind to live in peace means to live in harmony, with each one's interests falling into its proper place. St. Augustine defined peace as the "tranquillity of order." This means that peace is based on order and there can be no order without justice. Every social injustice in the world, every hungry child, every ill-housed family, from Calcutta to Chicago, may represent a potential threat to world peace.

It has been a life-long conviction of mine that the best climate for peace is a social order that is constructed upon the firm basis of justice and charity, one in which the individual person would be given the opportunity to achieve some kind of decent human existence. This, I think, has always been the ideal goal of western society.

True, the goal has often been obscured or temporarily lost, but never completely surrendered. Perhaps the crisis through which we are passing may well serve to remind us once again of the goal and of our obligation to strive toward it.

Obviously such an ideal makes serious demands upon us. It bids us once again to realize that we do not stand alone in isolation, but that we are members of a community of peoples who are dedicated to the idea of human freedom, a freedom that carries with it strict responsibilities for its proper exercise where the natural rights of others are involved.

SPIRITUAL VALUES

Again, the goal forces us to acknowledge that the spiritual values innate in Western civilization are not mere catchwords to be pronounced glibly and to suit a particular public occasion. They are intended to be guides for conduct in our public as well as our private life.

The world shall largely gage our sincerity according to the measure that these spiritual values are realized concretely in every sphere of living, whether that be social, political, or economic.

It may be well for us to remember that the corruption or collapse of spiritual values may be more devastating to the spirit of man than any atomic destruction. Nations have generally been able to survive physical catastrophies; they have never survived spiritual collapse.

We speak of waging war, but we consider peace as if it were something that just happens without any effort on our part. I think the time has come to talk of waging peace not merely with empty words but with meaningful acts. Our worldwide attempt to feed the hungry and to give people of all lands the means to build for themselves those social structures so necessary for the better life has been part of our waging the peace.

To wage peace is to thirst after justice for all. To wage peace is to labor for the triumph of God's justice on earth. It is to give rather than to receive; to share rather than to hoard; it is to be concerned for our fellowman rather than to be indifferent.

Practically, this means sharing our abundance, passing on our technical knowledge, in order to help develop the hitherto fruitless areas of the world.

It is in this sense that peace depends on the hearts of men. The simple goodness expressed, the love played out in action, the unheralded attempt to leave the world a more just place than it was when one came into it are all peace-waging acts. This is Christianity's great message of peace, which is the divine heritage given her by her Founder.

In this complex age peace demands leaders who are attuned to the grim realities of a world in tension and uncertainty. But however gifted these leaders may be, their work will not be effective if it lacks the cooperation of the average man. We must be convinced that peace shall not be given to us as a free gift. We must work for it unstintingly.

APPEASEMENT LEADS TO WAR

At the present time we are forced to work against great odds. A large part of the world is in the power of a few men who believe and implement an inhuman and godless philosophy of life. In our dealings with them we must avoid the extremes of unbending bellicosity and spineless appeasement. We completely reject appeasement not because we accept war as the only solution to our problems; we reject it because we desire peace. And if there is one lesson that we have learned from recent history, it is that appeasement leads not to peace but to war. This should not surprise us because appeasement, in the last analysis, is connivance with injustice, and peace can never be the result of injustice.

Faced with the fact of communism, we have been forced to accept a new kind of war, the cold war. For the most part, this has been fought by statesmen and diplomats, rather than by military men. This motion of a cold war is new to us, and it has been difficult to accept. We have had little or no experience with its weapons. In such a war there are no clear-cut victories, no unconditional surrenders. It is a difficult battle, fought on the ever-shifting terrain of diplomacy, and daily demanding new tactics. It has achieved one thing—it has kept the world from plunging over the abyss of total destruction. Its successes and failures must be measured according to that standard alone.

Now, more than at any other period in our history, there is urgent need for leaders of informed and independent mind, men sharply conscious of the limits of the possible in mundane affairs, men who are acutely aware that we do not live and act in an ideal world, but one in which evil and terror move in the threatening shadows of destruction and annihilation; men, above all, who know that the life of a nation, like that of an individual, may be an uphill journey all the way. Hence, they recognize the need for patience and prudence and grace. It is certain that an atmosphere of sterile criticism and simplistic formulas cannot and will not insure the emergence of such men.

Once more mankind is faced with a decisive choice. Shall it be war or peace, or, more accurately, shall it be survival or annihilation?

Man and man alone can and must make the decision. There is nothing but the evil lurking in his own heart that would force him to choose the easy way of collective suicide. It is our inescapable duty as free and responsible moral agents to use every good means within our power to prevent such a terrifying choice.

Facts Versus Fiction on Surplus Crops From the Colorado River Storage Project—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I began a reply to an attack on the upper Colorado River storage project by the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. As I noted yesterday, the crops which are grown in the four upper-basin States are not raised in surplus to any appreciable extent, nor are they ever likely to be.

On the occasion of his attack on May 19, 1955, the gentleman from southern California also made this statement with respect to the project and surpluses:

> A few days ago, April 18, 1955, during debate in the Senate on the upper Colorado River project bill, S. 500, Senator WATKINS, of Utah, said to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois:
>
> "Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the agricultural crops produced on lands under irrigation in projects such as the ones sought to be authorized by means of this bill are not the types that are in surplus supply?"
>
> There seems to be some difference of opinion between Senator WATKINS and the Bureau of Reclamation. (RECORD, May 14, 1955, p. 5688.)

From what the Census Bureau's figures show and from what the Department of Agriculture and the President's Water Resources Policy Commission have had to say about the nature of agriculture in these States, which I discussed in part I of my reply, it is quite evident that there is no difference of opinion between the distinguished senior Senator from Utah and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to agriculture in these States. But let me explain in greater detail.

The gentleman from southern California placed in the RECORD a list of some 34 possible participating projects, showing the types of crops which could be grown on lands supplied water by these projects, and then he proceeded to cite the dollar cost of the acquisition of these commodities by the CCC under the price-support program. His obvious implication was that all these commodities will be grown in great volume on each of the 34 participating projects and would end up in Government warehouses, placed there by the price-support program. Now let us examine this assumption and the facts surrounding each of these commodities he mentioned.

Certainly it is true that small grains will be grown on some of this land, and it is also true that small grains are eligible for price support. But the plain facts are, as the 1954 Agricultural Census for Emery County, Utah, indicates, that little grain is grown by farmers in that county where, as I mentioned yesterday, the participating project known as the Emery County project will be located. For example, out of 725 farms in Emery

County, 223 do produce small grains, but these grains are not placed under price support but fed to livestock and poultry. In this respect, it should be noted that of the 725 farms and ranches in Emery County, 639 produce cattle and calves. Nearly 95 percent of the small grain purchased is fed to cattle and other livestock. By and large Utah is a deficit feed area.

Next, the gentleman from southern California went on to say with respect to sugar beets:

> This year we have seen the spectacle of farmers on Federal irrigation projects in the West coming to Washington to protest the acreage restriction. This has happened in a number of places, notably in the immense Columbia Basin project of Washington with regard to sugar beets. * * *
>
> What was the administration's answer to these farmers? It was: no more acreage. (RECORD, May 19, p. 5689.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us examine the correct facts in this situation. The reasons why acreage cuts have had to be made under the Sugar Act are basically these:

First. Since 1934, the American domestic sugar requirements have been divided between our domestic growers of cane and beet sugar and foreign countries. The Sugar Act of 1948 limited American beet growers to 1,800,000 tons of sugar and domestic cane growers to 500,000 tons, based upon an estimated domestic sugar requirement of 8 million tons.

Since 1948, therefore, the amount of increased consumption occasioned by population growth and other factors has largely been supplied by Cuba. For example, in 1948 Cuba's basic quota was 26.7 percent of a 7,200,000-ton market. In 1954, it was 32.4 percent of an 8,200,000-ton domestic market. So although our consumptive needs and requirements have increased, domestic growers have not benefited from it.

Second. Since the prices of farm commodities have undergone a market decline, farmers have in increasing numbers wanted to plant and grow sugar beets. This is because in the light of lower prices for other crops the growing of sugar beets has become a more profitable alternative. However, as more farmers have turned to their production, it has meant smaller acreage allotments for those farmers who have had them in the past. This is why the representatives of sugar beet growers have wanted larger acreages.

Third. This situation can be remedied if the gentleman from southern California will help me see that H. R. 5404 is enacted into law, since this bill provides a formula by which the domestic growers can share in providing sugar for an increasing domestic sugar market. Now sugar beet and cane growers have received subsidy payments, Mr. Speaker, not because they produce too much sugar with resulting lower prices, but as a reward for relinquishing the large part of our domestic sugar requirements to friendly foreign nations whose economics primarily depend upon a single crop—sugar.

Fourth. Now the administration's answer to farmers who want to grow sugar beets is not as the gentleman from southern California has said: "No more A acreage." On June 8, 1955, the Department of Agriculture in a press release announced that new sugar legislation should be enacted which would return the relationship between domestic and foreign producers to a percentage quota so that the domestic producers could share in the added volume produced by our population growth.

Fifth. The sugar beet industry in general is on the decline in this upper basin area. For example, in Emery County, Utah, where the participating project by that same name is to be constructed, the Agricultural Census of 1954 indicates that only 2 farms produced sugar beets. In 1949, there were only 7 farms which produced beets.

Next the gentleman from California noted that farmers in most of the upper basin area produced dairy products, and then he proceeded to cite the CCC's present holdings, and ended with the statement that "nobody knows what we are going to do with all the butter we have hoarded away—RECORD, May 19, page 5689. Yes, it is true dairy products are produced on intermountain farms but, this is important, only in relatively small quantities when compared with livestock. Looking at the Emery County, Utah, project area again, the 1954 agricultural census points out that whereas 639 of the 725 farms and ranches produced beef cattle, only 64 produced and sold whole milk, and 108, which includes those 64, sold cream.

Now let us digress a moment and set the record straight on another aspect of this matter. The dairy price support program of Secretary Benson is making effective progress not only in getting rid of our surpluses but also in bringing supply back into line with demand and at better prices to farmers. On June 15, 1955, Secretary Benson, in a talk to the American Seed Trade Association of Minneapolis, Minn., stated:

> The level of price support for dairy products was adjusted to 75 percent of parity. * * *
>
> Within 6 months, there was clear-cut evidence that the dairy industry was beginning to emerge from its serious trouble. Now, less than 15 months after the dairy price support level was adjusted, the evidence is overwhelming that the program is functioning effectively.

What is the evidence? In essence, Secretary Benson, on the same occasion, presented it as follows:

First. During the marketing year ending last March 31, consumption of butter increased 9 percent over the preceding 12 months. Consumption of American cheese was up 14 percent. Fluid milk consumption is also rising.

Second. An increasingly greater proportion of the total milk production is going into fluid consumption as a result of increases in per capita consumption and our population growth. This leaves milk for manufactured products and less surplus for the Government to purchase.

Third. From October 1953, through May 1954, almost 1 billion pounds of dairy products were purchased by CCC. During the corresponding 8-month period just ended, Government purchases dropped to 472 million pounds—less than half as much.

Fourth. At the same time, CCC has been moving into channels of consumption at home and abroad huge stocks of dairy products acquired under the old program. Concerted effort has pared these stocks by nearly 500 million pounds since last October.

The Secretary concluded by saying:

> Looking ahead, I believe the time is fast approaching when the Government will no longer be buying surplus dairy products.

In the light of these two facts, first, the success of the Administration's dairy program; and second, that dairy products are not produced in disproponent amounts in the upper Colorado River Basin States ought to make it clear that the construction of the Colorado River storage project will not result in the production of the surplus basic agricultural commodities which comprise the "surplus problem" today.

Now the statement by the gentleman from southern California "that the administration is asking that the taxpayers of the Nation be forced to cough up this enormous amount of money to bring into production at an almost unbelievable cost these arid lands to grow more grasslands for cows to graze on and purchase more butter, cheese, and milk to add to the towering piles of surpluses"—RECORD, May 19, page 5689—is unwarranted. Yes; a great part of this land will be used to produce hay and forage crops for livestock as well as pasture. But this is primarily needed to feed beef animals.

Why, Mr. Speaker, is this important? An excellent answer not only with respect to this question, but why the development of the upper Colorado River project is so important to these four States was provided in 1950 by the President's Water Policy Resources Commission as follows:

> The several water resources programs in the Colorado River Basin should bring in some additional areas of new land besides providing more adequately for lands now suffering water shortages. This irrigation will greatly aid in stabilizing the range economy by providing wider opportunities for marketing livestock, by creating greater feeder possibilities, and by increasing the economic base so that the range need not be so badly abused. * * *
>
> To the extent that these programs can be spread into new areas and into the sparsely inhabited portions of the basin, even greater benefits will be provided by permitting close integration of livestock and feeding. (Ten Rivers in America's Future: No. 5 Colorado River, vol. 2, p. 81.)

Yes; every one of these participating projects, as the gentleman from southern California stated, "would produce hay and pasture," but as the President's Water Resources Policy Commission pointed out, this is not wasteful nor uneconomic agricultural production. Quite to the contrary, it represents making the best economic use of limited resources.

One-Worlders Seek To Destroy Our Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press for Sunday, June 26, carried an important editorial, one that every American citizen should read. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the editorial at this point:

ONE-WORLDERS AT WORK TO SELL OUT INDEPENDENCE

Views on the news:

As a citizen of the United States, do you believe in preserving your country's independence?

If the answer is "Yes," be on guard against the efforts of the globally minded visionaries who are trying to destroy it.

Two powerful and well-financed groups, Atlantic Union and the United World Federalists, Inc., are again beating the drums for federation with other nations.

The UWF's plan would take us into world government by amending the charter of the United Nations. Atlantic Union's scheme is less ambitious but likewise, within the framework of the U. N., would join the United States and the Western democracies, federally or otherwise, into a defense, economic, and political union.

What does all this mean to you?

It could mean that the United States, except in purely domestic matters, would be subservient to a world legislature.

It could mean, since treaty law takes precedence over domestic law, that if the United Nations is permitted to assume the responsibilities of world government, our constitutional guaranties might well be destroyed.

Any form of "defense, economic, and political union" with other countries would spell the end of our Republic as conceived by the Founding Fathers.

We now have defense agreements such as NATO which insure our freedom of action.

We give economic assistance to less fortunate countries without thought of repayment.

We cooperate in diplomatic and political affairs to promote peace and better understanding.

But once the United States joins either a limited or global federation of nations, your country then loses its right of self-determination while assuming the defense, economic, and political burdens of the world.

There are presently before both Houses of Congress concurrent resolutions requesting the President to invite appointed delegates from the democracies to meet with similarly appointed representatives from the United States for the purpose of exploring the possibilities of creating a supergovernment.

The resolution, advanced by the Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., is being sponsored by 16 Senators and 53 Representatives.

The United World Federalists are even more active through a large number of local chapters and the emotional propaganda that is generated whenever they can induce anyone of national importance to join their cause.

Both groups speak of the dangers which confront our country and imply that somehow these dangers would disappear if their pet nostrums were used to save the world.

But they never quite get around to explaining how or why except in the most naive and fatuous terms.

Without questioning the sincerity of those who favor our federating with other countries, it would seem they are ready to abandon the principles for which this Nation has fought and bled.

Although U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold said recently at Stanford University that "the times are far from ripe for world government," its advocates are recruiting new followers at an alarming rate.

True, our country is facing, as it has through the pages of its glorious history, many critical and dangerous problems.

But haven't we the strength and the patriotism to face them as courageously as we have in the past?

It is appalling that responsible elements of our citizenship have so little national pride that they would be willing to sacrifice our independence on the altar of a superstate.

They ought to try on some Davy Crockett caps for size and read a few volumes of American history.

Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., Reports That Mayors of 259 Cities, Speaking for 31,600,000 Americans, Maintain Continued Firm Opposition to Harris Natural Gas Bill as Serious Blow to Consumers; Forwards Objective Analysis of Measure Showing How It Would Raise Gas Rates To Provide Windfall Profits to Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I heard with a great deal of interest today that the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Honorable PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, had stated that it was somewhat unlikely the Harris natural gas bill would pass in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a serious blow to the consumers of natural gas via the interstate pipelines if this bill or any bill resembling it were to pass in this session or in any session. It is a bill which, I maintain, goes to extreme lengths to benefit a small group of oil companies at the expense of the millions of natural-gas consumers, even to the length of repealing—you might say—a Supreme Court decision. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I will continue to fight against this proposal to end Federal jurisdiction over the prices of natural gas in the field, when shipped in the interstate pipelines.

PHILADELPHIA'S MAYOR CLARK HAS LED CONSUMER FIGHT

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the mayor of my city, the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., has been instrumental in organizing an effective voice for the consumers of this country in expressing their opposition to this bill. He enlisted Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, and Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Jr., of New York, in a drive to organize scores of mayors of our major cities and of many smaller cities into a committee to oppose this natural gas price-increase bill. The latest count shows that 259 cities representing a total population of 31,600,000 in 21 States, and including 8 of the first 10 cities in population as well as many smaller ones, are enlisted in this drive against the bill.

Mayor Clark, Mayor Lawrence, and Mayor Wagner yesterday sent to many Members a letter expressing the continued opposition of their committee to the so-called compromise bill on natural gas. Apparently the mistaken impression has been given to some Members of Congress that the changes made in the original Harris bill had made the measure acceptable to Mayor Clark's committee of mayors. This is definitely not the case, as the letter points out.

In addition to the letters expressing this continued opposition, Mayor Clark enclosed an objective analysis of the Harris bill as amended, showing why the so-called consumer protective devices written into the bill would actually be ineffective in protecting the consumer. The producers, however, would be completely free of any effective control.

The mayor's letter, and the analysis are as follows:

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Philadelphia, Pa., July 12, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: A bill proposing radical changes in the Federal Power Commission's statutory authority to regulate natural gas producers was reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on June 28. The vote on this highly controversial measure was 16 to 15, narrowly secured after an initial tie vote which promised to keep the bill from being reported out at all.

As you know, a large number of mayors have joined together in a committee which gives expression to the fact that this bill, if passed in its present form, would operate to the severe detriment of natural gas consumers throughout the United States. As of the present time, this committee consists of the mayors of 259 cities, comprising a total population of 31,600,000 distributed throughout 21 States; and these cities include not only the Nation's largest municipalities (for instance, 8 out of the first 10), but also a wide range of smaller communities.

On behalf of this committee, we are writing you at this time, because Members of Congress are apparently being assured that H. R. 6645 (the amended Harris bill referred to above) is generally agreeable to the mayors of American cities in its present form. The chief purpose of this letter is to assure you that this is definitely not the case. The mayors' committee is strongly opposed to this bill and is convinced that its enactment

would be a serious blow to the natural gas consumers in all of our cities and would be counter to the public interest.

We are attaching herewith an analysis of this bill which makes clear, we believe both accurately and fairly, the adverse effect which the bill (despite the claims of its supporters) will have on natural gas consumers. We hope that your busy schedule will permit you a few minutes in which to read this highly important digest.

With our basic responsibility for the protection of consumers in American municipalities, we feel we must oppose this legislation with all the strength at our command.

Very truly yours,

DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
Mayor of Pittsburgh,
ROBERT F. WAGNER, Jr.,
Mayor of New York,
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr.,
Mayor of Philadelphia.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 6645 (THE AMENDED HARRIS BILL)

Section 1: The first section of the bill amends the Natural Gas Act by including in interstate commerce, commerce between the United States and a foreign nation.

COMMENTS

This provision is intended to clarify the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission wth respect to gas which is imported and exported from and to Mexico and Canada, clearly a reasonable extension of FPC authority.

Section 2 limits the "transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce" and "sale in interstate commerce for resale" to transportation after the natural gas has been delivered into the transportation facilities of the interstate pipelines, beyond the field or fields where produced, and sales are considered to be in interstate commerce only after transportation has commenced.

This is the heart of the Harris bill, making as it does an arbitrary defintion of interstate commerce completely outside of the philosophy which has grown up around the term of "interstate commerce," and contrary to the spirit of the Natural Gas Act as originally written. By this arbitrary definition, this important aspect of the natural gas business; i. e., the initial sale to the pipeline, is excluded from the control of the Federal Government, and puts the producers beyond any effective regulation.

Section 3, including the so-called consumer protective provisions, sets up a "reasonable market price" standard against which the Commission is to judge the field price included by the pipeline when it comes before the Commission in a rate case.

A. This section requires the Commission to make a finding with respect to the reasonableness of the price in new or renegotiated contracts, and allows the pipeline company to charge as operating expense only such part of the contract price which does not exceed the "reasonable market price." There is a similar provision which permits the Commission to apply the same standard against increases in field price based on escalation clauses, which a pipeline company wishes to pass on to consumers. Also, if a pipeline company wants to have an advanced determination made by the Commission, the Commission is empowered, on its own motion, to decide whether the field price is a "reasonable market price."

A. There are three primary difficulties with this section, plausibly worded as it is to give a semblance of consumer protection. The first of these difficulties relates to the use of the words "reasonable market price." There is no positive set of criteria established by the Harris bill which the Commission can use in arriving at such prices; nor is there any historical or legal background of use in making such determinations. Certainly, with respect to escalator clauses it would be very difficult for the Commission to prove that a new price, escalated up to the level of the most recent price contracts negotiated in the field, is not a "reasonable market price." Consequently, this provision would seem to give legislative sanction to the pernicious favored-nation clauses about which so much testimony was received.

B. Included in this section is a provision that after the Commission has made a finding, the pipeline company is required to pay to the supplier only the price found by the Commission to be a reasonable market price, and that the supplier is required to live up to the contract even though he may be dissatisfied with the price allowed.

B. The second difficulty with section 3 is that the provision attempting to hold suppliers to their contracts, even though the full price be not allowed by the Commission, is of doubtful constitutionality. Obviously, having once defined that such sales are not in interstate commerce, Congress cannot legislate with respect to the contracts under which the sales are made.

C. Finally, pipeline companies are permitted to charge the "reasonable market price" for gas which they themselves produce.

C. With respect to gas produced by pipelines themselves, to allow the pipeline the "reasonable market price" for gas produced by facilities which, in most instances, have already been paid for out of the rates charged for gas, is giving an unwarranted windfall profit to the owners of the pipelines. It also makes it economically beneficial to the pipelines that prices continue to rise in order that the gas which they own can be more fully priced as they sell it. Some change may be necessary in order to encourage pipelines to develop additional gas reserves; but the provision in the Harris bill provides an incentive far out of proportion to the advantages which could accrue out of more active exploration by the pipeline companies themselves.

Section 4 amends the certificate provisions of the Natural Gas Act by saying that when a pipeline comes before the Commission for authority to initiate or expand its service, FPC shall consider whether the field prices in purchase contracts for gas dedicated to this new or increased service are reasonable market prices.

This of itself is not a particularly pernicious provision and, indeed, some amendment of this sort could play a definite part in a strengthening of the Natural Gas Act. However, the meaningless words "reasonable market price" destroy what value the amendment could have.

GENERAL

The minority reports, specifically those on pages 60, 66, and 88 of the report of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on this legislation, give the full background as to why this legislation should not be enacted and what its effect will be. Putting it in its simplest terms, the report, on page 73, has a table which indicates that if the effect of this legislation is to raise the field price of gas by 15 cents per thousand cubic feet, $800 million a year will be added to the consumers' gas bill. This is the increase between 10 cents per thousand cubic feet, the present average field price, and a figure of 25 cents per thousand cubic feet which has many times been quoted as being the target of the oil industry, as a "reasonable" evaluation of their product. It is entirely likely that, freed from regulation, the oil industry will achieve this objective and that consumers will be subjected to this additional annual cost. The increase in prices which has already taken place in the past few years, as a result of the pernicious escalation clauses in the gas-supply contracts, has already cost the customers over $200 million a year, with increases still coming thick and fast.

Pan American Landmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer of June 30, 1955, carried an excellent editorial entitled "Pan American Landmark" which pays proper recognition to the airline on its 50,000th successful Atlantic crossing. The editorial follows:

PAN AMERICAN LANDMARK

"Saw the heavens filled with commerce,
Argosies of magic sails.
Pilots of the purple twilight dropping
Down with costly bales."

Alfred Lord Tennyson's poetic fancy flew into the world of reality this week, borne on the wings of a Pan American World Airways DC-7.

To Pan American goes credit for making the 50,000th successful Atlantic crossing, a feat which, in toto, can be likened to moving the population of a city the size of Philadelphia, some 2 million persons, to the moon.

The fanciful comparison fits. There is something definitely magical in Pan Am's record, in which there has been but one instance of passenger fatalities—in the wartime days of the flying boats—and none in the era of land-based aircraft.

If nothing else, international aviation has shrunk and shriveled the world to an extent that we are all close neighbors. Sixteen years ago, when Pan Am began regular service, ocean flights monopolized headlines. Today, at any given hour of night or day, people routinely skim the ocean skies in safety. And the fact that they do so can in large measure be attributed to Pan Am skill.

It was, for example, Pan American which began over-the-weather flights. The line also pioneered the method of least-time-track or pressure-pattern flying. This involves flying routes which appear many miles longer than necessary in order to take advantage of tailwinds, actually saving time. For the record, incidentally, a Trans World Airline pilot first hit upon the idea.

Aside from its technical accomplishments, Pan American is now pioneering in a field we hear little about, although it wins us untold friends.

The line, by loaning its capital and experience, has been guiding some of the less fortunate nations in Asia and Africa in building up their domestic airlines.

In lands where rail and road communications remain primitive, it has been possible to leap directly into the air age. Pan Am has helped such efforts, to the gain of all Americans and our Nation's stock abroad.

War loomed when the company began transatlantic operations. During World War II Pan Am contributed more, perhaps, than all our other air carriers combined. And today its fleet is such that 7,600 troops a day—more than half a division—could be ferried wherever required.

The very existence of this reserve is one of the chief factors making war as remote as it now is. The Plain Dealer is proud to tip its masthead, in lieu of dipping a wing, to Pan American's splendid performance.

Farewell Editorial of the Takoma (Md.) Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, is it always sad to see the death of a newspaper. It is something like losing an old friend.

After 27 years of public service the Takoma Journal has announced the suspension of publication for an indefinite period.

This Takoma Park, Md., paper was founded by the late John W. Coffman, Sr., on February 17, 1928. Mr. Coffman was a man who thought and acted as an individual. For the past 9 years his son, John Coffman, Jr., has followed in his father's footsteps and carried on the family tradition.

The Journal was a consistent winner in the Maryland Press Association competitions, winning top awards for general excellence and its fine editorials.

We regret to see newspapers of this caliber, edited by men such as its founder and his son, pass from the scene and I ask unanimous consent to have the farewell of this publication made part of the Appendix of today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONE WE DIDN'T WANT TO WRITE

Nine years ago today our team took the helm of the Takoma Journal, fulfilling a lifelong ambition to bring to the community a newspaper for all the people, but also one which stood for something.

During these years our team has spent every nickel, every waking hour, and every thought to fulfill our avowed purposes. We have had no vacation and no respite from the 24-hour constancy of living with the news. We have accepted abuse and praise as it came, sticking strictly to those principles which we believed in, fighting tyrants and ignorance, and defending the best interests of our community.

There was never in our mind any thought of a business venture as such, but rather only a dedication to the newspaperman's creed and a love of our town. Obviously we have tried to run the paper on a business basis, and, for the most part, have been able to follow our concept and still be successful. We have rejected offers to sell simply because we wanted to stay here, or because the would-be purchasers were more interested in grinding axes than in newspapering. And we still feel the same way.

The complexion of our town is changing, and with the changes come the attendant problems and growing pains. We had looked forward to aiding this growth, and, in fact, figured our decisions on a positive, forward-looking basis.

Newspapers are a singularly peculiar type of business which defies the understanding of most people. Their successful operation demands a close-knit team of experts, fluid and inexorable at the same time. You do not make mistakes in the newspapering business simply because it can mean the ruination of you, or worse, innocent victims. You stay "on the ball" all the time and ahead of developments. You see in four directions at once, curious but not suspicious, following a kind benevolence for worthy causes and keeping a close check on those operations which might be otherwise. By comparison to most businesses you live a lifetime in very short order—always under pressure of one kind or another.

We chose to ignore the very sound advice of many folks, including our doctor to "ease up," simply because you can't stay in this business and do that. But now the time has come when, after exploring every conceivable angle, there is only one decision to make, however distasteful it may be. We have made that decision because we flatly refuse to further jeopardize our team, a team which has given unquestionably and unstintingly. It we accept responsibility to our town and our newspaper, then we accept even more responsibility for our team.

As we close this phase of our newspapering career, we express sincere regret for having to make such a decision which thus denies to our people a news medium sorely needed here. Words cannot tell our appreciation for the loyalty of our subscribers and friends and the several advertisers who have supported us through thick and thin.

We elected to suspend the paper indefinitely because we refuse to sell to those who would use it primarily for personal expediency, or for causes inimical to the best interests of the community as a whole. We have, since last week, received several inquiries from such sources. We have also received several legitimate inquiries from qualified persons. While we know full well any new owner will be unlikely to run the paper just as we would, our final decision on the paper's continuance or suspension will rest solely on the premise we have stated.

And to our people, we say have faith in your local government. It is manned by honest men, who are doing a good job for you. Support them intelligently and independently, and our town will be even better.

Civil Rights Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith my testimony delivered today before House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 2, on civil rights bills:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you today and testify in behalf of my bills, H. R. 258, H. R. 259, H. R. 627 and H. R. 628. I hasten to assure you that I do not intend to belabor you with proof of obvious facts.

Let me state three propositions which establish the necessity of civil-rights legislation. First, today there is widespread violation of the civil rights—the human rights—of fellow American citizens. Second, it is clear to me, as it was to President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, that "the National Government of the United States must take the lead in safeguarding the civil rights of all Americans." Third, it is clear to me that Congress has been derelict in its duty to provide wise legislation to safeguard the civil rights of our citizens. I recognize that some will disagree with one or more of these basic propositions. But, as I said, I have no intention of reviewing the overwhelming and, to me, conclusive evidence in support of these propositions which has been presented to the Judiciary Committee on previous occasions. I can only respectfully disagree with any who as yet remain unconvinced of the soundness of these basic propositions.

As a member of the legislative branch of the Government, I am ashamed of congressional lethargy in the protection of civil rights. We have abdicated our responsibility completely. Furthermore, under the present administration the executive branch has shown no great zeal in this area. It has remained to the judiciary to carry the heavy load of this great national responsibility with any degree of honor. I am happy to applaud the courage and wisdom of our judges.

But it is most inappropriate that the Judiciary should be forced to carry this burden alone. It is very difficult for the courts to fashion a well coordinated overall policy for the effective protection of constitutionally guaranteed civil rights. The courts can only proceed by a piecemeal, case-by-case approach. It is regrettable the courts are forced to this difficult position by the failure of Congress to provide a coordinated legislative policy.

It is my belief that the bills which I have introduced would provide a more coordinated legislative civil rights policy and provide more effective protection of recognized civil rights. At the same time, analysis of these bills will disclose that they make no revolutionary innovations in the law. H. R. 627, identified as the Civil Rights Act of 1955, calls for the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights and a Federal Commission on Civil rights in the executive branch of the Government to investigate and report annually on the status of civil rights protection in the United States. Sections 111 and 112, pages 7 and 8, of this bill provide for reorganization of the Department of Justice to make enforcement of civil rights legislation more effective. I consider this one of the most pressing current needs, i. e., the effective enforcement of recognized civil rights. H. R. 627 would provide an additional Assistant Attorney General to head a more potent Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice and authorize additional FBI personnel to effectively investigate alleged violations of civil rights.

Title II of this bill, starting on page 10, would close some loopholes in existing civil rights statutes. At present, title 18 U. S. C., section 241, punishes conspiracies to encroach on federally secured rights of citizens. But it does not punish such encroachment when done individually. On page 11, subsection (b) is added by my bill to punish such individual encroachment. Also, this statute at present does not protect the rights of aliens. My bill, on page 10, amends present law to include all inhabitants of the

United States, thus including aliens, in its protection. This amendment would make section 241 consistent with section 242 on this score. At present, section 242 of title 18, United States Code, punishes officials who, under color of law, deprive persons of rights, privileges, and immunities secured by Federal law. The only proposed change in this section is to provide a more severe penalty when its violation results in killing or maiming the victim. This increased penalty provision is also proposed for section 241.

On page 13 of H. R. 627, a new section is added to these civil-rights statutes. The purpose of this new section is to clarify rather than make any great changes in existing law. But this clarification would make effective enforcement much easier. I am sure you gentlemen are aware of the case of *Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91), in which a county sheriff, a policeman, and a special deputy beat to death a Negro youth. A jury found the officers guilty of violating present section 242. The Supreme Court reversed the conviction on the grounds, among others, that the instructions to the jury did not correctly state the requirement of willful encroachment on a federally secured right. In addition, the Court indicated that section 242 raised serious problems of vagueness and indefiniteness. The Court said it is not always clear what rights, privileges, and immunities are federally secured. The new section added on page 13 of H. R. 627 gives legislative specification of some rights which have already been judicially determined to be federally secured. These remedies, in part, solve the problem of vagueness and indefiniteness attending prosecution under sections 241 and 242. (See hearings, Committee on the Judiciary, 81st Cong., serial No. 18, p. 91.)

Section 204, on page 14, of the bill amends title 18 U. S. C. section 1583. This amendment makes clear that the holding as well as selling into involuntary servitude or slavery is punishable. The insertion of "other means of transportation" is simply to bring the statute up to date, supplementing the now-present word "vessel."

Beginning on page 14, H. R. 627 amends existing protections of the right to vote. Section 211 makes it clear that section 596 of title 18, United States Code, is intended to apply to general, special, or primary elections. The existing language is "any election." Section 211 would amend this to read "any general, special, or primary election." Section 212 makes a number of changes in phraseology in the present section 1971 of title 42, United States Code, to close certain loopholes now open for construction. The phrase "general, special, or primary election" supplants the words "any election by the people." The present statute speaks only of distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The words "previous condition of servitude" have been dropped as unnecessary, since the slaveholding days are far removed. In their place have been substituted the words "religion or national origin."

It is clear that the existing guaranty against distinctions in voting based on race or color is expressly authorized by the 15th amendment. (*U. S.* v. *Reese* (92 U. S. 214 (1874)); *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649 (1944))) and is validly applicable in all elections, whether Federal, State, or local (*Chapman* v. *King* (154 F. 2d 460 (1946))). In addition, the present statute has been sustained under the equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment (*Nixon* v. *Herndon* (273 U. S. 536 (1927)); *Nixon* v. *Condon* (286 U. S. 73 (1932))), which clause also is the source for the claim that distinctions in voting based on religion or national origin are arbitrary and unreasonable classifications both as they appear in State laws or in the administration of such laws. Thus H. R. 627 provides an up-to-date legislative clarification of the federally secured right to vote and specifies civil as well as criminal sanctions for the effective enforcement of this coordinated legislation.

Since the Supreme Court decided the case of *Henderson* v. *U. S.* (339 U. S. 816 (1950)), and *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483 (1953)), any kind of racial and similar segregation and discrimination in interstate transportation appears doomed. It seems only a matter of time until, case-by-case, all such discrimination is condemned. The duty of Congress to immediately clarify the law and provide civil rights protection is clear. That is the purport of the last part of H. R. 627.

H. R. 259 is a Federal antilynching law. At present, under (18 U. S. C., secs. 241, 242, and 371), it is possible to prosecute law enforcement officers and individuals who conspire with such officers to substitute mob violence for the lawful adjudication and punishment of crime in accordance with due process of law. However, in many cases there is no provable conspiracy with law enforcement officers making it impossible to prosecute members of the lynch mob. It is the purpose of this bill to provide full Federal protection for this despicable crime, a crime which by its very nature indicates the breakdown of republican government as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. There is no doubt of the constitutionality of this antilynching law as applied to State officials or those who conspire with State officials. I see no constitutional impediment to its application to private individuals who take the law in their own hands and, in effect, destroy republican government in a given part of the Nation. But I recognize that this latter is more debatable.

H. R. 628 makes clear that the attempt as well as the completed crime of subjecting another to peonage or involuntary servitude is to be punished.

In conclusion, it is clear that, with the exception of certain aspects of the antilynching law, every provision I have offered raises absolutely no legitimate constitutional questions. Furthermore, I think it is clear that there is nothing revolutionary about the legislative program I propose. It builds on existing civil rights foundations, closes loopholes in existing laws, clarifies uncertainties in existing law and provides adequate law enforcement officials for the effective protection of recognized civil rights. In my estimation, Congress has been derelict in its duty, on the one hand, to keep civil rights legislation abreast of the progress of our Nation and, on the other hand, to provide effective enforcement machinery for existing civil rights protections. I think the legislation I propose is a step in the right direction toward fulfillment of these duties and I respectfully urge its favorable consideration.

The Attorney General was invited to appear and testify on Thursday, July 14, on these bills, but he declined. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Civil Service Commission, were all invited to appear on that date, and all declined. The Department of Labor, General Services Administration were invited to appear but no response has been forthcoming from them. The Housing and Home Finance Agency was invited and will appear.

Any claim by these agencies that these 53 bills present an overwhelming and impossible task is pure deception. Most of these bills are identical copies. There are at the most 13 different bills, and, as far as substance is concerned, no more than 10 different proposals. Furthermore, most of these proposals were referred for these agencies' consideration last winter.

These are the agencies primarily concerned with civil rights. The Justice Department, for example, has said that it could take no action because existing laws were too weak. Yet when offered the opportunity to testify on these bills, it declines. How can existing laws which are weak be made stronger without the benefit of the testimony of the Justice Department? President Eisenhower has stated that civil-rights issues should be considered on their merits. If the executive branch ducks responsibility to testify, how can Congress adequately supply the needs of the Nation? Apparently the administration wants to have its cake and eat it too. The agencies decline to express themselves. Why? Apparently the administration does not want to alienate voters in certain sections of the country, the South, for example, who supported Eisenhower. The administration gives the impression that it supports these bills with pontifical declarations. It does not implement these declarations by deeds and actions. The administration dares not oppose these bills. It is afraid to come down to the Judiciary Committee and approve them. Such a pusillanimous attitude is most unworthy.

Mel Price Blew the Whistle First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my short time in the House, I have come to recognize our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, MELVIN PRICE, as one of our most alert guardians of the public interest.

His most recent act giving evidence of his devotion to the public interest came when he was the first to question the circumstances surrounding the nomination of a partisan politician to the technical Atomic Energy Commission. Our colleague is in the fortunate position of being not without honor in his home area, as an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch attests. I include the editorial as a part of my remarks:

NOT FOR THE AEC

Personal and professional integrity should be required of any public official. So the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was justified in checking reports about the fiduciary conduct of Allen Whitfield, President Eisenhower's nominee for the Atomic Energy Commission. Whitfield has now asked the President to withdraw his name lest the Commission become involved in controversy.

There were, however, more fundamentally disturbing aspects of the Whitfield nomination, even if they did not carry the kind of implication which led to examination of his connection with the Valley Bank & Trust Co. of Des Moines. First there was the charge of Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, a Democratic member of the joint committee, that Whitfield had been named in response to a demand for more patronage for Iowa Republicans. Even more serious was the lack of any indication that the man was qualified by training, experience, or well-founded interest for the work of the AEC.

With the possible exception of the Central Intelligence Agency, the AEC is the most unusual of Federal agencies in that the peo-

ple—and, to a considerable extent, Congress itself—are kept uninformed about most of its activities. Secrecy about the AEC has been equated with national security. That is why it should be made up only of men in whose ability and fitness the public can have the utmost confidence.

If ever AEC memberships become plums for political lawyers and rewards for party workers, then some changes will have to be made. Whitfield's looked just like that kind of appointment, and that is the best reason for welcoming his withdrawal.

Address by Hon. John J. Sparkman, of Alabama, Before 56th Annual Congress of National Retail Hardware Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on yesterday I had the privilege of talking before the 56th annual Congress of the National Retail Hardware Association at their meeting at Buffalo, N. Y. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address I made at that time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

For several weeks, I have been looking forward with pleasure to being in Buffalo with you today.

There is always something stimulating about occasions when retailers meet to exchange ideas and to seek solutions to their business problems. When this is done in the relaxed atmosphere of an annual convention, we experience the perfect blending of business with pleasure.

It would be hard to find a more representative group of small-business men than the members of the National Retail Hardware Dealers Association. In every State of the Union, your stores occupy a central position in the pattern of our everyday life.

More than 40 percent of all hardware stores are located in towns of under 2,500 population. On the Main Streets of these small towns, these smaller stores ring up 28 percent of total hardware sales.

It is not a full statement, however, simply to say that hardware dealers are typical small and independent business enterprisers. To complete the thought, it is essential to add that in common with every segment of the American small-business community, hardware men today are plagued by much the same problems which bother most groups of small-business men who are trying, in the midst of prosperity for some, to conduct a retail business at a profit.

By way of illustration, since 1946 total annual hardware sales have increased by about 50 percent, or from $2 billion to almost $3 billion in 1954. Yet, the average yearly sales per store have declined by almost 10 percent in the same period.

At the same time, and covering the same years, your costs of doing business have climbed from 18 percent to 27.5 percent of sales. One direct result of this is that your average net profits, which stood at 9.9 percent in 1946, had declined to 1.9 percent last year, a dangerously low level.

Individually, however, and with the alert guidance of your association, you are taking steps to meet the challenges—or threats—to your profit position. Looming large among these challenges is the formidable competition from mass merchandisers, from mail-order houses, lumber yards, chain stores, discount houses, variety stores, and even food supermarkets.

It came to me as a surprise to learn that a recent survey of food supermarkets disclosed that almost one-third of the nonfood items carried were hardware supplies. Thirty-three percent of the surveyed supermarkets actually sold hammers.

In self defense, against this kind of competition, many of you in recent years have diversified and expanded your own merchandise lines by stocking housewares, power tools, sporting equipment, garden supplies, electrical appliances, and many other new lines.

Other modern merchandising techniques which are finding favor with hardware dealers are self-service systems and installment selling. With self-service you can pare your overhead and by extending credit you undoubtedly attract many customers who cannot always buy the larger items for cash.

Of course, in extending credit one must be guided by sound business principles. A close and somewhat anxious watch is being kept in Washington today on the level of consumer credit, which, as you know, is at an alltime high, being in excess of $30 billion.

As home buyers, we have obligated ourselves for another $79 billion in the form of mortgages.

On the other hand, personal income has also attained new heights, and the records show that those who buy on credit terms are making their payments fairly promptly.

Those who keep tabs on the Nation repayment rate say that it is currently taking between 11 and 12 percent of disposable income * * * a level which is not considered by some to be dangerous.

Rightly or wrongly, sky-limit credit with little or no down-payment and years in which to repay has become one of the characteristics of our present-day prosperity.

In commenting on this fact, a Washington economist said recently that: "Autos at 36 months means credit being extended clear out at the very margin of respectability."

There is clearly discernible a circus aspect that is creeping into the automobile credit picture today. In Florida, one General Motors dealer is presenting one share of common stock in General Motors to each car purchaser.

These Barnum & Bailey tactics are carried a step further by yet another Miami dealer who now offers a 6-day, all-expenses-paid trip to Paris to anyone buying an automobile.

I do not pretend to know who is kidding whom in a deal like that.

I expect to hear any day now that one of this dealer's competitors has topped the Paris package by throwing in a 2-day side trip to Rome.

I hope that this slight note of caution I am striking does not label me as being hopelessly old-fashioned. I realize that to be considered up-to-date in business circles these days, one must be an unquestioning optimist and exhibit at all times an almost evangelical faith that the present rate of business activity cannot possibly go in any direction but up.

Certainly, I am not blind to the fact that our economy is capable of even greater expansion.

Certainly, too, I believe that we can achieve an even higher standard of living, which is the proper goal of all economic effort.

But (and this is a rather large "but") this will not come about unless we base our future progress on the time-tested principles of a free competitive economy; unless the door of entry into business is kept open; and unless the benefits of any expansion of our production accrue to the many and not just to the already powerful few.

I should like some assurance that the small-business men of America are going to receive a fair share of this widely advertised prosperity.

In brief, I would feel more confidence about the future if our millions of small and independent businesses in both the production and distribution of goods did not find themselves at the end of the banquet table scrambling for crumbs.

That may sound somewhat unfashionable in the light of many present-day utterances. Commonsense tells us, however, that any prosperity which does not fully include the small-business community in its benefits is out-of-balance and will cause trouble.

From the small business point of view, there are several factors that suggest an unbalanced picture.

For instance, our biggest corporations are making an increasingly higher rate of profit than our smaller producers. In fact, many small concerns are not making any profit these days.

Yet, overall manufacturing earnings for 1954 were the second highest on record. Manufacturing profits after taxes were 3.4 percent above the 1953 level and only 1.5 percent below the record of 1950.

In the fourth quarter of 1954, however, the smallest group of manufacturers (those with assets under $250,000), went into the red by 3.5 percent after taxes, while every other size group showed fourth-quarter increases over the same period in 1953. Corporations with assets of over $100 million showed a profit of 13.7 percent of stockholders' equity.

I am disturbed by this widening gap between the profit rate of our biggest and our smallest companies.

I am concerned also because the small business share of our national sales pie is getting smaller.

Small manufacturers' share of total sales has fallen off from 19 percent in 1947 to 14 percent in 1953.

Small business is getting less, not more, of Government defense contracts.

I have tried to indicate to you some of my reservations with the popularly held theory that whatever seems good for big business must of necessity also be good for small business.

I do not hold to the conviction embraced by many advocates of the status quo that the fate of small independent businesses is chained by any natural economic law to the fortunes of our biggest and wealthiest corporations. It does not always work that way.

The trouble with the trickle-down theory of business prosperity is that the faucet is apt to get clogged up.

It is true that 29 American companies each sold $1 billion worth of goods and services in 1954, ringing up a combined sales total of more than $67 billion worth of products. General Motors Corp. headed this blue-chip list with sales of $9,823 million.

Even so, I do not see how it can be possible for us to maintain a well-balanced and prosperous economy in the years ahead unless we can broaden the business base and develop a commercial climate in which it will be possible for well-managed small and independent companies also to make a decent rate of profit.

We are living in a time when it is not enough for a company to do just a little better than break even and provide a mere living for its owner. Small businesses must earn enough to be able to finance their growth and expansion. In many cases they must either expand or wither away.

With their larger competitors spending heavily and expanding at an unprecedented rate, if the smaller companies merely stand still, the profit parade will surely pass them by.

My comments so far have been perhaps but a general preface to a consideration of what is probably the most important economic question facing us today. That is simply this:

What effect is the concentration of economic power having on our industrial and commercial life?

And again: Is the current wave of mergers on the verge of pyramiding economic power to the point where its top-heavy weight may crush out of shape and recognition our traditional free enterprise system of doing business?

T. K. Quinn, former vice president of the General Electric Co., stated before the Joint Economic Committee of Congress on February 1, this year, that there are: (a) 68 private billion dollar corporations in this country today, most of which have greater annual incomes than the total receipts of any one of the 48 States in the Union; that (b) as few as 200 industrial giants own outright the most important half of all American industry; and that (c) their control extends backward and forward to tens of thousands of suppliers and dealers who must either deal with them on their own terms or be eliminated.

The Small Business Administration has estimated that only 30 percent of the Nation's total manufacturing output is produced by small manufacturers. These constitute 94 percent of the total of manufacturing concerns. That leaves 6 percent of our largest producing corporations accounting for 70 percent of all manufactured products.

And still the wave of industrial mergers rolls on unchecked. Each day's newspaper carries the announcement of the intention of two more of our blue-chip companies to consolidate their forces into a single stronger unit.

I am convinced that only by means of a more rigid application of the antitrust laws can a stop be put to those mergers which clearly and illegally lessen competition and tend to create monopolies.

In this regard, I was keenly disappointed in the recent report of the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws.

This 63-man committee handed to the Attorney General a document which, if adopted, would modernize nothing and would strengthen only the opportunities for conspiracy and unrestrained monopoly.

Shortly after the release of the Attorney General's report, I called for full committee hearings on it. Perhaps the most pointed criticism during the hearings came from one of the members of the Brownell committee, Dr. Louis B. Schwartz, professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania and an acknowledged authority on antitrust matters.

He said: "The net effect of the report * * * is to weaken rather than strengthen the antitrust laws. * * * It does this in three ways: (1) By proposing specific legislative changes tempering the vigor of the antitrust laws; (2) by suggesting or endorsing interpretations of existing law favorable to big business; and (3) by underwriting a 'rule of reason' approach to the administration of the antitrust laws.

"Among specific legislative proposals to soften the antitrust laws are the following: (1) To terminate the right to treble damages which the victim of an antitrust violation has under present law; (2) to require the victim to start suit within 4 years; (3) to repeal the power of the Federal Trade Commission to limit extraordinary quantity discounts for very large buyers; (4) to repeal criminal provisions relating to price discrimination; (5) to reduce penalties for violating orders of the Federal Trade Commission."

There was, in fact, little reason to be surprised at the report which this 63-man committee handed to the Department of Justice. The committee was loaded with corporation lawyers whose business background and whose lifelong experience made it difficult, if not impossible, for them to make unbiased recommendations regarding how to strengthen our antitrust laws and regulations.

As one critic termed their report: "It is a handbook for antitrust violators and a document which will be relied upon by those seeking excuses and permission to violate our laws."

I should be less than frank if I did not say at this point that I have long felt that the Federal Trade Commission has not been sufficiently active in enforcing legislation designed to maintain a climate favorable to small and independent businesses. This has been particularly true of the past 30 months.

For one thing, the Commission has consistently side-stepped the fair-trade problem. As recently as last February, the Federal Trade Commission washed its hands of fair-trade enforcement in denying the request of a group of retail jewelers to conduct an investigation of the fair-trade enforcement practices of certain manufacturers of jewelry, silverware, and appliances.

According to the complaint, these manufacturers discriminated against the fair-trading retailers by holding them to fixed prices while deliberately allowing discount stores to sell the same products at cut rates. The retailers charge in effect that the manufacturers were using long-established retail jewelry stores as a "showcase stimulus to the business of discount houses."

In denying the application for an investigation, the Commission advised the retailers that they "may resort to various avenues of self-help." Specifically, the Federal Trade Commission told the aggrieved fair-trading retailers that they could sue in State courts for injunctive relief against price-cutting competitors. Or, the Commission added, they "may themselves disregard the resale prices fixed by the manufacturers and compete on a price basis with the discount houses."

The suggestion of the Federal Trade Commission that the retailers sue for injunctive relief appeared questionable in view of the Commission's further observation that under the facts alleged there is no "legally enforceable obligation upon a retailer to continue to observe the manufacturers' fixed prices." A retailer who "as a matter of law" is not himself bound to practice fair trade is hardly in a position to demand that others do so.

Furthermore, the jewelers contend that to meet illegal price-cutting competition with illegal price-cutting was scarcely an appropriate remedy since a businessman should not be forced to adopt a practice he is under a moral obligation to avoid. The Federal Trade Commission countered this statement of principles with the doubletalk that "it cannot seriously be suggested that price competition is morally reprehensible."

Obviously, the Federal Trade Commission is not interested in the enforcement of the Fair Trade Act.

The Commission is also derelict in the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act which helps small-business men to buy fairly just as retail price maintenance helps them to sell fairly.

In 1936, Congress gave the Commission power to impose quantity discount limits. It was not until January of 1952 that the Commission decided to utilize this authority and promulgated a quantity limit ruling which fixed one carload as the maximum amount on which manufacturers could grant discounts on rubber tires and tubes. Here, then, was an action having a direct effect on our entire economy.

Naturally, the tire manufacturers applied for an injunction. The Government has pressed this vital case with so little vigor that it still has not been decided by the courts and at the present rate of progress, there is no telling when it will be decided.

I mention this merely as one of many instances in which the Federal Trade Commission is not moving aggressively to protect small business.

In the Clayton Act and the Robinson-Patman Act, the Federal Trade Commission has a statutory broadsword to safeguard the basic principles of free competition. I think the Commission should use that broadsword against the larger restraints of trade and spend less time sticking needles in small-business men.

I do not think it is unfair or inaccurate to say that the vast powers which some Federal agencies hold over our economy today are not always exercised in behalf of small business. This is especially so of those agencies with regulatory powers and with quasi-judicial authority.

Does anyone believe that the Civil Aeronautics Board is working night and day to promote the interests of our smaller airlines and nonscheduled air transport companies?

If so, let them consider the case of North American Airlines, a flourishing nonscheduled airline which started in business after World War II. After years of persecution, the Civil Aeronautics Board on July 1, finally pronounced a death sentence on North American by cancelling its letters of registration, effective September 1.

I think that you will be interested in hearing what James Fischgerund, an officer of the company, had to say about this action. "The Civil Aeronautics Board has demonstrated," Mr. Fischgerund stated, "its inflexible hostility to low-cost, safe air transportation. The record of North American in pioneering aircoach and operating the lowest fares in the industry, has always bothered monopoly-minded members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and it is no surprise that they are resorting to technical regulations in an effort to strangle this popular type of service.

"Although we expected something like this, we were shocked by the Board's complete disregard of merit, judicial judgment, and orderly procedure in its frantic desire to 'get' North American. Obviously, we are the victims of a grudge for flying too many people, too regularly, too cheaply, and without any subsidy."

There is no safety issue involved. North American has a perfect safety record. Its chief mistake is that under the American system of free enterprise it has pioneered in mass transportation of passengers at low rates, and has built a strong competitor to the favored big airlines.

It is my belief that this airline would be well advised to take this decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board into court just as soon as it can get it there. I should like to see a judicial determination made of the issues involved in this matter. Only when the facts of this case have been scrutinized in the light of congressional intent can the propriety of the administrative action be accepted.

I have observed that very often the courts are more protective of the rights of small business than many Government agencies.

For example, there is a practice in the Post Office Department in mail fraud hearings whereby the trial attorney sometimes writes the decision of the hearing examiner. That is, the prosecutor also acts as judge and jury.

This is certainly one of the most insidious bureaucratic practices with which small-business men must contend. What prose-

cutor, given the opportunity to play the role of judge, would fail to agree with the case he himself had made, and automatically rule against the small-business despondent.

One more instance of the Post Office Department's disregard for elementary rights of small-business men was brought to light on May 13, 1954, by a ruling made in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

The Post Office Department had summoned a California businessman to come to Washington for a mail-fraud hearing. This man replied that he could not come to Washington because his wife was ill and, in addition, he did not have the money for the trip.

The Post Office Department refused to hold the hearing in California, which it could quite easily have done. The hearing was held in Washington without the businessman being present to answer the charge, and a fraud order was issued against him.

In declaring this order void and granting the businessman a permanent injunction against the Post Office Department, Judge Mathes stated:

"Had the Government moved judicially in a court of law, instead of administratively in an executive department, to put plaintiff out of business, it would be shocking in the extreme to learn of a summons by the court purporting to call upon him to leave his residence in California and cross the continent to Washington, D. C., with his witnesses and his attorney, or else default in the defense of his property right.

"It is equally shocking to learn that an administrative tribunal has so disregarded the necessity and convenience of a party defendant in an administrative proceeding."

The defects in procedures and the occasional abuses of power in the operation of a quasi-judicial hearing conducted by some agencies of the Government work to the grave disadvantage of small business.

Procedural reform as well as a reforming of the point of view of some Government personnel toward small-business men is overdue. In connection with this, the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch issued a report in March of this year which called for some drastic changes in the present judicial functions of these agencies.

This report advocates establishment of an Administrative Court of the United States which, among other functions, would take over the jurisdiction in the trade regulation field now vested in the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, among other agencies.

In addition, the report urges that hearing examiners should be replaced by hearing commissioners who are completedy independent of the agencies whose cases they hear. Such hearing commissioners would be under the control of a central authority to be known as the Administrative Court of the United States.

There are many recommendations of the Hoover Commission with which I disagree. I believe, though, that those dealing with this problem deserve consideration. Any step that would bring about greater objectivity and impartiality in the conduct of Government hearings is certainly worth careful thought.

Furthermore, there is no question in my mind but that beneficial results would be obtained if an investigation were to be made of the manner in which some Federal agencies handle complaints involving small businesses as contrasted with the way these agencies handle similar cases involving large corporations.

I have in mind specifically such agencies as the Federal Trade Commission; the Mail Fraud Division of the Post Office Department; and the Pure Food and Drug Administration.

I conceive the primary job of the Senate Small Business Committee of which it is my honor to be chairman, is to do whatever is possible to maintain that vitally essential balance of power between the larger and the smaller units of our economy.

The economic atmosphere must be made more conducive to the growth of small firms.

The rules of competitive fair play must be strengthened and enforced with vigor.

I should not like to see resale price maintenance scuttled until a workable substitute is found. I do not forsee any attempt during the present session of Congress to alter the present fair trade picture.

While we live in troubled times, I do not believe that anyone can destroy our free enterprise system by force. I am equally certain that if we are not everlastingly watchful, it can, in the slow course, of time, slip away from us.

The real bedrock foundation of our economic superiority is composed of some 4 million small-business enterprises. Every time a small business fails because of external reasons over which it could exert no control, such as unfair competitive tactics by its larger rivals, I feel that the foundation of our entire economic structure is to some degree undermined.

The title on the handsome brochure put out by your association expresses the thought perfectly: "Let's have competition—but clean."

The economic climate must be such as to encourage young men with ideas and initiative to continue to start new enterprises with the reasonable expectation that the rules of fair play will be enforced and that ability and hard work will bring their rewards.

Let it not be thought that I have any quarrel with big business as such. Bigness is not necessarily an evil in itself. It is only the uses to which bigness is sometimes put that draw my censure.

It has been well said that all power corrupts and that absolute power corrupts absolutely. That is why we must have reasonable checks on great concentrations of power whether they be in the political or economic field.

Our national history has shown that the average American small-business man is more than able to hold his own, given a fair chance.

Let us make certain that he has that chance, and thereby strengthen and maintain our system of free enterprise that has made us a free and great people.

Address by Ambassador of France on Anniversary of Landing of General Rochambeau at Newport, R. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by his excellency M. Maurice Couve De Murville, Ambassador of France, on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the landing of General Rochambeau and his troops in Newport, R. I.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY M. MAURICE COUVE DE MURVILLE, AMBASSADOR OF FRANCE, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF GENERAL ROCHAMBEAU AND HIS TROOPS IN NEWPORT, R. I., COLONY HOUSE, NEWPORT, JULY 9, 1955

It may seem that the 11th of July 1780 which we commemorate today is in the far distant past, but actually it was not so very long ago. It is far closer to us than we realize. In fact, hardly three average lifetimes separate us from those memorable events that took place here, one of the greatest and most beautiful military and political stories of all times.

On that July 11 in 1780, Gen. Jean-Baptiste de Vimeur, Count de Rochambeau, disembarked at the head of an army of 5,000 men who had been transported here by a fleet of more than 50 vessels to keep the promise made by France, in the treaty of 1778, to "effectively help maintain the liberty, the sovereignty, and the absolute and unlimited independence of the United States."

After the first few successful battles, the War of Independence had begun to mark time. A sort of military stalemate had been reached and operations had been suspended. The arrival of enemy reinforcements could change the tide at any moment for the 13 States. It was easy to understand why the morale of the Americans was at its lowest ebb when the presence of the French fleet was first announced. In fact, their spirits were so depressed that it took the people of Newport some time to realize that this French expeditionary corps, which had traveled 70 days crossing the Atlantic, was about to tip the balance of victory in favor of the American rebels.

Those Frenchmen were men of courage and zeal; the officers were members of the best families of France. Inspired to high enthusiasm when they learned of the courageous exploits of Washington and Lafayette, they eagerly offered their services to fight for the Americans under the banner of General de Rochambeau.

This great French general, a highly experienced soldier who had fought on practically every battlefield of Europe, was a man of great foresight and courage, a man, furthermore, with a clear understanding of his mission to the United States. His concern was not only to help the Americans to attain their freedom and independence. To him, his mission would not be fulfilled unless he succeeded in creating a close and lasting bond of friendship between his country and this young new Republic, and between our two peoples.

The responsibilities of his command had prevented General Washington from coming to Newport to welcome his new ally. In fact, it was not until 2 months after Rochambeau's arrival that the American commander in chief and the French general met—not in Newport—but in Hartford, Conn.

It did not take the French soldiers long to make themselves at home here in Newport. They were enchanted, as I am today, by your lovely city and its charming inhabitants.

This is how one of the young aides of Rochambeau, Captain de Closen, described your ladies. Writing in his diary, he said: "Nature has endowed the ladies of Rhode Island with the handsomest, finest features one can imagine; their complexion is clear and white; their hands and feet are, as a rule, small."

The social contacts between the French soldiers and the Newport-ites taught both peoples a great deal about each other. Each learned many customs of the other. Some of the more courageous among my countrymen even allowed themselves indulging in the habit of drinking tea. One of these brave souls, writing in his memoirs, described what he called this ritual. "Unspeakable quantities of tea are drunk," he said. "To crave mercy, when one has taken

half a dozen cups, one must put the spoon across the cup, for, so long as you do not place it so, your cup is always taken, rinsed, filled again, and placed before you. After the first cup, the custom is for the pretty pourer—most of them are pretty—to ask you, 'is the tea suitable'? and then she proceeds to pour another cup."

While the rank and file of Frenchmen and Americans were thus getting acquainted, Rochambeau was busily at work pondering and planning how best his mission could be fulfilled. At first there was some disagreement between him and General Washington on the course of action to be taken. Washington wished to take a stand against the enemy at New York, but Rochambeau felt that a combined operation, in Virginia, using the French fleet from the West Indies together with his forces, would be the better plan.

But these matters were soon ironed out, and it was not long before the two military leaders became close friends, extremely fond of each other. One of Rochambeau's men, Count de Segur, said of him that "he seemed to have been properly created to understand Washington, to be understood by him and," he went on to say, "to serve with Republicans." Of course, please remember that he was referring to Republicans as opposed to Royalists, and not to any political party existing in this country today.

What, actually, was it that impelled these French aristocrats and career soldiers to leave their homeland and go to fight on the American Continent in a struggle by a Republican Government against a monarchy?

To answer this we must look into the state of mind of the French people during that period. The cause of American independence had become immensely popular in France. The whole school of French philosophy, from Montesquieu to Voltaire, had, for some decades, been sevoted to defining and promoting a new concept of the social order and the rights of man. The words liberty, justice, and human rights had acquired a sort of magic ring.

The American Revolution had captured the imagination of all Frenchmen. They realized that America was destined to be the first country to make those new concepts a reality. Americans became to them the apostles and disciples of this new school of thought.

Speaking of the American people, Turgot, one of France's reformists, wrote in 1778 to an English friend: "It is impossible not to form wishes for that people to reach the utmost prosperity it is capable of. That people is the hope of mankind. It must show to the world by its example that man can be free and tranquil, and can do without the chains that tyrants and cheats of all garb have tried to lay on them under pretense of public good. It must give the example of political liberty, religious liberty, commercial and industrial liberty." And he concluded: "This revolution will prove, maybe, as profitable to you as to America."

Yes, the urge for social and political reform was awakening in our people at that time. They yearned for more equality among all people—they wanted to do away with privileged classes, to alleviate the burdens and sufferings of the poor. They were seeking some form of democratic government—they wanted a hand in the management of local affairs. Indeed, the French Revolution was on its way. Do you realize that the French Constitution came into existence only 4 years after your American Constitution was adopted?

The Count De Segur wrote, also, in his memoirs: "From every side public opinion in France was urging the Royal Government to declare itself officially in favor of freedom and independence for the Americans. The public were even reproachful of their government for its hesitancy in making such a declaration." Not only the general public, but even the King's ministers felt this way.

So eager and sincere were the French in their desire to help the United States to win its struggle for independence that they refused the offers of compensation made by Benjamin Franklin on behalf of the Americans for the military and economic aid given by the French. They had espoused the American cause for its own worth—the only compensation they wanted was victory for the young republic.

The love for liberty and the desire to help in attaining it has always been one of the outstanding elements of Franco-American cooperation. The friendships which were formed here in Newport during that first period of cooperation, the understanding of the qualities and characteristics of our respective peoples were to exercise a lasting influence on the relations between our two countries. This brotherhood in arms, born of an alliance with no self-interest other than to serve a great cause, was bound to be a permanent one. It established the foundation for a close and mutual friendship which, on our part, has become an integral factor of French existence.

There are many episodes in French history, particularly wars, over which, to this day, there are differences of opinion, and which still arouse heated passions and debates. But the story of our participation in the American Revolution is always mentioned with reverence and pride—in every generation and under every regime. The children of France know the story even before they can read it themselves. It is a story told with serenity—a story of noble and glorious deeds.

Today we pay tribute to the founders of Franco-American friendship—to Lafeyette, to George Washington, to Rochambeau, and to countless others. But let us not forget the memory of all those who, since them, have maintained and strengthened that friendship—the memory of those who fought side by side and gave their lives in our common struggle to maintain freedom throughout the world.

Let us not forget the lessons they taught us. The small confederation of 13 States formed in 1781 has become the greatest power in the world today. Twice she came to the aid of her oldest ally, France, when our liberty and independence were threatened.

When Rochambeau's troops landed at Newport 175 years ago, our two countries, in joining hands across the ocean, cemented the first Atlantic alliance in history. Ever since, France and the United States have fought and struggled together; they have surmounted all obstacles through unity and cooperation.

This unwavering friendship between two countries, unique in history, rests today, as it did 175 years ago, and will continue to rest, on the principles so clearly and so simply enunciated by Conrad Alexandre Gerard, one of the negotiators of the treaties of amity, commerce and alliance of 1778 between France and the United States: "Real goodwill," and "manifest interest."

Four Ex-Envoys to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which gives the views of four of our Ambassadors to Moscow, namely, Mr. Bullitt, Admiral Standley, Admiral Kirk, and Mr. Davies. The article appears in the July 18 issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR EX-ENVOYS TO MOSCOW

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Few Americans are better qualified to talk about Soviet foreign policy than the men who have represented the United States in Moscow. Newsweek asked former United States Ambassadors to Moscow what they thought of the latest switch in Soviet foreign policy and whether it meant that the Big Four meeting in Geneva was likely to result in a real lessening of tension between the Communist and the non-Communist worlds. Here are the answers of William C. Bullitt, who served in Moscow back in the days when the Reds were denouncing the United States as a nation of Fascist bandits; Joseph E. Davis, who saw the birth of the Popular Front movement; Adm. William H. Standley, who dealt with the Russians when they were "our fighting allies"; and Adm. Alan G. Kirk, who saw the cold war turn into a shooting war in Korea.)

BULLITT, FIRST AMBASSADOR TO RED MOSCOW

The Soviet Government has not changed its objective. Its aim is to install communism throughout the world—by war if necessary, by means short of bombing and shooting if possible.

The present grin, instead of the habitual snarl, on the face of the Communist tiger is a mask to seduce fools and cowards. A tiger or a man who steps back from the fence he wants to jump in order to get a better start is not abandoning his objective. He is merely trying to improve his chance to achieve his goal. From 1921, when Lenin introduced the "New Economic Policy," to the present moment, the Communists have often used this change in tactics. They have never changed and will not now change their objective of world conquest. They will not stop. They can only be stopped.

At the Geneva Conference the Soviet Government will try to bamboozle President Eisenhower into the belief that there has been a genuine change of heart, and that the Communists will be reasonable if only we will be sweet to them. The Soviet delegates will be ready to talk endlessly about disarmament and all sorts of European subjects; but they will use the talks to strive to achieve completion of their conquest of Asia.

Confidence in the moral stamina of the United States has been disappearing throughout Asia since the Chinese Communists broke our will to win the Korean war. If the Soviet Government can persuade us now to go just a bit farther on the road of appeasement, no ordinary man in Asia will dare be our friend.

At Geneva, the immediate objective of the Soviet Government will be to persuade us to make concessions in the Far East which will enable it to add another 700 million Asians to its war potential.

The fundamental objective of the Soviet Government will be to lull us into a sleep of death while it perfects the intercontinental bombers it needs to annihilate us by a sneak attack. It hopes to find President Eisenhower in a mood to refuse to face the ugly facts of life and inclined to put off the evil day and to play Louis XV to Foster Dulles' Madame de Pompadour: "After us, the deluge."

It is my hope and belief that the President will not be bamboozled.

ADMIRAL STANDLEY, OUR AMBASSADOR, 1942–43

As of now, I consider the change a shift in tactics only. It is the contention of Marx and Lenin that capitalism has inherent in it elements which will eventually destroy the system, namely, alternate inflation and depression. In my opinion, having stabilized our inflationary war economy program at high levels by the cold war,

the Soviet officials have changed tactics, hoping that it will result in recession at least and possibly in a real depression, which will enable homegrown Communists to take over. The Soviets are trying to brainwash the American citizenry to a mental state when they will accept complacently any peace or tension-relieving program submitted by the Soviets.

No action of the Soviet officials as yet justifies the assumption that there has been a change in the Soviet foreign policy of establishing world communism by peaceful infiltration. Optimistic expressions by prospective representatives about what can result from the meeting at the summit are not only not justified, but are aiding and abetting the brainwashing of our citizens. Nor will they be justified until there is concrete evidence of a change in policy such as the release of the illegally held prisoners of war, assurance of a future observance of the Korean armistice treaty, and assurance that shooting down our planes on peaceful missions by trigger-happy Russian pilots will be discontinued.

If the Soviets will not agree to a reasonable disarmament plan, I can see no reason for continuing the meetings, and disarmament plans without inspection, even limited, as indicated by the President in his press conference on July 6, should not even be considered by our representatives.

It is my belief that the Soviet officials will make a vigorous effort to get Red China into the United Nations. And the admission of some or all of the nations previously barred, may be used as a trade last.

I believe Soviets do want settlement in the Far East and the admission of Red China to the United Nations is the price.

I believe that President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles are fully equipped to deal with the Russians in a meeting at the summit for exploratory purposes only. But for the main meeting, our representatives should be selected on the basis of fitness and expertness for the questions to be discussed and decided upon.

ADMIRAL KIRK, OUR AMBASSADOR 1949–52

It is my view that some gain usually results from serious conversations with Soviet officials. Although such experiences have not always been markedly fruitful, nevertheless we do learn something of their intentions even if only in the negative sense, that is to say, what they will not do.

But with patience and forbearance on the part of the American public, and without raising too high hopes for easy and rapid solutions to world problems of such tremendous complexity, the conversations at Geneva are rightly to be viewed as of high importance.

Obviously, our President has particular qualifications for such a meeting because of his wide experience in negotiation. He dealt with allied governments during the war, with Soviet high officials during his period in Germany after the war, and with allied governments again when he was NATO Supreme Commander. Since then he has had the responsibility of his high office, and of course, with all the facilities of our Government at his disposal. His remarkable faculty for achieving harmony in situations of initial dissidence will stand us in good stead.

DAVIES—OUR AMBASSADOR, 1936–38

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Davies gives his views in answer to a series of questions put by Newsweek.)

1. The new look in Soviet foreign policy means, in my opinion, a revolutionary change, both as to foreign policy and tactics. Foreign policy with its implements of diplomacy and tactics heretofore were directed either to prevent war or to induce it. Atomic and nuclear fission have changed that completely. Physical war between hostile worlds now means complete extinction for both, and possibly the human race.

Self-preservation—the first law of life, controls the Soviet as well as others. Their scientists are completely aware of that situation. The Soviets as well as the Western World fully appreciate that any attempt to impose their ideology or political domination by physical force, would involve the risk of suicide.

There is every reason to induce both protagonists to seek settlement of differences through balance of power, and avoid permitting border differences and the threats of attack locally which might precipitate outright war. It was a "balance of power" imposed by the victors "at the summit" after the Napoleonic wars that preserved peace in Europe for 100 years, save only two minor conflicts, one in Crimea and the other in France.

2. But Soviet goals have not changed. Their methods perforce have been changed. The elementary and primary goal of their foreign policy will be to avoid all-out war.

Since Stalin's death there have been indications of internecine struggle for control. The solidification of policy is still in process of flux. No one knows exactly what it will be. But self-preservation will dictate the policy as to the necessity of preventing physical war.

3. Basically, President Eisenhower is justified in feeling optimistic about what can result from the "Meeting at the Summit." The fact of the meeting alone in and of itself, regardless of any specific agreements which may develop, is a step forward. It may contribute to arouse sufficient confidence in the good faith of both as will enable them to agree upon a modus vivendi which both worlds could accept and which would provide to each physical security against military attack. That achieved, time and evolution would afford an opportunity to work out a more secure and perfect peace.

4. As to a plan for disarmament, the Soviets profess a desire to achieve it. They will, however, probably require conditions that will assure security against outside attack. As to inspection, that again will depend upon the confidence which they have and the possible effect it might have as affecting their physical security.

5. As to unification of Germany through free elections, the Soviets will be concerned and governed by what power they still have through the electorate in Eastern Germany. Whether the Soviets will insist upon a disarmed as well as a neutral Germany, or whether they will agree to any unification plan at all if Germany insists upon remaining with the West, is the $64 question.

The Soviets fought the war not only to prevent conquest of Russia, but to provide that in the future the arsenal of war recognized to be in Germany would be rendered impotent, or at least under control of Russia and the West.

The crux of the German situation lies in whether or not the Soviets feel that they are secure against military attack from the West and from Germany.

6. From my experience, I would say that it would be entirely possible that Russia would disband the Cominform. Disbanding the Cominform is a part of the trading stock of Russia.

When I was in Russia in 1943 on a diplomatic mission, I had urged upon Stalin that the Comintern impaired the confidence of the West as it was an implement for internal Soviet aggression against non-Communist states, and that it ought to be abolished. Stalin immediately following that request did abolish the Comintern. As a matter of fact, the abolition of the Cominform would not affect the support of Russia by the Communist satellites in case of Soviet need.

7. In my opinion the Soviets would agree to letting into the United Nations some nations it has barred in the past provided it would not impair their influence or their present balance of power on vital matters as it now exists under the veto. The purpose of the veto was to prevent the possibility that the power of the U. N. might be invoked to support an attack against Russia. That protection they would not probably give up.

8. In the Far East it is to Soviet interest to stabilize and preserve the present status quo. They already have all they need in that area. Soviet interests in Siberia and in the East are well protected. If, however, the Soviets were to be convinced that hatred of enemies in the West threatened conquest, they would of course join up with Communist China to an even greater extent than they have already done.

9. As to the question of President Eisenhower's equipment to deal with the Russians, no man available is more qualified to handle the military aspects of the problem and the security of the West.

It would be difficult to find anyone who has a stronger and more consecrated purpose to bring about peace in the world with honor and safety to our country and world than the President has demonstrated in his handling of this matter. His judgment, his farsighted vision and strength, were all disclosed and demonstrated in his conduct of the war in Europe. I know of no other man who has all of these qualifications to such a degree as has President Eisenhower.

The Publisher Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend James J. Barton, publisher of the Berea Enterprise, included in his weekly column of July 8, 1955, some comments and thoughts which I wish to call to the attention of every American citizen. Mr. Barton's column follows:

THE PUBLISHER SPEAKS

(By James J. Barton)

The Enterprise joins Americans of good will and good thought in urging President Eisenhower to seek a reelection in 1956.

In Mr. Eisenhower the people of America have a leader in whom they can be justly proud. He is a man of unquestioned integrity, of devotion to his land, a man who proved his patriotism in the fire of battle.

He came to the office of President a hero—and his 2½ years in the office have not dimmed the people's admiration of him as a national hero.

When he came to the Presidency we were at war—although some people liked to refer to the Korean conflict as just a police action. Today we are at peace. The reason we are at peace is that Mr. Eisenhower has guided our Nation courageously and wisely.

He settled the Korean conflict and halted the slaughter of thousands of American boys on the faraway shores.

Just a little over a year ago, he faced a crisis in Indochina. There were skeptics who said he couldn't solve that one. There were leaders in our Nation who predicted we would be drawn into the Indochina fighting within 30 days.

But we didn't get in. Mr. Eisenhower guided us through that uneasy period with skill and statesmanship.

When he came to the Presidency, there was unrest and strike threats in labor.

Today in the Nation labor and management are at peace, and some of the most historic settlements of labor problems have been written during these past few weeks—the automobile industry's guaranteed wage and the steel-industry settlements are examples.

There were those who carped at Mr. Eisenhower when he was campaigning in 1952 about his views on labor.

Today, after 2½ years of Eisenhower, labor has never been so prosperous. Union membership is at an all-time high. Union labor has been treated fairly and justly by the national administration. It hasn't bossed Eisenhower, but he in turn has not bossed labor.

We feel that Mr. Eisenhower must accept the Republican nomination for President in 1956 and seek reelection because he is good for the Nation.

World tensions have not eased. There still is threat of conflict and strife—and we must have a strong hand at the tiller in crucial times such as these.

The man to guide us is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We respect his desire to retire to his farm and live the life of ease to which he is justly entitled because of his long service as a soldier, as supreme commander of the allied military forces in World War II, as president of Columbia University, and as President of the United States.

But, may we suggest to Mr. Eisenhower, that he has enlisted for the duration—and the duration is until the end of the present world crisis.

This means another term as President.

We urge him to listen to the voice of the people and to sacrifice personal security and ease to lead our Nation again.

We are for the renomination and reelection of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Looking Toward Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily for Tuesday morning, July 12, amply indicates that the discussion of foreign policy which was conducted here on the same afternoon filled a vital need.

Although it was printed in advance of our discussions, I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to the final sentence in the editorial:

If it is Eisenhower himself who makes the final assault on the summit, confining Dulles, Nixon, Knowland, and the brass hats to mere logistical support, there could be reason to share Ike's hope for peace.

I believe this sentence, although preceding in time yesterday's discussion, provides a fitting postscript to the theme of the debate.

I include the editorial as a part of my remarks:

LOOKING TOWARD GENEVA

The painful fact is that, despite the significance of the first top-level Big Power conference in nearly a decade, it is anybody's guess whether the Geneva gathering of July 18 will amount to anything or not, or is even intended to. Does it hold out hope for real peace as President Eisenhower has said, or will it steer clear of "substantive problems" like a polite drawing room social, as Eisenhower has also declared?

Does the United States view it chiefly as a means for exerting new pressure to roll back Soviet influence in Eastern Europe as Dulles implies; or do we see it as "the last chance" to avoid the genocide of total war, as Vice President NIXON asserted. Or is the whole notion of negotiating for peace envisioned as a snare and a delusion, as the administration's congressional foreign policy leader, Senator KNOWLAND, keeps telling the world?

Our decentralized leadership has made it anybody's guess. And perhaps most painful of all is that even guesses are futile. For the only clear indication emerging from Washington's confused preparations for the summit expedition is that this is a conference our leaders don't want. The picture one has gotten to date is of an act of bold and creative statesmanship being dubiously undertaken by vexed and uncertain politicians.

Behind this reluctance and vacillation lies the problem of Germany. Behind the Eisenhower expressions of good faith stands the Dulles-Adenauer axis. West German rearmament—a position of strength in Central Europe—from which, it is conceived, reunification of all Germany can be wrested on Adenauer terms, is the exclusive goal of this axis. As such, it supersedes total demilitarization of Central Europe, combined with progressive disarmament, and it thus supersedes the desirability of basic agreements reached at a top-level conference.

Yet pressures are building up overwhelmingly against the dreary and perilous continuation of this form of power politics, and these pressures appear to be registering signal progress. They have, on the one hand, undeniably dented the hard core of Soviet power politics. Molotov's U. N. speech was generally taken as a far-reaching Russian bid for peaceful coexistence to end the cold war, in the words of the Associated Press.

And they have been obviously felt in the White House. The President has come a long way since his lamentable television appearance with Dulles, in which he thumped his desk, angrily assuring us that he would not fall into the trap of appeasement at Geneva. A more constructive and positive approach has crept into his recent statements on the subject. If it is Eisenhower himself who makes the final assault on the summit, confining Dulles, Nixon, Knowland, and the brass hats to mere logistical support, there could be reason to share Ike's hope for peace.

The Acquisition of Uranium Mining Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an article by Robert S. Palmer, executive vice president of the Colorado Mining Association, dealing with uranium mining claims. Mr. Palmer is also a member of the Colorado bar, and this dissertation was presented by him at the law-day ceremonies at the University of Colorado on April 30, 1955. It was thereafter published in the May-June issue of Dicta, the bimonthly journal of the Denver Bar Association, the Colorado Bar Association, and the University of Denver College of Law.

Mr. Palmer is well known among many Members here in Washington and among the mining fraternity for his efforts on behalf of the mining industry, and small miners and prospectors in particular. He serves as executive director of the Colorado Mining Association, and in keeping with that responsibility has given increasing attention to the problems of the uranium mining field, including location and title problems.

This article is a review of the development of mining law in this country and how it has operated to the benefit of the individual prospector and to the Nation. This is then keyed to the recent developments in and around the development of uranium, and I highly recommend it as a competent and informative treatment of this complex but important field.

The article follows:

THE ACQUISITION OF URANIUM MINING RIGHTS

The United States is the paramount proprietor of the public mineral lands, holding them not as an attribute of sovereignty, but as property acquired by cession and purchase. As such paramount proprietor, it has the same right of dominion and power of alienation as is incident to absolute ownership in individuals. By the term "public lands," we mean such as are subject to sale or other disposal under general laws. Land to which any claims or rights of others have attached does not fall within the designation of "public land."

Public lands belonging to the United States, for whose sale or other disposition Congress has made provision by its general laws, are to be regarded as legally open for entry and sale under such laws, unless some particular lands have been withdrawn from sale by Congressional authority, either express or implied. Whenever a tract of land has once been legally appropriated for any purpose, from that moment it becomes severed from the mass of public lands.

As such absolute owner, the Government might, at its pleasure, withhold its lands from occupation or purchase, lease them for limited periods, donate them to States for educational or other purposes, and to individuals or corporations to aid in the construction of railways and other internal improvements, sell or otherwise dispose of them absolutely or conditionally, and prescribe the terms and conditions under which private individuals might acquire permanent ownership, or the right of temporary enjoyment.

With respect to the public domain the Constitution vests in Congress the power of disposition and of making all needful rules and regulations. That power is subject to no limitations; Congress has the absolute right to prescribe the terms, the conditions, and the mode of transferring this property, or any part of it, and to designate the persons to whom the transfer shall be made. No State legislation can interfere with this right or embarrass its existence. On the other hand, Congress has no power to legislate after the Government has conveyed its title.

The regalian doctrine of ownership in the crown of the royal metals, wheresoever found, based upon the theory that these metals were a prerogative of the crown, which prevailed in England, France, Spain, and Mexico, was never recognized in this country. A grant or conveyance by the United States carries all minerals, unless reserved

expressly or by implication in the law or instrument purporting to pass the title.

It follows as a corollary from what has been thus stated, that the system of rules which sanctions and regulates the acquisition and enjoyment of mining rights, and defines the conditions under which title may be obtained to mineral lands within the public domain of the United States, is composed of several elements, most of which find expression in positive legislative enactment. Others, while depending for their existence and force upon the sanction of the General Government, either express or implied, are, in a measure, controlled by local environment, and are evidenced by the expressed will of local assemblages, embodied in written regulations or rest in unwritten customs peculiar to the vicinity.

American mining law may therefore be said to be found expressed—

1. In the legislation of Congress.

2. In the legislation of the various States and Territories supplementing congressional legislation and in harmony therewith.

3. In local rules and customs, or regulations established in different locations, not in conflict with Federal legislation or that of the State or Territory wherein they are operative.

This system is by no means symmetrical or perfect. It is one of the most difficult branches of the law to even logically arrange for the purpose of treatment, and the embarrassments surrounding its philosophical exposition are almost insurmountable. The courts are not harmonious with regard to rules of interpretation. Its proper interpretation does not always involve Federal questions, conferring upon the Federal courts jurisdiction. It has thus come to pass that the courts of last resort in several of the States and Territories, in construing the same law, have reached diametically opposite conclusions; and in many of its most important features we have conflicting theories enunciated by different courts of equal dignity and equal ability, until we are almost constrained to say that "chaos has come again."

The Mining Act of 1872 provided that "all valuable mineral deposits in lands belonging to the United States, both surveyed and unsurveyed, are hereby declared to be free and open to exploration and purchase, and the lands in which they are found, to occupation and purchase, by citizens of the United States and those who have declared their intention to become such, under regulations prescribed by law, and according to the local customs or rules of miners in the several mining districts, so far as the same are applicable and not inconsistent with the laws of the United States."

The object of these provisions was to promote the development of the mining resources of the United States. Title, however, to mining claims on the public domain remains in the Government until patent is issued and the locator's interest, until then, is merely a possessory right.

On the other hand, one who has complied with all the terms and conditions necessary to the securing of title to public lands acquires rights against the Government which cannot be diverted by any subsequent withdrawal of said land.

The disposition of the public lands is the exclusive function of the Land Department. The Land Department of the United States, including in that term the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and their subordinate officers, constitutes a special tribunal vested with the judicial power to hear and determine the claims of all parties to the public lands and authorized to dispose of and to execute its judgments by conveyances to the parties entitled to them according to rules and regulations promulgated by it under the provisions of law regarding the disposition of the public domain of which the courts take judicial notice. The Secretary of the Interior has authority to make regulations respecting the disposal of the public lands, and such regulations when not repugnant to the acts of Congress have the full force and effect of laws. The rules of law as applied by the courts are binding upon the Land Department only insofar as they are not adverse to but assist its function as an administrative agency of the executive branch of the Government.

In the case of mineral land, it has been held that the so-called doctrine of exclusive jurisdiction can be extended to the point where the Land Department can declare a mining location null and void if the facts show that it was located for nonmineral land or lacks a valid discovery. Jurisdiction over possessory rights to unpatented mining claims, however, is vested in the courts. Also of interest in this regard is the decision of lands within national forests—practice—joint regulations. But it has been held that the court's jurisdiction is strictly limited to determining the right of possession between adverse mining claimants.

The Land Department considers and passes upon the qualifications of the applicant, the acts he has performed to secure the title, the nature of the land, and whether it is open for sale. Its judgment upon these matters is unassailable except by direct proceedings for its annulment or limitation. The courts have no revisory power over its decisions upon questions of fact, or of questions of mixed law and facts. But the jurisdiction of the Land Department is not an arbitrary, capricious nor unlimited one.

With these preliminary concepts in mind, let us take a look at some of the procedures and problems involved in the acquisition of uranium mining rights on public lands. It should be remembered that 38 percent of Colorado is federally owned; 85 percent of Nevada; 72 percent of Utah; 70 percent of Arizona; 52 percent of Wyoming; 45 percent of New Mexico; and 37 percent of Montana—a total of some 310 million acres of gross acreage of 550 million in these eight western States. All of this area of Federal land is not open public domain, for some is composed of forest withdrawals, power sites, parks, Indian lands and reclamation withdrawals. Parts of the area have mining claims on them or are under oil and gas leases. Withdrawn areas present many varying problems. Generally speaking, except for Indian lands, the Bureau of Land Management can be looked to for guidance in the acquisition of mining rights on public lands of the Federal Government.

Leasing of public lands for mineral development had been tried at an early date in our history, as illustrated by the Act of March 3, 1807, which provided for leasing the lead mines in the Indiana territory. The system was abandoned when President Polk, in his message to Congress on December 2, 1845, condemned leasing and recommended repeal.

For 18 years following the discovery of gold in California in 1848 there was no Federal law imposed on the miners who had flocked to and taken possession of the public domain. They were free and untrammeled in their operations and without any sovereign interference they made their own rules and regulations which became "the customs of the diggings" and reflected exactly what they as miners deemed best for their own good. Congress, which had the power, did not legislate for all these 18 years, because the miners working on the ground knew so much more about the nature of their rights and the best system of staking out and acquiring and operating their claims that Congress was willing to leave all this for the miners to decide for themselves. The Supreme Court of the United States placed the stamp of approval on the miners' customs, and the "law of the diggings" became the "law of the land."

In 1866, interests which were adverse to the miners urged Congress to enact legislation which would have wiped out this miner-made law and substituted a mining code which would have ignored what the miners had done for their own account. Senator Stewart of Nevada and Senator Conness of California were largely responsible for the passage of the first Mining Act of 1866. It was mainly concerned with lodes or veins but, contrary to much uninformed criticism, this act reflected the majority opinion of the miners on the subject. It was, however, drafted hastily in an emergency and had many shortcomings.

In 1870 Congress passed the so-called placer act which provided for the location of placer claims which had not been taken care of in the act of 1866.

The Mining Act of 1872 was the result of intensive study. It reinacted parts of the 1866 act and adopted such changes as the requirement that end lines on lode claims be parallel.

The basic law remained unchanged in its fundamentals until recent changes were brought about by "multiple use" advocates. There was, of course, the law of February 11, 1897 which permitted oil placer location until the passage of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

Observations of the workings of our mining law show that the locator of a claim, if he has a discovery, has a right superior to any other claimant so long as he is in possession and diligently proceeding with mining.

The miner in Colorado has 3 months from the date of discovery to record his claim in the office of the Recorder of the County in which the land embraced in the location is situated. A location may imply discovery but without discovery, the location is not good against the United States.

The point has been raised that possibly where the miner could not get title he could extract minerals from open public land without filing a claim and the product would be his, even against the Government, in the absence of an adverse claim under the mining law of 1872. Probably no sensible person would attempt such a procedure, not even a week-end prospector.

It has often been stated that a location, to be valid, must have a discovery. However, where a location is recorded without prior discovery, a later discovery will validate the location if no adverse claim has intervened.

In his excellent treatise on the subject of questions of discovery requirements on uranium claims, presented at the last meeting of the Colorado Mining Association, William G. Waldeck, Esq., of Montrose, Colo., delved into this subject rather thoroughly. He pointed out that those responsible for the passage of early-day mining statutes were not dealing with present-day problems such as those confronted by the uranium miner, for in the early days it was not unusual to find a lode or vein with its apex visibly outcropping at the surface. Then, discovery was a simple matter.

It is quite apparent that current situations must be taken into consideration in applying the law, situations which were unheard of in 1872. Interpretations by various agencies have been irreconcilable and at times in direct conflict. Thus it has become increasingly difficult for the mining lawyer to advise his client as to his rights.

Some liberality has been shown in the interpretation of the law by the courts in controversies between two claimants of possessory rights under the mining law. For example. It has been said that evidence of discovery by a prior locator will not be examined with great strictness in a contest in which a subsequent locator who has found a valuable deposit contends that the prior

locator had not made a mineral discovery. Apparently, however, a valid discovery is the paramount legal principle guiding the majority of the decisions.

The preponderance of decisions holds that mere indications of mineral, however strong, cannot take the place of mineral discovery itself. The ore need not be in commercial quantities for the showing is sufficient if it is such that the locator is willing to spend his time and money in further development work, in the reasonable expectation of finding ore that is valuable enough to work. Lindley is quoted as approving this doctrine in his reference to the case of *Book* v. *Justice Mining Company*: "When the locator finds rock in place containing mineral, he has made a discovery within the meaning of the statute, whether the earth or rock is rich or poor, whether it assays high or low. It is the finding of the mineral in the rock in place, as distinguished from float rock, that constitutes the discovery and warrants the prospector in making a location of a mining claim."

Reference is made to another series of decisions which are more liberal in their requirements as to discovery; e. g., As used by miners before being defined by any authority, the term 'lode' simply meant that formation by which a miner could be led or guided; it is an alteration of the verb 'lead,' and whatever a miner could follow, expecting to find ore, was considered a lode." Or again, the liberal view is that: "A valid location may be made whenever the prospector has discovered such indications of mineral that he is willing to spend his time and money following it, with a reasonable expectation of developing ore. A valid location may also be made when the vein appears at the surface merely as a 'gangue' or vein filling matter."

The courts will undoubtedly have to resolve these conflicting interpretations of the law. Miners have located claims in areas where they believe the same conditions and formations exist which are exposed on nearby lands, and on which they think that if explored and developed, will lead to ore. Some interpretations have been made which would imply that evidence of such circumstances can take the place of actual discovery of mineral in satisfying the requirements of the mining laws.

In two cases, *Shoeshone Mining Co.* v. *Rutter*, and again in *Ambergris Mining Co.* v. *Day*, such evidence was considered. In the first case, it was said, "The discovery of seams containing mineral-bearing earth and rock, which were discovered before the location was made, were similar in their character to the seams or veins of mineral matter that had induced other miners to locate claims in the same district, which, by continued developments thereon, were found to be a part of a well-defined lode or vein containing ore of great value. The discovery made was, therefore, such as to justify belief as to the existence of such lode or vein within the limits of the ground located."

In the second case, the Idaho Supreme Court Court stated, "If a miner has discovered certain mineral indications which he has followed up with the result that a rich and valuable orebody has been developed therefrom, it seems clear that another miner finding similar indications on contiguous ground or in the immediate vicinity would be in a measure justified in following up the evidences with reasonable expectation of finding mineral deposits, and this is true even though the indications, rock and deposits found, are such as the expert scientist, geologist and mineralogist in their finest theories tell him are not evidence of mineral deposits or even that they are evidences of the entire absence of mineral."

The liberal view was thus summarized as follows: "That the requirement of discovery is satisfied when there is shown to be such indications or showings of mineral upon a claim as would pustify a reasonably prudent person in the further expenditure of his time and money with a reasonable expectation of developing pay or commercial ore."

Two recent decisions of the Department of the Interior illustrate thsi trend. In each case the sufficiency of the contestee of the discovery was challenged. In the first case, *U. S.* v. *Merger Mines Corp.*, the valuation engineer for the Bureau of Land Management testified for the contestant that after several examinations of the claims in 1941–42 and in 1946, he had found: "There was no evidence of valuable minerals prospective or otherwise on the claims that would justify the development of a valuable mine."

Expert mining and geological witnesses for the contestee were of the opinion, based on their broad knowledge of the area, that the showings, while not disclosing any pronounced vein and but meager mineral content, were worthy of further prospecting and development considering their proximity to mineral deposits and that the expending of time, money and labor for such development was justified with a reasonable prospect of developing a valuable mine at depth.

The manager of the local land office at Boise, Idaho, rendered an opinion cancelling the mineral entry for nondiscovery. On appeal, the director of the Bureau of Land Management, Mr. Edward Woozley, overruled the local decision and stated, "It is my belief that the major intent of the mining law is to encourage the development of minerals, not to hinder that development. In an area where pay ore is ordinarily found only at great depths, it is obvious that even the most enterprising miner must have more than ordinary faith and courage since he must stake his time and money on following evidences of possible mineral which to many would seem no more than mere will o' the wisp. Unles the enterprise of such as these is recognized, many valuable deposits are doomed to remain dormant in the depths of the earth of no value to anyone. This is not consistent with the great present-day need for the development of minerals in the interest of the National defense and the public welfare. Nor it is, I am persuaded, consistent with the intent of the law."

"Considering the large expenditures of money and evidencing faith of the contestee, the similarity of the showings here to those which have led to the development, of valuable mines and the departmental decisions, supra, holding, in effect, that in that locality, a meager showing of mineral has often led to commercial ore attempts, the showing as to discovery in this case is accepted."

The other case, *U. S.* v. *A. A. M. Arnold, et al.*, is based on similar reasoning and comments were also similar.

These references are made for they shed light on the path courts may take in resolving the uranium locators' plight, particularly on the Colorado Plateau. In that region, early discoveries were generally made along the rims of mesas where outcroppings appeared. As the miners attempted to make locations away from the rims where no surface exposures were indicated, they were puzzled as to how to proceed. The depth of unproductive overburden varied from a few feet to more than a thousand feet.

Generally, miners on the Colorado Plateau select tracts where they locate their claims in proximity to known ore occurrences or perhaps close to areas where radiometric anomalies have been mapped either by the Government or by private parties; or perhaps the miner is guided in his selection of the place to locate his claim by noting favorable geological conditions. Exploratory work on such claims is usually done by various types of drilling, designed to determine the depth of ore horizons and ascertain the location of ore bodies. Usually a large area is located for the purpose of drilling. Sometimes ore bodies are found in relatively small concentrations, rolls, or deposits. These may be scattered or separated by barren ground.

Sometimes exploratory drilling is done on 1000-foot centers; then perhaps closer drilling is engaged in if the area is found favorable. When ore is discovered, it is advantageous to offset ore bodies and block out ore bodies before making the necessary expenditures for sinking shafts, tunnels or cross cuts which may involve the expenditure of large sums of money. Drilling programs may take place prior to actual discoveries. If, during this period, the locator is subject to location by adverse claimants or "claim jumpers," trouble may be brewing.

In the race to find new ore bodies, scientific methods may be used. Some ore bodies have been located with airborne radiometric equipment. The Jackpile mine in New Mexico is said to have been discovered through the use of this method. Even the study of trees and plants is being resorted to, for an analysis of the plant life in particular areas may serve as a lead to the location of ore deposits. Geochemical and geophysical techniques are being developed which may be used in future work in the increasing search for source materials.

Miners on the plateau refer to the Salt Wash member of the Morrison formation, the Shinarump, and the Chinle as being those which should be carefully studied, but recent development have led some to conclude that "uranium is where you find it" and that it may be found in many additional formations, estimated at 35.

What the future holds for the mining industry with regard to discovery requirements will be decided by the courts, but some are suggesting that the innumerable problems should be resolved by legislative action. In any case, it is to be hoped that the miner's needs and requirements will be recognized and that the prospector will not be sacrificed to the whims and fancies of major mining interests.

Location procedure generally requires the sinking of a discovery shaft upon the lode to a depth of at least 10 feet from the lowest part of the rim of such shaft at the surface, or deeper, if necessary to show a well-defined crevice. Such a shaft is not required in Utah.

Under an act approved by our governor April 8, 1955, it is possible for the locator of a mining claim in Colorado, in lieu of the sinking of a discovery shaft, within the period allowed for the recording of the location certificate, to file a map attached to the location certificate which shall be of a scale of approximately 1 inch equals 500 feet, prepared from an actual field survey and shall show the following:

(a) The name and address of the discoverer of the claim;

(b) The legal subdivisions of the land upon which the claim is located, if such land be surveyed;

(c) The claim pattern with courses and distances of the boundary lines, and reference to the nearest section or quarter-section corner of the public-land survey, if surveyed, or reference to a permanent monument, if unsurveyed, by which the location of the claim on the ground can be readily and accurately ascertained.

If the claim were located prior to April 8, 1955, the locator may, if he acts within 180 days, avail himself of the provisions of the section by preparing and filing with the county clerk of the county in which the claim is situated an amended location certificate with the map, as provided in the law.

Attention is called to the fact that this legislation does not change the present State law but simply gives the locator the right to file a map instead of sinking a discovery shaft. Such a shaft may serve no purpose whatever for it is a known fact that in many instances discovery shafts have been sunk

where no discovery of mineral in place has been made. Bulldozers have been used by enterprising individuals and companies to dig holes simply in an attempt to show good faith or to comply with Colorado law.

It is reported that the Federal Land Office is presently inclined to recognize the discovery of ore in a drill hole as a valid discovery of uranium. Some have questioned the merits of this procedure. Wyoming has attempted to amend its discovery shaft, tunnel, or pit requirement by providing for an aggregate of 50 feet of drilling, with no drill hole less than 10 feet, which shall expose deposits of valuable minerals in quality sufficient to justify a reasonably prudent man in expending money and effort in further exploration and development. Colorado law has been strictly interpreted in *Beals* v. *Cone*, where it was held that a discovery of mineral in place must be revealed in the discovery shaft and the mere fact that a discovery of mineral is made elsewhere on the claim cannot suffice or take the place of the exposure required in the discovery shaft. Courts in other States have been more lenient and have not required the exposure of mineral in the discovery shaft where discovery was made elsewhere on the claim and work performed thereon was equivalent to that necessary in driving a discovery shaft.

While legal minds may differ as to what the courts will do with drill holes in the future with reference to their application to laws of discovery, it is hoped that the courts will follow the procedure of taking into consideration the practices and customs of the miners so that orderly development of uranium deposits can take place.

Here, time does not permit reference to locations on State lands generally, or ways and means of acquiring rights to prospect on State lands. But Senate bill No. 273, approved by our governor April 15, 1955, provides that location of mineral claims may be made upon unleased State mineral lands. The discoverer of a body of mineral is required to post conspicuously a notice declaring that he has made such a discovery on the date attached to the notice. Within 10 days after posting such notice, he is required to notify the State board of land commissioners of his discovery and arrange for a permit to explore the extent of the discovery. Within 60 days from the date of the discovery, he is required to take a lease upon such terms as the land board may provide, or apply for an extension of the permit.

RIGHTS BEFORE DISCOVERY

The rights of a locator before discovery were summarized recently as follows: "There are two distinct lines of authority—one which might be called the strict interpretation of the law and the other the expanded interpretation of the doctrine of pedis possessio. Under this strict interpretation, no rights to mining locations attach until a discovery has been made. The only rights inuring to a prospector while searching for mineral prior to discovery is the right not to be disturbed in his possession of the actual ground underfoot upon which he is working. Such right would not allow him to withhold an entire claim from exploration by others."

"Under the 'expanded interpretation,' a citizen is in the position of an express invitee in entering and exploring the public domain for minerals. Under this doctrine, a miner who makes a location on unappropriated lands, remains in possession and diligently performs work looking to a discovery, is thereby entitled, while so engaged, to retain such possession and exclude others therefrom, at least for a reasonable time providing he takes proper action to so exclude others."

In advising miners on this last interpretation, it is respectfully suggested that you caution them that, in the absence of discovery, they should take great care in properly marking the boundaries of their claims, making their presence known, maintaining actual occupation and diligently proceeding with exploration; and when, or if, an attempted adverse entry is made, to take action promptly to eject the intruding party.

Injunctive relief may not be available in all cases. Generally speaking, in actions in the nature of quiet title or ejectment, cases may be decided upon the facts at the time the suits were filed. Perhaps there is some justification for the action of a few miners on the Plateau in maintaining armed guards on their claims prior to actual discovery. Legal precedent, however, would hardly condone this practice.

That a qualified person may take possession and hold public lands for a reasonable length of time while prospecting for mineral was affirmed in *Cochran et al.* v. *Bonebrake et al.*, wherein the department followed the doctrine of pedis possessio laid down in *Union Oil Company* v. *Smith* and further held that that doctrine was one of judicial interpretation, such possession being no more than a tenancy at will. Actual possession is sufficient against one with no better right. But a peaceable location by another will defeat it.

In the case of Sam Clark and Angeline D. Clark the department held that prior to discovery, an explorer in actual occupation and in diligent search for a mineral is a licensee or tenant at will, against whom no adverse right can be initiated or acquired through forcible or fraudulent intrusion upon his possession; but that if occupancy is relaxed, or be incidental to something other than a diligent search for mineral, another may acquire a valid right by peaceable entry and compliance wtih law.

To continue, once a location with a discovery has been made, the claim is good against the United States. The United States cannot invalidate a valid claim (location with discovery) for failure to do assessment work. The United States could invalidate for abandonment, but abandonment is a problem of intent and is sometimes most difficult of proof.

While the Government cannot invalidate a mining claim for failure to perform assessment work, a new locator can file on such land. The assessment work requirement is in part required by Federal statute and in part by local law or mining district regulations.

Recently, certain lands withdrawn by the Atomic Energy Commission were restored to mineral entry. Several thousand locations were filed in Montrose County alone. A long line of locators appeared at the county courthouse at the opening of the clerk's office at the time the land was officially opened for mineral entry. Objection was raised that locations had been made prior to the time set for the reopening of the land for location. Some locators evidently thought that the Bureau of Land Management could issue a patent to a mining claim located on withdrawn land that is later opened to mining entry, if no adverse claim has intervened. It seems that when a mining claim is located on land closed to mining entry, the mining claim does not vest without relocation after termination of the withdrawal.

A question which evidently has not been ruled upon is whether a mining location without a discovery is terminated when the Federal Government withdraws the lands on which it is located from mining entry prior to a later discovery, although the miner be diligently seeking the ore at all times. It is contended that the claim cannot be perfected by discovery after the date the withdrawal becomes effective.

The basic mining law should not be confused with mineral leasing acts. Prior to February 25, 1920, oil and gas, oil shale and certain other claims were located under the mining laws. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 permitted acquisition of leases on coal, phosphate, sodium, oil, oil shale, or gas by application for leases from the proper agency. Section 37 of the act protected all then existing valid mining claims. Potassium had been especially treated under the act of October 2, 1917. The Potash Act of February 7, 1927, placed potash under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. Coal had formerly been dealt with by special action.

The Leasing Act procedure is for the oil and gas or other mineral lease applicant to secure his lease from the Bureau of Land Management's District Land Office for the States in which the land is located. The application is recorded in that office. There is no requirement as to recording the lease in the local county clerk's office.

Examination of the debates preceding passage of the Mineral Leasing Act or the reports of the committees of Congress considering the legislation, fail to disclose that there was any intent on the part of Congress to withdraw those areas submitted to leasing procedure from mineral location. However, under the regime of Harold L. Ickes as Secretary of the Interior, there were land office decisions, which, in effect, segregated those lands generally referred to as oil and gas leased areas from mineral entry and further held that the filing of application for mineral lease will segregate the land from mineral entry (idem.). Some rulings went so far as to hold that the determination that land contained leasable minerals segregated the land from mineral entry. Additional rulings held, further, that consent by the applicant for patent to inserting a reservation of leasable minerals in the patent did not authorize the issuance of such a patent.

The miners on the Colorado Plateau, in the early stages of the development of the uranium industry, were not aware of these land office decisions when they made their locations and expended large sums of money in the development of their claims. Thus, in some instances, locations were made on prior existing oil and gas leased areas. Even eminent counsel such as E. B. Adams, esq., of Grand Junction, writing in Dicta stated, "At that time I had no idea of the millions of acres under oil and gas leases on the Colorado Plateau, or that the Bureau of Land Management had ruled that no valid mineral location could be made within the area covered by such leases."

There were those who felt that the correct remedy for this conflict was the obtaining from the department a reversal of its former decisions. Such a procedure is not uncommon with a department when a new administration goes into office. But the hue and cry became so great that emergency legislation, Public Law 250, enacted August 12, 1953, was enacted validating mining claims located on oil- and gas-leased areas within the period from July 31, 1939, to January 1, 1953. No mention was made in the bill of uranium claims, as such.

Pending the enactment of more extensive legislation, the AEC issued circular 7 providing for leases of uranium properties on areas staked in the same manner as mining claims. The act of August 13, 1954, was then enacted primarily for the purpose of establishing a system of multiple mineral development on public domain lands and on lands which the United States has patented with a reservation of the mineral deposits; to authorize the validation of certain mining claims located between specified dates; to repeal the requirement for the reservation of fissionable source materials to the United States in all patents and to remove any doubt that mining locations can be made for such materials.

Regulations have been issued to implement the law and it is suggested that those interested secure the circular entitled "Multiple Development of Mineral Deposits Under the Mining and Mineral Leasing Laws," which is a new part of 186 of the Code of Federal Regulations, title 43, Public Lands: Interior, chapter I, Bureau of Land Management. You will find the procedure therein provides delightful reading for some cool evening in front of the fireplace.

In urging the passage of this legislation, Clair M. Senior, Esq., of Salt Lake City, stated that the Interior Department appears to have interpreted the Atomic Energy Act of August 1, 1946, as precluding the location after August 1, 1946, of a mining claim for fissionable source materials.

The Atomic Energy Commission, to which is entrusted the administration of said Atomic Energy Act, does not appear, in its administration, to have shared said view of the Bureau of Land Management. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and committee reports in relation to the consideration of the above mentioned Public Law 250 do not indicate that Congress shared the Bureau of Land Management interpretation. It was also pointed out that most mining operations which were being conducted for uranium were under mining locations located subsequent to August 1, 1946.

It should be remembered that while oil and gas interests secured rights, under this legislation, to acquire leasable minerals on future mining locations as well as on prior mining claims if certain procedures referred to as in rem procedures are followed, that, in fact, the mining industry gained nothing in the new legislation of major importance.

Much has been said in the press about the reopening of millions of acres to mining location by the passage of this act but the facts are that in all oil and gas leases fissionable source materials were reserved to the Federal Government, its agents and representatives. The Atomic Energy Commission had, in effect, taken the position that it could designate mining prospectors as its agents for the purpose of mining and extracting uranium or other fissionable source material from any lands on which prior oil and gas leases had been granted.

Nevertheless, even at a recent regional meeting of the American Bar Association, spokesmen for the influential oil industry still maintain that by securing the passage of Public Law 585, they granted concessions to the mining industry. The mining industry is not clear as to what it gained for, as indicated above, it is still not clear what constitutes a valid uranium location. Formerly, the Land Office held that carnotite (the most common form of uranium ore on the Colorado Plateau) was nonmetalliferous. In a recent case, carnotite has been held metalliferous.

The test as to whether a uranium deposit or other mineral deposit is lode or placer is the character of the deposit (rock in place) rather than the type of mineral involved. A "lode" is a vein or "aggregation of metal imbedded in quartz or other rock in place," while a "placer" is a location of minerals "found loose in sand or gravel and not in the vein or in place."

Geologists may differ as to the source of the uranium, there being several different theories which have been propounded on the subject. But it is rather the method of occurrence—the character—that governs rather than the source. Some uranium ore deposits are located as placers, some as lodes, some under both laws, but the majority are located as lode claims. The predominant formation is horizontal, being flat-bedded and isolated as are the host rock sediments. Uranium deposits found in fractures should clearly be located as lodes. Most other uranium deposits are produced from ores which interfinger with mud or slit stone and are generally considered by the mining industry to be lodes. Locations should not be made for one mineral. Sometimes, as has been stated elsewhere, the treasure found is not the treasure sought.

The courts will undoubtedly be called upon to resolve many questions relating to the uranium industry before stability is gained.

Some attention might be directed to the difficulties involved in rendering a legal opinion on the rights, if any, of a locator who may in some instances be a company which is selling stock. As an illustration, in a recent SEC registration, a reputable law firm used the following verbage:

"The company is of the opinion that it has a good and satisfactory possessory title to (such and such) mining claims. Nevertheless, the validity of all unpatented mining claims is dependent upon inherent uncertainties and conditions that may prevent a fee title, in the usual sense, from existing or vesting. It is our opinion that possessory title to such unpatented mining claims is in the mining company, subject to the following considerations: It is necessary to emphasize that any such opinion as to the rights of parties to unpatented mining claims is to a very great extent dependent upon nonrecord facts which are not subject to determination by examining counsel relying on documents alone. This factor, together with the uncertainties of the law to be applied in the new field of uranium mining make an element of uncertainty inherent in any opinion relating to such claims.

"Title to the instant claims has been certified in your company by the abstractor. We find from examination of the facts set forth in the abstractor's certificate that this title is subject to certain exceptions. We should like to stress that certain of these exceptions are by no means unique to your particular claims, but are, in fact, inherent in a substantial portion of the uranium mining claims located in the area. Indeed, an examination of your claims leads us to the opinion that they are on a sounder legal basis than most such uranium claims. The abstractor has, in his certificate, concurred in this opinion and has stated that such title is 'unusually clear.'"

In expressing an opinion as to title, a great deal of commonsense and good sound judgment is required if the legal profession is to help the industry develop.

Much attention has been given in the Press to the misuse of the mining laws. Abuses have been reported—cabin sites have been located, saloons and hot dog stands have been constructed thereon. Complaint seems not to issue against legitimate mining locations but rather, these abuses. In *United States* v. *Rizzinelli* the Federal District Court of Idaho ruled that the nonmining activity of operating a saloon on a mining claim within a national forest could be prohibited. Also, there has been administrative action against the claimant based on nonmining uses of mining claims when it has been shown that the mining was not the principal purpose of the claim, and at least one injunction has been issued. Legislation is now before the Congress which, when enacted, will separate the surface and the subsurface rights prior to patent.

On March 11 of this year, the acting solicitor for the Bureau of Land Management stated in part that the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to sell timber on public lands does not extend to timber on valid unpatented mining claims. Only when a claim has been determined to be invalid in accordance with the rules of practice and applicable law, may the Bureau dispose of the timber. This is another case in which the department has reversed a former memorandum. However, notwithstanding this recent decision, current Federal legislation is designed to restrict the use of mining claims to mining uses prior to patent.

William E. Colby, Esq., who for many years practiced law with the recognized authority, Curtis H. Lindley of the San Francisco bar, and for 50 years practiced mining law, and taught the subject at the University of California for more than a quarter of a century, cautioned: "A fundamental premise which we must keep constantly in mind in considering proposed changes in the existing law is whether the alleged defects in that law are due to the law itself, or to a failure to properly enforce the law. If the latter is the case, new laws will have little effect in remedying the situation."

With reference to confining the use of the surface to strictly mining activities, Mr. Colby had this to say: "There would be great danger to the miner in any such plan. Zealous enforcers of the system could make it very uncomfortable for the miner and hamper his mining activities over differences of opinion as to what is a legitimate mining use. The courts have already recognized that timber, etc., must be used on the mining claims for mining purposes and have also prevented other uses foreign to mining and inimical to the public interest."

Regardless of the sage advice of such eminent authorities, it seems that legislation will be passed in this session of Congress which will restrict any mining claims hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States to no other use prior to issuance of patent therefor than for purposes of prospecting, mining, or processing operations and those uses reasonably incident thereto. The passage of this legislation will, in my humble judgment, present many new problems which the lowly prospectors have not faced in previous experiences with Government officialdom. God forbid that the prospector will be driven from the public domain. His value to humanity becomes more—not less—important as civilization advances.

The next step in proposed legislation will undoubtedly be a redefinition of what constitutes "discovery." Here again, caution is suggested lest all the principles herein enunciated and referred to be cast aside "in one fell swoop."

Box Score on the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, for several years the National Education Association's committee on international relations has issued annually a Box Score on the U. N. The 1955 edition, recently released, lists 22 subjects on which it tells briefly the problem, what action was taken by the United Nations, and what the results have been. These annual inventories of U. N. activities have been widely used by schools and also by many other organizations, such as clubs and churches. I am inserting the pamphlet herewith in the RECORD:

Box score on the U. N.: 1945–55

The problem	The action	The score
1. *Atoms for peace.*—How to promote development and guarantee use of atomic power for peaceful pursuits and the benefit of all mankind.	General Assembly unanimously endorsed (1954) creation of an international atomic energy agency of nations interested in sharing the development of atomic power for peaceful use.	An international conference on peaceful uses of atomic energy convenes in Geneva (August 1955). Negotiations for an International Atomic Energy Agency are in progress.
2. *Disarmament.*—How to control the increasingly destructive weapons of mass annihilation and reduce the general level of all armaments.	The impasse in disarmament negotiations was overcome in 1954, when Russia agreed to a broader basis of discussion, including international supervision of weapons.	General Assembly directed Disarmament Commission to make a new attempt at agreement, and subcommittee is now working in London.
3. *Formosa Straits.*—How to settle the hostilities in the China Sea between Communist China (People's Republic of China) and Republic of China (Formosa).	New Zealand brought issue before the U. N. (1954): Question debated; Communist China refused invitation to send representatives.	Still unsettled and world danger spot.
4. *French colonies.*—How to resolve disputes which have existed for some time between France and Tunisia and Morocco.	General Assembly voted to postpone consideration of these problems while negotiations are going on between France and the two colonies (1954).	Negotiations in progress.
5. *Greece.*—How to handle Greek complaint to Security Council (1946) that aid was given to Greek guerrillas by Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria.	The Security Council set up a Commission of Investigation which it sent to Greece. A General Assembly Special Committee on the Balkans made on-the-spot observations and helped mediate the complaint.	Conditions improved and the General Assembly Special Committee dissolved in 1951. A new Balkan subcommission of the U. N. Peace Observation Commission was set up in 1952. It was discontinued in 1954 at the request of Greece.
6. *Indonesia.*—How to resolve fighting between the Netherlands and the Indonesians over sovereignty for Indonesia.	Australia and India (1947) brought question to the attention of the Security Council. Security Council provided mediation and worked to settle disputes after series of cease-fires.	Republic of Indonesia (70,000,000) came into being in 1949, and became 60th member of the U. N. in 1950.
7. *International Law.*—How to establish and apply rules of international law, and to adjust and settle international disputes by legal rather than political or military means.	U. N. Charter created International Court of Justice as judicial organ of U. N. General Assembly set up International Law Commission to codify, and encourage progressive development of international law (1947).	International Court of Justice has delivered judgment in 10 cases. U. N. has requested 8 advisory opinions, but individual nations have not made full use of the Court.
8. *Italian colonies.*—How to settle disagreement of Britain, France, Russia, and United States on disposition of colonies renounced by Italy in Italian Peace Treaty of 1947.	The four powers concerned agreed to abide by decision of General Assembly.	As result of U. N. action Libya became fully independent in 1952; Eritrea was federated with Ethiopia as an autonomous unit (1952); Somaliland was put under trusteeship until 1960, with Italy as administering authority.
9. *Iran.*—How to handle Iran's charges that Russian troops lagged in leaving northern Iran and Russia was interfering in Iran's internal affairs (1946).	Security Council adopted resolution to work toward a solution.	Soviet troops left peacefully.
10. *Kashmir.*—How to avoid war over India's complaint that Pakistan was assisting tribal invaders of State of Jammu and Kashmir (1948).	Security Council commission arranged a cease fire, and both countries agreed on plebiscite by which this state could decide whether to become a part of Pakistan or India.	Truce lines were established and maintained. Some agreement obtained on demilitarization of area, but no agreement on conditions of plebiscite.
11. *Korea.*—How to treat surprise attack on Republic of Korea, June 25, 1950 by North Korean forces crossing the 38th parallel.	United States brought the problem before the Security Council which termed invasion breach of peace and requested U. N. members to assist Republic of Korea to maintain its independence. Sixteen nations sent troops, 46 gave economic, medical or other aid. Chinese Communist forces joined North Korean troops in same year.	First time in history that troops were used by an international organization for collective military action against aggression. An armistice agreement was signed July 27, 1953, after 2 years of negotiation. Prisoners were exchanged and extensive relief and rehabilitation programs begun ($48,000,000 budgeted for 1954–55). The U. N. firmly established the principle of nonforcible repatriation of prisoners. The U. N. is seeking unification of Korea by peaceful means; Russia remains opposed to unification.
12. *Palestine.*—How to decide future of Palestine when British mandate expired in 1948.	Britain asked General Assembly help in 1947. Assembly recommended partition: an Arab state, a Jewish and international status for Jerusalem, all linked in an economic union. State of Israel was created in 1948, became 59th member of U. N. in 1949.	Hostilities between Arabs and Jews broke out when British mandate expired. U. N. mediation secured end to armed conflict and an armistice was signed in 1949 Many questions remained unsettled and sporadic armed outbreaks occur, especially around the Gaza area.
13. *Refugees.*—How to help resolve the tragic consequences of war. Many refugee questions still unsettled: statelessness; the 870,000 Palestine refugees; several hundred thousand other refugees.	International Refugee Organization (IRO) created in 1948; superseded in 1951 by High Commissioner for Refugees. A separate agency was created in 1948 to aid Palestine refugees. General Assembly in 1955 provided for setting up of new voluntary fund to promote permanent solution to refugee problems.	Almost 2 million persons repatriated or resettled to date; the U. N. Works and Relief Agency for Palestine Refugees gives aid to more than 870,000. The U. N. mandate over Palestine refugees was extended 5 years until 1960.
14. *Rights of man.*—How to increase respect for human rights. This is one of the yardsticks for measuring social progress, and failures to do so endanger peace. Genocide (destruction of religious, national, racial, or ethnic group) is a prime example.	Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and convention on Genocide adopted by General Assembly, December 1948. (Almost 50 governments have ratified Convention, not United States.) Convention on Political Rights of Women adopted December 1952. All three in process of ratification by member nations.	A convention on Freedom of Information (to come before Assembly by 1956) is in the draft stage, as are two covenants—one on civil and political rights, and one on Economics, social and cultural rights. The covenants are to come before Assembly's 1955 session.
15. *Sowing seeds of peace.*—How to combat the virus of war which thrives on ignorance, hunger, disease and poverty.	Working in partnership with the United Nations are the Economic and Social Council of the U. N. and 10 Specialized Agencies set up to deal with international economic, social, and cultural problems. The agencies are: UNESCO (education, science, culture); FAO (agriculture); WHO (health); ILO (labor); International BANK (capital); International Monetary FUND (currency problems); ICAO (aviation); UPU (postal); ITU (telecommunication); WMO (meteorology); IRO (refugees).	The record of what the U. N. and these agencies have accomplished is impressive. Examples: In control of narcotic drugs a U. N. Opium Conference adopted first international agreement limiting production of wholesale trade in, and use of opium (1953). UNESCO has set up fundamental education centers to combat illiteracy in Mexico for Latin America, in Egypt for Arab nations. FAO is carrying out programs for seed and crop improvement, land reclamation, fisheries development, increase of electric power, and raising of labor production. WHO experts in many countries fight malaria (300 million persons affected), tuberculosis, other diseases. ILO brings government, labor and management together to solve industrial, manpower and related problems.
16. *Syria and Lebanon.*—How to speed up evacuation of these countries by British and French troops (1946).	Syria and Lebanon complained to Security Council. Great Britain and France accepted resolution favoring withdrawal of their troops in spite of Russian veto.	Following decision in Security Council, British and French troops were withdrawn.
17. *Technical cooperation and economic development.*—How to develop a program for raising living standards in underdeveloped areas.	(1) U. N. Technical Assistance Administration began in 1949 expanding its aid programs and coordinating them with programs of Specialized Agencies and member states. (2) General Assembly voted unanimously (1953) to create Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) to provide grants-in-aid and low-interest loans. (3) An International Finance Corporation to draw private capital into partnership with UN funds approved by Assembly at 1954 session.	Since 1950 (1) technical aid programs received pledges for about $97 million from 70 governments ($20 million average a year). There have been approximately 700 UNTAA projects in 84 countries. At end of 1954, 946 technical experts were working in some 75 countries and territories. In 1954 about 1,500 fellowships awarded. (2) Consultations about SUNFED are going on with member states. (3) Statutes for an Internation Finance Corporation being drafted by International Bank.
18. *Trade and tariffs.*—How to reduce trade barriers and high tariffs which block international trade.	(1) A charter for an International Trade Organization (ITO) was decided upon at Havana Conference 1947–48, but never ratified by member states. (2) A General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) with 34 member countries as contracting parties was formulated in 1947. (3) Commission on International Commodity Trade established in 1954, to study the international commodity market.	(1) Issue of ITO remains unresolved. (2) GATT has negotiated concessions leading to tariff reductions on more than 55,000 items. (3) CICT is now studying international commodity market and will report to Economic and Social Council end of 1955.

Box score on the U. N.: 1945–55—Continued

The problem	The action	The score
19. *Trust and non-self-governing territories.*—What to do about territories formerly under League of Nations mandate, or detached from World War II enemy states, and non-self-governing territories affecting 200 million people.	Trusteeship Council created which supervises administration of 11 territories. Under U. N. Charter administering powers are pledged to promote well-being of colonial peoples, to report to U. N. on conditions.	Trust territories: In Pacific, administered by United States (1), Australia (2), New Zealand (1). In Africa, by United Kingdom (3), France (2), Belgium (1), Italy (1, until 1960). U. N. receives reports on more than 60 non-self-governing territories. Trust territories are: Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—Marianas, Marshalls, Carolines—(United States); New Guinea (Australia); Nauru (Australia); Western Samoa (New Zealand); Tanganyika (United Kingdom); Cameroons (United Kingdom and France); Togoland (United Kingdom and France); Ruanda-Urundi (Belgium); Somaliland (Italy). U. N. has approved greater participation in public affairs by peoples of trust territories because of advancement they have made.
20. *Assignment children (UNICEF).*—How to help the two-thirds of the world's 900 million children who need food, medical aid, clothing and shelter.	General Assembly established United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (later called United Nations Children's Fund, but UNICEF symbol retained) in December 1946.	In 1955 UNICEF will have mass health and feeding programs in some 90 countries to aid approximately 32 million children and mothers. These include work to control and stamp out tuberculosis, malaria, yaws, trachoma and other diseases.
21. *U. N. membership.*—How can other nations join the U. N.? Deadlock on new members since 1950. Charter states: "Membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter, and in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."	Applications of 21 countries for membership in U. N. are awaiting recommendations from Security Council. U. N. began with 51 countries; 9 added: Afghanistan, Burma, Iceland, Indonesia, Israel, Pakistan, Sweden, Thailand, Yemen. U. N. established a Special Committee on Admission of New Members to explore means of facilitating admissions (1953).	While some member states advocate membership for all nations (universality), the following still seek membership: Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Republic of Korea, People's Democratic Republic of Korea, Laos, Libya, People's Republic of Mongolia, Nepal, Portugal, Romania, Vietnam, and Democratic Republic of Vietnam.
22. *Uniting for peace.*—How to handle threats to peace when the Security Council fails to agree (1950).	General Assembly adopted Uniting for Peace resolution, offered by United States in 1950. Resolution provided in part that General Assembly can act, by two-thirds vote, when veto deadlocks Security Council.	General Assembly strengthened. It can take action against aggression in case of a veto in the Security Council.

HOW TO USE BOX SCORE ON THE U. N., 1945–55

The purpose of box score is to convey in simple concise form as much of the history of the United Nations as can be easily read and quickly absorbed. It is hoped it may also serve to increase teaching about world affairs.

PRIMARY GRADES

When the child enters his first classroom he is embarking upon his first experience in cooperative living outside the home. This simple form of cooperation reaches great complexity in an association of sovereign states such as the United Nations. There the diversity of language, custom, religion, etc., are multiplied many times. The experience of the child in the classroom can be dramatized in such ways as to help him perceive that working together at all levels—the community, the nation, the world—is but an extension of earlier experiences. Here are some suggestions for ways in which box score may be useful.

Learn about the songs, dolls, stamps, coins, and candies of U. N. countries.

Learn about diseases of children, and problems of health.

Plan programs around Christmas and celebrations of other lands.

Draw flags of U. N. member nations.

Learn games played by children of U. N. nations.

Learn about food grown and eaten in U. N. countries.

Plan a plane trip to U. N. capitals.

Many of the activities for secondary grades which follow are applicable for use with primary students:

SECONDARY GRADES

Social studies

Assign boxes to individuals or groups of students to keep up to date.

Prepare a box score on U. N. specialized agencies.

Make a location map of U. N. activities, 1945–55.

Give quizzes about points covered in boxes.

Examine history of past federations of nations.

Compare League of Nations with United Nations.

Use school newspaper. Supply with world news of the week, profiles of U. N. personalities, etc.

Collect stamps of the United Nations.

Sponsor an international relations club.

Plan a visit to U. N. headquarters.

Write case histories about United Nations activities.

Arts and crafts

Construct a model of U. N. headquarters.

Draw posters depicting stories shown in boxes.

Use "UNESCO World Art Series" (India, Australia, Egypt are available), and "Catalogs of Color Reproductions of Paintings" to learn about art of the world.

Science and mathematics

Examine the U. N. budget; how special programs are paid for; what each nation pays.

Study the method of simultaneous interpretation of five languages at U. N.

Review U. N. work in the atomic field.

Determine what part science plays in the U. N. program.

View UNESCO film World Without End to see U. N. and Specialized Agencies experiments in medicine, agriculture, education.

Home economics

Study food habits of other lands and how U. N. delegates are fed.

Cook a U. N. lunch for teachers during U. N. week.

Sew a set of flags of U. N. countries.

Examine costumes of U. N. member nations.

Languages

Start an international correspondence program.

Sponsor a language conversation club.

Study U. N. reports prepared in the five official languages, English, French, Russian, Spanish, Chinese.

Learn greetings in U. N. languages.

Find out how much and where English is spoken throughout the world. Same for French.

English and literature

Read literary classics of other nations.

Study lives of great poets, writers, statesmen of the world.

Physical education

Learn dances, games, and sports of other nations.

Review Olympic movement and other international sports competitions.

Music

Listen to national anthems of U. N. nations.

Learn folk music and popular songs of other nations.

Start a collection of foreign-language records.

Libraries

Plan U. N. exhibits of books, posters, maps, flags, coins of other nations.

Encourage special reading and listening programs on U. N. countries.

Feature different country's exhibits each week during the school year.

Assemblies

Present pageants of the festivals of U. N. countries.

Plan observance of U. N. Day, Human Rights Day, World Health Day, etc.

Sponsor speakers from community who have traveled or worked abroad.

Plan film showings about the U. N., the specialized agencies, and related topics.

Other

Listen to local radio programs about U. N.

Sell UNICEF Christmas cards as a class project.

Participate in UNESCO Gift Coupon Plan (to send supplies and equipment to school rooms, libraries, and laboratories in less developed countries.)

SOME HELPFUL PUBLICATIONS

Atlasphere.[1] Inflatible plastic globe of world; washable; nontoxic; $1. Blaine Co., Inc., 110 West 34th Street, New York, N. Y.

Education for International Understanding in American Schools; $1. Committee on International Relations, NEA, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Festival of Nations (Pageant); free. AAUN, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Games of the United Nations Countries;[1] 25 cents. USCUN, 816 21st Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Guide to Teaching About the U. N. and World Affairs (with NEA).[1] Teachers' Handbook; 10 cents. AAUN, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

How Children Learn About Human Rights.[1] FSA Bulletin 1951, No. 9; 15 cents. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Model General Assembly, Model Security Council, Model Trusteeship Council; 10 cents each. AAUN, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Oliver Becomes a Weatherman.[1] Julian Messner, 8 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

Planning U. N. Quizzes; 5 cents. USCUN, 816 21st Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

[1] Especially useful at elementary level.

Poster: U N. Postage Stamps [1]; free. U. N. Postal Administration U. N., New York, N. Y.

Sharing Skill (stories of technical assistance); 35 cents. U. N., New York, N. Y.

Toys at Work.[1] Children's Press, Inc., Thorp and Monroe Street, Chicago 7, Ill.

U. N. Films; free. Films Division, U. N., New York, N. Y.

U. N. Reporter (monthly). Official condensation; $1 a year. James Gray, Inc., 216 East 45th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

UNESCO: What It Is, What It Does, How It Works. Flyer; free. United States State Department, Washington 25, D. C.

UNICEF and the Children; free. U. N., New York, N. Y.

Where To Go for U. N. Information. Department of State Publication 5112; 15 cents. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

WHO Newsletter (monthly); free to schools. World Health Organization, 1501 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, 6 D. C.

World Affairs. Approaches to an Understanding of World Affairs, 25th yearbook, NCSS, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.; $3.50. Paper bound.

World's favorite Recipes. USCUN, 816 21st Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

Your visit to the United Nations; free. Committee on International Relations, NEA, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

SOME RESOURCE AGENCIES

American Association for the United Nations, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Church Peace Union, 170 East 64th Street, New York 21, N. Y.

Committee on International Relations, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

United States Department of State, Public Liaison Division Washingon 25, D. C.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, United States Office of Education, Washington 25, D. C.

Foreign Policy Association, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Pan American Union, 17th and Constitution, Washington, D. C.

United Nations, Department of Public Information, New York, N. Y.

United States Committee for the United Nations, 816 21st Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.

United States National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 45 East 65th Street, New York 21, N. Y.

WHAT THE U. N. COSTS

Here is some material for a mathematics

Dollar costs

What is the per capita cost to 160 million Americans for the United Nations and the specialized agencies in 1955?

	Per capita (cents)
U. N. budget ($13,407,290)	8
Ten specialized agencies ($10,894,300)	6
Specific U. N. programs ($68,354,871) (including technical assistance)	42
Total ($92,656,461)	56

Dollar returns

Do citizens of the United States receive any direct return for their participation in the international agencies?

U. N. pension funds are invested in United States: $56 million.

U. N. spends in salaries, purchases, etc., yearly: $30 million.

Delegates and employees spend yearly about: $7 million.

Marquette University and the New Research Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the recent issue of the Marquette University Alumnus entitled "Gift to Medicine."

The article deals with a diagnostic and research hospital which will be built in Milwaukee, Wis., as a result of a bequest made by the late Kurtis R. Froedtert, a Milwaukee industrialist. The hospital will cost upwards of $3 million, and will be staffed by members of the Marquette Medical School faculty.

This is a magnificent gift to our community, and the plan which has been drawn by the executors of the Froedtert estate has been described by the Reverend Edward J. O'Donnell, S. J., president of Marquette University, as "a remarkable instance of philanthropic planning at its best." It will benefit our community and it carries a great promise for the future of medicine in Milwaukee.

I am certain that Marquette University, which is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year, is both honored and happy to participate in this worthy project. It will present a new challenge, and a new opportunity to Marquette as she stands upon the threshold of a new life.

The article follows:

GIFT TO MEDICINE—FROEDTERT ESTATE ESTABLISHES FUND FOR RESEARCH HOSPITAL TO BE STAFFED MAINLY BY MARQUETTE FACULTY

A diagnostic and research hospital to cost upward of $3 million and to be staffed by members of the Marquette Medical School faculty will be built as a result of a bequest made by the late Kurtis R. Froedtert, wealthy Milwaukee industrialist. The plan was revealed by executors of the Froedtert trust February 22 at a conference of university officials and Milwaukee business and industrial leaders.

Mr. Froedtert, who died December 6, 1951, left an estate estimated in excess of $10 million. In his will he stipulated that 60 percent of his estate should be established as a charitable trust to be used to build a hospital and for other educational, scientific, and health programs to be designated by the executors.

A medical center was deemed the most suitable expression of the will by the executors' group composed of Leon Foley, William Janssen, Jr., Howard Ott, and Joseph Rapkin, Mr. Froedtert's personal attorney. The executors followed the suggestions of Dr. Basil MacLean, director of New York City hospitals, who, in 1952, was requested to make a study of the medical situation in Milwaukee and submit recommendations for distribution of the Froedtert trust. He was assisted by John Law, an administrator at the Grace New Haven (Conn.) Hospital.

Upon completion of their survey in 1953 Dr. MacLean and Law made the following recommendations:

A moderate sized hospital should be built.

The primary purpose of the hospital should be teaching and research.

The Froedtert trust should give continuous financial support to the hospital.

The hospital should include on its board, representatives from the medical school and the community.

The Froedtert hospital should be built near the county general hospital.

Present plans call for the construction of a 100- to 150-bed hospital designed primarily for research and teaching. The center will be staffed mainly by full-time members of the Marquette medical faculty. The first step in the plan of the Froedtert executors is the strengthening and expansion of the school's full-time faculty. At the present time the faculty consists of 34 full-time instructors, of whom 8 are clinical teachers specializing in bedside lectures with actual cases. Other members staff the basic science departments such as anatomy, biochemistry, pharmacology, and physiology. When the medical center is completed, the faculty staff will be expanded to include 25 full-time clinical instructors.

The construction of the center and development of the faculty program is expected to require from 3 to 5 years. Although the cost of constructing the center will be financed by the trust, expansion of the faculty staff is anticipated to require an additional $300,000 annually for the next 5 years. As a result the medical school annual operating budget of $700,000 is being raised to $1 million. The additional funds will be solicited from the city's business and industrial leaders, many of whom have already indicated a willingness to assist in the program.

The location of the center and date for the start of construction were not announced. It was reported, however, that one recommendation receiving serious consideration was that the center be situated in the vicinity of the Milwaukee General Hospital at 8700 West Wisconsin Avenue.

With the acceptance of Dr. MacLean's recommendations by the executors, the medical school and Milwaukee are expected to experience a rapid rise to national recognition in the field of medical education and facilities. It is anticipated that the association of the university with a hospital devoted primarily to research and instruction will attract highly qualified physicians and medical investigators to the school's faculty.

The hospital will also serve the citizens of the city, State, and neighboring States by providing trained specialists for consultation and treatment in difficult cases. Because routine cases will not be accepted at the hospital, its construction will not affect the stability of existing hospitals in the city.

Dr. MacLean's detailed report cited the lack of academic stimulation in the field of medicine in Milwaukee and the dependence of the city on the medical school.

Commenting on the academic situation, Dr. MacLean said, "Milwaukee is a conservative city and its conservatism permeates many activities of the city, including medical and hospital affairs. It seems proper to say that Milwaukee is not apt to pioneer in medical matters, but is inclined to adopt practices proven elsewhere. Many of the physicians engaged in practice in Milwaukee are extremely capable and the private office patient receives good medical care. The stimulating effect of academic medicine, however, is said by some physicians to be felt less in Milwaukee medical practice than it is in many other large medical communities."

With reference to the need of the city for the medical school, the report said medical progress depends largely upon medical schools and Milwaukee will advance medically only if the Marquette Medical School is strengthened. Milwaukee is indeed for-

tunate to have a medical school that adapts itself so well to the community. Indeed, there is much less town and gown cleavage apparent here than exists in many communities with nondenominational schools.

Regarding the relationship of the medical school with Milwaukee area residents, Dr. MacLean wrote, "It is believed that the sympathetic feeling projected toward the school of medicine by the citizens are due to the willingness of the school to participate in community affairs, to make their facilities and staff available to assist worthwhile projects and because the dean of the school (Dr. John Hirschboeck), a native of Milwaukee, would appear to be as much interested in Milwaukee as in the Marquette Medical School."

The statement is illustrated in a survey of the citywide programs now being carried out by the school. A cancer diagnostic clinic at the Matthew Keenan health center is staffed by members of the medical school faculty. Another service to the community is the free eye clinic established through an endowment by the late Mrs. Harriet L. Cramer and located in the medical school.

Within the school building is also situated an isotopes clinic providing drugs such as radioactive gold and iodine and affiliated with three voluntary hospitals and the county general hospital. Members of the faculty also teach and practice at the county hospital.

The executors' plan was described by Father Edward J. O'Donnell, S. J., president, as "a remarkable instance of philanthropic planning at its best and promises much for the future of medicine in Milwaukee." Father O'Donnell said he was gratified that the Marquette Medical School has been thought of as a participant in this important undertaking.

Dr. Hirschboeck prophesied that the Froedtert trust would provide what is needed to make Milwaukee a leader in medicine He said, "it is axiomatic that the standard of medical care in a community is at its highest level when medical, dental, nursing, and other health profession education set the pace. Every citizen and every hospital will be almost a direct beneficiary of this great venture."

He credited the success of Bellevue Hospital in New York, the University of Michigan Hospital, and other public hospitals to "the presence of the medical school with its teachers and scientists in these hospitals." Cited by Dr. Hirschboeck as examples of "the best in centers for teaching, research, and patient care" were Johns Hopkins in Baltimore and the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn. "The standards of American medicine would collapse if these university hospitals did not exist," he said.

"The Marquette Medical School," said Dr. Hirschboeck, "needs more full-time teachers and scientists and hospital laboratories and wards where they can work and study perplexing problems in diagnosis and treatment if it is to continue its development. In short the school needs a teaching hospital," he continued. "There the faculty members can set up their research and educational headquarters and also provide those unusual diagnostic and treatment procedures which cannot now be furnished in existing hospitals in Milwaukee. But they will still spend much of their time teaching in Milwaukee County and other affiliated hospitals."

Faculty and physical expansion in the past has been handicapped because of an annual operating deficit of approximately $100,000. The support from the Froedtert trust and businessmen and industrialists of the city is expected to accomplish much in reducing this loss. Of vital importance during these years of deficit operation has been the contributions of medical alumni who, as a group, ranked fifth during 1953 among alumni of all the Nation's medical schools in the total contributions to their alma mater.

As a separate corporation from the university, the medical school has for the most part relied on its alumni and friends of the university for financial support. More than 2,000 physicians have graduated from the medical school with the majority establishing their practices in Milwaukee and other communities throughout Wisconsin.

An offspring of the Wisconsin College of Physicians and Surgeons, the medical school began its official association with the university in 1913. In 1917 the school was incorporated under its own articles of association.

Classes in the Wisconsin college building were discontinued in October of 1932 when the Harriet L. Cramer Memorial Medical School on North 15th Street was completed. The Eben and Helene Carey Memorial medical-dental library addition to the medical school was dedicated during 1954, completing the physical facilities of the school as it exists today.

I Now Belong to the Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Ohio, Representative OLIVER BOLTON, has been absent for a number of weeks because of illness. He has now returned to his duties and all of us are, I am sure, pleased to know that he has fully recovered. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD his weekly report from Washington dated July 14, 1955, in which he very ably discusses his thoughts and experiences during his recent illness:

I NOW BELONG TO THE CLUB

I now belong to a club with an increasing number of members. I am one of an estimated 1 million persons in the United States who has had a heart attack. In my case, the attack was mild. I experienced little of the sharp burning pain in my chest and arms which usually accompanies an attack; I felt no nausea, no buzzing in my head, no desperate gasping for breath.

Actually, it all started when I went to the doctor for a checkup on which I thought was an upset stomach. Becoming suspicious, after an electrocardiogram, he hustled me off to the hospital for more tests. His diagnosis: a damaged heart muscle brought on by overwork, tension, and fatigue. His prescription: complete rest for at least 6 weeks followed by partial rest and recuperation for several months more.

After the first few days in the hospital, with pills of one kind or another to keep me relaxed, treatment consisted mainly of rest. If you've been active all your life, if you've lived and experienced things intensely, you can understand how difficult it is to come to a complete stop suddenly. Virtually immobile, you lie on your back waiting for a muscle not much bigger than a good-sized fist to heal and to build new lines of blood supply for itself. You are allowed no visitors at first, except your immediate family and staff assistants.

Time drags slowly, but there are compensations. You get a chance to read some of the books you missed because of the long campaign last year and because of the press of congressional duties. You also get a chance to think, to mull over the problems of your own life as well as the life of the Nation and the world. You reexamine your philosophy, shore up some of your earlier convictions, discard others and—with the wider vision of one who has looked into the valley—you adopt broader ones.

Finally, after 6 weeks, the day arrives when the doctor says it's O. K. to go home to more rest, reading, and thinking. The weeks in the hospital have made you realize that life cannot be lived in a state of constant tension, but rather should be lived rationally and calmly, fully yet without overexertion, with interest in all things, with concern for some and worry for none.

With this philosophy, the doctors say I'll be as good as ever. They tell me that more than 80 percent of the persons with heart attacks resume their normal way of life after a reasonable period of rest. Personally, I am convinced I'll be better than ever—because out of my illness I believe I have developed a new sense of humility, a feeling about life which now contains for me a new freshness, a new meaning, a new wonder. Just waking up in the morning is a wonderful experience; walking in the sunshine is a new inspiration; each lick of work provides unusual satisfaction; and each visit with friends a warm new experience.

In short, I have learned, I hope, not only to live, but to extract a maximum out of life which I never believed possible before. I understand now what Father Jean Marie Latour meant in Willa Cather's novel, Death Comes to the Archbishop, when he said, "I shall not die of a cold, my son, I shall die of having lived."

I think the experience of the past few months has made me not only a better person, but a better Congressman.

AT THE SAME OLD STAND

It's wonderful to be back once more reporting to you from my desk at the Capitol. During my absence, I managed to maintain close contact with my office staff on pending legislation and on matters concerning the 11th Congressional District. I found the threads easy to pick up again.

Many of you were kind enough to write me a note or send me a card while I was ill. Each one was acknowledged, but the written word often fails to express adequately the deep appreciation I felt for your thoughts and your prayers. Let me say thanks again to everyone for your kindness and your friendship. It shall be my constant effort to merit them.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Indiana?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Indiana has more than 135,000 acres waiting to be brought into

agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But, it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

The Tennessee Valley Authority as a Tool of the Military

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to some views expressed recently by a distinguished elder statesman who served long and faithfully in this Chamber—former Senator Kenneth McKellar.

It was a thrill for me to find in my mail a letter addressed to me by Senator McKellar. It was even more of a thrill to read the clipping enclosed and see the spirit with which this great leader of years gone by is still rising to the challenge of present-day attacks upon the TVA.

Senator McKellar, one of the fathers of TVA, makes a timely reminder of the role of TVA as a bulwark of our national defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an interview with former Senator McKellar written by Robert Gray and published in Memphis, under the heading "TVA Need as Tool of Military Cited."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA NEED AS TOOL OF MILITARY CITED—LOSS WOULD LEAVE US UNPREPARED, SAYS MCKELLAR—BUILT TO HELP FIGHT WAR

(By Robert Gray)

Former Senator Kenneth McKellar, one of the fathers of TVA, yesterday urged support of the Tennessee Valley Authority by President Eisenhower and others for its real purpose—a bulwark of national defense.

The 86-year-old statesman declared that the uncertainties of international relationships are more critical today than when TVA was conceived in 1916, and that electricity is perhaps our most necessary resource in event of war.

WE'D BE UNPREPARED

"So why turn that power over to the private power companies now, principally at the suggestion of Mr. Herbert Hoover, who has been bitterly and persistently against TVA and all similar public power projects for at least 35 years to my personal knowledge?" asked the veteran lawmaker.

"To do so would leave us more unprepared in an emergency now than we were unprepared in 1916," said the former Senator. "The safety of the United States should come first. The private power companies are getting along well according to reports * * * and should not receive additional help from the Government at this time."

Mr. McKellar said he was greatly alarmed at the lack of knowledge on the subject of TVA by both President Eisenhower and his unsuccessful Republican predecessor, Mr. Hoover, of the fundamental purposes of the great TVA.

"In the interest of our national defense and preparedness our Congress and President Woodrow Wilson began these power institutions such as TVA in 1916," he recalled. "It was a military appropriation bill and TVA was section 124 of that act which prepared the way and furnished the money for our entry into World War I.

"The purpose of section 124 was purely military and for the defense of our Nation," he explained.

WARNS TVA FRIENDS, FOES

Mr. McKellar observed that "we as a Nation are furnishing foreign countries billions of dollars to build TVA-like developments abroad, while at the same time we let groups of citizens work against these same developments in our own country.

"I want to warn both friends and enemies of TVA to get back to fundamentals and vigorously support our common defense and the general welfare of our great country, rather than support private power companies.

"I am further alarmed because I believe President Eisenhower is simply choking TVA to death by allowing the old mossbacks led by Hoover to hold biased, partisan, and prejudiced hearings, and make reports to the public that are basically shortsighted presentations of the propower and anti-TVA private power companies who see in TVA something to purchase or lease at a price which will amount to little or nothing.

"As I make this statement I am confident that my old colleagues in the Senate and the House will not overlook the fundamentals involved and will not allow Mr. Hoover and and the private power company boys to do violence to TVA which, I hold, has been the greatest aid and economy to our national defense and our war efforts, and in peacetime to our economic welfare.

"It is the greatest piece of property that the Government owns today.

"I am as vitally interested in TVA now as I ever have been because it was the subject which occupied over 30 percent of my 42 years in Congress."

HELPED GET MONEY

"I personally helped obtain every dollar of the funds from 1916 to 1953 which went into TVA, and sometimes against the most vicious opposition—and always over opposition of the private power companies and Mr. Hoover.

"The Congress should not appropriate a thin dime to the Dixon-Yates deal.

"We could never have accomplished what we so well accomplished in World War II but for the fact our Government had on hand, ready to go, the TVA," Mr. McKellar declared.

Withdrawal of the Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interesting editorial, entitled "The Winner," and dealing with the recent decision of the President to withdraw the Dixon-Yates contract, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The editorial appeared in the Arizona Republic of Saturday, July 9.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Republic of July 9, 1955]

THE WINNER

There seems to be some doubt in the minds of people about who was the victor in the controversy over the Dixon-Yates contract. A great many leftwing Democrats and other advocates of public power maintain that President Eisenhower suffered a crushing defeat. We maintain those people are talking through their socialistic hats.

Let us consider the original purpose of the Dixon-Yates contract. As we understand it, it was to prevent the Tennessee Valley Authority from building a new steam plant for generating elecricity, the idea being that TVA was primarily a flood-control, navigation project which was intended only secondarily as a power producer. Mr. Eisenhower maintained that since the TVA already produced as much electricity via steam power as it did from waterpower, the intent of the original bill aready was surpassed and that the time to quit had come.

He maintained that TVA should produce no more power for several reasons. First, he does not believe that Government should compete with private business, especially when the competition is manifestly unfair. Public plants are exempt from taxation and are subsidized by the public, which gives them a tremendous advantage over the privately owned plant. Eventually Government competition can kill off any private venture with the aid of this edge, and that is a silly result, since private ventures pay taxes that help to pay for the Government-run plant. Further, it was pointed out that, although the TVA power is wonderful for the people and the business users in the immediate area, it doesn't help at all the people in the rest of the United States of America who also are paying for the upkeep of the TVA power system.

To prevent the further spread of TVA, Mr. Eisenhower entered into a contract with the Dixon-Yates people to build a plant which would supply power to TVA, which, in turn, would supply power to the city of Memphis.

The defenders of the TVA, the hopers-for-the-spread-of-government-in-business, immediately jumped on the deal charging all kinds of skulduggery. The President stood firm. And he emerged victorious. Or seemingly so. By now the opponents of the Dixon-Yates deal were prepared to do anything to stop the President. So they talked the city of Memphis into building its own power plant, thus removing the need for the Dixon-Yates plant. And claimed victory.

Now let us examine into the difference between a plant run by the National Government, one run by the State, and one run by a city. First there is a question of efficiency. It is common knowledge that plants run by a public administration are by and large much less efficient than plants run for profit. But let us disregard that point. The important thing is who pays for what, and who gets what in return. A public utility operated by the Federal Government can benefit only one area. The entire taxpaying public of the country must underwrite the benefits enjoyed by a tiny proportion of the Nation. If the State operates a public utility, the same is true except that the proportion of people who support the utility without benefit is somewhat smaller. And if a city operates a public utility almost all of the taxpayers at least get the services of the company. Their

utility bills may seem a little lower, but any apparent savings are usually cancelled out by higher taxes. But that is the affair of these people alone. If residents of a city want to operate in that fashion, it is their privilege. They aren't asking anyone outside the city to help pay the bill.

So if the people of Memphis want to operate their own powerplant, there is no reason why they should not. But to say that President Eisenhower has been defeated is nonsense. He wanted no addition to TVA for which all of the people of the country would be forced to pay. And that he stopped. No, friends. It looks to us like a complete victory for the President. Another socialistic advance by Government into industry was decisively thrown back.

Wisconsin Marks 50th Anniversary of United States Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Wisconsin joins with the rest of the Nation in hailing the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service.

Few, if any, States of the Union have a higher and closer regard for the work of this great conservation organization than has the Badger State. We of Wisconsin have pioneered in preserving our forest heritage and expanding it in a way which has won the admiration of the country.

The great Wisconsin commercial pulp and paper industry has been in the forefront of the soundest and most enlightened practices. Our power companies have been similarly in the vanguard of other private enterprises elsewhere in the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting article from the Sunday, July 10, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, summarizing the great landmarks in Wisconsin forest conservation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREST SERVICE MARKS ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY—UNITED STATES AGENCY WAS MAJOR FACTOR IN REVIVING WISCONSIN'S VALUABLE WOOD INDUSTRY

(By Lewis C. French)

The United States Forest Service is celebrating its golden anniversary, and no State should appreciate the agency's 50 years of work more than Wisconsin.

The State is restocking some 16 million of its 30 million acres with the "green gold" of new forests. In 25 years, this will make the State self-sufficient in raw material for its expanding pulp, paper, and timber industries—which have payrolls of nearly half a billion dollars a year.

Millions of barren, burned, and bankrupt acres—vast areas no one wanted—have been converted into thriving forests, producing employment and revenue as well as recreation.

"Wisconsin is known over the Nation as the one State where everyone interested in conservation and forestry work together," says M. N. (Mully) Taylor, of Merrill, executive director of Trees for Tomorrow, Inc.

Two men were responsible for creating the United States forest service, dedicated to the protection of the Nation's timber wealth.

ROOSEVELT SET BRAKES

One was President Theodore Roosevelt, an ardent and determined conservationist no matter whether it was game, soil, or trees. In an era of exploitation of the Nation's resources, he set the brakes.

The other man was Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, the first native-born, trained professional forester. As Chief of the United States Bureau of Forestry, Pinchot's appeal to save dwindling timberlands through controlled lumbering caught Roosevelt's ear.

It is significant that the Wisconsin Legislature in the early 1880's started talking of forest protection and created a legislative committee to study the problem of replenishing the pine empire. But the committee never did much.

DAYS OF SAWMILL BARONS

Those were days when sawmill barons dominated Wisconsin politics, and most basic land policy was designed to spur unrestricted logging operations.

Suddenly more than one-third of the 71 counties—those in the vast central and northern area—realized that more than 6 million cutover acres had been left in the wake of the sawmill lumbermen. This slash was tinder for fires. There were other millions of acres nature had never intended for agriculture.

Efforts to sell this cutover land as a new farm empire flopped. Often counties had more than half of their land on the delinquent tax list.

CCC CAMPS SUCCESSFUL

With these conditions prevailing, Federal foresters were welcomed into Wisconsin. One factor that more than any other proved that soil erosion could be stopped and forests regrown, was the civilian conservation corps (CCC).

A second important Federal contribution was the creation of the two national forests, the Chequamegon, with headquarters in Park Falls, and the Nicolet, with offices in Rhinelander.

The first units of these Wisconsin national forests were acquired in 1928. Uncle Sam helped move luckless settlers from blocks of tax delinquent land to new farms offering fresh hope. The Chequamegon was created as a national forest in 1936, the Nicolet in 1933.

No one can honestly say that the United States forest service is solely responsible for the revival of fine timber in Wisconsin. Many people and many agencies shared the task, but it remains a fact that the Federal agency came galloping to the rescue when the going was roughest.

State milestones in the transition included:

1. Creation of the Menominee Indian reservation forest under 1908 legislation restricting the annual cut to about 20 million board feet a year.

LABORATORY STARTED IN STATE

2. Building of the United States forest products laboratory in Madison (1910) which has developed new commercial uses for wood and forestry products.

3. Establishment of the Star Lake State Forest in Vilas County in 1913 by the Wisconsin Conservation Department forestry division. It proved that new pine could be planted like corn.

4. Passage by the legislature of the forest-crop law which exempts forest land from full taxation until harvest time, eliminating the need for clear cutting valuable stands to escape taxes that ate up chances of profit before the timber could mature. At about this time (1927), the first industrial forests were started by paper mills seeking to avoid the high cost of importing foreign timber.

CCC BOYS RETURN

5. Operation of the CCC camps through which huge strides were made cleaning up the barrens and replanting, giving thousands of youths their first appreciation of the forests and what they mean in daily living. Forest rangers say it is quite common to have tourists stop and ask to be shown certain plantations planted by the visitors in the CCC days.

6. Adoption of the zoning ordinances in Wisconsin, first in Oneida County in 1933 and Marinette County soon thereafter.

Under these ordinances, county committees with the counsel of trained foresters and agronomists, prohibited the settlement of submarginal land for agriculture, restricting it for forestry or recreation.

7. Resolutions passed by the First Wisconsin Commercial Forestry Conference in Milwaukee in 1928. Here forestry experts, paper mill owners and sawlog operators still operating set a policy to protect timberland from fire and to urge establishment of national forests for public interest.

8. Blocking out and improvement of the national forests.

FORESTRY CAMPS STARTED

9. Opening of the Trees for Tomorrow camp on the outskirts of Eagle River in 1946. Sponsored by 13 paper mills and power companies and dedicated to educating the public to the value of trees and clean water to Wisconsin.

10. Passage by the 1955 legislature of laws under which the State will share the costs of combating forest diseases and insects. These are the greatest foes of forests since a statewide fire-protection system has been established.

"The school kids and their parents just would not allow the ruthless exploitation of the land or the forests as did their forefathers," observed one forester. "The youth of today, enjoying the woods, wants a heritage of foresests for his children."

Now look around Wisconsin. It ranks second in the Nation for low forest-fire burn. Iowa, strictly a farm State, ranks first.

Wisconsin ranks third in the number of acres reforested—532,000 acres of new trees in various growth stages, some near the first thinning for pulp. Each year the State is planting between 25 and 30 million new trees, in 10-acre farm woodlots, 100-acre school forests, 10,000-acre industrial forests, or vast Federal and county forests.

HEADQUARTERS IN MILWAUKEE

Wisconsin is fortunate in having the north central regional office of the United States Forest Service in Milwaukee. Here are assembled the top experts in the forestry fields, with H. Dean Cochran, the regional forester, in charge.

This staff covers the Federal forestry developments in nine States, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Misosuri, and North Dakota. There are 14 national forests in the region.

"Our biggest problem now is not so much planting more trees but improving what we already have, the new stands and the recreation facilities for the public," says Cochran.

Although the Chequamegon and Nicolet Forests seem to embrace more than 2 million acres, actually Uncle Sam only owns 825,000 acres in the Chequamegon and 637,000 in the Nicolet. The rest is a mixture of private, State, and public tracts.

FUTURE IS BRIGHT

But look ahead. Land that once was shunned is now being developed in the Chequamegon and is producing an annual growth of around 60 million board feet a year. The allowable annual cut is 40 million board feet. The annual growth in the Nicolet is estimated at 47 million board feet a year with an allowable cut of around 30 million board feet.

Quite a change from those bleak, tax delinquent days.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am particularly pleased to include an article appearing in the Boston Herald on July 11, 1955, in relation to my distinguished friend, the outstanding majority leader of the United States Senate, Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and written by Holmes Alexander, whose articles appeared in a number of other newspapers throughout the country.

The leadership of Senator JOHNSON as majority leader of the Senate has been outstanding, constructive in every respect, the leadership of constructive support, of constructive proposal, of constructive opposition, and of constructive criticism. The people of our country have witnessed the Democratic control of the 84th Congress operating and functioning both in the field of foreign and domestic affairs in the best interests of our country and our people. In that leadership Senator JOHNSON has played a most important part. I am proud of his friendship. I am particularly proud of his outstanding leadership.

The article follows:

JUNGLE LAW AMENDED—JOHNSON COULD HAVE HURT IKE, BUT CHOSE CONSTRUCTIVE ROLE

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Senator LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON of Texas like it fine when reporters spell out his middle name—it belongs to his mother.

LYNDON'S mother is one reason why Majority Leader JOHNSON can throw the arm of approval over worthy legislation, even when it bears, for him, the dubious label of Republican. How come as true a Texas Democrat as LYNDON JOHNSON can rise above partisanship?

DO WHAT'S RIGHT

"That's easy," the Senator told me earlier this summer when he sat characteristically with his gleaming shoes on a gleaming desk top and his head below the level of his chair back. "My momma always told me—'LYNNUN, just you do what's right.'"

There's another family story which the tall, engaging Texan tells. Years ago when he was a boy, says LYNDON, he went to a party and came home with a black eye. Next morning his father came to the bedside and looked sternly down upon him.

"My daddy said," the Senator relates, "'SONNY, there are lots of ways of getting yourself noticed. Some of the boys at that party got noticed because they were very handsome, some because they were witty and attractive; but it looks like you chose the very worst way. You got mixed up in a rumpus. Next time you want to be noticed, try some better way.'"

Between them, the two Johnson parents raised up a handsome, gregarious, successful, charming son who is, I would surmise, the best-liked political person in Washington. By doing what's right and gaining public notice strictly by tending to business, LYNDON JOHNSON got to be a national figure at the age of 46.

Unhappily, at the year's half-way mark, JOHNSON was hit with a heart attack, quite likely brought about by the energetic performance of his job as Senate majority leader. What this cruel stroke of fate will do to his rising career, or to the length of his life, had best be left to Heaven—where, for the record, many nonpartisan prayers will be found on file for LYNDON'S recovery. Meanwhile, to borrow a phrase from Carlyle, the history of the 84th Congress can best be described as the elongated shadow of this great fellow LYNDON JOHNSON.

The name which his leadership goes by in Washington—"constructive opposition"—is a little pompous, but 'twill do.

HAD POWER, SKILL

JOHNSON had the power in his hands and the skill at his finger tips to make political life hardly worth living for the Eisenhower administration. Another political pro from Texas, House Speaker Jack Garner, did some unconsionable things to the ham-strung Hoover administration in 1931–32. The comparison is by no means exact, for Presidential popularity is not the same this year as in Mr. Hoover's last days of office. But there's no doubt that JOHNSON was tempted—and publicly urged by the "Social-Democrats"—to go all out to destroy the Eisenhower program, prestige, and image.

Instead, as the country has witnessed, the Democratic leader became the prime mover in the most "constructive" congressional session within memory. By the end of last month the Senate had passed 3 bills to every 2 bills passed at a similar period by the 83rd Congress. It was spending only 4 hours of debate to every 5 expended by the previous Senate with its lesser output. While bills-and-hours statistics are an imprecise way to measure congressional accomplishment, there's no doubt from observation that JOHNSON'S leadership has been expeditious and impressive.

Such is our transitory life that nobody knows which day will be the last for any man or any nation, but good deeds are never wasted and never lost in the sum of history. It's a fair guess that LYNDON JOHNSON has already made the political community a little better for his presence. The old saying that the "opposition's business is to oppose" now stands amended by the one important adverb—"constructively."

'It's a good amendment to the long-prevailing jungle-law of politics. Let Democrats and Republicans take notice and hereafter oppose constructively. Maybe some of us in the press coop, too, could learn from LYNDON'S law.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Battlement Mesa irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Battlement Mesa project is a part of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Public Opinion Poll With Reference to Changes in the McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Gallup poll made a survey of public opinion as to our immigration policies. It is interesting to note the results of the Gallup poll. A majority—53 percent—when asked the question "From what you know, do you think there should or should not be changes made in the McCarran-Walter Act?" responded that changes should be made. Only 15 percent said no. On the question "Do you think this act should be made more strict or more liberal?" 68 percent favored more liberal provisions and 26 percent more strict. On the question "Would you approve or disapprove of having a few families from Europe come to this neighborhood to live?" 63 percent approved and 27 disapproved. I ask unanimous consent that the public-opinion poll by Dr. George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the public-opinion poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Duluth Herald of June 15, 1955]

UNITED STATES PUBLIC FAVORS LIBERAL ENTRY LAWS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J.—Although a majority of Americans are not familiar with the controversial McCarran-Walter Act, among those who are—some 14 million in the total adult population—the prevailing sentiment is that the immigration law should be made more liberal.

Among the public, generally, survey evidence points to the fact that a large number of European immigrants could be absorbed into America's communities, as far as public opinion is concerned.

Two out of every three adults questioned in today's poll say they would approve of the idea of having a few European families come to their neighborhood to live.

If, say, three European families came to reside in each of the hundreds of thousands of neighborhoods across the country, it is estimated that about 3 to 4 million immigrants could be absorbed into America's population.

Under the present regulations of the McCarran-Walter Act, which bases quotas on national origins of United States citizens, the annual immigration quota is about 155,000.

After determining who those persons familiar with the existing immigration laws were, Institute reporters asked them the following question:

"From what you know, do you think there should or should not be changes made in the McCarran-Walter Act?"

The results for those familiar with the act:

Should be changes, 53 percent; should not, 15 percent; no opinion, 32 percent.

The 53 percent who felt there should be some changes were asked a further question:

"Do you think this act should be made more strict or more liberal?"

The results for those who want changes: More strict, 26 percent; more liberal, 68 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

To see how the general public, regardless of their knowledge of the present regulations, would feel about the influx of a few European families in their communities, each person in the survey was asked the following question:

"Would you approve or disapprove of having a few families from Europe come to this neighborhood to live?"

The results, comparing the views of the "informed" public with those of the general public:

Approve: General public, 63 percent; informed public, 81 percent. Disapprove: General public, 27 percent; informed public, 12 percent. No opinion: General public, 10 percent; informed public, 7 percent.

Analysis of the results reveals that in all groups in the population there is a definite majority approving the idea of European families coming to their neighborhood to take up residence.

The degree to which different groups hold this sentiment is as follows:

1. People in the Far West are more inclined to think this would be a good idea than are persons elsewhere in the country. Next most in favor of having European families come to their neighborhoods are easterners, followed by midwesterners and southerners, in that order.

2. By size of city, the idea finds greatest favor among persons in medium-size cities (25,000 to 250,000 population). Next highest approval comes from those living in small towns (2,500 to 25,000 population), followed by big-city dwellers (over 250,000) and those living in rural areas.

3. College-trained persons are more in favor than are those with high-school and grade-school education.

4. A larger majority of younger persons than older persons wouldn't mind their neighborhood becoming a new home for a few European families.

5. Professional and business people look more favorably on the idea than other occupation groups. The smallest majority in favor of Europeans coming to their neighborhood is found among farmers.

The Whitfield Case—Atoms in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Atoms in Politics," which appeared in the July 11, 1955, issue of the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal. The editorial follows:

ATOMS IN POLITICS

Allen Whitfield, the Des Moines attorney who asked President Eisenhower Friday to withdraw his nomination to a vacancy on the Atomic Energy Commission, should never have been named to the AEC.

Except for a minor connection with atomic energy as counsel for a nuclear-research installation at Iowa State College, Whitfield has had no experience in the field of atomic energy.

However, Whitfield's experience in Republican politics has been extensive. He is counsel to the Republican Party in Iowa and a former president of the Iowa Young Republican Club.

In addition, there is Whitfield's role in the management of an estate in Des Moines, which led the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy to conduct an extensive investigation of Whitfield.

Leaving the propriety of his handling of the estate entirely out of the dispute, it is still difficult to make a persuasive argument in behalf of Whitfield's qualifications as an atomic energy Commissioner.

The nomination of a man like Whitfield, with such an intensely political background and with no compensating qualifications in the field of atomic energy, did not further the nonpartisan nature of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The President will withdraw Whitfield's name. Then Mr. Eisenhower should find a man eminently qualified for the highly sensitive position on the Atomic Energy Commission.

Hogwash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of July 11, 1955:

MAYOR TOBEY'S HOT RETORT

Wholesome indignation characterizes the statement of Mayor Frank Tobey, of Memphis, in his interview in the Sunday Post-Dispatch.

From what Mayor Tobey said it is obvious that he and the national administration are of two different parties. It is also obvious that he does not mind hitting back hard. But when allowances are made, the substance of Mayor Tobey's statement adds up to a lot of commonsense. Because it will not be as widely printed over the country for the information of the American people as it should be, we reproduce Mayor Tobey's statement in full below.

Independent voters who do their own political thinking will see that the Memphis mayor demolishes the patently distracting tactic of the White House in demanding assurances that Memphis will build its own power plant rather than take a kilowatt of electricity from the Dixon-Yates utility promoters.

Mayor Tobey was interviewed by the Post-Dispatch before he went to Washington for conferences Monday with TVA, Budget and other officials. He said:

"In the first place there is no actual situation existing in which President Eisenhower on one hand gives an ultimatum of 90 days for Memphis to move toward building its own steam plant, and the city on the other hand races to meet the 90-day deadline.

"This is so much Republican hogwash to confuse the public.

"The true situation is that Memphis decided in its own democratic, fundamentally American manner to build a steam plant rather than accept power from Dixon-Yates.

"And by so doing, Memphis has taken the Eisenhower administration off the hook and opened the door through which the President can sidestep a political scandal of startling proportions.

"Consequently, it is our feeling that the administration should be thankful for our sincerity and honesty of purpose, rather than keep trying to insist that we come up with some special phrasemaking that will help the Republicans in campaign contests.

"Also, let's get the record straight. The Memphis city commission on June 23 passed a resolution authorizing our light, gas, and water division to commence the construction of a steam plant.

"We are not bluffing, and neither are we going to write campaign literature for an inept (Federal) administration when it bungles the public interest."

A straightforward answer to this from President Eisenhower, Attorney General Brownell, Budget Director Hughes and AEC Chairman Strauss would make interesting reading.

Address of Hon. Harry S. Truman at 10th Anniversary of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend the 10th anniversary celebration of the United Nations at San Francisco, Calif. One of the most significant highlights of this historic occasion was the address of the former President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, to the General Assembly on Friday, June 24. President Truman was warmly and enthusiastically received by the delegates at the United Nations and the public. He was in truth the hero of the occasion. I ask unanimous consent to have the address of former President Truman printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend its reading to every Member of the Congress. It represents not only a tribute to the United Nations but a constructive and challenging statement on foreign policy and America's role in the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN TAKES STOCK OF U. N.

You have conferred a great honor upon me by inviting me to attend this celebration of the 10th anniversary of the United Nations, and I thank you very much.

This is a memorable occasion for me. It is almost exactly 10 years since I spoke, as President of the United States, to the concluding session of the conference which framed the United Nations Charter.

I see many familiar faces, veterans of that great conference, and I am sorry to note there are some faces missing.

Tonight I am a private citizen of the United States. And, like the great majority of the private citizens of my country and peoples of all the world, I have faith in the United Nations and hope for its future. In expressing that faith and that hope I feel that I am expressing what is in the minds and hearts of millions of my fellowmen all over the world.

TRAGIC DEATH OF F. D. R.

It was my fate to take over the presidency upon the tragic death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt was among the first to envision the United Nations as an instrument to keep the peace.

My first official act when I took office was to instruct Secretary of State Stettinius to proceed with the United Nations conference as planned. My conviction was so deep that we had to have a world organization that I felt no event, no matter how sad and unfortunate, should interfere with the drafting of the charter of the United Nations.

I felt that there was nothing I could do, which would be more fitting to the memory of President Roosevelt, than to go ahead with the conference.

The conference was held in this city as scheduled, and the difficult task of drafting the charter was completed. When I spoke at the concluding session, I was pleased that the charter had been worked out and agreed to.

PLEDGE OF SUPPORT

On that occasion, I pledged my support to the United Nations. I believe that I have kept that pledge, both as President and since I have retired from the White House.

Certainly, I have never failed to work for the United Nations, and tonight as a private citizen I pledge my support of it once again.

Since the charter was signed, many things have happened, and many vital decisions have been made. The United Nations has faced many crises and many difficult decisions. There have been times when some people thought, and hoped, that the United Nations might fall. At one point in this period, armed aggression in violation of the principles of the United Nations took place with the support and help of nations that had signed the charter.

That aggression was met as it had to be met. We had to fight to preserve the principles of the United Nations.

And the charter which we signed here at San Francisco in 1945, was given new life and new vigor by sacrifices of the many brave men of many nations who fought to uphold it in Korea.

The decision to fight for this great organization has cost us much blood and treasure, but it was the right decision.

The purpose of the United Nations intervention in Korea, and the objective of free nations in building up their military strength in support of the United Nations have been deliberately misrepresented in some quarters.

GOAL TO ATTAIN

When the charter was drafted 10 years ago, we had before our eyes the goal we wished to attain, the priceless goal of world peace based on law, justice, freedom, and human dignity.

But we did not foresee all the difficulties and the trials and the pain that it would cost to pursue this great objective. Today, we know more about the price of peace, more about what it costs, how great it is, and how much determination and effort is needed to fulfill the pledges of the charter, but we are even more firmly resolved that the charter must be maintained.

The reasons are very clear. When I placed the United Nations Charter before the Senate of the United States and asked that great legislative body to consent to its ratification, I told the Senators that they did not have a choice between this charter and something better. The choice was between this charter and no charter at all.

Today, for the whole world, the choice is not between the United Nations and something better. The choice is between the United Nations—between the principles of the United Nations—and international anarchy and violence which may lead to total destruction for all the nations of the world.

LIVING INSTITUTION

The United Nations today is a living institution. Like all living things, it follows a development of its own. Some of the things we put down on paper in the charter have not come to pass, some of the procedures originally planned have proved unworkable, but they have been replaced by new activties, new procedures, all within the spirit of the charter, that we did not foresee 10 years ago. This is the course of all written constitutions if they are to endure and meet the changing needs of the years.

One of the most significant developments of recent times is the growing power and prestige of the General Assembly. It is in the General Assembly more and more that world opinion is making itself felt.

The Security Council, which in the beginning we thought would be the controlling body, is yielding to the General Assembly as the place where the force of world opinion is brought to bear upon the solution of the really vital issues. This development has been highlighted by the passage of the uniting-for-peace resolution, a great landmark in the constitutional development of the United Nations.

GROWING PRESTIGE

I think the growing prestige of the General Assembly is a development of the greatest volume and importance. There is no veto in the General Assembly. And if collective action is necessary in defense of the charter, a call for action by the General Assembly can be even more effective than a command from the Security Council.

The effectiveness of a request addressed to sovereign states, jealous of their sovereign rights, depends not upon whether the request is legally a command or a recommendation. It depends upon the extent to which the request expresses the will and has the support of an alert and aroused world opinion and a world conscience.

The Security Council could never speak for world opinion with the same moral authority as the General Assembly. Certainly the General Assembly now speaks with an authority that the great powers on the Security Council cannot ignore.

And it may be a good thing, especially for the large nations, to let them know that the balance of mankind is not going to give up striving for peace and order just because the great powers cannot agree.

MEMBERSHIP ISSUE

This raises the whole question of enlarging the membership of the United Nations.

Since this is a living and growing institution which should reflect and provide the means for crystallizing world opinion, it cannot be held forever in the iron mold imposed by the great war of 1940–45. Other nations are rightfully seeking admission. One of the best evidences of a real relaxation of international tensions would be the speedy removal of the obstacles to the admission of those nations justly entitled to be members.

The growth of the United Nations in its first 10 years has been a hard one, beset with difficulties and disappointments, but as I look back over that 10 years I am convinced more than ever that our conference here in 1945 did much more than draft an international agreement among 50 nations. I believe our conference in 1945 set down on paper the only principles which will enable civilized human life to continue to survive on this globe. These principles are, first, that there is no substitute for peace, and that force and the threat of force have become intolerable as instruments for the settlement of differences in a world which force can easily destroy. The second principle is that the life of mankind is a united and common life, carrying with it a common responsibility for the welfare of all. No place is far enough away from any other place in this atomic age to escape the obligation to be a good neighbor.

Ten years ago in this city all the nations represented here agreed on the goal of world peace. They also agreed that to achieve peace would require determination and effort. On that occasion, I said:

"If we had had this charter a few years ago—and, above all, the will to use it—millions now dead would be alive. If we should falter in the future in our will to use it, millions now living will surely die.

"It has already been said by many that this is only a first step to a lasting peace. That is true. The important thing is that all our thinking and all actions be based on the realizations that it is in fact only a first step. Let us all have it firmly in mind that we start today from a good beginning, and, with our eye always on the final objective, let us march forward."

And the Soviet delegate, then Ambassador Gromyko, said:

"The peoples of the countries represented in this conference pursue a common objective—to prevent the repetition of a new war * * * under the charter, members of the international organization obligate themselves to achieve peaceful settlement of disputes. Let us hope this aim will be realized."

The same views were voiced by many others.

ALL JOIN IN HOPE

Ten years after we see the truth of these views. We feel the increasingly insistent pressure of the common opinion of mankind throughout the world against force and the threat of force in international affairs. This year, as in 1945, the world still hopes that within the framework of the charter we can make real progress toward peace.

We all join in this hope, but we all know we cannot achieve world peace simply through organizations and meetings. There is no magic in international procedures. We must deal with the underlying problems. Today, one of the gravest problems facing mankind is the need to reduce the burden of armaments.

I have been, and I still am, one of the most ardent advocates of disarmament. In 1950 and in 1951, I placed proposals before this organization for reducing armaments under effective international controls. At the same time, I made it clear that unless agreement could be reached on this issue, even those nations which most abhorred the use of force—and which were most determined not to use force in the settlement of their difficulties—would be compelled by circumstances to build up their own armed strength in order to resist attacks upon them or upon the ideals of the United Nations.

BURDENS HEAVIER

This question of armaments has clouded the international horizon for many years. It grows more and more serious. Every year science places new and more terrible weapons in our hands. Every year the financial burdens of defense grow heavier and heavier. Every year the consequences of sudden attack and the perils of inadequate defense become more deadly.

Today, the battles of World War II are almost as far behind us technologically as the battle of Napoleon or the techniques of Genghis Khan. The use of force in international affairs today raises the threat—the almost incomprehensible threat—of total destruction, not only of cities and nations, but of all human life.

I earnestly hope that the time has come when we may break the deadlock on international disarmament. Recent negotiations on the subject have been overshadowed by other affairs, but the fact is that the expressed views of the principal military powers of the world on the reduction and control of armaments have come much closer together. This is a hopeful sign, and I pray that it may be a forerunner of better things to come.

REAL DISARMAMENT

To make real progress in this work of disarmament, we should move forward as rapidly as we can—not only toward the progressive and balanced reduction of armaments

under effective international controls, but beyond that, toward the proposition that no state, no nation, should be allowed to have sufficient arms to wage a successful war. Disarmament should become a steady process of creating conditions which make it more and more difficult for any nation to break the peace.

Effective disarmament should remove from the world not only the terror of atomic weapons and guided missiles, but also the threat of mass armies.

Effective disarmament means an open world with no secret armies, no secret weapons and no secret war planes. If we are to achieve effective international control of armaments, we have to have a world open to inspection.

This will be difficult. Some nations have become to accustomed to living in the dark that it is not going to be easy for them to learn to live in the light.

I believe that in time effective disarmament is possible.

TOP JOB FOR NATIONS

But I do not think that world peace can be achieved by disarmament alone. There must be a common determination on the part of all nations not to embroil the world in war. All nations must follow policies which will make possible the peaceful settlement of their differences.

For this reason, I welcome the signs in the world today that greater understanding and agreement may be reached among the great powers. I welcome the proposals for further conferences and negotiations. It may not be possible to make sudden or vast strides in these conferences, but agreement even in some things will be a gain. Agreement even in little things may be a foundation on which greater things can be built.

I am more convinced now than ever that the growth and development of the United Nations are essential for international peace and progress. The charter embodies the obligation of the members not to use force except in defense of the charter. This is both a legal and a moral obligation. It binds all the nations that signed and ratified the charter, even those which may be strong enough to violate it. It is a powerful, if intangible, restraint on all the nations. It is sustained by the mighty force of the moral judgment of mankind.

PRAISE TO FOUNDERS

If we can make that obligation good, if we can carry it out in practice, the way is open for an international community based on law and order. In such an international community, material and social progress will be within the grasp of every nation. The welfare of mankind will cause to be secondary to the grim question of national survival, and will become the primary concern of governments. In such an international community, the social and economic activities of the United Nations will reach their fullest development.

Second only to peace in the United Nations Charter is the emphasis it lays on improving the standards of living of mankind and safeguarding the fundamental freedoms and the dignity of men. This work must be carried on at the same time that we strive to eliminate war. Indeed, this humanitarian program strikes at one of the main causes of war. It is a tribute to the framers of the United Nations Charter that they gave this objective such great importance, and set up machinery for pursuing it effectively even before the framework of international peace was completed.

MUCH TO BE DONE

As I think back over the last 10 years, I am encouraged by what has been done in the economic and social field. But all our accomplishments to date are only a good beginning. There is much that remains to be done. Here is a challenge to the understanding, the generosity and the ingenuity of man.

We now take it as a matter of course that one nation should offer scientific instruction and technical advances to another, free, without excepting a return of any kind except the consequences of being part of the brotherhood of man. What a tremendous step forward this is in the realization of our common international responsibilities. Fifty years ago, a program of technical assistance, such as I proposed in the fourth point of my inaugural address in January 1949, would have been considered completely visionary. Nowadays, the only real question is—how big should such a program be? This revolutionary change in public opinion is the result, at least in part, of the economic and social portions of the United Nations Charter, and the general acceptance of their underlying philosophy.

I am glad to see that technical assistance and economic development are a growing part of the work of the United Nations. While all international good works need not be confined to the United Nations, there are many situations in which this organization is the best channel for such international activities. I hope all the member governments will support these activities of the United Nations wholeheartedly and generously.

CHOICES FOR WORLD

In this atomic age, no nation can live unto itself alone. There is no hope for any nation either in isolationism or in imperialism. The United Nations is the best hope of mankind for deliverance from mutual destruction. It is even more important in this respect than it was 10 years ago.

The United Nations is a beacon of hope to a world that has no choice but to live together or to die together.

The charter may not be perfect, but no charter can provide easy or automatic solutions for the complex and difficult problems of international life. The charter does give us the means—the opportunity—of meeting and resolving these problems by peaceful processes. In our impatient zeal for perfection, let us not lose faith in the charter and the means it provides for working together for our common salvation.

We have come a long way in the past 10 years. During this fateful period, two great forces have emerged to play an essential role in shaping the destiny of mankind. One of these is the United Nations, man's most ambitious attempt to keep the peace. The other is the development of nuclear science, which has unleased physical power of a magnitude hitherto undreamed of—a magnitude great enough to make fundamental changes in man's way of life for better or for worse.

We in our generation are confronted with the magnificent challenge of reconciling these two great forces. We must use the one and harness the other so that we may combine them for the everlasting benefit of all mankind.

A Reform That Backfired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "A Reform That Backfired" which appeared in the Journal of Commerce, July 12, 1955.

This editorial discusses the extremely important topic of congressional control of Federal expenditures and various proposed procedures through which more effective controls may be accomplished. I feel that this subject deserves the close attention of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

A REFORM THAT BACKFIRED

Irked by big unspent and uncommitted carryovers of funds from year to year, Congress put a $200 million ceiling on military foreign assistance carryovers. Now it is boiling mad because the Defense Department rushed through more than a half-billion commitments in the last 24 hours of the 1955 fiscal year and kept within the ceiling.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, sponsor of the carryover limit commented: "The amendment was designed to keep mutual defense funds within reasonable limits so far as planning is concerned. It was designed to keep the authorization funds to those amounts which the Department can reasonably expect to obligate within 1 year." But as Representative FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, noted over on the House side: "Of course, when the Senate had put in an amendment in their version, that anything over $200 million not obligated could be cut off, it was almost an invitation to the Department of Defense to obligate everything over $200 million."

The immediate reaction in Congress was that foreign aid funds for the new year should be cut back. The result of such a punitive cut would simply be to cripple a necesary program, with far-reaching repercussions on our foreign policy, without advancing 1 inch toward improving the system.

Year-end obligational orgies have scandalized administrations before this one, and the moral to be drawn from the Defense funds incident can be summed up in "How not to cure them."

Carryover ceilings, like public debt ceilings, are no substitute for control.

Fortunately, a special subcommittee on budget reform is scheduled to open sessions on Wednesday, under the chairmanship of Representative MAHON, Democrat, of Texas. The flareup over the Defense Department's handling of foreign aid obligations emphasizes the seriousness of the problem before the group and gives the sessions added point and timeliness.

Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey is to appear before the group, which is a subgroup of the House Appropriations Committee.

Chairman CANNON, of the Appropriations Committee, describes the sessions as aimed at exploring all fields and proposals relating to improving procedures for balancing the budget. Taken broadly, there is nothing wrong with this definition of the problem, provided it is borne in mind that balancing the budget alone could still leave the budget control problem wide open and would certainly not suffice to correct the disordered planning evidenced by last-minute obligational scrambles at the fiscal year's end.

A first essential for removing this type of practice is for Congress to devise methods for keeping in closer year-around contact with agency performance. But for this far less is needed than Representative CANNON's own plan, to be weighed by the subcommittee, to set up a budget bureau within the legislative branch itself.

The Hoover Commission's proposal to rescind unobligated balances each year-end looks neat at first glance but would no doubt get into precisely the same trouble Congress ran into with the mutual-aid funds.

A provision of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1955 requires that each

agency prepare and submit annually the amount of obligated but unspent balances as well as the amount of funds which have not yet been obligated as of the end of the past fiscal year.

Sensible procedure might well build from this base. It ought to be feasible, when appropriations are initially considered, for Congress and the agencies to agree on tentative benchmarks for obligations and expenditures for major programs over the year. Reports rendered quarterly or at intervals over the fiscal year would indicate how these benchmarks were being adhered to and what departures had been found necessary.

Indicating progress to date and carrying likely projections for the remainder of the fiscal year, these reports would keep Congress in touch and operate to prevent both lags and logjams. It would be unwise for Congress to seek to bind the Executive rigidly to the benchmarks, but Congress ought also to be entitled to an accounting where the agreed schedule is significantly departed from.

Some such apparatus for making the agencies accountable in terms of an orderly time schedule and requiring justification for departures seems to offer a practical middle ground to devices which pressure the agencies to keep the money moving on the one hand, and to the present uncontrolled state of affairs, on the other.

It is deadly serious business all around that the foreign-aid program should be threatened with a $600 million cut. Mr. Mahon's group has been provided a significant challenge as it sets about its task.

The Decadence of the United States Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received an article written by Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn., dated July 1, 1955.

In this article Mr. Sensing calls attention to the action of the United States Supreme Court in deciding cases on psychological and sociological grounds rather than according to law and the Federal Constitution.

For approximately 6 years I have been pointing out in speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives, and elsewhere, that the United States Supreme Court has been following a course of usurping legislative functions which the Court does not possess.

Whenever any one of the three separate and independent departments of our Government attempts to usurp the functions of another department, such attempted usurpation is a direct threat to the existence of our Government.

The public generally are becoming aware of the fact that the Supreme Court has for a number of years been overstepping its bounds, and that the nine men filling the positions of Justices of the Supreme Court have been palming off their own individual sociological views upon the people as being the law of the land. Such conduct is reprehensible in the extreme. It is a fraud upon the public. It is bound to have the effect of bringing about loss of respect for law and loss of respect for the Court.

The article by Mr. Sensing which I refer to is as follows:

THE DECADENCE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Our Government is a government of checks and balances, with three main divisions—legislative, executive, and judicial.

All three divisions have traditionally been held of equal rank. All three divisions should have the respect of the people.

In order to have this respect, of course, it must be deserved. Tragically enough, it is now beginning to look to many people as if one of these branches, the judicial, no longer deserves this respect. That is, so far as the United States Supreme Court is concerned.

This is tragic, because when the United States Supreme Court—traditionally held in highest esteem, and the court of last resort—loses the respect of the people, then our form of government has suffered a body blow.

Yet two of our distinguished southern Senators in recent days have made speeches which tend to show that the members of the Supreme Court are not qualified to hold their present high positions and that at least one major ruling substantiates this charge.

Speaking before the Harvard Law Club in New York City, Senator EAVIN, of North Carolina, emphasized the decadence of the Supreme Court by pointing out that only 2 of the 9 members of the Court as it is now constituted ever served as an appellate judge on any Federal court inferior to the Supreme Court before he was elevated to his present office; that, moreover, few of them have devoted their major efforts to the actual practice of law. In other words, they do not have the judicial training and temperament necessary for Supreme Court judges.

Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, pointed out that the Supreme Court's ruling on segregation was admittedly based on the opinions of psychological and sociological authorities rather than on legal precedents and the Constitution. He further pointed out in detail, naming them one by one, that most of these authorities had at one time or another been extremely active in Communist-front organizations, so cited by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

If the members of the United States Supreme Court are not qualified to hold their jobs, as evidenced by the fact that their decisions are based on other than respectable judicial authority, then they should be removed from office—just as would be the case in the other two branches of Government.

The implications to the future welfare of the Nation, as contained in the charges made in these two speeches, are even more serious than the problem of segregation itself.

Budget Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article entitled "Budget Reform," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of July 12, 1955.

This article is concerned with the extremely important topic of congressional control of Federal expenditures and deserves the close attention of the Congress:

BUDGET REFORM: NEED FOR IT IS APPARENT IN CONGRESS BUT OUTLOOK FOR ACTION STAYS UNCERTAIN

(By Joseph E. Evans)

Everybody—or, anyway, most everybody in Congress—talks about the Federal budget, but nobody does anything about it. Lately there has been a fresh spate of proposals for reforming, if not necessarily balancing, the books of the world's biggest business. But the outlook for action remains uncertain.

Whence the need for reform? Aside from the budget's chronic imbalance, several things are wrong with the way it is put together, and these, in turn, make the budget harder to balance. Procedures have developed over the years which nicely suit the reluctance of administrations and Congresses either to cut Federal spending deeply enough or to raise enough revenue to cover expenditures.

Take, for example, the way appropriation bills are handled. When Congress completes work on a bill covering a particular agency, like the Defense Department, or a group of agencies, the bill is sent to the White House and Congress works on other money measures. Money is thus appropriated for one purpose without regard to how much will be appropriated for some other purpose or for all purposes together and without regard to revenue. This disorderly practice is obviously no help in balancing the budget.

The Treasury recently suggested changing this procedure. Under its plan, Congress would continue to work on appropriation bills piecemeal, but no bill would be sent to the White House before all were ready to go. And before the batch was dispatched. Congress would review it as a whole with an eye to cutting the total appropriations.

CONGRESSIONAL COMPLAINTS

Some Members of Congress complained that this idea was unwieldy and it would not necessarily result in economies since there is no guarantee that Congress would reduce appropriations simply because it had a chance to look at them all together in one place. Beside, they said, the proposal is somewhat irrelevant, because what determines whether or not the budget is balanced is not the level of appropriations in one fiscal year, but that year's actual spending in relation to the actual tax take.

These objections unquestionably have some merit. But even if the Treasury proposal did not produce significant savings, it would be a more systematic way of doing things than the present way, and it would give Congress a greater degree of control over the budget than it now has, whether or not Congress chose to exercise that control.

One of the objections raised to this plan highlights a more basic fault in budget procedure. That is the fact that accumulated appropriations customarily exceed actual spending in a given year. How come the two do not coincide?

The answer which has found favor in recent years is that you cannot go out and buy aircraft carriers and B–52's as you would a lamp at a furniture store. It may take 2 or 3 years before they are completed and delivered—at which time they are paid for. Before the contracting can be done, it's argued, the money must be available. So Congress regularly appropriates huge sums that will not be paid out until later years.

The Hoover Commission, in one of its reports, found this argument dubious. It

recommended rescinding the so-called carryover of appropriated but unspent funds—a carryover which amounted to some $81 billion when the Eisenhower administration came to office and is now reckoned at around $54 billion. Under the Hoover plan, contracting would be done as now, but as a rule only the money needed to pay for deliveries and other bills falling due in the fiscal year in question would be appropriated.

Again, some of the consequences in terms of economizing may be debatable. Congress, for example, would be unlikely to refuse the Defense Department the money needed now to pay for an aircraft carrier it ordered 2 years ago. Still, the Hoover proposal could create more pressure for economy than now exists.

INVITATION TO EXTRAVAGANCE

All programs are now annually reviewed, but in the case of carryover projects the money is already appropriated, so there is little incentive to take it back. Nor is there much incentive for agencies, with vast sums at their disposal—the foreign aid carryover alone exceeds $8 billion—to be especially thrifty. Under the Hoover plan, the programs would not only have to be reviewed; their advocates would have to justify them all over again before they could get the money for them. Even without spectacular economies, the proposal would be one more step toward enhancing Congress' control over the budget.

Another idea for increasing the lawmakers' control is to set up what would in effect be a budget bureau under Congress. This special staff would work with the executive branch's Bureau of the Budget throughout the long and arduous process of budget construction, a process which takes a good part of the year every year. The idea is not new, but Representative CANNON, of Missouri, the Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, recently carried it further—perhaps a little too far. He suggested that the Executive's Budget Bureau be abolished and replaced by a congressional bureau.

At the same time Mr. CANNON made another proposal which raises perhaps the most curious question of all. That is the simple fact that nowhere is there a requirement, or even a tacit understanding, that the budget shall be balanced as a general rule. Individuals and companies are under severe economic pressure to strive for balanced budgets or, better, for surpluses, if not every year, at least over a period of years.

The Government is under no such presure; in fact, the political pressure is the other way. And yet there is nothing to compensate for this lack of incentive. Mr. CANNON's remedy is to have Congress require the White House to submit a balanced budget every year. Any such device would, it seems, have to be modified; it probably would not be feasible to prosecute a major war, for example, under this requirement.

EXCEPTIONS FOR CONVENIENCE

The danger of excessive rigidity, however, is a drawback more apparent than real. Congress, which made the rule, could make exceptions to it when it thought necessary. The real drawback, indeed, is precisely the likelihood that Congress would make exceptions whenever convenient, rather than whenever strictly necessary. We have just seen this principle in operation in a related matter; Congress approved an extension of the $6 billion increase in the statutory debt limit voted a year ago for 1 year only.

That, of course, is a difficulty with all the budget reform proposals. They might in practice tend to become rubber rules. Even so, they would be far from futile. They would, for one thing, remedy evident defects and give the Government a sounder fiscal set-up. And each in its way would make it that much harder for officials and lawmakers to be casual with the people's money.

The 110th Infantry Regiment, 28th Infantry Division, Pennsylvania National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief history of the 110th Infantry of Pennsylvania's 28th Division, presently commanded by Col. William A. Boesman, which appeared in the recent issue of the Pennsylvania Guardsman.

We are now considering the Reserve components in our national defense, and I feel that the sketchy history of the 110th Infantry will give all of us a better understanding of what some of these old outfits have done.

In order to keep the article within the limits for insertion in the Appendix, certain portions of the article have been delted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTING THE 110TH INFANTRY REGIMENT, 28TH INFANTRY DIVISION, PENNSYLVANIA NATIONAL GUARD

Few organizations have enjoyed the distinguished career of the 110th Infantry. Located in the southwestern part of Pennsylvania, for more than three-quarters of a century, it has called to its ranks the best of all classes of the sturdy people of that celebrated section. Organized shortly after the Civil War, it interested many brilliant veterans of that mighty conflict, and it is, in fact, a combination and a continuation of several historical organizations recruited from the district, organizations whose exploits fill many of the glorious pages of the history of the terrible days of the sixties.

Organized as the 10th Regiment Infantry on November 28, 1873, it stemmed from independent units of the 17th Division, Pennsylvania National Guard, organized in 1869.

Its original units, distinctively named during that early period, were known and lettered as follows: Light Guards, Monongahela City, as Company A; Mount Pleasant Rifles, Mount Pleasant, as Company B; Westmoreland Guards, Greensburg, as Company C; Livermore Rangers, Livermore, as Company D; Washington Blues, North Washington, as Company E; Keystone Guards, Monongahela City, as Company F; Coulter Guards, McLaughlinsville, as Company G; Washington Guards, Washington, as Company H; Gallagher Grays, Latrobe, as Company I.

The first commander of the regiment was Col. John A. Black, who ranked from December 19, 1873. Maj. D. D. Lloyd was the first major, and ranked from the same time.

On January 15, 1874, upon petitions of citizens of Waynesburg, previously favorably considered, the Waynesburg Blues was mustered as a part of the regiment as Company K. Later, in the same year, the 10th was detached from the 17th Division covering the counties of Westmoreland, Washington, Greene, Fayette, and Somerset.

At the beginning of the Spanish-American War the regiment was located as follows: Headquarters at Washington, Pa.; Company A at Monongahela City; Company B at New Brighton; Company C at Uniontown; Company D at Connellsville; Company E at Mt. Pleasant; Company H at Washington; Company I at Greensburg; and Company K at Waynesburg.

On April 27, 1898, the regiment entrained at Pittsburgh and traveled to Mt. Gretna for service in the war with Spain. Each company had a peacetime strength of 60 men. It was ordered to raise the number of men to 75 for each company. These men were secured by recruiting conducted in the respective units' home towns. The entire regiment was mustered into the United States service on May 11 and 12, 1898.

On May 17, 1898, a telegram from the Adjutant General at Washington, D. C., directed the movement of the 10th to camp at Chickamauga Park, Ga., where it would be part of the Army to invade Spanish soil.

The regiment, about 3,500 men, stepped on foreign soil at Paranaque, which is about 6 miles from Malate, a suburb of the city of Manila, Philippine Islands, on July 21, 1898.

The night of July 31, 1898 found the 10th to be the first American troops to encounter enemy fire in the Spanish-American War. In this first battle, the regiment lost 9 killed and about 40 wounded. After this battle the regiment was called the "Fighting Tenth" and retained the name until this very day.

A very commendatory order was issued and General Greene stated to the regimental commander: "The conduct of your troops has been so gallant that, when the final advance is made on Manila, your 10th Regiment shall have the position of honor."

It is well to note that a Pvt. Edward Martin served at this time in the 10th Regiment Infantry.

Pages can be written about this terrific regiment and its valorous service in the Philippines. The archives of history note the caliber and heroism of the fighting breed of soldiers sired on Pennsylvania soil. A monument erected in Schenley Park, Pittsburgh, stands today in everlasting tribute to the memory of the members of the 10th Regiment who lost their lives in the Spanish-American War.

On Friday, June 23, 1916, the various units of the 10th entrained at home stations for Mt. Gretna for service along the Mexican border. One battalion of the regiment was selected for duty in what is known as Big Bend County. The 3d Battalion under Maj. Henry W. Coulter was designated for this duty. The regiment returned from the Mexican border on October 5, 1916.

On Sunday, July 15, 1917, the various companies of the "10th" were directed to mobilize at their home stations for the war with Germany, and on August 5, 1917, the units were integrated into Federal service.

The regiment, when called in July, 1917, had about 1,900 officers and men. The officers had been carefully selected and trained and the men came from the best stock of southwestern Pennsylvania.

Richard Coulter, of Greensburg, commander of the Fighting Tenth, was made a brigadier general on August 5, 1917. The other field officers were as follows: Lt. Col. Henry W. Coulter, Greensburg; Maj. Edward Martin, Waynesburg; Maj. Joseph H. Thompson, Beaver Falls; and Maj. Thomas Anderson, Latrobe.

The Tenth became the base regiment of the 110th Infantry in World War I.

Col. George E. Kemp, of Philadelphia, father of Brig. Gen. Arthur D. Kemp, present assistant division commander of the 28th Infantry Division, was the first commander of the 110th Infantry. The companies of the old Tenth that were integrated into the new regiment were from Monongahela City, New Brighton, Somerset, Connellsville, Mount Pleasant, Indiana, Hollidaysburg, Washington, Greenburg, Blairsville, Latrobe, and Beaver Falls.

The exceptional training and high discipline of the organization, when it landed

in France, was largely due to the work of its fine officers and men under the command of Lt. Col. Henry Coulter.

The regiment became a combination of the old Fighting Tenth and the old Third, of Philadelphia, and in time, this fusion forged the regiment into one of the finest fighting teams braving the allied cause in Europe.

The 110th was assigned to units of the British 25th Northumberland Fusiliers for training purposes in France. The English division had been badly cut up in the German drive during March 1918, but had many high class officers and men left who were used as instructors. These war-experienced Britishers faithfully worked in assisting the 110th in grasping the new methods of war.

On the morning of July 4, 1918, orders were received by Major Martin, who was in command of the regiment, Colonel Kemp being in command of the brigade and Colonel Coulter in observation with the French, to move the organization to the second line trenches, as it was feared the Huns would start a new drive on Paris.

On July 6, 1918, the 110th Infantry Regiment engaged the enemy, for the first time in the trenches south of Cond'e-en-Brie and west of Artonges-Cond' road and known as the Confremaus sector.

The Boche attack began in strength about midnight of July 14–15. Companies B and C were sent to the Marne River to strengthen the French lines. These organizations were both badly cut up and took an important part in this great engagement, one of the many yet to come.

French towns and villages with names of Pargny, St. Agnan, Savigny, Courthiezy, Dormans, La Canairderie Farms, Mezy, Courmont and dozen others were consecrated with the blood of these fighting Pennsylvanians who so valiantly died on the fields of battle. Names of Americans all, who, by their sacrifice steeped the 110th in glorious fame in the annals of American history. Fetzer, Anderson, Braddock, Rowan, Jackson, Laird, Feldman, Adkins, Antonelli, Belko, Christoperson, Coccaro, Curry, Jaram, Kelly, Kurtz, Lundquist, Nelson, O'Neill, Potter, Ritter, Rohr, Struck, Vail, Wilson, Wnorovsky, Zimmerman and Zallewski. Seven hundred and sixty hero dead in all is the terrific sacrifice paid by the hearty Pennsylvanians in the service of their country in World War I.

Hundreds of the old "Fighting Tenth" were awarded high honors for conspicious gallantry in action in World War I. Lt. Col. Joseph Thompson was awarded the Congresional Medal of Honor; Col. EDWARD MARTIN, now United States Senator MARTIN, was among those who received the coveted Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster, so was Capt. E. J. Stackpole, Jr., now General Stackpole, publisher of the Pennsylvania Guardsman. Sgt. Eugene B. Cassidy, Sgt. John Dean, Cpl. George Ogden, Pvt. Henry Hacker and scores of others.

World War I casualties of the 110th Regiment were 4,183, or 112 percent.

The 110th was mustered out of service in May 1919 and was reorganized as 10th Infantry, Pennsylvania National Guard, in October of that year.

The fourth Federal call of this famous military regiment came in February 1941, when the 110th was ordered to Indiantown Gap for training with the Keystone Division again under command of Maj. Gen. Edward Martin. After 2½ years of Stateside service and 9 months in Britain, the 110th landed on Normandy beaches amid 1st Army's feverish preparations for the deep thrust from the beachhead.

On August 4, 1944, the 110th Infantry Regiment, the Fighting Tenth of Philippine Insurrection fame, struck into the forests of St. Sever with a 10-mile stab to the west. Continuing south the 110th passed west of Sourdeval. Another thrust of 10 miles on August 14 gained the corps' final objectives east of the Egreene River next day.

[I have deleted some very interesting description of the fighting of this regiment in World War II.]

Gen. George C. Marshall visited the 28th Division CP on October 11 north of Elsenborn, Belgium, and praised the Keystoners' combat record. "You are doing excellent work over here," he said, "and people back home are aware of it."

For General Marshall, this visit to the 28th marked the return to his old outfit. As a lieutenant, the general had served in the 110th in 1906–7.

The last move marked more than 7 months of combat for the 110th Infantry Regiment in Europe and World War II. Success of the regiment was the result of every man in every unit, organic or attached.

This great infantry regiment, borne in the hills and mountains of southwestern Pennsylvania lost approximately 2,700 men in 3 days of fighting in the Battle of the Bulge, but it inflicted a fearful toll of dead upon a numerically superior German enemy.

The fifth tour of duty for the 110th Infantry Regiment began on September 5, 1950, when it was summoned to Camp Atterbury with the 28th Division (commanded by Maj. Gen. Daniel B. Strickler) and subsequently, the NATO forces in Europe. It departed for Europe under the command of Col. Henry K. Fluck, present commanding general, 28th Infantry Division, Pennsylvania National Guard.

While on its tour of duty in Germany, it disclosed to the world its potential aggressiveness and fighting spirit that made it famous throughout 75 years of creditable service to commonwealth and Nation. German towns like Goeppingen, Gablingen, Mannheim, Hohenfels, Augsburg, and scores of others witnessed a valiant fighting team of youthful Americans serving warning to the curtained nations that anytime, anywhere, at any odds, here was the dreadnaught of freemen ready to uphold the rights of freedom-loving peoples against the tyranny of aggressors.

Although this record of the famous "110th" is but a scratch on the surface, it tends to acquaint other Pennsylvania guardsmen with the proud service rendered by this regiment in peace and in war. From the womb of its ranks many great leaders were born. Black, Hawkins, Barnett, Coulter, Kemp, Martin, Thompson, Winship, Kinnisson, Strickler, Fluck. And tomorrow will come more * * * sturdy western Pennsylvanians proud to serve and proud to die for the "Fighting Tenth" * * * true to the motto of this glorious force: "The devotion of each is the strength of the regiment."

The Republicans and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "The Republicans and Prosperity" which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 12, 1955:

THE REPUBLICANS AND PROSPERITY

It is news when a prominent Democrat comes out with a declaration that the President may be in a stronger position in 1956 even than he is in today. Yet such is the view of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. The Senator sees no prospect that economic conditions will worsen; he recognizes the fact that more people are employed today than ever before in our history, and altogether finds in the economic upswing a strong bulwark to the Republican cause.

The Senator's statement is important not only because of what it means for 1956; in a deeper way it is important because it reflects a change in some basic American suppositions. For 20 years the Democratic Party has been pictured as the party of welfare for the average man. The Republicans, by every device of propaganda and myth making, have been associated with economic hardship and depression. Such distortions can be a long time a-dying; and it has required a period of prosperity as sustained, as spectacular, and as widespread as the present one to make the truth apparent, apparent even to Democrats.

The Vice President, Mr. NIXON, was making a speech the other day to the national convention of Young Republicans in Detroit; there he helped pound home the theme which needs to be made incontestable by the next elections. In 1948, Mr. NIXON pointed out, Harry Truman was elected on the issue, "You never had it so good." Well, perhaps. But people have had it a great deal better since. The average weekly wage for factory workers with three dependents was $52 in 1948. Today that same factory worker is earning $70 a week—an increase of 35 percent.

Mr. NIXON continued with the statement that "there were fewer strikes and less time lost through strikes in 1954 than at any time since World War II." He added that, "Wage increases in 1954 provided more of a gain in real wages than any other postwar year, for they were almost entirely over the amount needed to compensate for the rise in the cost of living." These two statements are of interest not only in themselves but because of their source. They both come, Mr. NIXON pointed out, from the February 1955 issue of the monthly research report of the American Federation of Labor.

The congressional campaigns of 1954 caught the Republicans somewhat off guard on the economic issue. The economy then showed some spotty unemployment, and the Democrats did their best to make this look like a general decline. What was basically clear has now been demonstrated beyond any possibility of doubt: the 1954 adjustment was but a step upon an upward path. The Republican administration of President Eisenhower had succeeded, as no administration had succeeded in the present century, in bringing the country out of war, through readjustment and into peace without any real setback. It is an achievement which economists will long want to study and which the voters will surely remember.

By 1956 the identification of Republicanism with prosperity—prosperity soundly based and touching the whole people—should be complete. Senator HUMPHREY indicates that this will make the Republican Party hard to beat. He is certainly right, and he deserves credit for his readiness to discern and admit the facts.

Wisconsin State Legislature Urges Early Action on H. R. 600

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, since January 29, 1953, I have been urging the

construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital at Wood, Wis. This proposal is contained in H. R. 600, 84th Congress, which is presently pending before the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

On a number of earlier occasions, I had in detail described the antiquated and obsolete facilities at our Veterans Administration Center, Wood, Wis., and stressed the urgent need for the construction of a new hospital at that vicinity. The proposal contained in H. R. 600 has been heartily endorsed and supported by various veterans', civic, and other clubs in the State of Wisconsin, and by a number of individuals in our State.

At this time, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body a joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Legislature. This resolution memorializes Congress to provide for the construction of a new veterans hospital at Wood, Wis., through favorable action on H. R. 600.

It is my earnest hope that this legislation will receive prompt and favorable consideration. I shall continue to exert every effort to this end.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution 73, A

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to provide for construction of a new veterans hospital at Wood, Wis.

Whereas the present Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary facilities at Wood, Wis., includes 35 buildings built between 1867 and 1899, constituting more than one-half of the entire floor space; and

Whereas these old buildings are obsolete, unsafe and in constant need of repair and modernization; and

Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill (H. R. 600) which would provide for (1) construction of a new VA general hospital at Wood; (2) conversion of present hospital buildings into domiciliary facilities; and (3) abandonment of the antiquated and unsafe domiciliary buildings presently being used to house some of the 1,661 elder and disabled veterans living at Wood; and

Whereas only 2 of 14 urgently needed improvement projects for the veterans facility at Wood have ben programed for the fiscal year 1956 and 1957 by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas it appears that plans for improvement and major maintenance at Wood are delaped because of the possibility of the construction of a new replacement hospital; and

Whereas the construction of a hospital as provided in bill H. R. 600 would obviate the need for piecemeal patching up of the antiquated buildings at Wood; and

Whereas bill H. R. 600 has been referred to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, which has asked the Veterans Administration to submit its recommendations on the bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorialize the Congress of the United States to act favorably on bill H. R. 600 in order to provide facilities which veterans urgently need and deserve; and be it further

Resolved, That the Veterans Administration and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee are earnestly requested to recommend passage of bill H. R. 600; and be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each house of the Congress, to each Wisconsin Member thereof, to Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Harvey Higley, Veterans' Administrator, and to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

M. P. KNOWLES,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
MARK CATLIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

The Strengths and Weaknesses of Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week it was my privilege to address the Seventh Annual Foreign Policy Conference sponsored by Colgate University, at Hamilton, N. Y. The conference had gained national and international fame and reputation for its deliberations and discussions in the fields of international relations and American foreign policy.

I considered it a high privilege and honor to be asked to participate in the conference. The subject matter assigned to me as a topic for discussion was the strengths and weaknesses of our foreign policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the Colgate University seventh annual foreign policy conference, July 11, 1955)

It is a singular honor to be a participant in the seventh annual conference on American foreign policy sponsored by Colgate University. I extend my personal thanks and heartiest congratulations to Dr. Everett Case, president of Colgate University, and to Dr. Charles R. Wilson, director of the Colgate Conference on American Foreign Policy. The general theme of the conference, "The Strengths and Weaknesses of our Foreign Pollicy," reveals that we Americans do realize that our foreign policy does have areas of weakness and also areas of strength. The theme of the conference sets the pattern for our deliberations. The motto of this conference as indicated on your brochure is equally pertinent, "Foreign Policy Is Everybody's Business."

Never were truer words written or spoken. Our very survival, our hope of a better future, the continuance or defeat of the principles of freedom and justice are intimately related to our foreign policy.

Permit me to digress for a moment, however. This term "foreign policy" has always disturbed me. The word "foreign" has a negative meaning. It indicates something apart, different, unusual. I suggest that our relationships with other nations are no longer something apart from our everyday life. Nor should these relationships be different from our domestic policy. I prefer to recognize our relationships with other nations as an international policy, a policy of interdependence rather than a foreign policy. Just to show how strongly I support this contention, I have introduced a resolution in the Senate to change the name of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Committee on International Relations. Foreign policy seems to suggest the 19th century, the era of colonialism and imperialism. International policy speaks of the 20th century. It has its roots in the United Nations, in a spirit of interdependence without sacrificing national independence.

Now that I have pleased myself by talking about my pet peeve, let me proceed with some observations on the general theme of the conference.

The greatest challenge of our time is to recognize the kind of world in which we live, and to profit and learn from the lessons of history—a world in revolutionary change.

We here in America have learned that peoples of different backgrounds, races, national origins, and creeds can live together, work together, and build together. This achievement was made possible by a belief in and dedication to the universally accepted principles of a free society—the dignity of man, freedom of conscience, and a recognition of fraternity and brotherhood. Our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the principles of the French Revolution and the Magna Charta are the historical testimonials to the practical adaptation of these democratic ideals and principles. If it is possible to build a great nation whose destiny and progress is guided by these ideals, it should give us faith and hope that we are capable of doing our part in building a world order that will not sacrifice these principles and the institutions of freedom and justice.

Our history, our heritage and experience in self-government, yes, our own revolution, are in fact the sources of our strength. Our foreign policy is weakened and limited only insofar as we forget or fail to apply the yardstick of our democratic experience to the complex and intricate problems of the world in which we live. The enchancement of freedom is not made possible by aping the enemies of freedom. Democracy and free institutions are not made more secure or advanced by utilizing totalitarian techniques. To be strong we must be true to ourselves.

Now having philosophized with you for a few moments, let me get down to the particulars. In the main, I am proud of what our country has done in the field of international relations.

Fortunately, we have learned that national independence can be sustained and made meaningful only by a recognition of international interdependence. It took us two world wars and a worldwide depression to have this fact driven home.

It is to our credit, however, that we have learned our lesson and to our sorrow that we have had to pay so dearly for this belated knowledge. Today the climate of public opinion in America is one of acceptance of international responsibility. Isolationism is a thing of the past. The acceptance of our role in the affairs of the world is the most prominent political fact of our generation.

The crowning glory of the 20th century is the creation of the United Nations. We can be ever proud of our leading role in this greatest of all achievements in the realm of international politics. Once the victory on the battlefield was won, we did not turn our backs upon a war-weary and stricken world. Our finest hour was yet to come. We mobilized our resources to help the needy, to feed the hungry, to heel the sick, to rebuild the devastated cities, to help others reconstitute free government, to reestablish commerce and trade, to rehabilitate the exhausted economies of friend and foe alike. Here was the true expression of the spirit of American democracy. Here was a practical blending between applied democratic policy and the spirit of our religious teachings. Here was compassion and charity, here was forgiveness and kindliness, here was the full expression of American generosity and faith.

I have little time for those who are critical of the details—the little mistakes—when great decisions had to be made. Of course we made mistakes. We were neither prepared by experience or knowledge to undertake all the responsibilities that befell us. We recruited people from all walks of life to administer these huge programs of relief and economic rehabilitation. It was a difficult assignment just to find the people, much less to find people competent and trained for the task. We Americans had been so absorbed with the challenges of American political and economic life that we were not prepared, either psychologically or professionally, for international administration or participation, but we did the best we could.

We worked with what we had. We compensated for our lack of expert knowledge and training with a will to succeed, an abundance of resources, and a spirit of compassion and generosity. The strength of our foreign policy in this period was the strength of a good heart and a willing spirit. It was the strength of practicing our ideals. It was the strength of doing when something needed to be done. It was the strength of action when those of lesser courage might have hesitated.

Nor should we forget or underestimate the incredible accomplishment of creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—the most successful and the greatest alliance in the world's history. We did not content ourselves merely with a paper structure. We set ourselves to the task of building muscle and sinew around the structural anatomy of a collective security pact. The programs of military assistance, the Marshall plan, and mutual security gave spirit and strength to nations that only yesterday were weak and helpless. The Marshall plan will live in the pages of history as the most successful program of economic rehabilitation and recovery of recorded history. Not only was it great and imaginative in its design and purpose, but it has been equally great in its accomplishment.

I wonder sometimes if we have forgotten the terrible destruction of World War II. Not only were things ruined and demolished, but human spirit was almost destroyed. Established social patterns were uprooted, millions of people were wandering on the roads, dying in prisons and concentration camps. All of this was but only yesterday. Fear and frustration stalked the land. The political and economic climate was ripe for demagogues, dictators, and opportunists. The forces of communism moved in, backed by the power of the Red Army. It was this unhappy event that compounded the problems and difficulties which faced mankind after this most hideous of all terrible wars. It was almost beyond human capacity to rebuild a war-

weary world. But to this awful burden was added the even more intolerable burden of resisting and defeating the inroads of Communist imperialism and subversion. It is nothing short of a miracle that the areas of human freedom are as great as they are.

Again, not because of plan or design, but simply because we were the only nation with the resources and the strength, we were compelled to meet and challenge this evil force. Here again we were not prepared by experience or expert knowledge. But we did not shirk from the ordeal. We moved into action. It was here that NATO played such a significant role, because supporting Communist subversion was the power of the Red Army. The Marshall plan met the Communist aggressor on the economic front. In both areas we checkmated the Communist conspiracy. The Red Army did not move. The Western European economies did not fall prey to collectivism and communism. Germany did not fall into the hands of the Kremlin. Berlin was not strangled into submission. Soviet troops were removed from Iran. The Mediterranean area did not become a Soviet lake. Greece and Turkey were not destroyed by Communist subversion and armed attack. The Truman Doctrine, backed by the Greek-Turkish aid program, filled the power vacuum that was left by the withdrawal of British strength from the Mediterranean. Men like Mayor Reuter, of Berlin, Chancellor Adenauer, of West Germany, supported by American aid, defied the Communists and brought Germany and Berlin safely through the Communist onslaught.

These developments represent the strength of American foreign policy, but a strength that was always fortified by the wholehearted cooperation of our allies and associates in the great North Atlantic Treaty alliance.

Communist aggression and subversion checked in Western Europe moved to a new front and the attack was launched on South Korea.

The decision of our Government and of the United Nations to resist aggression in Korea may well be recorded in history as the turning point in the struggle against Communist totalitarianism. The design and plan of the Kremlin, thwarted in Western Europe, was now challenged and defeated on the battlefield in Korea. Collective security had met its first test and it succeeded. The free nations stood together.

I call to your attention the meeting of the Communist chieftians in Moscow in September and October of 1952. It was here that Joseph Stalin outlined the change of Soviet tactics and strategy. The program of open violence and aggression was to be replaced by a policy of political maneuver, economic warfare, stepped-up subversion, and dividing the United States from her allies. I recommend to the attention of every participant in this conference a careful study of the 19th Annual Communist Party Conference at Moscow in the fall of 1952. You will note that it was timed to take place during our presidential election. We were immersed in domestic politics. I regret to say that far too little attention was given to this important meeting by those presently responsible for our foreign policy.

The tipoff of the present Soviet peace offensive is to be found in the proceedings of this conference. Even Malenkov was unveiled at this meeting. General Zhukov came back into the limelight.

A weakness in our foreign policy is the failure on the part of Congress and appropriate committees of Congress to carefully study the strategy and tactics of Soviet foreign policy. We are always being caught off base, thereby placing us on the defensive. We seem to spend far too much time in counterattack rather than in planned programed political offensive. I have urged and recommended that a special subcommittee be appointed to maintain constant review and study in this field. Likewise, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, has sponsored a resolution to provide a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

The recent United Nations Commemorative Conference at San Francisco revealed the weaknesses and strengths of our foreign policy. Much that I have said here today was underscored and verified by the series of addresses delivered by U. N. delegates on the historic occasion of the commemorative conference. It was my privilege to attend these meetings. I digress to say I was the only Member of Congress to attend this conference. This fact within itself reveals a weakness in our foreign policy. Members of Congress should do more than issue statements on foreign policy. We must actively participate, whenever it is possible, in the meetings or conferences that lead to the discussion, review, or formulation of our foreign policy. If our foreign policy is everybody's business, then indeed it is above all the business of the Members of Congress.

I left the U. N. conference convinced that we had won our case against the Kremlin in the court of world public opinion. Even the hardbitten, disciplined Soviet delegates could not ignore the climate of political friendship and association of free nations. The address of Mr. Molotov was an unintentional testimonial to the solidarity of free nations. Every point that Mr. Molotov emphasized related directly to what we had or had not done. It was clear from his speech that NATO is successful, that the Soviet has given up in Western Europe. It was evident that our foreign policy this past decade has, in the main, been effective, particularly in those areas where we have an intimate knowledge and understanding of the political and economic forces.

The most significant observation to be made about the United Nations meeting was the unity of free nations despite all of the Soviet tactics to divide us and create distrust. You may recall that the address of Mr. Molotov was carefully analyzed and answered by our Secretary of State. Mr. Dulles did a good job in refuting Molotov's arguments. If I were to have judged these two addresses as a debate I am sure that Mr. Dulles would have won. But there is no reward in debate at this time. We have already won the argument, but we have not won the cold war. Regretfully, we have permitted ourselves to get bogged down in proving the fallacy and duplicity of Soviet pronouncements. We have won this argument, yes, won it over and over again. We win it in every United Nations session. It is one thing to prove the Soviets to be wrong, and yet another thing to prove ourselves to be right. The margin of clear-cut victory lies with the new, the underdeveloped, and the yet uncommitted nations. It is just in this area that the policy of the present administration is weak, confused, and at times petty.

Let me explain what I mean by relating this world struggle to the American political scene. You do not win elections by continuing to convince the convinced, or by discrediting an opponent already discredited. We in American politics understand it is the independent vote that determines the outcome. You gain that vote by standing on principle and coming forth with a program that has a wider appeal than just to the partisans you have already won. To put it another way, I have a feeling that we have become more concerned about the importance of exposing Soviet tactics than we have of expounding a dynamic and constructive American foreign policy.

One could not help but sense at the San Francisco United Nations Conference that people were looking to the United States to offer inspiration on a new level, to emphasize our positive goals for an honorable peace, and strengthening of underdeveloped areas—this was not done. The world is hungry for peace. The Soviet talks peace. They seem to sense world public opinion. To be sure, the Soviet is not able to convince the leaders of the nations that their program for peace is honorable and true. These leaders, however, are always subject to public opinion of their respective countries, and I noticed that Mr. Molotov again and again appealed over the governments to the people. He subtly intimated that the leaders of the Western nations were blocking Soviet efforts for peace. He attempted to drive a wedge between the governments and the people. He identified governments with the United States. He identified peoples with the Soviet Union. Soviet propaganda has never convinced delegates to the United Nations, but it has been effective in the villages, cities, and rural areas of countries that have delegates in the United Nations. The Soviet propaganda repeats the word "people" again and again, and regretfully the statements of our present diplomatic officials reveal that we are permitting our diplomacy to become the special privilege of the elite—of the diplomat—or even more unfortunate, sacrificing sound policy for domestic political advantage.

We must remember that there has always been and still continues to be a natural suspicion on the part of people everywhere over the so-called "art of diplomacy." Too many times in history of the world, people have been deceived by their diplomats. There have been too many secret agreements, too much duplicity, and Machiavellian expediency. The Soviet propagandists seem to sense this natural suspicion by people in free countries of their State Department and foreign ministries. Therefore, Mr. Molotov called upon the people to join with the Soviet in seeking peace—peace on Soviet terms. Now let us not underestimate the impact of this carefully conceived strategy. It could very well be dangerously effective, particularly if we permit it to go unnoticed or unchallenged. You do not successfully challenge this political strategy by merely pointing out that it is a fraud. More needs to be done. Surely the representatives of democratic republics and free nations should be the first to appeal to the people, to take their case to the people, to interpret their policy in language the people can understand.

Governments come and go, but the people go on forever. A successful foreign policy is one that has the support of the people back home as well as the acceptance of the people abroad to whom it is directed. A weakness in our foreign policy is that too much attention is paid to the embassies and the foreign ministries and too little attention to the workers in the factories, to the natives in the villages. How paradoxical this is.

Here we see the ironical situation of the dictators speaking like democrats, with a small "d," appealing to the people; of the tyrant extolling the virtues of freedom; of the oppressor dramatizing himself as the liberator and the emancipator. Yes, the irony of an imperialist extolling the virtues of self-determination. In our anxiety to win the debate point by point, to discredit our opponent on each and every occasion, we sacrifice the affirmative case that we need to make.

To be sure, this is not always the case. The President's proposal of use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is an example of what I mean by accentuating the positive and stating the affirmative case. Whenever we have done this we have been on the march to victory. The Marshall plan is another example where we literally ignored the arguments of the Kremlin and proceeded with our own program. NATO again provides a concrete example of action. The point 4 program is another example where a positive and constructive proposal left the Commu-

nists bewildered, confused, and weakened. We have examples of seizing the initiative, but all too often once we have seized it and are parading down the boulevard of a better world, we lose our trail and end up in a side street or back alley of bitter argument with the Communist protagonist. There has been far too much "playing to the domestic political galleries" for purposes of partisan political expediency. Too much doubletalk—a policy for home consumption and another for foreign use. What is worse, this doubletalk has come from the State Department.

Within a few days the leaders of the four great powers will be meeting in Geneva. Surely this is the most significant meeting of recent years. People everywhere are hoping and praying that this important meeting will lead to a just and enduring peace. As could be expected, there are those who feel that this meeting by itself may well solve the problems that beset the world. There are others who look upon it as a fruitless and hopeless effort. I am sure that we should all agree that somewhere in between these two extremes lies the practical possibility.

I think we would all be misguided if we expected sudden and spectacular results. The cold war has been very cold a long time and it is going to take more than a brief ray of sunshine to thaw it out. But the fact that there is a meeting is a good sign. If it does nothing else but to cause us to reexamine or reevaluate every facet of our foreign policy, it will be well worth the effort.

We may very well have to shift the emphasis in our foreign policy in the days to come. I am personally convinced that the Soviet Union has given up any hope of any further success in Europe. She may well seek to stabilize Europe even to the point of cooperating in the reunification of Germany and granting her satellite states a degree of independence and autonomy. We have no accurate way of knowing how much trouble, economically or politically, exists within the Iron Curtain area. We do know that all is not well. We do know that if the burden of rearmament is heavy upon rich America, it rests much heavier upon the much weaker Soviet economy. Remember it costs money to build guns, tanks, and planes in the Soviet just as it does here.

I am always shocked and disappointed when I hear spokesmen of American finance and industry expound upon the fear of bankruptcy for our country if we maintain a strong defense program. They show little faith in free political and economic institutions, or possibly they reveal gross ignorance of what the burden of such a rearmament race is upon a relatively poor and collectivized economy.

Then I imagine it is fair to assume that all has not been well in the satellite countries. They were impoverished and destroyed by the war, as were huge areas of the Soviet Union itself. Add to this, the costs of the Korean war to the Soviet, her aid to China, the admitted deficiencies of Soviet agriculture, the difficult task of rebuilding the areas destroyed by World War II, and it seems reasonable to say that there is and has been trouble behind the Iron Curtain.

But it would be equally wrong to assume that economic difficulties alone would prevent the Soviet from being an aggressor or engaging in war. Possibly the most compelling factor, if there is only one, that has temporarily changed the Soviet attitude is the terrible reality of nuclear warfare. We now know that the Soviet military has a closer identity with the present regime than before. Possibly General Zhukov and some of his associates have been able to explain to the Soviet leaders what would happen if the United States and the Soviet Union were to engage in war. The awful potentialities of the hydrogen bomb, and the guided missile with hydrogen warheads cannot help but have an effect upon men who now hold power and position and wish to continue in that favored role.

There is more reason to believe that the men in the Kremlin want time to consolidate their empire, time to strengthen their economy, time to consolidate their position—a position which has been very unstable since the death of Stalin. Whatever may be the reason for the Soviet peace talk, there is ample evidence to lead one to believe that concessions will be made, that tensions, at least temporarily, will be eased, that there will be a period of time when the possibilities for peace look more inviting and encouraging.

The one word that seems important to me is time. But this concept of time is meaningless unless it is used, and the question is who will use the time and for what purpose. If there is to be a time period for easing of tensions, will this mean less effort on our part? Are we to assume that the long-range objective of communism—namely, to dominate the world—will be given up or set aside? I see no convincing evidence to lead to that conclusion. Therefore time is an ally to whomever preempts it—uses it. We can be sure the Bolsheviks will not waste it—whether we like it or not, coexistence will be competitive. We had better plan our future around this fact, and to announce the broad outlines of our design and program at the Geneva Conference—yes at every important conference.

It would be a mistake on our part to assume that the Soviet will attend the Geneva Conference in a position of weakness. It is an even greater mistake to publicly talk about this, as was done by the Secretary of State and then released to the press, and thereby to taunt and irritate the egocentric men in the Kremlin. The recent air show over Moscow should dispel any doubts as to the Soviet's weakness, at least in arms. We Americans are prone to underestimate the technical competence of the modern Soviet system. The record should be clear: The Soviet has made remarkable strides in technical and scientific advance. She emphasizes in her educational structure, science and technology. Every policy and every directive is concentrated on producing military strength. Civilian goods, the needs of the consumer, are subordinated to the production of capital goods and modern armaments. The police state is not responsive to public opinion as is a demoncratic state. We must never forget that dictatorship removes dissident elements through the cruel and heartless process of liquidation, murder, and banishment. Public demonstrations of protest are crushed, at the same time that the dictator arouses in the minds of the people a fear of foreign intervention, encirclement, or attack.

I say these things because even some of our own policymakers have, on occasion, indicated that there may be a split between the Russian people and the Communist Party. The people have nothing to say about the government of the Soviet. The Communist Party and the government are one and the same. They are political Siamese twins, but with only one head—the Communist Party apparatus.

It is wishful thinking to base a foreign policy upon any major upheaval in the Soviet Union, or even in the satellite states. What is more, when one such upheaval did take place, namely, the riots in East Germany and Czechoslovakia in June of 1953, we were unprepared, we had no policy. All the loose talk of liberation that was so much a part of the 1952 presidential campaign, was either forgotten or forsaken. We were without an Ambassador in the Soviet Union on the death of Stalin. Our Central Intelligence was unable to obtain any information that indicated the demotion of Malenkov and the elevation of Bulganin. We were short of facts and information, and therefore unprepared to make any policy shift that might have worked to our advantage.

Every conceivable effort should be made to expand our intelligence service to give us more information. We were caught short even at the time of the North Korean invasion, despite the fact that our own military had been in North Korea for at least 2 years prior to the agreement on the 38th parallel as a line of demarcation between North and South Korea.

Therefore, wishful thinking about the condition of the Soviet will get us nowhere. What is more important is to build strength and cooperation between ourselves and our allies. To use every means at our command to expand the area of freedom, to strengthen the independent and neutral nations so they can resist subversion from within and aggression from without. Yes, to be prepared for every eventuality, recognizing we face the most powerful and diabolical menace the world has ever known.

Having said this, what do we do? I offer these suggestions:

(1) Until some foolproof, ironclad universal system of disarmament can be arrived at and fully agreed to with proper supervision, or other protective devices, we must maintain in cooperation with our allies a powerful defense force. The heart and core of that defense force must be continuing and expanding emphasis upon research and development. This includes both basic and applied research. Here the present administration flounders and vacillates. Nor will slogans suffice—"bigger bang for a buck" does not mean greater defense.

I am not a military expert, but I do suggest that it should be a matter of firm national policy that this Nation have the greatest air force in the world—modern, available, combat effective. The Air Force, of course, must be supported by modern weapons. We cannot afford to be second-best, nor can we be satisfied with having the planes on the drafting board or the modern weapons at laboratory research stage of development. I am talking about a defense force in being. Whatever the cost of that defense force may be, we must be prepared to pay it.

I reemphasize the importance of scientific and technological development. This means giving our scientists greater leeway, being less suspicious, recognizing that scientists frequently are unorthodox in their social and political views. There is a wide difference between disloyalty and nonconformity. We must protect our Nation from disloyalty and subversion. But this does not necessarily mean discharging a scientist of foreign birth who maintains his citizenship in a country like Switzerland, who is a known anti-Communist. We need the intelligence and scientific know-how of freemen everywhere. Just as we have created a collective defense force in NATO, I suggest we build a collective scientific force among the free nations, pooling ideas and knowledge, and drawing from that common pool for the development of defense and the expansion and progress of the partners.

To summarize, in the kind of world in which we live, a protective shield of strength is the first essential of a program of security. That shield must never be lowered, that sword must never be sheathed, until all nations are willing to beat their swords into plowshares and make war no more.

(2) I have emphasized military strength, but I want it clear that military strength must be supported by a dynamic and expanding economy. Therefore, the relations between defense policy and domestic political and economic policy are one and inseparable. The margin of superiority that we now maintain over the Soviet and its satellites is not in arms, but in the reservoir of economic and political strength that is ever present in free nations. The shield of strength that I have

emphasized need not be brandished before friend and foe alike. It should be a shield, consistently maintained and quietly regarded.

I suppose Teddy Roosevelt put it in the layman's language when he said, "Speak softly and carry the big stick." Regretfully, we have spoken loudly—very loudly—and the big stick that supposedly we were carrying wasn't nearly as big as we thought it was, and most of the time not available.

We have frightened our friends more than we have our foes by irresponsible talk. Too frequently public officials have talked of dropping bombs to solve different international situations. These A-bombs do not solve problems—they just dissolve things and people. Politically designed speeches, incorporating clever catch phrases, such as "massive retaliation," "agonizing reappraisal," "New Look," may make good headlines for an emotional public, but they do not make good policy, nor do they provide even stronge defense. I suggest we get on with the business of building a security force second to none, and quit bragging, threatening, and boasting. Actually, if the present administration would be more frank and open about our state of preparedness—and less addicted to official secrecy and censorship, it would have a sobering effect on both the Congress and the public. Censorship compounded by propaganda is no substitute for freedom of information supported by facts.

Having once developed the kind of military security that is essential for the defense of free nations, let us remember that the ultimate answer to the problems that beset us is not to be found in war. Military strength in this day and age is but a part of the apparatus of diplomacy, unless mankind indulges in the madness of thermonuclear warfare. No one can predict what the future will offer if such a catastrophe befalls us. We must look upon military strength as a means, one of several means, to arrive at agreements, to participate in negotiations, yes, as the precarious road to the conference at the summit. This has been referred to as negotiation from a position of strength. But that position of strength needs to be more than military power. The position of strength that we need, and must maintain, encompasses the closest cooperation with our allies. We must speak in one spirit—in unity for common objectives.

The first principle of Soviet strategy is to divide us from our allies, to break up the grand alliance. To portray America as the real threat to the independence and self-determination of peoples and nations. Therefore, every conceivable effort must be made for a meeting of the minds, for a common understanding by the leaders of the nations of the free areas of the world. This requires patience along with respect for and confidence in our partners. We have allies, not satellites. We cannot bully and coerce. We can only seek to persuade and give counsel. But decisions arrived at through consultation and discussion are firm decisions—the privileged possession of all participants.

I also urge that we give special attention to the attitudes and policies of our Asian, African, and Latin American neighbors.

Negotiating from strength, therefore, means military power and political unity, based on mutual respect and confidence amongst the free nations.

If we are correct in assuming that the Soviet does not now seek war, but rather seeks time and the easing of tensions, then we must reexamine our policies in light of this development, without sacrificing the first two essentials—military strength and political unity.

Any step in the direction of relaxed tensions must be welcomed by us and we should lead in this effort, making it ever clear to the simplest soul in the far corners of the world that the Nation of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt is a nation of peace, of freedom, of compassion, and justice.

I have been disturbed because of the reluctance of some of our top officials to recognize the opportunity that was at hand once the plan of a Big Four conference crystallized. This is no time for timid souls. This is the time for men of imagination, courage, and daring. The peoples of the world are weary of the constant threat of nuclear war, and particularly when that threat keeps coming from us in the strident voices of small men. The peoples are looking for a clear and challenging political faith that will arouse them to self-determination and liberation from both political and social tyranny. The toxin of fear has run its course. A tired and suffering humanity seeks the nourishing food of applied idealism. This is to our advantage. We are not warriors in the strict interpretation of the word. Our history is traditionally one of an expanding democracy—the fulfillment of equality of opportunity, the relation of human equality of law in the social order, and the dedication to a rising standard of living for all. It is these very virtues that fit the present world scene.

It is time, therefore, that we walk confidently in the stature, strength, and competence that our history and our present circumstances verify. In a world that is desperately in need of capital, we have the greatest capital resources among all nations. In a world where people are anxious for the blessings of science and technology, we are richly endowed with these blessings. In a world where the majority of people are ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clad, we are privileged to have an abundance of food and fiber and the knowledge of scientific progress for health and shelter.

We have that intangible source of strength that was so brilliantly emphasized in the recent Bandung conference, the spiritual values of freedom, the history of a people that cast off the yoke of colonialism, the thrilling and inspiring story of a new Nation conceived in liberty, with a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Our leaders were far too pessimistic about the Bandung confeernce. Official statements indicated that the Asian-African conference might very well become a propaganda springboard for the forces of Communism in the Far East. We again underestimated the importance of this conference. Our Government hesitated to even send official greetings. We apparently underestimated the great reservoir of good will that still exists in Asia and Africa for the America—for the America that had given freedom to the Philippines and Cuba, for the America that has always championed the self-determination of peoples. It was spiritual values and political idealism—yes, the moral forces that have made our country great—that served as our ally, our defender in this unique and all important meeting of the Asian and African nations.

I know we Americans take all of this for granted, but it truly is the good news of the 20th century. Millions of people in Asia and Africa are repeating in their own way the dramatic story of American independence. They are doing what we did. We, above all people, should be understanding and sympathetic to their cause. There is an identity of interest, of purpose, and of history, if we will but see it and make ourselves a part of it. National independence, self-determination, liberation from colonialism—all of this we have experienced. This is our message to the world. This message, found in the Declaration of Independence, has given faith to millions of people seeking dignity in all corners of the globe. This message of faith in human brotherhood and in human equality is our reservoir of good will in the world. It was this message that found its way into every speech at Bandung, save that of Chou En-lai. It is the spiritual and political values that make our society what it is, that really topped the news in the Asian-African conference. America was respected not for her atom bombs or her wealth, but for her ideals and her history. We must be true to these.

To the extent that we have lost friends, we have done so because we have forgotten the message of human brotherhood and equality, or forgotten to preach and live that message.

The time is ready for us to dedicate our talents, our resources, to winning the cold war, not just stabilizing it.

Specifically, I suggest, first, we join with the spirit of nationalism that grips the underdeveloped and underprivileged countries. Remind these people that we too are the children of self-determination, of revolution, and of a will to freedom and independence.

Second, respect the so-called neutralism of newborn nations, and make it clear that we understand their neutralism be one predicated on independence, self-determination, and self-government.

We must understand this neutralism and what it is—namely, a spirit of nationalism in former colonial areas. These neutral nations do not want to be appendages to Soviet imperialism or Western collective security. They have unhappy memories of exploitation by certain Western European countries who are now our allies. Their leaders have a keen awareness of the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion and have taken strong measures to defeat the Communist conspiracy. These neutrals are not pro-Communist—they are pro-themselves. And I suggest that as long as nations remain free, as long as the new nations of Asia and Africa work for themselves, create self-government, build their own economies, they are in fact strengthening the forces of freedom in the world. Why are we so much more critical of the neutralism of Burma and India than we are of the neutralism of Switzerland, Finland, and Sweden. Surely we realize that our friends of Switzerland, Finland, and Sweden are pro-democratic, pro-freedom. We admire their qualities, we admire their democracy, we herald their accomplishments. Let us be equally tolerant with the Asian nations.

Third, we should engage in greater use of our capital through international organizations such as the U. N., the World Bank, and other international financial development groups. Doing much more than we ever contemplate, not on the basis of gifts, but on the basis of long-term loans.

Fourth, we should step up our own point 4, but even more important, work through the U. N. and offer to greatly expand U. N. technical assistance. Let us take the initiative in this area.

Fifth, let us use our blessings of food and fiber. We can proceed through the U. N., offering vast quantities of food and fiber to be placed under the general direction of the U. N. Food and Fiber Reserve. Here we can seize the initiative. We have the food and fiber—we can call upon others to share.

Sixth, we must set a good standard at home—revise our immigration laws, immediately liberalize our refugee act, implement our program of civil rights. Any act of Congress that gives offense to large segments of free peoples of the world adversely affects American foreign policy. Our present immigration laws reflect adversely upon many people and do a disservice to the true tradition of the United States.

Seventh, we should authorize a dramatic expansion of student exchange, along with the exchange of technicians, professional people, farmers, laborers, businessmen, journalists, and others engaged in public communication.

Eighth, unstinting support of the U. N., with particular emphasis on the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture, Children's Emergency Fund. These programs represent America's compassion and

generosity exercised in a spirit of international cooperation.

Ninth, the systematic reduction of tariffs and other artificial obstacles to world trade, including reexamination of East-West trade restrictions.

Tenth, we must make unceasing efforts toward the reduction of armaments and the realization of universal disarmament.

Let us instill spirit and meaning into the disarmament discussions by demonstrating imagination. Let us offer to join with the rest of the world in reducing and then eliminating our armaments race, accompanied by a joint pledge that we spend a portion of the money we thereby save in helping to eliminate poverty in the world. The proposal of the late Senator Brien McMahon is one which should constantly be in the forefront of our minds as we participate in the disarmament discussions.

I welcome the proposal of the President in creating the Office of Special Assistant in Charge of Disarmament. I now hope that my own proposal for the creation of a Special Subcommittee on Disarmament that is to match the action of the Executive and strengthen our hand for disarmament will be accepted.

I have emphasized our more active participation in the United Nations, and its related agencies, because I am convinced that the most practical approach to the areas of Asia and Africa is through the United Nations. This great organization will be only as strong as the use that is made of it. It can only do as much as it is permitted to do by the great powers. Our entire international policy is based on our adherence to and respect for the Charter of the United Nations. We must become champions of that charter. On every occasion, in every conference, in every policy statement, we must relate our actions to the fulfillment to the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Charter of the United Nations is for the world what the Declaration of Independence is for us. It is a world charter of freedom and justice. It is the 20th century Declaration of Interdependence.

I recognize the weaknesses of the United Nations. But I also recognize that if this great instrument of international cooperation fails, then the law of the jungle prevails and modern civilization is on the precipice of disaster.

The achievements of the United Nations are significant. Its future possibilities are unlimited. The time is right for the Government of the United States to lay before the United Nations Assembly a comprehensive program for building a true and honorable peace—and pursue it relentlessly, boldly, and confidently.

The program I have outlined here today, while not new, is, in my mind, a proper emphasis of what needs to be done.

Let us again and again challenge the Soviet Union to fulfill the requirements of the charter. Ask her to join with us in the expansion of the agencies and services of the United Nations. Ask her to join with us, not only in a program of disarmament, but in a program of economic rehabilitation under the guidance and direction of the United Nations. Let us be so bold and daring and imaginative with our program and proposals that a refusal on the part of the Soviet to go along will leave her alone and forsaken.

It is time we recognized that power is more than armaments and wealth. Power is people and ideals—people who aspire to freedom and dignity; ideals that make possible an enlightened and civilized society.

I shall long remember what the Prime Minister of Burma had to say on his recent visit here to Washington. He said, "American ideals are more explosive than your atom bombs."

Here is the voice of the new Asia asking us to reassert our faith; asking us to live by the inspiration of our own traditions. Reminding us that the strength of the spirit is mightier than the sword.

It is this strength of spirit that represents our superiority over communism. It is this God-given strength that appeals to God's children.

Do the Russians Keep Their Bold Promises?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Do the Russians Keep Their Bold Promises?" and an editorial entitled "Infamous Record," both of which were published in the Washington Daily News of July 13.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO THE RUSSIANS KEEP THEIR BOLD PROMISES?—THE ANSWER IS "NO," AND HERE'S RECORD OF THEIR PLEDGES AND DEEDS

(By R. H. Shackford)

A new era in diplomacy with the Soviet Union opens July 18 in Geneva at the Big Four "summit" Conference. But the record of past Soviet diplomatic duplicity should dilute any grandiose hopes for the future.

Some say the Geneva Conference heralds the dawn of a new hopeful day; others say it is just another Communist trick. Some say the Soviets are ready to make a deal because they are weak; others say they are looking for Western concessions because they are strong.

There is only one unassailable fact amidst much speculation: The Soviet Union has violated every principle of decency and humaneness and almost every agreement it has made with the non-Communist world.

Despite this record, Georgi Malenkov claimed in 1953: "Soviet foreign policy is based on a strict and unflinching observance of all agreements concluded by the Soviet Union with other states."

Here are highlights of the record:

SOVIET PLEDGE

On November 16, 1933, the U. S. S. R. promised, in return for American diplomatic recognition, "to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States * * * to restrain all persons under its direct or indirect control from any act overt or covert liable in any way whatsoever to injure the tranquility, prosperity, order, or security of the United States."

SOVIET DEEDS

Within 18 months American Communists attended a Moscow meeting to discuss ways of undermining the United States Government. The United States charged direct violation of the 1933 Litvinov agreement. Soviet Foreign Commissar Litvinov imperiously replied he had no jurisdiction over the Comintern. Yet in 1943 the Soviets "dissolved" the Comintern.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. signed a nonaggression treaty with Finland on January 21, 1932, and joined the League of Nations on September 18, 1934. It also signed the covenant outlawing war and promising to respect territorial integrity of other nations.

DEED

The U. S. S. R. invaded Finland on February 10, 1939. The League branded the Soviet Union an aggressor and expelled her. The Soviets also invaded East Poland in September 1939 and partitioned it for the fourth time with Hitler.

PLEDGE

In the 20's the Soviet Union signed treaties of friendship and peace with the Baltic states of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia and, prior to the war, mutual assistance treaties.

DEED

In 1940 the Soviet Union invaded the three Baltic States and set up puppet Communist regimes. The opposition was liquidated and the new red regimes "applied for" admission to the U. S. S. R.

PLEDGE

On January 1, 1942, the U. S. S. R. signed the Atlantic Charter, promising to "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other"; to oppose territorial changes "that do not accord with the freely-expressed wishes of the people concerned"; to "respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

DEED

Since 1939 the U. S. S. R. has gobbled up 264,200 square miles of new land with 24,036,000 peoples who were formerly Finns, Poles, Rumanians, Balts, Germans, Czechs, and Japanese. The U. S. S. R. has imposed Communist governments on and dominates nearly 5 million square miles of other land with well over 500 million people. There have been no "freely expressed wishes" of people behind the Iron Curtain.

PLEDGE

On November 1, 1943, the U. S. S. R. promised to treat Austria as a liberated country and a victim rather than partner, of Nazism; to restore her freedom and independence, and not to demand reparations.

DEED

For 10 years the U. S. S. R. treated Austria as an enemy, occupied her and stripped her of equipment and resources. The U. S. S. R. has now agreed to a peace treaty which still treats Austria as an enemy.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. subscribed to the Cairo Declaration promising that "in due course Korea shall become free and independent."

DEED

The U. S. S. R. repeatedly blocked freedom for Korea and was the instigator and supporter of the war against South Korea.

PLEDGE

Time and again the U. S. S. R. promised to support the Republic of China and to covet no gain for herself in the Far East.

DEED

The U. S. S. R. supporte dthe Communist enemies of the Republic of China and demanded land and privileges in Asia.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R., with the United States and Britain, promised on December 1, 1943, to respect the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran after the war.

DEED

The U. S. S. R. refused to withdraw its troops from Iran and tried to set up a puppet regime in northern Azerbaijan. The Soviets got out only after extreme United Nations pressure.

PLEDGE

The armistice terms for Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria provided for three-power supervision of those countries.

DEED

The Soviet chairmen of the Allied Control Commissions repeatedly took unilateral action without consulting the West.

PLEDGE

At the Yalta Conference the U. S. S. R. promised to consult and concert their policies with the United States and Britain with respect to the liberated countries of Eastern Europe.

DEED

The U. S. S. R. has never carried out one word of this promise. It proceeded to create unilaterally puppet regimes and ultimately totally Communist states.

PLEDGE

At Yalta the U. S. S. R. promised to establish an independent and democratic government for Poland which would be pledged to "free and unfettered elections."

DEED

Poland has never been anything but a Soviet puppet. Opposition Poles have been liquidated. There has never been a free election since the war.

PLEDGE

At Yalta the U. S. S. R. promised to leave the final delimitation of Poland's western frontier for the peace conference.

DEED

On July 6, 1950, Soviet-dominated Poland and East Germany formally agreed to make the Oder-Neisse line the final frontier.

PLEDGE

At Potsdam the U. S. S. R. promised to treat all Germany as an economic unit.

DEED

The U. S. S. R. has always kept its zone of Germany isolated from West Germany.

PLEDGE

At Potsdam the great powers promised to limit their reparations claims so that the German people could subsist without external aid.

DEED

From the minute the war ended, the U. S. S. R. stripped Eastern Germany of everything that wasn't nailed down and many things that were.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. promised to allow the United States, Britain, and France access by road, rail, canal, and air to their respective zones of Berlin which is inside the Soviet Zone of Germany.

DEED

In 1948 the U. S. S. R. imposed a complete blockade of all western surface transportation in and out of Berlin, forcing the western powers to supply West Berlin by air with food and coal.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. promised to acknowledge four-power rule over Germany, pending formulation of a peace treaty.

DEED

The Soviet commander walked out of the Allied Control Council on March 20, 1948, ending its operations.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. promised at Potsdam to cooperate with the West to keep Germany completely demilitarized and disarmed.

DEED

As early as 1948 the Soviets started to rearm East Germans and now has a substantial army there under the guise of a police force.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. promised to permit freedom of speech, press and religion and the formation of free trade unions in Germany.

DEED

In practice the Soviets have destroyed every freedom in East Germany, chastised all religions, and created phony Red trade unions.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. promised to permit free movement of American and British representatives in the liberated Balkan countries.

DEED

Even Western officials have been prohibited from moving freely, American civilians have never been allowed free movement.

PLEDGE

On August 14, 1945, the U. S. S. R. and the Republic of China signed a treaty agreeing to "render each other every possible economic assistance, etc." Manchuria was to be a "part of China" and China was to administer to Dairen.

DEED

Manchuria was stripped of all its industrial equipment by the U. S. S. R. and when the Soviets left they connived to let the Chinese Reds in. The Soviets refused to let the Chinese nations reoccupy Dairen.

PLEDGE

Under the United Nations Charter the U. S. S. R. undertook many solemn pledges such as "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors," and to forego the use of force or threat thereof as an instrument of policy.

DEED

By every criteria, the U. S. S. R. has repeatedly violated the spirit as well as the word of the charter. It has made the Security Council an ineffective organ by repeated use and abuse of the veto power and has boycotted many U. N. activities.

PLEDGE

The United States sent the U. S. S. R. more than $11 billion in lend-lease. She promised to make a settlement at the end of the war.

DEED

The U. S. S. R. held out for years against a settlement and only in recent months has returned ships and started some repayments.

PLEDGE

The U. S. S. R. promised to cooperate in the early repatriation of prisoners of war.

DEED

Tens of thousands held by the Soviets are still unaccounted for.

INFAMOUS RECORD

If Al Smith were alive, his comment on the forthcoming Big Four Conference at Geneva unquestionably would be: "Let's look at the record."

History does not record anything so black and infamous as the record of the Soviet Union.

On page 47 of the News today the highlights of this record are reviewed.

Hope there may be that the next 10 years will be less dangerous and more tranquil than the last. They could hardly be more dangerous and less tranquil.

But to hope that everything is now going to be just dandy would be to ignore the lessons of the Soviet record. It will take more than smiles and peace talk to change it.

In World War II Maj. Gen. John R. Deane was sent to Moscow to head our Military Mission. His job was to expedite lend-lease supplies. The Soviets got their lend-lease, but General Deane got little cooperation from the Soviets. After a year of experience with the Soviets, General Deane advised Washington to be tougher. He was ignored. Some of his advice could be reread profitably now:

"I have sat at innumerable Russian banquets and become gradually nauseated by Russian food, vodka, and protestations of friendship. Each person high in public life proposes a toast a little sweeter than the preceding one on Soviet-British-American friendship. It is amazing how these toasts go down past tongues in the cheeks.

"After the banquets we send the Soviets another thousand airplanes, and they approve a visa that has ben hanging fire for months. We then scratch our heads to see what other gifts we can send, and they scratch theirs to see what else they can ask for."

And those were in war days when the Soviets really needed our help.

There is no danger today of the United States giving thousands of planes in return for a few visas. But it is just as well—in advance of the final communique at Geneva—to refresh our memories.

Death of Former Representative John Gregg Utterback, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on July 11, 1955, John Gregg Utterback, Representative from the 3d District of Maine in the 73d Congress and one of the foremost citizens of the city of Bangor, Maine, passed away. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, as well as an editorial from the Bangor Daily News of July 12, 1955, regarding Mr. Utterback, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN GREGG UTTERBACK—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

In the passing of John G. Utterback, the city of Bangor and the State of Maine have lost a distinguished citizen. In his long and able career as a city official and businessman, and later as a Representative in the United States Congress, John Utterback served his city, State, and Nation with distinction.

Born in Franklin, Johnson County, Ind., on July 12, 1872, he attended the public schools of his native city. Before 1905 when he settled in Bangor, he was a traveling salesman. Mr. Utterback engaged in the selling of carriages and later of automobiles in Bangor, where he served as a councilman and as mayor from 1914 to 1915. In 1932 he was elected to the 73d Congress, and in 1935 he was appointed United States marshal for the district of Maine, serving in that position until 1944.

[From the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of July 12, 1955]

MAINE LOSES A VALUABLE CITIZEN

The State and city have lost a remarkable and valuable citizen through the death of John Gregg Utterback. The Indiana native came to New England as a young man. He had been prominently identified with civic, business, and political life of Bangor for more than a half-century.

Mr. Utterback first came to prominence here when he established his carriage business after having toured northern Maine as a salesman. Elected to the Bangor Common Council in 1912, the voters chose him to serve as mayor in 1914.

He was a lifelong Democrat—never wavering from the party, although living and working in a strongly Republican locality. He was elected to Congress in 1932, but was defeated for a second term in 1934 by Owen Brewster. He served as United States marshal until 1946.

Mr. Utterback will be long remembered for his lifelong interest in young people. He was first president of Kathadin Council, Boy Scouts of America, and maintained an active interest in the scout movement until shortly before his death. His passing leaves a void in the community that won't be quickly filled.

Address by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, at the Annual Good Will Dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address delivered by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, at the annual good will dinner of the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, held in Boston on May 5, 1955. The reason for the delay in making this request is that I was endeavoring to get the other addresses which were delivered at the dinner, but I have not been able to obtain them. Therefore, I am submitting this address alone at this time, with the request that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GOV. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN AT ANNUAL GOOD WILL DINNER, MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE OF CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 5, 1955

Wordsworth, listening to the Highland lass singing in the field, was not disturbed because he thought that—

> "Perhaps the plaintive numbers flow
> For old, unhappy, far-off things,
> And battles long ago."

On the contrary, he asserted that he carried the music in his heart long after it had ceased to sound in his ears.

I like to think of that poem, "The Solitary Reaper," as expressing the spirit of this gathering. Catholic and Protestant and Jew are we and to a strictly logical mind it might seem that in emphasizing the fact we are perpetuating "old, unhappy, far-off things" that were better submerged in oblivion.

But the wiser view is that memory of "battles long ago" serves only to show how great is the principle of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, since it is able to overcome the ferocity of the bigoted mind end eventually reduce it to the semblance of "a tale that is told" or the plaintive music of ballad singers. To forget the battles might be all very well if it did not entail the risk of forgetting the spirit that has converted old hatreds into nothing more than a reaper's song.

For it is that spirit upon which we must rely to subdue and eradicate a great many other evils than religious strife. All thoughtful observers of the present state of the world are convinced that escape from the catastrophe of universal war will not come through the invention of more powerful weapons of war, or new ways of increasing wealth, or anything else belonging to the material world. The way of escape is by destruction of faith in war as an instrument of national policy; and the destruction of any faith, even a perverted and evil faith, can be accomplished by none but spiritual weapons.

Hence a gathering of Catholics, Protestants and Jews, as such, to work for the common good is something more than a practical means of achieving ends that we all desire. It is also a symbol of the power of the spirit. It is a reminder to politics that religion still leads the way; for this that religion has accomplished, politics is still striving blindly to achieve.

The greatest heresy that a man can embrace is the doctrine that I, only, am a child of God and that you, unless you subscribe to my creed, are none of His offspring and therefore not to be accorded the rights of a human being. This meeting is evidence of the extent to which religion, after long tribulation, has eradicated this heresy. But there is all too much reason to believe that the evil, like everchanging Proteus, is not destroyed, but has simply passed from religion into politics.

The fact that a man may be a Catholic, a Protestant, or a Jew and still be a God-fearing man is so universally accepted by Americans that we regard one who would deny it as not quite sound in mind; but a great many Americans who regard themselves as perfectly rational seem to be committed to the theory that anything un-American is by definition inhuman, or at least on a very low level of humanity. I maintain that this is no more than a new form of the old heresy that led to the wars of religion in what we now regard as times when the minds of men were darkened.

But are those minds any less darkened that seem to hold that because Englishmen and Frenchmen and Germans are not Americans, they should apologize for the fact? I stand here as a Protestant, with no apologies for my protestantism; but I am here and no man suspects my protestantism on that account. But when the President of the United States dares act on the theory that nations not American are nevertheless human and as interested as we are in improving the condition of humanity, he is bitterly assailed as having yielded something of his Americanism.

As a Protestant I resent any suggestion that my protestantism compels me to be a bloodthirsty persecutor of every other faith. I feel it no less incumbent upon me as an American to resent any suggestion that I cannot be American and still human enough to recognize the humanity in other nations.

What gives me hope in these troubled times is the fact that today very few people question my religion because I admit that the children of God are of many diverse types. I feel that if this can be brought about in the religious field there is a fair prospect that an equivalent recognition of our common humanity may eventually be established in the political field. I flatly refuse to believe that war is a necessary condition of human existence. It has always existed, to be sure; but there was a time when wars of religion had always existed and many believed that war was a necessary condition of the religious life. This audience and the great organization that it represents are proof that the theory that men must always cut each other's throats in the name of religion was a lie. I believe that the corresponding theory that men must always cut each other's throats in the name of patriotism is equally a lie. Differences will persist, as different creeds will persist; but there are other ways of settling differences and it is not beyond the power of of men of good will to find them out.

I am disturbed, but not too much disturbed, that politics lags so far behind. After all, it would be ironical indeed, to find politics leading in what is essentially an effort to establish the Kingdom of God upon earth. But the fact that Catholic, Protestant, and Jew can now work loyally together for what is desired by all men who believe in God is, I hope and believe, less important in itself than a foreshadowing of the time when "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

But it is not merely a foreshadowing, it is also a step—nay, a long stride—in that direction. So in accepting the award that you have been pleased to confer upon me I feel that I have been honored by men whose goal is indeed higher and nobler than the goal of men in public life, but one that lies in the same direction. Politics at its highest is confined to this world; its loftiest aim is to "Build the New Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land" while the goal of Protestant, Catholic, and Jew transcends that as far as the heavens are high above the earth.

Yet "to do justly and to love mercy" are 2 of the 3 things that the Lord requireth of us. To establish peace and justice among all men in all lands, the aim of true statecraft, leads, as I believe, inevitably to the third and greatest requirement: "to walk humbly with thy God."

With deep personal appreciation, then, I accept the reward, not as due to my own merit but as crediting me with an aspiration to achieve the ends that you seek; and it is my hope that together we may face the future with something of the confidence that inspired that great cry of David the King: "Through God we shall do valiantly; for He it is that shall tread down our enemies."

Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and exceedingly sound article written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SELFISH GRAB FOR PUBLIC POWER

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—One way of looking at this battle between private and public development of our great river systems is as a battle between two types of minds. One is the countinghouse, stockbroker mind which never raises its eyes beyond its ledgers and the ticker tape.

It sees a power site as a means of a profit for a utility company that holds the monopoly, an item on an account sheet, and not as a unit in a possible bigger and broader

development of a whole river system which instead would benefit everybody in the region and the whole economy. The other type of mind is that which can see that big, broad canvas, as did, for example, Theodore Roosevelt half a century ago.

He saw likewise that only the Federal Government can develop a whole river system, including its tributaries, in an integrated way to get the most out of it for the most people in the way of hydroelectric power, irrigation, navigation, and flood control.

BETTER LIVING PAYS OFF

Theodore Roosevelt never lived to see his dream come true; but some of the rest of us now have come to see a beginning of it. We are thrilled when we visit the great dams here and there which the people have built for themselves.

All of that not only enriches human living but actually pays out many times in income-tax returns to our Federal Treasury.

One wonders what Theodore Roosevelt would say could he come back today and see the countinghouse mind once dominant again, plotting against any further realization of the dream which still is only partly fulfilled. One wonders, for instance, what Theodore Roosevelt would say to Herbert Hoover.

HOOVER ON MUSCLE SHOALS

To one who has seen much of the story develop, it is not hard to understand why the cold, countinghouse mind has been directed at our water-resources program by the Hoover Commission.

We who were around here then can remember how Herbert Hoover opposed the public development of Muscle Shoals in Alabama—which in time flowered into the great TVA—and vetoed in 1931 a bill passed by Congress for that purpose, as had President Calvin Coolidge before him in that countinghouse era of the 1920's.

The memory goes back still further to an early assignment of a young reporter who was covering the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee in 1922 on various bills authorizing the sale of the First World War Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals and its nitrate plants to private industries, the bidders including Henry Ford.

But a farseeing Senator, George W. Norris, of Nebraska, saw possibilities of its development in the public interest for electric power and cheap fertilizer for farmers. Though his bills for that purpose were vetoed by the two Presidents, he prevented passage of bills to hand over the Government dam and plants—paid for by the taxpayers—to private interests at bargain prices.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt succeeded Herbert Hoover in the White House he espoused a broadening of the Norris Muscle Shoals venture into the TVA, embracing the whole Tennessee River system.

NORRIS' DREAM COMES TRUE

The way was prepared for sound, integrated public development of our river systems in the public interest by the 6-year investigation by the Federal Trade Commission, authorized by the Senate in the Hoover administration.

That showed how the utilities had failed us. Revealed was the exploitation of the monopolies they controlled, the inflation of book values to increase the rate base and rates; the piling up of one holding company upon another to milk out profits; the frenzied speculation in utility stocks.

All of that was corrected by various reform statutes, including the Public Utility Holding Company Act and the Securities and Exchange Act, among others. The result was a stabilization of the business of the utilities from which they and the public benefited.

HIGHLY FINANCED CAMPAIGN

Their business expanded greatly, hand in hand with public development of great river projects.

Now this balance of functions is threatened again. Utility interests are seeking to upset it, to try to stop necessary public development and hog it all for themselves in uneconomic and piecemeal development for profits that will go only to them, instead of benefits for all the real stockholders of our natural resources, the people.

To accomplish that, a highly financed campaign is now reaching out in all directions.

It would be a good time to take a look at this campaign as the Federal Trade Commission looked at it a quarter of a century ago.

Appropriations for Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "How About One Billion for Health?", which was published in the Bangor Daily News of July 12, 1955. This fine editorial points out the necessity for allocating additional funds for medical research.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ABOUT ONE BILLION FOR HEALTH?

There are occasions when we feel Congress is too generous about spending the taxpayers' money. But today we'd like to point out an instance in which we think the Federal legislators are being downright niggardly. We refer to funds for medical research on major killing diseases. Congress hasn't yet decided on a final figure but the largest amount we have seen proposed is $24 million.

Why not $1 billion? This may sound startling, at first. Yet what better investment could be made for the welfare of the Nation? Let us suppose the sum found the answer to dreaded cancer, for instance. Suppose it gave us new information on heart ailments and their treatment. Suppose it speeded up improvement of the Salk polio vaccine. Wouldn't research funds help the battle against cerebral palsy? Wouldn't it hasten the development of marvelous new atomic weapons for the war against disease?

It occurs to us that we Americans may have lost our perspective as to the relative importance of things. A Federal highway program running into many billions undoubtedly will be put on the books within a short time. We are spending billions upon billions for national defense. Other billions have been poured overseas in the form of foreign aid. Yet we discuss medical research in terms of only millions.

The suggestion of alloting 1 billion Federal dollars for vital medical research is in nowise linked to the philosophy of socialized medicine. The latter is something we oppose. We suggest the research funds be distributed as grants to appropriate college and medical research laboratories. The project should be carefully organized, just as our generals and admirals would plan war against an aggressor.

It need be no more socialism than was the Government's spectacular success in developing atomic energy. This was a wartime emergency and the immediate goal was to make atomic bombs but it spelled the dawn of the atomic age—an age which we hope will be peaceful and prosperous. The Federal atomic know-how is now being gradually passed along to private enterprise for peaceful use of atomic energy.

We startled and frightened the world with the atomic bomb. Would we not win the gratitude of the world if by a billion-dollar-research program, we were able to give the human race the answers to the diseases that kill and cripple?

We'd like to see the billion-for-medical-research idea catch on in Washington. If you like the idea let President Eisenhower and the Maine delegation in Congress know how you feel. Write direct or care of Bangor Daily News, Bangor.

A Plea for Assurance About Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter to the President of the United States, published under the headline "Abbot Pleads for Assurance About Geneva."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABBOT PLEADS FOR ASSURANCE ABOUT GENEVA

JULY 4, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As I am writing this note, we Americans are observing the Independence Day of our beloved United States. This day is also very dear to the Czechoslovak people, not only because July the fourth is the feast day of their great and beloved national saint, Saint Procopius, but also because the Czechoslovak people have always looked toward the United States with a great deal of love and admiration. It is for that reason that our own Independence Day has a deep meaning for them.

On the following day, July the fifth, the Czechoslovak people observe the feast of their two great apostles, Saints Cyril and Methodius, who brought them the light of the Christian faith over a thousand years ago. It is for this reason that I, as the leading clergyman of Czechoslovak descent in the free world, chose this date to address this note to you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Czechoslovak people suffering the scourge of communism behind the Iron Curtain.

The recent trends on the world scene have been causing grave concern and fear among the Czechoslovak people here and in their homeland. This uneasiness is becoming more intense as the time for the forthcoming Geneva Conference, which is to deal with the future of the world, is drawing near.

Many Americans whose ancestors came from Eastern Europe at the last national election gave their vote to the Republican Party, because in it they found hope for the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain. However, that hope is giving way to fear that the convention at Geneva will lead to trading and compromises in which the enslaved nations will be unjustly sacrificed to achieve coexistence. It would be a source of great relief and comfort to those peoples if they had the assurance of the President of the United States that no such dealing will be permitted to take place.

The peoples of the enslaved nations are being tried very severely. They are turning

their eyes to the United States as their only hope. The people of Czechoslovakia are looking forward with great hope that in the not-too-far-distant day they will be able to give you, Mr. President, an even greater ovation than they did in Prague in 1945 and again welcome you as their liberator.

Today, in Czechoslovakia there are some 300,000 people in concentration camps, many of whom are laboring in the Jachymov uranium mines, which have the greatest known uranium deposits in the world. Against their wills they are forced to produce uranium that may someday be used against them and against us.

In the name of our suffering brethren, I beg that you, Mr. President, take a firm stand in favor of liberation of the peoples enslaved by communism. The people of Czechoslovakia have demonstrated over and over that they do not want communism. The ordinary citizens never had the opportunity to freely express themselves in a free election. They were sold to Soviet Russia by a government which was infiltrated by Socialists and Communists.

If the Czechoslovak people were free to write to you, Mr. President, you would receive millions of letters pleading that you take their part at the forthcoming Geneva Conference.

Trusting that your genuine sympathy toward the enslaved peoples of Europe will find expression in efforts in behalf of these people who turn to you wtih hope and confidence, we give assurance of our prayers calling God's blessing upon you, Mr. President, and upon your noble efforts.

Very respectfully yours,

Rt. Rev. AMBROSE L. ONDRAK, O. S. B.,
Abbot, St. Procopius Abbey.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Morris L. Cooke, the first REA Administrator, to Mr. Ancher Nelsen, the present REA Administrator, in which Mr. Cooke points out what he believes are needed warnings about the danger of certain forces within this country that seek to sell the rural electrification program to private utilities, as recommended, in effect, by the Hoover Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 28, 1955.

Mr. ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: Your courteous letter of April 7 inviting me to attend the May 11 exercises was delayed in reaching me, owing to my absence in Puerto Rico. I appreciate your thought of me, but must decline your kind invitation, as I have another commanding engagement.

May I, Mr. Administrator, take this opportunity to share with you some thoughts which have been on my mind fairly continuously in recent months? For at least a decade before REA was born, rural electrification had been a top concern with me. As evidenced, for instance, by the "giant power" and Mississippi Valley reports, I had advised with the private companies on the most intimate terms and learned of their all but complete indifference to the plight of our farmer folk and, even more remarkable, of the industry's blindness to the great opportunity which the rural demand afforded.

That we knew then what we were advocating is shown by two letters of mine dated 1934 (in your files), one addressed to President Roosevelt and the other to Secretary Ickes, in which it was predicted that outlays of $1,800,000,000 would connect up 3,500,000 new customers. Seventeen years later, the REA annual report showed that just these outlays had provided 3,600,000 new customers. From my present information, it would appear that we have barely touched the rural load. You have the same opportunity to firm up rural lines and thereby vastly increase consumption and, through this, rural social well-being. This is the opportunity of which the urban companies are taking advantage.

The drastic cutting down, really almost eliminating planning advice to the cooperatives, has seemed to me to threaten the very life of REA. The sums that have been saved are almost negligible in the whole picture. But the loss in morale might have been catastrophic if it had not been for the fact that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, within its recognized limitations, picked up some of the reins as you let them drop.

When I think back to our early days and recall the manifold ways by which we attempted to educate and inspire those who had the local responsibility, the current attitude of the administration in allowing local units to sink or swim on their own seems like the equivalent of private-company indifference.

Through 40 years, during which, in and out of public office—municipal, State, Federal—I have had an opportunity to study the electrical industry, its top men as well as the rank and file. It is not like any other social unit. It is markedly without any sense of social justice or public service. It is operated essentially as a secret society.

Whether according to Herbert Hoover or anybody else, if our Government surrenders its vital interest in the electrification of rural America to the private electrical interests, it will be a long-remembered administration blunder.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE.

New Jersey Boystown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the July 7 issue of the Observer, entitled "Productive Results."

The article relates to New Jersey Boystown and to its director, Father Robert P. Egan, who has been doing outstanding work with the boys who make Boystown their home. It is a deserving tribute as well and one that any of us join in.

I have had the opportunity on many occasions to hear Father Egan talk about Boystown and the boys that make it their home. I can readily understand why on his first anniversary as director of that institution Father Egan can count many more new-won friends. We all feel a tug at the heart when we hear this warm, affectionate and understanding priest talk to various groups to enlist the interest and support for New Jersey Boystown. And from the boys themselves at Boystown there is nothing but praise for Father Egan.

I am pleased that I am able to join in the following tribute to Father Egan and our New Jersey Boystown.

The editorial follows:

PRODUCTIVE RESULTS

The entire community joins in extending sincere congratulations to Rev. Robert P. Egan, director of New Jersey Boystown, on his first anniversary as head of the local institution. He has provided an aggressive leadership for Boystown these past 12 months, and has won many new friends for the home.

Father Egan, an energetic man of 37 and a capable administrator, has created many vital improvements at the institution for the benefit of the 100 boys who live there. He has also been successful in enlisting the interest and support of nonsectarian groups such as Elks lodges and the Order of Eagles.

His efforts have also resulted in acquiring new furniture, television sets, a bus, and fire engine for the home. Another major accomplishment was the installation of a badly needed dental clinic which is operated on a volunteer basis by local doctors and nurses.

The appearance of Boystown groups on radio and television programs provided valued publicity for the local home and won many new friends throughout the State and eastern part of the country.

Those who know Father Egan recognize his ability to get things done * * * and they also are very well aware that he is a real friend of the boys who make Boystown their home during a critical period of their lives.

George Murphy, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very fine editorial from the Los Angeles Herald and Express, Tuesday, July 5, 1955.

Mr. George Murphy is well known to me and Americans everywhere as a moral and spiritual inspiration. He participates as a good citizen in local and national community service projects, giving unselfishly of his time and effort. His fight against communism is historical. I am proud to call him a friend and join in this salute to a great American.

The editorial follows:

HOLLYWOOD'S GEORGE MURPHY

People have been saying it for years, but the story of actor George Murphy as told by Richard English in the Saturday Evening Post is a heart-warming tale for Americans everywhere.

George Murphy led those who beat down the spearheads of communism in the Hollywood film industry during a dark period in its history, thereby protecting his fellow

players and the public which looks so much to Hollywood for its inspiration.

And George Murphy has always been truthful and honest, as much as he has been a fighter for the good of Hollywood.

"George Murphy is worth more to Hollywood than a dozen stars: He gives the town a good name," headlines the Post.

As Louis B. Mayer, long his boss at MGM, put it:

"Murphy's biggest value is in his very independence. He can never be anybody's man but his own and, as such, he has great value in Hollywood. He has never been afraid to tell the truth, whether it will be popular or not. It is not in him."

And as George himself says about his pride in his own United States:

"When you boil it down, working for your country is just an enlightened selfishness. What's the use of working and trying to raise a family if you can't leave them a country where they can enjoy what you've earned for them?"

Simple and unanswerable by any opposition.

Fate of 2 Million Jews in U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 6, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that Members of Congress will be interested in the information contained in the Memorandum of Urgency delivered to the President and the Secretary of State by the Jewish Labor Committee, and I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may read it:

MEMORANDUM OF URGENCY

JULY 11, 1955.

To: President Dwight D. Eisenhower; Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.
From: Jewish Labor Committee, New York, N. Y.
Subject: Request fate of 2 million Jews in U. S. S. R. be discussed at Big Four Conference at Geneva.

There have been expressions of hope and some dim signs of progress that the cold war may at last be relaxed. It is generally accepted that the unity, determination, and the strength of the free democratic nations will deter the Soviet Government from pursuing a further policy of aggression. A nation at war with its own citizens is no more peaceful than a nation at war with its neighbors. It is our feeling that on the eve of the Geneva Conference, our Government, in consultation with our allies, must seek to discuss the momentous problem of the liquidation of the cultural and spiritual life of 2 million Jews behind the Iron Curtain.

As you know, the Jewish Labor Committee, representing more than a half million Jewish workers in the AFL and CIO, has for many years since the end of World War II demanded of the Soviet Union to reveal the fate of 2 million Jews who survived. We have never relaxed our concern for these 2 million Jews within the Soviet Union.

There has been much talk by Soviet leaders, both at the U. N. celebration at San Francisco and at the United States Embassy Fourth of July party, about good faith. The best demonstration of good faith would be a cessation of Soviet policy that oppresses smaller nations and that denies freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, cultural freedom for national and ethnic groups.

As a representative major Jewish organization in the United States, we feel it our obligation to call to your attention the tragic situation in which two million Jews behind the Iron Curtain find themselves. The Soviet Union cannot maintain a position that this is purely a matter of internal policy and of no concern to anyone outside her frontiers. Every contributory factor toward tension by her is of concern to the powers consulting with her at Geneva.

THE BACKGROUND

The critical condition of Jews in the Soviet Union, the practical liquidation of Jewish culture, Jewish religion, Jewish literature and language, have been revealed over and over again during the past few years. Jewish organizations have presented documents and other supporting materials to our Government, to the authorities at the U. N. and to the press. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions has presented documentation of the liquidation of Soviet Jewish writers to U. N. authorities. The Jewish Labor Committee led in originally submitting to world public opinion the sordid record of the forceful destruction of Jewish life behind the Iron Curtain. These documents presented by us and since corroborated by other competent sources, revealed the suppression of the Jewish press, of Jewish publishing houses and printing plants and Jewish schools by Soviet authorities. In order to completely crush any vestiges of Jewish culture and literature, the Soviets deported or liquidated their Jewish writers, poets, cultural leaders and scholars. It is over 6 years since our original protests were made; yet we have been unable to ascertain the fate of any of these people.

On the 21st of January 1953, representatives of the American labor movement, fraternal and civic organizations, presented a memorandum to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D. C., dealing with the cultural genocide behind the Iron Curtain.

On February 17 and 18, 1953, the Jewish Labor Committee at its national conference in Atlantic City, revealed additional data and material with regard to this question.

To this day, there has not been a single reply from the Soviet Government to all these memorandums, reports, and publications. On the other hand, we are informed as to the feelings and attitudes of the Jews behind the Iron Curtain. From time to time we receive information of their humiliation, their suffering, their sense of isolation, and their deep desire to maintain relations with their brethren in other parts of the world. There have been dramatic incidents when, for example, officials from Israel visited the only remaining open synagogue in Moscow. Men and women stood in silence near the synagogue, in order to show some identity.

The shock they experience today is all the more profound, and their suffering all the more painful, that all this happens soon after 6 million Jews have perished in the death camps of Hitler's Germany.

OUR REQUESTS

Free communication: Those Jews in the Soviet Union who have relatives in the United States and other countries, feel themselves robbed of any opportunity for correspondence. Every contact of a Soviet citizen with his relatives in the free countries, especially with those in the United States, places the Soviet correspondent in jeopardy. We know the high price some people pay for daring to establish contact by correspondence with their relatives.

Free emigration: We also know the desire of many of these people behind the Iron Curtain to emigrate to those countries where they have relatives. All this is prohibited by the Government.

Free Jewish culture: The reestablishment of Jewish culture is a primary prerequisite. This means reopening of Jewish schools, press, publications, seminaries, etc.

Freedom of conscience: We can only imagine the impression it would make on the civilized world if a profound change in the above policies and practices of the Soviet Union took place; above all, if, at last, the Soviet Union were to permit freedom of conscience, of religion, of communication, of cultural contact between ethnic and national groups, and of emigration of those who want to do so.

It would be an event of great moral significance, both for the free world and for those who suffer behind the Iron Curtain, if this whole problem were posed and dealt with during the coming conference of the Big Four powers.

We are respectfully submitting the above in the fervent hope that the Geneva Conference of the Big Four powers will help to achieve peace with honor, as we in the United States have long been advocating in world forums. You are going with the blessings of a unified America, of all the nationalities that go into making us the great Nation we are. When you bring up the question we have posed, together with the others of paramount importance that are allied, it will be with the historic voice of America, speaking out for the oppressed, no matter where they reside.

Expenditures for Reclamation, Irrigation, and Power Projects in Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include tables presented to me by the International Cooperation Administration showing the programs and expenditures of the predecessors of that agency from April 3, 1948, to June 30, 1954, for reclamation, irrigation, and power projects in foreign countries. I am advised this agency is bringing these tables up to date.

The tables follow:

TABLE I.—*Summary of FOA or predecessor agency obligations for reclamation (including irrigation) and power projects, cumulative, Apr. 3, 1948–June 30, 1954*

[Millions of dollars]

Program	Table in which detail is shown	Obligations as of June 30, 1954
FOA and predecessor agency programs, total		277.6
European industrial projects	II	[1] 127.4
European overseas territory projects (special program in fiscal years 1950 and 1951)	III	1.6
Far East area, total	IV	65.5
Near East, Africa, and South Asia, total	V	83.1

[1] Obligations by fiscal year, in millions of dollars: 1949, $20.3; 1950, $70.9; 1951, $22.2; 1952, $6.9; 1953, $—0.4 (net deobligations); 1954, $7.5.

TABLE II.—*European industrial projects,*[1] *FOA or predecessor agency obligations for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects, by country and project, cumulative Apr. 3, 1948–June 30, 1954*

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project:	Obligations (procurement authorization)
Total	127,420
Denmark: Steam electric station (60,000 kilowatts), at Kyndy	3,317
France	18,029
Extension of the Office du Niger irrigation project in French West Africa	1,191
Thermal electric powerplant at Dechy (120,000 kilowatts)	12,048
Boiler for steam-electric station at Arrighi (100,000 kilowatts)	2,444
Boiler equipment for steam-electric unit at Nantes Chevire (100,000 kilowatts)	1,805
Boiler equipment for second steam-electric station at Arrighi (100,000 kilowatts)	541
Greece	7,908
Thermal electric plant in Eubean Gulf Territory (80,000 kilowatts)	7,188
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution from Eubean Gulf Territory station	293
Hydroelectric plant (40,000 kilowatts) at Agra on Vodas River	35
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Agra plant	121
Hydroelectric plant (50,000 kilowatts) at Ladhon	40
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Ladhon plant	174
Hydrolelectric plant (5,000 kilowatts) at Louros	45
Electric transmission, transformation, and distribution out of Louros plant	12
Iceland	4,861
Expansion of hydroelectric plant on Sog River	3,891
Expansion of hydroelectric plant on Laxa River	970
Italy	62,110
Steam-electric station (50,000 kilowatts) at Genoa	5,669
Steam-electric station (60,000 kilowatts) at Palermo	6,066
Turbogenerator with 60,000-kilowatt capacity to serve northern Italy	6,230
Turbogenerator (50,000 kilowatts) at Genoa for Societa Edison, Milan	6,169
Turbogenerator (50,000 kilowatts) near Turin for Societa Idroelettrica Piemonte (SIP)	6,096
Steam-electric station (60,000 kilowatts) at Civitavecchia Rome	6,110

[1] FOA European industrial projects are projects which are approved for major construction, modification, rehabilitation, or equipping of plants, installations, or facilities where substantial amount of integrated engineering or dollar procurement are required.

TABLE II.—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project—Con.	Obligations (procurement authorizations)
Italy—Continued	
Steam-electric station (60,000 kilowatts) at Naples	6,097
Steam-electric station (100,000 kilowatts) at Piacenza	10,519
Steam-electric station (30,000 kilowatts) at Naples	3,349
Steam-electric plant (120,000 kilowatts) near Tavazzano for STEI	2,580
Addition to steam-electric plant (30,000 kilowatts) at Turin	3,225
Netherlands: Thermal powerplant (124,000 kilowatts) on the Amer River	3,092
Portugal: Irrigation and power development in the Sorraia Valley and the plains of Villa Franca	897
Spain	7,500
Thermal powerplant at Burcena	3,750
Thermal powerplant at Escatron	3,750
Turkey	19,189
Power transmission line from Catalagzi thermal station to the Bosporus	6,543
Sariyar hydroelectric powerplant and related transmission lines	12,646
International: Austro-German hydroelectric powerplant at Braunau on the Inn River	517

TABLE III.—*European overseas territories, FOA or predecessor agency obligations for irrigation and reclamation projects, by area and project as of June 30, 1954*

[Thousands of dollars]

Area and project:	Obligations (procurement authorizations)
Total	1,577
French Territories: Morocco rice cultivation	264
Netherlands Territories: Surinam: Eysvoogel Land, reclamation	1,296
United Kingdom Territories: Cyprus antierosion and reclamation	17

GENERAL NOTE: This program, in which ECA utilized European program funds to finance directly specific projects in the overseas territories of European countries, was active in fiscal years 1950 and 1951. This table shows the current status, as of June 30, 1954, of the obligations originally entered into during that earlier period.

TABLE IV.—*Far East program, FOA or predecessor agency obligations for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects. By country and type of project, cumulative June 5, 1590–June 30, 1954*

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and type of project:	Obligations (procurement authorizations)
Total	65,481
Korea: Thermal power development (Seoul, Pusan, Sanehok)	29,000
	29,000

TABLE IV.—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and type of project—Con.	Obligations (procurement authorization)
China (Formosa)	24,470
Irrigation and reclamation	259
Hydropower generation	8,297
Thermal power generation	8,185
Power transmission and distribution	7,729
Indochina, Associated States	1,762
Irrigation and reclamation	1,166
Thermal power generation	596
Philippines	4,696
Irrigation (pump and gravity)	4,685
Electric power survey	11
Thailand	5,553
Irrigation and reclamation	3,504
Thermal power generation	1,100
Power system survey	50
Rural power	899

TABLE V.—*Near East, Africa, and South Asia FOA or predecessor agency obligations or programs for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects by country and project, July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1954*

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project:	Obligations
Total for region	83,109
Near East	8,199
Africa	8,076
South Asia	66,639
Regional	195
Total for Near East	8,199
Iran	3,403
Golpayegan Dam	137
Kouhrang Tunnel	66
Land-use surveys	140
Karkheh Dam	153
Khanat reconstruction	180
Irrigation improvement	92
River-basin survey	295
Karaj Dam	1,400
Zayanderoud Basin	335
Yezd deep wells	150
Shiraz power	450
Iraq	[1] 423
Range improvement	5
Irrigation designing construction	194
Irrigation and drainage laboratory	4
Water resources planning irrigation laboratory and groundwater survey	170
Water-resources utilization	50
Israel	162
Irrigation	25
Use of rangelands	30
Water storage	13
Improvement of rangeland	12
Improvement of rangeland and livestock	72
Irrigation methods	10
Jordan	2,025
Yarmouk Jordan Valley	1,090
Range water development	362
Range management and groundwater development	134
Forestry and soil conservation	39

[1] Includes a programed figure for 1954.

TABLE V.—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project—Con.	Obligations
Jordan—Continued	
General Wadi development	303
Wadi Duhleil	97
Lebanon	1,486
Litani River Basin investigations	786
Water reconnaissance survey	85
Kasmie construction project	241
Irrigation	72
Kasmie irrigation	302
Saudi Arabia	700
Natural-resources survey	140
Rural community development project	500
Ground-water development	60
Total for Africa	8,076
Egypt	2,527
Agricultural drainage	219
Drainage investigations and improvements	29
Underground-water survey	173
Land reclamation and development	1,719
Desert range development	82
Photogrammetric mapping	202
Desert grazing	103
Ethiopia: Water resources	[1] 400
Liberia	302
Hydroelectric hydrology	2
Aerial photographic survey	300
Libya: Ground-water resources	[1] 319
Development of overseas territories:	
French Morocco, hydroelectric project [2]	4,528
Total for South Asia	66,639
Afghanistan: Helmand Valley agricultural development	[1] 647
India	57,242
Ground-water irrigation, construction, and equipment	21,500
River valley development—power, irrigation, and flood control	9,889
Ground-water exploration	4,221
Do	3,500
Rihand River Dam construction	11,000
Powerplant expansion	2,900
Improvement of Rajaethan power facilities	3,600
Engineering services DVC (Marya)	632
Nepal	252
Irrigation	209
Irrigation from Tilawo	43
Pakistan	8,498
Ground-water exploration and tube wells	200
Malchi Dhand, reclamation	500
Bolan Dam	450
Baluchestan State Union development	300
water supply and control, Kamofali	750

[1] Includes programed figures for 1954.

[2] French counterpart funds derived from basic materials to be used for this project.

TABLE V.—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Country and project—Con.	Obligations
Pakistan—Continued	
Water supply and control, Punjab	85
Water supply and control, Taunsa Barrage	3,500
Soil and water conservation, Blauchistan Province	130
Do	55
Punjab ground-water survey	858
Water supply and control, irrigation Granges Kobaclak	1,670
Regional projects: Water spreading	195

The Record of Dixon-Yates Can't Be Just Laughed Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The Record of Dixon-Yates Can't Just Be Laughed Off," which appeared in the July 13, 1955, issue of the Courier Journal of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

The Eisenhower administration is doing its smiling best to bury that Dixon-Yates contract with as little show of pain as possible. By all accounts, which include photographic illustrations, the interment appears to be an occasion of pleasure, in the best tradition of a wake.

The President, says Attorney General Brownell, is "very happy" that the city of Memphis will build its own powerplant and so remove the necessity of the Dixon-Yates thing. Senator KNOWLAND, who speaks for his party in the Senate, is constrained to admit a few improprieties in the Dixon-Yates record, but still proclaims the President to have made a point of sound national policy. None should speak ill of the dead, it seems.

None, that is, except those who are concerned with the glaring truths of the record. They point out that Mr. Eisenhower was aware that Memphis official spokesmen said last December 20 the city would have none of Dixon-Yates power but preferred to build its own plant. The President, indeed, had responded in a press conference soon afterward to a question in point, saying Memphis had every right to build its own plant. He continued to defend the Dixon-Yates contract as a good deal.

But that was before the cauldron of scandal began to bubble. That was before the Senate's antimonopoly subcommittee introduced the figure of Adolphe H. Wenzell, the associate of the First Boston Corp. This investment house turned up as financial agent of the Dixon-Yates enterprise, but previously its Mr. Wenzell had doubled as consultant for the United States Bureau of the Budget on power policy.

And Mr. Wenzell, now telling all—telling more, in fact, than the administration's published record of the Dixon-Yates deal—said one "fairly big" conference on the transaction with the Atomic Energy Commission was omitted from that record. The missing item, then supplied, showed Mr. Wenzell to have been escorted into the meeting by Edgar H. Dixon, one of the officers of the Dixon-Yates combination.

It was in the AEC that the project was hatched in the first place. A group of private power enterprises, later headed by Messrs. Dixon and Yates, proposed to take over the supply of power to Memphis, a TVA customer. TVA thus would have more power for AEC.

Fortified by such a contract with AEC for 20 years, Dixon-Yates would have the Government's guarantee of plant construction, taxes and substantial profit—on a venture that could be nothing if not a private power salient driven into the TVA citadel with Government blessing.

It was AEC and Budget Bureau together that won the President to the deal and got Mr. Eisenhower's signal to go ahead. As it turns out, the President was never informed of many details. There were such matters as cheaper and more advantageous offers, as divided opinion in the AEC, as an alternate proposal by Kentucky's John Sherman Cooper, then United States Senator, who saw the clear signs of danger to TVA. The President stuck nevertheless to his position. It was good business; the opposition was "Democratic politics."

Now it all comes clear with the determined Tennessee contingent, Senators Kefauver and Gore and Governor Clement, dragging out the missing pieces. All the evidence of evasion, haste, subterfuge, and secrecy, all the highhanded disregard of ordinary safeguards, all the misrepresentations and the shrewd "policy reports" aimed at dismantling TVA power—all come out.

The President is quite affable with the mayor of Memphis. He should be. Mayor Tobey has placed in his hands the means of saying that nothing would have ever been started, if he, Ike Eisenhower, had but known about Memphis. But the broadest of smiles and the utmost of geniality are not going to obscure the Wenzell testimony and the shadow of conspiracies. The subject cannot be so easily changed. Whether the Democratic hope of keeping the truths vivid into next year will be realized, however, is another thing. Eighteen months is a long time in this world of events so swift and great.

Postal Rates Discussed by a Former Member of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, many of the Members of Congress remember Mr. Dudley A. White, who represented the Sandusky, Ohio, congressional district in Congress for several years. He has extended his activities in the newspaper world, and today is the president and publisher of the Sandusky Newspapers, Inc. Naturally, Mr. White is very much interested in postal legislation. He is the chairman of the American Newspaper Publishers Association postal committee, and, as the chairman, he recently made a report of the committee to the 69th annual convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. The excerpts from his report indicate that the ANPA postal committee, of which Mr. White is chairman, is comprised of

prominent editors and publishers throughout the country.

I am glad to have the excerpts from Mr. White's report inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE POSTAL COMMITTEE TO THE 69TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION

The attitude of ANPA toward a proper level of second-class rates remains the same as for many years. The ANPA knows daily newspapers want no subsidy and want to pay a reasonable rate based on the facts. The ANPA resents the charge that daily newspapers are receiving a subsidy because that charge is based on an arbitrary allocation by the Post Office Department of all its costs. We think all of the facts ought to be set forth for the Congress with respect to all of the costs of the Department with proper allocation of the various costs determined by the Congress and what is to be considered in the public interest and the general welfare.

Your postal committee does not see how it can be possible to put the Post Office Department on a break-even basis (which means to take in as much money as it pays out) under the arbitrary allocations of the cost ascertainment report. The following table shows total postal deficit, deficit allocated to second-class mail and deficit allocated to daily newspapers for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1952, 1953, and 1954:

Fiscal year	Total postal deficit	Deficit allocated to 2d class mail	Deficit allocated to daily newspapers
1952	$727,050,218	$240,386,260	$55,814,108
1953	662,991,631	244,269,815	55,097,823
1954	399,146,766	232,249,207	60,909,662

Second-class postal rates were increased 10 percent on April 1, 1952, another 10 percent April 1, 1953, and a third 10 percent April 1, 1954. Yet in spite of a 30-percent increase in rates over 3 years, the deficit allocated to daily newspapers was $5 million more for the fiscal year 1954 than for the fiscal year 1952. From these figures your postal committee can only conclude that under the present abritrary allocation of costs, it is impossible to establish a rate which would not show a deficit allocated to daily newspapers and continue the smear that daily newspapers receive a subsidy.

A good illustration of the arbitrary nature of the Department's allocation of its costs is found in the Cost Ascertainment Report for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. It shows rural-free-delivery service cost $191,771,706 for salaries and transportation of rural carriers. Creation and maintenance of rural-free-delivery service was voted by the Congress as public policy in the general welfare without any idea that rural-free-delivery service could carry enough mail to pay even a small portion of the cost of maintaining that service. Yet second-class mail is charged with $59,450,788, approximately 30 percent of this cost. This means that a greater percentage is allocated to second class than is allocated to any other class of mail, even first class.

Your committee believes that Congress should retain the power to fix rates and establish policies with respect to the Post Office Department rather than allocating that authority to a Commission.

ANPA postal committee: Chairman Dudley A. White, the Register-Star-News, Sandusky, Ohio; H. F. Bailey, the Telegram, Adrian, Mich.; W. K. Blethen, the Times, Seattle, Wash.; Frank A. Daniels, the News & Observer, Raileigh, N. C.; William Dwight, the Transcript-Telegram, Holyoke, Mass.; M. J. Frey, the Oregonian, Portland, Ore.; J. L. Horne, the Telegram, Rocky Mount, N. C.; Clarence B. Hanson, Jr., the News, Birmingham, Ala.; Harlan G. Palmer, the Citizen-News, Hollywood, Calif.; Charles McD. Puckette, the Times, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Ernest P. Schwartz, the Register & Tribune, Des Moines, Iowa; Fred B. Wachs, the Herald-Leader, Lexington, Ky.; Louis A. Weil, Jr., the Herald, Grand Rapids, Mich.; E. L. Gaylord, the Oklahoma & Times, Oklahoma City, Okla.

The Colorado Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial of the Medford Mail Tribune, Medford, Oreg., of May 3, 1955:

THE COLORADO MYSTERY

The more one reads about the upper Colorado power project the more amazing the support of this boondoggling venture by the Eisenhower administration becomes.

In the latest issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senator WATKINS, of Utah, who is leading the proponents, cites both the President and Vice President NIXON as heartily in favor of this billion-and-a-half expenditure by Uncle Sam.

There is no partnership here. The taxpayers of the country through their Government put up the cash, the private utilities don't contribute a cent.

And when the project is completed—if it ever is—the power and the water will be sold not through any private power companies, but by the Government.

How can the present administration ever again, use the argument that such government expenditures, ownership and operation is creeping socialism?

But that is what they have called TVA, and the effort to get a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon.

Not only that. But they have claimed there was no money available for such socialistic ventures and wouldn't be in the foreseeable future, especially in view of the condition of Uncle Sam's finances.

Nevertheless, speakers for the administration in the Senate never brought up this argument against the Colorado project and they went down the line for what is the most expensive and extreme example of what they have called "socialistic extravagance" in the recent history of American reclamation.

It is hard to fathom. Those who favor Federal irrigation and power projects as a part of advancing the national welfare and developing undeveloped areas in cases where private industry can't do the job as well—or at all—could be expected to favor this upper Colorado basin enterprise, even though as the New York Times maintains, quote:

"This newspaper is all for developing the underdeveloped areas of our country where feasible, but we do believe that large scale developments ought to have some realistic relation to expected costs and benefits. It would, of course, be possible to raise bananas on top of the Rockies if one wanted to spend the money but the question is couldn't this money be spent more advantageously elsewhere? * * * It is strange to find the Eisenhower administration so devoted to good business management so enthusiastic over this upper Colorado. No partnership is involved here, presumably because no business man in his right mind would invest in it."

Of course that may be the explanation. The present administration may not be concerned with socialism, creeping or otherwise, where private power files no complaint, and has no interest.

But it is hard to believe that anyone as essentially honest and straightforward as General "Ike" would be guilty of any such cynical hypocrisy when as the Times points out, he is so deeply concerned with economy, balancing the budget, and good business management.

It is just one of those things, which we believe all people really interested in the controversy of public versus private power, will wish to have explained as soon as possible, certainly before any work on the Colorado basin actually starts.

R. W. R.

How One American in Europe Evaluates Our Foreign-Aid Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under date of July 5, 1955, an American citizen who lives in Switzerland, wrote to me giving his observations on our foreign-aid spending and they are so interesting that this Congress and the people of the United States should have an opportunity to read them. I will quote the pertinent excerpts which follow:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In due course I received a copy of your letter of May 5, 1955, to Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary, Department of State, Washington. I sincerely thank you for your interest in my case.

Last week I was delighted to read, as per attached newspaper clipping, that you and three other Members were objecting to the proposed aid bill. Here I felt at least were four Americans determined to do something about the squandering of the taxpayers' money. However, my hopes were soon dashed to the ground when I read in yesterday's paper that the White House aid plan passed the House 273 to 128. Poor deluded Americans.

I have worked over in Europe for 35 years for a big United States corporation, speak foreign languages, can read local newspapers, and talk with the people, and I can assure you, dear Congressman, that Europeans really wonder how the American voter can still back a policy of waste such as the various gift plans that successive administrations carry on. They think that we are childish.

It grieves me to see the bighearted American people milked again for billions of dollars for aid in Europe that is no longer needed, particularly at a time when we still have millions of undernourished Americans and slums equal, if not worse, than in Europe.

European production is on an average 65 percent over that of 1938, and yet in 1938 the European nations managed to equip and arm millions of men. They are not doing it today in spite of increased wealth and production, because they and we have gotten them into the habit of the United States of America doing it for them.

Please note statistics in attached clipping.

I could tell you plenty of the scandalous waste of our gifts to Europe and some of the offshore deals are scandalous beyond imagination. One offshore contract running into millions of dollars covers airplane parts that are obsolete, but they still roll out deliveries. No wonder that Europeans who know the inside stories think that we are still children.

I really could go on writing pages of the unbelievable waste of taxpayers' money, but what is the good, it's water over the dam.

Now is the time for courageous men like yourself to start a campaign of propaganda putting an end for all time to the waste of American gifts to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the observations made by this American citizen are not the casual ones of the average American tourist. They are the observations of an American who has worked in Europe for 35 years as an employee of a large American industry and hence his views are entitled to great weight, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, my correspondent attached to his letter a statement on Western European output, the amount of goods produced, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, Paris edition. This table was prepared by the economic department of that newspaper, and under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it in the RECORD:

Herald Tribune's indices of Western Europe's industrial production

1948 average=100	1938	1952	1953	1954	1955			
					Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May
Austria	118	181	184	210	228	----	----	----
Belgium	85	110	116	120	118	129	126	124
Luxembourg	69	119	109	114	----	----	----	----
Denmark	77	117	121	129	134	136	----	----
Finland	75	124	127	142	145	164	----	----
France	90	131	127	139	152	156	152	156
Greece	132	170	193	235	235	250	----	----
Italy	101	147	161	176	173	----	----	----
Netherlands	89	133	146	160	150	170	----	----
Norway	81	135	142	151	181	172	----	----
Sweden	67	111	111	115	125	126	132	----
United Kingdom	86	114	121	129	139	141	132	138
Western Germany	196	230	251	279	292	302	316	329
Yugoslavia	63	111	122	139	144	159	----	----
Combined index:								
Including West Germany	101	137	144	157	165	168	166	175
Excluding West Germany	87	123	128	138	146	145	136	142

Miss Rosalind Russell Plays Leading Role in Kansas Disaster Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, during the month of May my home State of Kansas had the misfortune of experiencing several tornadoes which caused a tremendous amount of property damage and the loss of lives.

One of these tornadoes completely razed the town of Udall, killing one-tenth of the population and creating tragedy and disaster for those fortunate enough to have survived.

Since then many individuals and organizations have given contributions to aid the Udall survivors and to help rebuild their homes and businesses.

One such individual who played a leading role in raising money for this cause was Miss Rosalind Russell, who was on location at Hutchinson, Kans., at the time making a new motion picture, Picnic, directed by Josh Logan and produced by Columbia Pictures.

Throughout her entire career as one of the most successful actresses in motion pictures, Miss Russell has repeatedly distinguished herself for her great humanitarian work and her unselfish support of men and women in the armed services and of exigent charitable and humanitarian fund-raising campaigns.

Throughout the war years Miss Russell gave unselfishly of her talents and time to entertain our Armed Forces.

As stated above, Miss Russell was in Kansas when the tornado struck Udall, and without waiting for an invitation from any source she immediately volunteered her services to any agency equipped to provide necessary funds and service to aid the Udall survivors and to help rebuild their homes. She helped to organize a successful and large rally in the Wichita ball park Sunday, May 29.

Despite the fact that she had been working on location, playing the most difficult role of her career for an average of 12 hours a day, she gave her 1 free day to travel by auto, 110 miles round trip between Hutchinson and Wichita to personally appear at the ball park.

Her efforts in organizing this rally and in appearing and entertaining at the ball park realized $14,800 for the Udall sufferers with half again that amount subsequently donated.

Appealing to fellow actors in her motion-picture company for contributions because they had not appeared at the rally themselves, she secured a number of large cash donations for the fund including $1,000 from her friend and director, Josh Logan.

Through this humanitarian act Miss Russell won the respect, love, and support of the entire State of Kansas.

The people of Kansas are appreciative of these kind acts, and all contributors are to be commended for the part they have played in aiding these unfortunate citizens.

Address by Walter L. Fowler in Celebration of 150th Anniversary of Naval Lodge No. 4, F. A. A. M., Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 17, 1955, Naval Masonic Lodge No. 4, in the Nation's Capital, observed its 150th anniversary. It was founded when the population of Washington and Georgetown was only 13,000, and there were still 3,600 slaves in this area. In the century and a half this lodge has grown to strength and vigor, and it was most appropriate that its 150th anniversary should be commemorated by a very interesting address delivered by Walter L. Fowler, past master of Anacostia Lodge No. 21, and chairman of the committee on public relations for the general grand chapter, Order of Eastern Star. It is an excellent address, containing a great deal of interesting history, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY WALTER L. FOWLER, PAST MASTER, ANACOSTIA LODGE NO. 21, F. A. A. M., ON THE OCCASION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER, NAVAL LODGE NO. 4, MAY 17, 1955, STATLER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Toastmaster, most worshipful grand master, worshipful master, brethren of Naval Lodge, and visiting friends and brethren in December of 1868 your lodge acted favorably upon a petition for the granting of a charter to form a Masonic lodge in Uniontown (Anacostia).

That lodge is your eldest living child, gathering strength and vigor as the years roll on. In 1924, I served as its master, and throughout these years I can testify to the close fraternal relationship existing between parent and child.

It is a pleasure to be here tonight and to join in this part of the celebration in honor of a vigorous first hundred and fifty years.

You were originally organized May 14, 1805, as Washington Naval Lodge No. 41 under the Grand Lodge of Maryland and reorganized as Naval Lodge No. 4 on February 19, 1811, under the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia.

In 1811 Washington had a population of a few over 8,000, Georgetown nearly 5,000, Washington County 2,300, Alexandria City 7,227, Alexandria County 1,325, a total of slightly over 24,000 in all this area, including over 3,600 slaves.

Not a one then living had seen a telephone or telegraph, an elevator or a train. Automobiles, airplanes, radios, TV's, electric lights, and a thousand and one other things we enjoy today were then unknown.

I have read your history covering your first hundred years. They were illustrious; in fact, all your past has been glorious, and your future is bright with promise.

Even in those days, when the wilderness was close to Naval Lodge and men had to be tough to live, it is interesting to note that the lodge demanded that its members live like Masons. By an amendment to your by-laws in 1826, it was the duty of every member to report a brother repeatedly seen

in a state of intoxication. For the first offense, he was admonished by the master; for the second, suspended; and for the third, expelled. Some of the charges and specifications of the 1815 period both shock and amuse the reader of your history. One amusing specification reads as follows:

"Brother ——— has been seen by a member of this lodge riding a bull about the streets and acting in an unmasonic manner."

The subject of my address tonight is My Country:

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS

A brief period in the world's history. The history of the world for many years after Creation is nearly buried in oblivion. From the Creation to the Deluge, little more has reached us than the genealogy of the patriarchs. We have limited knowledge of the predynastic period of ancient Egypt. For that matter, the history of the early dynasties in that country is vague. The same thing is true of ancient Babylonia.

Come with me on a brief journey across the sea. I point out to you the Rock of Gibraltar and tell you that in ancient times it represented the limit of the world in the West. Here we meet the blue waters of the Mediterranean known to them as the Great Sea. No body of water on earth has so great historic interest. The Phoenicians, Egyptians, Greeks and Romans plowed its waters.

Off in the distance is the site of old Constantinople which fell to the followers of Mohammed in 1453 after over 1,000 years under the Cross. Soon on the south, I show you Alexandria founded in 332 B. C. Now we are looking at Egypt with its pyramids, ruined temples, and tombs telling us of a civilization existing many thousands of years before the birth of Christ. Over to the northeast lies Palestine named after the Philistines. It is a 140 miles from Dan to Beersheba and 40 miles from the Jordan to the sea. We must hurry so now we arrive at Jerusalem just for the purpose of having you think of its age because it was mentioned in the Egyptian records fifteen hundred years before the birth of Christ. Now we fly east over the site of ancient civilizations and find ourselves looking down upon China. I tell you that the ancient Chinese were writing authentic history on tablets of bamboo some thousand years before the birth of Christ. In this great scheme of rolling times, where was our country?

It was 463 years ago that Columbus came. He thought that he had found a new way to India. Four times he came, and he died never knowing that he had discovered a new world. England sent the Cabots. Ponce de Leon and many others came.

Four hundred and thirty-three years ago Magellan sailed around the world and disclosed that America was not a part of India.

Three hundred and forty-seven years ago Capt. John Smith, age 28, was only a short distance from this hotel on the banks of the Potomac.

One hundred and seventy-nine years ago war was declared for freedom.

One hundred and forty-nine years ago no white man had ever crossed our country. Just think of it. What an infant. Oh, the miracle of our progress. Now a Nation, mighty and majestic with 165 million citizens.

MY COUNTRY THROUGH THE EYES OF YOUTH

I saw my country through the eyes of youth and with Longfellow cried aloud:

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What Workman wrought they ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what a forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes,
Our faith, triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee!"

—*From The Building of the Ship, by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.*

What men! Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, age 33; Madison, father of the Constitution, age 36; Hamilton, first Secretary of the Treasury, age 32; Washington, Commander in Chief, age 44.

I was convinced that these men and others like them love their country and freedom more than self and security.

I followed with breathless admiration young Stephen Decatur as he sailed into the harbor of Tripoli to burn the flagship *Philadelphia*, once commanded by his father. When Somers sailed into the harbor of Tunis with the parting message, "Under that flag I was born, under that flag I have lived, and if necessary, under that flag I shall die." I followed him with bated breath, and even so when John Paul Jones cried, "I have not yet begun to fight."

In our library, I looked upon a commission signed by a great Commander in Chief appointing David G. Farragut a midshipman in the United States Navy, age 9:

"Faith of our fathers living still
In spite of dungeon, fire and sword
Oh, how our hearts beat high with joy
Whene'er we hear that glorious word."

In my youth with enthusiastic fervor I prayed, "God bless America."

I NOW VIEW OUR COUNTRY THROUGH THE EYES OF AGE

In my youth I hated treason—at my age I still despise it.

On the battlefield of Saratoga a towering monument, commemorative of that decisive struggle of the Revolution—about its base are four niches, and in these are bronze figures of three of the generals who commanded there: Horatio Gates, Schuyler, Morgan.

The fourth niche is empty, because the soldier who won that niche of fame had forfeited his right to be remembered—but below the niche, cut in stone, there is his name.

As you see it, you see a young colonial officer leading his troops against the walls of Quebec. You see him charging the British lines at Saratoga. You see him taking the cheers of thousands of men and recall that he is a national hero. Then you see him at midnight near the Hudson, selling his soul to Satan. The saddest figure in American history. Judas sold his Lord for 30 pieces of silver—Arnold sold his honor for £6,315 in English gold.

Alas! the closing scene, a friendless old man dying in London—Benedict Arnold—hero, patriot, traitor. He called for his old war-stained American uniform. What a tragic sight—from the fairest heights of human glory to the deepest gulfs of infamy and shame. An empty niche for fallen manhood, for faithlessness to a sacred trust.

In age I look about me and see oh so many who love their security and position more than they love their country. I see men who use fraternal orders and even the church for their personal advancement. I see men who wear emblems and who have held high fraternal office willing to sell honor, sacrifice friendships, trample reputations; do almost anything to keep themselves secure in their pitiable offices, or to obtain office. When I do, I feel like shouting, "Thou traitor—thy niche is empty."

We are living in a war-torn world threatened by the greatest conspiracy ever organized to destroy Christianity and the private ownership system. Our President, a few months ago, disclosed to the Nation the potential destructive force of new weapons. His message was of such serious import that all thinking men and women should have immediately joined with him in seeking Divine guidance and help. Speaking of those same weapons a scientist by the name of Oppenheimer said over the television, "that all may not be killed by them, but those left will be scarcely human."

Let us see what is actually going on in our country. Five hundred thousand fully armed desperate characters are traveling our streets and highways. A major crime is committed every 14 seconds. Every 4.2 minutes there was a murder, manslaughter, rape, or assault to kill in my country in 1954. It was the seventh consecutive year of increase in crimes with more than 2 million serious offenses.

My brethren, I am told that there are over 4 million confirmed alcoholics in our country, with drunkenness rapidly increasing among women and young girls. In this city the last thing that our fine policemen would do would be to arrest a woman for drunkenness, yet not withstanding it became necessary for them to arrest over 3,200 women and girls for this offense last year. Too many people in my country do not know the meaning of moderation.

Our insane asylums are filled to overflowing. Our institutions for the feebleminded are filled to overflowing. Our jails and workhouses are packed to capacity. Hundreds of thousands of illegitimate children are being born. The sacred state of marriage is in many places becoming a joke. One-third of all the marriages in this District is headed for the rocks.

Our national debt—$280 billion. Why, gentlemen, there has hardly been a billion minutes since the crucifixion of Our Lord. Senator BYRD, on March 10, 1955, said in the Senate, "We are mortgaged to the hilt—the $280 billion direct debt is equivalent to the full value of all the land, all the buildings, all the mines, all the machinery, all the livestock—everything of value in the United States."

In age I see our country in danger and cry—God save America.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO YOU?

I think it is fair to assume that, as in our past history, Masonry will be in the forefront to combat all evils destructive of the ideals for which we stand. You have an individual responsibility. A prophet of Israel stood before his people and speaking in terms of individual responsibility said in effect, "If Noah were here, he couldn't save you, and neither could Job or Daniel." They knew what he was talking about.

Noah was the greatest preacher that ever lived—for 120 years he preached in one parish. Job was the greatest father—every morning he would make sacrifices for his sons and daughters. Daniel was the greatest statesman—three times Babylon had been taken, and each time the victors made Daniel premier. His message was that the greatest preacher, the greatest father, and the greatest statesman all combined could not save one from his individual responsibility.

I should like to tell you about Napoleon's grand review of his troops just before he entered Russia, but time will not permit. Suffice it to say that upon his return from Moscow to Poland he left behind him 400,000 dead in the snows of a terrible winter. In his saddlebag as he galloped toward Paris he carried 40 bottles of perfume and every so often he would break a bottle and dash it over him. My brethren, all the perfume in

the world could not wipe out the stench of Russia. Men throughout the world were following his every move with bated breath. All eyes were turned toward Paris. Nobody was thinking of babies except those directly affected. Yet during the years that Napoleon was engaged in killing and destruction, Gladstone was born in Liverpool; Robert Browning was born in Camberwell; Charles Dickens was born in Portsea; Charles Darwin was born in Shrewsbury; Mendelssohn was born in Hamburg; and Lincoln was born in Kentucky. When a wrong is to be righted, a truth to be preached, a continent opened, a new world discovered, or a great book written, God does not send an army into the world—he sends a baby. For what purpose were you born?

In conclusion, may I tell you that while examining a map of Palestine I saw a dot under which were inscribed the words, "Supposed site of Meroz." I sought the history of the city and I found these words, "Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

Meroz had hung back. Hidden away in a safe valley, it had heard the call which summoned every patriot, it had felt the shock of battle on the other side of the hills, but nestled and hid itself only the more snugly. We can now only guess where once it stood and realize that its very name standards for "shirker." It was blotted out like other cities and other civilizations. You say, "It can't happen here," and I reply, "My God can be terrible when His thunderbolts are hurled." Victory at last is for those who come to the defense of the Lord against the mighty.

God bless and God save our country.

Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard thus far, I believe the rule before us is an unfair one. I think it is most unfair to have a closed rule on a bill as important as this. If there is some unfinished business, as was pointed out by the last gentleman, if we vote down the rule, perhaps that could be taken into consideration when a new rule would be reported. But, I certainly think it is most unfair to provide a repugnant social system for the widows in this particular bill.

And I want now to ask the chairman of the select committee, or anyone, for that matter, to answer this question: What justification is there for paying the widow of a general $242 as against the widow of a private $122?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is there any place in the whole American system where survivors' benefits are not tied to a man's attainment? Why should not the gentleman have much better survivors' benefits than survivors of people who work in his office?

Mr. RADWAN. That does not answer my question. The gentleman is asking me a question. I am asking the question, Is there any justification for such discrimination in this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is no discrimination.

Mr. RADWAN. But is there any justification for making such a disparaging difference here?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Is there any place in our whole system where survivor benefits are not tied to the attainment of a man?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I should like to answer that question.

Mr. RADWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The folks in our offices come in voluntarily. The private in the service is taken in. He does not go in voluntarily. He is drafted. He has no choice about it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Members of Congress come in voluntarily, too. And we Members of Congress have a better retirement system for ourselves than have the people who work in our offices.

Mr. RADWAN. In view of the fact that there just is not any answer to the point that I have raised, I believe this rule should be voted down, because it does not permit a legitimate amendment.

(Mr. RADWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Achilles Heel of the Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, July 13, 1955, in which Mr. Alsop takes a look at United States production of long-range bombers as opposed to the productive capabilities of the U. S. S. R.:

SAC'S ACHILLES HEEL
(By Joseph Alsop)

In a previous report in this space, two grave facts were revealed. First, the American Air Force takes about twice as long to go from the idea of an aircraft to production of the aircraft, if one can judge by the comparative performance in producing the B–52 and Bison bombers.

Second, current production of the Soviet Bison is considerably larger than current production of the American B–52. And the Soviets will still be turning out a few more intercontinental jet bombers each month than we turn out in America, even after the recently ordered increase of the B–52 production finally gets results.

These are facts so deeply disquieting that they may properly be called scandalous. Secretary of Defense Charles B. Wilson has tried to make light of these and other facts that indicate America is now losing her lead in the air to the Soviets. The existing power of the Strategic Air Command, he has said in effect, gives this country a lead in the air that can never be overcome. Meanwhile, however, Soviet air progress has also radically affected the power of SAC.

Consider first the status of SAC's long-range groups, which are presently equipped with 350 B–36's. This B–36 and the B–52 are the only American bombers able to do the round trip from American bases to Soviet targets and home again. Eventually, SAC's long-range groups are to be wholly re-equipped with B–52's, but for at least 2 more years the lumbering B–36 will continue to be SAC's intercontinental workhorse.

Unfortunately, this slow, heavy, rotary engined bomber was already classed as obsolescent against a Soviet air defense equipped with MIG–15's and MIG–17's. More unfortunately still, the Moscow overflights have shown that the Soviets are producing the even speedier "Farmer" day fighter and a remarkably fast and impressive twin-jet night fighter. Against an air defense equipped with these new aircraft the chances of the B–36 have to be marked down almost to zero. It is still SAC's intercontinental workhorse, but the B–36 is now passing from the obsolescent into the obsolete category.

That is bad enough. But the more honest air planners further admit that the Moscow overflights have indirectly but importantly devalued the 1,500 B–47's that make up the balance of SAC's offensive power.

The Soviets have a very practical motive for being so ostentatious about their new airpower. They wish to intimidate our transatlantic allies, who control SAC's most important oversea airbases. Moreover, this tactic of intimidation is plainly working only too well. Whatever the treaties may say, the British, the Spaniards, the French, and the others will go to almost any lengths to avoid inviting a visit from "Bisons" and "Badgers" carrying H-bombs in their bellies.

As a practical matter, therefore, the transatlantic airbases are now virtually certain to be denied to SAC, unless the countries where those bases are situated are already directly threatened with attacks by the Soviets. In any showdown that starts in Asia, for instance, SAC cannot reasonably hope to use bases beyond the line Azores-Iceland-Greenland-Alaska-Okinawa-Philippines.

In these circumstances, all SAC's B–47's will have to be double refueled to reach the more important Soviet targets. This means that each B–47 will have to be air refueled on the way out and air refueled once again on the way home.

The tanker fleet that SAC has for this purpose is largely composed of about 600 KC–97's, a slow, rotary-engined aircraft with poor altitude characteristics. The process of refueling is inordinately inefficient, since the speedy, high-flying B–47 must sacrifice half its cruising altitude and slow down almost to stalling speed in order to get gas from a KC–97 tanker. And if the tankers maintain the rate of one air refueling mission per day, they will be doing unusually well.

Consider, then, the situation when all B–47's flying to Soviet targets have to be double refueled. With approximately 600 KC–97's capable of flying one refueling mission daily, and with each B–47 needing two refueling missions to complete its round trip, the size of the tanker fleet will place an appallingly low ceiling on B–47 offensive sorties. In any 1 day, it will only be possible to use about 300 of SAC's great force of 1,500 B–47's.

In other words, Gen. Curtis Lemay either have five times as many B–47's as he needs to do his job, or he has one-fifth of the number of tankers he will need to do his job without the overseas airbases which he should no longer count on using. This is one of the central political-strategic facts in the modern world. And it is another proof that the trend of the air balance between this country and Russia all but amounts to a national scandal.

Government Competition With Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been carrying the fight against Government competition with free labor and free enterprise are greatly heartened by the President's strong statement against section 638 of the Defense Appropriation Act. This section seeks to place an unconstitutional curb on the Executive in any effort to terminate competitive business-type activities by the Federal Government. The President was never more right than when he states that this section invades the right of the executive department under the Constitution. In a sense the President's stand is a significant victory in the continuing fight to protect labor and business from unfair Government competition and invasion.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on this subject which appeared in the New York Times this morning.

The article follows:

PRESIDENT SCORES CURB ON MILITARY—SIGNS $31,882,815,726 BILL BUT ASSERTS ONE SECTION IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

(By Anthony Leviero)

WASHINGTON, July 13.—President Eisenhower sharply rebuked Congress today as he approved with reservations the $31,822,815,726 Defense Department appropriation bill.

In a special message the President denounced one section of the bill as unconstitutional and declared he would disregard it. He also attacked another provision, saying it was the sort of thing that could cause "a deadly attrition of our whole international trade policy." He called for its repeal.

He said he had signed the bill into law only because the Defense Establishment needed the money.

The message was one of the strongest criticisms of Congress voiced by President Eisenhower.

Section 638 of the bill, which he condemned as unconstitutional, would curb the authority of the Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, to terminate certain Department functions which he felt could be performed as well by private industry.

The section would require Mr. Wilson to obtain the approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees before he could get the Defense Department out of such businesses as bakeries, laundries, ice-making, coffee roasting, rope-making, and many other civilian-type activities.

In the name of economy, the administration has been eliminating these activities from military posts, camps and stations wherever it deemed local merchants could supply the services. But section 638 reflects complaints some Members of Congress have received from constituent businessmen who were supplying the goods used in these activities. Civilian employees generally operate these businesses in military posts.

President Eisenhower declared that the provision violated the constitutional principle that the three branches of the Government are separate and coequal.

"I believe it to be my duty to oppose such a violation," the President asserted. "The Congress has the power and the right to grant or to deny an appropriation. But once the appropriation is made the appropriation must, under the Constitution, be administered by the executive branch of the Government alone, and the Congress has no right to confer upon its committees the power to veto executive action or to prevent executive action from becoming effective."

The President said he did not "acquiesce" in the provision. He added that to do so would set a "dangerous precedent" of a kind that had been resisted by Presidents since the founding of the United States. He concluded by saying section 638 would be disregarded as invalid unless "otherwise determined by a court of competent jurisdiction." It appeared unlikely that the issue would come to a court test.

Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida, and a member of the House Appropriations Committee, assailed the President, saying:

"I am completely astounded, I am shocked. I have never heard such a complete and utter disregard of Congress by a Chief Executive. It is unbelievable that he places himself above the law. This is not a military government. We are not under martial law.

President Eisenhower has consistently shown a careful regard for the prerogatives of Congress. In two notable instances, however, he resisted Congress on an issue of executive and legislative prerogatives.

He resisted the demands of the subcommittee that investigated the Army-McCarthy dispute for testimony on confidential conversations of high policymaking officials and for confidential security files. And in the Dixon-Yates case he refused to yield confidential Budget Bureau records of preliminary policy discussions.

In both instances he relied, as many other Presidents have before him, on the principle that executive files are exempt from congressional scrutiny.

On the other hand President Eisenhower has sought congressional sanction on an issue in which many Members of Congress felt he had the inherent constitutional authority to act on his own. This occurred when he requested and Congress passed a resolution asserting the United States would defend Formosa against invasion by Communist China.

ROOSEVELT ACTION UPHELD

The late Franklin D. Roosevelt set a precedent in somewhat the same circumstances that President Eisenhower faced today. He denounced a provision of the urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 that would have prevented any Government agency from employing after November 15 of that year three officials accused of radicalism.

Mr. Roosevelt asserted there was no suggestion the individuals were disloyal and that no impeachment action had been started against them. He also said the rider was an unconstitutional encroachment on the Executive and that he did not consider it binding.

Later the United States Supreme Court upheld his view that this was a "bill of attainder." The High Court has defined attainder as "a legislative act which inflicts punishment without judicial trial."

Section 630, the other provision assailed by the President, was interpreted by him as a virtual prohibition against the "purchase of foreign-made spun-silk yarn for cartridge cloth." He said no opportunity was given to the administration to state its reasons against the rider.

"By making it virutally impossible for our friends abroad to sell us goods when such goods are materially less expensive to our taxpayers than those that can be procured domestically," the President wrote, "such provisions could effect a deadly attrition of our whole international trade policy and bring about impairment of our relations with other nations."

The President Earnestly Considers Expanding Cultural Interchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, 10 Members of the House of Representatives, 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans, last Saturday urged President Eisenhower to give serious consideration to discussing exchange visits between the United States and the Soviet Union at the forthcoming Big Four Conference at Geneva.

The House Members who signed the letter to the President were the gentleman from Pennsylvania, HUGH SCOTT; the gentleman from California, WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD; the gentleman from Utah, HENRY ALDOUS DIXON; the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.; the gentleman from New Hampshire, PERKINS BASS; the gentleman from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., the gentleman from Wisconsin, HENRY S. REUSS; the gentleman from California, JAMES ROOSEVELT; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; and myself.

The text of the letter to the President follows:

JULY 7, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have noted with interest certain recent events which point toward a lessening of tension between this country and the Soviet Union: the visit of the American athletes and chess players to Moscow, the proposed exchange program for farmers, and a recent editorial in an American newspaper suggesting an expanded cultural and sports program which was received favorably in an answering editorial in Pravda.

It has come to our attention that Senator KARL MUNDT, coauthor if the Smith-Mundt Act, has recently suggested to you that the encouraging and expanding of such exchange visits might be discussed at the forthcoming Big Four Conference at Geneva.

We believe this suggestion merits earnest attention, and we hope that you can give it your serious consideration. If agreement could be reached at Geneva to expand such contacts and establish regular tourist travel there would appear to be a greater opportunity for mutual understanding and world peace.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH SCOTT, W. S. MAILLIARD, H. A. DIXON, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., PERKINS BASS, FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., HARRISON WILLIAMS, HENRY S. REUSS, JAMES ROOSEVELT, LEE METCALF.

Hearings are currently being held by a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee on several bills which would greatly expand the President's Emergency Fund under which leading artists, athletes, and industrial

exhibits are sent abroad. The chairman of this Subcommittee on Distinguished Civilian Awards and Cultural Interchange and Development is the able gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF.

The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives on July 12 reported the bill—H. R. 7278, Report No. 1116—making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, which was read and referred with the accompanying report to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. This bill includes $5 million, a reduction of $1 million in the amount of the budget estimate, for the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs. The Subcommittee on State, Justice, Judiciary, and Related Agencies, which held hearings on this item under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from New York, JOHN J. ROONEY, is to be complimented for their support of this important program. It is to be hoped that the Congress will quickly adopt this program which was recommended to the Congress last year by the President as one of major importance to enable our country to meet and counter the gigantic propaganda offensive of the U. S. S. R. Wide support has developed for this program and the Hearst newspapers, following the historic address by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., at the National Press Club in February, have been outstanding in their support of this important program.

I would also like to include at this point in my remarks the text of a letter from President Eisenhower which I have just received:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 11, 1955.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: I appreciate your and your colleagues' July 7 letter suggesting that our meetings at Geneva include discussions of expanded contacts between the people of Russia and the United States.

When Senator MUNDT made this suggestion to me a few days ago, I assured him that we would give the proposal our earnest consideration. To you and your colleagues I gladly give the same assurance, and am grateful to each of you for giving me your thoughts on this important matter.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Editorials from the Washington Post, the Washington Evening Star, and signed articles which appeared in the New York Daily News, the San Francisco Examiner, and the Washington Daily News in regard to the cultural interchange program now under consideration by the Congress are included here also.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 14, 1955]

AMERICAN OVERSEAS

In the last year the United States Government has helped make it possible for several of its leading cultural organizations and some of its leading business concerns to display their wares abroad. Both have been enormously successful. In the first group were the Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra, the Symphony of the Air, the New York City Ballet and the Porgy and Bess company. They received enthusiastic receptions wherever they went. In Helsinki, the Philadelphia Orchestra won tremendous applause when it performed a Sibelius concert. The Symphony of the Air, formerly Arturo Toscanini's NBC Symphony Orchestra, received spectacular ovations on its far-eastern tour.

Similarly, the Commerce Department's sponsorship of American exhibits at trade fairs has been acclaimed in foreign journals. These fairs make it possible for American products to be sold on a much wider basis because they introduce American products to foreign buyers. Trade fairs abroad are not for show purposes as a cattle fair might be in this country but are meeting places for buyers who examine the samples and make purchases months in advance. President Eisenhower especially urged support of the trade fairs.

Congress today will vote on the appropriation for continued aid to these trade and cultural displays. The President asked for $6 million but the House Appropriations Committee cut the figure to $5 million. There is opposition to this amount and attempts will be made further to reduce the appropriation. We trust that the House will repulse these efforts. The Government does not pay the full cost of these projects but helps make up the deficits incurred. In the case of the Philadelphia Orchestra's tour of Europe the Government contributed only about $40,000. We can think of no better or more inexpensive way to advertise America's good name overseas.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 18, 1955]

GOOD INVESTMENT

At relatively small cost in public funds—about $2.5 million—the Department of Commerce in cooperation with private industry has put American enterprise on display at approximately a dozen international trade fairs during the past 6 months. Most of these have been in European cities where the holding of these exhibits has gained wide popularity and has proved a successful medium for advertising products and techniques of the participating countries. This initial experiment on the part of our own Government—one of the steps advocated by President Eisenhower in his program for expanding free world commerce—already has brought approximately 20,000 inquiries on American production methods, market possibilities, and trading exchanges.

The Commerce Department and more than 1,000 American firms already are planning further participation in fairs not only in Europe but in Asia, Africa, and South America. It is a program fully worthy of public support and the necessary modest amount of funds required to finance the Department's collaboration.

[From the New York Daily News of April 11, 1955]

D. C. WASH

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, April 10.—Uncle Sam's most pulchritudinous envoy is shortly to receive a painting lesson that should make President Eisenhower green with envy.

Clare Boothe Luce, after shepherding Italian Prime Minister Scelba around our eastern shores, will return Tuesday to her desk at our Embassy in Rome. As soon as she catches up on her work, she plans to accept an invitation from Sir Winston Churchill to visit him at his Sicilian vacation spot.

As if a bid from the indomitable Winnie was not enticing enough, the doughty retired statesman has added an irresistible clincher: "Come to Sicily and I'll teach you to paint."

An amateur named Ike had better look to his laurels.

Rumors to the contrary, Clare is not—repeat, not—about to replace C. Douglas Dillon as our Ambassador to France. There are three good reasons why this will not come to pass.

First, Dillon has almost recovered from his illness and has no intention of resigning. Secondly, Clare is completely enamored of her Italian post and feels that the anti-Communist task she has undertaken there will require at least another year or two for completion.

Most important of all, neither Ike nor anyone else has offered her the Paris post, or even mentioned it to her.

The former Congresswoman from Connecticut has not, however, been lacking a crusade during her current visit to America. Both at the White House and the State Department, she has seized every opportunity to press for an enlargement of our cultural program abroad.

Last years' most successful single venture in spreading American culture in Europe was our sponsorship of the musical, Porgy and Bess. This year Clare has arranged for its premiere in Italy by the same American company.

IKE HAS FUND FOR OVERSEAS CULTURAL TOUR

She is also making a heavy bid for Oklahoma and Showboat, in order to counteract Communist claims that the only plays and movies Americans can produce reek with crime.

Ike has at his command a special President's fund, with which to pick up the tab for overseas cultural appearances of American symphony concerts and theater groups.

Clare would like to see this extended to include official American participation in international art fairs and film festivals. To date, because the State Department has declined to give Government sanction to the festivals, Communist-tinged members of the international committees have deliberately selected American box office hits which depict the seamier side of our life.

If anyone objects, the Reds shrug: "After all, these are the biggest moneymakers in America, so you obviously prefer that sort of thing."

This is the argument Clare has presented to the State Department in urging that we officially enter the fairs and festivals. Then, like Russia and other participants, our Government can select only those films that present America at its typical best.

Our lady Ambassador, weary of Red strutting about the superior Russian ballet, would like to see groups from our City Center in New York travel abroad on the propaganda circuit. She is also plumping for a European tour by Radio City Music Hall's famed Rockettes.

A mutual dream of most of our American envoys, however, is unlikely to be realized in the near future.

WE STOLE SHOW AT ISTANBUL WITH CINERAMA

At the international trade fair in Istanbul last year, Uncle Sam stole the show with the presentation of This Is Cinerama. So sensational was the cross-country camera tour of America—from the Coney Island roller coaster ride to the flight through Grand Canyon—that the Russian and satellite exhibits stood virtually empty as long queues formed to watch the all-American entry. While the Russians screamed unfair competition, United States stock soared higher than a million-dollar grant-in-aid could have effected.

Since then, our United States Ambassadors have been clamoring for the State Department to send the film to their capitals. Unfortunately, for the richest country in the world, the cost of erecting the special tripli-

cate screens and multiple projectors appears currently prohibitive.

On other cultural fronts, however, things are looking up. Until recently, our envoys abroad have viewed with anguish the international trade fairs, with practically every flag flying except our own Stars and Stripes.

This month Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks leaves for a tour of at least a dozen international trade fairs in Europe. There he will try to convince our friends and foes alike that America is not merely an international cash register, a lucky monster of resources, but actually a vigorous, idealistic nation with a unique culture and know-how that could benefit all mankind.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 25, 1955]

JAPS GO WILD OVER OUR TOURING SYMPHONY

(By Oland D. Russell)

TOKIO, May 25.—Time was when American major-league baseball players would come to Japan, winning friends and influencing people far and wide.

But the newest sensation among the volatile and impressionable Japanese is the 94-man American orchestra "Symphony of the Air" which has just concluded a 20-day tour here.

Judging from attendance figures and the orchestramen's own enthusiasm, Japan really went all out in its devotion and acclamation for this former Arturo Toscanini symphony, which has stuck together since the departure of the old maestro.

The final performance at the former Ernie Pyle Theater yesterday brought the audience to its feet in a near frenzy as if some crooner had just appeared. The crowd wept and tossed paper streamers.

Everywhere they've gone, from Tokio to Sendai, from Yokohama to Hiroshima, these 94 men—without a single girl vocalist or side attraction—literally were mobbed by Japan's bouncy, emotional lovers of music.

Said Don Gillis, of Fort Worth, Tex., former Texas Christian University professor, now one of the three conductors:

"It's been a musician's honeymoon. Seemed like very note we struck made someone fall in love—with us."

The two other conductors who rotate with Mr. Gillis are Walter Hendl, formerly of the Dallas Symphony, and Thor Johnson, of the Cincinnati Symphony.

The players wear lapel badges with individual numbers. In all the principal cities where they played, Japan's young musicians quickly would identify artists by their numbers and waylay them individually for autographs or just the chance to touch their hero.

They would wait by groups, violin students swarming over violinists, aspiring flutists surrounding the piccolo players, etc., while drum pounders and bull-fiddlers, less agile logistically, often caught the brunt of the onrush.

Press Agent Abe Savage, of the New York Musicians Union, was one of the few nonmusical individuals on the trip, but he also wore a "symphony of the air" badge. When Japanese would surround him asking what instrument he played, Abe would tell them deadpan, "typewriter." And the kids could bow in politeness and awe of this curious addition to orchestration.

Everywhere they went that lapel badge opened more doors and hearts and brought them more favored treatment, at least among the mass of the Japanese people, than the resplendent cultured pearled badges of the International Chamber of Commerce, which just ended sessions here.

The orchestra leaves today for Korea for 2 days and then heads for Okinawa, Formosa, Manila, Bangkok, Ceylon, Singapore, and Kuala Lumpur. Everywhere the house is already sold out.

[From the Washington Daily News of May May 25, 1955]

ORMANDY CREW WOWS FRENCH; GOES TO LISBON

PARIS, May 25.—The Philadelphia Orchestra, under the direction of Eugene Ormandy, left for Lisbon, Portugal, on the next step of its European tour today.

It would up its triumphal appearances in France with a well-received concert in the Palais de Chaillot last night.

It was the fifth and last concert in France for the Philadelphia Orchestra, which drew record crowds in 2 previous concerts in Paris and 2 other performances in Bordeaux.

Last night's program consisted of Bloch's Concerto Grosso No. 2, Brahms' Symphony No. 2, Chopin's Concerto No. 2 in F minor, and Ravel's Daphne and Chloe, suite No. 2.

The audience applauded soloist Alexander Brailowsky's playing of the Chopin number and was enthusiastic over the orchestra's interpretation of the Brahms symphony.

The orchestra was in France under the auspices of the State Department's Salute to France program. The remainder of its tour includes:

May 26, Lisbon; May 27, Porto; May 28, Lisbon; May 29–30, Madrid; May 31–June 1, Barcelona; June 2–3, Milan; June 7, Geneva; June 9, Lugano; June 11–12, Strasbourg; June 13–14, Vienna; June 15, Berlin; June 16, Stockholm, and June 17–18, Helsinki.

[From the San Francisco Examiner of June 15, 1955]

HEARST AID WARNS ON SOFT WAR WITH RUSS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, June 14.—Frank Conniff, editorial assistant to William Randolph Hearst, Jr., today told a House Appropriattions subcommittee that the world conflict with communism had entered a new phase which might be described as the "soft war."

Conniff, representing Hearst, editor-in-chief of the Hearst Newspapers, who is in Europe, warned that the impending competitive coexistence struggle with Red Russia might be more difficult to win than a shooting war.

NEW WEAPONS

"Soft words instead of threats are the new Communist weapons," he said, "and we must be prepared to counter these different tactics. Perhaps even the terminology of recent years has been outmoded.

"But just as the cold war was a continuation of the hot war by other means, the soft war will be a form of a hard war by means other than actual combat.

"The shooting has stopped for a while but the Communists will intensify their drive for world dominance in every field and on every front."

The subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, Democrat of New York, was told by the witness that Hearst, after his visit to Moscow, where he interviewed the four new top Kremlin leaders, had concluded there should be a more dynamic presentation of the American way of life to the world.

SUGGESTIONS MADE

Conniff, who accompanied the publisher to Russia, listed the following Hearst suggestions:

Creation of a competitive coexistence council to plan strategy and tactics in the forthcoming struggle against world communism which might last into the next generation.

Carrying to the youth of the world the story of democracy and dispelling the picture of America as a sheer materialistic power.

Having our athletes and artists abroad act as good-will ambassadors with more direct availability to students and youth groups thereby countering the blatant propaganda activities of touring Soviet athletes and artists.

Realization that the current Russian coexistence approach was influenced by domestic difficulties now faced in the Soviet Union, including desperate problems of agriculture and transportation.

TRADE FAIRS

Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, another witness, urged the subcommittee to approve the requested $5 million appropriation for the Presidential emergency fund being used to support cultural missions and psychological cold warfare.

He pointed out that in the past 5 years, the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented.

However, THOMPSON continued, the United States awakened in time to what was happening and last year put in a last-minute entry at Damascus with an official exhibit of the film Cinerama. The picture stole the entire show despite a $500,000 Red Russian exhibition, he said. And when the Communists heard this country was planning a repeat performance at Bangkok, they withdrew entirely.

At the recent Frankfurt fair, THOMPSON testified, American producers displayed over 300 products commonly used in the average American home.

He said:

"The exhibit, entitled 'America at Home' featured a completely furnished full-scale five-room modern American home with actors impersonating an American family. Brand names that are household words in the United States were displayed.

"These fairs have given us an opportunity to refute Communist sneers at the 'myth' of the American way of life. Communist goods exhibited at trade fairs have often been of inferior quality but how are other peoples to know if there are no United States exhibits to make the contrast clear?"

Mrs. Hobby Resigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Post which is a splendid recognition of the fine service given our country by Oveta Culp Hobby.

The editorial follows:

MRS. HOBBY RESIGNS

President Eisenhower's tribute to his departing Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was warm and unqualified. Coming at a press conference called especially for the occasion, it was also dramatic and emotional, and as Oveta Culp Hobby prepares for her return to Texas it must be with a full heart and a high head. Her whole bearing made it apparent that she approached public service with a rare feeling of dedication, and the knowledge that her contribution has been so highly regarded by the President can be to her a never-ending source of satisfaction.

This newspaper was critical of Secretary Hobby because of disappointment in the way in which she handled the crises over the Salk vaccine. But it weighs the incident against

the record of all she has done in a bright and useful career.

In summing up Mrs. Hobby's work for the country, the President quite rightly harked back to the war days, when as organizer of the Women's Army Corps she showed creative and organizational ability of a rare order. The contribution that her women soldiers made to the winning of the war received the highest recognition.

As a member of the Cabinet, charged with pulling together a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare out of a welter of more or less unrelated Federal agencies, Mrs. Hobby was entrusted with the tasks of making a tangible reality out of the President's concept of liberality in human affairs. Once again she showed talents that should be the envy of many a highly placed executive.

Mrs. Hobby was a thoughtful and skilled advocate of the President's middle-of-the-road philosophy. Her department has functioned well as the conscience of the American free enterprise system. Now that for personal reasons she returns to private life, we are glad to salute her contributions and to wish her well.

Abundance Grows on Family Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Abundance Grows on Family Farms" which appeared in the July 13, 1955, issue of the Courier Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

ABUNDANCE GROWS ON FAMILY FARMS

This week a group of Russian farm experts will arrive in the United States to learn something about the system of farming which has made this Nation an island of food surpluses.

How much they will learn about the actual techniques of farming in the 5 weeks they will be touring the Nation is problematical. They expect to see everything from the citrus- and grape-producing areas of California, through the grain- and milk-producing areas of the Middle West to the United States Department of Agriculture Experimental Farm at Beltsville, Md.

What they will learn about the techniques of farm production and marketing, however, will be less important than what they will learn about American farmers.

As they travel across the plains of the Dakotas and Nebraska, the Russians will see farms on which the pioneer settlers only 75 years ago or less lived in sod huts. Today they will see on those same farms many rambling frame farmhouses supplied with electricity, running water, and some even air-conditioned against the hot summer sun.

The men who live in these farmhouses are only 1 or 2 generations removed from the European peasants who settled this region. They and their fathers have been able to make the progress the Russians will see in part because of the booming growth of this young Nation and in part because of Government programs which have helped the farmer to help himself.

For the most part this progress has been made through the Nation's insistence upon maintaining a family type of farming. But when the need has arisen, neither our farmers nor our city people have hesitated to introduce various forms of Government assistance to the farmers so that our supplies of food, fibers, and oils would be maintained and the family farm maintained.

In short, we have developed a family-farm-plus system of agriculture in this Nation. And it has been this system that has been responsible for the abundance which some of our own leaders now deplore.

As a Nation we have felt secure for some years because of our advanced position in atomic energy developments and our superiority in weapons. Today we are no longer as far ahead of the Russians in these fields as we were 10 years ago.

We still excel in industry, to be sure, but we stand alone among the nations of the world in our ability to produce farm products in superabundance.

And that, of course, is the reason why these Russians want to see how we do it. They admit that this is one field in which they have failed.

In short, it appears now that our ability as farmers is the one thing that is making the Russians back down from their position of aggression.

Our Government officials and farm leaders who deplore these so-called surpluses of farm products should take this occasion to reappraise their attitudes. It was Secretary of Agriculture Claude Wickard who said early in World War II that "food will win the war and write the peace." The cost of living with farm surpluses is one of the costs of maintaining the peace. It is a worthwhile investment.

Survey of Effects of Foreign Trade on the Eugene, Oreg., Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from the League of Women Voters of Eugene, Oreg., and a survey made by that organization of the local effects of foreign trade on the Eugene, Oreg., area.

There being no objection, the letter and survey were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF EUGENE,
Eugene, Oreg., June 26, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Eugene chapter of the League of Women Voters along with other local leagues, has been engaged in conducting a survey of the local effects of international trade.

Our survey, of the Eugene area, has been completed and I am enclosing a copy.

We thank you for the interest you expressed in our project.

Truly yours,

CAROL RICHMAN,
Chairman, International Trade Committee.

SURVEY OF THE LOCAL EFFECTS OF FOREIGN TRADE ON THE EUGENE AREA

INTRODUCTION

The National League of Women Voters is currently conducting a trade survey through its local leagues. The survey is being undertaken in the belief that by showing the effects of international trade on local communities and individuals we can best focus attention on the problem of international trade.

The Eugene league, along with eight other Oregon leagues, is participating in this survey.

The International Trade Committee of Eugene League of Women Voters conducted the survey. Geographically, it included Eugene and the surrounding area on a 15-mile radius. The survey tries to determine how exports and imports, through our industries and agriculture, affected us in the Eugene area. We looked for dependence on foreign trade and competition from foreign trade and for the reactions of the members of the community who deal with these problems in the day's work.

A national league booklet, including the formats for the questionnaires, guided us in conducting the survey. This brought the benefit of experts to the local level, and a semblance of uniformity to the national level. Various authoritative sources in the community assisted us in our preliminary research as we attempted to create an economic picture of the area.

The survey has been carried out objectively. Although the league has taken a stand on international trade policies, in our survey we have been interested in determining the position of the community rather than in furthering our own position.

DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA COVERED

Predominance of a single industry—lumbering—is the most striking characteristic of the Eugene survey area. Eugene is now considered the lumber center of the world, since it is centrally located to the greatest available stands of timber in the greatest lumber producing region of the world.

Agriculture is the second most important economic force. Farming in the area is fairly diversified with no one crop significantly predominant. The major commodities produced are: milk, eggs, filberts, walnuts, hairy vetch, red and alsike clover, seed and perennial ryegrass, and wool. It is not surprising that the largest industry in the survey area other than lumbering and woodworking is the canning of fruit. The local cannery employs a maximum of 1,500. The remaining industries are considerably smaller, ranging from 120 employees down.

For a statistical analysis of the local survey area, figures accurate for Lane County must be interpreted for agriculture and industries other than lumbering. Specific data for lumber production in this area are available:

Lane County:

Lumber: 118 mills employ 13,000; produce 1,400,000,000 board feet at an income of $80 million.

Other industry: 393 establishments employ 2,810 with an income of $5 million.

Agriculture: 5,870 farm households with a total income for farm products of $19,650,000.

Eugene survey area:

Lumber: Production is 900 million board feet for a realization of shipments approximating $67 million per year.

Actually, relative value of production from lumber, agriculture, and other industry in the survey area can be assumed to be the same as for the county economy. Although Eugene is more heavily industrialized, the farmland in the closeby Willamette Valley area is more productive than the outlying regions of the county. Lumber has the same paramount importance in the local area as in the county economy.

In our interviews we noticed especially the absence of any appreciable amount of strong feeling on trade policies. This attitude is most evident and most understandable in lumber. Although some competition through imports is recognized, the outstanding fact in this reward is that the domestic demand is larger than the supply so that we must

import lumber to meet domestic needs. The lumber producers have a market for all they can produce. Consequently trade is not an issue.

In the other economic areas of the survey there were several individual expressions of concern over specific competitive imports. One opinion is that: "The low standard of living of competitor companies adversely affects us in competing with the import of these products. Our domestic market is the most attractive in the world but the domestic producers of these products have minimum wage and pure food laws that the foreign manufacturer does not have to comply with." And another: "New Zealand frozen beef came in after the Korean war. It demoralized the market. It was so cheap it was terrible. It was 20 cents to American beef's 30 cents." However, in general it may be said that the threat of imports is not sufficient to cause feeling to run high. Nor is the extent of exports sufficient to arouse strong emotion in this direction.

The relatively isolated location of Eugene is perhaps worth mentioning. We are far enough from other centers of trade and ports so that shipping costs are high and tend to discourage intercourse beyond our region to a greater degree than is true for many other communities.

Perhaps the most impressive outcome of the survey was the general concern for national and to a lesser degree, international well-being. There was fairly universal agreement on the necessity for protection of industries essential to national security and industries vitally threatened, but in conjunction there was a concern for the effect of trade policies on the whole national economy, rather than solely on those producers immediately affected. The following statement is illustrative: "We must expand world trade—it's necessary under the American way. A tariff is not the answer. If we put a tariff on lumber they will apply a tariff on something that will hurt us a lot worse."

ROLE OF EXPORTS

Although there is lumber exported from this area, it is a very small percentage of production. Less than half of the companies interviewed reported export activities, and the range of the percentage of production exported is from 1 percent to 8–10 percent.

In other local industries exports play a minor role. Exported products mentioned are butter, glues, and furs but in no case was their importance stressed.

There appears to be no awareness on the part of farmers of the direct involvement in the agricultural export market, although there is recognition of the general effects of the export of agricultural commodities on the domestic market. This area is a substantial producer of milk, eggs, beef, veal, pork, barley, oats, wheat, and corn which are prominent among United States agricultural exports.

ROLE OF IMPORTS

A number of local producers are dependent on or find it desirable to use imports in their production. One lumber company reports the use of Swedish, Danish, and German parts and machinery. Imported raw materials used by various industries are: Tin, Philippine mahogany, African hardwoods, Japanese and German plywood panels, spices from the Orient, urea from England, Germany, and Norway, furs, bonemeal from England, and Canadian peat moss.

There are many imports that are considered competitive in varying degrees. The lumber industry recognizes competition primarily from Canada, from Scandinavia, and also Japan and Brazil. General feeling is that the competition is not a serious threat to the local lumber industry. It may be of value to mention a few of the opinions and solutions offered by those interviewed. One lumberman is in favor of a tariff on Canadian lumber and three were specifically opposed to a tariff on Canadian lumber. A suggested solution was a joint promotion arrangement for marketing between this country and Canada. There were comments to the effect that competition is healthy and that we must be willing to buy imports in order to be able to export.

Outside of the lumber industry some imports were mentioned as competitive but not as a serious threat to the local producer—flower bulbs and Canadian shingles.

Where imports are felt to present the most serious threat are in the field of agriculture and in industries processing agricultural products. Farm products produced locally with which imports are competitive: Pork, wool, beef, veal, oats, wheat, barley, filberts, walnuts, cherries (in brine), hairy vetch, red and alsike clover seed, and perennial rye grass seed. There is strong opinion on the effects of the importation of low-cost beef from New Zealand and Mexico on the American market. Also mentioned in this category were hides, and Canadian and Mexican cattle. A protective tariff is the desired solution. Strong opinion was also expressed that imports are a competitive threat to domestic filberts, walnuts, and cherries in brine. The feeling is that these products are produced more cheaply abroad because of cheap labor and low standards of living in the producing countries and that in order to protect our own high standard of living, the more cheaply produced competing products should be kept out, or kept in line with domestic prices by a tariff. Otherwise the domestic producers should be put in a better competitive position by subsidization. The woolgrowers are very conscious of the detrimental effect of imported wool on their market but seem favorably disposed, at least on a trial basis, to the current solution of subsidization.

BALANCE SHEET OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

The effects of exports and imports are relatively insignificant in the area, due to the predominance of the lumber industry which is involved only to a minor degree in international trade.

Agriculture is most involved in the export market, but it is impossible to estimate on the local level to what extent local agricultural commodities are effected by national exports of these commodities. Agricultural producers are more directly aware of the effects of imports than of exports.

It would seem that any attempt at a formalized balance sheet of industries involved in exports opposed to those effected by imports would be meaningless in the area of this survey because of (a) the small proportion of the community involved either way, and (b) the minor degree of involvement where it is found at all.

DEGREE OF INTEREST IN FOREIGN TRADE AND SOLUTIONS PROPOSED

The degree of interest in the Eugene area in foreign trade may be said to be low, owing to the relatively minor effects of foreign trade on the community as a whole.

Raising of the tariff to protect threatened industries is the most common solution proposed to foreign trade problems. The principle of subsidization is accepted principally by those participating in the Government program (wool growers). There is general agreement on the need to protect industries vital to national defense.

It is accurate to say, on the basis of our survey, that the prevailing attitude toward United States trade policy is in favor of expansion of trade, on the theory that this will benefit the national economy. In some cases mention has been made of international benefits in this regard. Almost without exception cognizance is given to the necessity of dealing with problems arising from excessive competition and injury to domestic producers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In conclusion, the committee acknowledges its indebtedness for information on the economy of the area to Messrs. C. L. Metcalf, of the Eugene Chamber of Commerce; E. I. Pitkin, Eugene Fruit Growers Association; A. D. McReynolds, lumber industry; Frank Worley, CIO; Joseph Willis, AFL; Clarence Jackson, master of Pomona Grange; R. E. Kerr; Farm Bureau; and W. B. Parker, Lane County agricultural agent; to our consultants on international trade, Dr. Marshall Wattles and Dr. James Kuhn; and our consultants on survey technique; Drs. A. L. Lomax and Richard Littmen. We are also grateful for data compiled and sent to us by Mrs. Elvera Horrell, Extension Agricultural Economist, Oregon State College; and Mr. E. W. Kenney, Director of Research and Education of the International Woodworkers of America, Portland; and for data prepared by the Eugene Chamber of Commerce—Market Data Report, 1954, the Lumber Industry of Lane County, and a list of Eugene manufacturers.

(Mesdames Littman, D. Johnson, J. B. Hall, Kuhn, Dykstra, Van Voris, Tussing, Kariel, Pomeroy, Benjamin, Wasmann, Cowan, Pierron, Richman, chairman.)

The President's Hideaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "The President's Hideaway" which appeared in the July 12, 1955, issue of the Irvington Herald, of Irvington, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S HIDEAWAY

The report is current in Washington that the tipoff on the location of the President's secret hideaway, which he used in the recent air-raid drill, was traced to a reporter representing Tass, a news agency serving Russian papers.

To go into a tizzy, now that the secret has been told, is ridiculous. If the President and the CIA wanted the President's hideaway to be a real secret, then carloads of newsmen should never have been invited to come along with the Chief Executive for his evacuation.

Moreover, if the news given to Tass, where the hideaway is, and other details, then who could feel confident that nothing would ever leak out about it? Perhaps pressure could be brought on reporters, perhaps they would talk confidentially to Communists, or perhaps they would slip up.

Therefore, the righteous indignation about the leak adds up to nonsense. If top Government officials are more interested in getting publicity than in really hiding away from everyone, and if the press coverage granted includes foreign representation, no one with good sense ought to fool himself that the President's hideaway is going to be kept a big, dark secret.

And with all the publicity given the recent hideaway motor escorts in broad daylight, and newsreel cameras going along for the ride, etc., why fool ourselves? There isn't any secret.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., Proposes Congressional Investigation of Railroad Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

REPRESENTATIVE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., PROPOSES CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF RAILROAD INDUSTRY

At the request of Richard W. Smith, international vice president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., which represents 90 percent of the Nation's railroad dining car workers, I have recently surveyed employment conditions in the railroad industry. As a result of this survey, I am convinced that these conditions warrant a full-scale congressional investigation of the railroad companies, with a view to amending the Railway Labor Act in order to insure that we have suitable legislation on the statute books to limit employee workloads.

Sufficient evidence already exists to indicate that these increased workloads are now, and have been for some time, endangering the health and safety of railroad employees as well as passengers.

Mr. Smith, who is also secretary-treasurer of the Joint Council of Dining Car Employees, the railroad division of the Hotel and Restaurant Union, advises me that the railroads have severely cut train crews in the dining cars in line with their recent economy and modernization policies. These curtailments have been so drastic as to lower the morale and the health of the dining-car crews to the extent that their very lives are endangered. Mr. Smith cited one example wherein a so-called buffet-car attendant, the sole employee in a dining-luncheon car consisting of 32 seats, is not only expected to serve the passengers but also to prepare hot meals. I am advised that similar conditions obtain in dining car departments on many major railroad lines.

The railroads, on the other hand, argue that the dining cars must pay their own way. This argument, according to Mr. Smith and other high-ranking labor officials, is fallacious because, technically speaking, apart from the ticket sellers, no other employee or department on the railroad takes in any money at all to directly cover his own wages and expenses.

I am equally disturbed by the unequivocal fact that, although the various fair employment practice (FEPC) laws have struggled valiantly with the problem of discrimination against Negro employees, additional legislation is necessary to insure that jobs in all departments and divisions of the railroads are open to colored employees. The policies of most railroad companies is such that jobs outside the departments traditionally filled by Negroes are closed to Negroes with as much as 20 and 30 years of tenure on the same line.

With the increased workloads and severe curtailment of dining-car crews, unless other branches of the railroad industry are opened to colored employees, the displaced dining-car workers, despite their long years of faithful service, will find themselves unemployed.

Mr. Smith has informed me that an election is presently under way among the dining-car employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad. These employees are now represented by the Dining Car and Railroad Food Workers Union, a small, independent organization. Local 858 of the A. F. of L. is seeking to represent the Pennsylvania dining-car workers and the National Labor Mediation Board is conducting an election beginning on July 11.

The A. F. of L.'s Hotel and Restaurant and Bartenders International Union was motivated to initiate and participate in the current election because of the marked discontent among the Pennsylvania employees. Underlying this discontent are many of the abuses which I seek to correct by a thorough investigation and subsequent legislation.

Without question, the best interests of the dining-car employees involved will be served most by effective representation, and by fair, just, up-to-date legislation, which requires a revamping of the obsolete Railway Labor Act. I am confident that Congress will back up this contention after a full-fledged investigation, which I shall demand in the immediate future.

Opening Statement of Subcommittee Chairman Clyde Doyle at House Un-American Activities Committee Public Hearings, Los Angeles, Beginning June 27, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do I am pleased to submit to the attention of all my colleagues the text of my opening statement as subcommittee chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee at the recent Los Angeles hearings which commenced June 27, 1955, in the Federal Building at Los Angeles, and continued for 6 days.

I submit the following text of the opening statement because both before and since I returned to Washington from the hearings at Los Angeles, and also at San Diego, several Members of this great legislative body have asked me what sort of an opening statement was made by me on occasions when I was presiding as subcommittee chairman, or by other committee members presiding over committee hearings. Therefore, I am aware that there is somewhat unusual interest in this particular feature of our committee hearings.

In the first place may I state that by virtue of the Doyle resolution, House Resolution 151, unanimously agreed to by this honorable body March 23, 1955, it provides as follows:

SEC. 2. (i) The chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in an open statement the subject of the investigation.

Therefore, the text which follows of my opening statement at the Los Angeles hearings is intended to comply with that requirement.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the obligations and requirements of House Resolution 151, I will state that at all times in the recent Los Angeles and San Diego hearings, there were not less than two committee members present. I mention this in view of subdivision (h) of section 2 of House Resolution 151, which provides as follows:

(h) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which shall not be less than two.

The statement is as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. DOYLE, LOS ANGELES HEARINGS, JUNE 27, 1955

The subcommittee will please be in order. Let the record show that the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, establishing this committee, duly appointed Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri, on my right, DONALD L. JACKSON, of California, and GORDON M. SCHERER, of Ohio, on my left, and myself, CLYDE DOYLE, of California, as a subcommittee, with myself as chairman, to conduct these hearings.

The full subcommittee is present. The Committee on Un-American Activities is a standing committee of the House of Representatives, composed of nine members. Each member is also a member of one other major congressional committee. Since the workload of this committee is so constant and heavy, it has been found necessary to divide the committee into subcommittees when the work undertaken is away from Washington, D. C.

The Congress of the United States has imposed upon this committee by Public Law 601, the duty of making investigations of the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and which attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and all other questions in relaion thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedical legislation.

In the discharge of this duty in the current hearings, the committee proposes to make further inquiry regarding Communist Party activities emanating from this and other areas which may be calculated to advance the Communist conspiracy and extend its influence and power. Preliminary investigation has indicated Communist Party membership of certain individuals occupying administrative or policymaking positions in certain organizations. It is the purpose of the committee to inquire as to the possible existence of a Communist Party plan to place its members in such important positions; the object sought to be obtained and the extent of such practices. It is also the purpose of the committee to inquire as to the extent, character, and objects of Communist Party activities in Los Angeles County during periods and at places not fully covered by testimony heretofore taken by this committee. The information obtained at this hearing should better enable Congress to legislate more ably and comprehensively on the subject of communism, or other subversive activities.

The committee has devoted much time in the past few years to the investigation of the subject of communism, and has endeavored to keep Congress well informed of the extent, character, and objects of the Communist conspiracy within this country as an aid to necessary remedial legislation. In the performance of this huge task, the committee, in its reports to Congress has made 18 recommendations for new legislation or the strengthening of existing legislation, designed to aid in the fight against this Communist conspiracy. All but four of these

recommendations by this committee have been enacted into law in one form or another.

The committee wants it understood that in the conduct of this hearing it is not interested in any dispute between management and labor or between one labor union and another labor union. Neither is it interested in the internal affairs of any labor union. It proposes, however, to investigate to the full limit of the ability and resources, Communist Party activities of any person as to whom reliable information indicates Communist Party affiliation and activity, whether that be in the field of labor or any other field, and regardless of who the person or group of persons may be. This is our bounden duty under Public Law 601.

It is the standing rule of this committee that in the event testimony or evidence is adduced in the course of committee hearings, disclosing Communist Party membership on the part of any individual, that individual, if he desires, shall be afforded an early opportunity to appear before this committee under oath for the purpose of denying or explaining any such testimony or evidence. This is part of the American way of doing right and justice. If this be such a person's desire, he should communicate promptly with a member of the committee staff.

I desire to make it clear that the fact that a lawyer appears before this committee as legal counsel for a witness, should not be taken as any disparagement against that lawyer for so doing. The committee invites counsel to be present. However, for the benefit of counsel who have not hitherto appeared before this committee, may I state a positive limitation on the privilege that legal counsel has before this committee. The committee is not a court and it does not follow strictly the rules of court procedure. The presence of counsel is permitted and encouraged for the purpose of advising the witness as to his constitutional rights. Counsel is not permitted to make oral arguments, or to address the committee. We want the witness' testimony and not that of the lawyer and we have the right to expect an ethical member of the bar to confine his advice to his client to matters involving his constitutional rights and not to put words in the mouth of the witness.

I would remind those present in this hearing room that we are here at the direction of the Congress of the United States to discharge an important function of our Federal Government that has been assigned to us by Public Law 601. You are here by permission of the committee. I trust that you will conduct yourselves as guests of this committee. A disturbance of any kind or audible comment during the course of testimony whether favorable or unfavorable to any witness or the committee will not be tolerated. For infraction of this rule the offender will be immediately ejected from this room and may not be allowed to return. I trust it is necessary only to call this matter to your attention once and that it will not be necessary to have it repeated.

There will be no television, radio, or mechanical recording during the taking of testimony. The only photographs that will be permitted to be taken will be still shots and they must be taken either before or after a witness testifies.

The salient provisions of Public Law 601, 79th Congress, which established this committee as one of the regular standing committees of the House of Representatives, by which this committee in these hearings will be bound are as follows:

"(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

"The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable."

In this connection I will say that when witnesses are subpenaed to appear before this committee, they or their legal counsel are supplied with a copy of the rules which govern the proceedings of this committee.

The distinguished designated legal counsel of our committee, Mr. Frank Tavenner, of Washington, D. C., will proceed to interrogate the first witness and all witnesses, who will first take the usual oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth before they begin their testimony.

American Farmers Favor Proper Enforcement of Robinson-Patman Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire unanimous consent to have reproduced an article which appeared in the Farmers Column of the California Record of May 31, last, and which was written by Mr. Allen F. Mather, formerly of Tennessee, but presently serving as executive secretary of the Agriculture Council of California.

The article is as follows:

THE FARMERS CORNER

(By Allen F. Mather)

There have been a lot of famous twosomes in the world's history—Damon and Pythias, Romeo and Juliet, Gallagher and Shean, to name but a few. But the pair that bid well to grab off most of the attention in the near future are Robinson and PATMAN. A couple of decades ago these gentlemen—Congressmen both—were coauthors of a piece of Federal legislation which plugs a chink in our antitrust armor. Logically enough, this is called the Robinson-Patman Act.

At the time this law was passed, we had long since adopted the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act—the big guns in antitrust artillery. Experience had shown, however, that there was need for more specific prohibitions against discriminatory pricing practices. Particularly in the buyers' market which developed following the great crash of 1929, certain large purchasers were demanding and obtaining rebates, discounts, and other types of preferential treatment over and above what could justly be attributed to their mass purchasing power.

Two primary results followed: sellers, in order to move their products, were forced to take less than a free, uncoercive market would bring; small, independent purchasers who were not in a position to demand and receive favorable price treatment were being forced to the wall by vicious and unequal competition. To correct these conditions, Congress adopted the Robinson-Patman Act.

Recent developments indicate that it may not be long before the general public recognizes Robinson-Patman as something other than a double-play combination. Specifically, the Attorney General's Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws has just submitted a 394-page report which is bound to have nationwide repercussions.

California agriculture—and hence the entire State—will pay particular attention to the recommendations relating to brokerage fees. Our tremendous production means nothing until this is translated into sales in the market place. Necessarily, this involves the farmer in our distribution system where—in the usual manner of mankind—fees are charged for services rendered. This is right and just, so long as these are not phantom fees.

The recommendations of the Attorney General's Committee, if adopted, would apparently permit exactly such a development. It is estimated that about 25 percent of the fresh-fruit business, for example, is handled through chain stores—the mass purchasers—and the balance through independents. If the chains are permitted to set up their own brokerage operations and collect brokerage fees on their own purchases, the way is open for a repetition of our earlier experiences leading up to adoption of Robinson-Patman.

If we wish to have equality of economic opportunity in the market place the 25 percent must not be allowed to disrupt the price structure to the detriment of the other 75 percent. The importance to the economy of California lies in the fact that these unearned brokerage fees would be extracted from the returns that our farmers would otherwise receive. It requires no Einstein to discern that this would be harmful to our entire California economy.

A great deal of study lies ahead before the Attorney General adopts the recommendations drawn up by his Committee. Still further study will be required before they become official administration policy. Then Congress will have the final say on any legislation. It is to be hoped that somewhere along the line a good, close look at the report on Robinson-Patman will result in some substantial revisions in the recommendations as submitted.

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, southern California has been fighting the Colorado River storage project with every resource at her command. Why?

Southern California spokesmen would have us believe that they are altruistic—that they oppose the project only because they honestly believe it would be bad for the Nation. But let us look at a few hard facts.

Southern California interests have spent tremendous sums of money to fight against the Colorado River storage project. Official reports filed under the Lobbying act—public documents which may be checked at any time to veryify what I say—show that southern California interests have paid approximately a quarter of a million dollars to a single lobbyist, Mr. Northcutt Ely who has directed the fight against our project.

And this is only a fraction of the money which southern California has spent to oppose us.

You all see, every day, delivered to your desks, examples of the highly expensive propaganda against the Colorado River storage project, which is being paid for by southern California.

We all know that every interested group may spend money to fight for a good project, because of the long-term return which may result. A group may oppose a project on principle—but when a group spends big money to fight against a project, there is always an ulterior motive. The money would not be spent if a corresponding return—in good, hard cash—were not expected.

Why is southern California willing to spend tremendous amounts to oppose us? What return can she expect for the money she put out?

The answer is obvious. There is an ulterior motive, and southern California does expect a return.

If the Upper Colorado River Basin is not allowed to develop and use its own share of Colorado River water, that water will flow on down to southern California. This is a multi-billion-dollar resource, whose total future value is incalculable. With such a stake, the expenditure of a million dollars or so for propaganda becomes fully understandable.

The simple answer is that southern California has the water which belongs to her—but she apparently wants all the water.

The Monopoly in the Antibiotic Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have heard complaints from several sources that big business is pushing out small business firms in the field of antibiotic products. Certain major producers of these products are virtually exercising a monopoly in the field. They are charging the public fantastic prices for antibiotics. They are fixing prices, and generally pursue other unfair practices which are seriously hurting the smaller firms.

A good example is the case concerning penicillin, the first really important antibiotic and probably still the most valuable from the clinical standpoint. Penicillin was introduced into this country from England during the early years of World War II. Because of its obvious military importance, it became overnight a joint Government-industry sponsored project. Many millions of dollars of public funds, as well as huge sums from private funds, were poured into the development and the establishment of the necessary facilities for the production of penicillin.

Either through rapid tax write-off or through actual plant construction with an option to purchase the plant later, several large corporations in the pharmaceutical or related fields entered into the production of penicillin. Over a period of years their efforts proved quite rewarding. At one time there were 21 basic manufacturers of penicillin, many of whom later also produced streptomycin, bacitracin, and other antibiotics.

As time progressed and the markets for penicillin became more saturated, the smaller producers were unable to compete with the larger producers. They were gradually being forced out of the market and found themselves in the unenviable position of being dependent on a few large basic manufacturers for their raw materials or dosage forms in order to supply their customers.

To be sure, there was quite a large number of small nonbasic manufacturers of antibiotic products several years ago. They were well-established businesses, but small in scope and in operations. They were dependent on the large basic manufacturers for their supply of raw materials, but as the latter began to exercise a greater degree of monopoly the smaller firms were driven out of the field.

Practically all of these small firms are by now out of business, with the exception of the Bio-Ramo Drug Co., Inc., of Baltimore, Md., which also may be forced to close down soon because of these unfair competitive practices. This firm has always been fair in its dealings with the supplier as well as the consumer, it has a fine business record and was conducted on a sound financial basis.

Mr. Frank R. Cusumano is the head of the Bio-Ramo Drug Co. He is a graduate of the University of Connecticut, where he received a Ph. D. degree in pharmacy in 1929. For nearly 10 years he represented the E. R. Squibb Co., in the New York metropolitan area as professional service representative. He came to Baltimore in 1940 to represent in a similar capacity the Hoffman-LaRoche Drug Co.

In 1945 Mr. Cusumano established the Bio-Ramo Drug Co., manufacturing drug products and pharmaceuticals. Several years later he became interested in antibiotics. He developed three preparations which were accepted by the American Medical Association as pioneers in the oral administration of vitamin B–12, and also obtained a patent on impregnated gauze pads for surgical use with antibiotics.

Today the Bio-Ramo Drug Co. is the largest nonbasic manufacturer of penicillin products. The firm has a research staff of trained experts and pharmacists. It is serving hospital purchasing agencies which are distributing antibiotic products to more than 500 hospitals affiliated with these purchasing agencies. In other words, it is not a fly-by-night company, but one that has built up a large clientele which depends on its services.

Mr. Speaker, I cite the case of the above-named firm to show what is going on in the antibiotic field and how the whole field is gradually falling into the hands of a few people. Their practices in driving out competition and pushing out the small firms are not only unfair and ruthless, but they are also un-American.

I feel that something concrete should be done in this instance, whether through legislation or investigation. I have assembled a good deal of material on the subject, and I intend to present it to the appropriate authorities to conduct a full-scale investigation of these evil practices. Meanwhile, I want to call the matter to the attention of Congress.

Servicemen's and Veterans' Survival Benefits Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion on the rule that the reason a closed rule was asked for was because it was a complicated bill and because amendments might seriously complicate the situation on the House floor. Be that as it may, since the members of the select committee have the power to introduce an amendment but we do not, I then make a request upon the committee to permit the House to express its will on the one glaring imperfection in this bill, and I ask the committee collectively and individually to offer an amendment, which they have a right to do, to give the surviving widow, regardless of the rank of the soldier killed, the sum of $140 so that everybody will be treated equally.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I just want to be sure I understand what the gentleman is proposing. The $140 figure is proposed as a lifetime consideration regardless of the age of the survivor?

Mr. RADWAN. That is correct.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman, of course, realizes that the actuarial equivalent for the younger widow, for the lower-ranking individuals, would be a lot less than that of the higher rank.

Mr. RADWAN. I realize that, but I make that request based on this consideration. There has been some suggestion by a member of the committee in the discussion on the rule that usually survivors' benefits are measured by the attainment of the man. Well, when a man is killed in action, whether he be a private or a colonel or a general, he attains the pinnacle, because he has given his all for his country regardless of rank. Rank ceases upon death, and there should be no further differentiation between the widow of a colonel or a general or a private based on that ground.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. Does the gentleman believe that everyone on active duty today should have the same rank and everybody get the same pay?

Mr. RADWAN. I do not believe that. I have always supported adequate pay scales for all members of our Armed Forces. My point is directed to surviving widows' benefits.

Mr. BATES. Certainly we should have as much consideration for our soldiers when they are alive as when they are dead.

Mr. RADWAN. I am concerned about the widow, whether she be the survivor of a private, a colonel, or a general. During their lifetime we are treating everybody in the officers' ranks on a fair basis, based on their ability to rise in the service, but upon death rank ceases, and it is for that reason that I make my request in all sincerity and in all good conscience to a committee that has done an otherwise fine job on this bill.

I shall support this bill with or without the correction I suggest, but it will be a much fairer bill if so corrected. Furthermore, the amendment I request will be supported overwhelmingly by the membership of this House.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it will not be possible for me to be present tomorrow when the House will consider the minimum-wage bill, due to the fact that I am leaving for Paris as a member of the congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

On the eve of my departure I cannot let the opportunity go by without briefly expressing my views and support of minimum-wage legislation.

I had hoped that the committee would report out a bill providing for $1.25 minimum wage per hour, but it limited the wage floor to $1 per hour. President Eisenhower's proposal to increase the present minimum from 75 cents to 90 cents an hour is unrealistic. It does not go far enough and, in my opinion, is not economic justice to millions of people who are in the lowest income group. At the rate of a 40-hour week, a 90 cents minimum wage will provide a family with an income of only $36 per week.

These are substandard wages which we should not tolerate in a country like ours. A realistic floor beneath wages would be an important factor in preventing industrial dislocation and exploitation of low-income workers. It would also help increase purchasing power, improve living standards, and be a stabilizing factor in our economy. A higher minimum wage will be beneficial to some 10 million low-paid workers and their families for whom it is vital to keep pace with the increase in the cost of living during the past 5 years.

The existence of substandard wages hurts everybody. It affects not only the low-income families, but it hurts the business people, the manufacturers, and the farmers because millions of consumers cannot afford to purchase the goods they produce. A higher minimum wage is a means for assuring continuation of America's economic prosperity. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the $1 minimum-wage proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram signed by four outstanding American labor leaders, heads of AFL and CIO unions, whose memberships reach into the hundreds of thousands. I have the greatest respect for their views on the subject. I am pleased to insert the text of the telegram into the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 13, 1955.*
Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Washington, D. C.:

We understand House of Representatives will consider the minimum wage bill on Friday, July 15. As spokesman for the four undersigned unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations especially interested in achieving a fair and realistic minimum wage because it directly affects many employees in our industries, we would like to urge you as strongly as possible to be present in the House at that time and to support in every way you can the passage of a bill that will raise the minimum wage to at least $1 an hour. It is most important that any attempt, under any guise, to substitute a 90-cent minimum for the $1 minimum be defeated. We urge you, therefore, to oppose and to vote against all such proposals. Congress has the opportunity now to raise the minimum wage to a more realistic level. It is high time that this be done, and we trust that this objective will have your full support when the House considers the minimum wage bill on Friday.

JACOB S. POTOFSKY,
President, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO.
DAVID DUBINSKY,
President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL.
EMIL RIEVE,
President, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.
ALEX ROSE,
President, United Hatters Cap and Millinery Workers Union, AFL.

Bananas on Pikes Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, the proposed Tomichi Creek irrigation project in Colorado would grow more supported crops to be added to the enormous agricultural surpluses now bulging the Nation's warehouses.

The Tomichi Creek project is a part of the multi-million-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Dosages From Natural Radioactivity and Cosmic Rays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Science, July 8, 1955, volume 122, No. 3158, entitled "Dosages From Natural Radioactivity and Cosmic Rays" by W. F. Libby, a member of the United States Atomic Energy Commission:

DOSAGES FROM NATURAL RADIOACTIVITY AND COSMIC RAYS

(By W. F. Libby, member U. S. Atomic Energy Commission)

The radiation dosages that people receive from the natural radioactivities and cosmic rays have been calculated and are given in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. Some direct observations are given in table 5.

Table 1 gives the dosages in milliroentgens per year for exposures at various altitudes directly over ordinary granite, typical sedimentary rock, and open oceans. Surface dosages decrease with height above the ground because of air absorption; 50-percent reduction occurs for every 370 ft. (1) For comparison purposes, it is interesting to note that in the United States, the average exposure rate from total fallout from atomic tests on Jan. 1, 1955, was about 1 mr/yr (2). The total dose during 1954 probably averaged about 15 mr. (2), principally because of the Pacific tests in the spring.

The values listed in table 1 were calculated on the following basis. The roentgen was taken to be 100 ergs of energy per gram of water. (Actually this definition is that of the rad, the internationally recognized unit of radiation dosage. For gamma rays it is nearly equal to the roentgen, which is 93 ergs/g.) The absorption coefficients of all radiations in tissue were taken as being equivalent to those of water. The dosages from the natural radioactivities in the earth were calculated on the approximation that the energy absorbed per gram by the human body on the surface of the earth is, to a sufficient approximation, equivalent to that absorbed per gram by the top layers of the rock of the earth's surface itself from the gamma radiation emitted by the rock (3). In other words, the total gamma-ray energy produced in a gram of granite from the thorium, uranium, and postassium contained was taken to be equal to the energy absorbed per gram of human tissue in the human body on the surface, except that a factor of 2 was used to correct for the geometric loss. It was interesting to observe that this simple method of calculation gave results in good agreement with those based both on separate consideration of each of the complicated radiations emitted by thorium and uranium in the rocks and on the use of the individual absorption coefficients for these radiations in tissue, together with correction for the "buildup" factors as the radiation is scattered and diffuses out of the rock (4).

The abundances of uranium, thorium, and potassium in granite were taken as 4×10^{-6} g/g (1), 13×10^{-6} g/g (1), and 0.03 g/g, respectively (1). In selecting these numbers it was realized that these were only averages and that fluctuations around these values do occur, that uranium contents as high as 200 ppm have been found in granite, and that thorium has been found as abundant as 500 ppm in some granites.

For sedimentary rocks, the general average figure of one-fourth of the values quoted for granites has been used. It is realized, however, that this is very approximate because the amounts of the various radioactive minerals in the sedimentaries fluctuate widely. The abundances of uranium and potassium in sea water were taken, repsectively, as 1.3×10^{-9} g/g (1) and 3.5×10^{-4} g/g (1). The abundance of potassium in the human body was taken as 2×10^{-3} g/g (5), and the abundance of carbon in the human body was taken as 18 percent. For the calculation of the dosage from radium assimilated in drinking waters throughout the normal lifetime, the bone weight was taken as 10 percent for the adult man. But for relatively brief periods of assimilation when the radium would be expected to be concentrated in the small volumes of the bone most metabolically active, the figure of 1 percent was used. All these numbers on the human body were taken as being equivalent to those of the "standard man" (6).

The dosages resulting from cosmic radiation were calculated from the ionization chamber data of Millikan et al. (7). From these data the dosages were calculated at altitudes up to 20,000 ft. and at the latitude of 55°N (geomagnetic) as well as at the geomagnetic equator. The results are given in table 2. It should be mentioned that the biological effects per unit energy may be larger for cosmic radiation because it consists of high-energy particles rather than gamma radiation.

The natural radioactivity in the human body contributes the dosages given in table 3. Of the 19-mr/yr dosage from potassium, 17 mr/yr is from the beta rays of the potassium itself. These were taken to be of a mean energy 40 percent of the maximum energy of 1.36 Mev. The specific activity of natural potassium was taken as 1,800 beta rays per gram, per minute, and 180 gamma rays of 1.45-Mev energy per gram, per minute (8). The gamma rays that contribute the remaining two units of the dosage of potassium were calculated on the basis of the assumption that only half of the gamma-ray energy is actually absorbed in the body. This leads to the result that in a packed crowd the radioactivity from the potassium in one's neighbors' bodies contributes an additional dosage of 2 mr/yr.

The dosage from carbon was calculated on the basis of the assumptions that the body is 18-percent carbon; the specific radioactivity of carbon is 15 disintegration/g, per minute (9); and that the mean energy of the beta radiation is 40 percent of the maximum energy of 167 kev (8).

In Table 4, various ordinary but somewhat unusual circumstances are used to illustrate the types of exposure that can occur in normal living. A wrist watch worn 24 hr/day that has a luminous dial assumed to have 1 μc of radium per watch—a figure perhaps slightly larger than the average—would give the central body, including the sex organs, a dosage of about 40 mr/yr. An airplane pilot flying 24 hr/day with an instrument panel consisting of 100 dials with 3 μc of radium each would receive, at an average distance of 1 yd. a dosage of 1300 mr/yr.

In order to check whether the dosages calculated here and given in Tables 1 to 4 are essentially correct, some direct measurements reported by various observers are given in Table 5. They agree reasonably well with the external component of the total dosages given for sea level in Table 1—the residues after subtracting 20.5 mr/yr, the dosage from body radioactivities given in Table 3.

It is interesting that the variations in natural dosage are large and under certain conditions the natural dosage may be nearly 100 times higher than the minimum—the dosage of seafarers. The fallout dosage rate in the United States on 1 Jan. 1955—1 mr/yr—was only 2 percent of this lowest natural dosage rate. Of course, during a test period when bombs are fired, the fallout dosage rates may approach, or somewhat exceed, the natural dosage rate for a few days before decay and weathering processes reduce them in a few weeks to rates that are small percentages of the natural background.

REFERENCE AND NOTES

1. H. Faul, Nuclear Geology (Wiley, New York, 1954).

2. M. Eisenbud and J. H. Harley, Science 121, 677 (1955).

3. This calculation was kindly suggested by L. D. Marinelli of Argonne National Laboratory.

4. U. Fano, Nucleonics 11, No. 8, 8 (1953); 11, No. 9, 55 (1953).

5. L. D. Marinelli, private communications.

6. "Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection," NBS Handbook No. 47 (1950), p. 16.

7. R. A. Millikan and H. V. Neher, Phys. Rev. 50, 15 (1936); H. V. Neher and W. H. Pickering, ibid, 61, 407 (1942).

8. "Nuclear Data," Natl. Bur. Standards U. S. Circ. 499 (1950), supl. 1, 2, and 3.

9. W. F. Libby, Radiocarbon Dating (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1952).

10. A. H. Sturtevant, "Genetic effects of high-energy irradiation of human population," address given 11 Jan. 1955 at California Institute of Technology.

11. R. M. Sievert and B. Hultquist, "Variation in natural gamma radiation in Sweden," Acta Radiol. 37, 388, 399 (1952).

12. F. P. Cowan, "Everyday radiation," Phys. Today 5, No. 10, 10 (1952); also AECU-1138.

13. V. F. Hess and R. P. Vancour, "Ionization balance of the atmosphere," J. Atm. and Terrest. Phys. 1, 13 (1950).

14. P. R. J. Burch and F. W. Spiers, "Radioactivity of the human being," Science 120, 719 (1954); P. R. J. Burch, "Cosmic radiation," Proc. Phys. Soc. London A67, 421 (1954).

TABLE 1.—*Total radiation doses from normal background radiation (mr/yr)*

Altitude of ground surface (feet)	Ordinary granite		Typical sedimentary rock		Open ocean	
	Equator	55°N	Equator	55°N	Equator	55°N
Sea level	143	147	76	80	53	57
5,000	150	170	83	103	------	------
10,000	190	230	123	163	------	------
15,000	270	350	203	283	------	------
20,000	414	560	347	493	------	------

TABLE 2.—*Cosmic-ray dosages*

Altitude (feet)	Dosages (mr/yr)
Sea level	33–37
5,000	40–60
10,000	80–120
15,000	160–240
20,000	300–450

TABLE 3.—*Radiation dosages from the natural radioactivity of the human body*

Source of radioactivity	Dosage (mr/yr)
Potassium	19
Carbon	1.5
Radium (bones only), uniform distribution	6.7
Radium (bones only), nonuniform distribution	[1] 67

[1] The radium content of the human body is based on data of A. F. Stehney of Argonne National Laboratory.

TABLE 4.—*Radiation dosages in various ordinary circumstances*

Radiation source	Location	Dosage (mr/yr)
Wrist watch (1μc of Ra per watch)	Central body, including sex organs, at average distance of 1 foot.	40.
Luminous dials in airplane cabin (100 dials with 3μc of Ra each).	Pilot is taken to be at an average distance of 1 yard from the dials.	1,300.
X-rays (10)c	Lumbar spine, anterior-posterior	1,500 each.
	Lumbar spine, lateral	5,700 each.
	Pregnancy, anterior-posterior	3,600 each.
	Pregnancy, lateral	9,000 each.
Uranium ore (0.1 percent—the minimum accepted by the AEC for purchase).	Flat surface ground	2,800.
	Mine with all walls of ore	5,600 (neglecting radon).
Phosphate rock (commercial fertilizer 0.01 to 0.025 percent U).	Flat surface ground	280–700.
People	Packed in crowd	2.

TABLE 5.—*Experimental data for hard background radiation (mr/yr)* [1]

Observer	Cosmic rays	Gamma rays		Cosmic and gamma rays (total)	Location
		From air	From ground		
Sievert and Hultquist	44	------	------	121–150	Streets of Stockholm.
	------	------	------	104–182	Over igneous rocks, Sweden.
	------	------	------	94	Clay soil (11).
	------	------	------	104	Wood houses (average center of room).
	------	------	------	145	Brick and concrete houses (types 1, 2) (11).
	------	------	------	[2] 296	Brick and concrete houses (type 3) (11).
Cowan	------	------	------	98	Outdoors, Brookhaven, N. Y., measured (12).
Hess and Vancour	34	2	53	90	Outdoors, Fordham Univ. campus, N. Y., 1 m above ground (13).
Burch	31–34	------	62	94–96	Leeds, England (14).

[1] Kindly collected by L. D. Marinelli of Argonne National Laboratory.
[2] Maximum, 520.

Army-Navy Men and Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article written by Drew Pearson appearing in the July 14, 1955, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. The article, entitled "Army-Navy Men and Dixon-Yates," follows:

ARMY-NAVY MEN AND DIXON-YATES
(By Drew Pearson)

A congressional investigation into the manner in which retired military officers use their Army-Navy careers to get into big business, then use big business to influence Government, has been long overdue. Various Senators have talked about such a probe, and one might now be held in connection with Dixon-Yates.

How much did certain high-ranking Army-Navy officers have to do with trying to kill off the Tennessee Valley Authority through Dixon-Yates? How close were they to the First Boston Corp. and the Mellons? How close were they to General Eisenhower? These are questions a congressional committee might well investigate.

The facts go back to Pearl Harbor days when Frank Denton, president of the Mellon Securities Corp., came to Washington as a colonel working for Gen. B. B. Somervell.

Colonel Denton, in turn, brought George Woods, president of the First Boston Corp., to the Army as part of Somervell's entourage. It was Somervell who pushed Denton for promotion to brigadier general, and after the war, General Denton, head of Mellon Securities, in turn got Somervell made president of Mellon's Koppers Co.

Also after the war, George Woods, of First Boston, and Denton, of Mellon Securities, merged their companies; so that, after 1946, Dick Mellon and his sister, Mrs. Allan Scaife, controlled the First Boston Corp., which, it's now revealed, put Adolphe Wenzell inside the Budget Bureau to concoct the Dixon-Yates project as a means of blocking TVA.

ADMIRAL ENTERS PICTURE

The story, however, does not stop there. After the war, another high-ranking officer, Adm. Ben Moreell, was picked by the Mellons to become head of their Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.

And the other day, Admiral Moreell, as a member of the Herbert Hoover Task Force on Public Utilities, wrote a lengthy, highly technical recommendation that TVA be turned over to private companies. Admiral Moreell, a fine naval officer, knows almost nothing about public utilities, and it would be interesting to ascertain who wrote the report for him.

A Senate committee might also inquire why those connected with the Mellons, from Adolphe Wenzell of the Mellon-controlled First Boston, to Moreell of the Mellon-controlled Jones-Laughlin, were so interested in blocking TVA.

Another point. Why was another retired Army officer, Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, picked by Ike out of nowhere to be made chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a job hitherto held by civilians? Since taking that job, General Vogel has consistently voted against other TVA commissioners and for Dixon-Yates. Why was it that Ike picked this particular Army officer? Who recommended him and why? Was he picked for the special purpose of gradually liquidating TVA?

A great many retired generals have been appointed to high positions of late and they should be scrutinized carefully if we are to safeguard our tradition of being a nonmilitary Nation.

A GENERAL BUYS OIL

Last week, Congressman DEWEY SHORT, Missouri Republican, denounced as terrible the fact that the Air Force had hired another retired general, W. W. White, vice president of Esso, to negotiate oil-and-gasoline agreements for the Air Force.

On February 26, 1954, 1 year and 4 months before the investigation by the House Armed Services Committee, this column revealed that Brigadier General White had been hired by the Air Force for the very dubious job of negotiating a $30 million agreement to sell aviation gas to the Air Force overseas.

This, according to the column of February 26, 1954, constitutes about two-thirds of all aviation gas that will be used by the Air Force overseas during the current fiscal year.

"White is not giving up his holdings in Esso as Secretary of Defense Wilson did in General Motors," this column reported. As an ex-vice-president of Esso, he will walk around to the other side of the table and purchase gasoline for the Air Force.

Congressmen investigating White's anomalous position on July 7, 1955, elicited the fact that he is still drawing pay from the Esso Export Corp. while working for the Air Force.

Tribute to the Corps of Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, while there is much in the final and last Hoover Commission Report on Water Resources which should not be approved, there is one feature on which we may all agree and that is the work of the Corps of Engineers.

In this connection, I desire to have included in the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Banner, issue of July 1, last, entitled "Merited Salute: Valley Shares Tribute to Corps of Engineers."

The editorial follows:

MERITED SALUTE: VALLEY SHARES TRIBUTE TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The public, which knows and values the work of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, concurs in appropriate tribute paid by the Hoover Commission in its Water Resources report:

"The Corps of Engineers has an enviable record for service and adequate engineering design * * * it has demonstrated its ability to carry out the very large engineering projects; and * * * it has been signally free of any taint of fraud or dishonestly in the administration of the vast construction program with which it has been entrusted.

"And this applies to 131 years, during which it has had those great responsibilities."

Truly a notable record maintained for nearly one and a third centuries; its activities including such major undertakings as the Cumberland River development now rapidly maturing.

Middle Tennessee is intimately acquainted with that, and aware that the vast undertaking was a matter of regional preference assigned to the Corps of Engineers. With a vision of needs, it has done that job.

Something of the general favor was further shown by the board of governors of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce this week, in voting unanimously that body's active support of full development of the Cumberland.

For improved resources of river navigation —an item of great importance throughout this city's and region's history; for flood control; for power production.

As Chamber President Herbert Corson declared: "There are cities in the United States that would float a bond issue for a far larger sum than any that is proposed if it were possible to buy the Cumberland from us. This is an asset we must appreciate and use for the benefit of our people and our community."

The developments brought into being under the Corps of Engineer program have enhanced that value.

River transportation is growing.

Recent years, and particularly this past spring, have demonstrated its value in terms of flood control—a facility of protection growing as the development proceeds.

The Nashville Banner and the Nashville Chamber of Commerce, since before the turn of the century, have insisted on the development of the Cumberland by the United States engineers. This policy began with the building of the first locks and dams, many of which, after a half century of service, already are beneath the rising waters thrown back by the modern multi-purpose, medium-height dams. The commendation by the Hoover Commission, and previous accolades from both Government and business groups, prove the wisdom of the corps' plan. It also justifies the Banner's position, long since sustained by Congress, that it did not make sense to turn over to the TVA a water system whose high stage of development and efficient maintenance is due entirely to the corps.

Three United States engineer-built dams on the Cumberland River system for several years now have been pouring power into TVA lines. They are Wolf Creek, Center Hill, and Dale Hollow.

During the summer of 1957 Old Hickory and Cheatham Dams, whose reservoirs already are beginning to rise, will begin generating electricity.

The Southeastern Power Administration, an agency of the Department of the Interior, recently told the House Appropriations Committee that the power generated at Wolf Creek, Dale Hollow, and Center Hill during the next 12 months would be worth $4,300,000.

This money, paid by the TVA to the Southeastern Power Administration, goes directly into the United States Treasury.

One hundred and thirty-one years of magnificent service were acknowledged in this commission report—a tribute shared in spirit by every citizen grateful for an agency of that stature and reliability in meeting the national needs to which, for its very expertness, it is assigned.

Statement by the Indonesian Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

JULY 14, 1955.

The Indonesian Embassay announced today that, for the sake of fairness, there should be some clarification in the distorted press release of July 12 issued by the Netherlands Embassy. It stated that Indonesia shows reluctance at having an objective observer from an impartial country present to confirm that fair and just treatment is being accorded to the 23 Dutchmen, by refusing a visa to Mr. Charles A. Horsky, an American lawyer retained by the Netherlands Embassy.

The Indonesian Embassy fully endorses and highly appreciates the opinion of Mr. Horsky, as reflected in the Dutch press release, that "the trials should, as far as possible, be insulated from politics, local and international."

This has always been and will continue to be maintained by the Indonesian court during the hearings. They have been and will continue to be conducted in a fair manner according to law. They are being publicly held to facilitate the objective reporting of them. As a point of interest, it should be noted that the hearings, which have already been resumed with Mrs. Bouman acting as defense counsel, are—as in the past—open to the public, whereby foreign and local correspondents and even some members of the American Embassy in Jakarta are present.

If there is any question of trying to make this trial an international political issue, this should be solely addressed to Dr. Luns, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands. In his press interviews in the Hague (at which Indonesian journalists were excluded, much to the embarrassment of the Dutch Journalist Association) in New York and in San Francisco, Dr. Luns clearly stated that the holding of the related press interview has been to attract world opinion.

Relative to this, the note of the Indonesian Embassy to the Netherlands Embassy, dated July 8, in refusing the visa application of Mr. Horsky, said: "After the publication of the white paper and the related press interviews of Dr. Luns, the inference that the visa application is not a political issue is beyond retraction. It can be clearly ascertained that the Government of the Netherlands has taken the initial steps in an effort to make the trial of the 23 Dutchmen an international issue. The request of the Netherlands Government that a visa be issued Mr. Horsky is not an isolated incident—it is a part of a chain of events initiated by the Netherlands Government. It is part of an inadmissible effort to influence the outcome of a pending judicial trial conducted by competent judges with many years of experience in western legal procedures and principles."

Additional confirmation of the fact that high standards of justice are maintained in Indonesia comes directly from the mouth of the Dutch lawyer, a Mr. Stoffels, who acted as defense counsel in the recent trials of the leaders of the so-called Republic of the South Moluccas at Jogjakarta. On June 16, 1955, Mr. Stoffels said: "It is not admissable to take general conclusion from the events in the procedure of Jungschlaeger's trial, saying that the administration of justice in Indonesia is valueless. * * * There are no reasons to be pessimistic concerning the future of administration of justice in Indonesia as appears from my experiences in Jogjakarta. Theoretically, there are sound conceptions as to the way of administering justice and there is also a firm tradition of an impartial trial. Conceptions of administration of justice in Indonesia are similar to those in the Netherlands."

In this regard, the note of the Indonesian Embassy to the Netherlands Embassy said: "The Indonesian Government regrets that the Netherlands Government failed to realize the international political implications of its request. The Government of Indonesia is of the opinion that it should refrain from any action contributing to the creation of new international tension in the area by throwing the existing good relations between the Government of Indonesia and the United States of America into needless jeopardy."

To date, there are 38 Dutch lawyers residing in Indonesia. What is more, there are numerous Dutch lawyers in Holland. Some of these could easily be selected by the Netherlands Government to act as defense counsels of the 23 Dutchmen at present standing trial.

The Indonesian Embassy, therefore, believes that the Indonesian Government will continue to persuade the Dutch Government to choose their own Dutch lawyers, rather than foreign lawyers, so that the trials can be insulated from international politics, as Mr. Horsky so rightly put it.

Al Malaikah Temple of the Shrine Charitable Football Game To Again Be Played on July 27, 1955, Los Angeles Coliseum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, when I recently presided as subcommittee chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee at public hearings in Los Angeles, at which time I had the pleasure of sitting with my distinguished colleagues MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri, DONALD JACKSON, of California, and GORDON SCHERER, of Ohio, the following information came to me about the oncoming annual football game sponsored by Al Malaikah Temple of the Shrine, the proceeds of which significant game always go to the Shrine children's hospitals. When I asked for further information about its setup this year, the following text was furnished me by Mr. W. E. Bradfield, who is one of the boosters of this magnificently unselfish and helpful enterprise by these worthy American citizens.

One of the significant features of this annual football game is that most all of the great fraternal and civic organizations of southern California cordially cooperate, and I was pleased to be informed that by reason of the amendment this Congress passed recently to the last tax bill, which amendment exempted from taxation the admissions to such games as the oncoming Shrine charitable game, is recognized as a very important factor by all the friends of the game who support this great welfare and humanitarian project annually. Friends of the game asked me to point out to you how much this tax amendment really means to them in increasing the amount available for charitable uses and purposes.

Following is the memorandum comment handed me about the game and its worthy objectives:

Four years ago the Shrine built a unit of its chain of hospitals for crippled children in Los Angeles where unfortunate youngsters are assisted without regard to race, creed, or color and without a penny of cost to the parents. The permission to build this hospital was granted by the imperial council of the Shrine largely through the efforts of men like Harold Lloyd, Elmer P. Bromley, Stanton Bruner, William Rhodes Hervey, and William Woodfield, the latter from San Francisco.

On July 27 a football game sponsored by Al Malaikah Temple of the Shrine will be played in the Los Angeles Coliseum, the proceeds of which go to the hospital. This game, now in its fourth year, is the personal project of Mr. Bromley, whom I regret to say I do not know personally because it is truly a remarkable thing which he has done.

The game teams are composed of 25 high-school graduates from northern California and 25 high-school graduates from southern California, selected by sports writers from all parts of the State.

The competition for places on the teams has become so keen that even nomination from among the thousands of young athletes is regarded as a high honor. The game has been of inestimable value in arousing interest in high-school athletics throughout the entire State, and it must be remembered that investigations of congressional communities has conclusively proved that athletic programs among our young people is one of the greatest antidotes of juvenile delinquency.

On July 27 about 2,000 high-school athletes and several thousand members of the Little League of baseball will attend the game as guests of individual Shriners and their friends who have purchased tickets for them.

With this in mind, you can see why I say that Mr. Bromley has done a remarkable thing.

He has created a youth movement which reached to the far corners of my home State. This movement culminates in a great football game, the proceeds of which go to aiding unfortunate crippled children to walk. How more perfect a program could one want?

Social Justice for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a pertinent article which appears in the June issue of the New Republican.

The article follows:

SOCIAL JUSTICE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(By John Campbell)

According to a few of our more powerful labor leaders, social justice for the working man has risen to guaranteed full pay when he sits at home doing nothing.

Succeeding years will prove in one way or another that this kind of justice is the pot at the end of the rainbow.

Social justice for the small-business man looks for no such guarantee of prosperity.

He knows this is God's world and that there is no utopia.

He expects no greater riches than his efforts and the gamble of life will give him.

For his worry and overtime work he expects nothing but the loss of his lifetime savings if he fails to produce successfully against fair competition.

In asking for social justice then, the independent-business man couldn't be asking for much.

He isn't.

It's just that when he reads in the newspapers that our Nation is enjoying unprecedented prosperity while small concerns in general really are suffering reserves, he knows something is wrong.

When he reads that giant business is making more profits than ever before in history, and he is making less than before, he is more than puzzled. Especially when he sees and hears many stories of how the giants seek new ways to spend surplus moneys, even waste money which would otherwise be given to the Government in taxes.

The small-business man's taxes are higher than ever. And instead of looking for new ways to spend money so that he won't have to pay it to the Government in taxes, he finds himself having to borrow money to pay the taxes he already owes.

With all of his troubles and worries, he then comes face to face with the fact that some of his employees are earning wages approaching his own profits in the business. Worse, they are organized and preparing to force him to pay them more.

Indeed, the squeeze between giant business and giant labor in which the small businessman finds himself today has become quite tight.

More and more it has become logic for the small businessman to quit his enterprise and go to work for the giants.

All good Americans should be alarmed over today's plight of the small businessman. If they are believers in freedom, they should make it their duty to help small concerns.

History proves that the death of small business has always preceded the death of democracy.

All regimented countries have a minimum of independent business.

Russia, for instance, is one giant business plus workers and no small business.

Social justice for small business had better not be too little too late. For our lovers of freedom will find the latter to be the point of no return and tyranny will be upon us.

Social justice for small business is simply an end to giantism in our country.

The power of giant labor and giant business has grown to a dangerous degree.

False economic philosophies of only a few labor leaders are being forced upon the entire United States at a fast pace.

A very few business concerns now possess most of the Nation's basic wealth—business and trade—merely because of their tremendous size.

Our Government is controlled now by these Goliaths. The labor giant dominates the Democratic Party. The business giant dominates the Republican Party.

First, Members of Congress pass legislation for the benefit and further growth of these two giants. Second, they serve the needs of the people.

Today, our daily press, television, and radio are dominated by the Goliaths so much so that public opinion favors these dangerous forces above true democracy. In fact, many people regard citizens who fight for freedom and democracy and openly attack giantism as radical. Giantism has no place in a democracy.

Business in a democracy is a lot of little independent people cooperating to do a big job—not the powerful few controlling all.

Social justice for small business, for the people, for democracy, is nothing less than the breaking up of these giants.

All of us most roll up our sleeves and begin the job.

The first step is to conduct a mighty crusade to alert and awaken the people to our great new danger.

New Republican is engaged already in this first procedure. We call it the security of opportunity program. Will you join us?

Cut out the poster on our back cover and display it. Urge others to join with you in this movement.

If at first you hesitate to display this strongly worded poster near you, it should alert you all the more as to how important this crusade really is.

Your hesitation was prompted, really, by fear of the giants.

When Americans live in fear, no matter how small the degree, it is high time to awaken to our growing danger and join this crusade for freedom and opportunity.

Report: Hearings on Alleged Coercive and Discriminatory Practices by Oil Company Suppliers Against Retail Gasoline Operators

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives has completed its interim report for presentation to the full committee.

This report deals with the subcommittee's hearings on alleged coercive and discriminatory practices by oil company suppliers against retail gasoline operators. The full report covers so many pages that the subcommittee has prepared and released to the press the conclusions of the subcommittee and its recommendations.

I believe that this summary will be of interest to many of my colleagues in the House.

I would also like to take this opportunity, as chairman of the subcommittee, to express to my fellow committee members, the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois, my appreciation for their full cooperation in striving to achieve an objective and constructive report on a highly controversial matter. The fact that the subcommittee is unanimous is due entirely to the splendid spirit of cooperation among all of the members.

The matters follow:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, CHAIRMAN OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S HEARINGS OF ALLEGED COERCIVE AND DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES BY OIL COMPANY SUPPLIERS AGAINST RETAIL GASOLINE OPERATORS

Subcommittee No. 5 consisting of the Honorable TOM STEED, the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, and myself as chairman have unanimously reached the following conclusions and recommendations on the basis of the testimony received in our hearings:

1. A substantial proportion of all sales of refined gasoline of major oil companies is made through retail outlets where the dealer has a short-term lease from the oil company supplier, usually for 1 year. The importance and the proportion of the total retail market serviced by such short-term lessee dealers has been increasing.

2. The dealer operating his station under a short-term lease with the oil company supplier frequently is not in fact independent and is subject to control by the oil company supplier. The freedom of choice of the dealer with respect to the manner in which he operates his station is circumscribed by the economic power of his oil company supplier, whether or not such power is specifically exercised against him.[1]

3. The short-term leases and sales practices of major oil companies in relation to sponsored products have had the effect of operating against a dealer's freedom of choice in using or dealing in competitive products, and operate to substantially lessen competition and tend to eliminate price competition.

4. Price Discrimination: Oil company suppliers, for the avowed purpose of having their dealers reduce their retail prices at particular locations to meet the competition of a dealer selling at a lower price, including off-brand gasoline, have held the level of their prices generally while at the same time cutting their prices to one or more dealers at a particular location. In such situations the lower price has prevailed until the low-price off-brand dealer saw fit to increase his price. This policy or practice has had the immediate effect of fomenting price wars among the retail dealers, and results ultimately in eliminating a substantial amount of price competition between and among both brand and off-brand gasoline. Moreover, short-term lessee dealers in many instances have been coerced or induced by their oil company suppliers into so-called price wars in an effort to secure the business enjoyed by the low-price off-brand dealer. It was also established that on occasion price wars have been started when some dealers engaged in price-cutting activities on their own initiative.

5. The lessee dealer needs immdiate and permanent relief to enable him to fulfill his role as an independent businessman. The present laws, procedures and enforcement policies are inadequate to achieve effective and permanent relief.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Subcommittee No. 5 recommends:

1. That the antimonopoly laws designed to protect and preserve small and independent business enterprises as necessary to our free and competitive enterprise system be strengthened. In that connection the subcommittee subscribes to the stated purposes and the principles embraced in H. R. 7096, for freedom of choice in trade, and H. R. 11, to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business.

2. That all oil company suppliers consider (a) the conversion of all leases with retail dealers, who have a satisfactory record of operation for a year or longer, into leases with a minimum term of 3 years, as is presently being done by some of the oil companies; (b) granting a new or untried lessee dealer a probationary period of from 6 months to a year after which period he should be tendered a 3-year lease if the company desires to retain him as a lessee; and (c) protecting the dealer during the probationary period by keeping his investment at a minimum and guaranteeing the return of his investment in the event the company does not wish to retain him as a lessee at the conclusion of the probationary period.

---

[1] Representatives of some of the oil companies testified that such control is necessary in order that the oil companies may protect their substantial investments. Other witnesses testified that many retail stations have been maintained at locations long after economic reasons for the substantial investment therein and their operation had disappeared.

3. That the full House Select Small Business Committee continue and expand its study of the problems of the small businessmen in the petroleum and other industries who are dependent upon large suppliers, to determine whether legislation is feasible which would provide for an administrative agency with the duty and authority to order divorcement, divestiture, or other types of relief when certain conditions or standards, to be legislatively set, are found to exist in the petroleum or any other industry.

4. That the record of the hearings be forwarded to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission and that these agencies (a) consider the utilization of existing laws to eliminate the deleterious practices shown in the record and the committee's report, and (b) to report to Congress those areas in which existing laws are not adequate to achieve relief and what further legislation is necessary in order to achieve comprehensive and permanent relief.

Wichita National Wildlife Refuge In Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest in the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma. It is proposed that a portion of this refuge be transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Defense for use by Fort Sill as an extension of the artillery range. Some of the evidence was not presented until after the committee hearings had been completed and the testimony had been printed. In order to present a clear picture, I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include in the extension of my own remarks the statement of Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, protesting the transfer, and the reply to that statement from the Department of the Army:

STATEMENT OF C. R. GUNTERMUTH BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATION SUBCOMMITTEE FOR ARMY CONSTRUCTION, WHO SPOKE IN BEHALF OF A DELEGATION FROM THE FOLLOWING FIVE NATIONAL CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS THAT APPEARED ON JULY 12, 1955, IN OPPOSITSON TO THE ARMY'S ATTEMPT TO TAKE OVER 10,700 ACRES OF THE WICHITA NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your courtesy in calling this special meeting of your committee. We will not consume more than 15 minutes of your valuable time. I would like to introduce my colleagues, Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation; Mr. Michael Hudoba, conservation director of the Outdoor Writers Association of America and the Washington editor of Sports Afield; Mr. Fred M. Packard, executive secretary of the National Parks Association; and Mr. Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society. I am C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. Chairman, the only reason that the members of your committee, and the other Members of Congress, have not been flooded with telegrams and letters of protest from people throughout the country is that comparatively few of the conservationists have learned of the Army's latest attempt to grab a large part of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma. News of the passage of the authorization bill is getting around, however, and we have been receiving inquiries from far and wide. We have been able to pacify some of the outraged citizens by repeating what was said in the House hearings on H. R. 6829, and in the Senate debate, that the action taken was not final, and that the land acquisition program for the Fort Sill Artillery School would have to be justified before the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. Chairman, the Army attempted to take over the entire refuge by a "paper transfer" 2 years ago, and as a result of the overwhelming number of protests that were received, the Secretary of the Army wrote to Mr. Packard of the National Parks Association that the acquisition was not necessary. The last paragraph of that letter, dated April 6, 1953, read as follows:

"The Army has decided to endeavor to carry out its mission at Fort Sill without acquiring additional land, either privately owned or on the refuge, for an infinite period, in an effort to determine if the problem of range requirements can be resolved short of acquisition. Accordingly, there are no plans for expansion into the wildlife refuge in the immediate future."

Mr. Chairman, we have studied the Army's request and have reviewed the transcript of the hearings and of the floor debate on H. R. 6829, and we fail to see where the Department of Defense has been able to justify the need for those refuge lands. The situation does not appear to be any different today from what it was 2 years ago. Any such transfer would be a grave mistake, since it would have a fundamental bearing on the future of the entire wildlife-refuge system.

I wish to emphasize that we are familiar with the Wichita Refuge. The land in question was inspected by me only 2 weeks ago, on June 27. Mr. Zahniser has been over the area, and Mr. Packard just returned from there last week. Mr. Chairman, that omnibus authorization bill moved along so swiftly that there was no opportunity to correct some of the misleading statements that were made during the floor debate. It was stated that the part of the refuge to be taken by the Army is the most inaccessible, and the part which is used neither by the public nor for game propagation. Here is a copy of a letter that was written to Senator MONRONEY calling attention to some of the inaccuracies in the statements made during the Senate debate.

The part of the refuge that has been used by Fort Sill for several years under a cooperative agreement with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and which the Army now wishes to acquire, is the most accessible. It is the land that has been serving the highest public use—it includes 6 good recreational lakes, 7 major picnicking and camping areas, the only youth group camp area on the entire refuge, and many miles of scenic drives. While they have tried to keep most of the big game on particular parts of the refuge, practically all of the different species inhabit the portion that the Army wants. It is used by big game throughout the year, and is the wintering ground for the buffalo and for that remnant herd of longhorn cattle. The area includes some of the best wild-turkey habitat.

During the floor debate, Senator STENNIS replied to a number of the Senators who were objecting by saying, "First, let me say that the proposition will come before the same subcommittee, for there must be agreement with the Armed Services Committee regarding the final taking and use of the land. If at that time there are any reasonable restrictions which can be imposed as a safeguard of the wildlife land, the subcommittee will certainly seriously consider them, and everyone interested will have an opportunity to be heard. I am sure that such restrictions will be imposed as are considered consistent with the necessary purposes for which the land is to be used."

Senator CASE then stated: "I hope the Defense Department will take due notice that, at the time it makes its presentation it will be expected to show, if it is to justify this acquisition, that it is impracticable to consider the use of some alternate range in some other part of the country for the firing of the long-range pieecs which are here involved." Senator CASE stated further, "At the same time, its value as a wildlife refuge will be greatly impaired. Let there be no mistake about that."

Gentlemen, we earnestly believe that the Congress should not approve this or any other attempt to break down the refuge system that was built up painstakingly and laboriously over a period of many years. The Wichita Mountains area, which is one of the oldest refuges, was established by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905. It was administered by the United States Forest Service for many years, but was transferred to the Bureau of Biological Survey in 1935, which is now the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. It is a unique and outstanding wildlife area. It has the heaviest public recreation use of all of the Federal refuges. It provides splendid facilities for wholesome recreation for people from all parts of the country; it is the blissful retreat of the residents of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico. Over 850,000 people used the area last year, and the better part of the recreational facilities are concentrated in the area that the Army proposes to take.

Fort Sill has been using portions of the refuge for gun emplacement positions for many years, Mr. Chairman—for the firing of the heaviest artillery and rockets that they have. The firing has been done from the refuge to Fort Sill. We cannot understand why the present cooperative agreement cannot be continued. If the operations were reversed, as they now seem to want, that part of the refuge that is left would be subjected to repeated fire losses.

During the House hearing on H. R. 5700 (H. R. 6829), Chairman VINSON, of the Armed Services Committee, made this request of Colonel Shuler, "Now, I would like for you to get information to advise the committee why this firing couldn't take place at Camp Polk or Camp Stewart and be ready to give us full information as to why you couldn't carry on this training at these two places as well as Fort Sill, and not by buying any more land at Fort Sill." Colonel Shuler answered, "I will furnish that to the committee, sir, when we get to Fort Sill in the bill," but upon reading the discussion pertaining to the Fort Sill item, we find no such list or any direct answers concerning alternative firing ranges.

During some of the questioning having to do with the possibility that the Army might not be permitted to purchase additional land adjacent to Fort Sill, General Williams told the committee, "I think you are probably thinking about whether we could fire these at some other place, and we could fire the Honest John or the 280 at other reservations. There are probably 5 or 6 in the country where we could fire them."

We understand that the so-called atomic cannon, for which the Army says it needs additional land for practice firing at Fort Sill, already is considered obsolete and is no longer in production. These are some of the questions that should be explored more fully before authorizing any expansion of the installation in Oklahoma. With the new military weapons that have come out in recent years, and the amazing developments that are being made all the time, we doubt that they will ever be able to meet future needs at Fort Sill—so why destroy the refuge? Then again, we are wondering if

that type of long-range firing should be practiced in such a populated area. Other such military operations are being performed in the large open areas of Arizona and Nevada.

When asked by Congressman BROOKS what the present size of the Fort Sill reservation is, Colonel Knowles agreed that it was about 6 miles wide and 28 miles long. We know little about range requirements, but if the Army should be permitted to acquire that 20,000 acres of private lands along the south of the refuge, they would add another continuous strip about 8 miles long and 3½ miles wide at its narrowest point. Certainly they should be able to stay within such a range, especially when the refuge lands could continue to be used as a buffer zone under a cooperative agreement. It should be stated that there has been little if any friction or dissatisfaction between the refuge manager and the officers at Fort Sill.

The Wichita Refuge is one of the remaining places in the United States where present-day Americans can get some concept of the waving grasses of the pioneer prairies. It is about the only place where biologists, botanists, ecologists, and other scientists can study the original flora and fauna in somewhat near its original state. More than 1,000 American bison (buffalo) roam the vast expanses, along with deer, elk, and pronghorn antelope. America's biggest herd of longhorn cattle, more than 350 prize specimens, can be seen at close range. Many of the steers have horns with as much as a 7-foot spread. Wild turkeys and prairie dogs and most of the other forms of original inhabitants of the plains provide enjoyment for those that are privileged to visit the area.

The Wichita has been providing many animals for display in public zoos. The surplus big game animals are removed annually to keep the herds within the carrying capacity of the range. It is no wonder that the Army wants that area. It is a marvelous place for anyone, of course, but it is especially important as an area being preserved for its present purposes. It is about the best demonstrational area that can be found, of the kind of rangeland that can be maintained under a sound management program.

Mr. Chairman, the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Mr. John L. Farley, stated before a House subcommittee last July that the Federal Government should acquire and develop 4 million acres of additional refuge lands, and that the States collectively should obtain and develop a minimum of 5 million acres, if the wildlife resources are to be maintained at somewhere near their existing level. The Army has been trying to grab the Cabeza Prieta game range and the Kofa refuge in Arizona. They recently got more than 100,000 acres in Alaska, and they want more. Whether it is because the Federal land does not cost them anything, or they want to add attractive hunting and fishing areas to their domain, we cannot be sure.

A number of bills have been introduced in the House and Senate which would prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from disposing of or relinquishing all or any part of any of the Federal refuges without the prior approval of Congress. It is hoped that such legislation would help to safeguard the relatively few acres that have been dedicated to wildlife, and we trust that the Congress will not permit the Army to take over and close to the public 10,000 acres of the best recreational land in the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge, including Mount Lincoln.

Mr. Chairman, if it is decided to appropriate the funds for that land acquisition program at Fort Sill, we respectfully request that a statement be included in the appropriation bill to prohibit the taking of the refuge lands. Thanks.

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1955.

The Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MONRONEY: We are disturbed by some of the comments that were made during the Senate floor debate on July 1 on the military authorization bill, H. R. 6829. This measure was cleared through the Senate so rapidly that there was no opportunity to correct the misunderstandings concerning the land acquisition program for Fort Sill, especially with regard to the 10,700 acres of land that the Army proposes to take away from the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge. It is hoped that more consideration will be given to this proposed transfer by the Appropriations Committee.

We note that you stated that "In fact, the wildlife area is quite a number of miles removed from the portion being requested in connection with this measure." Later during the colloquy, you stated that "It will preserve the integrity of the refuge. The part to be taken is the most inaccessible part and the part which is used neither by the public nor for game propagation." The writer is familiar with the Wichita Refuge, and with the land in question. The area was inspected by me only a few days ago, on June 27.

That part of the refuge that has been used by Fort Sill for several years under a cooperative agreement, and which they now wish to acquire, actually is the most accessible. It is the land that has been serving the highest public use—it includes 6 good recreational lakes, 7 major picnic and camping areas, the only youth group camp area on the entire refuge, and many miles of scenic drives. While an effort has been made to keep most of the big game on particular areas, practically all of the different species inhabit the portion that the Army wants. It is the wintering ground for the buffalo, and that remnant herd of longhorn cattle. It includes some of the best wild turkey habitat.

We cannot understand why the present cooperative agreement cannot be continued. They are using the largest cannons and rockets that they have. The firing is done from the refuge lands to Fort Sill. If the operations are reversed, the remaining refuge would be subjected to serious fire losses. Senator CASE mentioned the need for a range as long as five miles. We know little about military requirements, but if they acquire 20,000 acres of private land south of the refuge, they would have a continuous strip approximately 30 miles long and 3½ miles wide. Certainly they should be able to stay within such a range.

Senator MONRONEY, the Army contends that the refuge lands are needed for a buffer zone. There is widespread belief that the real desire is to add a most unique area and more hunting and fishing facilities to their domain. We feel that serious consideration should be given to the protection of the few recreational areas that are available to the residents of your State.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY STATEMENT ON PROPOSED LAND ACQUISITION, FORT SILL, OKLA., JULY 13, 1955

On July 12, 1955, Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, appeared before the Army Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations and presented a statement in opposition to the proposal by the Department of the Army to acquire certain additional land adjoining Fort Sill, Okla.

At the request of the chairman, this statement by the Army is prepared for the committee for its use in considering Mr. Gutermuth's testimony.

As explained to the committee by Army witnesses during hearings on the fiscal year 1956 military construction budget, the Army proposes to acquire 31,020 acres of land west of Fort Sill to permit proper use by the post of all artillery weapons. The acquisition comprises 20,320 acres of privately owned land and 10,700 acres across the southern portion of the Wichita Mountain National Wildlife Refuge. Mr. Gutermuth, in his statement, confined his opposition to the latter portion.

Army witnesses have testified to the committee that the added land taking is the only way in which firing of modern artillery weapons, such as the 280-millimeter gun and the 762-millimeter rocket (the Honest John), is possible at Fort Sill. Fort Sill is the artillery center of the Army, at which are located the Artillery School and the Continental Army Command Artillery Board. Ranges of those modern weapons reach a maximum of 31,000 yards.

The committee was given the full justification of this taking, including a briefing from a large-scale map showing how all alternatives were explored before the request for additional land was submitted. The committee, based on this presentation, favorably reported the item in its report released July 12, 1955.

Earlier, the two Committees on Armed Services were given the same justification facts and, despite a full hearing of opposition witnesses, these committees and later the Congress, approved the project as a line item in H. R. 6829, the military public works bill. No purpose would be served, therefore, in repeating earlier testimony except where necessary to refute statements made by Mr. Gutermuth.

Only those portions of Mr. Gutermuth's statement which are in error, which are half correct, or which quote material out of context will be dealt with here. Other portions of his statement are either correct or are matter of opinion on which debate would serve no purpose.

First, Mr. Gutermuth quotes one paragraph from a letter from the Secretary of the Army dated April 6, 1953 which states the Army "has decided to endeavor to carry out its mission at Fort Sill without acquiring additional land * * * for an indefinite period in an effort to determine if the problem of range requirements can be resolved short of acquisition. Accordingly, there are no plans for expansion into the wildlife refuge in the immediate future." This was true when written. Two years have been spent trying alternatives. At an average of 180 firing exercises a week, this means that over 18,000 firing exercises have been conducted in the 2-year period. The Army submits that this is sufficient "effort to determine if the problem * * * can be resolved short of asquisition." It cannot. On June 20, 1955, the Secretary of the Army personally testified before the committee in support of the acquisition. This is considered adequate answer to Mr. Gutermuth's quotation.

Second, Mr. Gutermuth states that he fails to see where the Department was able to justify the need. Again, attention is invited to the fact that three committees of the Congress, after carefully weighing Army testimony against that of opposition witnesses, decided that the request is justified. It is pointed out that the opposition to the taking of the privately owned land was equally strong and equally vocal.

Next, Mr. Gutermuth refers to Army testimony to the effect that the portion of the refuge requested by the Army is the most inaccesible and least used part of the refuge. This is correct. Mr. Gutermuth then cites the many recreational facilities in the part of the refuge used for several years by Fort Sill. This is also correct. The fallacy in Mr.

Gutermuth's statement is that, whereas the Army has 30,544 acres under permit now, it proposes acquisition of only 10,700 acres across the southern portion. The recreational facilities referred to are all in the northern 19,844 acres. They are not proposed for taking. Approximately 80 percent of the 10,700 acres which the Army proposes to acquire has been fenced off and access is denied to the general public except under special permit. This error on Mr. Gutermuth's part belies his earlier statement that he is familiar with the land in question.

Mr. Gutermuth goes on to say that the Army has been firing from the refuge into Fort Sill for many years and thus implies that no increase in range will be effected. With one exception, all the firing referred to was from a strip 300–400 yards wide along the Fort Sill boundary. This is virtually no different from firing entirely within the present reservation. The one exception mentioned required arrangements with the Fish and Wildlife Service 6 months in advance and was under such restrictions that it proved more trouble than it was worth and has not been repeated.

Next, Mr. Gutermuth contends that Army witnesses did not furnish the House Committee on Armed Services with promised testimony on alternative firing ranges at Camp Stewart, Ga., and Camp Polk, La. This committee devoted hours to the Fort Sill land item and the testimony covers 59 printed pages (pp. 3869–3928). Direct testimony by Army witnesses on alternative stations is found on pages 3915–3918. Furthermore, the commanding general of Fort Sill made this statement, on page 3877:

"Gentlemen, I think you are probably thinking about whether we could fire these at some other place, and we could fire the Honest John or the 280 at other reservations. There are probably 5 or 6 in the country where we could fire them.

"That won't improve the unsatisfactory situation that we have there at Sill. We have this mission which has been outlined, which is conducting gunnery instruction, tactical instruction, tactical employment. We call ourselves the artillery center of the world, and I think we are. And it involves teaching all weapons. If we had to do the firing at some other post and we had to move students and instructors to the other post, the cost, not only in money but in time, would be so prohibitive that actually I think it would cost as much in 1 year as it would to acquire this $2 million worth of land. And we wouldn't have an integrated instruction in artillery.

"We have a tremendous investment here, as was said, over $150 million in this reservation, and we are asking for a little over $2 million to insure the proper utilization of that land and to give us a mobilization base for an artillery school which we think is an important adjunct to our national defense."

This is the full statement of which Mr. Gutermuth only quotes a misleading portion.

The atomic cannon referred to by Mr. Gutermuth as being obsolete and no longer in production is the 280-millimeter gun. The 280-millimeter gun may become obsolete in the future because of development of other new weapons. However, weapons of comparable range will always be a portion of our artillery. The other military operations which, Mr. Gutermuth observes, are conducted in Arizona and Nevada, are either guided missiles (with ranges in the order of 100 miles) or nuclear devices tested by the AEC.

Last of all, Mr. Gutermuth contends that the Army could achieve its purposes by acquiring only the privately owned land. This would not be safe and the Army has so testified. Mr. Gutermuth admits, in a preface to this remark, that he knows little of range requirements.

The Army Must Learn To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe the records will show that I have been an advocate of strong financial support for the military. Unfortunately, the Army has had few champions in its quest for sufficient appropriations on which to survive. I think the following editorial, entitled "The Army Must Learn To Fight," is most appropriate, and I commend it to the Members of this body:

THE ARMY MUST LEARN TO FIGHT

The former Secretary of the Army, Robert Stevens, has returned to his textile business, and draws attention to the state of the United States Army, an important matter in this kind of a world. Mr. Stevens did a good job for the Army, as good a job as could be expected, in view of the sad state into which the Army has fallen.

The Army has taken the back seat in public regard among the services, largely because of the tight-lipped, self-effacing people that have been running it. Not so, the exception, Douglas MacArthur, when he was in charge. But inevitably the Chiefs of Staff and the real brass of the Army carry the stoical service traditions of West Point through the years of their duties, never being aggressive so far as their civilian bosses are concerned, always silent when politicians are slashing budgets, never saucy to newspapermen, never asking for more than the necessities.

The result has been that this country has never been prepared for war. The further result is that every young man in the country has been taught to regard the Army as second-class service.

In public regard, the Air Force comes first, the Navy with its elite Corps of Marines second, and the Army a tail-dragging third.

It is getting so that Army officers rarely wear their uniforms off duty, and the enlisted men wouldn't wear them at all if they weren't required to. The menial tasks of housekeeping throughout the world are parceled out to the Army.

When a cut in funds is required, the Army always is first in line to get it. After the wars, the battle-stained colors of the regiments are put away, remembered only by the inarticulate heroes of a hundred actions and their companions in Valhalla.

The military service as represented by the Army is an honored and glorious profession. It is valued in every nation in the world but the United States. For the glory of the Army the guardsmen are stationed at Buckingham Palace. Millions of Frenchmen thrill to the Sambre-et-Meuse. The Germans still keep sacrosanct the memory of those standards the Russians dragged along the streets in Red Square.

But here, in a country whose liberties have rested upon the Army from the Concord Bridge to the Yalu, we have a shoddy, sloppy regard for our benefactors.

The reason that Congress treats the Army with such little regard is that the Army never fights for itself on Capitol Hill. The engineers, it is true, get good treatment, but that is because they are charged with the rivers and harbors work which is so vital to many Congressmen.

The infantry, flower of the Army and queen of battles, gets the dirty end of the stick in United States peace, no matter how superb and heroic in United States wars.

The way young men jump into the uniforms of the more glamorous services in order to avoid being drafted into the Army is a national scandal, and a reflection upon the way patriotism is cultivated in this country.

The tragedy of the Army is that it has never learned the simple fact that it has to fight for itself in order to better fight for America.

World Beats a Path to TVA's Gate—We Finance Multipurpose Projects in Other Lands, Yet Attack Those in Our Own Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I desire unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD the column of Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, brilliant syndicated writer, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on July 10, last. I commend the reading of this well-written article by Mr. Stokes to the Congress.

The article follows:

WORLD BEATS A PATH TO TVA'S GATE

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Premier U Nu, of Burma, included a visit to TVA in his itinerary in this country.

But that's hardly news. In fact, it's routine at Knoxville and in the Tennessee Valley Authority region, whose inhabitants have become accustomed to a continual procession of visitors from all over the world. Nearly every official of a foreign government who comes to the United States puts TVA at the top among sights he wants to see while here.

Why? Because TVA is the one thing in our country about which most people elsewhere know.

This is easy to understand. It is because of what TVA has done for the land and the people of a large area of our Nation. It is something typically American, as the rest of the world looks upon us, for it represents the spirit of originality, of charting new paths, of pioneering to find new techniques to get the most out of our resources for the most people. It is a new frontier we have opened here when our old frontiers were closed. It is the essence of what we proudly call the American dream.

This particular American idea has been, and is being, copied all over the world. It is, in truth, the model for 18 other river-development projects in foreign countries, while 20 others embody various features of TVA. But, more than that, it is an export officially sanctioned. Our Government is actively sponsoring TVA's and helping to finance them as part of our foreign-aid program. That is a most effective way of helping other people to help themselves by developing their own water resources.

Only recently our Government advanced a a 20-year loan of $12 million to the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa to help that Government finance a 411-foot-high dam across Takekan Creek, a tributary of the Tanshui River, at Shihmen about 30 miles southwest of Taipeh. When completed—preliminary work began this week—it will irrigate 136,500 acres directly and indirectly and

furnish 120 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually, and store 251 million cubic feet of water and thus also serve to control floods. The Chinese Nationalist Government is investing $26 million in this multipurpose project.

This is merely one of several TVA's or partial TVA's to which we are contributing financially. One is a vast TVA in India being built for the Indian Government by a Philadelphia engineering firm. Also contemplated there is another project embodying reclamation and irrigation features of TVA, though not hydroelectric power, which is designed to utilize most effectively the water of the Indus River system, division of which is now in controversy between India and Pakistan. Significantly enough, this was suggested originally by an American banker, Eugene Black, now president of the International Bank, formerly a vice president of Chase National Bank. When he was in India for the World Bank in the interest of trying to do something about the India-Pakistan water dispute, which the bank is seeking to arbitrate, he saw the opportunity and value of a TVA type of development for the Indus system, and called in as consultant David Lilienthal, for many years Chairman of the TVA Board.

A businessman, Eric Johnston, a two-term president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, was delegated by President Eisenhower to negotiate for creation of another TVA—that proposed for the Jordan River system in the Holy Land.

Those are examples. Other people in other countries are, indeed, familiar with TVA.

But this idea which has become such a valuable item of export, making friends for us in many parts of the world, is under a cloud here. Not only is TVA itself under attack, as we know, but a fight is being made against extension of the TVA pattern to other great watersheds still undeveloped, such as Hells Canyon along the Idaho-Oregon border, as well as to other links in the Columbia River system.

Naturally this is hard for people elsewhere to understand. That explains the inquiries here to correspondents of foreign newspapers who at the instruction of their editors back home now are beginning to explore the attitude of the Eisenhower administration which represents such a change from the previous Roosevelt-Truman administrations. They are giving special attention to the complicated Dixon-Yates contract, now under investigation by a special judiciary subcommittee headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, so they can try to explain this attempted private-utility invasion of TVA espoused by the administration to their readers across the oceans. We are beginning to learn the truth of what one world traveler, Associate Justice William O. Douglas, of the Supreme Court, said:

"It may come as a surprise to many Americans that their Tennessee Valley Authority program is not only well known by countless Asiatics, even in the remotest reaches of that continent, but has come to mean to them a symbol of a hopeful new way of life for themselves and their children."

A Tribute to Fighting Bob La Follette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth, I want to pay my tribute to the memory of one of Wisconsin's outstanding sons, the late Robert M. La Follette, Sr.

Although three decades have elapsed since death removed him irrevocably from the arena of American politics, his personality and his principles are still among the living forces in our national life.

The passage of time has failed to cover them with the dust of obscurity, or to dim the luster of his imposing record of public service.

Both in the State of Wisconsin, and in the halls of Congress, Fighting Bob La Follette earned for himself the esteem and the affection of the American people.

"The Wisconsin idea," which he fashioned during his three terms as Governor of our State, became the inspiration for students of government the world over. He gave Wisconsin perhaps the best educational system in the country, a number of well-adjusted laws regulating public-service companies, and a series of constructive statutes intended to promote better living and working conditions for the people.

James Bryce, the historian, called La Follette's Wisconsin the "model State of the Union," and other observers have shared this view.

While a Member of the United States Senate, La Follette was the leading champion of virtually every measure intended to promote a better order of human life, and enacted during his lengthy tenure in office.

He was called "Fighting Bob," for he seldom divorced his dynamic and explosive personality from his prinicples and his actions. He fought the people's battles with every bit of energy at his disposal, refusing to yield from his position, and sparing no one who stood in his way.

Because of this, Robert M. La Follette, Sr. was perhaps the loneliest political leader of his generation, constantly exposed to bitter criticism from many sides.

His ideas were frequently ridiculed and denounced. His proposal to curb the authority and power of the Supreme Court of the United States, and other controversial suggestions, were roundly condemned and lost him many friends and supporters.

Nevertheless, the record of his personal achievements remains impressive. Further, many of the principles which he championed have withstood the test of time, and continue to play an important part in the life of our Nation.

The memory of Fighting Bob La Follette will live long in the hearts of the people of our State, and of our Nation.

Chickens Always Come Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 12, 1955:

GOODBY, DIXON-YATES

President Eisenhower, finally convinced that Memphis means business, has ordered "immediate steps" to cancel the Dixon-Yates power contract. His announcement followed a White House conference with Mayor Tobey, whose sincerity was for some reason more convincing to the President in Washington than it had been at Memphis.

The battle, therefore, is won, but the war goes on. The Tennessee Valley outside Memphis still needs more power, and what does the administration propose to do in order to allow TVA to fulfill its legal and moral obligation to supply it? The very least the administration, starting with the President, can do, it seems to us, is to decide whether it will sponsor appropriations for new TVA steam plants or a self-financing bond plan for those needed additions.

Furthermore, it needs to be recognized by the President and his advisers such as Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams that Memphis has been sadly victimized in this whole deal. The city of Memphis did not want to build this steam plant. It expressed what it wanted to do when it sold its powerplant and contracted to buy its requirements from TVA 17 years ago.

The ugly fact is that Memphis has been forced, against its wishes, into building a steam plant as the only remaining alternative to privately produced high-cost power, likely to retard its future growth, which the Eisenhower administration was thrusting upon it despite its strong and plainly spoken objections.

The Memphis pattern is not one which the Administration should wish to repeat and certainly it is one which no community in the Tennessee Valley will wish to have placed at its door. From start to finish the Dixon-Yates episode has represented neither the need nor the wishes of the people of the region directly affected.

It was conceived in a piece of deception—the deception that the power to be produced was connected with atomic plants. Because of that deception it was possible to exploit a loophole in the Atomic Energy Act and use AEC for a purpose for which it had never been intended—as a broker of electric power.

The integrity of AEC as an independent agency of Government was violated by the President's arbitrary order for it to execute the Dixon-Yates contract. A majority of the directors of the Commission had already voted against the project.

The excellent principle of competitive bidding was violated. Favoritism to a special interest was made the basis for the selection of the particular companies that were to receive the contract. An official of the No. 1 utility investment banking concern in Wall Street—Adolphe H. Wenzell—drew up the policy and pattern for Dixon-Yates, and made its specific financing plans, when he was employed as a consultant to the President's Bureau of the Budget—and when his banking house stood to profit $150,000 or more from the deal.

The President's order did violate to the constitutional separation of the executive and the legislative, by dictating to an agency which Congress had created independent. It fomented discord and disruption in AEC, obstructing the far weightier matters which AEC is primarily and solely responsible for handling. Coupled with the appointment of a hostile chairman at TVA, General Vogel, the Dixon-Yates schemes fomented the same discord and disruption in that agency.

Such is the balance sheet of Dixon-Yates—every item of it on the debit side. Nothing has been gained by anyone. Much has been lost by the entire country. Surely everyone concerned has every right to expect that in the wake of this extravagantly costly lesson the administration will present some affirmative and constructive plan, acceptable to the

people of the Tennessee Valley, to enable TVA to discharge its responsibilities as supplier of power.

Meanwhile, it becomes more imperative than ever that the investigation by the Senate antimonopoly subcommittee, now well underway, should go on unslackened. Particularly does the dual role of banker Wenzell need to be completely disclosed and dealt with.

The investigators will need to inquire into the climate and the personalities of official Washington which invited and made possible these miscarriages of Government.

Facts Versus Fiction on Surplus Crops From the Colorado River Storage Project—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in my reply to the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who on May 19, 1955, attacked the upper Colorado River storage project, I explained that the crops to be grown on project lands are not in surplus and not likely to be. Today I want to discuss his contention that bringing this project land into production would be done at exorbitant cost and then to discuss the economic need for bringing the construction of this project to conclusion as soon as possible.

The gentleman from California continued his denunciation of the irrigation pastures of the Colorado River project by stating:

> Every one of these irrigation crops (projects) would produce hay and pasture. Five thousand dollars an acre is somewhat expensive for grasslands, especially grasslands lying at altitudes up to 7,000 feet, some of which suffer from frost the year round. (RECORD, May 19, p. 5689.)

Let us examine this statement in two parts, Mr. Speaker. First, the higher altitude in the upper basin States does provide for a shorter growing season than that which exists at lower altitudes. However, this does not mean irrigated agriculture in the upper basin States is not economically sound and desirable.

There are several factors apparently unknown to the gentleman from southern California which bear out the truthfulness of this statement:

First. The irrigated land in the upper basin States requires less water than that at lower altitudes due to the shorter growing season itself.

Second. Experiment station research studies in this area indicate that with short growing seasons, an adequate water supply reduces the period required for plant maturity with two major results:

(a) Better quality crops produced, and
(b) Larger yields per acre.

In a few words, additional supplemental water means better utilization of limited agricultural resources.

Second, it is incomprehensible to me how anyone can examine the testimony of the Bureau of Reclamation before the Senate and House Interior Committees with respect to the estimated costs of the Colorado River storage project and come to the conclusion that the per acre cost to the Government will be $5,000. This is sheer nonsense.

On Friday, June 17, 1955, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, placed in the RECORD a statement in answer to a distorted article, which is written by Raymond Moley, full of half truths. Mr. Moley also made the same nonsensical statement that "the hidden cost would be $5,000 per acre." Well, here are the costs per acre by participating projects as authorized by S. 500, which were provided Senator WATKINS by the Bureau of Reclamation. Senator WATKINS said, and I quote:

> The facts: The average cost per acre for the 12 participating irrigation projects conditionally authorized in S. 500 actually is $537. Per-acre costs for the 12 units are as follows: LeBarge, $210; Paonia, $398; Florida, $343; Pine River, $332; Emery County, $400; central Utah $794; Hammond, $627; and Gooseberry, $349. The net average cost per acre for central Utah project is only $620 when project power revenues are subtracted. (RECORD, June 17, p. 7330.)

Now since the House bill does not authorize outright, as does the Senate version, the proposed storage projects known as Echo Park and Curecanti, it is evident that the per-acre costs of the participating projects authorized by the House version will be even less than those contained in the Senate version.

Mr. Speaker, there is yet another aspect of this surplus problem as it has been related to the upper Colorado River project by its critics. One of these critics, the gentleman from southern California, in his attack upon this project rested his case upon the false assumption that if this project were authorized it would be immediately constructed and additional land brought into production. But as my colleague from Utah, Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON, pointed out in a talk on this subject on May 23, 1955:

> Here again, he (the gentleman from California) made the false assumption that should this project be authorized it would be constructed and its irrigation features would be in production by next year in competition with other acreage growing supported crops. Surely he could not be serious.
>
> The legislation to authorize this project contemplates an orderly development of our entire river basin over a long period of years. * * * Before we can use the water we are entitled to, we must store up replacement water in mountain dams along the Colorado and its tributaries. The construction schedule, the first irrigation project will not reach full development until 1966. Irrigation features of the central Utah project—largest participating project in the legislation—will not be completed until 1983 if construction were to begin a year from now (RECORD, May 23, pp. 5826–5827).

This conclusion is amply supported by the experts of the United States Department of Agriculture who contend, based upon the rate of population increase, the trend in dietary habits, and the shift from the production of cereal crops to high-protein foods, that it is reasonable to expect that by 1962 production will be brought back into line with demand. This was the essence of the testimony given by Dr. Byron Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of the USDA, on February 1, 1955, to the House Appropriations Committee. Specifically Dr. Shaw said:

> It would take until about 1962 to bring production into balance with demand. (Hearing, Agriculture Department appropriations 1956, pt. II, p. 449.)

But the following questions, I realize do still remain: What evidence does Dr. Shaw base his statement upon? How will our present surpluses actually be liquidated? Is it desirable to increase the production of livestock and feed and forage crops for livestock—the primary agricultural commodities which now are produced and which will continue to be produced in the upper Colorado basin States?

Dr. Shaw answered these questions in his testimony before the House Appropriations Committee last February. He said:

> In considering what the shifts ought to be and what possibilities we would have of making shifts that may be profitable to farmers, I think the greatest single factor that has an influence on the use of substantial acres of land is the meat consumption of the United States population.
>
> Now, if we were to have per capita consumption at the average of the last 3 years, or the 151 pounds, by 1962 it would require 27 billion pounds of red meat. That is roughtly 19 percent more than was actually consumed in 1954. This would require about 3½ million more cattle, about 2 million more sheep, and about 9 million more hogs to supply the increased meat that would be needed by 1962.
>
> If you take the upper level or 156 pounds of red meat per capita, you would have to add still another 3½ million head of cattle, another million sheep and another million hogs to provide for the needs in 1962.
>
> The feed for that livestock would require 20 million acres more to produce the feed based on the 151 pounds per capita consumption (1952 to 1954 average) over the land than was used in 1953.
>
> In other words, it would require 10 million more acres of feed grains than was used in 1953 and 10 million more acres of hay and pasture than we used in 1953. This is a 3 million acre smaller increase in feed grains than actually took place between 1953 and 1954. There was no shift to hay and pasture going from 1953 to 1954. It would require a 10 million acre shift in that direction by 1962.
>
> If we were to consume 156 pounds of red meat, which was the consumption in 1954, it would require in 1962 some 35 million acres more land to grow feed than was used in 1953.
>
> That again would provide opportunity for the use of the 17 million acres that were used for growing wheat and cotton in 1953 that would not be needed in 1962. But it would indicate a deficit this time of roughly 18 million acres. In other words, the small difference in meat consumption—from 151 pounds per capita, which was the average 1952 to 1954, to 156 pounds which was the average per capita consumption in 1954—would take an extra 15 million acres of feed to provide that meat. (Hearings, Agriculture Department Appropriations, 1956 pt. II, pp. 447–451.)

In a few words then, according to Dr. Shaw, livestock production must be doubled on land in production at the present time if the increasing consumer demand is to be satisfied. The farmers and ranchers of the four upper Basin States can help supply much of this needed increase in livestock production, but this will require additional forage and feed crops as well as pasture to supplement the range used in grazing livestock as President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission pointed out in 1950. The production of much needed forage pasture requires additional water. This in turn necessitates the construction of the proposed participating and storage projects, so that the last major water reserve, the Colorado River, can be developed.

As Senator WATKINS pointed out in his talk on Friday, June 17, 1955, three major and independent studies on population and food supply indicate that by 1975, if the present birth rate continues, the population of the United States will be around "190 to 205 million people and that to provide food and fiber even at present dietary standards will require that approximately 100 million acres of additional cropland will be needed"—RECORD, June 17, 1955, page 7330.

How can this 100 million acres be provided? The President's Water Resources Policy Commission concluded in 1950 that it couldn't actually be met from domestic sources. Even when the reduced need of cropland for horses and mules, as well as increased maximum efficiency on present lands under cultivation and reclaimed lands are taken into consideration, this country will probably be some 24 million acres short of that required to supply our anticipated needs. To the extent that we fail to develop our potential production, this added deficiency will also have to be met by importation.

But we do have, as the President's Commission pointed out, the potential resources to bring into production the equivalent of 76 million acres as follows:

Source:	*Acres*
1. Acre equivalent of ordinary land reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection	21,000,000
2. Newly irrigated land equivalent (9 million acres of land in the humid areas will produce about as much as 6 million under cultivation)	9,000,000
3. Increased productivity on present lands under cultivation (liberally assuming that productivity would increase 18 percent by 1975 over the low period 1945–49)	46,000,000
Total available	76,000,000

(A Water Policy for the American People, vol. 1, pp. 17, 160, 65.)

In summary, it is evident:

First. By the time the Colorado River storage project is completed there will be no surplus agricultural commodities problem as far as we can now determine.

Second. Instead of agricultural production from lands supplied water from the Colorado River adding to a surplus, these products will be in great demand.

Third. Since by 1975 our ability to supply our food and fiber requirements is questionable, concern for the health and welfare of our citizens requires that reclamation projects having the economic feasibility of that which the Colorado River storage project has, must be now rushed to completion.

Every Member of Congress should keep these facts firmly in mind as we approach a vote on the upper Colorado River storage project. The economic justification of this project was, in my opinion, very expertly and concisely summed up by Dr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of streams for Utah, in his testimony on March 15, 1955, before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Dr. Clyde, it may interest you to know, was for 10 years dean of the School of Engineering at Utah State Agricultural College and more recently the Chief of the Division of Irrigation Research of the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. In his statement to the House Interior Committee on that occasion he observed that—

This country has become great because it has great natural resources, but also because its people looked forward. They did not wait for crises to develop. They anticipated them and prepared for them. We must anticipate our agricultural needs and prepare for them. The future needs are evident; the way of meeting them is clear. Begin now to develop the means of production of food and fiber to meet our needs 25 years from now.

This is the reason why • • • the Colorado River storage project, and participating projects, a basinwide development which will require at least 25 years to bring into full production the lands in the initial phase, should be authorized and construction started as soon as possible. It is a self-liquidating project and an investment in the Nation's future.

That is good advice. Let us anticipate our agricultural needs and take steps to meet them. We must face up to the problem which the President's Water Resources Policy Commission expertly described for us 5 years ago.

This, Mr. Speaker, concludes my reply to the gentleman from southern California. But tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I intend to discuss the real reason why Mr. HOLIFIELD, and California in general, opposes the construction of the Colorado River storage project.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Kentucky?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage.

Of this total, Kentucky has more than 170,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Back-Breaking Job: Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles concerning the untiring and overwhelming work brought about by our well-known and admired Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON, whose recent illness was a shock to the Nation:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar of July 5, 1955]

BACK-BREAKING JOB: MAJORITY LEADER—JOHNSON'S COLLAPSE DRAWS ATTENTION TO SENATE MANKILLER

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON.—The heart attack which struck down Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas) over the weekend focused attention on what has become one of the toughest jobs in Government—that of Senate majority leader.

Outside the Presidency itself, the Senate floor leadership is perhaps the most taxing and vexing post in Washington.

It is said around the Press Galleries that this job either maims men physically or kills them politically. It has done one or the other to many who have held it.

Senator JOHNSON, in the 6 months he has been majority leader, has demonstrated the rare combination of abilities needed for the job.

He has made the Senate run on the track—and on time.

And he has done so as leader of a split party which had only a two-vote margin and a role to play as opposition to a popular Republican administration.

FURTHERMORE

Making the Senate operate on schedule is only one of his accomplishments. He also has:

1. Reunited the members of his own party as they have not been in the Senate for 20 years.

2. Pushed through much of the Eisenhower legislative program without bringing down on his own head more than a smattering of criticism from Democrats.

The chief ingredient in LYNDON JOHNSON'S success formula has been sheer hard work—12 to 15 hours a day.

A close associate told this reporter less than 24 hours before Senator JOHNSON'S heart attack that the Senator was near the edge of sheer exhaustion.

His hope had been to hold on for a few more weeks, then take a long trip with his

wife before going back to his Texas ranch to relax.

Senator JOHNSON has not been a flashy floor leader. He has made few speeches, indulged in no tirades. He has rarely held the Senate in night sessions.

But he gets thing done. The bulk of his work is done in the cloakrooms, in conferences in his office and over the telephone.

SPEED-UP

He has prodded chairmen constantly to get key bills out of their committees.

He has worked for days with leaders of both parties to compromise most of the fight out of measures before they reached the floor.

His tact, his knack of getting politicians to settle their differences quietly and his consuming interest in politics have helped him and the Senate.

As a result, controversial bills which normally would have tied up the Senate for weeks have slipped through in a few hours or 2 or 3 days at most.

The results show in the statistics of this session compared with the 1st session of the 83d Congress in 1953.

As of June 30, the Senate calendar—which lists all bills reported by committees but not yet acted on—contained only 19 measures. On June 30, 1953, the Senate calendar listed 135 unpassed bills.

On June 1, committees had reported 445 bills and acted on 408. At the same time in 1953, only 366 bills had been reported and 296 disposed of.

LYNDON JOHNSON

It is ironic that LYNDON JOHNSON was stricken by a heart attack at the time when his colleagues were discussing him as a natural as a presidential candidate, if not next year, then in 1960.

Mr. JOHNSON earned his popularity by political leadership of the highest quality.

A lesser man, suddenly thrust in the role of Senate majority leader in an off-year election victory which left the executive department under control of the opposition party, would have played pygmy politics. A rabble rouser in that position would have used the majority to harass and embarrass the man in the White House and defeat the President's program, all for the purpose of making the executive department "ins" the "outs" at the next ballot. Many cases could be cited where exactly that happened. But there is nothing small bore about LYNDON JOHNSON.

An urbane, wise, and understanding political leader who sensed the temper of the times, Mr. JOHNSON has been a constructive leader, helping the President shove many important measures through Congress and giving to a divided world a demonstration of the essential political unity of the American people.

Mr. JOHNSON's Democratic Party has not lost stature by this show of responsibility on the part of the loyal opposition. To the contrary, there is greater cohesion among the Democrats in Congress today than at any time in the last 20 years, thanks largely to Mr. JOHNSON's wisdom in steering clear of petty and divisive issues.

The relentless way he drove himself to accomplish his mission unquestionably helped bring on the heart attack. His physicians say that Senator JOHNSON will have to remain in the hospital a long time. But the record of this congressional session, now speeding toward adjournment, will be largely a Johnson record.

Men of good will of both political parties will pray for the complete recovery of this unusual leader.

Building the Nation's Health from the Ground Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject "Building the Nation's Health From the Ground Up," which I delivered before the Alabama Association of County Agricultural Agents, at Birmingham, on Friday evening, June 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING THE NATION'S HEALTH FROM THE GROUND UP

(Address by Hon. LISTER HILL, Senator from Alabama, before the Alabama Association of County Agricultural Agents, Birmingham, June 24, 1955)

Thomas Jefferson declared that man is happiest who lives closest to the soil. His truth becomes self-evident when we observe the goodwill among you men of the soil gathered here tonight—you who have dedicated yourselves to the care of the good earth—to respecting her, to conserving and enriching her, that she might in turn give forth her bounty for the health, the strength, the happiness and the wellbeing of our people.

The Bible teaches us that it is from the good earth that all life springs. Civilization had its beginning when man first learned to cultivate the soil. The world is littered with the relics of civilizations that perished because man abused the land and unknowingly destroyed her lifegiving qualities. We see nations today pursuing the same road—leading to the same inevitable end. The menace of Red China's aggression and of the other danger spots of Asia and the Middle East are the results of generations of soil exhaustion—of peoples whose soils will scarcely support them. As you gathered here tonight so well know, the destruction of the soil breeds poverty and its handmaiden—disease.

It is about disease that I want to talk with you tonight—soil disease, plant disease, animal disease, human disease.

Basic to the health of all living things is the health of our soil.

Basic to the strength and prosperity of our country is the strength and prosperity of agriculture.

These truths were recognized by our Founding Fathers when the Continental Congress in the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 set aside public lands for the establishment of schools of agriculture and mechanic arts. Their importance gained further recognition in the Morrill Act of 1862 which devoted more of our public lands for the establishment and support of our land grant colleges for agricultural training and agricultural research, such as Auburn and Alabama A. and M. at Normal. Through the years we have built upon these foundations and passed law after law—to further strengthen and endow our institutions for agriculture training and research and to bring their benefits to the farmers and to all our people. To this end, it was my pleasure for years to work shoulder to shoulder with my late distinguished colleague, that great farm champion, John H. Bankhead.

We know that the first job of agriculture, and of agricultural research, is to produce enough food and fiber for everybody.

Abundant food supplies have become one of the hallmarks of life in America. This abundance we owe to the farmers of America and to our great advances in science and technology to which you men gathered here have contributed so much.

Agricultural research is also making vital contributions to the health of our people. Agricultural research and medical research are so interrelated—one so dependent upon the other—that they have become comrades-in-arms in the common battle against disease. As one who serves on the committees of the Senate that are responsible for matters of agricultural research and of medical research, I can tell you the two are bound together like Siamese twins. Medical research discoveries have conquered diseases of the soil, of plants and of animals. Agricultural research discoveries have protected the health and saved the lives of millions of our people.

There is no better example of the way in which agricultural research has served the health needs of our people than the story of penicillin. The story was recalled for us a few days ago by the distinguished codiscoveror of penicillin, Sir Howard Florey, the eminent scientist of Oxford University in England. Dr. Florey, visiting the United States, was my guest at a luncheon attended by a number of my colleagues on the Agriculture and Health Appropriation Committees of the Senate and House, who like myself are deeply interested in agricultural and medical research.

Dr. Florey told us how he brought penicillin to America in 1942, in the early days of the war. Four years of research with the antibiotic at Oxford had convinced him of the promise it held for fighting disease and for treating the mass casualties of the war. But with the limited facilities of his laboratory, only a tiny amount could be produced.

In fact, Dr. Florey had struggled 3 years with soil molds to produce less than one teaspoonful of penicillin. This tiny amount was given to an Englishman dying with a blood infection. The sick man's fever dropped rapidly and he seemed to be getting well. But the penicillin ran out. The infection returned and the patient died.

In 1942 England was fighting for her life. There wasn't the slightest chance that the laboratories at Oxford could be expanded. And so, Dr. Florey came to the United States to see if he could interest someone in this country in penicillin. A friend in New York suggested that he talk with scientists in the Department of Agriculture, who directed him to the Department's regional research laboratory in Peoria, Ill. There agricultural scientists found a way to increase the yield of penicillin so it could be produced on a commercial scale. They did it by feeding the mold on a new diet composed of agricultural products—corn steeping liquor, a by-product of the manufacture of cornstarch, and lactose or milk sugar.

Penicillin production throughout the world today is based largely on the methods worked out in the Peoria agricultural laboratory. Thanks to these methods, the cost of penicillin for an ordinary injection has dropped from some $35 to less than 20 cents. Drug manufacturers in this country are now producing about 20 tons of penicillin a month.

Dr. Florey's experience points up—in a very dramatic way—the contribution of agricultural research to human health. Without the research facilities that the Depart-

ment of Agriculture made available to Dr. Florey, we could not have broken—as we did—all previous recovery records among battled wounded. Common use of the wonder drug might still be a dream.

The production of penicillin has been worth all the money we have spent on agricultural research since the beginning of our government.

And along with penicillin has come a host of other powerful antobiotics derived from soil organisms.

The soil of New Jersey gave us streptomycin—our first effective weapon against the deadly and dreaded killer, tuberculosis, with which man and animals infect each other.

From a sample of soil in Caracas, Venezuela, came chloromycetin. Before its discovery, a victim of typhoid fever would lie in bed for weeks and months at a time, his family doctor helpless to aid him, and many victims died.

A sample of soil from a Missouri grain field gavebirth to aureomycin. To its discovery we owe our most effective weapon against cholera and brucellosis. Our livestock production in this country today has reached its present height because this great drug has freed animals of several killing diseases.

Terramycin, derived from a pinch of Indiana soil, conquers a wide range of infections.

The list could be extended almost endlessly.

Stimulated by our achievements, the search for new and better antibiotics is going on at a rapid rate today. Nobody knows how many species of these disease-killing soil organisms exist. Soil from all parts of the world is being examined in the expectation that each variety will yield some antibiotic that is unique unto itself. Last year 16 drug-manufacturing companies spent more than $20 million in soil-screening programs, searching for priceless new antibiotics.

Feeds fortified with antibiotics have brought about a revolution in livestock and poultry production. Very small supplements of antibiotic—a third of an ounce to a ton of feed—give a tremendous lift to the growth of animals, with consequent savings and profits to our farmers.

Many examples could be cited. With the antibiotics we know that a 200-pound hog can be readied for the market on 40 pounds less feed. The farmers of America are today saving 2 million tons of feed a year in the production of hogs. This is the equivalent of 100,000 boxcar loads.

Antibiotic feed supplements have had equally spectacular effects on poultry. Before the introduction of antibiotics, it took 12 to 14 weeks to produce a broiler weighing 3 to 3½ pounds, and poultrymen obtained only 3 crops a year. Thank to antibiotic supplements, they can put a broiler on the market in 9 weeks, giving poultrymen 4 and more crops a year. Furthermore, they can get their birds to market on 9 pounds of feed each instead of 10, and with a considerable saving in labor, overhead, and losses from disease. Likewise, turkey raisers can get their turkeys ready for market several weeks sooner at a saving of 3 to 4 pounds of feed for each week saved.

And now we are learning to apply antibiotics to plants. The recent development of a spray combination of streptomycin and terramycin has been used against a wide range of bacterial plant diseases and has been found to increase sharply the yield of crops and the size of vegetables and fruits.

Think what it means to our potato growers of Baldwin County to be able to increase their potato yields up to 72 bushels per acre by antibiotic treatment of their plants.

We see there is a continuing, renewing cycle of benefits, with the soil as the basic source. The soil produces the antibiotics. The antibiotics make men healthier. Healthier men use the antibiotics to increase Nature's yield.

The wonder drugs mean health and wealth for our people and stress once more our dependence on the soil and agricultural research for health, strength, and prosperity.

But the antibiotics are by no means all that agricultural and medical research have taught us about the strong influence the soil exerts upon the health of people, plants, and animals.

In Deaf Smith County, Tex., the people have practically no tooth decay. This is due, we are told, to the abundance of certain minerals in the soil of that section.

We have long known there is a direct link between goiter and a deficiency of iron in the soil. Today, scientists and doctors associate many other diseases with soil deficiencies—night blindness, anemia, heart disease, and pellagra—to mention only a few.

We know there is a direct relationship between soils and animal nutrition. Animals get their food from plants grown on soils. If these soils are deficient the animals suffer.

Missouri didn't just happen to be a mule-raising State. Farmers there are able to raise big, tough mules because of certain minerals in the soil of Missouri.

Scientists are constantly expanding their knowledge of the relation of soils to plant and animal and human nutrition. A dramatic discovery was made just a few days ago as a result of studies of the soils near Blairsville over in our neighboring State of Georgia. Researchers of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Georgia Experiment Stations found that turnip greens grown there produce vitamin B12, the important growth factor found in milk. This is the first time researchers have established that this vitamin can be formed in plants as well as in animals.

Laboratory rats fed on greens from Blairsville were found to grow much larger and faster than those fed on greens of the same variety grown at Experiment, Ga. Since this discovery, the scientists have observed that cattle do better in the Blairsville area than in other sections of the State.

This finding is expected to lead to new methods of treating our soils—to making plants and animals more nutritious, to reducing costs and raising profits for our farmers, to improving the health and strength of our people.

Agricultural research has opened the way to sharp increases in crop yields, in milk per cow, and in eggs per hen.

Development of grains resistant to rust has added an estimated $500 million a year to farm income.

Cotton insect control methods developed by Auburn's own agricultural experiment station are giving our Alabama cotton farmers protection against cotton losses ranging as high as $50 million a year.

Methods for chemical treatment of seed developed at Auburn are cutting deeply into seed and crop losses.

The emergence of poultry as Alabama's No. 2 crop symbolizes the series of lightning-like changes that have altered the character of our agriculture in recent years.

Beef and dairy cattle, once near-monopolies of the West, the Lake Region, and the North, have become mainstays of farm production in Alabama and throughout the South. Hog raising, originally pretty much a sideline, and a convenient way of converting farm garbage into extra cash, has now become a scientifically-managed enterprise in its own right.

Nothing better demonstrates the importance which medical science places on agricultural research than the grants which the National Institutes of Health and the United States Public Health Service are making to Auburn for such projects as research on the relationship of nutrition to cancer, research on the dietary aspects of muscular dystrophy, research on hookworm, and research relating to the insecticide control of blood-sucking ectoparasites.

I am happy to report to you that we have just won our fight in Congress to increase greatly the funds for medical research that the vital work of our agricultural-medical research team may go forward and be expanded.

It is with particular pleasure that I report to you that the funds which we voted for agricultural research and for extension work for the fiscal year beginning next Friday are the largest in the history of the programs—raising Alabama's share of research funds to well over a million dollars and her share of funds for extension work to well over $1,600,000.

When we consider all that has been done—all that is being done—all that remains to be done—does it surprise you that I have long named the soil and agricultural research as 1 of our 6 pillars of health?

The other five pillars are: Doctors, dentists, nurses and medical technicians; hospitals, health centers, and other health facilities; preventive medicine; medical research; and education—each vital to every one of us and to the strength and well-being of our country. None can be neglected if we are to wage effectively the total war we are waging against disease, if we are to build the health of our people.

I have long sponsored legislation to strengthen our pillars of health. Our Hill-Burton Hospital Act has, for example, greatly strengthened Alabama's hospital and health resources. Under the act we have built some 62 new hospitals and health facilities in rural and other areas of the State. We know what it means to our farmers and all our people to have hospitals when they need them. But we do not overlook the tremendous role that agricultural research and the application of its discoveries is making in keeping people healthy so they will not need to go to hospitals.

Our gains in health may be measured by the fact that in the last 12 years we have lengthened the life span of the average American by over 6 years.

This achievement is a tribute to the scientists of American agriculture, to the educators of American agriculture, in the high schools and colleges, to you men of the extension service, to the women of the home agent program, and to the men and women in our other great agricultural agencies, as well as to our health personnel and services, and our medical research programs.

You of the Alabama Association of Agricultural Agents are the educational extension arm of our agricultural research agencies. As we look to the future new and difficult problems challenge us. It is upon your shoulders that the responsibility will rest for carrying knowledge of our agricultural research developments and our technological advancements to our farmers, that their benefits may continue to be enjoyed by them and by all our people.

May I say here that practically all Government employees have had an increase in salary to meet the increased cost of living, and I strongly feel that there should be an increase for our agricultural agents and extension workers. I shall continue to work and to do my best for such an increase.

We know that the mounting demands of our rapidly increasing population for food and fiber will not be met by bringing new land into cultivation and that we must apply new knowledge for increased production on the land we now cultivate.

We will have to draw in ever-increasing measure upon our greatest asset, the human mind and its ability to meet difficult situations by imaginative new approaches.

Our first and immediate concern must be to make certain that we do not lose the gains that we have made, that the tools which you and our farmers must have for protecting the soil and for doing the job are not weak-

ened or destroyed. We must preserve our great farm programs and build upon them: Soil conservation, price supports, agricultural research and extension work, TVA, REA, rural telephones, vocational education, and all the rest. As coauthor of our Vocational Education Act and as chairman of the Senate Committee on Vocational Education appropriations, I am happy to report to you we have just secured the largest appropriation in the history of vocational education to bring sharply increased funds to Alabama for training in vocational agriculture, home economics, and the other training which the act provides.

The terrible losses from 4 years of drought and the severe freeze this year remind us that our highly diversified, mechanized agriculture of today represents the largest investment of capital in the history of farming. Each crop year in the practice of scientific agriculture involves, as we know, a tremendous outlay of money by our farmers and usually the incurring of large financial obligations by the farmers for seed, fertilizer, pesticides, farm machinery, tractor fuel, livestock, electric bills, telephone bills, labor costs and other expenses.

Scientists tell us that the drought which has moved up from the Southwest over much of the country is among the eight most severe droughts in centuries. Water levels over much of the Nation are now at a record low. We must employ new ways of conserving and replenishing this vital resource—water.

With the passage of our Water Facilities Act, irrigation is now available to our farmers in Alabama. We know that it will take research and education to show our farmers how to apply its benefits wisely and soundly. Auburn and our experiment stations are indeed to be congratulated on the pioneering work which they have done in the South in the possibilities for irrigation and the application of supplemental water.

Our losses from drought and freeze and the danger of losses from them in the future and the great investment of capital in irrigation facilities add new urgency to the need for more adequate farm credit and for strengthening and extending crop insurance for the protection of every farmer. I am sponsoring legislation for these purposes.

Agriculture's possibilities for the future are limited only by our vision and our determination. As we move forward, meeting the challenges of each day, month, and year, I have faith that your splendid record of the past will be excelled only by your contributions in the future to the health and prosperity of the farmers of Alabama, to the health and prosperity of the people of America, and to the strength and security of our country.

The Whitfield Case—A Careless Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. The editorial of July 13, 1955, entitled "Careless Nomination," follows:

CARELESS NOMINATION

The President's withdrawal of the nomination of Allen Whitfield to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission cancels out a carelessness which might have had unfortunate consequences. Neither the piety of Mr. Whitfield's reasons for asking that his nomination be withdrawn nor the unctuousness of the President's praise of him in withdrawing it can mask the fact that the nomination should never have been made. Mr. Whitfield was chosen for the immensely important AEC post without sufficient study of his qualifications.

The kind of investigation which should have been made prior to his nomination, instead of following it, was undertaken by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy after the publication of a detailed account of Mr. Whitfield's record written for the Des Moines Register by its Washington correspondent, Clark Mollenhoff. Mr. Mollenhoff told a story of Mr. Whitfield's role as a trustee for the estate of a Des Moines banker which certainly required explanation. Mr. Whitfield's insistence that an explanation would violate the confidential relations between a lawyer and his client seemed, in the circumstances, altogether unsatisfactory. An Atomic Energy Commissioner can no more take refuge behind this legal privilege than he can take refuge behind the privilege against self-incrimination.

One wonders what led to the selection of Mr. Whitfield in the first place. The most notable facts of his career are that he was a member of the Iowa State Republican Central Committee and that he served as campaign manager for the late Governor William S. Beardsley of Iowa. Since its inception in 1946, the AEC has never had a political leader among its commissioners. The exclusion ought to be continued.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Hon. Lyndon Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader of the United States Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, became ill from a heart attack 2 weeks ago. Since that time, practically every long-distance telephone call I received from Texas, the person calling asked how Senator JOHNSON was getting along. It has pleased me very much that I have been in a position to tell them every time that he is getting along better as he has constantly improved.

Senator JOHNSON is very much missed on Capitol Hill, and while we want to see him back as soon as possible, we want him to take the time necessary to fully restore his health. He is too valuable in too many ways for any risk to be run about his recovery.

I do not believe any person in public life in the United States has caused so much concern of the people throughout the Nation than the sudden attack and illness of Senator JOHNSON.

The Marshall News-Messenger, published in the district I have the honor to represent, and in the hometown of Senator JOHNSON'S popular and charming wife, had an editorial July 14, 1955, as follows:

JOHNSON ILLNESS ELECTION FACTOR

Texans are not the only ones concerned because of the serious illness of their senior Senator, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Likewise, leaders of the Democratic Party face important implications with respect to the entire system of American Government.

Prayers of the Nation are that the Texan will recover, and current reports from his bedside indicate his return to usefulness. Temporarily, however, his influence is lost; and his illness well could be a factor in next year's presidential elections.

His condition recalls the loss of Senator Robert Taft as a GOP leader 2 years ago. At the time there were differences between sections of his party and the President that needed to be reconciled if effective work was to be done by the new administration and Congress. Despite the fact that Taft had been a rival candidate for the Presidency he was displaying a fine spirit of cooperation as majority leader of the Senate at the moment he was struck down.

Senator JOHNSON has shown remarkable ability in holding together the diverse elements of his party in its work with a Republican administration. He has remained a loyal Democrat but has not favored mere partisan obstruction of worthy proposals. He has kept in mind the sort of record that his party should be able to submit in a national contest for control of the Government.

For nearly 100 years 2 parties of varying strength have been the mainstay of the American system. Neither has been free from divisions within itself at numerous times but, regardless of occasional third parties and the like, this country has not been afflicted with the splinter organizations or the political factionism that has weakened European nations with France as an outstanding example.

At strategic moments there has been the leadership to prevent such harmful developments. Its absence for any considerable period would have grave consequences. It is an essential of both parties. Republicans and Democrats alike should strive to find and retain it for the continued well-being of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting the following article published in the Dallas Morning News recently:

ILL WIND BLOWS GOOD FOR JOHNSON

(By Ruth Schumm)

The heart attack which almost cost the life of Senate Democratic leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON has served to publicize his beliefs and accomplishments more spectacularly than anything else could have, short of an obituary. After he was stricken, every newspaper and news broadcast brought the work of the Texas Senator dramatically and simultaneously to the attention of the whole Nation.

Although JOHNSON'S name recently had been mentioned more frequently and prominently as a possible presidential candidate because of his Senate record, observers had pointed out that this record was not well known outside Washington.

JOHNSON'S success as majority leader has been based largely on his smooth-working tactics behind the scenes, personal contacts and private phone calls which don't make headlines. This solved problems, but did not produce the colorful conflict that attracts publicity.

JOHNSON was getting the job done in remarkable, some thought unprecedented, fashion. But he was getting it done in a way that would bring him credit only among those who know the inside workings of the Senate.

Now his unique success in achieving party unity and such a notable record is being praised on every hand and called to the attention of the man in the street by editorial writers, columnists and commentators.

Conservatives who have shied away from JOHNSON as Democratic standard bearer because they remember him as a young idealistic Roosevelt-idolizing Congressman from New Deal days are now being reminded of JOHNSON'S achievements by compromise as a feet-on-the-ground progressive.

Liberals who could not warm up to the idea of having JOHNSON as their candidate because they thought of him as a typical southern conservative are now hearing about progressive measures which passed the Senate due largely to his work.

Independents are hearing of JOHNSON'S determination to make the Democratic opposition in the Senate a responsible one—a philosophy particularly appealing to the voter who wants to cast his ballot for the good of the country, regardless of party lines.

Even though Democratic leaders may believe now that a national convention would never nominate a man for President who had had a heart attack, JOHNSON'S complete recovery, combined with a continuation of his successful policies of Senate leadership, may change their minds.

A clue to some of the thinking along this line comes from JOHNSON'S Senate colleague, PRICE DANIEL. DANIEL, who supported President Eisenhower in 1952, made the following observation about JOHNSON this week in his newsletter to Texas papers:

"It is he more than anyone else who has been able to bring together for the good of the country a majority in the Senate on many important issues. It is he more than anyone else who might be able to help restore unity and confidence in the Democratic Party, both in Texas and in the Nation."

And the following article from the Associated Press:

AFTER HEART ATTACK—SENATOR JOHNSON AGAIN ABLE TO WATCH ACTION IN SENATE

WASHINGTON.—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, a heart attack only 11 days behind him, is again beginning to keep in close touch with developments in the Senate, where he normally serves as Democratic leader.

JOHNSON is still confined to bed at the Naval Medical Center in suburban Bethesda, Md. Whatever activity he undertakes is under the careful eye of doctors treating him for a heart attack they have termed moderately severe.

But through members of his immediate family, a few aids; and 1 or 2 Senate colleagues who are permitted to visit him, the Texas Senator keeps abreast of developments.

He reads the newspapers and some selected correspondence previously checked over by assistants. A television set has been placed in his room. A kind of censorship over it, as well as the newspapers, is exercised by his wife Lady Bird.

She has been near him constantly since he entered the hospital, and sleeps in an adjoining room.

The women secretaries of JOHNSON'S office staff have set up shop in a room near JOHNSON'S own 16th floor suite. They are on duty in turns during the day, alternating between the hospital and the Capitol.

Their job at the hospital is largely to handle the telephone calls, letters, telegrams, and flowers.

The Senator's brother, Sam Houston Johnson, says LYNDON JOHNSON is "doing what the doctors tell him to," adding:

"They keep an hourly check on him, and make sure that he is not taxing his strength. If he's feeling good they'll let him see someone, and they watch to see that he doesn't get tired out."

One of the attending doctors said if JOHNSON continues to progress, he may be able ot leave the hospital in about 3 weeks, and then spend another month or so in Washington before returning to Texas.

Supplemental Appropriations, 1956

SPEECH
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 14, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my very great appreciation to the members of the Army panel for their splendid cooperation throughout the conduct of the hearings on the Army's requirements for construction during fiscal 1956.

The Congress and the Nation have been very fortunate in having such experienced and able men as the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] to carry on this extremely important work. In particular do I express appreciation to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], who acted as chairman during much of the hearings, and who brings to the committee a wealth of valuable experience from his work in this field in previous sessions of Congress. All of them have given tirelessly of their efforts and unselfishly of their time.

I also want to commend the executive secretary of the committee, Earl Silsby, for the fine manner in which he has assisted in all of our efforts. I have never seen a young man develop and progress more than he has in the short time he has been with this committee. His work has been very helpful, and very valuable to us.

As speakers before me have pointed out, we were confronted with a very difficult situation, due to the lateness of the hour when the military construction figures reached us from the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget. Consequently, we were confronted with the necessity for crowding our work much more than is desirable, in order to have this bill ready for consideration. This work, in addition to all the other duties that attach themselves to all of us in the closing days of a session of Congress, has resulted in most difficult problems. I can see no justification for the delays in submitting the administration's recommendations to Congress, and I trust that we may have a higher degree of cooperation from administration spokesmen in the future.

Be that as it may, we have tried to ferret out the facts that should be learned by a congressional committee in connection with this request for military construction items. We have attempted in this bill to provide those essential activities that we felt should receive first consideration. We have given prior consideration to troop housing, to dependents' housing to necessary operational facilities that are a part of any military base. We have tried to delete or to postpone those items which could safely be deferred until a later date. It should be borne in mind that in practically every military installation a great part of the facilities are of the World War II temporary construction type. It was expected that they would be demolished years ago. Unfortunately there has been a continuing need for vast military installations, and we have had to continue their use. They are not the type of facilities that we should want our troops to live in and work in. They are neither comfortable nor adequate. Maintenance costs are excessive.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I have been interested in the gentleman's observation about these certain deletions that have been made by the Military Construction Subcommittee. I was particularly interested in his remark that some of these installations were of World War II variety, and were somewhat unsatisfactory.

I notice that a deletion was made for the Academic Building of the Commanding Generals' Staff College at Leavenworth. I would like to say to the gentleman this particular installation is not of World War II vintage; it is of Civil War vintage. This particular installation was put first into operation in about 1859 to accommodate a class of about 150 student officers. We have now enrolled approximately 1,000 and expect to reach an enrollment of 1,200 for a peacetime army strength. I wonder if the gentleman feels that in view of that this particular item here would fall into the general category he has described so ably.

Mr. SIKES. I am going to comment on the item that the gentleman has referred to in a very short time. I know of the gentleman's interest and I think it is most commendable interest. When I reach that point in the bill I will be glad to yield further to the gentleman.

Now, if I may return to the general considerations observed by the committee in marking up this bill, we emphasized construction first of troop housing, family housing, mess facilities, and necessary troop operational facilities. We deleted or recommended postponement of theaters, swimming pools, branch exchanges, and similar projects.

Undoubtedly in the consideration of a budget request as large as this, containing many hundreds of separate items, it is possible that the committee has made mistakes in its selection of items which are to be constructed. We cannot claim any unusual vision in these matters; we simply do the best we can under the circumstances with the limited time in which we have to work. There are two items in particular I would like to discuss.

The first item is the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth. This is an old established facility. It has been one of the most important, I think, of all the Army facilities. For many years it has been recognized as the center of advanced training for the higher officers of the Army. Practically every ranking officer in the service has attended this school. In addition many officers from Allied Armies receive important training at Fort Leavenworth.

Request was made of the committee for $5,433,000 to build an academic building for Fort Leavenworth. Although we recognize the importance of the school, the committee decided that it is an item that can be deferred. The present buildings are masonry structures. They meet present requirements. New buildings will provide improved working and living conditions and are desirable. However the information that was given to us by the Department of the Army showed that only preliminary plans are available for the new building. Therefore there is serious doubt that anything could be accomplished toward providing new facilities prior to the first of the next year, and accordingly the committee deferred the item.

Perhaps a stronger case could have been made by the Army for this facility. As a matter of fact, since the action of the committee has been made known, strong pleas have been received from official sources for reconsideration because of the importance of the work that is done at Fort Leavenworth.

I have suggested to them that if there are additional considerations that should have been brought to the attention of our committee, that these can still be presented to the other body. If this item is included by the other body then of course we in the House committee can have second look, in which case I shall certainly review very carefully all the facts.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida for the interest he has shown in this proposed academic building at Fort Leavenworth.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt at that point may I say again that one of the determining factors in the decision of the committee was the fact that only preliminary plans are available for the new academic building. We felt it would be the first of the year before complete plans could be prepared and that no great damage would be done if the construction were deferred until the next construction bill is under consideration.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman to the extent that the deferring of this will not disrupt the morale entirely of the whole Army of the United States; on the other hand, referring back to some of the masonry buildings that have been converted into use at Fort Leavenworth for the commanding generals' school, I know from my own observation that some of these masonry buildings that are being used are as follows: A stable is now converted to a classroom. An old riding hall has now been converted to a classroom. I have seen both of these.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AVERY. This old riding hall has temporary petitions in and it is about as soundproof as a hotel room. Then a gymnasium has been converted into a classroom. I will grant they are conducting a college out there and a very efficient one, as the gentleman has mentioned. There are exchange officers there from some 42 other countries but it is not a very impressive school that we can show the other countries that send their officers over here for observation and training, that are sent to this college to be trained, and find themselves being schooled in an old converted stable.

Mr. SIKES. I commend the gentleman for his interest in that institution.

If I may proceed, I would like to point to another item of great interest to me and I think of great interest to the committee. It concerns the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. One of the major items of land acquisition in this bill is for acquiring an additional 20,320 acres of privately owned land at a cost of $2 million for Fort Sill, in Oklahoma. It is also proposed to acquire by transfer from the Department of the Interior 10,700 acres from the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. That would be 10,700 acres out of a total of 30,554 acres in the refuge.

I think we all realize this is one of the most important wildlife refuges that we have in this Nation. Every person who loves wildlife and loves the outdoors appreciates the important activities that are being carried on there. The committee heard the Army justify its requirement for this land and a strong case was presented. Fort Sill is the Army artillery school. That is where essential gunnery practice is carried on. More and more are we dependent on very long-range weapons, including the atomic cannon, and guided missiles. We have a very large investment at Fort Sill, and no other base provides comparable facilities for artillery training. Gunnery practice with modern weapons is being carried on at Fort Sill with greatest difficulty. The present ranges simply are inadequate for the job. In addition there already is an element of danger in that it is now necessary to fire across Fort Sill and across a double highway and a railroad. Undoubtedly it is necessary that we make it possible for our soldiers to receive proper training in the use of weapons. We would be derelict in our duty here if we failed to provide facilities for that training. Accordingly the committee acquiesced in the request for additional land and in the transfer of a part of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge.

In this connection I think I should point out that the Army testified the ground to be taken from the Wichita Wildlife Refuge is the least desirable land and the least used land in the refuge, that it has but few recreational facilities.

After the committee had completed its deliberations and had reported its recommendations to the full committee we received a request from the Wildlife Management Institute and others that they be heard on the transfer of this land from the Wichita Wildlife Refuge. Their request came very late because already the authorization bill had passed both Houses of Congress, had been cleared by the conferees, and had gone to the White House. Our committee had completed consideration and markup of the bill. Nevertheless, because of our interest in this matter, a special hearing of the committee was called to hear all those who asked to be heard on the proposed transfer.

I must point out that to my great surprise I found some of the statements made by those who oppose the transfer of this land are almost exactly opposite to the statements that have been made by the Army. They stated that the land to be transferred is some of the most valuable land in the refuge, that it is used to a great extent by tourists who visit the area, and that important recreational facilities are located in the area. The committee wants to be fair to both groups. It does not believe it has enough information to change its recommendations at this time, but I do feel that I should say to the House that I personally have a great deal of interest in this matter. I feel we should do what we can within reason to protect our wildlife resources. I suggest the possibility of working out a joint use program or of writing in safeguards which would insure a continuation of the wildlife management and conservation work at the Wichita refuge, without denying needed training facilities to the Army.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Our record also showed, did it not, that there had been a full day of hearings not only before the Committee on Armed Services, the legislative committee of this body, but also the legislative committee of the other body, and after hearing full discussion both committees approved this transfer? Did not our committee feel that we would be a little presumptuous to overrule the action of these two committees without very careful consideration?

Mr. SIKES. I always welcome the comments of my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida for his interest in this wildlife refuge. I would like to say as one who has been keenly interested in its preservation I am perfectly content to leave the matter in his hands and certainly will urge those who are interested in it to see to it that it is taken care of in the Senate.

Mr. SIKES. I know of the gentleman's interest in this and other wildlife matters, and I commend him for this great interest.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Many of us have been concerned about the failure of wildlife refuges, especially as the gentleman from Florida was concerned about this unique refuge at Wichita. We are gratified that the gentleman has taken this attitude that they will explore and investigate all of these alternative plans in order that we may, if possible, preserve the integrity of this very beautiful and very important and very historic refuge at Wichita. I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this matter up and trying to preserve this refuge, if it is possible, and at the same time protect our Nation's interest.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman for his interest, and I know that he has contributed much in this important field.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I appreciate the remarks about the wonderful fish and wildlife facilities in Oklahoma. This happens to be located in the district I represent. And, it is not easy, being a member of the Committee on Armed Services, representing both the edges and the Wichita refuge, to make a decision. But I think any decision that we might make or that we have reached should be in the interest of the country first. Of the 60,000 acres, approximately in the Wichita wildlife refuge, Fort Sill is taking only 10,500 acres. That part that is being taken is not doing any serious damage to the fish and wildlife. It is not affecting the recreational facilities, Buffalo, Texas longhorn cattle, the fishing, the swimming, the boating, the Easter pageant, the wild turkeys, the antelope, the birds, nor the native grass. Approximately 80 percent of the area in the fish and wildlife reserve to be acquired is behind locked gates and is not accessible to the public. The inaccessibility of this area is due to the very rugged terrain and lack of development on the part of the Wildlife Service.

I think in the interest of the country it is essential, where you have millions of dollars of investment in the finest artillery field in the world, to see to it that they have sufficient range not only for the ammunition mentioned but other types as well.

Not only is this in the interest of Fort Sill and of the country, but it is in the interest of the safety of all those living adjacent to the area; as far as the farmers and ranchers are concerned, it takes the homes of 55 families. I dislike to see that, but again I say it is in the best interest of the country that that land be taken. And it will enhance the value of Fort Sill where we train the men who will protect us in the future.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very important contribution.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it should be pointed out in considering this situation that while we do have a regard for

wild life, we also have a greater regard for human life. With the added range of the heavy artillery that we have and the rockets and missiles, it is now necessary for them to go to the eastern extreme of Fort Sill and fire across a heavily traveled highway, across the post itself, where the classrooms and the quarters are, and on into the hills. This is not in my district, but I trained there as a much younger man, and I think I know those hills fairly well, having walked over, ridden over, and dug into them.

I feel that if it is necessary to increase the skill of our artillerymen to protect the lives of those who are there in order to give us more security for this Nation, that should outweigh any of the arguments made in behalf of wildlife refuges which are nice to have, of course. But as I said a moment ago, human life comes before wild life.

Mr. SIKES. I assure my good friend that all of these considerations and those brought out by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] were carefully weighed by the committee. It was upon these considerations that the committee concurred in the request for funds for the additional land needed by the Artillery School at Fort Sill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. The Army request for funds for military construction during the fiscal year 1956 was based on a program of $566,533,000. Our committee has recommended an appropriation of $483,612,000, a reduction of $61,388,000, and a 13-percent reduction in percentage below the request that came to us.

In addition, we authorize the reprograming of $15,091,000 of prior authorizations. I think I should point out that this entire Army construction program is not to come out of new appropriations. All of the money for this program is from funds that were carried over in the Army's procurement and production program for prior years. The Army had a tremendous buildup in its procurement and production program during the Korean and immediate post-Korean war years. That money, of course, was for weapons, tanks, trucks, and all the other thousands of allied items that are necessary for the Army to carry on its very important missions. When it was found that it was not necessary to spend that money, a part of it was held for future use by the Army. Now that money is being diverted to Army construction rather than having new money appropriated from the Treasury.

Of this appropriation of $483 million, approximately 32 percent or $160,500,000 of the total, is for antiaircraft facilities worldwide, including land acquisition and construction of additional Nike guided missile positions, $48,283,000 is for permanent barracks spaces to provide 25,222 spaces to house troops in the continental United States. Nineteen million dollars is for supporting facilities; battalion and regimental buildings, dispensaries, classrooms, and other standard facilities; $122,264,000 is for family housing to provide 8,308 units of permanent on-base family housing owned by the Government and issued to troops in lieu of quarters allowances. Of this, all but 806 units are in continental United States; $37,800,000 of this money is for land acquisition. Most of it is for 51,637 acres in Okinawa made necessary by the fact that Okinawa is a permanent bastion of the American forces.

I would like to point out that of the thirty-odd million dollars for land acquisition in Okinawa only $7,500,000 is for Army use. The remainder is for the Navy and Air Force. It has been customary under our method of procedure for the Army to acquire land for the other services. Thus this item appears as a charge against the Army budget, and it makes the Army budget look $22 million bigger than it actually is.

Here is one important item that I want to discuss. We are providing for improvements at the United States Military Academy that have long been overdue. I think everyone here who has been to the Academy realizes we do not have adequate classroom facilities or adequate barracks facilities for the boys who are training there. It is highly improper that this situation has been allowed to exist so long. This bill will help to correct that situation.

Seventy-nine percent of the money carried in this program shall be expended in the continental United States, the remainder primarily in Iceland or in Okinawa.

I believe that takes care of the primary items I wanted to discuss, but I shall point out that among the items deleted were funds for the west coast, Ammunition Loading Terminal in California, theaters which we felt could be postponed, the academic building of the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and in addition, the Black Hills Ordnance Depot, and some units at Fort Huachuca which are not budgeted and on which the House has had no discussion and has had no justification from the Department.

I am disturbed by the fact that not only the Army but also the Navy and the Air Force still fail to bring us plans for dispersal of facilities. We appear to have learned little in this atomic age about the very essential requirement for dispersal of military facilities. We still are concentrating our buildup of installations. They are huge installations which grow bigger and bigger around central key activities. This, of course, makes them highly strategic and susceptible to atomic bombing or to attack by guided missiles. I feel that this is a very dangerous thing, and that additional stress should be placed on the dispersal of those facilities.

I think more particularly is this true of naval and Air Force facilities which are more subject to crippling blows because of the fact that they are more completely tied down by dependence upon boat facilities and airfields. It has been testified again and again that small operations which can be carried on from many points are the key to this problem. But I see little that indicates a willingness to cope with threat at this time.

Return of the Fighting First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the Boston Post, Saturday, July 9, 1955, entitled "Return of the Fighting First."

The 1st Division has a magnificent combat record and certainly any veteran who was a member of this division has a right to be proud of it. At the moment, it is commanded by a close acquaintance of mine Maj. Gen. Guy S. Meloy, a veteran of both World War II and the Korean war. The return of this division marks the initial phase of the Army's "Operation Gyroscope," wherein complete combat units rotate with one another.

The editorial follows:

RETURN OF THE FIGHTING FIRST

The First Infantry Division of the United States Army, one of the greatest combat units in the world, is coming home after 13 years in Europe.

As part of the Army's new rotation system, units of the First will board ship at Bremerhaven, Germany, at the end of this month, bound for New York. By November, their replacements will all be abroad and the last detachments of the First will be home.

When they get home, something should be done publicly—and something pretty important—in recognition of the extraordinary and heroic service of the Fighting First.

No American military unit, so far as the records indicate, has ever been out of the United States on foreign soil for so long a period. None has made a more extraordinary record record in two wars.

The First Division was activated in France in World War I. Although most of its troops were new then, it included units with a lineage as far back as the Revolution.

The division was sent to England in the summer of 1942 to train for the invasion of north Africa. They were the first American infantry ashore there, and their battle record in that campaign was tremendous.

When the High Command decided to invade Sicily, the First Division lived up to its name and its record. They were the first infantry ashore in that campaign.

After Sicily, they were withdrawn to prepare for the invasion of France. On June 6, 1944, a little more than 10 years ago, they landed in the Normandy beachhead, under terrific fire, and captured their positions. Seven days later, they led the American breakthrough and captured Marigny.

Before the war ended, they had captured more than 47,000 prisoners. When the shooting was over, they took over in Germany as the solid keystone of American defense.

There is less need for them now in Germany. The NATO army is increasing and will be augmented in 2 years by elements of West German troops. But the First was on hand, ready for war, in the grim days when the Russians had few other first-line troops to face their millions.

The Russians have always been afraid of the German Army, because it came very close to destroying them. They might well fear the American Fighting First Division even more. For the First met and shattered every one of the best German divisions from Kasserine Pass to Soissons.

It was time to bring them home. They are the first and best of our Infantry Regulars, and we are proud of them, and grateful, too.

What Communists Mean by "Cold War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on the day the Geneva Conference begins we need to remind ourselves of the true nature of the problem we face there. We want to end the cold war; they intend to win it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Scripps Howard papers of July 5 which describes the situation incisively:

WHAT THEY MEAN BY "COLD WAR"

The decision of Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper, to play up with approval one sentence from President Eisenhower's last news conference is not surprising.

The Presidential sentence was: "Stop talking about cold war."

Taken alone that sentence plays right into the current Communist propaganda slogan: "End the cold war."

The Communist game, of course, is to try to equate the President's remarks with its own propaganda slogan.

This incident highlights a danger of which there seems to be little awareness in these days of high optimism about the Big Four Conference. It is the tricky game of words and slogans at which the Communists are masters and at which the West has proved itself most inept.

Last fall, the Communists made a lot of hay for awhile with "Peaceful coexistence"—until Western leaders deflated that phrase by showing that the Communists didn't mean what the phrase means to Westerners.

After a lull, the Commies resumed their peace campaign—using "end the cold war" as the key slogan.

The Soviets are making more headway this time—primarily because no top leader in the Western World has taken the time or trouble to explain to the people that the real meaning of the Red slogan is total surrender. Even President Eisenhower in extemporaneous remarks fell into the Red trap.

When the Soviets talk about ending the cold war they mean that the United States should give up all its foreign bases, dismantle the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), take all of its troops home, abolish its nuclear weapons, stop talking about the Eastern European satellites, and forget about the international conspiracy of Communist subversion and subjugation. In Red jargon, the United States must give up its positions of strength and be willing to appease Moscow in a gigantic Munich.

In other words, to satisfy the Soviet demand for an end of the cold war the West, especially the United States, must stop doing everything it laboriously has done for 10 years to protect the free world from Communist domination.

When the West talks about ending the cold war it means freedom for Soviet satellites, an end of the international Communist conspiracy, lifting of the Iron Curtain, unification in real freedom for Germany, Korea, and Indochina. All these the Soviets reject.

There is no East-West agreement on the simplest definition of "cold war."

Therefore it is delusion with tremendous danger for the West to talk loosely about ending the cold war—as though it agreed with the Red propagandists. It is difficult for western leaders not to oppose any kind of war—cold or hot. Their alternative is to remind their people it was the Communists who started the cold war and it is the Communists who can end it with reasonable international behavior.

To stop talking about the cold war until the Communists really have changed their policies is to run the risk of losing the cold war to the Commies—which is exactly the objective of the new rulers in the Kremlin with their soft talk.

Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee held hearings last week on the vital civil rights bills which have been introduced by a number of the Members this year. I appeared before the subcommittee headed by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. With your permission, I would like to place in the RECORD at this time the text of the remarks which I made in the committee. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will act favorably and promptly on these measures.

The remarks follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to appear here today concerning these vital civil rights bills. I thank you for this opportunity.

As you know there are a great many measures pending which deal with this question. Many are identical and serve as evidence of the great interest in and need for the legislation proposed. There seems to be several basic groups into which these bills fall.

There are two groups of omnibus bills: The first of these, introduced by Congressmen POWELL, ADDONIZIO, RODINO, and BARRATT O'HARA, contain much that the other proposals embody, but adds the so-called FEPC provisions. This I wholeheartedly support as I do the other measures designed to ensure equality of oportunity for all.

The second group of omnibus bill, includes my own, H. R. 3423. These also include much that a number of the other bills propose and provide for the prohibition of discrimination in interstate transportation. It seems to me that in this area of Federal jurisdiction the enactment of such basic legislation is long overdue. The public shame of forcing certain American citizens to ride in designated areas of public conveyances and to accept inferior accommodations is abhorrent to every concept of freedom we cherish and degrades not only the person discriminated against, but the entire Nation for allowing the practice to survive. The concept of segregation remains with us in defiance of the Supreme Court and the Constitution.

The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning this bill contains the very clear statement that since the present law (sec. 3 (1) Interstate Commerce Act) "neither require nor prohibits segregation of the races" the Commission "has limited its inquiry to the question whether equal accommodations and facilities are provided for members of the two races." Discrimination is inherent in that statement. The Supreme Court ruled in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U. S. 343, 1954), "Separate * * * facilities are inherently unequal." The Court, to its everlasting credit has discarded the ancient mockery of freedom called "separate but equal." Shall we do less? I am told that we received the best international press we have had since the Marshal plan, as a result of the Supreme Court decision. If we were to act now to eliminate this shameful condition on the eve of the Four Power Conference at Geneva, it would, I am sure, be most helpful to the President, and to the cause of freedom which we so earnestly espouse.

The Interstate Commerce Commission declined to openly take a position on this proposal in view of certain cases now pending before it, where the precise question at issue is involved. It is my understanding that the two cases which are cited have been pending for some time. In view of this reluctance or hestancy on the part of the Commission and the emphatic decision of the Supreme Court, it would seem all the more urgent for Congress to act now and prevent any further delay in eliminating finally this rejected doctrine.

The next group of bills generally deal with a form of murder some times called "lynching." That such legislation outawing mob violence and granting the injured the opportunity to recover damages has not been previously enacted is most surprising to me.

Similarly, the next group of bills relating to activities which can be characterized as Ku Klux Klan marauding would certainly appear as appropriate in reaffirmance of constitutional guarantees upon which our society is based. Lest it be thought that such activity no longer plagues us, I have here a small clipping from a magazine published this week reporting such an incident near Chicago there was gunfire.

The fourth group of bills would authorize the ceation of a Commission on civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government. We are all most conscious of the war being waged around the world for the minds and hearts of men. The Communists use every trick in the book to picture themselves as the champions of the downtrodden. We spend millions of dollars annually throughout the world to combat this falsehood and to promote the true concept of freedom and democracy which is our heritage. We delude ourselves if we think that excessive security safeguards can prevent Communist propaganda from influencing minds which are constantly subjected to injustice and intolerance. The Supreme Court pointed this out in the Brown case (supra) when they held that the impact of segregation is greater when it has the sanction of the law.

The next group of bills in intended to strengthen the law relating to the right of qualified citizens to vote freely for candidates of their own choice. Intimidation of voters and discrimination against certain otherwise eligible citizens is the mark of dictatorship. The violation of these rights in this free Nation should be made the subject of stringent penalties, both civil and criminal, as these bills propose.

The next to last group provides for the reorganization of the Department of Justice by the creation of a new Civil Rights Division. This Division coupled with an augmented FBI, as these bills propose, would do much for the preservation and enforcement of the civil rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Finally, H. R. 3420, and the other bills in the last group, would prohibit attempts to (1) hold another in peonage; (2) entice another into slavery; and (3) sell another into involuntary servitude. The prohibition

against what is commonly called "shanghai" attempts is extended to cover all modes of transportation rather than vessels only.

It is significant to note that in connection with this proposal the Department of Justice has reported that it would have no objection to its enactment. These bills make criminal the various acts now merely proscribed by the law. Penalties imposing fines of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both are provided for all such violations. I do not believe there can be any objection whatever to the enactment of these amendments.

There are other proposals I know, which merit your consideration. I hope that I have not taken too much of your valuable time or delayed any other Members. My own interest in this legislation and the urgent need for its enactment has prompted me to make this appeal to you. I earnestly hope you will act favorably on these bills. Thank you.

Will Automation Become Our Servant or Our Master?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, July 16, 1955:

A strange, new word has come into our language.

Its name is "automation."

It refers to automatically controlled machines that do the work once done by human beings. The machines that seem to have a brain.

In time automation will be as common as the automobile.

At the present, however, this approaching technique is not altogether welcome.

Some people fear that it will throw millions out of work.

Others naturally suspect and dislike any machine that seldom gets tired, never makes a mistake, and has the uncanny faculty of being smarter in its fashion than many people.

We stand on the threshhold of a great revolution in human affairs. A bloodless one, that will make the standard of living that we enjoy in 1955 seem primitive to the people inhabiting this earth in the year 2000.

We must make certain adjustments in our own way of thinking and arrive at controls over the controling automatic machines, either by law or collective bargaining, to make these mechanical servants work for the benefit of all.

The manifold possibilities of nuclear energy, linked to automation, will open up the greatest forward movement in history.

Assuming, of course, that the Communists are made to behave.

Already, the United States has too much of one commodity, food. Automation will undoubtedly bring a surplus of some industrial goods, unless we spread our distribution.

It is fantastic, in one way, that we should have an excess of food, while hundreds of millions of people in Africa, China, India, and parts of Soviet Russia do not get enough to eat.

It has been suggested that we give some of our superabundance to help the less fortunate in other lands, thereby promoting trust and friendship and cooperation among the peoples of this world. I believe that we should do this, out of the goodness of the American heart. At the same time it would serve as a guide and encouragement to other peoples, as proof that only under freedom can man enjoy the harvest of his own skill, and effort, and enterprise.

In the United States we have over $7 billion worth of surplus food. The Commodity Credit Corporation of our Government buys up the extra corn, wheat, rice, cheese, butter, and dry milk that the farmers cannot sell without depressing the market price. It costs $700,000 every day, just to keep this surplus stored in grain elevators, warehouses. In addition, much of it is held in the holds of hundreds of ships of the reserve fleet at more expense.

The CCC tries to fight its way out of this surplus by giving some of it away to schools, charitable institutions, and to persons in need. But still the flood of grain piles up.

Because not enough storage space is available, the Government has been forced to build storage bins in more than half the States.

The Congress has cut the wheat-acreage allotment in an effort to control overproduction, but this doesn't seem to do much good, for improved methods make it possible to grow more wheat per acre as time goes on.

We can understand the position of the farmers, and we realize that their income and purchasing power must be maintained, as a prop to our national economy. It does seem strange, however, that the farmers who were always considered to be the exponents of self-reliance and self-sufficiency, should insist upon such expensive and wasteful subsidies for themselves.

The whole price-support program points up the great dilemma: "How to control, or manage, or distribute, the overproduction in agriculture?"

Unless we find the right formula for this, we shall have two problems on our hands when automation brings overproduction of industrial goods.

In the recent session of Congress, a strong effort was made to repeal flexible price supports, replacing them with rigid, and higher subsidies. Congressmen from the industrial States were obliged to oppose this move, to save consumers from the higher prices that would result from higher supports.

Farm surpluses pose a very serious problem.

The Government, for various reasons, cannot dispose of the excess.

If we try to sell them at cut prices abroad, such a move would have a harmful effect on foreign economies. The corner grocer would strenuously object if we tried to give them away to the consumers of our own country.

Back in the 1930's, people were outraged by a Government policy that encouraged farmers to plow over their crops, and to slaughter hogs rather than send them to market in order to prevent the complete collapse of farm prices and farm incomes.

Today, we are appalled by any suggestion that extra food be destroyed in order to keep farm prices up.

How to control overproduction on the farms, is a question that is difficult to answer. Farmers, like other people, do not change their accustomed ways easily. A farmer who has spent years in raising wheat or cotton, is not easily convinced that he should change to some other crop, that might be useful to industry; or assured that there will be a market for it.

The convenient way, for the present, is for the Government to bail him out.

The whole program is unmanageable.

We must find a better method and soon.

From this experience, we must also anticipate a similar problem arising out of the forthcoming industrial overproduction so that we may make the adjustments that will prevent unemployment and waste.

Before the industrial revolution in the last century, the production of food and clothing and housing and durable goods depended to a large extent upon the brute strength of men and horses.

Then we fitted man to the machines, by making him a cog on the assembly lines.

Now we are beginning to substitute automatic electronic controls that will produce for him, and protect him even in his sleep.

Where one man, checking the dials, can superintend a huge machine that takes a raw material and carries it through all the steps to the finished product with a negligible expenditure of his own physical energy and with little strain upon his nervous system.

One man doing the work that once required hundreds of hands.

What happens to the millions of workers who would be displaced as automation takes over?

Although our population will be increasing, the number of those available for work will not keep pace.

At the beginning, more and more of our children are going to college, which means that they will start their lifework at a later age.

At the other end of the cycle, thanks to old-age and survivors insurance, and various private retirement plans, more people will be leaving the ranks of the employed at an earlier age.

While these factors will reduce the demand for jobs, they will not eliminate the unemployment that will be the immediate result of increasing automation.

Labor leaders are beginning to worry about the workers who will be displaced by the new labor-saving machines.

To offset this, there is a movement to reduce the workweek from 40 hours to 35 hours; to discourage people from holding two jobs; and to bargain for a guaranteed annual wage in the largest industries.

It is my guess, based on adjustments made to similar challenges in our economic history, that we will accommodate ourselves to progress without any severe dislocations.

Shortly after the turn of the century there was fear that technology would throw many people out of work. But new products and new services came after the machines so that today we have a far better distribution of jobs and income than we ever had before.

Automation, by reducing labor costs, will mean larger profits that must circulate to create new enterprises and new jobs.

We should not be afraid of having too much, as long as we diversify.

Take the case of such giants as Dupont and Union Carbide. Through research development they have doubled the number of items that they manufacture today in comparison with their product line of 1925. Thanks to their ability in creating new products, that contribute to our rising standard of living by opening up expanding markets.

Only those who feel comfortable with things as they are distrust the changes that are the inevitable partners of progress.

We who believe in the American future, knowing that it can never be static, welcome any improvements that are capable of producing widespread abundance and a shorter workweek. Because we believe that people will have greater pride and satisfaction in their work once they are liberated from the drone-like repetition of the assembly line and will recover their dignity as craftsmen. When man becomes not the slave of the machine but its master, a new era in human development will arrive.

For greater leisure will bring to all people the opportunity to enlarge their own horizons.

This is the good that will come of automation, if we put it to use for the general welfare.

This is not to minimize the adjustments that must be made, and the unique problems that must be solved.

There could be trouble, instead of harmony, if out-of-date thinking mismanages the electronic brains, failing to harness them to social and economic progress.

History proves that we are a flexible people, able to adapt ourselves to changing conditions, without sacrificing our essential freedoms, and without throwing our economy out of balance.

Whenever a revolutionary product or method is developed there is usually a branching out.

For instance, who could ever foresee that for every job created by the manufacture of automobiles many more would come into being through the auxiliary industries and satellite services that accompany tens of millions of motorcars from design, manufacture, sale, use, maintenance, etc.

In order that automation, the new wonder, shall be of benefit to all I believe we should give some thought now as to how it should be regulated.

The Congress should investigate automation, to set up those safeguards that will insure the best and wisest use of this amazing technology.

A Selling Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Omaha World-Herald of July 8, 1955, entitled "A Selling Job," which is based on the statements of Congressman BEN JENSEN, of Iowa.

In the short time I have been in Congress I have known BEN JENSEN to be an able, conscientious representative from that section of Iowa bordering Nebraska. His tireless efforts to help in stabilizing the Missouri River are not to be halted but are to be continued in a campaign of bringing industry to the available land along the river in both Nebraska and Iowa.

The editorial follows:

A SELLING JOB

Now that the Missouri River has been brought under control with the big upstream dams, much low-lying land along the river is available for industrial use. So says Iowa Representative BEN JENSEN.

But, Mr. JENSEN says, Omaha, Council Bluffs, and other river cities must undertake a "selling" job to bring industry's attention to the changed situation along the Missouri.

A good idea.

Nothing is so likely to chill a seeker after industrial sites as the possibility of flooding. Many lines of business have had costly experience along that line in the Pittsburgh area, for example.

It may take a few years to convince industrialists that the flood threat along the Missouri has been curbed permanently. But when they become convinced, Omaha and Council Bluffs stand to gain heavily. Both cities should be spreading the good news.

High Praise for the Dean of the Congress, Senator Carl Hayden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, within recent days announcement has been made in my State that our senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN, will stand for reelection again next year. By virtue of hard work and statesmanlike conduct over the years, Senator HAYDEN has won the esteem and gratitude of nearly everyone in Arizona. Typical of the response to his announcement was an editorial published this week in the politically independent Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson.

I have asked that this editorial be reprinted so that his colleagues may know that he is honored for his fine qualities "in his own country" as well as among his coworkers here.

The editorial follows:

HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

A few days ago an announcement was made that CARL HAYDEN, Arizona's Democratic Senator, would seek reelection in 1956.

The announcement pleased practically all Democrats in the State, and many Republicans, as well.

For CARL HAYDEN, dean of the Congress in point of service, who started his work as a representative of his State in the House, in 1912, goes far beyond party lines in his service to his State. He serves all Arizonians, regardless of party, and very effectively, too.

Politically, HAYDEN is one of the least heard, but one of the most powerful men in Washington. His long record for fairness has made him innumerable friends on both sides of the aisle in the Senate, and his political astuteness has gained him the respect of friend and political foe alike.

As chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee he has the power, and uses it, to support legislation he feels is beneficial to his State; but even before he held that post Senator HAYDEN had placed his indelible stamp on the great distances of the American West. The initials FAP on the national highway markers are there as a memento to HAYDEN's work for Federal aid to the highways of the Western States where great distances but small populations made it impossible for the States to properly construct sufficient main highways alone.

The Federal matching funds worked out under HAYDEN's plan, permitted the construction of the great highway network we have today and which is constantly being extended.

But to the people of Arizona CARL HAYDEN is more than just a powerful Senator. He is a personal friend to whom they turn when they need help. A letter to Senator HAYDEN, outlining the problem, never goes unanswered and seldom is it futile. His ability to smooth the way for his fellow Arizonians has been tried and tested often, regardless of party affiliations. Senator HAYDEN, folks will tell, is the man to see if you want to get things done."

Senator HAYDEN has been in Congress 43 years, 28 of those years in the Senate. Arizonians will be glad to know that he is willing to run again and will undoubtedly send him back to round out his full 50 years in Congress and celebrate his golden anniversary as Mr. Arizona, in Washington.

Inconsistency Seen in United States Dairy Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Paul Pioneer-Press of July 15, 1955:

INCONSISTENCY SEEN IN UNITED STATES DAIRY POLICY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Secretary Benson is applying a much higher standard of adequacy of milk supplies in justifying high Federal prices inside eastern milk tariff walls than his Department lawyers officially defined as adequate in justifying his cuts in Federal prices of factory dairy products including butter.

This fact was dug by the Pioneer-Press Thursday from the United States Department of Agriculture's latest study, just released, of the impacts of sanitary barriers, Federal milk orders, State milk control laws and truck laws on the milk industry.

As to Federal prices, both of dairy products generally and of fluid milk for table use, Federal law requires that price supports shall be set at such levels as will insure "adequate" supplies.

In legal justification of his cut last year from 90 to 75 percent of parity in Federal price supports on butterfat, Secretary Benson, on advice of his lawyers ruled that a 6 percent milk surplus nationally was so clearly adequate that he had no choice but to reduce the dairy price supports.

But on April 19, Secretary Benson raised New York fluid milk price supports to about 100 percent of parity, although New York prices were producing surpluses of 30 to 40 percent over table milk sales even in the short production months, the Department's own report reveals.

Secretary Benson's action on that day denied New York producers' plea for a $6-a-hundredweight Federal minimum price. Instead, he raised the minimum to $4.75 a hundredweight, as compared to the Department's full parity figure for April 15 of $4.71 for all milk.

The new USDA study Thursday was hailed by Midwest dairy observers as narrowing down the hot and growing issue of dairy tariff walls to determination of the legal meaning of the word "adequate" as applied to milk supply.

Disturbing Midwest dairying is this sequence that grows out of Government actions: 1. Eastern Federal prices of fluid milk are raised on one legal definition of adequacy while Federal dairy factory prices are cut on a different legal definition; 2, the higher eastern Federal prices on fluid milk stimulate milk production there to break all records, while discouraging consumption; and 3, the surplus unused there for table use spills over in subsidized competition with Midwest dairy products.

In May, 59.79 percent of New York fluid milk production, or more than half a billion pounds, was thus unused as table milk and was sold at class III for manufacturing at a price of $2.847 a hundredweight. This was 15.4 cents a hundredweight less than the manufacturing price in St. Paul. It means a subsidy of New York dairy manufacturers in that amount, plus freight costs, as against Midwest dairy manufacturers. The subsidy was collected from New York City consumers out of their high fluid milk prices. New York

dairy farmers never get the high fluid milk prices.

The new USDA study confirmed that conflicting sanitary regulations hinder the movement of milk into a substantial number of cities, and that State milk control laws used a variety of restrictive measures. Although less critical of the department's own Federal milk orders, it admitted that these contain some provisions that may be described as unduly restrictive.

Appearance of the study is expected here to sharpen the scrutiny by the House Agriculture Committee.

The Department's study didn't say anything about advice given by the consultants, including Drs. E. Fred Kohler, of Minnesota, and Roland W. Bartlett, of Illinois, both of them critics of milk barriers, who had been named by Secretary Benson to aid in the work.

Opinion Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, during my years of service in the Congress, beginning in 1939, I have regularly conducted polls of public thinking on vital national issues in my congressional district. These polls have been in the form of a printed questionnaire, requiring simple yes-and-no answers, mailed to registered voters in my district, regardless of political affiliation.

Responses to these questionnaires have always been excellent. The tabulated results, which virtually constitute a referendum of the district, have proved of enormous value to myself and, I hope, to my colleagues in the Congress.

My congressional district is probably as representative and contains as many varied interest groups as any in the Nation. It has the wealthy, the poor, and the middle class. It has a high concentration of labor, white-collar workers, small business, large industries, and some of the finest farmlands found anywhere. It includes a thickly populated section of Pittsburgh, extends to the rural areas, and takes in many large and small residential towns in northern Allegheny County.

The percentage tabulation of the answers on this latest poll are included below without comment, along with the results of the poll concluded last February 3, 1955.

I trust they will prove as interesting and informative to all who study them as they are to me.

The polls follow:

POLL RESULTS, JULY 1955

1. Should minimum wages be increased to at least $1 per hour? Yes, 68 percent; no, 32 percent.

2. Do you favor farm-price supports at a rigid 90 percent of parity instead of the administration's flexible price support program? Yes, 11 percent; no, 89 percent.

3. Would you favor using our armed services to defend the Chinese Nationalist islands of Quemoy and Matsu in the event of Red aggression? Yes, 46 percent; no, 54 percent.

4. Should we continue the foreign aid program for at least 2 more years? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent.

5. Do you favor the President's highway program over the Senate-passed Gore plan? Yes, 79 percent; no, 21 percent.

6. Do you believe that satisfactory progress is being made toward balancing the Federal budget? Yes, 55 percent; no, 45 percent.

7. If income taxes are cut next year, should relief be evenly distributed at all income levels, rather than granting greater relief to low-income groups? Yes, 60 percent; no, 40 percent.

8. Should the armed services be permitted to draft men into the Reserves? Yes, 52 percent; no, 48 percent.

9. (On the State level.) Would you prefer an adequate sales tax rather than Governor Leader's income tax plan? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

10. Do you want the House to approve the Senate-passed bill permitting the construction of a maximum of 135,000 low-rent housing unnits in each of the next 4 years? Yes, 43 percent; no, 57 percent.

11. Do you favor free distribution of surplus food to the certified needy? Yes, 87 percent; no, 13 percent.

12. Do you believe that President Eisenhower is doing a satisfactory job? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

POLL RESULTS, FEBRUARY 1955

1. Do you approve of Eisenhower's program in general? Yes, 90 percent; no, 10 percent.

2. Should the budget be balanced prior to any important tax cut? Yes, 83 percent; no, 17 percent.

3. Do you believe that our expenditures for national defense are adequate? Yes, 76 percent; no, 24 percent.

4. Should the Federal Government encourage and guarantee private health-insurance programs? Yes, 51 percent; no, 49 percent.

5. Should tariffs be selectively lowered through reciprocal trade agreements? Yes, 72 percent; no, 28 percent.

6. Should the draft law be renewed? Yes, 85 percent; no, 15 percent.

7. Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents per hour? Yes, 77 percent; no, 23 percent.

8. Eisenhower says a salary raise for Members of Congress is long overdue. Do you agree? Yes, 64 percent; no, 36 percent.

9. Should the incentives for men to remain in the military service be increased and the incentives to be discharged be reduced? Yes, 82 percent; no, 18 percent.

10. Should the voting age be lowered from 21 to 18 years? Yes, 35 percent; no, 65 percent.

11. Do you agree that the flexible price-support program is a marked improvement? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

12. Eisenhower said: "The transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree? Yes, 78 percent; no, 22 percent.

13. Do you think the Eisenhower administration is making satisfactory progress in securing world peace? Yes, 81 percent; no, 19 percent.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the $1½ billion upper Colorado storage project approved by the Senate and the ostensibly smaller House bill are one and the same thing.

The bill as reported out by the committee is S. 500 with all after the enacting clause stricken and the body of H. R. 3383, as amended by the committee, substituted. We thus have two versions of S. 500. The projects they provide for are as follows:

	S. 500 (Senate)	S. 500 (House) and H. R. 3383
Power and storage dams	Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo.	Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, Navajo.
Participating irrigation projects (authorized).	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Gooseberry, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.	Central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, Smith Fork.
Participating irrigation projects (conditionally authorized).	San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette.	Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, Woody Creek, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers extension, Sublette, Animas-La Plata.

From the foregoing tabulation it may be seen that as to projects the only difference between the bills is this: The Senate authorizes the Echo Park and Juniper Dams now, as well as the Gooseberry project, while the House version neglects to mention Echo Park and Juniper, although it conditionally authorizes Gooseberry.

Although the bills differ in detail, they are essentially the same in objective and in projects contemplated for development of water and power in the upper Colorado River Basin. Both bills must be considered together and treated as one bill. Should the House pass the measure before it, it is obvious that the principal matter for the conferees to discuss would be the treatment of these three projects. Chief among them, of course, would be Echo Park.

Should the House act favorably on the pending bill, it is likely that the project authorizations and other provisions of the Senate bill will be added to the House bill in conference. In view of the fact that the Senate refused to eliminate Echo Park by a vote of 52 to 30, let no Member be deluded that Echo Park is not in this legislation.

Some Light on TVA and Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an article from the Chattanooga News-Free Press of July 12, 1955. This article bears directly on the Dixon-Yates-TVA subject now currently under discussion:

LINE HELD ON TVA EXPANSION

Back in 1948 when plans for construction of the Tennessee Valley Authority's New Johnsonville steam plant were being debated, opponents of further expansion of TVA, including Purcell Smith, highly publicized lobbyist for the private electric power industry, proposed that Tennessee cities build their own steam plants.

Gordon Clapp, then Chairman of the TVA, denounced this proposed solution to the valley's power needs as a backward step, as inefficient from an engineering point of view, and as one that would be likely to end the valley's industrial development.

Ken Whitaker, Chattanooga's most vocal champion of public power socialism, also denounced the idea of municipal plants.

But now the public power advocates are shouting hallelujahs because Memphis' decision to build its own steamplant has caused President Eisenhower to decide to cancel plans for construction of the Dixon-Yates private-enterprise powerplant at West Memphis, Ark.

The President ordered cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract for the simple reason that Memphis' decision to build its own plant made the Dixon-Yates plant unnecessary. The Dixon-Yates contract was negotiated to replace TVA electricity to be used by the Atomic Energy Commission at Paducah, Ky.; to protect the Tennessee Valley against a power shortage. It was negotiated, furthermore, after the President had been informed Memphis could not build its own plant.

No reasonable supporter of private enterprise would want to see $107 million spent for an unneeded powerplant. If Memphis had given assurance in the first place of its intention to build its own powerplant, there never would have been a Dixon-Yates contract.

The public-power enthusiasts, who have indulged in ridiculous excesses of hysteria and bearing of false witness in their opposition to the Dixon-Yates plan, claim they have won a great victory by blocking the construction of the Dixon-Yates plant. And they have gained their end in that respect.

But the most important issue in this controversy is that of further expansion of TVA socialism. And the Eisenhower administration has definitely held the line against TVA expansion.

It is very clear from the attitude of the public power people that they are scheming to have the new Memphis plant "integrated" with the TVA. In other words, they want to expand the TVA by subterfuge.

But President Eisenhower and Congressmen from other parts of the country, whose constituents are tired of paying for "cheap TVA electricity," are not likely to let that happen. Certainly they should not let it happen.

If Memphis wants to build its own plant, it should be Memphis' plant—and Memphis' problem. And that, by the way, may turn out to be quite a problem.

Guided Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Friday, July 15, 1955. Mr. Alsop discusses in his column the vital guided-missile problem:

AND GUIDED

The intelligence estimators have been sent into a quick huddle by a seemingly minor detail in the recent Soviet statement on Germany. In a passage concerning the horrors of modern war, there was a brief reference to the invention of new, formerly nonexistent weapons of mass destruction * * * atomic, hydrogen, guided, and others.

In this casual manner the Kremlin has, in effect, declared that guided missiles which are weapons of mass destruction are now accomplished facts. And the Kremlin has further placed these guided missiles in the same grisly class as the A-bombs and H-bombs.

The experts are not certain precisely what this may portend. But it is a fair bet that it means the Kremlin is well satisfied with the progress of its guided-missile program. The bet is logical because Soviet guided-missile development has been an all-out effort, both more intensive and larger in scale than the comparable American effort, ever since the end of the last war.

A deadly, unseen race is going on, in fact, to produce the first workable models of the true ultimate weapon—the intercontinental guided missile with atomic or hydrogen warhead. And in this race, while the Soviets are working all out and have now begun to hint of their own success, the American motto is plainly "business as usual."

The prevailing Pentagon censorship is nowhere stricter than in this special field on which the fate and future of this country may quite probably depend. But anyone with the most trifling experience in such matters can see that there is little urgency in the American effort, just by taking a quick look at the way the effort is organized. The pattern of organization is a matter of common knowledge in the aircraft industry.

The effort is headed up under Brig. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever and his Western Division of the Air Research and Development Command. General Schriever has a total staff of about 100 persons.

In addition, he has the consulting services of the Remo-Woolridge Corp., an extremely competent scientific group headed by the two former chief scientists of the Hughes Aircraft Co. General Schriever's chief scientific adviser is the brilliant Atomic Energy Commissioner, Dr. John Von Neumann.

Such is the superstructure of the American effort to build long-range guided missiles. The actual missile projects are in the hands of primary contractors, who in turn employ swarms of subcontractors. Atlas, the projected intercontinental ballistic missile with a speed 10 times that of sound, is a Convair contract, for example. Navajo, the slower ram-jet missile of intercontinental range, is a North American contract; and the still slower Snark is a Northrop Aviation Co. contract.

The primary contractors by no means give all their time to these vast projects which have been confided to them. The Convair Co., for instance, is working on the F-102 fighter and the B-25 bomber, a new jet transport and a jet-powered flying boat, a seaplane fighter aircraft and the Terrier guided missile, in addition to having responsibility for Atlas. The subcontractors are similarly handling the needs of the long-range guided missile projects along with much other business.

The Pentagon maintains, meanwhile, that the long-range guided missile projects have highest priority. "Every dollar that is asked for is promptly made available," is the Pentagon theme song. But that is meaningless. Los Alamos, at the end of the war, had 8,000 people at work behind the barbed wire. In the long-ranged missile effort, the substitute for Los Alamos is a brigadier general with a staff of 100, plus a rather small industrial company, plus a chief scientist who is giving this life-and-death job what time he can spare from his other duties as atomic-energy commissioner.

Building long-range missiles is a vastly more difficult job than building A-bombs. What is wanted to do the job, of course is a Manhattan district type of organization, outside Pentagon channels, able to mobilize all needed scientific manpower, enjoying a commanding industrial priority, and above all directed by the sort of huge collective or synthetic superbrain that was the Los Alamos laboratory in wartime. But that kind of organization would upset the Pentagon's dominant budget balances by developing really massive expenditure requirements.

The people now involved in the long-range missile effort are all admirable and capable people. But the organizaiton is wrong. The priorities are wrong. The Pentagon outlook is wrong (which is not surprising, since Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, originally regarded the whole effort as visionary nonsence). And so the Soviets are being given a golden opportunity to win the guided-missile race.

Never a Better Chance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of an editorial from the Yakima Herald published at Yakima, Wash., under date of July 6, 1955, entitled "Never a Better Chance." This editorial points up the fact that passage of H. R. 5789, legislation which I introduced to provide for a means of financing construction of the John Day Dam, would be a smart business venture for Uncle Sam. I would like for all of my colleagues to read this editorial, and so, with unanimous consent, I insert it in the RECORD:

NEVER A BETTER CHANCE

It is reassuring that congressional Appropriations Committees have voted to set aside $500,000 or $600,000 for advance planning for the John Day Dam, for never has there been a better opportunity to get the project done quickly and economically than under the present plan offered by Representative SAM COON, of Oregon.

The private power companies have agreed to put up as much as they are called upon to provide of the $273 million for power features of the dam. The United States would put up $37 million more for the navigation and irrigation features. The navigation part is important, for it will mean slack water navigation on the Columbia as far upstream

as Pasco. Although the private power companies are willing to put up the bulk of the money, local public bodies will have an opportunity to join in the plan, too, and it will be the Federal Power Commission which finally determines which agencies shall participate, and to what extent.

Under the Coon proposal, the Government will construct, operate, and at all times own the dam. The partnership plan amounts to advance sale of power, which will bring in the money to build the dam. The other big dams were built from Federal tax money, which is to be paid back in 50 years through power sale. The local money in this case will pay for upkeep, maintenance, and operation also.

The plan suggested by Representative COON would be a smart business venture for Uncle Sam. It is timely because so many eastern Congressmen have become unwilling to put up so much Federal money for what they consider "local projects."

Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to extend an article entitled "Hoover Commission Report—Veteran's Friend or Foe?" which appeared in the May 1955 issue of the periodical published by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

The article follows:

HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT—VETERAN'S FRIEND OR FOE?

(By Joseph F. Barr, national commander, Jewish War Veterans)

Any analysis of the recent report of the Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly identified as the Hoover Commission on the Federal Medical Services, which would reject the report in its entirety would be unwise and unrealistic. It would do a real disservice to veterans and to the medical profession for a good many of the recommendations made by the Commission in this report are excellent.

For example, the suggested creation of a Federal Advisory Council of Health; the substitution of outpatient medical care for hospital care for those who, having received maximum benefits from hospital treatment, can safely be released if adequate medical care is provided to insure against a relapse; the emphasizing of a sound program of geriatric medicine for the aging veteran with the view of keeping domiciliary care at a minimum; the establishment of a National Library of Medicine; the broadening of the program of preventive psychiatric medicine for those in and out of active service and the institution of an effective national program under Federal auspices to conduct medical research.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Some of the other recommendations, however, are completely without merit. Others are not only deficient in merit, but seem to approach and, in fact, may be said to surpass the brutal, meat-ax, approach of the unlamented Economy Act of 1933.

Some of the statements in the report are difficult to understand unless approached on the premise either of a deliberate attempt to mislead or befuddle and confuse.

For example, on page XI of the report, it is stated that a review of the Federal medical services shows great expenditures, 4,149 million in 1954 including 2,030 million in disability allowances.

Does the report mean to imply that disability allowances are a part of the cost of Federal medical servcies?

The report on page 5, footnote 7, explains that the term "disability allowances" includes compensation for service-connected disability, pension to veterans for nonservice disability; monetary payments to retired officers for disability; and disability payments to Federal employees.

Why then, is the 2 billion 30 million included in the cost of medical services? These benefits must continue to be paid, under law, for disability, even if the Federal medical services program is completely eliminated. No plausible, logical explanation appears to be available for the exaggeration.

TWENTY MILLION ELIGIBLE

The report, on page 1, states that 20 million people are eligible for care on a facilities-available basis and that of this figure about 17,500,000 are veterans who are eligible for free hospitalization on their statement of inability to pay.

This is inaccurate. Eligibility is based, under law, on a sworn statement of inability to pay, accompanied by a statement under oath, of assets and income. This material difference appears either to have escaped the notice of those who prepared the report or to be of no importance whatsoever in the view of the Commission. The Jewish War Veterans of the United States feels that an oath possesses some value and that a showing of pauperism should not be a requisite to treatment for an ill veteran. Apparently the Commission also feels that the hospital benefit should continue to be available to those veterans who require the treatment. The only difference, therefore, is, What should be the financial qualifications? On this issue the Commission proposes a completely unrealistic idea of making the veteran assume the obligation to pay tor the traeatment if, at some later point in his life, he accumulates what some future bureaucrat may believe would justify an attempt to collect for the cost of the treatment.

No statutory period of limitation is proposed and no guidelines are suggested on which any such action would be based. The very cost of administering such a program is appalling and the dread of facing some future demand would, in and of itself, be enough to keep many who are actually entitled to the treatment, from applying for it.

MORE CROSS SERVICING

On page 7 the Commission recommends more cross servicing among the military hospitals and between the VA and Public Health Service hospitals. Both law and Executive order already provide for such cross servicing and one is tempted to inquire whether the recommendation was made with complete cognizance of the fact that treatment in Public Health and VA hospitals is based upon a completely different approach than that which governs military hospitals.

In military hospitals the aim is and has to be, the most expeditious return to acutely ill individuals to the active services. In VA and civilian hospitals the patient generally requires long-continued treatment for chronic diseases.

The report calls attention to the number of unused beds in VA hospitals apparently as a basis for arguing that this proves there are numerous surplus beds. As a matter of fact, innumerable applications for hospitalization are being denied by the VA—or the applicants placed on a waiting list, not because beds, as such, are not available, but because VA appropriations over the years have been so reduced that the personnel to service these beds are not available. It is this fact which causes the beds to be unused, rather than, as would seem to be indicated by the Board, the fact that these beds are surplus to the need.

COST BASIS

This whole concept of closing down hospitals on the idea of surplus beds and of shifting between the VA and the military hospitals and the Public Health Service hospitals seems to be based on the idea that the cost of medical services provided by the Federal Government to any one of its classes of beneficiaries and particularly to the veteran for non-service-connected disability would be reduced thereby.

No citizen who is a taxpayer and this includes millions of veterans, ever more conscious of the cost of government because of the multiplicity of local and Federal taxes, will oppose a justified recommendation to eliminate unnecessary expenditures. However, all citizens must oppose a recommendation not justified, and if there is a need for the beds.

The question then arises, who is going to determine this need, and upon what concept is this need to be determined? Does the fact that a bed is not available because of the lack of physician and nursing service to go with it mean that that bed is surplus?

Does the fact that applications for medical care for non-service connected causes are either denied or put on a waiting list because doctors and nurses are not available mean that some of the beds which are not available on this account are surplus? With a determination of surplus beds based upon a true and proper evaluation no veteran will disagree but with such a determination based upon a lack of medical or nursing services because of economy at the expense of veterans, one cannot agree.

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

In its recommendation No. 6 the Commission suggests that all present outstanding authorizations and appropriations for construction of additional veterans' general hospitals be rescinded except for those now under construction or under contract. This recommendation is based on the supposition, unfounded as shown above, that there are available a sufficient number of beds.

Yet, in the District of Columbia, the only VA hospital is Mount Alto, an institution originally constructed in 1901 as a girl's seminary, having neither the location nor the facilities which can adequately service this community of veterans.

Congress has authorized, but has made no appropriations for, a VA hospital to be located on land belonging to the Soldier's Home, made available out of Soldier's Home Park, and adjacent to a new community hospital which is already under construction.

In the District of Columbia area there are thousands of eligible veterans who require, for service-connected disability, let alone the nonservice disability group unable to pay the cost of hospital treatment, the medical service which a modern hospital would make available. As already stated, the Hoover committee itself recommends that hospital treatment for the nonservice connected should continue to be available.

See, in this connection, the statement on page 36 of the report that: "The Commission, however, believes that the sentiment of the American people is that a sick and really indigent veteran should be provided care in VA hospitals." The Commission, however, is of the opinion that this treatment should be made available only under added restrictions—to avoid fraud.

To justify its assertion of goldbricking and falsification of claims for the hospital treatment, the Commission relies upon what it calls a random examination in 1952 by the

General Accounting Office covering 336 cases.

Closer examination shows that about 10 percent of these cases were almost certainly goldbricking. The law and regulations at that time required only a statement of opinion as to the ability to pay. On that score, there might be a difference of opinion regarding the nearly 200 cases where the weekly income was between $75 and $100 a week.

No effort was made to ascertain why in any of the cases the affirmative statement of inability to pay was made. Who can tell whether in such cases the unescapable obligations of the veteran were such as to leave him no surplus?

Also, it is generally known that the report of the General Accounting Office in 1952 was based on selected cases, i. e., that these cases were not selected at random but were combed out in an individual examination of some 40,00 cases. An analysis of individual cases that shows perhaps one-half or 1 percent to be based on questionable entitlement, is a record that few institutions dealing with the public can equal.

FUTURE LIABILITY

Recommendation No. 9 is that a veteran should assume a future liability to pay for hospitalization based on non-service-connected disability, the debt so created to be payable in the future on a noninterest basis when and if the veteran ever reaches financial security.

In partial support of this recommendation the Commission calls attention to the fact that in some instances, where veterans have provided themselves with health insurance, some insurance companies have refused to pay the VA for services because no payment is made for treatment in veterans' hospitals.

To adopt the committee's recommendation means that (1) a debt would be created, to be enforced at the whim of some individual or group—to hang over the head of the veteran and his family; and (2) the establishing of still another agency to maintain and administer the program of collections thus envisaged.

Recommendation No. 13 which proposes a transfer to the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the authority to establish and maintain medical criteria for disability, both initial and continuing, ignores the fact that the Department of Medicine and Surgery was created for the specific purpose of providing a complete medical service and doing away with anything other than the practice of medicine by doctors.

One who is familiar with the history of the law creating the Department of Medicine and Surgery (Public Law 293 of the 79th Cong.) cannot help but recall the criticism based on the allegation that VA doctors were not engaged in practicing medicine but in paperwork. Hence the law to assure that doctors in the Department of Medicine and Surgery would practice medicine.

Rating disabilities or providing criteria under which disability would be rated is not practicing medicine. The proposal to transfer these functions to the Department of Medicine and Surgery would not accord with the basis on which a separate Department of Medicine and Surgery was created "to provide a complete medical service."

NOT ONLY VA

One cannot ignore the fact that the Commission's report which covers the total program of Federal medical services, has, in the mind of the public, been identified as relating only to the VA medical services program for the non-service-connected group.

The report shows—in small letters it is true—that the VA medical program cost is slightly over $700 million or about one-third of the total Federal program in the medical field. Three and one-half million veterans are suffering from service-connected disabilities and even the most critical do not suggest any redirection of care to this group.

What is the cost of furnishing treatment and of standby facilities available to treat this group? Should treatment be made more difficult to get? If so, what would be the cost in terms and despair—for this group alone?

Are veterans to be the forgotten men when the alarm of war dies down?

The Nation cannot—should not—must not forget the men and women who served.

The VA medical service program has resulted in benefits which cannot be measured, aside from that flowing from furnishing veterans unable to defray their own expenses of hospitalization the needed treatment. The country, as a whole, has gained untold advantages from the resident and intern training programs. Medical research has been considerably advanced through the research programs under VA auspices.

It is the view of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States that the direct and indirect benefits, which the country as a whole realizes, more than offsets the total cost to the Nation for providing an adequate Federal medical service program, and that the total cost of providing hospital treatment in non-service-connected cases, where the need exists and there is an inability to defray the expense by the veteran, when compared with the result, is not such as to justify either the specter of reckless expenditures or of alleged fraud which the critics of the existing program have raised.

What the Commission says on page 36, viz: "That a really sick and indigent veteran should be provided care in VA hospitals" represents not only its view but that of all veterans and citizens except for a few critics.

Does any one actually propose any other program in this field? And, if so, what selfish motives do these critics serve?

Orchids to Mr. Norblad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I would like to point out that the people of Nebraska, as those in every State of the Union, want value received when they designate us as trustees to conserve or spend their money.

The American people are entitled to an attitude of good judgment on our part as their elected representatives.

The included editorial comment substantiates the consideration that the able Congressman WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon, has given to the taxpayers' dollar through his commendation of the Post Office Department. And I might add that since January 1955, three post offices in the First District of Nebraska have been closed at a net saving to the American taxpayers, based on actual operating expenses and income, of approximately $5,000.

The editorial follows:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of June 15, 1955]

ORCHIDS TO MR. NORBLAD

Representative NORBLAD (Republican, Oregon) stood up in the House the other day to praise the Post Office Department for closing the post office at Keasey, Oreg., which is in his district.

The Keasey post office was closed because its operating expenses were $1,550 last year, while it took in only $418.

Mr. NORBLAD evidently was impressed by these figures. We can think of a good many politicians who might profit from his example.

Illness Called Boost to Johnson Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, I publicly stated my belief that the senior Senator from Texas, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON, is the best-qualified man in public life for the office of President of the United States. Nothing that has happened has changed my conviction.

I was very pleased to learn that there are others who share my belief. One of those is Holmes Alexander, the noted newspaper commentator who is highly regarded throughout our country for his excellent judgment and his perceptive insight into the political forces of our times.

On Sunday, July 10, 1955, the Dallas Times Herald carried an article by Mr. Alexander outlining his views.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that this article be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks so that Members of Congress may have the benefit of the thinking of this highly informed and highly regarded commentator:

ILLNESS CALLED BOOST TO JOHNSON CAREER

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 9.—Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S career, far from being ended by his illness, has been given a new beginning.

I am able to report from an intimate source that the Senator's closest political and personal associates now look upon his heart attack as a benign stroke of fate.

One or more Democrats in town who were associated with Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration are comparing JOHNSON'S illness with the former President's polio stroke in the summer of 1921. But JOHNSON'S recovery, his physicians now believe, will be rapid and complete, whereas Mr. Roosevelt was bedridden for many years and a cripple the remainder of his life.

At 46 JOHNSON may look forward to full and normal activities.

Contrary to loose reports, there seems to be no probability that JOHNSON will relinquish his post as Democratic floor leader of the Senate. Even if he should offer to do so, his Democratic friends and colleagues would not allow the resignation except under medical insistence.

PRESSURE SEEN

Although JOHNSON has repeatedly declared himself out as a national candidate in 1956, he may be under more pressure by his friends than formerly. Some of his backers are saying that JOHNSON will benefit both by the country's warm-hearted concern for his recovery and by the opportunity which he is afforded to sit down and allow people to

come to him for discussion of national affairs.

From my close observation of his career and of his processes of thought, it seems as certain as such things can be that JOHNSON will be in inevitable demand by his party for a national nomination in 1956.

The Senator's plans are fairly well set for the immediate future. Circumstances will force him to revise his methods of work and as a strategist of political events he has always proceeded on an energetic but logical plan. It may be reported that he is overseeing his own recovery in exactly this manner. That is to say, he is changing the emphasis from strict attention to all details to emphasis on big affairs only.

Even at the life-and-death phase of his illness, which struck him down on July 2, JOHNSON insisted on receiving informal digests on the state of national events. His doctors, at first reluctant, later agreed with the Senator's intimates that politics is his breath of life and must not be shut off.

REST AT RANCH

JOHNSON's schedule calls for leaving the Bethesda Naval Hospital at the end of this month and returning home for a rest on his cattle ranch near Johnson City, Tex.

In the autumn he will be examined by a picked staff of physicians who will prescribe the nature and amount of work he can do. JOHNSON will strictly abide by this regime, whatever it is. Present diagnosis already indicates that his heart will not be impaired once he recuperates from the present attack.

In January he will be back in Washington with a staff of assistants to whom he will leave the myriad details which he formerly made his own responsibility.

JOHNSON's friends believe that the attack this month might have killed him if it had come a year later, but coming as it did, it was a warning and an opportunity for him to make a change of pace which, in and by itself, is necessary for the kind of campaigning and political leadership which lies ahead.

Memorandum Relative to the Big Four Conference in Geneva Presented to the State Department on Wednesday, July 6, 1955, by the Polish American Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 6, 1955, a committee representing the Polish American Congress presented to the Secretary of State, through properly designated officials, a memorandum giving the views of over 6 million of Americans of Polish extraction relative to the Big Four conference now being held in Geneva.

The delegation consisted of Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress and president of the Polish National Alliance, Miss Adele Lagodzinski, vice president of the Polish American Congress and president of the Polish Women's Alliance, Rev. Valerian Karcz, secretary of the Polish American Congress, and Dr. K. Kozakiewicz, treasurer of the Polish American Congress and president of the Polish Roman Catholic Union. It was accompanied by Congressmen ANTONI SADLAK, of Connecticut, JOHN LESINSKI, Jr., of Michigan, and myself, as well as Mr. Karol Burke, the Washington Representative of the Polish American Congress.

The memorandum made a very careful and valuable analysis of the problems which led up to the present world situation and pointed to the necessity of correcting the injustice to the enslaved nations of the world as a necessary condition for the success of any negotiations which are intended to promote the cause of the world peace.

A lengthy discussion which followed elaborated on the immediate questions involved.

I believe the memorandum to be a definite and valuable contribution to the advancement of this objective, and submit it, herewith, for the information and consideration of this Congress.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM RELATIVE TO THE BIG FOUR CONFERENCE IN GENEVA PRESENTED TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 6, 1955, BY THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

In view of the forthcoming conference of the four great powers, the Polish American Congress, as spokesman for 6 million Americans of Polish extraction, considers it its duty to submit its views regarding the present state of international affairs as it affects the United States of America.

Soviet imperialism is a very serious threat to the peace of the entire world. In pursuit of its goal of world conquest, Soviet Russia is playing upon the fear of total war which permeates all free nations today.

Many of these nations do not understand or perhaps do not want to understand the dangerous objectives of Soviet policy. They labor under the illusion that peaceful coexistence with the U. S. S. R. is possible in spite of the fact that the entire history of the Russian nation proves the contrary. The realities of the present world situation bear witness to the fact that we are not living in peaceful but rather in armed coexistence with Russia.

From a small principality Russia has grown within a period of 300 years into an empire embracing over 8 million square miles of territory and a population of over 180 million. The Communist revolution in Russia did not alter this policy of conquest. On the contrary it accelerated Russian expansionism and outlined new goals. Lenin, the father of Russian communism, wrote: "First we shall take over central Europe, then later, the Asiatic countries. Then we shall encircle the United States, which will drop into our hands like overripe fruit."

In 1920, the U. S. S. R. set out to conquer central Europe by invading Poland. If successful, the plan was to continue its aggressive designs against all of western Europe. Thanks, however, to the heroism of the Polish Army, the Bolsheviks were routed near Warsaw. This crushing defeat prompted the Soviets to postpone temporarily their program of eventual world domination.

The Soviet leaders worked out a careful plan of world conquest. At the basis of this plan is the propagation of Communist ideology abroad, which focuses its attention on existing social, economic, and political controversies in an effort to attract the disgruntled and the anarchistic elements. Underground Communist networks in every country are the vanguards of conquest. By engaging in espionage and sabotage and by contributing to the moral dismemberment of free nations, they are preparing the way for the final stage—world revolution.

By resorting to moral and physical terror, the Soviets are forcing the people of Russia and those of the satellite nations to participate in the gigantic development of Soviet potential with which it hopes to subjugate eventually the rest of the world.

In 1939, German imperialism cooperated with Russian plans. The German-Russian Alliance, which precipitated World War II, marked the beginning of Communist success, enabling Russia to seize one-half of Poland, all the Baltic countries, and Rumania. Soon after, the infamous Yalta Pact, the most shameful demonstration of the irresponsibility and naive credulity of Western leaders, enabled the successors of Lenin to realize a major portion of their goal of conquest without losing a single Russian soldier. Today Central Europe and much of Asia are under Communist control, with the Reds brazenly and consistently preparing for further conquests.

What happened at Yalta is almost beyond belief. Poland, and along with it other friendly countries, did not want communism. A Communist government was imposed upon them against their will.

At the present time Soviet Russia is striving to break up the anti-Communist front, to isolate the United States, and particularly to liquidate American Army bases on foreign soil. One of Russia's most successful moves in that direction was accomplished through the Austrian Peace Treaty.

While the Austrian Peace Treaty pushes back the Russian military front only a relatively short distance, it requires the Western Allies to withdraw from a much larger and more vital area. It eliminates American military bases in Austria and makes it impossible for Austria to come to the aid of Western Europe in case of a Russian attack. Through the Austrian Peace Treaty, the Reds have also won a propaganda victory in the eyes of neutral nations, which view the Russian move as a sign of goodwill in the interests of world peace. Any interpretation of the Austrian peace terms as a concession on the part of Russia is premature. Because of the absence of Western Allied troops, the Reds can easily occupy the entire country whenever it will suit their purpose.

In reality, Russia needs a breathing spell to prepare for additional conquests, to complete its communization of the enslaved nations, to bolster the treasonable activities of the Communist Party in the free countries of the world and to build up its own war potential as well as that of its satellites.

Russia needs time for a knockout superiority. It doesn't want war until it is ready for it. That is the real reason behind the the temporary display of Red cordiality. It wants to throw the free world off its guard. It would give us a few years of peace for a future of slavery.

The Russian interpretation of coexistence with the free world is best illustrated by Lenin's own words: "The existence of the Soviet Republic with capitalistic states side-by-side is unthinkable for a longer period. One or the other must eventually triumph. But before that happens a number of unavoidable terrific clashes will take place between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeoise countries."

We, the Americans of Polish descent, perhaps understand communism far better than many people. Our ancestral homeland, adjoining that of Russia, not only thwarted the Communist designs upon Europe 35 years ago, but during the last war it suffered the most, and continues to suffer under the Communist yoke.

In these crucial moments of world history, we wish to present our concept of the most effective defense of the basic interests of the United States.

As the most important requisite for peace, the United States must demand the emancipation of all central and eastern European

countries from Communist-imposed governments. Only the restoration of complete independence to these nations would fence off Russia from Europe and the Mediterranean Sea and would eliminate the present continuous threat of aggression against Western Europe.

A proposed neutral belt of nations, between Russia and the West, can only be of real value if it is composed of truly independent nations in Central and Eastern Europe. These nations, in an effort to preserve their national existence, would strive to maintain a lasting peace. They would constitute a barrier to the aggressive tendencies of both the Russians to the east and the Germans to the west. Of these central and eastern European nations, Poland is the most important for the following reasons:

It is the largest nation and the most populous.

Its economic potential is the greatest. One of the three largest coal regions in Europe is located within its boundaries.

Its passionate love of freedom would operate as a powerful antidote to poisonous Communist propaganda. In defense of this freedom, it must be remembered, it made the greatest sacrifices of any nation in World War II.

Its geographical position, separating Russia from Germany, is of strategic significance.

We should never lose sight of the fact that a united, powerful Germany can in the future, as she has on many occasions during the past 200 years, become an ally of Russia. Even today there are many important circles in Germany, not at all communistic, which visualize Germany's future and its expansion only through cooperation and harmony with Russia.

By sacrificing Poland to Russia, the Western Allies opened a direct highway from Soviet Russia to the West. If Poland were free today, armed with American material and technical assistance, it would be a strong bulwark against Soviet aggression as well as a barrier against any eventual alliance between Germany and Russia, so dangerous to the peace of Europe and the world.

A free and independent Poland, with boundaries on the east fixed by the Treaty of Riga in 1920 and the western boundaries on the Rivers Oder and Niese, is essential to the preservation of lasting peace in Europe and to America's security.

Experience has shown that in our relations with Soviet Russia only a firm stand and a willingness to use force can achieve positive results. The President's wise decision to defend Formosa is an excellent example. Whenever there is appeasement war is not far behind.

It is essential that the United States should not give in to the aggressor.

During the impending conference, Russia will endeavor to have her illgotten gains legalized. It will seek to safeguard them by the elimination of the nearest armed bases in Western Europe.

We note with alarm that some prominent citizens, incapable or unwilling to interpret Communist aims, are urging the United States to take some chances in making concessions to the Soviets.

Even the slightest concession would turn the conference into another Red victory. It would multiply our troubles and add to our woes.

Since Russia is not yet ready to wage a major war, the time to make demands upon it is now. Russia must be told to relinquish its grip on all its satellites, withdraw to its original frontiers, and remove its puppet governments and agents from Communist-dominated lands.

The Reds have no right to Poland, China, the Baltic, and Balkan countries, or other satellite territories.

If the United States would firmly demand the implementation of the policy of liberation for Communist-controlled lands outlined by the President 3 years ago, then the whole world would realize that the United States has finally embarked upon a course leading to freedom and peace.

Liberation should become the core of United States policy.

When the United States shows unrelenting opposition to all that is evil, when it tries to right the wrongs committed against the victims of Yalta and when it builds a solid foundation for peace based on liberation, God will bless our land and its people and protect our children from slavery.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President of the Polish American Congress and President of the Polish National Alliance.
ADELE LAGODZINSKI,
Vice President of the Polish American Congress and President of the Polish Women's Alliance.
Rev. VALERIAN KARCZ,
Secretary of the Polish American Congress.
Dr. K. KOZAKIEWICZ,
Treasurer of the Polish American Congress and President of the Polish Roman Catholic Union.

The Status of Forces Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement which I had made a part of the record of testimony before the Foreign Affairs Committee on House Joint Resolution 309, the Status of Forces Treaty:

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the members of the committee for being permitted to appear and to submit a statement on behalf of House Joint Resolution 309, which provides for revision of the Status of Forces Treaty and other agreements, or withdrawal of the United States from the Treaty, so that foreign courts will not have criminal jurisdiction over American military forces serving within their boundaries.

Under the Status of Forces Treaty, ratified by the Senate last year by a vote of 72 to 15, the courts of foreign countries are vested with jurisdiction to try American servicemen for offenses committed against the laws of those countries.

Because of this treaty, which obtains with NATO countries and certain others, namely Japan, Saudi Arabia, Lybia, and Iceland, procedural and substantive rights of the members of our United States military forces have been given away. This is something we in Congress could not do, even if we were so compelled, by internal legislation by the Congress. It is only because of the interpretation of language in our Constitution that treaties are the "supreme law of the land" and need not conform to the Constitution, that this is possible.

Several able and conscientious efforts have been made in this session to accomplish what is proposed by House Joint Resolution 309, and I believe it is the overwhelming sense of the Congress that it must be done.

The objections raised did not go to the merits of this resolution, but rather to the procedures by which it was suggested.

We are informed by the Department of the Army that from January 1, 1954, through November 30, 1954, a total of 7,416 persons subject to military law of the United States were accused of offenses subject to the jurisdiction of foreign courts throughout the world. Jurisdiction was waived in 5,424 cases, and 793 cases were tried.

What happened to these American servicemen who were tried in foreign courts? The complaints were dismissed as to 255 individuals, and 123 were acquitted. The balance were fined, given suspended sentences, or incarcerated in foreign jails or prisons. As of February 10, 1955, the same source informs us, 58 United States citizens subject to military law are serving time in foreign institutions pursuant to sentences by foreign courts.

The numbers in themselves are not startling. While I do not have the record at hand and cannot quote the actual statistics, I would not be surprised if a comparison of the number of crimes and punishments at home was proportionately comparable. But what is involved is a principle, as deep-rooted as our form of government.

It was always my understanding that the Constitution follows the flag. Wherever our American servicemen go, wherever the flag is carried, the rights, privileges and guaranties of the Constitution go also. We have a Constitution that is unique. We have a concept of criminal law that has been evolved by our people, our legislatures and our courts such as is found nowhere else in the world.

Several procedural and substantive guaranties written into the Bills of Rights are peculiar to American law. One is the right to trial by jury. This right obtains in England, but in few other countries. Some criticism has been leveled at our jury system, and possibly with some merit, but no more eminently fair system has been developed anywhere, and trial by jury is a right our people expect and are entitled to. Even if this right were granted and the jury system installed in all of these treaty countries, how difficult it would be for an American serviceman to get a fair trial in a Japanese court, before a Japanese judge and a Japanese jury. How improbable it would be that an unbiased, impartial jury could be selected to try an American serviceman for an offense committed against a native of the forum. And, with the language barrier that exists, it would be nearly impossible for an American to conduct an examination of the jury panel to determine qualifications, bias, and other matters that go into the selection of a jury.

Other practical considerations are involved. According to the treaties, the accused American must be accorded by foreign courts such rights as a prompt and speedy trial; to be confronted with the charges against him; to subpena witnesses in his behalf; to be represented by counsel; to have an interpreter; to confront the accusing witnesses; and to communicate with his government. In theory, then, it would seem that many concepts of American justice are being followed. In practice, however, it is much different. Japan, for example, provides for court-appointed lawyers, but in many cases the Japanese lawyer cannot speak our language and cannot adequately communicate with the defendant. He is not given an opportunity to consult with the accused before trial, does not sit with the accused during trial, and does not prepare an adequate defense—which would be considered by most courts in our country as reversible error. I can conceive of many other practices that exist in foreign tribunals which would deny the American serviceman "due process of law" as measured by our standards.

There are certain matters of substance, matters of punishment that violate our constitutional prohibition against "cruel and unusual punishment." They are shocking. I am advised that the penal codes of France and Belgium still contemplate the use of the guillotine, and those of Italy and Luxem-

bourg command the firing squad for execution of the death penalty—outlawed in the United States for many, many years. The Dutch criminal code provides that sentences for periods not exceeding 15 years shall be served in solitary confinement, a practice followed in America for short periods of time only and then as an extreme disciplinary measure, a punishment for flagrant violation of prison regulations. Under the codes of several other countries, convicts are permanently deprived of civil, paternal and marital rights for committing relatively minor felonies.

These are but a few examples in which the letter and spirit of the American concept of justice is violated. I am sure a careful examination of the criminal laws of these countries will yield many more.

We are assured by many able legislators and lawyers that by the terms of these treaties an accused is accorded all the rights to which a citizen of the country in question is entitled. That is not enough. We did not send our Armed Forces to Germany to make German citizens of them. They should go there with the assurance that in return for the protection they are giving us we at least will safeguard their rights. We should not be prepared to accept these treaties until these questions are answered satisfactorily: Do these treaty countries recognize a defendant's right not to be twice placed in jeopardy for the same offense? Do these treaty countries respect a defendant's right to refrain from testifying against himself? Do these treaty countries require that criminal prosecution shall be by presentment, indictment, or information in the manner prescribed by our Constitution or other law? Do these treaty countries accord appeal, habeas corpus, and other review proceedings that are guaranteed to our citizens—or, for that matter—to their citizens in the United States? Do these treaty countries permit bail or prohibit excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment? Do these treaty countries presume a defendant innocent until he has been proved guilty beyond a reasonable doubt?

Unless all of these questions can be given an affirmative answer, substantial rights of our American military are being denied. A great injustice will continue to exist unless we take prompt action to reexamine and revise the Status of Forces Treaty.

We Sing a Bold Song

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of security is a grave issue to which we must rightly devote much attention today. However, I believe we must always weigh the issues to assure that in our headlong rush for security on every side, we do not compromise or destroy the American birthright of individual initiative. This spirit has given our Nation an invaluable climate of opportunity which has, in turn, permitted us to make life more secure for our citizens.

In this regard, I wish to commend to the Members of the House a thoughtful editorial which appeared recently in the Somerset (Ohio) press on Thursday, July 14:

WE SING A BOLD SONG

"Let me make the songs of a nation," said Andrew Fletcher, "and I care not who makes its laws."

He was discussing ways to regulate the Government.

Recent headlines: "Guaranteed Tariffs," "Federal Aid for Education," "Federal Aid for Highways"—suggest that our desire today is that the Government shall regulate us.

But listen as the Nation sings:

"Davee, Da-avy Crockett, King of the Wild Frontier."

Perhaps it is brash optimism to suppose that this musical tribute to a rugged individualist is a bubbling up of an awakened Nation spirit of self-reliance; or to imagine that a moppet who puts on a coonskin cap and chants "his land is biggest, his land is best" is much concerned with the economic reasons why this is so. Nor, most likely, does the adult who hears "freedom was fighting another foe" find anything there to alter his intentions to swap a little freedom for a Government subsidy.

It is probably even ironic that, while celebrating a man who scorned security four generations ago, we clamor for security in our lives and ask restraints on those who grow strong by challenging the frontiers of today.

Plenty of frontiers are left. So are men to challenge them. Matching their daring to the needs of the day, they blaze trails into the wilderness of consumer desires and hack out new strong points of jobs and payrolls.

No folk tunes reward them. But in singing "Davy Crockett" we sing our admiration for the pioneer spirit of yesterday. There is hope that we may yet recognize it close at hand.

Poker Players at Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world today are turned toward Geneva and the so-called summit meeting. We hope for real steps toward a comfortable peace, but we dare not be optimistic, for we know that no real strides have been made at similar meetings in the past—in fact, they have resulted in backward steps for the free world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial of timely interest from the July 18, 1955, edition of the New York Daily News:

POKER PLAYERS AT GENEVA

The Big Four summit conference opens today at Geneva, Switzerland—a sort of glorified poker game to be played by the heads of state of Britain, France, Russia, and the United States.

These men are British Prime Minister Anthony Eden, French Premier Edgar Faure, Soviet Premier Nikolai Bulganin, and United States President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Advisers and aids will hike the total number of conferees.

The conference is to last 6 days at most because General Eisenhower has made it clear that he isn't going to sit around chewing the fat longer than that. He has to be home on the job by next Sunday. The Russians, of course, would like to string it out for months or years—talk being one of the things they love best.

WHAT IT IS—WHAT IT ISN'T

It's advisable for all of us to keep clearly in mind what this conference is not, as well as what it is.

As the President made clear Friday, just before flying for Geneva, this is not a gathering which can be expected to wrap up the peace of the world for the next 10, 20, or 100 years. What the poker players will do mainly is to try to figure out areas in which agreements might possibly be reached between the Red slave empire's boss nation, Russia, and the Western Powers.

If they find any such areas, the Big Four nations' Foreign Ministers will be handed the probably tedius and time-eating job of working up the agreements themselves.

The subjects which the conferees will discuss will not include all the East-West frictions.

NO MORE TEHERANS, NO FURTHER YALTAS

President Eisenhower, for example, does not want to talk about the Far East, because no representatives of Far East nations will sit in at the summit parley. Eisenhower wants to avoid even a suspicion of selling out other countries behind their backs, as was done so gaily by the late F. D. Roosevelt at Teheran and Yalta.

Our side wants to talk about the nations now held in slavery by Moscow—Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc.—and to urge the Kremlin to let them hold some genuinely free elections. This suggestion gives Khrushchev, Bulganin, and their comrade gangsters the fantods.

Both sides say they are willing to discuss reunification of Germany. But the Kremlin hopes to razzle-dazzle the West into agreeing on a weakly armed and neutral Germany, whereas our side wants a Germany free to arm, except perhaps in its East Zone, and to choose its allies.

There is likely to be quite a hassle on every point that gets into the Geneva conversation.

Can we, then, expect any real results from the summit conference?

In this newspaper's opinion, we can hope for results of benefit to our side only if the western leaders will play shrewdly and boldly the fistful of high-powerered cards they hold, and will refuse to appease the commies—whose long-range objective is, as always, to conquer the world.

PLAY THIS GAME RIGHT

The West is stronger than the Red slave empire in every way except as regards numbers of foot soldiers now under arms and ready to fight.

Russia has a snowballing depression, bad food shortages, and a serious scarcity of productive machinery. Famine is raging in China. The satellite peoples hate their Red slave-masters' guts. The United States Strategic Air Command is on round-the-clock alert to spread hydrogen and atomic destruction the length and breadth of Russia, with special attention to industrial areas and nuclear plants. There are those who believe that one husky push from outside would topple the Red empire like the proverbial house of cards.

If our President and his western partners play this game in tune with these facts, they may light the fuse for the eventual explosion and disappearance of world communism without a war. If they fiddle and falter, cringe, and try to appease, it is hard to see how anything but increased danger of a disastrous world war can come out of Geneva.

Resolution of the Polish National Fund of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and constituent, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis Kowalczyk, president of the Polish National Fund of New Jersey, Inc., has sent me a copy of a resolution adopted unanimously at the United States Independence-Justice for Poland Day rally held on July 4, 1955, at the Sons of Poland Camp, Randolph Township, N. J. As one who looks forward to freedom for the Polish people, I submit this resolution to the House:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY AT THE UNITED STATES INDEPENDENCE-JUSTICE FOR POLAND DAY RALLY, SPONSORED BY THE POLISH NATIONAL FUND OF NEW JERSEY AND HELD ON JULY 4, 1955, AT THE SONS OF POLAND CAMP, RANDOLPH TOWNSHIP, N. J.

We, the Americans of Polish descent and the free Poles who found sanctuary in the United States after the postwar enslavement of Poland by the Soviet Union, gathered to commemorate the 179th anniversary of the signing of the American Declaration of Independence, declare the following:

1. The Poles during their 1,000 years of existence as a nation always fought not only for their own freedom and independence but also for those of others, including the American people, as evidenced by the fact that not only 2 famous sons of Poland, Generals Tadeusz Kosciusko and Kazimierz Pulaski, with the latter being one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, but also over 1,000 other Poles fought in the ranks of the Freedom Force of the American Revolution.

2. The Poles were the first to fight the Nazi aggression and their contribution to the victory over the Nazis is generally recognized. Yet Poland has suffered defeat in victory and remains in slavery as a result of the infamous Yalta Pact.

3. At Yalta, Poland, the most faithful and trustworthy member of the World War II Allies, and other nations were sacrificed by the Western powers on the altar of appeasement to the Communist Moloch.

4. The Yalta attempt at coexistence with the Soviets resulted among others in the imprisonment of 16 top leaders of the Polish underground who courageously led the fight against the Nazis, and in the introduction of Moscow puppets as Polish representatives in the United Nations.

5. In connection with the Big Four conference, the Western powers in their effort to establish a peaceful coexistence with the Soviet should keep in mind the numerous violations by the Soviets of previous agreements.

6. We do not believe that a coexistence with the Soviets is possible. Only the overthrow of Communist dictatorship and the withdrawal of Russia to her 1939 boundaries can assure freedom of all nations and establish real peace in the world.

7. Having faith in justice and in the strength of the democratic nations, led by the United States, we hope that at the Big Four meeting the heads of the United States, Great Britain, and France will take the stand based on righteousness and insist on the following:

(a) Nullification of the Yalta Pact.

(b) Withdrawal of recognition from Communist governments of Poland and other nations of Europe and Asia.

(c) Withdrawal of Soviet forces from occupied territories.

(d) Restoration or recognition to the Free Polish Government in London.

(e) Return to Poland of her eastern lands given to Russia in accordance with the Yalta agreement.

(f) Recognition of Poland's right to her ancient western lands and accordingly of Poland's present western boundaries on the Odra-Nysa Rivers. We observe with anxiety the revisionist tendencies of certain German circles which may lead to the military alliance with Soviet Russia and in consequence to a new world war.

(g) Release by Russia of the remaining imprisoned leaders of the World War II Polish underground government, as well as of all political prisoners.

(h) Creation of conditions in the Soviet-occupied lands which would assure freedom of religion, freedom of expression, and free elections.

8. We warn that further appeasement of Soviet Russia, whether under a guise of peaceful co-existence or any other, will only result in eventual Communist victory over the free world and in destruction of the western civilization.

9. We assure the people in Poland that we will not rest until Poland will be free again.

Long live the United States of America—champion of reedom and democracy and the only hope of the enslaved world.

Long live the indomitable spirit of a free and democratic Poland.

RT. REV. MSGR. F. P. KOWLACZYK,
President, Polish National Fund of New Jersey.
VERY REV. CANNON MAJOR ALBERT A. ROJEK,
Secretary General, Polish National Fund of New Jersey.
WALTER MARUT,
Mayor of Wallington, N. J., General Chairman, Independence Day Rally.
JAN ZAPRAWA-OSTROMECKI,
Vice President, Polish National Fund of New Jersey.
EDMUND HEMMERLING,
Assistant Secretary General, Polish National Fund of New Jersey.

Meeting at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column Keenotes, on the subject of the forthcoming meeting at the summit. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Unlike Mount Everest and other mountain heights which withstood the efforts over many centuries of mere men to reach their pinnacles, the summit at which the heads of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union are meeting in Geneva could have been reached at almost any day of any year since the unhappy Big Four meeting at Potsdam after World War II.

It required no great burst of human endurance as in scaling Everest; no great and superhuman courage. All it took—but that, indeed, was much—was an atmosphere of not necessarily good will but willingness to discuss explosive issues calmly.

If nothing comes of the Geneva Conference, the world will have been no worse off for its having occurred. If anything good comes of it in the reduction of tensions between peoples, and in the removal, even a little, of the constant danger of hydrogen warfare, then it will have been very worthwhile and a boon to humanity.

The world waits hopefully for the outcome of these conferences, but not in any state of suspended animation. We continue with our work of increasing the military strength of the free world. We assume the Soviets are busily engaged as ever in turning out new and more powerful weapons and in maintaining their overtight stranglehold over the peoples they hold in bondage.

Nevertheless, I find it reassuring that our President can go to Geneva to meet the crafty and unpredictable Russians without any partisan backbiting at home, without any divisive challenges to his sincerity, without any political suspicion-mongering. He truly has bipartisan support for his efforts to achieve a better basis for peaceful understanding.

In this connection, I am indeed most proud of the members and the leaders of the Democratic party in the Congress, particularly such wise and patriotic men as Senator George, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who did so much to make this conference at Geneva a reality, Congressman RICHARDS, who succeeded Judge Kee as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Speaker RAYBURN, the now-ailing Senator JOHNSON, and others. They did not merely stop politics at the water's edge; they went far out of their way to make sure the President's leave taking was backed up by the overwhelming confidence, support, good wishes and sincere cooperation of the Congress.

There have been times in our recent history when true bi-partisanship such as this was impossible to achieve, even in foreign policy matters on which the fate of America and all humanity rested.

But we have learned much, and, I hope, profited from mistakes of earlier decades. Perhaps we have just become more aware of the shrinkage of the world since learning the meaning of such terms as fireball, fallout, obliteration of whole cities, and so on.

Geneva—a city long associated with man's hope for peace, has yet another chance to redeem past failures.

We'll just have to wait and see, and hope, and pray.

Commentary on the Public Service of Hon. Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "See Thou Character," by Mr. Raymond Moley in his Perspective column in Newsweek magazine of July 18, 1955.

PERSPECTIVE

(By Raymond Moley)

SEE THOU CHARACTER

You might well pause in your work or play, ladies and gentlemen, and consider for a few

moments what it takes to make a great American. It would fit the mood of such a moment of reflection to contemplate, as a vivid example, Herbert Hoover as he completes his latest public service.

There have been 41 years of such service since in 1914 the first rumblings of a generation of war and strife called him, at the age of 40, from a distinguished professional and business career to a broader service of mankind.

Two of his successors as President have regarded him as the man of all men in public life to survey the vast burden of government which, unless it is lightened, may well engulf us all.

Consider the Hoover equipment for this task. He came from the grassroots of America and knew as a child and youth the ideals and habits of its people. As a young man in foreign fields, he acquired the capacity not only to deal with large affairs but to see from abroad the ultimate place which his own Nation must take in a restless world. As an engineer and manager, he learned the secrets of an industrial civilization. In Europe he saw the dire tragedy of western nations intent upon their own destruction.

Hoover, the Quaker and humanitarian, comprehended long before politicians prattled about welfare the need that organized government provide a minimum of subsistence while cherishing the initiative indispensable to a full life. Then there followed 12 years in the Cabinet and the Presidency. Where else in this generation or in our history has there been such personal equipment for a broad look at the way we are governed?

The statistical descriptions of the labors of the Commission are impressive indeed, but they convey none of the essential feeling of the labors imposed upon the Chairman. The field of Government operations was divided into 19 sections, each with a task force to do the spadework and to make preliminary recommendations. Some of those task forces in turn subdivided their work with committees for each part. Hundreds and hundreds of meetings were held all over the United States. The personnel of the task forces included scores of men who, with the compelling example of Hoover before them, gave weeks and months to public service.

Let us see what this job meant in terms of labors of the chairman. Hoover toiled from 10 to 15 hours a day, mostly in weeks 7 days long. He divided his week between New York and Washington, usually using the weekend for the Nation's Capital when, as he said, he could "get the most work out of his congressional members." The task-force reports were often intolerably long and badly written. Some were excessively dry. But Hoover read them all, and with his own hand and pencil rewrote most of them as commission reports. On one report alone, which in its raw state ran to 1,783 printed pages, Hoover labored every day for a month to make it shorter and more intelligible.

The staff of the commission itself and its various task forces was large and needed at all times the supervisory attention of the chairman. There were also the innumerable appointments which he had with people in the departments surveyed, as well as with individual members of the task forces. Then there was the commission itself to guide and moderate. This required many meetings, sometimes for days at a time. With the patience of Job, the chairman dealt with the quibbling of some of the members and when he could not persuade, he encouraged minority reports. Finally, he had to endure the political sniping from the agencies which it was necessary to criticize and from political opportunists in Congress who still hope to win votes by abusing Hoover.

Only a man with character chiseled out of granite and blessed with an extraordinary physical equipment could survive such a service. Altogether, Herbert Hoover has created a reputation and has established a record that will become a great American story long after the storms of controversy that have swept across his career have lost meaning and content.

A Committeeman Remembers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, 35 years ago, civil service retirement became a reality by the passage of legislation by the 66th Congress. It was the culmination of many years of effort on the part of the civil service employees and Members of Congress alike. One of the Members of Congress instrumental in the enactment of such legislation was the Honorable Addison Taylor Smith, who was a Member of Congress from Idaho from 1913 until 1933. During his term of service he was a member of the House Civil Service Committee.

It is significant to note that Addison Taylor Smith was born and reared in my hometown of Cambridge, Ohio, and that he came to Washington in 1888 as the secretary to Congress J. D. Taylor, of Cambridge. Mr. Smith served with distinction as secretary to Congressman Taylor and later to a Congressman from Idaho, and subsequently became a resident of the State of Idaho from which he was elected to Congress. Mr. Speaker, it is especially remarkable that Congressman Smith, who spent a great portion of his life looking after the welfare and interests of the aging civil service employees, should be blessed with a long and useful life and now, at the age of 92, continues his active interest in the affairs of the day.

In the latest issue of the periodical Retirement Life, special tribute is paid to the activity of this courageous and dedicated Congressman.

A COMMITTEEMAN REMEMBERS

So it has been 35 years since the civil-service retirement law went into effect. To a good many of us the law goes back almost to the farthest reaches of our official service. But not to one of NARCE's most valuable and highly-respected executive committee members; not to ex-Congressman Addison T. Smith. His had been a familiar face in the corridors of our National Capitol for more than 30 years before the law granting annuities to formal Federal employees ever reached the floors of Congress.

Coming first to Washington in 1888 as the secretary to an Ohio legislator, Mr. Smith in 1913 was himself elected to Congress from the State of Idaho. For 20 years thereafter he was a member of the House Civil Service Committee, and as a member of that committee gave his help to that persistent little group of Federal workers who were determined that the aging civil-service employee should have ahead of him something besides indigence—and the poorhouse.

He remembers Robert H. Alcorn, too. Remembers him well as a quiet, courteous young man with a friendly manner and the tenacity of a bulldog. During those trying times when it looked as though there might never be a civil-service retirement law, Bob Alcorn, he says, was almost a daily visitor to the offices of influential Congressmen and their committee rooms.

Mr. Smith remembers, too, that during his very early days in Washington, aged Government employees were commonly referred to as "Government paupers." And whether they were dismissed from their jobs into abject poverty or were kept on the rolls as informal pensioners was, it seems, very largely in the hands of their supervisors. Mr. Smith recalls—and Mr. Alcorn doubtless will also—when many of such infirm "pensioners" came to their offices on crutches or had to be brought in carriages.

Federal employees everywhere and all of us retirees owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the Addison T. Smiths and the Robert H. Alcorns—to all those sturdy pioneers who helped to bring our Retirement Act into being.

Messrs. Smith and Alcorn are still in there pitching, too; lending their skills and their knowledge toward the enactment of an even better civil-service retirement law.

Harold "Pee Wee" Reese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the night of July 22 the people of Brooklyn will pay high honor to an adopted son. Thousands of grateful citizens will gather at Ebbets Field, home of one of the greatest baseball teams the Nation's popular pastime has ever known, to present their affectionate salute to a young man who has rendered exemplary service to youth, and the parents of our Nation.

I speak of Harold "Pee Wee" Reese, star shortstop of the Brooklyn Dodgers Baseball Club. "Pee Wee" Reese is an illustrious son of the great State of Kentucky, who, for almost twoscore years, has been an inspirational example of sports at its best.

"Pee Wee" Reese night at Brooklyn might well be observed in every hamlet and home throughout the Nation.

For "Pee Wee" stands as a symbol of all the fine and decent men who participate in the great sport of baseball and give our male youth the incentive to mold themselves into similar specimens of responsible manhood.

His inspirational stature transcends the field of sports.

Not only is he a model athlete and top competitor and sportsman, but he is a citizen who finds time to take part in the affairs of his community and gives of his energy to help those who cannot help themselves.

"Pee Wee" Reese has fulfilled a noble featured role in the contemporary drama of this generation. His contribution to our continuing battle to keep our youth from falling into the morass of delinquency, is immeasurable.

On the occasion of his being honored with a civic testimonial of affection by

the good people of Brooklyn, I am sure the Congress of the United States will want to join in presenting their very best wishes and appreciative accolade to "Pee Wee" Reese who wears No. 1 on his uniform and is No. 1 in the minds and hearts of many baseball fans throughout the world.

White House Conference on Education Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of the action by the Committee on Appropriations in cutting the funds for travel of delegates to the White House Conference on Education is that this amounts to ignoring a directive of the 83d Congress.

That Congress required, and I repeat, required, that the White House Conference on Education be "broadly representative of educators and other interested citizens from all parts of the Nation."

This cannot be done for the $50,000 which the committee included in the bill. Travel costs money and it is not right that public-spirited citizens be asked to participate in such a worthwhile conference, which is one of the greatest educational programs in this Nation's history, without paying for a minimum of travel. No one is asking that we give these fine citizens money for food or lodging—merely a seat on a train.

For the amount which the committee included, we could invite back the delegates of just 5 States. The travel funds needed for California, Illinois, New York, Texas, and Washington alone amount to a little more than $50,000. Are we to ask the other 43 States to leave their delegates home or perhaps every State to trim its delegation and penalize these citizens who have labored so diligently?

Certainly with all the money we have appropriated for foreign aid, we can allow this important educational conference $170,000 for travel expenses. Otherwise, we are deliberately eliminating the delegates of at least 26 States, where funds are either prohibited or will not be authorized or are unavailable. And the total will probably run higher, unless we ignore the requirement of the 83d Congress and fail to get a broadly representative group.

Participation in the White House Conference must not be hinged on ability to pay travel expenses.

I was proud to join with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] in a statement to the Committee on Appropriations urging that the full amount be granted for the White House conference, and I again urge that these funds be restored in conference with the Senate.

Salient Facts in Proposed Fort Sill Range Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, the artillery and guided-missiles center at Fort Sill is one of the five key Army installations and schools in the Nation. The effectiveness of American artillery in World War II and Korea is recorded on the pages of history. As was true then, the fulfillment of the mission of artillery and guided-missiles center is today a vital necessity to the continued defense of the United States and the free world. With the development of longer-range artillery weapons and ground-to-ground missiles, expansion of Fort Sill range is absolutely necessary. Due to its favorable geographical location and excellent expanse of ideal and varied terrain, Fort Sill, with its tremendous physical investment, can pay much greater dividends to the Nation with the acquisition of this minimum amount of land, affecting a minimum number of people and costing a minimum amount of money to assure maximum results in artillery training.

FACTS

Present size of Fort Sill is 74,000 acres; it is the smallest of the five principal Army schools.

Number of additional acres sought is 31,020. Of this, 10,700 acres are now under Department of Interior control and 20,320 acres under private ownership.

Estimated cost of acquisition is $2,216,000.

Acquisition will displace 45 farm families, 2 storekeepers, 1 small school, 1 rural church, and 1 amusement park.

TYPES OF LAND

Private: Low to fair grade agricultural, predominantly for grazing.

Public: Low-grade land, predominantly rough, mountainous country, mostly inaccessible to public, with meager improvements, lying along extreme southern edge of Wichita Mountains Wildelife Refuge.

Proposed acquisition will neither affect public use of principal recreational areas in refuge nor refuge's principal mission of propagation and perpetuation of wildlife.

INVESTMENTS MUST PAY DIVIDENDS

Physical investment: It is conservatively estimated that the investment in facilities for national defense at Fort Sill since 1911 would exceed $250 million. Maximum dividends from this huge investment can be realized by expenditure of slightly more than $2 million for additional rangeland.

MILITARY REQUIREMENTS

The Fort Sill Reservation was adequate before World War II when weapons of that period usually fired from 2,000 to 5,000 yards. Today the range of modern artillery weapons is measured in terms of miles, not yards. Some weapons, like the 280-millimeter cannon, the Honest John rocket, and newly developed and classified electronic projectiles, are extremely long-ranged—beyond the capabilities of the existing Fort Sill Reservation, allowing for maximum safety zones.

MANEUVER AREAS VITAL

Teaching of modern tactics and techniques as developed at artillery and guided-missile cents for the Nation and free world requires dispersion, coupled with high mobility quite beyond the capabilities of the present reservation to support. Acquisition of this 31,020 acres will assure adequate areas for maneuvering and training, not only for the present but the foreseeable future.

No atomic projectiles will be fired on the Fort Sill range, but the artillerymen who man the weapons which launch these projectiles must be trained. They must learn to maneuver these weapons, firing conventional shells in tactical situation which parallel the combat situations they may face, and to do this they must have greater range facilities.

TESTED AREAS NEEDED

An additional vital national-defense role is conducted by Continental Army Command Board No. 1 at Fort Sill, which field tests all new developments in artillery weapons, many of which are known to be extremely long-ranged and still remain on the classified list.

The closely integrated functions of this board and the artillery and guided missile center in the perfecting of new weapons and techniques could better serve the interests of national defense if additional testing and training areas are acquired.

ANSWERS TO OPPOSITION

As is historically true in any plan to secure privately held land for the common good, certain opposition has arisen to the proposed Fort Sill land acquisition. Principal opposition in this case stems from a handful of affected land owners who have enlisted the support of many wildlife and sportmen's groups who are wholly unfamiliar with and generally misinformed on the vital defense issue involved. These groups have magnified beyond all reason the effect of the proposed acquisition and have tried to alarm the public with a cleverly conducted campaign based on half-truths. Basically, the answer to this opposition can be found in the fact that the defense of the Nation must be rated far above the value of a few picnic spots and the dedicated principles of a few bird-lovers.

Some of the issues raised by the opposition are answered below:

First. Why acquire additional range land when Fort Sill is leasing some range now?

Answer: Land at Fort Sill under lease.

A. Hay cutting: Nine lessors, of these 4 are permitted to plant alfalfa on parts of their leased tracts.

Explanation: These leases are for fire prevention on the artillery ranges. Without them the post engineer would be required to cut the hay at great expense to the Government and loss of the hay to the economy of this section. The alfalfa

clause is inserted in some leases to make the lease more attractive on poorer tracts. The contracts provide that the lessor cannot interfere with the full military use of this land.

B. Sheep grazing: Two lessors of small tracts.

Explanation: For fire prevention. Controlled grazing within the ordnance ammunition inclosure and on an adjacent close-in training area. These leases also provide that lessor will not interfere in any way with full military use of the land.

C. There are no other leases of land at Fort Sill and no crops are raised other than hay—alfalfa with hay in four instances. Military requirements for land long ago put an end to cattle grazing which used to be permitted in some areas.

Second. Why not take all of the wildlife reservation and no private land?

Answer: The wildlife reservation is a unique facility of great value and interest locally and nationally from a conservationist's point of view. Its recreational facilities are unsurpassed in this section of the country and are a contributing factor in the traditionally high morale of Fort Sill troops. The small part requested in the Fort Sill acquisition program is of little value to wildlife conservation and contains practically no recreational facilities. The private lands involved, on the other hand, are of value only to the few landowners involved.

Third. Why not to the north?

Answer: This land is valuable, expensive farmland, well watered by Cache Creek and its tributary streams. To get required continuous range, a much larger acquisition would be required.

Fourth. Why not to the east?

Answer: This land is also more valuable farmland. In addition, most of it is potential oil land with producing wells throughout and extending to the present east boundary of the reservation. It is open, rolling country, not well suited to military training. Here again it would be necessary to make a much larger acquisition to obtain the required continuous range.

Fifth. Why not to the south?

Answer: This comprises the city of Lawton and town of Cache, with a relatively dense urban and suburban population. Lawton is built up to the reservation south boundary fence.

Sixth. Can the existing water supply support Lawton and Fort Sill?

Answer: Yes; with proper conservation the water supply is sufficient for present and foreseeable needs.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there exists at least 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in humid areas of the United States which can be developed for agriculture at a fraction of the cost of the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado storage project. The Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage. Development costs would be from $60 to $100 an acre for such land. The cost involved to taxpayers of the Nation in developing new and supplemental water for the acreage serviced by the upper Colorado project, which amounts in all to only about 600 square miles of new land, would range up to 50 times as much for each acre developed.

As an example, the Department of Agriculture lists acreage available for low-cost development in these 21 States as follows:

	Acres
Alabama	633,000
Arkansas	1,865,000
Florida	1,970,000
Georgia	1,721,000
Illinois	69,000
Indiana	135,000
Kentucky	170,000
Louisiana	2,769,000
Michigan	690,000
Minnesota	874,000
Mississippi	1,272,000
Missouri	323,000
New York	100,000
North Carolina	1,157,000
Ohio	95,000
Pennsylvania	90,000
South Carolina	996,000
Tennessee	242,000
Texas	3,928,000
Virginia	514,000
Wisconsin	316,000

When Wages Go Up, So Do Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including at this point a pertinent editorial that appeared in the Racine (Wis.) Journal Times of July 13. I commend it to the attention of all Members of this House.

The editorial is as follows:

WHEN WAGES GO UP, SO SURELY DO PRICES

Among practical economists (the nonbook variety) it has been axiomatic that prices usually rise faster than wages and that earning power seldom catches up with the cost of living during periods of general inflation. In the past year or so there have been indications that this trend has been reversed to some extent, and that increasing buying power has not been matched by increasing prices. But now there are signs that the same familiar cycle is about to return. Steelworkers won themselves a big wage increase in recent negotiations with major steelmakers, but the steel firms passed on the wage increase in the form of a substantial price increase. Not only will all of us, as consumers of steel directly or indirectly, pay for the wage increase, but the steelworkers themselves, who are also consumers, will pay a part of it.

It is not often that it is possible to find as clear a case of "chain reaction" in wages and prices as the recent steel increases afford. It is almost what teachers call a bookcase.

The United Steelworkers, hard pressed by the need to show their membership substantial gains to match the guaranteed wage plan recently won by the auto workers, pressed Big Steel hard for a wage increase. The steel manufacturers did not want a protracted strike at this time, when their market looks richer than ever before. In addition, they very apparently had no intention of absorbing any part of the wage increase in the present price structure. So an increase of 15 cents an hour was granted, which made the steelworkers happy, and the price of all steel was increased an average of $7.50 a ton, immediately.

Thus the cost of the wage increase was passed on by the steel manufacturer to his consumer, the manufacturer of steel-made products, who will pass it on again in the form of price boost on consumer goods. Within weeks or months, the cost of everything from toasters to automobiles will be raised, and even some of the things made with steel machinery will be increased. This means that the consumer's present income dollar will buy less, and he will want more money. Even the steel workers themselves will want more money, which starts the cycle over again.

This is inflation, no matter how you spell it. True, it may be just a little inflation in the isolated case of this one, particular pay raise. But there are those who argue that there is no such thing as a little inflation, any more than there is such a thing as a little garlic. Major inflation is only an accumulation of such incidents, accelerated by their own number.

No one would recommend, flatly, that all pay increases be denied because, to some degree, they are all inflationary. There are many other factors in the economic complex and many other influences on the price structure than the cost of wages. But we have here a classic case of wages determining an increase in the cost of a basic commodity. Unless increased productivity or some other factor can be brought into play to act as a brake on the inflationary spiral, we are about to see it take another twist upward, and our economy will not be sounder as a result.

Mutual Security Appropriation Bill, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7224) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I have not attempted to vote for any of the crippling amendments, but I do want to voice my objection to this measure which continues the giveaway program to foreign countries. As many of you know, I have always been opposed to this particular bill and all amendments thereto. No

doubt Russia today would be very pleased to know what is taking place here on the floor. This sort of thing, the dissipation of our wealth, is what Russia likes to see, and we have consistently played into their hands. If you scatter your shots and scatter your men, you will never win a war. I think nearly everyone admits that a lot of this money is absolutely thrown away.

The ramifications of our so-called mutual-security program, another name for the extravagant and wasteful foreign-aid program, are many indeed. Briefly, a glance at the overall picture brings out an idea of where our borrowed money goes. There are such items as development assistance to American Republics, then we branch off to Asia, where we find something about the nonmilitary assistance programs in Afghanistan, Ceylon, and India. I note that there is a program in India for drilling deep wells. To my way of thinking our American citizens, especially since they are footing the bill, should come in for a share of deep wells where needed.

In the Far East we can find nonmilitary assistance programs in Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Formosa, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Philippine Islands, Thailand. In the Near East we find our money going to the Arab States, Israel, Egypt, Greece, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, and Libya.

It is interesting to look briefly at some of the activities our borrowed money goes to support and develop. Remember somewhere there is supposed to be some sort of justification for this type expenditure. Remember, too, the money we spend is borrowed money. Money we are working to pay back and money represented in your income-tax payments. On the list of activities there is something about purse seine fishing, irrigation, training, poultry husbandry training, crop and livestock development, agricultural machinery, industrial design, industrial audit, forest research laboratory, Pakistan railways, production engineering development training program, preplanning of construction, electric-power system training, telecommunications training, methods of training management development, and so forth.

I have mentioned a few of the items our money is being spent for in the more remote countries of the world. Bear in mind that our money goes elsewhere in the world. To name each country would take too much space, but I will give you the number of countries in each general area of the world. In the Near East, Africa and south Asia there are 45 countries; in the Far East, there are 18 countries; in Latin America there are 29 countries, island possessions, etc., receiving aid; and in Europe there are 14 countries—a total of 106. It makes a person dizzy to read all the charts and graphs prepared to show where our money goes and for what purpose. I am of the opinion the program, while in itself unwieldly and bulky, is deliberately confused to avoid a forthright understanding by the average citizen of what goes on.

One of the most puzzling aspects of the program, beyond the vague objectives and purposes of the program itself, lies in the question of why should the United States undertake to tutor and educate the world?

What obligation do we have, what justification do we have, what, actually, right do we have to try to impose our thinking and our methods on others—most of whom can trace a history far beyond our own. The thought occurs to me that if we disrupt age-old customs and habits and introduce new methods where do we stop it? New production methods call for new industrial methods, and new industrial methods lead into new distribution methods and so on. Employment will be affected, imports and exports will be affected, new sources of materials will have to be explored, and, in short, a veritable chain reaction will develop which we, as instigators and the responsible factor, will be unable to escape. It seems to me that we have a bear by the tail already—we should not continue to hold on, yet we dare not turn loose, and the situation cannot improve.

Despite the seriousness of the matter, I found one section of the hearings on mutual assistance downright amusing The discussion involved the spending of large sums in Denmark for training in the field of food stores. A portion of the program calls for sending experts to Denmark to train the Danes in the operation of self-service food stores. The fact is that the Danes originated the idea of food store cooperatives and we now find ourselves in the ridiculous position of spending borrowed money teaching the Danes methods they taught us in the first place. I fear this type of thing is all too prevalent.

In Western Europe, the foreign countries probably closest to us economically and culturally, the field of activities cover such items as management development, marketing and distribution, community self held, development of competitive business practices, housing, government administration, collective bargaining techniques, manpower utilization, agricultural training and extension, strengthening free trade unions, scientific training projects, and arranging and supporting of self-financed projects, How about that list of activities? Not only are the categories vague, but also difficult to tie in with any sound reason for stripping our coffers and burdening our taxpayers.

An item under the "United Nations expanded program of technical assistance" I see where the food and agriculture operation sent a British hides and skins expert from Tanganyika to Ethopia to advise that country how to improve its hides and skins industry. You and I foot the bill for that sort of nonsense.

In another section, I see where we are teaching the Japanese how to grow rice—something they have been doing for quite a long while. Without a doubt there have been improvements in both rice strains and methods, but I fail to see why we should go to Japan with the taxpayers' money and try to teach them something they have been doing for years in their own country, in their own style and in accordance with their system. The average farm holding is less than 3 acres. There is nothing to prevent them from coming to us at their own expense to learn our system.

I could continue to cite the nonsensical aspects of this vast and expensive, and wholy unjustified spending program, for, to my mind, the whole thing fails to make sense. But I have given you a sampling of what goes on and at a cost amounting into the billions. Where this will end apparently no one knows for by the very nature of the operations one thing leads to another and so on through an ever expanding plan.

What do we gain from this? Well the principal gain is a budget out of balance and quasi-friendships which are no stronger than the everchanging minds of the leaders of the various countries. Our Nation represents only one-sixth of the world's population yet we are spending ourselves into bankruptcy trying to feed, tutor, instruct, and support some 106 foreign nations. It is well to be a good neighbor and try to help the less fortunate—you and I would help our friends and even a stranger in trouble to the extent of our ability and in accordance with our means. But it is doubtful if we would be constrained to borrow money to risk bankruptcy to give aid to a doubtful friend, or even a proven friend, especially if that friend were actually in better shape than we are. Remember our national debt of some $280 billion, and our per capita debt of between $800 and $900—that is for every man, woman, and child in the United States. I don't know of any foreign country in that bad shape financially.

Finally, I am a firm believer that charity should begin at home. We have a lot to be done in our own country for our own people and I feel we should come first. Our roads need improving, our drainage, flood control, and reclamation programs should be stepped up, and our agricultural and industrial economy can stand improvement. I say let us take care of America then if there is a surplus that exists without burdening the taxpayers we can give some thought to other sections of the world. The quicker we come to our senses and stop trying to buy friendship and meddling in the affairs of other nations, the better off we will be.

Something About Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a statement from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, by David Lawrence, dated July 5.

This article is worth reading by every Member of the House and reflects in large measure the opinion of the vast majority of the American people.

Norman Thomas, leading American Socialist, said of public power, "Public development of power is socialistic, and it is rather childish to deny it."

The statement of David Lawrence follows:

UNITED STATES NEEDS SHOWDOWN OVER PUBLIC POWER

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—What constitutes a good political issue—and which party is right in appraising the mood of the American people? This question has just been crystalized in the attitude taken by political leaders of both parties toward the problem of Government ownership of all electric power facilities.

In Britain the public-ownership fever, known as nationalization of industry, has about run its course as the Conservatives found out in their recent election victory. But in the United States there are evidently leaders of the Democratic Party who think they can strike "pay dirt" in the issue of public power. Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, is the leader of the public power side and Senator KNOWLAND, of California, Republican, is asserting that the American people would never approve Government ownership of electric power as a national policy.

This is not a new controversy. It was Senator Norris, of Nebraska, Independent, and originally a Progressive Republican, who a few decades ago insisted that the Federal Government appropriate funds to improve navigation and effectuate a system of flood control on the Tennessee River. It was argued then that this was a legitimate Federal purpose and that the byproduct—electric power—was incidental. The issue went to the Supreme Court of the United States which decided that the Federal Government had the authority to construct such projects as flood control and improvements of navigation.

But as the years have gone by what was incidental at the beginning—the generation of electric power—has become primary now. The advocates of Government ownership of electric power, when faced a few years ago in the Tennessee River with a seasonal shortage of water for electric power purposes, began to urge the appropriation of Government money to build steam plants to generate electricity. Thus, in time the Government ownership supporters have made no bones about their original deception and have come out boldly for Federal construction of electric power plants of all kinds.

Certainly the Government can furnish electric power more cheaply than private companies if the latter are not relieved of taxes. The Government can sell anything to the consumer more chealy than private enterprise if it wishes to subsidize the projects. In the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Government is collecting tax money from taxpayers in every part of the country and using it to benefit the Tennessee area alone.

But the issue goes deeper. Why stop with electric power? If the Government can provide cheaper electric power for certain areas and hide the costs through nationally imposed taxes, why isn't it logical to apply the principle of Government ownership to steel, to automobiles, to aluminum, to airplanes, to railroads, to farming and to food distribution?

In Russia they have collective farms but the farmers don't like the system. They do manage to cut out profits for the middleman. If the object is merely to have the Government own everything then, of course, labor unions become unnecessary, or at least they become subject to Government control and regulation as well.

From a political viewpoint there may be a few votes on the side of Government ownership of electric power in and around the Tennessee Valley and in the Pacific Northwest, but in the rest of the country the Republicans ought to welcome the issue with open arms. For if the Democratic Party wishes to use its opposition to the Dixon-Yates contract as a symbol of its enthusiasm for Government ownership and nationalization, the Republicans can look forward to a victory on the opposite side of the argument. America is basically interested in private rather than public ownership.

What needs to be reexamined also is how far the Democratic Party wants to go in committing itself to Government ownership as a principle in national policy. For the Republican Party, which has consistently opposed anything approaching State socialism or communism or fascism, can be depended upon to oppose vigorously any encroachment by Government into the area of private enterprise. The Democrats are toying openly with ideas of State socialism—they are still the radical party in America—and a showdown on such issues would be a healthy thing to bring about in the 1956 presidential and congressional campaign.

Burlington, Wisconsin's May Day—United States Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am calling attention to an outstanding Americanism program sponsored by the American Legion and the citizens generally of Burlington, Wis., a small but active and progressive city in my congressional district.

One year ago, they inaugurated a program entitled "May Day—United States Way," and on May 1, 1954, this event gained national recognition. Then again on May 1 of this year, the same program was repeated but on an enlarged basis and now again the sponsors of this celebration have received recognition throughout the country. It might well be presented as a national Americanism program.

Mr. Speaker, this article was written by Mr. Don Reed and appeared in the Racine (Wis.) Journal Times for Sunday, July 10, 1955:

BURLINGTON'S MAY DAY—UNITED STATES WAY DRAWS PRAISE IN NATION AND ABROAD

(By Don Reed)

"How far yon little candle throws its beam. So shines a good deed in this naughty world."

The above quotation from Shakespeare might be applied to May Day—United States Way, the Americanism celebration, observed in Burlington on May 1, for the past 2 years.

Dr. Robert Spitzer, one of the prime forces behind the movement, pointed out that other cities in the Nation are becoming Americanism conscious. Spitzer cited the movement now going on in Milwaukee to have every home in the city have an American flag.

PRAISED IN ROME

Overseas comment on the celebration appeared in Rome, Italy, in the May 1 edition of the Daily American. It reported—"May Day, for a long time virtually abandoned by the defenders of liberty to the demonstrators for world communism, has taken on a new meaning in a small Wisconsin town, Burlington." The story went on to tell of the 1955 May Day celebration here.

The Rome Daily American is circulated not only in Italy but throughout the Mediterranean and Middle East.

The Pacific Stars and Stripes, Tokyo-Yokohama edition, said, "Americans in tiny Burlington staged patriotic demonstrations in answer to the traditional observances throughout the Communist world. In Burlington, church bells beckoned townsfolk to religious services to start a day-long celebration called May Day—United States Way."

Persons in the United States also have written words of praise for Burlington's efforts. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles M. McBride, assistant to Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, in writing about the observance said, "So many others have followed your good example that it must be a relief to the citizens of Burlington to realize that they are saved the necessity of crowding the entire United States into the confines of their small community to do justice to a worthy cause."

He wrote that he had been particularly observant of the manner in which other cities caught on to the idea this year.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Roy Henle, Washington, D. C., news commentator, wrote, "Congratulations on your splendid May Day success—next year we'll make it national."

Gen. Mark W. Clark, president of Citadel University, Charleston, S. C., messaged: "I want to congratulate Burlington on the excellent results of May Day—United States way. I am pleased to know that such a fine idea was so successfully executed and I send best wishes for a continued and enlarged program in the future."

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, wired: "This program represents an excellent example of outstanding patriotism."

Mrs. F. Miller, New York City, wrote, "Please accept my congratulations for your idea—May Day—United States way. It is a wonderful idea to have Americans march on May 1. I hope your good work selling the story of our country to the people who cannot see the forest for the trees continues."

W. F. Farrell, La Jolly, Calif., commented, "Any people wise enough to create a constitution such as ours and make it work without dictatorship, regimentation or guns, don't need to import any foreign isms. Yours for a success that will be heard all over our country even into the colleges."

Mayor Jack Humble, Racine, stated, "You have shown the rest of the United States the right way to go, and I hope that the rest of the country will copy from you and thus make our country a better place in which to live."

PRESS CARRIES STORY

Domestic Newspapers too, praised the event. The Fort Worth, Tex., Star Telegram devoted an editorial to the event. The Rotary Reporter, distributed in 89 countries as the official Rotary International magazine, carried stories of the event and its meaning. The Wall Street Journal commented on the celebration.

Bob Considine, national syndicated columnist, on March 10 devoted an entire column to the Burlington celebration, describing it as the lighting of a single candle instead of cursing the darkness.

M. L. Benedum, of Pittsburgh, Pa., Who Has Earned the Title "The Greatest Oil Wildcatter of Them All," Celebrated His 86th Birthday With Renewed Confidence That His Philosophy of Life Has Paid Rich Dividends Because It Is Based on His Unswerving Faith in Mankind

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 86th birthday of one of Pittsburgh's most highly respected citizens as Mr. M. L. Benedum, affectionately called "Mike," celebrated his natal day surrounded by a small group of his associates in the Steel City.

The history of American industry is replete with many biographical sketches of self-made men who have attained the pinnacle of success through sheer determination and hard work. None of them, however, surpass the Horatio Alger aspects of the life of Mike Benedum, who, leaving school at an early age, found himself on his 16th birthday working for $14 a week. Mike's determined effort to advance himself reveals the depth of character, integrity, and ambition of this native of West Virginia who has earned for himself the title as the "greatest oil wildcatter of them all."

Mike Benedum's success in life has been the subject of many newspaper and magazine articles as well as a recent book on his wildcatting activities. This year as he reached the 86th milestone on life's highway, William Allen, staff writer of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, wrote an interesting article which appeared in the July 10, 1955, issue.

Because the article discusses the philosophy, philanthrophy, and outstanding qualities of one of Pittsburgh's foremost citizens and a truly great American, I am inserting Mr. Allen's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In my opinion, Mike Benedum's active and useful life is a source of inspiration to those of us who have never lost faith in the traditional American concept of free enterprise and individual effort.

Mr. Allen's article follows:

MIKE PUTS HIS MILLIONS WHERE HIS BIG ADVICE IS—BENEDUM GUSHES AT 86 TO NEW VENTURE—"I'M MERELY TRUSTEE OF MONEY TO EMPLOY IN PUBLIC INTEREST"—WILDCATTER TELLS HIS PLANS

(By William Allen)

Fabulous, philosophical M. L. "Mike" Benedum gushes on to his 86th birthday this week with plans for another big oil adventure and a word or two for other men of great wealth.

Within months, Mike, the greatest oil wildcatter of them all, will begin drilling operations in Colombia, South America.

He has 750,000 acres of land south of the Caribbean and he's pushing the project as vigorously as he pushed for his first gusher some 62 years ago when his stake was every penny he had.

His word for the other wealthy men of this world is as simple and to the point, as Mike always has been:

"I have always felt I am merely a trustee of money and that it is my responsibility to employ that money in the public interest."

The words fit in with the new project in South America.

The philosophical wildcatter announced the big project last night in an interview with KDKA-TV news editor Bill Burns.

ONE OF BIGGEST VENTURES

"I am going into Colombia again. I hope to bring in another old field for those people down there," he said.

According to Mike, he and some associates have owned the 750,000 acres for the past 40 years. Back in 1915, Mike brought in the first Colombian oil field, has produced some 500 million barrels there and is still producing from the field.

But this venture has become one of his biggest because the stake is all his.

He owns every foot of the land himself and he's going on nothing but this thoughts that beneath the surface lies the black gold that has made Mike Benedum one of the 10 richest men in the world.

The land lies about 350 miles up the Magdalena River near the village of Simiti. It's called Simiti Range, a name worth remembering.

SCOFFS AT AGE

Mike, as usual, scoffs at the idea that it is possible that he's too old to go into such a big venture.

He explains simply he's brought in many other oil fields, some fairly recently, and he has a lot more such work to do in the next 20 years.

There's no doubt that Mike's brought in some big ones—some when other oil men said there couldn't possibly be oil where Mike pointed.

There's the west Texas, Illinois, Louisiana, and Mexican fields, to name a few.

But because it is birthday time, it also is time for Mike to look back and philosophize a little. He looks back every year about this time.

FABULOUS AS HIS STORY

Mike's story is as fabulous as Mike himself.

Born in Bridgeport, W. Va., he quit school at an early age to take a job for $14 a month.

The boy of 16 years worked hard and saved his money. He gave up smoking, in fact, because it cut into his earnings.

Soon he had a $800 stake and a spot where he thought there might be oil. There was, and Mike has been staking, striking, and gushing ever since.

But if there is any reason for biography, it is learning from those who have done the job well before you. And to get to the man Mike Benedum, you must listen to what he has to say.

His birthday parties are the usual times for reporters to pay a visit, and behind him Mike has left a trail of mighty good quotes.

WAY OF LIFE

Ages and what he has had to say go something like this:

Age 72: "To get along well in life you must make up your mind that you will have to make sacrifices. Work, economize, and save money."

Age 74: "I treasure my friends more than anything in the world."

Age 75: "I am not afraid of death because I have learned not to be afraid of life."

Age 77: "Labor and business live in the same house. Both have enough sense not to tear it down."

Age 79: " I have been hearing for 40 years that Pittsburgh is finished. But it keeps going ahead and has the men and materials to go even further."

Age 80: "The problems of today and tomorrow will be solved, as they always have been."

Age 81: "The people of the world haven't lost their heads entirely. Atomic energy will be used to better mankind. This world never had it so good and you can't make me believe the world is going to destroy itself."

Age 83: "Despise nothing but selfishness, meanness and corruption; fear nothing except cowardice; covet nothing that is your neighbors except your neighbor's kindness of heart and gentleness of spirit; think many times of your friends and seldom of your enemies."

Age 85: "There is more opportunity in this world than ever before. In my lifetime I have seen more progress than did Methuselah in all of his 900 years. I have much to do in the next 20 years."

AT A GLANCE

There then is the man Mike Benedum—at a glance.

What Mike has had to say as each birthday rolled around reflects the times.

One year it was labor-management relations that had shallower men worried.

The next year it was Pittsburgh's future.

Then came atomic energy and the bomb to shake the entire world.

Each year Mike—whose formal schooling admittedly has been limited—met each as they came, giving each the thought of a man who has learned life in the oilfields, under the broiling sun, with the power of Mother Earth surging above and beneath him.

He has said many more things and lived them all.

He has lived them with philanthropic gifts of rare glass to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, money for Pittsburgh hospitals, and a soil reclamation project in Ohio.

For his hometown in West Virginia, there has been a million-dollar church and a townhall.

Mike said simply: "I've always wanted to do something for my hometown."

And back in 1933 when Washington decided it needed someone on the old National Recovery Act planning committee, it was Mike who stepped up and did a bangup job.

HUNDREDS OF WAYS

There have been hundreds of other ways in which he has lived up to his ideals.

During World War II, someone said Americans ought to buy war savings bonds and Mike wrote out a check for $1 million.

It was his way—big as usual—of helping out.

His favorite charity really isn't charity yet reflects the type of man Mike is.

He has set up some 100 revolving funds so that both boys and girls—who are deserving—can get the college education he missed.

The money has been given to different schools and the boy or girl can use it to get their education. But after they have graduated, they must pay back the cash.

Thus, the money is there again for someone else to use.

There are no other strings, the boy never has to become an engineer and work for Mike.

An associate explained:

"Mr. Benedum is a great believer in the fact man should work to help himself. He thinks everyone should have the courage and honesty to pay back what he has taken."

That brings up another saying of the great wildcatter himself:

"What good is it to a man to have the knowledge of a Solomon if his acts are those of a fool?"

PHILOSOPHY SUMMED UP

To paraphrase and sum up Mike's whole philosophy, What good is it to a man to have money if his acts are those of a pauper?

But no matter if Mike hadn't given a thing, he has lived up by simply living, wildcatting and getting the job done.

Who could doubt when Mike was asked if our oil reserves might give out and his answer was:

"That's another one I have been hearing for years. No, we are not running out of oil. We just might have to go a little deeper, that's all."

There is the man who will go to South America, risk his own money "to bring in a new oilfield for those people down there."

The man, Mike Benedum, lies deep.

This year the birthday party will be a small one. Just a little luncheon with a few of his business associates.

Mike's doctor (Mike probably doesn't believe him) thinks a man 86 years old shouldn't subject himself to big gatherings and long receiving lines.

So Mike has said what he will say for his 86th birthday:

"I have always felt I am merely a trustee of money and that it is my responsibility to employ it in the public interest."

Those few words go a long way to pointing up Pittsburgh's renaissance, the gifts of Pittsburgh's mighty industrialists before and after the rebirth of Pittsburgh.

The man, Mike Bedenum, lies deep, deep like the oil he has brought gushing to the surface.

Are American Boys Expendable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, supplementing remarks made on the floor with reference to defense against foreign attack, I am including an article from yesterday's Washington Post by Joseph Alsop:

RUSSIA'S AIRPOWER SHAMES OURS

Despite the strictly phoney talk in Washington, the Soviet delegation will go to the summit meeting at Geneva with more military strength behind them than the Soviet Union has ever before possessed. That, no doubt, was the real fact behind Nikita Khrushchev's warning at the July 4 party in Moscow, that the Soviets were not going to Geneva to negotiate from weakness.

From the straight military viewpoint, in truth, the American negotiators are the ones who should feel a bit nervous. For the one great trump this country has always held since the end of the last war—a wide air-atomic lead over the Soviet Union—is now being snatched away by a massive Russian effort.

On the other hand, the superior American stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons are ceasing to matter very much because the Soviets are now accumulating sufficient stocks of their own to wreak total destruction on the United States.

On the other hand, the Soviets are now beginning to lead the United States in quality as well as quantity of aircraft production.

The change in the bomb balance has been going on for a long time. The truly revolutionary development of the last 12 months has been the change in the air balance. A series of reports in this space in the last week have touched on some aspects of that change. Overall, it can be summarized as follows:

The Soviet air program first began to catch up with the American air program in the field of fighter production. Here the United States has been altogether outclassed.

The Soviets have produced about 4,000 supersonic MIG–17's, while we have produced a few scores of the F–100 fighters which is comparable to the MIG–17 in all ways except in its inferior altitude characteristics.

The Soviets have already gone into full production with their still newer, still faster "Farmer" fighter, whereas we have produced two prototypes of the comparable F–104. The Soviets are now starting production of a first-class, jet-powered, all-weather fighter, while we have nothing comparable that is anywhere near real quantity production.

Second, as far as current output is concerned, the Soviets have now passed the United States in the field of long-range jet bombers. They are now producing their T–37 bomber at a considerably higher rate than we are producing the comparable B–52 in this country, and their monthly output will still be 4 or 5 bombers per month higher than ours when the recently ordered increase in B–52 production finally takes effect.

They also are producing their T–39 bomber comparable to our B–47, at a rate of 20 to 30 per month, and this rate is expected to rise. And whereas the output of fast tankers suitable to air refuel the B–47 is extremely unsatisfactory, the Soviets have in quantity production a four-engine turboaircraft well suited for air refueling the T–39.

Third, the Soviets have achieved certain technical successes of a distinctly alarming character. The new Russian air engine with 18,000 to 20,000 pounds thrust, which powers the T–37's and T–39's, was ready for use at least 2 years before the comparable jet engine, the J–75, which is just emerging from the experimental stage.

And Soviet air-lead time—the time from the conception of an aircraft until the beginning of quantity production—now appears to be only one-half of American air-lead time.

Fourth, because of Soviet air gains already achieved, our one existing advantage is being quite largely neutralized. This advantage is the Strategic Air Command's large force-in-being of B–47 bombers.

But the B–47, being a short-range aircraft, depends on overseas bases to reach Russian targets. And the allies who control these overseas bases are more and more reluctant to allow the bases to be used when the chips are down—because they are being more and more intimidated by the combination of growing Soviet air power and growing Soviet stocks of H-bombs.

Fifth and finally, there also are excellent reasons to believe that the Soviet effort to produce the true ultimate weapon, the high-speed guided missile of intercontinental range, is well ahead of the American long-range missile effort, which is on a strictly business-as-usual basis.

That is the true balance sheet.

Maybe President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin will make real progress in the disarmament talks in Geneva. But until disarmament is a solid reality, this kind of air-balance sheet is a national scandal, made all the more shocking by the tremendous cover-up that is going on at the Pentagon.

While the cold war continues, the Soviet capture of the traditional American lead in the air constitutes a national emergency. It should be treated as such, instead of being hidden behind huckstering phrases.

Mr. Speaker, this article corroborates information from many dependable sources. If we permit ourselves to be lulled into a sense of false security—if we lower our guard—the enemy is in position to deliver a blow which the President has intimated may devastate 53 American cities, including Washington.

Such an attack would be airborne. We must be prepared to meet it in the air. Why shackle TVA which provided both the bomb and the carrier which ended the last war? TVA products saved hundreds of thousands of American boys in the last World War. With TVA crippled, how will we save American boys in the next world war? We could not have saved them without TVA. With TVA crippled by Dixon-Yates how will we save American boys in the next world war? And how will we save the 53 American cities to which the President referred in his directions to Attorney General Brownell?

It is an unpleasant subject but burying our heads ostrich-like in the sand will not protect us against superior Russian armament. Let us face the situation and utilize every agency at our command to strengthen and improve national defense. And as a part of that program let us keep TVA—Dixon-Yates to the contrary notwithstanding.

Enforcible or Unenforcible Disarmament?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following is the prepared text of a speech delivered by the Honorable Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force, at a Foreign Policy Association luncheon in New York City on Monday, June 27, 1955.

We have had two sensational stories from Moscow recently. One was about the annual May Day celebration when the Russians shocked our American defense officials by showing off a flight of intercontinental jet bombers and some advanced fighters and other planes which have led experts in the field to the conclusion that the Russians are now in the process of surpassing the United States in airpower.

The Russians have hit at the armaments question from another angle, too, in recent weeks; and again with embarrassing results for us. As the Five Power subcommittee of the UN's Disarmament Commission was ending its sessions in London last May, the Russians made a sensational release in which they accepted most of the proposals for unenforceable disarmament which the Western Powers had been urging. It is thus quite possible that some day soon we will find the Russians accepting all the current Western proposals for unenforceable disarmament and then going on to make quite a propaganda case for themselves if the United States and the other Western Powers refuse to carry through what they themselves have suggested.

These moves of the Russians have put two difficult questions to the United States Government for decision. First, shall we allow the Russians to catch us and indeed surpass us in the absolute weapon, in that air-atomic power of which we have always thought ourselves the undisputed master; and, second, are we really on the right track with these proposals for unenforceable disarmament which the United States Government has been making recently?

These two questions together make up one single issue, compared to which all other

matters of foreign or domestic policy are secondary, for this country will come through the hydrogen phase of civilization only if it solves in parallel action this pair of problems.

In the brief time I have today I shall not try to talk of both these enormous subjects. As far as the first goes, the question of the race between Russia and the United States for supremacy in air-atomic power, I shall make only two brief points. The first is that nothing can be more threatening to the security of our country and more damaging to any hopes we have for a successful foreign policy than to let the Russians catch up to us in airpower. And the second is that we are doing just that. We have been asleep for some time. We have had some foolish ideas that the Russians cannot build airplanes to rank in quality and quantity with ours. We were told not very long ago by the Secretary of Defense that the Russians were building only defensive war planes; it has even been said that we have been basing our military planning in large part on this assumption.

We have had these ideas in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, and now finally the facts are upon us. The evidence is that the Russians have drawn even with us in quality in most types of military aircraft and are ahead of us in the numbers of such aircraft which they have produced and have put into their combat units in all categories except that of the medium bomber. The United States is well ahead in numbers, so far, in the B–47 medium bomber. It is apparently the only category in which we are ahead.

Serious as this loss of our air supremacy is it is not on this subject that I propose to talk to you, but rather on the parallel question of disarmament.

But, let me first say why it makes sense to talk in the same breath of strengthening our military forces and at the same time of disarming them. The reason is this.

The two policies—that is, the policy of arming and the policy of seeking a world disarmament—are both working to achieve the same end, namely, a world of peace. We have to have strong military armaments as a stop-gap until we achieve a world agreement of disarmament because an overwhelming military force in the United States and particularly an overwhelming air-atomic power in the United States can, for a while, stop the Russians from starting a war and perhaps enable them to persuade their Chinese partners not to start one.

On the other hand, an arms race is not a permanent solution to the cause of peace. It can only put off for a while the hydrogen war. And, since a hydrogen war is such a terrible thing to contemplate, we must drive now and at the same time as we are building up our air atomic power to seek agreement of all nations to do away with the very institution of war itself. This we can only do by getting rid of the weapons of war without which war cannot be made.

It does, then, make sense to talk of arming and disarming at the same time.

This brings me to the big question I want to discuss with you today. What kind of a system of disarmament is the United States to work for—an enforceable system or an unenforceable system? This is not an abstract matter. The fact is that until recently, say, until about the summer of 1954, the United States policy line was to insist on an enforced system of disarmament or no disarmament at all. Now, since about the summer of 1954, this policy line has been reversed and the United States has now committed itself to disarm under an unenforceable system, provided, of course, that the other major powers agree. And what is more, it looks as though the other major powers very well may agree, and soon. Some of our major Western allies have already agreed, namely, Britain, France, and Canada. And the Russians have come very close, indeed, to accepting all of the details of the unenforceable plan the Western countries have proposed.

What is the difference between the two? Why do I make such a point of the difference between the two systems? If you will bear with me a minute and let me try to define them I think you will see why.

An unenforceable system of disarmament is one in which—

1. The nations give up some of their arms, but not enough to prevent them from making war if they want to.

2. Every nation counts on using its own trading ability to get a disarmament agreement under which it will keep the arms which it considers most important for itself. For example, from our point of view, we would like to keep atomic bombs and cut down on the ground troops. From the Russian point of view they would like to get rid of the atom bombs and would be willing to make cuts in the ground forces.

3. The only protection the countries have under an unenforceable system is an inspection system, that is, a system which will warn them when some other country violates the agreement. This has been called the fire-alarm principle. Notice that in an unenforceable system there is only a fire alarm—there is no fire department.

4. Therefore the only protection each country has under an unenforceable system, if some other country does break the agreement, is to go to war to compel the other country to live up to its agreement or, without going to war, to start the arms race all over again.

Now what is an enforceable system? This has never been clearly defined by the United States Government, but here are the basic principles of any truly enforceable system:

1. The disarmament would take place by stages. But, at the end of the last stage, the disharmament would be substantially complete. The nations would retain only those military forces needed for domestic policing. In other words, the nations would not have enough arms to make war against their neighbors.

2. The United Nations would have enough forces (which would not have to be very big, say, to give you some idea of the order of magnitude, about 10 divisions worth) with which it would compel any nation which violated the disarmament treaty, to live up to its promises, and in accordance with the agreed terms of a disarmament agreement.

3. The political arrangements for these United Nations forces would be such that the forces would be outside of the control of the big powers. They would have to be run by the neutrals or at least in some way which would guarantee that the U. N. forces would be used effectively against the big powers as well as against small powers and in accordance with the terms of the disarmament agreement.

Now I am not saying that the United States has ever committed itself formally to the enforced system. All I am saying is two things. First, that the United States up until about the summer of 1954 held firmly to the proposition that if there were any disarmament it would have to be under an enforceable system, and second, that I think this attitude was right and that the United States Government should readopt this as its policy, should put the matter to the American people for decision as to whether they will go along with it, and if they do, as I believe they will, should then make enforced disarmament the leading proposition of United States foreign policy

What has happened so far is this, and it is very important that we understand it.

Immediately after the end of World War II there was a tremendous surge of enthusiasm for the idea of seeing to it that there would be no more world wars; and, since the atomic bomb had just burst upon the world the major attack of the statesmen was on the control of atomic energy. The United States, the Canadians, and the British took the lead in this but the Russians came along and worked with us too. There was a whole series of international agreements which I will not spell out to you today which were the result of the determination of the statesmen of the world to see to it that we would not have another world war if they could help it, and particularly not a war with atomic bombs.

Then two things happened. It became clear, as I have said, that an enforceable system was the best, indeed, the only acceptable way of working out a system of disarmament. The policy declarations of the Government of the United States were all along that line. And second, the memories of the horrors of World War II receded and therefore the enthusiasm of the world for peace greatly diminished.

The Russians became impossible. They kep insisting on a plan they called the Vishinsky proposal, which was a form of unenforceable disarmament in which all the advantages would go to Russia. The plan was, roughly, that there should be disarmament by stages in which the atom bombs would be first given up and then afterwards there would be some reductions in so-called conventional forces. This of course would have been very good for Russia but not good for the free world, and it never got anywhere.

Then, and this is the significance of the change which started in the summer of 1954, the western countries, Britain, France, the United States and Canada, in the lead, renewed their efforts to get some kind of disarmament. Only this time they came out in favor of an unenforceable system. The western proposals were, roughly, these:

1. There should be a disarmament by stages.

2. The first step in the disarmament should be the reduction of the so-called conventional forces. As to this the western powers became specific. They came out for limits of 1 million to 1½ million men each for Russia, Communist China, and the United States, and 650,000 each for Britain and France.

3. Then, when the conventional forces have been reduced, the United States and the other countries would give up all of their atomic bombs.

4. There would be no enforcement of this agreement. The only protection would be the inspection system, the so-called fire alarm. Then, if the Russians broke the agreement we would have the right to break it ourselves and could start the arms race all over again, or make general war against Russia.

There is, I repeat, to be no enforcement in this new western proposal. As one official of the State Department put it recently:

"* * * Any significant breach of the agreement would be reported immediately by the enforcement agency and remedial action could be taken by that agency, the Security Council, the General Assembly or the other participating states, relying on collective action by national armed forces as a last resort. Should such remedial action prove ineffective or be blocked, the United States and its allies would be free to withdraw from the agreement without any basic embarrassment to their ability to defend themselves against the offending nation."

The United States and the other Western powers were now, in short, committed to a policy of unenforced disarmament, of giving up our atomic bombs under a system which would still leave the Russians and the Chinese with 1½ million men each, and therefore could not be enforced except by starting a world war. They managed to

persuade their Chinese Communist partner to slow down on the bellicose statements that Mao-Tse-tung was making about conquering the Matsus, Quemoys, Pescadores, and Formosa during this calendar year. They made powers were now, in short, committed to a appeals to the Germans offering them a unified Germany if the West Germans would abandon the West. They agreed to a meeting at the summit. And as part of this peace propaganda they publicly released through the Tass agency their acceptance of all of the Western proposals for disarmament, with the one exception of the extent of the inspection service. This difference on the inspection service is at the moment the only difference that does exist between the West and the Russians on the subject of disarmament. The difference is not at all unbridgeable. It is possible that the Russians may come around at any moment and resolve this final remaining difference between the West and the East.

Now this is a very important policy which our Government has adopted and it is time we had a thorough-going debate on the subject.

I would like to express my views on it. They are:

1. Unenforceable disarmament agreements have been tried over the centuries and never with success. I think it is true that as a general proposition you cannot make Marquess of Queensberry rules about war. As long as you leave large armed forces in the possession of the great powers, in other words, as long as you recognize that war is the final way of solving differences between peoples, the attempts to sanitize war by eliminating certain weapons, qualitatively or quantatively, will not work.

2. By applying this to the particular situation, I think it is most unwise for the United States to be talking about a plan under which we give up all of our atomic bombs and still leave the Russians and the Chinese each with 1½ million men in their conventional forces. I believe that the effect of doing this, even if the Russians and the Chinese lived up meticulously to their promises, would be to give the Russians military superiority in Europe and would give the Chinese military superiority in Asia.

3. I do not believe that an inspection system can catch all of the fissionable material the Russians can hide in their own vast territory or in that of their Chinese Communist partner. I believe that the effect of any such unenforceable agreement would be to have the United States and the Western Allies respect meticulously their promises to destroy their atom bombs and would leave to the Russians and the Chinese the ability to hide their bombs from us.

4. I believe that the disadvantages and risks to the United States of an unenforceable system are so obvious that they would be rejected by American public opinion and by the representatives of that opinion in Congress.

5. I believe, in short, that we should drop this unenforceable idea and get back to the important task of trying to work out an enforceable system which would be acceptable first to the people of the United States and then, if possible, to the rest of the world.

I believe that the people of this country would be willing to accept an enforceable system, that is, one on which they could rely, or as it has been called in the past, a foolproof system. And I know they should be given the chance to decide this. I do not think it is right for the Government of this country to reject the idea of an enforceable system merely on the assumption of governmental officials that the people of the United States will not do something they have never been given the chance to think about. It is, in short, my earnest hope that the Government, presumably through the President and his newly appointed Secretary of Disarmament, Mr. Stassen, will spell out to the American people what an enforceable system would consist of, and then ask them whether or not they would support their Government in urging such a plan upon the other governments, both those of our allies and those of the Communist bloc. I believe, in short, that we should make the matter of enforced disarmament the major policy of our foreign relations. For only through it is there any hope that we can come through this hydrogen phase of civilization without destroying our country and most of the rest of the world with us.

Merger of Farm Magazines Kills Voice of Family Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am vitally interested in our fight to preserve the family farm. In March, June, and July, the Better Farming magazine printed three articles on the problems facing the family-type farm. Simultaneously their editorial policy emphasized the need for correcting them. I have in my possession certain letters indicating that this particular editorial policy will terminate with the merger that was recently announced in which the Farm Journal will absorb America's oldest farm magazine, Better Farming, successor to the Country Gentleman.

I personally deplore the elimination of the editorial voice of Better Farming. This editorial voice for the family-type farm may be extinguished.

Problems of the family farm are not only individual, but they are of vital concern to America as a whole. This merger is an obvious and tangible injury to the future welfare of the independent farmers of America.

It is with heartening pleasure that I received this complaint by the Federal Trade Commission of the action to prevent and restrain this merger. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a copy of the complaint:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BEFORE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—IN THE MATTER OF FARM JOURNAL, INC., A CORPORATION, DOCKER NO. 6388

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that the party respondent named in the caption hereof and hereinafter more particularly designated and described, has violated and is now violating the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act (U. S. C. title 15, sec. 18) as amended and approved December 29, 1950, hereby issues its complaint, pursuant to section 11 of the aforesaid act (U. S. C. title 15, sec. 21) charging as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent Farm Journal, Inc., is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania with its main and principal office located at 230 West Washington Square, Philadelphia 5, Pa., and causes to be printed, published, sold, and circulated several publications for distribution to subscribers and purchasers.

PAR. 2. Curtis Publishing Co. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania with its main office and principal place of business in Philadelphia, Pa.

PAR. 3. Among the publications published and distributed by Farm Journal, Inc., to subscribers and purchasers in each of the 48 States is the publication entitled "Farm Journal," which enjoys an average monthly net paid circulation of approximately 2,882,000 copies. "Farm Journal" was first published in 1877 and has been published continuously since that date. In 1938 Farm Journal, Inc., purchased a publication known as Pathfinder and is publishing such periodical under the trade name of Town Journal.

PAR. 4. Curtis Publishing Co. is engaged in the printing, publishing, and circulation of various publications in all 48 States of the United States. In 1911 the Curtis Publishing Co. acquired the Country Gentleman, which is the oldest existing agricultural magazine in America, having been published continuously for 124 years, it being a continuation of or the successor to the Genesee Farmer. Recently the name of Country Gentleman was changed to Better Farming. Better Farming is a well-established and prominent farm journal and has a national net paid monthly circulation of approximately 2,554,000 and is sold and distributed in all 48 States of the United States. The Curtis Publishing Co. also publishes the Saturday Evening Post, Ladies Home Journal, Jack and Jill, and Holiday magazines, all enjoying wide national circulation.

PAR. 5. On or about June 1, 1955 respondent, Farm Journal, Inc., acquired the publication Better Farming, along with certain property tangible and intangible, from the Curtis Publishing Co.

PAR. 6. Published in the United States are numerous magazines and newspapers, part of which are directed to various special segments of the population. There are published certain magazines and newspapers, called agricultural periodicals devoted to the interests and needs of the people living in rural areas, especially farmers.

Agricultural periodicals have two sources of revenue, sales and advertising. Their subscribers and buyers in most instances reside in rural areas. Their advertisers are business concerns and others desirous of reaching the farmers and other persons living in rural areas. Certain business concerns are dependent primarily upon farm publications as a practical national advertising medium because of the specialized nature of the product they are offering for sale.

Agricultural periodicals published in the United States may be national or regional, general or specialized. Their appeal varies as to advertisers and buyers in accordance with the anture of the publication.

PAR. 7. The total average circulation of all general agricultural periodicals amounts to approximately 23 million, consisting of about 110 separate publications, which are divided into four general categories as follows:

1. Monthly farm magazines;
2. Monthly farm papers;
3. Semimonthly or biweekly farm papers; and
4. Weekly farm papers.

The total average circulation of monthly farm magazines with a circulation of 1 million or more is approximately 10,664,000 or about 46 percent of the total average circulation of general agricultural periodicals.

There are only 6 farm magazines with a circulation of 1 million or more and only the Farm Journal and Better Farming provide any substantial type of national coverage for the farm reader or advertiser. In addition to the largest, Farm Journal, and the acquired publication, Better Farming, the remaining 4 magazines with more than 1 million net paid circulation, are:

Capper's Farmer with a net paid circulation of approximately 1,356,000;

Successful Farming with a net paid circulation of approximately 1,311,000;

Farm and Ranch with Southern Agriculturist with a net paid circulation of approximately 1,298,000; and

Progressive Farmer with a net paid circulation of approximately 1,262,000.

The combined circulation of these six magazines is approximately 10,664,000, and by this acquisition agricultural periodicals published by respondent will have a net paid circulation of approximately 5,436,000, or approximately 51 percent of the total net paid circulation among the six largest competitors in the farm magazine field and approximately 24 percent of the total net paid circulation. Of the four smaller publications, the Progressive Farmer and Farm and Ranch with Southern Agriculturist have circulation only in the southern area of the United States, south of the Ohio River, and are strictly regional in distribution. The remaining two publications, Capper's Farmer and Successful Farming, have limited circulation throughout the United States, but are primarily regional in nature.

Of the remaining 104 general agricultural periodicals which are of the newspaper type and are primarily regional in nature, 72 have a circulation of less than 100,000; 21 have a circulation of between 100,000 and 250,000; 8 have a circulation of between 250,000 and 500,000; 3 have a circulation in excess of 500,000.

PAR 8. Entry into the field of farm publications is relatively difficult. Of the six largest farm publications with a circulation of 1 million or more, the last entry into the field was the publication known as Successful Farming, which was first published in the year 1902. Prior to that, the Progressive Farmer started publication in the year 1836; the Farm Journal in the year 1877; the Farm and Ranch with Southern Agriculturist in the year 1869; Capper's Farmer in the year 1879; and Better Farming, formerly known as Country Gentleman, in the year 1831. The most recent entry in the field was the National Future Farmer, published by Future Farmers of America in 1952. There have been no substantial national entries in the field in the last 50 years.

The Farm Journal and Better Farming, prior to June 1955, were publications primarily aimed for the rural subscriber and were specialized in nature with reading appeal and advertising directed primarily to the rural population of the United States and were the only two such farm magazines enjoying national circulation. In an advertisement appearing in the Advertising Age dated April 25, 1955, at page 17, Farm Journal represented that it was "America's largest, most successful farm magazine." In naming its five competitors, said advertisement named the six leading farm magazines in the United States and recognized that only two of said magazines were of a national character, they being the Farm Journal and Better Farming. The other four farm magazines were classified by the respondent corporation as "regionals," or local in character and circulation. The four regionals among the six leading farm magazines listed by respondent were the Progressive Farmer, Successful Farming, Capper's Farmer, and Farm and Ranch.

At such time the publication Better Farmer was the only competitor on a national basis of Farm Journal among media especially serving the great farm communities of the Nation. Before June 1955 said Better Farmer and Farm Journal were in direct competition throughout the United States for buyers and advertisers.

PAR. 9. For the year 1953, advertising revenues for farm magazines were approximately $41 million, of which the Farm Journal and Better Farming had approximately $16 million, or 38 percent of all moneys spent for advertising in farm publications. For the first 3 months of the year 1955, the Farm Journal and Better Farming had combined advertising revenues of $4,544,000 as compared with the combined advertising revenues of the other 4 farm magazines having a circulation of more than 1 million of approximately $4,252,000. Of the combined advertising revenues of the acquired and acquiring magazines and the other 4 publications with circulations in excess of 1 million, the acquired and the acquiring companies' revenues for the first 3 months of 1955 amounted to 51 (plus) percent of advertising revenues.

PAR. 10. By its acquisition of Better Farming, the respondent corporation has eliminated the only competitor with national advertising and circulation coverage in the monthly farm-magazine field.

PAR. 11. Prior to, and at the time of the acquisition herein, respondent offered to sell, did sell and distribute its said Farm Journal and other publications in commerce, as commerce is defined in the Clayton Act, and still does.

PAR. 12. Prior to the acquisition herein, the Curtis Publishing Co. offered to sell, sold and distributed its said Better Farming and other publications in commerce, as commerce is defined in the Clayton Act.

PAR. 13. Respondent has violated section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, in that the acquisition from Curtis Publishing Co., heretofore described, may have the effect of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly in the following ways, among others:

(a) Actual and potential competition between respondent herein and the Curtis Publishing Co., the first and second publications in the agricultural field, in the publication and sale of agricultural publications and advertising therein has been or may be eliminated;

(b) Actual and potential competition generally in the publication and sale of agricultural publications and advertising therein may be substantially lessened;

(c) The publication Better Farming formerly known as Country Gentleman has been or may be permanently eliminated as an independent, competitive publication and factor in the agricultural publications industry;

(d) The acquisition of Better Farming by respondent Farm Journal, Inc., has enhanced or may enhance respondent's competitive advantage in the distribution and sale of general agricultural publications and advertising therein to the detriment of actual and potential competition;

(e) Industrywide concentration of the publication, distribution and sale of general agricultural magazines and advertising therein has been increased;

(f) Elimination of Better Farming as the only effective or substantial competitive general agricultural magazine published nationally may cause potential and actual advertisers, as well as potential and actual subscribers and purchasers in the great farm communities of the Nation, to become dependent upon respondent for the purchase of either advertising space in, or the purchase or subscription to, a general agricultural magazine of a national character.

PAR. 14. The foregoing acquisition, acts, and practices of respondent, as hereinbefore alleged and set forth, constitute a violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 18) as amended and approved December 29, 1950.

Wherefore, the premises considered, the Federal Trade Commission on this 30th day of June A. D. 1955 issues its complaint against said respondent.

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given you, Farm Journal, Inc., respondent herein, that the 20th day of September A. D. 1955, at 11 o'clock is hereby fixed as the time and Philadelphia, Pa., as the place when and where a hearing will be had before a hearing examiner of the Federal Trade Commission, on the charges set forth in this complaint, at which time and place you will have the right under said act to appear and show cause why an order should not be entered requiring you to cease and desist from the violations of law charged in this complaint.

You are notified that the opportunity is afforded you to file with the Commission an answer to this complaint on or before the 30th day after service of it upon you. Such answer shall contain a concise statement of the facts constituting the ground of defense and a specific admission, denial, or explanation of each fact alleged in the complaint, or, if respondents are without knowledge thereof, a statement to that effect.

If respondent elects not to contest the allegations of fact set forth in the complaint, the answer shall consist of a statement that respondent admits all material allegations to be true. Such an answer shall constitute a waiver of hearing, as to facts so alleged, and an intial decision containing appropriate findings and conclusions and an appropriate order disposig of the proceeding shall be issued by the hearing examiner. In such answer, respondent may, however, reserve the right to submit proposed findings and conclusions and the right to appeal under section 3.22 of the Commission's Rules of Practice for Adjudicative Proceedings.

If the respondent elects to negotiate a consent order, it shall be done in accordance with section 3.25 of the Commission's Rules of Practice.

Failure to file answer within the time above provided and failure to appear at the time and place fixed for hearing shall be deemed to authorize a hearing examiner without further notice to respondent, to find the facts to be as alleged in the complaint, to conduct a hearing to determine the form of order, and to issue an appropriate order requiring the respondent to divest itself of all assets or other interest acquired by it from Curtis Publishing Co., and, thereafter, to enter an initial decision containing such finding and order.

In witness whereof, the Federal Trade Commission has caused this, its complaint, to be signed by its secretary, and its official seal to be hereto affixed, at Washington, D. C., this 30th day of June A. D. 1955.

By the Commission.

ROBERT M. PARRISH,
Secretary.

Puerto Rican Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the probable impact of the Senate-passed amendments to the minimum-wage law on Puerto Rico has received considerable public discussion. Not all of the information about the Senate bill has been correct, however.

Since we hope that the bill may soon be before the House and then in conference, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this subject which appeared in the New York Times on June 25, 1955, together with my letter of reply

to the editor correcting the matters of fact on which the editorial writer had been misinformed.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 25, 1955]

PUERTO RICAN WAGES

Puerto Rican Government officials fear that the minimum wage bill now before Congress would, if enacted, throw 45,000 out of work on the island, with migration repercussions here. These views deserve widespread and sympathetic consideration — especially on Capitol Hill. But some background, too little known on the mainland, is essential to understand them.

The first Federal minimum wage law, passed in 1938, applied to all parts of the United States, including Perto Rico. But wages there were—and still are—far lower than those on the mainland. (Now about 55 cents an hour compared with over $1.80.) The increases called for, therefore, were much greater there than here. In fact, the effects on Puerto Rican industry and employment were catastrophic.

The law was amended in 1940 to provide that in Puerto Rico tripartite committees, after careful study, would recommend to the Federal Wage and Hour Administrator different wage floors geared to the circumstances of each particular industry—effective on his approval. This system, still in effect, has proved the advantages both of flexibility and direct participation of the interests involved: management, labor and the public.

The current minimum wage bill, already passed by the Senate, however, would force on Puerto Rican and Virgin Island employers specific flat wage increases for all industries, beginning next year, which would progressively raise wages by 25 cents an hour for all workers by January 1, 1958. The effects would, of course, vary widely with different industries, depending on present wage floors. For example, during 1956, needlework wages would be forced up 217 percent, those in clothing 110 percent, and in metals and machinery 72 percent. In some industries the increases by 1958 would be as much as 207 percent.

Not only would these provisions of the bill do away with the demonstrated advantages of the present system; they would seem to mean, at least in some industries, drastic employment readjustments. With 16 percent of the Puerto Rican workers now jobless, compared with 2 percent on the mainland, this could mean widespread distress. The Government thinks it would also increase the number of Puerto Ricans coming to the mainland and the formidable problems they must face when they get here.

This bill is now before the House. We hope its Members will not approve the sections applying to the islands before they are sure what the results will be—both there and here.

JUNE 29, 1955.

The EDITOR,
New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of June 25, 1955, on Puerto Rican Wages is partly based on the assertion that the minimum wage bill now before Congress may "throw 45,000 out of work on the islands." I have already shown in my letter of June 23, that this figure has no foundation in fact. Partly your editorial is based on new data. You state:

"For example, during 1956 needlework wages would be forced up 217 percent, those in clothing 110 percent, and in metals and machinery 72 percent. In some industries the increases by 1958 would be as much as 257 percent."

I regret that you use these misleading figures in your editorial, but I welcome the opportunity to show you once more that the information which you seem to get from some Puerto Rican Government officials does in no way represent the actual situation.

The members and the staff of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have analyzed carefully the relative increases in wages resulting from S. 2168—the bill to which your editorial refers.

The alleged increase of 217 percent does not refer to the needlework wages generally, but to one classification only: The sweater and bathing suit division which covers only about 400 employees out of the nearly 40,000 in the needlework classification, according to the Wage and Hour Division survey. And it does not refer to the impact of the Senate bill, but gives the relative increase between June 4, 1951, and January 1, 1958. The rate history of this division is as follows:

	Cents an hour
Rates set by industry committees:	
Jan. 1, 1945	15
June 4, 1951	21
June 6, 1955	50
Increases according to S. 2168:	
Jan. 1, 1955	57½
June 6, 1956	66½
January 1, 1958	75

The increase between June 4, 1951 and June 6, 1956, is about 217 percent. But this percentage is quite meaningless as a description of the effect of S. 2168. The significant percentage increases stipulated by S. 2168 are figured by taking as a base the rate of June 6, 1955, the rate now in existence. Those increases, cumulatively, are as follows: to January 1, 1956, 15 percent; to June 6, 1956, 33.3 percent; to January 1, 1958, 50 percent.

Even a 50 percent increase over a period of 2½ years may be considered high by some. Let me therefore compare the relative increase resulting from the Senate bill with the relative change between June 4, 1951 and June 6, 1955—an increase which was determined by industry committee procedure. The average yearly rate of increase according to S. 2168 is 17 percent, whereas the average yearly rate as determined freely by industry committee procedure was 32 percent. And yet this is the same classification to which the following statement in your editorial refers: "In some industries the increases by 1958 would be as much as 257 percent." This percentage is arrived at by comparing the June 4, 1951 rate with the January 1, 1958 rate.

It is obvious that mere percentage increases without any other information on the industry are not too meaningful. I would like to add therefore that no sweaters were manufactured in Puerto Rico before 1951, and that no bathing suits are manufactured there at present. The Senate bill allows a firm to open a new plant in Puerto Rico, to pay between 57½ cents and 75 cents an hour and compete with the mainland manufacturers of bathing suits who pay average hourly rates of $1.39 to their workers (December 1954). It can hardly be said that this situation is unfair to Puerto Rico.

The second alleged increase of 110 percent in clothing is no more meaningful. It refers to the following classifications: hat and cap division, necktie division and the suits, coats and jackets division. The third is the most important one of these divisions. The rates in this group increased as follows:

	Cents an hour
Rates set by industry committees:	
Dec. 2, 1940	20
Jan. 1, 1945	24
May 14, 1951	35
Mar. 14, 1955	55
Rates according to S. 2168:	
Jan. 1, 1956	62½
Mar. 14, 1956	73½
Jan. 1, 1958	80

As compared to $1.63 average hourly earnings on the mainland (January 1955).

The 110-percent increase you quote is based on the change between May 14, 1951, and March 14, 1956. But if March 14, 1955—the rate in existence when S. 2168 was passed by the Senate—is taken as a basis, the actual increases are: to January 1, 1956—13.6 percent; to March 14, 1956—33.3 percent; and to January 1, 1958—45.5 percent.

Again comparing the average annual rate of increase according to the Senate bill to the average annual rate of increase for the period preceding the bill, the following average relative rates of change are obtained: May 1951-March 1955; average yearly rate of 13 percent; March 1955-January 1958 average yearly rate of 15 percent. This means that the Senate bill would speed up the increase by 2 percent—a figure which can hardly be called unreasonable.

Again a few words about the industry in question. Men's and boys' clothing is an important industry in Puerto Rico. In 1949 it employed about 5½ percent of the production workers in manufacturing industries. But only 15 out of about 70 firms shipped part, or all of their production to markets outside Puerto Rico. This means that only 15 firms were subject to Federal minimum wage legislation.

The third percentage increase which you quoted in your editorial refers to metal and transportation equipment. This is the rate history of the classification in question:

	Cents an hour
Rates set by industry committees:	
Oct. 24, 1945	35
June 14, 1948	40
Nov. 30, 1951	58
June 27, 1955	75
Rates according to S. 2168:	
Jan. 1, 1956	82½
June 27, 1956	100

The 72-percent increase quoted in your editorial refers to the period from November 1951 to June 1956. The relative increase provided in the Senate bill is 33.3 percent over the rate in existence on June 27, 1955. This rate is higher than the 6-percent average yearly increase between 1951 and 1955. However, a comparison of these periods is not too meaningful because the law did not permit industry committees to raise the minimum wage beyond 75 cents an hour.

All experts on Puerto Rico seem to agree that industries now paying the same minimum rate as the mainland minimum are able to adjust easily to the new rate, even if Puerto Rico did not have more time to reach the $1 rate in metal trades. It should also be pointed out that the average hourly earnings in mainland metal trades vary between $1.62 and $2.11 an hour depending upon the classification (January 1955).

I do not want to imply that the three classifications mentioned are typical for Puerto Rican industry. I take them as examples merely because your editorial contains percentage increases referring to these classifications.

But I want to recall that the testimony given before the Subcommittee on Labor by representatives of the Puerto Rican government admitted that wage increases in the past were too little and too late. The delays in the operation of industry committees are well illustrated in the above examples.

It is true that there is always a range of judgment as to the exact rate at which wages in Puerto Rico should be speeded up. But the irrelevant and exaggerated claims made in your article of June 20, as well as in your editorial of June 25, do more harm than good to Puerto Rico.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

They Were Not Brainwashed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article which appeared in This Week magazine on Sunday, July 17. I hope that this article accurately reflects the views of the Department of the Army.

In justice to the prisoners of war whose loyalty remained unshaken during their periods of confinement, many of whom died in Communist prison camps, the Army should carry through this program:

THEY WERE NOT BRAINWASHED

(By A. E. Hotchner)

WASHINGTON.—I am sitting in an Army Intelligence conference room in the Pentagon with the team of intelligence officers whose job it has been to study and evaluate the conduct of hundreds of men who were prisoners of war in Korea. Now, for the first time, they are ready to speak out on behalf of the Army, and I am going to set down, as one voice, the startling answer to their critics. Here is their story:

There are over 40 men in this country, now walking around free, whom the Army will shortly bring to trial for allegedly treasonous acts committed while they were prisoners of war in Korea. These men do not yet know of their pending indictments. But, you may be sure, their consciences anticipate punishment.

However, since the Army began its prosecutions of ex-PW's in 1953, public sentiment has run strongly against us. Several men have already been tried and convicted, with sentences ranging up to 40 years and dishonorable discharge. The mothers and wives of these men have been understandably upset and have appealed to Congressmen and the press about the convictions—urging, in extenuation, that they had been "brainwashed." The result is that, by now, in the public's mind, the Army has been cast in the role of a revengeful villain.

INNOCENT VICTIMS?

Over and over the Army is asked: Weren't these men the innocent victims of the Reds' vicious technique of brainwashing? Is it fair, therefore, to hold them responsible for their acts? Weren't some of the men tortured unmercifully? Wasn't the Army guilty of double-crossing when it told those PW's who refused to return that it would not prosecute them—but then grabbed Dickenson and Batchelor and sentenced them to 10 and 20 years respectively?

Well, now that investigations are completed, the time has come for the Army to speak out, and divulge the real truth about the so-called brainwashed collaborators. Let's get right to the point:

1. No man being prosecuted was brainwashed—in fact, no American military prisoner was brainwashed during the entire Korean War.

2. No American PW has been or will be tried by the Army who was physically tortured. But torture, in the classic sense, was not used at all as a means of obtaining converts.

3. The Army has in no way violated its word in respect to PW's who at first refused repatriation.

4. The men who did not collaborate with the enemy generally fared as well as or better in enemy hands than the men who did.

Pretty surprised? Well, let's discuss this brainwashing business a little. In the public's mind it is some mystical oriental process that involves hypnosis, secret drugs, insidious torture, Pavlovian conditioning, and various other devices impossible for the subject to resist. But, as far as Communist prisoner-of-war camps in Korea go, the public's concept of brainwashing is completely wrong.

Torture, brutality, and mysterious drugs had nothing to do with what went on there.

There was torture, yes, in the sense of physical harassment, great mental pressures applied to men under prison conditions by a foreign system with a different standard from America. There was brutality, yes, in the sense of atrocities committed in combat situations or immediately thereafter on so-called death marches to permanent camps.

But neither of these was applied as a normal method of prisoner handling to obtain converts.

COMMUNIST GOALS

Even though brutality occurred in some instances, no trials have resulted for acts of misconduct committed in connection therewith.

The objectives of the Communist brainwashing attempts were inconsistent with a "torture" program. They were:

1. To secure favorable propaganda.

2. To organize the PW's for easier handling.

3. To obtain intelligence information.

4. To change political concepts of the PW's.

None of these objectives would be accomplished if PW's were reduced to robots robbed of their intellect. Let me repeat again—there is not one iota of evidence that drugs, hypnosis, or any other device except dramatic persuasion were used on our PW's in Korea.

There were 3,322 United States Army prisoners repatriated from Korea but in only approximately 40 cases (plus those already tried) is there sufficient evidence of flagrant criminal acts to warrant the Army to authorize prosecution. And this after exhaustive checking and cross-checking, beginning with the processing investigators who accompanied the shiploads of ex-PW's when they were coming back to the United States and continuing through nearly 2 years of intensive investigation by all levels of the Army.

Actually, this low percentage of serious offenders is a fine record; but, there is no reason to go easy on the guilty ones—they flagrantly betrayed their fellow soldiers and their country.

You have had sympathy for these men, have you? Then you'd better get to know them a little better. They range from privates to lieutenant colonels with educational backgrounds varying from grade school to West Point graduates. Here are a few samples:

Case 1: An officer accused by 180 PW's of having written and given anti-United States speeches, taught Communist-indoctrination classes, announced that the United States was not his country, informed on other prisoners, lived in special quarters where he put photos of Red leaders on his walls.

Case 2: Enlisted man, accused by over 500 ex-PW's from the camp. A typical comment about him was: "This stinker is a liar, a collaborator, a traitor, and a coward." He betrayed his fellow prisoners to the Reds. He referred to the United States as his enemy, was in charge of the camp's system for spying on American prisoners and actually put the finger on several fellow prisoners who were planning to escape.

This man had to be given special military police protection on the repatriation ship that brought him home because of the number of ex-PW's who informed shipboard investigators that they planned to kill him at the first opportunity. Despite his protection, he was severely beaten.

Case 3: Enlisted man, whose record has been corroborated by 160 ex-PW's who were in his camp. He was chief monitor (Communist political indoctrinator) of his camp in charge of the ideological indoctrination of newly captured American prisoners. He produced propaganda recordings, articles, and speeches, wrote Red-slanted articles for the camp newspaper, induced other PW's to sign surrender pamphlets by use of threats and harassment. He was friendly with the five top-ranking Chinese of the camp, and he received special food, clothes, living quarters, and medical treatment. He was given special protection from other PW's; he gave the Chinese technical intelligence and order-of-battle information on the United States Army.

During the PW camp "Olympics"—athletic events—he mounted the reviewing stand of the Chinese general who commanded all PW camps in North Korea and gave a speech which ended with the words:

"I now stand in the ranks of the peace-loving people of the world. Long live the democratic People's Republic of Korea, long live the People's Republic of China."

Case 4: Enlisted man whom over 800 former PW's charged, and who admits, that he helped train Red intelligence personnel to be censors. He was one of the worst informers, and words like "rat," "traitor," "skunk" appear frequently in statements of his former fellow prisoners.

Case 5: An Army captain whose acts were reported by 110 former PW's. He was a member of the central peace committee, which ran the collaborationist program for the Reds, and he campaigned to get the job. In many long interviews held with him, he has at no time claimed any kind of torture or pressure. He counseled other prisoners to collaborate with the enemy and he himself signed and circulated propaganda articles among the prisoners for their signature. He is accused in a sworn statement of abandoning his men while they were under fire.

Still sympathetic? Still think the Army is too tough? Well then, here is a breakdown of the crimes committed by 20 of the serious cases, picked at random:

Five men prepared a series of surrender leaflets urging our soldiers to lay down their arms.

Five gave broadcasts over the Peiping radio, parroting the commie line that the war was being waged by MacArthur and Truman for personal Wall Street gain.

Fifteen prepared propaganda articles for a great variety of Communist publications.

Fifteen signed surrender leaflets and other documents.

Two gave Red propaganda speeches to fellow prisoners.

Two posed for propaganda pictures.

Ten informed on fellow prisoners, contributing to the death of 3 men.

One gave intelligence information to the enemy. He claims he was "tortured" into this. The torture consisted of having to stand at attention for 3 hours.

WHAT MADE THEM DO IT

Why did these men perform these heinous acts? Not one of them claimed that he was drugged, hypnotized, or subjected to real torture. According to their own admissions, they collaborated for better food, more tobacco, the possibility of getting better medical care, from fear induced by threats, mental duress and withholding food.

An officer who went into combat in Korea, during the early days of the war, was captured within a few hours. Less than a week after that leaflets were dropped on our men urging them to lay down their arms and surrender. These leaflets had been written by, signed by, and contained the photograph of that officer. Now just how much could that man's brain have been "washed" in that short time?

Another officer prepared and signed a surrender leaflet addressed to his own troops in the United States lines with his photo on it. This surrender leaflet said, "Turn your guns aside, I strongly appeal to you to surrender to the People's Army at once."

He gave as his excuse: "The Reds questioned me 3 times—the first time for 15 or 20 minutes, the second time for 40 minutes, the third time for 15 or 20 minutes." Thus, less than 2 hours of questioning caused an officer to sell out his country. By his own admission, he was neither threatened nor offered any inducements by his captors.

He was, of course, afraid. But so were his buddies on the front line who kept fighting and did not surrender their arms as he was begging them to do.

As for the charge that the Army has doublecrossed some of the nonrepatriated soldiers whom it lured back with promises not to prosecute, we have a tape recording of the actual broadcast made to those men. It said this, in effect: if you return, we will not place charges against you for your previous refusal to return, which was desertion.

But the Army never promised, and could not promise, to erase all the offenses ever committed by these men. They were held strictly accountable for their acts while PW's, just as every other man was, but they were given amnesty for having deserted.

One thing should be stated clearly at this point: in setting out its case, the Army in no way intends to minimize the rigors and hardships of the Korean prison camps. The monotony, the terrible food, the fears, the threats, the absence of mail, the presence of informers, the occasional punishment by solitary confinement, the constant tension and atmosphere of duress were all hard to take.

NO EXCUSE FOR TREASON

But they are not valid excuses for treasonable acts against the United States or for committing crimes against fellow prisoners which in many instances, resulted in their maltreatment or death.

Besides, the records of returned prisoners show that men who refused to collaborate with the enemy fared as well, and in many cases better, in enemy hands than the men who did collaborate. Generally, the former were placed in labor camps and kept busy—the best thing that could have happened to them.

In recent months, various plans have emerged for dealing with brainwashing. One of the latest was an admiral's personal suggestion that American soldiers be encouraged to say anything their captors want them to, thereby making brainwashing unnecessary. This suggestion and others like it lose sight of the fact that a soldier is sworn to defend his country to the death.

When a soldier has weapons, he is bound by duty and patriotism to use them against his country's enemies. He is not absolved from this duty because he becomes a captive. In the absence of material weapons, such as rifle and bayonet, he must use the only weapons left to him—resistance to the harassment of the enemy.

The Communist PW's on Koje-do waged a battle against us which was heard throughout the world. Is the cause of democracy so much less important than communism that our PW's not only do not resist but are urged to cooperate with the enemy? Let's not forget that one of the aims of communism is to destroy one of the principal strengths of America, its moral fiber. By encouraging soldiers to lie, deceive, and confess, we ourselves break down that fiber and aid the Communists in their cause.

CONTINUING FIGHT

Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, emphatically agrees with this point of view.

The Army is not punishing any soldier who performed any act, no matter how vile, if the PW was trying to obtain food for survival, medical aid for any wound or illness, or to avoid physical torture.

But until the Army learns of a better way to uphold its own and our country's standards, the Army will stick by its guns: an American prisoner of war will give his name, rank, serial number, and date of birth. Nothing more. Not a word more. He will continue to fight mentally and he will do everything in his power to escape. Make capture easy, and you destroy the fighting spirit of your Army.

The Army realized that its prosecutions would be hard on the families of the men involved, but what about the families of the men who suffered as a result of the selfishness and treachery of the few? If the Army does not punish these traitors, has it kept faith with those soldiers who served honorably and, in many cases, made the supreme sacrifice for their country?

THE ARMY'S ANSWER

And how can we estimate the weakened position of the United States internationally when a segment of world support may have been alienated from the United States as a result of Communist propaganda mouthed by a small group of our soldiers?

Hard, defiant troops are the Army's answer to brainwashing—it's better for their country and the soldier himself. Thousands of men did us proud, only a few disgraced us. For this, we insist on their punishment.

Person to Person, With Margaret Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently, millions of Americans had the opportunity to visit, by way of television, in a home which we, in Missouri, feel symbolizes all that is best in family life in America.

On this program, Miss Margaret Truman introduced her mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. Harry S. Truman, at Independence, Mo.

The wholesomeness and the friendliness of the ensuing half-hour visit was truly typical of this wonderful family, for almost 8 years the first family of America.

Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who missed the program, will be interested in reading the transcript. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of Person to Person for May 27, 1955, inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CBS TELEVISION—PERSON TO PERSON, WITH MARGARET TRUMAN

Miss TRUMAN. Good evening; I'm Margaret Truman. The name of the program is Person to Person.

It's not possible for Edward R. Murrow to be here tonight. He is in London, following up the British election results. He asked me to help escort you through a home in Independence, Mo., that I know very well—I was born there. And our guests tonight will be two persons of whom I'm very fond—my mother and father, Mr. and Mrs. Harry S. Truman.

Harry S. Truman is a former President of the United States. He spent almost 20 years in Washington as Senator, Vice President, and President. He loves politics and people, particularly Democrats.

Since the Trumans left Washington I have been living in New York, but our family home is where it always has been, in Independence, Mo.

This is where we live. It's a rather rambling, Victorian-type house, built 89 years ago, shortly after Abraham Lincoln died. It has 12 rooms, and stands on the corner of North Delaware Street and Truman Road, about a half acre in all.

It's exactly 9½ miles from here to my father's present office in the Federal Reserve Bank Building in Kansas City. As he drives himself to work each morning down Truman Road—it will always be 15th Street to me—he passes Truman Car Wash, Truman Road Grill, Truman Pharmacy, Truman Palmistry, and Truman Road Hamburger Shop. And when he makes the 30-minute trip home each night he can still note Harry's Tavern, Harry's Cafe, and Harry's Used Furniture.

We love Missouri.

When my father was a Senator we used to spend about 6 months a year in Independence. Or mother did. Dad was frequently out speechmaking.

Later, when my father was at the White House, mother always came home for the summer.

Now, this has been the only home for my parents for the past 2 years and 3 months; that is, when Dad isn't out gallivanting around and talking to people.

We have never had cameras in the house before. But I hope they are working tonight.

Mr. TRUMAN. It's all right with me.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, so many people ask, "How are your parents making out from their switch to Pennsylvania Avenue and Washington to North Delaware Street in Independence?"

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, I think we are doing very well. I always liked the hometown better than any other place I know of. I didn't have anything particular against Washington, but I think that Independence is a much better city.

Miss TRUMAN. He is likely prejudiced. Mother, please tell everyone why you went back to Missouri instead of staying in Washington.

Mrs. TRUMAN. There was never any question about staying in Washington. Never any question of not coming home. Is that reason enough?

Miss TRUMAN. That's reason enough. Mother, where is Vietta?

Mrs. TRUMAN. Oh, she's in the kitchen.

Miss TRUMAN. Vietta knew me before I knew her. I was 3 years old when she came to work with us. She raised me, too. Hi, Vi.

VIETTA. Hi, Margaret.

Miss TRUMAN. I must tell every one that Vietta stayed 8 years at the White House as sort of master of bread and rolls and when I had my first concert Dad insisted she go with me. Now she is the big wheel in the Independence kitchen.

Say, I haven't had a chance to talk to you since the big party at the house celebrating Dad's 71st birthday and groundbreaking for the new library. How many people were there?

VIETTA. Between 200 and 250. I had plenty of help.

Miss TRUMAN. I want to go back and talk to Mother and Dad. Mother, are we still getting a lot of sightseers and visitors?

Mrs. TRUMAN. All the time. Every day. We had a funny experience the other night. Dad and I went over to see your cousin across the street and there were so many out here in front of the house we couldn't come home. We had to spend most of the evening on the front porch all by ourselves because our cousins weren't at home.

Miss TRUMAN. What about the time someone picked your tulips?

Mrs. TRUMAN. Oh, yes; some woman came in the backyard and started picking all my beautiful white tulips and one of the men on the place went down there and asked her just what she thought she was doing and she said she didn't think Mrs. Truman cared if she took some of her tulips. She took all she wanted.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, we know you're not the greatest believer in the accuracy of poll takers, but on your morning walk around town, do you ever take a poll of how people feel toward you?

Mr. TRUMAN. Whenever I meet them I can tell very well that they are happy to see me. There are a great many of them who don't know me as well as those home folks do, that are somewhat awed by the fact that I once lived in the White House, but it doesn't bother me because that never occurs to me, and I can see how I'd feel if I were meeting a President and I still lived here in Independence as a private citizen.

Miss TRUMAN. Everyone who stopped at the house in recent years knows we have a big iron fence around the property with a gate that opens only when we push a button in the house. Incidentally, Ed Murrrow's television men tell me the gate needs an oiling.

Mrs. TRUMAN. I am afraid he was telling the truth.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, why don't you explain why you have that fence out there?

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, the fence had to be put up to keep the American propensities from collecting souvenirs and tearing the house down. I was told that when Herbert Hoover went to Washington as President, they took the door knobs off his house and almost tore the house down before they placed guards there to prevent it. The Secret Service decided that the fence would save our property from being destroyed. It is an old story that Americans like to collect souvenirs. When I was in the First World War it was said that the British fought for the control of the seas and the Americans fought for souvenirs, and they are still fighting for them.

Miss TRUMAN. Mother, we were talking about tulips a minute ago. How does your garden grow?

Mrs. TRUMAN. Oh, we have had some wonderful rains and the garden is all in bloom, especially Mrs. Lasree's Peace Roses. They're gorgeous.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, you used to tell reporters that the White House was a jail. Do you feel free now?

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, substantially so; practically as free as I expect we ever will be. For some reason or other, I don't suppose we will ever be as free as we would have been if we hadn't lived in the White House.

Miss TRUMAN. I think that sounds logical. Mother, do you miss Washington?

Mrs. TRUMAN. Oh, yes; I miss Washington. I miss Washington a lot. I loved it there but I am completely happy at home.

Miss TRUMAN. That's what I thought. Mother, would you and Dad show us to the living room, please?

Mrs. TRUMAN. Yes; we'd love to.

Miss TRUMAN. All right. This is our side porch. It leads on down to our dining room. We usually have our meals here. First off, let's show everyone the portrait of Dad that you like so much. As we know, Mother, that's yours, right?

Mrs. TRUMAN. Strictly mine. No library, no museum ever gets it.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, while we are at it, let's show the painting of your daughter and get it over with.

Mr. TRUMAN. Right over here.

(Portrait of Miss Truman.)

Miss TRUMAN. Someone asked me recently, Daddy, "Did your father ever say that your house in Missouri creaks and groans like the White House?"

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; it did creak and groan just like the White House. It doesn't groan so much now.

Miss TRUMAN. Remember the night, speaking of ghosts, that you heard a knock on your bedroom door in the White House?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; I heard the knock and got up and answered it about 3 o'clock in the morning. There wasn't anybody there. I think it must have been Lincoln's ghost walking up and down the hall.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, I just won a small bet. Before Ed Murrow left he said that I couldn't steer you away from politics this long. I win but you'll get your chance. I have a lot of things that he wants me to ask you. Dad, do you have anything left up your political sleeve?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; nothing in particular.

Miss TRUMAN. I want Mother to answer this one. Have you made sure that Daddy takes things easy since he left Washington?

Mrs. TRUMAN. That's a laugh—between the piles of mail and the many, many visitors, it's a little difficult.

Miss TRUMAN. So many people want to know what you do to relax inasmuch as you don't fish, hunt, or play golf.

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, my only relaxation is to work and I never have known anybody to be injured by too much hard work. It is the lack of it that kills people.

Miss TRUMAN. Well, now I think I will ask you to show us the way to the music room.

(Laughter.)

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, how is the book coming?

Mr. TRUMAN. Coming along all right. I think we will meet the deadline on the 15th day of June, and the book will probably be published about the 15th of September, I hope.

Miss TRUMAN. I know you once had the stories of your years in Washington up to 1 million words. How long is it now?

Mr. TRUMAN. We have had to cut down to about 500,000. That is a very hard job but I think we are going to succeed in doing it.

Miss TRUMAN. That still sounds like a lot of words. Mother, how is the proofreading going?

Mrs. TRUMAN. It is still pretty strenuous.

Miss TRUMAN. Everyone in the Truman family knows that when mother gets to proofreading on anything dad is working on, that means it is on the way to completion.

Back in the other room we saw the paintings, one of me and one of dad. Dad, let's look at mother's. I think that is awfully good.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is a wonderful picture of your mother.

Miss TRUMAN. That's my favorite. Let's see some non-Truman paintings. You two sit and I will introduce them.

Over Dad's shoulder is a present to Dad from Sir Winston Churchill painted by his own hand at Marakecsh. I brought this home from London when Sir Winston asked me to bring it to my father.

Now, over the piano is an original given to us by Grandma Moses.

Dad, now it's your turn to explain things. Could we have the history of the piano, please?

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, this piano is the one that was purchased for you when you were a very little girl. You had your first lesson on it and it's been your piano ever since. It gets a right good workout when you're at home.

Miss TRUMAN. I think I was 7 or 8. Do you remember the first thing you taught me on that piano?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; I think it was a little waltz I taught you. I think I can still play it.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, when you did that television tour through the White House you showed everyone you could still play. Let's prove you still haven't lost your touch.

Mr. TRUMAN. Let's try and see what happens. Then you can tell whether the piano is in tune or not. This is your waltz.

(Mr. Truman played the piano.)

Miss TRUMAN. Isn't that Paderewski's Minuet?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; that's part of it.

Miss TRUMAN. I enjoyed that. If you want to go back to your chair, I have another question to ask.

Mr. TRUMAN. Fire away.

Miss TRUMAN. Just how much influence and help was Mother when you were in the White House?

Mr. TRUMAN. She was a wonderful influence and help. A President is in a bad way if he doesn't have a First Lady that knows her job and is a full support to him. She's the greatest help a President can have. Mine was.

Mrs. TRUMAN. Thank you.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, how is the new library coming?

Mr. TRUMAN. It's coming along all right. They have the ground graded and they are digging the foundation now. They have the signal to finish in about a year and 2 months.

Miss TRUMAN. That's good. Are you going to travel toward the den now and show us some of that?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes, I think so. I have a picture of the library out here I want to show you. Here it is.

Miss TRUMAN. Have they made much progress since the ground-breaking 2 weeks ago?

Mrs. TRUMAN. Oh, yes, a lot of progress. And he goes by most every morning on the way to the office to see just what they are doing.

Miss TRUMAN. Are you going to go easy on the Truman Library builders?

Mr. TRUMAN. I'm going to watch them put it up and I'll see that they do it right, just as I always did whenever I had anything in charge like that.

Miss TRUMAN. Sidewalk superintendent. How much have you stored in Kansas City ready for the library?

Mr. TRUMAN. There is an old big vault full of books, papers, and pictures and things of that kind that will go into the library when it's up. There is a tremendous collection of Bibles in the vault that will be very interesting when they are put out for the people to see.

Miss TRUMAN. How much is it all going to cost and how much cash has the committee raised so far?

Mr. TRUMAN. It is estimated that the library itself will cost $1,700,000, and we have collected $1,200,000. I think the rest of it is in sight. We will have the money all collected by the time that the library is ready to use.

Miss TRUMAN. Good. I suppose some day day the scholars will go through your personal papers and draw up a summary of your administration. What do you hope you will be remembered for?

Mr. TRUMAN. I hope to be remembered as the people's President. I have always said that there are a great many important organizations with lots of money who maintain lobbyists in Washington. I'd say 15 million people in the United States are represented by the lobbyists in the city of Washington. The other 150 million have only 1 man who is elected at large to represent them—that is, the President of the United States. When he goes back on them they are in a bad way.

Miss TRUMAN. What do you think has been the most important development in the country or world since you left Washington?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think we are approaching a peace settlement and, I hope, the end of the cold war. The signing of the treaty is a step in that direction.

Miss TRUMAN. A moment ago I saw the icon you received from Queen Helen of Rumania. Do you recall the circumstances surrounding that gift?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Government of the United States, at my direction, sent 200,000 tons of wheat to the starving Moravians and the Queen of Rumania presented me with this icon, which came out of the mosque of St. Sophia—Constantinople it was then.

Miss TRUMAN. You know a lot of people have said to me, your father sure loves a fight. True or false?

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, I never held up a fight, but I never ran from one if it was necessary to meet things head on.

Miss TRUMAN. Mommie, do you want to say a few words about politics specifically or in general?

Mrs. TRUMAN. No; not in either category, thank you.

Miss TRUMAN. Well, that's definite. Dad?

Mr. TRUMAN. You know your mother never talks about such things.

Miss TRUMAN. Ed wanted you to talk about the campaign in '48. He wanted to know what made you so sure you would win.

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, I have been through a similar experience on 2 or 3 occasions and I had come to the conclusion that when the people know the facts and they know that you are telling the truth and stand for the things that are for their best interests they will vote for you and I was very well assured if I could see enough people and talk to enough people I could be elected and that is what I did and this is the way it came out.

Miss TRUMAN. Well, tell me, what is the toughest decision you had to make?

Mr. TRUMAN. To go into Korea to save the United Nations Republic of South Korea.

Miss TRUMAN. Dad, what advice do you have for young people who want to go into politics.

Mr. TRUMAN. Well, the best thing they can do is study history, particularly the history of their country, their city, their county and their State, to read all the history they possibly can and study about what makes men act and the biographies of the people who made history are much more important to a person who wants to go into politics and the fundamental thing is that a politician must be fundamentally honest, intellectually and otherwise. Unless he is he won't make it.

Miss TRUMAN. Well, I have to go now so I guess I will have to say goodby.

The Florida Presidential Primary Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles written by John Perry regarding the Florida presidential primary law.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLORIDA'S PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY—STATE'S POLITICAL STATURE BOOSTED BY MODEL LAW

(By John Perry)

(First of a series)

Florida, so long ignored in national political campaigns, almost overnight has become a "weathervane" State.

This is because it now has what leading political scientists call the most modern presidential primary in the Nation.

This model law, enacted at the 1955 session of the State legislature, gives Florida voters—for the first time—a strong voice in nomination of presidential candidates.

Candidates for presidential nomination now must count Florida high among States where popularity races are run and delegates are won early in pre-convention campaigning.

MAY BE TEST

If jockeying for the nomination with one or both of the national parties turns into a real horse race, candidates are quite likely to make Florida's new presidential primary one of the first tests.

This means not only offering their names on the Florida ballot, but also coming into the State to campaign actively.

This is especially true in the Democratic primary, if Adlai Stevenson seeks the nomination.

Unlike 1952, when he did not ask for the nomination, in 1956 Stevenson must go out early and harvest delegate votes. If he does not, there are others in his party who will—and may anyway.

MUST ENTER

To win the nomination he will have to run the risk of entering early State primaries, which now include Florida.

His interest in taking the gamble in Florida would be threefold:

1. This traditionally Democratic southern State in 1952 went Republican for the first time since 1928. If Stevenson is to convince the Democratic convention he can do better in Dixie than he did in 1952, he must produce some concrete evidence.

A Democratic presidential primary victory in Florida would be eloquent evidence. At the same time, a loss could be equally damaging. But, then, so would a refusal to take the gamble.

2. Stevenson has been working hard to mend the North-South split within his party. If he enters Florida's new primary he could put to test his efforts toward conciliation.

And he also could give such Florida Democrats as Senators SPESSARD HOLLAND and GEORGE SMATHERS, who hung back in 1952, opportunity to demonstrate their more recently professed party ardor.

At present only Democratic prospect on the horizon besides Stevenson is Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, for whom southern conservative Democrats have no love at all. They will be unable to turn again to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, who has counted himself out in 1956.

3. Florida's new primary falls early, but not too early.

Presidential primaries will have been held in New Hampshire, the first, March 13; Minnesota, March 20; Wisconsin, April 3; Ohio, May 8; and Oregon, May 18, when Florida's comes off May 29.

Thus, a candidate will have had opportunity to snowball strength in other early primaries in various sections of the country before dipping his toe in the uncertain political waters of Dixie.

GOP SIDE

On the Republican side, unless President Eisenhower bows out, there will be no contest to speak of, and GOP primaries anywhere will be little more than complimentary votes for the President.

In Florida, it would be even less indicative of his strength, since only registered Republicans could vote for him in a primary—and it was registered Democrats who carried the State for him in 1952.

But if Ike steps down, there'd surely be a mad scramble for the nomination. Each candidate will be filing in Florida to prove he, too, can make a good showing among Florida Republicans and to pick up those precious delegate votes.

PRIMARY LAW WILL SPARE STATE EMBARRASSMENT

(By John Perry)

(Second of a series)

In 1952, Florida came close to being the laughing stock at both national political conventions.

Some St. Petersburg Republicans made their television debut physically struggling with members of a rival faction for possession of the Florida standard.

And Florida GOP delegates wore first one candidate's button and then another's.

At the Democratic presidential nominating convention, three rival delegations showed up from Florida—each pledged to Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia. One was the Trojan horse delegation, whose members intended to switch to Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, after the first ballot.

EMBARRASSING

Such was the spectacle of contested delegations which at first amused then disgusted the Nation and embarrassed Florida.

After 1952, it was generally agreed national conventions should spend their time on the serious business of nominating national tickets and that internal State squabbles should be settled back home.

This is exactly what is provided in Florida's new presidential primary law, most modern in America. It makes it impossible for Florida to come up with contested delegations.

Only one delegation of 24 members with 20 votes will be allowed to go to the Democratic convention. (If Republicans hadn't carried the State, Florida would have had eight more half-votes in 1956.)

REPRESENTATIVE

And that delegation will be just about as representative of Florida Democrats' wishes as is possible. For example, Florida might send up 6 delegate votes for Adlai Stevenson, 8 for RUSSELL, and 6 for KEFAUVER.

It even goes a step further. Each of the 8 congressional districts sends 2 delegates—a man and a woman. This gives each geographical section opportunity to be represented in the convention with votes for its favorite for the nomination.

Thus, the Miami area might send delegates for Stevenson; St. Petersburg-Tampa area, for KEFAUVER; north Florida, for RUSSELL, and so on.

In addition, eight delegates—each with a half-vote—are to be elected at large, which gives added strength to the candidate favored by most of the people throughout Florida.

DELEGATES SELECTED

It should be kept in mind that in this primary it is delegates to nominating conventions who are selected. Actual voting on presidential and vice presidential candidates selected by each party convention still comes in the November general election.

What the voter will see on his presidential primary ballot is, under the name of each candidate for nomination, names of delegates-at-large plus two from his own congressional district.

He makes one cross or pulls one lever for the slate of his choice. There will be as

many slates on the ballot as there are nomination candidates who have been filed.

And there can be unpledged slates. Of course, the voter may vote for only one slate.

Here is what makes it impossible for there to be contested delegations:

The day of politicians filing at random and just for the ride to a convention is over in Florida. Slates must be organized.

If more than one slate pledged to the same candidate files, the secretary of state immediately notifies the candidate. If the candidate says which slate he wants to represent him, that's the one which goes on the ballot.

Should he express no preference, the first slate to file is the one on the ballot. Thus the issue of contested delegations never comes up after the primary.

Under the new primary law, the way is left open for a candidate to cause a slate to be organized for him. And if he isn't actively seeking nomination, it's possible for his friends to "draft" him by putting up a slate for him.

STATE'S POLITICIANS TO BE IN LIMELIGHT

(By John Perry)

(Third in a series)

It's a little early for most of them to realize it, but leading Florida politicians are going to be on the spot in 1956.

The State's new model presidential primary law makes it difficult to the point of embarrassment for them to continue to duck national party issues.

Those running for office especially will be on the spot, since the new presidential primary falls on the date of the second primary election.

TOOK PART

In the past, Florida's top political figures have taken part in national party conventions or not, as it suited their own political fortunes of the moment.

Many of them disappeared from the political scene or got involved as little as possible on the theory that their own careers came first and they had no obligation to participate in party affairs.

And if they did file as convention delegates, it was under the old loose, hazy system which let them run and serve as delegates pretty much like free agents.

These conditions, against a background of a one-party Democratic South, contributed to national party neglect of Florida.

POLITICAL DECAY

Worst political decay, approaching that of "rotten boroughs," was found in Florida's Republican Party during the Democratic years. Quality of national convention delegates from both Florida parties left much to be desired.

The new presidential primary is designed to raise the prestige of delegates above that of political hacks seeking free trips to conventions.

Now, no delegates (except national committee members) can go to conventions without being a part of organized slates. The new law even requires each slate to be headed by an "organizing chairman," who would be so identified on the ballot. Supposedly, he would be a person of statewide reputation likely to add prestige to the slate.

NEW FACET

And this is what adds a new facet to Florida's every-man-for-himself political picture.

It will be difficult for Florida bigwigs to stay out of the picture altogether, for they are certain to be asked to head slates for presidential hopefuls.

Take just one, for example, the Governor, who heads the Democratic Party in Florida. He may have political plans of his own in 1956. But what does he do if he is asked by a leading presidential hopeful to head his slate in this State?

If he accepts, he may offend Democratic voters who favor a different candidate. If he declines, he may offend the candidates' supporters.

He simply will be facing what governors in other States have long accepted—public office requires participation in party affairs.

ORGANIZED

Provision is made in the new primary law for no-preference slates, but even these must be organized and headed by someone.

Such a slate of delegates, pledged to no one and so listed on the ballot, eliminates necessity of running a "stalking horse" candidate, who, as everyone knows, will be abandoned after the first ballot or two—leaving his delegates free to go their own way.

Since more than one no-preference slate is possible, this allows factions within the party to run unpledged delegates. If there is more than one no-preference slate, it generally is understood one favors a certain candidate.

Even if leading Florida political figures would like to be on a "neutral" no-preference slate, they will find it hard to do because of pressures on them to head pledged slates.

NEW VOTING LAW LINKS DELEGATES WITH CANDIDATES

(By John Perry)

(Last of a series)

Some States have preferential primaries to guide their national convention delegates on how presidential aspirants rate with voters.

Other States, like Florida in the past, just hold primaries to elect convention delegates.

Florida's new model presidential primary law makes election of convention delegates an accurate popularity poll, combining both features in one primary.

LITTLE MEANING

This follows experience of political science researchers, who have found a presidential preference poll has little meaning unless it is linked—as now in Florida—with election of delegates.

The 1956 presidential primary in Florida will produce a slate of delegates who in all likelihood will be split. But this split not only will reflect accurately the proportion of popularity of each presidential hopeful but also will give him his delegates from the sections of the State where he is the strongest candidate.

This new law, which allows the voter to express directly his preference for a candidate for party nomination, for President, stems from a nationwide study of the 1952 conventions.

Under financial grants and supervision by the American Political Science Association, these studies were made by one or more universities in each of the 48 States.

Conclusions upon which the Florida act is based were drawn by Dr. Paul T. David of the Brookings Institution, who directed the project and edited its five-volume report.

Florida's act was coauthored by Dr. Manning Dauer, head of the University of Florida political science department, and William A. F. Stephenson of St. Petersburg, Pinellas County Democratic chairman.

SHORTER BALLOT

The act provides a shorter delegate ballot, eliminating the previously long ballot, on which delegate candidates at the bottom of the ballot got as low as 6 percent of the total vote.

It also—

Assures the Florida Republican Party of a delegate primary, which it previously was entitled to only at the discretion of the hidebound State committee when the party failed to poll 20 percent of the statewide vote. This primary is now available to all parties polling 10 percent of the vote cast or achieving 10 percent of the registered electors.

Keeps this a closed primary, so members of one party cannot vote in the primary of another party.

In conjunction with another new election law, for the first time sets first and last filing dates for all primary candidates. In 1956, filing must be made between February 21 and March 6. The presidential primary comes at the second primary election, May 29. This gives Florida one of the earliest presidential primary filing dates, preceded only by those in New Hampshire and Minnesota.

Provides for election of national committeeman and committeewoman at the same time.

Allows the two national committee members to be alternates to the last two delegates elected at large.

Gives at-large delegates permission to fill out incomplete slates by appointment in those congressional districts where at-large delegates get a plurality.

NEW STATUTE CAUSES FLURRY

Florida's new model presidential primary law is causing quite a flurry in political science circles.

Dr. Bruce Mason, University of Florida political scientist who helped draft it, has been invited to explain the model law at the National Municipal League convention June 24 in Seattle, Wash.

Dr. Manning Dauer, dean of the University of Florida political science department and William A. F. Stephenson of St. Petersburg, Pinellas County Democratic chairman, who coauthored the law, have been asked to write joint articles on it in the American Political Science Review and the National Municipal Review.

Industrial Progress in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorail entitled "Coming Along Industrially," which was published in the State, of Columbia, S. C., on July 15, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMING ALONG INDUSTRIALLY

It is good for South Carolina to continue to grow industrially, as long as that growth is sound. There is no place in this State for fly-by-nights, high-pressure promoters, or undesirable plants, but there is a hearty welcome for the type of industry that will meet the test.

During the first 6 months of this year a total of $81,419,000 was invested in, or allocated for, new plants in this State. This was something of a record, the total being greater than for the entire year of 1954, or 1953, or 1952. The figure for all of 1951 was $91,315,000, which was just $10 million above the first 6 months in 1955. By the end of the year, 1955 will far exceed 1951 for there is every indication that the second 6 months of 1955 will see continued industrial

expansion, and will go down in history as the banner one.

Along with the total for the first 6 months of this year, S. W. Gable, acting director of the State Development Board, made public the names of the firms making the investments. It was an impressive list including some of the most notable in business.

We have plenty of room here for firms of this character and we congratulate Chairman Stanley Ilewellyn, Mr. Gable, and members of the development board, not only on the results obtained, but upon the standards they insist upon.

Often in these columns we have cited the fact that at the end of World War II industrial worth in this State totaled, in round figures, $500 million. Today the valuation is around $3 billion. True, the H-bomb plant accounts for about $1,500,000,000, but it should be included since the H-bomb plant is equipped for peacetime as well as wartime activity and its payroll rightly should be classed as an industrial one.

Two things have happened that please us very much. Our new industry shows diversification. For a time we feared that we were getting overly heavy in textiles. Another thing, we are getting better geographical distribution. Areas that heretofore have had no manufacturing to speak of are now being chosen for big plants. This is good and for several reasons, one of which is that it makes for a better labor supply and, too, some of our distinctly agricultural counties greatly need the shot in the arm that manufacturing payrolls will bring.

As we have commented before, we must absorb our new industry and not let it absorb us. So far we have been able to do this, which is a right remarkable feat considering the phenomenal way in which our industry has multiplied in the last 10 years.

Let no one be led to believe that these new plants just came here of their own accord. Such an impression would be quite contrary to the facts. There is keen competition among Southern States, but also there is keen competition from other sections trying to keep industry from coming down here.

First, the job is to persuade a manufacturer that South Carolina is the State for him. Then comes the competition among counties and local communities for the plant.

If anyone had predicted 10 years ago that South Carolina's investment in industry would grow six times by 1955, that there would be invested here around $3 billion in plants, the person making the forecast would have had a skeptical audience, indeed. Such would not have been thought possible. But that is what has happened, and to all who have had a part in bringing about the transformation, a tip of our hat.

Tribute to Lewis Ankeny McArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the name of Lewis A. McArthur will endure in my State of Oregon for many decades because he, more than any other person, gave meaning and vitality to the place names of Oregon. His monumental work of Oregon Geographic Names will be standard in its field far into the distant future. One of my personal treasurers is an autographed copy which Mr. McArthur presented to me during the course of some of my own writings about Oregon.

Omar C. Spencer, noted lawyer and historian, has written an eloquent tribute to Lewis McArthur for the Oregon Historical Quarterly of March 1955, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this salute to a remarkable and scholarly man appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Lewis A. McArthur was born in 1883 and died in Portland in 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LEWIS ANKENY MCARTHUR, 1883–1951

(By Omar C. Spencer)

Lewis Ankeny McArthur, or "Tam" as he was known to all his friends, was born at The Dalles, Oreg., on April 27, 1883. He died at Portland, Oreg., on November 8, 1951. He came by the name of Tam from his early youth because his older brother, Clifton, tried to call him Tom or Tommy, but instead said Tam or Tammy.

His father was Judge Lewis Linn McArthur, who served as a Supreme Court judge (1870–78), as a circuit court judge (1878–82), and as a Portland lawyer until his death in 1897. His mother's maiden name was Harriet Nesmith. She was one of the organizers of the Oregon Historical Society in 1898 and served on its board of directors from the beginning until 1924. His paternal grandfather was William P. McArthur, a naval lieutenant in command of the first survey of the Pacific coast for United States Coast Survey during the years 1849 and 1850. His maternal grandfather was James W. Nesmith, a pioneer of 1843, who took an active part in the provisional, Territorial, and State governments of Oregon. He was United States Senator from Oregon from 1861 to 1867, and served on the Senate Committee on the Conduct of the Civil War. He served as a Representative from Oregon from 1873 to 1875. Although a Democrat, he cast his vote in 1861 in favor of the Union. Harvey W. Scott, nationally known editor of the Oregonian, said of Nesmith on the occasion of his death:

"Among the notable men of Oregon, James W. Nesmith, since the earliest settlement of the State, has held a leading place. He was a man of intelligence, unusual force of character, large individualism, and originality, an excellent friend and citizen, withal, a true type of those representative Americans who laid the foundations of the empire in the West."

Scott was not given much to praising Democrats. This editorial is all the more significant on that account.

When we consider the environment and background provided by parents and grandparents such as these, it is little wonder that Tam would be interested in appraising facts, in topography, in the history of Oregon. And Tam was not just interested in those subjects, he possessed an active desire to accomplish something toward those ends.

At an early age Tam moved with his family from The Dalles to a farm near Rickreall in Polk County and then to Portland. With a neighbor boy, Maxwell Wood, Tam published a little newspaper which they called the Bee. There is no record that this paper had any sting, but it is said that the Bee was sharp and alert and reflected the activity of two youthful minds. He attended the primary grades and preparatory department of Portland Academy. After graduation Tam worked on the Oregonian for Harvey W. Scott, an editor he admired. He entered the University of California in 1903 and graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Science in 1908. For 2 years he was employed as a ticket agent and telegraph operator of the Oregon Electric Railway Co. at its Jefferson Street station in Portland. Following that he filled various executive positions with the Pacific Power and Light Co. until his retirement in 1948.

From Tam's youngest days he had a passion for accuracy in each of the many fields of interest that engaged his active mind. One of his goals was the completion of the topographic map of Oregon, and he did much toward that end. He originated a new form of atlas sheet layout for the national forests in Oregon and Washington. This was adopted by the national Government and is still in use.

He was instrumental in securing an annual State appropriation of $20,000 for topographic maps and stream measurements by writing the original bill and personally appearing before committees of the Oregon Legislative Assembly in 1911.

He secured the State cooperative fund for the completion of the Troutdale, the Bend, and the Hood River, Oreg., topographic maps when the States involved had decided to spend their funds elsewhere.

He persuaded the United States Geological Survey to incorporate the photographic topography of the United States Forest Service on the Columbia National Forest for the preparation of the Hood River and the Steamboat Mountain sheets. It is said this was the first time this method of topographic mapping had been used in the West and the first time the results were incorporated on the United States Geological Survey maps.

He obtained much new material and read proof on the General Land Office map of Oregon, issued in 1922, and he read proof on every map of the State issued by the Oregon State Highway Department.

In the field of history Tam was outstanding. He contributed 10 articles to the Oregon Historical Quarterly, not including those on place names. Among these were Pacific Coast Survey of 1849 and 1850 and The Lakes of Oregon. He also wrote 31 book reviews for the quarterly.

Upon the retirement of his mother, Harriet Nesmith McArthur, in 1924, after 26 years of service on the board of directors of the Oregon Historical Society, he succeeded her on the board and served until 1948, or a total period of 24 years, thus completing a period of 50 years as a board member for mother and son. Tam filled various offices in the society and was its president from 1937 to 1945.

Tam McArthur's greatest work and the one that overshadowed all else in bringing him generous and widespread recognition was Oregon Geographic Names. This collection, presented first in the Oregon Historical Quarterly, appeared in two editions in his lifetime and after his death in a third.

This third revised and enlarged edition, prepared for the press by his wife, Nellie Pipes McArthur, included an introduction by Tam's friend, Robert W. Sawyer. What follows is largely quoted or paraphrased from that introduction.

Just when it was that Tam became interested in the geographic names of his native State seems not to be known. Perhaps an editorial by Harvey W. Scott in the Oregonian of December 18, 1904, gave the stimulus. This editorial, under the caption "A General Review of Local Titles," opened with these sentences:

"An interesting subject is the study of Oregon's geographic nomenclatures. The subject is a large one and a volume would be required to exhaust it."

It is possible that the seed planted by the words of Scott germinated into reality. At any rate, in 1907 Gov. George E. Chamberlain created the Oregon Geographic Board. According to ex-Gov. Oswald West, who succeeded Chamberlain, the board "appears to have died but was given new life in 1914—no doubt," West says, "at the instance of

Tam McArthur." Whether or not this surmise is correct, Tam McArthur's interest in the geographic names of Oregon must have been demonstrated, for Governor West named him a member of the resuscitated board.

The Oregon Geographic Board has no background in the statutes. It gained, however, official recognition of a listing in the Oregon Blue Book, biennial publication of the Secretary of State, and in its first appearance, in the 1915–16 issue, McArthur is recorded as a member of the board. In 1916 he became its secretary and he continued in that office until 1949 when illness forced his retirement.

Proceeding thus from speculation to fact, we can record that McArthur's study of Oregon geographic names began some 40 years ago. It is evident, too, that his undertaking to compile a record of the origin of those names began more than 25 years ago, for in December 1925, there appeared in the Oregon Historical Quarterly the first installment of his collection of names and their background. There were installments in the seven succeeding Quarterlies and then, all having been assembled, they were presented in February 1928, in book form under the title they had carried in the magazine, Oregon Geographic Names.

In the preface to the first of the Quarterly sections, the compiler as McArthur called himself, interchangeably with the writer, said that he had for many years gathered notes on the origin of Oregon geographic names. David W. Hazen, reviewing the book, wrote that the collection was begun before McArthur knew that he was going to write a book. "And when he became a member of the Oregon Geographic Board," Hazen continues, "he set out to learn the whys and the wherefores of every important place name in the Beaver Commonwealth."

Perhaps not at the beginning but certainly as the work of collecting names and their history proceeded, the idea of a book had become a hope of McArthur's for so he wrote in the preface to the opening installment in that December Quarterly. Then, in the preface to the book itself he said, "It is the hope of the compiler that this book may be reprinted at some future date." Late in 1944 the hope was realized with a second edition containing hundreds of additional names; and in that volume the hope was again expressed in the same words.

Lewis A. McArthur was qualified as no other man could be "to learn the whys and the wherefores" of the place names of Oregon and to tell the story in the printed word. He came to the enterprise with more than abundant resources. There were the interest and the curiosity that prompted and sustained it. There was an amazing retentive memory. There was a broad knowledge of Oregon and Pacific Northwest history, including an intimate acquaintance with the journals and the other writings of and about the explorers, the traders and the trappers, the naturalists, the officers of the army and the navy and the settlers of Oregon before, during and after the years of the covered wagon. There were his own family background and the record of its participation in local, State and national affairs. He had a capacity for making and keeping friends, and because there was fun, entertainment and satisfaction in being his friend he had eager responses from each to his calls for aid. There were associations with the Federal agencies engaged in works relating to the geography of Oregon. There were his simple, but living and straight-forward writing style, his passion for accuracy and the right word. All these he had in his progress through the years as he gathered and set down his record of Oregon names. The creative expression of these possessions is apparent on page after page of his books.

In spite of the research, the vast knowledge, and the deep wells of information that were drawn on in the formation of his volumes, there was a continuing realization of the danger of error, especially in taking, without verification, material compiled by others. And so from the first quarterly installment to the last and in each preface there was an appeal for corrections and suggestions. From the beginning the search was for the fact, the truth, the correct date, the right initials, the proper spelling. Once an error was demonstrated, a correction was cheerfully recorded for the next volume.

Following the Oregon Historical Quarterly installments that went to the making of the first edition, there appeared five new groups of names in the issues of the quarterly from December 1943, and these, with the corrections, and other names and their stories made the new material in the second edition. The third and last assembly began in the quarterly for December 1945. In this group there were 15 installments altogether, continuing through the issue for June 1949. After the first, the caption subhead was the telephone phrase given wide currency by the popular radio program Information Please, thus still expressing the wish for more facts. These 15 installments provide the new material in the third volume.

It was but natural that in the first edition of Oregon Geographic Names there would be included the more important and better-known Oregon place names. The third edition contains 3,947 place names, many of which are post offices of but a temporary life. However, as a result of Tam McArthur's efforts, they are assured their place in Oregon local history.

With all his mental activity, no man ever suffered more from progressive physical impairment. But his patience knew no limits and to his last days he had a casual wit and a straight-faced humor. All in all, he was a most remarkable man. In his younger day he was often referred to as a walking encyclopedia. His accomplishments in his older days proved this to be true.

Almost immediately after Tam's death it was urged throughout Oregon that in commemoration of him and his work some geographic feature in the State be given his name. In time there was chosen the then unnamed broken caldera above Three Creeks Lake in Central Oregon, and with the approval of the United States Board on Geographic Names it now bears the name "Tam McArthur Rim." Just east of Broken Top and the Three Sisters, the rim is a prominent feature of the Central Oregon landscape.

A most befitting finale was enacted on a warm, sunny day in August of 1954. Robert W. Sawyer, a close friend, and Lewis Linn McArthur, a son, together with other relatives and friends, journeyed westward from Bend, Oreg., toward Broken Top Mountain. There on Tam McArthur Rim they complied with his last request by scattering his ashes.

Thus was concluded a ceremony symbolic in several ways, chief of which was the comparison between the rugged Cascade Range and the rugged mentality of Tam McArthur—even to his dying day. And there amidst the eternal solitude of the Cascade Range may his great soul rest in peace forever.

Brotherhood: The Cornerstone of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, entitled "Brotherhood: The Cornerstone of Democracy." Secretary Mitchell delivered this excellent speech concerning brotherhood at the annual convention of the Rabbinicial Council of America at Fallsburg, N. Y., on July 11, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD: THE CORNERSTONE OF DEMOCRACY

(Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell before the annual convention of the Rabbinical Council of America, July 11, 1955, Fallsburg, N. Y.)

It is a special pleasure to meet with you because it gives me an opportunity to express some views about which I feel strongly. Our jobs have much in common. It is my job to try to improve the condition of the wage earners of our great country. You and those who have preceded you have always championed the cause of justice for those who toil.

In recent years, orthodoxy and traditionalism have too often tended to fall into popular disrepute. While reform is essential to progress, traditionalism and orthodoxy are also essential to real and lasting progress.

Our moral and ethical traditions provide the anchor that keeps us from slipping away from what is good while we move ahead to a better way of life. They provide the guidepost by which we can judge whether we are on the right road. They are part of the heritage and background of which we should be proud. They are the embodiment of the sound and abiding principles to which we must ever remain true.

To see the truth of these statements, we need look no further than the present world struggle between communism and democracy. Communism rejects traditionalism and orthodoxy. It rejects religion and the moral and ethical principles on which all religions are based. It sets up its own credo to take the place of faith in God.

By remaining true to our religious heritage, whatever it may be, we can make a contribution toward strengthening democracy and preventing the spread of communism.

As leaders and teachers in the Jewish faith, you are able to make a significant contribution to the fight against communism, and to the preservation and improvement of the American way of life.

I hardly need tell you that social justice, which some economic and political reformers think they invented, actually has its roots in the Bible. Perhaps that is why rabbis, ministers, and priests are able to make such a valuable contribution toward the preservation of social and spiritual values, and the promotion of social justice.

The Jew has always recognized the dignity of labor. The Jewish sages have always taught that work was noble and idleness disgraceful. They actually earned their daily bread by working as tailors, carpenters, masons and in similar occupations.

The Ten Commandments contained one of the first attempts to prohibit excessive hours of labor. They not only prohibited work by the Jew on the Sabbath but also forbade him from employing his servant on that day. The servant, a fellow human being, was also entitled to a day of rest.

As you know better than I, justice to the laborer pervades much of Jewish literature. The Book of Leviticus requires that the wages of a hired servant shall not be retained overnight. He is entitled to his pay when it is due.

The Prophet Malachi preaches eloquently against those who oppress a worker in his wages.

I could go on and on, but you are more familiar with these eloquent passages than I.

Justice to labor has become part and parcel of our religious tradition.

The popes have given voice to the same sentiments. The Protestant clergy has eloquently preached the same ideals.

These ideals are the ideals of free men who know that every man is created in God's image. As long as we maintain them and carry them into effect, we need not fear the Communist threat against individual dignity and freedom.

There is a synagogue in Washington, D. C., which bears these words: "To the glory of God and the brotherhood of man." All of us—regardless of our religion—would do well to dedicate our lives in this fashion.

The very discovery of America contains lessons in brotherly cooperation for all of us. In fact, the brotherhood of the New World was quite literally the result of unbrotherly acts in the Old World.

We are all familiar with the fact that many of those who first settled in America were motivated by a yearning for religious freedom. And the great diversity of groups settling in our country was apparent from the very beginning. We had the English settlement, at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, the Dutch at New Amsterdam in 1614, the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and the Jews who landed in New York in 1655.

These were among the forerunners of the mass migrations to our shores for 3 centuries. Here millions of people have found the fulfillment of their dreams of freedom, brotherhood, and opportunity.

Here we have built a country in which the highest and best aspirations of individual human beings can be realized and rewarded. Here we have everything necessary for people to lead their lives in freedom, with dignity and with charity and brotherhood toward their fellow man.

We can be proud of what we have accomplished, but we cannot be satisfied, even today, with the conditions within our own land.

It would be nice if we could say that from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, and from Sandy Hook to the Golden Gate, all Americans were brothers, and prejudice, discrimination, and intolerance were nonexistent.

Unfortunately, however, despite all the progress of 350 years, we still have far to go. A leading public opinion analyst has estimated that "discrimination in employment wastes $10 out of every $75 pay check on the phony luxury of indulgence in our prejudices." He estimated that the annual cost of discrimination to American business and industry is $30 billion annually.

We all know of persons who preach brotherhood but do not practice it. Covert quotas still exist in some colleges and prep schools. Some businesses drastically restrict the level to which persons from minority groups may rise. One manufacturer will not have a Negro in a secretarial position; a law firm will not permit a Catholic to become a partner; an industrial enterprise will not promote Jews to executive positions; a financial institution will hire only native-born Americans. Some private employment services accept job orders that say "gentiles only," "white only," or "no non-Caucasians."

These forms of discrimination are still prevalent today. Unfortunately they sometimes occur even in firms whose officers or owners claim to practice brotherhood. They protest with indignant self-righteousness that some of their best friends are Jews, or that they have nothing against Negroes, but—.

We may properly ask: How come all this at this late date? What is stopping us as a people, individually and collectively, from living up to the principles we profess? Why aren't we translating into daily living those basic tenets which are the foundation of every religion?

In a country in which persons of various races and creeds have served in the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Federal, State and local Governments, how can we afford to reject any man, upon the basis of his race or religion or national origin? Have we not seen persons of every type make invaluable contributions to the national well-being, both in public and private life? Have not business, the arts, the sciences, the professions, labor and public service benefited from the contributions of all the highly diversified population of our country? Who can stand before God and say that he is better than his neighbor because of the color of his skin, the way he worships God, or the country from which his ancestors came?

In a world that is one-third yellow, one-third brown, and one-third white, how can America maintain its position of leadership if we consider inferior the non-white two-thirds of the world's people?

To ask these questions is to answer them. It is obvious that there is neither excuse nor justification for prejudice and discrimination. It is clear that as a Nation, both domestically and internationally, we are injured by prejudice and intolerance.

We have the words and actions of our leaders to teach us the need for brotherhood and love of our fellow man.

When George Washington visited the Hebrew Congregation at Newport, R. I., Moses Seixas, the warden of the synagogue, referred with a great sense of gratitude to the privilege of living under "a government which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance; but generously affording to all liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship, deeming everyone, of whatever nation, tongue, or language, equal parts of the great government machine."

President Washington set the theme and direction of our national aims when he replied, "It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoy the exercise of their inherent natural right, for happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that those who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Thomas Jefferson expressed the epitome of brotherhood when he said, "All men are created equal."

It was for Abraham Lincoln to emancipate the slaves and officially remove this stain upon our democracy. In his life and literature, Lincoln left us a heritage of brotherly love, "with malice toward none; with charity for all."

President Jackson to President Eisenhower, our Chief Executives have shown that people can be appointed to high office regardless of religion or race.

Since Lincoln's day the Negro has made steady progress. One occupies today a sub-Cabinet position in the United States Department of Labor, and another has for several years sat on the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. Segregation has been eliminated in the Armed Forces.

It was in 1948 that the Supreme Court struck down the restrictive covenant on real estate; and it was in 1950 that the Court opened the doors of white universities and colleges to Negroes who could not get equal facilities everywhere.

In 1954 the Supreme Court found that segregation in the public-school system is repugnant to our Constitution.

The clause in Government procurement contracts which prohibits racial and religious discrimination in employment is being enforced vigorously through the work of the President's Government Contracts Committee.

You can see that there is no one person, no one party, and no one era that can claim credit for all that has been done. Sometimes our progress has been greater, sometimes less. The fact that we have moved constantly forward, however, speaks well for the American people. It denotes their determination to take those steps necessary to make our democracy grow and to strengthen our institutions and our people.

If the progress of the past is any key to the future, it is safe to predict that in the lifetimes of many of those now sitting in this room, the last traces of discrimination based on race, color, creed, or national origin will be swept away.

The America free of prejudice which I foresee will not come by itself. It will require the continued efforts and determination of all of us. It will require patience, understanding, cooperation, and good will. It will require the translation into our daily living—at work, in our schools, and at our places of worship—of all the principles of brotherhood.

We are all aware of the fact that children of every race, color and creed can play together without difficulties. They even overcome barriers imposed by language differences, and by disparity in age. It is only from their elders that they learn the prejudice which corrodes and warps their spirits and hardens their hearts.

We have shown in many of our houses of worship, in hundreds of thousands of businesses across the land and in the Armed Forces that there is no more reason for adults to discriminate against their fellow human beings than there is for children to do so. We have shown that persons of all races, creeds, and national origins can work and live together in the military forces, in peace and war. Numerous employers and workers attest to the ease with which all types of persons can work together smoothly, efficiently and profitably. And in thousands of communities across the land, persons of different races can pray together.

So far I have discussed only the discrimination based upon race, religion or national origin. Other types of prejudice are equally costly and equally unjustified.

We are faced with a growing problem of discrimination against those of mature and advanced age. The extreme accent on youth which seems to be a part of our current national philosophy is not justified by the facts. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that older workers, property placed, are more steady, more reliable, and at least as productive as their younger fellows. In safety and attendance the records they compile set examples for younger workers to follow to advantage. Management's investment in training them is amply justified by the lower turnover rate among mature and older workers.

As a Nation, we are growing older, both with respect to the population as a whole and our labor force. There are 42 percent more workers over 45 today than there were in 1940. There are 40 percent more workers over 65 than there were 15 years ago. This trend seems certain to be accelerated in the years ahead. It is estimated that by 1970 almost half of our people of voting age will be 45 or over.

In addition to the moral wrong involved, we cannot afford the waste that is caused by discrimination against older workers. It is far more profitable to have them productive than on public assistance.

This is another area in which we must work to break down prejudice and promote understanding.

There is still one other form of prejudice which is worth studying, and that is on the basis of sex. While women are accepted as the boss in the home, they are not always

accorded the status of equals in the labor market. The affection which we feel for mothers, wives and daughters is not always translated into an equal break for women workers at the employment office when, through economic or other reasons, women must work. In addition, we too often pay women less money for the same work than we would pay to a man who did that job.

The increasing acceptance of women in all phases of this country's activities is evidence of the progress being made in the achievement of the goals for which we are working. Both President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Eisenhower named a woman as a member of their Cabinet. Women have served our Nation as Ambassadors—our present Ambassadors to Italy and Switzerland are women. Women are Members of the Congress and of State legislatures, and a number of them are serving as judges. Large numbers of women hold important posts in State, county, and local governments. And business and industry depend in large measure upon women workers. The total number of women workers, as of the latest estimate, approached 19 million. This was close to a third of the total working population of the Nation.

We in America have far less manpower than do the Communists. In numbers we stand no chance of matching them. Our effectiveness must be based upon the training and skill of our workers and the utilization we make of the talents they acquire. Those prejudices we still have based on race, color, religion, national origin, age, or sex hamper us in the effective utilization of our manpower. As individuals and as a Nation, we cannot afford the cost of this prejudice.

I am glad to see that there seems to be a growing awareness of this fact. There seems to be a real determination on the part of millions of Americans to throw off the blinders of discrimination and prejudice. There seems to be a growing realization that each man and woman is entitled to be judged upon the basis of his or her merits.

If we are to achieve our goals in the field of brotherhood, all of us must—

1. Practice brotherhood in our daily lives.
2. Teach and train and hire and promote upon the basis of ability alone, without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin.
3. Urge others with whom we work, study, pray, or socialize to practice and promote brotherhood.
4. Be positive and courageous in our attitude toward brotherhood.

If we will all follow these general rules every day of the year, we shall succeed in making a real contribution toward the strengthening and improvement of our great democracy.

In this atomic age, a little more brotherhood could be helpful in the international field also. President Eisenhower has taken several significant steps in this direction which, I believe, have and deserve the support of the American people.

You will recall that in his speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, the President made proposals for peaceful uses of the atom and stated that we must find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.

On March 19, 1955, President Eisenhower established a position in his office, with Cabinet rank, to develop the studies and conclusions on this Nation's basic policy toward the question of disarmament. This position has been designated in the press as Secretary of Peace. It is the first time that any country has ever given this kind of attention to the promotion of peace.

President Eisenhower has also made a dramatic proposal for an atomic-powered merchant ship as part of the program for peaceful uses of atomic energy. Such a ship could touch at every port in the world and demonstrate in terms that all could understand the sincerity of America's determination to harness the atom for the service of mankind rather than his destruction. Such a ship would be further evidence of America's belief in brotherhood.

We who are interested in brotherhood ought to support these proposals of the President.

Leadership of Hon. Earle C. Clements, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we miss the wonderful leadership and the presence of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], but I think we all feel that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] is doing a very splendid job under difficult circumstances.

I read a most complimentary statement with regard to the Senator from Kentucky, which was published in the Washington Star of July 10, 1955, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARLE CLEMENTS IS WELL QUALIFIED TO FILL LYNDON JOHNSON'S SHOES

(By Joseph F. McCaffrey)

For a man who has shunned publicity all his life Kentucky's EARLE CLEMENTS finds himself in an embarrassing spot as the ninth-inning replacement for the stricken Senate majority leader, LYNDON JOHNSON.

Although Senator CLEMENTS has served 32 consecutive years in public life, he still refers to himself as being "not very good copy." He professes not to think anything he says or does is worth recording. As a result, his office scrapbook is slim.

This self-effacing quality has cost the Kentuckian a certain amount of fame. A Kentucky friend says:

"If a good man would only keep track of his work in the Senate and get notices out to the papers, EARLE would be one of the most famous men in the Senate."

But Senator CLEMENTS has never found modesty a political handicap. Historians say only 90 men have served in the House, the Senate, and as State governor. EARLE CLEMENTS is one of the 90.

"I think he's solved the riddle of politics," one Republican Senator said recently. "Most of us stand in front of the curtains so we can take the bows. EARLE stands in the back of the curtain so he never gets the blame."

JOHNSON'S BACKSTAGE

Most observers credit him with as much responsibility for the smoothness of the Senate's operations in the 84th Congress as Senator JOHNSON, who was in front of the curtain.

For a relative junior, Senator CLEMENTS has had a rather spectacular Senate career. A year after joining that body in 1951, he was chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. A year and a half later, at the 1952 Democratic national convention, he worked behind the scenes to heal the North-South split.

Says Minnesota's Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Mr. CLEMENTS' Chicago role:

"I knew who EARLE CLEMENTS was, of course before the convention started. But after it was over I knew why he had come so far. There is a man who has more horsesense than any man I have met in politics."

Mr. CLEMENTS is—as a Kentuckian would say—"right proud" of the Democratic 84th Congress.

"I don't believe that to be successful there must always be cannons booming and rockets firing. Just because there is no deep, emotional conflict doesn't mean this session hasn't been productive."

HARD WORKER

Senator CLEMENTS works hard at whatever job confronts him, and has little use for emotional debates. When the time for action comes, he has the reputation of acting fast and hard—some say ruthlessly.

As governor of Kentucky he cleaned up the State park system in iron-fisted fashion. He improved State roads by the rather unpopular means of adding 2 cents to the gas tax. In a Dixie-oriented State he opened hospitals in Louisville in 1948 to postgraduate study by Negro doctors and nurses; in 1950, he allowed State-controlled schools to admit Negroes on action by the board of trustees.

Most important, he balanced the Kentucky budget, and says he'd like to see the same thing happen here.

ATTRIBUTES FOR JOB

Senator CLEMENTS brings with him in his move up from Democrtic whip to acting majority leader many of the same attributes that made Senator JOHNSON so effective: Organizational ability, a built-in card index file in his mind and a burning desire to get things done as quickly, yet as neatly as possible.

To Mr. CLEMENTS' organizational ability goes credit for the health of the Kentucky Democratic Party today. He took over its leadership in the midforties, after the Republicans had elected their first Governor in more than 20 years. Not only did he heal deep splits, but also headed the ticket which swept the State back to Democratic control.

Recently, while on a trip back home to Morganfield, the Senator took a visitor on a tour of Union County.

"Darndest thing I ever saw," said the visitor when he returned to Washington, "the Senator was county judge back in the days of WPA and all during the tour of the county he named every road and culvert that was put in with Federal money. Why, he even gave me the dates and the costs, as well as the rights-of-way involved."

All of these things contribute to Senator CLEMENTS' feeling so much "at home" in politics. During the final year of his term of Governor, in 1951, he was made attractive business offers ranging in salary from $35,000 to $50,000 a year. He turned them down to continue in politics.

Politics, after all, comes as natural to a Kentuckian as a love for blue grass and fine horses. The Senator's father had been active in local politics, so it was natural that after coming back from World War I as an infantry captain the younger Clements should run for sheriff of Union County.

After that came county clerk, county judge, a seat in the Kentucky State Senate, where he eventually served as majority leader, the House of Representatives, then Governor, and, finally, the Senate.

At 58, Senator CLEMENTS is young enough to be a vigorous and effective Senate leader, yet old enough so—under present conditions—he probably will not be the object of a Presidential boom. His advice to the young, therefore, can be taken as coming from a man at the pinnacle of both his power and his ambition.

"I'd say," says EARLE CLEMENTS, "that young men interested in public life should realize that good government is the best politics. It's been my observation that the electorate, when convinced of one's good performance, will stand by him whenever he goes before them again."

Area of Production Definitions and the Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, before the House takes under consideration the various proposals to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, specifically pertaining to an increase in the minimum wage levels, I wish to call to the attention of the membership the close association of such legislation with the administrative definitions imposed by the Secretary of Labor on "areas of production" as carried in the act.

Too, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter received from Mr. Lon Mann, of Marianna, Ark., which will give the Congress a first-hand account of how these definitions operate to impose discriminatory burdens on a part of our economy.

Mr. Mann's letter reads as follows:

MANN'S GIN, INC.,
Marianna, Ark., July 11, 1955.

Mr. E. C. GATHINGS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GATHINGS: I am the manager and a stockholder of Mann's Gin, Inc., a cotton gin located inside the city limits of Marianna, Ark., which has a population of 4,500. Due to the location of this gin we are classified as being "out of the area of production" and are subject to minimum wage laws.

At the present time there are 22 active gins in Lee County. They all gin cotton grown in this county, haul the bales to the same compress in Marianna, and haul the cottonseed to the same choice of oil mills in eastern Arkansas and Memphis, Tenn. However, only six of these gins are subject to minimum wage laws. Sixteen are not. Needless to say, this places the six gins located in the city limits of Marianna at a tremendously unfair advantage in trying to compete with the other 16 gins, some of which are only 2 miles outside the city limits.

The Marianna ginners have no desire to see every gin in the country placed under minimum wage laws because we realize that the man who will foot the bill will be the farmer, who is already caught between rising costs and declining income. However, we do not feel that it was the intent of Congress to give any particular group of ginners an advantage over their neighbors and realize that the situation that has developed is the result of a technical, rather than a practical, definition of "Area of Production" in section 536.2, title 29, chapter V, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mann's Gin, Inc., is located less than 2 blocks from cotton fields which are out of the area of production, technically speaking, because they are also inside the city limits. Farmers Gin Co., operated by A. C. Mahan and James Burkett, is just across a gravel street from a cotton field. The HYL Gin, operated by Charles Yancey, Jr., is just across a drainage ditch from a field of cotton. This situation is not unusual. Every country town in the cotton country has cotton gins and cotton fields well within the city limits.

The solution to this situation in my humble opinion is merely to recognize the facts and to either delete ginning from the group of industries covered by minimum wage laws or change the definition of Area of Production to mean any county on which cotton is grown as a major crop.

Any assistance that you can give me and the rest of the ginners in this same situation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

MANN'S GIN, INC.,
LON MANN.

Mr. Speaker, this statement by a cotton ginner clearly illustrates the inequity under the definition of the Secretary of Labor. To carry this matter one step further, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a news release I issued on July 8, 1955, which shows in some detail the operations of this law under this definition and its effect on our farmers:

AREA OF PRODUCTION DEFINITIONS AND THE MINIMUM WAGE

(By Hon. E. C. "TOOK" GATHINGS, of Arkansas)

The farmer goes to the marketplace and asks "What am I offered?" for the American farmer must sell his product in the market and pay, in great part, for the processing of that product for the market. The cotton farmer's price for his cotton must absorb the cost of ginning. The farmer cannot pass on to the consumer any increase in his cost of production.

There are many complex reasons why farm net income has declined in recent years, but certainly one of the principal reasons is the increased cost of marketing farm products, and the increased cost of production from higher farm labor and equipment costs. The following information, taken from official Government sources, shows graphically what has been happening to our farmers:

[Billions of dollars]

Year	Gross farm income	Production expense	Net farm income	Labor cost of distributing farm products
1947	34.0	17.2	16.8	10.6
1948	34.5	18.9	15.6	11.5
1949	31.8	18.2	13.6	12.1
1950	32.1	19.7	12.4	12.7
1951	36.9	22.4	14.5	13.9
1952	36.8	23.2	13.6	14.7
1953	35.4	22.2	13.3	15.5
1954	34.0	21.5	12.5	(1)

[1] Not available.

These figures show that in agriculture, since 1949, costs have gone up 11 percent while the farmers' net income has fallen 8 percent. To increase the minimum-wage level, as has been proposed in legislation now before the Congress, will have a most serious effect on American agriculture.

When the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed in 1938, the Congress realized the need for exempting agricultural workers and, in addition, the exemption of operations and processes involved in preparing for market and handling agricultural commodities.

The Congress was advised by representatives from the Cotton Belt that the cotton farmer pays the cost of his ginning, and that to increase the cost of ginning would result in reductions in the farmers' income. Accordingly, the Congress placed in the law an exemption of such agricultural handling operations within the area of production.

However, despite the clear intent of Congress, the Secretary of Labor, through the definition of "area of production," has virtually nullified this exemption. So well have they drawn their definition that only 14 percent of the cotton gins in the Nation are exempt under the bureaucratic decree, and only 4 percent of the cotton compresses are eliminated from the provisions of the minimum wage and maximum-hours law. Now that these proposals are before the Congress to increase the minimum wage, these definitions imposed by the Secretary of Labor pose an increasing threat to the farmer.

Under the present departmental definition, and it will be remembered that earlier definitions issued by the Secretary have been condemned and nullified by the Federal courts, a cotton gin in a rural county of Arkansas is not considered as being in the area where cotton is raised if (1) more than 5 percent of the cotton received at the gin in any month was transported more than 10 miles from the farm, or (2) if the cotton gin was within 1 mile of a village having a population in excess or 2,500, or 3 miles of a city having a population of 50,000.

Another example to indicate the extent to which this definition has nullified the intent of the Congress to exempt operations and processes involved in handling and preparing for market of agricultural commodities is the fact that cotton warehouses in the Cotton Belt which handle 94 percent of the cotton crop are not considered by the Department as being in the area where cotton is produced.

And, in the case of poultry, the Department of Labor has ruled that it is not an agricultural commodity and, therefore, dressing and preparing poultry for market is not exempt.

Nor does the Department of Labor take into consideration new processes and techniques in preparing food for the market. Canning of fruit and vegetables is exempt but the freezing of foodstuff is not. Today, great savings to the consumer have been effected by packing some vegetables in the field and hauling them to the packing sheds for precooling prior to shipment. Yet, this new technique is penalized by the Department which has ruled that since the packing is done in the field the cooling operation is not exempt.

It is apparent that action should be taken to eliminate the Department of Labor's authority to restrict and nullify the intent of Congress and that careful study must be given to any proposal to increase the minimum wage level in order to protect the farm economy. To increase the minimum wage 33⅓ percent, as has been adopted by the Senate, together with a continuation of the Department of Labor's definition of "area of production," would result in great damage to our farm population and to the Nation's welfare.

Price of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial from the Daily Pantagraph, of Bloomington, Ill., for June 19, 1955, opposing the efforts to amend the Natural Gas Act to destroy Federal controls over the in-

terstate sale prices of natural-gas producers.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL GAS PRICE ISSUE AFFECTS YOU

Every central Illinois family depending upon gas for range, water heater, or residence heating has an interest in the struggle now going on in Congress to remove natural gas from price regulation at the point where it is sold to pipeline companies. There has been no question of regulation at retail level but the price in Bloomington is affected by the price where the gas enters the pipeline.

There has been dispute over the power and right of the Federal Power Commission to regulate wellhead prices ever since the Natural Gas Act was passed in 1938. The law was not clear on that point and regulation of wholesale prices was forestalled by one method or another.

Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, pushed a bill through Congress in 1950 to make sure that no such regulation take place. It was vetoed by former President Truman.

Then in 1954 the Supreme Court ruled in a case involving the Phillips Petroleum Co. that the FPC does in fact have power to regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead, and the FPC has done so since that decision was given.

The Eisenhower administration has let it be known that legislation similar to the Kerr bill might be looked upon with favor. Several bills have been introduced to exempt natural gas at the point of production. One, House Resolution 4560, has been at the hearing stage before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The fight is based almost entirely upon regional interests. Legislators from States producing most of the natural gas are strongly backing the bill to free production and gathering of gas from price regulation. Legislators from States where much of it is consumed want the regulation. Producers oppose regulation; consumers want it.

The chief argument for exemption from regulation is based on the claim that production is highly competitive as against the monopolistic nature of the pipeline transmission firms and the retailers. Such organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce and the Illinois Chamber of Commerce have taken this position.

Proponents of regulation base their case on the argument that price at the distribution point cannot be effectively regulated if the price at the source is not regulated. Production is part of the natural gas monopoly system, they hold.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, scores in attacking the competitive claim of the exemption group with this statement:

"According to sworn testimony before the Federal Power Commission by a number of pipeline executives, all the competition in the gas fields is between buyers seeking a supply of gas." He also says that 70 percent of the independent producers account for only three-tenths of 1 percent of the total gas sold to interstate pipeline companies while 7 producers supply one-third the total and 100 companies produce more than 85 percent of the total.

Senator DOUGLAS further holds that pipeline companies are limited in their opportunity to purchase additional gas to fields close to the existing pipelines. To say that 5,000 producing companies are in competition with each other for sales to pipelines is like saying that grocers in Richmond, Va., are in competition with grocers in Kalamazoo, Mich., he asserts.

It appears to us that the issue should be settled on the basis of well-established national policy on monopolies. That is: Whenever a basic commodity or resource essential to the national welfare is so used by monopoly control as to force prices up, the monopoly must be broken up or must be regulated by Government.

Utilities are recognized as being monopolistic by nature. Traditional United States policy favors regulation as against Government operation.

This being national policy, the gas issue rests on the question as to whether production of natural gas at the source is a part of the overall natural gas monopoly. It appears to us to be inseparable from such monopoly.

Thus it follows that unless the price is regulated at the point where it enters the pipeline no price regulation system can do more than pass on to the consumer any increase in price at the point of entry. If this be the case, there can be no real price regulation without power to regulate natural gas prices at the source.

It is our further concern that exemption of natural gas production from price control at the wellhead will not strengthen free competitive enterprise in this field but rather crystalize sentiment in favor of nationalization of utilities.

Amicable Franco-American Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial reproduced in the July 7 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald. The editorial was presented as a public service by Mr. A. N. Spanel, chairman of the board of the International Latex Corp.

This editorial proves, if proof be needed, the value of the friendship between France and the United States. As a result of amicable Franco-American relations, the United States aircraft industry is being licensed by French companies responsible for some important and ingenious inventions in the production of jet planes.

Mr. Spanel and his company are to be highly commended for calling to the attention of the American people this splendid example of international cooperation among nations of the free world. This is but another example of the mutual value that comes from close working relations between dependable allies.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY LICENSED BY THE FRENCH

PARIS.—There are many evidences here of a growing collaboration between the United States and French aircraft industries which will work to the advantage of both nations and contribute considerably to Europe's future safety.

The French are doing a remarkable job in exploiting fields of aviation design neglected by more powerful nations because of the international race to build the fastest and longest-ranged bombers, fighters, and guided missiles. These fields include small, low-thrust jet engines; ram-jet-powered military interceptors; transports having high lift and great economy of operation; jet-powered executive and private aircraft, and certain types of helicopters.

IMPRESSIVE PRODUCTION LICENSES

The list of production licenses and similar agreements sold by French aircraft firms to United States aircraft companies already is impressive. Continental Motors acquired the rights to build and market the French Turbomeca jet engine line, including some having only a few hundred pounds of thrust.

Aerojet Corp., which produces most of the rocket take-off-assist devices used by the United States Air Force and Navy, acquired sole production and sales rights in the United States for a new device to reverse the thrust of jet engines developed by the Societe Nationale d'Etude et de Construction de Moteurs d'Aviation. Beechcraft now is demonstrating Morane-Saulnier four-place executive and private aircraft throughout America with a view to mass producing it there.

UNITED STATES FIRMS SENDING EXPERTS

Republic Aviation, of Farmingdale, L. I., which has built a majority of the new jet fighters and fighter-bombers being used by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces, is sending its top experts to Toulouse to look over the new twin-jet Caravelle medium-range transport plane. They will decide soon whether it would be a good item for their company to produce.

The Societe Nationale de Constructions Aeronautiques du Sud Est (SNCASE), which designed and built the Caravelle, is already engaged in maintenance work on Republic Thunderjet fighters of the French air force at its Toulouse factory. It produces important elements of the F-84-F version of the aircraft for NATO at Marignane.

Several United States companies have become interested in the tiny Djinn helicopter which was put in production by another French company, the Societe Nationale de Constructions Aeronautiques du Sud Ouest (SNCASO) after exhaustive tests in the Alps. Negotiations for United States rights are now in progress. The Djinn's rotor blades are driven by jets of compressed air created by a Turbomeca engine of about 240 horsepower.

FRENCH CARGO TRANSPORTS

Breguet, one of the oldest French firms, has designed a cargo transport called the Integral, which strongly interests United States Army logistical specialists. Its souffle wing will have a movable flap that transforms the thrust of its four turbine-propeller (turboprop) engines and large propeller blades from a horizontal plane downward into a vertical one. This would give the craft great vertical lift and extremely short takeoff and landing runs.

It is being observed here that the United States and French aircraft industries complement each other to a greater degree than any other two industries in the world.

The United States industry is one organized primarily for mass production, although its facilities for research are not excelled by those of any other nation. Its long-range aircraft have dominated world civil and military aviation in performance, even though the numerical production of Soviet Russia has been larger since the end of World War II.

The French industry has in production at least 14 aircraft types with several others in preproduction, but its unit costs are bound to be large for most types because there is no domestic demand equaling that of the United States and Britain to start the ball rolling. American and French experts rightly feel that French ingenuity can be tremendously valuable in filling gaps not being explored with intensity on the other side of the Atlantic. (Ansel E. Talbert, military and aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune.)

Presented as a public service by—
INTERNATIONAL LATEX CORP
DOVER, DEL.

Greed for Water Prompts California Opposition to Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, having replied in full to the attack the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] made against the Colorado River project on May 19, 1955, I intend today, or I indicated at the close of my remarks yesterday, to explore some aspect of the subject: Southern Califronia's Opposition to the Colorado River Project.

Mr. Speaker, there is one aspect of this problem of agricultural surpluses that does relate to the upper Colorado River storage project but it has nothing to do with agriculture in the upper basin States of Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. That is the matter of the growth of the cotton industry in southern California and its dependence upon water directed from the Colorado River which belongs to the four upper basin States. As you will recall from my earlier remarks, the Commodity Credit Corporation, as of May 31, 1955, had $1,113,018,141 invested in some 6,512,142 bales of upland cotton. More significant, however, is the fact that as of May 31, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 1,727,725 bales of upland cotton valued at $302,175,455.

Along with this increase in CCC holdings of cotton, we also note, Mr. Speaker, that the production of cotton in California has skyrocketed. The cotton acreage for the State of California over the past 9 years is as follows, Mr. Speaker, according to the Cotton Branch of the Commodity Stabilization Service of the United States Department of Agriculture:

[Acres]

Year	Imperial County	Riverside County	San Joaquin County	All other counties	California
1945	9	1,091	317,900	----------	319,000
1946	9	829	358,162	----------	359,000
1947	9	2,891	533,100	----------	536,000
1948	80	3,660	806,220	40	810,000
1949	395	7,725	922,830	50	931,000
1950	725	4,018	578,257	----------	583,000
1951	31,300	26,385	1,255,965	1,350	1,315,000
1952	90,800	33,720	1,266,400	2,080	1,393,000
1953	116,630	46,500	1,182,750	2,120	1,348,000
1954	68,655	26,387	848,875	2,075	945,992

Statistics alone, Mr. Speaker, cannot adequately describe the tremendous size of the California cotton industry, but the following statement from an article entitled "Cotton-Circa, 1955: The Cotton Belt Moves Westward" in the magazine Tideways for May 1955, which is published by the Port of Stockton, Calif., describes this tremendous growth as follows:

> The word "cotton" might conjure up pictures of moss-draped Savannah plantations, darkies singing "Tote that barge," or southern colonels riding horseback through their Mississippi Delta acres. This is cotton in the tradition; it's business—a gigantic business. Since the curtain rang down on the second war to end all wars, cotton growers in California have added some startling chapters to the cotton story.
>
> Here sharecroppers became multimillionaires. Here huge groaning earth-moving machines scraped the valley floor level as a sheet of glass. Here miles and miles of irrigation canals brought water to the thirsty fields.
>
> Cotton is big in California—the State's most valuable crop. * * * With the added productivity of Imperial and Riverside Counties, about 1½ million bales of cotton are grown on a million California acres (pp. 8–10).

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note that in 1953 California farmers derived 16 percent of their income from the sale of basic commodities, all of which are in surplus today, with the possible exception of peanuts. But, and this is important, Mr. Speaker, of this 16 percent, 13 percent of California farmers' income in 1953 was derived from the sale of cotton.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the history of California does indeed add some interesting chapters, not only to the cotton story but the upper Colorado River storage project as well.

For example, the gentleman from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has never told the Members of this body that the increase of cotton acreage from 9 acres in 1945 to 116,630 acres by 1953 in the Imperial Valley was made possible by diverting Colorado River water onto that land. The same is true of the increase from 1,091 acres in 1945 to 46,500 acres in 1953 in the Palo Verde and Coachella Valleys in Riverside County.

Why was it, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from southern California was quick at the outset of his attack upon the Colorado River storage project on May 19 to point out that his "remarks must not be construed as an attack on all reclamation policies"—RECORD, May 19, page 5687? Because he knows as well as I do that California has become the great diversified agricultural State it has, only because of water. He knows that its future will be greater if California can get more water. For example, the gentleman from southern California voted for the Trinity River diversion Central Valley project in California, nor is it likely that he will oppose any project that will benefit his State of California. He did not raise the question of surpluses in connection with the Trinity project although he did with respect to the Colorado River project. His inconsistency with respect to reclamation, Mr. Speaker, was clearly evident in the colloquy between himself and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], following the address on May 23, of my colleague from Utah [Mr. DAWSON]. Since it is so appropriate, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read Mr. MILLER'S remarks:

> I notice the gentleman from California attacks the project [Colorado River] because it would add to crop surpluses. One of the first places in the record as being opposed to irrigation, Is the Imperial Irrigation District would be if they did not have water to put on that great valley? It is a little amazing when he finally boils it down that he is opposed to two projects, namely the upper Colorado, and the Arkansas-Fryingpan. His arguments in the RECORD are not very consistent when they are based against an irrigation project because of surpluses; as a matter of fact, the crops produced under irrigation projects [Colorado] do not add to the surplus. (RECORD, May 23, p. 5828.)

He is opposed to the upper Colorado River project not because of the intrinsic worth of any of the special arguments he has presented but because southern California agriculture as well as southern California municipalities and industry want all of the Colorado River including that which belongs to the four upper-basin States of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico. This is water which by default goes to southern California unless the proposed storage projects are built. Let no one "kid" themselves about this.

Put in a few words, as my colleague from Utah [Mr. DAWSON], did so well in his talk on May 23:

> It is not irrigating acreage in Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah some 10 to 15 years from now that threatens to add to our surplus. We need not fear that. But if southern California could steal this water it would be added to the other Colorado River water now being used to grow cotton on vast irrigated tracts of land. Here is a commodity not in short supply and one not needed to feed our expanding population. (RECORD, May 23, p. 5827.)

Here is the crux of the matter. You Representatives from the great cotton-producing States of the South ought to be able to see the "cloth of which this southern California argument against the upper Colorado River storage project is made of."

The gentleman from southern California complained or asked why we should put land into production when acreage allotments are being cut, although this, as I have pointed out, in previous remarks on this subject, is not related to the Colorado River storage project. You ought to ask him why the cotton-acreage allotments were cut so drastically in 1954 and 1955. Why? Because between new California acreage competing for allotments and a decline in the cotton export market, cotton-acreage allotments in the Southern States have taken great cuts as you know. And you can bet that they will be cut further if California continues to bring new acres into production with the help of Colorado River water which belongs to Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Colorado.

Is there little wonder why the gentleman from southern California was able to put a list of some 205 California public and private organizations in the RECORD which opposed the construction of the upper Colorado River storage project? Let us examine a few of them. He lists the Imperial Irrigation District as No. 29. Why is it against this project? Because its farmers want Colorado River water to grow more cotton. He lists as No. 72 the Caleot, Ltd., of Bakersfield, Calif. This is a cooperative organization of some 3,000 farmers who grow cotton. He lists as No. 44, the Imperial County Farm Bureau. Why is it opposed? Because its members grow cotton on new acreage with upper basin States water from the Colorado River.

Some 35 to 40 agricultural organizations in California were listed as opposing this project. Why? They want all the water from the Colorado River whether it legally belongs to them or not. The California power and water lobby likewise is not really concerned about Dinosaur National Monument or the claim of invasion. Since Senator WATKINS exploded that myth several weeks ago, their attack has shifted to this one of agricultural surpluses which I have discussed on several occasions. Yet it didn't bother California Representatives when they voted for the Trinity project on June 31, 1955.

Nor do they really think that increased agricultural production in the four upper basin States as a result of the construction of this project will add to our agricultural surpluses.

These are but red herrings which southern Californians used to hide the real reason why they are opposed to the upper Colorado River project. Simply put, they want all the water they can get from the Colorado River whether it belongs to them or not. Mr. Speaker, this concludes my remarks.

Address by Hon. W. St. John Garwood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address deliverd by the Honorable W. St. John Garwood, distinguished associate justice of the Supreme Court of Texas, before the Tennessee Bar Association on June 17, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF W. ST. JOHN GARWOOD, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS, TO BAR ASSOCIATION OF TENNESSEE, MEMPHIS, TENN., JUNE 17, 1955

Mr. Toastmaster, Mr. Chief Justice, and other dignitaries to my right and left, you charming ladies, whose bright presence so illuminates these erstwhile somber gatherings of our profession; your honors and lawyers of the free State of Watauga, Franklin, and Tennessee, especially after such an introduction from an accomplished introducer like Captain Chandler, you may well be discontented with this speech; but you need not be discouraged by the title. The titles to my speeches, like authorities cited in my opinions, are sometimes quite irrelevant to the subject matter. Texas being ever more prolific of lawyers, even as she is of oil lands wherefore to litigate (in occasional definance of the statute of frauds and the parol evidence rule) our court this past year has been quite crowded. So when your diligent president lately requested the title of my address, and I had neither address nor title, I bethought me of what happened in a similar situation concerning a lecture at the law school of our State university. I told the student committee the title would be supplied later and, of course, forgot about it. On arrival at the lecture hall with some vague notes on a subject like "Does Oral Argument Really Help?" I was shocked to see on the bulletin board an impressive picture of the speaker and underneath in mammoth letters "Come and Hear Supreme Court Justice Speak on Law Is Universal." I said, "Who, in God's name, told you I would speak on 'Law is Universal'?" They replied, "Oh don't mind that, Judge. You wouldn't give us a title, and we had to have one to go with the picture, so we figured that 'law' and 'universal' would fit just about anything you might say." So I told President Kuhn I would speak on Law Is Universal, and that is still all he knows about it.

While I have, as yet, no purpose to seek public office in this "old and famous" State—like so many Tennessee lawyers have successfully done in Texas—I yet feel myself no stranger here. The mighty Sam Houston and the daily more immortal David Crockett were not the only Tennessee-Texans. The prolific blood of this commonwealth probably permeates at least one-seventh of our seven millions plus population; and doubtless accounts for four-sevenths of our political and jurisprudential energy. The first Chief Justice of the Texas Republic was James Collinsworth, formerly United States District Attorney for the western district of Tennessee. True, the Chief Justice actually committed suicide before he wrote any opinions; but this was probably less out of disrespect for our Supreme Court than despondency over the then prospects of law enforcement in Texas. And from that time onward we have rarely been without a native Tennessean on our Supreme Court, not to speak of our Court of Criminal Appeals, 11 Courts of Civil Appeals and some 160 district courts. Even today my able brother on our court and former speaker of our House of Representatives, Robert W. Calvert, boasts nativity in the Tennessee metropolis of Pulaski Post Office. And, of course, we have had even more Tennessee-Texas lawyers than judges or other officials. Even the first Hebrew in Texas was a Tennessee lawyer, Capt. Adolphus Sterne, from Memphis. He was also a warrior, in the Sam Houston tradition, and with other east Texans, started the so-called Freedonian Rebellion against Mexico in 1835—apparently by way of quieting their title, if any, to some east Texas lands, no adequate remedy at law being available. The Mexicans vigorously abated that premature action, and for a while lawyer Sterne languished under sentence of death, without benefit of habeas corpus; but his legal gifts somehow eventually redeemed what his military talents nearly lost. My wife's father might have been a fine Tennessee-Texas lawyer. At the ripe age of 16 he was a court reporter at Jackson; but evidently that closeup view of the profession somehow caused him to enter the cotton business.

We almost had two Tennessee-Texas lawyer presidents of the United States. They say Sam Houston would have got there, but for the local furor against his antisecession views, and Sam Rayburn would have been vice president and president, instead of Mr. Truman, if some individualistic fellow in Mr. Rayburn's home district hadn't chosen that particular time to run against him for Congress. Now that we don't know who belongs to what party in our demopublican or republicratic state, our political future is obscure, but whatever it may be, some Tennessee-Texan will probably have a large part in it.

My distinguished friend, Senator KEFAUVER, said in Houston last month that Tennessee is literally a parent of Texas. And that's the way we look at it, whether you consider us as children that would inherit from you under the common law or otherwise. When I visited Lookout Mountain some years back, where my wife's people had a summer home, I started a conversation with an old Negro gardener about the many Tenneseans that came to Texas, including a lot of my own and my wife's relatives. "Yassuh," he said, "that sho' is a fack. We has a sayin' hesh about it. When somebody's gone and we can't find him, we say, 'guess he stole a hoss and went to Texas'." Then, after some thought, he added, "But I reckon yo' folks didn't steal no hoss."

In a sense he may have had something there, so far as one side of my family goes. Now that the question of secession is almost res judicata or stare decisis in Texas—except for occasional arguments about things like the tidelands oil or preemptive Federal jurisdiction in labor cases—Sam Houston now represents to us just about what George Washington does to Americans generally. And would that, in this distinguished company tonight, I could truly boast some close connection with him. But, alas, it had to be that my one and only relative in the Texas Revolution, a Kentucky hotblood called Capt. Robert Coleman, was so unmindful of his own posterity as to become General Houston's particular enemy and get himself kicked out of the Texas Army after the battle of San Jacinto for libeling the General's military talents as well as his private morals.

The Garwoods have since tried bravely to regain face. My father took his bachelor of arts degree at old Sewanee some 70 years ago, and, representing that institution, won the intercollegiate oratorical contest at Nashville over Lebanon's champion, who was our subsequently famous Senator Joe Bailey, and Vanderbilt's candidate, Texan T. W. Gregory, later Attorney General of the United States. How in Tennessee, to which high oratory is more indigenous than cotton, corn, and some products of corn one reads about, how in Tennessee, these three Texans could have made the finals of an oratorical championship, always puzzled me. The answer doubtless is that the native orators, like their illustrious ancestors, and their nationally known successors of this very day, were busy in Illinois, New York, or California—bearing the true gospel to hungry foreigners who needed it more than the folks back home.

I first contributed my bit to the family redemption by becoming acquainted with Bill Goodman and the Honorable Prentiss Cooper, who were shining lights at Harvard Law School in my day there. Their subsequent accomplishments have gratified the Harvard alumni everywhere, but more importantly Governor Cooper's have been of great service to Texas jurisprudence. We Texas judges have unfortunately to wrestle with politics as well as the law—as if either one wasn't enough by itself. In my first, and nearly last, primary race following appointment to the bench I drew as an opponent a mysterious possessor of a law license, who probably had never filed suit on a promissory note, but who did have the $100 filing fee and the highly politicogenic name of Jefferson G. Smith. Now to match a name like Jefferson G. Smith with W. St. John Garwood in the piney woods of East Texas and the windy plains of the West was bad enough. But on top of that, to have to admit being a Harvard graduate almost foreclosed a promising judicial career. It would have been about as short as Chief Justice Collinsworth's, if I hadn't been able to prove by Governor Cooper that the great State of Tennessee actually preferred Harvard men for high office. I probably won't need the Governor in future elections, because the filing fee has now been raised to $750, and, on advice of counsel, I plan to change my name, St. John, to Stonewall Jackson. But his aid in a dark hour will not soon be forgotten.

Actually, we Texans are less conscious of Tennessee as a parent than we are proud of her simply for what she is. You may be far from the oldest, richest, biggest (or loud-

est) of the States, but we all know that the big men of Tennessee have been big everywhere. One with the people and things back home, they have yet understood and left their imprint on the whole Nation. One with our great Nation, they have yet understood that world problems are our problems and have tackled them with courage and imagination. They were statesmen, as well as good lawyers and able politicians. They were men of character, who would not suppress an original idea out of timidity or purchase popularity with conformity.

When the rural southern Democrat, Andrew Jackson, said, "Our Federal Union. It must be preserved," it did not confuse him that Alexander Hamilton, of New York, had felt the same way and that John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, felt rather differently. Jackson's disciple, Sam Houston, for the same conviction, walked out of the governor's office in Texas in 1861 amid the jeers of the crowd that had once acclaimed him as its hero and would in a later and sadder hour recall his honest prophesy of defeat.

The southern Republican, Andrew Johnson, who risked both friendship and life in his convictions in a bitterly divided State, was the same Andrew Johnson, who, in the face of impeachment and almost alone, defended a prostrate South against an American Congress of his own party that did not know the difference between patriotism and vengeance.

Next to the great experiment of the men of 1787, who made America out of a group of remote and selfishly divided little sovereign ties, perhaps next to that in importance in the development of the United States was the combined action of Jackson, Houston, and James K. Polk in bringing together the United States and the sovereign, if somewhat shaky, Republic of Texas, thereby repatriating a lot of valuable Tennesseans, acquiring a big new State and getting color of title to most of what is now the Western area of the Nation; and this over the violent protest of about half of the political leaders of America, who, lacking the vision of the great Tennesseans, could see only the immediate and emotional issue of slavery.

Cordell Hull will no doubt go down in history as the key figure in the transition of our national attitude on world affairs from that of a sort of reluctant ex post facto intervention in particular wars or other crises to that of a deliberate, constant effort to influence future world development in the interest of peace and progress for motives of enlightened self-interest.

If I have any statement worthy of your serious thought tonight, it would be along this latter line, even though I might thus appear to this professional gathering like the justice of the peace, who "knew no law, to speak of."

In the short period since 1914 swift historic currents have moved this Nation from economic and political isolationism and military unpreparedness to where we are a sort of de facto government of a large part of the world. Eastward and westward our military, economic, and political power reaches out beyond the seas to stop only at the Iron Curtain. On the very soil of many a proud sovereign nation is to be seen today the physical presence of our influence—both animate and inanimate—in impressive volume and variety, though largely military and for the limited purpose of joint defense. Nobody originally wanted it so. But it is so; and not because of any improvident executive agreements at Yalta or Potsdam, but in great part because America, who was not soon enough conscious of her own power and true interests, twice remained both unarmed and uninterested in the face of impending world wars, which she might have prevented, but which have at long last left her to replace the British and French, in the front lines of civilization's defense.

Nor, it now seems, do even the last internationalistic among us want to pull back to within our own borders, canceling our costly overseas commitments and assuming the risk of what may happen on the far sides of the two oceans. And rightly so. Indeed, some fruits of our present politico-military "one worldism" seem almost to be ripening.

Even so, after the experience of two world wars in 25 years, followed by 10 years of cold war, including Korea, we Americans know at last that life in the international field is no more static than life generally. If Russia continues to pull back her military lines, it will be hard for us not to follow suit; and how do we know that the same thing will not happen that followed Yalta and Potsdam? On the other side of the world, defeated and disoriented Japan, with nearly 90 million of bold and capable people packed in rocky islands half the size of Texas and dependent for life itself upon manufactured exports, is an obviously prospective recruit for the firm of Marx, Krushchev and Mao. "Neutral" and hungry India is another and vast question mark, not to mention Burma and all of southeast Asia. Granting that all tyranny is unstable, it yet seems reckless to assume that Russia or any of the large Asiatic nations will soon sink into innocuous weakness. The chairman of our Joint Chief of Staff has recently said just that. In other words, for all the "new look" since Stalin's death, the good old days of no military service, no income tax, and few southwestern reporters on the shelf will probably not soon return. The cold war may last like that between Rome and Carthage and then reach its atomic showdown. And this time we all understand that it will be, not just somebody else's war, like we used to say, but first and foremost our war.

And the results—immediate and remote—of any large modern war, are not less clear to all of us. We know that in modern war defeat is unspeakable and victory an illusion; that the very Marxist totalitarianism, which now threatens us, had its birth in war; that law, cherished political institutions, sound economics, free enterprise, and even public and private morals may well be wrecked by one more modern war. We know that even protracted expectation of war takes a toll of the same kind if of less degree.

These facts clearly underlie both what has been repeatedly stated by many leaders of the western world, including President Eisenhower and Sir Winston Churchill, and, indeed, what is actually being done, in the direction of a more real unity between the similar allied and largely peaceful nations of the West. If they had had in the 1930's a common policy and direction in the matter of world affairs and armament, there would probably have been on World War II that created a new world yet more dangerous, socialistic and unhappy than the old. Unless they can achieve and maintain a greater unity than the present largely military arrangement of NATO and the nine-power pact, it is doubtful if that alliance will hold in the face of the shrewd and ruthless tactics of a determined and powerful enemy, with whose philosophy and objects we are all too familiar. As Arnold Toynbee, rated the greatest historian of this century, wrote just a few weeks ago in the New York Times Magazine, "If we mean, as we do, to save our way of life, we peoples of the free world cannot rest satisfied with our present relations with one another. It is not satisfactory that France should have been able to torpedo the well-considered policy of all the other NATO countries by rejecting the EDC treaty. It is not satisfactory that Britain should have been able to drive a big nail into EDC's coffin, as Britain undoubtedly did by failing to join EDC herself. It is not satisfactory that the United States should have it in her power to involve her European allies in an H-bomb war without their having a say in a decision at Washington which, for Europe, might prove to be a condemnation to annihilation."

Actually our enormous reliance on the NATO arrangement connotes of itself at least an assumption that these nations will always act as a unit. More importantly, the transcendent step of rearming our late enemy, Germany, implies, not merely the gravity of the times, but also the proposition that out future close association with Germany will somehow keep her from acting as she did in 1914 and 1939. One may well ask, what kind of close association will it be that can control the future conduct of a strong and sovereign nation? One may ask also, how dare we risk again a voluntary reduction of our armament, costly as it is, without at least some new and powerful assurance that the armaments and resources of our NATO allies will be on our side if Russia goes back on her agreements yet another time?

Thus the question of closer unity between the similar peoples of the world versus the concept of complete national sovereignty may well be the great issue of this generation. To quote Mr. Toynbee again, "Unless we can bring ourselves to enter into a much closer union with one another at the price of painful sacrifices of sovereignty all around, NATO will be in danger of breaking up." Obviously, neither through the United Nations nor otherwise can there be anything like a de jure "world government" in the foreseeable future. But, when one imagines, for example, a real federal union between particular peoples like ourselves and the Canadians—which seems a rather natural thing—does it not seem also at least possible that all the NATO nations, which are not greatly different from us or among themselves, might be willing and able to become a true federation, for the limited purposes of defense, foreign policy, and commerce between themselves? Already, by formal treaty, which, of course, involves a de jure, if not de facto, limitation of sovereignty by the contracting parties, we have gone far in this direction in the matter of defense, and we may soon go so far as to offer guaranties to Russia against aggression by Germany and our other associates. As regards commerce, we see today the rather convincing spectacle of a Republican President and much of the biggest of Republican big business vigorously arguing for more free trade in the interest of sound economy and world peace. If some such union be accomplished, considering the combined resources, talents, numbers, greater unity of action, and world influence it would afford, it might well be a real answer to the undoubtedly doubtful question of whether our civilization will survive the next 50 years, and it would fit into the United Nations as a proper regional grouping, even as the Communist bloc now constitutes such a group in all except the name.

Balancing the possibilities, including the many obvious doubts and difficulties, against the present and future dangers and costs that confront us, Senator KEFAUVER and a goodly number of other distinguished Senators and Congressmen, including some from this State, believe that the matter is at least worth a serious investigation. These gentlemen have accordingly introduced a congressional resolution whereby this Nation should invite the other NATO nations to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from such other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and report on the possibilities of closer union between their peoples along the lines I have suggested. The active supporters of the resolution outside of Con-

gress, while not large in number, are a cross section of the best minds in business and the professions in this Nation, including some distinguished people in this State, city, and this very audience.

The convention, of course, could bind nobody to anything, even a moral commitment, but that is said to be its principal virtue. The delegates, being private citizens, although appointed by governments, could speak and recommend with unusual freedom. Even the publicity attendant on such a meeting would probably focus world thought as nothing else could upon the necessity for world order and the possibility of achieving it by means short of war. It would, incidentally, disconcert the Russians. It might suggest, if not a union itself, at least some other practical, positive approach to the problem of life in an atomic world. Personally, I do hope the resolution will pass, and that as a result of it, or some other statesmanlike effort, at least some more realistic unity can be achieved between the NATO peoples. The left will, of course, condemn the idea as encouraging a new capitalistic, white-race imperialism. The right will damn it as a scheme to dilute American institutions, free enterprise, and high living standards by association with the worn-out European peoples. And there may well be objections to it more valid than either of these. Yet since a real world government is impractical, and what we have, much as it is, is not enough, what are we to do? One can hardly believe that all we hear from admittedly great men about the need for greater unity among like-minded people in this obviously shrinking world is just words, words, words. Surely wise old Sir Winston meant something quite serious when he gave as the theme for his final volume about World War II, How the Great Democracies Triumphed and So Were Able To Resume the Follies Which Had So Nearly Cost Them Their Life. The size, number, and rapidity of events in the last 40 years indicate that great, new world forces are at work which must be understood and somehow managed. They may, as some historians think, involve the breakdown of nationalism as people have heretofore known and revered it.

Most lawyers understandably view new institutions with more than average suspicion. And yet, in all candor, I suggest that our law, despite its own greatness, is but a manifestation—one of several manifestations—of a deeper greatness of our people, to wit, the innate ability to cope with events and bring out of them the good and orderly way of life; that, if we fail to cope with events, our good law of today may go the way the good law of Rome went, when the barbarian crashed her gates. I suggest finally that the Tennessee tradition is one of lawyers who do cope with events; and that thus we Texans will always rest easier having joined a Nation in the government of which Tennessee lawyers will always have an influential part.

Exemption of Natural Gas Rates From Federal Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I recently prepared for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch an article analyzing the proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act and outlining some of the reasons why exemption from Federal regulation of the gas producers' interstate sales is against the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that this article of mine from the June 26, 1955, issue of the Post-Dispatch be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUGLAS ASSAILS $600-MILLION-A-YEAR GRAB TO EXEMPT NATURAL-GAS RATES FROM FEDERAL CONTROL—ILLINOIS SENATOR SPELLS OUT OPPOSITION TO FULBRIGHT BILL IN SENATE AND HARRIS BILL IN HOUSE

(By PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senator, Democrat, Illinois)

Consumers' gas bills—residential, industrial, and commercial—are bound to increase by 8 to 25 million dollars a year in Missouri, by 14 to 44 million dollars a year in Illinois, by 11 to 33 million dollars a year in Arkansas, and by comparable amounts elsewhere if the powerful oil industry has its way in the present Congress.

At issue is a bill (the Harris bill in the House, the Fulbright bill in the Senate) to exempt from Federal regulations the interstate sales of nontransporting natural-gas producers, and to fix up the interstate pipelines with highly inflated cost allowances, as attempted in the Moore-Rizley bill in 1948.

The effect of the bill, if passed, would be to let producers of this excellent and much-sought-after fuel charge all that the traffic will bear, and to give the interstate pipelines an enormous handout also. Reasonable estimates disclose that this may add as much as $600 million a year to the Nation's present gas bills.

The interests which would get the biggest part of this bonanza are not the sturdy and struggling little independents and wildcatters in dirty overalls, in whose name the legislative attack on the captive consumers is being made by the big interests. Ninety percent of the gas sold in interstate commerce is produced by about 175 producers.

Of the 29 largest producers, who produce nearly two-thirds of the natural gas, 20 are major oil companies or their subsidiaries; Phillips Petroleum, Stanolind Oil & Gas (Standard of Indiana), Humble Oil & Refining (Standard Oil of New Jersey), Magnolia Petroleum (Socony-Vacuum), Shell Oil, Gulf Oil, Atlantic Refining, Shamrock Oil, Skelly Oil, Sun Oil, the Texas Co., Sunray Oil, Union Oil, Pure Oil, Sinclair Oil, etc. They read like the "who's who" of America's oil industry and are not exactly a needy or penniless group—or a neglected one, if we recall their 27½ percent depletion allowances.

OIL MEN'S WAR CHEST

With such enormous sums at stake, it is no wonder that the oil, gas, and pipeline companies have gathered a "public relations" war chest for this exemption bill which the Wall Street Journal estimated at $1.5 million—or that we in Congress are receiving lots of inspired mail, identically worded resolutions from chambers of commerce and an occasional misinformed city council, slick literature and editorials with the industry slant clearly showing beneath alleged consumer appeals, plausible economic analyses to show how little of the consumer's dollar the poor little gas producer gets, snide attacks on opponents of exemption as "socialists," etc.

Standard Oil of Indiana, whose subsidiary, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., is the second biggest gas producer in the country, has singled me out for special attention with 1 three-page letter to employees in Illinois, and 1 nine-page memorandum seeking to refute some of the arguments I have made for fair regulation.

The company tactfully urges letters—not form letters, though—to show me the light. I suppose I should feel complimented by such attention from this $2 billion enterprise, which has also loaned its top economist to head up the big brain trust of the American Petroleum Institute, mobilizing the forces for exemption.

FIGHT FOR THE CONSUMERS

In the face of this concerted drive, it is fortunate that a growing number of Members of Congress, mayors, and law officers of scores of the Nation's biggest cities, and a few civic and union groups, State utility commissioners, and distribution companies have taken up the battle for the consumers.

The narrow margin (16–15) by which the Harris bill was voted out of committee in the House and the window-dressing of apparent, but actually useless, Federal controls ("reasonable market price") included in the bill, show that there is a good chance to beat the exemption drive if the people understand the issues.

In conformity with its great traditions, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has consistently done more than any other paper I know to explain these issues to its readers.

Historically, the efforts to win exemption for these producers' sales began with the Moore-Rizley bill in 1947–48. This was too raw even for the 80th Republican Congress. An exemption measure (the Kerr bill) was unfortunately passed in 1950, but President Truman courageously vetoed it.

The increasingly industry-minded Federal Power Commission gave the producers exemption in 1951, only to be reversed by the Supreme Court in the Phillips case in 1954. The court held that the Natural Gas Act gave the commission power to regulate those interstate rates, and that it should get on with the job.

So now the industry is back again seeking "clarification"— or more buntly, exemption.

ARGUMENT AGAINST EXEMPTION

The basic argument against exemption is simply this:

Competition does not and cannot operate between gas producers to keep the field prices "just and reasonable."

In the absence of such competition, only fair regulation can protect the consumers of this essential commodity.

Since the sales transactions between producers and pipeline companies are in interstate commerce only the Federal Government can do the job.

Natural gas can be distributed only by a system of pipelines and gas mains that tie the city users inextricably to utilities, the utilities to the pipelines, and the pipelines to the producers, so that neither pipelines nor consumers can "shop around" for better prices.

With expensive cooking and heating appliances bought (about $10,000,000,000 worth for the Nation), the gas used is caught. With expensive big lines laid ($40,000 to $100,000 a mile), the pipeline company is caught.

With a desirable fuel that is in great demand, the producer now has the upper hand, and he has started acting that way in jacking up his prices. He has the pipelines and the consumers over a barrel.

NOT LIKE COAL, COPPER, IRON, ETC.

These marketing relationships differentiate the natural gas industry completely from coal, copper, oil, iron ore and the other commodities with which the oil industry publicists mistakenly try to compare it. Barges, trucks and railroads can haul those other materials. Competition among producers is possible.

But with natural gas the testimony is conclusive to the opposite effect: the transportation is monopolistic, and now that demand is outstripping the supply, the only effective competition in the field is between pipelines bidding up the price. These higher prices

then get passed along the chain to the consumers. Clearly this situation requires utility-type regulation.

It is illuminating to see what has already been happening to field prices of gas while the Federal Power Commission has followed its hands-off policy.

From 1946 to 1954, the average cost of gas to the 17 pipelines that bought 96 per cent of the gas sold interstate by the non-transporting producers incerased from 4.4 cents a thousand cubic feet (M c. f.) to 9.7 cents per thousand cubic feet, or by 120.8 percent.

In aggregate terms, this means the increase in the cost of gas to these pipelines is running at the rate of over $196 million a year. This may be chickenfeed in Texas, but it is big money in Illinois and Missouri.

Moreover, I introduced into the Senate committee's record tables showing gas-purchase contracts in the Southwest running as high as 20 cents and 22 cents per thousand cubic feet. New contracts at 14 cents are common. A May 27 prospectus of People's Gas in Chicago states that it expects the average cost of gas purchased by its affiliate natural-gas pipeline to be 13 cents in 1955.

The upward movement is thus rapid and getting faster, and most-favored nation clauses and renegotiations, which hike the prices under existing contracts whenever another producer in the area gets a higher price, speed the spiral upward.

INCREASES PASSED ON

These higher costs are being steadily passed through to consumers. The 14 principal pipelines transporting gas from the Southwest, whose sales are regulated by the FPC, have since 1949 either been granted or have pending rate increases totaling $251 million a year, a great part of which is due to higher field prices.

The utilities, in turn, have been passing these increases on to their customers. Recent rate increases for People's Gas in Chicago, for instance, have been $4,657,000 in 1953, $5 million in 1954, and $3,716,000 thus far in 1955.

In consequence, the unit costs of gas to consumers have been going up, while the unit costs of electricity, the principal competitor to gas for residential use, have been declining.

Higher gas costs have disappointed the New England consumers and already jeopardized the success of the recent pipeline projects there. Distributors in Oklahoma and elsewhere are also complaining that higher prices for natural gas may price it out of the market for industrial users or else saddle the major burden of all increases on the captive residential users, who cannot transfer to coal or oil as easily as industries with alternative facilities.

The lobbyists for the exemption bill try to minimize the impact of these higher prices on consumers by saying it will only mean a few pennies a day to each. But 2 cents a day—which is far too low an estimate—is over $131 million a year for the 18 million residential customers.

This is the way all utility regulation works, saving modest sums per day for the small users. It is a shocking concept that pennies extracted from the many which mean millions for a few are a trifling matter.

COMPETITION PREVENTIVE

I have already pointed out how the physical arrangements of the gas-distribution system—pipelines and gas mains—and the various escalator provisions in purchase contracts prevent competition from being effective to keep prices down.

Other factors also obstruct competition among producers:

(A) Gas reserves, according to the American Gas Association, are not building up as rapidly as before in relation to gas consumption. If an exhaustible resource faces a demand that is rising faster than supply, the situation is made to order for price gouging.

(B) All available statistics show that the major oil producers dominate the interstate gas sales markets and the ownership of known gas reserves.

(C) There is much evidence that the only competition is between gas purchasers. The Messrs. De Golyer and McNaughton, noted geologists and petroleum engineers of Dallas, recently advised Natural Gas Pipeline Co.: "The availability of this gas to Natural depends upon its aggressiveness in obtaining such gas in competition with other pipelines." And I understand Natural is bidding 5 cents per M c. f. more than the highest present field price to try to get gas in Jack and Wise Counties in Texas.

(D) State conservation rules and laws for minimum wellhead prices likewise reduce competition.

(E) And finally, the pipeline companies, under regulation, can pass on all increased costs to their customers. Furthermore, under an inexcusable ruling of the FPC, they get a bigger allowance for the gas they themselves produce if the market price goes up. Thus the pipelines lack any real incentives to bargain with the producers for a low price.

A PUBLIC UTILITY SITUATION

All of these factors reinforce the conclusion that this is a public utility situation, that competition does not operate to keep prices fair, and that regulation is the only possible answer.

The inevitable high costs to the consumers in the absense of regulations are made quite clear in the statements of industry spokesmen about proper field prices.

Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, seems to believe a 5-cents-per-M c. f. increase over present field prices would be fair. That means $200 million a year more from consumers. Dr. Richard J. Gonzales, economist for Humble Oil, declared that 20 cents per M c. f. might be right—a rise of 10 cents over present averages. If this became the average, gas consumers would pay over $400 million more each year. Others suggest 25 cents per M c. f., which means over $600 million a year more from consumers.

AN ATROCIOUS DECISION

Obviously, the producers stand to collect billions in added profits if the exemption bill is enacted. For example, a 10-cent increase in price would bring Humble Oil & Refining Co. $1,600,000,000 of additional profits from its presently owned gas reserves.

Another feature of the proposed legislation which will eventually add several billion dollars more to gas consumers' costs is the provision to allow the pipelines to charge as an operating expense the "reasonable market price" of the gas which they themselves produce. This would write into law the basic principle of the FPC's atrocious decision in the Panhandle Eastern case which reversed, for pipeline-produced gas, the longstanding "cost" or prudent investment method of ratemaking.

This may be legal gobbledegook to the casual reader, but it means millions of dollars more to the pipelines and it persuaded them to enlist as stanch and contributing allies of the big oil companies in the drive for this legislation.

What it means in simple terms is this: It is costing Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co. an average of 2.35 cents per thousand cubic foot to produce gas from its wells, including a fair return on its investment. But Panhandle is now claiming the "weighted average field price" of 10.42 cents per thousand cubic feet, or 8 cents more than its real cost. Or take Colorado Interstate Gas Co.: It claims a field price of 9.4 cents per thousand cubic feet while its actual cost of production is 2.23 cents, and the consumers must pay the difference.

Increased profits thus handed to the pipelines through the back door already total over $40 million a year, according to data from the FPC.

The standard in the new bill, "reasonable market price," is even looser and higher than the method applied by the FPC. On the basis of 1953 gas production by the pipelines, if the difference between actual cost of production and market price is 10 cents per thousand cubic feet—and that may be a conservative estimate if regulation is killed—the additional profit to the pipelines would be $100 million annually.

Obviously the enactment of the proposed legislation would be a gold mine for the pipelines as well as the nontransporting producers.

My bill, S. 1248, would, on the contrary, compel the FPC to go back to legitimate cost of prudent investment as a basis for rate regulation. It would stop this pipeline raid on the consumer, which the FPC and the Harris and Fulbright bills seek to legalize.

SPUR TO EXPLORATION THEORY

It is sometimes claimed that regulation has stifled exploration, and only by allowing the pipelines these phantom costs can they be induced to find new reserves of natural gas, but the facts are to the contrary. The pipeline companies and their producing affiliates in the Southwest produced 50 percent more gas in 1953 than in 1947. From 1950 to 1953, pipeline funds spent for exploration and development rose from $7,500,000 to nearly $15 million. Obviously, regulation was fair and did not stifle new development.

It is said by the proponents of the exemption legislation that the producers could not exist on the 6-percent return generally allowed utilities, but only the proponents have suggested that they be limited to 6 percent. I would expect, from the nature of the producing business, that the rates of return allowed would be somewhat higher than those normally granted to gas and electric distribution utilities. I am sure the FPC can be counted upon to be more than fair to the producers in this matter.

It is often claimed that regulation of nontransporting producers' interstate sales is just too complicated and difficult to be feasible, but the short answer to this is that for 16 years the FPC has regulated natural-gas transporters who are also engaged in extensive exploration, development, and production of natural gas. These companies have prospered and grown under regulation, and at the same time, down to 1952, the FPC ordered rate reductions totaling $43 million on an annual basis.

The FPC can do the job of protecting both consumers and producers, if it only will. The Congress should leave it with the authority and direct it to proceed.

EXPERT ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

(By Post-Dispatch)

A deep rooted concern for humanity and a burning opposition to injustice and exploitation probably are the best explanation of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS' great interest in consumer protection.

Going beyond his teaching and general studies of economics and welfare legislation while a professor at the University of Chicago in 1929 and 1930 he delved into the specific utility manipulations of a prominent Chicagoan—Samuel Insull.

DOUGLAS' revelations and his drive against exorbitant traction, electric and gas rates in Chicago were not popular with those in power. Some tried to get him fired from the university, but history soon vindicated his judgment.

Even since, in State legislative battles, in commission hearings, in election campaigns, in the Chicago City Council and in the United States Senate, DOUGLAS has championed

the cause of the unorganized and usually politically weak consumers.

In Senate debates he has fought for competition as a defense for both consumers and small business. Where competition fails in a utility situation, DOUGLAS has supported what he believes to be fair regulation. He is generally credited with the main legislative fight which made the Kerr bill to exempt gas producers from Federal regulation a national issue in 1950 and led to its veto by President Truman.

DOUGLAS unsuccessfully fought the Hinshaw bill in 1954 which exempted from Federal regulation pipelines operating wholly within a State but, nevertheless, completing interstate transit of gas.

Now he is on the warpath again against the Harris and Fulbright bills to free the interstate sales of gas producers from Federal regulation.

My Community and World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before the school year ended, junior class high school students across the Nation took part in a special contest writing special papers on the subject My Community and World Affairs.

Many students in the State of Washington took part. Only recently Mr. Lon D. Leeper called to my attention an entry which already has won second place in the district and may win a trip to the United Nations for its author, Patty Branstetter, of Pasco, Wash.

Upon reading the entry, I was convinced it could well be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the excellent manner in which this highschool junior phrased her thoughts—especially since we are observing the 10th aninversary of the United Nations this year.

I know that we have heard some great speeches from great leaders during the anniversary celebration in San Francisco. But in the case of Patty Branstetter, as in the case of others who took part, here is an expression from a person who several years from now will have the responsibility of making the United Nations work in the future.

Those are my thoughts. I am sure that Senators will be interested in Patty's thinking, so I ask unanimous consent that this essay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY COMMUNITY AND WORLD AFFAIRS

As the development of communication and transportation has expanded, the world has become smaller and smaller. This smallness of scope has brought the peoples of the world and their communities into closer contact with one another. It makes our pace of living faster, creating responsibilities and problems that we must face and solve. We realize more and more how dependent we are upon one another. It is practically impossible for any one country to look into its own problems without facing those of other countries. Having realized this, the people of the world have taken a step forward in solving this problem; we have organized the United Nations. The roots of the United Nations are the communities of the world. Our world is made up of millions of people, forming thousands upon thousands of communities, of which mine is just one; but it is one. My community is a community of the world and a root of the United Nations; therefore it is my community's responsibility to look after the world and to try to contribute to the betterment of mankind.

Pasco, my community, seemingly developed overnight, increasing in population from hundreds to thousands. The people who came to this area couldn't just sit back and let the world go by, because they were affected by the world's problems. These problems are many and varied. We, in Pasco, realize the importance of the atomic project at Hanford that brought part of this boom to our area. Because atomic energy isn't being used solely for peaceful purposes, this is a world problem directly influencing our community.

The construction workers, scientists, and technicians brought their families to this area, coming by the hundreds for this development. This increase in population created no little demand for businesses to provide them with the necessities and luxuries of life; this demand for businesses brought more people to Pasco to fulfill this need.

Another world problem is the one for food. There is the recent irrigation project of the Columbia Basin that has turned vast stretches of arid land into fertile farms. This has made a plentiful supply of grain, more than our community or Nation can use, so it aids substantially in helping to feed the world.

The dams that were built and are being built for this project of irrigation have opened up another new field of work. They have supplied large amounts of electricity to this and surrounding areas. But just what does the abundance of this electric power mean? It means cheaper power to operate the wheels of industry, for wherever there is abundant power factories will be built.

This creates another problem—the problem of transportation. Pasco has solved part of that problem. The construction of a large railway center just outside the city limits of Pasco has been started. It will become the shipping terminal of the Northwest, hence to all parts of the world.

This brings into view the fact that we have one of the farthest inland water ports in Washington, which also makes our products accessible to the world by water transportation. These two main factors of shipping will greatly increase our community's usefulness to the trade of the world.

While this hustling community grows we must ignite the spark of working together with each new member to Pasco and keep alive that spark in every member, old and new.

All these things count, no matter how minute they may seem. Nothing would be accomplished in my community if everyone thought, "Oh, well, I'm just one person; it makes no difference whether I know that problems the world faces or not—because somebody else will take care of them." It is lucky that there are more people of the type, who know the value of individual participation, otherwise the world would be in a sorry state and Pasco would have an uninterested outlook.

We realized the need for an organized community, if Pasco were to withstand the onrush of people and remain prosperous. The problems facing us for housing, businesses, recreational, and school facilities had to be met and conquered. Everyone had to feel that his part was essential to the betterment of Pasco.

There are many civic organizations that try to make our community a better place in which to live; they know that the better the community is the better the world will be. These civicminded people know the problem of providing a good education for the people in our evergrowing area. They have helped to get the new schools and college, and will help to get others built in the future.

What Pasco does for its young people will be noticed in later life; this well-laid foundation will be noticed throughout the world. We will go to college or into our respective fields of work. The people with whom we come in contact will be here in Pasco, in different parts of our Nation, or in the different countries abroad. Our customs and culture may be different, but we must all learn to live and work together to build a peaceful and happy world.

Another aspect is the present adjustment of trying to do everything possible to make our country a safe place in which to live. There is not one person who doesn't know the need in this area alone for protection because of the atomic works at Hanford.

The entire tricities, of Pasco, Kennewick, and Richland have nearly 80,000 population; therefore we realize the danger in living in such a strategic defense area as this.

We, like the rest of the people of our Nation, know that this is where the individual, working in organizations, plays a big part. Young and old alike are giving their time to being alert and watchful by serving as ground observers, working in the Red Cross, donating blood, and joining our Armed Forces.

We are keeping awake, but we are not always thinking of this danger, because we have a strong faith in our Government and in the other governments working together in the United Nations. If peace without warfare is possible, every available means through the efforts of the several nations will be tried. The United Nations reflects back on my community, for they are trying to work out problems peaceably for the welfare of all, but all the while keeping their own individuality, just like each person does in my community.

My community is helping the world to face its problems, those of farming, industrial development, atomic power, and so very many more. My community aids in solving directly and indirectly these difficult problems. Yes; my community is concerned with world affairs.

Human Dignity and the Quest for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the meeting at the summit, that is now underway at Geneva, was uppermost in my mind on July 3, when I gave an address before a sacred patriotic assembly at Provo, Utah, the county seat of my home community.

In view of the interest in this historic meeting and of the significant forces underlying American participation in any effort for contributing to freedom and peace, I hereby request unanimous consent to reproduce the text of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUMAN DIGNITY AND THE QUEST FOR PEACE

It is indeed an honor to be invited to speak to you in this assembly on the Lord's Day. I am humbly grateful for this opportunity.

In this place, and with the thousands who are gathered here, many of them personal friends and neighbors with whom I have labored for many years, I feel a kindred spirit that is uplifting and inspiring. Truly, it is good to be here even under the heavy responsibilities that rest upon me on this occasion.

It is an encouraging and hopeful sign when a community will plan, as a part of its Independence Day celebration, a sacred and patriotic assembly devoted to worship of God, with emphasis upon the part He has had in the birth of this Nation and its preservation to this time. If all the peoples of the world would sincerely and prayerfully follow the example in spirituality which you have set, and if their governments would be guided by the same high principles, I am sure the dark clouds of war and aggression would soon disappear. I extend to you my heartiest congratulations upon this occasion.

Years ago I viewed a motion picture which made a deep impression upon me. This documentary picture dealt with the great Jewish family of financiers, the Rothschilds, which had played, and to some extent continues to play, such an important part in the history of Europe, and by way of Europe, throughout the world.

A DYING FATHER'S COUNSEL

The story portrayed the early life of the faimly in a German community confined, as it was, to the ghetto, a restricted, depressed part of the city assigned to the then hated, unwanted, and persecuted Jew.

The father gives advice from his deathbed to his five sons who are about to leave home to seek and attain fame and fortune elsewhere. Incidentally, 3 of these sons later headed 3 great branches of this powerful European family.

I paraphrase the counsel of this dying father to his sons: Remember your heritage my sons. So prepare and conduct yourselves always, that you can walk the earth with dignity.

Walk the earth with dignity.

What prompted such advice, I asked myself.

Then I remembered what God had revealed to the ancient prophets of Israel concerning the beginning of the human race upon this planet, and the dignity of man as the son of God. Immediately it was clear to me that this father had in his heart a deep-seated conviction which no adverse circumstances could alter.

The thought came to me that this paraphrased admonition of a dying father to his sons could well be the rallying cry of those who today are striving for a better world—a peaceful world in which it will be possible for all men everywhere to walk the earth with dignity. Because it is only in a peaceful world where men are free that it is possible for man to achieve his highest destiny.

PRESIDENT STRESSES HUMAN DIGNITY

This need for a recognition of human dignity was stressed by President Eisenhower in a 1954 address at the American-Jewish Tercentenary Dinner. He stated:

"Of all religious concepts this belief in the infinite worth of the individual is beyond doubt among the most important. On this faith our forefathers constructed the framework of our Republic. In this faith in human dignity is the major difference between our own concept of life and that of enemies of freedom."

These views of a simple German-Jewish father and the President of the most powerful nation upon the face of the earth suggested to me the theme of my remarks this evening. Time is extremely limited to deal with such a large subject, but I hope at least to outline it and bring out a few highlights during the time allotted to me.

However, before I review the steps by which our forefathers constructed the "framework of our Republic" upon an abiding faith in human worth and dignity, however, I would like to take you back a few weeks from the present. At that time a nationwide civil defense operation was conducted in our larger cities, including our Capital City of Washington.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE TESTED

President Eisenhower, and a select group of officials, and some civilians were, upon a given signal, to depart for secret rendezvous points from which they were to carry on their functions under emergency conditions. An enemy air attack with atomic and hydrogen bombs was simulated.

Notwithstanding the fact that this operation was officially described as "successful" in accomplishing its objectives, there was much to justify the tag "Operation Confusion," a name given it by some outspoken critics. Whether the program demonstrated the adequacies or inadequacies of civil defense is still under debate.

This minor operation, however, serves to point up in a small but dramatic way the confusion of our times. Events of the past two decades have left the people of this country and the world at large completely bewildered. As we talk of peace, we prepare for war.

Former allies are now our enemies, and our opponents of yesterday are now our friends and allies. Those we were taught to hate, we are now courting as friends. We are now spending billions of dollars to prepare erstwhile enemies to fight on our side in defense of the free world, which some of them were trying to destroy only a little more than a decade ago.

MEETING AT THE SUMMIT

On the 18th of this month there will be a meeting of the Chief Executives of Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States for the purpose of finding a way to ease tensions, to stop the cold war, and, we hope, to bring about a peaceful world.

There is an abundance of hope that out of this conference will come at least a lessening of the tensions which are now threatening to erupt into a worldwide contest that might well end civilization.

But while there is hope, there is little actual confidence of success. The President and Secretary of State are warning us not to expect too much.

Here in America we have, as well, complex domestic problems, a welter of controversies over labor-management relations, agricultural price supports, segregation, and other major issues. And to complicate matters, hanging over our heads is the threat of an atomic war that may reduce our civilization and our material accumulations to rubble in a matter of days.

Out of this domestic and international maze of troubles, trials, and tensions, there should grow an irresistible demand for permanent world peace. If peace does not soon come, all of our discoveries and advances, which could make this the Golden Age of all time, may go for naught.

WILSON AND MAC ARTHUR

Statesmen and other leaders of the world have considered this confusion, this challenging dilemma of 20th century civilization and have come up with some conclusions remarkably similar.

The late President Woodrow Wilson, for example, in his justly famous essay, The Road Away From Revolution, declared:

"The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

"Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists—to everyone who fears God or loves his country."

A quarter century later, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, on the battleship *Missouri* following the Japanese surrender in 1945, spoke these words:

"Men since the beginning of time have sought peace. Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn failed, leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem basically is theological and involves a spiritual recredescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2,000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

In the quarter century that separated those two remarkably similar utterances, the world experienced some tremendous upheavals. Depression. The rise of dictators and new aggression. World War II—the greatest blood bath in world history.

COLD WAR AND HOT PEACE

In 1945, the worldwide military conflict ended, and a new era of peace seemed assured. A new international organization, the United Nations was formed as a successor to the ill-fated League of Nations.

Then came more tension, new conflict—Greece; Palestine; Korea; Indochina; Formosa. Cold war and hot peace.

Today, great armies are not marching. Fighting on a large scale has ceased. But the dove of peace, if it is prudent, will not stray far from a bomb-proof shelter. Even though formally proclaimed in many treaties, peace appears to have eluded the nations that fought for it so long and desperately.

That elusive peace, which was not achieved by the military efforts of War II, is today the focus of world attention, and the subject of fierce international debate. Furthermore, the nations who are parties to that debate, are backing up their words with large arrays of military forces, armed with the most powerful and destructive weapons ever known to mankind. In their quest for peace they are prepared to blast and burn their opponents from the face of the earth.

Grave as were the problems which prompted the late President Wilson to issue his warning, which I have just quoted, his times could well be described as an era of peaceful existence compared with the conditions that face the world today.

WILSON'S WARNING AND TODAY

If that warning of our World War I President was justified when it was written, and I believe it was, it should thunder in our ears today.

But our day is not the only period in our country's history when it has faced grave crises brought about by the breaking up of a coalition which had been successful on the field of battle, and also when greedy, power-mad despots were trying to make slaves of the peoples of the world.

Let us take a look at the beginning of our country's history when a similar situation existed. From this vantage point we may get help to sustain us in our present troubles, and we may find some guideposts to a way out of the complex and frightening problems of our times.

Immediately following the War of Independence, there arose a political crisis which threatened to end in disaster for the victorious Colonists.

Indeed, it was generally believed by the political philosophers of that day that the loose Federation of American Colonies could not possibly survive after the common danger which had held them together was removed.

What influence, what power, they reasoned, could possibly unite the English, the French, the Dutch, the Germans, the Swedes, the Irish—nationalities which, in Europe, had been at war intermittently with each other for over a thousand years? Religious differences also were regarded as a major divisive factor.

A NEW FORCE FOR PEACE

However, it is now clear that the political prophets of those days were not adequately aware of a force that was making itself felt in the New World—a force which was believed to be new, but which we now know grew out of a great truth which is as eternal as time itself.

This truth, and the power that came from it, was revealed by the Creator of this earth to Moses and recorded in Genesis:

"Got created man in His own image, male and female created He them."

All the great events hailed as epochs in man's quest for liberty are small, indeed, when compared with the sublime event of man's entry upon this earth.

Here on American soil in the New World, the dignity of man as the child of God, as revealed in Genesis, was recognized in these words, immortalized in the Declaration of Independenec:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

There can be no mistaken about the purpose of our Founding Fathers in making these declarations on that historic Fourth of July in 1776.

"AUTHOR OF LIBERTY"

These early American patriots were strongly influenced by the noblest teachings of the Old and New Testaments, comprising the Bible. To them, they were the word of God, and He was reverently accepted as the Creator and the author of man's rights and liberties. To them a government without God was unthinkable.

They accepted, in toto, the doctrine of the fatherhood of God and its corrolary, the Brotherhood of man, even though they may not have seen clearly all its implications.

It was self-evident to them that all men were created equal before God, because the God they worshipped was a universal God and a just God. Man, His offspring, therefore, was entitled to justice and equality of treatment from Government and before the law.

It also was self-evident to the Founding Fathers that with God as the foundation of all rightful government, man, in all his dignity as a son of God, should have certain rights that are inalienable; that should never be taken away, nor circumscribed, not even by the highest authority of any government established by man.

MAN'S INALIENABLE RIGHTS

First of these inalienable rights of man was the right to life itself, which was God given. To this right was added the "rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness," without which the right to life becomes meaningless.

At this point, I feel impelled to interpolate a quotation from the prophet Lehi, who declared on this continent centuries before that "men are that they might have joy." There seems to me to be a striking similarity between this statement of doctrine and the thoughts expressed in the language "the pursuit of happiness." The prophet and the Declaration of Independence seem to be in harmony on this point.

Having laid down in general terms what rights man was entitled to as a child of God, the authors of the Declaration proceeded to announce another great principle which was new to the world of that time:

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

GAINS FOR HUMAN DIGNITY

Once again the dignity of man was recognized in this monumental document. As a child of God, man instituted governments, the chief purpose of which was not to rule or master men, but to secure and protect the God-given rights of men.

Government was to be man's servant, his protector; not his master. In order to end despotism from which they suffered, they made it clear that there was no room here for the recognition of the divine right of kings, of dictators, or of statism—the concept of the supreme state which is the basic element of Hitler's national socialism and Lenin's Russian communism.

Under the Declaration of Independence, no leader or government can reign supreme. The document recognizes and implies that man, the offspring of God, was placed on the world, organized for his use, for a definite purpose; that man himself is the source of the powers that government is entitled to assume in the role of his servant and protector. As the preamble to the Constitution puts it, "We the people" are sovereign.

CONTINUING THE STRUGGLE

Upon the premise of human dignity under God, the framers of the Declaration of Independence created a political enumeration of human rights that is still without equal in world history. As much as they had accomplished, however, their work did not end there. In fact, their work had only begun.

Confronted as they were with the rapid disintegration of the loose federation which had fought the war against the mother country, the leaders of the American independence movement put themselves to the task of creating that government which would secure the rights they had declared were the birthright of man, and for which they had made heavy sacrifices of blood and treasure through 8 long years of cruel warfare.

THE MAYFLOWER COMPACT

They had before them no written constitutions of other countries which they could adopt as a pattern for a new government in a lew land.

They undoubtedly were profoundly impressed by the Mayflower Compact, which had been adopted on November 11, 1620, and which has been described as the first constitution for the complete government of the people under its jurisdiction on the North American Continent.

But the Mayflower Compact set up no governmental structure to carry out its simple and solemn affirmation of the moral law, which, in essence, was the Christian religion.

But even with this inspiring document before them, the framers of the Constitution were plowing virgin soil in drafting a written Constitution, providing for a representative form of government. How brilliantly they performed their task is now a matter of history.

The Constitution, together with the government provided under it, has been one of the great milestones in the history of human liberty and of nations.

PRINCIPLES UNDER ATTACK

In spite of the fact that the principles, set forth in the Declaration of Independence and translated into action in the Constitution, seemed to be the cement which held the coalition of colonists together during the trying days following the victorious conclusion of the Revolutionary War; in spite of the fact that the Government set up under the provisions of the Constitution has survived a bitter Civil War and has been the chief defender of the liberties of the world in two world wars; and in spite of the fact, let me repeat, that America is one of the mightest nations in existence, in spite of all these demonstrated achievements, to which many more can be added, there are Americans who attack the Constitution and our form of Government as being outmoded, and inefficient. Others, including Communists and their sympathizers, have joined in the attack, on other grounds.

These critics, sometimes unwittingly, have urged upon us strange doctrines and practices of totalitarianism which they believe will enable us to be more efficient and to better meet the needs of an atomic age. They have a feeling that we cannot act fast enough. They chafe at delays resulting from the checks and balances built to the Constitution to prevent despotism. They become unduly alarmed when demagogs appear to have achieved success in putting into temporary eclipse the Bill of Rights.

Is there merit to these criticisms?

RIGHTS OF MAN FOREMOST

Let us, first of all, recall the principle objective of the Constitution. It was to provide a Government which would protect or secure the rights of man as stated in the Declaration of Independence.

It was to protect the ordinary citizen against despotism, either of kings, emperors, dictators, or of statism.

In order to accomplish this high objective, the Constitution not only had to designate the officials and the framework to carry out the ordinary functions of government for the common welfare, but it also had to protect man against the possible invasion of his rights by his own Government.

It did that in the division of powers into three coordinate branches of Government, each to be a check upon the other two.

To make doubly sure that a citizen's inalienable rights would be fully protected, the Bill of Rights was added in the first 10 amendments. The 10th amendment made it clear that the only powers the Federal Government had were those which were expressly delegated in the Constitution. All the remaining powers were to belong either to the States or the people.

THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The Bill of Rights also listed the freedoms that belong to the individual citizen no matter how humble his station in life—rights that no one, not even the Government itself, could take away or abridge.

It began with that impressive list: That no law "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances," could be passed by Congress.

Other rights were enumerated and, again to make sure that nothing had been overlooked, the ninth amendment declared: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Implicit in the Constitution is the important right of a citizen to own property and to enjoy the fruits of his own labor. The Bill of Rights protects this right, important to each of us.

PROTECTS AGAINST DESPOTISM

The Constitution is the only written basic law of long duration that has been able to protect the people against the despotism of

their own Government. In this field it has been eminently successful.

Even in so-called democracies where the parliamentary system exists, parliaments are supreme and there are few rights of the individual citizen which parliament cannot abridge or take away.

Tonight I have touched upon a few of the highlights of the American story—a story that has been a great inspiration to oppressed and enslaved peoples throughout the world.

I have purposely ignored our great progress in the field of the material. While that progress is important as a part of the story, to me it is not nearly so significant a phase in our development as the great spiritual forces that were set in motion in the beginning of the history of this country.

I have tried to emphasize principles and causes rather than results, for the reason that the material results speak largely for themselves.

THE TRUTH OF AMERICA'S POWER

The story of the great truth of America's power, and what was done about putting the force generated by that truth to work for the good of man, has been one of mankind's most uplifting achievements. It has proved its worth in making this country great, strong, and peace-loving, and it provides a sound and effective base for any diplomatic conferences or negotiations in which we may become involved in our positive efforts to attain peace throughout the world.

In man's long quest for permanent peace—a just peace wherein man may enjoy to the fullest the freedoms under which he can make the greatest progress both spiritually and materially—it has been, and can continue to be, one of the world's strongest forces.

The concept that man is a child of God, entitled to "walk in dignity" upon the earth, and endowed with inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, is a highly volatile force in human and governmental relations. This force, developed in righteousness is our strongest weapon in the fight for permanent peace in the current worldwide conflict of competing ideologies.

A MESSAGE FOR OPPRESSED PEOPLES

Our biggest problem is to get this phase of the story, this complete picture of whatever true greatness America has achieved, through the iron curtains erected by despotisms, to the people behind them. These enslaved and long-suffering people are God's children, entitled to walk in dignity before their fellow men and to enjoy the God-given rights that many of us here in America take so much for granted.

The oppressed and enslaved people of the world must be reached by us and shown, by our teaching and above all, by our example, that this Christian-American approach to government heals and blesses, instead of bringing sorrow and destruction. It seeks no power to enslave men. It does not covet their material possessions. It is motivated by love instead of hatred. Under its benign influence, we become more than ever our brother's keeper.

If we appreciate these truths, and if we believe in our hearts that they are true, then it is up to each of us to embark upon a personal crusade to live the kind of a life that our inspired Government demands of us, and to communicate these ideals to the other peoples of the earth who can profit from them.

THE NEED FOR A MORAL CRUSADE

The need for such a moral crusade was very effectively described by President Eisenhower in a 1954 speech before the World Christian Endeavor Convention. In the course of this remarkable address, he made this ringing declaration:

"Because, my friends, though today we must remain strong, we must remain strong in all the economic and the scientific affairs of the world, we must remain strong militarily for the protection of our firesides and our rights to prevent domination by those who would seek to enthrall us, yet bullets and guns, and planes, and ships, all the weapons of war can produce no real or lasting peace.

"Only a great moral crusade, to determine that men shall rise above this conception of materialism, rise above it and live as people who attempt to express in some faint and feeble way their conceptions of what the Almighty would have us do, that is the force that will win through to victory, and the world will have prosperity and peace—prosperity beyond all imaginings of the past. And science will be developed and devoted to the happiness, the welfare of man, and not to his destruction, and all of us can live together peacefully and happily."

This is a monumental philosophy of the spiritual forces of our Republic that our President will carry with him into the forthcoming conference at the summit with other world leaders.

PRESIDENT NEEDS OUR PRAYERS

He and the others who sit in council with him will need the benefit of our personal interest and the support of our prayers. Yes, we should pray that God will bless and inspire those whom we believe to be our enemies.

The quest for peace is not easy. The road is tortuous and long. But the goal is worth all the effort required, worth working for everlastingly and unstintingly. God grant that the avenue of action, the principles of sound human relations, based upon Christian principles and philosophy and so clearly charted by our forefathers nearly two centuries ago will guide us to that glorious goal, when all of God's children can walk the earth with dignity.

American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday it was my privilege to address a large civic gathering in the city of Chicago. I discussed various problems of American foreign policy and preparedness. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CAUTIOUS OPTIMISM" FOR THE BIG FOUR MEETING AT THE SUMMIT: MEANWHILE "GREATER AIRMINDEDNESS NEEDED FOR AMERICA"

It is a great privilege for me to join with you at this outstanding patriotic celebration.

It is most appropriate that the courage and pioneering of Capt. Stephen Darius and Lt. Stanley Girenas be marked once again, as you have achieved so well today, by this great rededication on the part of civic, veterans, church, business, labor, and fraternal groups.

THREE SYMBOLS POINTED UP BY THESE HEROES

Today, we take renewed inspiration from the unforgettable deed of these two unforgettable, outstanding World War I veterans.

There is a real and varied meaning—direct and symbolic—in the goal which they sought 22 years ago, in embarking on a nonstop flight from New York to Kaunas, Lithuania.

Let me mention three of the meanings, as I see them, of their epic undertaking.

AMERICA'S FRIENDSHIP WITH LITHUANIA

1. The most direct symbolism was, of course, the uniting of the people of the United States with the people of Lithuania—a country relatively small in population, small in size, but big in heart and large in meaning to mankind.

For Lithuania, like her other Baltic neighbors, represented the welcome rebirth after World War I, of the sovereignty of proud peoples who had long aspired for it.

Lithuania proved that the hunger in the human heart to be free, to be independent, to forge one's own destiny voluntarily through one's own leaders, rather than in slavery and under alien-imposed leaders, is one of the deepest hungers in the human breast.

LITHUANIA'S UNHAPPY FATE AT RED HANDS

As we all know, 6 years after the 1933 flight, came World War II, with the onrushing Nazis, and then Soviet armies, blotting out the freedom of whole peoples.

The trend of World War II changed when, 2 years later, the Nazi aggressor turned on its former ally—Red Russia.

This attack failed, due in major part to the tremendous lend-lease aid given by the people of the United States, and then due to the opening of the victorious second front.

But when the guns ceased firing in World War II, Lithuania, far from being reborn remained shackled—the subject of monstrous, atheistic persecution, heartless mass deportations and liquidations.

Today, nonetheless, the spirit of Darius-Girenas, the spirit of Lithuanian-American friendship is stronger than ever before.

Not all the darkness imposed by the tyrants of the Kremlin can extinguish the flame and hope in the hearts of the Lithuanian people, nor in the hearts of Lithuanian-Americans here, or of Lithuanian descendants elsewhere in the world. The flame, the hope for what? For liberation.

SENATE RESOLUTION SOUNDLY REAFFIRMS UNITED STATES LIBERATION FEELINGS

Yes; we pledge to this valiant country our continued friendship, our continued efforts toward that day when Lithuania shall yet be free and independent. We shall never acquiesce to her slavery. We shall never abandon her, nor other enslaved peoples.

That is the purpose of Senate Resolution 127 which I have been pleased to cosponsor with Senators GEORGE, CLEMENTS and KNOWLAND. This resolution is no empty gesture, but a dramatic, meaningful reaffirmation of America's deepest feelings.

TRAILBLAZING BY AIR PIONEERS

2. But there is a second symbolism of the 1933 flight.

It is a symbolism of the Eagles of America, the intrepid trailblazers into the "wild blue younder" of the sky.

Six years earlier, Charles Augustus Lindbergh, in his "Spirit of St. Louis," had made his memorable "lone eagle" nonstop flight across the Atlantic to Paris.

The Lindbergh flight, then, the Darius-Girenas flight and similar intrepid adventures, represented man's soaring into the unknown. They represented his courageous ascent through the vast ocean of air, above the vast ocean of water to far distant places.

Today, we are truly living in an air age—one so breathtakingly new that not even these immortal air pioneers might have been able completely to imagine it.

This air age involves travel at supersonic speed. But not only has the sound barrier already been broken, but the successive barriers of heat, barriers in which most airplane metals would ordinarily melt under terrific pressures, these barriers are being conquered.

TOO MANY HORSE AND BUGGY CONCEPTS IN AIR AGE

And yet, it is a pity, indeed it may almost be a tragedy that our laymen's thinking and doing have not caught up with the achievements of our aeronautical engineers, our inventors, our scientists.

In spite of the fact that the aerial highway is today the most important, the speediest means of national and international travel, we still are hobbling along with "horse and buggy" concepts and "horse and buggy" accommodations for air travel.

UNITED STATES AIRPORTS INADEQUATE TO CURRENT, FUTURE TRAFFIC

In spite of often heroic efforts, the airports of this Nation, almost without exception, particularly around our major cities, are usually obsolete and choked with ever-mounting traffic.

The streets and highways to and from airports are invariably congested with so many slow-moving vehicles as to make us think we are living not in the air age but in the "snail's age."

And problems of jet aircraft noise, problems of safety of airport environs, these and other diverse technical problems require far more intensive teamwork and research than we as a Nation have thus far given to them.

DEFICIENCIES IN MILITARY AVIATION SERIOUS

Meanwhile, the problems of military aviation are even more ominous.

For example, the reenlistment rate of the United States Air Force itself is appallingly low. We are losing United States Air Force pilots, navigators and other technicians at a rate which is shocking and intolerable. We have simply failed to provide sufficient incentive for young and middle-aged men (and their families) to remain in the Air Force as a career.

But there are other disturbing aspects as well—aspects which make even the historic warning of a great air pioneer of my own State—Gen. Billy Mitchell—seem mild indeed.

We have, to be sure, a great and well deserved pride in American aviation progress. But the fact of the matter is, that in the design of aircraft, and particularly air engines, we Americans have often been left behind by superior technical developments in Allied countries, and, yes occasionally in Soviet Russia itself.

Time after time the Russians have permitted foreign observers to glimpse only a portion of their modern, intercontinental air fleet.

But that series of glimpses has devastated the superoptimism, the haughtiness of some Americans who may have thought that, because we are Americans and because we are free, we would automatically be preeminent in aviation development.

The fact of the matter is, that while in an overall sense we still fortunately retain air superiority, our margin seems to be fast shrinking. So a speeding up toward the end of widening our advantage is essential.

WE MUST TRAIN MORE ENGINEERS, TECHNICIANS

Meanwhile consider the problem of our inadequate reservoir of aircraft engineers and other technicians. These men are indispensable for blueprinting and carrying out the construction of the planes of 1958, 1960, and 1965. But the existing reservoir is not being replenished by sizable enough "waves" of new graduates from our colleges and schools—men absolutely vital if this Nation is to survive.

What we need is action now to remedy these conditions, not mere studies of the problem. We have had commissions and commissions pointing out the problems of the air age time and again. Great organizations like the American Legion and the Air Force Association and other fine groups have sounded the warning signals again and again. But we still have not come around to acting with indispensable national teamwork for all-around air development. It is such active teamwork and planning which alone will provide the recipe for national military survival and national civilian progress.

HELP STRENGTHEN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN AIRLINES

As vital parts of both goals we must have the healthiest, strongest possible aviation industry—every single phase of it.

We need the strongest, healthiest possible domestic and international airline system. Time after time in emergencies our commercial airline crews, equipment, and staffs have helped to contribute to a crucial military margin, as in the early days of the Korean conflict.

The aircraft and airline industries are not a luxury for America. They are not simply another business which we may blithely watch lagging or encountering difficulties.

America's free enterprise airline industry today requires enormous stockholder and bondholder investments, simply for necessary constant modernization, let alone for expansion. Every effort to encourage sound modernization and sound expansion needs be made.

Meanwhile, we can ill afford an arbitrary "stop and go" military aircraft production system, alternately expanding overnight, then being slashed overnight. I realize that as the world situation changes, our miltary plans change, but surely we can provide greater continuity in our planning. Similarly, mass inductions of our cadets and then mass release of trained pilots doesn't make sense. Meanwhile, the mighty civilian aircraft and airline industries remain as mainstays—mainstays of the very life of this Nation in an age strewn with peril.

ULTIMATE DANGERS OF THE MISSILE AGE

But now we are moving from the air age to the missile age.

Today, missile experts visualize an intercontinental-guided or ballistic missile, capable of traveling half way round the world at a possible speed of 10,000 miles per hour.

Thus, we here in Chicago today may in the not too distant future be but 30 minutes away—by missile—I repeat 30 minutes away—from a rocket launching site in Soviet Siberia.

These facts—the facts of a contracted world—utterly change many of our concepts about defense and about foreign policy.

Meanwhile, with this fantastic new capability of speed, has come the even more fantastic capability of weapons of mass destruction.

You are all familiar with the grimly unfolding developments in fission and fusion weapons. It is a subject necesarily shrouded with secrecy.

But this we do know: Fallout from one type thermonuclear explosion has already been proven to make an area of 7,000 square miles, downward from the detonation unsafe for human habitation.

The scientists are constantly expanding the potentialities for the mass obliteration, not simply of cities, but of entire regions of nations. Yes, some scientists say, depending on the bomb's and country's size, the possible blotting out of entire nations themselves, is possible.

Some civil defense experts have estimated that the nature of lingering radioactivity may be so deadly and lasting, that some cities or regions, if struck by particular weapons, may never again be entered by man.

And there are other ominous guesses by genetic experts as regards the possible effects of radioactivity, not simply on bomb target victims, but on whole generations of peoples thousands and thousands of miles away, but subject nonetheless to wandering clouds of radioactivity.

THE UNENDING QUEST FOR PEACE

3. This, then, is the background of the third symbolism to which I shall refer. It is the symbolism of peace, the unending quest for peace.

No one knows better than the veterans and the veterans organizations represented at this occasion, how absolutely important it is that we leave no stone unturned in our efforts to avert war.

Stephen Darius and Stanley Girenas had known war at firsthand, as innumerable members of this audience have known it at firsthand.

They were men of peace even though they had to take up arms in defense.

OUR SINCERE EFFORT AT GENEVA

Tomorrow July 18, at Geneva commences a historic conference at which once again American leaders in good faith, in absolute sincerity, will try anew to help banish war from this planet. So will Prime Minister Eden of the United Kingdom and Faure of France.

I know that I voice your own feelings when I say that the hopes and prayers of mankind are with the President of the United States as he undertakes this effort in conjunction with our allies.

Yet, there is a sense of cautious vigilance in the heart and mind of Dwight D. Eisenhower, his associates and allied counterparts and in your heart and mine.

THE DARK RECORD OF SOVIET TREACHERY

In 1933, the very same year of the flight of Darius and Girenas, we, as a Nation, recognized the U. S. S. R. In the 23 years which have elapsed, we have learned to our regret time and again, that the Soviets invariably make agreements in order later to break them at their convenience. They sign documents in order later, at their convenience, to make shreds of paper of them.

They adopt zig-zag tactics, now soft, now tough, now compromising, now uncompromising, in order to confuse, to deceive, to lull.

This has been the unbroken record of Soviet duplicity since 1933, and indeed since the Soviet counter-revolution of 1917.

No thinking person could possibly ignore this dark record. And that certainly includes the alert President of the United States who, is well aware of that record and who after all, has had abundant experiences with the Reds.

It is obvious, therefore, that any agreement reached at Geneva or anywhere else must be viewed against this background. It must be viewed against the background of the outrageous Communist violations occurring at this very minute against the letter and spirit of the Korean and Indochinese armistice agreements.

WE MUST NOT SLAM THE DOOR TO CONFERRING

And, yet, it is a hard fact that if in angry reaction to these and other flagrant Communist abuses, if we were mistakenly to abandon all effort in attempting to speak to and negotiate with the Soviet Union—if we were to do that—we would not be serving the cause of peace.

For us to make the mistake of slamming the door angrily against all further discussion, against all East-West conferences, would only be to blunder into strengthening Soviet lying propaganda throughout the world.

That propaganda has falsely asserted that the United States is a "reckless, war-mongering power, eager to explode its atomic bombs, unwilling to talk about peace or negotiate for peace."

That Red propaganda is, of course, utterly false. No one desires peace more than we do. No one realizes that world war III

could mean mass slaughter for victor and vanquished alike.

We are willing and eager therefore to talk, to confer at Geneva or anywhere else—at any appropriate time—to try to resolve East-West tensions.

WE WILL NOT APPEASE

But we are not willing to close our eyes to the tragic record of the past.

We are definitely not willing to experiment in appeasement, because history confirms that there is nothing more suicidal than an attempt to appease an aggressor.

Dwight D. Eisenhower will not appease. He will not abandon principle. He will not abandon Lithuania or the other enslaved people. He will speak in the cause and spirit of freedom. We have faith and confidence in him and in the able team which accompanies him.

CONCLUSION

Thus we have seen the three symbols of the Darius-Girenas flight which we observe today.

The symbol of American friendship for the Lithuanian people.

The symbol of the contracted world, contracted by aviation-missile progress.

The symbol of man's unending quest for peace.

May we go forth refreshed and inspired in this threefold tradition which they left for us.

And, in the years which are up ahead, as we pause again to remember the flight—may we be further along toward each of these three great objectives.

Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, Before the San Francisco Labor Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I was privileged to deliver before the San Francisco Labor Council dinner on the occasion of the ceremonies in San Francisco, commemorating the 10th anniversary of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE SAN FRANCISCO LABOR COUNCIL, JUNE 24, 1955

It is a pleasure and a privilege to join with you today in a discussion of the United Nations, and the role of organized labor in international organizations dedicated to the fulfillment of the objectives of the United Nations Charter.

We are all aware of the vital role which labor plays in a democracy. We are also aware of the fact that in a totalitarian society the trade unions are among the first casualties when the dictators take over. Labor plays an equally vital role in the conduct of our foreign policy, because no matter how well conceived our foreign policy may be, its success is dependent in large measure on our internal strength. And we are proud in the knowledge that American labor is a vital component of this strength and provides an indispensable source of vigor and support which enables our Government to conduct its relations with other nations to the best advantage of our people.

It is, perhaps, startling to realize that 10 years have passed since the representatives of 50 nations assembled in this beautiful and historic city to draft an instrument which was intended to represent the culmination of man's eternal search for peace and security. This instrument was, of course, the Charter of the United Nations. By adhering to it, the original 50 states, together with the 10 additional states which subsequently joined the Organization, solemnly pledged themselves to repudiate war and aggression forever after. Equally important was the fact that they established the most promising and potentially effective international organization ever created in the history of the world.

Ordinary men and women everywhere in the world do not demand too much of life. What they seek and yearn for is a just peace, a recognition of the dignity and worth of man and his right to the fundamental freedoms and decent standards of living for themselves and their children. It is these needs—so simple to enumerate—yet sometimes so difficult to achieve—which led to the establishment of the United Nations 10 years ago.

As set forth in its charter, the major purpose of the United Nations is the maintenance of world peace, security, and economic stability by means of internationtal cooperation and understanding. Underlying this objective is the proposition that if the causes of international tension and disunity can be removed or reduced, these basic demands of mankind can be met.

By what specific means did the founders of the United Nations expect to accomplish these fundamental objectives?

First, by removing the causes of war through the creation of conditions necessary to peace and friendly relations among people everywhere—higher standards of living, improved health conditions, increased food production and adequate distribution, the improvement and expansion of commerce, and a broader acceptance of fundamental human rights.

Second, by providing a mechanism for the adjustment of differences which endanger international peace, and security when normal diplomatic intercourse has failed; and

Third, by providing the means for building collective security against acts of aggression, threats to and breaches of the peace, and for using diplomatic, economic, and, ultimately, military measures when it became necessary to prevent the outbreak or spread of hostilities.

The United Nations is not a superstate. It is composed of sovereign states which have given it only limited powers, under which the U. N. Organization may impinge upon the sovereignty of its members only to the extent that they have voluntarily permitted by their adherence to the charter. Since the United Nationas is not a superstate, it cannot, without the cooperation of member nations, settle dispute, safeguard collective security, maintain peace, or launch economic and social programs and projects designed to eliminate the tensions and unrest which often lead to war. A further consideration is the fact that the United Nations was not designed to make the peace following World War II, but rather to maintain the peace once it was established.

The United States supports the United Nations because the charter expresses our fundamental principles and objectives in this very difficult and complicated world. Fulfillment of the aims declared in the charter will best advance the interests of the United States—for these aims—peace founded on justice; freedom, economic and social progress for ourselves and for all peoples—represent and summarize the domestic and foreign policy goals of the United States. It is because realization of the aims expressed in the United Nations Charter will materially advance United States interests that support of the United Nations is a fundamental element in our foreign policy.

Let us examine briefly the machinery which was created to enable the United Nations to accomplish its objectives.

The United Nations was established with six principal organs: (1) the General Assembly; (2) the Security Council; (3) the Economic and Social Council; (4) the Trusteeship Council; (5) the International Court of Justice; and (6) the Secretariat. Each of these performs important functions.

The General Assembly, consisting of all of the members of the United Nations, was designed as the center or core. Although the General Assembly was originally designed as a forum or town meeting of the world, it has developed very considerably following the paralysis of the Security Council by the Soviets.

In any event, I believe that the greatest value and importance of the General Assembly lies in the fact that any point of trouble or discord in the international scene may be brought out into the open. The Assembly is not paralyzed by the veto power. Because in the limelight of public opinion, even the most powerful States do pay heed to the conclusions reached in such public discussions, the General Assembly has assumed far greater importance than was originally envisioned by the founders of the United Nations. In fact, it may be said that it has assumed an entirely new role.

The Security Council has, as its basic function, the maintenance of international peace and security, including the regulation of armaments. It is concerned primarily, according to the charter, with disputes or situations which may endanger peace and security, or which actually result in the occurrence of violence. In the first circumstance, its function is to conciliate differences; in the second, to repress or check any resort to force. It also exercises a watchful eye over international relations for any evidence of a dangerous situation, and was designed, under certain circumstances, to be the enforcement arm of the General Assembly.

The inclusion within the United Nations structure of its third organ, the Economic and Social Council, is a recognition of the fact that conditions of stability and well-being are necessary for friendly relations among nations and that the achievement of these conditions is conductive to peace. Within its orbit are the promotion of higher standards of living; full employment, conditions of economic and social progress and development, solutions of international economic, social, and health problems; and universal respect for the observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without discrimination as to race, sex, language, and religion.

Because international economic and social problems are so complex, 10 agencies and a number of functional and regional commissions were established, charged with important duties in the social and economic fields. Of the remaining principal organs—the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat—their titles indicate their functions.

It is indeed unfortunate that until the Korean conflict, the efforts of the United Nations in pioneering for peace have not been as well known as the Great Power disagreements.

International disunity and conflict inevitably receive greater attention and publicity than do harmony, unity, and cooperation. As a result, the East-West conflicts and disagreements over political and security matters have monopolized public attention and have tended to obscure the many

important, but unspectacular, United Nations achievements which have done much to promote peace and stability in the world.

When one considers the deep antagonisms which rend this world, it is remarkable that the U. N. exists at all. But what is even more remarkable is that it not only exists—it lives, it thrives as a positive, creative force.

Looking backward, we cannot fail to be impressed by the ability which the U. N. has shown to adapt itself to changing, unforeseen circumstances. It has demonstrated to a marked degree the flexibility which is characteristic of the most valuable and enduring human institutions. It has likewise shown a high quality of courage and a remarkable singleness of purpose.

The United Nations is in fact a declaration of interdependency. The charter of the U. N., conceived and written in the United States under the auspices of our Government, is the 20th century proclamation of peace, freedom, and security. It represents for the world what our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution mean to America.

But liberty and justice are not attained by their mere proclamation. Surely we Americans know that freedom and security represent the continuing challenge to liberty-loving people in every generation. We Americans should be proud of our role in the U. N., and our active participation within its councils. Our traditions, our history, have uniquely prepared us for a role of leadership in creating a world order based on the enduring principles of freedom, justice, and equality. It is to these principles that the United Nations is dedicated.

Rather than withdraw from the responsibilities and task of achieving the hopes and aspirations of the United Nations Charter, we should declare to the world, day in and day out, that the United States will proceed with confidence, with determination, and with perseverance to the end of strengthening the U. N. and all of its agencies. We are people of peace. Ours is a government of law. Ours is a society of equal opportunity. Surely these credentials qualify us as an active participant in the greatest international organization the world has ever known.

The singleness of purpose of the U. N. is worth emphasizing. The discordant clatter of the Soviet bloc sometimes tends to drown out, but never to destroy, the underlying harmony of the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations. This underlying harmony, this fundamental singleness of purpose, has been demonstrated time after time on crucial votes which have seen 45 or 50 or 55 nations of the world alined on one side and the 5 Soviet bloc members braying to themselves on the other.

It is this singleness of purpose, I believe, which has enabled the U. N. not only to hold together but to grow in stature and prestige despite the trying events of the last 10 years—events which no one could have possibly foreseen 10 years ago.

The fundamental difficulty which the U. N. has had to survive and which its founders did not foresee has been the cold war. The U. N. was founded on the premise of Big Five unanimity. Rarely, perhaps never, in the history of human affairs has an institution built on such a shaky premise flourished so mightily.

The fact that the U. N. has flourished is in itself the most eloquent and impressive testimony to the need for the U. N. and to the determination of the people of the world to make it work.

It is important to recognize that in its fight to survive during the cold war, the UN has gone through structural and institutional changes which make it something different from what it was 10 years ago. As the Security Council has been frustrated by Soviet abuse of the veto, for example, the General Assembly has gradually and of necessity assumed certain functions which the Charter contemplates should be performed by the Security Council. The uniting for peace resolution which the Assembly adopted in 1950 established a procedure whereby if the Security Council is unable, because of a veto, to act on a threat to the peace, the Assembly itself may take the matter up immediately—in emergency session on 24 hours' notice if necessary—and recommend collective measures, including the use of armed force.

Let it be noted that the word "recommend" is used. The Assembly cannot compel action. But the action will be taken if the governments of the world want it to be taken. An Assembly recommendation can be effective to the extent that the U. N.'s members are willing and able to make it so.

This is just another way of saying that the United Nations is what its members make it. Those members are all sovereign nations in their own right, and they lose none of their sovereign capacities by participating in U. N. proceedings.

There are some people who profess alarm over the changes which have taken place in the U. N. as a result of the cold war. In my judgment, the changes, on the contrary, are cause of satisfaction. What sort of human institution is it that does not change in the course of time to adapt itself to changes in its environment? The fact that the U. N. has changed has nothing to do with any imaginary, Machiavellian plot to subvert the sovereignty of the United States; it is, instead, indicative of a healthy vitality on the part of the U. N. And we should all rejoice that this is so.

The member nations of the U. N. have had the courage and the wisdom to meet collectively a series of crises and challenges which in their gravity and complexity far surpass the events which led to the failure of the League of Nations. The list of accomplishments of the U. N. in keeping the peace is impressive. I shall name only a few of the most outstanding.

The U. N. was scarcely a year old when it was confronted with the refusal of the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops from Iran. The U. N. met this challenge to its authority and Soviet troops were withdrawn.

The second major problem involved Syria and Lebanon. Both of these countries requested the immediate withdrawal of British and French troops from their territory. Although the Soviet Union blocked by the veto the Council's proposal for a gradual withdrawal of these troops, both France and Great Britain announced that they would abide by the expressed desire of the majority of the Council and the troops were withdrawn.

When Greece complained that her independence and territorial integrity were being threatened by neighboring States the Security Council appointed a commission to make an on-the-spot investigation and to report back to the Council. When the Commission reported that the Greek complaints were justified, the Council's efforts to carry out the recommendations of the Commission were frustrated by Soviet vetoes. The matter was ultimately transferred to the General Assembly on the proposal of the United States. The Assembly adopted a resolution calling on Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to cease their activities, and then established a Special Committee to keep the situation under continuing surveillance and to keep the General Assembly informed of all developments. The moral pressure of this action by the rest of the organized world, acting in concert gave strength to the Greek Government.

In Indonesia, the United Nations first succeeded in obtaining a cease-fire in the fighting between the Dutch and Indonesian forces. Through the efforts of the Security Council, a truce was secured and agreements were made terminating hostilities and affording full independence to the 76 million people inhabiting Indonesia.

In India, large-scale war was averted as a result of the efforts of the Security Council with respect to the Kashmir question which involved a dispute between India and Pakistan. The Council established an on-the-spot commission and obtained a cooling-off period. Ultimately a cease-fire was arranged and open warfare was terminated.

In 1948, when the Soviets engaged in their unlawful blockade of Berlin, war clouds gathered rapidly and ominously and it began to appear that armed conflagration would break out at any moment. As a result of a meeting of the parties in the forum of the United Nations, a truce was worked out and the matter was ultimately settled without armed conflict.

In Palestine, when full-scale war broke out between the Arabs and the Jews, the United Nations stepped in, obtained a cease-fire and ultimately an armistice, supervised by a Mixed Armistice Commission. Two years later, again as a result of the United Nations action, the new state of Israel was born and a serious threat to the peace of the Middle East was averted.

In Korea due to the failure of Soviet-American negotiations concerning the establishment of an independent government for Korea in 1947 and 1948, the United States submitted the problem to the General Assembly. Under United Nations auspices, elections were held and an independent democratic government was established in South Korea.

The outbreak of hostilities in Korea during the summer of 1950 put the United Nations to its first real test. Lacking the armed force which was envisioned by the charter, as a result of Soviet refusal to cooperate in its creation, the Security Council, in the absence of Russia, immediately took the only action possible under the circumstances. It adopted resolutions declaring North Korea's invasion of South Korea to be a breach of the peace and called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the North Korean forces to the 38th parallel. This action was based not only upon the complaint of the United States, but upon the report of the United Nations on-the-spot Commision on Korea. The resolution also called upon members to lend every assistance to the United Nations and to refrain from giving any assistance to the North Korean authorities.

The subsequent events are now history. We all know that the United States carried a greater part of the burden. However, we also know that armed forces of 16 other member nations fought with our forces and that never before had the principle of collective security been so firmly established; never have so many nations acted together in defense of that principle; never have the rights of the weak against the strong been so stoutly protected.

For one reason or another, some people in the United States have sought to distort history on this point. Let us keep the record straight.

The United States did not fight the Korean war under either the compulsion or the direction of the United Nations. The truth of the matter is that United States forces had already been ordered into Korea before the United Nations intervened. And despite all the hue and cry which we heard later—after the going got tough—no voice was raised in serious protest at the time of the decision to fight in Korea.

The principle of collective security was at stake in Korea, and both the United States and the United Nations rose to meet the challenge. But also at stake in Korea were the vital interests of the United States—to

a greater extent than those of any other U. N. member and so much so, in fact, that no less an authority than Secretary of State John Foster Dulles recently told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in regard to our intervention in Korea:

"I believe that the vital interests of the United States would have justified our taking this action alone, if we had had to."

After all, it was United States forces in Japan which would have been threatened by a Soviet-dominated Korea. It was the United States defense line in the Western Pacific which would have been breached.

Nor is there any basis for the complaint that American troops were sent to fight in Korea under United Nations command. There was a United Nations command, true; but from the beginning to the end of the Korean fighting, an American general was at the head of it, and he got his orders, not from U. N. headquarters in New York, but from the Pentagon in Washington.

Now, it is fashionable to criticize other members of the United Nations for not putting more troops into Korea. We all hope they will do more in the unhappy event that such a situation arises again. But the constant repetition of this complaint, like a broken phonograph record, obscures the contribution which other U. N. members did make to the Korean action. Ambassador Lodge has estimated that if it had not been for these contributions, the United States would have had to put two additional divisions of its own in the field. American casualties in Korea were tragically high; but if it had not been for the U. N., they would have been even higher.

It seems to me that the real significance of this action is, first, that it constituted the first collective international force and action in support of United Nations principles; second, it stimulated the United Nations to develop new machinery and better methods for meeting future threats; third, it aroused the free peoples of the world to the necessity of mobilizing their strength for defense; and fourth, it strengthened the will of small nations to resist by proving that they will not have to stand alone against aggression.

Important and impressive as it is, peacemaking is only one of the accomplishments of the United Nations. The flexibility with which the U. N. has met the demands of Asia and Africa for political independence and economic development is only slightly less remarkable than the manner in which it has coped with the exigencies of the cold war. And in the long run, this phase of U. N. activities may be even more significant and productive of international peace and prosperity.

The United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program is perhaps the best known of these activities, but it is only one of many things the U. N. is doing to promote human welfare and economic development. There is, in addition, the whole area of specialized agencies—the Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Health Organization, the International Labor Organization, the Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunications Union, the Universal Postal Union, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

But apart from these efforts, vast progress has been made in a number of fields, particularly in regard to technical assistance. In this country, for instance, where many of us are inclined to take our living stnadard for granted, not many realize that out of the world's 2,400 million inhabitants about 1 out of every 2 persons lives where there is generally not enough food. That his daily diet is only 400 calories above starvation level and 750 below that enjoyed by the more fortunate one-third of mankind. Every day there are an additional 80,000 new mouths to feed in a world whose farmlands have not yielded enough food to keep pace with population growth.

One person in eight suffers from malaria. More than 8,000 a day die from it, on the average. Even more suffer and die from tuberculosis. In many sections of quite a number of countries, 250 or more children out of every 1,000 die before they reach the age of 1 year. Sometimes this infant death rate may be as high as 400 per 1,000 a year.

About 50 percent of mankind can neither read nor write. Earnings are also extremely low. Two out of every 3 people earn, on the average, less than $200 a year, or its equivalent. Of these half earn less than $50 a year.

These are ugly, indeed dangerous, facts about the Twentieth Century, which so often has been called an age of progress. These deplorable facts represent the urgency of our challenge and responsibility.

In large part following American leadership and inspiration, the members of the U. N. in 1950 put in motion an action program to send experts from the U. N. and its family of specialized agencies into farms, homes, hospitals, schools, workshops, and government offices in the less-developed countries throughout the world to help peoples to help themselves. It also sends young men and women to study and to be trained abroad.

The UNETAP in 1954 sent more than 1,500 experts of 63 nationalities to 71 countries and territories and awarded more than 1,500 fellowships or scholarships to nationals of 86 countries and territories.

The problems of the less developed countries are by their very nature slow to resolve. There are no miracles that can be wrought. It takes time and patience to train teachers, doctors, fishermen, foresters, farmers, and technicians to grow more food, to produce more goods, to use natural resources more efficiently. It obviously takes time to reach people who cannot read or write how to grow more food or to use modern machinery. This is a long-term job. It must be tackled vigorously and supported with capital investment to make a lasting impression against age-old primitive conditions and inertia. The U. N. technical-assistance program offers one of the best ways in which nations can work together to help people help themselves.

Through labor, agricultural, commercial attaché specialists and other officers in our Foreign Service, through economic aid and our mutual-security program, through the technical-assistance program, through assisting the development of international labor standards, and in many other ways our Government is constantly seeking to aid our friends and allies to develop conditions within which accelerated progress for all elements of their populations will be possible.

Let us examine briefly at this time, the vital mission and wonderful record of accomplishment of the International Labor Organization which is one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, although it antedates that organization by some 26 years.

In its original statement of purpose, contained in the preamble of its constitution, the ILO was to deal with the regulation of hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week; the regulation of the labor supply; the prevention of unemployment; the provision of an adequate living wage; the protection of the worker against sickness, disease, and injury arising out of his employment; and many other matters which today are commonplace in many countries of the world.

In 1944, after a quarter of a century of successful operation, the International Labor Organization, meeting in Philadelphia, reaffirmed its program for peace in what became known as the Declaration of Philadelphia.

Among the ringing statements included in this declaration was the statement that "poverty aynwhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere." This declaration was said by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt to sum up "the aspirations of an epoch which has known two world wars" and "may well acquire" a historical significance similar to that of the Declaration of Independence of the United States.

The declaration reaffirmed the fundamental principles upon which the International Labor Organization was founded, citing in particular the following:

That labor is not a commodity.

That freedom of expression and of association are essential to sustained progress.

That poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere.

The basic aim of the International Labor Organization is to promote social justice in all countries, and to this end it collects and disseminates information about labor and social conditions, formulates international standards, and supervises their national application. It also provides technical assistance in carrying out social and economic development programs.

The record of the International Labor Organization in steady, solid achievement and progress toward the accomplishment of its basic aims and objectives is truly outstanding. In fact, I believe that any objective appraisal must lead to the conclusion that of all the organized international cooperative efforts now going on, the ILO has clearly traveled the greatest distance in the achievement of its goals.

Of course, we know that in social and economic affairs the ultimate goals are never fully achieved. However, we know and recognize solid progress when we see it, and I am proud of the fine record of this great organization in improving conditions of labor and labor's status throughout the world, and I am proud of the role which organized labor, in general, and American organized labor, in particular, has played in the achievement of this great progress.

We know that our great labor federations and international unions have long been in the vanguard of those who understand the strategic importance and implications of the labor factor in the struggle against Soviet communism. Through the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and personal representatives abroad, American labor has been active in helping free unions around the world to gain in strength and responsibility. In this task it has not only stressed to brother workers the treachery of communism to the workingman and the emptiness of its promises, but has also proved an effective proponent of democracy and the ideals of human dignity and freedom on which our Nation was founded.

Have We Been Winning the Cold War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following brilliant analysis of United States policy by James B. Reston, chief Washington correspondent of the New York Times, was delivered as the Gideon Seymour lecture at the University of Minnesota and reprinted in the New Leader

of July 18, 1955. I wish it could be heard or read by every American:

HAVE WE BEEN WINNING THE COLD WAR?

(By James B. Reston)

There is confusion and frustration today about our foreign policy because there is no general agreement about what a foreign policy is, what it can do and what it cannot do, and what its objectives are. The debate proceeds endlessly (and often fruitlessly) because the debaters cannot agree on a valid test of what is progress.

We need, therefore, to develop a philosophy about our country's place in the world today, a way of looking at these endless scare headlines. Otherwise, I fear, the constant press of events will drive us into a state of indifference, which is a menace to democratic government, or into a condition of constant anxiety, which destroys both a tolerant public opinion and private tranquility.

I have no doubt whatsoever about the outcome of the cold war. No handful of men in the world are smart enough to run this vast Communist empire. The thing is against human nature, and its inner contradictions will bring it down if we are vigilant and patient. But this a marathon, and we're running it like a 100-yard dash. It might be useful, therefore, to suggest a way of looking at this struggle.

First of all, I suppose it is necessary to say that we have to have a foreign policy. We can no longer safely avoid the entangling alliances General Washington warned us against. There is no return to the old unencumbered, unentangled days.

If anybody is looking for normalcy, let him look around the world at his leisure. This is it—what we have now. One day it is Quemoy and Matsu. The next day it will be South Vietnam. Yesterday it was Europe, now it is Asia and tomorrow it may be Africa or Latin America. It is obvious, I think, that the only power in the world equal to the power that threatens our civilization is the power of the United States.

What is not so obvious is that, so long as we have air bases in Turkey, Britain, North Africa, France, Germany, and Canada, our striking power is closer to the vital industrial and political centers of the Communist world than Communist airpower is to ours. From our positions in these countries, we can, if necessary, get over Moscow faster than they can fly from their nearest bases to this country, and these same allied bases greatly increase our own early-warning defenses against enemy attack. We cannot, however, have bases without entangling alliances, and in the present barbaric state of the world, the United States Strategic Air Force, scattered around the periphery of the Communise world, is still the greatest deterrent to large-scale war.

Second, it is important to remember that foreign relations are foreign. They concern our contacts with other independent nation states, most of which are as proud and cantankerous as we are. We cannot legislate beyond our own frontiers. We cannot buy the consent of others. We cannot change the French constitution. We cannot make Nehru stop lecturing the world from his pinnacle of neutrality, much as we did in the 19th century. In short, we have power in this field, but we are not omnipotent.

A third fundamental follows: Nations, like individuals, have to limit their objectives, or take the consequences. Napoleon and Hitler refused to limit their objectives, and were destroyed; the Japanese did the same thing when they set themselves the objective of destroying United States power at Pearl Harbor. But this business of limiting one's objectives is difficult for America to learn, which is probably why we are trying to defend the doormat on Communist China's front stoop right now.

We are accustomed to doing the impossible in America. It is a part of our national psychology. It is a glorious tradition which cleared the American frontier of trees and built a fantastic society. But in foreign policy it can be a great danger. People and nations are more stubborn than trees. They cannot be moved so easily. Consequently, it is not a bad idea in foreign affairs to limit your objectives, to keep your commitments in line with your power, and to avoid demanding things you are not willing to pay for.

Fourth, the main objective of our foreign policy is very simple: It is to defend the security of the American people. It is not to remake the world or protect the status quo or to win wars. It is to guard the safety of our people, to encourage an environment in which they can enjoy the blessings of liberty and to prevent the outbreak of an atomic war.

Finally, these foreign-policy questions are difficult, not because the Democrats are disloyal or the Republicans stupid, but because Asia is in revolt, Soviet and Chinese power have vastly increased, British and French power have greatly declined, new techniques of war—from atom bombs to subversion—have been devised, and all this has become part of our responsibility before we have had time to adjust our habits of mind or our institutions to our new role in the world.

Under these circumstances, it is not a good idea to expect too much. The great antagonists of the world—the United States and the U. S. S. R.—have contradictory views of the end of life itself and, unfortunately, they are not only the two most powerful nations in the world today, but they are also the least experienced.

In these terms, rather than in the terms of the perfectionists, I think we are doing pretty well. The United States has learned the lesson of the major British failures of the early part of the century. Very often, it seems, our "muddling through" has merely replaced their "muddling through," but there is this important difference: they did not deter the big war when they had primary responsibility and, so far, we have.

The British did not raise enough strength in the critical periods of the century—from 1908 to 1914 and from 1933 to 1939—to keep the Germans from thinking that they could win without being severely punished. They would not raise their defense budgets to meet their commitments. They would not break up the family and conscript their sons until it was too late. Nor were they able to put together an effective coalition of nations to deter the potential aggressors.

The United States has learned these lessons. It reversed the League of Nations decision of 1920. It has conscripted its men ever since the war. It has maintained enough offensive power to terrify the Russians. It has stationed its young men all over the world. And it has committed itself to oppose aggression from the north cape of Norway right through the heart of Europe to Trieste; thence across Turkey to Pakistan, southeast Asia, Formosa and the Pescadores, Korea, Japan, and deep into the South Pacific.

When I think back to my early days as a foreign correspondent, when the British and the French were saying, in the thirties, that all would be well if only the United States would make clear that it would oppose aggression, I am amazed at our progress and appalled at the complaints we now hear about America in London and Paris.

A generation ago, men were saying the American Constitution divided power so evenly that no important treaty with another country would ever again pass the Senate. Ten years ago, it was said that the power of the Presidency would always be paralyzed at the time of crisis. All this was said about our selfishness and the paralytic rigidity of our political institutions.

The American capacity for unity, however, has proved to be greater than the predictions. The Republican Party, which was supposed to go isolationist as soon as it came into power, has not only sustained the defense treaties made by the Democrats but has extended our commitments in the last 2 years to Pakistan, to most of Southeast Asia, and to Korea, Formosa, and the Pescadores. Three years ago, Western Europe had an alliance with the Democratic Party; today it has an alliance with America. And the astonishing thing is that the main foreign policy opposition in the Republican Party today comes from those who want us to do not less, but more.

Meanwhile, the American people, despite their frustrations, have poured out their substance to their allies, to the neutrals, and, on occasion, even to those who have sworn to destroy everything that gives meaning to our society. All this is so remarkable and is so widely overlooked that I sometimes think the world has lost its sense of wonder. There has been nothing like it, in my judgment, in the history of sovereign nations.

Moreover, we have not only organized our power but we have used it effectively and with restraint. It is popular now to dismiss Korea as a disappointment, if not a failure. But in the long story of the 20th century I think it will look very good alongside the names of Abyssinia and Spain and the occupation of the Rhineland. Ever since late in June 1950, when the American planes went into action against the first Soviet open aggression at the 38th parallel, the men in the Kremlin have had to reckon with the very real possibility that any open aggression against the free world might be struck by the power of the United States. This is the central fact, it seems to me, of the postwar era.

It does not, however, follow from this that the battle is over. Much of our national frustration today springs from the illusion that foreign policy has a beginning and an end, like a football game. We are willing to sacrifice but we want it to end almost right away. It is significant, I think, that we talk about the Soviet Union as a "headache," and keep on looking for a pill that will make it go away. But foreign relations are like human relations. They are endless. The solution of one problem usually leads to another.

So, while I sincerely believe that America has just passed through one of the great decades of its history this is a perplexing, shifting, perpetual business which demands new methods, new men, and new ideas all the time.

The first objective of the cold war was to keep the 175 Red army divisions from marching at a time when there were only about 10 Allied divisions between the Elbe River and the North Sea. It was equally important to prevent the economic disintegration of Western Europe, to build and organize the military forces of the free world into an effective coalition, and to stop the Communist resort to armed force in Korea.

These things were done, and they were remarkable achievements. But Korea deranged our whole cold-war effort. It turned our minds almost wholly to the problems of military power. In the belief that Korea was the first act in a world war, Washington concentrated on questions of force, played up military aid to the Allies and played down economic aid to other countries, though the Marshall plan and the point 4 program were extraordinary accomplishments.

This is what almost always happens in Washington. Like all institutions, government clings to the familiar, often long after it admits conditions have changed. Almost everybody in the Government talks about adjusting to the most subtle and perplexing tasks of the cold war—of getting its economic and information programs back in balance with the military—but the budget and the thinking in official circles still reflect an official preoccupation with questions of military power. The United States has won the first phase of the cold war and doesn't

know it, and has moved into the second phase and isn't ready for it.

We have to move along now, it seems to me, not on one but on many fronts. We have to have a "new look" military establishment in the event of a catastrophic test of strength, but we also have to face an "old look," for the police problems we face in the jungles of Asia are in some ways more similar to the tasks of the French and Indian wars than to anything else.

The deterrent power of the Strategic Air Force and its family of atomic weapons and guided missiles has to be kept up to date, of course; this is our shield. But we dare not allow this obvious need to prepare for the big war—which may never come if we maintain the shield—to dominate our budgets and our energies to the point where it will keep us from waging the war that is here right now.

While there are many things going on in this field, no doubt, that are not disclosed to a reporter, I suggest and suspect nevertheless that we are not devoting as much money, manpower, and imagination to the political, economic, scientific and ideological aspects of the cold war as we might.

Consider, for example, the expenditure of foreign-aid funds. If a country seems to be on the verge of disappearing under the Iron Curtain, there is no limit to what we will spend at the last minute to try to save it. But getting funds for a country that faces, not an immediate, but a long-range crisis is extremely difficult.

For example, the United States has poured far more into Indochina in the last couple of years than it has spent since the end of the war on the vital task of developing India. Asia is watching this contrast between India, trying to develop a continent through free institutions, and Communist China, trying to develop another continent by compulsion. This may very well be the race that will determine the long-range future of all Asia. But our motto seems to be: "Billions for sinking ships, but as little as possible for Nehru." If he goes down, of course, we can always say he was a difficult fellow—and it's true—but it may be small consolation.

I don't know what percentage of our atomic-energy budget and our scientific brains is going into the development of atomic and thermonuclear weapons and what percentage is going into the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. We are not told such things. But again, I suspect that a disproportionate amount is going into big business.

We are power-minded, and that is all right. But a capacity to destroy all life in a 20-mile-wide belt from Chicago to Milwaukee with a single H-bomb ought to be enough to deter the Russians. Meanwhile, a great deal more of our energies in this field might be applied mose usefully to the peacetime projects. In the long run, the atomic electric power race may prove to be more decisive than the atomic bomb race.

The lag in our information program illustrates the same problem. It is almost impossible for any speechwriter in Washington today to write a speech without saying something about "the wars of ideas," but I haven't run into anybody with a new idea in this field since the President produced his "atoms for peace" plan.

Everybody agrees that we are in an ideological war, but the ideology of this great country is being distorted at home and misunderstood all over the world. We won our independence with a flurry of the finest pamphlets ever written in the English language, and we have devoted more time and more money and energy to the arts of persuation than all the countries of the world combined. Yet our information program is pedestrian and ineffective, and even our allies are left in monumental ignorance of what kind of people we are and what we are trying to do.

One reason for this is that we have concentrated almost entirely on ways of saying things or on psychological tricks, rather than on what to say. Almost every debate on the United States Information Service is dominated by discussion about transmitters on land and transmitters on sea, and how clever we are at floating balloons back of the Iron Curtain.

Meanwhile, platoons of undisciplined Senators and Congressmen and retired generals, who forget that their voices carry beyond the county line, send up clouds of banalities which frequently blur and muffle the true and generous voices of America. We can never speak with a single voice and never should, but somebody, sometime, should try to remind the politicians that what they say is part of the Voice of America, too. We cannot measure the effectiveness of our information program in megacycles. A poor distribution system is better than a good distribution system if we say the wrong thing, for a powerful system merely multiplies our mistakes and carries them farther across the world.

Another reason for our failure in this field is that the contacts between the responsible official and the responsible reporter in Washington are poor. The Government leaves the press to interpret many of the most important developments in the world on its own.

Two things follow from this. The interpretation is often inaccurate and almost always contradictory, and these inaccuracies and contradictions become part of the flow of the news which goes abroad and adds to the confusion of friend and foe alike.

Meanwhile, the representatives of the foreign press in the capital are often left without adequate access to our knowledgeable officials at moments of international crisis. So great is the mistrust around the world of Government propaganda that the voices of our officials are often discounted just because they are official voices. The readers in Paris are more likely to believe the reports of their own correspondents in Washington than the statements of American officials, but these reporters from overseas very often find it difficult to get adequate guidance at the right time. The officials who are available to them in moments of crisis often do not know the facts, and those officials who know the facts are not available. Thus, valuable instruments of good will are often overlooked or even antagonized.

To summarize: It is not surprising that we have concentrated on questions of power in the last decade. It was necessary; we have to save our lives before we can decide what to do with them. But I believe we have done that part of the job and know how to keep on doing it, and we must now concentrate a little more on this 50-year war the President talks about.

There is no escape into the unentangled world of George Washington's dreams. It is forbidden by the guided missile, the intercontinental-supersonic bomber, the atomic bomb, and an enemy who is sworn to the destruction of everything that gives meaning and purpose to our lives.

If we limit our objectives, however, and judge our progress by something short of perfection, there is no need, it seems to me, for despair. The need is for a patient, well-informed people, both attentive and unafraid, who know what this great country stands for and are willing to die for it if necessary.

Meanwhile, I hope we can be a little more hopeful and a little less flighty. A man can't stay breathless for 50 years. Where I come from, people keep wanting to jump from one extreme to the other; Congressmen either go fishing or go crazy.

The future, we may be sure, will produce as many surprises as the past, and require as much industry and imagination. The world is changing fast. Our own country's population has doubled in the last 50 years. We are in more than an arms race. We are in a race with the pace of our own history, and the pace is so swift that our habits of mind and our institutions are lagging behind.

This applies to the quality of men we are sending to Washington; to our outmoded political campaigns which paralyze our leadership for months on end; to the seniority system in Congress, where durability is put above intelligence, and to many other aspects of our national life.

When we talk about the cold war and how we are progressing in it, we should not think only or even primarily about the State Department, or Secretary Dulles, the President, and the noble gentlemen on the Hill. We should think as well about our schools, and our teachers, about our communities and ourselves.

To our shame, this was the year when the Chief Justice of the United States felt obliged to state in public that if the Bill of Rights were to be voted on today, it would be fiercely controversial and have a hard time passing. And he made a good point about it:

"We cannot," he said, "delegate to any or all of our governmental representatives the full responsibility for protection of our freedoms from the processes of erosion. Such protection can be had only through an understanding on the part of individual citizens."

Oregon's Flax Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, revitalization of Oregon's flax industry is promised as a result of important discoveries made by Jess Harmond, Department of Agriculture research engineer at Oregon State College, Corvallis.

Oregon's Willamette Valley is the one place in the United States where climate is favorable to the cultivation of flax, but the industry has been plagued by high costs. Under the new developments, processes which formerly took 10 months or more and expensive handling can be speeded up to a 10-day continuous-line production. Flax production is expected to increase in Oregon during the coming years, and a new farsighted corporation, Willamette Flax Products, has been organized in Albany, Oreg.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Malcolm Bauer, of Portland, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor for June 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLAX PROCESS BOON TO OREGON

(By Malcolm Bauer)

ALBANY, Oreg.—Automation, or something very much like it, has come to Oregon's flax industry and has saved it in the 11th hour. The only State that produces flax will increase its production in the next few years as a result of a discovery made at Oregon State College in Corvallis, Oreg.

The discovery was that of Jess Harmond, United States Department of Agriculture re-

search engineer at the State college. His discovery: Flax fiber can be processed in 10 days in a continuous line to produce linen thread. Currently the flax processed at the Oregon State Penitentiary plant at Salem requires more than 18 months from field to final processing, and this is par for plants over the world.

Mr. Harmond's finding has resulted in the organization of a new corporation. Willamette Flax Products, formed by a group of Albany residents to rejuvenate the flax-growing industry in Oregon's Willamette River Valley, the one place in the Nation where the climate is favorable to the cultivation of flax.

The industry has been languishing along in Oregon for many years, its survival dependent entirely on the operation of the flax-processing plant at the Oregon State Penitentiary. There the labor factor was no problem, and the high-cost operation was maintained year after year at a loss, utilizing the fiber grown on about 1,000 Willamette Valley acres.

PROBLEM OF HIGH COSTS

Oregon at one time had nearly a score of privately operated flax plants, and the flax industry was one of the State's most promising. But from the start, almost a century ago, it was plagued by high costs. In the accepted process it was necessary to handle the fiber some 32 times from harvest to finished thread. First the straw was stacked in a storage shed. Then it was removed, each bundle untied and pushed through a deseeding machine. The straw was then retied and stored until the following summer, 10 months away. The flax was then soaked in tanks in order to loosen the fibers from the coarse elements in the straw, then it was stacked in field for the drying or "retting" process. Once dried, the "scutching" began. In this process the fibers were beaten loose from the stalks. But these had to be stored until the following winter when moisture content was just right for handling.

PROCESS TELESCOPED

This is essentially the process followed in flax processing throughout the world. It is little wonder that high-cost American labor could not compete with that of other nations.

But Mr. Harmond's process has telescoped all this activity to 10 days. The flax can be retted and scutched and ready for the looms almost immediately after harvest.

The new company has contracted for an additional 800 acres of Oregon flax production, and during the next few years will double its contracted acreage with each year.

The new flax-processing procedure will cut costs aproximately in half in addition to its immense shortening of the processing time. As a result, the finished-product prices quoted by the new company are far below those normally asked for domestic linen.

Willamette Flax Products has purchased an idle flax plant at Santiam. Its first year's production already has been contracted for at the new low prices, according to Eldon Bragg, president of the company.

Power for Development of Metallurgical Industry in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relating to the development of power for the advancement of the metallurgical industry, and a nearby supply of dolomite in the so-called Inland Empire of the State of Washington, together with a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Availability of power in the Pacific Northwest coupled with a nearby supply of dolomite caused the War Production Board to select Spokane, Wash. for the production of magnesium to further the war effort. This action in 1943, during World War II, was followed by the Defense Plant Corporation's constructing a metallurgical plant in Spokane with electrical furnaces of unique design, using 10 kilowatts for each pound of aluminum produced.

The source of power for this new industry was the Grand Coulee Dam where construction costs are being repaid to the Federal Government with interest.

Many uninformed have considered the benefits of Grand Coulee Dam as regional rather than national in scope. Nevertheless, the power generated has played its part in winning World War II, in the Korean conflict, and has started new industries such as this one.

The plant has since been leased to a private firm, the Pacific Northwest Alloys, Inc., for the production of ferro-silicon and low ferro-chrome alloys.

Last fall, the Emergency Procurement Service of GSA made a major contribution to the advancement of the ferro-chrome industry by contracting with the Spokane magnesium plant for the conversion, purification, and concentration of low grade Government-owned chrome from Montana and Oregon for the Government stockpile. This initial contract for 73,000 tons has resulted in a very successful operation and has brought the approbation of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce as evinced by the following letter from them to the Administrator of GSA.

I join the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane in thanking the Emergency Procurement Service and General Services Administration for their foresight in recognizing and making a success of this operation.

SPOKANE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Spokane, Wash., June 6, 1955.

HON. EDMUND F. MANSURE,
Administrator, General Services Administration, General Services Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSURE: The Spokane Chamber of Commerce has been prone to ask favors from Government officials and to criticize them on occasion, but unfortunately has not been equally prone to commend the same officials. This letter is an exception.

We of the chamber of commerce wish to express to you our gratification over the outcome of the contract between the Emergency Procurement Service of the General Services Administration and the Pacific Northwest Alloys Co., which was negotiated in August 1954.

The contract has meant a great deal to Spokane and to the company, and I believe, to the Government as well. We believe you can take a great deal of pride in your planning which made the contract possible. Prior to this contract period sizable quantities of low-grade chrome ores produced in Montana and Oregon were considered to be economically unusable and not acceptable for movement to stockpiles due to their low chrome content. In fact, at the time this contract was entered into by the General Services Administration there was question in some quarters that the Government had contracted for a product that could not be produced, or if produced, would not be of economic use by the steel making industry.

The successful beneficiating, converting and concentrating of these low grade chrome ores into low carbon ferrochrome for the defense stockpile by the Pacific Northwest Alloys definitely demonstrates that the action of the General Services Administration in entering into the purchase contract for these ores was in the Government's interest. We believe that the results can now be definitely evaluated and we are taking this occasion to list them as we see them, both those for the Spokane area and for the Government. The contract has benefited Spokane and the Inland Empire by:

1. Keeping the Mead, Wash. plant in operation: At the time this contract was received there existed a strong possibility that the company, due to a continuing low in commercial ferrochrome purchasing, might be forced not only to terminate production, but even to return the plant to the Government.

The receipt of this contract permitted the company to not only continue operations, but also to bridge the period of low commercial buying so it is now operating at full capacity. This activity has resulted in continuing work for 150 people and the employment of 337 new workers, for a present total of 487 employees, who spend a monthly payroll of $200,000 in the Spokane area.

2. Firmly establishing new type ferrochrome industry in the Spokane area: Parallel with its Government contract the company has, by using purchased low chrome content ores, developed a sizable production of its new low carbon ferrochrome for commercial use. The steel industry reports the company's new product is giving excellent results in making of stainless steels, due to ease of handling, low product loss during addition, and reduction in steel costs due to iron content gains by its use.

3. Opening up new potential market for Montana and Oregon low chrome ore production: Prior to the company developing its new process and receipt of the present Government contract which proved desirable low carbon ferrochrome could be produced economically from low chrome content ores, Northwest low chrome ores were "begging" on the market. This was due to the excessive high cost of upgrading the ores to produce an acceptable and usable ferrochrome under existent processing methods.

The Government has benefited from the contract by:

1. Effecting conversion of materials generally considered to be valueless into stockpile product: Prior to signing of this contract, low grade chrome ores were generally considered valueless. Negotiation of contract with Pacific Northwest Alloys permitted conversion of this material into a stockpile product which can be put into immediate use by the steel industry in case of national emergency.

2. Increasing national stockpile of low carbon ferrochrome: By astute negotiation of terms and prices for the current contract, national stockpile of low-carbon ferrochrome has been increased at an economically attractive market price.

3. Assisting in establishment of manufacture of new metallurgical product: Through volume required by the Government contract the economic and feasible manufacture of a new metallurgical product, which has now proven to be cost saving to the steel industry, has been established.

We wish to thank you and your deputy, Commissioner A. J. Walsh, of the Emergency Procurement Service, for your foresight in recognizing the responsibility of converting these ores by Pacific Northwest Alloys, and negotiating the contract with the company.

The success of the operation has certainly vindicated your judgment.

Yours sincerely,

L. W. MARKHAM, *General Manager.*

Latin America Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Christianity and Crisis, issue of July 11, 1955:

LATIN AMERICA TODAY

(By Eugene L. Stockwell)

For a few days each year Latin America captures United States newspaper headlines. Last year the invasions of Guatemala and Costa Rica awakened us to the turmoil south of our border. To many Latin America appears to be a distant volcano, unnoticed most of the time, which occasionally erupts to our annoyance and confusion. Yet the volcano will not be silenced. Revolution follows revolution, southern governments request economic aid, social unrest prevails. United States leaders and politicians travel southward to inquire earnestly about political and economic needs, to patch up tottering policies, to silence opposition, to understand this land in ferment. In recent months Latin America has received many such visitors, headed by Vice President NIXON in the Caribbean, Secretary Dulles at the Caracas Conference, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower around the continent.

What is happening today in Latin America? What is the overall situation south of of the Rio Grande? Any attempt to answer such a query suffers inevitably from wide generalizations. To lump together Uruguay's stable democracy, Bolivia's social revolution, and Venezuela's bloody dictatorship, is close to preposterous. Yet there are general trends visible which enable us to grasp Latin America's essential problems and provide a framework within which Latin American developments should be interpreted.

The 20 Latin American nations have a population roughly equivalent to that of the United States, and live in a geographical area almost three times the size of the United States. For a century and a half, since independence was won from European tutelage, the dominant notes in Latin America have been political instability, economic chaos, and social unrest. The roots of much of this reach back to colonial history. The protests against oppressive Spanish and Portuguese colonial policies catapulted Latin American nations into a freedom which they desperately needed but for which they were sorely unprepared. They had little tradition of democratic representation. There were few, if any, norms of humanitarianism, despite the strong influence of the Roman Church in the colonies. A medieval feudalism prevailed in the economic and social spheres. It was inevitable that the growing pains of incipient nations should be severe. They are still felt throughout most of Latin America as it struggles to attain maturity and respect amid the speed of an industrial age.

The amazing fact is not that there is political and economic instability in Latin America; it is that in a relatively short period of time many of these nations, sensing their opportunities and responsibilities, have evolved rapidly toward some measure of democracy. What has happened in Uruguay in the past 50 years indicates what can happen. From fratricidal civil conflicts it has moved to a stable democratic organization, enlightened social legislation, and a liberty which is most remarkable. But in most of Latin America it is precisely at this point of political and economic evolution and revolution that serious storm warnings have been appearing in recent years.

Latin America's destiny depends solely on its relations with the United States. President Franklin Roosevelt's good neighbor policy spelled great hope for Latin-American democrats. The abrogation of the Platt amendment, the 1933 proclamation of the principle of nonintervention, the President's 1936 trip to Buenos Aires, the reciprocal-trade agreements, the interchange of professors, and the general interest taken in good hemispheric relations meant much to Latin America, and created a vast reservoir of good will toward the United States. The tragedy is that the gains of the thirties are being dissipated in the fifties. In 1947 there were only five dictatorships in Latin America, and two of them were tottering. But today over half the Latin-American nations are suffering the ruthless despotism of totalitarian regimes, and there is no assurance that the pendulum has as yet swung all the way to the right.

Latin American democrats are tempted to cast much of the blame for these late developments on the United States. Their arguments cannot be shrugged off easily. They point repeatedly to three failings in recent United States policies which have adversely affected our Southern neighbors. These criticisms point up the condition of Latin America today.

I

In the first place, many feel there has been a distortion of the doctrine of nonintervention. Hailed as the bulwark of freedom at the 1933 Montevideo Conference, it has been transmuted into a refuge for despicable dictators. The doctrine was much needed after the "big stick" policies of Theodore Roosevelt, who relied on the Marines to compel obedience to United States decisions. No Latin American regrets the passing of the "big stick" era. But the protection of weak sovereignties, implicit in the doctrine of nonintervention, has of late been turned into a protection of the despot from international scrutiny as he violates the most elemental human rights. Over-rapid recognition of insurgent military regimes has bolstered up dictatorships imposed in open violation of national constitutions. Economic and military aid has been distributed indiscriminately to dictators as well as freedom-loving governments, often supporting the repression of liberties or fortifying military cliques which subsequently have rebelled against legally constituted governments. The United States turned a deaf ear to the clamor of Latin American democrats who could not bear to witness the 1954 hemispheric conference at Caracas held on the doorstep of Venezuela's Pérez Jiménez, a vicious tyrant by any standard. This seemed to many a peculiar interpretation of the doctrine of nonintervention. Democatic Costa Rica refused to attend the Conference for this very reason, though its President José Figueres is a fast friend of the United States. The Organization of American States, in which the dictators hold the voting power, struck off the agenda of the Caracas Conference all consideration of protection of human rights, among other items dear to Latin American democrats, in order as one put it, "not to mention the noose in the home of the hanged." The United States consented. The responsibilities of democratic world leadership that the United States has assumed should not be negated by a too rigid doctrine of nonintervention. At least in the realms of diplomatic courtesies, moral influence and economic aid, democracies can be favored as against dictatorships without violating nonintervention.

What are the limits of nonintervention? At what point does nonintervention become covert intervention against the weak in favor of the strong? These are not questions that admit easy answers. One might hope, however, that the United States be more politically realistic in its dealings with Latin America, and if it must recognize the existence of corrupt governments and maintain formal relations with them, at least it might refrain from giving political, economic, and military aid to those who mock the very freedoms we choose to defend in our worldwide struggle against communism. Certainly there is cause for gratitude in the United States prompt support of Costa Rican democracy against the recent invasion encouraged by Somoza's Nicaragua dictatorship. The same may be said of President Eisenhower s refreshing decision to aid the revolutionary government of Bolivia. Yet, there is much that could be done to avoid entangling alliances with Trujillo, Peron, Odria, Pérez Jiménez and others of similar caliber.

II

The Communists are active in Latin America. Just how successful they have been so far is most difficult to determine. But it is certain that we make a great mistake if we interpret Latin America merely in terms of the global tension between communism and democratic freedom. The facts simply do not fit that pattern. The understandable concern of the United States to fight communism at every turn has carried over to its dealings with Latin America. However watchful Latin American countries must be for Communist infiltration, the supreme issue at the moment in Latin America is not between communism and democratic freedom, but between non-Communist totalitarianism and democratic freedoms. Seemingly the United States has been beguiled into supporting those who are most outspoken against communism—the dictators—and thereby has aided and abetted the very regimes that foster the conditions which ultimately could be most propicious for communism.

The Guatemala episode is enlightening. Prior to 1944 Jorge Ubico was Guatemala's iron-hand dictator. The average per capita income in Guatemala was about $77 per year, as compared with $1,680 in the United States. About 2 percent of the people owned 70 percent of the land. About 50 percent of the population owned no shoes. The country had one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world. Illiteracy reached at least 70 percent. Ubico, the dictator, served United States interests almost slavishly, going to the extent of cruelly persecuting the population of German origin in a bid to please his northern neighbor engaged in a war against Nazism. The general condition of the country was ripe for some kind of revolution, and though today it should be obvious that such conditions are a fertile field for communism, in the early forties few suspected it. The 1944 revolution deposed Ubico and brought in President Arévalo, a sincere democratic liberal, who put through many social reforms designed to benefit Guatemala's peasantry. Arévalo was later succeeded by Arbenz, a more willing tool of the Communists. As Donald Grant of the St. Louis Post Dispatch has pointed out (in the Journal of International Affairs, 1955 issue, devoted to "Problems and Progress in Latin America," which journal should be required reading for anyone desiring to understand present-day Latin America) this was the moment at which the United States could have undergirded Guatemala's feeble democracy. The United States was not interested. Inter-

national communism was. There is no doubt that in subsequent years the Communists gained a measure of influence and control in Guatemala. The United States then felt obliged to counter Communist gains with measures which were most distasteful to the rest of Latin America, except to most of the dictators. Secretary Dulles turned powerful pressure on the Caracas delegates in March, 1954, to push through an anti-communist resolution. In June, 1954, the Castillo Armas forces invaded Guatemala from foreign bases (principally Honduras) with at least political and diplomatic aid from the United States, if not more. The rapid downfall of the Arbenz regime is known to all. Castillo Armas is now a de facto dictator in his own right, and a good many of the social and political gains Guatemala made from 1944 to 1954, particularly during the early years under Arevalo, appear to be in danger, if they have not already been lost.

There are many lessons to be learned from Guatemala. One is that the United States aid, given at the right moment—1944—would probably have avoided the unfortunate turn of events in 1954. Another is that the support of dictatorships such as Ubico's, which themselves pose threats to democracy comparable to the threats of communism, may only result in easing the task of international communism. If the United States uses the Communist yardstick to guide its foreign policy in Latin America, it runs the real danger of supporting the wrong side, unless it extends the yardstick to include the conditions which give rise to communism in the first place.

An encouraging step in the right direction is occurring in Bolivia. Prior to 1952 the Bolivian Indian lived under unspeakably sordid conditions. For decades the country had been at the mercy of the Patino tin empire, which could hardly have perpetrated greater devastation on Bolivia had it ravaged the country systematically. Pre-1952 Bolivia is comparable to pre-1944 Guatemala. In 1952, under the inspired leadership of Victor Paz Estenssoro, a new era began. During the past 3 years Paz Estenssoro has nationalized the mines, extended the right to vote, carried through an agrarian reform, and generally attempted to improve the lot of the underprivileged. Yet these have been exceedingly difficult years for Bolivia. The shackles of decades cannot be shaken off easily. Bolivia has baffling economic problems to deal with. The United States must help to avoid another "Guatemala" 10 years from now. President Eisenhower has heartened democratic Latin America by tendering support to the Paz Estenssoro government. It is to be hoped that Congress will not deny Bolivia its greatest opportunity in the name of economy on foreign aid. A relatively small amount of aid in these crucial years to Bolivia, as well as to other democratic governments, can mean much to Latin America and to the United States as well.

III

A third area of very great concern to Latin America is its economic life. Problems in this area are extremely complex. A good many of our southern neighbors accumulated considerable dollar and sterling reserves during World War II, and for a time were able to rely on these, but now those reserves are expended. From 1945 to 1953 the per capita income in Latin America rose 3.3 percent each year, a remarkable increase. But during the last few years this upward curve has tended to fall off. Latin America must look to the United States for aid in order to build up its savings which in turn will establish a firmer basis for local investment and reinvestment. It is to the interest of the United States to provide such aid, for Latin America offers a huge market for United States products, just as the United States is the major market for Latin American exports. It is estimated that an annual average of $627 million have been invested in Latin America from foreign sources (principally from the United States) in recent years. But to continue Latin America's economic expansion at the rate of the past decade there is an annual need of $1,000 million during the coming few years. From whatever source it may come, that amount is needed to assist Latin America to greater economic self-sufficiency. It should be noted that what is requested is not a grant or a gift. Latin America wishes loans on reasonable terms, and expects to repay them as it is already doing. (The figures in this paragraph are taken from Serge Fliegers, "The Financing of Latin American Economic Development" in the Journal of International Affairs, mentioned previously, p. 56.)

Where will the help come from? This is the crucial issue which caused some hard feeling at the Inter-American Economic Conference at Rio de Janeiro last year. It involves one of the attitudes dearest to the Eisenhower administration which can cause trouble in our relations with Latin America. There are four principal sources: (1) private investors, who exact more for servicing the loans and who generally do not allow long repayment periods, (2) the Export-Import Bank, financed by the United States, (3) the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, financed primarily by the United States, and (4) some type of hemispheric bank or fund designed to meet the needs of Latin American nations on easier terms than those required elsewhere. This last was the proposal many countries carried to Rio, only to meet the opposition of the United States. Why? Surely there are many reasons, but one which causes deep concern is that the present administration relies heavily on the wide expansion of private investments. The support given by our Government to the New Orleans investment conference recently is an indication of this. Repeated pronouncements such as those of Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and Mr. Henry Holland of the Department of State, are disquieting in that they indicate that our Government would leave the main investment task in private hands. In a word, the job is given to those who make it most difficult for Latin America to accept the financing.

Beneath this insistence on private investment lies a deeper attitude which, Latin Americans suspect, influences our leaders' thinking. Latin America is thought of primarily as a profitable investment market. Financing left to private investors, despite current talk of partnership, would seem to place Latin Americans at something of a disadvantage, for the major benefits would accrue to the stronger partners, the investors. But what is profitable for United States business is not necessarily the best international policy. If investments siphon off too much profit the inevitable result will be retaliatory restrictions which close down the country to future investments. Such a policy will also foster hatred toward the United States. No nation enjoys being thought of as a lush field for foreign profit, least of all Latin American nations which have suffered the results of disastrous economic imperialism during the past century. Latin America should not be considered a bridge to better profits for the United States investors. It should be seen as a series of respected and important communities which are essential partners in world democracy. In the measure that our economic aid helps to undergird democratic governments, to raise living standards, and to contribute toward a greater degree of self-sufficiency, we are performing a task which will be profitable in the best sense, both for us, for Latin America, and for the world at large.

Latin America ceased to be a series of colonies over a century ago. In recent times it has been throwing off the shackles of economic imperialism. These nations have struggled toward a new consciousness of national self-respect. The concomitant confusion, with varying degrees of militarism and corruption, has enabled dictators to turn events to their own advantage. Yet Latin Americans have never ceased to fight for their freedom from tyrants without and within. The United States has a golden opportunity to aline itself with the democratic aspirations of Latin America that will rebound to our mutual well-being for years to come.

Address by James P. McGranery at Commencement Exercises of Central Catholic High School, Allentown, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable James P. McGranery, recently Attorney General of the United States, delivered by him at the 26th commencement exercises of Central Catholic High School, at Allentown, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the permission of Monsignor Fink, Father Daday, right reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, reverend and dear sisters, lay members of the faculty, parents of the graduates, and other guests, I am grateful for the privilege of speaking to you who are members of the class of 1955 on this happy occasion, as you receive your diplomas from the Allentown Central Catholic High School, here in Rockne Hall, whose cornerstone was solemnly laid by his beloved eminence, Cardinal Dougherty, almost a decade and a half ago.

Less than 30 years have passed since his eminence authorized the building of the Monsignor Masson Memorial High School at the request of your right reverend director, Monsignor Fink—now prothonotary apostolic and vicar forane—whose priestly vision, genius for administration, and scholarship inspired him to create a most fitting tribute to the memory of Monsignor Masson: an institution that was to educate, in the true sense, succeeding generations of the youth of Allentown and her surrounding communities, from Lehigh Valley's 48 parishes extending south to Doylestown and Boyertown, west to Kutztown, north to Palmerton, and east to Hellertown.

The Central Catholic High School, largest coeducational Catholic high school in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, has grown under the sound administration of Monsignor Fink and the capable direction of Reverend Father Huesman as well as of your able and learned principal, Father Daday, guiding a devoted and highly trained faculty of priests, Sisters, and lay-teachers who have dedicated their skills in pedagogy and their gifts of leadership to preparing young Pennsylvanians for careers as citizens of the United States and citizens of heaven.

Your education has been made possible by your parents, faithful trustees of your temporal and eternal futures, who have sacrificed to make financially possible Allentown's Catholic Central High School, at the same

time contributing through taxes to the support of the public schools. Thus, your parents and guardians have been true to their obligations to God, to country, to the community, and to you; and they have lessened the burden of school taxation for their neighbors of other faiths.

Sisters of St. Francis; Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary; Sisters of St. Joseph; Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, and Sisters of Mercy have bestowed upon your school a great gift: The endowment of their lives. All the knowledge they have gained in graduate study of the arts and sciences, and the most advanced theories of teaching—are made available to students so fortunate as to be enrolled in this school. More than this, however, they share with each student the goodness, the holiness which light their own days. For no one can walk with the "wisdom of holiness," without becoming in some degree wise or in some measure holy.

Whether you have taken the academic or college preparatory course, the commercial or the general or the home economics course, you have been educated spiritually, intellectually, socially, and physically. Your natural abilities have been cultivated and developed. You have been led to study the relations of man to his creator and to all of creation.

While your mind has been trained to think, your character has been formed to meet the challenges of approaching maturity. Indeed, the teachers who have guided you in exploring the paths of learning, have sought to help you achieve to the fullest the Christian idea of man—unique among God's creatures, sublime in dignity and eternal in worth; because:

"God created man to His own image: to the image of God He created him." (Genesis 1:27).

On this concept of the individual, in the Christian tradition and the culture of our western civilization rest. If secularism, materialism, atheism were to become dominant, then civilization would fail, culture would be dissipated, and our society—the Government of this Republic—would inevitably perish.

Penn's Woods were explored first by God-fearing men: the Swedish, then the Dutch and, finally, followers of William Penn who counseled that the authority of God must be first in men's minds and hearts if they were to survive in freedom.

The Declaration of Independence began the life of our Nation by asserting—

"That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and thus made way for the Constitution and its first 10 amendments, founding these United States on the Christian idea of man.

This great Nation will exist only as long as it remains true to its basic ideal of man's intrinsic dignity: our inheritance from the Saviour, who exalted the duties of temporal citizenship by His partaking of them.

Hence, it is that the Christian fulfills his obligations by working among his fellows in society, to preserve the legacy of Christian culture, the inheritance of Catholic thinking, the only firm foundation for good government: respect and reverence for the authority of God as delegated to public officials through the action of the electorate.

The good citizen is loyal to God; to country; to God's image in his neighbor and in himself. He prepares for the Kingdom of Heaven by performing his duties as a citizen of these United States which, in God's providence, safeguards the democratic idea: freedom to develop in accordance with the natural law and thus to prepare for his final destiny.

You have been blessed in your school where the priests, the sisters and the lay instructors are united in their interpretation of truth, presented through a course of studies which fits you to bring your powers to fruition and to live in the harmony of justice and love, the happy way of life.

The habit of discipline which you have acquired is the secret of an ordered life—the "tranquility of order" that is peace. Yours will be a well-balanced future because you have had the benefit of a balanced curriculum.

The Middle Atlantic and Maryland Accrediting Association has long since conferred accreditation upon your school, thus affirming that your diploma is a passport to any university or college in which you desire to pursue higher education, as have so many hundreds of the graduates of prior years. Nevertheless the true seal of Central Catholic High School's excellence is in the imprint that those graduates have placed upon their own lives and the lives of their neighbors in this beautiful valley and beyond—through their service of God in whatever vocation they have chosen.

For, to paraphrase the thought of a great professor, this secondary school, as you well know, has been:

"Enough of an industry to enable the student to learn, at first hand, the meaning of hard work and business management; enough of a self-governing city to enable him to learn in it the rudiments of politics; enough of a laboratory to enable him to learn scientific method; enough of a museum, a theater and a concert hall to enable him to learn how to appreciate the fine arts; enough of a guild workshop to enable him to learn the fundamentals of professional craftsmanship and ethical cooperation; enough of a school to enable him to study and meditate; enough of a monastery to enable him to contemplate and serve God."

Needless to say, I am not suggesting that each of you will sing of creation as did Caedmon, 13 centuries age, in the double monastery presided over by the valiant Saint Hilda of Whitby, whose splendor of being, and recorded prudence as administrator, student, scholar and religious have illumined the history of her sanctity, and transmuted into legend the legion of her friendships.

Nevertheless, whether you go as a religious or as a member of the laity, into the paths of this world, you will find the reality of peace, the serenity of beauty, if you advance with the gentle courtesy of Saint Francis of Assisi; if you seek knowledge with the logical comprehension of the perennial philsopher, Saint Thomas Aquinas; if you serve God and our country in the spirit of Saint Thomas More, who was ever "the king's good servant, but God's first."

Today, you join a procession of distinguished alumnae and alumni who have been graduated in other years from the Central Catholic High School of Allentown, and you are joined in this brave fellowship by the thousands of graduates of the many other Catholic high schools and academies of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia which, through the wisdom, zeal, and courage of His Excellency, the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, of the Order of the Holy Cross, Archbishop of Philadelphia, are increasing in number while maintaining the high standard of scholastic achievement and spiritual vision of the presently existing schools.

You face a future that baffles even the so-called statesmen, scientists, scholars, and leaders of an older generation. The shadow of the A-bomb and the H-bomb and the U-bomb casts the gloom of fear and uncertainty over tomorrow's world for our brothers here and abroad.

The darkness is not born, however, of the nuclear age—which could usher in a new era of constructive achievement. It is the shade resulting from an eclipse of God's everlasting love of His creatures and of all creation. The dark moon of the godless Soviet is striving to black-out the center of our universe, our divine source of light, truth, and justice; faith, love, and hope.

Instincitvely, our neighbors know that the peace gestures now being offered by the men of the Kremlin are reappearances in renovated guise of the same strategy that Stalin described in his book, "Problems of Lennism," when he said:

"We used the mighty weapon of peace. It created mass sympathy for our revolution, both in the west among the workers and in the east among oppressed people."

We are reminded that the motto of communism has not changed since Russia's favorite textbook: The Road to Victory, stated:

"If you want to begin a war, talk peace."

The Russians recognize no rules, no positive law. They have revived the tactic of deceit, which, after all, is no newer than the Trojan Horse. Although they retreat from the well-armed foe, even more, they fear the strength of good against evil, of truth against falsehood. They have enlarged their dominion over the souls of men, not through superior armies and armaments, but rather by infiltrating and softening further the already weak moral fiber of those whom they have later enslaved. They have not laid waste the factories, the cities, and the countryside. They have devastated the stronghold of religion, the city within, the arsenal of the democratic idea, man's freedom to believe and follow God.

For, with satanic shrewdness, they cringe before the legions of God.

"We know that to them that love God, all things work together unto good." (Romans 8: 25.)

And so, the forces of the atheistic Soviet can never triumph—either through the contest of war or the subterfuge of a false peace—over a nation whose citizens enshrine the divine citizen of earth and heaven in their hearts.

Today's darkness will disappear before the brightness of tomorrow—and the fear of this hour will pass—if we restore God to His citadel in the souls of our brothers; for, as Dante phrased it:

"In Thy will, God, is our peace."

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Louisiana?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage.

Of this total, Louisiana has more than 2,769,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Appendix

Dealing With the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Dealing With the Russians," written by David W. Hacker and published in the Arkansas Gazette of July 3, 1955. I invite the attention of Senators to this very excellent article because it demonstrates the extremely interesting analogy between the present action of the Communists and the action of the Russians before the beginning of this century in the illegal detention of American citizens.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEALING WITH THE RUSSIANS—IT WAS THE TASK OF DISTINGUISHED ADOPTED SON OF ARKANSAS TO HELP FREE FIVE AMERICANS FROM A PRISON AT VLADIVOSTOK—THE CASE OF 1896 OFFERS A PARALLEL TO PROBLEMS OF TODAY

(By David W. Hacker)

A gnarled hand laboriously scratches a line next to a long row of etched lines in a plaster or wood wall.

A stub of a pencil presses ever so lightly on a scrap of paper.

It's July 4.

But to the nameless dozens (or hundreds) of American citizens in bondage in Russian prisons, firecrackers, parades, and family gatherings are but memories.

July 4 is just another day. One day closer to freedom from Russian captivity.

So it was on July 4, 1896. Five American seamen (in place of today's airmen and soldiers) spent the day in a Vladivostok jail, wondering when their day of independence would come.

They had been in prison since the previous November. They would be free in another 6 months. But they didn't know it at the time.

The incident suggests that a Russian is a Russian first—and a Communist or an imperialist second. The experiences of today and of the last century show a parallel—that our diplomats face exactly the same stubborn wall of resistance in their dealings with their Russian counterparts.

Our present Ambassador, Charles Bohlen, has had little notable success in gaining information, let alone the release, of the Americans held by the Soviets.

Fifty-nine years ago, it fell to an Arkansan holding down the post of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Russia, to press for the freedom of the five American seamen.

The diplomat was Clifton Rodes Breckinridge.

This Arkansan, born of the famed Breckinridge family at Lexington, Ky., November 22, 1846, had multiple careers and left as a legacy a daughter who has spread the family name even wider.

For the whole period of this Nation's history, the Breckinridges have written their pages of merit.

John Breckinridge, friend of Madison and Jefferson and Attorney General under the latter, is credited with helping to write the "Kentucky Resolutions" which protested the alien and sedition laws of the John Adams administration; a son, Joseph Cabell Breckinridge, though only 34 at the time of his death, was secretary of state in Kentucky; and Joseph's son, John Cabell Breckinridge, was elected Vice President in 1856 on a ticket headed by James Buchanan—the youngest ever elected.

John Cabell Breckinridge—father of the Arkansas Breckindridge—was nominated by Akransas for the presidency in 1860, but he withdrew at the Democratic convention at Charleston, S. C. When that convention failed to nominate, he later was named by a reconvened convention at Baltimore to oppose Abraham Lincoln. When Kentucky proclaimed neutrality, Breckinridge lost Senate seat by opposing war policy. Joining Confederacy, he was major general 3 years, became Secretary of War in 1865, advised Gen. J. E. Johnston on surrender, helped President Jefferson Davis pack for an attempted flight westward, then fled to England via Cuba. He later returned to his native Kentucky, where he resumed the practice of law.

It was in 1870 that Clifton R. Breckinridge moved to Arkansas. He had been educated at Washington (now Washington and Lee) College in Virginia, though bad eyesight had forced him to quit his studies before graduation. At 15, he had entered the Confederate Army as a private at the outbreak of the War, later shifting to the Navy where he was a midshipman.

At Pine Bluff, Breckinridge undertook life as a cotton planter, and engaged in the commission business there.

In 1882, he entered politics, being elected Congressman at large on the Democrat ticket. Two years later, he stood for the congressional seat from the second district and was elected—a seat he held until 1894—with one significant break.

When he lost the Democratic nomination in the primaries of 1894 to Judge John Little, Breckinridge was appointed on July 19, 1894, to one of the most important diplomatic posts ever offered an Arkansan. Breckinridge resigned his congresional seat on August 15.

Breckinridge's life is an illuminated—though generally unknown—page in Arkansas' history.

The Gazette editorially said of his appointment at the time: "The appointment of the Honorable Clifton R. Breckinridge to the Russian mission is one of the handsomest compliments that has ever been paid to Arkansas. * * *"

Although he served but 3 years in the St. Petersburg post, Breckinridge was involved in a number of cases with strange parallels to modern times. Had he lived beyond December 3, 1932, Breckinridge would have been among the first to say a Russian is a Russian first and an Imperialist or a Communist second.

Most of Breckinridge's efforts while in Russia were concerned with the release of American citizens seized by Russian officials in much the same manner as American fliers and citizens are being held by Russia and satellite nations today.

The case of the seamen—all seal hunters—is celebrated as the Robben Island incident, little known but significant in showing the consistency of Russian attitude toward foreigners.

The first knowledge Breckinridge had of the incident came, curiously enough, not from Russia, but the United States. The Department of State, on November 13, 1895, dispatched a telegram to Breckinridge inquiring of a report that a number of sealers had been seized.

Two days later Breckinridge replied to Washington that he had "no official news" of the seizures. The same day he called on Count Kapnitz, who told the American Minister that he had heard nothing of the seizures but warned "his Government would deal with the greatest severity with seal poachers."

On November 30 Breckinridge reported to Washington by cable the following translation of an article which had appeared in the November 7 issue of the St. Petersburg Novoe Vremia: "Foreign pirates continue to make attacks on Russian industry in the Bering and Okhotsk." The article said the Russian ship *Yatka* had seized 17 poaching schooners at the Isle of Seals (Robben Island), in the Sea of Okhotsk.

Breckinridge learned from Russian sources at last that 17 men had been tried January 12–24, 1896, at Vladivostok. All were reported to have pleaded guilty.

Early in the spring of 1896, the mayor and top officials of San Francisco petitioned for information on rumors that the seamen had been sentenced to 17 years in chains.

Russian officials denied this and said the usual sentence for poaching was only 2 years.

Finally, on June 15, 1896, Chichkine, the Russian Foreign Minister, released to Breckinridge the names of the five Americans. All San Franciscans, they were Steven Brenan, Roger Sheehy, James Mulloney, Frank Peterson, and Edward Howe.

Chichkine said the 5 had received only 18-month prison terms. He brushed off Breckinridge's pleas for further consultation on the matter by saying the cases were entirely in the hands of provincial officials.

The five Americans submitted petitions for pardons but they were denied by the Government.

The prison sentences expired between January 25 and February 6, 1897, "earlier," noted Breckinridge in his final dispatch to the Department of State, "than he had anticipated."

Another case Breckinridge handled was that of John Ginzburg, a Russian-born but American-naturalized citizen.

Ginzburg had emigrated to the United States at the age of 14. A number of years later, he took a trip to Europe and applied for a visa to enter Russia. United States diplomatic officials refused to issue the visa because of past Russian maltreatment and refusal to approve visas of United States passports in favor of Jews.

A man of stubborn if perhaps a little "addle-headed" bent, Ginzburg took matters in his own hands and slipped across the border. He was promptly arrested and imprisoned. The Russians charged that Ginzburg had fled Russia to escape evading the

compulsory conscription, despite the fact he had left the country 4 years before he was subject to conscription.

It took Breckinridge nearly 2 years of persistent hammering at Russian Government doors before he gained Ginzburg's release. In one of many letters to Russian officials, Breckinridge said to Prince Lobanow:

"To charge an offense as a subject at so tender an age (14) is to anticipate by a great leap the obligations of manhood; and the fact that he seems to have been in America, beginning in extreme youth, at the time any public obligation would have matured here, presents in this particular the antagonistic principles and laws of the two countries at their most pronounced points of difference."

Ginzburg was released January 16, 1895, and allowed to leave the country.

While Breckinridge used the utmost in tact and diplomacy all through the involved proceedings, he actually had little sympathy with Ginzburg as an individual. Ginzburg had flouted diplomatic advice in the first place by entering Russia without a visa.

During Ginzburg's imprisonment, Breckinridge wrote to the United States State Department, "I don't think I ever knew of a man who more persistently disregarded the advice he sought or seemingly tried harder to get into prison."

It also fell to Breckinridge to plead the right of missionaries to seek asylum on Russian soil, a duty which has current mean. Father Georges Bissonnette was expelled from Russia only in the past few months, the latest victim of a Russian refusal to treat all churches equally.

Other problems that Breckinridge dealt with during his stay in Russia—all of which bear a likeness to problems that plague this country's diplomatic representatives in Russia today—included the right of foreigners to own real estate and to do business in Russia.

Breckenridge left the diplomatic service in December of 1897 but he served in one more government post.

In June of 1900 he was named to the Dawes Commission which was engaged in distributing the estates of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians of the then Indian territory (Oklahoma). That job lasted until July of 1905, and he returned to Pine Bluff, later moving to Fort Smith.

In 1917, Breckinridge was named a Sebastian County delegate to the State Constitutional Convention.

While living at Fort Smith, he also organized the Arkansas Valley Trust Co. As a Pine Bluff resident in the early 1900s, he helped found the YMCA there.

Breckinridge retired in the early 1920s, probably shortly after his wife Katherine Carson Breckinridge, a native of Memphis, died in 1921. He was listed as a resident of Fort Smith in the 1927 Directory of American Congress.

About 1930, Breckinridge moved to Wendover, Ky., to be with his daughter, Mary Breckinridge, founder of the famed Frontier Nursing Service, which has meant so much to the hill folks of Kentucky.

Breckinridge died at Wendover in 1932.

Expanding United States Investments Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of an informative article from Sunday's July 17 New York Times, concerning a current meeting in Geneva on the important problem of increasing the flow of private foreign capital throughout the world, particularly into underdeveloped areas. This has long been a subject of deep interest to me, as indicated by my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 7, 1955, on pages 6568–6570.

In order to encourage the flow of such capital, certain unnecessary and self-defeating restrictions imposed by various foreign countries should be removed. I cite one such restriction, interference with independent accounting on foreign investments.

Mr President, I have been pleased to hear from Mr. Alden C. Smith, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the American Institute of Accountants, relative to the necessity for greater freedom on the part of American businesses to employ their own accountants in connection with auditing of investments auditing of investments overseas.

There has been too much of a tendency for some foreign countries to impose nuisance restrictions on the right of foreign national accountants to practice within their boundaries.

I believe that treaties guaranteeing such rights on a reciprocal basis are indispensable to expansion of United States investments overseas, and that the supernationalist type restrictions to which I have referred are contrary to sound international economic relations.

I send to the desk, in addition to the New York Times clipping giving a general survey, to which I have earlier referred, two editorials, one from an American periodical, the other from a British periodical, confirming the necessity for freedom of accountancy. I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the article and the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 17, 1955]

SECOND GENEVA TALKS BASED ON FINANCE—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF UNITED NATIONS TO SURVEY CAPITAL FOR SMALL NATIONS—TO DEVELOP RESOURCES—SIXTY-SIX-PAGE REPORT TO SHOW HOW ISOLATIONIST VOGUE INSPIRED BY DEPRESSION IS PASSING

(By Paul Heffernan)

While the great powers' summit representatives are discussing political coexistence at Geneva this week, another international meeting in the Swiss city will be busied with concerns of the world's backward nations and how foreign private capital might help them.

Concerned about the little powers will be the 20th session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. Looming large on the agenda is the fifth of a series of continuing United Nations studies on the international movement of private capital.

The report is a 66-page survey of the gradual improvement that has been going on in recent years in the private-investment climate of most nations of the world. The survey reviews scores of legislative efforts made in most undeveloped nations to make it easier for foreign investors to bring in and take out capital.

ECONOMIC ISOLATION ENDING

Between the lines of nearly every page can be sensed the same idea—that the vogue of economic isolationism inspired by the great depression is gradually giving way to acceptance of the interdependence of domestic and foreign interests on the private-capital front.

In investment areas where foreign capital still tends to be held suspect—such as in public-utility enterprises and in extractive industries—the new tendency is to be more receptive to foreign private capital than to foreign state capital.

The requirements of other days that foreign capital might not own more than 49 percent of an enterprise is now largely a dead letter. Not one Latin-American nation has in effect today any rigid "49 percent law." In the Middle East the idea has no backing at all.

Even in India and Pakistan, where foreign ownership of enterprises was for years deplored, the issue is being viewed more moderately.

India's official policy is noncommittal and flexible. In Pakistan, foreign capital is now permitted to own up to 60 percent of an enterprise.

FRENCH HAVE PROPOSAL

A proposal has been put forth by the French Government to satisfy the interests both of foreign investment and "home ownership." The French proposal calls of establishing two categories of equity capital, with managerial rights reserved wholly or partly to one class of stock.

The principle of immunizing foreign capital from liability to double taxation is gaining ground all over. Close to 400 tax agreements are in effect today or under negotiation between nations. The Government of Colombia is sponsoring in the United Nations a multilateral convention proposing that income be taxed exclusively in the country from which it is derived.

Tax-exemption laws to stimulate private investment from abroad are likewise becoming more widespread. Most countries of the Far East and Latin America and many in the Middle East had adopted such measures. Among areas with such tax incentives are the British territories of Barbados, British Guiana, British Honduras, the Gold Coast, Jamaica, the Leeward Islands, Nigeria, Trinidad, and the Windward Islands.

Live concessions have been introduced in the Netherlands Antilles, Egypt, Formosa, India, Pakistan, Israel, Haiti, and Indonesia.

LATIN-AMERICAN SURVEY

Also indicative of the way the wind is blowing are measures taken by certain Latin-American nations to induce foreign capital to develop even mining and oil properties and public utilities. The United Nations survey cites the following:

Agentina: After adopting a law 2 years ago liberalizing the permissible repatriation by foreign interests of capital and earnings, the Argentine Government saw fit to go even further in the petroleum field by acquiescing to unrestricted repatriation by foreign interests of profits resulting from exploitation of oil properties.

Cuba: Government loans to foreign interests exploiting oil properties in association with private Cuban capital are forgiven if the wildcatting does not pan out.

Chile: For control over foreign copper enterprises. Chile has shifted from a discriminatory foreign exchange regulation to an income tax—a device that will facilitate the establishment by such companies of a credit against liability to taxation in their own countries. There is also a Chilean surtax on profits, declining with increase in output, to provide an incentive to expand production.

Peru: To attract foreign capital into the public utilities field, Peru has passed a law requiring that consumption rates authorized by the Government must be reviewed at least every 3 years and will be adjusted whenever profits exceed 15 percent or fall below 5 percent of invested capital.

By far the greater number of the new laws affecting the treatment of foreign capi-

tal have as their objectives the relaxing of restrictions governing the transfer by foreigners of the earnings on their capital as well as those affecting outright repatriation of the foreign money.

LEGISLATION ENACTED

The U. N. report sums up the effect of recent legislation affecting remittance of foreign capital as follows:

Argentina: Earnings up to 8 percent of capital transferable annually. Capital (including reinvested earnings of up to 8 percent) repatriable after 10 years in annual amounts of 10 to 20 percent of principal.

Brazil: Foreign capital may leave the country freely, subject to the hazards of remittance at fluctuating and depreciated rates of exchange. Brazil's multiple foreign exchange rate control over the outflow of capital is under restudy.

Chile: Earnings from approved investments transferable for 10 to 20 years. Original capital repatriable after 5 years in 5 annual installments.

Colombia: Earnings freely transferable and capital freely repatriable.

Nicaragua: Earnings and capital transferable without limit at the rate of exchange applying to essential imports.

Paraguay: Earnings and capital transferable annually at the free rate of exchange up to 20 percent of registered capital.

Egypt: Earnings transferable freely at the prevailing rate of exchange. Capital repatriable after 5 years at an annual rate not exceeding one-fifth of registered value.

Israel: The present law, which is proposed to be liberalized, permits transfer of earnings or repatriation of capital annually up to 10 percent of registered capital.

Jordan: Earnings freely transferable. Capital repatriable after 1 year in 4 annual installments.

Turkey: No restrictions either on the remittance of profits abroad or the repatriation of capital.

Afghanistan: Earnings transferable and capital repatriable freely at the official rate of exchange.

Taiwan: Profits transferable up to 15 percent of capital, with further remittances subject to special approval. Capital repatriable after the second year in annual installments of not more than 15 percent.

India: Approved investments—excepting stocks bought on the public exchange—repatriable at any time to nationals of other than sterling area, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark.

Japan: Capital of approved investments repatriable after 2 years at an annual rate of 20 percent.

Pakistan: Earnings fully transferable and capital repatriable on approved investments, excepting shares purchased on the public exchange.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times of April 7, 1955]

AUDITING ABROAD

Private American investments abroad could be increased if the recommendation of the American Institute of Accountants for freedom of auditing across national borders is implemented. The foreign affairs committee of the institute reports that some foreign countries have adopted or proposed drastic restrictions on the practice of accountancy by other than nationals of these lands.

For those countries which are seeking the trade and industrial progress provided by private capital, this type of discrimination is a shortsighted policy. American investors, for example, generally take it for granted that the companies in which they put their money will be audited by independent certified public accountants. In the field of foreign investment they are especially concerned that sound business and fiscal policies are used before venturing their capital.

A number of treaties concluded between the United States and other countries have guaranteed reciprocal rights for nationals to practice in the fields of accountancy, administration and law. The growth of international trade and investment will be increased, the AIA says if businessmen will support the inclusion of similar clauses in treaties with all countries in which American citizens have commercial and financial interests.

[From the London Accountant of April 2, 1955]

AN ESSENTIAL FREEDOM: ACCOUNTANCY SERVICES FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INVESTMENT

On another page of this issue, we reproduce the full text of a pamphlet just issued by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the American Institute of Accountants. It states in unequivocal terms the belief that members of the accountancy profession should be allowed to practice wherever their clients' businesses require them to do so and that any curtailment of this freedom may constitute a real hindrance to international trade and investment.

Businessmen and investors, the Committee points out, not only expect the enterprises they put their money into to be audited by properly qualified accountants, but also that they should be allowed to select their own auditors for the task. To meet this perfectly natural demand, many of the larger professional firms in Great Britain and the United States have established branches in other countries, thus insuring the same standard of service to clients throughout their organizations. As well as thus providing facilities to their clients, these firms have also helped to develop the accountancy profession in the countries in which they have become established. The committee instances the debt owned by the accountancy profession in America to those English and Scottish accountants who settled in the United States last century primarily to look after British interests.

Unfortunately, there has been a tendency by certain countries in recent years to endeavor to restrict the activities of foreign accountants within their boundaries. Some go so far as to insist that all principals and staff employed by foreign firms should be nationals of the country in which the branch is situated. The difficulty of operating in a country where such an embargo exists need not be stressed. The United States Department of State, recognizing that free choice in these matters is essential to good international trade relations, has made specific mention in recent treaties with other countries that both parties should be at liberty to employ their own professional and technical experts in each other's territories.

The opinion of the profession in the United Kingdom on this point is similar to that expressed by the American Institute of Accountants. In 1951, an act was passed in South Africa prohibiting partnerships and profit-sharing between accountants resident in the Union of South Africa and accountants resident outside the Union. It also prohibited the use of a firm name which included the name of any person who was not, or who had not been during his lifetime, ordinarily resident in the Union. Partnerships already in existence on April 12, 1951, were not to be subject to the prohibitions until October 31, 1956, or such later date as would be prescribed. Following successful protests by the Council of the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales, and others, the South African Parliament is now considering an amending bill containing provisions which would be satisfactory to members of the accountancy profession in this country.

Referring in its report for 1953 to the above matter, the council clearly stated its belief that "* * * the ideal arrangement is reciprocity, in all parts of the world, of the right to practice under the professional designation which the individual accountant has obtained by suitable training, experience, and examination and that there should be no restrictions on the right to enter into partnership or agency arrangements with properly qualified accountants, whatever may be their country of residence." In the interests both of the profession and of the business community, it is hoped that the tolerant opinions of the English and American institutes will come to be universally recognized and accepted.

Silliman Evans and Amon G. Carter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago the Nation lost two of its finest leaders in the field of the press, politics, and economics. The distinction of their life and work is described in Newsweek magazine, and I ask unanimous consent to have the article from that magazine printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUBLE LOSS

Two of the most compelling newspaper figures of this century left the American scene last week. Only hours after attending the funeral of his lifelong friend and onetime employer, Amon Giles Carter, at Fort Worth, Tex., Silliman Evans died of a heart attack there. In a week, the profession lost two men who, through most of this century, had held notably to the old-fashioned idea that a newspaper is properly an instrument for community leadership and development. Fabuolously, the tall, brisk-striding Carter spoke up for Fort Worth on every conceivable count. Ingeniously, the squat bustling Evans projected the virtues of Nashville, Tenn., and the South. He opposed political machines as obstacles to the South's progress.

Amon Carter was a blacksmith's son, born 60 miles from his beloved Fort Worth. At his death, the 75-year-old owner and publisher of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram was the rich master of a vast estate, 900-acre Shady Oak Farm.

THE PROHIBITIONIST'S SON

Silliman Evans, too, was a Texan, born at Joshua in Johnson County, son of a frail Methodist preacher who was a passionate prohibitionist. Hard-drinking, loud-dressing Evans, who made his start in journalism at $12.50 a week, was at his death the owner and publisher of the Nashville Tennessean and the master of Traveler's Rest, an ancient Tennessee estate once owned by a partner of Andrew Jackson.

Both were more than good newspapermen; both were also successful in business and feared in politics. One of Carter's first possessions, a $2,000 diamond ring (bought with money he had earned as a salesman), was utilized ingeniously to further his newspaper career. Hired as advertising manager of the old Fort Worth Star at $35 a week, Carter later repeatedly hocked the ring to help meet the paper's payroll. After 17 years he was in control of the Star-Telegram.

He not only ran a robust newspaper, one that was Democratic but stood for Eisenhower. He also pioneered in Fort Worth radio, drilled 99 dry oil wells and then struck

it rich, and became the biggest stockholder in American Airlines in which Evans, was also a director.

Under Carter, Evans became known as the most influential political reporter in Texas. For news beats, he never hesitated to go after sizable adversaries. One of his most stirring exclusives: An exposé of the Ku Klux Klan.

MANY IRONS

As Washington correspondent for the Star-Telegram, Evans became an intimate of the New Dealers. He was appointed an Assistant Postmaster General, helped build up an airline and revitalize an insurance company, and organized the Chicago Sun. When he took charge of the Nashville Tennessean in 1937, the paper had been in receivership for 4 years. Today it is known as one of the South's best and certainly most objective papers.

Endlessly, Amon Carter huzzahed Fort Worth as the place "Where the West Begins" getting it many businesses. Just as inexhaustibly, Evans sought new industries for Nashville and Tennessee.

Last week it was certain that the names of the two old, hard-driving friends would not disappear from American journalism. The president of the Star-Telegram is Amon G. Carter, Jr. The president of the Nashville Tennessean is Silliman Evans, Jr., and its vice president is Amon Carter Evans.

ANSWERS, TOO

Last April, stockholders in the world's oldest distributing agency, the American News Co., were confronted with bad news. After a rough 1954, the firm had lost $113,955 in the first quarter of 1955. To one stockholder, the vigorous Henry Garfinkle, head of three east coast distributing companies, this slump in earnings raised "serious questions as to the ability of the present management to run this vast enterprise efficiently."

In June, Time, Inc., announced that newsstand distribution of four of its magazines (Time, Life, Fortune, Sports Illustrated) was to be shifted from American News to Select Magazine News. SM is now mutually owned by Reader's Digest, McCall Corp., Meredith Publishing Co., Street & Smith, Popular Science Publishing Co., and Time, Inc.

Last week Henry Garfinkle was elected president of American News. Last week, too, American News announced the voting of the company's 553d consecutive dividend in its 91-year history.

Address by James P. McGranery at Immaculata College Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable James P. McGranery, recently Attorney General of the United States, delivered at the 31st commencement exercises of Immaculata College, at Immaculata, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With the permission of Your Excellency, Bishop McCormick, Mother Mary Hubert, Mother Cornelia, Sister Anastasia Maria, right reverend and very reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, reverend dear sisters, parents, and other guests, I count it a distinguished honor to speak to you who are members of the class of 1955 upon this 1st day of June when you join the illustrious procession of the alumnae of Immaculata College.

The world that you enter today is one in which all men are hungering for truth and goodness and justice but many know not what they seek; and so they search in vain.

The reality of the A-bomb, the H-bomb, and the U-bomb confronts all thinking people with the inevitable alternative of peace or destruction. It is a choice presented over the air-waves and through the headlines to our contemporaries in the guise of a new problem. Yet it is the age-old, ageless problem of good against evil, of truth against falsehood, of justice against slavery. It is the decision that each son of Adam and Eve has met again and again in living his own life.

For peace has always meant the tranquillity of order whether among nations or in the heart of man. Peace comes only from justice: Child of the law implanted in the nature of man since his divine creation, and the twin of truth: The seeing of all creation in the perspective of eternity.

Goodness is the basis of beauty; the good man loves truth and lives according to the law of God. The ultimate source of all authority. If, as has been said, the word holy is derived from the Anglo-Saxon halig, meaning whole or healthy, then only the holy man fulfills the destiny of his own nature; for he, alone, is a whole man, complete with the vigor of health that results from a tranquilly ordered life.

To change the world, it is necessary, first, to change the world within. To establish peace among nations, men must first find in their own hearts the peace that follows from love of God and love of God's image within his neighbor and in himself.

There are no easy answers; but there are no questions which cannot be answered. Although the splitting of the atom has resulted in a new medium of destruction, it can as well result in a new era of constructive achievement.

The danger which menaces this Nation and other freedom-loving nations is not the stockpile of nuclear weapons or the armada of jet-propelled bombers behind the Iron Curtain. Rather, it is the infection of evil in the godless men of the Kremlin, and a symptom is their lust for power over the souls of men. Ever since the first follower of Marx denied the existence of God and mocked at justice and goodness and truth, the contagion of evil has spread. The Soviet's warfare, waged with the germ of atheism, has not stopped at boundaries of countries or continents. Insidiously, the Communists have sought to undermine men's belief in God; for they know well that governments fall easily when citizens have lost faith in the authority on which all just government is founded.

And so, it has become evident that a plague is spreading over humanity. It is a dread disease that threatens to wipe out the liberty of men to find their way to God. It cannot be stopped by the temporary expedient of coexistence. Can one coexist with evil? There is no magic formula with which to inoculate mankind. There is, however, an ancient preventive prescription—nature's defense against the infection of illness: The restoring of health to the body politic.

Men must become whole and complete again. They must live according to the commandments, the two commandments which contain the whole law of God. If they can become holy in the true meaning of the word; then only will they bring to the world peace in our time, peace for all time, peace within—the tranquillity of order.

It is with some temerity that I speak thus of tomorrow's challenge—to you who, during the past 4 years, have developed spiritually, intellectually, socially, morally, and physically while increasing in scholarship and performing your duties as members of Immaculata's student body.

You have grown in grace of soul under the inspired guidance of the sisters, servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. In the shadow of the tower bell sounding thrice daily the Angelus, asking the handmaid of the Lord to bring the eucharistic Christ to teach His ways in their work of apostleship, and recalling with the earliest and most precious community traditions. The history of Therese Renauld, whose devotion to the Angelus—inspired by Father Gillet of Sacred Memory—was the prelude and the promise that she was to be the first one whom God called to become a Sister, servant, of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

The prayer begun a century and a decade ago in Monroe, Mich., by their holy founder and their first Sister, has echoed and re-echoed on hillside and valley, in the United States, Peru, and Chile, from hundreds of convent towers where thousands of religious have consecrated their lives and devoted their nights and days to personal sanctification and the education of youth.

These holy Sisters knew from the beginning, as did the heroic, young redemptorist missionary—who later entered a Cistercian monastery—that the teacher, who shows the way to God, must not only know the way but first most go the way.

My own beloved first teacher, who is still my trusted counselor and revered friend, Sister Christella, more than 50 years ago instilled in my child's awakening mind, a zest to explore the spiritual realms which she had surveyed and charted lovingly and knowingly. Serenely pursuing her duties, she continues to encourage and inspire me from afar, as she does her many students of other days.

Truly, the paths of sanctity have always been familiar to these religious, robed in the color of Mary, and to their protectors and shepherds who have guided and advised them in their glorious adventure of bringing children to their Divine Father.

It was another sainted redemptorist, the venerable John N. Neumann, C. SS. R., D. D., fourth bishop of Philadelphia, who brought into his diocese this congregation which had been dedicated to Mary's Immaculate Heart a few years prior to "the time Pope Pius IX defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God."

And it was Bishop Neumann, who, a century ago, counseled the Sisters thus:

"Divine providence will see that you always have the necessities if you faithfully observe your rule, and by mutual love and harmony, draw his blessings upon you. * * * If we would be religious teachers, we must first be religious, regular in the observance of rule, lovers of silence, patient under trials."

The twofold purpose of the Sisters, servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, was to be fulfilled in our Commonwealth with an abundance of thousands and tens of thousands of children educated for God in heart, soul, mind, and body at academies, parochial schools, and diocesan high schools; and an increase of hundreds and thousands of vocations to swell the community which has been likened to "the river which takes its rise in some little mountain spring and broadens and deepens as it proceeds on its course, carrying blessing and joy to a thousand hearts."

It was to attain its fruition, however, with the coming to the archdiocese of Philadelphia in May, 1918, of its new shepherd, now of holy and beloved memory, who in his unfailing wisdom and selfless generosity was

to inspire, direct, and protect it for the next 33 years.

Nineteen hundred twenty, the 75th anniversary of the religious, who had chosen Mary Immaculate as patroness before the United States had chosen her as protectoress, witnessed the granting of a college charter to this magnificent institution which was to be named in her honor.

In June of 1921, after his return from Rome, where he had been welcomed into the ranks of princes of our church, his beloved eminence, Cardinal Dougherty, wrote giving his paternal approval and blessing:

"This undertaking appropriately coincides with the diamond jubilee celebration of your congregation. The college may be regarded fitly as the flower of so many years of hard toil, self-sacrifice, and progress in education.

"I both thank and congratulate you on this auspicious event; and I pray God to continue in your college the success which you have achieved in all your previous enterprises."

This great churchman who, rejoicing first in his priesthood, was a loving shepherd to all of his vast flock, and vigilant with the timelessness of true statesmanship in the interests of mother church, continued through the fruitful years of his holy life to extend his warm and wise friendship to the administration, the faculty, and the study body of Immaculata.

As honorary president of her board of trustees, he was the guiding influence of this college which was endowed with the holy lives of the sisters, servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary.

And since 1952, His Excellency, Archbishop O'Hara, of the Order of the Holy Cross, has continued to foster the purposes and ideals of your alma mater: To fit the students for good citizenship in this world and a happy eternity in the next.

Your parents are to be congratulated for having selected Immaculata as your college. For, while it is accredited according to the highest standards of secular educational agencies, it provides for the development of mind and heart and soul, and stresses the molding of character—without which intellectual growth can be at best unbalanced preparation for life.

Each of you has indeed been made ready to become a whole and complete person, a valiant woman. You have the love of truth and justice which all men need and too few share. Whatever the vocation that you find it in your wisdom to follow, the world will be better for your work. You will bring to it the peace that Immaculata has implanted in your heart.

A Negro Speaks on Desegregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Negro Speaks on Desegregation," which appeared in the July 11, 1955, Orlando Sentinel, Orlando, Fla. I hope Senators will take the time to read this very interesting and informative article, written by an educated and respected southern Negro, which accurately describes the situation in the South, and which I believe expresses the feelings of the vast majority of the colored people in the South on the desegregation problem.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEGRO SPEAKS ON DESEGREGATION

EDITOR.—There has been much discussion in your columns of recent weeks concerning desegregation. A recent article by a member of the Negro race presents their viewpoint in unmistakable terms. This article is a bit lengthy, but feel that it deserves the required space. This article is by W. R. Farley, founder of the Goodwill Radio Hour and Goodwill Youth Council of Southland, Inc., and is as follows:

"I believe that I am in a better position to express the views of the Negroes and the whites of the Southland than those who live in the northern section of our country.

"First of all, I was born in the South, worked in the South, and received what education I have as a Negro in the South. I have worked with the white brothers from the farmlands to the back alleys of city streets. That's why I feel I can talk about 'the race problem.'

"Personally, I feel as most Negroes do: That here in the South we have learned to work together in peace, with good will toward each other, and with each one holding his distinctive place in life.

"I feel also that both white and Negro recognize their 'sore spots.' These 'sore spots' are brought about by ignorance on the part of both sides. They have been painful to both the white man and the Negro alike.

"Today things are changing in the South. Much is being done to correct past mistakes. Negroes are getting better wages, better schools, better churches, better and more recreational facilities.

"The Negro race is no different from any other race. But in the South he is different from the Negro in the northern section of the country because he realizes when the going gets rough, he can call upon his white friends for help and, believe me, this is being done every day. The southern people have always loved and helped their colored folk.

"And, regardless of what anyone may say or do, the Negro in the South is not seeking force, agitation, communism, or radicalism as the solution of this problem. Those who are thinking rightly know that time, education, training, religion, and cooperation, tempered with goodwill, will bring about the solution of our problems.

"What I am trying to say is this: The Negro must first learn these things himself. I am not blaming him, because I can see thousands of reasons why he has not measured up to certain standards. First, his time has been short compared with the white race in America. Give him time. Don't make him feel that the heights have been reached, or can be reached quickly, when he has just begun.

"I think all will admit that the Negro race has come a long way in a short space of time. The most dangerous point in the general progress of the Negro race now is the fact that he is being misled by many agitators who would have him believe that he has caught up with the fellow who was several hundreds years ahead of him. Give my people, the Negroes, time and they will run a good race, because they have it in them. They may not get ahead of the winning horse, but they will run an honorable race.

"We are indeed proud of our white friends and the progress they have made in America. We know, without the white man the Negro race could not have progressed as far as it has.

"The progress of the two races has been an interesting one. If you will let your mind run back 100 years, and see where the Negro stood in the South, then compare it with where he stands today, you can readily see that the race has come a long way.

"There's no place in the world, where the Negro owns and controls as much as he does in the South. Take for instance Atlanta, Ga. I would say without question that Atlanta is the Negro capital of the world. It is thought by many to be the center of education and culture, finance and business.

"In the face of this, we have pressure groups—agitators, forcing issues upon both white and Negro. These groups are a little hard to swallow. What are they trying to do? They have not taken the time to count the cost of the overall picture of the races. They don't know or care what will happen to the Negro 50 years from now. They are grinding an ax, but whose ax and why?

"These agitators and so-called liberators should stop making fresh wounds by 'pulling off the scab.' To my mind, their efforts are designed to destroy the whole pattern of segregation and to establish an integrated social order in which there will be no distinction in this country on the basis of race, religion, color or nationality. I do not believe this is the solution of the race problem. God made a distinction between races, so why should mere man try to change it? I would not rejoice in reading the pages of history to find the Negro had lost racial identity and racial heritage.

"Yes, I am concerned for the Negro, because I fear that if all these changes are brought about, in the long run he will be the loser—the Negro will probably be set back another 50 years.

"In my observations I have found that the Negro can attend most of the schools in the North and get a fair education, but few of the Northern States which educate him will hire him as a teacher. The State of Connecticut does not have 25 Negro teachers. Personally, I will take my turn in the South, for in none of these integrated States does the Negro get anywhere near proportionate representation. There, every device imaginable is employed to keep Negro teachers from being assigned to teaching jobs for which they are qualified. Recently a reputable New York labor union made a survey on the employment of Negro teachers in the city of New York. This survey disclosed that a systematic scheme had been adopted to exclude Negroes as teachers.

"So, let's turn to the South and look at the picture there. This type of thing is not true in the South, and yet it might be, if the South were to become one of these integrated States. Let's look at one of the Southern States: Georgia, for example. The State of Georgia employs 7,313 Negro teachers and pays them close to $15 million in salaries per year. North Carolina paid its Negro teachers over $22 million last year. Despite all the hullaballoo about the liberal North and East, no Negro has been made head of a State college or university. But here in the South the woods are full of Negro colleges and university presidents. In Texas a Negro college president of a State school gets $10,000 a year.

"Florida is another State which ranks at the top on teacher's pay. Mississippi paid $7,414,278 in salaries to 6,753 Negro teachers in the State last year.

"So, my friends, I'm only calling an ace and ace and a spade a spade. You can see for yourself the millions of dollars that go into the hands of my people, the Negroes, throughout the South.

"We, the Negroes of the South, with the goodwill and help of our many white friends, are creating our own social standards, our own way of living. If given time, we will create a standard of distinction and goodwill so effective that others will seek it also.

"What is needed now is time, education, training and a little more real Christianity, living what we preach."

ZACH SAVAGE,
Economist, Florida Agricultural Extension Service, Gainesville.

Retirement of Postmaster Arthur H. Tifft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on July 1, 1955, Arthur H. Tifft, postmaster at Redmond, Oreg., retired. I presume that several other postmasters retired on that same day. Mr. Tifft, like many other retiring postmasters, has received from the Postmaster General an honorary recognition citation for meritorious accomplishment and devotion to the United States postal service.

In recent years, American communities have enjoyed a period of expansion. Most of the postmasters who retired on July 1, 1955, can look back over their terms of service as a period in which this growth and expansion brought many changes and developments in their post offices.

A postmaster, Mr. President, is a man of dignity and importance in his community. The responsibility of the office makes the postmaster inherently a leader.

American people in hundreds of towns look upon the postmaster as the local personification of Uncle Sam. To him come people with a profusion of problems—many of which are, by no stretch of the imagination, connected with the postal business. He is the individual citizen's closest and most intimate contact with the Federal Government.

Art Tifft, of Redmond, Oreg., was such a postmaster, and his post office is typical of hundreds of others across the Nation. An editorial in the Redmond Spokesman of July 7, 1955, is a splendid tribute to a faithful public servant on the occasion of his retirement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which the editor, Joe Brown, has written with such deep appreciation, and which epitomizes the experience of all postmasters, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOST COLORFUL POSTAL YEARS

Merely being retired as postmaster isn't going to keep Art Tifft from being a central figure in Redmond. In fact, with Federal restrictions removed from his civic activities, he'll probably start in where he left off 18½ years ago as one of the town leaders. Certainly, he'll be the leading Democrat, and that in itself will make him a man right off the bat to be reckoned with, if you happen to be a Republican.

Meanwhile, as he sits back for a while and gets used to being a private citizen again, he can take stock of those 18½ years and issue with confidence a challenge not only to the next postmaster, but to the next half-dozen, in something like the following terms:

"You might run a bigger Redmond post office than the one we have now, but I'll give you odds you'll never run one that goes through such a period of spectacular changes and growing up."

In the first place, it was during Tifft's administration that the post office achieved a first-class rating because of volume of business. And then a lot of things began to follow, especially after the war.

House-to-house mail delivery was started, and it made at least two big changes immediately in town. It brought house numbers, and for the first time people could tell you where they lived. It also brought several miles of sidewalks, since people could receive mail only when living on a sidewalk street.

At about the same time, United Air Lines started regular service to Redmond, delivering major air mail service right to the post-office door.

A little later the railway mail service, which had never been very certain in its schedules, gave way to special trucks which cut hours off the regular service between here and Portland.

Then only last winter the most spectacular innovation of all was put into effect—the regular coastwise service in Redmond for fist-class mail carired by air. Redmond became by far the smallest city in the United States to receive this experimental service.

Although Postmaster Tifft took it all in stride, one does have to acknowledge these developments were unusual in scope for just one term of office.

One thing Redmond never did get, though, during Tifft's term, was a new postoffice and Federal building. The office is still housed in the same old quarters, though these are somewhat enlarged.

It was through no fault of the postmaster, however, that this dream didn't come through for the town. He was always ready with facts and figures and a sales talk whenever the Federal authorities seemed to be looking in his direction. Could be, though, that this one shortcoming will turn out to be a good break in the end. If we'd have got the new postoffice 10 years or so ago, we'd have outgrown it by now—and would be stuck with it. As it is, we can expect a much larger one to begin with. And—with Tifft no longer a Federal employee but a politicking Democrat, perhaps he'll be even more valuable now in helping us get it.

Just as familiar, of course, with most of the changes that have taken place here is the new acting postmaster, Bill Hughitt. He served as assistant postmaster for 13½ years. He's one who should know there isn't likely to be another period quite so colorful, but because of his part in it, he should certainly have the incentive to capitalize fully on the gains that were made.

Address by Hon. William Benton at Foreign Policy Conference at Colgate University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address given by our former colleague, the Honorable William Benton, publisher of the Encyclopedia Britannica, at the Foreign Policy Conference at Colgate University, at Hamilton, N. Y., on July 14, 1955.

The address is a further indication of the vital leadership which Senator Benton continues to exercise in world affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DUEL FOR MEN'S MINDS

Eight hundred and sixty days after the death of Marshal Stalin—and just 4 days from today—the meeting at the summit opens in Geneva.

Whatever the outcome, the lives of all of us will be touched for good or ill—or for our continuing frustration.

This may sound to you like the opening gambit a thousand speakers have used at a hundred collegiate conferences over the past 10 years. If it does, I can only say: the thousand speakers were right, as I am right. A meeting of top statesmen is always potentially a momentous event.

The Geneva meeting could mark the beginning of the close of an era—the era of war's aftermath—and war's aftermath historically is often as disruptive as war itself. Yes, it could signal a dawn—a dawn in which the frightful fears and tensions of that aftermath begin at last to be dissipated. Geneva can be both an end and a beginning.

This is now the hope of mankind. Nehru spoke for mankind last week on Brioni where I myself a year ago had the opportunity to visit with President Tito. Nehru said, "I am a hopeful person."

But in contrast to mankind's hopes—what are America's actual expectations? Obviously, mankind's present high hopes should now be tempered by America's more sober expectations. We Americans have blundered, diplomatically and politically, more than once in the past decade because we have let our optimism distort the tables of probabilities. Our headlong scramble to disarm in 1945 and 1946 is an example.

It would be fatuous now to expect the Soviet Union and the West to compose their major differences—and thus to achieve accommodation. But it does not seem fatuous to anticipate the onset of a wary truce in the fist shaking and name calling. We Americans can even hope for a fresh grant of time in which the threat of the dreaded armed clash will hang less heavily over us.

For change is in the air. It is not yet under our feet. But we pray for it as we breathe deeply and look at the incipient rainbow in the eastern sky. There is talk of liquidating the cold war. Frozen diplomatic channels seem to begin to thaw. While there is no satisfactory evidence that basic strategy is being altered, a shift in tactics is clearly here.

This shift started on the Communist side. Indeed, one explanation given for the shift is the steadiness of the non-Communist coalition—its failure to shift. The Kremlin, according to this theory, has abandoned hope that the Western alliance will collapse or disintegrate in economic catastrophe. I suspect there is a measure of validity in this theory. In retrospect, the achievement of the West in its policy of building what Dean Acheson called "positions of strength"—positions of strength from which to negotiate—has been astonishing, and in history, unique.

Another proferred explanation for the shift of Communist tactics is that for internal reasons the Russians need time and breathing space. There is a fair amount of evidence to support this. Only this week Mr. Nehru assured us that the Soviet Union wants to devote its energies and resources to internal development. But we should be foolish, indeed, to base our present policies on anticipation of an internal Soviet collapse. Parenthetically, may I say that Secretary Dulles' statement to the House Appropriations Committee, revealed last week, that the Soviets are at the point of collapse, will probably bring him more castigation than he deserves. I think that what he meant is that the Soviets have always been closer to internal disaster than the Western World. Indeed, they have been most truculent when they have been most in

trouble. Whenever the Kremlin has inflicted fresh hardships on the Russian people, it has justified its harshness at home by inflating the menace of the foreign devil. Conversely, cordiality has never been a sign of weakness. Thus present cordiality may actually signify confidence.

Still another explanation for the Communist shift of tactics is that the new regime thinks that if it can prove to the world that it is more flexible and adaptable than Stalin, then the Western World will relax. This is the doctrine that honey catches more flies than vinegar; that the best way to make a man take off his coat is to shine warmly on him instead of to blow coldly.

There are even those who think the new Kremlin leaders lack the old revolutionary zeal; that they are ready to consolidate their gains within, and enjoy them, while they abandon the earlier concept of world revolution and conquest. Stalin once said to an associate of mine, "Neither country wants war but you fear it more than we do." There are now those who feel the Presidium fears war as much as we do. If this is true, it bears out the thesis advanced by George Kennan as part of his argument for the containment policy. Kennan contended that revolutionary fervor never survives in full force to the third generation of leaders. The third generation are bureaucrats, at least to the public. Lenin could demand and get great sacrifices. Stalin inherited some of the same ardor. But the Khrushchev generation must make concessions to its own people. This, Kennan said 5 or more years ago, provides the basis of his forecast of the forthcoming erosion from despotism within the Soviet Union.

Each of these theories has some merit. These and many others, in the weeks ahead, will be continuously debated and re-assessed throughout the world.

We Americans, however, cannot go far wrong if, while we debate, we make sure that we keep our attention focussed on those elements in the Soviet pattern which hitherto have been constant. Through the mist of our hopes, we must keep our gaze steady in order to make sure we do not mistake form for substance.

Unquestionably the style of the new leadership is far different from the ponderous manner of the last few years of Stalin's reign. My own present experiences in seeking visas for a proposed visit to Russia this fall, in contrast to my last experience in 1946, vividly illustrate the change in style. An official of the Soviet Embassy actually called on me at my office 2 or 3 weeks ago. He chatted wittily and amiably. His questions were intelligent and courteous. His English was meticulous and exact and he told me he had married his English teacher. He stayed for 2 hours and promised the visas.

The new men appear gregarious and even jolly in contrast with the inscrutable and aloof Stalin. They do unexpected things. Take, for example, the appearance of Messrs. Khruschev, Bulganin and others at our Embassy's July 4 celebration in Moscow. Their visit and their deportment have no precedent. Even solid old-Bolshevik Molotov has caught the new spirit. He was seen sporting a cowboy hat in Cheyenne. He reminded me of those dour Calvin Coolidge campaign pictures in Indian headdress.

Can we assume that the new men at the helm of the Soviet state are a different breed from Stalin, as suggested by Walter Lippmann in his dispatch on "The Garden Party" last week? We can surely hope that they may become so in time, but that is as far as we should now go. As one authority on the Soviet Union put it, Stalin's successors were his best pupils. It is of course true that many a pupil later steals away from the teacher to whom he brought the apple. As yet, however, there can be no safe presumption that Stalin's pupils will seek to undo his work. They may merely tamper with the legacy he passed on to them. Shall we not do well to assume that the pupils, now turned bosses, are simply pursuing Stalin's goals, in the language of Clausewitz, "by other means"? An old Russian proverb reminds us that "a friendly bear is more dangerous than an enemy."

The present professed desire for coexistence is hardly novel. Coexistence and the inevitability of war are both old standbys of the Bolshevik vocabulary. One or the other has been periodically unveiled—as expediency warranted. In the past, when the Communists have spoken of coexistence, they have not intended to call of their war on the free world. All they have meant was that on a "business-like" basis—without sentimentality—even mortal opponents sometimes find it convenient to agree—at least temporarily. On this basis they are prepared to come to terms with us on some subjects at certain times.

The root cause of most difficulties between ourselves and the Communists has been the nature of the Communist doctrine itself. This doctrine has not recognized the legitimacy of our existence. The cold war was declared in 1948, in the opening line of the Communist manifesto—"a specter is haunting Europe, the specter of communism."

We Americans make a grievous error if we disparage the importance of doctrine in the actions of our adversaries. Nor should we ever underestimate the variety of tactics in their repertory. In the pursuit of their goals they are realists and their essential test is pragmatic. Further, let us never misapprehend their doggedness or patience. The U. S. S. R. is an opponent not ashamed to make a tactical retreat. The Communists are sure that history moves in phases. They believe that revolutionary opportunities ebb and flow, but on the whole that history is on their side—even if their timetable be miscalculated by a decade, or a century, or thereabouts.

It is now 10 years since my duties as Assistant Secretary of State first required me to study and appraise the Communist ideology and the apparatus for projecting that ideology. I believe that the ideology and its apparatus are at least as formidable as the physical instruments of power. They are less so over the short pull but more so over the long. I believe further that while military and economic and political agreements may flow ultimately from the Geneva Conference, there will not in the near future be a truce in the ideological duel. There will be, we must hope, some letup in the cold war. The booming guns of anger and invective will perhaps be muted. If so, they will be replaced by the rapiers of the fencers. The cold war may settle down to an ideological duel in which the peoples of the world have the time and the chance to take a look at the promises and deeds of communism and of the free world. They will take this look, you may be sure, in terms of their own future welfare—and not of ours or the U. S. S. R.'s.

The duel for men's minds will continue. From the standpoint of American policy, we should put far more money and vigor into it. Harold Lasswell, the pioneer scholar in the field of political propaganda, has said that, in the hands of the Communists, "Propaganda is an instrument of total policy, together with diplomacy, economic arrangements, and armed force. Political propaganda is the management of mass communications for power purposes. In the long run the aim of propaganda is to economize the material cost of power. Even more specifically, the aim is to economize the material cost of world dominance."

If the world can be conquered by propaganda, so much the easier for the Communists. If propaganda can soften up the potential opponent, and make his conquest by arms the easier, that is a smart way to economize.

In the countries in which Communists are firmly entrenched they seek to pass on to succeeding generations a largely unchanging world view. Their techniques include a many-sided combination of material incentives, repression, and indoctrination. One of our leading experts on Russia summarized their skills this way, "The Russians are very, very good at policing, fighting, and propaganda."

That they are good at policing and fighting comes as no surprise to us. But it is in the field of indoctrination that the Bolsheviks have developed most spectacularly. Further, they have never been satisfied merely to use indoctrination as a means of extracting temporary political loyalty. Their aims have been far more ambitious. They have literally sought to exorcise and destroy old values in entire populations. They seek to graft new values on the societies which come under their control. They attempt to brainwash whole populations. Last week one of the turncoat GI's described it this way: "We don't have a political setup like what they have in China. Even the smallest kid in China is indoctrinated under communism. They walk the street like soldiers." Another of the returning GI's said, "Communism destroys the soul."

The Communists are not primarily concerned with short-run power gains. If their only aim were military domination and economic control, they would not tamper with the cherished ideas of subject peoples as they are doing in eastern Europe. They would encourage them to keep their priests and synagogues. The empire builders of the past learned that the attempt to impose new lares and penates increases popular resistance to the ruler. The Communists are no ordinary—or temporary—imperialists. If they were they would not risk heightened opposition—at a time when the going is rough at best.

According to the most recent estimate there were 375,000 full-time propagandists employed in the Soviet Union, and 2,100,000 part-time propagandists, in the field of oral propaganda alone. This estimate states that the Soviet Union is spending $1,167,200,000 a year for propaganda, and that the East European satellites are spending $529 million. The published budget of Red China carries an item of $1,500,000,000 for propaganda. This makes a total of more than $3 billion for 1953. The programs were expanded in 1954. But this is only part of the story. Every intellectual in Russia—let us say five to ten million men and women—is expected to be a part-time propagandist. The Communist Party, controlling every medium of communication, from the schoolroom through the mass media and the arts right down to the circus, drills into these intellectuals and into these media that their first duty is the indoctrination of the people.

Throughout the Soviet Union there are some 6,000 special schools devoted exclusively to training professional propagandists. These have an enrollment at any one time of 185,000 students. Above these 6,000 schools are 177 regional "propaganda colleges" to train 135,000 "alumni" of the local schools. This is 50 percent more than the total college and university enrollment of Great Britain. And above the regional schools are a dozen higher institutions giving "graduate training" to several thousand advanced students. Communist leaders throughout the world, such as Mao of China, Togliatti of Italy, Duclos of France, and Browder, Foster and Dennis of the United States—have attended these advanced schools.

Communism began as propaganda. It survived for more than half a century as propaganda. Its greatest heroes have been propagandists. It is Lenin and Marx, the propa-

gandists, who are enshrined in Red Square and in the hearts of the faithful. Its greatest advances have been scored by a combination of propaganda and political warfare.

I have many times cited China as a classic example. I once told the United States Senate that China fell to Communist propaganda, not to Communist arms. Earlier, I believe I was the first officer of our Government to advance this theory. I formed it listening to General Marshall talk about his experiences in China. Madame Chiang Kai-shek made the same observation 2 years ago in San Francisco.

The Communists succeeded in identifying themselves with anti-imperialist sentiment in China, with needed land reforms, with opposition to traditional graft and corruption, and with other issues deeply felt by the Chinese people. For our part, we failed either to identify ourselves with legitimate Chinese aspirations or to expose the fraudulent nature of the Communist claims. In the crucial years 1945–47 we were spending on propaganda in China less than $1 for every thousand the Communists spent. We shipped to China $3½ billion in arms but no radios or movies.

In the first legislation I sponsored as a Senator, back in the spring of 1950, I called for what I termed "A Marshall Plan of Ideas." This resulted in hearings before a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee that summer. I want to quote just a few lines from two witnesses at those hearings:

John Foster Dulles testified: "I believe that the question of whether we have a general war or not may depend, may hinge, very largely upon the relative effectiveness of the Communist propaganda and the free-world propaganda."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower testified: "I should like to put myself unequivocally on record immediately in this general tone, that with the purposes sought by this resolution, I am in complete and absolute accord—so emphatically that it is possible that I will experience a sense of frustration in trying to express how deeply I do agree."

When I recall to you this testimony, by two leaders now allegedly important in Republican circles, you may wonder why the United States has not better equipped itself with manpower and money for the continuing duel for men's minds. I wonder myself. However, to some who fought the fight right after the war—when the Voice of America became a major target of the Republican National Committee—it may be regarded as a sign of its acceptance that the United States information and educational exchange operation now has a budget roughly quadruple its first peacetime budget of 9 years ago. This growth has taken place in an atmosphere of skepticism and recrimination. It is a tribute to the urgency and vitality of the program.

Yet the program has not gained acceptance by the Congress or the American people as an instrument of foreign policy remotely comparable in importance with military and economic policy. We Americans build our battleships first, and then argue about a few million for radio. The Russians build their billion-dollar propaganda agency first.

I am not suggesting that we step up our propaganda and cut down on the Army, Air Force, Navy, or Marine Corps. We must continue to lead from strength and unfortunately in today's world this means military strength. But I am suggestin ga major build-up of strength for the forthcoming duel for men's minds, the duel which may indeed become more intense if accommodation is reached on some of the more acute political and economic issues. We should now greatly expand our efforts imaginatively to dramatize the ideas for which we stand. We should do this on all fronts—economic as well as political—and we should provide the manpower and money to develop projects which will disseminate the ideas of freedom—and carry them forward throughout the world. By comparison with the military, such operations are inexpensive. As Dr. Lasswell tells us, their aim is to economize the material cost of power. Thus it is in the national interest to finance every project in this field which offers a reasonable hope of contributions to our foreign-policy objectives If we aren't to develop President Eisenhower's atom peace ship, let us come up with a better project.

President Eisenhower is right on this: We must seek the projects to dramatize our ideas. Further, and here I go back to my own pioneer responsibility in the development of our information program, we must greatly strengthen the arm of our foreign policy through which we disseminate our ideas and combat those hostile to us. Through this arm, we implement policy so that all the world can understand it. Indeed, through it, policy itself often evolves.

Since the end of World War II the aims of our information program have largely revolved around these three objectives—first, to encourage and unify our friends and our potential friends; and second, in so doing to disseminate a truer understanding about America; and last, increasingly as we felt the impact of the Soviet attacks, to expose Communist falsehoods about us and about themselves. Indeed, Senator HUMPHREY commented in his speech here on Monday that "our leaders have been more concerned about exposing Soviet tactics than expounding a dynamic American policy that will win us friends."

There is a basic psychological weakness in all three of these aims. They are all in our own image: they are centered on what we want other people to know, and not on what they themselves want to know. Our own image may merely make them envious—or cause them to give up in despair. Further, as Senator HUMPHREY said, "We have been playing far too much to domestic political galleries." Obviously, other peoples are more interested in themselves than they are in us.

If an uneasy truce in the use of force between nations is now in the offing, the competitive struggle in the field of ideas will remain. If we use this truce to improve our position in this competitive struggle, the truce can deliver values to us which might make us impregnable a decade hence.

We must seek with renewed vigor to show that our system can be of help to a billion human beings in the development of their own freedoms and well being. We must show that we are willing and able to help them develop the conditions of life in their own countries which will enable them to build up the highest standards attainable with their labor and resources.

As I have often said, the aim of such a program should be to give to foreign peoples, to the best of our ability, the information they want and need to help them realize their own legitimate aspirations.

Now what knowledge can we give these billion people in the so-called "critical periphery" and the underdeveloped areas—what knowledge can we give them that they want and need for their own development?

First, we can help them get straight news. This they want.

Second, they have a tremendous range of practical problems to which we have practical answers; problems of agriculture, health, technology, communications. This is their language. We can talk it.

Third, some want to know what we have learned about the operation of an economic system, and even a political system—what we have learned which may help them in their hoped-for growth. We can seek to show them, in their terms, that they are far more likely to realize their most cherished ambitions by the methods of freedom, and in association with the free nations, than by totalitarian methods or in totalitarian company.

We must demonstrate that their prosperity and their peace lie with us and not with the Communists.

Coupled with the foregoing is the propaganda of the deed—our own actions at home and abroad. The Communists—not ourselves—have developed the doctrine that words can speak louder than deeds. This we deny. Our policy must be: Right actions, and the right words—and enough words—to describe those actions. Thus we can prepare ourselves for any further intensification of the duel for the minds of men. Thus we can help build our defenses of the future.

My friend of Yale undergraduate days, Russell Davenport, in his poem, My Country, published in 1944, outlined America's goals in six noble lines. These are universal goals—not America's only. These are goals of the free world, and of the United Nations. These goals cannot be achieved by military or political or economic policy or all three. They require the fourth arm, the arm of the educator and evangelist who girds himself with ideas of concern to his fellow man, and who projects these ideas so clearly and simply that they kindle renewed faith and hope in the minds and hearts of men. These are Russell Davenport's lines which I commend to you today:

"That all the peoples of the earth may know
The embattled destination of the free—
Not peace, not rest, not pleasure—but to dare
To face the axiom of democracy;
Freedom is not to limit, but to share;
And freedom here is freedom everywhere."

Contingent Expenses at Overseas Diplomatic Establishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, July 17, 1955, an article entitled "Diplomatic Wives Keep Tight Budget at Overseas Posts," written by Ruth Montgomery. I commend this article to the attention of all Senators. I believe that we could render this Nation a greater service by giving closer study to the needs of some of the diplomatic establishments abroad for funds with which to meet contingent expenses. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIPLOMATIC WIVES KEEP TIGHT BUDGET AT OVERSEAS POSTS

(By Ruth Montgomery)

Penny-wise and pound-foolish Uncle Sam is getting more for his money than he sometimes deserves in our overseas diplomatic establishments—thanks to a fortunate collection of unpaid ambassadors' wives.

This conclusion is inescapable after a month's round-the-world visit to 20 cities in 15 countries. At 10 major stopovers of 2 or 3 days each, we rubbed our eyes like Alice

in Wonderland at the magical transformation our frugal ambassadors, against penny-pinching odds, have wrought in the gentle art of living.

At our top diplomatic posts throughout the Far East, the yearly entertainment allowance for an ambassador averages only $3,500, scarcely sufficient to cover the required Fourth of July wingding without the countless dinner parties that must be arranged for visiting Congressmen, local officials and the diplomatic corps.

To add to the financial embarrassment, several United States military and FOA officials in the same capitals receive higher entertainment allowances than the Ambassador and thus can top the hospitality of Uncle Sam's No. 1 representative.

An antiquated law limiting the expenditure for an ambassador's limousine to $3,500 forces our top envoy to ride to official functions in a second or third-rate automobile while the Ambassadors of poorer nations arrive in Rolls Royces and Cadillacs.

Requests for needed furnishings and improvements become so involved in archaic Washington redtape that most ambassadorial families are of necessity turning into do-it-yourself enthusiasts.

When Ambassador and Mrs. John Allison arrived at their new post in Japan 27 months ago, they found it almost devoid of usable furniture. Five-star Gen. Douglas MacArthur had generously lent scarce items to members of his staff during the occupation, and when President Truman recalled the war hero, he gave him no time even to bid his troops farewell, let alone to take household inventory and recall the loans.

Many of the general's subordinates cheerfully forgot to volunteer the return of beautiful chests, cabinets, sofas and beds, and as they returned to the States for reassignment, shipped the furniture home to themselves at taxpayers' expense.

Mrs. Allison, faced with gaping holes or a choice of Army-issue eyesores, sent for her own furniture and ransacked the attic for pieces which she could saw down to usable size and cover with Japanese silks in tangerine and greens.

In the Philippines, if Uncle Sam is not losing face it is only because of the high caliber of Ambassador and Mrs. Homer Ferguson. Our present Embassy residence in Manila is a disgrace for a rich and powerful country which once ruled the islands.

During the protectorate days our Governor General in Manila occupied a breath takingly beautiful place set in a park of tropical foliage. After the Filipino President acquired this as his official residence, the American Ambassador moved into a spectacular new Embassy of mansion proportions situated on built-up land in the bay.

Came World War II, and afterward for inexplicable reasons this dreamhouse became the offices of our Embassy and Uncle Sam rented the pleasant house of Mike Elizalde, then Philippine Ambassador to Washington, as a residence for our envoy. But Miko has gone home, and the Fergusons are now forced to live next door in a dowdy, dark house lacking even carpeting for the slippery stairs.

In fact, when visiting American officials arrive in Manila, either former Senator Ferguson or the Filipino housekeeper has to relinquish a bathroom in favor of the house guest.

Betty Jane Peurifoy, piquant, charming wife of our Ambassador to Thailand, has, with the aid of native Thai silk slipcovers, converted our rambling Bangkok Embassy into a cool oasis in that steaming, mosquito-ridden land of mystery.

Betty buys her exotic materials from Jimmy Thompson, borther-in-law of Under Secretary of Air James Douglas, who fell in love with that "Anna and the King of Siam" country during his war duty there and returned to revolutionize the native silk industry.

Former Kentucky Senator John Sherman Cooper can thank his good fortune that he took chic, chairming Lorraine Shevlin as a bride before departing for India. Lorraine has not only charmed everyone and scored a diplomatic coup by entertaining Prime Minister Nehru for dinner at the Embassy—the first such invitation he ever accepted—but has also served as her own decorator in transforming the sticky tan rooms into a starchy blue-and-white setting.

The Palace Revolution in Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Palace Revolution in Albania," which was written by Glenn A. McClain, director of the Eastern Kentucky Center of International Relations, Richmond, Ky., and published in the summer 1955 issue of World Affairs. Mr. McClain is a former Massachusetts citizen and teacher who is now resident in Kentucky.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PALACE REVOLUTION IN ALBANIA

(By Glenn A. McClain, director, Eastern Kentucky Center of International Relations, Richmond, Ky.)

While the Western World was speculating on the meaning of a shift in Russian leadership an interesting prelude to this palace revolution took place in the Balkans. Since 1945, the Kremlin has used Albania as an experimental colony in the religious and economic fields. New strategy in nationalizing church groups and collectivizing farms was followed by a long expected shift in the command of the Albanian Communist Party. Some indication of what might be in store for the other satellite countries can be gained from an analysis of the political situation in Albania during the past year.

Mehmet Shehu, the secret police chief of Albania, deposed Enver Hoxha as leader of the tiny state. In true Byzantine style, Shehu, the butcher of Corusha, seized the reins of power on July 23, 1954. Albania has since seemed more committed than ever to the Russian brand of satellite rule. The struggle for leadership between these two Albanian Communists has provided an interesting example of Russian strength and influence in the Kremlin's most neglected colonial outpost.

The story of the development of Communist strength in Albania is one that has not been fully told in the West. Aside from occasional dispatches from the British news services or interviews with refugees, little information of importance trickles out of Albania. No trade with non-Communist countries exists and few travelers get near the Albanian borders. Only the news from the underground published by such foreign language newspapers of the liberation groups as Shqiperia, Flamuri, Albania Libre, Zari I Ballit Kombetar, Vardar, Zeri I Lire, and Skenderbeu gives the true story of the systematic exploitation of Albania. These foreign language papers and the parties they represent often differ as to the political future of Albania. They all work together to fight communism, to preserve the boundaries of 1939 and to establish liberty once more in the land of Skenderbeu. Their efforts have been fought with tenacity by both the deposed leader, Enver Hoxha, and the new dictator, Mehmet Shehu.

Communism in Albania is imported from abroad. In 1917 the Vienna Bureau of the International decreed that a Balkan confederation should be formed by the "free will of the so-called democratic people" of the area. Many individuals in exile contributed to a publication entitled the Balkan Confederation. The first infiltration of leftist ideas in Albania was initiated by Vienna. The large number of exiled intellectuals there began not to propagandize communism but to create conditions for the founding of a Balkan confederation. Their idealism was used by the Third International to corrupt liberalism in Albania as well as in other Balkan countries.

From 1917 until 1924 communism in Albania consisted mainly of radical ideas developed abroad by a handful of Albanian intellectuals who had studied in Athens, Belgrade, and Rome. Zogu, a son of an old Albanian mountain family, had risen to prominence. He became Prime Minister on December 22, 1922. Many of the important issues in Albanian politics and international relations have since crystalized around his personality. Zogu's premiership lasted until February 28, 1924, then Monsignor Fan S. Noli became the new revolutionary Prime Minister. Noli's radical program was needed in Albania, which had suffered for centuries from European interference, backward land policies, and internecine political feuds between the land-ownings Beys. Noli, under the influence of Maleshova, a Moscow-trained Communist secretary, tried to rule as a dictator in 1924. He failed miserably as Hoxha has more recently failed and as Shehu will eventually fail. All would-be dictators in Albania from Noli to Shehu have failed to solve the nation's complex problems, social, economic, and political. Noli solicited recognition from Russia as an approach toward the solution of his problems. Shehu, the present dictator of Albania, is under direct Kremlin control. Noli refused to hold free elections after he took over as Premier. Since the first so-called free elections of 1945 in Albania, this same pattern of autocratic power has been followed by the Kremlin-inspired leaders. The Peoples Republic of Albania as established on January 11, 1946, has received 99 percent of the vote each year since then in annual elections. The usual Communist-rigged, one-party election slate has been the only choice for the Albanians. All freedom groups abroad are agreed that such methods will never work again. When Albania is liberated, free elections must be held under the auspices of the United Nations if the wishes of all Albanian refugee parties in exile prevail.

The fall of Noli in 1924 resulted in the return of Zogu to power. He remained in control of Albania until 1939 when Mussolini seized his most expensive colony. Many resources exist in Albania which is only 8 percent arable, but they have never been properly exploited. After successive Italian and German occupations, the Communist movement in Albania became very weak. In 1941 the Communist Party gained new vitality under the organization and discipline imposed by the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. Two organizers, Dushan Mugosha and Miladin Popovic, set the apparatus of the party in motion. The adroit tactics of Moscow can be distinguished here. The movement was presented not as the effort of a truly Communist Party but as a National Liberation Front. This fiction has

been maintained until today in Albania as in other satellite countries.

Evner Hoxha, an obscure schoolmaster, soon became the new leader of the Communist forces in Albania. The Titoists who seized control of the Albanian economy from 1945 until the Kremlin schism in 1947 considered Hoxha to be the most noncontroversial leader available. Meanwhile Colonel General Mehmet Shehu had been the real power behind the throne in Albania since 1945. It was no surprise to informed experts in the West when he finally unmasked the brutality of his police power and deposed Hoxha on July 23, 1954. Information transmitted by various overseas new agencies seemed to indicate confusion over the issues at stake in Albania. First reports after the change in leadership blamed Tito for the revolt. These reports apparently were incorrect. Only the isolation and relative obscurity of Albania, particularly pronounced at the present time, have made the real issues difficult to analyze. Nothing has really changed in Albania except that the Kremlin has tightened its hold on this small bastion of Russian strength in the Mediterrenean. The so-called "Albanian revolution" was in reality a change in the strength of the guardians of the Kremlin. Shehu is a fanatical Communist who has long experience in purging all those who might stand in the way of his ideological sympathies. Hoxha has been relegated to the obscurity of a Communist Party functionary in a state where party membership is not important.

The problem of Albania is one which should directly concern the free world. Albania is alone and isolated from all the other satellites by the formation of the recent Greek, Turkish, Yugoslavian security pact. A splendid opportunity exists which the West can exploit. Albanian underground forces abroad have made things so difficult for the Communists in Tirana that little can be done to fortify the country. Captured documents from underground sources show that Russia only ships its most outmoded supplies to Albania. Through terror and brutality, the Shehu regime maintains a semblance of order in the cities. The underground fights openly in the mountains and rural areas.

America has helped Albania in the past. After World War I, President Wilson refused to let Albania's rights be overrun. In notes to the European governments on February 20, and March 6, 1920, Wilson's energetic intervention saved the liberty of Albania. Today the Balkan nations are in the throes of economic despair and political slavery. The liberation of Albania could pave the way for a rebirth of freedom in the Balkans. The palace revolution of July 23, 1954, may hasten the day of freedom toward which the Albanian people are striving with anticipated American support.

Tenth Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while the United Nations 10th anniversary was being celebrated at San Francisco, Mr. Carroll Binder, a noted columnist and editorial writer, wrote a series of articles from San Francisco which I commend to the attention of the Senate. Mr. Binder is editor of the editorial page of the Minneapolis Tribune, and has performed outstanding service to the United States as our delegate to the United Nations Commission which studied freedom of the press throughout the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the articles by Carroll Binder which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA DIDN'T FOOL US AT TIME U. N. WAS BORN

The return this week of the United Nations to its San Francisco birthplace is giving rise to some confused and misleading discussion of the circumstances in which the U. N. was brought into being 10 years ago and the mission given it at that time.

Some speak nostalgically of a spirit of harmony which they think prevailed then. They seem to think that if only the mood of 10 years ago could be recaptured, an era of peace with good feeling could be inaugurated.

Others speak critically of the mood in which they think the United States delegation participated in the 1945 meeting. They attribute the unhappy experiences of the past decade to the trustful innocence of the United States about Russia. This, they claim, took the form of a belief that the United States and Russia would be at least as close and friendly allies in peace as they had been in World War II.

Neither of these impressions has any foundation in fact. The more quickly they are dispelled the better it will be for the United States and the U. N.

I have been looking over the dispatches and editorials I wrote for the Star and the Sunday Tribune from the San Francisco conference 10 years ago.

They note, of course, the yearning of warweary people throughout the world for an international organization which would, in the words of the preamble of the U. N. Charter, "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." They report the "present high tide of American sentiment for participation in a system of collective security."

But the bad faith, sabotage, and uncooperativeness of Russia were discussed in at least a dozen dispatches. The full text of the agreements made at Yalta was not known at that time but the dispatches repeatedly refer to Russia's breach of the agreement with the United States and Great Britain about Poland and Czechoslovakia.

They report the steadfast resistance of the United States and Great Britain to Russia's efforts to gain recognition for a group of Communist Poles with headquarters at Lublin as the Government of Poland.

They report the profound anger of the United States and Great Britain when word reached San Francisco that 16 anti-Communist Polish leaders who had gone to Russia to negotiate with the Kremlin were arrested.

As early as April 25, the day the conference opened, I spoke of "Russian uncooperativeness which disturbs all friends of a workable security system." I raised the disturbing question as to whether there may "come a time when Russian highhandedness will create such ill will and distrust as to undo the whole security effort."

Some of the things I reported happened in the organizing sessions or were being reported from crucial areas of Europe where the war was just ending. Other dispatches were based on information given me by leading members of the American delegation, British Foreign Secretary Eden, Prime Minister Fraser, of New Zealand, and other key participants in the San Francisco meetings.

Senator Arthur Vandenberg, the ranking Republic member of the United States delegation, Harold Stassen and other members of the American delegation showed full awareness of what Russia was up to in their discussions with me. The American delegation resisted Russia's efforts to pervert the U. N. into a vehicle for the extension of Soviet influence. So did the British Commonwealths and many other delegations.

I draw upon dispatches filed to these newspapers at the time to refute the canard that the United States was hoodwinked by the Russians at San Francisco. Dispatches filed to other newspapers afford similar refutation.

Demaree Bess said in the Saturday Evening Post on February 26, 1955: "I can personally testify that American delegates were by no means so hoodwinked as Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge seems to believe. During the San Francisco Conference, I talked with most of the American delegates and advisers, and I did not find a single one of them who expected 'close and friendly' future relations with Russia inside or outside the U. N. It was obvious to all persons familiar with the facts that postwar relations were certain to be difficult."

The struggle over admission of Argentina, which had a Fascist pro-Axis government, was long and bitter. The struggle over a veto for the great powers and the amount of peace-preserving power to be vested in the U. N. was as lacking in harmony as subsequent struggles in the U. N.

I recall these facts to put the organizing period of the U. N. in better perspective. Like the old graduate's reminiscences of the great days through which he lived as a student, the nostalgic sighs about the lost harmony of the founding days have little relation to reality.

This makes the U. N.'s accomplishments during its first 10 years all the more remarkable. Although some of those who attended its birth optimistically expected it to be the fulfillment of Tennyson's dream of a world in which the war drums would throb no longer and the battleflags would be furled, this was not the mood of those principally responsible for bringing the U. N. into being.

These founders of the U. N., on the other hand, did not share the cynicism of those who predicted that the U. N. would fold up when confronted with a major crisis, as did the predecessor League of Nations. The cynics compared the founding of the U. N. to a second marriage—"the triumph of hope over experience."

The U. N. has never yet become a universal organization. Twenty nations which would like to belong are still waiting admission because Russia objects to the admission of some and the United States objects to the admission of others.

But it is the nearest to a world community that mankind has ever come. No member has ever withdrawn and it is unlikely that any will, as members of the League of Nations withdrew when it displeased them.

As this is being read I shall be en route to San Francisco to see what the U. N. is like at the end of its first decade and gather impressions as to what it may be like during the coming decade.

BINDER SEES MOLOTOV PEACE PLAN LOOPHOLES

(By Carroll Binder)

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.—V. M. Molotov, traveling salesman for the Soviet brand of peace and arms limitation, put his wares on display Wednesday at the 10th anniversary meeting of the United Nations of which he was one of the founders.

To this long-time observer of Soviet propaganda and behavior it seemed that Molo-

tov had introduced a few new offerings and slightly altered the wrappings of stock items.

Molotov reinforced the customary Soviet demand that Communist China be seated in both the general assembly and security council of the United Nations with the assertion that Red China "obviously should be a party to any discussion" of reduction of armament, prohibition of atomic weapons and removal of the threat of a new war.

It is "unjust and unlawful," according to Molotov, to deprive Communist China of its "rightful place in the United Nations." Further toleration of this "unlawfulness" will "undermine confidence in the United Nations," he said.

Russia also sought to give greater impetus to its arms limitation campaign by proposing that a world conference be called not later than the first half of 1956 to discuss the general reduction of armanents and prohibition of atomic weapons.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that a time limit has been set on the proposal for holding an arms limitation conference.

Molotov tried to make people believe the Soviet Union has incorporated all the proposals of the United States, Great Britain, France and Canada for the reduction of conventional armaments without any modifications in its disarmament proposal of May 10.

He also said Russia has met them half way on the question of atomic weapons.

This is not true but Molotov obviously hopes the potential customers won't notice the jokers inserted by Russia which make the sort of arms reduction and atomic weapon scrapping it proposes utterly unsafe for the west.

Molotov did this by incorrectly stating the western proposal for controlling atomic weapons prior to their complete prohibition. He said that proposal would allow the use of atomic weapons only in exceptional cases and by decision of the security council.

Such a limitation on the use of atomic weapons would give Russia a veto on their use at all times and to my knowledge has never been envisaged by the United States and other western nations.

Molotov misled his hearers when he gave the impression that Russia now agrees to effective international controls on the size of military establishments and the outlawing of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

He said an international control organ would establish control posts in large ports, on railroad junctions, on highways and in the airports of all the countries concerned.

"Their responsibility shall be to see to it that no dangerous concentration of land, air and naval forces takes place, in order to forestall any attack of one nation upon another," he said.

This international control organ shall have, according to Russia, its own staff of inspectors who at all times shall have unlimited access to all the objects of control.

If put into operation such a system would introduce a new element behind the Iron Curtain. For the first time officers of a power outside and above the Soviet dictatorship would function on Soviet territory as they function on non-Soviet territory.

This would have novel implications for people living under the Soviet dictatorship, for it would demonstrate to them that there is something outside of and independent of the regime which at present is the ultimate in power as far as they are concerned.

But Russia's definition of places to be supervised and limitation of access to specified objects of control leaves a large loophole which other nations would view with extreme anxiety so long as Russia seems bent on seeking security through universalization of its institutions.

They have such a system of supervision of the Korean armistice and the allies feel that it affords them wholly inadequate protection against Communist violations of the armistice provisions about military installations in North Korea.

Unless the international control could move freely about Soviet territory to check possible atomic weapon concentrations in places distant from ports, railways, highways, and airports there could be no lasting sense of security in other atomic weaponless countries.

Molotov couched his proposals in such soothing talk about Russia's desire for peaceable coexistence and an end to the cold war, the creation of an atmosphere of trust, and professed such a desire to translate words into deeds that he got far more frequent applause from visitors in the galleries than President Eisenhower or any of the previous speakers.

This created a sympathetic climate in which to propose that the United States get out of those bases near Russia and that both the United States and Russia take their troops out of Germany.

Molotov did not refer to Soviet bases in satellite countries or note that Russian troops would be only a few hundred miles from the heart of Germany while American troops would be 2,000 miles away.

Molotov did not have have the floor to himself. Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo of Cuba followed him with such a devastating summary of Russia's subjugation of its neighbors and "enslavement of 98 million human beings" that President Van Kleffens felt called upon to rule the Cuban out of order.

When Carlos Romulo of the Philippines supported the Cuban, Van Kleffens said there were other places in the U. N. in which to make such an attack on a single state but this commemorative meeting was not qualified to deal with such a discussion.

To many it seemed that Molotov's presentation violated that principle in spirit if not in the letter. But the Cuban said everything he had included in his prepared text and got more attention than he otherwise would have gotten.

He gave reporters a new lead on the Molotov story. He got the congratulations of Secretary of State Dulles and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge as well as the embraces of some of his Latin American opposite numbers. He could afford to be ruled out of order.

Molotov, however, had used the greatest forum the world has ever afforded to win support for Russia and try to put the United States on the defensive. He, too, undoubtedly considered it a successful day's work.

Sweden Urges U. N. Seat for Red China

(By Carroll Binder)

San Francisco, Calif.—Only one non-Communist country—Sweden—has said at this 10th birthday celebration of the United Nations that Communist China should be admitted to membership.

Osten Unden, Sweden's Minister of Foreign Affairs, said:

"Experience has shown that the work of the U. N. for securing peace is hampered by the fact that the Government which is the undisputed master of the whole of the Chinese mainland is not recognized by the United Nations as the representative of that country.

"I should like to express the hope that an early solution of this problem will be reached."

Several other non-Communist countries strongly implied their belief that Communist China should be admitted by saying that the U. N. would not reach maximum effectiveness until it becomes universal.

The Burmese delegate said the prestige and authority of the U. N. is "seriously impaired by the absence of so many states who have a worthy part to play in fashioning the future of our globe, and the sooner they are admitted the better it will be for all of us."

The Pakistan delegate called for admission of all sovereign states who are willing and able to undertake the responsibilities of joining this august body. Their absence can tend to alienate prospective and frustrated members from normal standards of international cooperation and international behavior.

Iran, Iraq, Brazil, and Greece commended the idea of universality in terms which could be interpreted as opening the door for Communist China if it undertakes to live up to the obligations of a member.

George Yeh, Nationalist Chinese Foreign Minister, presented his Government's case Thursday against treating with the Chinese Communist government in any way at any time.

Yeh attacked the Peiping regime in particular and communism in general in such strong terms that President Van Kleffens interrupted him with a request that he not stray so far from the purpose of these commemorative meetings.

That made Nationalist China the third member to be called to order, the others being Syria which attacked French rule in north Africa and Cuba which recited that story of Russian subjugation of neighboring states and enslavement of 90 million human beings.

Yeh deleted some of the more specific indictments of the Communist regime, but like the other speakers he got his principal charges aired. The galleries applauded him frequently.

He tried to jolt those who think that Sovietism has switched to a permanent policy of peaceful coexistence by saying communism owes its present strength to the creation of carefully timed periods of alternating tension and relaxation—a calculated plan to exploit the world's fear of war and longing for peace.

"Communism," Yeh said, "must be stopped before there can be lasting peace." The Chinese Communist regime, he contended, is not based upon peace but war.

Yeh compared Nationalist China's resistance to admission of Red China with Emperor Haile Selassie's warning to the League of Nations not to appease fascism.

"Korea, Vietnam, and Nationalist China," Yeh said amid bursts of applause from the galleries, "are faced with an aggressor far more ruthless and determined than Mussolini. Let us hope that the United Nations will not let itself be turned into an instrument of appeasement."

The Russian delegation was not on the floor and the few Communist satellite representatives present read their newspapers.

The Soviet bloc and others interested in bringing Red China into the U. N. continue to discuss privately deals whereby countries such as Italy, Spain, Austria, Portugal, Ceylon, Jordan, and Libya may be brought into the U. N. in return for the admission of Communist China and other countries in which the Communist bloc is interested.

U. N. Speakers Employ Historic Quotations

San Francisco.—Sixty top spokesmen of 60 nations have tried to say here in speeches not exceeding 20 minutes each what they and their countrymen think of the first 10 years of the United Nations and the outlook for the future.

Some of the speakers at the 10th anniversary meeting of the U. N. were renowned orators. Some were notorious windbags. Others were abler diplomats or politicians than public speakers.

The many hundreds of thousands of words spoken from the rostrum of the San Francisco opera house thus range from the eloquent to the boresome, from the noble to the trite, from the high-minded to the parochial.

Many of the 60 speakers chose to interlard their own words with familiar or unfamiliar quotations designed to reinforce the points they sought to make.

These quotations afford interesting insight into the thinking of the speaker and the attitude of the nation he represents. They also illustrate the catholicity of the U. N. membership.

I have just gone over the first 30 texts to see what sort of quotations were incorporated. These quotations and allusions fall into three broad categories—political, religious and poetical.

President Eisenhower set a stiff pace for the quotation marathon by drawing upon Abraham Lincoln:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present.

"The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

Carlos Romulo, of the Philippines, who is a professional orator of the star-spangled school, outdid all others in his recourse to the anthologies. He recited Tennyson's famous lines in Locksley Hall envisaging a time when—

"The war-drums throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd in the parliament of man, the federation of the world."

President Truman used those lines in addressing the U. N. 10 years ago.

Romulo also quoted two verses from the Indian poet Radindranath Tagore beginning "Where knowledge is free; where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls."

Romulo then shifted to Thomas Jefferson's prose beginning: "When we reflect that the eyes of the virtuous all over the earth are turned with anxiety on us, and when we reflect that * * *."

The Filipino orator got his audience ready for those lengthier quotations by brief quotations from Robert Frost, O. Henry, and Thomas de Quincy.

Harold MacMillan, British Foreign Secretary, quoted Winston Churchill in his peroration.

Joseph Bech, Luxembourg Foreign Minister, also quoted Churchill. Neither selection represented the highly-quotable Churchill's best phrasing.

Paul Spaak, Belgian Foreign Minister, and several other speakers quoted the eloquent words of the preamble of the U. N. Charter, beginning:

"We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war * * *."

Osten Unden, Foreign Minister of Sweden, closed his address with a quotation from Adlai Stevenson:

"Experience suggests that it has not been easy for men to learn the wisdom and virtue of tolerance for ideas and ways of life which deeply offend the cherished tenets of their own faith. In times past men of fervent faith regarded religious tolerance as a sign of moral weakness rather than moral strength. It seems that only when warring faiths have become convinced that they must choose between common survival and mutual extinction do they agree to live and let live."

Emilio Nunez-Portuondo, Cuba's permanent representative to the United Nations, closed with Bertrand Russell:

"To stop war, we must not only work on governments; we must cleanse our own hearts of the poisons that make war seem reasonable: pride, fear, greed, envy, and contempt. It is a difficult business, but if it cannot be achieved, the end is death."

Eduardo Zulueta-Angel closed with the hope that mankind's motto may be "Glory to God in the highest and peace on earth to men of good will."

Abba Eban, Israel's ambassador, closed his address with the declaration that the first decade of the United Nations should be regarded as a mere prelude to a journey which will only have reached its destination when all peoples shall dwell "each beneath its vine and fig tree with none to make them afraid."

Mohammad Mir Khan, Pakistan's permanent representative to the United Nations drew on the Koran for his peroration:

"Man was evolved out of nothing, and through low beginnings, but he was given insight and understanding. God showed him the way. And if man doth wilfully reject the right, man but chooses chains and yokes and a blazing fire within his own soul."

Jeronimo Renorino, foreign minister of Argentina, quoted from Peron and Momolu Dukuly, secretary of state of Liberia, quoted from the "words of the great president of our nation, Dr. William V. S. Tubman." But Dukuly also cited "the poppies in Flanders' field" as he spoke of those killed, maimed and bereaved by war.

Some of the speeches delivered during the past week undoubtedly will be quoted from in future speeches. I have not attempted to anticipate the anthologists by selecting such passages from the mound of texts in front of me. I have chosen, instead, to show what speakers thought would bolster their own speeches.

Livestock Sold on Account of Drought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. KEITH THOMSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, if the parliamentary situation permitted, I would offer the following amendment to H. R. 7201:

Page 38, line 3, after "SEC. 6," strike out "effective date" and insert "Livestock sold on account of drought.

"Section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to involuntary conversions) is hereby amended by redesignating subsection (f) thereof as subsection (g) and by inserting after subsection (e) of such section the following new subsection:

"'(f) Livestock sold on account of drought: The sale of livestock (other than poultry) held by a taxpayer for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes shall be treated as an involuntary conversion to which this section applies if such livestock—

"'(1) are so held in an area in respect of which the President determines under the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, that a major disaster exists because of drought, and

"'(2) are sold (whether before or after such determination) by such taxpayer solely on account of such drought.'

"SEC. 7. Effective date."

Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 83d Congress, with the extreme drought conditions covering much of the livestock-producing areas of this country, an amendment was proposed to section 1033, Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amendment to H. R. 6440, 83d Congress, which passed this House on July 29, 1953. This was known as the Millikin amendment. As I understand the situation, it had been studied by the Department and accepted as a sound and necessary revision to the code, if our livestock men, already in distressed conditions, were to be given fair treatment under our tax laws. The Members of this House are more familiar than I with the situation that prevailed in the closing days of the 83d Congress in the other body. As it was reported to me, this was one of the bills that everyone thought would pass but which got lost in the shuffle.

In the first days of the 84th Congress I introduced H. R. 207 to accomplish the purpose. In fact, it went a little farther. Everyone with whom I have talked on the committee, or in the Department, seemed to appreciate the necessity of solving this problem if we are to be fair taxwise to the rancher in his hour of distress, and also in the best interests of the Government who collects large sums from our ranchers in Federal income taxes. There, however, seems to be reluctance on the part of both the Department, and members of the committee, to open up the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in this session of Congress. In all fairness, I think that this is something that needs to be taken care of now.

Under present law, a livestock man who is forced, because of drought conditions, to convert his breeding herd, or a substantial part thereof, into cash rather than see them starve, is subject to taxes on his gain. Because of supply and demand, when everyone over a large area sells the price is low. When the drought is broken and he tries to get back into the business, he is left, after paying his capital-gain tax, with only 74-cent dollars with which to buy higher priced cows than he originally sold. This simply means that the economic disaster to our area is strung out over an unreasonably long period of time. To the Government it means that the rancher cannot readily get back on a profitable basis, where the Government will be sharing 20 percent or more of his income by reason of our progressive income tax on ordinary income. Therefore, the Government stands to lose large sums of money from income taxes unless this amendment is enacted into law.

This amendment would simply give the livestock man who is forced to sell breeding stock because of drought conditions the same treatment as any other business man who suffers a loss because of an act of God, such as fire, and so forth. I urge its consideration and adoption at the earliest possible moment.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, 50 years of reclamation law, precedent, and experi-

ence are jettisoned by the upper Colorado River project.

Example 1: Present law requires repayment within 40 years, with respect to power and municipal water, and 40 years plus a development period of not to exceed 10 years with respect to irrigation.

Under this bill—

(a) The power allocation is permitted to be repaid in 100 years.

(b) The municipal-water allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years from the date of completion of each unit.

(c) The irrigation allocation is permitted to be repaid in 50 years in addition to any development period authorized by law.

Thus, the repayment period for power is extended 60 years, municipal water 10 years, and irrigation 10 years plus an undetermined period, over existing law.

Example 2: Present law requires that no contract relating to power or municipal water be made unless it will not impair the project for irrigation purposes. Under the bill, contracts relating to municipal water may be made without regard to this section. Although this may not be a bad result, it is another symptom of eroding the reclamation law by individual pieces of legislation instead of considering such matters in the context of a national water policy bill.

Example 3: Present law requires interest at not less than 3 percent per annum on the power investment. Under this bill, interest would be the cost of money to the United States, or about 2½ percent per annum.

Example 4: Present law requires a finding of engineering and financial feasibility, the latter to be in terms of the 40-year repayment ability. Under this bill the so-called benefit-cost ratio has been substituted for financial feasibility in order to come up with an economic feasibility based on fantastic national benefits supposedly to be realized. This constitutes one of the greatest breaches of present law and leaves Congress with no well-defined standards of feasibility whatsoever.

American Servicemen Imprisoned in France

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, shocking disclosures of conditions under which American servicemen are imprisoned in France are contained in a Chicago Tribune article today which I include as part of my remarks.

A Tribune correspondent reports the almost unbelievable fact that Airman Jose Montijo, against whom I am informed no formal charges have been placed, is already in solitary confinement under conditions worse than we in this country would mete out to a convicted criminal.

A few days ago I presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in hearings on House Joint Resolution 309, a report on French prisons written by a Frenchman, as well as a report of American consular officers who visited American servicemen Keefe and Scaletti.

Those reports pointed out the dietary and medical deficiencies of the prisons, the lack of hygienic living conditions, the lack of heat in the prison cells, and many other facts which in effect add to the severity of the sentences imposed upon our American boys.

Those reports included the fact that Keefe has been required to pay a customs duty on the packages of food sent him by his mother in her efforts to augment his meager prison fare.

Today's Tribune report adds other facts which altogether add up to a situation that would never be tolerated in an American jail.

I call attention especially to the report on Montijo. According to a letter from the Air Force last week, Air Force inquiries reveal that no definite charge has been placed against this young American and there is no time set for his trial. He may be forced to wait another 6 months before he has his day in court.

This is a violation of human rights that no government should tolerate with respect to one of its citizens.

Surely the following account by Correspondent Ress will arouse our determination that the status of forces agreement, under which these men have been imprisoned, must be modified or terminated without delay:

FRENCH CONVICT 214 YANKS IN YEAR—WAIVE PROSECUTION IN 2,000 CASES—DEMAND CHANGE

(WASHINGTON, July 17.—Imprisonment of 58 American soldiers in foreign countries has stirred congressional demands for annulment or revision of the status of forces treaty which gives alien lands court jurisdiction over GI's. A bill by Representative BOW, Republican, of Ohio, calls for revision of the treaty and directs the President to terminate adherence to the pact if revision cannot be obtained. Representative GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, has introduced a resolution to annul the treaty.)

(By Paul Ress)

ORLEANS, FRANCE, July 17.—Ten percent of the American soldiers stationed in France got acquainted first hand with French police in the last year. They were involved in 2,500 crimes, accidents, or incidents.

Records show the French waived jurisdiction in all except 242 cases, although they were entitled under the status of forces agreement to prosecute all 2,500 GI's. French tribunals convicted 214 and acquitted 28.

Officers at communications zone headquarters here said "only 18 American soldiers received prison sentences and actually served them." None spent more than a year in a French jail.

TWO IN PRISON

Two Americans, however, Richard Keefe, 26, of Washington, D. C., and Anthony Scaletti, 25, of Coraopolis, Pa., have served nearly 2 years of 5-year terms for stealing an Orleans taxi and attacking the driver. They were the first to be handed over by the Army to foreign justice.

Headquarters officers said only two other Yanks are incarcerated in French prisons today. They are Sgt. Leonard Young, of South Williamsport, Pa., sentenced to 8 months in Nancy prison for passing bad checks and swindling, and Cpl. Merry Feagins who got 45 days in Fontenay-le-Comte jail, near La Rochelle, for assault.

"No Americans are in prison today awaiting trial," the officers asserted. Airman Jose Montijo, 25, of Phoenix, Ariz., is in Fontainebleau jail, however, awaiting trial for murder.

REPORTS 15 IN JAIL

The Army told Congress several months ago that 15 American servicemen were then in foreign jails. Thus, Yanks serving time in French prisons made up about a fourth of all GI's in foreign jails.

Traffic incidents account for most of the 2,500 affairs involving Yanks.

No GI in any North Atlantic Treaty Organization country has been given such stiff sentences as those imposed on Keefe and Scaletti. Both are having trouble with their teeth while in Fontevrault prison. Each has had at least six teeth extracted. The meager prison diet, deficient in vitamins, is believed responsible for their dental trouble.

VISITED BY CHAPLAIN

The Reverend Victor Van de Walle, Catholic chaplain of the Chinon engineering depot, visits them once a month. He is forbidden to give them American cigarettes from the Army post exchange. As a result, Keefe and Scaletti must buy them from the penitentiary commissary for 55 cents a pack. Prison authorities also refuse to allow the chaplain to bring chocolate or candy bars and American language news magazines to the men.

The Americans occupy 800-year-old monks' cells in the 12th century Benedictine Monastery converted into a state prison in 1804 by Napoleon. The austere cells have never been modernized. Richard the Lion Hearted's tomb is in the prison chapel.

WORK FOR PITTANCE

Keefe weaves wicker chairs and Scaletti cleans dirty linen and jail clothes at the prison laundry. Such work in France is farmed out to concessionaires who pay inmates a pittance.

Father Van de Walle has been spending his own money for the items he is allowed to give the prisoners. He has placed a donation box in the post chapel with a sign: "For Fellow Americans in Fontevrault Penitentiary."

Montijo, accused of the murder of Andre Maillet, 19, has been in solitary confinement at Melun since May 15. He may stay there 3 more months before he comes up for trial.

The American is charged with stabbing Maillet in a street brawl over Madeleine Thomas, mother of Montijo's son, 7 months old.

SEES LITTLE OF SKY

Windows of cells of prisoners charged with murder are covered by a metal screen so that Montijo can get only a narrow glimpse of the sky. As a solitary, Montijo eats his two meals a day in his cell, the meager repasts being shoved through a slot in the door. He also takes his exercise alone, under the eyes of two turnkeys.

He earns pin money by painting eyes on lead soldiers, cowboys, and Indians for a concessionaire of the prison.

CIGARETTES BARRED

He has been visited by Lt. Col. Ira Smith, Air Force judge advocate in Paris, and by Catholic Chaplain Patrick J. Barrett, of Portland, Maine. His fiance visits him three times a week, obtaining a permit each time.

She is not permitted to take him cigarettes, food, candy, or books. She can give him money, and with that he can buy French tobacco and other articles from the prison commissary. Montijo is permitted to draw three French books a week from the prison library.

Michigan Joins Parade Opposing Upper Colorado Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial under date of April 29 from the Kalamazoo Michigan Gazette:

ECHO PARK

The Senate passed last week the Colorado River Storage Bill by a vote of 58 to 23. Just prior to that final vote, Senator NEUBERGER had offered an amendment to exclude Echo Park Dam from the bill. The Senate rejected his amendment 52 to 30.

Thus the Senate took action on one of the most hotly disputed questions that has ever arisen in the field of conservation and reclamation. And in that field the country has seen some famous fights.

To the people of the great West, water means development, productiveness, power, progress, prosperity.

The bill just passed in the Senate, if approved by the House and the President, would give the green light to the upper Colorado River Basin project, and would supply water to portions of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The lower Colorado River Basin has rapidly developed, especially in the Southern California region. People in the Upper Basin began to worry about the situation some 40 years ago, fearing that all the water claims might be staked out before anything could be done in the area to the northward.

Accordingly, the States of the Colorado valley negotiated a compact in 1922 which aimed to reserve a part of the flow for the Upper Basin.

Southern California contends that the project now pending in Congress violates the compact. Both California Senators voted against the bill. The other Western Senators supported the legislation.

The dispute has centered largely on the proposed Echo Park Dam, a feature of the upper basin project.

The dam site, where the Green and Yampa Rivers come together, is described by some as the key to the whole project; but others contend that it would be feasible to build the other dams and postpone the construction at Echo Park.

Those who oppose the Echo Park Dam declare that it would flood the most picturesque part of the Dinosaur National Monument. They maintain, further, that this alleged despoiling would open the way to the eventual destruction of the national parks, handing them over to exploitation for public power purposes and commercial profits.

On the other side of the controversy, it is pointed out that Echo Park is not a park at all, but only a pioneer name for a small area. In the course of the Senate debate, Senator O'MAHONEY said he thought he could "show conclusively" that the dam would not damage or endanger the scenery or the wildlife in the area.

Conservationists, nature lovers, and leaders in the national park movement have generally ranged themselves against the Echo Park Dam; and they have aroused a good deal of feeling around the Nation.

We note that both Michigan Senators voted for the exclusion of Echo Park from the bill; and, defeated in that move, they both voted against the whole bill.

The measure now goes to the House, where the same issues will probably arise, with much the same kind of arguments pro and con.

Most of us will hope for an eventual decision on the basis of reason rather than emotion.

It might help a bit to remember the similar dispute that flared up when it was first proposed to use a portion of Niagara Falls for power. Subsequent events have failed to bear out the dire predictions then made by the more sentimental lovers of the falls.

No one, we think, will believe for a moment that the Eisenhower administration and a large majority of the Senators are out to destroy the national park system.

Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a radio address, recently given by my colleague, CHARLES W. VURSELL, entitled "Peace and Prosperity."

The address follows:

PEACE AND PROSPERITY

My friends, today, in the 30th month of the Eisenhower administration, I would like to speak to you about the present condition of our country, which so intimately affects you, and me, and our 160 million people of this, the greatest government of liberty, freedom and opportunity in the world.

How the policies of Government we have followed have brought about such a great change, for today, throughout the length and breath of our Nation, we have peace and prosperity. We have made the transition from war to peace, when most people, a few years ago, felt that when war ended and peace came, we would be plunged into a depression. Many thought it was unavoidable, but, through our policies of Government, we are moving forward—with peace and prosperity—that no longer has to be maintained through the terrible destruction and sacrifice of war. We have obtained the two great objectives our people for years have sought—peace and prosperity.

In 30 months, a remarkable change has come over the people of our Nation. The national blood pressure and temperature have gone down. The future is more promising. Nerves are less frayed. War tension has been eased, and this new tone of thinking of the people can be described, I believe, to a considerable extent in one word—confidence.

Confidence and faith in the honesty, in the high purpose, and in the wisdom and leadership of President Eisenhower, who has so unselfishly dedicated his every effort to the service of our people. In assuming the reins of Government 30 months ago, the President followed these broad policies of Government:

First. To maintain justice and freedom among ourselves, and to champion them for others, so that we may work effectively for enduring peace, honesty, efficiency, and economy in Government;

Second. To keep our economy vigorous and expanded—thus sustaining our international strength, and assuring better jobs, better living, better opportunities for every American citizen; and

Third. To concern ourselves with the human problems of our own people, so that every American may have the opportunity to lead a healthy, and rewarding life.

To carry out this full program, we set about to strengthen our military power and productive capacity to discourage resort to war, and to protect our vital interest; to strengthen our national defense, and to build up our air power, our nuclear weapons, and at the same time, to encourage the peaceful use of atomic power; to continue to ferret out and destroy Communist subversion, and adopted sound policies for building up the economic power of our country—all of which were necessary to deter Russia from starting world war III.

On all of these fronts, the President, working with the Congress, has followed policies that have been crowned with success.

We have achieved peace and prosperity on the home front, so let's take a look at our foreign policy, and note a few accomplishments there: The Korean war has been stopped; the dangerous Trieste problem, affecting Italy and Yugoslavia has been solved. The Suez problem has been solved. Iran, with her great oil production, which 2 years was swinging in the balance, from day to day, threatened to collapse and go with the enemy, has been saved and brought into the western alliance.

In South America, in Central America, great agreements have been made, under which one foothold of international communism has been eliminated.

The great NATO pact of Western Europe, binding those nations together, building a wall against further expansion of communism to the West, has been ratified, and the powerful nation of Western Germany has been added to that alliance of defense against communism.

Through the Pacific, we have strengthened the free world by adoption of the Manila Pact, and the defense treaty with the Republic of China, and in addition, the Bandung Conference, affecting a number of Asian nations in the southwest Pacific, was brought into being—greatly expanding the strength of the free nations of the world.

As the strength of the free nations of the world has been built up under the leadership of President Eisenhower, Russia, apparently, has been convinced that she can no longer bluff or attempt to challenge the strength of the United States and her allies. With the result she is now in retreat, and her leaders are now talking peace, with the approach of the conference at the summit, which opens in Geneva, Switzerland, Tuesday, July 19.

When the President left by plane Friday to participate in the Big Four Conference at the summit in Geneva, with his great Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, where he will sit at the conference table with the heads of the Governments of England, France, and Russia, in the most important peace conference the world has ever witnessed, he must be comforted and encouraged with the thought of the great leadership and service he has rendered this country on the domestic front, and in the knowledge that he will be sustained by the confidence, the prayers of the people of America, in the great responsibility and task before him on the foreign front.

Now, let's return for a moment to conditions here on the home front: The year 1953 was the most prosperous to that date in peacetime in our history.

The year 1954 was threatened with the recession; employment was dropping, and business as well. Moving swiftly to prevent a depression, the Eisenhower administration quickly gave the people a reduction in taxes of $7.4 billion. This extra purchasing power, left in the pockets of the people, and the revision of our entire tax code brought about an upward turn in business, and in employment, that beat off a depression, and the year

1954 became the second most prosperous peacetime year in our history.

By reducing the budget by over $14 billion in the first year of the Eisenhower administration, which made this tax reduction possible, and the reduction by several billions in the budget for the second year, and when other policies of the administration had time to come into play, with the beginning of 1955, business continued to rapidly expand, employment increased 2 millions, and the economy of our country is roaring forward on a broad highway of prosperity to constantly higher levels, with over 64 million people now employed at the highest wages in the history of our Nation.

In addition, inflation has been stopped; the cost of living has turned downward, and the wage earners, because of the reduction of taxes, are taking home more net pay today than ever before in our history.

It is estimated that our national gross production, or national gross product, by the end of this year will reach the highest peak in history—$380 billion, or $20 billion more than it was in the previous year—1954, and we expect to balance our national budget next year.

Unfortunately, because of 2 years of drought in southern Illinois, our farmers are not fully enjoying the prosperity the people of the Nation generally are. And again, due to overproduction, and the piling up of a mountain of farm surpluses of billions of dollars over the years, these surpluses overhanging the market have depressed farm prices.

However, this administration has come to grips with the farm problem, and with the great progress we are making in reducing these Government-owned farm products, by increasing our exports, and by new legislation, I feel sure that within a reasonable time our farmers, generally, will be fully sharing in the prosperity of the country.

The Colorado River Storage Project Pays Its Own Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Colorado River storage project has been attacked in some quarters on apparently economic grounds. The word "apparently" is used advisedly, because a thorough analysis proves that the attacks are not based on economic facts, but on misstatement, misinterpretation or misunderstanding.

I am sure that Leslie Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, is perfectly sincere in the stand he has taken about the Colorado River project. However, I would be less than frank if I did not point out to you that the position he has taken in his May Reader's Digest article, and elsewhere, is typical of that taken by critics who have attempted to discredit the project on economic grounds by giving only one side of the story. Governor Miller has tried to prove the project unfeasible by a set of figures which treat it entirely on a cost-per-acre basis for irrigated farm land.

This approach, while it can be made to appear fairly convincing when its proponent is not subject to questioning or to rebuttal, is neither honest nor realistic. The Colorado River storage project is a multipurpose project and can honestly be evaluated only by considering all of its purposes and not just one of them. Furthermore, the Colorado project—or any other—must be judged on a basis of net cost, not gross cost. If the resulting benefits are substantially greater than the original costs, any project is a sound investment.

When Mr. Miller appeared to testify before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee last March, he was subjected to cross examination, and a great many of the basic fallacies in his theories were clearly brought out.

Mr. Miller had made a great fuss in his direct testimony over the fact that the cost of putting water on an acre of land would be substantially more than the selling price of this land. This was the basic theme of his article in Reader's Digest magazine and of his attacks on the Colorado River storage project generally.

When I questioned Mr. Miller, however, he had to admit that the cost of putting water on land is not actually related to the market price of that land. The reason is that the cost of putting water on land is not a capital investment, but an operating expense.

I cited him an example with which we were both thoroughly familiar, in our State of Wyoming. On the Powell project, the going price for land was $150 an acre with water available. But alfalfa hay was selling for $30 a ton and it was possible to raise 7 tons of hay on an acre of irrigated ground in 1 year—which brought a gross return of $210 an acre for 1 year, from which all operating costs, including that of putting water on the land, had of course to be deducted in figuring net profit.

This clearly shows how ridiculous it is to maintain that an operating cost—putting water on irrigated land—should be related to the market value of the land itself.

Each unit of the Colorado River storage project has been made the subject of a cost-benefit analysis as well as a feasibility analysis. The feasibility analysis, required by law, must prove that any proposed reclamation project will be self-liquidating. The cost-benefit analysis is not required by law, but is submitted to Congress as a matter of Reclamation Bureau policy; it compares costs with measurable benefits on a local, regional, and national basis.

Mr. E. O. Larson, director of the Bureau's region 4 with headquarters in Salt Lake City, introduced some very revealing evidence into the public hearings conducted by the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation on March 9 of this year. Mr. Larson and the agricultural economist from his office, Paul Sant, discussed the question of cost-benefit ratio at length and introduced an analysis of the Seedskadee project in Wyoming—one of the irrigation projects, called "participating projects" of the overall Colorado project.

The known costs of this unit were computed against the total benefits on a year-to-year basis over a 100-year period—considerably short of the expected life of the project. For purposes of the cost-benefit analysis, money allocated to irrigation—which is interest-free under irrigation law—was charged with 2½-percent interest, compounded annually.

Benefits which were taken into account included the direct increase in farm net income; the increases in profits to businesses handling, processing, and marketing farm products; and the increase in the supply of goods and services.

During the construction period, there would be no offsetting benefits to be computed against the $23,272,000 construction costs of the Seedskadee project, which would therefore accumulate $2,362,000 in — theoretical — interest charges. During the first 5 years of operation, following completion of the project, growing benefits would not offset interest on the unpaid balance of the investment, but by the sixth year benefits would total more than interest charges. Interest—which would reach a peak of $4,533,000 in the fifth year—would be systematically reduced until in the 18th year benefits would be large enough to cover all interest charges and leave a net profit.

Annual payments on the original capital investment would continue to the 60th year—50th year of operation after a 10-year construction period. After repayment on capital investment had been completed, total annual benefits of $1,443,000 would be a net profit to the Nation.

At the end of 100 years, the Seedskadee project would not only have paid for itself, but the Nation would show a net benefit—after allowing for compound interest charges during the repayment period—of $83,345,000.

This figure compares with a total cost of $33,376,000, which includes $10,140,000 assessed as the Seedskadee's prorata share of the costs of the basic Colorado River storage project. In the years following the first century of operation—and the estimated life of the project is more than double the 100-year period on which computations were based—the net benefits would continue to accrue to the national economy.

The same sort of analysis has been made of each unit of the overall project which has been approved by the Department of the Interior, and each of the units shows a cost-benefit ratio of greater than unity—that is to say, the measurable benefits exceed the costs.

It should be noted that the cost-benefit ratio does not take into account increased tax revenues which come from the increased land and crop values on an irrigation project. This broadened tax base is a very sizable item. A study of existing reclamation projects indicates that the return in increased taxes alone has, to the year 1953, been approximately 125 percent of the total cost of all reclamation projects constructed since the reclamation program was begun more than 50 years ago. Actually, this is a very conservative estimate, because many of the reclamation projects are not

yet in full production, or not in production at all in some cases.

In 1952, individual-income taxes paid directly by irrigation farmers and by persons of the neighboring towns and villages whose business or employment was affected by construction of 15 reclamation projects under special study, were estimated at $105 million. An appropriate share of corporation and excise tax revenues, directly attributable to reclamation development, was estimated at $75 million in 1952. Total tax collections attributable to the reclamation development since it was begun in 1916, calculated on the same basis, have been just 4½ times the total construction cost for the projects—$264 million.

These increased tax revenues go directly into the Treasury, for the benefit of all the taxpayers of the Nation, but they do not count toward repayment of the reclamation projects, nor are they used in computing any type of feasibility or cost-benefit analysis by which projects are justified.

Another important benefit to the national economy comes from the increased purchasing power which stems from the local prosperity which is created by a sound reclamation project. The farmers and their families, and the families who draw their livings from the supply and service industries in the farm communities, have more money which they spend for farm machinery, automobiles, household appliances, shoes, clothing, recreational equipment and many other things which are produced in other parts of the Nation. This is another very real benefit which is in addition to those used in determining the feasibility of a project, or its cost-benefit ratio.

So far, I have discussed only the irrigation side of the picture of the Colorado River storage project, meeting Mr. Miller on his own ground and showing that even in the restricted field of agriculture the project is economically sound and worth while. There are, however, other factors even more important to the national economy.

When I questioned him at the House hearings, Mr. Miller had to admit that water is vitally needed in Wyoming—and in the other upper basin States—for development of natural resources, for industry and for cities. A great deal of water developed by the Colorado River story project will go for this purpose, but Mr. Miller had been conveniently forgetting this, and talking only of the cost of irrigating farmland.

A great deal of the water which will be put to use through the Colorado River storage project will go to cities and to industries—and industrial development holds the real key to the future of the upper Colorado River Basin.

In the basin lie more than 90 percent of our known uranium and vanadium ores, more than one-third of our bituminous coal, reserves of oil shale more than double all the petroleum so far produced in the world and triple the known reserves of liquid petroleum underground. There are vast deposits of phosphates, important quantities of titanium and many more important minerals and raw materials. These are strategic materials, vital to national security as well as to our economic future.

It is unthinkable that the Nation should let these vital resources go undeveloped, and is quite obvious that their full development must be achieved by developing the full industrial potential of the region in which they are located. This requires all of the water available, as well as substantial development of electric power.

An excellent example is at hand in the experience at the Geneva Steel Plant, constructed near Provo, Utah, during World War II. The plant is now an important unit of United States Steel Co., employs 5,000 people, and produces 1,800,000 tons of steel a year.

To achieve that production, the Geneva plant uses between 12 and 25 million gallons of water a day. To obtain that quantity of water, in a water scare area, every possible source has been utilized. The steel plant purchased water in Deer Creek reservoar—a reclamation project constructed prior and during World War II, by the way—and developed water from other sources—but the plant could not have been put into operation except for the fact that the land for the plant site was purchased complete with appurtenant water rights. The water which had been used to irrigate farmlands was converted, along with the farmlands themselves, to industry. The pattern will be repeated over and over again as this area develops.

This means that tremendous quantities of water which may originally be developed for irrigation of agriculture will eventually be used for industry—and paid for at industrial prices. Even so biased a critic as Raymond Moley admits that industrial and municipal prices for water would justify the Colorado development.

A good parallel may be found in the Yakima project in the Pacific Northwest. Originally developed solely as a reclamation project, for the purpose of putting irrigation water on good farmland, it contributed greatly to our atomic-age development—something never contemplated by the original planners. Some 7,000 acres of land—and the vital water rights which went with them—were taken out of the original project for the development of the Hanford Plant of the Atomic Energy Commission. If the water had not originally been developed for irrigation, it would not have been available at the critical time to be put to its present use.

One of the most damaging half-truths which has been widely used in the propaganda put out by opponents of the Colorado project has been in connection with project costs.

The figure generally quoted for basic construction cost is $1.6 billion, which is completely unrelated to the actual figure carried by H. R. 3383, or to S. 500 passed by the Senate.

H. R. 3383 has a total authorized construction cost of $760 million and the total authorized construction in S. 500 was just over $1 billion. Other projects might be authorized—if found fully feasible from every ecomonic viewpoint—over a period of 20 to 25 years.

Let us stick to consideration of the projects which would be authorized by H. R. 3383, which is what we shall be voting on. It is manifestly unfair to include unauthorized projects in a computation of costs, and then to confine attention to fully authorized projects only in looking at benefits—and our opponents have not presented anywhere near the full benefits even on this unbalanced basis.

A major factor in the overall importance of the Colorado River storage project is the production of hydroelectric power. Although secondary to the conservation and use of water, the production of power is highly important to this expanding and developing area. Furthermore, it is through production and sale of power that the entire project becomes economically feasible.

The multipurpose dams authorized by H. R. 3383 would have more than 800,000 kilowatts of installed generating capacity. Sale of this power at a price of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour delivered at load centers would make the storage dams not only self-liquidating—including standard interest charges—but would assist in paying out the costs of the irrigation features of the overall project.

The 6-mill charge, while high in comparison with power costs in some areas of the Nation, is a competitive price in this area. Representatives of the 10 major privately owned utilities in the area have repeatedly testified that they would be willing to purchase the entire output of the storage project—provided the power potential is developed in an orderly manner, as it would be—at the 6-mill price, which is slightly less than the cost of producing power in the most modern coal-steam generating plants in the region.

The fact that the entire power output of the dams can be sold in the upper Colorado River basin is extremely important. It means that the same people benefiting from the water development will be directly paying for the project through their purchase of power. None of the direct costs of the Colorado project will be paid by people outside the area directly concerned. The fact that the power will be sold at a price substantially higher than that sold from, for example, Hoover Dam is meaningless in view of the fact that it will be purchased in the upper basin. The people of that area are ready and willing to pay the 6-mill price—which is, after all, a competitive price in that region—in order to purchase the combined waterpower development which is so vital to their future.

It is ironic that the major opposition to the Colorado project is coming from an area which has directly benefited to a fabulous degree from the full development of the lower basin of that same Colorado River system.

Southern California, which is spearheading the fight against upper Colorado River development, has perhaps gained more than any comparable area in the United States from reclamation development. The Hoover Dam complex and the Parker-Davis complex furnish southern California with more than 4

million acre feet of water a year, in addition to more than 3 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power at a rock-bottom price which in effect constitutes a power subsidy to the area. More than 16 percent of the total water controlled by the Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles comes from the Colorado River via these projects. Two major reclamation projects in southern California—taking water from the Colorado River—in 1 current year produced crops with a gross value of more than $117 million, and over their comparatively short lifetime have produced crops with a gross value of more than a billion dollars. The tremendous municipal and industrial growth of southern California would have been literally impossible without the reclamation-developed water and power from the Colorado.

In the light of these facts, it is more than ever hard to understand California's dog-in-the-manger attitude toward development of the upper Colorado Basin—except on the theory that southern California wants to violate the Colorado River compact of 1922, prevent development by the upper basin of its share of the water, and eventually claim title to the water guaranteed to the upper basin States.

The 1922 compact divided the water on a fair basis between the upper and lower basins. The upper basin States have never disputed the compact, despite the fact that more than 90 percent of the water in the river originates within their boundaries. They intend to abide by the terms of that compact, solemnly and honestly entered into and approved by the Congress, and they expect California to do the same. There can be no other basis for harmony and cooperation between States—or between nations.

To my colleagues, who over many years have observed first hand the disastrous results of nations violating treaties and agreements—and, on the brighter side, the magnificent results which can be attained when nations join in equitable agreements and honestly adhere to them—the importance of this point must be more than obvious.

In the final analysis, our position can be summed up very simply. We feel that it is our water, guaranteed by compact, and our right to develop it. Without it, our four States cannot hope to grow and develop their potential for the security and prosperity of the Nation. With it, we can not only pay our own way, but provide a substantial boost to the economy—and the security—of the country as a whole.

Grier Says Textiles Pay Much of Japan Aid Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, our textile people, both employers and employees, are terribly alarmed over the recent agreements at Geneva to lower the tariff on Japanese textiles coming into America. I share personally this apprehension. I hope every Member of this House will read the following article which ably expresses our sentiment by F. E. Grier, of Greenwood, S. C., president of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association and first vice president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute:

GRIER SAYS TEXTILES PAY MUCH OF JAPAN AID COST

GREENWOOD.—An industry official asserted today that cotton textiles are being asked to bear virtually the entire load of economic aid to Japan and added: "The result may be the extermination of an industry which ranks among the Nation's top six."

The statement came from F. E. Grier, of Greenwood, president of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association and first vice president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, central trade association of the industry.

The comment of Mr. Grier, president of the Abney Mills of Greenwood and chairman of the board of Erwin Cotton Mills in Durham, N. C., was prompted by the recent tariff reductions on textiles granted to Japan by the United States State Department at the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) Conference in Geneva.

"I know that textile people in all parts of South Carolina, as well as throughout the country, are just as worried about the drastic Geneva tariffs as I am," said Mr. Grier.

"From talking with people in our own plants, I am convinced that this anxiety is shared by both the employees and the management personnel of the textile industry.

"I have studied the very complicated tariff schedules which have been issued and I do not hesitate to say that this is one of the most critical situations which has ever confronted our industry.

Mr. Grier pointed out that these tariff cuts, affecting virtually the entire range of United States mill output, amount to an average of 27 percent on cotton gray goods and are even deeper on bleached, printed, and colored goods, running to 48 percent on some categories.

He cited also that the increasing importation of Japanese textiles, manufactured at a labor cost 10 times less than that which prevails in this country, had already begun to hurt United States mills before the "astonishing" concessions were granted at Geneva.

The reductions are scheduled to go into effect September 10, he said, and to prevent the devastating effect they will have upon the mill industry and cotton agriculture, the ACMI is making a strenuous effort to obtain quantitive limitation on imports.

Without an "equitable quota system," he stressed, the United States mill industry and cotton agriculture seem certain to fall victim to Japanese monopoly.

He cited that the executive committee of the ACMI, in a recent emergency session, called for a quota which would amount to an increase of not more than 50 percent, based on the average annual volume of 1953-54, which are the two highest import years since World War II.

Mr. Grier continued:

"We do not for one moment underestimate the importance of keeping Japan out of the Communist camp, but we are extremely doubtful that America can buy international friendships.

"At the same time, we are sensitive to the humanitarian elements involved and we agree that the Japanese people should be permitted to sell the product of their labors.

"However, what we object to is that the American textile industry is being asked to bear virtually the entire load of this effort—and the result may be the extermination of an industry which ranks among the Nation's top six.

"The purchasing agents for many of our industry's customers are already on the way to Japan. Still others are making plans to go there immediately.

"If something cannot be done about the situation, then we may find ourselves in a more precarious predicament than representatives of the State Department ever dreamed possible."

Stay the Execution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during his campaign in 1952, President Eisenhower said that he believed in action and not words in behalf of small business. He promised that if elected small business would get action. I wonder if the kind of action he had in mind was the recent action of the Civil Aeronautics Board revoking the operating authority of North American Airlines, a "small business" in the airline industry.

There was no question of safety involved in the Board's action. In fact, North American has had a perfect safety record. The action was based solely on Board allegations that North American had flown too regularly and too frequently. The Board charged that North American had violated the Board's economic regulations which were designed so that the small independent airline cannot possibly be a threat to the 13 favored carriers.

North American was started after World War II by a group of veterans. Even though it has been very successful, it is still a relatively small company. It has only 9 planes compared to the 1,200 owned by the 13 Board-favored airlines. You would think that such a small company would hardly be worthy of much of the Board's attention. But the Civil Aeronautics Board is an unusual Board. Last year when the Civil Aeronautics Board's appropriation was under consideration before the House it was brought out during the debate that almost half of the Board's budget for economic enforcement has been spent over the past few years in an unceasing effort to "get" North American. Why is the Board so intent on putting out of business this small airline?

Perhaps the basic reason for the Board's almost fanatical fight against North American has been that North American has displayed the all-important virtue that American small businesses have been displaying for generations. It had the ingenuity and the freshness of approach to develop a new idea—a new concept in air transportation that has been a smashing success—low-cost, air-coach service. North American decided after the war that the real future in aviation was in the mass market that could only be tapped with low fares. Hence, they developed air-tourist service. Just about all the offi-

cials of the major airlines scorned North American's idea of low-cost air service and said it was utterly impractical and impossible. Even as late as 1949, the rest of the airline industry was insisting that air-coach service could never succeed. But air coach, as developed by North American, did succeed. And North American achieved its success without a penny of Government subsidy.

The details of this story of North American and aircoach are unique, but is not the pattern the same as we have seen so many times in this country? Our industrial success has been the constantly repeated story of the innovator who has had the chance to try out a new idea. Philosophically, this opportunity for new ideas and new businesses is the basic reason for our concern in Congress over the welfare of small business. It is a realization that much of our industrial progress stems from this spurring challenge of the independent business.

For an example of benefits to all from the challenge of the newcomer, just look what North American's innovation has done to air transportation. Air coach which was so scorned just 5 years ago by most of the other airlines has now been adopted by almost all of them and amounts to more than 35 percent of total airline business. Indeed, air coach has accounted for two-thirds of the growth in air transportation over the past 5 years.

But North American's success is the cause of its downfall. Its success has embarrassed many people, most notably the Civil Aeronautics Board. It upsets the Board's pat picture that air transportation should be a carefully regulated monopoly whose development can be minutely plotted by an all-seeing Federal Board. The Board completely failed to see the potential of air coach. And it took a company from outside the Board's neat little chosen group of 13 airlines to prove to the Board the feasibility of air coach.

The Board has interpreted its mission to be the protection of the monopoly of the 13 grandfather carriers. Although aviation has grown 40 times since the Board was set up, the Board has never found reason to admit a single new carrier to compete with these chosen 13 airlines. Just how long is Congress going to tolerate this Government nurturing of what may turn out to be one of the largest monopolies. For certainly if aviation grows to anywhere near the extent competent experts predict, it will be one of our very largest industries. And it will have been given to a chosen 13 companies without any opportunity for a new company to enter and compete.

I do not believe Congress ever intended that the Civil Aeronautics Act should be interpreted to protect from substantial competition a company whose revenues are over $300 million a year. And I do not believe Congress intended that a Government board should treat air transportation as a complete monopoly for the lucky 13, particularly when most of those 13 are making higher profits than, for instance, any of the manufacturing industries surveyed by the Federal Trade Commission.

If there had been a board similar to the Civil Aeronautics Board governing the growth of the automobile industry, we would never have had the mass-produced car of today. Such a board, if it had followed the Civil Aeronautics Board's policies, would have put Henry Ford out of business for building too many cars too cheaply in the same manner the CAB is trying to put North American out of business for flying too many people too cheaply.

I believe the time has come when Congress must completely review our Nation's air-transportation program to reestablish the traditional role of at least a limited opportunity for the entry of new companies.

But, until this can be accomplished, it is vital that the present revocation order be stayed. The Board must not be permitted to make a mockery out of the efforts of Congress by destroying the very assets which we are seeking to preserve.

Another Example of Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of the United States should know about the statement made by Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., distinguished minority leader of the House of Representatives, upon completion of House action upon the supplemental appropriations bill, July 14, 1955. It is as follows:

Never in my long legislative experience have I ever witnessed such irresponsibility and lack of appreciation of obligations to the country as was the performance today of the leadership of the Democratic-controlled Appropriations Committee.

Piqued because the Rules Committee failed to give them a rule to trespass upon the legislative jurisdiction of other committees, they recklessly of their own accord destroyed their own studies and findings requiring several weeks of effort.

Because they could not have their own way, these men killed appropriations to keep going wage-and-hour enforcement, highly essential defense appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Nation's intelligence system; the administration of farmers' home loans; the Small Business Administration; seriously handicapped civilian defense and health services; and greatly restricted functions of the Justice and Labor Departments.

For the information of the country, I just want to outline the facts. The supplemental appropriation bill was approved and reported to the House by a Democratic-controlled committee. The request to waive all points of order was submitted to a Democratic Rules Committee.

This Democratic committee refused the request. Then the chairman of this Democratic-controlled subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee personally made points of order against these worthy items in this bill.

In each and every instance the Democratic chairman of the committee quickly conceded the points of order and these necessary appropriations were stricken from the bill.

Senator Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate, is being helped greatly toward recovery from the heart attack he suffered recently by the laudatory editorials regarding him which have appeared in scores of Texas newspapers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert three of these editorials—from the Blanco County News, Blanco, Tex.; the Robstown (Tex.) Record; and the Canadian (Tex.) Record.

The editorials follow:

[From the Blanco County (Tex.) News of July 8, 1955]

SENATOR JOHNSON SUFFERS HEART ATTACK LAST SATURDAY

Blanco County, as well as the entire Nation, was shocked and worried last Saturday with the annuoncement from Washington that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON had suffered a severe heart attack and had been hospitalized. At present he is reported to be better, but will not be able to serve in the Senate in the remainder of this session.

Senator JOHNSON has been accorded the highest respect for the way in which he has conducted the affairs of the Democratic Party during this session where he has served as floor leader. Acclaim has come from all parts during the past weeks for the efficient way he has gotten the work done on the Senate floor. Much of this was accomplished by Senator JOHNSON himself, through endless hard work.

He was being mentioned in more than one quarter as a presidential prospect. Exactly what ultimate effect this illness will have is open to conjecture.

Home folk in Blanco County hope and pray for their native son's speedy recovery. Our Nation needs such men as LYNDON.

[From the Robstown (Tex.) Record of July 7, 1955]

OUR TOWN

Texas, and the Nation generally, but more specifically Robstown and south Texas, have suffered an irreparable loss—at least temporarily—by the sudden and untimely illness of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas. We say Robstown and south Texas particularly since it was in the 14th Congressional District as secretary to the late Richard Kleberg that LYNDON JOHNSON literally cut his political teeth. He has always held a special affection for this section and its people. Few, if any, will disagree with the appraisal that Senator JOHNSON has reflected credit not only on his home State as the Democratic leader in the United States Senate, but has realistically and courageously led the Democratic Party through the difficult years since the 1952 Republican victory. Under his leadership in the Senate, and that of Texas' beloved SAM RAYBURN in the United States House of Representatives, the Democratic Party in fact has, even in defeat, become the "party of responsibility" so aptly called for by Adlai Stevenson following the 1952 election. As minority leader in the United States Senate, during the first days of the Eisenhower administration LYNDON JOHNSON started building a record of party responsibility for the

Democrats. He demanded and received—as the youngest floor leader in the history of the upper Chamber of Congress—the support of his Democratic colleagues both right and left of center. The result has been a party legislative record unparalleled, perhaps, in the history of the country for its bypartisan approach. A controversial figure at times in his home State, LYNDON JOHNSON may have stepped on a few toes along the way, but his rise to national leadership is sufficient indication that his relentless drive to get the job done rates high in the annals of public service regardless of the level of interest. As a fledgling debate coach in a Houston high school where we first knew LYNDON JOHNSON, he took his teams to the State finals in the 2 years he served in that capacity. At that early stage in his career he quickly earned the reputation of a hard-driving, hard-working, and shrewd manager. He gave no quarter and asked none. From there he stepped on to the Texas political scene as secretary to the late Congressman Dick Kleberg, and throughout this south Texas district he not only became intimate with the people and their problems, but earned a reputation as the most able and hard-working administrative assistant on the Hill in Washington. He hardly had time to unpack his luggage in the National Capital when he was elected to the speakership of the "Little Congress," the most coveted spot in Washington among congressional employees. A year or so later, LYNDON JOHNSON came back to Texas to organize and set up the National Youth Administration during the postdepression days under the Roosevelt administration. Within a few months he had whipped together an organization that was held up over the Nation as an example of one of the most efficient and ably managed of Government agencies. From this beginning it was only a matter of time that he would be headed for a distinguished career of public service. He was elected to represent the Austin Congressional District when the late James Buchanan died, and he entered the House of Representatives as one of the youngest men ever to serve in that body. In the House his qualities of leadership, coupled with his relentless drive, quickly earned him the tag of a "comer" in national affairs. If he emerged quickly as a leader in the House, his career in the United States Senate in which he has served since 1948 has been phenomenal. He has earned the respect and admiration not only of his colleagues on the Democratic side, but the members of the opposition, both in and out of Congress, as well as that of the President. And all this has been packed in 46 short years. Significant of LYNDON JOHNSON'S stature as a national leader is the fact that much of the metropolitan press which once fought him so hard and so bitterly has long since recognized his unusual qualities of leadership and political know-how. They—and not the known JOHNSON supporters—have been calling attention almost daily to his potential as the Democratic presidential nominee in either 1956 or 1960. But all that, it now seems, must await his complete recovery. In typically LYNDON JOHNSON style, he became ill while planning to work over the long holiday weekend. And in typically LYNDON JOHNSON style, we predict he will work just as diligently in recovering as he has at his career of public service. Texas and the Nation can ill afford to lose this young man's leadership and devotion to duty. We fervently hope, God willing, he will be able to assume his normal activities within a few months.

[From the Canadian (Tex.) Record]

SENATOR LYNDON JOHNSON BEST HOPE FOR DEMOCRATS

If the heart attack which struck down Texas Senator LYNDON JOHNSON last Saturday proves serious enough to keep him out of public life permanently, both Texas and the Nation will feel the blow in years to come—but the Democratic Party itself may be the hardest hit.

Both his political foes and his political friends must recognize in Texas Senator LYNDON JOHNSON a powerful and able leader, and one who has come to the front at a time when leadership has been woefully needed.

LYNDON JOHNSON, at 46, is relatively young in years but older than most of his fellow Senators in political experience and ability. He has been generally recognized as the man most likely to succeed in bringing the badly split Democratic Party back together as a working unit in government and, more important to many Democrats, as a man who could succeed in returning the party to some semblance of its former faith.

The editorial suggestion of a Florida newspaper that LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, be the next Democratic presidential nominee was hailed throughout the South and warmly welcomed by many northern Democrats. If any man can heal the present breach in the Democratic Party, LYNDON JOHNSON is probably that man.

JOHNSON would almost certainly rally the support of both warring Texas factions of the party as a presidential nominee and return to the party ranks hundreds of thousands of independently minded Democrats who voted in 1952 for a Republican nominee in preference to the leftwing candidate of the national convention.

Both his party and his Nation can well use the services of such a man, and we join millions of his friends in wishing for the Senator a speedy recovery and a return to the public service in which he has proved himself so well.

Voyage to Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the San Diego Union, of July 14, 1955. The editorial follows:

VOYAGE TO LIBERTY

While Democrats in Congress rushed to exploit the furor created by Edward J. Corsi's emotional outburst against the Refugee Relief Act, they have been slow to act on nine revisions in it, all substantial, which President Eisenhower requested on May 27.

Though there is need for change, the best possible efforts now are being made to work under present legislation. The arrival of the U. S. S. *General Langfitt* in New York Tuesday morning proves this. The ship had 1,234 passengers, all of them admitted under the act. Almost 100 of them had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. The rest were men, women and children who fled communism before the Kremlin engulfed their homelands.

While the program has been bringing increasing numbers of refugees to this country, this is the first time that there were sufficient numbers to charter an entire ship. Pierce J. Gerety, former general counsel of the Civil Service Commission, now responsible for the operation of the program, has apparently confined himself to his job and been unconcerned by the furnishings of his office and size of his personal staff, two of Mr. Corsi's main preoccupations.

It is interesting and pleasant to note that Senator LANGER, Republican of North Dakota, was at the dock Tuesday to greet the refugees; he welcomed them in German, the native tongue of many. Senator WATKINS, Republican of Utah, was there to greet them in English. There is no indication that Mr. Corsi was on hand.

New Jersey's Governor Views President Eisenhower's Strength in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the New York Times of July 15 which gives Governor Meyner's views of President Eisenhower's strength in 1956.

At his news conference on July 14 Governor Meyner said he felt that the situation could well change by next year. As an example of issues that were reducing the strength of the President the Governor pointed to the Dixon-Yates power controversy. He observed that when Stephen Mitchell, former Democratic National Chairman, condemned the President last year for supporting the contract he was criticized by some newspapers. The Governor continued:

Now these same sources turn around and praise the President for canceling the contract.

The New York Times article follows:

MEYNER MODIFIES VIEW ON ELECTION—HE SAYS HIS APPRAISAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S STRENGTH DID NOT EXTEND TO 1956

TRENTON, July 14.—Governor Robert B. Meyner today modified an earlier prediction he made on President Eisenhower's chances for reelection.

The Governor, who has been mentioned as a possible Democratic candidate, stirred political circles 2 weeks ago with the remark that he thought the President could be returned to office "if the election were held tomorrow."

At his news conference today the Governor said his statement did not pertain to the 1956 election. "I didn't say what would happen in 1956, I said tomorrow," he explained. "In a 6 or 7 months' campaign you can develop a lot of issues which can change the picture."

The Governor admitted the present thinking of the people in New Jersey favored President Eisenhower, but he said he felt this could change by next year. As an example of new issues, the Governor pointed to the Dixon-Yates power controversy. He observed that when Stephen Mitchell, former Democratic National Chairman, condemned the President last year for supporting the contract he was criticized by "some newspapers." The Governor continued: "Now these same sources turn around and praise the President for canceling the contract."

DEMOCRATIC RECORD REVISED

The record of the Democratic Members of Congress was praised by Mr. Meyner. In adopting a conciliatory rather than a hostile course, the Governor said, the Democrats have contributed strongly to the adoption of several key administration bills. The Reciprocal Trade Agreement was cited as one example, and the Governor predicted the foreign aid program also would be saved by the Democrats.

Discussing the Democratic presidential candidates, Mr. Meyner said New Jersey leaders had not yet decided whom they would support.

"I don't think there is any final formalized opinion, and I certainly would want to discuss the national picture with State political leaders before speaking for them," he said. The Governor sidestepped questions related to his personal choice, but he said that, "I worked arduously for Adlai Stevenson in 1952 in Warren County."

During the coming legislative campaign the Governor plans to travel to most sections of the State to discuss issues. He asserted he would put his best efforts forward from Labor Day to election day, adding, "I will discuss the issues and not personalities."

The Democrats have announced they will go to great lengths to gain control of the legislature for the first time since 1937. All 60 assembly seats and 11 Senate vacancies are at stake in the November election.

South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, America is no stronger than the moral character, courage, and fortitude of our people at the grassroots. It is always encouraging to those of us in the National Government to see our people back home preaching and teaching Americanism.

I recently had the pleasure to observe Prof. Lawrence George Nilson as he taught the schoolchildren in my district the patriotic songs of our Nation. He was impressing them through song and, by his example, to respect our flag and to love America. He wrote a song entitled "South Carolina," which some of the schoolchildren of Abbeville and Due West, S. C., sang at Erskine College, where it was my pleasure to speak. This song, dedicated to one of the great Original 13 States, is worthy of incorporation in this permanent RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, it is through men like Professor Nilson that our youth will be trained to meet the challenge of tomorrow.

SOUTH CAROLINA
TO OUR SCHOOLCHILDREN OF SOUTH CAROLINA
(MAY TRUTH AND FAITH ABIDE)

"South Carolina—
Our home, our native State,
A glorious role on hist'ry's scroll
Was destined thee by fate.
But in our hearts another page
Grows brighter age by age.
The love we bear is written there
My South Carolina.

"South Carolina—
Rise, gird thyself anew.
The past is bright but still
The light of progress beckons you.
Through storm and stress whate'er betide
May truth and faith abide.
To God and country still we pledge
Our South Carolina."

(Words and music by Lawrence George Nilson (1953).)

Violation of Treaties, Obligations, and Agreements by the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress I had the privilege, as a member of the Committee on Communist Aggression, to hear the testimony of former President Herbert Hoover. Mr. Hoover stated at one point that the Soviet Union between 1917 and the start of World War II had entered into 36 different nonaggression pacts or treaties with other nations. He pointed out that they had violated every one of them.

With the Summit Conference in Geneva before us, this testimony of a former President prompted me to investigate how well the rulers in the Kremlin had adhered to treaties, agreements, and understandings entered into with the United States and other nations during and after the war.

The record shows that the agreements entered into by the Soviet Union at Cairo, Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam have been violated 65 times. In other words, the Soviet Union has nearly doubled its prewar record of never keeping any agreement they ever entered into. This appalling record of more than 100 violations of agreements supposedly designed to preserve peace should be carefully considered, no matter what the outcome at Geneva.

During the 38 years of Bolshevik rule in Russia, the Kremlin has not only violated 36 different nonaggression pacts but during this period of time 16 different, independent nations have been swallowed up by the Soviets. Ten of these nations had been recognized as independent and sovereign states by the Kremlin. Seven of them had, in good faith, actually signed nonaggression or mutual assistance pacts with Russia.

This most tragic story of our time began when the National Republic of Byelorussia was overrun by the Red army on December 30, 1917.

This was followed, in April of 1920, with the military seizure of the independent Republic of Azerbaijan, a country which had been recognized as independent by the major nations of Europe, the Middle East, and the Far East.

The independent Republic of Armenia, established in May 1918, was recognized by the United States, the Supreme Allied Council, and the major nations of Europe, including Russia. Armenia fought with us against the Germans during the First World War. The gangsters in the Kremlin signed a treaty guaranteeing Armenia's sovereignty and territorial integrity on December 2, 1920. Then they immediately took over the country.

Next came the independent democratic Republic of Georgia in February 1921. As in the case of Armenia, Georgia and Russia had concluded a nonaggression pact only a few months before the invasion.

Next on the list was the Ukranian National Republic, a government established on November 20, 1917, and recognized as independent by the major powers. Here again, as in Armenia, Russia endeavored to force the Ukraine into an agreement in the form of a treaty of recognition. When she refused, the Reds attacked and, after a bloody 3-year war, in 1920, the Ukraine joined the others behind the curtain of Soviet rule.

During this early period of aggression, the last independent nation to be taken over by the Reds was the Turkestanian Democratic Republic, a nation which the Kremlin has now divided into five parts.

Once Russia had consolidated these six independent nations in her orbit, she turned to the rest of the world with professions of good faith, and a desire for peace.

The now infamous Litvinoff Pacts of the 1930's were supposedly outward manifestations of the Kremlin's desire to maintain peace in the world. Yet in 1939 we learned that these pacts, some of which had been renewed only months before, were not worth the paper they were written on. Neither was the Russian declaration supporting the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Treaty of Paris.

Russia had a nonaggression pact with Georgia, back in 1921. It did not mean anything. Russia also had nonaggression pacts with Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Poland. They did not mean anything either.

And whatever agreements they had before the war with Albania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, they were forgotten when the time came for the Kremlin to drop the Iron Curtain around them.

In October of 1939 the three Baltic nations, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, signed mutual assistance pacts with the Russians. The Finns refused and precipitated the Russian-Finnish War. The League of Nations formally expelled Russia as an aggressor nation in 1940. But the Baltic nations signed, even though Poland, which also had a nonaggression pact with Russia, was then in the process of being taken over by the Red Army and the Nazis.

The following June in 1940 the Baltic states suffered the same fate as Poland. In less than 72 hours, in spite of the nonaggression pacts which they signed in 1933 and renewed 5 years later, more than 5 million people were swept into the framework of the Soviet Union. Along with them went Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina.

Czechoslovakia was the next to suffer. This tragedy began in 1943 when President Benes went to Moscow and signed a treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and postwar cooperation. This, too, was proven to be worthless for 5 years later, on May 18, 1948, the Communists took over Czechoslovakia.

Hungary received different treatment. Here the Armistice Agreement entered into by the Russians and the Hungarians proved to be as false as all the other

agreements the Reds had ever entered into. Hungary, true to her word, declared war on Germany on January 20, 1945. But the Reds forgot about their promises to arm the Hungarians so they could defend themselves. Instead, they turned to subverting the government to their own purposes.

Of the 16 independent nations now under Red rule, only 2 of them ever had any effective native Communist Party. Eleven of the governments were deposed by force, and 4 were ousted by ultimatum.

These examples of bad faith which occurred before World War II have been completed overshadowed by the treaties and agreements broken by the Soviet Union since the war. For most of these agreements were made with the United States.

Specifically, they include the Yalta agreement, the Potsdam agreement, the agreement on the Allied Control Commission which was set up to operate in Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania; peace treaties with these three nations; the Cairo Declaration, which was also reaffirmed at the Potsdam Conference; the Declaration of Teheran, the China-Soviet Union Treaty of 1945, and even the Soviet-Iranian friendship agreement of 1921.

Iran was forced to go to the United Nations Security Council to protest against the Soviet Union's violation of her territorial integrity. This basically was a violation of the United Nations Charter itself.

It should be obvious today, on the basis of their record that any proposal made by the Soviets at Geneva will be broken when the Kremlin feels it expedient to do so.

During the 1930's, when Hitler was gathering strength, the Kremlin encircled Germany with a pattern of nonaggression and mutual security pacts. Every one of them were broken, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia are now behind the Iron Curtain. As a matter of fact, so is Korea above the 38th parallel.

Since the end of the war, the Soviet Union has violated treaties, obligations and agreements 14 times in Germany, 12 times in Hungary, 10 times in Rumania, 7 times in Austria, 6 times in Iran, 5 times in Korea, 3 times in Manchuria, once in Japan, and another time in Poland.

Every one of these violations affected the lives, well-being, and freedom of millions of people. It is a cruel and heartless record. It is a record which we should not only study carefully but well remember.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Michigan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Michigan has more than 690,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

New Link, Los Angeles to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Los Angeles was delighted last year when Scandinavian Airlines System began flying from Los Angeles to Europe over the Polar Route. As you know, flying time between the West Coast of the United States and Europe is substantially reduced by operating over this route rather than transcontinently with a change of planes in New York.

I am delighted to learn that Pan American World Airways has applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board to duplicate the Scandinavian Airlines System service and fly from Los Angeles to Europe "over the pole." It is imperative that United States airlines flying in the international field keep pace with their foreign competition. Unlike their foreign competitors, American lines are privately owned. Their competitors from abroad are invariably owned by their governments which feel that national prestige dictates that they have a strong civil air transport system.

Prompt approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board of Pan American's application to fly this new and revolutionary route to Europe is desired by the city of Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker the Los Angeles Examiner of June 7 carries an editorial which clearly points out the benefits which will accrue to Los Angeles and Southern California by prompt certification of Pan American on this route. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

NEW LINK, LOS ANGELES TO EUROPE

American-flag carriers hope soon to compete directly with foreign airlines now using, or about to use, the "over the pole" great circle route between western America and the Old World.

Application to this effect by Pan-American World Airways is now before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

At present, Scandinavian Airlines System exclusively operates this route.

Pan-American's application includes Los Angeles as terminal for its projected transpolar run.

At the same time, Canadian airlines expect to start operations on the some route within a few weeks from Vancouver, B. C.

British Overseas Airways is preparing to follow suit.

There is no reason whatever why this increasingly important air lane between western America and Europe should remain even temporarily a foreign monopoly. International comptition is not only healthy, but necessary in developing and exploiting new airways.

And it is unthinkable that in this process, American airlines should not immediately become participants and leaders.

Pan-American, with new equipment soon to be delivered, promises to outspeed foreign rivals. Present plans call for 18-hour flights to London from Los Angeles.

The value of this new service to southern California is obvious. But not more so than its value to American aviation.

The President Declares That Freedom of the Arts Is a Basic Freedom, One of the Pillars of Liberty in Our Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in most of the New York newspapers an editorial signed by Huntington Hartford, heir to the A. & P. fortune under the title "The Public Be Damned?"

The advertisement attacked American art criticism, abstract art, the contemporary theater, art dealers and museum officials, and the public. Mr. Hartford's editorial reached millions of readers and cost some $25,000. In an interview with Paul Mocsanyi, art critic for the United Press, Mr. Hartford said:

I'll deduct the money from my income tax.

He also told Mocsanyi regarding the advertisements that—

They won't cost me anything, of course.

In an editorial in the Arts Digest for July 1955 the editor and publisher, Jonathan Marshall, atempts to answer Mr. Hartford's attack. Among other things, he says—

Although we doubt whether the author wants to be a dictator or censor of art, he is calling for such a dictatorship. Perhaps we would be more accurate if we said that the demand appears to be for a vigilante group. This group might police studios, galleries, and museums—and, of course, the art schools—and would protect us from that which is obscure and from our own imaginations.

There is no need to define art here or to take a stand behind any type of art. We believe that every artist has a right to create as he desires, for the market can be his judge and the public has a free choice. Mr. Hartford can look at whatever paintings he chooses, as can the clerk in an A & P store; as can you. But this does not give any of us the right to say artists must paint in this way or that, as if there were only one right way of doing it. "It must be understandable and beautiful to me to be good," is what Hartford erroneously implies.

In his message congratulating the Museum of Modern Art on its 25th anniversay, President Eisenhower declared that—

There is an important principle which we should ever keep in mind—the principle that freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land.

The position taken by the President is, indeed, basic to our freedoms. New ideas and experimentation are essential to art and to democracy. We must guard our freedoms jealously, for it is these very freedoms that differentiate our form of government from communism, naziism, and fascism. It can be doubted that Mr. Hartford has thought through to the inevitable conclusion the course which he is recommending.

The editor of the Arts Digest concludes his statement by asking the following question which also seems to me to go to the heart of the problem: "Can funds used for these purposes be truly called educational and remain tax exempt? We hope that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will look into the matter."

The editorial from the Arts Digest follows:

"THE PUBLIC BE DAMNED?"—NO

(By Jonathan Marshall)

While we were at press for the June issue a full-page advertisement, titled "The Public Be Damned?" appeared in most daily New York newspapers. Signed by Huntington Hartford, heir to the A. & P. fortune, the ad has created a great deal of misgiving and anxiety in art circles. We feel that Hartford's blast was an ill-disguised attack on artistic freedom and set a dangerous precedent.

In brief, the advertisement attacked American art criticism, abstract art, the contemporary theater, art dealers, and museum officials, and the public. Hartford said, "It is * * * unfortunate that the art-loving public is not required to pay * * * to spend an evening looking at paintings * * * their reaction might be fully as vociferous as that of theatergoers, and the art critics might wake up to the true value of their wares." In case the self-styled art critic does not know, we are delighted to inform him that one of his prime targets, the Museum of Modern Art, charges admission and its attendance has been steadily rising. Most museums have paying members, and memberships continue to grow. We might also point out that paintings sell for far more than the price of a theater admission.

Mr. Hartford carefully selected his out-of-context quotations, and his article, for that is what it was, reached millions of readers. It costs some $25,000 to reach the public which, in reality, he damns, but the A. & P. heir apparently is not worried. In an interview with Paul Mocsanyi, art critic for the United Press, he said, "I'll deduct the money from my income tax." Prior to that he had said to Mocsanyi, "They won't cost me anything, of course."

We feel that it is a dangerous precedent for wealthy individuals to attempt to buy public opinion. It is especially dangerous when they invade a field in which their experience is limited. This is not to say that either artists or critics are above criticism, for they usually welcome it. But when one man spends thousands of dollars to proclaim that "The purpose of great art * * * is a moral one" and tells us that unless a painting has easily recognizable beauty it is not art, we must question his motives.

We doubt whether Mr. Hartford was frightened by an abstract painting as a child. Instead we wonder whether he is merely afraid of that which he does not understand. This fear often underlies the attacks on creative freedom which have taken place since the days of primitive man. Unfortunately it is easier to ridicule through laughter, or attack with platitudes, than it is to study and be openminded.

Huntington Hartford reveals himself in several places in his article. First he says, "I am frankly bitter against those who encourage obscurity in painting." This is amplified by the statement that "recognizable subject matter is indispensable to painting." And finally he says, "I believe the diseases which infect the world of painting today—of obscurity, confusion, immorality, violence—are not confined either to this single art or even to the arts in general. These are the diseases which, if the disaster of dictatorship ever overtakes our fair country, will be a major cause of it, and since the germs exist in such a pure, unadulterated form in the real of painting * * * I suggest that it is time we * * * do something about it." The latter statement is nothing less than a call for the censorship of art.

Although we doubt whether the author wants to be a dictator or censor of art, he is calling for such a dictatorship. Perhaps we would be more accurate if we said that the demand appears to be for a vigilante group. This group might police studios, galleries, and museums—and, of course, the art schools—and would protect us from that which is obscure and from our own imaginations.

There is no need to define art here or to take a stand behind any type of art. We believe that every artist has a right to create as he desires, for the market can be his judge and the public has a free choice. Mr. Hartford can look at whatever paintings he chooses, as can the clerk in an A. & P. store; as can you. But this does not give any of us the right to say artists must paint in this way or that, as if there were only one right way of doing it. "It must be understandable and beautiful to me to be good," is what Hartford erroneously implies.

New ideas and experimentation are essentials to both art and democracy. We wonder how Mr. Hartford can reconcile his professed love of democracy with his call for standardization of art and elimination of imagination. Those who desire to interpret from an artist's so-called obscure painting are entitled to do so, and we think that the real art enthusiast will continue to choose without Mr. Huntington Hartford.

Two questions remain that we cannot answer here. Why did the great New York newspapers accept this advertisement by an untrained critic attacking the integrity and competence of trained leaders in a professional field? And can funds used for these purposes be truly called educational and remain tax exempt? We hope that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will look into the matter and that the newspapers in question will have the courage to decline advertisements in future when they are in reality attacks on artistic freedom.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, The dams are needed only to subsidize the irrigation projects. The sole purpose for including the giant power dams in the bill is to provide power revenues to subsidize 88 percent of the cost of the participating irrigation projects. The dams are first and foremost big "cash registers" for the landowners to be served by the irrigation projects. Their revenues would not benefit the whole Nation, but only these favored few residents of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

Glen Canyon Dam, by far the largest in the chain of four, is located so far downstream that none of the water to be stored in it will be used to irrigate the participating projects.

The Interior Department admits that for at least 25 years the dams will not be needed for river regulation. The facts show that upper basin development will not require these storage units for river regulation for up to 50 years and probably longer.

The dams cannot be justified because of a need for power in the upper Colorado region. Steam power could be produced more cheaply by using the region's vast coal reserves.

The sole function of the dams for at least 50 years will be to provide revenues from the sale of power to pay for the participating projects, if, in fact, the power can be sold at the contemplated 6-mill rate, which is doubtful.

Who Doctored the Record?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 11, 1955:

WHO DOCTORED THE RECORD?

Whatever may have been the propriety of Adolphe H. Wenzell's serving on both sides of the table in the Dixon-Yates deal, his testimony before the KEFAUVER subcommittee makes two things very clear indeed.

First, it is clear that somebody in the Budget Bureau and in the Atomic Energy Commission undertook to conceal Mr. Wenzell's role in the Dixon-Yates negotiations.

Last August, in order to answer criticism of the contract and to fulfill President Eisenhower's directive that all facts pertaining to it be made public, these two agencies released to the press elaborate chronologies which purported to show the record of every conference and every document dealing with the subject.

Nowhere in these documents was Mr. Wenzell ever mentioned. Nowhere was it revealed that he served as vice president of the investment firm which arranged financing for the Dixon-Yates deal, and also served as a Budget Bureau consultant who sat in on the formulation of Government policies which made the deal possible.

How did it happen that the chronologies mentioned a major conference on January 20, 1954, at which Mr. Dixon with the backing of J. Wesley McAfee of St. Louis proposed to build a powerplant at West Memphis—but did not mention that Mr. Wenzell and another First Boston executive were present? How did it happen that one important conference which Mr. Wenzell attended with

8 or 10 others at the AEC, as well as a personal conference he held with AEC Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, were omitted from the record altogether?

To suppose that these omissions were pure coincidence strains credulity too much. Obviously, the allegedly complete record was not complete until Senator KEFAUVER's committee dug out the facts. Obviously, somebody in the administration edited the record before it was published.

Why? If Mr. Wenzell's role was "proper—indeed yes," as the President said at his press conference this week, why was the record of it covered up?

The second fact which Mr. Wenzell's testimony makes clear is that somebody in the administration has been guilty of shockingly misinforming the President. At his news conference June 29, the President said "Mr. Wenzell never was called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract." Mr. Wenzell's own testimony now shows this to have been untrue. The President's flat statement can be explained only on the assumption that his advisers on this matter failed to inform him completely, just as they failed to inform the public completely.

Who edited the public "record"?

Who told the President only half the story?

The Kefauver subcommittee should press its inquiry until those questions are answered. And President Eisenhower, it seems to us, ought to be conducting his own inquiry into the same questions.

Our Antitrust Laws Must Be Strengthened, Not Weakened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of my statement before the Celler Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on July 13, 1955, in opposition to H. R. 6875:

I want to thank you for your kindness in according me the opportunity to express my views this morning in opposition to H. R. 6875. This bill, as you know, would change the mandatory requirement of treble damages in private antitrust suits and leave the imposition of more than actual damages in such actions to the discretion of the judges. At the same time, however, it would continue the compulsory treble damages provision where the violation, in the words of the bill, "shall have been willful."

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted, it seems clear that it will weaken substantially the deterrent effect which treble damage actions presently occupy in our antitrust framework. The specter of treble damages for antitrust violations has been an ever constant warning to potential antitrust violators, particularly in recent years when substantial awards have been made in such private actions. As the able representative from the Department of Justice noted in his well documented statement, defense counsel have openly recognized this fact. Jerrold G. Van Cise, a prominent practicing lawyer epitomized his legal experience under the antitrust laws in the following language:

"We find that the threat of treble damage suits, even more than the possibility of Government action, deters businessmen from carrying out the proposed acts or practices. It is our estimate that for every act or practice which results in an actual treble damage there are hundreds of others which were once considered for action by businessmen and were rejected by them because of the fear of treble damage claims" (p. 7, statement of Bicks).

This deterrent effect of treble damages has long been acknowledged by responsible officials in charge of enforcing the antitrust laws. As the former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Mr. Morison, related to this very subcommittee:

"We have, for the first time since the history of the enactment of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act, begun to see the development of private litigation under the triple-damage statute, which is of substantial help. It already is a deterrent, I point out, in the case of the movie industry—there it is a substantial deterrent. It is a substantial deterrent in whatever area the Government has decrees, and the effectiveness of this is for the first time being felt. We begin to feel that we have some companion element of assistance in this which we never had before" (hearings on H. R. 3408, 82d Cong., p. 15).

If treble damages are presently an effective deterrent to antitrust violations, it stands to reason, that modifying the mandatory exaction of triple damages will substantially weaken the salutary effects of this provision of the law. It seems to me that since the private antitrust suit has achieved some success in recent years as an adjunct to the efforts of the Department of Justice to enforce the antitrust laws, there should be set forth by the proponents of H. R. 6875 some overwhelming public interest involved which militates against permitting the private action to succeed in its avowed purpose that is;, penalizing violators of the antitrust laws.

It is difficult for me to understand the position of the Department of Justice in advocating enactment of this bill. The representative of the Department adopts the position, rather naively I must confess, that, and I quote:

"The bill could not, as some urge, impair the deterrent effect of private suits. Expressly barred from the benefit of any discretion is the conscious malefactor. This provision, I note, was added to the original Walter bill at the request of this Department. And the unwitting violator seeking to act in conformity with the law is in any event unaffected by the threat of treble damages" (Bicks, p. 11).

This is the same reasoning advanced by the Attorney General's committee, which also advocated this legislative change. The Brownell committee said:

"Moreover, may we urge that making triple recovery discretionary will not impair the deterrent effort of private suits. For the conscious malefactor cannot expect the benefit of such discretion, and the unwitting violator, seeking to act in conformity with the law is naturally unaffected by the threat of triple damages" (report, p. 378).

In view of the testimony your subcommittee heard concerning the composition of the Brownell committee, its solicitude over unwitting violators, Mr. Chairman, is understandable. But the learned members of the Antitrust Subcommittee surely realize that many so-called unwitting violators will seek to improve their knowledge or to secure legal advise so they can conform to the law, only if they continue to be faced with the discouraging prospect of treble damages for each transgression. On the other hand, the tendency to be unwitting, Mr. Chairman, I submit, will increase if through ignorance one can escape the peril of the threefold penalty.

I think the history of antitrust litigation certainly in the last 10 years, shows that the persons who were most often hailed into court, are the big corporations, who through the years have made a practice of employing the very best legal talent available.

I think the history of the Department of Justice shows that many of their best men are repeatedly recruited from that Department into the legal departments of all of these big corporations and they do it because they want to get the best advice they can.

None of them can claim ignorance of the law. None of them can claim ignorance of the various interpretations of the law as placed upon it by our courts.

Their knowledge on that score is always up to the minute.

They are constantly watching the progress of legislation in this Congress.

I am not being critical of them for seeking the best advice and watching so closely the progress of legislation and the trend of the court opinions.

I think they are wise in doing that. But it points up the fact that there are and will be, very few if any, unwitting or unwillful violators.

So the cry that you need this bill as now before you in order to protect the unwitting or the unwillful, I think cannot stand up under analysis.

The deterrent effect of the present law will be further diminished, Mr. Chairman, because without the incentive of treble damages, plaintiffs will be unable to commence private actions or to see protracted litigation to its conclusion. Violations of the law undetected by the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission will thereby go unpunished.

The Attorney General's committee, which it seems to me, showed an undue concern for antitrust defendants, said the change from mandatory to discretionary damages would not reduce incentive for private suits. They state, and I quote from page 379 of their report:

"Nor will incentive to private suit be curtailed. The inducement of mandatory trebled damages is no longer necessary to encourage suits by injured persons. The development of both the procedural and substantive law, largely favorable to the plaintiff, plus the award of attorney fees, affords sufficient incentive to private antitrust actions."

I disagree with the conclusions of the committee. As the statistics show, plaintiffs have been notably unsuccessful in private treble-damage actions. Can they be more successful if they have the additional burden of proving willfulness before recovery of treble damages is to be allowed? The proposed legislation will only add to the burdens already encumbering the private suitor. It can only further discourage the institution of civil proceedings.

Apparently, the Attorney General likewise disagrees with this conclusion of his committee. If I understand the position of the Antitrust Division's representative correctly, it is that a reduction of the mandatory treble-damage provision is necessary in order to encourage private enforcement of the antitrust laws. As the Attorney General's representative stated to this subcommittee on June 29:

"Allowing some courts discretion to assess double or treble damages where violations are not willful may mean more verdicts for private plaintiffs."

We thus have this anomalous situation, Mr. Chairman. The Attorney General's committee recommends discretionary damages on the grounds that the inducement of mandatory trebled damages is no longer necessary to encourage suits by injured persons. At the same time, the Attorney General himself advocates discretionary damages principally on the grounds that plaintiffs will thereby win more often and that by upping the total number of plaintiff ver-

dicts, and thus strengthening the promise of attorney fees, the bill may in fact increase incentive to sue.

The proponents of this legislation should be able to make up their minds as to whether this bill will or will not increase the incentive for private persons to bring antitrust actions under section 4 of the Clayton Act. Certainly, that is one question this subcommittee must answer before it passes upon this legislation.

I frankly confess, Mr. Chairman, that I am unable to explain the complete reversal of the Department of Justice in this important matter from the position it maintained in previous administrations. You read at the last hearing, Mr. Chairman, the testimony of Mr. Graham Morison, who stanchly supported the treble-damage section of the statute as an important auxiliary to the enforcement activities of the Department of Justice. As you well know, Mr. Morison was in charge of the Antitrust Division, when he stated:

"Now, presumably, if you did away with the triple-damage suit entirely, and you still wanted substantial enforcement in order to have economic freedom, you would have to quadruple the size of the Antitrust Division."

The administration's desire to cut down on Government expenditures, is utterly at variance with the recommendation for this legislation, if it intends not to increase or decrease, but merely to maintain existing antitrust enforcement standards. To enact this bill must necessarily add measurably to the number of Government employees in the Department of Justice.

If they are just going to proceed on the same level on which they are proceeding, but without the aid of the treble damage threat, they would have to at least keep their personnel at the same number that they have had in prior administrations instead of cutting back as they are doing.

We are all in favor of cutting down on personnel where you can save some money for the Government but the appropriation should not attempt to be saved if it means less enforcement of our antitrust laws.

To seek to determine, however, whether enactment of this bill will be an incentive to the institution of litigation is begging the question. The existing statute and any amendment of the statute should not be predicated upon incentives to sue. The purpose of the existing law is, and any amendment thereto should be, to deter prospective violators from violating the statute.

Mr. RODINO. I might point out, Congressman, that I agree with you wholeheartedly; it appears, however, there has been a change in position in some of those who previously felt this law was a deterrent as was indicated by a letter of the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in 1953, who now, however, does not take any position in the matter and as a matter of fact, it is my understanding from a reading of their positions that there are four different positions on the Federal Trade Commission.

But nonetheless they clearly stated in 1953 in a letter addressed to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable CHAUNCEY REED, that the Commission believes that the present mandatory triple damage provision to the Clayton Act is a deterrent to violations of the antitrust laws.

There was no question then of an incentive to litigation. That position has been indicated all along up until this time.

Mr. MULTER. I am glad to hear that.

I hope that that will be the conclusion of this subcommittee and the full committee.

As a lawyer of many years experience, and with a deep seated interest in the true administration of justice, with which principle I am sure this entire committee agrees, I do not want any of our courts cluttered up with law suits because there is an incentive held out to lawyers of having the court award them fees if they succeed in the litigation. That will be the only incentive remaining if the proposed bill is enacted. The very threat of the punishment of being required to pay triple damages and attorneys' fees will keep cases out of the courts because most prospective violators will behave. Too many of our sitting judges are out of sympathy with these antitrust suits as is evidenced by the small number of recoveries in triple damage suits. The non-jury cases invariably turn, not upon a question of law but upon a determination of a question of fact by the sitting judge. Questions of fact are determined by judges, as this committee well know, by the judge's opinion based on his own background and philosophy. As the trier of the fact he has the right to disregard overwhelming evidence, and findings of fact are rarely, if ever, reviewed by the appellate courts.

Under Federal jurisdiction they have the right to, but they rarely do.

To require a finding of fact of willfulness in these cases would in most instances be tantamount to barring the remedy. Vesting discretion in the court as to which defendant should or should not pay double or treble damages will invite years of litigation as to when and how the court may exercise its discretion. Will the judge or the jury make the determination of willfulness? On what will the court base the exercise of its discretion; the size of the violator's business, or the type of business or maybe the color of his vehicles? Or the color of the necktie he may be wearing the day he testifies?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. I would like to interrupt there to inquire of our colleague if there be any doubt in his mind whether or not a jury would determine the question of willfulness under proper instruction from the court under the Walter bill?

Mr. MULTER. Sir, is your question whether or not the——

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Is there any doubt in your mind that the jury would determine the question of willfulness?

Mr. MULTER. Under the way the proposed statute reads?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Under the Walter bill.

Mr. MULTER. There is considerable doubt. I think lawyers will agree that the way this bill reads now, there will be years of litigation before you finally settle the question as to whether or not this is a question of law or a question of fact, or a mixed question of fact and law and if so, is it within the province of the court alone or is it within the province of the jury to determine the fact and then the court impose the penalty.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Then it is your studied judgment that there is grave doubt about how that provision would be construed?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes.

I think that you will find there is considerable agreement among the legal profession on that subject. If the judgment of the committee should be to report a bill which is intended to provide that treble damages should be recovered only where there is a willful violation, then I urge as strongly as I can I am opposed to the bill in the present form or even if you clear that up I don't think there should be any discretion vested in the court and I don't think it should be dependent upon whether it is willful or not. But if the judgment of the full committee is that that is the way the law should be changed, I urge as strongly as I can that you clarify this and indicate precisely whom you want to determine this question; shall it be a question of fact, then say so in your bill. Specify whether the violation was willful or not should be a question of fact to be determined by the jury where there is a jury. And specify further whether the court is to be bound by that. You should say precisely what you intend. Advisory opinions on questions of fact by juries to the court may be disregarded by the court.

When it comes to the sentence in a criminal case, the jury has nothing to do with it and the jury is charged by a judge who wants to be very careful—"Don't you consider what the penalty may be. This is for the court to determine. You are just going to determine the guilt or innocence of this defendant and then the court will take into consideration all the surrounding facts and circumstances and background of the defendant and sentence him accordingly. You are not to consider whether there is a penalty or not." If the jury is to pass on this question of willfulness as a question of fact do you want the court to be bound by it? If the court is to be bound by it you should say so. On the other hand if it is for purely advisory purposes, you should say so. I predict if those matters are not clear in the bill as out bring it out, those questions will result in years of litigation on that very question.

It is true that the lawbooks are full of decisions by the courts determining the meaning of willfulness and they vary from State to State and from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Even if we assume we have settled on the Federal court level what is willful and what is not willful, you still run into the other questions. Who will determine the question, court or jury, and shall the court be bound by the jury's verdict on that question?

Mr. RODINO. The question propounded by the distinguished member of this committee seems to be one that arises in the minds of many of us, and I think the gentleman has wisely indicated that the language of the bill might be spelled out in such detail that it will not be left to a question whether or not willfulness may be within the province of the judge or the jury or both, since it is a mixed question; that seems to have been the thread that permeates throughout these hearings, that a presentation, whether it will not give rise to further litigation and never resolve this question.

Mr. MULTER. That brings up another question which has been raised in the testimony before this subcommittee. I have read most of it. That is the question of whether or not there are so few recoveries in treble-damage suits because the jury or the court is unwilling to grant the full damages, and I think in some instances this committee has been told that a plaintiff going into court has no choice, he either sues for treble damages or he does not.

Let me suggest that that is not so. Any plaintiff going into court who thinks he does not want to penalize a defendant to the extent of the treble damages does not have to ask for the treble damages. He can ask for simple damages. He can't get the treble damages unless he asks for them in his complaint.

But he can waive them if he wants to. So that has not been one of the difficuluties in getting the judgments in favor of plaintiffs who should be so compensated. Compensated may be the wrong word, because the initial amount of damage he sustained is supposed to be compensation and when they triple that, that is supposed to be by way of punishment of the defendant.

I think you will find in very few cases is there a defendant who has not been willful to the extent that we mean to interpret the word "willful." As I have already pointed out, these defendants know precisely where they are going and what they are doing. In most instances, whatever the charge is it is a violation of the law as a result of long premeditated and deliberate thinking and action on their part.

I don't mean to say that they have deliberately intended to go in and violate that law, but their course of action was dictated

by the way they thought they could evade the law.

Why put a premium on a violator's guessing right as to whether the trial judge will be tough or easy.

Let the statute stay as it is and he knows his penalty in advance of commission of the wrong.

This switch in the Department of Justice, Mr. Chairman, disturbs me. It disturbs me for the following reasons:

The first suggestion to this subcommittee that the treble-damage provision should be modified and made discretionary was made by Kenneth C. Royall (hearings on H. R. 3408, 82d Cong. p. 46). Mr. Royall was at that time and now is a partner in the law firm of Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey. This firm now represents and has represented 20th Century-Fox Film Corp. as a defendant in more than 144 private treble-damage actions under the antitrust laws. At least two other partners in the firm, Mr. Koegel and Mr. Caskey, represented defendant, 20th Century-Fox, in the Government antitrust suit against the movie industry. Mr. Royall appeared before this subcommittee on behalf of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the official position of the Department of Justice has been communicated in both the 83d and 84th Congresses not by the Attorney General or even by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, but by the Deputy Attorney General, William P. Rogers, Mr. William P. Rogers, Mr. Chairman, was a partner in the law firm of Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey before he became Deputy Attorney General.

In view of this disturbing association, I feel this subcommittee should probe deeply into such questions as: Were any investigations made by the Antitrust Division which would warrant a shift in Department policy such as enunciated by Mr. Rogers to the 83d Congress? Has the staff of the Antitrust Division recommended such a shift in Department policy? What was the basis for Mr. Rogers' recommendation in the 83d and 84th Congresses? Have we here an instance of an attempt to weight the scales of justice in favor of special groups? Why did not Mr. Rogers disqualify himself from any consideration of this matter? Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a most serious situation indeed.

I want the committee to understand that I am making no blanket condemnation of the Atttorney General's staff or attack upon the integrity of the various gentlemen who participated in the recommendations resulting in the making of the Attorney General's report. But I bring to bear upon this matter my own vast experience in connection with the legislative process, including my many years of activity on bar association legislative committees.

Persons participating in such work necessarily bring to bear upon their recommendations their own personal experiences and consciously or unconsciously, that of their clients. While I would not have excluded from this committee some representatives of the viewpoint of the antitrust violators, I would have made certain that they would not have had the extensive representation evidenced by the makeup of this committee. But what is more important, I would have made certain that there were at least an equal number of representatives of the viewpoint of those injured by the violators, and of those who could show the difficulty injured parties have had in getting redress from the courts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I can answer any questions that you may desire to put to me, I will try to do so.

Mr. RODINO. Any questions?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. No questions.

Mr. RODINO. No; I would merely like to state to the gentleman that he always comes here with a wealth of information and the experience he has both as an attorney in this field and as a Member of Congress and one who is expert in the field of banking and business, and enlightens us a good deal in these matters as indicated here. His apprehension regarding this certainly will give us much pause, and I assure the gentleman that his statement will receive our earnest consideration. I am particularly interested in the latter part of your statement where you refer to Mr. Rogers, and I certainly think this is cause for thought on the part of our committee.

There is no doubt in our minds and that no reasonable man could conclude otherwise than that persons who have formulated certain opinions and who have had some interest undoubtedly should feel it proper to disqualify themselves. Of course, there always is a question which I suppose must be resolved by the individual. We know that many people can separate themselves and do a proper job, and nonetheless it does give rise to speculation and concern.

Mr. MULTER. I think in fairness to the public officials involved I think we ought to recall that some of our judges whom we expected would be very biased because of their particular type of activity at the bar before becoming judges nevertheless became some of our most outstanding and fairest jurists, and I think the same can be said of many of our public officials.

I don't want to be understood as condemning any of our public officials, because I think we have difficulty enough recruiting good and able and honorable men into the Government. I do think they should be overly careful not to raise any suspicions because of their prior connections when they come before the Congress to testify.

Mr. RODINO. I think the gentleman has well stated it. Thank you very much, Congressman MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you for the privilege of being here.

Peace and Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are on Geneva, where President Eisenhower and the other heads of state are meeting to attempt to bring about a lessening of world tension and a settlement of some of the more outstanding problems facing the world. It is, indeed, a momentous occasion and it has caught the imagination of the world as almost no other meeting has in recent years. People everywhere are unanimous in their desire for peace and actually sometimes are so blinded by their desire for this objective that they will overlook obvious faults in proposals made by various nations which look toward peace as their end, but which might well sacrifice everything else to achieve this end.

Such a development is one which we must guard well against in the negotiations, and I am happy to say that it has been apparent to many of the leaders of opinion in the communities of the United States. One of the finest examples of thoughtful editorializing on the subject of the Geneva Conference that has come to my attention in recent days appeared in the Burlington Times, a newspaper published in my district. For the information of my colleagues, I would like to include this editorial at this point in my remarks. The editorial follows:

PEACE AND GENEVA

No man who understands the mood and temper of the world's peoples today has any doubt that peace is what they hunger for. And even if they did not so passionately desire it, the frightful prospect of a nuclear war makes the quest for peace a search for a means of human survival.

All this we in America understand well. We bow to no one in our devotion to this quest. No neutralist, and certainly no Communist, has a superior appreciation of the need for peace.

Those who believe otherwise either do not know America very well, or do not want to.

Because we do seek peace so genuinely, our leadership statesmen realize they can never close the door to negotiations with the potential enemy behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. No matter how much fraud is practiced from Moscow and Peiping, we can never assume there will not some day be an earnest offer of peace from those capitals.

The next test of Communist sincerity comes at Geneva on July 18, when leaders of the Big Four powers gather for their summit meeting.

The world has been built up to a state of anxious expectancy over this conference. Men longing for peace seemingly will not shake off the idea that the magic of a single meeting of great national leaders can dissolve all their fears and assure peace forever after.

America's statesmen have the difficult task of bringing these yearnings into more realistic focus, without dashing hopes that the conference may provide at least a beginning toward a sincere settlement.

Peace is so heady a wine to some men that they appear to forget that it is not a commodity which should be bought at any price. As the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, of Michigan, so wisely reminded world diplomats at San Francisco 10 years ago, what we seek is not simply peace, but peace with justice.

We, in company with our friends, do not have the power now to insure a just peace in Eastern Europe, where satellite peoples who wish to be free are under the Communist yoke.

But at least we can avoid putting a formal stamp of approval on these and other Red conquests. We cannot at this moment correct these wrongs, but we need not accept them, either.

Furthermore, we do have the power to avoid new injustices as we search for peace. At Geneva we shall be leading from strength. Our bargaining position is good. We need not, we must not yield cherished free ground merely because the clamor for peace is about our ears.

To Help Us Win Men's Minds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica Evening Outlook of July 5, 1955:

TO HELP US WIN MEN'S MINDS

There are times when it is necessary to fight fire with fire. A dictator or a totalitarian country can order a campaign of sabotage and subversion with a minimum of delay and it will be carried out with maximum efficiency. A nation of free people, however, will be handicapped in devising countermeasures. Its elected representatives must first pass laws providing for such measures, and this takes time. It is best to be prepared in advance and to have the weapons at hand.

To this end, a national freedom board is advocated by the American Legion, by Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, and would be set up under legislation introduced in Congress by the two Californians. The proposed board would include the Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Director of United States Information Agency and five members named by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, from individuals in civil life. It would conduct a continuing study of each existing program of the executive branch of the Government undertaken to combat the activities of international communism, and would consider other anti-Communist measures. Its conclusions would be evaluated and transmitted to the President and the National Security Council in the form of a comprehensive plan for effective future action.

We think there is a very great need for such a board, to coordinate and direct our present scattered propaganda efforts in a carefully planned strategic campaign. In the battle for men's minds which will decide the future of the world, the United States and the free nations actually have every ideological advantage, including overwhelming present evidence of the vast superiority of their way of life—but they have not been getting their story across to the people of backward countries, or even to many of Europe's poor who are not behind the Iron Curtain. A national freedom board could be the focal point for our global effort to demonstrate to the world the depth of our national ideals, the falsity of those of Soviet Russia, and our determination of work for the uplift and freedom of all peoples. Our scattered propaganda agencies in Washington now fire only scattered birdshot—they need to concentrate on a few propaganda A-bombs. The Knowland and Jackson bills would help to bring this about.

Aid to Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is very unfortunate that the Members of this House voted to cut in half the request of the administration for a $200 million special fund for Asian economic development. This is the sort of program which I feel holds out more promise of settling the present world tensions than any other. I have said before that we must find an imaginative way of meeting the economic and technological needs of Asia in order to combat the rise of communism in that area. I sincerely hope that the Senate will see fit to restore the cut in the Asian fund, and that this House will support them at a later date. In matters which affect our international security we cannot afford to be miserly.

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 11, 1955, on page A5048, I inserted a letter received from the Polish American Congress, Division of Michigan, in connection with a joint meeting to be held by representatives of various organizations composed of Americans whose countries of their forefathers are now behind the Iron Curtain, and my reply thereto. The purpose of this meeting was to adopt a resolution for transmittal to President Eisenhower in regard to the Geneva Conference. I am now in receipt of a copy of the resolution that was unanimously adopted and I ask consent to insert it in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the President of the United States will meet at Geneva with the heads of the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union to explore the possibilities of relieving world tensions; and

Whereas the spokesmen of the Soviet Union have expressed their desire to talk honestly and sincerely with the Western Powers in the interest of peace and disarmament; and

Whereas it is essential to the future of the world and to the maintenance of the high position of leadership of the United States that the representatives of our Government insist, as a prerequisite to any agreements, that certain conditions be met with reference to the countries behind the Iron Curtain; and

Whereas there can be no real peace in a world half slave and half free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned, and members of our respective organizations in metropolitan Detroit, representing a total of 600,000 Americans of Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Serbian, and Slovakian extraction, convened at the Veterans' Memorial Building in Detroit on July 12, 1955, respectfully request His Excellency, the President of the United States, to champion the cause of freedom and liberation of all the nations behind the Iron Curtain by demanding of the Soviet Union, as conclusive proof of its desire for world peace and disarmament, the immediate withdrawal of all Red troops and the restoration of the right of self-determination expressed through free elections in all the nations in Europe under Soviet domination.

Adopted July 12, 1955.

Nick Evans, President, American Bulgarian League, Detroit Chapter; Ivan A. Marohnic, Croatian Group; Anton Benesz, Secretary, Michigan District, Czechoslovak National Council of America; Peeter Einpaul, President, Legion of Estonian Liberation, Inc.; Rev. Fr. Andrew P. Jacobs, Hungarian Council; Lado Demeter, President, Slovak Federation; Dainis Rudzitis, Director, Latvian Association of Detroit; Vytautas Kutkus, Secretary, Lithuanian Organization Center in Detroit; Bruno Stachura, President, Polish American Congress, Michigan Division; Michael A. Bida, President, Rumanian American National Committee; Rev. M. D. Mijatovich, Serbian Council; Mitchell S. Jachimski, General Chairman.

Brooklyn Policeman Wins "Public Protector Award"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to bring to the attention of the Congress of the United States the heroic deeds of one of my constituents, Patrolman Edward W. Hall, Jr., one of "New York's finest." He was recently presented with the New York Journal-American's "Public Protector Award" for his heroism in a gun battle against 3 thugs. This display of great courage came at a time when the policeman was not even on duty.

According to newspaper reports, this is what happened: Patrolman Hall was on his way to report for duty one Saturday evening in May. As he was driving along Halsey Street, in Brooklyn, still in his civilian clothes, he heard a woman scream and he stopped to investigate. Suddenly, 3 men, who had just robbed a cab driver, ran up to his car and at gun point ordered Hall to drive them away in the car. Hall immediately drew his own gun, but before he had a chance to fire 1 of the bandits shot him in the chest. Although severely wounded, Hall managed to fire five shots at the fleeing gunmen. He wounded 1 of the gunmen who was found lying under a car a short distance away; another 1 was subsequently arrested.

Hall was hospitalized for a period of 2 months. In the hospital it was found that the bullet which penetrated his chest went through the left lung and was only inches away from the heart. Incidentally, this was not the first time that Patrolman Hall was shot at, he has earned two citations for bravery in the past.

In addition to the New York Journal-American award, Hall was also presented with a check for $100 and a certificate of honor by Police Commissioner Francis W. H. Arams of New York. While these rewards are symbolic of the gratitude which New York feels toward men of the type of Hall who risk their lives to protect the public, they are small rewards when compared to the risks which a conscientious protector of the public must take in these days of increased crime and juvenile delinquency.

It is my opinion that men of this caliber, who think of themselves last, de-

serve a good promotion. I would certainly recommend a promotion for Patrolman Hall without the least hesitation. I also wish we had many more like him in New York, which would make our city a safer place in which to live and raise our children.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief article from the New York Journal American of recent date describing the presentation of the awards to Patrolman Hall and also to the family of a heroic fireman who lost his life in a 5-alarm fire. The article is as follows:

FIREMAN AND PATROLMAN GETS JOURNAL AWARDS AND $100 EACH

A fireman who died on top of a ladder during a 5-arlm fire and an off-duty patrolman who was nearly killed in a gun battle with three armed holdupment, today were named winners of the New York Journal-American Public Protector Awards for May.

Mrs. Corrine Cumming, widow of the late Fireman Frederick Cumming, Jr., accepted the $100 in cash and a Certificate of Honor which accompanies the monthly award in a special ceremonl at Fire Headquarters.

"We are humbly proud of your husband whose devotion to duty cost him his life," said First Deputy Commander George F. Mand.

Present at the ceremony were Mrs. Cumming's children, Louis, 16; Frederick III, 11; and Corrine, 8; her father, Louis A. Kast and Fire Chief Peter Loftus. The Cummings live at 16-45 Kessel Street, Forest Hills.

In a similar ceremony at police headquarters, CommanderAdams praised the "unflinching courage in the face of great odds," of Ptl. Edward W. Hall Jr., 34, and presented him with $100 in cash and a certificate of honor.

Witnessing the award were the hero's wife, Olga, and their children, Edward III, 9; Pamela, 5; and Deborah, 1½. The Halls live at 1008 St. Marks Avenue, Brooklyn.

When Ladder Company 15 arrived at the five-alarm fire enguifing a leather factory at 14 Ferry Street, shortly before midnight on May 4, Cumming, 44, took a hose line to the top of the fifth floor.

Several explosions nearly blew him to the ground but he stuck to his post. After nearly an hour on the ladder he suddenly collapsed. Firemen caught him and carried him to the ground, where he was pronounced dead.

Patrolman Hall, who has earned two citations for bravery, came in line for his third on the night of May 14, when he was driving along Halsey Street, Brooklyn, in civilian clothes.

Hall heard a woman screaming and stopped to investigate. Three men approached his car, yanked open the door, and told him to drive them from the scene. They had just kidnaped and robbed a taxi driver and hid in a hallway where a woman discovered them.

He drew his gun, but before he could fire he was shot through the chest. Despite his wound he leaped from the car and shot one of the men who fired back and wounded Hall in the right hand. Two of the bandits were captured.

Hospitalized for 2 months, Hall is still on sick leave.

The following 10 were named as runners-up for the fireman-of-the-month award:

Firemen Michael V. Cannizzaro, Louis F. Capriccio, John L. Ehlers, Philip J. Fowler, Welkko Lindquist, John McNamara, Bernard Sobel, Harry C. Soffel, Jr., Frank Savino, and the late Andrew K. Wright.

The following 10 were named as runners-up for the policeman-of-the-month award:

Detectives William J. Brennan, Thomas J. Crane, Joseph Fuccillo, Edward Lehane, Edward Mahoney, Thomas Mattimore, John O'Neill, James Paskins, Arthur Torrell, and Martin Waldron.

Abetting Disloyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following items from the Tablet of July 9 and 12, 1955:

ABETTING DISLOYALTY

The Fund for the Republic is in the news again, this time for giving $5,000 to the Quakers of Plymouth Meeting, Pa., who would not discharge a librarian in the face of protests by patriotic citizens of the town. The librarian is Mrs. Mary Knowles, a former secretary of the Samuel Adams School, in Boston, who in 1953 refused to answer questions before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on her Communist affiliations. The Samuel Adams School was named an adjunct of the Communist Party by the Attorney General. Mrs. Knowles was also identified by Herbert A. Philbrick, FBI counterspy, as a member of his own Communist cell.

Joining the protests of patriotic groups, the Plymouth Township School Board forbade teachers to take children to the library. Contributions by the two townships and the Community Chest to the library were stopped. Confronted with these protests against employment of a person who wouldn't answer questions involving treason to the United States, the Quakers remained adamant. As a reward, the Fund for the Republic gave them $5,000 for "courageous and effective defense of democratic principles," thereby making it a democratic principle that one should refuse to testify concerning his or her disloyalty before a committee set up by the Congress of the United States.

The Fund for the Republic is a curious instrument set up in 1952 with $15 million of Ford Foundation money at its disposal. It is dedicated to elliminating "restrictions on freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression in the United States and the development of policies and precedures best adapted to protect these rights."

FOUNDATIONS ARE ASKED TO AID SENATE INQUIRY

WASHINGTON, July 11.—A Senate committee with jurisdiction over broadcasting is trying to get privately endowed foundations to do some research for it.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, has spoken to Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, present of the Fund for the Republic, about undertaking a study of free speech.

Senator MAGNUSON said committee staff members had spoken to other foundations.

"It's an idea we had," said Senator MAGNUSON. "This is so big and we have so little staff and money. It's a new concept of congressional inquiry. It surely would be objective and have some standing if this type of people would do it."

The chairman said there were many problems on which the committee needed help. These include allocation of very high frequencies and ultra high frequencies, monopoly ownership of stations, multiple-ownership rules and political broadcasting.

AHEPA Leader Asks for Immigration Laws To Conform to American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Gregory G. Lagakos, of Philadelphia, Pa., chairman of the immigration and nationality committee of the order of AHEPA, the fraternal organization composed principally of Americans of Hellenic extraction, made an excellent analysis of the shortcomings of our present immigration laws in an address delivered before the annual encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, New Jersey Department, at Mount Freedom, N. J.

As sponsor of a bill to revise the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 in order to make our immigration laws a more faithful reflection of American ideals, I wish to include Mr. Lagakos' fine address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

The loyalty of your organization—of your members—of your people to our democratic form of government and our country, can never be questioned, can never be challenged. American history is replete with glowing instances—nay with a constant and uninterrupted flow of innumerable and stirring examples of loyalty, sacrifice and patriotism among American Jewry. Just to go back, not too far, but back to the dim and dark days of the Civil War, there were two outstanding American patriots, Joseph and Jessie Seligman, of New York, who, seeing the country's urgent need for prompt assistance, sold $200 million worth of United States war bonds and Government securities at their own risk, personally guaranteeing a return in case of loss—at the time we were in danger of losing the Civil War—an act which Professor Dodd, a great historian, President of the University of Virginia and former American Ambassador to Germany, describes as "a fact scarcely less important than the Battle of Gettysburg." It was indeed one of the great turning points of the war. I feel certain that I do not have to review the legion of other noble and inspiring acts of loyalty and of dedicated service to our country. No one but a blind and intolerably stupid fool would deny the unparalled contributions of your people in general, and of the Jewish War Veterans specifically to the defense and security of the United States.

But there is another reason for the great honor I feel in being afforded the privilege of addressing this annual encampment. Because I am familiar and deeply interested in the great and humanitarian field of immigration and naturalization. I am constantly aware of the splendid work your organization is doing in its continued leadership and support of efforts to liberalize and humanize our immigration laws and policies. Your fight, independently and collectively, together with the fight of many other loyal and patriotic American organizations is to erase from our statute books the harsh, unjust, and discriminatory provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act. Your fight to remove once and for all the insulting stigma of the national origin theory from our laws and to see our laws reshaped so that they will conform to American ideals, which require equal treatment of

all persons—this fight is truly admirable and worthy of the highest praise and commendation. I, therefore, feel that anyone invited to speak to such a group as yours is indeed the beneficiary of a great honor.

But I believe, too, that all fair-minded people, aware of world history and of American history, would naturally expect your organization and other American Jewish organizations throughout the United States to lead the fight against the inequities and injustices of our present immigration laws. Your peoples' long and wonderful history is in itself a shining beacon of absolute and unwavering steadfastness—a pole star of firm belief in the basic concept of the dignity of man. Your fight is an unshakable and eloquent affirmation of the inalienable and undeniable language of the Declaration of Independence—that all men are created equal. You so properly believe that each individual is to be judged on his own merit—or demerit. That each individual is capable of possessing equal mentality, intelligence and capabilities regardless of his race, religious creed, national origin or color, and that persons living abroad and behind the Iron Curtain, whether they are refugees, escapees, expellees or just plain, ordinary worthy aliens in quest of an opportunity to live in this land, are not to be judged accordingly to breed, like cattle—but on the only proper basis of their character, fitness and ability to lead a worthwhile life in this country.

Now this brings me to the subject I should like to discuss with you here at Mount Freedom (which, incidentally, is a very appropriate name and a most appropriate meeting place for your splendid organization). The subject of immigration and naturalization is very close to my heart, and, I know, very close to yours. The heart of our present immigration law is the national origin quota system, an indigestible and un-American theory now being practiced upon all applications for immigrant visas. This formula was first introduced into our law in 1924 and has been retained in the McCarran Act, our present immigration law. This theory asserts briefly that intending immigrants to the United States from the western part of Europe are more desirable, more assimilable, and are of a stock that will produce better American citizens than people who were born in the eastern and southeastern parts of Europe. This insulting formula, based on bias and prejudice and not on logic or reason, admits a total of approximately 150,000 people per year and fixes maximum quotas for each country. These quotas range from 100 to 65,000 annually.

Now, exactly how was this formula established? Each country's quota was allocated so that it would be equal to the percentage that persons of that national origin residents in the United States in the year 1920 was of the total white population of the United States at that time. Well, if the law enacted by the Congress in 1954 was a formula based on percentage as of the year 1920—then why in 1952, when our immigration laws were completely overhauled, didn't the Congress fix the year 1948—or 1952 as the basis? The reasons—reasons of discrimination, prejudice, and distrust against certain nations and faces in favor of others—were stated quite forcefully by the late Senator McCarran himself in debate on his immigration bill on May 16, 1952. "The cold hard truth is that in the United States today there are hard core indigestible blocs who have not become integrated into the American way of life, but who, on the contrary, are its deadly enemy." Senator McCarran did not specify from which nations the indigestible blocs were coming, but if we examine the United States immigration quotas allocated to each nation, as set forth in our present law, we can clearly discover what nations Senator McCarran had in mind.

The annual quota of the United Kingdom (England and North Ireland) is 65,361. Germany, 52,814; Ireland, 17,756. But for Egyptians the quota is 100; Iran, 100; Israel, 100; Turkey, 225; Greece, 308. In other words one born in England is stated, in terms of legal certainty and accuracy, to be 600 times superior in intellect, ability, and desirability to that of an Egyptian or a Jew—and 200 times more desirable than a Greek. This type of hokum is not only insulting to many of our allies who resent this unfair discrimination, but it has produced foreign-policy tensions and feelings that have no proper place among our allies and friends. This law, therefore, is endangering our relations with peoples and with our allies throughout the world. It would be absurd to claim that Germany, who twice precipitated the world into war, with its superior race theories, is culturally closer to America than Italy, Israel, Greece, or Turkey—and if Germany is closer, is the degree of propinquity 80 times greater than in the case of Greece and 115 times greater than in the case of Turkey?

Many other statements made, unfortunately, by some prominent Members of Congress during the debate on the McCarran bill—illustrated the climate of opinion which has produced our immigration laws since the early 1920's, an opinion and attitude of wholesale mistrust and fear of certain races.

The unanimous testimony of an anthropologist is that the concept of a "pure race" is entirely erroneous and fallacious. No pure race can be found in any civilized country—unless in the United States it being the Eskimos and the Indians. The present races of man have intermingled and inbred (fortunately) for so many thousands of years that their genealogical lines have become inextricably confused. On this I am pleased to refer you to the statement of principles regarding Immigration and Naturalization Policies issued March 15, 1955, as representative of the joint views of the American-Jewish Congress, Jewish War Veterans of the United States and 37 Jewish Community Councils which comprise the National Community Relations Advisory Council. The statement of principles to which I have referred represents a complete reiteration of the intelligent opinion stated by outstanding Catholics and Protestants, as well as Jews interested in this problem.

Another great hardship placed on these "indigestible blocs," is that actually the quotas in many of these countries are reduced by half because of the mortgaging under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which stated that if persons are admitted to the United States as "displaced" persons, those numbers would be deducted from such countries' quota in future years. Those countries were permitted to mortgage up to 50 percent of their annual quota for an indefinite period. Accordingly, only 154 Greeks can come here each year instead of the very low 308 figure—and the Greek quota is already oversubscribed for the next 58 years. Latvia quota is reduced by half for the next 320 years. So, if a Latvian applied for a visa today, and assuming that it can be met and complied with all security regulations and screening, he would have to wait until 2275 A. D. in order to receive his visa. The Polish quota is oversubscribed and mortgaged for the next 45 years.

Another gross inequity is that Congress had made past convictions for crime—grounds for deportation—despite the fact that the Constitution of the United States plainly provides that no ex post facto law will be passed. Thus, a man who committed a crime years ago and has paid his debt to society, or a man who 30 or more years ago was a member of an organization which is now prescribed, and at a time that membership in such organization was perfectly legal—may now find himself facing deportation, even though he may be married and have a wife, children, and grandchildren—all citizens of the United States and all residing here. Families are disunited—homes are broken up—sometimes for no real reason whatsoever. When the alien cries out that such deportation statutes plainly violated the constitutional prohibition against ex post facto laws, the answer he gets is that the ex post facto clause in the Constitution only refers to criminal laws—and that deportation, no matter how severe, is not punishment in a criminal sense. What could be more criminal—what could be greater punishmment than that inflicted upon an alien who suffers deportation from his country—from his family—from everything he has lived and worked for, and to be sent physically and forcibly to an entirely strange and foreign land in which he has no relatives and no family ties? As a matter of fact, under our present immigration law, even failure on the part of an alien to register or to have on his person at all times his registration card may submit him to deportation proceedings.

This brings us to another inequity—the creation in the McCarran Act of a conditional second-class citizenship. Thus, even after an alien is naturalized and becomes a citizen, he is subject in some cases, to loss of citizenship if he is absent from the United States for over 3 years and, in some instances, 5 years. A natural-born citizen, on the other hand, loses his citizenship only by actually renouncing it—by declaring allegiance to a foreign country, by serving in foreign armed forces, or for such reasons generally. This we-give-it-to-you—we-can-take-it-away idea is not consonant with basic American concepts of fair play, honesty, and integrity—and has irreparably harmed us in many ways.

Another inequity is to be found in the tightening up of the requirements that permit an alien with close family ties to remain in the United States by applying for suspension of deportation. Before the present law, an alien here illegally, in that he overstayed his visa, such as a visitor or a student or seaman, and who had a United States-citizen spouse, child or parent who would suffer a serious economic detriment by the alien's deportation, could upon proof that he was a person of good moral character—adjust himself and his immigration status into that of a legal resident alien. Now, such an alien finds it almost impossible to do this. He now must prove that his deportation would result in an exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to him or to the members of his family. As the Government has stated, "only in a case where an alien's deportation would be unconscionable would consideration be given. This shows the antialien attitude and the climate of mistrust and distrust that exists, instead of a sympathetic, understanding feeling of help for the worthy alien with closely-knit family ties in this country.

Another inequity is the feature that permits representatives of the Attorney General in deportation proceedings, known as Special Inquiry Officers, to make the investigation, present the case, hear it and make a decision. This unlawful combination of enforcement and judicial powers within one agency violates the basic principles of a fair and unbiased hearing. There should be a complete separation of those who investigate and prosecute and those who sit in judgment. Let us refer to the findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission on this question. The report states that Special Inquiry officers now perform an essentially judicial function. In deportation proceedings for example, such officers are required to conduct the hearing, present and receive evidence, rule upon all ob-

jections to the introduction of evidence on motions made during the course of the hearing, render a decision based upon reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence, exclude from the record any evidence that is irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious.

If it appears at the hearing that the alien may be deportable on grounds other than or in addition to those stated in the warrant of arrest, to lodge additional charges and prepare a written decision which shall set forth a summary of the evidence adduced and his findings of fact and conclusion of law as to deportability. Yet, these special inquiry officers are, for the most part, unqualified to perform legal or judicial functions. Of the 90 special inquiry officers serving as such, only 24 have had some legal education and of that number only 19 are attorneys. Such officers, therefore, perform an important judicial function in administrative law without requisite training qualifications.

But let us have no illusions—we have little chance of getting Congress to act favorably on these proposals. It will take an intensified program of State and nationwide education. People must know of this terrible blight on Americanism, decency, and honor. They must be told by groups such as yours—such as mine—time and time again. They must become awakened, aroused, and determined to do something about it. They must write to their Congressmen, their Senators; Members of Congress must hear from their constituents from the North, South, East, and West.

But the people will write only if they know of the problem and are sufficiently aroused. This is our job as loyal and patriotic citizens of the United States, who are determined to use the vast reservoir of strength and the dignity and prestige of our great organizations and societies, such as your group, for the purpose of assuring the necessary enactment of liberal legislation—legislation which will not only restore our country's national and international prestige and position, but will give understanding and humanitarian assistance to thousands of qualified aliens who properly look to the United States as the one clear and shining symbol of hope, freedom, and leadership for all the world.

Not for the AEC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 11, 1955:

NOT FOR THE AEC

Personal and professional integrity should be required of any public official. So the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was justified in checking reports about the fiduciary conduct of Allen Whitfield, President Eisenhower's nominee for the Atomic Energy Commission. Whitfield has now asked the President to withdraw his name lest the Commission become involved in controversy.

There were, however, more fundamentally disturbing aspects of the Whitfield nomination, even if they did not carry the kind of implication which led to examination of his connection with the Valley Bank & Trust Co. of Des Moines. First there was the charge of Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, a Democratic member of the Joint Committee, that Whitfield had been named in response to a demand for more patronage for Iowa Republicans. Even more serious was the lack of any indication that the man was qualified by training, experience, or well-founded interest for the work of the AEC.

With the possible exception of the Central Intelligence Agency, the AEC is the most unusual of Federal agencies in that the people—and to a considerable extent Congress itself—are kept uninformed about most of its activities. Secrecy about the AEC has been equated with national security. That is why it should be made up only of men in whose ability and fitness the public can have the utmost confidence.

If ever AEC memberships become plums for political lawyers and rewards for party workers, then some changes will have to be made. Whitfield's looked just like that kind of appointment, and that is the best reason for welcoming his withdrawal.

The Mess in the Postal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, after a long delay, on the 10th of June the President signed S. 2061, giving postal employees a pay increase. The proposal for an adequate pay increase was bitterly opposed by the administration. The Post Office Department insisted that any pay increase should carry with it a complete reclassification of postal positions. Finally, after much deliberation, the postal employees were given a pay increase much less than that desired by the majority of the Members of Congress. Previously a bill had been passed in 1954 to grant the postal employees a pay increase, but it was vetoed by the President. A second bill, S. 1, slightly more generous than the bill finally enacted, was passed during this session and was also vetoed by the President.

Realizing that, through no fault of the postal employees, the pay increase was long overdue, the Congress voted to make the increase retroactive to March 1, 1955. There were many of us in the Congress who thought that the retroactive provision should have dated back to August of 1954 when the pay bill was first vetoed. However, the Congress did make S. 2061 retroactive to March 1, 1955, insofar as the pay increase provisions were concerned. We felt that, by giving the postal employees a little back pay, we would make up to them in a small measure for the delay in getting the legislation enacted into law.

Accordingly, I was shocked and chagrined to learn that the benefit of the retroactive features of the law is being taken away from the postal employees by an administrative decision. The Post Office Department, under the present administration, has established a "deferred-payment" program. We passed a uniform allowance bill last August, but because of administrative delays, the benefits of the uniform allowance bill were not made available to the employees until April 22, 1955. The postal employees are being given their retroactive pay on the 15th of July. The retroactive pay amounts to only 6 percent of their salaries. For those in the lower pay levels, it is considerably less than their semimonthly pay check, but the benefits that might have accrued to the employees through the payment of this retroactive pay have been snatched away from them by departmental instructions that their regular semimonthly pay check, which is due on July 16 will be deferred until the 22d. The Department states that it is necessary to establish a 1-week pay lag to put into operation the biweekly paydays. Although they are establishing the pay lag during the month of July, they are not putting the biweekly program into effect until December of this year.

I do not know what the postal employees are going to do about their established obligations which fall due on the 16th of July. Their 6 percent retroactive paychecks will not be sufficient to meet those obligations, especially in the case of those employees in the lower pay levels. They have been underpaid for a long period of time and now they are going to have their pay periods pushed back an additional week. The Government is going to keep their week's pay, but, of course, they will pay no interest on this money. The employees will receive this pay only when they retire or leave the postal service.

Under the law that we passed, the Department was given up to 6 full months to put into effect the reclassification procedures. They are taking every bit of the 6 months allowed, which means that the readjustments to the employees under the new salary schedule will not be payable to them until some time in December. The adjustments in the case of many postmasters and supervisors are substantial. In the case of most of the clerks, letter carriers, and other employees in the lower pay levels, they amount to something like $100 a year—except in one glaring instance where the adjustment amounts to 80 cents. After 6 long months of waiting, the employee in step 4 of level 4 will receive approximately 3 cents a payday additional on his paycheck under reclassification.

Much has been made on the part of administration spokesmen over the fact that by providing 26 paydays, the employees will receive 1 additional day's pay a year. This again is an outstanding example of the "deferred payment" program of the Government, because it is quite likely that the employees may have to wait 12 years to get the additional day's pay. He will only benefit from the additional day's pay when there have been a sufficient number of days to provide an additional pay period. This could take as much as 12 years and, with the week's pay lag established administratively, it could probably take even more.

I am rather amazed, after reading the press releases from the Post Office Department, to learn that they have to delay the pay period for a week. When

Postmaster General Summerfield took office, he roundly criticized the existing accounting system in the Post Office and established 15 accounting regional offices. We were told that greater efficiency and greater service to the individual post offices would result from the establishment of these regional offices. The postal employees have always received their pay within a period of 3 days (and in many instances within 1 day) following the close of the pay period, but now—with the improved techniques about which Mr. Summerfield has so proudly boasted; with the introduction of many accounting machines; with the introduction of the graduate accountants into the regional setup of the Post Office Department—we learn to our amazement that it takes 7 days to do what used to be done in 1 day. Perhaps we should look into the efficiency and the effectiveness of this much-vaunted regional setup.

I think it is outrageous that the pay periods of the postal employees are being delayed and that the benefits that they should have received from the retroactive pay provisions are being snatched away from them. I believe that when Congress returns for the next session—or perhaps even before this session closes—we should give consideration to granting a further salary increase to the postal employees in the lower-pay levels who have been so long denied an adequate pay increase and, when a modest pay increase is given to them by the Congress, have had the benefits of such an increase partially snatched away from them by faulty administration.

United States Slows Arming of Arabian Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Los Angeles Herald-Express of July 12, 1955:

HAIL HEARST VIEWPOINT—UNITED STATES SLOWS ARMING OF ARABIAN NATIONS

(By Sam Yorty)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Sam Yorty, former Congressman from Los Angeles, who last year after a tour of the Middle East wrote a series of articles for the Herald-Express on the importance of Israel in maintaining a free world, has written the following article on the present tension along the Egyptian border.)

All available evidence indicates that the United States arming of the Arab nations is being slowed down as a result of the Gaza flareup and American-armed Iraq's threat to fight alongside Egypt against Israel.

Students of the area have always questioned the wisdom of arming the Arab nations before they make peace with Israel from which Nation their invading forces were driven when Israel was established by a decision of the United Nations.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., has just returned from a visit to Israel and the Middle East. Like other informed and objective observers he reported that a solid defensive alliance against the Communists was in the making in the Middle East, once Israel-Arab differences are settled.

Mr. Hearst "hit the nail on the head." Middle East security cannot be established while these differences plague the area.

This means the United States should press harder for Israel-Arab peace meanwhile refraining from arming the Arabs who have clearly demonstrated that arms in their hands are a serious threat not only to Israel but to world peace.

IRAQ BELLICOSE

In testifying on the mutual security bill earlier this year, the State Department contended that military aid to Iraq did not threaten Israel because of Iraq's treaty alliance with Great Britain and Turkey.

Iraq's bellicose offer to help Egypt against Israel proved this reasoning to be fallacious. An interesting sidelight is the fact that Iraq was picked as the first Arab nation to receive American arms partly because it has no common border with Israel and was considered more amenable to establishment of Israel-Arab peace.

But Arab solidarity against Israel irrespective of common borders with the tiny democracy is now a demonstrated fact which can be ignored in the future only at great peril to efforts to bring about peace between the belligerents.

UNFAIR ADVANTAGE

The combined Arab States are much larger than Israel. Our arms would give them a grossly unfair advantage. It is obvious they would press this advantage to the fullest extent.

While arming of Iraq will continue but will not be increased, according to the Department of Defense, the administration has decided against arming any additional Arab States, at least during the current fiscal year.

This decision will be welcomed by those who have looked with alarm at a program that called for arming totalitarian and feudal kingdoms while they remained technically at war with the tiny democracy which has proven itself a dependable friend and ally.

Mr. Hearst has rendered another valuable public service by emphasizing the fact that Middle East security can follow but cannot precede Arab-Israel peace.

Another Reason For Not Building The Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, invasion of Dinosaur National Monument by Echo Park Dam and power facilities will be unavoidable if the bill passes.

Your committee voted to strike the controversial Echo Park Dam from the bill. Butt his action was a sham; Echo Park Dam is still in the bill, and the House must be realistic and treat it accordingly.

In actuality, the project is the nondivisible $1½ billion entity described in House Document 364 of the 83d Congress. Only segments of that entity are contained in the House bill. Although such expensive and controversial integral parts of the whole projects as Echo Park have been deleted from the House bill to make it more palatable, they cannot be deleted from the project. Authorization of the intial segments will make mandatory later authorization of the remainder so that power revenues can be obtained to help repay the investment.

The Trojan-horse strategy of the proponents of the bill is only too obvious. They voted to remove Echo Park Dam from the House bill to facilitate its passage. However, the proponents know full well that Echo Park Dam will be restored by the conference committee or by legislation in future Congresses. Backers of the bill have been so brazen about this strategy that they discussed it freely with the press. The Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, which has been campaigning hard for the project, on June 9, 1955, reported from Washington on the action by the committee:

Backers of the river bill and Echo Park were not dismayed by the Thursday vote. It has long been a part of upper Basin States' strategy to delete the Echo Park Dam in the House bill on the hope that it will be restored by a joint House-Senate conference committee. Otherwise, House leaders said it would be impossible to get the project bill through the Rules Committee and past the House.

On July 1, 1955, the same newspaper carried an interview with Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, of Utah, in which he was quoted as saying:

If we can get a bill through this session, we can amend it later. * * *

Echo Park is still in the bill because the project will not work without it. Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph A. Tudor testified before the 83d Congress that taking Echo Park out of the upper Colorado storage project would be like takng the pistons out of the engine of an automobile. The project will not function without Echo Park Dam.

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer testified before your committee this year that the project would not be economically feasible without Echo Park Dam. He stated that the economic feasibility of the project might be established without Echo Park if some of the participating projects also were deleted. However, this was not done by your committee. It deleted—temporarily—Echo Park, but retained all of the participating projects. In other words, the committee sends to the House a bill which the Commissioner of Reclamation conceded would be economically infeasible.

Echo Park no more can be taken out of this project than history can be abolished by taking out and destroying the page of the history book upon which it is recorded. This is a total project, and the maneuvering through the committee and through the House will not succeed in convincing the people that Echo Park Dam is not in the bill, because it is. Even if Echo Park is not restored in conference, which is unlikely, backers of the project will come back to Congress in the future and say, "We have spent billions of the taxpayers' money on the upper

Colorado storage project. Now we have to have Echo Park to make it work. Gve us the pistons for the engine."

In the famous words of the Supreme Court:

All others can see and understand this. How can we properly shut our minds to it?

A Sound Analysis of the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, for years we have been hearing conservationists argue against the Colorado River storage project solely on the grounds that they opposed construction of Echo Park Dam within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. These spokesmen repeatedly insisted that they were not opposed to—in fact, that they strongly supported—development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin if Echo Park were eliminated. They vehemently insisted that they were not working in the interests of the southern California water lobby, which has violently opposed any development in the upper basin.

The House now has a bill for the Colorado River storage project which has completely eliminated the controversial Echo Park Dam. It would now be logical to expect that these conservationists would solidly back the proposed development—which is precisely what they have urged over the years. A few conservationist spokesmen have done just this, clearly proving the integrity of the basic position they have taken.

The fact that other so-called conservationists have suddenly switched to the southern California propaganda line, urging defeat of the entire project despite the fact that the only unit they have previously opposed has been eliminated, makes the sincerity of their arguments very much suspect.

The Salt Lake Tribune, under date of July 12, 1955, published a penetrating analysis of the present situation under the title "Wilderness Groups Are Strangely Silent," which I request unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

WILDERNESS GROUPS ARE STRANGELY SILENT

Strong behind-the-scenes efforts are being made to clear the upper Colorado River development program with the powerful House Rules Committee. The aim is to get the legislation on the floor of the House for action before adjournment, expected early in August.

Sponsors of the bill are hopeful that the enthusiasm of the majority of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for the program would speed the action of the Rules Committee made up chiefly of eastern and southern Congressmen. The committee report filed last weekend said the project is sound and feasible from both an engineering and an economic standpoint.

The 70-page report, presenting strong and clear arguments for congressional authorization of the vital upper basin program is signed by 20 of the 23 committee members. It makes no reference to Echo Park Dam, stricken from the bill by the subcommittee because of the controversy over its construction within Dinosaur National Monument. The Senate-approved version of the bill includes Echo Park but it is believed this project is dead for the present and that it will not be restored in conference committee if the House passes the pared-down program. The entire program would be risked by any effort in this direction.

The committee emphasizes again that the project would more than pay for itself in 50 years, that in some respects the provisions of the bill are more conservative than established policy for reclamation works. The quality of water flowing to the lower basin would not be impaired by the program, and lower basin water users would be protected from "unfair" withholdings of water. The need for water and power in the upper basin is growing. The types of crops to be grown on newly developed land would not be surplus. The reservoirs are necessary in order to meet delivery commitments of water to the lower basin. The litigation between California and Arizona is no reason for delaying initial phases of the program.

The majority report makes good reading in the Intermountain West which depends upon development of the last big water resource for future industrial and agricultural growth. Reports of the minority members of the committee also should be carefully studied and answered, notably that of Congressman HOSMER of Long Beach, Calif. He pretends to believe that the Echo Park issue is not really removed from the program, and points to "hidden costs" which, he says, taxpayers of other States would have to share.

Congressman HOSMER's arguments are interesting in light of the fact that California has received more reclamation money than all the States of the upper basin together. Of the $2½ billion spent so far on reclamation in 17 Western States, 28 percent or more than $700 million has gone for California projects. The Federal Government has spent nearly a half billion dollars on the Central Valley project alone and is paying another $130 million for projects now authorized within the State. Yet southern California spokesmen like Congressman HOSMER continue to recite antireclamation propaganda which does harm to all such western development programs.

The southern California water lobby will not change its pitch, but what of the stand of the wilderness preservationist groups and eastern newspapers which have based their opposition on the Echo Park symbol—invasion of a national monument? Two weeks have passed since the House subcommittee jettisoned Echo Park, yet only one leading opponent has announced withdrawal of opposition. The Washington Post and Times Herald has editorially endorsed the upper Colorado program without Echo Park. General Ulysses S. Grant 3d of the American Planning and Civic Association, Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League of America, Fred M. Packard of the National Parks Association, and other spokesmen for wilderness groups and such influential newspapers as the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and St. Louis Post-Dispatch have said they opposed the program because of Echo Park. If they have changed their stand since the dam was dropped from the bill we have not heard of it.

The real issue is not the cost or Echo Park. It is whether the upper basin gets the water to which it is entitled under the Colorado River compact or whether it flows on down to southern California.

A 10-Year Moratorium on War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I have issued on the eve of my departure for Paris to attend the NATO Parliamentary Conference as a member of the United States congressional delegation. In it I am proposing the idea of a 10-year moratorium on war. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO ON A 10-YEAR MORATORIUM ON WAR

I am grateful to Speaker SAM RAYBURN for appointing me a member of the United States congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris. I hope that the information acquired abroad and the conversations we shall have with the various heads of the NATO governments will be helpful in the development of suitable plans for maintaining peace and security.

When I was elected to Congress last November I had pledged to myself to do everything in my power to further the cause of lasting peace and the abolition of war. Since the beginning of this year I have given much thought to this problem and on several occasions I spoke on the subject.

Last January Gen. Douglas MacArthur, in an address in Los Angeles, urged the United States to proclaim its readiness to abolish war in concert with the other powers of the world. I then wrote to General MacArthur and offered to introduce a resolution in Congress declaring that "it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes." He subsequently replied that it would require more than a congressional declaration "to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war," and suggested that I pursue the matter in Congress and there seek to obtain action "to implement the basic concept."

On April 18, I delivered an address in Congress on the subject The Search for Peace, in which I developed the need for a people-to-people approach to the problem of international peace, and I concluded by offering three proposals for Congress to consider. The proposals were: 1. A resolution along the lines suggested in my letter to General MacArthur expressing the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes; 2. revision of the United Nations Charter by extending to the U. N. authority to halt aggressions, facilitate universal disarmament, enforce international law, etc.; 3. set up a mission for peace to be comprised of elder statesmen who would conduct private discussions leading toward peace.

On May 4 I introduced three resolutions in the House incorporating these proposals, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

A few days ago I was gratified to read the dramatic statement by the late Prof. Albert Einstein and seven other eminent scientists appealing to mankind to abolish war or face the risk of extinction by slow torture from radioactive dust and rain. The appeal stressed that neither side can hope for victory in such a war and that there is a very real danger of the extermination of the human race. The question raised by the

scientists was: "Shall we put an end to the human race, or shall mankind renounce war?"

It is my opinion that we cannot have an out-and-out declaration to abolish war without certain conditions. Such a declaration against war is unquestionably a lofty ideal for which civilization has been striving for many years, but it has little meaning unless we can find a means for enforcing it. I would suspect that even if the Soviet Government agreed to a joint declaration in concert with other powers abolishing war, we would have no guaranty that she would abide by this declaration. From past experiences with the Soviet Union, it would be natural for us to suspect that she would use their international agreement as an opportunity for strengthening her position, while at the same time we would be weakening ours by curtailing our military power.

Nevertheless, there is much to this idea of abolishing war. We should not dismiss it lightly. If we could only put it on a practical basis, I am convinced that it would work. Great powers should not refuse to deal with each other on a basis of reason. Only fear, greediness, and a lust for power can lead to such acts of folly. The leaders of great nations in this atomic age can and should rise above the lust and fear. If they are true leaders they must help the peoples of the world rise to a higher level of self-interest—and they will forever be rewarded by the gratitude of all mankind.

Consequently, I am suggesting the United States should invite the principal powers of the world to join in a declaration establishing a moratorium on war for a period of 10 years. In order to give this idea a practical basis, it is necessary that full right of inspection be granted to all parties concerned, or to a central group agreed upon by all parties, to determine whether the moratorium is being carried out. In turn, to help ease world tensions and bring about greater international cooperation, any nation willing to abide by the principles established under the moratorium on war may be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

The question would, naturally, be raised: What would be the effects of such a moratorium? The effects would be almost limitless in their benefits to all mankind:

1. Of primary importance is that a universally agreed moratorium on war would bring peace for at least 10 years to a world which is hungry for peace.

2. It would result in a drastic reduction of the armed forces and the war potentials of all countries.

3. It would make possible universal disarmament for a period of a decade.

4. It would give a breathing spell to all countries, and particularly to the United Nations, during which time better ways of maintaining a lasting peace could be found.

5. During this moratorium period scientists of all countries would be enabled to concentrate on peaceful uses of atomic energy and the use of scientific inventions for the welfare of mankind.

6. Much of the wealth of the world, which ordinarily goes for military purposes, would be saved and used to aid the underdeveloped countries by helping to raise the standard of living and improve health conditions everywhere.

Undoubtedly other beneficial effects would result from a 10-year period free of war and free from the fear of war. It would be a period of great peace of mind to all of humanity. That, in itself, would be of valuable mental, physical, and moral benefit—truly a blessing for all.

Would Russia accept such a moratorium on war? No one can answer this question with utmost certainty. I believe that she would. Why?

After 10 years of the cold war, Moscow appears to be in a difficult economic situation. The food shortage in Russia and its satellites is no longer a secret; industrial development has fallen behind that of the West; the standard of living in the Communist countries is way below that of the non-Communist countries; there are definite signs that the people are becoming restive, impatient, they need a period of relaxation—in other words, a breathing spell—to strengthen their economy and to gain some respite from the constant strain under which they live and work.

All of this is supported by the current indications that Russia desires to find a solution to world problems, that it has become somewhat more conciliatory and that it wants an end to the cold war. If such be the case, then she will grasp at the opportunity of a moratorium on war. Should Russia be willing to accept a moratorium, then there is genuine hope for peace in our time. On the other hand, should Russia reject the idea of a moratorium, she would stand condemned by the whole world as a hypocrite and potential aggressor and not as the white night of peace which she claims to be.

For all these reasons I feel that Russia would be inclined to accept the idea of a moratorium.

It is clear that the entire world would benefit by it. We would be using our resources and manpower not for the preparation of war but for the betterment of mankind and improving the standard of living everywhere. The peaceful uses of atomic energy offer great prospects and hold out great hopes for all mankind. Coupled with the possibility of greater development of natural resources, this should result in a substantial improvement in living standards. New areas could be opened up and old ones rehabilitated—and all that at less than the cost imposed on nations at the present time to build up their armed might in their efforts to attain security.

In this way we could remove the discontent which exists in certain parts of the world and upon which communism thrives. Furthermore, if we would use our resources and our manpower dedicated for this purpose, at the end of the 10-year period not only would the United States itself be a stronger nation but we would also have stronger allies. By the same token, those who are today neutral or undecided peoples would have no room and no desire for communism because of the changed situation and the improvements achieved.

In any event, I believe the moratorium on war is worth a try for all countries, because it would remove all present fears and dangers threatening the peace. Those precious 10 years would be used to prove that in this world of abundance of all material necessities no nation need be in want, nor need any nation resort to war for its survival.

In the event some of us, whether here or abroad, may have forgotten the great losses in human lives and material wealth during World Wars I and II and the Korean war, let me cite just a few figures. In World War I about 10 million men of all countries lost their lives in battle and another 10 million civilians as a direct result of the war, making a total of 20 million lives sacrificed in vain. In World War II, 17 million were killed in battle and another 17 million civilians died because of the war, or a total of 34 million lives lost. In the Korean war, approximately a million were lost in battle on both sides, and perhaps 1 or 2 million civilians died. In all, a total of 55 to 60 million human lives were sacrificed in those three wars alone.

As for the loss and destruction of material wealth, the figures are truly astronomical. Let me just cite the figures for the United States alone. World War I cost the United States a total of $66 billion, including military expenditures, interest on war debts, veterans' pensions and compensations. In the same manner, World War II has cost us the sum of $450 billion, but interest on war debts, pensions, and other compensations will increase this figure considerably in the years to come. The Korean war thus far has cost us $151 billion, and this, too, will continue to rise as the interest and pensions accumulate over the years. In all, the United States has spent more than $667 billion on these three wars—and we are now nearly $275 billion in the red.

These lives need never be sacrificed again, nor need the wealth of America and of the world be dissipated if in the 10 years during which the moratorium on war would be in effect we could prove that the needs of the world can be satisfied by peaceful means. This is the point we wish to prove to the nations of the world. We want to convince them that war has been not only a waste of manpower but also of material resources. We want to prove to them that by saving our manpower and material wealth we can provide a sufficiency of all human needs and security for all the nations of the world.

I propose to bring this suggestion of a 10-year moratorium on war to the attention of the world's leaders meeting at the summit conference in Geneva for their consideration.

Reciprocal Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article relating to reciprocal trade and its application to the United States tariffs on Swiss watch movements is deserving of our attention:

WHERE IS THE WORLD'S BUSIEST TWO-WAY STREET?

When people talk about this street, they talk about reciprocal trade in the same breath.

This street runs right through your hometown, keeps going clear around the world. You ride it every day.

Every time you look at your watch, you get into your car, you use the phone, or go shopping, or pay a bill, you travel the world's busiest two-way street.

If you have a doubt, consider this:

The United States does a big business with its friendly neighbors everywhere in the world. A business that runs into billions every year.

In return, the United States buys the things its friendly neighbors make.

A good example of this two-way street trade has been America's trade with the watchmakers of Switzerland.

In the past 9 years, America purchased about $1 billion worth of goods from Switzerland—gaining a profitable trade balance of $500 million for its businessmen, farmers, and workers. Almost 50 percent of America's purchases was in our watches and watch movements.

In return, the Swiss bought more than $1,500 million worth of American-made products in the same period. Paid cash for them, too. And were it not for the purchases America made in Swizerland, the Swiss people couldn't have bought many of the things you make. Electrical appliances, movies, airplanes. Furs, fuels, lubricants. Machinery, medicines, chemicals. Name it, and the Swiss probably bought it from the United States of America.

For food and farm products alone, Switzerland spent about $68 million a year in America.

So no matter how you earn your living—office work, farm work, teach, own a business, or take care of your home and family—you travel the two-way street of international trade.

Recently, this street has been narrowed, instead of widened. Tariff has gone up 50 percent on jeweled-lever Swiss watches and movements, and other serious restrictions on trade with the watchmakers of Switzerland are pending.

This means fewer watches will be sold in the United States of America, fewer American exports to Switzerland.

But it's not too late to mend the potholes that are slowing down commerce on this economic highway. It's not too late to resurface the road that has helped keep prosperity high in both countries.

Goods and good will between friendly nations cannot go very far on a oneway street.

The past has shown it takes two-way trade to insure the security of our people, the expansion of our economies.

(Published by the Watchmakers of Switzerland, during the 104th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce pledged between the people of America and the people of Switzerland.)

Mayor Tobey's Hot Retort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of July 11, 1955:

MAYOR TOBEY'S HOT RETORT

Wholesome indignation characterizes the statement of Mayor Frank Tobey of Memphis in his interview in the Sunday Post-Dispatch.

From what Mayor Tobey said it is obvious that he and the national administration are of two different parties. It is also obvious that he does not mind hitting back hard. But when allowances are made, the substance of Mayor Tobey's statement adds up to a lot of commonsense. Because it will not be as widely printed over the country for the information of the American people as it should be, we reproduce Mayor Tobey's statement in full below.

Independent voters who do their own political thinking will see that the Memphis mayor demolishes the patently distracting tactic of the White House in demanding "assurances" that Memphis will build its own power plant rather than a kilowatt of electricity from the Dixon-Yates utility promoters.

Mayor Tobey was interviewed by the Post-Dispatch before he went to Washington for conferences Monday with TVA, Budget, and other officials. He said:

"In the first place there is no actual situation existing in which President Eisenhower on one hand gives an ultimatum of 90 days for Memphis to move toward building its own steam plant, and the city on the other hand races to meet the 90-day deadline.

"This is so much Republican hogwash to confuse the public.

"The true situation is that Memphis decided in its own democratic, fundamentally American manner to build a steam plant rather than accept power from Dixon-Yates.

"And by so doing, Memphis has taken the Eisenhower administration off the hook and opened the door through which the President can sidestep a political scandal of startling proportions.

"Consequently, it is our feeling that the administration should be thankful for our sincerity and honesty of purpose, rather than keep trying to insist that we come up with some special phrasemaking that will help the Republicans in campaign contests.

"Also, let's get the record straight. The Memphis City Commission on June 23 passed a resolution authorizing our light, gas, and water division to commence the construction of a steam plant.

"We are not bluffing, and neither are we going to write campaign literature for an inept (Federal) administration when it bungles the public interest."

A straightforward answer to this from President Eisenhower, Attorney General Brownell, Budget Director Hughes, and AEC Chairman Strauss would make interesting reading.

Slum Clearance Helped Cut Baltimore Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, written by George Carpozi, Jr., and which appeared in the July 15, 1955, issue of the New York Journal-American is well worth reading. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

THEY PROVED TEEN CRIME CAN BE CURBED—SLUM CLEARANCE HELPED CUT BALTIMORE DELINQUENCY—CLUBS AND SPECIAL POLICE UNIT ACT TO ELIMINATE GANG CLASHES

(By George Carpozi, Jr.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The struggle to control juvenile delinquency has become an increasing ordeal in altogether too many of the Nation's cities and towns. Why? Are the methods used to cope with this problem outmoded? Do we need a fresh approach? To bring into focus the answers to these and other questions, the Hearst newspapers assigned a team of reporters to study a group of communities where crime by youth actually has gone against the tide—downward. This series reports to the Nation the successful methods being used in the hope that cities and towns which have yet to find a solution to delinquency may find it here.)

If any city or town in the United States can claim that better housing helped bring juvenile delinquency under control, Baltimore is the one.

Maryland's most populous city—which has attracted national prominence among city planners—reports a 13 percent drop in youth crime during 1954. And in 1953 there was an 8 percent reduction in delinquency over 1952.

While in many communities slum clearance can mean only a partial solution to juvenile delinquency, Baltimore is an exception. It lays a considerable portion of its success in checking juvenile crime at the doorstep of better housing.

That is because Baltimore had many distinct problems resulting from slums, among them one which in itself was unique.

During World War II the city had been invaded by thousands of "hillbillies" from the mountains of Virginia, West Virginia, and Tennessee.

They converged on this seaport and important defense building center to get employment in war industries. They brought with them their families.

Living by standards unknown to the worst class of Baltimoreans, these hillbillies seemingly had a code all their own.

Drinking, fighting among themselves, and sex seemed their principal interest in life.

Their children, unburdened by parental guidance, roamed the streets at all hours. The younger ones were dirty-faced, ill-fed, poorly clothed. As soon as they reached their early teens they would fall into the patterns set by their parents.

Their homes were run down. Most of them were filthy and housed from 4 to 5 in a room. Moonshine parties with barefoot hillbillies strumming banjoes were not uncommon sights to police called to bring peace and quiet for sleepless neighbors in the early morning hours.

TRAIPSING BAREFOOT

In fact, it was not an uncommon sight to see the hillbillies traipsing along Baltimore's business streets barefoot.

But the mountain people were not the only ones living in slums. An all-too-great percentage of the city's Negro population and a large number of whites also dwelled in these unhealthy surroundings.

By no means, however, were these two last-named groups comparable in their social standards to the hillbillies.

Nevertheless, this atmosphere and environment was a made-to-order incubator for juvenile delinquency and crime in general.

But Baltimore officials recognized the problem before it got out of hand, and acted speedily.

SLUM CLEARANCE BEGUN

With Federal aid, a huge slum-clearance program was begun.

It meant razing row on row of ancient, small three-story houses fronting on congested midtown streets. It meant sending bulldozers and wrecking cranes into narrow, dirty alleys to tear down dilapidated frame firetraps which were homes for some of Baltimore's most poverty stricken.

Advancing vigorously with this program since the end of the war, the city has uprooted more than 20,00 low-income residents from some 5,300 such slum dwellings and transplanted them into clean, modern houses and apartments.

A total of 5.494 housing units for more than 24,000 inhabitants has been built so far—more are on their way. In addition, almost 3,800 housing units for 16,000 persons have been erected on undeveloped suburban land to provide better living for families formerly located in the city's congested areas.

LARGE PLAYGROUNDS

The new developments utilize large land areas for playgrounds, parking facilities, and bench and park accommodations.

In this new environment, more and more of Baltimore's youths are growing up unfettered by the unhealthy tenement atmosphere which ushers so many youngsters into the street—to join gangs or commit crimes.

However, Baltimore's successful fight against juvenile delinquency is not being waged wholly with brick and mortar.

While some social reformers cry "get rid of the slums and you'll get rid of juvenile delinquency," no one is more aware than Baltimore's officials and citizens that better housing in itself is not the solution—although in this case it helped enormously.

A unified attack on the problem by other forces was needed.

These efforts, spreading out on a broad front, were exerted by police, the courts, State and city agencies, and private organizations staffed by citizens with a special interest in youth.

OTHER STEPS TAKEN

Let us see the steps each used—and still uses—to fight delinquency.

The Baltimore Police Department fights youth crime primarily through its bureau of aid and prevention, which includes the juvenile protective unit, area project unit, policewomen's unit, and missing-persons bureau.

Commanding the bureau is Capt. William L. Hartung, whose success in combating juvenile delinquency has earned him a reputation in police circles throughout the country.

Hartung has what many law-enforcement agencies concede is the most unique station in police work in the United States.

By operating under one command, the various units of the bureau of aid and prevention are able to do exactly what the name implies. The integration of these units enables one or more to help another in any situation requiring more than a normal amount of attention that any unit can give by itself.

REINFORCEMENTS

For example, if there is an outbreak of juvenile crime in a given area of the city that proves too much for the three-man juvenile protective unit, members of other units—including policewomen—will be assigned at once to work with the JPU.

In this way, action in dealing with emergency situations is speeded up and trouble almost always brought under control before it gets out of hand.

Another unique feature in Baltimore's antidelinquency offensive is the inclusion of police boys' clubs and Boy Scout troop units in the makeup of the Bureau of Aid and Prevention.

A former athlete and baseball player, Hartung helped organize the first police boys' club in 1944. Soon after, he helped form the first Boy Scout troop under police sponsorship.

CLUBS FOR BOYS

Today there are 3 such clubs for white boys, 1 for Negro youths; 7 police-sponsored Boy Scout troops for white boys, 1 for Negroes. Each club has about 600 boys.

Clubrooms are situated in the city's various police precincts, and are open from 4 to 10 p. m. weekdays, noon to 10 p. m. Saturdays.

Baltimore officials agree these clubs have had spectacular success in preventing delinquency. As a result, they have provided for additional clubs and troops to be organized in each of 6 new police stations to be built under a $3 million program.

BUSINESSMEN AID

Each station will have a special wing devoted entirely to the clubs and troops.

Significantly, the club Scout work was financed from 1944 to 1954 at no cost to the taxpayers. The Variety Club of Baltimore footed the bill.

And when difficulties were encountered last year, a committee of leading businessmen was formed spontaneously to provide funds for operations and serve as advisory committee to the club Scout operations.

Among the leaders on this committee is Fred I. Archibald, publisher of the Baltimore News-Post and Sunday American, whose reporters—James Mullikan and Aldine Bird—made the survey for this article.

Typical of all Hearst newspapers, the Baltimore News-Post and Sunday American has taken and held the lead in the city in campaigning for positive action against juvenile delinquency.

One of its accomplishments was the Police Boys' Clubs. Another was a drive for establishment of youth recreation centers which could absorb idle time and help organize young people for useful purposes.

PRIVATE AGENCIES JOIN

As a result of a study made of the famous Moline (Ill.) REK, set up and operated by teenagers from school, the newspaper primed for similar centers in Baltimore—and got them.

A lion's share of credit for Baltimore's encouraging delinquency statistics belongs to the city's private agencies. In addition to the YMCA, YWCA, YMHA, and YWHA, which provide the familiar facilities for youth, several organizations in Baltimore have come up with other successful programs to stem delinquency.

These include the Boys' Brigade, a quasi-military organization; the Red Shield Boys' Club, which provides outlets for youthful energies; the Big Boys of Baltimore, an adult group which provides athletic equipment, entertainment and guidance to youths; the Lions Club, which maintains several recreational centers and playgrounds; the Baltimore Youth Commission, a semipublic agency working with young people of both sexes, and numerous religious organizations which run programs much like those conducted in other cities.

One of the church groups merits further mention—the Presbyterians and the Society of Friends, which operates the McKim Boys' Haven, a home for boys.

Organized in 1947 by the Reverend Robert S. Meyer, the home is a haven for boys who need help. They live there and use the community center's recreational and athletic facilities—and stay out of trouble.

The American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on page A1134 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 5, 1953, I made some remarks in respect to the need for more affirmative methods for dealing with communism and particularly on the intellectual level. I inserted a paper prepared by a student of this matter, Sam Lambert, entitled "Needed: A Coordinated Offensive Against the Philosophy of Communism."

I also inserted a UP news item dated February 26, 1953, entitled "Ford Foundation Sets Up Fund for Survey of Dangers in Method Used in Combating Communism." I did not point up the purpose of inserting the reference to the Ford fund. It was twofold: First, it is certainly true that by pursuing improper methods for combating communism we can damage our cause; second, how unfortunate it was that the Ford Foundation set up $15 million for a negative approach, instead of appropriating $15 million to figure out good and proper methods for combating communism.

With that background, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the people of our country a group of citizens who have moved ahead in affirmative manner to effectively combat communism, using proper methods and appealing to intellectual groups to a large degree, I trust, and this is my own observation, because it is among the intellectual groups that the surface appeal of communism has been most effective; the appeal being against social injustices—of which there are always many.

The American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism has been so effective in its short life that it has been singled out for special attention by the rulers of the Kremlin. I have in my possession a translation from an article from Izvestia, Moscow, April 17, 1955, headed "Press Conference of the 'Committee for Return to the Homeland.'" It is a diatribe directed against the American committee and reading between the lines exhibits a tremendous fear and concern about the effect the American committee is having behind the Iron Curtain. The establishment of the Committee for Return to the Homeland is a tribute to the fine work being done.

So I want to commend the efforts of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism and the people who have worked so hard to realize its aims and objectives. The accomplishments of the Committee in the fight against communism constitute a worthy example of what can be achieved through cooperative efforts of private citizens. Through one of its major undertakings—Radio Liberation—the committee is enabling the anti-Communist emigration from the Soviet Union to deliver daily through the Iron Curtain to the peoples of the Soviet Union a message which encourages them to hope for eventual liberation and which fosters a spirit of resistance to the dictatorship which oppresses them. In order to acquaint the Members and the American people generally with the fine work being performed by the committee, I would like to take this opportunity to summarize briefly the background, history, objectives, program, and accomplishments of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism.

It was in 1950 that a group of Americans actively interested in combating the Bolshevist doctrines being forced on the Soviet peoples by their leaders began a study to see how best this might be attempted. What they had in mind originally was to bring together emigres from all parts of the Soviet Union who would participate in the effort to weaken the hold of the Bolchevik rulers over the Soviet peoples. It was apparent at the outset that certain policy decision would have to be made and adhered to if the attempt to coordinate emigres of different nationalities and different views into an effective working unit was to be successful. After careful study, the organizing committee concluded that its efforts to create a coordinating center could be utilized for propaganda purposes only if they were based on a fundamental and involate principle. This was:

No group would be acceptable which was unwilling to agree that the political or geographic framework of a future Soviet Union can be decided only by the peoples of the Soviet Union themselves.

In other words, the committee decided on a principle of "equal assistance to, equal cooperation with, all emigre groups whether great Russians or non-Russians who desire to carry on an active struggle against bolshevism and who recognize the unconditional right of all the peoples inhabiting the territory of the Soviet

Union to determine their own fate on the basis of a democratic expression of the will of the peoples." Emigre groups who participated in the center were to be free to continue their separate organizational status and carry on activities of their own choosing so long as they did not conflict with the platform of the center. Furthermore, it was decided to support only one political center.

The American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, which was informally organized late in the fall of 1950, was formally incorporated in the State of Delaware in January 1951, under the chairmanship of Eugene Lyons. Mr. Lyons continued in this post until the spring of 1952, when former United States Ambassador to the U. S. S. R., Adm. Alan C. Kirk, took over. In September 1952 Admiral Kirk accepted the position of Chairman of the Psychological Strategy Board in Washington, and was succeeded by Vice Adm. Leslie C. Stevens, United States Navy, retired. Admiral Stevens headed the organization for the two following busy years during its initial experimental stages. In September 1954, upon the resignation of Admiral Stevens, Howland H. Sargent, former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, was elected president. Other officers of the committee are as follows: Reginald T. Townsend, vice president and director of public relations; Andre D. Yedigaroff, assistant to the president; B. Eric Kuniholm, director of political affairs division; S. Y. McGiffert, director of radio liberation network; Robert H. Dreher, director of radio programing support division; and Spencer Williams, director of press and publications. Trustees are: Mrs. Oscar Ahlgren; John R. Burton; William Henry Chamberlin; Hon. Charles Edison; J. Peter Grace, Jr.; Allen Grover; H. J. Heinz II; Isaac Don Levine; Eugene Lyons; Henry V. Poor, counsel; Howland H. Sargent; Theodore M. Steele; Vice Adm. Leslie C. Stevens, United States Navy, retired; Dr. John W. Studebaker; Reginald T. Townsend; William L. White; and Philip H. Willkie. The committee's headquarters are located at 6 East 45th Street, New York, and serves principally as a support base for the European operations. Robert F. Kelley is the European deputy to the president. He is assisted by Isaac Patch, Jr., emigre relations adviser; Manning H. Williams, director of radio division, Rolf Hartmann, chief of radio engineering; and Prof. Oliver J. Fredericksen, adviser to the institute.

For a summary of the aims and objectives of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism, I turn to a statement of November 21, 1954, by the committee's president, Howland Sargeant:

> The American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism was conceived and exists today as a tangible expression of the friendship of the American people for the peoples of the Soviet Union. The very existence of the partnership of the committee and of the emigration is a signal to the world that a great chasm divides the peoples of the Soviet Union from their oppressors. At the same time, it is a source of hope to those oppressed peoples that their deliverance from the dictatorship is of deep concern to the freedom-loving people of the United States. • • • The American Committee has been completely and unswervingly dedicated to the cause of liberation of all mankind from the source of Soviet power.
>
> The objectives of the American committee, simply stated, they seemed to me to be to work in partnership with all dedicated elements of the emigration which are willing to work cooperatively with other democratic elements in conducting activities designed to weaken the power of the Soviet dictatorship, primarily within the U. S. S. R., to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with conditions as they actually exist in the world, and to increase the spirit of resistance of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain in the Soviet Union by letting them know that they and their plight have not been forgotten. Finally, to find increasingly effective ways to cooperate in carrying out practical projects to weaken and ultimately to crush and stamp out Bolshevism, thus helping to provide the climate in which the American committee's most important goal can be achieved—the liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

One of the committee's original aims—to create a united front of exile political organizations, excluding procommunism, and Fascist groups—has not been fully realized because it has not yet been possible to coordinate the widely differing philosophies of the various groups. The committee, however, has left the door open to cooperation with Russian and non-Russian anti-Communist groups at such time as a working agreement between them can be reached.

Nevertheless, a review of the accomplishments of the American committee during its 4 years of existence reveals an impressive contribution to the anti-Bolshevist cause. This contribution is revealed in the work of the two major undertakings supported by the committee, both located in Munich, Germany—Radio Liberation, and the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the U. S. S. R.

Radio Liberation—Osvobozhdenye—Russian for "liberation"—went on the air on March 1, 1953, with Russian emigrees broadcasting anti-Communist messages and uncensored news to the Soviet Union and to Soviet forces in the occupation areas. From the early broadcasts in Russian at the rate of 12 hours per day, the facilities of the station have been expanded until it is presently on a 24-hour-a-day schedule of broadcasts in 17 different languages comprising many of the nationalities now under Bolshevik domination. Nine transmitters beam the broadcasts to the vast area behind the Iron Curtain. The staff consists of about 300 persons—primarily of former Soviet citizens, and German and American technicians, all working under American policy guidance. The programs are carefully prepared by former Soviet citizens who tailor them to appeal specifically to various segments of the population. There are two main indications that the programs are getting results. The Soviet Union is expending considerable resources in attacking the broadcasts in the Soviet press, and intense Soviet jamming efforts began 10 minutes after Radio Liberation went on the air and have increased continuously. Despite these efforts, the testimony of the continual flow of escapees is evidence that the message is getting through.

The other major undertaking of the committee is support of the Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of the U. S. S. R. which was founded early in 1950 by a group of Soviet emigree scholars with the encouragement of the Russian Research Center of Harvard University.

The purpose of the institute is twofold:

First. To provide an opportunity for emigree scholars from the Soviet Union to engage in continued study in their fields of specialization.

Second. To elicit from the academic forces of the emigration valuable information concerning conditions within the Soviet Union.

The capacities of the institute have been steadily expanded, particularly its facilities for research on Soviet problems. From a start in 1951 with about 100 volumes and a few scanty files of Soviet periodicals, the library of the institute has now grown to 23,000 volumes with an extensive collection of earlier Soviet periodicals and a virtually complete file of current major Soviet publications. Western scholars have pronounced it the most useful collection of materials for research on Soviet problems in Europe. The institute possesses a unique advantage among institutions devoted to research in the same field: It is staffed with men and women of professional qualifications who have had first-hand knowledge and experience of life within the Soviet Union and who can interpret and evaluate Soviet policies and developments against this background. The free world, particularly the neutralist areas where there is an inadequate understanding of Soviet policies, practices, and intentions, has much to learn from these persons whose scholarly and scientific careers in Soviet institutions lend a rare authority to their appraisals, and the institute serves as the channel through which their output can be disseminated effectively. The institute has won recognition from the West German Government as an academic institution, meeting standards prescribed by German law, and its publications in English, Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Turkish, and German are being increasingly consulted by free world circles concerned with questions of Soviet policies and practices.

The American committee also devotes its attention and resources to special projects under which the anti-Communist emigration is enabled to counter effectively Soviet designs against the free world, particularly in the psychological and propaganda fields. An example of such a project was the participation in 1954 of the two Moslem emigres from different parts of the Soviet Union in the annual pilgrimage to Mecca where they exposed the hypocrisy of the team of so-called pilgrims sent in by special plane from Moscow. The American committee assisted these anti-Communist Moslems in making this trip which

had a profound influence on the Moslem world.

This record of accomplishment and those who are engaged in this worthwhile cause which shows sympathy for the suffering of the oppressed, friendship for other peoples, and passionate conviction that freedom is the birthright of all humanity deserve the commendation and appreciation of free peoples everywhere.

Following is a list of the publications made by this institute. I am certain anyone interested in this program will find these publications of great interest:

1. The World's Dilemma and a Way Out (liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union), 1952.
2. Two Sides of the Coin (a demonstration of the need for objectivity), 1953.
3. A Free Voice at the Moscow University Bicentennial (messages of emigre scholars and scientists), 1955.
4. A Free Voice at the Soviet Writers Congress (radio liberation speaks to the peoples of the Soviet Union), 1955.
5. Anniversary Selection of Radio Liberation Broadcasts.
6. Current Publications of Radio Liberation.

The American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the remarks I have heretofore made in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to the fine work being done by the American Committee for Liberation From Bolshevism, I am inserting an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 3, 1955, pointing up this thinking:

TODAY IN EUROPE—UNREST SPREAD IN RUSSIA BY REFUGEES' EUROPE RADIO

(By David Lawrence)

BONN, June 2.—Not very far away from here—at Munich—there's a work in operation of profound importance to the free world. It's called Radio Liberation. Unlike the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe, both of which also perform a valuable service in the cold war, this enterprise is carried on by refugees who talk directly to the people in their homeland.

The best testimony to the effectiveness of Radio Liberation is the intensive efforts of the Soviet regime to jam the transmitters and prevent people behind the Iron Curtain from listening to these broadcasts, which are delivered in 17 languages for the nationalities inside the Soviet Union. Now broadcasts have just been begun to the Soviet people in the Far East.

With the exception of a few American advisers and technical assistants, the program staff is made up entirely of former citizens of the Soviet Union. Several are onetime listeners who have fled from the Communist dictatorship. Unlike those broadcasting on other projects which are recognized as "foreign," the speakers on Radio Liberation use such terms as "we Russians" or "we Ukrainians," and, when they criticize the Soviet system, they do it as members of the family and as fellow citizens—not as outsiders.

AMERICAN IN CHARGE

Robert F. Kelley, who was for many years in charge of the Russian desk in the Department of State, is deputy to the president of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism and heads up the work in Munich. He described the activities of his group to this correspondent as follows:

"The overall objective of Radio Liberation's broadcasts is to deepen and widen the gulf between the peoples of the Soviet Union and their Communist rulers. With this end in view, the broadcasts seek to increase the stress and strain and the tensions which exist in the Soviet Union and to sow the seeds of disaffection where it does not now exist.

"Consequently, Radio Liberation seeks to encourage in the Soviet Union the spirit of resistance to oppression, to fortify anti-Communist sentiments, to bring home to the peoples of the Soviet Union that they have friends in the free world and to develop among them a sympathetic attitude toward Western democracies. An effort is made to reduce to a minimum the collaboration of the peoples of the Soviet Union with their Communist Government and to develop an attitude of noncooperation and such passive resistance as will not entail punishment of the participants.

"The activities of the American Committee for Liberation from Bolshevism are based on the concept that the peoples of the Soviet Union are our potential allies in the world-wide struggle against communism. There is no question but that disaffection exists on a wide scale in the Soviet Union in varying degrees, ranging from incipient dissatisfaction with existing conditions and doubts as to the realization of Communist ideals, lack of sympathy with present problems of the Kremlin and so on, to complete disillusionment and fierce hatred of the Communist regime.

"It is in the interest of the free world to integrate the opposition of the peoples of the Soviet Union to the Communist rulers, however passive and ineffective such opposition may be at present, into the struggle of the Western democracies against the Kremlin."

This work is carried on with considerable difficulty and with some danger. The Soviets have been trying to intimidate and terrorize the broadcasters, and during the past year Communist agents have been especially active in trying to undermine the operation. Six months ago one of the most capable leaders of Radio Liberation was murdered and another member met a mysterious death which has never been satisfactorily explained.

SABOTAGE EXPECTED

Efforts likewise may be expected from inside Germany to try to sabotage the project. Already Communist sympathizers have raised the point that such broadcasts should not be permitted by foreign committees but the government authorities have refused to listen to such objections. Meanwhile, the steady stream of refugees from behind the Iron Curtain continues and they all say that the Radio Liberation broadcasts are giving hope to many persons, who spread their ideas by word of mouth. There is no way of estimating what may some day grow from little seeds dropped here and there inside the satellite countries as well as in the Soviet Union.

Radio Liberation is supported not by any government but by the people in various countries. The American committee is composed of Howland H. Sargeant, formerly assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, and a board of prominent Americans, with headquarters at 6 East 45th St., New York, where comprehensive records of the work being done are maintained.

Congratulations! Bob and Helen Coar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to include an article that appeared in the latest issue of the new Capitol Hill newspaper, Roll Call. The excellent profile of Robert and Helen Coar illustrates vividly the health bipartisanship with which they have discharged their service to the Members of the Congress.

On this 20th anniversary occasion, I join my colleagues in saying "Congratulations—May the future be as kind to you as you have been to your country as well as the Congress."

The article follows:

MEMBERS TO HONOR COARS JULY 20 FOR 20 YEARS OF RADIO SERVICE

(By Al Lista)

They'll roll up the aisles in the House and Senate July 20. Congressmen and Senators, in a show of rare unanimity, will send showers of well-deserved oratory reverberating around the Chambers, toasting the achievements of a remarkable husband and wife team which has been responsible for the creation and development of what is now the Joint House and Senate Radio-Television Facility.

July 20 marks the 20th anniversary of the founding of this vital service which started out in the early days of radio's development and which today is doing a rushing business in recording and filming the portentious utterances of America's elected representatives for the enlightenment and edification of the folks back home.

The story of Robert J. and Helen B. Coar is, as anyone on the Hill can tell you, the story of this radio-television facility and in a sense reflects the saga of this Nation's herculean progress in the field of mass communication.

As is true of many successful and long-lasting enterprises, the Joint House and Senate TV Radio Facility sprang from humble beginnings; a single room divided by a partition. In order to insure proper voice resonance the walls were draped in monk's cloth—a far cry from bright soundproofed panelings that line the present-day studios. But this pioneer studio was not then the property of the Congress, it represented the vision and enterprise of Bob Coar, who at the age of 29 had already helped pioneer much of the early sound and electronics developments of the last twenties while an engineer for the Radio Corporation of America.

While attending the engineering school at night, Bob filled in the days working with the New York Telephone Co. as an installer of electronic equipment and prior to that with the New Jersey Power and Light Co. in Summit, N. J.

His capacity for working long hours has carried over to this day. Just recently this writer had occasion to work with the TV facility on a project which did not wind up until 2 a. m. and drove out to spend what was left of the night at the Coar's home in Fairfax, Va. Thinking that I had done well in getting to the breakfast table at 8 o'clock, I found out that Bob had taken Bob, Jr., on his paper route at 6 a. m. "It's one of the few times I'm able to be with my boy," he explained.

By the time he was 20 years old, Bob Coar had earned his engineering certification, attended an installation and development school at the Bell Laboratories and held responsible positions wtih two of the largest utility companies in the New York City area.

At the tender age of 12 he was running the motion picture projection machine in Batten High School in Elizabeth, N. J., from which he was graduated before his 16th birthday. It is no wonder that RCA engaged him as a staff member in 1926 to teach advanced electronics and instruct in the installation and operation of motion picture equipmnet. This put Bob on the ground floor of the then new industry—sound motion pictures.

Later, Bob was ordered by his RCA bosses to aid in the conversion of the Orpheum circuit of vaudeville theaters to sound motion pictures—the forerunner of the present RCA Studios. Despite the early glamor of Hollywood and handling the recording and sound for such musical smash hits as Rio Rita and Hit the Deck, Bob accepted the opportunity to participate in the documentation of the Chicago's World's Fair. For the first time the demonstrators of a world's fair were able to display their wares through the new mediums of motion and sound.

Adding to the richness and variety of young Coar's background is his association with the world famous sleuth, Raymond Schindler. On a flight to New York from the Chicago Fair he chanced to meet Mr. Schindler and proceeded to discuss the latest in electronic developments that would aid in crime detection. Before the plane had rested its wheels on the runway in New York the famous Schindler had invited the 23-year-old Bob to address the World Association of Detective Science and Crime Detection convention that was taking place in New York City. The question period after his talk lasted for 3 hours.

Schindler, recognizing a good man when he saw one, hired Bob as his laboratory technician for the development of scientific electronic and recording devices for use in the detection of criminals. This relationship lasted until 1934 when Bob decided to go into business for himself building sound equipment.

It is at this point that Bob did another successful piece of pioneering * * * he married the lovely Helen Badgley, who as a child star in silent films was known as Little Helen Badgley, the Thanhouser Kidlet, the Best Known Baby in the World. She played roles of menaced infant innocence in thrillers produced by Thanhouser Corp., New Rochelle, N. Y. Later, Helen had parts in Mary Pickford films.

That same year Bob was consulted by the FCC in setting up sound recording facilities for the transcription of hearings before the Commission. It seems that the stenographers had difficulty in transcribing the new jargon of the communications experts testifying before the committee. Such words as "megacycles" were appearing in the record as "Maggie Sickles." Hence Coar began cutting platters that could be played back slowly to shorthand and stenotype wizards so they could capture the maze of scientific terminology.

It was while serving as a consultant that Bob seriously considered opening an independent recording studio that would service Members of Congress and high Government officials. The late Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, is credited with giving Bob his greatest impetus toward undertaking this new project.

Capper promised to cut weekly 15-minute platters, and special jobs when he needed to sway Kansas opinion on emergency issues. To further bolster Coar's decision, Arthur Capper said, "Roosevelt's New Deal furnishes plenty of emergencies, son." The potential clientele readily suggested itself to Coar and he proceeded to pack up his New York operation and take his new bride to Washington, where they have been ever since.

The difficulty of serving the legislators who were busy answering rollcalls and attending committee meetings made it impossible to support the new operation on the small trickle of Congressmen who could make the trip down Pennsylvania Avenue for a recording.

"We had to eat," Coar recalls. "Any work that came along, we took. We cut platters for FDR, the State Department and a redheaded fellow who had an aversion for dragging downtown to meet early morning recording schedules. The redhead goes by the name of Arthur Godfrey, I believe."

From 1936 to 1946 the Capitol Hill recording business was a side issue, with commercial studio work being the major breadwinner. Later, in 1936, at the suggestion of the then Speaker of the House Bankhead, they moved a recorder into room 414, OHOB, as a convenience to the lawmakers. This ready accessibility proved to be the shot-in-the-arm that congressional recording needed. The traffic really became heavy with the advent World War II and by V–J day Capitol Hill recordings had gotten completely out of hand. The Coars abandoned their downtown office and concentrated on the Congress entirely, but outside criticism caused the legislators to take the operation under their official wing. In 1947, Bob and Helen Coar became official employees of the Congress.

By 1948, a presidential election year, the flood gates really opened. A deluge of recording requests inundated the new radio facility by the new radio-conscious lawmakers.

By 1952 the need for an expanded facility made itself most apparent. The economy-minded Congress took a reading of the financial situation and found that the facility had piled up a credit balance of $117,500.32 without being a burden upon the individual Member's pocketbooks. Before adjourning, authorization was obtained to plow back a goodly portion of this increment to install TV studios in preparation for the convening of the 83d Congress. This established the present form of the Joint House and Senate Radio-Television Facility.

The value of the facility to the present officeholders will probably be best told by the Members July 20 when individual Members will rise on the floor to pay tribute to Bob and Helen Coar on the 20th anniversary of their association with the congressional family. The personal and intimate attention they have received at the hands of the Coars while they, in most cases, amateurishly approach the use of camera and lights will be gratefully acknowledged by their statements in the RECORD.

The Charleston, S. C., Naval Shipyard Rewarded by the Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Charleston Naval Shipyard is one of the outstanding shipyards in the Nation. Records in the Bureau of Ships indicate that the efficiency and cost per unit of conversion and construction at the Charleston Naval Shipyard is more economical to the Government than any other yard in the Nation. This is a record of which we in South Carolina are indeed proud. The men and women in the Charleston Naval Shipyard, both military and civilian, have a tradition unexcelled in the Nation. Part and parcel of this tradition is pride of performance.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, recently the Charleston Naval Shipyard was the recipient of the Navy's three top safety awards for the last calendar year. One was the Secretary of the Navy's Industrial Award, another was the Secretary of the Navy's Motor Vehicle Award, and the last was a National Safety Council Award. The National Safety Award is a national distinction and was awarded over every other single naval shipyard in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for and on behalf of the great family of employees at the Charleston Naval Shipyard I express the pride in such singular accomplishments. I want the records of this Congress and future Congreses to know of what my people did in their day and generation for their Nation and the security of democracy everywhere in the world.

Unanswered Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial as contained in the Washington Evening Star, July 18, 1955:

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

The Commissioners have decided on the most drastic and unusual action that can be imagined to end the transit strike. Its details should become known during the day and will be given the careful study they deserve.

In the meantime, it is passing strange that the basic facts of the company's dispute with the union are receiving no public attention whatsoever from the Commissioners. These relate to the company's ability to pay compared with what the union is demanding.

The facts, of course, are available. They should be placed before the public by the Commissioners or the Public Utilities Commission, or some disinterested group that commands public confidence. The failure to do this suggests that the Commissioners and the Public Utilities Commission, sharing responsibility for constructive action in this strike, are afraid to face the facts, and it invites the suspicion that their motives extend beyond mere settlement of a labor dispute.

The company's position is that it does not have the revenue now to meet even the watered-down version of the union's original demands which would, in the ordinary course of events, be offered as a basis for settlement.

The union's position is that the company's ability to pay is, from its point of view, irrelevant. Senator MORSE has been quoted in support of that theory, and its application to the role of an arbitrator—who would

be concerned only with the wages and benefits the men should receive, without reference to the company's financial ability to meet them. If the company cannot pay what the union is entitled to receive, should the public meet the difference through subsidy? If so, should we not determine the equity of subsidy and its size, and find out how it is to be paid?

The company's books are available to any authorized group which wants to examine them. The Public Utilities Commission's own agents know the facts. If the company is telling the truth, it is being asked to invite bankruptcy by agreeing to pay out more than it receives. It is difficult to see how the management is any more recalcitrant than the union, though in the uproad there has been no real opportunity for collective bargaining to run its course.

As the Commissioners feel that they must have legislation, why are they so intent on the extraordinary measures now being recommended? Legislation designed to invoke the methods favored by Congress in the past should at least be considered, but they have been ignored. A joint resolution, for example, could apply to the present emergency the procedure outlined in the Railway Labor Act, with its Presidential fact-finding and reporting machinery. The Public Utilities Commission, like other Federal and State regulatory agencies, could grant temporary relief on its own initiative, pending a conclusive finding. It knows what the facts are, and they are spread upon its own record.

Representatives McMILLAN and BROYHILL have demonstrated, by their efforts at conciliation, that the two sides are not too far apart. Why, in these circumstances, are the Commissioners so intent on setting a precedent which is as dangerous as it is complicated? What are they hiding? What are they really seeking to do?

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, enclosed find some very important articles regarding the upper Colorado River project:

CENTRAL UTAH (INITIAL PHASE), THE PROJECT'S LARGEST IRRIGATION SEGMENT, IS THE MOST INFEASIBLE OF ALL

The central Utah project (initial phase) which would cost $127 million for irrigation alone and irrigate but 160,000 acres at a cost of $794 per acre, exclusive of hidden-interest subsidy by the taxpayers. The Bureau studies show that the water users could repay only $94 per acre over a period of 70 years, or only 12 percent of the cost.

Such a submarginal project should not be considered for authorization until the Congress has available to it an investigation and report by a disinterested board of engineers.

It of course cannot be denied, and is not here denied, that such a project would be of some benefit to local area residents and landowners. But such benefits could accrue to any area in which the Federal Government could be prevailed upon to erect some power feature, the revenues of which, for untold periods in the future, would be used to pay 88 percent of the cost of putting water on the land. This, in effect, is a thinly veiled Federal grant.

IRRIGATION PROJECTS ARE FINANCIALLY INFEASIBLE, REQUIRING AN AVERAGE SUBSIDY OF 88 PERCENT OF THE COST

None of the reclamation components of the project would be financially sound themselves. The original direct-irrigation investments on the 11 projects recommended by the Secretary range from $200 to nearly $800 per acre for the central Utah project (initial phase). For the Navaho project authorized by the Senate-approved bill, the original investment would be over $1,500 per acre. Including the cost of the storage units allocated to irrigation, the average direct investment (construction cost) disregarding hidden interest, would be $750 to $900 per acre, varying with the number of projects included.

As compared to these costs, the average value of already irrigated farmlands in the project area is about $150 per acre. Thus, the average investment proposed by the project would be 5 to 6 times the average value of the land after irrigation.

Of the total irrigation investment, the irrigation water users on the average would be able to repay about 12 percent. Consequently, these irrigation projects must be subsidized to the extent of about 88 percent either by power revenues or directly from the Federal Treasury by such devices as allocations for assumed "flood-control benefits," "fish and wildlife benefits," etc.

The Power of Rivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most widely discussed summation of the Hoover Commission will be its final report on water resources and power. This report is of particular interest in my region of the country and, thinking it might be of interest, I present herewith some incisive comments on this report by the editor of the Arizona Daily Star, of Tucson:

THE POWER OF RIVERS

As the Hoover Commission closed its books, it submitted one final report on water and power.

The report urged the sale, lease, or transfer of all federally owned powerplants, along with townsites and related buildings. It also recommended the breaking up of the Tennessee Valley Authority and proposed that the Government stay out of the business of harnessing rivers for power or other purposes.

While the commission was not so drastic in its opinions as was its task force, the proposals it endorsed present the entire nation with a very important problem.

Energy created by man creates production for the use of man.

The waters of the Nation's rivers, the property of all of the people, are a never-ending source of energy once harnessed. Coal mines can and will be depleted; oil and gas reserves are not endless, but are a diminishing asset. The possibilities of atomic energy are not yet fully known. But water-power, tumbling down our rivers, is a great national asset, the value of which is known.

It was the Republicans who, under Theodore Roosevelt, first saw the possibilities of such development and moved the Federal Government into the field of conservation and power production. Republicans under Coolidge and under Hoover, himself, as President, pushed to successful completion the Hoover Dam, most certainly a proper Federal project. The dam has its opposite ends in different States and it impounds the waters draining from several other States. It furnishes power for a great production area which pours, in Federal income taxes, huge sums into the Federal Treasury.

No single private enterprise, no single State, could have sponsored and accomplished this task. In fact, every proposal that Arizonans made that Arizona should attempt the task, was voted down and abandoned because of the impassable difficulties involved.

It was Republicans who saw the feasibility of the Salt River Valley project, a cooperative, built with Federal support in 1912, which turned the Central Valley of Arizona into a great wealth-producing area, which is not only paying the bills for the project, itself, but is creating a great source of income taxes for the Treasury.

The TVA, which the report recommends be broken up, has added immeasurably to the agricultural and industrial wealth of the South by its 650 miles of dams and lakes, not to mention the income derived from recreational uses of the same waters.

These projects, and many similar ones, such as the Bonneville Dam in Washington, which provided the power for the development of plutonium, are the outgrowth of Federal participation. They would not have existed otherwise. There is still a place for the Government in the field of harnessing our rivers for their power potential.

Warning Signals on Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted against H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1955. The measure passed the House, 372 to 31, and now goes to the other body. Because of the widespread public interest in this legislation and its very great importance to millions of Americans, I wish to make very clear the grounds of my opposition. My opposition was twofold:

First. I objected to the legislative procedures followed by the House in its consideration and enactment of this measure.

Second. I was—and am—deeply concerned over the cost and tax implications of these new amendments. I am equally concerned over the warnings of responsible members of both the legislative and executive branches—including many in the House who reluctantly voted for the measure—that it may well jeopardize tht long-term financial soundness and stability, and even the very survival, of the entire social-security system.

Despite insistence of Republican members of the House Committee on Ways and Means, and the urgent appeal of

representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, public hearings on the legislation were denied by the majority of the committee. Testimony of HEW representatives on the bill, taken in a few closed sessions of the committee, was not available to Members of Congress prior to yesterday's vote.

The measure was brought onto the floor of the House under a suspension of the rules, with only 40 minutes of debate permitted proponents and opponents combined, and with no opportunity for amendments.

This measure, lowering the retirement age of women to 62, providing for total disability benefits for covered employees starting at age 50, providing benefits for disabled children, and extending coverage to certain self-employed professional people, contains many desirable features and has objectives which are commendable.

The gag-rule procedures under which the legislation was handled do no credit to the faith of its sponsors in either the merits of the bill or its objectives and do no credit to their faith in the proper legislative processes of full disclosure of facts and free debate.

House adoption of the measure under these conditions follows on the heels of last year's action of Congress extending social-security coverage to many additional millions of self-employed persons. The actuarial implications of this added coverage have not yet been fully assessed. Now scores of additional grave, unanswered questions are raised by the new legislation.

The legislation voted by the House yesterday increases the social-security tax next January 1 on both employer and employee from 2 to 2½ percent. By 1975 the combined tax rate projected in this bill will be 9 percent. The tax on gross (not net) income of self-employed individuals, including farmers, will become 6¾ percent by 1975. It is conservatively estimated that by that year the total social-security tax collections will approximate $20 billion annually. Clearly, the saturation point on this tax has been, or soon will be reached. Other revisions of the law which may prove even more important than those currently proposed, and involving additional costs, may well be precluded. Yet no serious study of the claims or proper priorities of these other possible revisions has been made.

I concur completely with the supplementary views stated by seven members of the Committee on Ways and Means:

We are creating a scale of benefits which must be supported by a social-security tax which, in the not too distant future, will be equal to and in many cases higher than the Federal income tax. * * *

Insofar as the cost of this program is concerned, we should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide even greater benefits and to provide against an ever-wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created. We have succeeded in avoiding the full impact of the costs by shifting most of the burden to the future.

I do not believe it is true devotion to the solution of human needs, to the maintenance of a sound social-security system, or to the welfare of present or future generations, to disregard these warnings. There is no kind of political pressure which can persuade or compel me to disregard these warnings or to share in legislative procedures which refuse even to give adequate hearing either to the warnings or to the facts.

Smokescreen for a Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

SMOKESCREEN FOR A RETREAT

One of the most pertinent and shocking facts now emerges through the smokescreen with which the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower is covering its retreat on the ill-starred Dixon-Yates power contract.

That fact is the full measure of the impropriety of Adolphe H. Wenzell's serving the Government at the same time that his investment house was arranging financing for Dixon-Yates.

Paul H. Miller, an official of First Boston Corp., as was Wenzell at the time, testified Wednesday to the Senate antimonopoly subcommittee that Wenzell drafted the Dixon-Yates financing plan while serving as a consultant to the President's Bureau of the Budget.

He testified that one reason First Boston waived its usual fee for the service—amounting to $150,000—was that it wanted to avoid charges that the bank profited from Wenzell's work with the Budget Bureau.

Yet as late as June 30 President Eisenhower told his press conference:

Mr. Wenzell never was called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract. He was brought in before the contract was ever proposed. My understanding is that quickly as the Dixon-Yates thing came up he resigned.

Senator KEFAUVER proposes to call Budget Director Hughes to explain why no mention of First Boston Corp. was made in the administration's official documentation of Dixon-Yates. The committee might also inquire why the President has been so sadly misinformed and noninformed about Mr. Wenzell's role.

Senator KEFAUVER's committee is hot on the scent of the charge that Mr. Wenzell violated the conflict-of-interest law. This part of the criminal code forbids Government employees outside interests which conflict with their interests as Government servants.

Meanwhile the administration continues to send up new puffs of smoke. General Vogel, Chairman of TVA, reports, as everyone already knew, that the Dixon-Yates plant is no longer needed. Budget Director Hughes reexamines the project at the President's behest. Attorney General Brownell assigns FBI agents to find out if Memphis can really go ahead and build its own steam plant.

Whatever the fate of the Dixon-Yates project—and its future does not appear bright—there should be no letup in the investigation of the Wenzell double role and of the apparent favoring of special interests which has characterized the whole unbusinesslike business.

Labor and Farm Groups Back Private Development of Niagara Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this Congress truly represent the people who send them here, they will not support public development of the power resources of Niagara Falls. For the people do not want it. Municipalities do not want it. Consumers do not want it. Labor does not want it. Farmers do not want it. They have taken a good look at the phoney bookkeeping of the public power enthusiasts and they have identified it for what it is—a governmental device to serve the interests of a few at the cost of the many. Mr. Speaker, there are some hydroelectric sites where public development may be necessary and desirable. Niagara Falls is not one of them. Private enterprise stands ready, willing, and able to develop the power there, just as it has been doing for the past 50 years. The people who will use the power and pay for it want private enterprise to do the job. Why do we temporize? Why don't we listen?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of Leland D. Smith, master of the New York State Grange, and A. J. McMahon, chairman of the National Power Committee of the Utility Workers of America, CIO, before the House Public Works Committee last month.

Mr. Smith, of the Grange, spoke for "135,000 rural and small-town folk, an organization made up of people in the lower- and medium-income brackets."

I want it understood—

He said—

that I am not appearing here in behalf of any corporation or company but only in behalf of what we in the Grange believe to to be the interests of all the people who live within transmission range of Niagara Falls.

The whole issue seems to boil down to the decision between two issues: (1) State owned and controlled subsidized power, or (2) power produced under the management of companies or corporations built by the sale of bonds which are not tax exempt, operated by these companies or corporations who will pay into the local, State, and National treasuries several millions of dollars yearly. This will be done at a time when the local municipalities and the New York State government are casting about desperately to broaden the tax base, also at a time when the Federal Government is turning thums down on the sale of tax-exempt bonds.

There is nothing in the policies of the Grange organization, either in New York State or nationwide, which favors subsidized power at Niagara. One brief statement from the records of our last National Grange session, held at Spokane, Wash., in November 1954 and contained in the report of the committee on national welfare, of which I was a member, states: "We believe that as long as the Federal budget is unbalanced, and the National Government is heavily in debt, Congress should exercise restraint in appropriating public funds for the develop-

ment of national resources unless the development is essential to the national welfare and development by private enterprise is impossible."

Our own New York State Grange has for years been on record favoring private development of Niagara power.

President Eisenhower has stated that the Niagara issue should be resolved in accordance with the wishes of the local people concerned. The Grange is a nonpolitical organization and is only working for what we consider to be the best interests of all people concerned.

The delegate body of our State Grange, comprised of people who are taxpayers in New York coming from 56 counties in the State, have voted unanimously time and time again to allow private companies or corporations to develop the additional power at Niagara, and they fully recognize that the existing corporations, namely, Niagara Hudson, Consolidated Edison, New York State Electric & Gas Co., Rochester Gas & Electric Co., and Central Hudson Power, are the ones that will obtain the capital necessary to do the work.

We of New York do not hold any brief against these companies, because their service and their rates are favorable, and it appears to us that with the increased facilities, these present rates should be lessened.

President Andrew J. McMahon, chairman of the National Power Committee of the CIO, spoke before the House Public Works Committee in opposition to the so-called Buckley bill providing for public development of Niagara power, and in favor of the Miller-Capehart bills, which would allow private enterprise to do the job.

Mr. McMahon said in part:

In our experience, earned at the collective bargaining table at thousands of meetings, we must support H. R. 142 introduced by Representative MILLER, of New York, and/or H. R. 420 introduced by Representative DONDERO.

As union men, we believe these bills are good for us, but more importantly, they are good for the State of New York and the people of the United States.

The record is filled with reasons for our opposition—to H. R. 5706 introduced by Representative BUCKLEY—but there is one significant phase of the Buckley bill which I must refer to. It provides that the licensee, presumably the New York State Power Authority, shall have control over the rates. Note how far-reaching this apparently simple provision actually is. It circumvents the Public Service Commission of the State of New York, which would grant a rate return necessary for the operation of a business—and unions can only get increased wages out of increased profits, which come, at least in part, from increased prices. Actually, this control of resale prices together with the use of the so-called preference clause would set up in New York State something approaching the Tennessee Valley Authority and unions just don't do well with the TVA.

Letter From President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last I addressed a letter to President Eisenhower wishing him Godspeed on his mission to Europe.

In response I have a letter from the President which is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 15, 1955.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am deeply touched by your kind letter of July 14, and shall carry in my mind its message as I leave this evening for Geneva. Thank you very much for taking the time to convey this message to me.

With best personal wishes,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Atomic Power Is Born in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on July 18, 1955, for the first time in America, and perhaps in the world, electric energy of commercial quantity was generated from atomic energy. On that day, Lewis L. Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, threw the switch which closed the circuit and sent the electricity into the network of the Niagara-Hudson Power Corp. to be used in lighting homes and factories of the people in central New York. It was momentous and historic occasion which I was privileged to observe, and represented the culmination of many years of planning and effort on the part of thousands of persons directly and indirectly engaged in the atomic energy program. The address of Mr. Strauss is attached herewith:

Looking ahead to this occasion during the past few days, I found myself thinking back to an event that preceded this one by 12½ years.

I tried to create in my mind's eye what the scene must have been on that raw winter's afternoon of December 2, 1942, under the stands of Stagg Field Stadium at the University of Chicago. There, you will remember, Enrico Fermi and his small group of associates prepared to start the first atomic reactor.

What were their emotions in that moment of eternity? Did any vision of the future reveal itself to them as the control rods were slowly inched out of the slots in that primitive pile of uranium and graphite?

Of course, there could be no public celebration of that event. Another 2½ years were to pass before the secret could be told of man's success in mastering the energy of the invisible atom by means of a self-sustained chain reaction.

Dr. Fermi and the other scientists who were guardians of that awesome secret foresaw even then just such a day as this when the energy they had brought under control would be used to light homes, provide propulsion and turn the wheels of industry.

They knew that 1 pound of uranium—a piece no larger than a golf ball—if fissioned completely, could produce as much energy as 2½ million pounds of coal. The energy bound up in such a 1-pound ingot of natural uranium would represent about 3 million kilowatt-hours of electricity. Or to express it slightly differently, 400 to 500 pounds of natural uranium could provide all the electric power currently used in the United States, assuming that complete fission could be achieved. It was early recognized that, in a reactor designed for the purpose, the uranium could be so handled as to breed more fissionable material at the same time it was furnishing heat. In this respect, upranium has a potential which conventional fuels do not possess.

However, on that December day in 1942, the men gathered around that first atomic reactor had little time to speculate on the future. Dreams of atomic power for man's peaceful pursuits had to be put aside. We were at war, and the goal was to win a deadly race to produce an atomic weapon. We had good reason to believe that the Germans were working on such a weapon, and it was clear that we had no recourse but to see that we were not bested and beaten to that goal.

Once the war was over, we were compelled to continue the development of nuclear weapons, because no other prudent course lay open to us. On the strength of our defenses rested our hopes of escaping from another catastrophic war. Nevertheless, we were determined to move as rapidly as possible in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy in our own country, and to encourage similar development in other countries. As a Nation, we have good reason to be proud of the use we have made of the peaceful atom and of our cooperation with friendly nations abroad.

Fermi's first pile of uranium and graphite bricks was but a primitive ancestor and bore hardly any resemblance to the SIR Mark A reactor housed here at West Milton in its huge shell of steel.

Fermi's pile had a computed normal power level of one-half watt and, for a few minutes on that December day, it was allowed to rise to a level of 2 watts—barely enough to light a flashlight.

Today, as the mere byproduct of a reactor designed, not to provide commercial power but to propel a submarine, we are met to turn over to the people, for their peaceful pursuits, up to 10 million watts of electricity—5 million times the power level of Fermi's pile of only 12½ years ago.

Surely this is an exciting occasion, but even so, we must bear in mind that we are only now arrived at a point in the atomic age comparable perhaps to that reached by the caveman who discovered that he could make fire by rubbing two sticks together, and who went on to dig a pot hole in the floor of this cave and chisel out a smoke hole in the roof so he might warm himself and cook his food. It took thousands of years before his descendents learned to put that heat through engines to drive their trains, ships and planes and do all the multitude of things that we now perform with the relatively feeble energy derived from the chemical reaction we know as fire.

We are just at the small beginning of trying to apply the great energy of atomic reaction, but our program should be vastly accelerated by our accumulated knowledge. Each forward step such as the one which is occurring here today, adds to that store of knowledge.

In a matter of minutes now, the homes and industries of this part of the Nation are to receive several thousand kilowatts of atomic electric power.

In 2 years or less our first full-scale plant to produce commercial electrical power from atomic energy will be supplying 60,000 kilowatts of electricity to the Pittsburgh area. That plant, for which President Eisenhower broke ground last Labor Day, is under construction at Shippingport, Pa.

American companies, and groups of companies and cooperatives in various parts of the United States stand ready, as of now, to build 6 commercial atomic power plants with a total capacity of 765,000 kilowatts and have them completed within the next 5 years, at a total cost of nearly $250 million. Some of these groups are prepared to pay the entire cost out of their own pockets without any financial help from the Federal Government, even though atomic power plants are not yet a paying proposition, that is to say, they are not as yet economically competitive with conventional plants.

American industry, large and small, is in the picture in an impressive way. In close partnership with the Federal Government under the new Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the role of industry will grow and grow.

The feasibility of using the great heat generated in atomic fission to make steam, which is in turn used in turbo-generators to produce electricity (as is the process which we will see demonstrated here in a few moments) was given a practical demonstration by the Atomic Energy Commission as long ago as December 1951, although on a considerably smaller and more intimate scale than that we are now about to witness.

On that earlier occasion, using a small pilot-type reactor of the experimental breeder design, we converted enough atomic energy into electricity to satisfy the needs of a good-sized commercial building. That was at the Commission's testing station in Idaho. That is to say, a 250-kilowatt generator added to the reactor supplied enough electricity to run the machinery and provide lighting for the reactor building.

Again, in March of 1953, at the Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the same results were achieved with an entirely different type of reactor, a homogeneous experimental type.

In each case, of course, the amount of electrical power produced was too small to be commercial. Not until today, has a sufficient amount of power been produced as the byproduct of an experimental reactor to make its commercial distribution practical.

However, there can no longer be any question of the feasibility of atomic power. The atomic submarine, the *Nautilus*, has provided impressive testimony of that.

Our second atomic submarine, the *Sea Wolf*, is to be launched at Groton, Conn., on Thursday of this week. The reactor which will provide the electric power for today's event, is, as you know, the land-based prototype of the liquid metal-cooled reactor which will go into the *Sea Wolf*. It is the first full-scale reactor of this type.

This prototype reactor for the *Sea Wolf* went "critical"—that is, it achieved sustaining nuclear chain reaction for the first time—on March 20. And just 2 months ago to the day, its first useful power turned its own turbines and propeller shaft.

It is interesting to note that, since May 18, when this occurred, the Atomic Energy Commission has had three power reactors operating simultaneously—this one at West Milton, the land prototype of the *Nautilus* reactor at the commission's reactor testing station in Idaho, and the atomic power plant aboard the *Nautilus* herself.

As I have said, this prototype reactor which stands ready now to release its power into waiting homes and industries, was not built with the intention of serving as a commercial power plant. It was conceived, built and operated on an experimental basis to provide design information and develop operating techniques for its "sister plant" to be installed aboard the *Sea Wolf*.

Therefore, the submarine intermediate reactor which is sealed inside the large steel sphere here at West Milton might properly be regarded as a military device. Certainly its prime purpose was to enable us to develop the most efficient power plant possible for one of our newest and most effective weapons of defense.

The capabilities of the *Sea Wolf*, the amount of power at her command and other details of her power plant and performance must be secret. And this prototype of her atomic power plant must likewise remain so classified, in the interest of our national security, even though that prototype is today being converted to the most benign purposes.

To my mind, this circumstance—that is to say, the fact that this plant was designed and built to serve a military function—is the most appealing aspect of this wholly peaceful occasion.

I find it appealing for this reason. All of you will surely recall President Eisenhower's stirring speech to the United Nations on December 8, 1953—when he launched his proposal which has since come to be generally known as "atoms for peace."

Let me briefly quote from that speech, which has inspired and lifted the hopes of men and women all over the world. They are words that deserve to be heard again and again:

"It is not enough to take this weapon out of the hands of the soldiers. It must be put into the hands of those who will know how to strip its military casing and adapt it to the arts of peace. The United States knows that if the fearful trend of atomic military buildup can be reversed, this greatest of destructive forces can be developed into a great boon, for the benefit of all mankind."

The President went on to say:

"The United States pledges • • • to devote its entire heart and mind to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

Now today, this atomic powerplant designed and constructed for experimental military purposes is being consecrated—in the most convincing manner possible—to the benefit of man.

It is a moving demonstration that the atom can indeed be stripped of its military casing and adapted to the arts of peace.

What we are about to do may well stand as a symbol of our hopes and aspirations for the day when the atom will serve only as the servant of man, and never again as his destroyer.

Like this submarine prototype reactor, now converted to the production of civilian power, our atomic weapons stockpile also has another and happier potential. Conventional weapons such as shells, tanks, guns, and planes become obsolete with time and whatever is recoverable is by salvage at a fraction of their cost.

But when the day which we pray for finally comes,—when our atomic devices are no longer necessary to deter aggression, then the nuclear components can easily be converted into material, such as is in this reactor, to become great sources of beneficent power, providing the conveniences and blessings of peace to our people.

Beside me stands a large two-way switch. If I throw its blade in one direction it will turn the propellor shaft of a military weapon.

But when I throw it in the other direction, as I about to do, it will send atomic electric power surging through transmission lines to towns and villages, farms and factories—power not to burst bombs or propel submarines, but to make life easier, healthier and more abundant.

This switch is a symbol of the great dilemma of our age.

I throw it now to the side of the peaceful atom and by that choice we of the United States mark the beginning of a fulfillment of the scriptural injunction of Isaiah:

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks."

Sabotage of the Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial commenting on a book by Herbert Hollander entitled "Crisis in the Civil Service." The editorial was reprinted from a recent issue of the Louisville Times on the editorial page of the St. Louis Post Dispatch:

SABOTAGE OF THE CIVIL SERVICE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Trend away from patronage has been reversed and merit principle is being undermined in Eisenhower administration, editorial says; challenges partisanship in White House; says President acts as hidebound Republican though he owes little to party.)

Friends of the Federal civil service have been increasingly alarmed during President Eisenhower's administration. One of them, Herbert Hollander, of Washington, has written a book. Its title is indicative "Crisis in the Civil Service."

According to Mr. Hollander: "Through the years, by dint of prodigious effort, the percentage of Federal positions subject to patronage appointment—to the spoils system—was steadily reduced.

"Today that trend is being reversed and the undermining of the merit principle goes forward on a much larger scale than is generally recognized and by various means. The need for a new effort to combat the rising tide of spoilsmanship can not be doubted."

Here is one aspect of the greatest oddity of politics in our time. Nobody had reason to believe that President Eisenhower would countenance a spoils system at the expense of the merit system in the Government service.

His predecessors, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, were both adepts in the school of politics. Mr. Eisenhower had never been to that school. The last thing that might have been expected of him was that he would turn out to be a hog for patronage.

But in this and other ways he sometimes makes Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman look almost nonpartisan. At the outset Mr. Eisenhower appointed a few Democrats to office—conspicuously Mrs. Hobby, of Texas.

But these were Democrats who had bolted their party in Mr. Eisenhower's behalf in 1952. They were rewarded in accordance with an ancient patronage principle.

For the appointment of an actual Democrat to any place of consequence, Mr. Eisenhower waited until last month. He made Gordon Gray an Assistant Secretary of Defense for international affairs. Generally in positions having to do with foreign relations, Mr. Eisenhower's aversion to Democrats has become notorious.

And this in spite of the fact that his own Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, was more than once called upon by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman.

Mr. Eisenhower's whole outlook was probably indicated when he appointed his campaign manager of 1952, Arthur Summerfield, as Postmaster General.

To put a politico in this position was the traditional thing to do. President Truman had set a different and refreshing example.

When Robert E. Hannegan quit the office, Mr. Truman selected in his place a career man of the postal service, Jesse M. Donald-

son. But Mr. Eisenhower cast aside this heartening precedent.

Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Truman ever made such a campaign for the election of a Democratic Congress at midterm as Mr. Eisenhower made for the election of a Republican Congress in 1954.

It was a campaign spectacular for partisan exaggeration. It was conducted in the face of the fact that, even if it had been successful, Mr. Eisenhower would still have needed Democratic votes for his program on Capitol Hill.

Many of the members, even some of the leaders, of his own party in Congress consider themselves under little or no obligation to give him legislative support.

Why is the President in so many ways such a hidebound Republican, even to the point of undermining the Civil Service? He has no reason to be grateful to the party.

The obligation is the other way around. The party could not have won without him in 1952 and could not conceivably hope to win without him next year.

Yet, he repeatedly acts as if he were somehow beholden to its ward heelers and job brokers.

We repeat, this is the greatest oddity of politics in our time.

Cardinal Mindszenty and Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Monday, July 18, 1955:

THE CARDINAL AND GENEVA

Gratification over the conditional release of Cardinal Mindszenty from his life prison term, just as the Geneva conference opens, shouldn't make us forget that this Hungarian Catholic leader never should have been in prison in the first place.

The trial and imprisonment of the Cardinal is only one of thousands of crimes committed against humanity by the Communists at the direction of the Kremlin—the same Kremlin whose leaders are posing in Switzerland today as great lovers of mankind and peace.

The Mindszenty trial in 1949 was the high-point of the ruthless Red campaign against religion in the Eastern European satellites. In the end, the Reds liquidated the Catholic Church in those countries as an effective instrument of Christianity.

Cardinal Mindszenty is not to be a free man. The Hungarian announcement merely said the Cardinal was to be "allowed to interrupt his term of imprisonment" because of his "advanced age and state of health." Cardinal Mindszenty is only 63.

The gesture can be interpreted only as another propaganda step on the eve of the conference. It costs the Communists little to be "magnanimous" with Cardinal Mindszenty. They assume people will not read between the lines or remember the past but only say: "See, the Communists have even changed their approach to religion."

The Soviets harvested a lot of similar hay on the Austrian treaty. The Western World, including its leaders, hailed the treaty so highly people forgot it was a tough treaty for Austria and that a gentler one should have been signed years ago.

The "interruption" of Cardinal Mindszenty's prison term is another of the gestures, cheap for the Communists to make, by which they hope to be accepted at Geneva as decent and repentant beings worthy of Western concessions and trust.

Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov warned the West at San Francisco the Soviets had made their concessions and that it was now the West's turn. President Eisenhower and his Western colleagues will hear more of this same tune at Geneva.

Kitimat—Triumph for Pioneering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of the House a series of three articles by Mr. Nat S. Finney, Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News staff reporter, as they appeared in the June 28, 29, and 30, 1955, editions of the Buffalo Evening News.

Mr. Finney, in my opinion, has done an excellent job of reporting on the financing and building of Aluminum Company of Canada's new power project in the wilds of British Columbia.

The articles follow:

KITIMAT—TRIUMPH FOR PIONEERING: PRIVATE CAPITAL DRAGS POWER OUT OF CANADIAN WILDS—QUARTER OF BILLION DOLLARS, 70 PERCENT FROM UNITED STATES, HELPS FINANCE ALCAN'S HUGE PROJECT IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

(This is the first of three articles on the financing and building of the Aluminum Company of Canada's new power project in the wilds of British Columbia.)

(By Nat S. Finney)

KITIMAT, BRITISH COLUMBIA, June 28.—The private investor's dollar today is cracking open North America's greatest resource of power and water in this damp and craggy upper left hand corner of the continent.

A quarter of a billion dollars—an amount comparable to what taxpayers have ponied up for public projects just south of the Canadian border has been sunk already in the Aluminum Company of Canada's huge project here.

And on the drafting boards of ALCAN's engineers are plans for spending as much again to turn the melting snows of British Columbia's Tweedsmuir Park area into power to run miles-and-more of potlines that transform Jamaican bauxite into fine aluminum.

Most of the money—some 70 percent of it, according to the stockholders' records of Aluminum, Ltd., the holding company that owns ALCAN—has come from the United States, where such grandiose projects have come to be considered Government monopolies.

DOLLARS TAKE CHANCE

Up here where the mountains comb 200 inches of rain and more out of sodden winds off the Japan current the spirit is different.

Canada's westernmost province didn't trouble to ask the dollars needed to build Kitimat-Kemano, whether they were public or private dollars. What British Columbia wanted to know was whether or not the dollars were willing to go north and take a chance.

One of the odd things about the transaction that brought ALCAN into this wilderness was that the British Columbian government knew ALCAN's private dollars were going to do it before ALCAN's officials had made up their minds.

The excitement stirred by this vision of giants in the earth had reached a pitch where British Columbians knew ALCAN could not turn back. They said so, and ALCAN's officials, who are a hard-headed crew, had to admit they were captives of a great dream.

LIKE 100 YOSEMITES

It is hard to see Kitimat-Kemano from close up. An amphibious aircraft drops down into the fjord that shapes the Douglas Channel, and there are the smoking potlines, the huge scar of the developing townsite, clawed from a primeval forest. That's Kitimat.

Kemano, where the power is generated, is reached by boat—down the Douglas Channel to Devastation Channel, through Alan Reach and Barrie Reach to the Kemano River. The deep, salt water inlets are slots in snow-clad mountains off which the green glacier water cascades in a hundred Yosemites.

To see the scheme in its grand design it is necessary to lift high over the Pacific ranges and look down, so to speak, on a 200-mile-wide landscape stretching from the 125 degree longitude to longitude 129—from Kenney Dam, which plugs an enormous drainage basin, to the open sea of Queen Carlotte Sound.

HARNESSED IN CAVERN

In this wide area $250 million of private capital is literally lifting the face of the continent. A great chunk of the headwaters of the Frazer River, which flows east and then south, is turned around and poured into the northern ocean.

But with this difference. The waters, as they drop through the great barrier of mountains between Tahtsa Lake and the Kenano River, 2,600 feet closer to sea level, are put in harness inside Mount DuBose.

In an enormous cavern, which eventually will house 16 generators, each capable of producing 150,000 horsepower of electricity, there is a practical answer to the question of "Where are the snows of yesteryear."

Even this birdseye view of the Tweedsmuir Park-Kitimat-Kemano area falls short of conveying the excitement of what's happening in the upper left hand corner of the continent. This development—with a conservatively estimated 2,240,000 horsepower potential—is just one bite out of a mother lode of natural energy.

UNESTIMATED POWER

For a complete view it's necessary to glimpse a quarter of the earth's sphere. Pick up the enormous ocean current that sweeps, warm and humid, up the coast of Asia and across the north Pacific. Chill westerly winds supercharge themselves from the warm sea to produce the Aleutian fogs.

The mountains of Southern Alaska, the Yukon, and British Columbia seem to have been designed by nature to comb the moisture from these winds, and to dump it as rain or snow before the winds, which keep pushing south and east across North America, reach the central plains of Canada and the United States.

How much power could be had from all this snow and water is a matter of wild guestimation. ALCAN's experts say 10 million horsepower "feasible for harnessing" in British Columbia alone. But they add, as a hedge, that nobody listed Kitimat-Kemano as "feasible for harnessing" 20 years ago.

KITIMAT—TRIUMPH FOR PIONEERING: POLYGLOT CREW CUT ALCAN'S HUGE WORKS OUT OF WILDS—OLE SANDSTROM, BOSS OF CONSTRUCTION, LOSES HIS COMPOSURE WHEN HE TELLS OF DIFFICULTIES

(This is the second of three articles on the financing and building of the Aluminum Co. of Canada's new power project in the wilds of British Columbia.)

(By Nat S. Finney)

KEMANO, BRITISH COLUMBIA, June 29.—Ole Sandstrom, who bossed construction at this far-northern Alcan Aluminum Works, cannot be calm about his recollections of how $250,000,000 of private money got invested here.

So before Ole talks about how it all happened, the toastmaster takes a fast glance around the room to make sure, and says:

"All right, Ole. No ladies are present, so you can go right ahead."

When Boss Sandstrom landed here with his first crews in May of 1951, they had to wade ashore at the mouth of the Kemano River.

The river was no good for navigation, and its banks were crowded with huge cedars, spruce, hemlocks, and black birch. The site for the powerhouse was 15 miles upstream.

SIGNS IN EIGHT LANGUAGES

Construction men were scarce that year. Boss Sandstrom took what he could get—a small corps of seasoned men; and a gang of untested navvies, collected from halfway around the earth.

"The safety signs had to be done in eight languages," says Ole, with adjectives appropriate to his strong feelings about such an odd lot. "The guy who could understand you and tell the Lithuanians what to do was a valuable guy."

Ole Sandstrom's story of the months it took to cut into the Kemano wilderness unfolds with an obligato of sulphurous gripes over all the work that had to be done before his crews could begin working.

Close to 400 miles of road had to be busted through forest and mountain. Channels had to be dredged. Docks built. Sites cleared and foundations secured.

SAND AND GRAVEL MOUNTAIN

"I learned one lesson," says Boss Sandstrom with a rueful, twisted grin. "If you're going to have a lot of snow, figure out some place to put it. Don't be a bonehead like I was. I got stuck with 5 feet of snow and no place to put it."

But Ole Sandstrom's luck wasn't all bad. At Kitimat he discovered a sand and gravel mountain. "Only sandpit I ever saw," he grins, "where you can scoop it out from the bottom."

To get bulldozers into the gap in the Nechako Mountains where he wanted to build Kenney Dam, Boss Sandstrom had to hack a highway to the Canadian National Railway that runs between Prince George and Prince Rupert. From Vanderhoof, British Columbia, 60 miles of 2-lane road now lets tourist into the Nechako Canyon.

LONG POWER LINE

Kennedy Dam isn't the highest rock-filled dam in the world—only the largest from the standpoint of fill. It took 1,000 men and some new tricks to make the plug that has created a 358-square-mile reservoir that assures Kemano powerhouse unlimited water, but by November 1952, the gates of a diversion tunnel were closed and storage began.

Boss Sandstrom doesn't waste his expletives on Kennedy Dam. That was routine. What makes the corn pop in Ole Sandstrom's vocabulary is the powerline from the Kemano powerhouse to the Kitimat aluminum potlines. This line "traverses 50 miles of rugged mountain terrain," according to Alcan's handbook on the project. To Boss Sandstrom every one of those miles is possessed of a personal Sandstrom devil. Landslides cut him off when he got a crew in. Helicopters had to fly in the groceries. Roads went out when cloudbursts hit the upper end of Kemano Canyon.

WANTED ROOM FOR OTHERS

There were plenty of days, Boss Sandstrom admits, when carrying that power over Kitdala Pass to Kitimat—where there was room for factory and town sites—seemed crazy. Why not stick the smelters in at Kemano?

That could have been done—maybe. But the Aluminum Company of Canada had some ideas about private enterprise that couldn't have been fitted into the limited space at the foot of Mount DuBose, inside which the powerplant is located.

Alcan executives don't say so directly, but they make it clear they don't want to be put in the position of monopolizing the power they are wringing out of the northern snows.

They hope—and expect—that there'll be other industry, not Alcan-owned, at Kitimat. There's room there for a big pulp and paper mill, and power to run it when it arrives.

KITIMAT—TRIUMPH FOR PIONEERING: ALCAN IS BUILDING MODEL COMMUNITY

(This is the last of three articles on the financing of building of the Aluminum Company of Canada's new power project in the wilds of British Columbia.)

(By Nat S. Finney)

KITIMAT, BRITISH COLUMBIA, June 30.—The Aluminum Company of Canada is private enterprise, but it is not going to have either a blighted industrial neighborhood or a disgruntled company town on its hands 20 years from now, when it expects 50,000 people will live here.

It won't, that is, if some very bold outlays of private dollars and some far-seeing planning can prevent the site of its newest aluminum smelter from going sour.

R. E. (Rip) Powell, the Illinois-born president of Alcan, would lift his bushy eyebrows with distaste were it suggested these bold outlays and vaulting plans are motivated by an attack of guilty social conscience at past offennses of the private dollar.

INVESTMENT IN COMMUNITY

He doesn't, of course, want to head a company that's wearing a social black eye. He's not unaware of the fact that unhappy people have their ways of getting back at big businesses they think have done them dirty. These would be good negative reasons for what Alcan is doing in the upper left-hand corner of the continent.

The affirmative reason is a conviction born of experience, that good business and healthy communities go together, and that when a business and a community are born together, as much foresight ought to be invested in the community as is invested in the business.

In 1950 Kitimat was an Indian settlement of 500. The settlement is still there at the head of Douglas Channel. But the towering forest that covered the land that rises from the head of navigation and the Kitimat River is being slugged and bulldozed down.

LORDLY TREES GONE

Where spruce and cedar once groped up 150 feet for a share of sunlight there are fire hydrants sprouting up and manhole covers. The gigantic machinery that moves the earth in modern days is slicing out roads and grading homesites.

It's a sorry fact that the lordly trees are gone. But the truth is no single tree of the primeval forest can stand against the winds alone. There's no alternative but to start from the bare earth up to create the arboreal beauty of a mature city.

Alcan hired city planners for its grand design—men like Clarence S. Stein who have proved they're immune from the hatbrim-horizon that has cramped most developments.

TEN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

The residential areas—which are several miles distant from the industrial area and across the river from the service center—are surveyed out for air and view. There are 10 neighborhoods, each looped by a thoroughfare, each with its own projected school, each with its separate shopping center.

No child should ever have to cross a thoroughfare to get to school in Kitimat. A curious statistic tells the story of minimized traffic hazards. In British Columbia as a whole—and the Province is far from urbanized—there are 6 miles of city thoroughfare for each 1,000 persons. In Kitimat the figures will be 2 miles per thousand.

The goal at Kitimat is private home ownership, private ownership of retail and service business, tax-supported utilities and schools.

TELLS NOBODY WHAT TO BUILD

But Alcan isn't kidding itself that this will happen without the corporation putting some yeast in the buckwheat cakes.

To get things moving—the areas for the first two neighborhoods stripped and graded, the sewers and water in, etc.—Alcan has dropped $10 million of its money in the community pot.

Furthermore, Alcan has used some of its business muscle to get mortgage money on good terms. (These are about the same terms that American investment companies are offering in United States cities.)

But Alcan tells nobody what to build or where to build, and it keeps its nose strictly out of the civic business, leaving that to the local reeve—the name the mayor goes by because incorporated Kitimat is a hybrid of town and county.

How will it all come out? Nobody is cocksure, but there's a lot of quiet confidence, and now and then a star or two in the eyes of the people who have come way up here to work out their destiny, accepting isolation and a somewhat noxious climate.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the benefit-cost ratio of the upper Colorado River project has been distorted contrary to reclamation law in an attempt to justify the project's unsound economics.

The bill would, in effect, approve the use of the so-called benefit-cost ratio for testing the economic justification of irrigation projects. This has never been authorized by law. The testimony shows that, as now practiced, the benefit-cost ratio is simply a device used in attempting to justify projects which are both economically and financially infeasible, first, by use of fictitious and unrealistic values to inflate the benefits, while, second, at the same time overlooking factors of cost to the Nation which would result from the project.

Example No. 1: On one participating project—the Hammond—the Reclamation Bureau would collect from the farmers only $2.02 per acre per year, but

says the direct benefits are $11.50 per acre per year, or 2,000 percent of the amount it would require the farmer to pay. This contrast in benefits and repayment ability is simply not believable. Any formula achieving such a result obviously needs a drastic overhauling.

Example No. 2: The Government's revenues from firm power production at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams would be decreased as much as 25 percent during the time—which may be as long as 25 years—the storage dams of the proposed project are filling. This loss has been ignored by the Bureau.

In view of these major discrepancies, coupled with the fact that most of the projects named in the bill have a marginal benefit-cost ratio under the Bureau's own figures, there should be an independent review of the Bureau's computations by a group of impartial expert economists. On the Seedskadee project, for instance, the Bureau had to find $638,500 of indirect benefits and $313,100 of public benefits to add to the finding of $614,500 in direct benefits—all items over a 100-year period—to arrive at a final ratio of only 1.46 to 1. The indirect-benefits category includes such nebulous factors as "the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers," while the public-benefits category is even more speculative, including dollar figures for Bureau guesses as to the "increase or improvement in settlement and investment opportunities, community facilities, and services and stabilization of the local and regional economy."

The only true criterion of economic justification of reclamation is reimbursability which has been the required basis of findings of feasibility since the inception of Federal reclamation in 1902. It should be maintained in the law without change. This the project utterly fails to do.

Bread on the Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my privilege to call to the attention of this House the gallant achievement of a young lady in my district, Miss Greta Patterson, of Batavia, N. Y., who celebrated the Fourth of July by swimming across Lake Erie from Angola in the United States to Crystal Beach in Canada.

Miss Patterson's accomplishment proved to be such an inspiration to her fellow townsmen that they have started a campaign to raise $100,000 to build a Greta Patterson Community Swimming Pool.

Last week, the fund-raising drive received a tremendous boost. It was a gift of more than $12,000, and it came from Charles R. Bishop, a sightless veteran of World War II, and now a Batavia businessman. What gave the gift wings was the fact that it represented funds given to Charles Bishop by his fellow Batavians 10 years ago, when he returned home, sightless, from the war.

Mr. Bishop said he had been trying for a long time to find a way to repay the community for its generosity, and believed the Greta Patterson Swimming Pool was the answer. "My prayer," he said, "is that the swimming pool drive will be a success."

With such an inspiring start, how could it do other than succeed?

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an account of the Greta Patterson Community Swimming Pool Fund and Mr. Bishop's gift to it, from the Batavia Daily News of July 14, 1955:

BLINDED WORLD WAR II VETERAN WILL DONATE FUND GIVEN TO HIM FOR COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOL—CHARLES R. BISHOP SAYS HE WANTS TO GIVE IT ALL—OVER $12,000

Declaring that he wants "to do something for the community that has been so good to me," Charles R. Bishop, 31, sightless World War II veteran, today said he will donate the entire fund that the community raised for him to the Greta Patterson Community Swimming Pool Fund.

His gift, amounting to over $12,000 and representing more than an eighth of the $100,000 goal, is contingent upon the swimming pool appeal being a success.

In other words, his donation will immediately go into the Swimming Pool Fund as soon as other contributoins bring it within approximately $12,000 of the amount needed to construct the pool.

WANTS TO HELP

"I have been hearing about the community swimming pool," said the World War II veteran who now operates the Smoke Shop at 6½ Main St. "The more I got thinking about it, the more I knew I wanted to help.

"I figured the best thing I could do was give the money that the community gave to me back to the community to help make sure we would have a swimming pool. I know how much I would have enjoyed it if there had been one in Batavia when I was small.

"REPAY COMMUNITY

"I know that a swimming pool would mean so much to so many. In a way, I would repay my fellow-veterans, particularly through the enjoyment it would give their children and it would help repay the community, too.

"I know of no way where I will ever need to use the money. I have my own little business. I get Government and State financial aid because I was blinded. That should meet my needs.

"My prayer is that the swimming pool drive will be an overwhelming success. I feel that the money that has been given to me should go back to the people who were so kind to me. I believe the swimming pool is the answer."

SHOT BY SNIPER

It was on October 12, 1945, that Charles Bishop was shot by a Japanese sniper while he was on guard duty in Yokohama in Japanese vengeance carried out almost 2 months after hostilities were to have ceased.

Several hours passed before he was found by other Americans. The sniper's bullet penetrated near his right temple, went through his right eye and came out through his left eyebrow, clipping off the optical nerves.

His Army identification and his billfold containing papers and $25 had been stripped from him. Identification was made from a letter he had received from his brother, Robert E., now of 130 North Spruce St., which was found in his shirt pocket.

CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED

Long hospitalization ensued in Japan and the United States. He returned to Batavia in 1946 and opened the Smoke Shop.

In November and December of 1945, through the News, the Charles Bishop Fund was raised. Its purpose was to serve to finance him in any business he might desire. Scores of contributions were received.

The total was $10,368.63. It was invested in Government bonds with Eber L. Palmer, superintendent of the State School for the Blind, Milton R. Miller, editor and publisher of the News, Warren W. Hawley, Jr., former president of the State Farm Bureau Federation, Rev. T. Bernard Kelly, rector of St. Joseph's Church, and Harry L. Page, Jr., director of the Genesee County Veterans' Service Agency, as trustees.

MATURITY VALUE $13,775

The value of the bonds is now approximately $12,000. If allowed to go to maturity, the bonds' value would increase to $13,775. The only expense was the rental of a safety deposit box.

One $5,000 issue matures December 15, 1957; another a $5,000, January 14, 1958; another $2,375, May 4, 1958; and another $1,400, May 18, 1958.

Charles Bishop said that he will leave the bonds intact so that their value increases until the campaign reaches the point of requiring the money to assure the pool.

The Batavian credits Rev. W. Wylie Young, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church and cochairman of the swimming pool fund, with "giving me the first idea. I happened to hear him one day over WBTA when he devoted the program to the swimming pool project.

"I talked it over with my parents. They agreed. So did my brothers."

Wednesday afternoon, Charles conferred with the trustees at the home of Mr. Palmer. They, too, concurred, assuring him that it was "his money and up to him to do with it as he deemed best."

Charles resides with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer P. Bishop at 27 Holland Ave.

The Battle Is Won After 27 Long Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to designate the dam to be constructed across the Green River at Eagle Gorge in the State of Washington as the "Howard A. Hanson Dam." Since 1928 when an organized effort began to control the Green River's flood ravages, Col. Howard A. Hanson has led the area committee for this flood-control program.

In support of this legislation, I include an editorial from the July 15, 1955, Seattle Times. This fine editorial, I believe, expresses the sentiment of all the communities and individuals who have worked together for this project.

The editorial is as follows:

THE BATTLE IS WON AFTER 27 LONG YEARS

Only President Eisenhower's signature is needed now to crown with victory the Seattle area's 27-year fight for a full-scale flood-control program on the Green River, based

on a dam across that stream at Eagle Gorge. Congress has approved an initial Federal appropriation of $1 million for construction of the dam. No one has the slightest notion that the President will reverse the decision.

The Federal appropriation will release a $1,500,000 contribution to the cost of the project by the State of Washington, voted by every State legislature since the session of 1949; plus $500,000 added by King County, earmarked by the county commissioners for this purpose 6 years ago. The President's approval of the appropriation bill will be the signal for the Army Corps of Engineers to proceed with preliminaries leading to construction of the dam.

It would be difficult to find in Seattle's history many enactments of the Congress more directly conducive to the material progress of Seattle and its immediate hinterland to the south. The project will safeguard from flood dangers the rich farmlands of the Green River Valley and facilitate the development of wide river shorelands, ideally situated for big payroll industries along the lower banks of the stream, where it becomes the Duwamish.

From the beginning of the fight for this flood-control program, it has been a major project of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. It was in 1928 that a meeting was called in Auburn to discuss means of curbing the Green River's frequent flood ravages. Representing the Seattle Chamber was the chairman of its rivers and harbors committee, Col. Howard A. Hanson.

From that day to this, Colonel Hanson has been the spearhead of continuous efforts to forward the undertaking. There have been few examples of such long and determined personal dedication to a single public cause. When the dam at Eagle Gorge is completed, it would be unthinkable for it to be given any name but his in perpetual recognition of his tireless services.

Many others deserve credit for work in behalf of this project. Every Member of the State's delegation in Congress for the past 10 years, and back before that, has had some hand in supporting it in Congress. State officials and legislators, officials of the King County and Seattle municipal governments and of the port of Seattle, along with men from all the Green River valley communities, have worked to promote this undertaking.

On many an occasion, delegations have made the trip to Washington, D. C., sometimes at their own expense, to speak for it. The Army Corps of Engineers has backed it since it first was recommended in 1947 by Col. L. H. Hewitt, then district Army engineer here. The names of the late Charles L. Wartelle, former city enginer, and the late W. Chester Morse, former city engineer and water superintendent, should not be omitted from this listing.

The congressional commitment of Federal funds for th Green-Duwamish River project opens new and significant vistas for the future development of this area and for the material and economic welfare of its people.

The Whitfield Story and Dixon-Yates—The President Deserves Better Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Friday, July 15, 1955:

ENTITLED TO THE BEST

The Office of President of the United States is so overwhelming in its unending demands that no one who occupies it could hope to make every decision on his own. He must in the very nature of things depend most of the time on the advice of others in deciding what he will do and say.

This means that Dwight D. Eisenhower is entitled to the very best advice a man can possibly have. Yet the lamentable fact is that all too often he does not get even mediocre advice let alone the best. All too often he gets downright bad advice and lands in unnecessary trouble.

Fortunately for himself and for the country President Eisenhower has from time to time reversed himself or substantially modified his position and thus has extricated himself from the consequences of the bad advice provided him. It is all to Mr. Eisenhower's credit for him to do this. We may be grateful when he acts on the facts after they finally get before him. Five instances will suggest that bad advice goes to the President with unhappy frequency.

After the report of the Clay Commission on a Federal program for highway construction, the President was persuaded to indorse in effect its plan for use of special Federal highway bonds to finance the road program. This plan was a device to get around an unbalanced budget and the objections to it as well as the arguments in its favor should have been presented fully to the President. But he was so poorly advised that he soon found the administration plan under sharp attack from no less an Eisenhower admirer than Senator BYRD of Virginia. Recently the White House has let it be known that it will accept a compromise solution to the road problem.

Last March the Civil Aeronautics Board recommended that permits of Pan-American Airways and Northwest Airlines be renewed for the flight from Seattle to Honolulu. Acting on advice within the Cabinet, the President overruled the CAB. He ordered Pan-American should have the flight alone. Republican Senator THYE, of Minnesota, and Congressman JUDD of the same State were quick to protest. When all the facts were put before the President he quickly saw that he had been poorly informed and even more poorly advised. He did the unpleasant but necessary thing of reversing himself outright.

Back in March the President appointed Allen Whitfield of Iowa to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Eisenhower did so on the advice of some of his staff whose interests were less in Mr. Whitfield's qualifications for the important AEC than in "the Federal patronage situation in Iowa." Worse than Mr. Whitfield's lack of qualification was his seeming disqualification because of his involvement in a possible breach of legal ethics case. After the pro-Eisenhower Des Moines Register and Tribune dug into Mr. Whitfield's background, the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Commission decided to hold hearings on his fitness. Now it has been arranged for the appointment to be withdrawn and Mr. Eisenhower has publicly agreed.

Nothing in all Washington has needed thoughtful study more than the Government's loyalty-security program. Yet Attorney General Brownell advised the President that there was no need for a Presidential commission of distinguished citizens to review the program and to assist in its improvement. And so Mr. Eisenhower declared himself. Not even the Wolf Ladejinsky case, which had the State Department at odds with Agriculture on whether the Government's land reform expert was a risk, changed Mr. Brownell. But the President has wisely announced that he now has no objection to the creation of such a commission by Congress.

The Dixon-Yates contract is enough in the public mind to require little more than mention. The President was poorly advised in the beginning. Then essential information was withheld from him as the situation went from bad to worse. His advisers allowed the President to say things at press conferences that simply were untrue. Finally he had to cancel the whole slippery business after standing by it for more than a year.

The President of the United States deserves better advice than such a record shows. He deserves it and he should be getting it. He cannot rely on advisers who tell him only half the story.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article written in the London Sunday Express of July 10 and a letter from a prominent constituent in my district, Mr. Alfred L. Hammell, Fair Acres, Greenwich, Conn.

The letter and the article points up how dangerous and impractical it is for Government to engage in business activities. More than that, it points up our system of private enterprise in which I strongly believe is the best system in the world.

The letter and article follow:

GREENWICH, CONN., *July 15, 1955.*

Hon. ALBERT P. MORANO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORANO: Knowing of your very great interest in preserving the free-enterprise system in America, I thought of you when one of my associates sent me from abroad a clipping from the London Sunday Express of July 10 entiled "Flop All the Way."

Notwithstanding the recent reports of the Hoover Commission pointing up the many business activities in which the Government is engaged, there are those who are not only contending for the status quo of these enterprises but are also seeking further subsidy, which means expansion of activities already undertaken for Government account.

We certainly need to be on the alert and I thought you would be interested in having a copy of the article mentioned above because it points up what can happen when nationalization of an industry is undertaken and how difficult it is to reverse the process. It may be that you will think so well of the item that you will want to have it included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely,

ALFRED L. HAMMELL.

[From the London Sunday Express of July 10, 1955]

FLOP ALL THE WAY

What is the most urgent need on the domestic front in Britain today?

To check the rising cost of living; to make the pay packets go further; to cut the cost of filling the housewife's shopping basket.

Nothing is so important as that.

But the bosses of the National Coal Board drop a block-buster on our hopes of achieving it.

For they announce that coal—which sets the price of everything—is to go up by an average of 11s. 5d. a ton tomorrow week.

It is the biggest single price rise since the coal mines were nationalised.

And it is the twentieth raid on our pockets since the mines passed into States ownership 8 and a half year ago.

In that period the price of coal has just about doubled.

It is a frightening story.

The latest increase will mean an extra bill of £20 million for the electricity industry; nearly £18 million for gas; £9 million for the railways; £1 million for the fishing fleets.

What is the reason for this latest staggering increase in the price of coal?

Do not look for it in fatter pay packets for the miners. Higher wage packets for them will take only £13 million out of price increases estimated to produce £118 million in a year.

Look for it, rather, in the complete and utter failure of nationalization.

Britain—whose prosperity was founded on the export of coal—is being forced to buy coal abroad in ever-increasing quantities.

It is largely to meet the loss on those purchases that the price is now being raised.

Coal, which should be the source of our strength, has become the weakest link in our economy.

Let the tragedy of coal be pondered by those who even today are mad enough to propose further experiments in nationalization.

The Proposed Fallon Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the present confusion surrounding the proposed Fallon highway bill shows what happens when a congressional committee other than Ways and Means attempts to write a tax bill.

The original suggestion of the railroads that a tax of not less than 50 cents per pound of tire was so ridiculous that a counterproposal of 10 cents additional per pound of tire was soon suggested.

No consideration has been given to the scientific development of the rubber industry. In a few years innertubes may not be manufactured in any quantity at all and tires, in all probability, will wear longer and be lighter in weight. The anticipated revenue may not reach half the amount currently expected.

Under the rules of the House of Representatives, the Speaker is constrained to give precedent its proper influence. Precedent was broken when a major tax bill was not referred to the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Since the Fallon Bill contains approximately $12 billion in additional taxes, if the Rules Committee follows precedent it would have to grant a closed rule. In this case, the House would not have an opportunity to correct the inequities in the present Fallon bill.

I suggest that Speaker RAYBURN reverse himself and assign the tax part of the Fallon bill to the Ways and Means Committee where an equitable nondiscriminatory pay-as-you-go tax bill can be written. Then the House can decide whether they want President Eisenhower's highway program or the Democratic highway proposal.

Life Insurance Act of 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will take a full 5 minutes to call to the attention of the House the various documents that are available on this very complicated subject, and tell the members what has been done.

Last year, when we went into this field, the subcommittee immediately held seminar sessions, so to speak, to inform ourselves about the subject, with the insurance industry, representatives of the State insurance commissioners, the Treasury Department, as well as the staff of the joint Tax Committee. As a result of those studies the staff prepared a very excellent report to our committee on the taxation of life insurance companies, pointing out the detailed problems that are involved in the consideration of such taxation.

On the basis of this report which was made available about a month ahead of time, the subcommittee held hearings on December 13 and 14, 1954, and then made particular recommendations in its report.

After those hearings, when this Congress convened, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and myself continued our conferences with the Treasury Department and the life insurance industry to try to work out the further details of this particular bill.

I am happy to say that the entire industry with one exception seems to be, in fact is, in accord with this. There have been a lot of things they have not liked; nonetheless, they felt that the over-all job was good, and they approved it along with the Treasury Department. I do want to mention the one company that is not in agreement with this particular bill; as a matter of fact, they sat in on our seminar and attended our hearings. In our report the subcommittee set out its viewpoint. The reason this company did not go along is that they have always felt that taxation of stock life insurance companies should be different from taxation of mutual life insurance companies.

As we dug into the field we found that most of the new growth in the life insurance field comes from the stock companies. They are the small companies, and inasmuch as the industry is dominated by the mutuals we felt we would be making a serious error if we taxed the stock companies on a different basis; that we might well be stunting the new growth of the industry. For that reason we did not accept Acacia's viewpoint.

As the chairman of the committee [Mr. COOPER] has stated, we are not done with this problem. We think we have made great progress in the bill we are recommending; perhaps some of us think we have actually found the formula. But we have agreed with the Secretary of the Treasury to put it into effect for a year, if the House and the Senate agree, and then next year we will restudy it to make sure that we have got a permanent formula for the taxation of life insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, In order to complete the record on the life insurance taxation bill I am inserting two letters received by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee from Secretary of the Treasury G. M. Humphrey in regard to the bill for the taxation of life insurance companies:

JULY 7, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I attach a copy of the letter which we originally had intended to send to you on the proposed bill on taxation of life insurance companies. Since the letter was prepared, the bill has been limited to 1 year only and I have discussed it with Mr. MILLS and Mr. CURTIS who assure me of their concurence with our view that the whole problem should have further study, and that further legislation should be developed for enactment next year.

Since the bill contains substantial improvements over the law in effect last year, and since the suggestions embodied in the attached letter will have your careful study in connection with next year's legislation, we withdraw our objection to H. R. 7201 and 7202 and approve its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

JULY 7, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I regret that the Treasury Department cannot unqualifiedly endorse H. R. 7201, which provides a new method for the taxation of life-insurance companies, even though it will be effective only for the years 1955 and 1956.

The bill would make desirable improvements in the definition of income. It would limit abuses by investment companies which do a small amount of insurance business, and by certain casualty companies which inflate their life-insurance business by means of policy loans, to qualify for favorable tax treatment. The bill would be fairer than the present law because it would treat the group annuity business of the life-insurance companies more like tax-exempt qualified pension trusts with which they compete. It also properly would eliminate duplication of the 85-percent intercorporate dividend credit and the proposed 85 and other percentage credits for reserve and other policy interest. The proposed segregation and separate taxation of their cancellable health and accident business, on a basis comparable to mutual fire and casualty companies in the same line of business, seems sound, though the wisdom of not taxing substantial amounts of the profits of some of the companies should have further study.

However, the proposed exclusion from the tax base of a flat 85 percent of investment income for ordinary life-insurance business

does not appear to be justified. The resulting tax currently seems inadequate.

Our estimates indicate that, on the basis of present earnings and contracts with policyholders, the life-insurance companies will need only slightly over 75 percent of their 1955 investment income to meet their required reserve and policy interest, as compared with the 85-percent allowance in the bill. On these facts, it does not seem fair to the Government to adopt a formula which will permit the companies to go untaxed on investment income which is not needed under their contracts with their own policyholders. The total annual investment income of life-insurance companies now exceeds $3 billion. The corporate tax on almost 10 percent of that total is a very large sum.

Since 1921, life-insurance companies have been taxed only on their "free investment income," that is, their investment income in excess of the amounts they were committed or required to set aside as reserves under their policy contracts. Their income from other sources has gone untaxed.

The 1942 law assumed that the companies would be required to earn 3¼ percent on a major part of their investments to meet their policy requirements, and determined their taxable free investment income on that assumption. As the companies wrote policies on the basis of lower interest rates, this high assumption of required earnings was so unrealistic that the companies would not have been required to pay any tax at all for several years, even though they actually had very substantial investment income over their contractual needs.

In 1950, a taxing method was adopted under which the tax was based on the actual free investment income for each year. Though probably not ideal (other income continued untaxed; the individual companies were taxed on an industry average of their investment income), this method at least provided a logical basis for taxation. The life-insurance industry accepted this method, and even urged its adoption on a long-range basis.

In 1951, the policy requirements were about 87½ percent of actual earnings, which left a free investment income of 12½ percent. The 52 percent corporate tax on 12½ percent of earnings was about equal to 6½ percent on the entire investment income. A 6½ percent tax was imposed on all investment income, and was successively extended through 1954. This taxing method had no logical basis of its own, other than as a shortcut method of computation.

In the years since 1951, the companies actual free investment income has increased steadily. It is estimated that for 1955 they need only 75.5 percent of their investment income to meet their policy requirements. If determined in the same way as was done in 1951, the comparable tax rate on all investment income would have to be almost doubled (increased to 12.7 percent) in 1955.

The Treasury Department has reviewed carefully the history and problems of taxation of life insurance companies. The valuable material in the hearings and the staff studies of the Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, published last year and earlier this year, has been examined. On the basis of our review and examination, I suggest that a attempt be made to develop a method of taxing life-insurance companies like other business on the basis of their entire income from all sources, with appropriate deductions for their expenses and additions to their reserves against their policy contracts. The reliance on free investment income alone ignores income and losses from mortality experience, the relation between loading charges and operationg costs, and capital gains—which may be quite substantial.

Life-insurance companies were taxed like other corporations on the basis of their entire net income until 1921, when the tax base was confined to free-investment income. At that time, income taxation was still so new and undeveloped that it was found to be extremely difficult to deal adequately with the specialized problems of the life-insurance industry. Substantial advances have been made since that time in tax administration, and the methods and techniques of income measurement. It should now be possible to develop a fairer basis for taxation which will include all of the income and deduction items which properly reflect the earnings position of a life-insurance company.

The development of a satisfactory formula for taxing insurance companies on a comprehensive concept of income will take time. In the meantime, the 1950 formula (taxation of actual free-investment income) gives a logical standard for measuring free-investment income and the industries' capacity to pay. We estimate that this formula would produce revenue of $368 million for this year, as against $189 million under the 6½ percent rate in effect from 1951 through 1954, and $215 million under H. R. 7201. In the absence of any legislation this year, the 1942 formula will become applicable again and produce revenue estimated at $274 million, as compared to $215 million under H. R. 7201 and $368 million under the 1950 formula.

The Treasury is impressed with the need for a fair and sound approach to the taxation of life-insurance companies. A satisfactory solution must recognize the special situation of the life-insurance industry and its responsibilities to policyholders. At the same time, it should impose a tax which is fairly distributed among the companies and fair in relation to the tax burdens of other savings institutions and taxpayers generally.

I and the Treasury Department staffs will be glad to be of such assistance as we can to your committee and staffs in any further examination of this subject which you choose to undertake.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

The Problem of Industrial Dispersal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years I have been deeply interested in the problem of dispersal and decentralization for purposes of decreasing the dangerous vulnerability of the United States to enemy blitz attack.

Down through the years, I have been in contact with every Government agency working in this field.

I am frank to state that unfortunately we, as a Nation, have not achieved a fraction of the progress which we should have achieved by now, reducing the appalling overconcentration of industrial targets in this country.

During the past decade there has been a tremendous expansion of the factories of the American free-enterprise system. But we have lost to date a golden opportunity by not dispersing many of these factories. Instead, they have largely congregated in the already over-congested handful of major American urban centers.

I earnestly hope that legislation to establish a Hoover-type commission to make a full and complete study of the dispersal problem will be enacted before the end of this Congress.

Ordinarily, I am somewhat skeptical of leaving to commissions the making of more and more studies on subjects which already have been studied in detail. I do not believe that studies should become a substitute for action, but rather, simply a step prior to action.

It would appear, however, that a Hoover-type commission could bring this issue up to the proper level of governmental, industrial, labor, and public attention, and set a comprehensive policy which would thereafter be carried out.

I send to the desk three items indicative of this problem. The first is the text of a letter to me from Director Arthur S. Flemming, of the Office of Defense Mobilization of the Executive Office of the President, together with a copy of his testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee earlier this year on this problem. Director Flemming commented upon a reference to the dispersal problem which I had made in an address in my State last month.

The second is a letter from the senior vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Kenneth R. Miller, likewise commenting on this subject.

And finally, as an indication of the actual status of dispersal, which is, I repeat, a very inadequate and disturbing status, I append an editorial feature from Time magazine's issue of June 27. I ask unanimous consent that all three of these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the several items referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of June 29, relative to accelerating plans for industrial dispersion in which you enclose a copy of your fine address recently delivered at Wisconsin State College.

On February 22, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Civil Defense of the Senate Armed Services Committee and suggested that the Congress authorize the establishment of a Hoover-type commission to study the problem of dispersion. This problem has become more complex since the advent of more powerful nuclear weapons and its resolution, I firmly believe, requires the united action of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government. It seems clear that the national dispersion policy, announced by President Truman in August 1951, is wholly inadequate in view of these recent nuclear-weapons developments and that a revision is essential.

I am pleased to see that a bill (S. 2215), to establish a civil defense commission to study dispersion, has been introduced jointly by Senator KEFAUVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Defense, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and Senator JACKSON of that subcommittee. Other bills of a similar nature have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I hope that the Congress will take favorable action on one of these at an early date.

You have indicated your interest with respect to the progress of industrial dispersion so far achieved as a result of rapid tax amortization. May I point out, in this connection, that since the dispersion criteria were made a part of the tax-amortization procedure, we have processed through February 15, 1955, 637 projects subject to the dispersion criteria each costing $1 million or more. Their total estimated cost is $4.7 billion.

Of the 637 projects mentioned above, 546 were not located in congested urban areas or near major military installations; 86 were granted exceptions to the criteria through documented evidence that excessive losses or delays in production or unreasonable economic hardships would ensue due to a change of site; and 5 were denied certification for refusal to meet the dispersion criteria and failure to justify exception.

If you desire any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director.

EXTRACTS FROM REMARKS OF ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION, AT HEARING BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 22, 1955

The nature of the problem of dispersal was summarized very effectively by those who participated in the project East River when they said:

"The problem, therefore, is one of achieving the best balance of dispersion or spacing within the practical limits of a properly functioning urban economy."

It is clear that this "best balance" is going to be obtained only as leaders in the fields of management and labor as well as representatives of our State and local governments search for the best possible solution for their specific problems. The Federal Government must be an active participant in the search for these solutions as it has the responsibility for pointing up the interests of the Nation as a whole as judged by the capability of Soviet Russia to launch an attack on continental United States.

This search for the best possible solutions to the problem of dispersal is not going to be pursued vigorously until the legislative branch unites with the executive branch of the Federal Government in expressing their joint conviction that such a search must be undertaken and likewise unite in establishing the broad framework of policies within which such a search must take place.

In order to expedite a united attack of this kind on the problem of dispersal it is suggested that the Congress authorize the immediate establishment of a Commission to be appointed in a manner comparable to the appointment of the Hoover Commission by the President and by the Presiding Officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives. This Commission should be charged with the responsibility of presenting a series of recommendations to the Congress on the problem of dispersal not later than May 15, so as to give the Congress the opportunity of acting on them before the adjournment of the present session. The technical information that would be needed by such a Commission is available and as a result it should be able to complete its work within the time limits indicated.

This is the only way in which a solid foundation can be constructed on which a meaningful dispersal program can be erected.

In the meantime I feel that the problem should be approached along the lines of the following statement:

The executive branch of the Federal Government a few years ago recommended policies of dispersal and protective construction. Under the terms of the dispersal policy, new defense facilities were to be located not less than 10 miles beyond the perimeter of certain designated areas of industrial and population concentration. Adherence to this standard by many industrial concerns has reduced their vulnerability to attack.

The recent statement of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission on weapons effects, makes it clear that it is still possible to reduce, by dispersal, the disastrous effects of blast and heat, when accompanied by protective measures against fallout. It is equally clear, however, that a mileage yardstick that would conform to the increases in weapons capabilities could not be applied in a practical manner to all situations in all parts of the country. Any effort to do so would disrupt the economy of some parts of the Nation and would fail to take into consideration differing geographic and other factors. Therefore, a revision of the dispersal policy is necessary that will take into consideration the practical problems that confront the States and cities and that will result in their being able to work out reasonable dispersal plans applicable to their situations.

State and local governments of each of our major target areas should develop plans, in cooperation with the Federal Government, to enhance our ability to withstand attack, through dispersal of industrial facilities, protective construction and active participation in civil defense programs. No hard and fast rule can be provided by the Federal Government that would be equally suitable in all situations and in all parts of the country. Criteria for measures which will lessen or minimize the damage which an attack might inflict must now take into account size of the cities, the relation of geography, terrain, economic, and other factors. Thus it can be seen that the situation in each area must be analyzed carefully in the light of numerous considerations. This has not been done. The Federal Government, however, has available some basic information to assist State and local governments in making such analyses with the Department of Commerce being the focal point through which such assistance will be given. Similar assistance will be available to industries through the Department of Commerce as the focal point.

In terms of new industrial construction, advice should be sought from the Department of Commerce or other appropriate Federal agency. In the case of new defense facilities where application is made to the Office of Defense Mobilization for a rapid tax amortization certificate, the certificate will not be granted unless such advice has been sought and adequately considered in the selection of the site.

The Departments and agencies of the Federal Government will not move forward with the construction of new buildings unless the proposed location conforms to the advice given by the Federal Government to critical target areas and industrial concerns.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
OF MANUFACTURERS,
New York, N. Y., July 13, 1955.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We have read with great interest the very constructive address which you gave before the Wisconsin State College at Whitewater on June 29. We were indeed interested to note your comments on page 4 with respect to the business communities' interest in industrial dispersal—particularly the views of the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Our association has long been interested in the problem of plant location and dispersal. However, it has recognized the many manifold problems incident thereto. Our various committees are concerned with the related problems of water supply, proximity of markets, transportation costs and attendant to the latter, certain phases of the antitrust laws, availability of labor and other problems which must confront management in deciding where to locate or relocate their plants.

Questions of this nature have long been of interest to our association and its members. We greatly appreciate the encouragement given to American business outlined in your letter of June 30.

Of course in all of our deliberations, as in your own thinking I am sure, we are guided by the fundamental concepts of our free enterprise system.

Sincerely,

KENNETH R. MILLER.

INDUSTRIAL DISPERSAL—BETTER DEFENSE AND BETTER BUSINESS

In last week's simulated H-bomb attack, Washington officials dispersed to 31 different hideouts. But for United States industry—the heart of the Nation's warmaking power—dispersal was not so easy. Had there been a real H-bomb attack, 15 accurately dropped bombs could have demolished two-fifths of America's industrial capacity.

The Pentagon is deeply worried over the small progress toward dispersing United States industry. Air Secretary Harold Talbott has already warned that the Air Force plans to discourage further expansion of plane and missile factories in southern California, where 25 percent of the region's payroll is devoted to military aircraft production.

So far, little has been done on purely military grounds to speed up industrial dispersal—partly because of the enormous cost. Not until 2 years after the Korean war began did Washington take its first—and only—significant step. It ruled that in the future all new plants seeking rapid tax amortization certificates would have to be located at least 10 miles outside "probable ground zero," i. e., defense industry and population centers. By that time, however, the Government had already granted fast tax writeoffs for $20 billion in defense construction. Moreover, even the belated rule has largely been ignored. Only 546 projects, costing $3.9 billion, have met dispersal requirements. Meanwhile, the requirements themselves are outdated, have not been changed to meet the greater threat of the H-bomb.

However, the situation is not as black as it looks. For purely economic reasons, United States industry has been doing a great deal of dispersing on its own. In the past year alone, the chance to save on shipping costs to the booming west coast market caused more than 35 national firms in the East and Midwest, e. g., Elgin, Borg-Warner, to set up branches in the southern California area. The need for sufficient labor at reasonable wages has forced many other corporations out of heavily industrialized regions into rural areas. Cleveland's Clevite Corp. (bearings and bushings), which has decentralized into 11 plants in the past 10 years, insisted that "with smaller plants * * * we achieve greater efficiency." Overall, since 1940 the proportion of United States industry concentrated in cities of 100,000 or more has declined from about one-half to one-third.

Industry has also gone to work in other ways. Twenty-four industry task forces have been formed, and the rubber, chemical, and iron and steel industries have each produced thick, detailed manuals on what to do if bombs drop. Typical topics: how to set up management succession lists in case the top echelon is wiped out; the collecting and storing of vital records in a safe place; arranging for alternate officers to sign emergency payrolls.

Some companies went to work on their own. Koppers picked a "reorganization point" outside Pittsburgh, stocked nearby bank vaults with microfilms of vital com-

pany records, and instructed key personnel to head for this emergency shelter at the first sign of attack. Standard Oil (New Jersey) set up an alternate office 60 to 75 miles outside New York City to feed, sleep, and serve as GHQ for 100 top executives. Curtiss-Wright bought 84 square miles in north central Pennsylvania to assemble jet engines and 5,000 acres in New Jersey's Ramapo Hills for a bombproof headquarters. The petroleum industry has set up five regional committees to run the natural-gas and oil industry in each area, and A. T. & T. arranged alternate toll-call routes and emergency generators. One company has even stocked its secret rendezvous with disaster pay checks printed on distinctive notepaper and made out in standard amounts.

But dispersal is not practical for all, can be both bad economics and bad defense. Some industries, e. g., automobiles and shipbuilding, require large concentrations of machinery, labor, and materials, and any attempt to break them down into small, easily dispersed units would be almost as damaging to war production as bombing itself. Nor is dispersal simply a matter of picking up a factory and transporting it to the middle of nowhere. While the factory might be safer in its new home, it might also produce next to nothing—for want of housing, skilled labor, and transportation facilities to get raw materials.

Nevertheless, from now on industry should incorporate military purpose in its economic thinking and keep dispersal firmly in mind as it plans further expansion. Dispersal and decentralization are as much considerations of forward-looking management as healthy labor relations or sound accounting practice. For many companies, dispersal will mean not only greater safety in war but greater efficiency in peace.

Mrs. Hobby Failed To Recognize Scope of Her Assignment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis Journal on Thursday, July 14, 1955:

MRS. HOBBY'S POST

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby could not continue to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the President's Cabinet after the bungling of the Salk vaccine inoculation program.

President Eisenhower, a kind man who is loath to make people unhappy, allowed the lady who heads an executive department to set the date of her resignation.

Secretary Hobby said she was leaving the Cabinet with regret, because of personal reasons of a high order. Her husband, former Texas Gov. William P. Hobby, 27 years her senior, has been seriously ill.

Mrs. Hobby came into national prominence as the commander, with the rank of colonel, of the WAAC, later the Women's Army Corps. Personable and efficient Colonel Hobby wore her honors and her uniform well. Her appointment to be head of a new executive department, with cabinet rank, was generally approved.

But it became apparent shortly after Mrs. Hobby went to Washington that she had been too busy with one thing and another to realize there has been a change in the social philosophy of the Federal Government.

She was in favor of health, education, and welfare, of course, but she did not recognize the challenge or the scope of her new assignment. She was wary of the threat of "socialized medicine" and seemed to be more concerned with the ledgers of education and of social security than with the human values.

In that frame of mind Mrs. Hobby failed to foresee and make proper provisions for the general use of the Salk vaccine in the fight against polio. She sought to place responsibility for the stalled program, and the defective serum, on the Bureau of Public Health. After that, she was through and her resignation was a matter of timing.

Mrs. Hobby just wasn't the woman for the job. She might have served with distinction in some other assignment, even in the Cabinet.

Cuba Worries About Sugar Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Hartford Courant, the oldest newspaper of continuous publication in America. This editorial was published Saturday morning, July 16, 1955. It concerns the matter of the sugar quota for Cuba. It is an intelligently well-written editorial, with which I am in complete agreement.

Cuba is the gateway to Latin America. In some respects, United States relations with Cuba act as a barometer of United States-Latin American relations in general. Cuba is the fourth most important country in the world for United States private investment, which at the end of 1950 totaled $642,400,000. Forty-one of Cuba's active sugar mills are owned and operated by American interests and produce approximately 43 percent of Cuba's sugar crop. Any modification of the Sugar Act, based on legislation now being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, would have an immediate and adverse impact on the general economy of Cuba.

As this splendid editorial in the Hartford Courant points out, Cuba is our sixth largest market for exports from the United States. Products exported to Cuba are produced in every section of the United States. Rice growers and processors in Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, and California benefit. Farmers in Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, and Minnesota derive income particularly in agricultural exports. Textile manufacturing States of North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, Massachusetts, and Connecticut find Cuba a good market. Large quantities of iron, steel, and other metal products are exported from Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.

It is to our best interest, therefore, that we increase our sugar quota rather than cut it. If we increase our sugar quota from Cuba, thereby stabilizing Cuba's economy, this would also increase our export market to this neighborly country.

The editorial follows:

CUBA WORRIES ABOUT SUGAR LAWS

In Cuba, where sugar-growing is the bulwark of the economy, any changes in United States trade policies are anxiously viewed. Cubans cannot forget grim days of the 1920s and 1930s, when American tariff and quota barriers had disastrous effects on the island. Now the administration has recommended changes in sugar legislation to divide with domestic producers an expanded market. Some quick figuring has shown Cuba that, no matter how it works out her sales will drop. When the island's largest industry suffers, her people will suffer.

Well, what are we to Cuba, and what's Cuba to us? There is a special relationship. We freed the island from Spanish domination in 1898, and in years thereafter our statesmen promised her independence and a chance to grow into a prosperous, modern nation. Over the years, despite fluctuations, Cuba has grown to be a strong neighbor and a good customer. Only five countries in the world bought more from us last year than Cuba. And, with prosperity, the island has been pushing a public-works program while private construction has been active. But it is all based on a sugar economy, and the prospects of American legislative action has alarmed the Cubans.

True, Cuba has been developing her outside markets. Demand from the so-called free-world market has been heavier than expected, but some of that has been via the Soviet Union. Cuba has received a large share of business from Russian buying in the world markets. But if stifling action is taken here, Cuba will find her progress checked. A low state of political and economic health may result. And that, Cuban leaders think, will be dangerous to us as well as them. For each American dollar used to buy Cuban sugar, President Batista has noted, $1.18 is spent on American goods, including agricultural products.

We have special reason to view with care any actions affecting our relations with good neighbors of the Western Hemisphere. The Cubans feel that any cut in the established sugar quota would bring immediate economic instability and cause serious consequences. The island is a respected and close friend of the United States. We should proceed cautiously in economic matters affecting that friendship.

Why the Soviets Will Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on July 10 there appeared in This Week magazine a very enlightening and encouraging article written by a distinguished American woman, Mrs. Perle Mesta. The outstanding contents of the article, and Mrs.

Mesta's long identification with Oklahoma, prompt me to ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I therefore submit such a request.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE SOVIETS WILL FAIL

(By Perle Mesta, former Minister to Luxembourg)

Question: Mrs. Jesse D. Wolff, of Mamaroneck, N. Y., asks: "Mrs. Mesta, as an American woman, what is the most important thing you learned about Russia on your trip there?"

Answer: There was much that I learned in my 3 months in the U. S. S. R. But the most important thing I learned was why the Soviets are bound to fail.

This suspicion, which I brought with me as I landed in Moscow, became a conviction as I traveled from Leningrad to Stalingrad, from Odessa to Astrakhan. You cannot travel thousands of miles in this country and not sense that something is missing. And when that something, that void that engulfs the country, turns out to be a knowledge, a love, a reverence for God, the Supreme Being, the only cause and Creator, it suddenly becomes crystal clear what's wrong with Russia.

The Soviet Union, I now know for a certainty, is completely lacking in those foundations, whose builder and maker is God—about which the Apostle Paul wrote so movingly to the Hebrews—and it is therefore bound to collapse. The Soviet system, truly, has no foundations. It has no moral principle supporting its regime, no spiritual source from which to renew its strength daily. It is deliberately godless, intentionally atheistic, politically immoral.

I do not mean to say that the Russian people are irreligious, that there is no faith, hope or charity in the people of Russia. One of the most moving sights I ever witnessed was of the hundreds packed into Moscow's Elokhov Cathedral, praying with the fervor of early Christians. But as I watched their faces I was not sure whether they were praying more for deliverance from their current godless masters or for a true outpouring of the spirit, the coming of a new and shining Pentecostal day.

FRONT FOR TOURISTS

In the U. S. S. R., despite official efforts to camouflage it, the Russian Orthodox Church is a kept church. It exists, not "by the grace of God," but by sufferance of the Kremlin. It is a front for visitors, a concession to the aged, a sorry testimony to duplicity.

I got into several heated arguments with various Soviet officials when they seemed to be trying to brainwash me with their anti-American, anti-Christian, anti-capitalist doctrines. I am afraid I exploded with some undiplomatic replies. In the end they gave up, convinced they had an incorrigible Christian and capitalist on their hands. What I told them, while all off-the-cuff, was also all from the heart.

To me the ultimate collapse of the Soviet system is an elementary as the multiplication table—and as certain. For the Soviets are trying the impossible. They think that by ruling God out of churches and synagogues they can rule Him out of the hearts of the people. They think they can annul His law of mercy and love as easily and effectively as they demote Malenkov or shoot Beria. But they can't, and they are finding it out. They can no more destroy God, destroy spirit, than they can annul the multiplication table or stop the sun from shining. For they are fighting infinity—and they are bound to lose.

Nomination of Simon Sobeloff To Be Judge in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial entitled "Disappointing" which appeared in the July 18, 1955, issue of the State, a newspaper published in Columbia, S. C. This editorial has reference to the President's nomination of Simon Sobeloff, the Solicitor General who helped the Justice Department present its position on school segregation before the Supreme Court, as a judge in the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. This editorial presents very well the sentiments of the people of South Carolina, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISAPPOINTING

It was disappointing that President Eisenhower passed up qualified South Carolina material to name a resident of Maryland to succeed a resident of Maryland as judge of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals.

We are not going to enter into any personal review of the nominee, on whose qualifications we are unable to speak at first-hand, but all things being equal, the rotation system should have been followed. This would have meant a judge from this State. Only twice in 62 years, and not at all since the late 1920's has South Carolina had a judge on this, the second highest court in the land.

We heard a couple of days before President Eisenhower made his decision that insofar as geography was concerned, it was possible that Judge Parker, who is from Charlotte, which is on the State line, would be considered as representing this area. Were he from Raleigh, it was pointed out, or any point farther north, this might not be argued. The person from whom we got this information was pulling for a South Carolinian, but he said the facts might as well be faced—that this might be the thinking. It turned out he was right, or at least that the nominee didn't come from down here but from the upper area.

Carrying the matter further, Judge Parker retires in about 2 years. Then, this man thought, it should be almost certain that South Carolina would be turned to for the judge.

A point we should like to raise about Mr. Sobeloff is whether he would consider himself competent to sit should an appeal come before the circuit court on some phase of implementation of the desegregation decree.

Since Mr. Sobeloff as Solicitor General outlined the procedure that the High Court followed, should he be eligible to pass judgment on his own plan?

It is possible that the circuit court of appeals may have many cases before it in the next few years concerning efforts to continue segregation, yet remain within the scope of the decision of May 17, 1954. Therefore had we had the say, we would have chosen a person not already committed.

Whether an attempt will be made to block the nomination in the Senate, we do not know. Both Senators from this State have issued blasts, criticizing Eisenhower's failure to name a man from South Carolina, and also the fact that the nominee has already chosen sides on an issue that the Court from time to time may have to review.

The other side of the argument could be that the Supreme Court having spoken and the principle having been established, there would be no conflict.

Anyway we are convinced it would have been better to have chosen someone else. That, it seems to us, would have been a more representative way of completing the court.

Modernization of Old Oregon Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a Senator gets all kinds of letters. Occasionally among his letters he finds one free of emotion, with critical objectivity, pointing out cautions and danger points that should be kept in mind as new legislation is studied, drafted, discussed, and finally approved. Such a letter has come to my office in Saturday's mail. It is written by Byron Brinton, editor of the Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier, a paper which through its editorial columns enlightens its readers in every issue on the important questions of the day—be they local, State, or National. Mr. President, because the subject matter of his letter is extremely pertinent, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAKER, *July 13, 1955.*

Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER.

DEAR WAYNE and DICK: I have just returned after going with the State highway commission, Judge Rea, etc., to Ontario by way of the new Huntington-Ontario freeway grade. En route the commission related its pending plan to complete the modernization of the old Oregon Trail from Huntington to Baker.

This is just a thought which comes to me, and on which I am commenting this week per proofs of an editorial enclosed.

The local resident, the farmer, the school busses picking up children, the R. F. D. man, the livestock haulers to the small local markets, the logging trucks, the fishermen and hunters—none of these people in daily walks of life will get to use the new super highways. Our ranchers living beside these limited access routes will travel half the distance to town—or all the way—before they can get onto them. The ranchers on the branch lines like Enterprise, Halfway, Sumpter—these people will live on the secondary roads and take the super routes perhaps only on a holiday.

The small town is bypassed, even the small city is bypassed and the average small businessman is forced to make considerable adjustment.

I think this is the frame of mind you will find many, many east Oregonians in. Per-

haps this is not true on the west side. But I wonder whether folks are going to find the national highway program so romantic when they wake up as I did today and find that I can't see where it solves our local road problems at all. Our Muddy Creek farming area—richest in Powder Valley—near Haines hasn't yet even an oiled road. Pine and Eagle Valleys, northeast of Baker have a State secondary highway which is not yet safe for livestock semitrailers and up till 6 months ago they weren't even allowed on them until some supermen local drivers convinced the State they could negotiate the corners and stay in their traffic lane by handing one dual wheel over Powder River. Yet this is their 40-mile lifeline to market.

I am not opposed to a national road program. I think the metropolitan areas should solve their traffic tangle. We should also plan for the long range even in the back country. But I hope the national highway bill permits States such as Oregon—particularly eastern Oregon—to share to a major degree for improvement of secondary rural highways. It is going to be very, very difficult to answer to our rural people who pay higher gas and excise taxes on their vehicles when they never drive upon the roads they are compelled to help to build—unless their own market road feels a little of the modernization.

I am a little concerned that the national highway scheme is going to launch truckers into the long-haul business rather than solve the transportation needs of John Q. Citizen. I am not opposed to this, nor to highways for national security, but I hope we aren't doing it in the name of helping out local-road needs.

The 19 miles betwen Huntington and Ontario will cost $3,255,000—and there isn't a single access, farm or ranch served on the entire distance. Yet 200 farmers in the Muddy Creek area are told year after year that they can't have $100,000 to put an 11-mile market road in shape to haul grain and livestock to their market and railhead and main highway at Haines. School busses get stuck in snowdrifts in bitter cold, the dairyman can't keep his cream cans on his truck for washboard gravel, the dozens of housewives can't live with the dust, the surface mires into mud during the wet season and heaves into frost rolls during the spring. I hope that somewhere in the highway bill there is leeway where the State can't in the future tell us there is not enough money in the secondary road fund.

I trust that you don't take this too seriously. Naturally the national highway bill is not intended to take over local road problems. But I hope this helps you look at what's apt to come out of it through the eyes of the rural resident who will pay for the program but will be a little put out if someone doesn't warn him he isn't going to get much out of it.

Kind regards,

BRINTON.

Farm Platform of National Young Republican League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement of the farm platform as adopted by the recent National Young Republican League Convention.

This is a recommendation from a group of fine young people. To me it is most encouraging to see their interest in the agriculture question. The group is not entirely composed of farmers, but has a keen understanding of the farmer's problems.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE SUBCOMMITTEE PLATFORM

This American free-enterprise society is experiencing an era of food abundance, which is the fruit of and complicated by an industrial society the like of which the world has never seen. History shows that every nation at some stage reaches a high point in food supply and if once lost seldom reoccurs. This food abundance therefore is an estate which not only the American farmer but everyone in this Nation should hope to preserve. It follows that the American farmer should not be penalized for furnishing this estate for our Nation.

We, therefore, as a generation of young people resolve that we will, with the help of God, preserve for posterity this Nation's ability to produce.

For agriculture to remain strong the American farmer must receive a price for his products that will cover the cost of production and give a fair return for his labor and capital risk.

We, therefore, condemn as a fraud on all posterity the leadership of any generation which acts to subsidize inefficiency in agriculture. We charge the New Deal and Fair Deal administrations with placing deeply and dangerously into debt all future generations just for the sake of political advantage in their day. Shame on that leadership.

We hold these following national policies fundamental to the welfare of agriculture:

High employment, rising productivity, and a good distribution of income after taxes.

Monetary and fiscal policies which will contribute to the maintenance of a stable general price level.

The prevention of restraint of trade or the exercise of monopolistic power by any group—Government, industry, labor, or agriculture.

The encouragement and creation of private capital used properly throughout the world.

The encouragement of foreign trade and investment.

Demonstrate our humanitarian concern for other peoples by using our abundance to alleviate suffering throughout the world.

We hold these farm prices essential to a strong agricultural economy:

The maintenance of consistency between our foreign policy objectives and domestic price support programs.

An expanded program of research and education with current emphasis on projects to improve marketing and reduce its cost to the farmer to encourage new uses and increase the utilization of farm products; and the adoption of improved techniques and increased efficiency in the processing and distribution of farm products.

Adequate farm credit at a reasonable rate of interest.

Adequate rural electric power and communication service at a reasonable cost.

Assistance and encouragement for farmers to maintain and improve land resources.

Special assistance to help the operators of low income uneconomic farm units make necessary adjustments. By improving the living standard of this group of people the entire national economy will benefit.

Continuing efforts to improve diets through education and promotional work as well as special programs such as the school-lunch program.

Improvement of crop and market news reports and outlook information.

Improvement of agricultural weather forecasting.

Improvement in certain types of Government grading, inspection, and regulatory work so that our products will be more competitive on a domestic and international market. These should be in keeping with the welfare of the people of this Nation and yet not unduly burdensome to the American farmer.

Reasonable price protection through price supports, production adjustment, storage programs and the use of marketing agreements and orders where producers develop feasible programs.

We commend the Eisenhower administration and the Republican 83d Congress for its courageous action in stopping the trend toward socialization in agriculture.

We commend the administration for its stand on revising the Sugar Act to give domestic producers their proportionate share of the increased domestic consumption created by our increasing population.

We realize, however, there is much left to be desired in the way of good farm legislation.

We deplore the fact that agriculture is at the present time receiving a declining proportionate share of the national income. Immediate action should be taken to remedy this fault for the benefit of our entire Nation.

We would like to recommend a serious study of the following programs which used separately or together may well be the answer to an equitable farm program.

1. The "land-bank" system of production control.

2. Two-price system for certain commodities.

3. "Quality" differentiation between various grades of the same commodity.

Billy Graham Has Reply to the World's Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Graham Has Reply to World's Needs," which was published in the Florence (S. C.) Morning News of July 18, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAHAM HAS REPLY TO WORLD'S NEEDS

North Carolina's evangelist Billy Graham spoke on the shores of Lake Geneva yesterday within sight of the Palace of Nations where the Big Four leaders are to begin their momentous meeting today. What he said was very simple, but so much the crux of the matter that it can't be said too often.

Graham, quite simply, urged the nations to forget their national greeds and turn to God.

And he said something else which the statesmen and the politicians and their experts would do well to remember—that while the people of the world have been warned not to expect too much, they nevertheless are expecting plenty from this conference.

No nation holds a corner on perfection as the world's leaders prepare to talk at Geneva. All have made mistakes, some deliberate, some unintentional, and out of fear and suspicion.

But in any event, it is now too late for blame. When a ship is sinking and the passengers are in imminent danger of drowning, it is no time to hold a debate on whether or not the captain could have avoided the disaster.

Today, the world stands in the same position, heading slowly but steadily for a rock labelled "destruction by thermo-nuclear weapons."

This is no time to suggest who is at fault. There is now only time to change course and bring sanity back into international relations before it is too late.

This is no time for cynicism or politics. Some commentators are already hinting that the Republican "experts" are trying to shape policy in terms of its political effects on Congress and on the 1956 elections. These ostriches fail to realize that if world tensions aren't eased there will be no Washington, and most of the voters will be buried beneath heaps of rubble.

President Eisenhower starts the conference bolstered by the prayers of millions of Americans and others of good will around the world. The President, we are told, has himself prayed about the forthcoming conference, and we may be sure that he is only too conscious of how much a successful conference outcome could mean to generations yet unborn to listen to those who would place expediency and politics above the welfare of mankind.

It is to these latter people that Billy Graham's words were addresssed. It is to be hoped that those on all delegations to the Big Four meeting will heed them.

Politics and diplomatic expediency have been tried and failed. More and more the simple people of the world are turning to God, seeking inspiration for a way out of the present terrible impasse.

Can the Nation's leaders do less?

Cost to the States of the Colorado River storage project

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by the States	Actually authorized		Authorized and contemplated	
		Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation	Cost of project construction	Cost of interest on construction allocated to irrigation
Alabama	0.93	$10,164,900	$13,280,400	$15,354,300	$31,889,700
Arizona	.41	4,481,300	5,854,800	6,769,100	14,058,900
Arkansas	.48	5,246,400	6,854,400	7,924,800	16,439,200
California	9.22	100,774,600	131,661,600	152,222,200	316,153,800
Colorado	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Connecticut	1.88	20,548,400	26,846,400	31,038,800	64,465,200
Delaware	.50	5,465,000	7,140,000	8,255,000	17,145,000
Florida	1.47	16,067,100	20,991,600	24,269,700	50,406,300
Georgia	1.30	14,209,000	18,564,000	21,463,000	44,577,000
Idaho	.26	2,841,800	3,712,800	4,292,600	8,915,400
Illinois	7.64	83,505,200	109,099,200	126,136,400	261,978,600
Indiana	2.55	27,871,500	36,414,000	42,100,500	87,439,500
Iowa	1.21	13,225,300	17,278,800	19,977,100	41,490,900
Kansas	.97	10,602,100	13,851,600	16,014,700	33,261,300
Kentucky	1.01	11,039,300	14,422,800	16,675,100	34,632,900
Louisiana	1.69	11,913,700	15,565,200	17,995,900	37,376,100
Maine	.38	4,153,400	5,426,400	6,273,800	13,030,200
Maryland	1.95	21,313,500	27,846,000	32,194,500	66,865,500
Massachusetts	3.23	35,303,900	46,124,400	53,327,300	110,756,700
Michigan	5.78	63,175,400	82,538,400	95,427,800	198,186,200
Minnesota	1.68	18,362,400	23,990,400	27,736,800	57,607,200
Mississippi	.46	5,027,800	6,568,800	7,594,600	15,773,400
Missouri	2.48	27,106,400	35,414,400	40,944,800	85,039,200
Montana	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
Nebraska	.73	7,978,900	10,424,000	12,052,300	25,031,700
Nevada	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
New Hampshire	.27	2,951,100	3,855,600	4,457,700	9,258,300
New Jersey	3.62	39,566,600	51,693,600	59,766,200	124,129,800
New Mexico	.31	3,388,300	4,426,800	5,118,100	10,629,900
New York	14.75	161,217,500	210,630,000	243,522,500	505,777,500
North Carolina	1.38	15,083,400	19,706,400	22,783,800	47,320,200
North Dakota	.22	2,404,600	3,141,600	3,632,200	7,543,800
Ohio	6.39	69,842,700	91,249,200	105,498,900	219,113,100
Oklahoma	.99	10,820,700	14,137,200	16,344,900	33,947,100
Oregon	.95	10,383,500	13,566,000	15,684,500	32,575,500
Pennsylvania	7.53	82,302,900	107,528,400	124,320,300	258,203,700
Rhode Island	.52	5,683,600	7,425,600	8,585,200	17,830,800
South Carolina	.65	7,104,500	9,282,000	10,731,500	22,288,500
South Dakota	.24	2,623,200	3,427,200	3,962,400	8,229,600
Tennessee	1.17	12,788,100	16,707,600	19,316,700	40,119,300
Texas	4.05	44,266,500	57,834,000	66,865,500	138,874,500
Utah	.34	3,716,200	4,855,200	5,613,400	11,658,600
Vermont	.16	1,748,800	2,284,800	2,641,600	5,486,400
Virginia	1.48	16,176,400	21,134,400	24,434,800	50,749,200
Washington	1.57	17,160,100	22,419,600	25,920,700	53,835,300
West Virginia	.71	7,760,300	10,138,800	11,722,100	24,345,900
Wisconsin	2.65	22,406,500	29,274,000	33,845,500	70,294,500
Wyoming	.15	1,639,500	2,142,000	2,476,500	5,143,500
District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, etc.	1.41	15,411,300	20,134,800	23,279,100	48,348,900
Total	100.00	1,093,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,651,000,000	3,429,000,000

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, 98 percent of the project's cost would be borne by the taxpayers of the 44 States in which the project is not located.

Less than 2 percent of the cost of the Colorado River storage project would be borne by the taxpayers of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The percentage of the Federal tax burden paid by those States, of the other States of the Union, and the amount in dollars which each will have to pay, as calculated by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, is as follows:

How Tyranny Is Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., before the Rochester Advertising Club, Rochester, N. Y., on June 2, 1955. The address is entitled "How Tyranny Is Born."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TYRANNY IS BORN

Mr. Chairman, members of the Rochester Ad Club, and friends, I consider it a privilege to be given the opportunity to address this fine group of civic-minded citizens. I am sure the activities of your club extend to an interest in government at all levels—municipal, State, and National. It is to our National Government that I shall invite your attention today and to an insidious movement which would change the basic principles upon which our Nation was founded. This insidious movement would destroy our way of life if "we, the people" do not stem the tide toward concentration of power in the executive department of Government.

In his essay on politics, Aristotle, that great lover of democracy, observed that the usurpation of the people's power, even in small degrees, eventually destroys their liberty. We have witnessed such a drift in our country in recent years.

SAFETY DEVICES

It is of course understood that we cannot have efficient government without delegation of power to our public servants. Realising that power is dangerous, whether in government or in a machine, the framers of our Constitution drafted an instrument whereunder "we, the people" delegated dangerous powers to our Government. By an ingenious and novel arrangement, the use of that power by our public servants may be controlled by "we, the people."

We have not exercised this control as effectively as we should. If we would prevent the destruction of our Constitution and the resultant loss of our liberties, we must be vigilant. May I give you an example of what I have in mind.

A boiler in a YMCA building let go with frightful results. The designers of the boiler provided automatic safety devices to prevent an explosion, just as the designers of our Constitution provided safety devices to prevent the loss of our liberties. In the case of the YMCA building, the superintendent and the janitor had grown careless and let the safety devices get rusty. When the pressure reached the danger point, the safety devices failed to work and the boiler exploded. "We, the people," like the superintendent and the janitor, have become careless and are letting the safety devices in our Constitution get rusty, through disuse, and are in danger of losing our liberties which our forefathers contended are more precious than life itself.

Let us review some of those safety devices in our Constitution:

The power delegated to government is divided among three branches, all directly answerable to a common master, "we, the people."

LEGISLATIVE

Article I, section 1, provides that "all legislative power shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." Section 8, in 18 different subdivisions sets forth in detail the power which the draftmen found necessary to confer upon Congress.

There are restraints on that power. For example, Congressmen who make our laws can be impeached, or jailed for misconduct. The electorate can repudiate them at the polls. Their laws can be repealed. The courts can override their laws when they conflict with the Constitution.

JUDICIAL

Article III, section 1, provides that "the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

But, the judges, like the Congressmen, may be impeached. "We, the people" can override their decisions by amending the Constitution.

EXECUTIVE

Article II, section 1, provides "the executive power shall be vested in the President."

His veto of congressional acts can be overridden. The President can be impeached. He may fail of reelection. Congress may deny him funds to finance any threatened usurpation of the people's power.

Even with our remarkable safeguards, history is replete with instances of usurpation of the people's power by all three branches of government.

USURPATION OF POWER

The Executive branch of Government has, in recent years, been the principal offender in the usurpation of power. I should like to give you four examples of attempts by the executive branch of Government to usurp both the legislative and judicial functions.

1. In a letter to the chairman of a congressional committee, a president said, "I trust that your committee will not let the bill's doubtful constitutionality prevent its passage." In effect, the president said to Congress, "Disregard your oath to defend and support the Constitution."

Threatened by the power of political patronage, Congress passed the bill. A few months later the Supreme Court, then composed of "nine old men" of unquestioned wisdom and integrity, declared the law unconstitutional. An enraged President, in his lust for power, demanded that Congress pass a law enabling him to pack the Supreme Court with judges who shared his philosophy. Had Congress yielded to the President's pressure, one of the vital safeguards to our liberty would have been destroyed.

Although blocked by Congress in his effort to pack the Court, the President eventually succeeded in greatly changing the philosophy of the Court by the appointment of men to the Court who shared his political views. And so today the Court's opinions are frequently out of step with the spirit and philosophy of the Constitution. How well he succeeded in changing the Court's philosophy is attested by Facts Forum Survey, a national organization, whose purpose is to stimulate interest in vital issues of the day, inspiring expressions of informed and enlightened public opinion. On March 10, 1955 they reported that their surveys reveal that only 29 percent of our citizens believe that the current Supreme Court decisions are keeping faith with the spirit and letter of the Constitution.

2. The Constitution says that only Congress has the power to declare war. Yet we have witnessed a President send our boys to fight a cruel war in far-off Korea—a war which the administration didn't want to lose, but apparently was afraid to win. To circumvent the letter and spirit of the Constitution, the President called the Korean war a "police action."

I do not contend that we should not have fought the Communists in Korea. I do contend that we should not have sent our fighting men there without the authority of Congress, as provided by the Constitution. The President violated his oath to support and defend the Constitution when he resorted to subterfuge to circumvent it.

3. We have witnessed a President seize the steel industry without authority of law and in violation of the Constitution. In justification of that illegal and unconstitutional act, he proclaimed that the inherent power of his office gave him authority to do what he thought best for the people. Caesar might have proclaimed that to his Roman senate. Hitler might have proclaimed that to his Reichstag. Mussolini might have proclaimed that to his Fascist state, and Bulganin may be proclaiming that to his Kremlin today, but who in our Republic could conceive of a President of the United States proclaiming that the power of his office gives him authority to do what he thinks best for the people, regardless of the law of the land and the Constitution of our Republic?

I would remind him, and I would remind you, that ours is a Government of law, not of men. I would remind you, and I would remind him, that it is from a government of men that tyranny is born.

COURT'S DECISION

Seizure of the steel industry was declared unconstitutional by a majority opinion of the Supreme Court. However, the Chief Justice rendered a minority opinion in which he was joined by two associates. The minority opinion reasoned that, although neither Congress nor any expressed grant of power under the Constitution had authorized the President to seize the steel industry, he was granted such power, they argued, by the United Nations Charter. Think of it—granted power by the United Nations Charter, denied by the Constitution of the United States—granted power by the United Nations Charter to invalidate or to override the Constitution of our Republic and the law of the land. If two additional associate justices had concurred, thus making a majority opinion, America would today be governed by the United Nations Charter instead of our own Constitution.

The Supreme Court of Iowa rendered an opinion in which it stated that the United States Constitution is superior to the United Nations Charter in governing the affairs of our Republic. When the case reached the Supreme Court, the membership of that body had been reduced by the death of Justice Robert H. Jackson to 8, 4 of which rendered the opinion that the United Nations Charter is superior to our Constitution and 4 said it was not. The important question is whether Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Jackson, will vote to sustain the United States Constitution, or will favor the United Nations Charter and thus take us into world government via the back door.

"We live under a Constitution," said Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, "but the Constitution" continued this great jurist, patriot, and statesman, "is what the judges say it is." That is why, I submit, great care must be exercised to assure that only those who understand the philosophy of our system of government and who will fearlessly interpret the Constitution, as our forefathers intended they should, are appointed to this Court.

SECRET AGREEMENTS

4. The Constitution requires that all treaties with foreign governments be ratified by the Senate. In recent years the executive department of Government has circumvented the Constitution by calling treaties agreements. We were told by the Secretary of State, soon after assuming office, that the executive department has, since World War II, entered into thousands of secret agreements involving our country beyond the comprehension of our people.

On April 12, 1952, John Foster Dulles, speaking to a convention of lawyers in Louisville, Ky., said: "The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the State and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

Mr. Dulles was a private citizen when he made this address and the President was Harry Truman. However, after the November election, when Mr. Dulles became Secretary of State, he switched his stand—another example of man's chronic lust for power. As Secretary of State, he now has, by treaty law, the very power—to override the Constitution and to barter away, piecemeal, the sacred rights guaranteed to our citizens by the Constitution—which he previously denounced.

His excuse: "You can trust us in the Eisenhower administration not to abuse treaty power." But men in high places, as at Yalta, are aften blinded by zeal or a one-sided viewpoint—a contingency against which the restraints of the Constitution were drawn by the wise men who founded our Government.

If treaty powers overriding the Constitution are left in force, who, following the Eisenhower administration, will exercise them in the future? Far better Jefferson's policy, "In questions of power, let no more be heard about confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

BRICKER AMENDMENT

The purpose of the Bricker amendment is to prevent the President from circumventing the Constitution. It would, therefore, further safeguard our liberties. It should have the wholehearted support of every American who thinks first of America as all loyal citizens should.

If we would avoid tyranny, we must reverse the trend to concentration of power in the hands of the executive department of Government.

Democrats Blow Their Tops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democrats Blow Their Tops," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on July 13, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS BLOW THEIR TOPS

Certain Democrats, especially those with presidential aspirations, are trying desperately to find an issue on which to attack the Eisenhower administration. This accounts for the fire and brimstone they are calling down upon the Dixon-Yates contract. Thus far the public, outside of the area which enjoys cheap electricity at the expense of all the taxpayers, appears to be unimpressed, but the antics of some of the Democrats are amusing.

The Democrats are claiming a great victory because President Eisenhower has canceled the Dixon-Yates contract to feed power into the TVA grid. He did so on the understanding that the city of Memphis will build its own powerplant, which will relieve the power shortage in the area and make it possible for TVA to maintain an adequate supply to Atomic Energy Commission plants.

Actually, the decision of Memphis authorities to go off the Federal dole and pay the entire cost of their own electricity was a victory for the taxpayers. They will no longer be required to subsidize the constantly expanding power operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Eisenhower administration has accomplished its objective of halting TVA's creeping socialism.

But not all the citizens of Memphis are happy about the outcome. Former Mayor Watkins Overton points out that TVA "has made it possible for us to enjoy low-cost power for 20 years." But at whose expense? The taxpayers of the rest of the country, of course.

The ex-mayor also bemoans the fact that the people of Memphis will have to pay for building their municipal light plant. And why shouldn't they? Or does the ex-mayor think the people of Ohio and other States should contribute to the cost? This just goes to show that when the Government gives some of the people something for nothing they will holler if anyone tries to take it away from them.

Some of the most absurd hollering, however, has been emitted by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, who said on television that the negotiation of the Dixon-Yates contract was worse in many respects than the Teapot Dome scandal of the 1920's.

KEFAUVER was generous enough to concede that no bribery was involved, as in the Teapot Dome affair, but he professed to be horrified that the Government had invited in and welcomed with open arms a utility expert to make a survey of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The expert was Adolphe H. Wenzell, then associated with the First Boston Corp. He was asked by the Bureau of the Budget to see if there was some way of getting the Government out of the power business. Wenzell suggested several ways but, and this is significant, President Eisenhower rejected his recommendations.

In spite of Wenzell's findings that 64 percent of TVA's power is now generated from steam plants, that it would have an annual deficit of $21,500,000 if it had to pay the going rate for long-term loans and that it pays no Federal taxes, Mr. Eisenhower said he did not want to curtail the existing operations of TVA. But he made it clear he did not want to expand TVA either, and that additional power facilities should be provided by municipal or private financing.

Now KEFAUVER is complaining that Wenzell's recommendations were concealed until a Senate committee exposed them. The real crime of concealment, however, was committed by the public-power advocates who led the country to believe that the primary functions of TVA would be flood control and navigation. Power production was to be incidental to these activities. But today power production is the main activity of TVA, with twice as much power produced from steam plants as from multipurpose dams.

Thus the public was sold a false bill of goods. The real motive for TVA was socialization of the power industry in the Tennessee Valley. This has already been accomplished, but the Eisenhower administration is being attacked because it is opposed to more socialization. That is the real issue. We think the people will be more inclined to support Eisenhower than the something-for-nothing boys.

Informants Praised by FBI Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folowing article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 18, 1955:

HOOVER CITES AID—INFORMANTS PRAISED BY FBI CHIEF

(By Arthur Kranish)

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, underscored "the value of confidential informants" yesterday by reporting they contributed to more than a thousand arrests in the past year.

The unusual compilation on the work of anonymous tipsters was contained in the FBI chief's summary of accomplishments for the fiscal year which ended on June 30.

Apparently taking note of criticism directed against so-called faceless informers in recent months, the top G-man set his statistical experts to work on the problem.

They disclosed:

Confidential informants provided FBI agents with valuable tips that enabled them to track down and arrest 850 Federal criminals in the past year.

Similar information received by the FBI and passed on to other agencies brought about more than 400 other arrests.

Hoover also listed these other accomplishments:

There were 10,615 convictions in FBI cases, representing success in 96 percent of the cases brought to trial.

A total of 10,182 fugitives from justice were captured.

The upward trend in bank crimes continued, with 335 robberies compared with 271 in 1954. Convictions increased from 246 in 1954 to 355.

Flint Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the Centennial of Flint, Mich., I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release setting forth the plans for that celebration. It was my good fortune to be present in that city last summer at the golden jubilee of General Motors to mark in history the production of that corporation's fifty millionth automobile. The people of Flint are accustomed to see memorable occasions celebrated in a magnificent manner. For this coming centenary I am sure the city will present an outstanding spectacle worthy of its great history.

The news release follows:

FLINT CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Throughout the Nation attention will this summer be turning to the city of Flint, Mich., as it celebrates a century of growth and progress.

The Vehicle City's observance of the 100th anniversary of its incorporation will not only call attention to its industrial achievements but will dramatize the educational and cultural advantages of the city and its promise for the future as well.

The centennial program, organized and financed by civic leaders, will demonstrate the community's hospitality. Flint's youth, and out-of-town visitors as well, will be encouraged to stay as permanent citizens and tie their economic and family futures to the future of Michigan's second largest city.

First in a series of four major free-to-the-public events will be the Flint faith and freedom rally September 4. Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, permanent Under Secretary of the United Nations, will be the guest of honor and keynote speaker for the rally. Dedicated to brotherhood and understanding, the faith and freedom rally will set the spiritual tone of the centennial celebration.

All of the city's cultural, educational, and industrial achievements will be the theme of the Flint forward parade the night of September 7.

The theme section of the parade will have 20 elaborate illuminated floats depicting the development of Flint in colorful terms. The floats will be designed by Centennial Art Director Robert Moore, of New York City. They will be sponsored by Flint industrial and civic organizations.

As the floats move through the streets they will be synchronized with narration carried by public address systems strategically placed among the line of march.

The parade will also include numerous bands and marching groups, as well as religious, civic, educational, military, fraternal, nationality, industrial, labor, and veterans' organizations.

The climax of Flint's birthday celebration will be a spectacular centennial revue on wheels, the Flintorama spectacle on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday evenings, September 9 through September 11. The show will have a cast of 1,000, guest stars and scores of antique horse-drawn and automotive vehicles, contemporary and dream cars. Performed on a huge multileveled stage in Atwood Stadium, the Flintorama will project through script, music, dance, and pageantry the dramatic story of the Vehicle City. More than a thousand costumes, several tons of

lighting equipment, fireworks, and special effects will be blended together in Flintorama.

The production will be directed by New York Producer-Director James Vincent Russo. Russo directed the National Company of Finian's Rainbow, coproduced the Bette Davis revue, Two's Company, and the Joe E. Brown musical, Courtin' Time.

Last summer Mr. Russo directed Omaha, Chuck Wagon of America, a historical spectacle with a cast of 1,200 which climaxed the year-long centennial of Omaha, Nebr., and the Nebraska-Kansas Territory. It is anticipated that Flintorama will play to an audience of approximately 60,000 in its 3 days of presentation.

Beginning August 27 and running through the last day of Flintorama, September 11, there will also be a "Flint Past, Present, and Future Exhibit" at the new Ballenger Field House.

The exhibit will be a comprehensive, graphic presentation of the past and present development of every phase of Flint life with a dramatic projection into the future.

Growth of the city's population, educational, and religious activities, industrial expansion, and city planning are a few of the myriad civic and municipal activities which will be covered in the exhibit.

Managing director of the centennial is Alfred Stern, of New York City. He is director of the Community and Industrial Showmanship Department, American National Theater and Academy. Stern's largest community celebration was the direction of Detroit's 250th birthday festival throughout 1951. His latest was Omaha's year-long centennial in 1954. He also directed the Detroit Automotive Golden Jubilee in 1946.

A Decade of Progress in Employing the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an essay by Richard Makover, of Hartsdale, N. Y., which received the fourth award in the 1955 national essay contest sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped:

A DECADE OF PROGRESS IN EMPLOYING THE HANDICAPPED

When wars are waged between nations and manpower is endlessly poured into the battle by both sides in their efforts to win victory; when the wheels of industry are turned by men and women laboring in productive factories; when helpless babies are born into the world, beginning their struggle with a disobliging society—then the result is some who inevitably are injured and must join the ranks of the handicapped. The boys come marching home, but not all can march and the long ambulance train is filled with those who will never again be proper bolts for the war machine. The wheels of progress turn and some are caught in the revolving cogs, and their jobs are filled by others. A whim of nature, and an individual is stricken with a crippling disease or a congenital deformity, which will thwart his ambitions. These people are handicapped and a decade ago the situation of most was hopeless.

A decade ago the disabled person had little chance for a good job. Usually, he was not trained in a trade where his handicap would be discounted. Employers were generally suspicious of handicapped job seekers and gave them no chance to show their worth. The disabled person was forced to live on charity or by the assistance of his friends and his feeling of helplessness and dependence precluded his chance for a normal, happy life.

The last 10 years, however, have been a decade of progress, and the next 10 seem even more promising. The physically handicapped now have a chance to be not only useful and employed, but to be independent and to profit by their labor, as well. The employer is more understanding and more willing to give jobs to the disabled. The disabled person has been given a chance to overcome his disability by learning a trade where he is not hindered by it. With these advances, the handicapped person has been given a chance to show what he can do, and has proven how well he can do it.

The chance began in 1945. The events responsible for the achievements of the ensuing decade were the formation of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped and the inauguration of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, or NEPH Week. Before the President's Committee was formed, there were other organizations working for the handicapped—the Veterans' Administration and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation with its affiliated State rehabilitation divisions and agencies for the blind; Federal and State employment services; and private associations—but NEPH Week was the first successful attempt to bring nationwide recognition and interest to the problem of rehabilitation for employment of the physically handicapped. This recognition and interest have broken down the barriers of ignorance and fear. The employer is now more favorably inclined toward employing the handicapped and he has learned that employing the handicapped is good business.

The rehabilitation which has played such a large part in the decade of progress prepares the individual in many ways. The disabled person is prepared physically, mentally, and socially for his new life. He receives vocational training in a job that is in line with both his ability and his disability. Everything is done to allow him the best adjustment and to insure success in his new job. This process of rehabilitation has become increasingly more widespread as greater recognition, through NEPH Week and year-round activities, is given to the problem of the physically handicapped. Since 1945, almost 2 million handicapped workers were rehabilitated and placed in new jobs. About half of these placements were for disabled veterans.

The entire Nation profits from the employment of the handicapped. Under the ideals of democracy, all men are equal and are entitled to an equal chance. When given this chance, the handicapped person does his part to keep America strong, and the country benefits from his work. The 2 million handicapped since 1945 contributed an estimated 4 billion man-hours per year. That the American employer recognizes the worth of these rehabilitated individuals is proved by the increasing number of monthly placements.

In addition, rehabilitation changes the disabled person from a liability to an asset; for it is costlier for the Government to maintain an individual by public assistance year after year than to rehabilitate and give him employment. Each disabled person on public assistance costs the taxpayers annually $300 to $500 per person spent only once. As a taxpayer, the rehabilitated person will turn back $10 in income tax during his working life for every Federal dollar invested in his rehabilitation. One group of disabled persons were earning $17 million a year. After joining the Federal program, their earnings are now $114 million. An earlier group of 44,000 had an average annual wage of $148 per person. After rehabilitation, each was earning $1,768 per year, and their total earnings rose from $7 million to $78 million. Thus the rehabilitation not only raised the standard of living for these people, it benefited the country economically as well.

Moreover, disabled workers have been shown to surpass the other workers in fulfilling their duties. More than half of the disabled persons have fewer absences; more than half have a better labor turnover; more than half have fewer accidents than their fellow workers. And it cannot be said that the disabled do not work as well as other workers; for when placed in jobs which suited them, more than 85 percent proved themselves just as efficient as nonhandicapped workers.

And so, the physically handicapped of America have shown that they are not only worthy of help, but that the United States has good reason to help them. In the end, the Nation will benefit as much from the rehabilitation of the handicapped—in money, in ability, and in man-hours of work—as the rehabilitated will benefit from the Government's help. In 1954, the annual rate of employment of the disabled was 70,000, but in 1959, employment will be given to an estimated 200,000 annually because of the vocational rehabilitation amendments of 1954.

A time is approaching when no one who can work will be barred from employment because of a physical disability. The time will come when the war veteran, the injured workman, and the disease-stricken American will all be given the chance to show that jobdemocracy is for all. The time will come when the physically disabled will no longer be discounted. The time will come when all those physically handicapped will be able to work; for in the words of John Sullivan Dwight:

"Work, and thou wilt bless the day
Ere the toil be done;
They that work not, cannot pray,
Cannot feel the sun.

"God is living, working still,
All things work and move;
Work, or lose the power to will,
Lose the power to love."[1]

[1] John Sullivan Dwight, "Working."

The Bricker Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George E. Sokolsky, entitled "Bricker Proposal a Way to Truth," which was published in the New York Journal-American on July 13, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRICKER PROPOSAL A WAY TO TRUTH

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It would seem now that this Congress may adjourn without taking any action in the

Bricker amendment. That does not at all mean that this proposition is dead. President Eisenhower's personal popularity has had a hypnotic influence on the legislators of our country so that what he opposes is regarded as politically dangerous.

The Bricker amendment involves nothing that most countries do not practice. Its general principal, for instance, is binding upon the Government of Great Britain, which cannot by treaty affect the domestic law of the country. If a treaty calls for a change in domestic law, it would require an act of Parliament to make it effective. It could not be secret because it would be debated. It could not contain misunderstood or hidden, or ambiguous clauses, because the Government would feel called upon to explain the details in Parliament and the opposition would bring out the facts.

GENEVA AND YALTA

The opponents of the measure feel that it would give the appearance of a limitation upon the President, particularly upon President Eisenhower. Republicans, who denounce both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman for Yalta and Potsdam, object to regularizing our treaty procedures during the administration of President Eisenhower, lest it reflect upon his popularity which seems so important to them. Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, commenting on this particular point, said:

"Opponents of my amendment say that it would tie the hands of the President. That is true in one sense, but untrue in the impression intended to be conveyed. The President's hands are tied by the Constitution, particularly by the wise restraints of the Bill of Rights. My amendment would also tie the President's hands, but only to the extent that he could not make international agreements in conflict with the Constitution nor make one-man law for the people of the United States by executive agreement. Why should not the President's hands be tied to that extent? Why should the President have power to make treaties and other international agreements which conflict with the Constitution? What domestic laws should the President have power to make by international agreements not approved by either House of Congress? I have never heard a convincing answer to these questions."

As we approach the Geneva Conference, this question takes on the additional meaning that many Americans would like to be sure that Geneva is not another Yalta. As much as they are sure of the good-will and abiding faith of President Eisenhower, they cannot but recall that back in 1945, President Roosevelt was a man of such extraordinary personal popularity that he had been elected to the Presidency four times by enormous majorities. Yet today no one in this country is satisfied with the results of Yalta, except the Communists who exult in Russia's victory.

SECRET DIPLOMACY

Geneva may amount to nothing and no treaty or agreement or secret agreement may come from it. On the other hand, it is a meeting among politicians, three of whom hold office by popular elections. For President Eisenhower, it is more immediately important than for Sir Anthony Eden, because Eisenhower is already involved in an election campaign. While some may take the position that Eisenhower cannot be defeated by anyone, politicians know that anything can happen in an election and that a man who is at the apex of popularity in 1955, may not be quite so high in 1956.

Therefore it would be of political value to strengthen President Eisenhower's position by making it possible for him to bring back from Geneva some document that might give the impression of achieving world peace, even though the full value of the document may not be known until years later and may be harmful to this country, as Yalta was.

Since the beginning of World War II, secret diplomacy has become current. Along with it has developed a tendency to suppress the news even in a free country. Every government tries to exercise some form of censorship, including our own. The most effective form is the withholding of important and crucial information from the people by refusing it not only to the press but to Congress. In many instances today such data can only be obtained from government, and therefore become altogether unavailable.

Some way needs to be found to get at the truth early enough to be of potency. The Bricker amendment is one way because it requires debate in Congress.

Tribute to Carl E. Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN WELKER
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the June 23 issue of the Payette Lakes Star, of McCall, Idaho, paying tribute to Carl E. Brown, a pioneer lumberman of Idaho.

Carl E. Brown has been my friend since childhood. The article pays tribute to one of Idaho's most outstanding citizens, and I commend it to my colleagues for their reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARL BROWN PREDICTS EXPANSION OF PAYETTE LAKES AREA LUMBERING

(By Britt Nedry)

"Because of the sensible policy of sustained yield and perpetual growth in our forests, the lumbering industry in the Payette Lakes area will increase rather than diminish, as has happened in so many regions"—so spoke Carl E. Brown, pioneer lumberman and founder of Brown's Tie & Lumber Co., with headquarters at McCall, in an interview at the Star office Saturday. Mr. Brown pointed to the vast stands of timber in the Payette National Forest and based his confidence upon the modern practice of forest conservation, harvesting the ripe timber and restoring the cut areas.

"The sawmill operations, the logging industry and allied work represent an annual payroll of at least $1 million annually and, in addition, we have the headquarters of the Payette National Forest here, which is probably another one-half million dollar payroll—the forestry and lumbering economy is a tremendous year round asset to this area," the venerable lumberman stated.

FROM NEW ENGLAND TO IDAHO

The Brown family had its roots in Whitefield, N. H., where Carl was born in 1878. He and Ida Herrington were married in 1902 and came to Idaho in 1903. The Browns had 4 children—Mrs. Stan Harwood, McCall; Warren Brown, McCall; Mrs. Tuck Beyerle, Boise; Mrs. Homer Davis, Nampa; and 10 grandchildren.

In the early days in Idaho, Carl tried mining and then got the mail contract from Warrens to Big Creek—2 days in and 2 days out. He came to McCall in July 1910, and carried the mail to Warrens. Then, with Theodore Hoff, a sawmill and flour mill was established and Brown bought the interest of Bert Bills.

Times were hard, Brown reflected, and at times the mail contract kept the family in food until they got the tie contract for the railroad.

In 1929, he "bought out" Mr. Hoff for $40,000, as the business had expanded to include a planing mill, land, and box factory at Horseshoe Bend.

In 1930, Carl had a big tie contract, but by 1932 the general business conditions (depression) made tough going at the mill. However, in 1933 a Government contract for the lumber in constructing CCC camps made things better and since then the business has steadily increased. A fire, July 16, 1940, destroyed the plant, but it was rebuilt under the direction of Joe Kasper, head millwright, with ample facilities for the tie and lumber sawing operations.

"The people of Valley County and Idaho have been very kind to me," Mr. Brown observed, "and I have been able to obtain credit at the bank when I needed it. To build up a large business during good times and bad requires cooperation and patience from all concerned."

SERVED AS DEMOCRATIC SENATOR

Carl Brown was elected to the Idaho Senate in 1923, and he served five terms in the legislature as Senator from Valley County. He was also Democratic National Committeeman from Idaho in 1940–44.

Mr. Brown explained that in the 1944 convention at Philadelphia he favored Truman for Vice President, as he didn't like Henry Wallace's "socialistic" ideas. In 1952, he left the Democratic Party to support Eisenhower and, he declared, he will oppose any further extension of Federal power, as announced by Adlai Stevenson and others who have recently spoken for his former party.

CIVIC RESPONSIBILITIES TAKEN

An outstanding event which reflects the integrity of Carl E. Brown in civic matters was his insistence that the extensive mill property be included within the village of McCall. "Business should pay its share of municipal taxes and contribute to civic progress like anyone else," he declared emphatically.

The 77-year-old veteran business man and philosopher now spends his winters in Arizona and returns to the beautiful Payette Lakes for the summer. His son, Warren Brown, is manager of the mill operations and his grandson, Frank Brown (who was valedictorian of his class this year) is learning the lumber business from the woods up, so as to take his responsibilities in the business as the years develop. However, the forward looking patriarch asserts with confidence that the production of the Brown Tie and Lumber Co., will be increased by 5 million to 6 million feet per year over the 24 million-foot cut now maintained.

We could call this the "Carl E. Brown Story"—a typical narrative of good American fortitude and energy, combined with fair dealing and sound business principles. Carl repeatedly pays tribute to his coworkers and his wife and family; he says people are kind and considerate. Yes, that's true, because people who live by the Golden Rule receive from others the measure of good will which they give.

Operation Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CON-

GRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a copy of the report made by the Alabama State Department of Civil Defense on their participation in the 1955 Operation Alert.

I have long felt that our entire Nation is too apathetic regarding the dangers of a possible enemy attack and that we thereby increase the number of potential casualties, should such an attack ever occur.

I am very pleased that Alabama so effectively participated in Operation Alert and that the civil defense officials also feel they have learned additional valuable information for increasing the protection of our peoples.

The report follows:

OPERATION ALERT 1955

Operation Alert, 1955, a National Civil Defense exercise, was conducted June 15–16, 1955. The exercise was based on a hypothetical atomic attack on 50 critical target cities of the continental United States with additional attacks on Alaska, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Panama. The civil defense phase of the test which covered theoretically a 9-day period was telescoped into 27 hours. The purpose of the exercise was to test evacuation plans and public warning systems, and to develop the supporting capabilities of all areas within the State not under attack. All phases of technical and logistic planning and operational readiness, along with the current organizational structure within the State was determined.

Gov. James E. Folson, on being notified of the supposed atomic attack by the director of civil defense for the State of Alabama, Pitt Tyson Maner, issued a proclamation of a supposed state of emergency.

Governor Folsom cooperated to the fullest extent in offering all available services to the devastated areas immediately after the bombs were dropped and was the first governor to declare a state of emergency.

It was assumed that Birmingham, Ala., would be a target in this region, however, it was not a target and Knoxville, Tenn., and Atlanta, Ga. suffered the mock attack. Civil defense experts in the State of Tennessee and Georgia made estimates of the loss of life, injured and damage to property which could have occurred in the actual dropping of these bombs.

Mr. Thomas H. Goodman, Federal Civil Defense Administrator for region 3, requested supplies and personnel for our sister States of Tennessee and Georgia to help augment the needs in the disaster area where chaos was said to be reigning. Alabama theoretically began sending help. Urgent requests came to the Office of Civil Defense throughout the day and night by teletype machine, radio and telephone.

The Alabama Department of Civil Defense received requests for water and purification equipment, feeding supervisors, communications supplies, draglines, bulldozers, auxiliary police, radio equipped vehicles and blood supplies.

The various State departments, including highway patrol, welfare, industrial relations, agriculture and industries, corrections and institutions, aeronautics, health, Alabama Ground Observer Corps, together with the Alabama Military District, Birmingham office, and the Alabama adjutant general's department cooperated with the civil defense department to the fullest extent. The amateur radio operators throughout the State were also of invaluable aid.

When these urgent requests started coming into our office we immediately went to our inventory sheets that had been prepared in advance. Our first request was for the arrangement of transportation for the total blood output of Birmingham ANRC blood center to Atlanta as long as it was necessary. We quickly checked our transportation inventory and found that the Alabama Air National Guard had airplanes available to furnish transportation for this request. Our next request was for 500 auxiliary police and 100 vehicles radio equipped for common frequency to cope with the falout problem and lateral evacuation of evacuees from Atlanta. We found that the Alabama National Guard had 250 auxiliary police and transportation to Atlanta, and we made a quick check with the public safety division and this department furnished the 100 vehicles radio equipped for the fallout and evacuation problem.

Our next request was for 20 emergency feeding groups. This request was furnished by the State department of welfare. An urgent request followed for 100 bulldozers and 50 draglines. We called upon the highway department for this request and found that 50 bulldozers and 15 draglines could be shipped by rail immediately from Montgomery, Mobile, Gadsden, and Birmingham. A request for 5 rescue teams with equipment was furnished by the department of industrial relations. Another request for 22 feeding teams and 11 administrative and supervisory workers was received. These workers were requested for Marietta and Fayetteville, Ga., where evacuees from Atlanta had assembled. A request for water purification units was furnished by the Alabama National Guard and was sent directly from Montgomery by truck.

Alabama's civil defense was called upon to give support in this exercise in the form of manpower and equipment to neighboring States. The State of Alabama had in reserve in case it was needed 2 million pounds of beef, 8 million pounds of pork, over a million bushels of wheat, and 7½ million bushels of oats, 3 million bushels of corn, 1 million bales of cotton, and 18 million chickens. The department of corrections and institutions advised that they could secure 500 pints of blood on 12 hours' notice. The department of aeronautics reported 400 aircraft of all types and 1,200 registered pilots for emergency duty. The department of industrial relations reported 800 common laborers, 300 truckdrivers, 45 linemen, 30 policemen, 25 firemen, 85 practical nurses were available if Knoxville and Atlanta were attacked. The department of health reported that its medical supplies, first-aid stations, improvised hospitals, and subordinate units could be utilized and 35,000 casualties could be cared for in hospitals in the State

Operation Alert 1955 was a real challenge for the civil-defense department. Our role in this alert was to mass our resources and support the States in our region that were attacked. We were prepared and furnished all requests made to this department during the 27 hours which the whole office force remained on duty.

In the event that an enemy should attack the United States, all of the people, all of the facilities, and all of the skills and energies must be utilized to the fullest extent. To successfully carry out this program will require the cooperation of every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

I want to personally express my thanks, appreciation, and congratulations to everyone who participated in Operation Alert 1955. I feel that this was the best exercise we have had to date and it could not have been without the cooperation of all of you. Operation Alert has shown us a lot of mistakes and weaknesses so much the better. Now we can all go to work remedying that situation. Again I want to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the wonderful job each of you did.

PITT TYSON MANER,
Director.

Upper Colorado River Project Freezes Up 323 Days a Year But Costs $5,000 an Acre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project lies at such high altitude that it would have a growing season of only 42 days a year.

It would cost the taxpayers of the Nation nearly $5,000 an acre to develop hay lands in this high, cold country where in some places it snows every month in the year, and where spring killing frosts come as late as July 11 and fall frosts as early as August 22.

A large part of the land to be irrigated in this inconceivable project lies at an altitude of 6,500 to 7,000 feet in the Wyoming counties of Lincoln, Sublette and Uinta.

In Lincoln County killing frosts come as late as June 30 on an average, and as early as August 22. The growing season runs between 53 and 73 days.

In Sublette County killing frosts come as late as July 11 and as early as August 22. The growing season runs between 42 and 62 days.

In Uinta County killing frosts come as late as June 11 and as early as September 7. The growing season runs between 88 and 92 days.

The upper Colorado River would cost the Nation's taxpayers $5,600,000,000 or more than $140 for each American family, and possibly much more. This does not include losses due to the tax exemption of the project. It would grow crops which are unneeded. So, on this reclamation project the taxpayers would pay for the land and then for the unneeded crops it grows.

That is, it would grow crops if frost and summertime snows did not kill everything. The whole thing is ridiculous, extravagant, and unnecessary. It constitutes an immoral taking of private property for Government socialism of desert mountain lands.

Congress is being asked to appropriate billions of dollars to bring these new farms into production in a country where there are as few as 42 days in which to grow even pasture grasses for dairy cows and sheep to graze on and to produce more surplus butter and wool.

It snows practically every month of the year in these 3 counties where it is proposed to develop 110,000 acres.

If more agricultural acreage is needed in this country there are millions of acres of first-class land awaiting development in humid, fast-growing sections.

We do not need to go to the top of the Rocky Mountains to create new farms on poor land at fantastic cost. It is indeed a proposition as absurd as growing bananas on Pikes Peak. This further extension of the absurdities of socialism which prevail in every country ought to be stopped right now in America.

Does Southern California Want All the Water?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the States of the Colorado River Basin are beset with a problem of great magnitude and this problem is water. This region is fighting desperately for the right to develop and use the only remaining source of water available to them—the share of the Colorado River which belongs to the people of these States by law and by right. Without this water, our States simply cannt continue to grow and develop.

A part of the water of this same Colorado River has been apportioned to California. A large share of it goes to southern California where the rapidly growing industrial, agricultural and municipal economy very largely depends on it. This is as it should be and no one has any quarrel with their legitimate use of this water. We definitely want southern California to have what is rightfully hers. But we are disturbed, Mr. Speaker, and deeply disturbed by the use—or perhaps more perfect terminology would be, lack of use—to which southern California is putting a great deal of this vital water.

In southern California's Imperial Valley, down in the hot desert country below sea level, lies the Salton Sea. The Salton Sea is a dead sea, a salt lake with no outlet to the ocean. Into that mournful body of dead and waste water is pouring, each year approximately 1¾ million acre-feet of good Colorado River water. That is more than two-thirds the total amount of Colorado River water now being used in the 4 upper basin States of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming.

The Salton Sea was dry at the beginning of this century, until the Colorado River flooded out of its course in 1905 and poured into this desert waste hole. Its level dropped steadily from the time the flood was brought under control, in 1907, until 1936 when the completion of Hoover Dam made vast quantities of Colorado River water available for irrigating Imperial Valley—and the waste waters from this operation poured into the Salton Sea.

Mr. Speaker, the tremendous evaporation rate in that hot, below-sea-level climate would normally drop the level of the Salton Sea about 8 feet a year. But so much Colorado River water has been allowed to waste into it that the lake level has risen 12½ feet since 1936, and 5 feet since 1950. Since 1950 about 1¾ million acre-feet a year have run to waste in the Salton Sea.

We sympathize with southern California's water problems, Mr. Speaker, but other States have water problems too. This country cannot afford to waste millions of acre-feet of precious water.

We want to develop the water of the Colorado River for beneficial, life-giving use—through construction of the Colorado River storage project, and later through projects to divert water into Arizona and Nevada. I suggest that southern California put her own share of Colorado River water to beneficial use instead of trying to deny other States the use of their lawful quota of the waters of the Colorado River.

Possible Loss of State Roads Seen Under United States Highway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the attached news article from the Jackson, Miss., State Times raises some very disturbing questions about the intergradation of the new interstate highway system with the existing State highway. With this type of procedure, many millions of dollars will be wasted due to the failure to properly utilize the existing roads.

The article follows:

POSSIBLE LOSS OF STATE ROADS SEEN UNDER UNITED STATES HIGHWAY PLAN

(By Prentiss Cox)

Some of Mississippi's best and most expensive miles of main artery highway may have to be abandoned under the new Federal superhighway program, unless present laws are changed.

T. C. Robbins, State highway department director, admitted under questioning Thursday that 4 of the State's main United States highways—11, 51, 80, and 90—do not meet standards of the so-called Clay committee superhighways system.

All four have been included by the United States Bureau of Public Roads in the gigantic, multibillion dollar supermilitary highway system that intends to link all the Nation's major population centers, and 42 of its State capitals.

"We will make every effort to salvage what we can of the existing highways, when and if the Federal project becomes a reality, and the money is allocated by Congress," Robbins said.

Asked what would happen to those miles that could not be salvaged as part of the new four-lane highways, Robbins said, "That's simple."

"We have no choice."

"There is a State law that the highway department can maintain only one road for a given route. Those miles not in a new highway would automatically go back to the county," he said.

Since it is not likely a county would spend the money to maintain an old highway, unless in some particular local cases it could be used for local traffic between towns, this means in effect that the present highways 11, 51, 80, and 90 will have many of their miles abandoned if the Federal project is ever built.

Many of the miles are new construction.

Highway 80 between Jackson and Vicksburg, still under construction, does not meet the standards.

Highway 90 near Biloxi, just recently completed, does not qualify.

Robbins, and Chief Engineer E. M. Johnson, explained this happened because the United States Bureau of Public Roads changed their qualifications in "midstream," after contracts for recent construction was already let.

"It is not possible at this early stage to estimate even roughly, how many miles can be salvaged for the new superhighways, and how many will have to be given back to the counties," Johnson said.

"We'll have to go over those highways inch by inch to determine how much of it can be salvaged," he said.

Johnson explained that the present four main highways do not qualify, because:

1. The new superduper roads must be "freeways" to get Federal matching funds, and none of the four are "freeways."

2. A "freeway" means that the road must be four lane, divided by an island in the middle, with limited access from side roads. Some miles of the existing highways can be converted to this, some cannot.

3. Many miles of the present four highways do not meet technical requirements for the new superduper roads. Parts of these highways were built as long ago as the 1930's, and highway construction specifications have changed drastically since that time, Johnson explained. This refers to width of the road, types of shoulders, materials used, and other technical problems.

4. The exact routes must be approved by the United States Bureau of Roads, and even if the highways met all other standards, there would probably be some needed changes in routing.

The entire problem is only in the "tentative plans" stage right now. Congress has not yet acted on the highway bill now before it, which will provide the money for the program.

"But once the money is available, we'll move fast," Robbins said.

"We won't let that money sit in the bank long," he said.

Asked whether U. S. 51 would be the first of the four superduper roads to be built, as reported in Jackson's morning daily Thursday, Robbins said "No."

"All four are part of the program, and no one has priority over the other," Robbins said.

Why Should Anyone Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an item appearing in the Washington Star of July 13 regarding a proposed District of Columbia unemployment bill.

The item indicates that unemployment compensation benefits shall run a full year and the amount to be paid has been increased from $30 to $54 a week. Such legislation must be a complete discouragement to those who are employed and willing to earn their own living.

The item follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT BILL PASSES SENATE UNOPPOSED

A greatly liberalized District unemployment compensation insurance measure was approved in the Senate in 2 minutes yesterday without a recorded objection. It

would raise the maximum benefits to the jobless, for a period of a full year, from the present $30 a week to $54 a week. The House District Committee as yet has made no move even to consider the bill.

The bill was called up in the Senate by Senator MCNAMARA, Democrat of Michigan, head of the subcommittee that recently held the hearings. The group made a report indicating the bill was in line with recommendations made by President Eisenhower for an improvement in the District law so that it would become a model for the States.

Earlier, however, Senator HRUSKA, Republican of Nebraska, a member of the McNamara subcommittee, issued a statement in which he asked for a delay in Senate action so that more "mature and seasoned consideration" could be given the problem and in which he denounced the Senate bill as going a long way too far in liberalization.

Maj. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton, USAF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it will please many of my colleagues in this Congress to have a report on the success an old friend is achieving in strengthening NATO and our overseas defenses. That friend is Maj. Gen. Bob Eaton, of the United States Air Force. Members of other Congresses will recall the courtesy and helpfulness he invariably showed in his work as Director of the Office of Legislative Liaison in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. Before he returns to the United States next September to assume command of the 10th Air Force, based at Selfridge Field, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the glowing report that has just come in about Bob Eaton's work in the Near East.

General Eaton presently commands the Sixth Allied Tactical Air Force, with headquarters at Izmir, Turkey. Izmir is the historic Smyrna, in that ancient land where Russia has covetously eyed the Bosporus and Aegean Sea for centuries because they afford a warm-water outlet for its ships. Here the American general, Bob Eaton, has built a modern jet Air Force out of diverse and formerly unfriendly elements, which is an important unit of the Allied Air Forces of Southern Europe. Greeks and Turks were catapulted out of an agricultural past of donkey-cart transportation into the air age, but without benefit of a common language or common tradition have quickly formed and air instrument that is fully effective by the best of NATO standards.

Accomplishing this was a diplomatic as well as a military achievement, and full credit must go to Bob Eaton, who supplied the direction and the leadership. His orders, when he arrived in Izmir 18 months ago, were to unify and bring the readiness capability of 1 Greek and 2 Turkish tactical air forces to the point where they would be ready to perform NATO war missions whenever called upon. How fully and successfully he has carried out his orders in only a year and a half, and increased American prestige at the very edge of the Iron Curtain, is dramatically told in a story in the June 24, 1955, issue of Republic Aviation News.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pride to request the permission of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tribute to an able Air Force general who is my friend, and an understanding friend of Congress. The article tells how the United States Air Force under the NATO program, and through the devoted service of Maj. Gen. Bob Eaton, has helped mold the Greek and Turkish air forces into a powerful jet air armada to oppose Soviet aggression as follows:

THE (THUNDER) JET AGE COMES TO THE NEAR EAST

Not long ago the jet air age struck the new Republic of Turkey and Kingdom of Greece with the suddenness of a Thunderjet. And today, pilots flying Republic F–84G Thunderjets, patrol the skies of Turkey and Greece like suspicious wasps. Many of these young lads grew up in families whose livelihood was earned in isolated regions of the interior where transportation is mostly related to horses, donkeys, and carts.

The vast chasm between the thinking of parents who use animals for transport and a young airman who "rides the pipe" of a 600-mile-per hour fighter-bomber has been bridged overnight. And the program of training Greek and Turk pilots was done without benefit of a common language or custom.

About 1951, when jet flying began in Greece and Turkey, there were few Turkish words or thoughts which could receive and transmit highly technical jet terms. The Turks already had a great interest in flying and their reciprocating engine equipment was excellent but jet aircraft required a new language in many cases. In Greece, the language did have technical words because 2,000 years ago the Greeks were leaders in the fields of science and many of today's scientific words are Greek in origin. But the Greeks had to learn to apply these old words to new jet flying.

THE LANGUAGE WAS A MAJOR PROBLEM

Therefore, the creation of all-jet forces in Greece and Turkey involved the difficult task of translating thoughts. If the thought could be put over, any language—Greek, Turk, American, or Indian sign language—would do. And on this frail but elastic communication base today's NATO jet forces in Greece and Turkey were built.

The beginning of the NATO flying program was 18 short months ago, when Maj. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton arrived in the ancient city of Izmir carrying an important tactical order in his hip pocket. This said he would unify and bring the readiness capability of one Greek and two Turkish tactical air forces to the point where they were ready to perform NATO war missions whenever called upon. And so on October 14, 1953, the Sixth Allied Tactical Air Force began to establish operational command at strategic points in Turkey and Greece.

Prior to General Eaton's arrival the Turks and Greeks with American aid had modernized and expanded airfields for jet operations in the midst of country containing slow and leisure-loving peasants. When the jet planes first came the aircraft were a sensation. Many of the countryfolk dropped whatever they were doing (or not doing) and made their way immediately to the aircraft on foot, donkey back or horse cart. They surrounded the propellerless miracle and its American operators, closely inspecting both.

The transition into jets was accomplished by American instructors and advisers of the United States Military Aid Missions in Greece and Turkey. These missions, JUSMAG (Joint United States Military Aid to Greece) and JAMMAT (Joint American Military Aid to Turkey) have the responsibility to not only supply needed equipment to the Greeks and Turks but also to advise them in its basic use and maintenance.

The language difficulty among pilots or pilot candidates was not acute because before a Turk or Greek can be eligible for flight training he must have completed advanced schooling which includes considerable English. The major problem was in the support or the "keep them flying" side of aviation. In this bracket are the enlisted personnel who must be taught maintenance, supply, communications, and administration. To help meet the training requirements the Aid mission revised USAF's "Operation Bootstrap" with a Turkish version called Operation Anladim which in Turkish means "I understand." This helped tremendously.

GROUND CREW TRAINING TOOK TIME

Many of the enlisted personnel who report for duty have never hammered a nail or used a saw. Some cannot read very well, but nevertheless they must be trained to take care of complicated F–84G's and help keep them flying. Some neophytes begin their training as far back as dismantling and reassembling a wooden box. From there they are taken through the use of a screwdriver, socket wrench, soldering iron, welding, voltmeters, switches, electronics, and on into the cockpit.

Flying instructors or other airmen who complain about their personnel not understanding a simple order in simple American should serve a tour in Greece or Turkey. They would soon discover that giving American orders to American personnel is a downright cinch.

After all, when a sergeant yells "Nuts" in American everyone knows what he means. But in Turkey or Greece if he says "Nuts" someone might think he is referring to tree fruit such as almonds or walnuts.

If the American adviser is station at Larissa AFB, Greece, or Eskisehir AFB, Turkey, the men he talks to will understand only the pure English they have studied in English classes or a complex local jargon the troops have invented together. Therefore an instructor who murders "the King's English" and who lacks the sympathetic qualities of a good teacher doesn't get far with his men. The rating of AOCLD (Aircraft Out of Commission for Language Difficulties), will be hung up.

It was discovered early that it was impossible to satisfactorily translate many technical instructions from American into Greek or Turkish. Not only were many new jet words or definitions missing in the Greek and Turkish dictionaries but the interpreters had to be schooled in the technical subjects before they could make meaningful interpretations. This creates an impossibility because a language scholar is not necessarily a scientist who can translate the complete operation of a landing gear in a Republic F–84G. Training is therefore conducted in English and continuous English classes are held the year around to help the program. As slang and American industry words creep into everyday talk the language is naturally transformed from "English" to "American."

BUILDING AN AIR FORCE FROM SCRATCH

When General Eaton began establishing his Sixth Allied Tactical Air Force from absolute scratch in October 1953, he had the problem of working with pilots, mechanics, and administrative personnel, trained by JUSMAG, JAMMAT, and Turk and Greek air force commanders and whipping them into

a top-flight, unified, all-jet NATO air force overnight.

The 600-mile-per-hour F-84G Thunderjet was a decidedly new bird in this ancient part of the world. The choice of the airplane was excellent, however, because it was a proven flying platform that was easy to fly for a jet. Its control and performance did not vary if properly used. It was rugged and well designed for for maintenance. Crews could master it.

The Turks and Greeks entered the jet age with abounding enthusiasm. An extra dividend was the bond it cemented between the two countries which had battled each other for centuries. As they progressed, General Eaton and his staff of Turkish, Greek, and American personnel working at a fever pitch to accomplish the miracle they were directed to perform. Assisting him in key spots were one of Turkey's top air force generals, Maj. Gen. Hamdullah S. Goker, Chief of Staff; Greece's dynamic Brig. Gen. Constantinos Geranopoulos, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations; Korean-experienced Col. William McBride, USAF, Assistant Chief of Staff for Operations, and Col. John Dick, USAF, Assistant Chief of Staff for Logistics.

EATON GAMBLED AND WON

General Eaton's problems were many. An example was the reluctance of some authorities to accept the Turk's ability to keep aircraft maintained sufficiently well for long hours of flying. These critics didn't have the faith of Eaton who gambled, after studying the Turks, and stepped up the requirements for the NATO flying hour program. The last 6 months record has proved he was right—sensationally so. After a slow start, the Turks now fly jets according to the best of NATO standards. The Greeks had already taken to jets with the same alacrity as their ancestors took to ships. Another example of a problem that had to be licked was the Turk's inherent desire to hoard supplies. Like other Middle-Easterners they are natural hoarders and bargainers. Their bazaars are filled with stored junk or treasure which they fondle, "keep for a rainy day," or use for bargaining. Eaton had the difficult task of breaking down this traditional desire to hoard. He and his staff worked long hours with Turkish commanders to teach mechanics the value of replacing worn or partly worn parts with new ones before it was too late. By winning this battle the number of flyable aircraft improved tremendously.

In coordination with Maj. Gen. Patrick W. Timberlake's, United States Air Force, Forces Southern Europe at Naples, Italy, and Lt. Gen. Paul W. Kendall's Allied Land Forces Southeast Europe Command, also headquartered in Izmir, Turkey, and Adm. William Fechteler's Allied Forces of Southern Europe at Naples, Italy, many exercises and maneuvers were conducted. Communications were improved and tightened, stock controls and inventories were given considerable attention, flying hour performance was carefully scrutinized, readiness capability was a constant subject of discussion. And all through the NATO program continual American language classes are being conducted.

Since General Eaton's Sixth Allied Tactical Air Force has no command function except in case of war, the bulk of his accomplishments are obtained by field visits of his staff officers and enlisted specialists. Their big job is to advise and recommend. The Turk and Greek commanders act on these suggestions. JAMMAT and JUSMAG work closely with the entire program.

LEADERSHIP IS EXCELLENT

Such field-visit meetings without fail begin with the traditional Turkish hospitality of coffee or tea. American fliers who have been accustomed to the short twice a day flight-line coffee break are now convinced that a piping hot demitasse of tea or coffee prior to a meeting stimulates the thinking bringing about better understanding and harmony.

As an example of Turkish Air Force leadership, United States airmen cite Brig. Gen. Enver Akoglu, Commander of the 1st Turkish Tactical Air Force based at Eskisehir.

General Akoglu, a champion wrestler in his youth, is now in the impatient middle-age bracket. To him a hearty handshake is one that feels to the American like his arm is being torn off.

The general frequently paces the floor of his headquarters, grumbling half in Turkish and half in English about the younger generation. "Here I am an old man," he declares, but not meaning it, "and I can fly jets as good or better than any young fellow. They should be better than me. Why can't these young fellas do better than that?"

COMBAT-READY JET CURTAIN

Of course, the general, who paces the floor like a nervous mountain lion ready to strike, knows his pilots have the ability and are progressing rapidly, but he demands perfection in making his Tactical Air Force one of the finest in NATO's Allied Air Command.

In Greece it is the same story of excellent leadership and desire to keep pace with the fast-moving jet age.

The Greece-Turkey area is where Russia has covetously eyed the Bosphorus and Aegean Sea for centuries because it is a warm-water outlet for its ships. Also, it is a path to the rich Middle East. Here the young Turks and Greeks of Maj. Gen. Robert E. L. Eaton's 6th Allied Tactical Air Force are doing an excellent job for the free world. To insure its success the United States Air Force Groups of JUSMAG and JAMMAT are providing splendid cooperation and the Greek and Turkish commanders are bringing their units to a surprising state of readiness. Together they have built a jet curtain as an antidote for the Iron Curtain. As one says in Turkish, "Ta-mam" or in Greek "Endaxi." That means "O. K."

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the project is not self-liquidating, as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau presents this as being a self-liquidating project. Plain arithmetic shows that it would not be. Simple interest alone, even at 2½ percent, on $1 billion of original investment for the smaller project proposed is $25 million per year; for the larger $1.6 billion development proposed is $40 million per year. Total net revenues, as estimated by the Bureau for the smaller or larger developments, would average less than these amounts. As the project could not pay simple interest on the investments, its revenues could never retire the capital cost. The Nation's taxpayers would have to do that. Or, if revenues were earmarked to retire the capital, the taxpayers would have to pay about all of the interest. In any event, the net burden on the taxpayers would be more than $1 billion for the smaller development and $4 billion for the larger development by the end of the proposed repayment period. The accumulated debt would keep on increasing until paid off by general taxation, since it could never be repaid from project revenues.

Dedication of Crucifix in Jordan Park, Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered by Rev. G. L. Koors, pastor of St. Francis Xavier Church, East Gary, Ind., at the dedication of the Crucifix in Jordan Park, May 29, 1955, as a memorial to all those who have served in all wars of our Nation, together with an accompanying newspaper article.

There being no objection, the sermon and newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reverend fathers, sisters, sir knights, and beloved in Christ, we welcome you to the dedication of this Crucifix here today. In the 10th verse of the 12th chapter of the Book of Zacharias we read, "They shall look upon Me, whom they have pierced."

Nineteen hundred and twenty-two years ago today, Pentecost Sunday, the Holy Spirit descended visibly upon the Apostles assembled within the room wherein Christ ate the Last Supper with them, and where, in obedience to their Master's command, they awaited the arrival of the Paraclete. Immediately thereafter, they entered the streets of Jerusalem crowded with citizens from every known part of the visible world. It was then that Peter, whom Christ had chosen to be the visible head of His Church, stepped forward and began to preach. The multitudes were amazed, for they heard him and the other Apostles speaking in their own tongues—Jews and Gentiles, Medes and Persians, as well as citizens from Egypt and Arabia. What was this message? In answer to this question I can answer only, in the words of Peter himself, as recorded in the Acts, namely, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by Him, in the midst of you, as you also know; this same being delivered up, by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, you by the hands of wicked men have crucified and slain."

At that moment Christ began anew His work of salvation in His new form, His Mystical Body, the Church. Very few up to this time had actually followed Him in His human and physical form, although many had seen and heard Him. Yes many had been the recipients of His kindness and favors, His consolations, His true leadership and love. Many too, had been healed and cured by His divine power. From this it is evident, then, that His crucifixion, His supreme sacrifice of Himself upon the cross, was necessary not only to atone for the sins of mankind, but to merit for Him the graces necessary for faith. His resurrection, His ascension into heaven, and the fulfillment of the promise of the paraclete made it pos-

sible, even on this first day of His church in action, for the conversion of thousands. His crucifixion and death, were always most closely related to His resurrection. Never did He refer to one without reference to the other. Hence, Peter and the other Apostles began, and the church has continued to teach Christ crucified through the centuries that followed. The crucifix, therefore, has never been inimical to the believer, but rather it has been ever a source of strength, of hope, of courage, of inspiration in times of trial and misfortune. It has been a continuous motivating factor to induce and enable the individual to accept His challenge, "He who does not take up his cross and follow Me, is not worthy of Me." The, individual, therefore, must realize he is to die to sin, if he hopes to rise to life with God. The crucifix, then, is ever a source of consolation and encouragement, for no trial, misfortune or suffering that we may experience, can ever compare with the sufferings of Christ on the cross.

On through the centuries the church has grown and prospered by the teaching of Christ crucified, as well as by the ministration of those graces He merited by His death on the cross. For, as much as we like to glory in Christ's resurrection, we must never forget His calvary. And like Christ, the church, whose mystical body she is, has experienced her calvaries and resurrections from persecutions without and within her domain. For the first three centuries of her existence, the mighty Roman Empire, under ten tyranous emperors, tried in vain to destroy her, as did the determinate counsel try to destroy Christ in the crucifixion. The soil of faith was watered the more by the blood of martyrs. Constantine the Great, in the fourth century with the cross as his battle standard, defeated the outnumbered armies of the Emperor Maxentius. Charlemagne stopped the Moors and the influence of the crescent from overrunning the Catholic countries of Europe in the eighth century. And in the 11th century, knights and princes, as well as servants and peons of these Catholic nations, again under the banner of the cloth woven crosses upon their bosoms, formed the crusades to rescue from the Mohammedans the Holy Sepulchre and other places endeared by the physical presence of Christ in the Holy Land.

In 1492 it was Christopher Columbus, who braved the unknown waters of the Atlantic, in search of a new and shorter route to India, that discovered our great America. In claiming the newly discovered land for his king and queen, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, he also claimed it for Christ. For his first act of gratitude on the island on which he landed, was to erect a cross and to name that land San Salvador, the Holy Saviour. Columbus, a Catholic, whose very name Christopher, means Christ-bearer, had brought Christ to the new world. From that day on, Catholic missionaries and Catholic men and women have helped to explore, to develop and to settle this magnificent country of America. Yes, these very shores on which we stand today, were explored and the Catholic ideals and principles sown by Father Marquette, in whose memory a park has been named near here. History will attest that man's greatest achievement in life has come to him through and from the teachings of Christ. It was His supreme sacrifice on the cross that brought man the blessings of life and the pursuit of happiness. Christ died that we might live. Thus the crucifix is the symbol of God's love, which every Catholic missionary used to fortify him in danger, comfort him in sorrow, sustain him in trial, and to intensify his zeal in the discovery, exploration and development of this fair land. For by the crucifix our blessings have been restored and through it shall they be secured.

Persecution of the Church from within, however, has been not only from the schism of disobedience to divinely established authority, and the reformation adopting heretical doctrines or optional acceptance of truths, but from a laxity of morals and a slothful performance of duty by nominal Catholics as well. It has been this philosophy through the late centuries. that has subjugated the world to the influence of secularism and materialism. Which is an heretical doctrine of accepting Christ without the cross. Or as exists in the Communist world, the acceptance of the cross without Christ. The only remedy or cure for this condition, is a return to the teachings of the Apostles and the Church, of Christ crucified.

It is then, on this Pentecost Sunday, 1955, with the fine cooperation of the city officials of Gary, that we American Catholic Men, Knights of Columbus, Members of the Abraham Lincoln General Assembly Fourth Degree, by the initiative of the Catholic Action Committee, feel it a privilege and an honor, and are duly proud to be able to dedicate this crucifix as a lasting memorial to those who have lived, loved, labored and died for our Nation. Theirs was a sacrifice complete, not only to establish, but also to enrich and protect this great country of ours. No greater tribute or befitting memorial could be erected, than this huge crucifix, which in itself is symbolic of supreme sacrifice. For Christ Himself said, "Greater love than this, no man hath, than to lay down his life for his friends."

With true charity, then, love of God and our fellow man, joined with the unity of fraternal care, we patriotically place this crucifix here, in memory of those valiant souls who have given their all, to endear and protect the blessings of God for others. May its presence here, remind each of us, not only today but in the days to follow, of our duty to keep and further this Nation under God. And prompt us to work as brothers in the pursuit of happiness with God. To each passer-by, may it enlighten his intellect, strengthen his will and move his heart to a greater love of God and country. As we look its way, may we be inspired to cherish and treasure the more, our God-given rights, and be encouraged and prompted to live Christlike in our daily lives, so as to make America and the world a better place in which to worship Him freely and conscientiously. We offer this infinite sacrifice of the Mass, whose efficacy springs from the sacrifice on Calvary, to God, in adoration and praise, in thanksgiving and satisfaction, and to beg of Him that this crucifix shall never be a stumbling block or become obnoxious to any man, but rather a source of truer love, more faithful service and a more loyal appreciation in the hearts of everyone that passes, in the words of the prophet Zacharias, "shall look upon Me, whom they have pierced". Amen.

May the blessing of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, descend upon you and remain with you always. Amen.

KNIGHTS ERECT CRUCIFIX ALONG ROAD NEAR GARY

An atmosphere of solemnity has been fused with the hustle and hurry of one of northern Indiana's busiest intersections.

Balancing the mood created by speeding automobiles, restaurants, billboards, and gasoline stations at the intersection of U. S. 12, 20, and 6 is a 20-foot crucifix, erected recently by the fourth degree Knights of Columbus of the Abraham Lincoln general assembly.

The oaken cross and terra cotta corpus faces west from the center of the junction, ready to catch the eye of travelers entering Gary.

DEDICATION MASS

"We want to remind everyone of the presence of a divine providence in our lives," said William T. Schulte, former Indiana Congressman and chairman of the Catholic affairs committee of the Knights of Columbus group. The crucifix is the first of eight similar religious reminders scheduled to be erected by the Knights of Columbus in northern Indiana, Schulte said.

The cross, which was erected on Holy Thursday, will be dedicated at a special field Mass at the foot of the cross at noon today. Celebrant of the Mass will be the Reverend Robert Traub, chaplain of unity council of the Knights of Columbus, Hammond.

MASS CELEBRANTS

The sermon will be preached by the Reverend Clemmens L. Koors of East Gary, chaplain of the Abraham Lincoln general assembly. St. Mark's Church choir, directed by the Reverend John Wittee, will sing.

Other participants in the mass will be the Reverend Alvin Jasinski, deacon; the Reverend Michael Homco, subdeacon, and the Reverend John Strebig, master of ceremonies.

Members of the Knights of Columbus group will meet half an hour before the Mass at St. Luke's Church, sixth and Vermont Streets, Gary, to march to the cross.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, these very pertinent remarks from the minority report on H. R. 3383 so clearly summarize my own opposition to this bill that I hope many of my colleagues will give them their serious consideration and support:

Low cost nuclear-electric power developments and potentialities have been disregarded and ignored: The age of nuclear power has arrived and electric-power companies are already building at their own expense new plants which will supply electricity produced by atomic fission.

Tied in the bill are expensive hydroelectric projects, the power revenues from which would be expected to repay not only the cost of the power dams and installations, but also 88 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Planning figures show that it may take up to 100 years to pay for these projects out of the hydroelectric power "cash register."

Thus, for financial success, nuclear-electric energy must not be produced more cheaply than hydroelectric energy for at least 100 years.

What are the prospects in this regard?

Simply, that not in 100 years, not in 50 years, but in a much shorter time nuclear-electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy.

Just 15 years ago, in 1940, nuclear power was practically unheard of. By 1945, 5 short years later, the first A-bomb had exploded over Hiroshima. Research for peacetime use was so concentrated during the subsequent 10 years that today commercial nuclear-electric-energy generating plants actually are being constructed.

The British Government announced a 10-year program for building 12 atomic-power

stations at an estimated cost of $840 million. The British say these plants will produce electricity at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with their present conventional generating cost of 7.2 mills.

United States cost figures prepared by James A. Lane, of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, show the average figure in this country for producing electricity in conventional steam plants is 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills.

That is without considering that nuclear-electric plants can actually produce plutonium as a byproduct which can be sold for a high price, in the neighborhood of $100 a gram.

If this be done, there is little cost left for power generation to bear, and a reactor plant could put on the transmission line 1- or 2-mill current instead of 6.7-mill current. Even if the military demands become satisfied and the price of plutonium eases back to its fuel value of about $20 a gram, the sale of byproduct plutonium can be a substantial source of operating revenue.

Within 5 years, atomic powerplants should be commercially competitive with present lower cost sources of power, which, of course, are the hydroelectric plants involved in this project.

Taxes for Americans Living in Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to Congressman FLOOD from an American living and working in the Panama Canal Zone:

The Honorable DANIEL FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Employees here were given a lift in morale when they read of your interest in us as shown in the text of the hearings where you showed that one person without ulterior or political motives took issue with the cause of a minority group of citizens who are without representation.

On appearing before the Senate committee, the Governor again made the statement, as he has done before, that the employees here do not pay any taxes other than the Federal income tax. This is contrary to mine and others' points of view and cannot understand the reasons behind this statement. The gentleman has proven his astuteness, ability, and integrity and more than earned the recognition by Senator HOLLAND of his outstanding accomplishment in his assignment which carries more varied problems with more interference from others than any other I can think of at present.

My contention is that the taxes are collected but not identified as such, and are buried in the enigmatic phrase used so often in the hearings, i. e., "general corporate expense." To shorten this, I quote figures from General Accounting Office audit of the Company/Government for 1953. In fact, the GAO states in their audit "the division (commissary) realizes a reasonable margin * * * to cover the expense of handling, selling, and a share of the administrative expenses, interest, and Canal Zone Government costs." How can anyone say that we do not pay for government when we purchase in the Government-owned stores?

The following figures are taken from the GAO audit for fiscal year 1953:

Division:	*1953 net profit before general corporate*
Commissary	$1,242,460
Clubhouses	249,329
Hotel Washington	921
Tivoli guesthouse	49,065
Nursery	5,293
United States rate rentals	199,931
Local rate rentals (loss)	178,811
Electric power	490,051
Water system	184,920
Telephone system	10,652
	2,253,811

That pays for a lot of general corporate charges, but look at the enclosed newspaper where we will have to pay more. Based on reported income since 1951, I cannot see where there is the slightest doubt but that the canal has paid for itself at least twice since it opened in 1914, and no juggling of figures can prove otherwise. When my 2 years are up I'll drop by to see you on my way home.

U. N. Stands By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times, Tuesday, July 19, 1955, entitled "U. N. Stands By."

The editorial follows:

U. N. STANDS BY

It was fitting that the Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold, should welcome the Big Four heads of governments at their first meeting yesterday at the Palace of the Nations in Geneva. They needed U. N.'s blessing and they got it. They needed the assurance, before all the peoples of the world, that their purpose was also the very purpose of the United Nations.

The Big Four are materially strong enough to be the masters of mankind if they could agree on a program. They are materially strong enough to ruin mankind if they were to fail to agree and carry their disagreement into war. But they are not strong enough, collectively or separately, to defy the moral sense of humanity. None of the free countries would wish them to be. Certainly we in the United States would not desire that kind of strength for our country.

The Big Four are meeting just as any conceivably small four might meet, in accordance with the charter stipulation that "all members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means."

Mr. Hammarskjold, who was in Geneva to attend the recent session of the Economic and Social Council and who will be there at the Atoms-for-Peace Conference next month, found it convenient to be available for the Big Four gathering. Officially, he spoke yesterday on behalf of 60 nations. These 60 nations, representing a majority of mankind in spite of existing restrictions of U. N. membership, have moral if not legal rights this week at Geneva. They have a right to a peaceful world; they have a right to be free from the fatal fallout of great wars.

In this city, in its enclave at the foot of East 42d Street, U. N. continues its solid, if at the moment undramatic, functing. It is already preparing for next September's Assembly meeting, the provisional agenda for which may be ready later this week.

Here and in Geneva U. N. lives on. It lives on even in the sprawling buildings on the shore of Lake Leman, inherited after so much sad disillusionment from the League of Nations.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the huge concealed Federal subsidy to the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico is unwarranted and unconscionable.

Under the proposed plans of financing the project, the concealed subsidy by way of accumulating interest on money borrowed to construct the project would be huge. Its burden would have to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers for generations to come.

Under the repayment provisions of the Senate-approved project bill the concealed Federal subsidy on only the projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior—Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and 11 participating projects—as estimated and admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation would be $1,153 million over the repayment period or $3,150 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated. If the four additional storage units and the Navaho, San Juan-Chama, and Gooseberry participating reclamation projects authorized by the Senate bill are included, the corresponding Federal subsidy, based upon equivalent methods of computation, would amount to $4 billion or over $5,000 per acre on the 745,000 acres to be irrigated.

Under the repayment provisions of House project bill, the concealed Federal subsidy on the minimum number of projects authorized by the bill—4 storage units and 11 participating projects—would amount to $1.6 billion at the end of the overall repayment period of 90 to 95 years, or $4,300 per acre on the 366,000 acres to be irrigated; but with the inclusion of additional projects contemplated for authorization, the subsidy would be substantially the same as under the Senate-approved bill, namely, $4 billion or $5,000 per acre.

As compared to Federal subsidies amounting to $3,000 to $5,000 per acre that would be involved in the project, the value of irrigated land in the area of the proposed reclamation projects averages only about $150 per acre.

In view of the fact that the crops that would be grown on the proposed project's high altitude marginal land would be largely hay, grain, and forage crops for livestock, and dairy products, which are now largely surplus and would in turn

be resubsidized under the farm program, the huge Federal subsidy required for the proposed upper Colorado River project would be a totally unwarranted and unconscionable burden on the Nation's taxpayers for many generations hence.

The Albany Bureau of Mines Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Albany (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald of June 25, 1955:

It is little short of amazing to note the extremes to which Oregon's Democratic Senators will go in their attempts to discredit the Eisenhower administration.

An example is contained in a recent issue of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER's newsletter, sent to newspapers throughout Oregon.

Under the hearing "Again, McKay Abandons Oregon" NEUBERGER writes: "The payroll of the United States Bureau of Mines Laboratory in Albany, Oreg., has been reduced from 375 to 250 because the laboratory's production of zirconium has been shifted to the Carborundum Metals Co., of Akron, N. Y. This is in line with Secretary McKay's policy to transfer Government functions to private corporations.

"All of us want to cut down Government bureaucracy as much as possible, yet it seems passing strange that McKay's actions so frequently favor eastern industry over western employment and development."

This statement is obviously intended to prejudice Oregonians in general and Albany voters in particular against the administration. It lacks the foundation of truth and shows that Senator NEUBERGER is either ignorant of the Northwest Electrodevelopment Laboratory's background or is deliberately ignoring it.

The fact is the Bureau of Mines regional headquarters was saved for Oregon and Albany by Secretary McKay, as everyone here knows if Senator NEUBERGER does not. A survey team, it will be recalled, had recommended consolidation of three western Bureau of Mines regions and removal of headquarters to Reno, Nev., which would have been done had not Secretary McKay stepped in. As a result of his intercession region No. 2, of which Albany was headquarters, was converted to region No. 1 and augmented by addition of Alaska, which was previously region No. 1. Albany was retained as headquarters for this enlarged region.

Another fact is that it was the Roosevelt administration, not the Eisenhower administration or Secretary McKay, that set the pattern for abandonment of the local Bureau of Mines pilot plant.

The chief motive underlying establishment of the Northwest Electrodevelopment Laboratory here in 1943 (thanks largely to efforts of Republican Senator Charles McNary and Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, by the way) was to complete experimental work on the production of zirconium. When laboratory work had so far advanced that production was adjudged feasible the zirconium pilot plant was constructed. It was developed and expanded during succeeding years as needs of the Atomic Energy Commission, chief consumer of zirconium, increased.

Yet from the very beginning the Bureau of Mines made it clearly understood that it was not in business and that the pilot plant would cease producing zirconium as soon as private industry was able to take over the project.

This was in conformity with a Bureau of Mines policy that had long been in vogue and still is—to render available to private enterprise the formulas and specifications for production of materials carried through experimental stages and perfected by the Bureau.

About the time work started on zirconium here the Bureau of Mines through the agency, largely, of Dr. William J. Kroll had sent titanium well on its way toward the field of major construction metals. The titanium and zirconium processes were so similar that a private enterprise financed by an RFC loan and operating in the Niagara Falls area essayed to take over zirconium production, whereby the local pilot plant came near to extinction, saved only by the fact that the titanium process in use at Niagara was found unsuitable to processing of zirconium. This cost the Government a lot of money and almost cost Albany the zirconium plant.

And remember, that was before President Eisenhower or Secretary McKay had anything to do with running the Government.

If Senator NEUBERGER did not know all this he might be forgiven for his slur on McKay, but it was his business to find out before he wrote. If he did know, then he deliberately tried to smear the Secretary of the Interior.

Why Hurry Action?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a great many people in my congressional district are concerned over the fact that the House Ways and Means Committee has not given thorough consideration to the social-security bill which it has reported. The following editorial from the Shawano Evening Leader, Shawano, Wis., of Monday, July 11, 1955, asks an important question, Why Hurry Action?

The editorial follows:

WHY HURRY ACTION?

A House committee has voted in favor of extensive and costly revisions of the social-security law, on an immediate basis. It ignored recommendations by Secretary Hobby and others that the proposals should be given thorough study along with full public hearings.

No matter how one feels about broadening the base of social security and increasing benefits, it is difficult to see how hasty action can be justified. To vote major legislation on a hurry-up basis is to invite all kinds of problems and dangers. The only sound procedure is to take whatever time is needed to study the proposals, let all points of view be heard and considered, weigh the pros and cons, and then vote.

It is reported that there is strong sentiment in the Senate for doing just that. May it prevail—in the interests of the taxpayers, and of the social-security beneficiaries now and of the future.

Now that a compulsory social-security system, upon which millions of citizens are utterly dependent, has become an established part of our lives, it would be nothing less than criminal to alter it except in a spirit of the highest statesmanship. The integrity of social security is synonymous with the integrity of our money.

Minimum Wages in Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, in taking up minimum wage amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the House Committee on Education and Labor wisely declined to go into the matter of minimum wages in Puerto Rico. The committee undoubtedly felt that the considerations involved were complex and that the effects would be far-reaching and critical to the future development of the island's economy, with particular reference to the vital industrialization program. It was indicated that before making any recommendations concerning minimum wages in Puerto Rico, it would first conduct a careful study of all important factors involved.

The commitee's action in this respect was entirely in accord with popular and official sentiment in Puerto Rico. I think the Education and Labor Committee is to be commended for its wise and realistic approach to the problem.

On July 11, 1955, the Secretary of Labor responded to a series of 10 questions which I submitted to him with regard to considerations affecting wages in Puerto Rico. Under unanimous leave to extend by remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the Secretary's memorandum for the information of all Members of Congress who might have interest in this question:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR REPLY TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE HONORABLE A. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

1. Have all wage orders for the various industries in Puerto Rico covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act been revised since the mainland legal minimum wage was increased from 40 cents to 75 cents in 1949?

Wage orders for all Puerto Rican industries have been revised upward at least once since the mainland legal minimum wage was increased from 40 cents to 75 cents in January 1950.

2. Has any determination for wages in any industry in Puerto Rico been revised since 1949 more than once? How many times?

Fifteen industries, constituting the vast bulk of all employment subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act in Puerto Rico, have had their wage orders revised upward more than once since the 75-cent rate went into effect on the mainland in January 1950. Fourteen were revised twice: One, the metal, machinery, transportation equipment and allied industries, has been revised three times. Among these industries are those having the greatest competitive relationship with industries in the States. These 15 industries are: Banking, insurance, and finance; button, buckle, and jewelry; cement; corsets, brassieres, and allied garments;

hosiery; leather, leather goods and related products; men's and boys' clothing and related products; metal, machinery, transportation equipment, and allied industries; needlework and fabricated textile products (16 of 19 divisions); paper, paper products, printing, publishing, and related industries; plastic products; rubber, straw, hair, and related products; shoe manufacturing and allied industries; sugar manufacturing; textile and textile products.

3. Have all wage revisions since 1949 resulted in raises, or have there been cases where it has been found that no increase was possible?

As indicated previously, minimum wage rates for all industries in Puerto Rico have been increased at least once since 1949. There have been instances however, in which the recommendations of an industry committee for a particular industry or industry division have been rejected by the administrator of the wage and hour division as not being adequately substantiated by the evidence placed before him. In each of these instances the industry or industry division was subsequently referred to a new committee and in every instance in which action has been completed, some increase in the preexisting rates was approved by the administrator.

4. Why have not revisions been more frequent and how frequent should they be?

The frequency of revisions has been limited by the budget allowed for the industry committee program in Puerto Rico. During the last 2 years, for example, it has been possible to convene only 1 industry committee each year because of budgetary limitations. Although several industries have been assigned to each committee, it has not been possible to review the wage orders with the frequency needed.

As a general rule, wage orders should be revised on an average of once every 2 years. This is the frequency which was recommended by a subcommittee of the House Labor Committee which made a first-hand study of this problem in 1950. A certain flexibility is necessary, however. Newly emerging factors may in some industries require a review after a much shorter period of time to keep the minimum rates abreast of the economic conditions in a particular industry.

The budget approved by both the Senate and the House provides funds for 3 committees for the 1956 fiscal year but a supplemental submission of the President requests an increase to 6 committees which we estimate is required for a review of each wage order every 2 years.

5. What industries which operate in the mainland and in Puerto Rico will have actual increases in wages in the mainland as direct result of a 1956 increase in the legal minimum wage? In case there are any, will the increase in the mainland be uniform? Please give actual increases industry by industry.

The data presented by the Department to the House and Senate subcommittees show an extremely wide variation in the impact of the proposed minimum wage increase on mainland industries, both with respect to those which have Puerto Rican counterparts and those which do not. In many mainland industries there would be no direct impact whatever, or at most a very negligible one. The primary metal industries, the transportation equipment industries, the machine industries and most of the fabricated metal products industries are outstanding examples among this group. Thus while an increase in the minimum wage would have no real effect on members of such industries in the States, a direct percentage or cents-per-hour increase on similar Puerto Rican firms would result in a heavy impact.

Among the mainland industries which would be affected by an increase in the legal minimum rate, the impact both in terms of the number of employees directly affected and the direct wage bill increase would fluctuate widely. In work clothing, for example, 51 percent of the production workers would be affected by a 90-cent statutory minimum, with a resultant direct wage bill increase of 5 percent. In synthetic textiles, on the other hand, only 2 percent of the production workers would require increases with a labor bill increase of less than one-half of 1 percent. In contrast with this varying impact on mainland industries, a direct percentage or cents-per-hour increase for Puerto Rican industries would result in a uniformly heavy impact industry by industry.

6. Will the Department be in a position to revise wages in Puerto Rico in all industries which compete with those affected in the mainland within the next year?

The Department is prepared to schedule reconsideration by industry committees of all wage-order rates for industries which compete with industries on the mainland in order to achieve an appropriate adjustment in these rates at the same time, or soon thereafter, as any increase in the legal minimum wage applicable to the mainland. Pursant to a Department recommendation, the Senate has adopted a modification of the wage-order proceedings in order that final orders may be issued more promptly after receipt of committee recommendations than is possible under the present act.

7. Has the Department taken steps to cope with the situation that may evolve in Puerto Rico from an increase in the legal minimum in the mainland?

In line with the appropriation approved by both Houses of Congress, the Department is planning for three Puerto Rican committees during the fiscal year beginning this month. If the supplemental appropriation requested by the President is approved by the Congress, the Department will be ready for a program of six committees during this fiscal year. Six committees will be able to review all wage-order rates for the industries which compete with the mainland and also the rates applicable for a substantial segment of the remaining industries covered by the act.

8. Does the Department favor an immediate, indiscriminate, across-the-board increase in Puerto Rico, by percent or quantity, as a result of the mainland increases in the legal minimum, or would the Department recommend that whatever increases may be called for in Puerto Rico should be determined by the committee system as has been the case since 1949?

The Department recommended a flexible approach, as was noted in the departmental letter of May 18, 1955, to Senator DOUGLAS which is contained in the transcript of the Senate subcommittee hearings at page 1251. Industries in Puerto Rico have extremely wide variations in production costs and other competitive factors. These require the flexible system afforded by the industry committee procedure whereby adjustments in minimum rates may be made in conformance with the abilities of the individual industries to adjust without severe dislocation or cessation of their operations. In some very important industries, such as the hand-sewn needlework products, competition is not with the mainland but with foreign countries like the Philippines and Japan. Hence a mandatory percentage or specified cents-per-hour increase, based presumably upon the theory of equalizing competitive relationships with the mainland, would bear no relation to the ability of the industry to adjust.

Even in those industries which do compete with the mainland industries, extent of competition varies markedly and cannot be measured by any system of direct mandatory increases. The only method that appears to offer a satisfactory way of making practical minimum-wage adjustments in these industries is through the present committee system pursued with vigor. The law already requires minimum rates for Puerto Rican industries that are both (a) high enough to prevent any competitive advantage to Puerto Rican over mainland industry and (b) as high in relation to the mainland rate as possible without substantially curtailing employment in the Puerto Rican industry.

9. What would be the effect in Puerto Rico of a uniform raise to all industries percentagewise or by a fixed amount? Would all industries in Puerto Rico be equally able to stand this increase.

An immediate increase in island wages by a fixed percentage or absolute amount for all industries which is out of proportion to the current rate structure would seem likely to cause a substantial curtailment of employment on the island. Experience shortly after the passage of the original act in 1938 which led to the adoption by Congress of the present system of minimum-wage fixing for Puerto Rico reinforces this conclusion. Of course, the effect would not be the same on all industries. The impact of a fixed increase would seem to be particularly great on the Puerto Rican industries which compete primarily with low-wage foreign areas, producing handmade products such as hand-sewn needlework products.

A uniform increase in the wage rates for all industries may also affect seriously many of the Puerto Rican industries for which wage-order rates have already been adjusted to reflect actual minimum rates in the mainland higher than the present legal minimum rate of 75 cents. This is the situation, for example, in the metal and machinery industries for which minimum rates of 65 and 75 cents an hour became effective on June 27, 1955.

Even where the wage paying ability of the Puerto Rican industry would be improved by an increase in the legal minimum on the mainland, there is no fixed relationship between the wage rates on the mainland and in Puerto Rico. Moreover, some industries on the island have received recent increases in minimum-wage rates, whereas other industries have not received increases for periods up to 5 years.

10. In case some industries in Puerto Rico were so affected by a uniform increase as to have to discontinue operations, what chances are there that the other industries or newly established industries would rapidly absorb the unemployed resulting from the closing down of affected industries?

Historically, Puerto Rico has suffered from both unemployment and underemployment. While the situation has improved in recent years, lack of opportunities for employment is still a serious problem for a large part of the work force. In such a situation, it is extremely doubtful that workers from closed plants would readily be absorbed by other plants.

Gas Bill Gyrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is difficult, if not impossible, for almost anyone to understand the many and complicated maneuvers which have characterized the handling of the controversial natural-gas bill since it was

reported by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on June 8 by a vote of 16–15.

However, one able, objective and highly competent reporter made a significant statement on television last Sunday evening. I refer to Joseph F. McCaffrey, representing McCaffrey reports and one of those entitled to admission to the Radio and Television Correspondents Galleries of Commerce.

He said:

Let's take a look now at the newsmakers of next week * * * and the weeks to come.

The highly controversial natural gas bill, which has been lying dormant in the House of Representatives, may be a newsmaker either this week or the week after.

A sudden move will be made to bring it up for a floor vote before this session adjourns. Its supporters figure it has a better chance of getting through this session than next year. Next year is an election year and many eastern and midwestern Members will be a lot more sensitive to the consumer pressure against the bill in 1956 than they may be today.

The events of the last 2 days and particularly of the last few hours bear out completely the accuracy of his statement.

Who Stands To Benefit From H. R. 6645 (the Natural Gas Exemption Bill) and Who Would Pay for It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have asked me if I could advise them of who stands to profit if H. R. 6645, which would repeal the Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case and would exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission, should become law.

I have told them that the hearing before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee contained uncontradicted evidence that as of the end of 1954 there was slightly over 211.1 trillion cubic feet of known recoverable reserves of natural gas.

I have further told them that the best information I could obtain indicated that 30 of the largest and most prosperous gas and oil companies in the country controlled approximately 63 percent of these reserves. The following is the best information I have of the companies involved, and their gas reserves, stated in trillion cubic feet:

1. Humble	18.0
2. Phillips	17.9
3. Texaco	10.5
4. Standard of Indiana	9.9
5. Socony-Vacuum	7.5
6. Shell	7.0
7. Cities Service	6.3
8. El Paso Natural Gas Co	4.5
9. Standard of California	4.0
10. Gulf	4.0
11. Continental	3.8
12. Sun	3.8
13. Pure Oil Co	3.7
14. Panhandle Eastern	3.5
15. Colorado Interstate	3.3
16. Chicago Corp	2.5
17. Skelly	2.4
18. Atlantic	2.2
19. Ohio Oil	2.1
20. Republic Natural	2.1
21. Cities Service Gas Co	2.0
22. Tidewater Association	1.8
23. Sinclair	1.7
24. Union Oil	1.6
25. Superior	1.5
26. Sunray	1.5
27. Natural Gas Pipeline	1.5
28. Southern Production	1.3
29. Pan America Petroleum and Transportation	1.3
30. Arkansas-Louisiana	1.1

It should be obvious if these companies are able to secure the benefits of H. R. 6645, which they have been vigorously supporting for months, they will then concentrate upon obtaining higher prices for their gas.

This would add immediately as much as $30 billion to the value of the known proven reserves.

If an increase of only 15 cents per thousand cubic feet could be secured, this would add to the cost annually, at the 1953 rate of use, $806,500,500, and, of course, the gas consumer would foot the annual bill.

Some of my colleagues have also asked me who would bear the burden of these increased prices. It is obvious that the consumers of natural gas throughout the United States would have to pay for any increase in price reflected in rates. According to the American Gas Association, there were 24,649,900 residential gas consumers in the United States in 1953. There is no doubt but that this number has increased substantially since that time.

They will pay for any windfall involved in this legislation or for any giveaway program which is foisted upon them. While I hope that the few fundamental and uncontradictable facts will lead the House to reject this bill, I have no doubt whatever but that these gas consumers and their families will exercise their right of approval or disapproval of any action taken here in this matter.

What Moscow Wants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which I consider to be one of the most provocative and perceptive editorials it has been my privilege to read, concerning the present Geneva Conference.

This editorial was published in the London Economist of June 25, 1955. It is entitled "What Moscow Wants," and the news dispatches up to this time indicate that the author of this editorial had prophetic vision and wisdom.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MOSCOW WANTS

It is odd how many question marks seem to be held necessary by commentators on current Soviet policy. Nearly every discussion of this topic begins with a question; few end with an answer. Even Mr. Macmillan, in last week's foreign affairs debate, maintained that the latest Soviet moves could be interpreted either as "reassuring signs of a new policy" or as "sinister warnings of a more subtle but just as deadly a threat." The Foreign Secretary added: "One can speculate on all that forever. * * * What we have to do is to act."

At the summit next month, and in the whole period of negotiation that is now coming up, it is to be hoped that the Western governments will not seriously adopt the view that Soviet policy is too enigmatic to be analyzed, and that leaps must therefore be made into the dark. For, in fact, the range for speculation is far smaller than Mr. Macmillan seemed to suggest. The Russians are approaching the imminent negotiations with a clear and consistent policy, and they have themselves provided an ample outline of it. Surely that outline must be the starting point for Western policymaking in this new phase.

The five main elements in present Soviet tactics may be listed as: conciliatory gestures; an accompaniment of conditional threats; explicit and far-reaching demands; stubborn evasions on vital points; and multiple variations on the theme of neutralism. The first three, taken together, amount to a demand that the free nations must now make a choice—a choice between a détente on terms that would cripple both their defense and their bargaining power, and a new competition in strength which, Moscow claims, will destroy them. Western eyes, fascinated by the one conciliatory side of this diplomatic pentagon, have still to be fully opened to the other four. Mr. Molotov may have taken to a 10-gallon hat, but it is hardly surprising that he finds it too small; the Kremlin still commands plenty of brains.

The Russians are not themselves in doubt about the disruptive purpose of their recent gestures. As one Moscow radio commentator put it last week, western statesmen who thought that the new Soviet attitudes toward Austria, Yugoslavia, disarmament, Western Germany, and Japan were the result of the "bankrupt policy of positions of strength" (the Atlantic alliance) were quite wrong; all the Soviet moves had, in fact, successfully checkmated this western policy, which Pravda describes as "in the throes of a profound crisis" brought about by the new Russian diplomacy.

Moscow is insisting as strongly as ever on its monopoly of peaceful intent, and demanding that the western governments must match its recent concessions. It is evidently important for its policy that western leadership should seem baffled and angered by the Russian moves. The tranquil reaction of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles to the invitation to Dr. Adenauer proved impossible to fit into this picture; it was therefore firmly passed over, and Moscow has been pouring out stories about consternation in Washington instead. Great pains are also being taken to distort the American suggestion that the summit conference might discuss the promises of free elections that were given to East European countries after the war. Pravda and its satellite echoes transform this into a demand to restore the regime of capitalists, landlords, and gendarmes. For their part, the Communists say that at Geneva they will emphasize everything that might make for agreement.

Unfortunately, they are simultaneously making it clear that they will do nothing of the kind. Quite some time before Mr. Molotov's speech at San Francisco, they had already semiofficially issued their list of urgent problems, ripe for solution, and it contains seven far-reaching demands. In proposing the removal of all armed forces from Germany, they give no encouragement to anyone in the West who thinks they would be content if the Americans fell back to the Ems or even across the channel; Pravda makes it plain that they must return to Kansas, while the Russians retreat no farther than Königsberg. Nor does this apply to Germany alone; a second demand (on which the latest Russian disarmament terms are made to depend) is for the abolition of all military bases on foreign soil—leaving Germany a military vacuum, with the French Army facing the Soviet and satellite forces across the north European plain almost alone and without even American air support from British or north African bases. M. Pinay pointed out earlier this month that the West's true security is its common defense organization including the presence of allied forces in Europe, which is the real guaranty of it. Moscow evidently makes the same diagnosis; and it seeks to destroy that security at the root.

These first two Russian demands are obviously unacceptable to the West, but others are piled on top of them. Communist China's right to a veto-wielding position in U. N. is pressed as part of a general Far Eastern settlement based on sovereignty, implying the abandonment of Formosa and doubtless of South Vietnam, too. The cold war must be halted; this unelaborated demand embraces the ending of western broadcasts to eastern Europe and of support for refugee organizations, but not any corresponding slackening of Communist propaganda and activity in free countries, for that, Moscow insists, is nothing to do with Russia and must not even be discussed at Geneva. The western governments must wind up their controls on the export of strategic commodities and equipment to Communist countries, whose own governments would, however, retain their total control over all foreign trade and their power to use it as a political weapon; the Soviet bloc's 6-year boycott of Yugoslavia, and Russia's abrupt action against Australia when the Petrov inquiry began, are instructive examples.

A sixth and a seventh item, both of them familiar enough, were later named as "really urgent problem" for discussion at the summit; European collective security, and disarmament. Here one reaches the evasive side of the pentagon. When the Russians speak of "European collective security," they are referring to a specific plan, long canvassed by Mr. Molotov, under which all European countries would rely for protection on pledges given by all other European countries. This plan, which evokes the ludicrous idea of, say, Hungary falling upon Russia's flank in the event of a Soviet attack on Finland, would be laughed out of existence in a matter of weeks if it were seriously proposed in any country where free discussion is possible. The Russians are, not surprisingly, unwilling to answer any searching questions about it, but it is constantly flown, like a gaudy if somewhat fragile kite, too high for close inspection.

No explanation is offered why a European collective security system should be preferred to the world-wide system which U. N. ought to provide, and whose development Moscow has persistently blocked; nor do the Soviet leaders admit any inconsistency between this preference for the part rather than the whole and the Litvinov maxim that "peace is indivisible. European security suits the Russians because it edges the United States out while leaving them dominant throughout the continent—their propaganda now dwells on the theme that the Soviet Union is a European power, while Americans are strangers—but it is presented in quite other terms. Disarmament, likewise, is a field for evasive tactics. The Soviet terms offered on May 10, although at first sight far more realistic than anything previously offered, still contain blurs and gaps at vital points; and Mr. Molotov's claim at San Francisco that Russia had accepted in full the western plan for conventional arms was a bland lie.

Turning to the most openly unfriendly part of the new Soviet policy, the Western analyst notes a certain confusion. For months before the ratification of the Paris agreements, Soviet diplomats at cocktail parties were muttering "This time we are serious" (a remark to whose revealing implications they seemed blind. After ratification the Russians solemnly interred their treaties with France and Britain; and almost at once Mr. Molotov was in Paris beaming at the very men who carried the agreements through. The melodramatic Warsaw Conference gave birth to a mouse, and since then the threatening rumbles have become fainter. The Warsaw fiasco doubtless reflected rising Soviet hopes that the West Germans could yet be weaned away from the Western alliance, and that the painful business of baring an East German army to the eyes of Poles and Czechs could be avoided. But it would surely have been better not to have made the big bowwow noises in the first place. Mr. Molotov at least should know by now that they yield diminishing returns as surely as cries of "wolf."

The fine hand that signed with Ribbentrop the pact which carved up Poland is more evident in the last sector of the New Look policy. Never has the ancient strategy of divide and subjugate been more skillfully executed. Mr. Molotov's warehouse now stocks shades and grades of neutrality, noninvolvement, freedom from alliances, active coexistence, zones of peace, toothless Titoism, and nonplaying NATO membership, to suit all the possible clients who can be detached, or semidetached, from the alliances of the free nations. He has tried on the neutral-belt idea, found it cramping, and slipped into something looser, his comfortable old European security habit. And at this point the pentagon is completed. For the most notable thing about the conciliatory gestures that form one side of it, and in themselves are meant to create a general mood of euphoria, is that, apart from disarmament, the most important of them have been made not to the West or the free world as a whole, but to selected nations, first to the Japanese, then the Austrians, the Yugoslavs, and the Germans. And in each case the basic appeal has been, quite simply, "see how nice we can be to you if only you shake off the deadly Anglo-American embrace."

After a tour round Moscow's new diplomacy such as has been attempted here, certain things are crystal clear. It is nonsense to deduce that the Russians are at last giving up their basic aims. As the Foreign Secretary suggested last week, they are trying to get the free nations to lay aside their protecting coat by beaming instead of blasting; but they want the coat off just the same, and they are quite open about it to all who care to listen to them. The West's new strength and unity have evidently helped to bring about their change of tactics, as have the Russians' own internal difficulties and dissensions; but that does not mean that their diplomacy is in retreat, or that there will be any lessening of subversive activity by their local Communist pawns. On the contrary, the Russians are approaching the summit in their familiar fashion—with a set of maximum demands which they would be surprised to get, but for which they will press all the harder if the West seems ready to yield.

How much less the Russians will actually settle for depends on the interplay between their own need for a settlement and western unity, patience, skill, and imagination. The last is not the least important. If western statesmen can do no more in the phase of subtle diplomacy that is now beginning than adopt negative and defensive postures, the West will lose not only the confidence of "third-party" nations, but confidence in itself. The real challenge to the West is to show itself not more elastic and yielding than the Russians, but more imaginative and positive in the pursuit of peace.

Flaws in the GAW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial by Maurice R. Franks which appeared in the June 1955 issue of Partners magazine:

FLAWS IN THE GAW

(By Maurice R. Franks)

Whether or not the auto industry buys any part of Walter Reuther's demand for a guarantied annual wage is today just a side issue. Of main concern to all Americans is what would happen to them were the GAW principle to invade all United States industry and become a general pattern for employment.

The real danger is that such a thing can swiftly develop and almost overnight transform already creeping socialism into actually leaping socialism.

It may be that Mr. Reuther is unaware of this and, as a good American, would be shocked when shown what's behind the door he is trying to stick his foot in. Or it may be that his eyes are wide open and that his heart is fully in tune with the revolution his efforts are sponsoring. After all, didn't he once while working in a Soviet Russian factory write home to friends in this country, urging them to "Carry on the fight for a Soviet America?" And since then, even while waging war on Communist elements in the labor movement, has he not loudly supported the very type of economic and social reforms that are grounded in Socialist doctrine and tend at every step to smother the forces of traditional American free enterprise?

The Socialist game is deep and devious and many of its most ardent mechanisms escape the public gaze. The GAW gimmick, as I see it, is just such a mechanism—as I shall endeavor to show.

A LEVELER OF MEN

To begin with, the GAW preaches the doctrine of security at the expense of energy, initiative, and enterprise. For the worker it demands security, but it encourages no worker to build his own, through developing his individual talents and husbanding his own resources; instead, it looks to the employer to supply it and bear all costs, even though the creation of such questionable worker security can spell the end of true security for the company that employs him. Such utterly erroneous emphasis is thoroughly socialistic.

Next, in true Fabian style, the scheme to guarantee production wages gets the cart before the horse and falsely assumes that purchasing power, in the form of wages, can be established before it is created by and through production. It would spend money before it is earned and, of course, reaches into another's pocket to do so. In a word,

it would rob Peter to pay Paul—without pointing out that Paul stands next in line to be robbed. For Paul is robbed of merchandise that can't be produced because of soon excessive production costs. Or he is robbed of money when he has to pay the costs of his GAW in the form of higher prices—the reflection of Peter's having to pass on to the consumer such costs as he and his business are in no financial position to absorb. Or, in the very last and very sad analysis, Paul may be robbed of his job, his very livelihood, when Peter prices himself out of the market and is compelled to shut up shop.

In general, thus, the effect of "guaranteeing" wages is to level both the worker and his employer and rob them of the very security they presently possess as a result of their combined productivity. To support them in their resulting destitution there is, of course, the Government—or, rather, the Government's herded taxpayers, all neatly lined up as they await their own turn to be leveled, thus completing the Socialist pattern.

BETRAYAL OF SENORITY

The character of the forces at work should be clear as we observe them in general. If they are not, then the GAW's betrayal of unionism's sacred principle of seniority offers us a closeup of the levelling force in action. Seniority is a system of individual employment security based on ability and years of service. Under the GAW, the whole thing is turned upside down and the junior worker automatically gets more consideration, while the senior worker gets the least. Because, in case of a layoff, the junior worker leaves the job assured of full pay checks while not at work, whereas the veteran worker must stay on the job and work his regular hours in order to collect his.

Nothing could be closer to socialist idiocy than this proposal to penalize the have and compel him, through the proof of his own accomplishment and the sweat of his own brow, to subsidize the have not. It's the principle of soak the rich brought all the way down the line and deposited at shop level.

So far the socializing effects of the GAW are noted only as they apply to business and industry per se—and as they would begin to apply to individual workers and employers. Let's now expand the picture a bit and judge, if we can, the effect of generally guaranteed wages upon the whole American economy.

TOWARD A SOCIALIST AMERICA

Like everything drawn from socialism's bag of tricks, the GAW philosophy ignores the simple fact that no economy can guarantee anything not supported by productivity and that productivity shrivels when creative employment shrinks. It thinks only in terms of drawing from a barrel, without stopping to consider that barrels have bottoms and that it takes work to fill a barrel and maintain its reservoir. It shoulders aside the basic fact that work can be performed only by workers creatively employed—not by managers, not by union or company officials and certainly never by government administrators.

It also turns up its nose at the important fact that our economy comprises far more than its largest and most conspicuous industries—that in reality it is a farflung network of interdependent enterprises, large and medium size and small.

The point lost in all GAW pipedreaming is that the people employed by all these many enterprises are consumers as well as producers and that, as a composite group, these people are counted upon to buy the goods and services they separately produce. But as consumers they are a hard-boiled lot, forever interested solely in price and quality and in no way interested in the nature of the costs responsible for high prices. As customers, they always make for the market that offers them the most of the best for the least. And on that same market all free industry must forever compete for sales.

Stripped of all highfaluting theory, this means that sales—goods and services bought and paid for—are the only real guaranty there ever can be in any economy on earth of anything that even remotely resembles a wage. Even doles by government must be paid for out of somebody's production, and even this production is determined by sales.

CONSUMER NO PHILANTHROPIST

To assume that the customer will buy luxuries or even necessities simply because they were produced under union auspices in the interest of some passionately declared utopia—or even simply because they were made in America—is to kid ourselves that consumers are philanthropists.

The fact is, if the establishment of anything like a generally applied guaranteed annual wage forces up the prices of domestic commodities to a point beyond the ability or willingness of the domestic consumer to pay—and if foreign-made goods of competitive quality are offered on the American market at far lower prices simply because they are not overburdened with fancy production costs—then you can bet it will be the foreign-made goods the American consumer will go for. The net result of that will be diminished United States business, diminished United States production and a rapidly diminishing likelihood that any guaranteed United States wages could be met.

Raise the price of a pair of American-made shoes because the cost of a GAW compels it, and the person needing shoes will look elsewhere for a pair, no matter where they come from. And he won't care a tinker's dam whether the workers who produced them receive $3 an hour of $3 a week—or why. And because of his indifference as to where he buys his shoes, his television set, his typewriter, camera, sewing machine or cigarette lighter, his desertion of American-made goods will further damage already cost-ridden United States productivity. Millions—yes, billions— of domestic man-hours of production will be lost to our economy; and if those man-hours still must be paid for—well, there goes your old ball game. And along with it, the American high standard of living that today we are so proud of. For as productivity collapses, so does American business and industry—taking with them the employment of Americans like you and me, our purchasing power and all our confidence in ourselves. In the resulting crash, all our present security would vanish in thin air.

EFFECT ON OBLIGATIONS

Homes, cars, furniture and electrical appliances—yes, and many an insurance policy set up to assure a growing child of a future college education or a comfortable retirement for its beneficiary—these and many other personal assets for which the American worker has obligated himself to pay for over and extended period of time would certainly slip from his grasp. Obligations easily undertaken in boom times—especially in times influenced by a temporary GAW inflation—simply cannot be met under conditions of rapid deflation, occasioned by the forced default through bankruptcy of one business after another.

These are the conditions our social-minded planners are bound to lead us to—conditions, discouraging to capital investment, conditions in which no bank can be persuaded to loan money to a business already hopelessly on the rocks. For there we'd have the situation wherein the last resort of business and industry would of necessity be a Government handout, each bearing the inevitable red tag to indicate Government ownership or control. And to the Government the people themselves would be forced to go for what would then amount to a Guaranteed Annual Dole (GAD).

The age of administration and bureaucracy would then be fully upon us. Socialism, the foolish king of our lives, would sit on his shabby throne only long enough for the greedy tyrants of world communism to burst in upon him and seize the scepter from his palsied hand. For there would be no enterprising nation on earth to step in and save us from our sorry selves and put us back on our industrial feet—as we have stepped in and poured out our money to save other peoples from the worst follies of their socialism. We'd be left to ourselves, to share and share alike the wretched minimums allowed the proletariat by communism wherever it raises its hammer and sickle—and to remember with hopeless nostalgia the days when the glittering maximums of free enterprise and personal initiative and production for profit enriched our lives.

In our case there could be no sidestepping the penalties for yielding to the social planning of Fabian phonies and dreamers of a Soviet America, whose minds are frozen with the false notion that production is solely for use and not for profit and who today offer us a full schedule of "securities" based on strangling the profit motive and killing the goose that lays our golden eggs. And worst of all, there could be no return to the productive realities of our American economy as we know it today.

Were it possible for the GAW permanently to stabilize our economy, as Mr. Reuther predicts and may honestly believe it can, perhaps the general proposal would have something. But it does not lie in its power to stabilize. Because the very character of a dynamic economy makes it forever and delicately responsive to the laws of supply and demand. To "stabilize" it is to deactivate it, stifle it, and eventually kill it—as the case obviously has been in Soviet Russia. If security for the working class of our country be our sincere and practical ambition—as it should be—certainly nothing in the way of security can be pursued in any Socialist direction.

OUR SUREST GUARANTY

The inescapable fact is that our truest security—our surest guaranty of wages, salaries, and profits—lies in productive work, in joining forces as true partners in production to turn out the most of the best for the least. It lies in considering ourselves first of all as consumers, then as producers of the goods we must or want to consume. Out of this process, which is enterprise, comes an honest day's pay for an honest day's work, provided all of us pitch in as partners in America and first contribute an honest day's work for an honest days' pay.

This is our system and it is one that is tried and true. When fully applied it has brought—and always will bring—good times to every segment of our economic society—the worker, the employer, the investor, the taxpayer, and the customer; in a word, the American in his various interlocking capacities.

This is our system, and it is the very opposite of the socialism that has brought ruin to every economy it has ever been applied to.

To ignore these facts as together we explore the future of our economy and together we endeavor to improve our way of life is to blind ourselves to the basic flaws in the GAW.

Israel, June 1955—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the first in a series of five articles written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., during his recent visit to

Israel. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

It appeared in the June 20, 1955, issue of the New York Journal-American:

W. R. HEARST IN ISRAEL: ARABS LIVE PRIMITIVELY, JEWS MODERN, DYNAMIC

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

NEW CITY, JERUSALEM, June 19.—From my window in the King David Hotel in Israel, where this is being written, I can look out over Mount Zion to the Mount of Olives in Jordan beyond the Old City of Jerusalem for a distance of about a mile.

But in the contrast that exists between the Arab and Jewish sides of Jerusalem it is like passing through the ages from the primitive past to modern western civilization.

I made the passing this Sabbath day, crossing through the ruins of "no man's land" in the diplomatic car of the American consul, Mr. John Sebene.

The heart of the old walled city of Jerusalem, where lie the tomb of Lord Jesus Christ and the sacred shrines of the three great religions, is typically Arab. By this, I mean its streets are crooked and narrow and cobblestoned.

From its tiny hole-in-the-wall shops emanate strange sights and unsavory smells which I found are peculiarly characteristic of the Arab world from Casablanca to Damascus.

Black-garbed Arab women shuffle along, balancing baskets of vegetables or pans of bread on their heads. Barefoot, half-naked urchins scamper through the pilgrims who have come from many parts of the earth to visit the sacred scenes of the life and last days of our Saviour.

Idle men sit on stools outside the eating houses or shops and listen to eerie Arab music coming from tiny dilapidated radio sets. Occasional policemen, who wear khaki-colored spiked helmets, keep an eye out for pickpockets and furtive shoplifters.

CONSTANT DIN

The din is great and constant, what with the cries of the street vendors mixed with the arguments of their potential customers, the clip-clop of little overburdened donkeys making their way through the bustling mass of sweaty and tatterdemalion humanity. Lastly and always there are swarms of flies on everything and everybody.

Despite the sense of uncleanliness that a westerner feels, the bodies may not be as unwashed as they appear, since the Mohammedan religion calls for the faithful to wash their feet, hands, and face five times a day before prayers.

To visit the Holy Sepulcher, to walk along the Via Dolorosa—or Path of Pain—over which Christ carried part of the cross on which he was to be crucified, fills one with a humble sense of profound reverence and awe. One is deeply conscious of the goodness of Christianity in this holiest of cities.

The contrast between the medieval walled city and hustling modern metropolis which the Jews have made of their part of Jerusalem is more than just striking. One cannot escape the conclusion that despite, or perhaps because of, the difficulties placed in their way by the Arab world, which refuses to accept the existence of the Jewish national home, these people are going to be successful in their determination to develop a new and dynamic nation.

On arrival on this side of the city, one is immediately impressed by the spirit of vitality and modernity that is reflected in the appearances and actions of a people of many races with only their religion in common, who have come here from all parts of the world to help make their dream of a homeland come true.

Streets are wide and clean. The shops are many and attractive. New housing developments are spotted all over the rolling countryside. There is an atmosphere of strong will to work and strength of purpose.

From what I have seen in the few hours I have been here I would say that it is going to take more than the Arab economic blockade, frontier incidents and the resentful ill-will of the 40 million people in the Arab world to make the Jewish people abandon fulfillment of the centuries-old aspiration to have a place they can call home.

Israel, June 1955—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second in a series of five articles written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., during his recent visit to Israel. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

It appeared in the June 21, 1955, issue of the New York Journal American:

W. R. HEARST, JR., IN ISRAEL: WILL FIGHT TO THE END, SAYS BEN-GURION—EGYPT CAN HAVE QUICK PEACE, ISRAELI LEADER TELLS HEARST

(By Kingsbury Smith)

TEL AVIV, June 21.—Israeli Defense Minister Ben-Gurion has warned that if the Arab nations start another war the Jewish State will fight until it has won a complete military victory.

But Ben-Gurion gave assurances that Egypt can have peace with Israel in 5 minutes if it really wants it.

A founding father of the Mid-East democracy and its first Prime Minister, Ben-Gurion had a long and frank discussion yesterday with American Publisher William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and this correspondent.

Israel concluded an armistice with the neighboring Arab states early in 1949 after the Israeli Army, though numerically small in comparison with its opponents, had repulsed the Arab attack that followed the United Nations-sponsored partition of Palestine.

OBJECTS TO ZONE

Ben-Gurion said Israel did not view with favor the Egyptian proposal for a demilitarized zone, nor would he personally support any plan for the establishment of a U. N. force on the frontier to keep Egyptian and Israeli forces separated.

Ben-Gurion asserted experience has shown the Arabs could not be trusted in respect to creation of a demilitarized zone.

"We will not give up our right to protect ourselves," he said. "We have a right to protect our own frontiers. We are able and determined to do so."

Ben-Gurion was informed by Hearst that Egyptian Premier Nasser had assured him a few days ago in Cairo that Egypt wanted peace with Israel.

EAGER FOR PEACE

The defense minister said:

"If Nasser wants peace and maybe he is sincere—he seems to be a decent fellow—he can have it in 5 minutes by simply negotiating with us a treaty of peace, friendship, and cooperation.

"There is a desert between our two countries. While our forefathers in the time of Moses had some grievances, there is no reason why Egypt and Israel should not enjoy good and mutually beneficial relations today.

"I am afraid, however, Nasser is not master in his own house.

"I am afraid he is powerless to control the elements that are not willing to reconcile themselves to the permanent existence of the State of Israel.

AFRAID OF EACH OTHER

"Peace depends on two things: One, recognition by the Arabs that we are here to stay. Two, our right and ability to defend the sovereignty of our state and the lives of our people."

Ben-Gurion said that until Egypt has a popular democratic government he doubted whether its leadership would be capable of making peace with Israel.

"They are afraid of one another over there," he said. "Your President can say he is not going to make war with China over imprisoned American airmen, and he has a sufficiently strong position in his own country to do so.

"The time may come when the Egyptian leader will be able to do what he thinks is right.

"Until then, we will wait patiently. We are not going to make war on Egypt, nor on any other Arab state.

"But at the same time we are not going to stand idly by and see our soldiers and people killed. Our pioneers are too precious for us to lose."

After talking with Ben-Gurion and Premier Sharett, Hearst talked with Maj. Gen. E. L. M. Burns, of Canada, chief of the U. N. Truce Supervision Organization. Hearst then visited the Gaza area.

Israel, June 1955—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the third in a series of five articles written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., during his recent visit to Israel. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

It appeared in the June 22, 1955, issue of the New York Journal-American:

W. R. HEARST, JR. WRITES FROM HOLY LAND: LITTLE ISRAEL HAS VITALITY AND MAKINGS OF A GREAT NATION

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

TEL AVIV, June 21.—In size, Israel is one of the smallest states in the Near East. In its spirit, its faith in the future, its vitality and rate of progress at which it is developing itself as a nation, it is outmatched by no country in the world.

It is an inspiring sight to see at firsthand what has happened here since the birth of this nation 7 years ago. This is especially so if you first visit some other parts of the Middle East as I did.

My first impression of passing from the middle eastern past to the modernity of western civilization not only held good but grew hourly greater as I traveled across this tiny state today.

The contrast between the apparent apathy of backward countries like Jordan and the energy of this melting pot of world Jewry is truly amazing. I could not help but feel that a great nation is in the making here.

This belief was strengthened by my talk with Israeli Defense Minister Ben-Gurion. The 68-year-old inspirational leader of Israel, who was formerly head of the Govern-

ment, returned not long ago literally from the plow to assume direction of national defense.

It was a stimulating experience to sit with this man who has played and is continuing to play such an historic role in the birth and development of the Jewish nation.

In temperament, in intellectual brillance, in dynamic forcefulness and even in physical stature he reminded me somewhat of Sir Winston Churchill. Both are great patriots. Both are imbued with fighting spirits.

For other reasons, Ben-Gurion made me think of the late Arthur Brisbane, my father's great, page one columnist. His workshop reminded me of Brisbane's. Truly a house of learning. A veritable library with books lining every wall from floor to ceiling in three rooms.

Almost as if reading my mind, Ben-Gurion mentioned Brisbane. He recalled reading his column regularly, remembering that it had appeared in the New York American, now the Journal-American.

TELLS TRAGIC TALE

He also recalled my father and showed an interest in what was happening to the Hearst newspapers. I promised to send him some.

Ben-Gurion told me the tragic tale of a young girl who came to Israel from Australia. The story, and the manner in which it was related by the elderly soldier-statesman, seemed to me to epitomize the spirit of Israel today.

Explaining the type of attack to which the Jewish state is being subjected on its borders by neighboring Arab nations, which refuse to reconcile themselves to the permanent existence of Israel, Ben-Gurion said:

"Two weeks ago I visited the place near Gaza where the Egyptians shelled our frontier settlements. They killed a worker and blew the legs off a young girl and a boy.

INSPIRED BY IDEAL

"The girl, who was only about 21, had come from Australia. She came from a well-to-do family. There was no material need for her to come here. She was not being persecuted in Australia.

"She came because of an ideal. Because she too wanted to help build a national home for her people. She did not stay in Tel Aviv, where she could have gone to the movies, and lived in relative comfort. She went to a dangerous and difficult area."

Leaning forward in his chair with an expression of genuine grief clouding his intelligent face and emotion stirring his voice, Ben-Gurion exclaimed:

"Her legs were cut off. For me that was terrible. We cannot afford to lose that type of people.

"Six million Jews were destroyed by Hitler. Maybe to Nasser (Egyptian Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser) a few human lives mean nothing. But every one of our pioneers is precious to us."

READY TO FIGHT

With anger in his eyes, this old man, who is witnessing a dream come true and who is determined it shall not be wrecked in a nightmare of any new Arab attempt to drive the Jews into the sea, convinced me that Israel remains more ready than ever to fight for survival.

Speaking with great pride and gratification of what has been accomplished to date in building up a national home, Ben-Gurion said that in his opinion the main achievement has been turning the Jewish people back to the soil.

In reference to the fact that Jews throughout the world had become mostly merchants and traders, he added:

"For 2,000 years we were prevented from living on the soil. The first wave of pioneers who came to Palestine in the late 1880's, found it was too much for them. The second wave, of which I was one, came 40 years ago and we finally succeeded.

"We did so because our leaders at the time said we must go back to the land. We put emphasis not on owning soil, but on working it."

COMMUNAL SETTLEMENTS

This was the beginning of what came to be known as a kibutz or communal settlement.

In these settlements people worked without individual profit. They received no payment in cash for their services. They were given food, clothing, and housing in accordance with what was considered by an elected body of their own local communities to be their needs.

They lived together in barracks and their children were turned over as babies to local nursing homes, though their parents visited them daily. All profits earned by the community were plowed back into its development.

These kibutzes represent probably the purest form of communism that exists in the world without the evil aspects of the Soviet brand such as antireligion, regimentation, and despotic rule.

MORE LIBERAL TREND

Nevertheless it appears that Israel, having tried a taste of it, has found it wanting. We were told the trend now is away from these collective kibutzes to a more liberal, free-enterprising, cooperative system.

Shortly after establishment of Israel there were more kibutzes than cooperatives. Today, the latter greatly outnumber the former.

As communities developed, the urge for individualism grew stronger among the members. Parents wanted their children to live with them. They wanted their own homes. They wanted to earn money with which they could do as they pleased.

Since the communities, again unlike Soviet communism, were free to determine by majority vote how they wished to develop, most of them chose the cooperative system.

There is an interesting lesson here for those who think communism, even in its most enlightened form, can satisfy mankind.

Israel, June 1955—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the fourth in a series of five articles written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., during his recent visit to Israel. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

It appeared in the June 23, 1955, issue of the New York Journal American:

W. R. HEARST, JR., WRITES FROM HOLY LAND: ISRAEL'S TINY SIZE PROVES SURPRISE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

TEL AVIV, June 22.—One of the most surprising aspects of this visit of mine to Israel has been the size of the Jewish State.

For instance, we drove from the new city of Jerusalem to Tel Aviv for an hour's chat with the venerable David Ben-Gurion, one of the founding fathers of this enterprising young nation. We then drove back to Jerusalem to talk with Prime Minister Moshe Sharett for another hour. And all this before lunch.

Granted, we had to get up early, but such is the width of Israel from its inland boundary in the hills of Judea to Tel Aviv on the sea.

After lunch we motored south from Jerusalem to a frontier post on the edge of the so-called Gaza strip, a narrow slice of territory along the Mediterranean which holds 200,000 Arab refugees from Palestine.

This is a tense area where recent frontier incidents have created the danger of war between Egypt and Israel.

Evening found us driving back along the coast to Tel Aviv, where we arrived around 9 o'clock.

Thus in 1 day of leisurely driving, interrupted by long talks with Jewish leaders and officials like Maj. E. L. M. Burns, of Canada, Chief of the United Nations Truce Commission, and a visit to the troubled border, we have covered almost half of the country.

In yesterday's article I related the details of the friendly talk I had in Tel Aviv with Defense Minister Ben-Gurion about Israel's future.

My meeting in Jerusalem with Prime Minister Sharett was something of a surprise. I had been led to believe that Ben-Gurion was the firebrand and Sharett a more moderate member of the present government.

In fact, Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser, Egypt's Premier, conveyed that impression during my talk with him in Cairo last week.

Nasser said he felt Ben-Gurion was inclined to pursue a policy of force in respect to the neighboring Arab states, whereas Sharett apparently favored a policy which would lead the Arabs to think there was no danger from Israel.

However, in contrast with the mild-mannered, soft-spoken attitude which Ben-Gurion had shown in his conversation with me, I found Sharett peppery, jumpy, and almost irritable. He was suffering from a cold and that may have been the reason.

DOUBTS SOLUTION

Sharett was quite annoyed with the refusal of Egypt to agree to high-level talks to seek a solution of the frontier problem.

With regard to Nasser's proposal for establishment of a demilitarized zone in the Gaza area, Sharett said:

"We did not reject it. This does not obligate us to its acceptance. We think it not only would not solve the problem, but would create a worse problem.

"It would leave the field free for bands to infiltrate. It would create a vacuum and make such a demilitarized zone a happy hunting ground for the Arabs.

"We have proposed establishment of a mined zone, which would be patrolled by both sides."

URGES CONFERENCE

Sharett said if Egypt really wanted peace with Israel, Nasser would accept the proposal for a high-level meeting. He added:

"If representatives of both governments would sit down at the conference table with a United Nations representative, we could thrash this thing out. But the actions of the Egyptian Government indicate they don't want peace with us."

What Sharett had to say about the frontier situation seemed realistic, but I thought he was a little unrealistic about the reasons he gave as to the advantages the United States would derive from conclusion of a mutual defense treaty with Israel.

I think the American people would understand it if they were told Israel wanted us to help protect them militarily against the danger of another Arab attack, but I don't believe they will accept the argument that the United States would receive advantages from a mutual defense pact with this little nation.

Israel, June 1955—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the last in a series of five articles written by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., during his recent visit to Israel. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

It appeared in the June 24, 1955, issue of the New York Journal-American:

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, JR., WRITES FROM TEL AVIV: ISRAEL DESTINED TO LEAD MIDDLE EAST

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

TEL AVIV, June 23.—At the conclusion of this brief visit to the Near East, I am inclined to think that Israel, if it continues to receive financial aid from world Jewry and continues itself in peace for the next 10 or 20 years, will eventually emerge as the leading nation of this area.

The more I have seen of the vitality and progressive spirit of the people of this tiny Jewish state, in comparison with the backwardness in some neighboring nations, the more convinced I have become that Israel will lead the way on development of the Middle East.

For example, one of the distressing sights to be seen in Jordan, especially around Jerusalem, is the arid land. There is mile after mile of barren surface that looks as though some giant hand had plucked away the trees and vegetation and scattered the topsoil, exposing white, dry rocks.

This must be typical of the land in this area, I thought. Yet just over a ridge, in Israel, I found the land dotted with trees and green cultivated plots.

As I drove through the country, areas covered with brown soil were pointed out to me which, I was told, had been just as bare as the land I had seen in Jordan.

Today, thanks to reforestation, irrigation, intelligent planning, and, above all, hard work, the land of Israel is beginning to bloom.

People who can perform a virtual miracle with mother earth will likely become the dominant influence in this area in the future, especially when they include, as they already do, idealistic pioneers from many different parts of the world, including Asiatics.

It is true, of course, that Israel has received during the past 7 years much greater financial aid from abroad than any neighboring Arab State. World Jewry poured vast sums of money into this little State to keep it going, especially in the face of the Arab economic blockade against it. American aid, private and governmental, is estimated to have totaled around $900 million.

In contrast, the United States has given only $40 million to the new military regime in Egypt, which, under the well-intentioned leadership of Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser, is striving to bring that poverty-stricken country of 20 million people out of its primitive past with a far-reaching modernization program.

Nevertheless, one cannot escape the conclusion that if the same amount of money had been given to some of Israel's neighbors the results would not have been as impressive as they are here in Israel.

The reason being that since 1948, since 1948, when the Jewish national home was established, a million energetic, intelligent Jewish immigrants, imbued with the will to work and the fervor of fanatics, have come to this little country.

EXEMPLIFIES COURAGE

The courageous and enterprising spirit of these people is exemplified by the frontier village of Nahal Oz. I visited this tiny settlement on the edge of the Gaza strip tinderbox area of border friction between Israel and Egypt.

It was from this region that Israeli troops recently conducted a raid against the Egyptian military position which Defense Minister Ben-Gurion frankly admitted to me was intended as a reprisal for provocative attacks by Arabs against Israel. Thirty-two Egyptian soldiers were killed in the raid.

Nahal Oz is inhabited by youths ranging in age from 19 to 22. They include 27 young women. This settlement was established 3 years ago as an outpost to protect the border region. Young men and women drafted for military service were asked to volunteer for this dangerous post.

At the end of their military service, which lasted 2½ years for the men and 2 years for the women, they had the choice of remaining to guard the frontier and develop a settlement or of returning to their homes in safer area. All of the youths decided to remain. They are members of an organization called the Fighting Pioneer Youth.

Approaching the village by car, we came to a country road on which there was a sign marked, "frontier, danger." We drove on through ploughed fields to a barbed-wire road block and then turned into the village.

It looked like a Hollywood setting for a wild west frontier town. There were half a dozen wooden shacks and a sheltered stockyard with several houses and a few cows.

The sun was setting as we arrived and a cool breeze blew in from the sea. I caught a glimpse of youthful figures huddled around the door to one of the shacks. A youth in khaki shorts and dangling shirt was playing a harmonica.

In the distance I noticed another figure emerging from the fields with something on his shoulder. Through field glasses I saw that the thing on his shoulder was a bazooka.

HOMEWARD BOUND

Through my mind flashed the line of Thomas Gray's Elegy about the farmer homeward bound, plodding his weary way, but for the life of me I couldn't remember any reference to a bazooka.

While scanning the shacks I caught sight of another suntanned youngsters in bathing trunks. Beneath his arm was a rifle, while through the half opened door of one of the shacks I could see a machinegun leaning across a bed.

These youths were the vanguard of a nation in the making.

The director of the camp, a lean, bronzed youngster of 21, named Odden Levin, told me that 2 weeks ago an Egyptian artillery post, which could be seen on a hill not far away, had shelled the village, but that no one was hurt, not even the 2-year-old tot I saw scampering around, the child of 1 of the 9 married couples in the settlement.

"Until recently," Levin said, "we had frequent infiltrations by Arab refugees. Last year they cost us 8 percent of our crops. They would come at night and steal the crops.

"We shot 3 or 4 of them but they still came, until our soldiers raided the Egyptian military post. Since then, none have bothered us. I guess they are afraid to come now."

The visit to that frontier settlement was one of the most fascinating experiences of my trip to Israel.

STRIKING CONTRAST

It was in striking contrast with the normalcy of Tel Aviv and especially the comfort of the new Dan Hotel in which this dispatch is being written.

Speaking of hotels, I started this journey in the Near East by attending the inauguration of the new Hilton Hotel in Istanbul and ended it today with attendance at the opening of Tel Aviv's newest, the Accadia.

Though smaller, it compares very favorably with Conrad Hilton's latest tourist temple. In fact, it was patterned after his very successful one in the Caribbean. From what Mr. Hilton told me, if the Accadia enjoys the same success it will do all right.

I recommend that you visit this most interesting part of the world.

Now, from my sixth floor room in Tel Aviv's Dan Hotel, overlooking this brilliant corner of the Mediterranean, we are off for Athens, Greece.

Still Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation authorization is misleading. Section 12 of the bill reported by the committee contains an appropriation authorization of "such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act but not to exceed $760 million." This implies that such sum is sufficient to construct the projects authorized by the act. In fact, according to the Reclamation Bureau figures contained in the hearings, an additional $173,468,300 would be required to construct the authorize features, bringing the total sum to $933,468,000.

In view of the notoriously inadequate estimates made in the past by the Bureau, it is a very good possibility that ultimate costs for these features alone will be well over $1 billion.

In any event, it should be thoroughly understood that the figure used in the bill will not, according to Bureau estimates, construct this project. Instead of $760 million, the actual figure is $933 million, or, if a lower Curecanti should be constructed—either is authorized by the bill—the cost would be $894 million. Here are the figures taken from those supplied by the Bureau at pages 64–67 of the hearings. The projects here accounted for are only those named as authorized in section 1 of the bill:

11 participating projects	$304,356,300
Glen Canyon Dam	421,270,000
Flaming Gorge	82,942,000
Navaho (dam and reservoir only)	36,400,000
Curecanti (940,000 acre-feet)	49,305,000
Total	894,273,300
Curecanti (modified plan)	88,500,000
Total	933,468,300

Actually, the project development sought to be authorized by the bill is just the starter for some 34 or more storage and reclamation projects specifically named, contemplated, and designated in House Document No. 364 as the upper Colorado River storage project,

involving a construction cost of $1.6 billion at least, or over twice the amount of the appropriation set forth in the House bill. The figure of $760 million in the House bill is an attempt to hide from Congress the true cost of the development.

Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain To Be Dedicated on September 25, 1955, at 2 p. m., at National Memorial Park, Falls Church, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was a decade ago, during World War II, that four chaplains of the United States Army, Lts. John Patrick Washington, a Catholic priest, from Newark, N. J.; Alexander D. Goode, a Jewish Rabbi, from Temple Beth Israel, York, Pa.; Clark V. Poling, a Baptist minister from Schenectady, N. Y., and George L. Fox, a Methodist minister from Vermont, in a spirit of unity and sacrifice, gave up their lifejackets and went down on the torpedoed steamship *Dorchester*.

On September 25, 1955, at 2 p. m., the first large permanent memorial in the Washington area to these four brave men of God—the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain—will be dedicated, with appropriate ceremonies, at National Memorial Park, Lee Highway, Falls Church, Va.

Commissioned 3 years ago by Mr. Robert F. Marlowe, president of National Memorial Park, at a cost of $50,000, the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain was designed and created by the well-known sculptor, Constantino Nivola, of New York, and the prominent Washington architect, Walter Marlowe.

Set against dense green trees, the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain consists of a great ship, 22 by 24 feet, of reinforced white concrete, arising as if in its final moment from a large four-pointed, star-shaped pool. Twenty-four jets of water pour from the keel of the vessel into the large pool, cascading as if a whirlpool into a smaller oval pool below. Hovering an inch above the water are four panels, joined at right angles, each portraying a significant facet of each of the four men's faiths.

The dedication of the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain is under the auspices of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, and has the active cooperation and participation of the armed services, veterans' organizations, religious groups, and many other community organizations. The United States Army Band will present a concert and Dr. Daniel A. Poling, prominent churchman, will speak.

A highlight of the program will be the presentation of the four chaplains' award to a chaplain of the Navy and Air Force who best exemplifies the spirit of the service. This is an annual award presented by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

The united strength of all faiths, the devotion and sacrifice of men of God, whose leadership has made our country strong, symbolized in the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain at National Memorial Park, deserves the complete endorsement of the community.

As is inscribed on the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain—

The four chaplains have not gone, for they won immortality through the simple dignity of faith. Their courage is its own poet, its own praise.

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. (John 15: 13.)

Beloved Italian Prelate-Founder Hailed as Friend of Immigrants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address by Archbishop Cushing on the 50th anniversary of the death of Bishop John Baptist Scalabrini, founder of the Pious Society of the Missionaries of St. Charles:

The commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the death of John Baptist Scalabrini, founder of the Pious Society of St. Charles, is most timely. It comes at a moment in history that confirms the religious, social, and political ideals of this outstanding churchman.

As we read the bishop's life and study his achievements we come in contact with a prelate of burning zeal who made the influence of his faith felt in every field of human endeavor. Everywhere and always he was a courageous and genial pioneer.

FAR AHEAD

His life story began at Fino Mornasco, Como, where he was born on July 8, 1839. It ended on June 1, 1905, at Piacenza. It is the story of a never-ending outburst of new initiatives, studies, prepared, and executed in perfect harmony against great opposition and any doubts which might arise among individuals or among groups more or less conservative or reactionary.

Even as a young student he showed his inveterate, independent personality. During these years he lifted up his voice openly in praise of religion and gave of his time to the teaching of the catechism, while others boasted of their anticlericalism and gloried in calling themselves free thinkers. He went further and decided to join the ranks of the priesthood, which was not a very popular vocation in his day.

As parish priest, as rector of a seminary, and bishop, he proved himself a servant of God with great vision and courage who brought forth a constructive program against the enemies of the church and in behalf of the education and sanctity of the people. He was far ahead of his time. His works were many, heroic, amazing. No field of activity was neglected by him and no work was too small or too great for his extraordinary talents.

He conducted catechism classes and reformed this all-important work of religious instruction; he wrote textbooks for the education of the youth; he trained teachers; edited a magazine; he organized national cathechetical congresses, and he encouraged men of strong faith and great integrity to enter the political arena.

IMMIGRANT AID

The most outstanding among the social and religious accomplishment of this dynamic bishop was his work in behalf of the Italian immigrants.

With a truly apostolic mind and heart he soon saw that his mission was not only to the people of his diocese but to those who were leaving his diocese and every diocese in Italy to cross the seas for the betterment of their economic condition. He perhaps more than any other figure must stand as the symbol of the concern and solicitude of the church in the mother country for her children scattered throughout the world.

Today the missionaries of Bishop Scalabrini work among the Italians in North and South America, Australia, and in almost all the countries of Western Europe. In their seminaries of Italy, the United States, and Brazil, more than 1,000 students are now preparing themselves for the religious and social assistance of tomorrow's immigrants.

Added to all of these efforts, Bishop Scalabrini, more than any other person, was the man who was finally successful in persuading St. Frances Cabrini to go to America, there to give courage to the Italian immigrants who had been neglected for many years. It was Bishop Scalabrini who begged Mother Cabrini to rush to the assistance of his missionaries working in New York; it was he who asked for and obtained Archbishop Corrigan's invitation to her to go to New York. Finally, it was he who begged Leo XIII to order her to go west and not east as she had wished.

But this saintly bishop was not content to send his priests and his Sisters out among the immigrants. He himself followed them to America. In 1901 he sailed for the United States, where he visited all of the Italian colonies and where he was welcomed in triumph. He discussed the immigration problem with local bishops and also with the President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, who received him in private conference at the White House. In 1904 he again set out from Italy. This time he went to Brazil and to the Argentine. The hardships of this last trip, where he traveled for miles on horseback shortened his life.

JOURNEY'S END

On his return to Italy, he barely had the time to prepare a lengthy report of his visits to the Americas for St. Pius X who had requested it.

He had come to the end of his laborious journey. On June 1, 1905, Ascension Day, God called this servant home. The servant of God could well say that he had personally fulfilled the mandate he had given his missionaries:

"Wherever there be an Italian immigrant, take to him the comfort of the faith and the smile of his native land."

I have often spoken of the spiritual empire which under God's providence was carved out by the emigrants of Irish descent in the English-speaking world. With the great barrier of language as a hurdle, the Italians have carved out for themselves a similar empire of the spirit in North and South America and in distant Australia. It is well that we should pause to pay special tribute to this phase of the life of Bishop Scalabrini and to the Italian emigrants today.

The beginning years of this century saw what had been previously a relatively small

trickle turn into the full tide of Italian emigration. Where before there had been thousands, there were now tens and hundreds of thousands who each year left the Italian homeland to make for themselves new careers in the lands of promise. It was at this time in 1905, a half century ago, when the work of Bishop Scalabrini was finding its complete justification and its plans were beginning to find their ripe fruition, that God in His all-wise providence brought him back home for eternal rest. We meet today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of his passing not in terms of the grief that must have overtaken the members of his religious family and indeed the church universal 50 years ago. We meet rather in thanksgiving to Almighty God that Bishop Scalabrini's works have followed him so that he lives today with the souls of a myriad of Italian immigrants, who far from their native Italy were nonetheless aided to preserve and strengthen their faith by the work of the Pious Society of St. Charles, the priestly sons of Bishop Scalabrini.

MOST PRECIOUS POSSESSION

Almost from the beginning of what we know as the history of the West, Italy has sent to the far corners of the world her most precious possession, her children. The roads which in their vast network interlaced all the lands about the Mediterranean and united them in that unity which made it possible for the Romans to think of the Mediterranean as their sea, bore upon them not alone the legionnaires of Caesar's conquests. They were the means of travel, too, for hundreds of thousands of Roman citizens who took up their life and work in France, Portugal, Spain, and Britain and so many other places which today have as their common bond the fact that they were members of the Roman Empire and heard together the Gospel preached to them by the See of Rome.

In every age Italy has parted with her children because the azure sky and the turquoise blue of the Mediterranean and the stark grandeur of the Apennines have not sufficed to make up her lack of material resources. As they left Italy, they brought to each new land from the land of their origins some precious gift. In more ancient times it was the Roman sense of the majesty of law, which was the ordered understanding of the duties of man to himself and society codified by the great Roman jurists. In later days it was, together with the law, the message and faith of Christ brought to Rome by St. Peter and St. Paul and professed by countless witnesses whose names are written in the book of life.

In this land of ours before the First World War the magnificent words of Emma Lazarus at the base of the Statue of Liberty were taken in their fullest meaning by the people of this country and we could truly say:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me,
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

In these days Italy sent us in abundance her children who have enriched the life of this Nation beyond measure. They came in tremendous numbers to a land which gave them at best a grudging welcome. They came, moreover, with their thrift, their industry, and their sense of destiny which has always inshpired Italian colonization throughout the centuries. In particular, they were prepared to see themselves grow rich and successful and esteemed in their children rather than in themselves. For their children they were prepared to make every sacrifice, and the warm sense of family that the Italian people brought to us constitutes a debt that we shall not soon repay.

In this emigration and with it and in planning far ahead of it stood the priests of the Pious Society of St. Charles, called affectionately from the name of their founder, the Scalabrini Fathers. To no group do the Italo-Americans, today so successful, today so completely accepted by their fellow-citizens, owe more than to this dedicated band whose post is always in the forefront of emigration from Italy. They have kept the Italian people close to Almighty God and His altar, and they have kept them close to the sweet patronage of the dear Mother of God, who has been to them in time of tribulation such a source of strength and help.

EMIGRATION CRISIS

It is well for us as we commemorate this anniversary to ask ourselves whether we still make sufficiently possible that emigration from other lands to our own which would seem to be indicated by the law of God. There is a fruitful cross-pollination of culture which takes place whenever the strain of a vigorous people is added to the life of America.

I think that all too little noticed was a pastoral letter issued 2 years ago by the bishops of Australia in which they set forth that the earth had been made by God for all His children, and that if Australia were not prepared to bring in the numbers that could profit by the vacant land available, it should be thrown open without any discrimination to settlement by the teeming masses of Asia, the land poor, the hungry, and dispossessed of mankind.

This may well have seemed a radical note to strike. Yet it was the only thing that could be said that would be in keeping with the Christian Gospel. I was happy to note that shortly afterward the non-Catholic Christian leaders of Australia identified themselves with the stand of the Catholic bishops. They, too, agreed that since the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, and He has made it for man's use, man cannot in any given century, for whatever reason, narrow or restrict the use of the earth's abundance to a selected few.

Even if my voice be a lone one, I feel that I must ask how in Christian conscience we shall be able to justify before the Lord of heaven and earth the self-righteousness that has led us to make of America an exclusive preserve for those whom we esteem to be the well born. This has been called, and with more than little reason, a people's century. The accusation of the uprooted peoples of the world will forever condemn us, if we are not prepared to extend once more what was the glory of America's past, the torch of liberty enlightening the world and the sincere handclasp of welcome to the stranger at our gates.

SCALABRINI FATHERS

You who are familiar with the work of the Scalabrini Fathers know how quickly and easily Italian people have become assimilated to the main stream of American life, while at the same time preserving all the best features of their specifically Italian culture. The same is true of all the peoples whose cultural diversity could be the greatest asset of the land we love. Bishop Scalabrini was not given by Almighty God length of years to see the fulfillment of his hopes in the establishment of the Pious Society of St. Charles and the Missionary Sisters of St. Charles, but we have seen it and rejoiced in it. Now, if we are to follow in his tradition, we must dream our dreams of what can be done to make his dreams come to greater realization.

Today in many parts of the world the Scalabrini Fathers are carrying on the work foreseen for them by their great founder. In Latin America there is hardly a nation which has not opened the doors of its hospitality to Italian immigrants and by so doing has invited the presence and the labors of these devoted men of God. In human affairs we often hear the expression that any great institution is only the lengthened shadow of one great man. This we cannot say about the work of God because in all of those who do His work He seeks only instruments for the fulfillment of His providence.

May we not say however that the times and the circumstances called out for that vision which Bishop Scalabrini possessed, in which he foresaw the needs of immigrants, the most important of these being the preservation of their spiritual inheritance. "Where there is no vision the people perish." The preservation of the faith of those who came to the New World come from the Old is perhaps the most important labor undertaken in this century.

There is so much of a natural tendency to concentrate on material success, that there must be voices which speak clearly and surely of the things of eternity, the values which are not measured by any yardstick of time. The greatest force in the world is an idea, and the greatest idea that the world has known is the word of God made man for our salvation. To keep this idea always to the forefront, with soft insistence, in season and out of season, in all patience and doctrine, has been the task of apostolic souls since the day of Pentecost. It is a work that will always be needed so long as the world finds in Christ and His cross contradiction and not salvation.

BROTHERS IN CHRIST

How we could wish that there were a hundred apostles like Bishop Scalabrini. How many have come to this land from Catholic Europe and fallen into a laxness and indifference which might have been avoided if some one were at hand to say the word of truth and light. They have need to know, those who come to our shores, that there is one God here as there and that His law is universal. It is not changed or mitigated by prosperity. It does not shift with the worldly success of those who have once known God and His truth. There is but one God of all, rich to all those who call upon Him.

Those whom we welcome to America today have been tried in the crucible of suffering and persecution and want. They are the strangers to whom now God wishes us to give the best of welcomes and a share in our hearts' love. Their children and ours will walk together as those born free, but they will walk more surely and unitedly as they have the remembrance that, when their parents of this generation met, they met as friends and brothers in Christ.

It is not easly for a nation or a people to bid farewell to so many of the best of its children as perforce Italy has done and for the foreseeable future will have to do. If the farewell good wishes that they receive and the spiritual help that is theirs from the homeland is matched by our generous welcome and an invitation to union with us in prayer, we shall have built a bridge across the ocean which will be forever the sign of our unity in Christ by whom all walls of division have been broken down.

Panama-United States Treaty of Understanding and Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which

recently appeared in newspapers in the Panama Canal Zone, both of which discuss in some detail the various ramifications of the United States-Panama Treaty:

CLUBHOUSE, COMMISSARY PRICES TO CLIMB—HOSPITAL, SCHOOL, ELECTRIC POWER HIKES ALSO LIKELY

Part of anticipated Panama Canal Company deficits of $1,906,000 for Fiscal Year 1956 and something which may well be in the vicinity of $2,970,000 for Fiscal Year 1957 are to be met by increases in the prices of goods and services furnished by the company to pancanal employees and to those of other United States Federal agencies on the isthmus.

The four fields in which increases are sure to come are rent, electric power rates, commisary prices and service center prices. Rent raises have already been announced.

Other increases may come in hospital and school charges.

Through the possibility of toll increases has been mentioned in congressional hearings, neither the Governor nor the Canal board of directors have made known any project they may have to up tolls.

While the bulk of the anticipated deficits is expected to be met by a revision of former income and expenditure estimates in various bureaus, it is certain that an appreciable part of the large sums will have to be borne by employees.

For instance, the Commissary Division, among others, will have to pass along the cost of the recently authorized 7½-cent pay increase for Federal workers on its staff.

The imminence of higher zone living costs was revealed in a recent Panama Canal circular to high-level personnel whose responsibilities include supervising the fiscal affairs of various divisions.

The measures and sums listed in the circular, for the present, amount in effect to no more than suggestions. The executives concerned have the right to suggest other means to reach the same economic ends.

The anticipated deficits for fiscal 1956 and 1957 are apparently the difference between the anticipated income from all sources—including tolls and tolls credits on government ships—and the expense of operating the canal, plus a fixed percentage of net gain which the canal must turn in to the United States Treasury.

This percentage is an arbitrary figure set annually by the Treasury, based on an average of the rates of all the Government's outstanding bonds. The figure has risen from 1.75 percent for 1952 to 2.48 percent for 1956.

For the past 10 days or more the plan involving increased cost burden for employees has been causing quiet consternation in circles where it became known.

However, the largest lump sum of increased income it is planned to produce from a single source is $400,000 each year from the hospitals.

The employee will not pay directly for all of this. Armed services are expected to assume some of the burden.

Private patients, including retired employees who enter the hospital from Panama, will almost surely have their rates increased. But the employee rate is expected to jump, too.

The Commissary Division, which would otherwise be expected to produce $650,000 in net gain for fiscal year 1956, will have to ante up an additional $125,000 profit this year, as the plan stands.

For fiscal year 1957 it would normally be expected to produce $410,000 net gain, but must make up another $100,000.

Restaurants (service centers) are expected to increase prices by 1 percent to produce an extra $29,000 net gain for fiscal year 1956, $24,000 for fiscal year 1957.

In the rents picture, the 7 percent cutback which operated for some months has been reduced under the plan to 3 or 4 percent. This is expected to produce $88,000 additional for this year, $87,000 for fiscal year 1957.

Electric current would go up, too. The sale of such current is expected to produce an additional $87,000 for each fiscal year. To do this a 6-percent raise in price will be necessary. What part of this percentage would be borne by the employees and what part by other consumers on the zone is not known.

The schools division is expected to produce an additional $50,000 for each year. Presumably this will mean a rate hike for tuition students in the Canal Zone schools.

Over 300 Patriotic Citizens of 23d District, California, Honor House Un-American Activities Committee at Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for the information of yourself and all my colleagues in this great legislative body the text and content of a very lovely dinner on Wednesday, June 29, 1955, at Downey, Calif., in the great 23d District which I am representing this my fifth term in Congress.

In addition to what appears on the face of the program hereinafter set forth, please be informed on account of the inability of Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana, to be present at the recent Los Angeles hearings, Hon. MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri, took his place.

I know you will be pleased to learn that more than 300 citizens were seated at the beautifully decorated tables honoring this subcommittee.

The program follows:

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1955, DOWNEY WOMAN'S CLUB, DOWNEY, CALIF.

TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT COMMUNITY LEADERS HONOR CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE, 23D DISTRICT, AND HIS COLLEAGUES ON THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. GORDON H. SCHERER, OF OHIO; HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS, OF LOUISIANA; HON. DONALD L. JACKSON, OF CALIFORNIA

Frank S. Tavenner, legal counsel.
William Wheeler, staff member.
In session in Los Angeles, Calif., June 27–30, 1955.

HONORARY SPONSORING COMMITTEE

Cochairman: Mayor Richard W. Stephens, Huntington Park; Edmund F. Shaheen, Compton.

Richard Adams, community leader, Bell Gardens; Elton Allen, president, chamber of commerce, Huntington Park; Ellis C. Allsop, civic leader, Maywood;

Harry E. Billings, businessman, Compton; Claud Black, district governor of Rotary, Downey; Samuel Block, attorney, Compton; Frank G. Bonnelli, State assemblyman, 52d District; Judge A. D. Boone, municipal judge, Downey; Francis J. Bradley, city treasurer, Huntington Park; Leonard F. Brown, city councilman, Bell; Percy Bruner, mayor, Lynwood; Frank G. Bussing, mayor, Compton; James G. Butler, city attorney, Compton; Judge Roberta Butzbaugh, municipal judge, Bellflower;

Frederick Cade, businessman, Downey; Gerald L. Chapman, city treasurer, Compton; Delwin M. Clawson, city councilman, Compton; Henry Clemens, representative, AFL; Del W. Cox, city councilman, Huntington Park; Phil Cote, businessman, Bellflower;

Vincent Dalsimer, attorney, Bellflower; Howard Day, businessman, Compton; Peter De Bruyn, community leader, Paramount; Milo Dellman, city councilman, South Gate; Judge Ralph C. Dills, municipal judge, Compton; Judge Donald Dunbar, municipal judge, Compton; James W. Duncan, president, chamber of commerce, Lynwood;

Eugene R. Erickson, assistant director, Rancho Los Amigos; Rev. Sutton O. J. Evans, community leader, Watts; George Evans, city councilman, Compton; Morris Ewing, community leader, Willowbrook;

Supervisor John Anson Ford, Los Angeles County; Armand Francis, president, chamber of commerce, Downey; Doyle Frazier, president, chamber of commerce, Bell Gardens; Jack L. Freeman, civic leader, Maywood;

Sam Gendel, businessman, Vernon; James V. Gibson, mayor, Bell; Walter Giles, community leader, Watts; Mrs. Ruby Godbey, national chaplain, VFW Auxiliary; Mrs. Gene Gross, chamber of commerce, Bell Gardens; John C. Gutting, police chief, City of South Gate;

Mrs. Ruth Haggarty, professional leader, Downey; Supervisor Kenneth H. Hahn, Los Angeles County; Edward Hardwick, attorney, community leader, Watts; Russell Hardy, city councilman, South Gate; F. C. Hemphill, superintendent, Compton High School; Dr. Wm. Hendricks, community leader, Willowbrook; Phil Howser, businessman, Maywood; R. E. Hutchinson, councilman, South Gate;

William K. Ingram, police chief, Compton;

Dr. Taylor M. Joyner, principal, South Gate High School; Mrs. Cora Johnson, community leader, Watts;

Vernon Kilpatrick, State assemblyman, 55th District;

Supervisor Herbert C. Legg, Los Angeles County; B. J. Little, city councilman, Compton; George R. Loftus, businessman, Compton; Albert T. Lunceford, representative, Greater Los Angeles CIO;

Harry Mathews, businessman, Compton; Paul Martin, president, Compton Junior College; Wendell Martin, community leader, Bellflower; C. D. Mosier, president, chamber of commerce, Paramount;

Frank Nimocks, attorney, Downey; Ray Nortvect, community leader, Bell Gardens; Dr. Parke C. Oliver, principal, Bell Gardens High School;

D. D. "Bud" Pearson, city councilman, Lynwood; Lewis Parson, fire chief, Compton; Charles Peckinpaugh, mayor, South Gate; Herbert C. Peiffer, city clerk, South Gate; Guy E. Peterson, fire chief, South Gate; William H. Poole, city clerk, Bell; Carley V. Porter, State assemblyman, 69th District;

Donald D. Reber, superintendent of schools, Lynwood; Newt N. Reeves, councilman, Huntington Park; Robert Robertiello, attorney, Bell Gardens; George B. Roberts, representative, CIO; Jack Robinson, superintendent of schools, Paramount; Jesse L. Robinson, community leader, Compton; Leo Rule, businessman, Compton; Fred Russell, businessman, South Gate;

Isaac Shakarian, community leader, Downey; Clifford F. Shambaugh, superintendent of schools, Downey; Fred Shuey, president, Los Nietos Valley Shrine Club; Reno H. Sirrine, businessman, Downey; Col. C. S. Smith, publisher, Compton; Mrs. Reba Studebaker, community leader, Hollydale;

John M. Taylor, president, chamber of commerce, South Gate; Al Terrence, busi-

nessman, Huntington Park; Robert J. Thomas, director, Rancho Los Amigos; Mrs. Ardella B. Tibby, superintendent of schools, Compton; Donald Tierney, community leader, Bellflower; James O. Tucker, community leader, Hollydale; Edd Tunks, businessman, Downey;

Peter Van Horsen, community leader, Bellflower;

Mrs. Arlylillian Walker, community leader, Watts; Roy Weatherby, businessman, South Gate; Carroll Weberg, District Governor of Lions; Leland Weaver, city councilman, South Gate; George Willson, city councilman, Huntington Park; Floyd A. Wilson, businessman, Bellflower;

Ned Young, veteran leader, Downey.

PROGRAM

(Richard W. Stephens, M. C., mayor, city of Huntington Park)

Invocation	Rev. Rodney V. Cogswell, minister, First Presbyterian Church of Downey.
The National Anthem.	
Pledge of allegiance.	Judge Harry R. Simon, judge, municipal court, Huntington Park.
Dinner	Dick Schofield, program director, KXLA, Pasadena.
Introductions, head table.	Dick Schofield.
Remarks	Mrs. Ardella B. Tibby, elementary school superintendent, Compton.
Introduction of Congressman DOYLE.	Edmund F. Shaheen, president, chamber of commerce, Compton.
Address	Hon. CLYDE DOYLE. Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio. Hon. EDWIN E. WILLIS, of Louisiana. Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON, of California.
Music by	Noel Boggs Trio.
Radio broadcast	KXLA, Pasadena.

Thursday, June 30, 1955, 9 p. m.

A Stone Curtain Threatens Park Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, for years members of the southern California water lobby have thoughtfully held the coats of conservationists who would fight the Echo Dam phase of the Colorado River storage project. Now that the Echo Park feature of the project, the target of the conservation groups, has been eliminated from the House bill, the southern California water lobby is using every device to incite these same conservation groups into a battle against the entire project.

The reason advanced for these tactics is that proponents might somehow "sneak" the Echo Park unit into the bill. This is ridiculous, because nothing can be added to a House bill without knowledge and approval from the House.

Unfortunately a few conservationist leaders—chiefly the professional paid secretary—have, for some reason, gone along with the strategy of the southern California water lobby.

I use the word "unfortunately" advisedly, because by doing this—by attacking the entire project—these few conservationists are showing an inconsistent attitude, a lack of good faith, and lending credence to what some of us have charged all along—that these groups have been and are the tools, unwitting or otherwise, of the southern California water lobby.

More than that, by casting stones against the entire project because they once objected to a single unit, these few conservationists are building a barrier that will jeopardize expansion of our park and monument system in the future. I predict that the "barrier of stone" built as a result of these tactics will prove detrimental in the long run to the conservationists and their goals.

Specifically what do you think will happen when we have proposals in the future for expansion of a national park or monument, or when someone proposes a new park or monument in the West? I will tell you what will happen. The people of the area concerned will rise up in wrath to oppose such a proposal.

If a few professional "conservationists" can recklessly and willfully oppose the development of an entire region—one-twelfth of the United States—on an issue which no longer exists, the people of that region may easily be prejudiced against the entire conservationist movement.

When the conservationists opposed building Echo Park Dam within Dinosaur National Monument, we could respect their views and their principles, even though we differed with their interpretation of the facts. But when the conservationists succeed in their campaign to have Echo Park Dam eliminated from the over-all project, and then turn to attack the entire project, we can only interpret it as a headstrong determination to impose their will on the Nation. The few professional spokesmen who are doing this are thus threatening to defeat the legitimate and laudable aims of all the genuine conservationists in the Nation.

These are the questions that will be asked whenever a park or monument expansion is proposed. The tactics of a few today will jeopardize true conservation in the future.

I might add that there are many areas in the West that will be great new recreation areas for the entire Nation to enjoy, areas that will be the new monuments and parks of the future as our Nation grows in size, ability to travel and in desire to see and appreciate the wonders of our great land. There are a number of such areas in the upper basin States, but the people concerned will rightfully ask, what will happen 20 years from now in that very "preserved" area?

The stone curtain has been erected so high, the sanctity so absolute, that all perspective has been lost. When an entire vital project is opposed because of one controversial unit which has in fact been deleted, then the people of the West naturally fear for their future.

My constituents point with scorn at the tactic of opposing an entire four-State development that will aid millions of people, including the entire Navaho tribe, because some conservationists once saw something they didn't like in one phase of that development.

As a sincere advocate of conservation, I urge these groups to support the Colorado River storage project. As it is outlined in the House bill, it is a conservation measure of the greatest magnitude.

Let's have no more of these feeble excuses, as manufactured by the southern California water lobby, that Congressmen should vote against this bill because something might be added without their knowledge. Let's face the facts, not the phantoms.

True conservation is embodied in every paragraph of H. R. 3383, and I sincerely urge your support of it.

Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 of this year, at the request of the New England governors, several of the Members of Congress from New England conferred with the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Governor of Massachusetts; Hon. Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of Rhode Island; Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, Governor of Connecticut, together with F. D. Merrill, of New Hampshire, first vice president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, and John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, vice president, region 1, of the same association, in reference to the Federal highway program.

The governors' group, together with Mr. Merrill, who is commissioner of the department of public works and highways in New Hampshire, and Mr. Volpe, the commissioner of the department of public works in Massachusetts, stressed the importance of the passage of the so-called Clay bill and their opposition to the so-called Gore bill. I have communicated with both of these officials for their comments on H. R. 7072, the Fallon proposal. I am pleased to submit for the consideration of the Members their replies, which include the recommendations and suggestions of Commissioners Merrill and Volpe.

The letters follow:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Boston, July 18, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Member of the United States Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: This is in reply to your letter requesting my comments on H. R. 7072, a highway bill introduced by Representative FALLON, of Maryland.

This bill is very favorable in many respects.

1. It provides more money than the Gore bill (S. 1048).

2. It distributes the interstate money on the basis of need rather than by an arbitrary formula. The "needs" basis will permit Massachusetts to complete its interstate system by 1968. Therefore, we are very much in favor of this section of the bill.

3. The methods proposed to finance the bill appear to be reasonable and we have no objection to these recommendations.

4. Section 7 of this bill states that 50 percent of the cost of relocating utility facilities may be paid for from the Federal funds in those States where the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility company. This applies to Massachusetts and we are opposed to this section. We are currently engaged in a multi-million-dollar highway program in Boston, Worcester, and Springfield. We plan to expand our program and construct similar highways in Lowell, Lawrence, Haverhill, Fall River, New Bedford, and Taunton. The highways being planned in most cases will be on the Federal-aid system and will therefore be eligible for Federal funds.

From our experience in Boston and other large cities, the cost of relocating utility facilities is very expensive and the permissive legislation contained in this bill for the payment of such work would considerably diminish the amount available for this highway work.

At the present time, all utility facilities in Massachusetts are within the highway location by sufferance and the owners of such facilities are required to pay the total cost of relocation when highway improvements are made. We would like to see this section deleted from the bill.

Section 11 pertains to the Davis-Bacon Act of August 3, 1935, which is relative to the minimum-wage law. We believe that this section should be deleted from the bill and that the labor laws of the individual States should apply.

The administration bill S. 1160 carried a provision whereby those States which had recently constructed sections of the interstate system in their States to the required standards should be reimbursed for the same. This bill nor the Gore bill (S. 1048) made any such provisions for reimbursement, but such a feature would be very favorable to Massachusetts inasmuch as we have spent several million dollars in our postwar program to improve our main roads and most of these are on the interstate system.

I have made estimates of the amounts of money which Massachusetts would receive by this bill and I am pleased to inform you that we can easily meet the matching requirements.

I trust that this letter will be helpful to you in understanding our reaction to the H. R. 7072.

Very truly yours,

JOHN A. VOLPE,
Commissioner.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC
WORKS AND HIGHWAYS,
Concord, July 6, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: It was most kind of you to send me the copy of H. R. 7072. My quick analysis of this bill is:

1. It provides an excellent highway program.

2. Details which will possibly concern Massachusetts are:

(a) It does not have the reimbursement provision for interstate roads already constructed as provided for in the bipartisan proposal. I believe this feature was really important to Massachusetts and that they may not like the elimination.

(b) It adds Federal control to several features which have always been State matters. These are: Labor provisions (inclusive of Davis-Bacon Act); utility reimbursements (which may be contrary to existing State laws); vehicle weights.

In my judgment, it is far superior to the Senate bill. The tax increases and matters noted above are probably all controversial ones, but the good judgment of the Congress will be able to resolve these points. From a practical viewpoint, H. R. 7072 appears to provide substantially the program almost every group has asked for. It is, therefore, essentially different from the bipartisan proposal only in methods of financing. The bipartisan bill was a deficit-financing proposition, while H. R. 7072 is on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Very sincerely,

FRANK D. MERRILL,
Commissioner.

Whatever Ezra Wants the Farmer Gets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a copy of a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson written by Mr. G. B. Palmer, of Greenbush, Va.

In the light of Mr. Benson's apparent determination to take the part of the middleman over that of the farmer, I believe Mr. Palmer's letter is a concise and unanswerable statement of the unfairness implicit in the attitude of an official whose sworn duty is to protect and advance the welfare of American agriculture.

The letter follows:

GREENBUSH, VA., *July 15, 1955.*

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I read in the paper today that the President, Mr. Eisenhower, in his message vetoing the repeal of the guessing games played by the Department of Agriculture in apples, made the statement, "I cannot see how the apple farmers will be helped if the Agricultural Department's analysis and publication of price trends are cut off." If anybody but the President of the United States had made that statement, the answer would have been that he did not have brains enough to see it.

I will further quote a July 1 newspaper, "Pig population promises consumer lower pork prices. Farm experts look for prices to tumble when the bumper pig crop starts to market in a month or so. Federal market men forecast * * *."

If you had some lean Yorkshire pigs ready for market the end of August or the first of September, would you appreciate this pat on the back by the Department of Agriculture?

Whether the subject is apples, pigs, or promegranates, actions by the administration which tend to weaken the farmers' market, of which this is an example, may pass unchallenged but, from the President's statement it is quite apparent that he did have the capacity to think up the veto idea. Do I do you an injustice, sir, when I assume that it must have been on your advice?

At times it becomes difficult to account for the thinking and actions of those in high office. On this particular subject, it might be a fair question to ask whether the sympathies of the Secretary of Agriculture are with the farmer or with the buyer?

There are times when, if we give those who are supposed to act for us credit for honorable intentions, it leaves but one alternative to account for what happens—stupidity.

G. B. PALMER.

Big Unions and Big Business Squeeze Out Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting excerpts from the testimony of Mr. George Romney, president of American Motors Corp., which company manufactures the Nash and Hudson automobiles in Kenosha and Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. Romney points out that present-day labor leaders are excelerating the concentration of great economic power in giant business and industrial corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the union workers employed at American Motors in Kenosha, Wis., are aware that Walter Reuther has set a pattern with the Big Three in the automobile industry, by which he is actually undermining their jobs. This is a serious matter and my constituents should fully understand the implications involved in the present trend toward the concentration of business and industrial concerns that will ultimately liquidate small businesses. The American Motors Corp. is small compared with the Big Three in that field, yet it is producing what I consider to be the finest automobile on the American highways today.

We must keep this great industry competitive and thereby insure jobs for the workers and a continuation of small business.

This article containing excerpts of Mr. Romney's testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly appeared in the June issue of the New Republican.

The article follows:

The concentration of great economic power in large corporations which dominate a market and in a labor organization embracing in its membership substantially all employees in a given industry, places such corporations in a peculiarly favorable role in the market place.

In the automobile industry where style is a primary sales tool, public acceptance of a styling approach can be achieved by the sheer impact of product volume.

"Sin, seen too often; too familiar with its face,
Is first endured, then pitied, then embraced."

Familiarity helps to shape styling preference, and styling innovations undertaken by a company doing 50 percent of the business are more certain of public acceptance than

equally good or better innovations by smaller firms.

It is not impossible now for the bigger companies to duplicate a smaller company's product improvement and, through sheer volume merchandise it as a big company innovation.

The domination of advertising and news media contributes to this acceptance even to the point where improvements of questionable consumer value can become a must in the products of all other companies.

For instance, General Motors spent $32,944,248 in newspaper advertising in 1953, while Nash spent $2,318,764 and Hudson spent $3,221,918. In 1954 GM increased its advertising expenditure 13.5 percent to $37,391,415.

But the outstanding example of the advantage of mere bigness is in the body tooling cost. It is the largest single cost in an automobile, and one which has increased 4 or 5 times since World War II.

A complete body for a single plant production costs $20 million in tooling. The larger the number of cars, the lower is the tooling cost per unit. However, the tremendous production volumes of the Big Three are not required to achieve optimum cost results in the auto industry.

I would like to say that despite all these competitive hardships from the Big Three, they have not reached their present positions through practices or policies that are, in and of themselves, subject to the criticism of competitors or customers.

The UAW–CIO has contributed to the tremendous advantage in the automotive field of the Big Three.

The concentration of great economic power in large corporations has been made even more favorable because of the union's past unwillingness to enter into agreements designed to deal with the particular economic factors affecting the smaller manufacturers.

American Motors pays higher wages than any one of the Big Three, and some of our fringe benefits are just now getting to the Ford workers.

It is our intention to insist vigorously on collective bargaining this year that is based on the economic facts of American Motors and not of Ford or General Motors.

We know that if the union will bargain on the facts and not on the basis of sheer power, the results will eliminate the competitive advantage that has been enjoyed by GM and Ford in this area of cost.

We are hopeful that the union will recognize this approach as being in the interest of its American Motors members.

The question is whether all in the auto industry can keep up with the most profitable. Can we all live on the same scale as the Rockefellers?

Industrywide bargaining? It could push us in the direction of cartelism or nationalization of industry.

Such a course would lead to an economic leveling on the highest plane, or the lowest, or a midpoint balance.

We would not have had the $5 a day wage in the industry, as pioneered by Ford, if there had been industrywide bargaining, and probably not today's supplemental unemployment compensation.

Others in the industry would not have gone along with it, and it would not have come about.

I oppose a course which I think tends toward a greater concentration of economic power in this country.

What American Help Has Meant to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Abba Eban, Ambassador from Israel, has called to my attention an editorial in a special July 4 edition of the Jerusalem Post in which appreciation is shown by the people of Israel for American grants and technical assistance.

I think this supplement is well worth the reading of all Members of this body. It will dispel the doubts of many that American aid to foreign countries is wasted and unappreciated. Taking Israel as a case in point, 4 years of technical and economic assistance have contributed to the great progress made there in farming, housing, power, industry, and roads, all which are increasing the living standards of the people of this new country. Those who have visited Israel say a miracle has been wrought in a few short years. Thousands of displaced persons have been settled, various projects were planned and executed. The nation has become one of diligent, hard-working citizens who carry on their drive of self-sufficiency.

The builders of Israel will be the first to recognize the necessity of outside aid such as that given by the United States. In good time all United States assistance will cease as its purpose will have been served. The faith of the dynamic people of Israel will nevertheless continue to make their land one of prosperity. America should be proud of its part in making this a reality.

The editorial follows:

WHAT AMERICAN HELP HAS MEANT
(By Economist)

It is only when we pause to reflect that we fully appreciate the extent of the United States contribution to the economic development of Israel. There have been contributions of individual United States citizens, predominantly but not exclusively Jewish, to the United Jewish Appeal, to other institutions and agencies working or supporting work in Israel, to individuals, friends, and relatives living in Israel and through purchases of bonds of the Government of Israel. Aside from all this, however, has been the economic assistance extended by the American people through their Government. This assistance so thoroughly permeates the economy that we tend to lose sight of the extent to which our economic life is based on it, and of the extent to which its continuation will be necessary until Israel achieves a position of economic independence.

The simple listing is impressive. The first Export-Import Bank loan of $100 million, in January 1949, went a long way toward supplying the construction equipment, the industrial equipment, the trucks, the pumps, pipes, tractors, farm implements and other materials necessary for the launching of new agricultural settlements and the extension of existing ones and other goods which were desperately needed by the State to provide housing and opportunities for work for the waves of immigrants flowing to the country. Other resources available to the State had to be used, first of all to provide food, clothing, and other elemental necessities. Without the Export-Import Bank loan the expansion of productive facilities would have come a good deal harder. The second Export-Import Bank loan in 1951, of $35 million contributed greatly to the continuation of the program of irrigation and agricultural development. In 1951–52, the first grant-in-aid was made in the amount of $63.5 million. Each year since that date successive grants have been made totaling, all told, by June 30, 1955, $226 million. The United States Government has also sold to Israel, at nominal cost, very substantial supplies of milk powder, egg powder, potatoes, butter, cheese, peanuts, and other food commodities. More recently the United States Government extended a long-term loan of $13 million to the Israel Government for the purchase of additional surplus food commodities, partly to make up for losses sustained during the last winter's drought. The special feature which distinguishes this loan from others is that it is repayable not only over a very long-term period, but also in Israel pounds instead of in United States dollars.

From the beginning of the grant-in-aid program, there has been the accompanying program of technical assistance. Measured in dollars, this has amounted, up to June 30, 1955, to some $5 million. Expressed in what in this case are more meaningful terms, the contribution of technical knowledge and experience to Israel's young industry, agriculture, government, and other activities, the value of this assistance cannot be measured but is unquestionably far greater than its cost to the United States Government. The same type of technical assistance has been extended by the United States Government through the agency of the U. N. and its specialized agencies. Here, too, the value to Israel is not to be measured in money. The United States has also made available in exchange for Israel pounds American books, periodicals, and phonograph records.

Within the past few weeks, the United States Government has concluded an agreement with the Government of Israel under the terms of which it will supply fissionable materials and related equipment, information, and knowledge accumulated in the past few years so that Israel may move ahead with research toward peacetime uses for atomic energy.

In the past 7 years, Israel's import surplus, financed by gifts, loans, German reparations and private investment has amounted to a total of aproximately $1,750,000,000, a litle more than $1,000 for every man, woman, and child here. The greatest part of this has come from the United States. The United States Government itself has provided approximately $400 million or almost one-fourth of the total. It is not to minimize aid from other sources, nor of course the achievement of citizens of Israel themselves, to say that without American aid living standards in Israel today would be far below their present levels, the number employed in useful and productive work would be far smaller, if in each of the years

since independence we had been forced to manage with some $60 million less of imported goods. We still have a long way, probably an even longer way to go before we reach a position of self-support. In 1954 we still earned only one-third or slightly less of the goods and services we imported. We still required and used gifts and loans aggregating about $200 million in that year. It is no easy task to achieve the 50 to 70 percent increase in our production and the manifold increase in the export of what we produce that will be required if we are to pay for the imports we need to live and to continue our development. Assistance from abroad and from the United States Government will continue to be necessary for some years to come and in large amounts although we expect and believe that we can move toward the eventual elimination of this aid. We trust that the United States Government itself shares our view. We know that it shares our objective. The recent discussions with respect to the development of the water resources of the Jordan River system seem to us to indicate clearly American readiness to continue to supply the assistance we so vitally need if we are to achieve our common goal.

Economic assistance by one government to another, contrary to some opinions, is no new phenomenon in world history. What is new and what is the special contribution of the United States to relations between peoples is the extension of such assistance without intervention in the political life and affairs of the country assisted and without an abridgment of the political independence of these countries. We have seen this new process at work in the relations between the United States and Israel. What is also new is the use of assistance for such planned construction, humanitarian and positive purposes as in Israel in the last 6 years. This is an achievement for which the Government of Israel can claim credit.

JERUSALEM, *July 4, 1955.*

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Minnesota?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Minnesota has more than 874,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

Southern Oregon Shakespearean Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President "The play's the thing," in Ashland, as the southern Oregon community begins its 20th-year production of its renowned Shakespearean Festival. Drama lovers from throughout the West flock to Ashland, and the quality of the Shakespearean production is recognized by the National Broadcasting Co. with a coast-to-coast broadcast from the festival stage, which is also broadcast to our Armed Forces overseas.

Shakespeare is produced in a near-authentic replica of Elizabethan London's Fortune Theater in a simple and colorful setting in famed Lithia Park. Four plays will be staged this year during August.

With a scattering of professional actors, the casts are made up primarily of college students from many parts of the country, some faculty members of Southern Oregon College of Education, and townspeople and are under the able direction of Prof. Angus Bowner. Substantial business and professional people, who see the festival as a valuable community asset, compose the board of directors.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article on the Shakespeare Festival at Ashland by John Armstrong which appeared in the Portland Oregonian of Sunday, July 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAKESPEARE PACKS THEM IN

(By John Armstrong)

The veteran Rogue River Valley lumberman was slightly puzzled by the whole experience. "It was my wife's idea, buying those first season tickets. I just went along with her to see one play, figuring once would be enough.

"Funny thing, though. I've been back 10 or 11 times since then. You know, I kind of get a kick out of those plays."

Not an untypical reaction among the residents of the Ashland area, and such faint praise coming from the rank and file sounds even sweeter to actors and directors of the Oregon Shakespearean Festival than the rave plaudits of experienced drama critics.

A revolution of sorts has been taking place in this quiet little southern Oregon city, since the first performances of festival players in Lithia Park 20 years ago. Things have changed so much that the No. 1 summertime sport for the town's small fry now is not playing games or fishing, but going up to the old Chautauqua shell in Lithia Park each afternoon to watch the actors rehearse.

Ashlanders no longer are bothered by, but rather are proud of, the yearly influx of talented, and sometimes eccentric, outsiders. And the conventional minded no longer are upset by the sight of thespians ambling along Main Street in their affectedly sloppy, offstage garb, with unshorn hair and beards (grown intentionally for the roles they play) blowing in the breeze.

They know what magic these unprepossessing characters can conjure on stage.

Year after year, the packed houses to which Shakespeare is played are made up not only of dedicated drama lovers from as far away as San Francisco and Los Angeles, but first in attendance are repeat customers from the immediate area.

And the festival association's board of directors is not composed of publicity-conscious, pseudoculture seekers, but of substantial business and professional people, who see in the Shakespeare Festival a valuable community asset.

Such backing may also have been attracted because the festival has operated in the black since its inception, yet has never carried on any fund drives.

What's the reason? Why has this pioneering of a return to Shakespeare happened in little Ashland, instead of some large center of the arts?

There's a simple answer. The organizers, participants and customers of the Ashland Festival together have discovered that the Bard of Avon is downright entertaining, well able to compete with the best today's playwrights have to offer, and yes, even the movies and TV.

Over 300 years ago in England he wrote his plays to amuse, thrill and entertain, not just the social upper crust, but more especially the hoi polloi, often uneducated or illiterate, who paid their pittances for the privilege of standing in the pits and watching the drama unfold.

Shakespeare wrote that his viewers might feel laughter, sympathy, fear and the other basic human emotions. Unfortunately, in the years since he wrote, scholars and actors alike lost sight of these fundamentals. They preferred to think of him as primarily a philosopher writing with deep, hidden meanings. Generations of school children, forced to memorize his plays line for line, have been turned against him. Placed on the operating table in the college class room, he has been dissected and analyzed, cut in such small bits of meaning and interpretation that Shakespeare the master entertainer has been lost.

Some place along the line, the simple 16th century methods of staging disappeared, and the fast-moving action at which Shakespeare was so adept was lost in a welter of huge stages with vast unhandy sets and lengthy intermissions breaking up the continuity of the plays.

Now comes the Ashland renaissance, the return to basics, and once again "the play's the thing." In a picturesque amphitheater under the open sky, a near-authentic replica of Elizabethan London's Fortune theater, the plays are staged in simple but colorful settings, without intermission or break (through a coffee bar is open at the rear of the theater throughout the performance).

SEVERAL STAGES USED

The stage is built on two levels: a curtained inner stage above flanked by two casement windows through which action also can be played; a curtained inner stage below; the main stage flanked by two side stages; and a forestage which juts out into the audience.

Action moves swiftly from area to area, or can be played in two places simultaneously.

Carried along without any interruptions in the mood and tempo of the play, be it humorous or tragic, the audience literally loses itself. Dialog that seemed in your schooldays involved and often confusing, here becomes quite simple and takes on meaning.

Even without hearing the speech, the color of the costuming, the pageantry and byplay, the always fluid action, ranging from exciting swordplay to slapstick comedy, strike a responsive audience chord. This, doubtless, explains why children, unable to follow the lines, still find the plays entertaining.

The August-long Oregon Shakespearean Festival is rated by the Oregon State highway commission as the No. 2 tourist attraction in the State, a far step from the first 3-day, 2-play fete held in 1935.

Founder Angus Bowmer, professor of English at Southern Oregon College of Education, sole producer, and director during the festival's early years, now has 4 play directors, 2 technical directors, a costumer, director of publicity, educational director, musical director, and general manager to assist him.

This is no small-time operation. The new theater, built to replace the original plant which burned in 1940, is a $100,000 structure. Modern stage lighting equipment valued at $25,000; costumes and properties worth $18,000; 1,000 new elevated seats, offset for unobstructed viewing and costing $18,000; a 1955 budget of $37,000—all these spell prosperity.

Such prosperity is healthy prosperity, for 98 percent of the festival theater's revenue comes from box office and programs.

A number of interested patrons have contributed to the new seats and provided scholarships for deserving actors who are unable to pay their own expenses of participating in the festival. Authentic Elizabethan music had become a part of the festival through a 5-year grant for a musical director, provided by a California man. Local merchants buy advertising in the program.

In its early day, many local people took roles in the plays, but it was only natural that is the festival's national reputation increased, more and more outsiders garnered the choice parts.

Today the casts are made up mostly of college students from many parts of the country, bent on careers of teaching or community theater; some college faculty members and a sprinkling of professional actors. A few townspeople also appear.

Townspeople still perform yeoman service in the information booth, backstage and landscaping and caring for the theater grounds.

Prestige has accrued. Stanford University offers a field course in Shakespeare at the festival for graduate and undergraduate credit. The National Broadcasting Co. each year carriers a coast-to-coast production

from the festival stage, a broadcast that also goes to the Armed Forces overseas.

As other Shakespeare festivals and theaters have sprung up over the continent (and there are now 10), actors and directors from the Ashland Theater have gone to them to help direct and produce in the authentic tradition pioneered here in Oregon.

This year, four plays to be staged during all of August, include: A Midsummer Night's Dream, Macbeth, All's Well That Ends Well, and Henry VI, part 3. They will be produced in the order, starting August 1, a different play each night. A fifth play, Timon of Athens, will be produced on August 23, and 30. Admissions run from $1.20 to $2.40.

Further information on plays, tourist accommodations and ticket reservations may be obtained from the Oregon Shakespearean Festival Association, box 27, Ashland.

Actually, this Shakespearean festival is one of those things that you almost have to tritely describe with "you have to see it to know what I mean." The remarkable thing is, that once you've seen it, like the hard-headed lumberman, you will see what I mean, and you'll go back.

My wife and I are going again this year. This time we'll take the children.

Ann of Arkansas A. and M.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Ann of Arkansas A. and M." written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., head of the Department of Education of the Arkansas A. and M. College.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANN OF ARKANSAS A. AND M.

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., head, Department of Education, Arkansas A. and M. College)

Ann came from a home that is above average economically and educationally. It was normal to expect her to secure a college education under this favorable environment. The only questions were, where to go and what to select as a major.

C. C. Smith, executive assistant to the president, first approached Ann concerning Arkansas A and M. College. He came to her home to discuss the subject, and before he departed the entire family was in the conversation. Since Ann was the only child, the family was a small and happy one that enjoyed discussing family problems.

Ann was going to college, but she desired to consider carefully all the factors before she made a selection. She recalled how much she had enjoyed a Christmas musical program at the First Presbyterian Church, that had been dircted by Prof. A. A. Harris and his wife, Mrs. Helen E. Harris. Since her father was a graduate of Ouachita College, she was interested in a college known for good music and where the religious atmosphere existed. The Harris program thus was an important factor in her later decision.

Sophia Sue Harper, assistant professor of education and art, gave an art exhibit to a club in which Ann's mother was a member. Again, Ann was favorably impressed and this became the third important factor in her selection of a college.

Ann can still recall Miss Harper's points in this address. They were: (1) Know the materials, prices, and places to buy the articles; (2) know the recipes made with materials from the home for modeling purposes; (3) know how to use scrap materials; (4) know how to conduct an art program in the classrooom; (5) know how to care for art materials; (6) know how to do block lettering (both upper and lower-case letters); and (7) know something about how art can be used in the home, the school, the community, and for leisure time activities. This was much like one of her favorite TV programs—Professor Fixum.

President Horace E. Thompson had spoken in favor of a building program at the First Baptist Church, hence she knew Mr. Thompson before college began. They met the first day at the new Student Union Building. Mr. Thompson welcomed her to Arkansas A. and M. They visited and drank Coca-Cola and Ann semed to enjoy the experience as much as Herb Herrin would. She was impressed with the friendly atmosphere.

Ann had selected a college but was still seeking a major. She contacted Leon V. Vawter, director of student affairs and guidance. After a series of tests and several conferences, her decision as to a major was easy. John Willis, Jr., associate director of guidance, and Miss Floy Ealey, dean of women, were able to aid her, too.

While Ann had seriously considered religious education as a major before entering college, she decided she would be satisfied by being just a good citizen. She found, however, that the college encouraged student religious organizations, both denominational and nondenominational. She became a close friend of Naomi Clifton, director of the B. S. U., and they spent hours together in the beautiful new building talking about religion. She learned to minister to the needs of others, also.

Ann became interested in several new courses in the division of teacher education, human behavior, personal welfare, human growth and development, introduction to philosophy, and school and community. All of these courses were new and she found great challenges in them.

School and community particularly appealed to her. Ann believed that all citizens interested in preserving and expanding the American public schools as a democratic institution should be interested in the course. This was a general education course that had been developed through the cooperation of the divisions of teacher education and social science. She recently listed the points of this course in a discussion as: a careful consideration of the individual, social integration, prejudice, democratic living in school, realization of worldwide interdependence, our common humanity, the value and understanding of differences, the ideological conflict, war, the United Nations, the Commission of Human Rights, UNICEF, World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and UNESCO.

Ann's other favorite general education course is consumer problems. The course developed as a result of the two conferences of consultants in general education. The influence of Stephens College is noticeable here.

General education is of vital concern to Ann, the faculty, and the students. "The philosophy of general education" and "general education as a pattern in our world" have become reality, with such favorites as Dr. Judson R. Butler, dean, college of general education, Boston University, and Dr. B. Lamar Johnson of the University of California as consultants. "Methods of teaching and presenting general education subjects" is the current yearly subject.

Ann seems to express a current feeling concerning general education, that it could become "general regulation." This would be possible if the majority definition of Dr. Walter S. Monroe were altered. Then such men as President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard would have lived in vain.

When Ann decided to enter teacher education, she came across a series of new events. She found that admission to courses in education does not necessarily constitute admission to teacher training. Dr. H. K. Moore, divisional chairman, the education faculty, the major professor, and the dean of the college acted favorably on her application and thus she had successfully passed the screening process.

Ann met with J. D. Moore and Sophia Sue Harper to determine whether to enter secondary or elementary practice teaching. Mr. Moore has been in Peabody and Miss Harper at Ohio University studying modern trends. She had decided to enter teacher education, she had ruled against entering the Ford program (even though Arkansas A. & M. had produced the most candidates and the first one to secure her master's degree), she had the necessary academic average, and finally she selected secondary education, because she desired to teach biological courses.

In considering her practice teaching experiences, Ann listed several points that were real to her. They were: (1) The frequent stimulating conferences with the cooperating teacher and surpervisor, (2) the thrill in learning how to keep an Arkansas school register correctly, (3) the observation of a successful hot-lunch program, (4) the loading and unloading of school buses and (5) getting acquainted with books, manuals, pamphlets, charts, model, specimens, and other teaching tools.

Ann recently remarked that two of the courses she still makes frequent references to are: Art and handicrafts, which was developed by Miss Harper and E. Glazener, and health, safety, recreation, and hygiene, which was developed by Dr. John P. Dratz and W. C. Hobgood.

Dean James H. Hutchinson met with Ann in the new library just before graduation. Ann discussed her future program and found a friendly college still interested in her. She departed with a determination to achieve success in her future.

The college is interested in serving its students by reflecting the college community. The college cannot progress unless the patrons receive what they want and need. The college can impress the public schools by example.

For the past 2 years J. E. P. Griner, director of extension, has promoted a graduate course each semester in cooperation with the University of Arkansas. Four such courses have been offered and now a new group of students started in September. Ann was in that group. She is teaching and attending the course each Monday night that the writer is teaching. She plans to secure the 12 hours in the 2-year period and to attend the summer school of the University of Arkansas the next 2 summers and secure her master's degree in August 1956.

Ann may be teaching in your school next year.

Plan for Overseas Market for Anthracite Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following lead article

which appeared in the Scrantonian, Scranton, Pa., Sunday, July 17, 1955, which narrates in some detail a plan devised by Mr. H. H. Shaver, vice president of the Hudson Coal Co., which would increase the sales of anthracite coal abroad:

COAL OFFICIAL PROPOSES PLAN TO EXPAND ANTHRACITE'S OVERSEAS MARKET—PREDICTS INCREASE IN SALES IF UNITED STATES WOULD SUBSIDIZE FUEL SHIPMENTS—HERBERT H. SHAVER, HUDSON EXECUTIVE, OUTLINES PROGRAM

(By Joseph X. Flannery)

A Hudson Coal Co. official who recently returned from a trip to England and several European nations has come up with a novel proposal that would expand the overseas market for anthracite.

Herbert H. Shaver, 1622 Wyoming Avenue, vice president of the local coal firm, believes that if the United States would subsidize the cost of shipping hard coal across the Atlantic, millions of tons of fuel would be purchased by the foreign nations.

In addition to helping an American industry, the subsidy would deliver a blow to the Russian economy, for nations that are now buying coal from the U. S. S. R. would turn to the United States for their supply.

Mr. Shaver has made his proposal unofficially in industry circles, but he has no imminent plans for proposing it to the Government.

The facts behind the proposal are simple: England has a shortage of anthracite, but it cannot afford to pay United States prices for it. Aid from the United States Government in the form of a subsidy on shipping charges would make it possible for the English to meet the price.

The same facts are true of other West European nations, some of which are now buying anthracite from Russia. In return, the U. S. S. R. is obtaining strategic goods and machinery.

This painful simplification of the facts doesn't cover all the angles of the proposal. There are differences in the quality of coal and other obstacles which stand in the way of immediate opening of new markets for anthracite overseas.

For instance, England has been a coal exporting nation for generations and her ports are equipped for loading the fuel on ships. But equipment for unloading coal is lacking and this would require an investment of millions of dollars.

This situation has made it necessary in the past to reroute shipments of bituminous to Rotterdam and Antwerp, Holland, where unloading facilities are available. The coal was then placed on barges and towed across the English Channel.

In England, coal is the only commodity that is still rationed.

The consumer is allowed only approximately 2½ tons a year regardless of the size of the dwellings.

Generally speaking, most English homes are heated by bituminous-burning fireplaces. Householders use what little anthracite they can obtain for cooking and for hot water.

The anthracite supply that is used in England is supplied by Welsh mines. This fuel—though it is in short supply—is of superior quality than American anthracite. The ash content is about 5 percent, compared to between 9 and 10 percent in American coal.

But because there is a shortage of the fuel in England, the difference in the ash content wouldn't make much difference in the demand—if the price was right.

The British Government has controlled mining in England since the labor government of Clement Attlee nationalized the industry. Prices are regulated by the National Coal Board, which rules the industry with an iron fist.

Mr. Shaver's subsidy suggestion might influence the National Coal Board's present negative stand on importing anthracite.

The agency did import a total of 6 million tons of bituminous from the United States and European producers in 1954 at a cost of $20 million. This represented the difference between the cost of the imported coal and the cost of coal mined in the British Isles.

Because the cost of importing anthracite would be even higher, the Coal Board has turned thumbs down on suggestions of turning to the American market to purchase much needed hard coal. Too much spending on importing coal would reduce England's supply of American dollars and other imported goods would have to be cut to make up the difference.

The Coal Board's job is a difficult one, as events last week proved. The agency increased the price of coal 18 percent and its action was attacked by Conservatives and Laborites alike.

But the board said that the increase was made necessary by higher wages, losses on imported coal, the cost of its capital improvement program and of its safety and health measures.

A sidelight to the increase is that it improves the chances of the British eventually turning to America to import anthracite. The jump in the price of the British domestic anthracite will narrow the gap between British and American fuel. A difference will still exist, however.

Despite the shortage of anthracite in England, the nation still manages to export some of its domestic hard coal to Canada. This is done primarily to gain American dollar credits. And the coal that is exported is in sizes which the English market does not need.

In turn, the coal is sold in Canada at about $1.50 a ton more than United States coal would cost because of the difference in quality. The smaller ash content makes it a better buy.

However, Mr. Shaver believes that a subsidy on shipping costs by the United States would result in the sale of at least a half-million tons of anthracite in England and between 3 and 5 million tons on the Continent.

He proposes that the Government pay between $6 and $7 per ton to cover the shipping costs, thus putting the American anthracite in a position to compete favorably with coal from behind the Iron Curtain.

The proposal is similar to one voiced in the past by United Mine Workers President John L. Lewis. However, Lewis wanted the United States to loan ships to the miners' union to ship the coal abroad.

One of the results of Mr. Shaver's trip abroad was the possibility of selling some Hudson coal to wholesalers in Holland, where a shortage of anthracite also exists.

The deal has not been concluded, but Mr. Shaver said that it involves mixing American and Dutch coal. The Dutch coal has a smaller ash content than American coal, so the mixture would reduce the difference in the two fuels.

If the deal is completed, it will mark the first time in several years that the Hudson Coal Co. sold coal overseas. Yet, in 1952, 250,000 tons were sold abroad by the firm.

A United States subsidy on anthracite shipping charges would also open up an overseas market in other nations on the Continent, Mr. Shaver believes. Given the choice of buying the same product at an equal price from the United States or Russia, western European nations would buy from the United States, the Scranton man said.

Mr. Shaver, who is general sales agent of the Hudson Coal Co., made the trip abroad with Harry B. Bartley, vice president of the Imperial Overseas Corp., a bituminous producing firm with headquarters in New York City and workings in central Pennsylvania. The group also included 54 New Jersey coal retailers.

In England, the Americans held a joint meeting with the executive committee of the Coal Merchants Federation of Great Britain.

Later the two groups attended the annual meeting of the Coal Merchants Federation of Great Britain. The session was attended by more than 600 representatives of fuel dealers from the British Isles and members of the National Coal Board. The conclave was addressed by Sir Brian Robertson, chief of the transportation division of the British Government, and by Sir Hubert Houldsworth, chairman of the National Coal Board.

The Americans also visited Holland, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy before returning home.

Address by Robert I. Rogin at Cerebral Palsy Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most informative address by Robert I. Rogin, president of United Cerebral Palsy. This national organization under Mr. Rogin's leadership promotes research and rehabilitation in one of the dread diseases in the neurological group. Approximately 550,000 persons in the United States are afflicted with cerebral palsy, 200,000 of whom are less than 21 years of age. The cost of maintaining these stricken citizens, borne by their relatives and friends, approximates $190 million per year. The income-tax loss to the Federal Government, by virtue of the fact that these persons are not gainfully employed, is estimated at $300 million per year.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the world of today, we have become increasingly mindful of the fact that our welfare and security is related to the degree with which other peoples have an understanding of our democracy, our attitudes, and our practices as a nation. We have come to learn that what others think of us, how they judge our actions and reactions deeply affect our essential security, our very survival in a world of conflicting philosophies. To make our position known and understood, our Government has established the Voice of America which beams to the rest of the world the meaning of America.

SPREADING KNOWLEDGE

Similarly, each of our affiliates—local, State, and national—serves as a voice of cerebral palsy. The future of cerebral palsy depends in large measure on the understanding an knowledge which we pass on to our fellow citizens. The louder our voice, the greater will be the understanding by our fellow citizens, by Government, by professional groups, by employers, and by all the people sensitive to the needs of the handicapped.

How are we fulfilling this function of being the voice of cerebral palsy? To begin with, the mere fact that we exist, that there is an organization wholly devoted to cerebral palsy in your community, puts cerebral palsy on the map. You are, and hence people

are aware of you and are aware of the problem. You have created visibility. You have stirred interest. Millions today know the words "cerebral palsy," who only a few years ago had never heard the term. A cause takes on dimensions when it is associated with an organization.

The movie trailers, the newspapers and magazines, books, telethons, the radio, the whole complex of publicity mediums have spread the story of our cause and have given to the people of America a vivid recognizable awareness of the problem.

PROMOTING ACTION

But that is only the beginning. More important than what we say is what we do. That is the acid test. How are we meeting this test? Let us see.

Locally, the most effective symbol is the clinic, either separately or as part of the hospital, then the in-patient facilty, then the special school unit, the transportation facilities, either voluntary or commercial, the recreational center, the summer camp, the adult recreation center, the dental clinic, the resident care facilty, the vocational advisory and job-finding service, the psychiatric counseling, the parent counseling. Not many affiliates have all of these facilities, but heartening progress is being made, resulting in everincreasing services. All this will result in the improvement of the physical, intellectual and social condition of the cerebral palsied. These services speak more eloquently than all of our words. They are the true voice of cerebral palsy, the voice which demonstrates most effectively to the public what their dollars are providing.

THE STATE ASSOCIATION

We move on to another branch of our family—the State association. I conceive its major value to be in the field of legislation. The problem of cerebral palsy is too staggering to be solved by private funds alone. Government has a stake in the welfare of every citizen. The campaign to restore every cerebral palsied to self-sufficiency must be a joint effort between Government and private groups such as ours—a true partnership preserving the best features of private initiative and governmental responsibility.

The State association does more. Some, as in New York, give grants for the training of personnel. They make available the accumulated experience of all the affiliates within the area, so that the little brother may profit from the lessons learned by the older one in in true family fashion. Some provide special studies in the various areas, foster symposia, participate in the meetings of health and community councils and stimulate the State, health, education, and welfare departments to greater activity. They too are the voice of cerebral palsy.

THP NATIONAL ORGANIZATION

And now we come to our national organization. It is important to emphasize that you, each affiliate and each State organization are the national organization. Without the affiliates there can be no United Cerebral Palsy Association. Presisely because we are united, there is a national organization devoted solely to cerebral palsy. The important word is "united." Because our problem is nationwide, because it transcends city and State lines, because many of the solutions can be approached only on a national level, UCPA became an inevitable necessity. To my mind, the primary function of national is research. If we are to achieve our ultimate goal—the conquest of cerebral palsy—it must come through organized research. Discovering the cause, prevention and cure of cerebral palsy is not a local problem. Grants must be made without regard to geography or local pride. It must be a coordinated national effort to avoid wasteful duplication and to achieve the maximum results.

A UNITED VOICE

So it is with legislation, with program planning, with the training of personnel—doctors, therapists, teachers, vocational guidance counselors, with the development of proper teaching techniques. You have seen the results, the studies going on in universities and hospitals throughout the land, the increasing grants given by Congress for the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, the stream of booklets issued by national on legislation, educational programs, vocational guidance and camping, the educational and vocational work shops held each summer in different parts of the country.

What we have, therefore, is a mutual flow of strength, a circulating, fertilizing stream of strength which has enriched each member of the family. The voice of cerebral palsy speaks in many forms and in many places. This voice is heard in an ever-swelling chorus, proclaiming the hopes, the aspirations, the yearnings and the realizations of the cerebral palsied. It is a united voice—the voice of united cerebral palsy.

Immigration Reform—Address by Gregory G. Lagakos, Chairman, Committee for the Revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 of the Greek-American AHEPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 11, Mr. Gregory G. Lagakos, chairman of the committee for the revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 of the Greek-American organization known as AHEPA, addressed the annual encampment of the Jewish War Veterans of New Jersey on the subject of immigration reform. Pertinent excerpts from Mr. Lagakos' speech were published in the July 16 issue of a responsible Greek-American publication entitled "The Chicago PNYX," edited by Mr. Peter N. Mantzoros, himself a strong believer in the reform of the McCarran-Walter Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the extract from Mr. Lagakos' speech, as printed in the Chicago PNYX, appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISION OF THE MCCARRAN ACT

The loyalty of your organization—of your members—of your people to our democratic form of government and our country—can never be questioned—can never be challenged. American history is replete with glowing instances—nay with a constant and uninterrupted flow of innumerable and stirring examples of loyalty, sacrifice, and patriotism among American Jewry. Just to go back, not too far—but back to the dim and dark days of the Civil War—there were two outstanding American patriots—Joseph and Jessie Seligman, of New York, who, seeing the country's urgent need for prompt assistance, sold $200 million worth of United States War Bonds and Government securities at their own risk, personally guaranteeing a return in case of loss—at the time we were in danger of losing the Civil War—an act which Professor Dodd, a great historian, president of the University of Virginia and former American Ambassador to Germany, describes as "a fact scarcely less important than the Battle of Gettysburg." It was indeed one of the great turning points of the war. I feel certain that I do not have to review the legion of other noble and inspiring acts of loyalty and of dedicated service to our country. No one but a blind and intolerably stupid fool would deny the unparalleled contributions of your people in general—and of the Jewish War Veterans specifically to the defense and security of the United States.

But there is another reason for the great honor I feel in being afforded the privilege of addressing this annual encampment. Because I am familiar and deeply interested in the great and humanitarian field of immigration and naturalization. I am constantly aware of the splendid work your organization is doing in its continued leadership and support of efforts to liberalize and humanize our immigration laws and policies. Your fight, independently and collectively, together with the fight of many other loyal and patriotic American organizations to erase from our statute books the harsh, unjust and discriminatory provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act. Your fight to remove once and for all the insulting stigma of the national origin theory from our laws and to see our laws reshaped so that they will conform to American ideals, which require equal treatment of all persons—this fight is truly admirable and worthy of the highest praise and commendation. I, therefore, feel that anyone invited to speak to such a group as yours is indeed the beneficiary of a great honor.

But I believe, too, that all fairminded people, aware of world history and of American history, would naturally expect your organization and other American Jewish organizations throughout the United States to lead the fight against the inequities and injustices of our present immigration laws. Your peoples' long and wonderful history is in itself a shining beacon of absolute and unwavering steadfastness—a pole star of firm belief in the basic concept of the dignity of man. Your fight is an unshakeable and eloquent affirmation of the inalienable and undeniable langauge of the Declaration of Independence—that all men are created equal. You so properly believe that each individual is to be judged on his own merit—or demerit. That each individual is capable of possessing equal mentality, intelligence and capabilities regardless of his race, religious creed, national origin or color, and that persons living abroad and behind the Iron Curtain, whether they are refugees, escapees, expellees or just plain, ordinary worthy aliens in quest of an opportunity to live in this land, are not to be judged according to breed, like cattle—but on the only proper basis of their character, fitness and ability to lead a worthwhile life in this country.

Now this brings me to the subject I should like to discuss with you here at Mount Freedom (which, incidentally, is a very appropriate name and a most appropriate meeting place for your splendid organization). The subject of immigration and naturalization is very close to my heart—and, I know, very close to yours. The heart of our present immigration law is the national origin quota system—an indigestible and un-American theory now being practiced upon all applications for immigrant visas. This formula was first introduced into our law in 1924 and has been retained in the McCarran act—our present immigration law. This theory asserts briefly that intending immigrants to the United States from the

western part of Europe are more desirable, more assimilable and are of a stock that will produce better American citizens than people who were born in the eastern and southeastern parts of Europe. This insulting formula, based on bias and prejudice and not on logic or reason, admits a total of approximately 150,000 people per year and fixes maximum quotas for each country. These quotas range from 100 to 65,000 annually.

Now, exactly how was this formula established? Each country's quota was allocated so that it would be equal to the percentage that persons of that national origin residents in the United States in the year 1920 was of the total white population of the United States at that time. Well, if the law enacted by the Congress in 1954 was a formula based on percentage as of the year 1920—then why in 1952, when our immigration laws were completely overhauled, didn't the Congress fix the year 1948—or 1952 as the basis? The reasons—reasons of discrimination, prejudice, and distrust against certain nations and faces in favor of others—were stated quite forcefully by the late Senator McCarran himself in debate on his immigration bill on May 16, 1952. "The cold hard truth is that in the United States today there are hard-core indigestible blocs who have not become integrated into the American way of life, but who, on the contrary, are its deadly enemy." Senator McCarran did not specify from which nations the indigestible blocs were coming, but if we examine the United States immigration quotas allocated to each nation, as set forth in our present law, we can clearly discover what nations Senator McCarran had in mind.

The annual quota of the United Kingdom (England and North Ireland) is 65,361. Germany, 52,814; Ireland, 17,756. But for Egyptians the quota is 100; Iran, 100; Israel, 100; Turkey, 225; Greece, 308. In other words one born in England is stated, in terms of legal certainty and accuracy, to be 600 times superior in intellect, ability, and desirability to that of an Egyptian or a Jew, and 200 times more desirable than a Greek. This type of hokum is not only insulting to many of our allies who resent this unfair discrimination, but it has produced foreign-policy tensions and feelings that have no proper place among our allies and friends. This law, therefore, is endangering our relations with peoples and with our allies throughout the world. It would be absurd to claim that Germany, who twice precipitated the world into war, with its superior race theories, is culturally closer to American than Italy, Israel, Greece, or Turkey—and if Germany is closer, is the degree of propinquity 80 times greater than in the case of Greece and 115 times greater than in the case of Turkey?

Many other statements made, unfortunately, by some prominent Members of Congress during the debate on the McCarran bill illustrated the climate of opinion which has produced our immigration laws since the early 1920's, an opinion and attitude of wholesale mistrust and fear of certain races.

The unanimous testimony of an anthropologist is that the concept of a pure race is entirely erroneous and fallacious. No pure race can be found in any civilized country—unless in the United States it being the Eskimos and the Indians. The present races of man have intermingled and inbred (fortunately) for so many thousands of years that their genealogical lines have become inextricably confused. On this I am pleased to refer you to the statement of principles regarding Immigration and Naturalization policies issued March 15, 1955, as representative of the joint views of the American-Jewish Congress, Jewish War Veterans of the United States and 37 Jewish Community Councils which comprise the National Community Relations Advisory Council. The statement of principles to which I have referred represents a complete reiteration of the intelligent opinion stated by outstanding Catholics and Protestants, as well as Jews interested in this problem.

Another great hardship placed on these indigestible blocs, is that actually the quotas in many of these countries are reduced by half because of the mortgaging under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which stated that if persons are admitted to the United States as displaced persons, those numbers would be deducted from such countries' quota in future years. Those countries were permitted to mortgage up to 50 percent of their annual quota for an indefinite period. Accordingly, only 154 Greeks can come here each year instead of the very low 308 figure—and the Greek quota is already oversubscribed for the next 58 years. Latvia quota is reduced by half for the next 320 years. So, if a Latvian applied for a visa today, and assuming that it had met and complied with all security regulations and screening, he would have to wait until A. D. 2274 in order to receive his visa. The Polish quota is oversubscribed and mortgaged for the next 45 years.

Another gross inequity is that Congress had made past convictions for crime—grounds for deportation—despite the fact that the Constitution of the United States plainly provides that no ex post facto law will be passed. Thus, a man who committed a crime years ago and has paid his debt to society, or a man who 30 or more years ago was a member of an organization which is now prescribed, and at a time that membership in such organization was perfectly legal—may now find himself facing deportation, even though he may be married and have a wife, children, and grandchildren—all citizens of the United States and all residing here. Families are disunited—homes are broken up—sometimes for no real reason whatsoever. When the alien cries out that such deportation statutes plainly violated the constitutional prohibition against ex post facto laws, the answer he gets is that the ex post facto clause in the Constitution only refers to criminal laws—and that deportation, no matter how severe, is not punishment in a criminal sense. What could be more criminal—what could be greater punishment than that inflicted upon an alien who suffers deportation from his country—from his family—from everything he has lived and worker for, and to be sent physically and forcibly to an entirely strange and foreign land in which he has no relatives and no family ties? As a matter of fact, under our present immigration law, even failure on the part of an alien to register or to have on his person at all times his registration card may submit him to deportation proceedings.

This brings us to another inequity—the creation in the McCarran Act of a conditional second-class citizenship. Thus, even after an alien is naturalized and becomes a citizen, he is subject in some cases, to loss of citizenship if he is absent from the United States for over 3 years and, in some instances, 5 years. A natural-born citizen, on the other hand, loses his citizenship only by actually renouncing it—by declaring allegiance to a foreign country, by serving in foreign armed forces, or for such reasons generally. This "we-give-it-to-you—we-can-take-it-away" idea is not consonant with basic American concepts of fair play, honesty and integrity—and has irreparably harmed us in many ways.

Another inequity is to be found in the tightening up of the requirements that permit an alien with close family ties to remain in the United States by applying for suspension of deportation. Before the present law, an alien here illegally, in that he overstayed his visa, such as a visitor, or a student, or seaman, and who had a United States-citizen spouse, child, or parent who would suffer a serious economic detriment by the alien's deportation, could upon proof that he was a person of good moral character—adjust himself and his immigration status into that of a legal resident alien. Now, such an alien finds it almost impossible to do this. He now must prove that his deportation would result in an exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to him or to the members of his family. As the Government has stated, "only in a case where an alien's deportation would be unconscionable would consideration be given. This shows the anti-alien attitude and the climate of mistrust and distrust that exists, instead of a sympathetic, understanding feeling of help for the worthy alien with closely-knit family ties in this country.

Another inequity is the feature that permits representatives of the Attorney General in deportation proceedings, known as special inquiry officers, to make the investigation, present the case, hear it, and make a decision. This unlawful combination of enforcement and judicial powers within one agency violates the basic principles of a fair and unbiased hearing. There should be a complete separation of those who investigate and prosecute and those who sit in judgment. Let us refer to the findings and recommendations of the Hoover Commission on this question. The report states that special inquiry officers now perform an essentially judicial function. In deportation proceedings, for example, such officers are required to conduct the hearing, present and receive evidence, rule upon all objections to the introduction of evidence on motions made during the course of the hearing, render a decision based upon reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence, exclude from the record any evidence that is irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious. If it appears unduly the hearing that the alien may be deportable on grounds other than or in addition to those stated in the warrant of arrest—lodge additional charges and prepare a written decision which shall set forth a summary of the evidence adduced and his findings of fact and conclusion of law as to deportability. Yet these special inquiry officers are, for the most part, unqualified to perform legal or judicial functions. Of the 90 special inquiry officers serving as such, only 24 have had some legal education, and of that number, only 19 are attorneys. Such officers, therefore, perform an important judicial function in administrative law without requisite training qualifications.

But let us have no illustions—we have little chance of getting Congress to act favorably on these proposals. It will take an intensified program of State and nationwide education. People must know of this terrible blight on Americanism, decency, and honor. They must be told by groups such as yours—such as mine—time and time again. They must become awakened, aroused, and determined to do something about it. They must write to their Congressmen, their Senators; Member of Congress must hear from their constituents from the North, South, East, and West.

But the people will write only if they know of the problem and are sufficiently aroused. This is our job as loyal and patriotic citizens of the United States, who are determined to use the vast reservoir of strength and the dignity and prestige of our great organizations and societies, such as your group, for the purpose of assuring the necessary enactment of liberal legislation—legislation which will not only restore our country's national international prestige and position, but will give understanding and humanitarian assistance to thousands of qualified aliens who properly look to the United States as the one clear and shining symbol of hope, freedom, and leadership for all the world.

Financing Private American Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great bulwarks of the American system consists of American private institutions of higher learning.

No country in the world has a system of private colleges and universities such as we have, just as no country in the world has a system of such publicly supported institutions. My own State of Wisconsin has, I believe, what is generally regarded as one of the finest arrays of private institutions of higher learning

Both types, public and private, have an indispensable role to play; both types have faced serious problems in these inflationary times because of constantly mounting costs all along the line.

The plight of private educational organizations is particularly serious. It is estimated that nearly two-thirds of the country's privately endowed colleges and universities are run at a deficit. Meanwhile, as private tuition fees necessarily mount, the proportion of young Americans attending private schools has been declining in relation to the percentage attending public institutions.

Fortunately, steps are being taken to help relieve the financial stress of private institutions. American corporations are generously contributing increasing sums, spurred on by soundly liberalized features of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to tax deductibility of income for gifts up to 30 percent.

A great deal more needs still to be done by way of private sustaining of our institutions of higher learning. And I believe that America's great foundations, together with organizations such as the Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., can and will render ever-increased service along this line.

America needs its private colleges and universities. It needs to see their enrollment expand, rather than contract. It needs to see them attract and retain the finest possible faculties. This is a technical age, in which sound higher education is a necessity, not a luxury.

I send to the desk a fine article on private college problems, from the July 16 issue of the Christian Science Monitor, as written by its distinguished financial editor, George Ericson, on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE SUPPORT OF EDUCATION GROWS

(By George Ericson)

For several years the American people have been hearing warnings given out by educators and other leaders that the higher institutions of learning in this country were facing a financial crisis. The fact that this crisis, resulting from soaring costs and inadequate revenues, has not yet been resolved does not mean that the admonitions have been fruitless. But the remedy for the serious lack of funds by the bulk of the Nation's colleges and universities is not one that can be brought forth in 1 or 2 years. The solution, as it now appears to a number of leaders in both the business and educational fields, lies in gifts from corporations and businesses, which would form the major part of philanthropic giving.

Corporate giving to meet educational needs is a comparatively new idea. It wasn't so long ago that donations by firms for charity or worthy causes were considered out of place by directors who felt they had no directive from shareholders to give away some of the latters' money. This attitude began to disappear about the time of the First World War, when the Red Cross, YMCA, and community-fund drives enticed contributions from corporate coffers. These formed a sort of entering wedge which widened the corporate flow of giving to include grants for education. At first this type of aid was comparatively small, reaching about $30 million by 1936, the first year when figures on aggregate giving in this field became available. The total has risen rapidly and is estimated today to approximate $400 million of the more than $4,500,000,000 given by private sources for all causes.

BUSINESS' NEW ATTITUDE TOWARD GIVING

The increasing gifts by business and foundations for educational purposes apparently is the result of a growing consciousness that business and industry have a stake in the kind of preparation for living that colleges offer. They have become aware that there is a dearth of large private givers caused by steep progressive taxation and that this breach must be filled, or else retrogression follows a weakened or inadequate teaching staff and inferior facilities. If business does not fill this breach the Government undoubtedly will. With Federal support there is usually Federal control. Few would contemplate political dictation of our educational institutions with equanimity.

However, the Federal Government is not showing any desire to take over the job of financing the private universities. Instead, it has tried to foster philanthropy by allowing deductions from income for gifts up to 30 percent. There is recognition here of the need to foster freedom by the competition of private schools with tax-supported institutions. It is estimated that nearly two-thirds of the country's privately endowed colleges and universities are run at a deficit, the aggregate of which amounts to several hundred million dollars a year. This means, moreover, a constant pressure to increase tuition fees, already high.

TO AID ADVANCEMENT OF SOCIETY

The new attitude being shown by more and more companies with regard to their responsibility for aiding cultural and social causes is exemplified in a statement by Donaldson Brown, former chairman of the finance committee of General Motors: "Corporations are a part of the community in which they operate, and owe to the community a duty equal to that of any individual who gains his livelihood there."

Others have expressed the corporate obligation in a somewhat broader sense. Benjamin F. Fairless, chairman of the executive advisory committee, United States Steel Corp., said recently that corporate responsibility lies not alone in the technical field but in the field of human relations; it is in that field where the university evolves leaders schooled in the humanities and the social sciences. Therefore it is the liberal arts, he says, which must furnish the well-rounded leader of breadth of vision and imagination.

Conscious of the importance of adequately trained college people and the interest of business in a fresh supply of potential leaders, a Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc., was established on May 1, 1955, with offices at 6 East 45th Street, New York, N. Y. It has received support from several funds or foundations and therefore does not solicit or accept contributions. It aims to counsel corporations and corporate foundations already interested in financial aid to higher education or how to formulate and administer a company program for that purpose. Its establishment is indicative of the importance of the problem. In a recent address by David Graham, financial vice president, Standard Oil Company, Indiana, he made the statement that as time goes on, "a greater percentage of the corporate gift dollar will be going to education * * *. With increased understanding of the need, I am confident, will come more generous corporate giving." The purpose of such giving is, in the words of a Carnegie Corp. leaflet, "not to contribute to the alleviation of the plight of some individuals, but to the advancement of society as a whole."

Regulation of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the resolution passed by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce relative to the production of natural gas and its present unfair control by Government:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Dallas Chamber of Commerce is gravely concerned over regulation of natural-gas producers by the Federal Power Commission; and

Whereas the independent producers of natural gas are now in a freely competitive market and have no assurance whatsoever of a fixed market; and

Whereas Federal regulation in peacetime of this valuable commodity is not justified; and

Whereas freedom from Federal regulation has stimulated the natural-gas industry to discover, develop, and sell natural gas at competitive prices; and

Whereas control by the Federal Government will jeopardize continued increases in gas production to the detriment of the consumer and the national security which depends upon gas as a source of energy for defense production; and

Whereas Federal control will greatly restrict gas exploration and will result in regulation of other competing fuels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the president of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce be directed to communicate with the Texas congressional delegation and the Texas Senators and with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives informing them of the basic issues at stake and urging their support of legislation to protect the natural-gas producers from Federal regulation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the members of the Texas congressional delegation and the Texas Senators as well as to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and that a copy of this resolution be sent to leading chambers of commerce throughout the State of Texas.

JEROME K. CROSSMAN,
President.

J. BEN CRITZ,
Secretary.

APRIL 15, 1955.

Aspirations of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on July 19, 1955:

ASPIRATIONS OF MANKIND

President Eisenhower's brief speech opening the Big Four conference at Geneva is one of the most comprehensive, understanding, and conciliatory statements to be made by any world leader in the postwar period.

Tempered by a realization of the dangers inherent in the enmity that a decade of cold war has bred, the American leader frankly outlined the difficulties to his conferees and reminded them that the solution is largely within the competence of the four of us.

In this vein the President subscribed to the fact that man is master of his fate, for he said "the problems that concern us are not inherently insoluble * * * their solution is not beyond the wisdom of man. They seem insoluble under conditions of fear, distrust, and even hostility, where every move is weighted in terms of whether it will help or weaken a potential enemy."

At another point President Eisenhower said "it is not always necessary that people should think alike and believe alike before they can work together."

That the friendship which has pervaded the preliminary meetings has carried over into the conference itself was seen in the response of Soviet Premier Bulganin, who pledged his country to contribute atomic material to an international pool. This is the world atomic bank that the President called for in his United Nations speech in December 1953, but which the Russians have held aloof from until yesterday.

This welcome cooperative attitude, which caused the President to predict that the conference will be a great success and caused Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to be more encouraged than ever, is only the beginning. And the employment of atomic energy for peace rather than war is only one of the problems.

Most fraught with controversy is the unification of Germany. The President insisted on the unification of the country and its sovereign right to select its own allies, but he also said the solution "should take account of the legitimate security interests of all concerned" and he specifically mentioned those of the Soviet Union.

Also difficult is the limitation of arms. Te dwelt at some length on this problem and said that a system of "effective mutual inspection" which would rule out the fearful element of surprise attack was the foundation for real disarmament.

Revival and application of the promises of free elections for the people of eastern Europe were called for. The end of Communist agitation and infiltration which has done so much to plant distrust was another presidential request. And to eliminate the tension and the suspicion, the President of the United States said "it is time that all curtains whether of guns or laws or regulations should begin to come down * * * in an atmosphere of mutual respect and confidence."

Here, with great good will and confidence, is a program to end the false peace of the postwar years and make peace real. If the President's final admonition is subscribed to by the Russians, the outlook is bright. He told his colleagues that "we are not here merely to catalog our differences. We are not here to repeat the same dreary exercises that have characterized most of our negotiations of the past 10 years. We are here in response to the peaceful aspirations of mankind."

Address of Hon. E. L. (Tic) Forrester, Member of Congress, to American Legion Auxiliary for the State of Georgia, July 15, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, it is my pleasure to include an address by my distinguished friend and colleague, Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, Member of Congress from the Third Congressional District of Georgia. This address was delivered to the American Legion Auxiliary of the Department of Georgia on July 15, 1955. It was received by a large and enthusiastic audience and drew favorable comments from all parts of the State. Many of the members of the American Legion Auxiliary who heard this address were so impressed with its contents and its substance that they feel as I do that it should be made available for widespread dissemination and distribution through this means.

The address follows:

Madam President, my friends, this is a fine occasion for me. It affords me the opportunity of seeing many of my true friends; it allows me the privilege of thanking you personally for the great affection and honor you have so generously conferred upon a distinguished lady of the district I have the honor of representing, when you conferred the presidency of your organization upon Mrs. R. T. Ragan; also, to again express my pleasure that the American Legion saw fit to bestow its highest office upon the capable shoulders of a man from our district, Erle Cocke, Jr., who was so liberal and generous in his introduction of me; also, it presents the opportunity to speak to one of the greatest groups in all this world. Also, I wish to convey to you the hearty greetings and felicitations of the entire Georgia delegation, all of whom specifically requested me to tell you that they appreciate your great work, your complete patriotism and loyalty, and that they are sure that this convention will be one of the most successful you have ever had.

I am delighted to come in your midst, as a Legionnaire, and as a public servant to give you to some extent an account of my stewardship and as a private in the ranks, discuss with you matters of moment and concern.

Mrs. Ragan submitted to me two subjects that I might speak upon:

1. Building America Under God.
2. Strengthening Our Country.

I like both subjects so well that I decided to talk on both of them. The truth is, both subjects so parallel each other that I think that a discussion of one would necessarily cover the other.

We will build America under God, or we will not build. We will march under God's banner, or not at all. History conclusively proves that fact.

It is said with reliable authority that Columbus was 400 years late in his discovery of America, and that Lief the Norseman had touched our shores in the 10th century. Lief did not realize he had done anything, and did not tell anyone. During the intervening years, great political and religious persecution developed, and men and women of courage, character, and faith longed for religious and political freedom. They were not looking for security, they were not asking to be made wards of the Government, they simply wanted freedom, the right to work, the right to build, and the right to work out their own destinies. God approves people of that kind. The time was ripening for God to do something with and for valiant and worthwhile people. In the 14th through the 16th centuries, political and religious persecution, fraud, and corruption had gained such ascendency in Europe, that the only way for good people to begin anew would be to find a new continent. God had that unknown continent ready and waiting. Columbus came, Columbus saw, and Columbus talked. In the 16th century, brave and resolute men and women came to blaze a trail in America, and to build a civilization by cutting down the wilderness, building homes, schools, and churches, and pulling themselves up by their own efforts. These people loved God and freedom, and were willing to die for their beliefs.

God gave them a leader. This was the new Canaan, and this country had a spiritual birth. The physical proportions of Joshua and Washington were almost identical. Both were privileged to see the land they were to fight for before being called on to do battle. Both were commanders in chief of their respective armies. Both fought a 7 years' war. Boht were selected heads of their governments. Both established 13 colonies. You say there were only 12 tribes of Israel? You are right, but Joseph's inheritance was divided between Ephriam and Manessah. Both gave God the credit for their victories, the indispensable ingredient in their successes.

Both men encountered misunderstanding and opposition from some of their people. How many of us have ever understood why the Tories opposed us in our battle for freedom? I was always curious about that, and to such extent that I found some of their speeches, and I want to tell you what their argument was: They said, no democracy has or can exist more than 200 years; that greed, fraud, intoxicating power, unreasonable demands upon the part of the people, will pull down the pillars supporting the temple of democracy. Our people never argued history with the Tories. Our people said, your history is true, but God is on our side, and God will be our leader, and God will preserve our form of government. Our ancestors realized that the country they were founding on democratic principles was God's last experiment as to whether man could be depended upon to govern himself, that without God they were sunk, with God they could not fail, that they must make good because there were no other new continents to settle.

From that humble beginning, our country became the greatest and the richest the world has ever known. Whether it will remain so, depends on whether we are and will continue to be a Godly nation. The future will be decided on our faith and what we do.

In my lifetime we have fought three major and devastating wars, each accompanied by a lowering of the spiritual level. The greater the war, the greater the moral

sag or deterioration. In those wars we have lost much of the cream of young American manhood. Few realize that in Korea we lost those outstanding young men that this country had educated to become its generals and its admirals. Yes, we lost thousands and thousands of our boys, boys who were once as vibrant with life as we are, and who responded to friendship's glow as we do. They gave their lives to bank the fires of hell, but they left for us, the living, the responsibility to put that fire out. Surely we should know now that the price of liberty is high. Our dead comrades only made the downpayment, and we must complete the purchase price.

Instead of these wars solving our problems, and swords being beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks, we find ourselves in the greatest dilemma of human history. Thirty-five years ago communism could have been wiped out as easily as passing your hand over a candle to snuff out its feeble flame. But we did not. The magic word was "tolerance." Tolerance of evil, tolerance of crime, tolerance of ideas repulsive to God, and to right. We have extended tolerance to a group calling themselves liberals, who are the most intolerant people ever spawned. People who, if they had the power, would crush you, your sentiments, your constitution, and your way of life, as they would crush an ant. It is my considered opinion based on my experience as a public servant that this group is the most prejudiced and malicious group of people this world has ever known. May the do-gooder realize this, before it is too late. Communism hates God and hates morality. God says man "is a little lower than the angels." Communists say man is like the brute that perishes.

As Joshua said to the proud and ungodly people of Israel, "By the hand of God you have been carried from bondage in Egypt to a land of milk and honey." Joshua reminded them that God said, "I have given you a land for which you did not labor, and cities which ye built not, and ye dwell in them; of the vineyards and olive trees which ye planted not do ye eat." After that solemn reminder, Joshua said to the children of Israel, "Choose you this day whom ye shall serve." I say to the world today, which could easily be the last century of a departing civilization, Shall it be Karl Marx with his deadly philosophies, or Jesus Christ, with everlasting life to nations and men and women who serve him? That question cannot be answered in a parrotlike manner. It must be answered: We will be true to Christ with all our hearts, souls, and beings, and He will be our leader, no matter the personal cost. Indeed, Paul, the apostle, saw the great need of the human race when he said, "I will preach nothing but Christ and Him crucified." I would to God that every one of his ministers and servants made the same resolution, for it is Christ or chaos. Common honesty requires me to tell you, though I know it will be disputed, that the rank and file of our people know less about Christ and our Constitution, even our philosophy of government, than ever before in our history. No wonder so many are confused and accept leftwing ideas. In 1783 Washington surrendered his commission as Commander in Chief of the Revolutionary Army at Annapolis, Md., saying to his faithful men, "The job is done, well done." It was then, but I am wondering what will be said as to the job we have done when the 200 years which the Tories said would bring to a close a democratic government rolls around in 1983?

Today we owe $281 billion, twice as much as every farm, with all its equipment and crops, is worth on the market. The budget is not balanced, and we continue annual deficits. We have 18 million veterans, and more to come. We have an obligation to them and we must perform it. We have our armies and military machines to support, and we are told that the Communist military machine far exceeds ours in striking power, even including the air, and in every way except the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and in this field we are told that if we are superior, Russia is speedily catching up.

The overriding problem is survival. The four horsemen—the atomic bomb, hydrogen bomb, bacteriological warfare, and chemical warfare—are riding high over this world. President Eisenhower says, "This is the age of peril." Churchill says, "In all history, this is the most difficult century in which to be born."

It is my opinion that any person who would advocate a war is out of his senses. Thirty carefully placed bombs would theoretically blanket the 3 million square miles of the continental United States. Additionally, each day brings evidence that military science is progressing at a geometric rate, and packing more than millions of tons of TNT power into a single bomb. Guided missiles may be shot from one continent to another, and this field is only in its infancy. At the same time, my friends, despite the facts just stated, anyone who treats lightly the possibility of war is deliberately or ignorantly ignoring the facts. Certainly war must be looked upon as an unmitigated horror, but slavery under communism would be a worse horror. I am certain there is no one in this audience who would not, if the showdown came, be willing to risk war, terrible as war would be, in order to save this Republic and to prevent Christianity from being wiped from the face of the earth.

We must use our ingenuity and our God-given brains in conjunction with our allies, to make sure that this war, if it comes, will not be because of something we did or did not do, and if it then comes, by the grace of God, we must win it.

I do not know what the talks being planned will produce. Maybe not much, maybe nothing, but I am glad our leaders are willing to sit down and talk, and willing to reason and willing to do everything honorable without compromising our fundamental principles, to preserve the peace.

If the Communists have any regard for humanity, the witnessing of one hydrogen bomb explosion should bring them to their senses. I wish every American could see one of those awful experiments, and see the death-dealing devices man has made, and how shocking and devastating science can be without God in command. I am certain that the awful indifference that has made civil defense a joke in this country would disappear. It is bewildering to see how little our Nation's Capital and our great cities have done in that respect. Now is the accepted time to provide that defense. Do not forget this fact. It is my judgment that if we realize what we are facing, and what the terrible cost will be exacted of us for victory, we would be different. I believe it would change our ideas from which we can get from our Government to what we can do for our Government. Wouldn't that be healthy? We would be more careful with the taxpayers' dollars. We would demad a dollar's worth of service for every tax dollar. We would quit being so patient with those screaming for their claimed rights, and we would finally demand that they consider and rise to the performance of their obligations to the greatest country that ever existed on this earth. We would become realistic to the enemy within our gates.

A few days ago we voted out a Reserve bill in the House, and I supported that bill. It was one I hated to vote for, and one that is hard to defend support of, but harder to defend opposing. Only 250,000 boys can annually come under that program, though we have a million boys becoming of eligible age yearly. You say that is discrimination? I admit that, but the Government simply cannot train all of those young men as they become of age. A huge Army over the years will wreck the economy of this Nation. This Reserve must be the answer, for we must be realistic. It would be interesting for you to know the history of this Reserve bill upon the floor of the House. This bill was under the leadership of our Hon. CARL VINSON, whose generalship upon the floor is unsurpassed. An amendment, as you doubtless know, was offered which had the effect of destroying the States' sovereignty over their National Guard, and that amendment was accepted by the House. Congressman VINSON did the only possible thing when he moved that the Committee arise, which had the effect of leaving the bill suspended in the air. I affectionately told Congressman VINSON "Robert E. Lee never executed a more sucessful retreat." Mr. VINSON in a few days had regrouped his forces, so he took the bill again to the floor and the Reserve bill was passed, leaving the States' right to maintain their National Guard unimpaired. A few years ago General Eisenhower, in testifying before a congressional committee, suggested that the drafting of our women might become imperative. I certainly hope not, but without an adequate Reserve, that could some time become an actual fact.

During this age of peril, certain groups have used our dangers as opportunities to change our way of life and to destroy the rights of the States, and to build up an awful centralized Government with limitless control. You and I know that unlimited power is extremely dangerous, and that we cannot grant that power. In this Reserve bill that I have just discussed, this bill was threatened with defeat, unless we accepted an amendment that would destroy the constitutional right of the various States to maintain and control their National Guard.

I pledge to this great and patriotic organization and to the people of America, that I will oppose with every ounce of my being every attempt to break down our landmarks and traditions. I will never agree to permit a bloodless revolution win in our country as the price for so-called cooperation in the battle for our existence.

No human agency should have unlimited power. A good man does not want it. It is exceedingly dangerous for a bad man to have it. The reason our United States Supreme Court does not have the respect of law-abiding people as it so universally had and deserved at one time is perhaps to be found in one of their rulings to the effect that there is no restraint placed upon it that they do not choose to impose. I challenge that statement. They have oaths. They have the Constitution. They have a duty to God and man. No wonder with such puffed up notions they talk psychology and sociology and substitute psychology and sociology for the Constitution. No wonder they say the Constitution means one thing today and another thing tomorrow, and that they, and they alone can change it with impunity through construction. No wonder they have repeatedly voided State appellate court decisions on questions of fact instead of law. No wonder so many criminal convictions have been reversed and there is practically no end to appeals on convictions for crime. No wonder the Rosenbergs' conviction was reviewed in the courts approximately 14 times, and the day before their electrocution the execution was ordered stayed by one Supreme Court Justice, who, contrary to law, entertained a petition by a person who was not an attorney for the Rosenbergs, and who was not a practitioner of that Court, despite that Court's own rule that an attorney desiring admittance to their Court must submit a certificate from the chief justice of his State appellate court that he is licensed to practice in that court and must additionally submit certificates from two attorneys li-

censed to practice in the Supreme Court that the applicant is of good character, etc.

Believe it or not, the United States Supreme Court has no appellate jurisdiction of any class of cases that Congress sees fit to withdraw from its jurisdiction. Our forefathers had sense and wisely inserted that check and balance. Last year Senate Resolution 44 was introduced in the Senate, and passed the Senate. That bill came before the Judiciary Committee in the House, of which I am a member. I discovered that inserted in that bill was a provision depriving the Congress of any power or right to make exceptions or regulations regarding constitutional questions, which would have placed our Constitution in the hands of nine men, with all power to regulate taken from the people. I lead the fight to kill that bill, and we killed the bill, and if I never do anything else, that was worth going to Congress for. It might interest you to know that this year I introduced a bill which would leave to the respective States the administration of their school facilities. Whether I can pass it in my lifetime I do not know, but it would be a wonderful emancipation if we could.

Perhaps you are aware that our Supreme Court has held that a treaty or even an executive agreement made by the President will override and annul any State law and even the Constitution. The Bricker amendment would cure that terrible decision. Yet few amendments have been so viciously attacked. Mr. Truman was against it. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles thought it wonderful when Mr. Truman was President and Acheson was Secretary, but when they got in the driver's seat, they also turned against it. The amendment is sound and imperative. I intend to support it. The only way you will ever get it, however, is to demand it.

Do you know that in some quarters and in entirely too many, the word "conservative" has become a word of opprobrium? I am a conservative, and I will tell you why. That word means "preservative," "within safe bounds," "moderate." I always want to be conservative in dealing with your money, your lives, our Constitution, and our country. A conservative believes that if we are to fight communism effectively, we must fight it at home with the same fervor we mobilize our youth to fight it overseas. A conservative believes it is important that Communists be removed from Government jobs, and from other positions where they can and have molded sentiment against our way of life. A conservative does not think that a person who drew your money and worked in our Government though a Communist, when our boys were dying in the battlefields fighting communism, should receive the praise and popularity many are receiving, when years later and after the statute of limitations has prevented any prosecution, and without fear of any punishment, admits that he was a Communist. A conservative thinks that person is at least unstable, and besides praise should be withheld from traitors. A conservative does not think that a Communist should broadcast news and opinions over the radio and television to the loyal people of the land, and a conservative happens to believe that no newspaper should have as editor any person who admits that once he was a Communist. A conservative does not believe that this Government should be prevented from tapping the wires of persons planning to commit sabotage or espionage against this country, nor does he believe that the Government should be so hamstrung with restrictions that would render useless that medium of detection.

A conservative does not believe that organizations such as the DAR, UDC, GAR, American Legion, and other patriotic organizations should be held in contempt by groups oppposed to the country they or their ancestors brought into being, and who were liberal enough to let those groups sit at the table and eat of the fruit believing they would not despise the country that was so good to them, but would be loyal and patriotic.

This is a dark hour—but a challenging hour. Our problems are colossal—but our opportunities for service are unlimited. These opportunities are not for the timid. The foe is confident, and arrogant, for they believe their battle is almost won.

We must rise up to our opportunities and our responsibilities. It is great to be living now. Our fallen comrades who died for America expect us to do our best. I know you will, so my request to you is, insist that others do so. You people are a wonderful inspiration to me. You are entitled to the best that is in me, and if I know my heart, you shall have it.

The greatest speech I ever heard was from the lips of Captain Carlson, the commander of the *Enterprise* that battled the seas though half overturned, for 13 days, Captain Carlson riding with it. He was being honored in Washington and was called upon to say a few words, and this is what he said:

"I deserve no honor or praise. I am simply a humble seaman who was trusted with a little piece of America. It was a great privilege and I did my very best to bring that piece of America back home."

I promise you, as your servant, I will do my very best to protect America and its people.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpt from the minority report on H. R. 3383 draws attention to a most significant aspect of the reason why this bill should not be enacted. I hope my colleagues will consider it most carefully:

The project should not be authorized at this time because the economic, engineering and financial survey prerequisite to its proper evaluation are still inadequate and incomplete.

The official reports of the Bureau of Reclamation and the testimony of Bureau witnesses clearly show that the investigations, surveys, and studies in regard to engineering and the economic and financial aspects of the proposed Colorado River storage project and participating projects are incomplete and inadequate.

The provisions of the Senate bill itself, which require further studies and report by the Secretary of the Interior on economic feasibility and financial reimbursability of the 11 participating projects previously recommended by the Secretary, demonstrates that reliable information is not now available even on those projects that the Bureau has already reported upon. The House bill seeks to cover up this deficiency even in the face of the clear recommendation of the administration that these projects be reevaluated before authorization.

The Senate bill with which the House bill might go to conference includes authorization of scores of projects on which no reports have as yet been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior, on many of which only the barest reconnaissance data is now available.

The record reveals the need for much more thorough investigations and studies of the proposed storage units. Even as to the Glen Canyon storage unit, the Interior Department officials have expressed concern over the adequacy of the foundations and have stated that decisions as to final plans would not be made until further studies are completed after authorization. Plans for the other storage dams are even less decisive. Thus there is grave question as to the adequacy of cost estimates and the financial feasibility of the storage features of the project.

In addition, it is clear from the record of the hearings that the proposed storage units of the project will not supply any water to the reclamation components now proposed and are not needed to enable these projects to obtain and use the amount of water estimated by the Bureau to be required. Yet under the House bill, it is proposed to spend about $600 million, and under the Senate bill about $750 million, for storage units that are not to be needed to meet basic water supply requirements for at least 25 years and probably more.

In view of the foregoing, action on the project at this time would be premature and without justification.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the project repayment provisions of the upper Colorado River project are unrealistic and economically indefensible. The proposed repayment plan for the project would be to pay off the entire irrigation investment in 50 years by applying all power and irrigation revenues toward that end. Thereafter, the huge power investment would be paid off in not to exceed 100 years.

The record reveals that such a plan might work in the case of a development comprising the Glen Canyon and Echo Park storage units and the 11 participating reclamation projects recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but would fail with additional projects added.

At the House hearings, a Bureau witness, E. O. Larson, stated—page 215, House hearings on H. R. 3383:

With 11 participating projects paid out concurrently, you could do that and pay off power in less than 100 years. But one disadvantage of that plan is that you cannot take on more than the 11 projects without raising the power rate, if additional projects are developed while the power is taking 100 years to pay out, the higher you have to raise the power rates.

Studies indicate that the minimum number of projects specified for authorization in the House bill might pay out under the repayment provisions of the bill, and that it would take 90 to 95 years to repay the power investment with power sold at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. But with additional projects added, either storage units or irrigation projects, either the power rate would have to be materially increased to get within the

100-year payment period for power, or the period of repayment would be far greater than 100 years.

The $1.6 billion overall project would have no possibility of payout with 6-mill power under the repayment provisions of the House bill. In fact, it could never pay out under such a financial program.

Moreover, to predicate a repayment plan on continuing revenues from hydroelectric power development for 100 years in the future is unrealistic and unsound, in view of possible changes in economic conditions, obsolescence, and competing sources of power, including atomic energy.

William M. Jardine and James T. Jardine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 6, 1955, in Logan, Utah, the mortal remains of two distinguished sons of Utah were laid to rest. William M. Jardine and James T. Jardine now rest in the soil of the State they loved so much, and within sight of the school they were graduated from—the Utah State Agricultural College. Both of these illustrious men enriched the tradition of the motto of the college "Labor Is Life" with their contributions in the national and international field.

Both men, for a number of years, were at the college and in Government service, and made significant contributors to irrigation agriculture and to forest and range science. William was president of Kansas State College, United States Secretary of Agriculture, Minister to Egypt, president of Wichita University and for a time Kansas State treasurer, called to that post to restore the confidence of the people of Kansas in the integrity of their State government (one of the highest tributes that could be paid to what we call character). A prominent Wichita, Kans., newspaper, upon his retirement from Wichita University, editorially remarked that "one of the finest figures in Kansas and national public life for the past 45 years was leaving" and recorded the admiration of Kansas for "keen and wise intelligence, bold and vigorous in action, a personality strong and attractive, and a spirit that was undaunted by difficulty."

James T., after a period of teaching at the college, was a distinguished investigator in the Forest Service. He is credited with the initiation of a number of the basic concepts of range management, through his research and a resulting series of publications. These pioneer concepts are still recognized as basic principles in what has since become the science of range management. Later he became Chief of Research for the United States Department of Agriculture, the largest research organization in the world. Previously he was director of the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station.

At the memorial exercises for the Jardine brothers, the alumni association of the Utah State Agricultural College presented, through its president, Dr. R. O. Porter, a tribute. I would like to make that tribute a part of the RECORD:

A tribute to William and James Jardine. There were giants in the earth in those days—mighty men, men of renown. So it is recorded in Genesis. Since those recordings, history is replete with instances of mighty men of renown arising to the occasion and requirements of their times. History also records a close correlation between pioneering, hardship, and poverty and the men and women of great spiritual, moral, and intellectual fortitude, indomitable will, and physical courage.

No greater heritage could be want than the influence of humble homes and worthy institutions inspired by the pioneering spirits of men and women whose lives are purposeful and devoted to the ideals of God and humanity.

Such was the home into which these two brothers were born and reared to young manhood. Such was the school into whose care they were entrusted for the development of their mature and lasting philosophies, their cultural and technical skills.

But in addition to home and school there must be a combination of intangible genetic influences to produce giants in the earth.

In the persons and lives of these two distinguished brothers, William and James Jardine, we recognize the desirable hereditary and environmental factors for the production of nobility of charater, intellectual leadership, and physical fitness.

We, the alumni of the Utah State Agricultural College, feel honored in having had the names of these men on our rolls for so many years. The college is honored in having had the privilege of directing their education during the formative years of their lives.

I am sure the Jardine brothers felt great pride in the institution which during more than 60 years of pioneering liberal education for the masses of a high scholastic basis has turned out more than its share of giants of the earth.

The alumni salute and pay their last respect to two of our cherished members.

Secretary Folsom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle and Rochester Times-Union voicing a well-deserved tribute to the newly appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom.

This appraisal comes from those who have known intimately both the man and his works. Rarely has anyone assumed a Cabinet post with such outstanding equipment of character, ability, and experience. The newest Secretary will demonstrate the wisdom of President Eisenhower's choice:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle]

SECRETARY FOLSOM

Rochester soon will claim a full-fledged member of the Presidential Cabinet. He is Marion B. Folsom, former treasurer of Eastman Kodak, for more than 2 years Under Secretary of the Treasury. On August 1 he will become Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He has served the Treasury with distinction. He will serve with even more distinction in the new assignment where he will be overshadowed by no superior.

Rochesterians will know that Mr. Folsom earned the promotion. It was no political appointment, because the Secretary is no politician. Besides, if politics were involved, he would have been passed over for geographical reasons. He will be the third New Yorker in the Cabinet, the others being Dulles and Brownell. He takes the place because of his proved diligence and because he knows something of the problems he must face. He was in full sympathy with the forward-looking policies of Eastman Kodak in its dealings with people. Perhaps he was more instrumental in forming those policies than is generally recognized.

At any rate, although an expert in finance and a believer in sound fiscal policies, his sympathies are warm. His administration of social security and welfare can be expected to be kindly but firm. He is no cold-eyed offspring of soulless corporations. His secretaryship will be no soft spot, as his predecessor, Oveta Culp Hobby, can testify. But he has a way of informing himself fully, of being ready to act, and being sure of his facts.

Cabinet membership is a great distinction. It carries with it high honor and precedence and some perquisites. But it does not pay in proportion to its demands. Successful service demands a desire to serve. Mr. Folsom has proved his willingness to serve at a sacrifice.

Good luck, Mr. Secretary.

[From the Rochester Times-Union]

FOLSOM IN CABINET: HE BELONGS THERE

A great deal more than hometown pride supports President Eisenhower's appointment of Marion B. Folsom to full membership in his Cabinet as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The President is not likely to offer a more conspicuous example of finding the right man for the right job.

Every element in Folsom's career for the last 30 years markedly fits him for the place. He was a pre-New Deal advocate of social security, he helped write the first social-security law and subsequent amendments, and he has been a stanch evangel in the national business community for what he always describes as the modern way of relieving apprehensions about the hazards of living.

Folsom was a pioneer among top business executives willing to devote part of their time and energies to public problems. He has found an amazing number of ways to do so, in advisory committees, in technical assistance to committees of Congress, in private organizations with public purposes.

As a Cabinet member he will feel perfectly at home when called to testify before congressional committees, for his 20-year relations with such committees have been uniformly and mutually agreeable. He always confronts a congressional committee realizing that it has a job that it is trying to do in the best way possible. With this attitude, good relations are quickly established.

Folsom has an exceptionally wide acquaintance in the national business community. As research chairman and later chairman of the Committee for Economic

Development he led in this most conspicuous private endeavor to achieve economic stability.

Organized during the war by Paul Hoffman with the immediate purpose of setting landmarks for the transition to peacetime economy, CED has continued the major voice for sanity and stability in the economy, both in the private and public sectors.

We congratulate Folsom upon his appointment to larger opportunities, and the Nation for obtaining his services.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, the project will damage the Nation's agricultural economy. The project would grow crops already in agricultural surplus. The upper Colorado River project would supply irrigation water for high altitude land in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is very important to consider what crops would be grown on this land.

Among the crops now being supported by the Nation's taxpayers are the following: Corn; cotton; wheat; butter; oats; butter oil; cheese; milk, dried; wool; rye; barley; beans, dry; cottonseed oil; grain sorghum; seeds, hay, and pasture; soybeans. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and the price is held up to a desired level. What are called proportionate shares are established by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, if more sugar-beet land is brought into production, shares of all others must be decreased accordingly.

From Reclamation Bureau reports, a table has been compiled showing the type of crops which would be grown on each of the 33 proposed projects, and whether or not they are supported crops.

The table follows:

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge	7,970	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Seedskadee	60,720	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
Lyman	40,600	Small grains	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Silt	7,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Potatoes	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Smith Fork	10,430	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Paonia	17,040	Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Florida	18,950	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Alfalfa	
Pine River	15,150	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
Emery County	24,080	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sheep	Yes.
Central Utah	60,380	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Hammond	3,670	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beans	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Gooseberry	16,400	Alfalfa	
		Pasture	
		Grains	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Navaho	137,240	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Vegetables	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
San Juan-Chama	225,000	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Rabbit Ear	19,190	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Troublesome	13,640	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
West Divide	65,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook	31,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Dolores	66,000	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beans	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Sublette	84,000	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitgrowers	3,850	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Bostwick Park	6,870	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Dallas Creek	21,940	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
East River	2,750	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitland Mesa	19,400	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Grand Mesa	25,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Ohio Vreek	16,910	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Tomichi Creek	27,580	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Battlement Mesa	6,830	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Bluestone	10,875	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Vegetables	
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Eagle Divide	10,875	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Parshall	27,510	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Woody Creek	2,965	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.

No Magic Power in Minimum Wage Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I take this opportunity to call attention to an editorial entitled "No Magic Power in Minimum Wage Law," which appeared in the July 5 issue of the Davenport (Iowa) Morning Democrat. Although this viewpoint does not necessarily reflect my own thinking on minimum wage legislation, it is a viewpoint worthy of consideration by the Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

NO MAGIC POWER IN MINIMUM WAGE LAW

Supporters of the proposal before Congress to increase the minimum wage are basing their arguments on the ancient fallacy that laws have magic powers.

Neither Congress nor any State legislature can "decree" prosperity. Obviously, Congress does not pay the wage increase it legislates. Neither does it increase the employees' rate of output, nor induce customers to buy. The theory of minimum wage legislation is that a significant number of employers could afford to pay better wages and all that is needed is a law. This is not necessarily true. If the increase is too great, marginal firms will go out of business unless they can raise prices without losing customers. It may be

argued, of course, that firms which cannot pay the minimum wage ought not to be in business. But this overlooks the fact that the law may cost employes their jobs.

Only if economic conditions affecting employers permit a wage increase can the laws be considered successful.

Employers have raised wages steadily during the prosperous postwar period. In 1945, the average factory worker earned $1.02 per hour. As of June, 1955, the wage had increased to $1.85. Further, during the period 1951 to June, 1955, prices remained relatively stable while wages increase from $1.59 to $1.85. Thus the wage gains were real. The fact is that under our competitive system there is no way in which the results of increased output of goods and services can be kept from employees.

Let's go back a few years. In 1930–31, wholesale prices stood at approximately the same level as in 1840, or 90 years before. Yet, in the same 90-year period, average wage rates increased by approximately 700 percent. This is a phenomenal and little known fact. No law was responsible.

During the 90-year period there was no national minimum wage fixing and little social legislation. It was the competition in the goods market which helped to keep prices down, and it was the rivalry among employers for scarce labor which drove wage rates up and up. Yet in spite of this dramatic performance of a free economy, and despite the fact most employees now earn more than the legal minimum, the view persists that somehow Government must help raise wages.

We must realize that low wages are not a cause of economic distress, but a symptom. The basic cause is low productivity which cannot be raised by minimum wage laws. Thus the only sound way to raise wages is to increase real prosperity by increasing the rate at which we convert work and raw materials into useful goods and services. This is not theory. It is a truth already dramatically demonstrated in this country. Since 1900, our rate of output of goods and services has steadily increased. Our living standards are higher and we work shorter hours.

Meanwhile real wages—adjusted to increases in the cost of living—are three times as high as in 1900.

It would thus appear that if we can maintain a steady growth in productivity, attempts to legislate pay increases are unnecessary.

The Vote Is Not All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a newsletter entitled "The Vote Is Not All," prepared by my colleague, the Honorable ROBERT W. KEAN, of New Jersey. In his column Representative KEAN, whom many of us on this side of the aisle look to as our party's expert in the field of social security, very ably discusses the pros and cons of the social-security bill which this body passed earlier this week. Representative KEAN clearly expresses the problem which confronted many of us in voting on this measure as a result of the unusual manner in which the bill was handled by those in charge of the legislation.

THE VOTE IS NOT ALL

(By Hon. ROBERT W. KEAN, of New Jersey)

WASHINGTON.—There is a courtroom scene familiar to many Americans. We have viewed it in the movies, in plays, on television, and sometimes in real life. The scene is the lawyer, facing the witness and demanding a "yes" or "no" answer to a question.

If the scene is fictional, often the author has seen to it that he holds his audience by making sure they realize a "yes" or "no" answer can't tell the full story and will create a false impression on the jury.

A lot of you, I feel sure, at such a moment experience the sensation of wishing the witness would just ignore the lawyer and blurt out the whole story.

By this time you may be wondering why I am writing about theatrics; the answer is that I am about to draw an analogy of this to experiences in Congress.

That which I described above is not at all unlike the emotions a Member of Congress may feel at certain times when he casts a "Yea" or "Nay" vote. The Member knows the "Yea" or "Nay" does not always do justice to his convictions about the legislation and, unfortunately, the vote may be the sole yardstick by which a segment of the people will judge him on that issue.

When I vote on the new social-security bill Monday (this column is being written July 15) I am going to feel like that witness who has many words to say but must limit his pronouncement to yes or no.

Therefore, in this space, I wish to report the full story—tell why I plan to vote "Yea" for this social-security bill after severely criticizing the fact that the Democracts in control of ways and means refused to hold full public hearings on the legislation.

SHADES OF MERIT

All legislation is a matter of compromise. It is rare that a bill is all black or all white; bills are usually gray. Hence, a Member must weigh the good against the bad. Then he must vote according to which predominates.

Let us take this social-security bill. Even though it provided for an expenditure by the system's trust fund of more than $2 billion annually on an average, the Democrat majority insisted on considering it without public hearings. In fact, their initial suggestion was to have the committee report the bill out with only 3 days of executive session.

However, committee leadership soon found there were so many unanswered questions that their first suggestion was impossible. An additional 3 days were granted for consideration of the bill. Thus, it was sent to the floor of the House without the advantage of any expert consultation except from those in the Social Security Administration after a mere 6 days of executive session.

The Democrats also insisted that the House consider the bill under a procedure known as suspension of rules, allowing only 40 minutes of debate in all. Only 40 minutes on a bill which will tax the people of this country next year and in succeeding years $1,700 million, of which Essex County will pay more than $13 million annually.

It is true those covered by social security will be entitled to further benefits under certain conditions. These benefits may (we can't be certain because of lack of adequate hearings) prove to be hazardous, however, because the people of the country may or may not feel they can afford to pay the price for the insurance as the social-security tax keeps increasing.

Here is a typical example of the difficult decision I faced in deciding how to vote on this bill:

The legislation broadens social-security coverage which I have long advocated. It would bring lawyers and dentists into the system for the first time, thus carrying out the proposal I have made in bills this year to that effect—a proposal I have been making for many years.

It provides for continuance of benefits to totally disabled children after they reach the age of 18—something I think is highly advisable.

It lowers the benefit age for widows. This I have long advocated.

It lowers the retirement age for all women to 62. There is some danger here that this will cause industry to force the retirement of women at that age who still want to work. This section is very expensive, costing the trust fund approximately $1 billion a year.

MOST CONTROVERSIAL ITEM

The most controversial item is the payment of full social-security benefits to those reaching the age of 50 who become totally disabled. This is a worthy objective. But there is a catch—no one knows or can estimate its true cost.

The social-security actuary estimates that the disability-payment provision will cost approximately $1 billion annually. However, he will not guarantee his guess. The insurance people say it may cost twice as much.

Another point is that no one knows how the necessary certification of disability can be handled. Doctors say State certification cannot escape abuse. It should have been of paramount importance to have given most careful consideration to this proposed new field of social-security benefits.

Of course, when you increase benefits, the tax to pay for them should be raised at the same time. This is a sound principle. In the proposed bill, the present tax will be raised by one-half percent January 1, 1956, becoming 2½ percent on employee and 2½ percent on employer.

Following out the pattern in raises in social-security taxes, which increase about every 5 years to a maximum under this bill of 4½ percent on employee and 4½ percent on employer 20 years from now, we may be making the tax so high that it will preclude the possibility of other needed improvements to the social-security system.

On the other side of the balance sheet, I am certain that Senator BYRD of Virginia, chairman of the Finance Committee, will insist that full study and public hearings be held on the bill before it goes to the Senate floor.

That's the story behind the vote. It's a gray bill. A shade grayer than I like when I vote for legislation. In my final analysis I decided the good slightly outweighed the bad in the bill. Therefore, I made the compromise and decided to yote "Yea."

The witness doesn't get out his full story by answering in one word.

There is much more behind that "Yea" than generally meets the eye.

Anniversary of the Radio-Television Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a very busy congressional office—in close touch with the public but seldom receiving public attention—observes its 20th anniversary today. On July 20, 1935 Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. Coar partitioned a small room, hung monk's cloth on the walls, and offered radio recording service to Members of Congress. Today Robert and Helen Coar are

still operating the service, now called the Joint Senate and House Radio-Television Facility, and they have built it into a major public service arm of the Congress.

The Coars' studios produce Members' shows which go to some 1,700 radio and 100 television stations each week. They operate with a staff of 13 who are currently handling the broadcasts of some 269 Members of the House and 80 Senators. Since Members must pay for these services out of private funds, the facility operates at no cost to the taxpayer. When the Congress authorized the expansion into television studios in 1952, it drew only part of the facility's credit balance of $117,500, which had mounted up over the years.

In this age of mass communications, newspaper, radio and television correspondents in Washington are hard pressed to cover even the "top of the news" in full. But it is vital to our system of government that the average citizen be fully informed about the work of his own Representative in the Congress and about issues that are of local importance. The radio-television facility has given the Members an opportunity to report to their constituents with much of the personal flavor of a neighborhood speech. It has enabled many of us to bring the sights and sounds of the Nation's Capital into the homes of our people, and it has awakened in these citizens a new interest in the working of their Government.

As for the Coars themselves, I have always found them a joy to work with. Although the pressure of work must often be imposible, they always seem to have time for a pleasant word and quiet bit of advice on how to improve the technical quality of the broadcast.

It has been a delight to know the Coars and I add my warm personal congratulations to the many they will be receiving today.

Eisenhower and the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, some of us have been fascinated by the short list of so-called must bills reported last week by Republican leaders as representing President Eisenhower's present demands on the Congress. The things the list includes, the things that it omits, force us to wonder what the President feels about legislation involving the health, security, and well-being of all our 165 million people—legislation involving, if you please, the general welfare.

The must list included just five items—the military Reserves bill, a bill to authorize the mislabeled atom-powered merchant ship, some kind of highway bill, some kind of housing bill, some kind of school-construction bill.

Now three of these items are military or quasi-military. The Reserves bill is strictly a military concern. The President's personal highway program, emphasizing Federal spending primarily for interstate—or military—highways, involves national defense. The atom-powered ship would be an intended demonstration in the field of international relations, an effort to prove that in regard to atoms for peace our hearts are in the right place.

Only two things on the must list, therefore, involve strictly domestic affairs—the housing bill and the school-construction bill.

Now is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the White House is not informed of the facts regarding school legislation and housing legislation?

The housing bill was held up because all four Republican members of the Rules Committee declined to vote to clear it for action. I am not criticizing the sincerity and judgment of the gentlemen; I am merely saying that responsible Republican House Members declined to support their President on the public housing section of the bill reported by the legislative committee.

There is a school-construction bill pending in another legislative committee, already approved with what is reported to be bipartisan support by a subcommittee. It is more generous in regard to Federal aid than the President's own recommended program, but he cannot blame us if we exercise our judgment and act more responsibly toward school children than his banker-advisers think wise. The point is, the bill is pending—and a push by the White House on the specific bill might help us get action.

Mr. Speaker, let us observe what was omitted from the must list.

We could not expect the President, perhaps, to come out in favor of the bill to improve and liberalize the social-security system which Mrs. Hobby, his Welfare Secretary, who has just resigned, busily opposed.

But the President omits from his "must list" even things that he himself has requested in the past—minimum wages, free polio shots for the children of needy parents, the inadequate health reinsurance program he has recommended.

On all these matters—housing, schools, polio shots, minimum wages, health legislation, social security—the Congress could quickly act if it got the proper guidance from the White House.

But we get no such guidance. These proposals directly affecting the well-being of the people are not the things which this administration seems to classify as "necessary." The administration gives no adequate guidance even to congressional spokesmen of its own party, so that all these welfare measures are hung up in committee.

Members know that I am deeply concerned for national defense. They know that I have stood in this House and urged more money for defense, more for atomic research, an end to reckless and dangerous cuts in our armed services.

But the strength of this country rests in more than its arms. It depends on the health, economic security, and sense of justice among all our people. It depends on the Government's attitude toward the general welfare. And on the simple matter of vital legislation for the general welfare, the President's "must list" lets the people down.

McDermott on Passports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the July 14 Cleveland Plain Dealer an article by Mr. William F. McDermott which merits every Member's careful attention.

At a time when some people are still saying that the only way to improve Government service is to spend more money, Mr. McDermott has suggested a sure-fire method of cutting redtape and improving the service at a saving to the American taxpayer.

The article follows:

MCDERMOTT ON PASSPORTS—FOUR-YEAR LIMIT BUREAUCRATIC NONSENSE—TIME, MONEY WASTED—LIFE PERMITS?

(By William F. McDermott)

The State Department has complained to Congress that its Passport Division is being overworked because Americans are on a colossal traveling spree. I take that sentence from a dispatch in Monday's Plain Dealer. The head of the Passport Division is Miss Frances Knight, who told a congressional committee that the State Department issued a record number of 480,000 passports or renewals in the last fiscal year. I am sure she needs more help to expedite the issuance of passports under the present regulations but I can tell her how to get it without hiring another hand.

American passports are now valid for 2 years. After that they can be renewed, but not for more than a total of 4 years. That seems to me bureaucratic nonsense. It messes up the Passport Division of the State Department with a lot of unnecessary work.

Your passport is an identification of your citizenship. It should be as permanent as your birth certificate or papers of citizenship.

I don't see why American passports should not be issued for life. They can be revoked at any time if the holder commits a crime or becomes undesirable in one way or another. But this business of ordinary American tourists being obliged to apply for a new passport every 2 years is completely silly.

If the State Department thinks it inadvisable to stamp passports good for a lifetime, as they should be, then the State Department might ease its problems a little by making passports valid for 6 or 8 years, instead of the 2 years it now permits.

MONEY COULD BE SAVED

All this stamping of papers and inconvenience to travelers are a ridiculous waste of time. Miss Knight may need more employees and I would be in favor of supplying the money to hire them, but she might have mentioned to the congressional committee that money could be saved in the passport division if the regulations for the issuance of passports were changed.

It now takes about a month to get a passport for foreign travel. It used to take 7 or 10 days, which was long enough. An effi-

ciently operated passport division should be able to issue the proper credentials in 2 or 3 days, and the Department can do it if you go to Washington and present your case as an emergency.

In fact it shouldn't take more than 10 minutes to fill out and supply a passport, if the applicant had the proper papers in hand.

We are hag-ridden by bureaucracy and this bureaucracy is about as annoying to the traveler as anything in western Europe. Russia is a different problem.

The Russians will spend an hour examining your small possessions when you enter the country. The officers will leaf through your books, though they can't read them. I never knew what they were looking for and I suspect they didn't. It was the job of a functionary to create the greatest possible delay and annoyance to a visitor.

I suspect that we are getting into that habit ourselves because of the growth of a bureaucracy which makes it own rules and separates itself from the common sense and general reasonableness of the majority of mankind.

VISA ABOLISHED BY SOME

There was a time when passports and visas were not considered necessary for foreign travel. You just went and spent your money and everybody was satisfied.

In recent years, many European countries have abolished the visa requirements by arrangement with the United States. They still have customs examinations and long delays at the frontiers.

We talk about a united western Europe. At every port of entry you are reminded that it is not united.

The French customs officials are completely unpredictable. Sometimes they will require you to open every piece of baggage you are carrying, and they will thumb through with curious and eager hands. The next time they will not even request you to open your luggage, but will mark your suitcases with a chalk of approval and smile you to the boat train.

Going into Belgium or Holland you are likely to have a strict examination. It involves delay and inconvenience. There is no reason for it, except an ingrained tradition and a needless, illogical suspicion.

Tourists do not carry dope or any other form of contraband. The customs officers do know the people who deal in this traffic. If they don't they should be fired.

Glossary of Official Governmentalese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the New York Times of July 17, 1955:

Some oldtimers in official Washington have brought their own private glossary of official governmentalese up to date for the benefit of newcomers. It goes like this:

A program: Any assignment that cannot be completed by one telephone call.

Channels: The fellow who has his desk between two expediters.

To implement a program: Hire more office staff.

Note and initial: Let's spread the responsibility for this.

Point up the issue: Expand 1 page to 15.

Research work: Looking for the guy who moved the file.

Interpretation: Your opinion.

We are aware of it: We hoped the fool who started it would have forgotten it by now.

To activate: Make carbon copies and add more names to the memo.

It is in process: It's so wrapped in redtape that the situation is almost hopeless.

Under consideration: Never heard of it.

Under active consideration: We are looking in the files for it.

We are making a survey: We need more time to think of an answer.

Give us the benefit of your present thinking: We'll listen to what you have to say as long as it doesn't interfere with what we have already decided to do.

Conference: Conversation.

Statistician: One who draws a mathematically precise line from an unwarranted assumption to a foregone conclusion.

Expert: A person who avoids small errors as he swoops toward the grand fallacy.

Ike's Support Needed on Gas Decontrol Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we in Texas have many small producers of gas who are competing in the exploration and production of gas. They cannot exist under Government control since the business in this country is based on free enterprise and not a controlled economy by the Government, the latter principle being socialistic and not American. So it is that I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the facts so that they may understand rather than cast their vote through prejudice or lack of information. I would like to call attention to the following editorial:

[From the Dallas Morning News of June 24, 1955]

IKE'S SUPPORT NEEDED ON GAS DECONTROL BILL

One pending measure that deserves strong bipartisan support from everyone who believes in free enterprise is the bill for Federal decontrol of the price of natural gas at the wellhead. At present the support is bipartisan but is not strong enough to get the bill through the last-minute jam without a strong stand by the administration.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who supports this measure, has called on President Eisenhower to put the influence of his leadership behind it. The Speaker is clearly right. There is just as much reason for President Eisenhower to come out for States rights on the gas issue as there was for his courageous stand on the tidelands issue 3 years ago. The basic principle is the same in both cases.

The President's own commission on fuels is on record as opposing Federal control of gas prices at the wells. The President will be no more than consistent with his own record if he comes out clearly for decontrol of gas prices. This control never was intended in the Natural Gas Act but was imposed by a Supreme Court interpretation, or misinterpretation, of the law a year ago. The control never was sought by the Federal Power Commission, now called on to administer it.

Unless this decontrol step is taken, most of the incentive for new gas discoveries will be lost, and prices to consumers will rise. Also there will be precedent for other Federal price controls, possibly leading to a peacetime OPA. Prompt decontrol is needed to stave off economic regimentation and to protect free enterprise.

The Peace We Fought for Is in Sight and We Can Win It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I made some remarks on the floor today noting my exceptions to and disagreements with an article by Paul G. Hoffman in Life magazine.

As I stated on the floor, it is my belief that in fairness to Mr. Hoffman his complete article should also be available in the RECORD, and under permission to revise and extend by remarks I offer it for publication in the Appendix.

THE PEACE WE FOUGHT FOR IS IN SIGHT AND WE CAN WIN IT

(By Paul G. Hoffman)

Everyone is aware that the struggle between the free world and the Communist countries is entering a new phase, one which is already witnessing a relaxation of tensions and which may produce some more at next week's meeting at the summit in Geneva. We should not expect too much from all this, as the President and others have warned, since the basic realities of the struggle endure. But it is highly important that the American people understand why this relaxation is taking place. The reason for it is the biggest news of our time: the fact that after a decade of costly struggle we are finally winning the peace.

We are winning it because the free world has been blessed with leaders who were wise enough to see that to win the peace we had to wage it with as much boldness, daring, and imagination as we would apply to waging war. We are winning the peace because these leaders worked together, with vision transcending purely national interests, and saw to it that nothing was allowed to keep the free nations from waging the peace with a common strategy.

How successful this strategy has been is not yet appreciated by the American people. A recent Gallup poll showed that 73 percent of all Americans believe that war is inevitable. I found this shocking and depressing because if such a war is inevitable the world is likely to destroy itself. Even if war is not inevitable, such pessimism makes it much more likely.

But this attitude is most depressing to me because I think it is wrong. Having encountered so many rough bumps in the decade of cold war just ended, we have forgotten that along the way the free world has won many significant victories, many of them through the United Nations, in its battle for peace. To refresh your memory, I have listed the outstanding milestones.

MILESTONES ON THE ROAD TO PEACE

Forcing Soviet Army to evacuate Iran: May 1946.

Economic recovery of Europe through United States aid: April 1948 to date.

Survival of Yugoslavia outside the Soviet orbit with Western aid: June 1948 to date.

Breaking Soviet blockade of Berlin by airlift: June 1948–August 1949.

Armistice in the Jewish-Arab war: February 1949.

Creation of NATO: April 1949.

Defeat of the Communists in Greece: October 1949.

Settlement of Dutch-Indonesian war: November 1949.

Halting aggression in Korea: June 1950–July 1953.

Settlement of Kashmir war between India and Pakistan: August 1953.

Cease-fire in Indochina: July 1954.

Settlement of Trieste dispute: October 1954.

Agreement on rearmament of West Germany: May 1955.

Recently we have passed even more significant milestones in very rapid succession. We have finally succeeded in breaking down all the barriers to rearming Western Germany. That victory quickly brought profound changes in Russian policy: A sudden willingness to grant a treaty to Austria, a decision to end the war of terror against Tito and his independent brand of communism, an offer of recognition to West Germany, an announced willingness to talk seriously about disarmament and an effective system of international atomic control.

TOP CARDS AT THE SUMMIT

Because of these victories, the meeting at the summit finds the free world holding the top cards. And the greatest single card it will have is the fact that President Eisenhower will be the free world's chief spokesman. No other man could take to that meeting the confidence and hopes of so many millions. His special status is based on the happy coincidence that in the eyes of all Europeans he is something more than the President: He is the liberator of Europe. As such, he draws equal respect from the Russians, who remember that it was he who stood atop Lenin's tomb with Marshal Stalin to celebrate the conquest of Nazidom by the Grand Alliance. This is bound to make him the dominant figure of the Geneva Conference. And because of it Eisenhower can do more than any other man in the world to establish peace.

I came to that conclusion quite a long while ago. I was very pleased the first time I ever met General Eisenhower, at a time when he was still president of Columbia University, to hear him declare with great earnestness that the most important single business before the world was winning the peace. At that time a number of shortsighted people were urging a preventive war—"drop the bomb"—as if war could ever be prevented by starting one.

The next time I saw General Eisenhower he was running NATO in Paris. In June of 1951, while he was still torn in his own mind as to whether he should yield to the insistent pleas that he run for President, I called on him to do what I could to persuade him. I knew that his greatest personal desire, after so many years of strenuous duties, was to get a few years of ease and rest. I also knew that none of the ordinary arguments, having to do with the power or glory of the office, could move him. No soldier had ever been covered with greater glory or given higher honors by all the nations of the world; almost anything else that might happen to him would seem in a way an anticlimax.

The greatest obstacle was his very real humility. He honestly thought that many other men were better qualified for the presidency and told me so. That gave me an opening.

AN EXPERIENCE NO ONE ELSE HAS

"General," I told him, "there is just one fact you have to face before you decide this thing. You can take this world further along the road to peace than any living man and here's why. The reasons you can do it are not necessarily because you are smart or anything else. It's simply because you have behind you an experience that no one else has." I went on to describe this unique experience: the victorious commander who had been idolized in all the world capitals, whose name was a byword all over the world and who commanded the respect of the Russian leaders—and was in addition the one man above all others they would undoubtedly least like to tangle with.

"After all that," I said, "if you can name anybody else who can contribute as much as you can to winning the peace, I'll take my traveling bags and go somewhere else."

He did not say anything but that was the first time I felt that I had made an impression on him.

I have never had any reason to think I was wrong in my arguments that day. On several occasions, in my opinion, it was Eisenhower alone who saved this country from war. One of the most dangerous periods was the time of the French collapse at Dienbienphu, when some of our military leaders were urging military intervention in Indochina, including the use of atomic weapons. It was the sober judgment of President Eisenhower and his inexhaustible patience that ruled out any such rash move. He maintained his position until a cease-fire was finally brought about.

In the same manner he firmly blocked an attempt by Senator KNOWLAND and other influential men to launch a blockade against Red China. Such a move would undoubtedly have been popular because of national resentment at Red China's imprisonment of our fliers. But the President pointed out that there had never been a blockade in history that did not lead to hostilities and he sternly rejected the proposal.

Only last April the worst war scare of the decade suddenly spread alarm all over the Nation. Responsible military leaders warned that a Red Chinese invasion of Formosa and the offshore islands was imminent and argued that we should start bombing the Chinese mainland. Again it was Eisenhower who put a stop to these hysterics. On the one hand, he sent emissaries to restrain Chiang Kai-shek from doing anything provocative. On the other, he gave the Red Chinese unmistakable evidence that force would be met with force and the present de facto cease-fire was established in the Formosa Strait.

I do not mean to suggest that by actions of this sort Eisenhower has licked the problem. But his actions have purchased time during which tempers can cool and tensions be broken down. Ensenhower knows from his military experience how time can be a strategic factor of tremendous importance. His military background also enables him to do things which a President with a civilian background might not be able to accomplish. He can safely conciliate when someone else might be accused of softness to Communism. He can ignore provocations when a civilian might be accused of seeking peace at any price. When public passion is inflamed by an incident such as that of the fliers, and demagogs try to make political capital of it, Eisenhower can talk softly where pressure might unnerve a civilian into risky action.

Eisenhower the soldier can work for peace more effectively than anyone else because his background renders him immune to attacks upon his courage or judgment in crises. Having been first in war, he can be first in peace without apology. And this is vital in a period when recurring crises could easily create a war psychology, as the sinking of the *Maine* forced a war with Spain.

The present relaxation of tension did not come about because one bright morning the Soviet leaders suddenly woke up feeling kindlier toward the world. It came about because they finally realized that their strategy of waiting for the free world to collapse was not working out. It was failing because the free world was effectively waging the peace in the only way it could possibly be won, simultaneously, on four fronts: the military, the economic, the political and the psychological.

On the military front it was necessary to maintain adequate strength to prevent any encouragement to aggression. This we have done and are doing. NATO is its most effective expression and German rearmament its most powerful new force.

On the economic front it was necessary to keep the free world prosperous and healthy. In this we have made great strides.

On the political front we have kept common cause with our allies and are making encouraging progress in our relations with such groups as the Columbo powers in Asia (India, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon, the three Associated States of Indochina, Malaya and Nepal).

On the psychological front we have maintained information programs to see that our cause and our accomplishments are not misrepresented or overlooked. One result as the African-Asian Conference at Bandung proved, is that we have far more friends among the nonwhite peoples than many had dared hope.

THE COST OF WAGING PEACE

The cost of this 4-front waging of the peace in the last 10 years has been enormous: $365 billion for the United States, or nearly $100 billion more than our total national debt. Most of that—$300 billion—has gone for defense, $50 billion has gone for economic aid, $13 billion for political efforts, and $2 billion for information. But winning the peace justifies any cost.

So far our biggest victory has been to avert the economic chaos and collapse on which the Soviets placed their chief reliance. It is not an exaggeration to say that America's willingness to spend the money to prevent this collapse literally saved the world.

It is easy to forget how desperate, hopeless, and defeatist that world seemed when Europe first started picking itself out of the ashes. I remember because I was in Europe in 1946 as president of Studebaker, surveying the prospects for the automobile business. What I saw made me think the prospects were not very good for the auto business or anything else. Everywhere too many people seemed to have a fatalistic resignation to inevitable collapse, followed by the triumph of communism, flourishing, as usual, on disaster.

When one visits Europe today it scarcely seems like the same place. It has miraculously risen from near prostration to the greatest prosperity in its history. Great Britain not only has a balanced budget but has built up her gold and dollar reserves through a phenomenally successful export drive. France's production has shot 32 percent ahead of its highest prewar level. The Low Countries have increased their prewar output by nearly 100 percent and are flowing like biblical lands with milk and honey. Even improverished Italy has struggled to her feet, while the recovery of Western Germany is the wonder of the world.

These things have happened because the free world has leaders who, for the first time, actively waged the peace.

Harry Truman deserves credit for seeing the need to put up $400 million to bolster the defenses of Greece and Turkey, making the latter strong enough to resist Soviet pressure and Greece strong enough to defeat the Communists in her civil war.

Gen. George Marshall, as Secretary of State, saw the need for the vaster concept of ECA. He conceived it, he told me recently, while sitting in the Kremlin after a stormy and

futile session of negotiations during the 1947 Moscow conference. During that meeting Marshall realized that the Soviets were counting on European collapse and would do everything they could to bring it about. Truman had the vision to back him in the Marshall plan. At that time the Republican Party controlled both the Senate and the House of Representatives; the leadership of the late, great Senator Arthur Vandenberg secured overwhelming bipartisan support for the plan, in and out of Congress.

However, the Marshall plan could not have succeeded had not Europe itself possessed the leaders able to see beyond their own national interests. As ECA Administrator I made my first trip to Europe in 1948 half fearful that the critics, who called it "Operation Rathole," might be right. But people like France's Foreign Minister Robert Schuman gave me courage. He insisted that Europe could be saved, but only by planning for the recovery of all Europe, including Germany. "The day has gone by," he said, "when we can afford to have the energies of the French people dissipated by opposing each other."

NO TIME FOR HATE

I was surprised to find the same attitude on the part of Dr. Dirk Stikker, foreign minister of the Netherlands, who I know had been a leader of the Dutch underground and had nearly lost his life to the Nazis innumerable times. I was startled when he stressed that the revival of Western Germany held the key to European recovery and told him so. I shall never forget his reply: "There is too much to do in Europe now to take time to hate."

Belgium's Premier Paul-Henri Spaak had equal vision. He insisted that all the countries must work closely together and his thinking went far beyond the present degree of cooperation to embrace something very close to a United States of Europe, with all trade barriers washed away and one great market for goods. And I found the same sort of foresight in Premier Alcide de Gasperi in Italy, a man facing problems burdensome beyond imagination but who could still say, "We must not let the recovery of Italy alone blind us to the need for the closest cooperation among the nations."

De Gasperi also helped educate me to the practical limitations of progress under Europe's habits and tempo. At the first meeting I had with him in 1948 I told him the American people could scarcely be expected to tax themselves to aid Italy if Italians continued to evade their own taxes.

"Have just a little patience," said De Gasperi. "Under our tax system today—and this has been true for 500 years—if an individual paid all the taxes he legally owes he would not have anything. For five centuries evading the tax collector has been the custom and the habit of Italy. We know we can never have a successful democracy here until we have tax morality, and we intend to bring that about. By next year, I assure you, we will have practically doubled the tax collection we have this year. But it can't be done overnight." He made good his word. Within a year tax collections were almost doubled.

Too many other political leaders helped importantly in waging the peace for me to mention them all here; but Churchill and Eden in Britain and John Foster Dulles in the United States cannot be omitted.

Ironically but fittingly, it was not the free world but the Communist world which experienced economic chaos and the danger of collapse. The Soviets are now in the midst of the major agricultural crisis as severe as that which hit the United States in the great depression. The short-lived Soviet effort to turn out consumer goods was a miserable flop and there is reason to think that the whole Russian economy is showing severe strain from efforts to carry out a crash program of atomic armament, plus a brash program of heavy bombers, plus aid to the Communist Chinese and the European satellites. All this came on top of what was already predominantly a war economy in a nation whose steel capacity is only one-third of America's and which is woefully short of electric power. The Russians are finding it impossible to produce both butter and guns and their people are getting restive.

THE MOMENT OF OPPORTUNITY

That is why the meeting at the summit is our oportunity. If the Russians, for whatever reason, are willing to let the cold war simmer down to competitive coexistence, I do not see how our free society can fail to win the competition. Up to now the Communists have not been in any hurry about resorting to war because their doctrine teaches them that time is on their side, that capitalism, being rotten, will collapse of its own weight. Only now are they beginning to discover that Karl Marx was criticizing a dead society, the capitalism of 1848, that United States capitalism, 1955 style, is more revolutionary than anything communism ever imagined and that it is their own vaunted system that is inefficient and cannot be made to work properly.

It is their system, not ours, that contains the seeds of its own destruction. Time is on our side, not theirs. If we can keep winning the peace, it is their system that eventually will have to come our way because their own people will discover for themselves that theirs does not work.

The important thing is that we not let any momentary lessening of tension lure us into making shortsighted economies in our four-front waging of the peace.

We must maintain our military strength but remember that it does nothing but buy us time, the time in which to try to win the peace by peaceful means.

We must increase our exertions on the economic front. Asia is the place where we must expend our greatest efforts in the decade to come. The future of the world may well rest on whether the young democracies of Asia are able to achieve prosperity and at the same time keep their freedom. We must not only help them but learn to be patient with them—though we do not necessarily always have to agree with them—and above all avoid any insistence that they develop along patterns preconceived by ourselves. Their sovereignty is very new for most of them and they are very properly sensitive about it.

There is still vast good will for America all over the Far East. Even where the press is antagonistic, as in India, I found nothing but good will toward me as an American. And in other countries the same thing holds. The prestige of America as the symbol of freedom, at its high peak in Asia when we freed the Philippines, lessened somewhat when we supported the French in Indochina, but it is still there.

THE TRUE REASON FOR GREATNESS

That is why the psychological, the informational, front of winning the peace is very important. We must make them understand the true reason for America's greatness. It is not because we have the highest standard of living. It is because every individual in our form of society is free to advance as far as his abilities can carry him; it is because we are the first truly classless society in the history of the world. These are the things that enabled us to create great abundance, but without these things that abundance would not be worth having.

The great recovery in Europe, which nobody thought could take place, has already had a big echo effect on the Russians, despite the Iron Curtain. Where there is no curtain, as in Berlin, the great prosperity of West Germans has had a dramatic impact on the East Germans. They can see for themselves the contrast between capitalist plenty and Communist privation, and can discern the relationship of plenty with freedom, privation with tyranny. The Russians have not been able to conceal from their own people or their satellites the disparity between the hardships of their lives and the relative abundance just across the Iron Curtain. The effect becomes cumulative: unrest in the satellites creates an explosive situation and the Soviets are forced to make some concessions, as in calling off the fight against Tito. Since that fight started because Tito refused to accept the status of a Soviet satellite, the effect of his success is bound to create a demand for greater freedom throughout the satellites. Freedom is a very infectious thing.

Transpose these conditions to Asia, where the contest is between the slave economy of the Red Chinese and the free societies of India, Japan, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines. If the latter, with our help, are able to prove that freedom moves faster and accomplishes more, then the impact upon the Chinese people will be just as great as the recovery of Europe has been upon Russia and its satellites.

These are the conditions for winning the peace. We must not expect to win it overnight. But win it we must, because the alternatives are too terrible. As Senator Vandenberg said, speaking of the struggle to achieve peace, "Here is the heart and core of humanity's hope for tomorrow. I know of no better hope."

Give Away to the Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Public Works will shortly report out a bill to provide Federal aid for highway construction. This bill, unless changed, provides for reimbursement of public utilities from Federal funds for required relocations of their facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal or national highway systems. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a very comprehensive letter from Mr. G. T. McCoy, California State highway engineer, which fully explains the inequities of such a provision.

The letter follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
Sacramento, July 15, 1955.

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: In further reference to the proposed Federal highway legislation which at this time is under consideration by the House Public Works Committee and may possibly be on the floor of the House by the time you receive this letter, I wish to advise that I am very much concerned about the provision in the Gore bill relative to reimbursement of public utilities for required relocations of their facilities which have been initially installed within State highway right-of-way of the several States under provisions requiring relocation at the expense

of the utility, when necessary, for highway reconstruction or maintenance operations.

There are several important factors in connection with the matter that I urge you to consider:

1. The obvious inequity of the Federal Government making it permissive for the States to pay for relocation costs out of highway funds is apparent if we ask ourselves this question: Why should utility relocation costs be passed on to the motorist instead of to the consumers of utility facilities in face of the fact that the utility and its consumers have received the benefit of free right-of-way use, which right-of-way was purchased in practically all States at the expense of the motorist?

2. It is the considered opinion of practically all State highway administrative officials that the Federal reimbursement sought by utilities is an intrusion upon State sovereignty and that any attempt to secure additional reimbursement at the Federal level will result in a serious disruption in the planning to eliminate the critical deficiencies on our nationwide street and highway system. While it is true that the proposed legislation is permissive and not mandatory, we are very certain from past experience that this is only the beginning of the overall utility company reimbursement program. If they get their foot in the door at this time, their next move will be to make the legislation mandatory rather than permissive. Another serious problem is the fact that this proposal by the utilities could well represent the entering wedge to overthrow the entire legal and judicial concept of the responsibility of utilities to highway authorities and the responsibility of highway authorities to utilities.

3. It appears that the utilities are attempting to establish through Federal legislation a vested right in particular locations in publicly owned highway right-of-way, and this in face of the fact that when they installed their facilities on publicly owned right-of-way they assumed the contractual obligation, in most cases, to relocate and readjust at their own expense if and when their facilities interfered with the orderly improvement and expansion of the publicly owned highway facility within the publicly owned right-of-way.

4. I wish to further call to your attention the point that both Federal and State constitutions require that just compensation be paid to all property owners for property or improvements taken for public purposes, and under these same constitutional provisions, utilities are now reimbursed for the value of land or rights in land taken from them and the cost of readjustment of their facilities when they own a private right-of-way or own fee title to the land. It follows that the only purpose of this legislation is to secure rights that they do not now enjoy without paying for such rights and that, further, they are attempting through Federal legislation to abrogate their existing contractual obliations with the several States.

5. This all adds up to the fact that utilities spokesmen in seeking to change the present policy on Federal reimbursement are seeking to exploit both the Federal Government, the States, and their local subdivisions. First, they have come to the State and local legislatures, seeking legislative sanction to establish themselves, free of charge, within the public highway right-of-way, agreeing that as a consideration for such permission they would remove their facilities at no cost to highway agencies. Now that they have obtained this valuable concession from the States and localities, they come to the Congress, seeking to have the Federal Government pay their relocation costs. We are unable to see any equity or justice in utility proposals of this kind.

6. It seems to highway officials that the utilities are seeking further subsidies from the Congress. State highway departments and the Federal Government have already been subsidizing utilities for many years by permitting them to make free use of the highway right-of-way and facilitating their maintenance operations at lower costs than would otherwise be possible. Moreover, the highway departments and Federal Government have been paying higher construction and maintenance costs to accommodate utilities in the highway right-of-way. Now the utilities are asking for further subsidies.

7. It might be well to consider whether the constitutional right exists to reimburse the utilities out of public funds for relocation in the highway right-of-way. Would this be making grants of public funds to private individuals or corporations, in violation of constitutional prohibitions?

8. Furthermore, we are fearful that the proposed Federal legislation would cause critical conflict between Federal and State laws which could possibly take years to adjust, causing a critical and unwarranted delay in the highway modernization program that is so badly needed to maintain the economy of our Nation.

California has solved this problem through the passage of enabling legislation by our legislature in a manner satisfactory to all parties concerned, and it is my considered opinion that the Congress should stand aside and give the States an opportunity to work out their own problem with public utilities.

Notwithstanding the fact that this utility reimbursement feature may be reported out of the House Public Works Committee, I urge you in all fairness to the motorists who will pay the cost of any planned Federal highway construction program to do everything possible to amend this utility reimbursement provision out of the Federal highway legislation presently being considered by the Congress.

If I can be of any further assistance, or supply you with any further information relative to this very important problem, I will appreciate your advising me as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

G. T. McCoy,
State Highway Engineer.

Robert A. Taft Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Rules Committee today approved a resolution to establish a memorial on the Capitol Grounds to the late distinguished Senator from Ohio, Robert A. Taft. In connection with this resolution, I would like to call your attention to an excellent editorial in the Geneva (Ohio) Free Press which points out that a memorial to Senator Taft "would be a memorial to an exalted concept of every Senator's obligation to represent all the people of a State to the best of his ability." I commend this article to your reading:

MEMORIAL TO TAFT

The proposal for a marble bell tower on the Capitol Grounds in Washington as a memorial to Robert A. Taft's senatorial service is being well received in Congress. A resolution to accept the structure from the Taft Foundation has been signed by the Ohioan's former political opponents as well as by his associates on the Republican side.

In a very real sense, this would be the justification of a Taft memorial close to the Capitol in Washington—the Ohioan's distinguished service in dignifying and enhancing the two-party system of politics at a juncture in American history when pressure was strong for one-party totalitarian government.

Taft made his mark as the leader of a loyal opposition. He became a symbol of the personal integrity in public life that keeps politics from deteriorating into an utterly ruthless war of survival. His very presence in the Senate became a guaranty to millions of his countrymen that their affairs were in dependable hands.

He was as quick to protect railroad workers against a threat of being drafted into the Army by an angry Chief Executive as he was to protect the legal concept of trying war criminals under ex post facto laws. He dared to put his name on an overdue law protecting the rights of citizens against strong-armed labor leaders, knowing he would be persecuted by the unions. He became a champion of personal welfare even while his opponents were slandering him as a defender of property rights.

He pondered every problem conscientiously in the light of the latest facts that had bearing on it and could change his mind when the weight of the evidence shifted—the mark of real greatness.

No Senator in the 20th century has done more to restore faith in the constitutional concept of representative government than Taft. A memorial to him on the Capitol Grounds would be a memorial to an exalted concept of every Senator's obligation to represent all the people of a State to the best of his ability.

Mrs. Pearl C. Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I call the attention of the Members of the House to an event of great significance occurring recently in Dallas, Tex. Our President, himself, saw fit to comment and so it is that I respectfully submit a letter from the President of the United States to Mrs. Pearl C. Anderson and a résumé of a story that lies behind it, which can be an inspiration to many of the citizens of this great country:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 4, 1955.

MRS. PEARL C. ANDERSON,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MRS. ANDERSON: Through Congressman BRUCE ALGER I have learned of your recent gift to the Dallas Community Chest. I understand that your making this gift is one of many acts of kindness and charity by which you, and your husband during his lifetime, have helped others—regardless of race or creed—to have a better life. Beyond this, the spirit which underlies such gifts as yours cannot fail to be an inspiration to all who know it.

With all who honor you I join in warm applause.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Midtown Dallas business property conservatively valued in excess of $200,000 was conveyed to the Dallas County Community Chest trust fund Saturday by Mrs. Pearl C. Anderson, a leading Negro citizen.

Mrs. Anderson is a member of the board of directors of the Dallas Council of Social Agencies, a member of the Community Chest.

The property henceforth will be administered by the trust with the net income to go during her lifetime to Mrs. Anderson. Upon her passing, the funds derived from the properties will be known as the Pearl C. Anderson fund in the trust.

The property is located in the 1700 blocks on Jackson and Wood Streets, between Ervay and St. Paul. It is half a block from the new Statler-Hilton Hotel.

The gift was made known at a meeting at the Baker Hotel of the officers and directors of the trust fund and prominent Dallas leaders. Earl Forsythe, of the firm of Worsham, Forsythe & Riley, who is legal counsel of the trust fund, prepared and presented the legal instrument to the board of trustees.

The property has a front of approximately 81 feet on Jackson and 76 feet on Wood. Its deepest point dissecting the block from Jackson to Wood is 182 feet. It includes four 2-story buildings, a small parking lot, and three garages.

The gift continues the philanthropic work begun many years ago by Mrs. Anderson and her husband, Dr. J. W. Anderson, who died in 1947.

She credits the Rosenwald Foundation which established the grammar school in Winn Parish, Louisiana, where she attended school, with inspiring her determination to improve her own lot and to help others improve theirs.

"I hope that one day I would be able to do something like that for others," Mrs. Anderson said. "As a member of the board of directors of the Council of Social Agencies I have seen the great needs, and have been thinking about what I could do.

"Then I learned about the community chest trust fund. It covers the very things I want to do, and deep in my heart I feel that my gift can do the greatest good through this trust fund."

Harold F. Volk, president of the trust fund, was appraised of Mrs. Anderson's gift Saturday at Kansas City, where he is visiting his mother who recently underwent an operation. Mr. Volk is en route home from Europe. In acknowledging the gift, he said:

"This magnificent contribution is a true investment in humanity. With her gift, Mrs. Anderson will help immeasurably to better social conditions by perpetuating the services of health and welfare agencies in Dallas County. I believe I can speak for the entire community, which will benefit from her generosity, in expressing gratitude to Mrs. Anderson."

Fred M. Lange, executive vice president of the trust fund, hailed the gift as one of the noblest in the history of Dallas.

"This is one of our community's finest examples of effective philantrophy," he said. "It also is tangible evidence that those who understand our community's needs, as Mrs. Anderson does, will want to help now and in the future to insure their being met."

J. B. Adoue, Jr., vice president of the trust fund, presided in the absence of Mr. Volk.

The trust fund is a perpetual account, its yearly incomes to maintain, repair, improve, or enlarge properties of the community chest agencies, to contribute toward operating expenses and support of any specified philantrophic agency, and to endow or otherwise benefit any designated institution, memorial, or other trust fund.

Guests at the Saturday meeting honoring Mrs. Anderson included other officers and members of the trust fund board of trustees, Henry S. Miller, Sr., secretary and treasurer; R. R. Gilbert, J. L. Latimer, B. F. McLain, John E. Mitchell, Jr., and Mr. Forsythe; Karl Hoblitzelle, creator of the Hoblitzelle Foundation which build the Hexter Memorial Lighthouse for the Blind, a chest agency; C. A. Tatum, Jr., chest president; Dick Price, chest executive committee chairman; Les T. Potter, chest campaign chairman; Mrs. John P. Walker, Jr., chest vice president; Dr. John F. Anderson, Jr., chest church relations committee chairman; George Allen, board member; and William L. Crawford III, executive director of the chest; the Reverend Thomas J. Shipp, president of the Council of Social Agencies; Roy Dulak, executive secretary of the council.

The Reverend Luther Holcomb attended and gave the invocation. Dr. Anderson gave the benediction.

In the instrument of conveyance, Mrs. Anderson expressed a preference, but did not make it a condition, that the property be used "regardless of race, color, or creed, for the care of needy men, women, and children, and for aiding, reformation, or relief for victims of narcotic drugs, intoxicating liquor, released inmates of penal and reformatory institutions, wayward or delinquent children or adults."

Two of the four buildings are occupied by business offices. The 2-story stone-faced building at 1716 Jackson was constructed by Dr. Anderson in 1922, and was the Anderson home until 1948. The adjacent building, 1718 Jackson, housed his medical offices. A restaurant is in the building at 1800 Jackson.

The property on Wood includes a 2-story apartment hotel, the parking lot, and garages.

Mrs. Anderson has been active many years in the health and welfare services in Dallas, and with her husband made contributions to institutions in the South and Southwest.

She is a member of the board of the Council of Social Agencies, a member of the regional and Dallas boards of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and a member of the operating committee of the Hexter Memorial Lighthouse for the Blind.

Long active in YWCA work, she is a member of the board of Maria Morgan Branch for Negroes.

Mrs. Anderson provides college educations for members of her own race through private gifts and through two established scholarships, one at Texas College in Tyler and one at Oak Ridge College in Huntsville, Ala.

Because of her gratitude to the Rosenwald Foundation for schools in her native Louisiana, Mrs. Anderson has been a contributor each year to the Jewish Welfare Federation, a community chest agency.

Before Dr. Anderson's death, Dr. and Mrs. Anderson contributed leadership and monetary assistance to the YMCA in Dallas. He contributed generously toward the construction of Moorland branch, and in the early 1930's they established a temporary camp for YMCA boys at their summer home, Gasita del Campo, located on a 16-acre tract 10 miles northwest of Dallas.

Another notable gift was to the Children's Hospital of Texas, one of the first subscriptions to this chest agency. He also was a heavy contributor to Freeman Memorial Clinic, a chest agency, churches, orphanages, colleges, and high schools, and became known as a leading Negro philanthropist.

The Anderson Anatomical Hall was given to Meharry Medical College at Nashville, Tenn., his alma mater, by Dr. Anderson. As a student there, he had dissected in an old barn.

Mrs. Anderson is a life member of the Women's Auxiliary of Goodwill Industries, receiving the honor last week. She is a member of St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church, and formerly was a member of the Dallas deanery of the National Council of Catholic Women.

The Taipei Conference May 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, with all the conferences that have been going on this year I feel the attention of the House should be called to a genuine anti-Communist meeting which was scheduled for May of 1955. This was the Taipei Conference which was held informally instead of officially due to a last-minute technicality. Since this Conference has received little publicity and little information about it has been made available, I desire to call a few facts about the Conference to the attention of the Members:

The Asian Peoples Anti-Communist League was formed at the instigation of the Republic of Korea for the purpose of welding all anti-Communist peoples of Asia into a united force against communism. Although the organization is ostensibly nongovernmental, the Governments of the Republic of Korea and the Republic of China have taken a great interest in its activities. The League held its first conference at Chinhae in the Republic of Korea in June, 1954. The conference was attended by delegations from Vietnam, Formosa, Thailand, the Philippines, the Ryukyu Islands, and Nationalist Chinese delegations from Hong Kong and mainland China. It was in an address to this first conference that President Syngman Rhee offered to send 2 Korean divisions to aid in the fight against Communist aggression in Indochina. The conference elected Dr. Kyu Nam Choi of Korea as secretary general and determined to hold its second conference in Taipei, Formosa during 1955.

The Taipei meeting was scheduled to commence on May 23, 1955. In addition to representatives from Korea, the Republic of China, the Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, the Ryukyus, Hong Kong and Macao, the countries which had joined the League, observers were expected from 8 other countries including Japan, Turkey, Cambodia, Laos, and Malaya. In addition the conference was to be attended by 2 representatives of an organization known as the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations which has its headquarters in Munich, Germany. These were Yaroslow Stetzko, formerly Prime Minister of the Ukraine, and Domitro Waltsheff, a former Foreign Minister of Bulgaria. Chiang Kai-shek was scheduled to address the conference.

At the last minute the conference was indefinitely postponed due to the objection of the Republic of Korea to the scheduled attendance of observers from Japan. According to the Chinese News Service Information Bulletin Korea also objected to the admission of Japan and India to the League on the grounds that these two countries were "flirting with communism" and were "pro-Communist."

Even though the conference was postponed many of the delegates were already en route to Formosa. An informal conference was therefore held at Taipei on May 30 and 31, 1955. There were 26 delegates from Formosa, Japan, Hong Kong, Pakistan, Turkey, Burma, the Ryukyus and the National Alliance of Russian Solidarists.

It was announced that the conference determined upon positive action to increase their resistance to communism through such means as exchange of information. The delegates reportedly branded peaceful coexistence, neutralism and isolationism as

suicidal means of combating implacable communism.

This information was compiled by the Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include some very excellent factual data on the subject of Dixon-Yates as expressed by our colleague, Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, on the Dave Garroway program last Thursday morning. A transcript of his interview follows:

Mr. BLAIR. Good morning, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. Good morning, Mr. Blair.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. HALLECK, why did the President cancel the Dixon-Yates contract?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, fundamentally he canceled the Dixon-Yates contract not because of any victory for the opponents of Dixon-Yates but because the city of Memphis finally agreed to do what they should have done in the first instance by saying they would build their own steam generating plant.

Now, before I get any further, Mr. Blair, I want to thank you for having me on this program. There have been so many misleading charges, and not only misleading but I say downright false, that on occasion it seems to me that they are trying to work up some issue that would be about the equivalent of the squirrels on the White House lawn.

Now, the fact of the matter is that the people of Memphis came up here almost 2 years ago. They saw the President. And he said to them then, Why don't you build your own steam generating plant? Well, they said, you don't understand; this is a way of life down here. Well, I suppose it is a way of life, and certainly with 140,000 thousand homes down there being heated with electrical energy that is subsidized by the taxpayers of all the country, I can understand that, too.

You see, in the TVA area we are getting up to where 70 percent of the power will be generated by steam plants, not by falling water in hydroelectric plants.

Well, in any event, the people of Memphis said that they weren't going to build their own steam plant. Then of course, there was a shortage impending, and the President—at the President's direction began through the Budget Bureau and the Atomic Energy Commission the negotiation of a contract, two of which similar contracts had been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission, one at Portsmouth, Ohio, and another at Paducah, Ky., to supply power in that Memphis area. And that progressed until in the House of Representatives, the President having said that he would not ask for a further appropriation to build further steam plants in the Tennessee Valley, the Appropriations Committee put in a provision to commit the taxpayers of all the country to spend another $100 million to build another TVA steam plant. And when that came on the floor of the House of Representatives, it was decisively defeated.

And so the city of Memphis said, well, we will build our own steam plant. Now, if they had said that in the beginning, there never would have been any Dixon-Yates contract.

Mr. BLAIR. Of course the other side claims, Mr. HALLECK, that the White House knew about the Memphis plant beforehand. You disagree with that?

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly do. As a matter of fact, the President in his budget message in January 1954, a year and a half ago, specifically said that plans were under way to acquire from private utilities 500,000 or 600,000 kilowatts of power in that area. So those people knew all the time this whole program was being developed. They knew what the score was. The representatives of Tennessee, and I don't blame them for fighting for what they want down there, came up here and demanded that we put up another $100 million to build another steam plant in the Tennessee Valley.

Now, I think that the people of this country ought to understand what the real issue is here, not a lot of cheap things that have been talked about.

The issue is whether or not we would go along with a just, fair, and decent contract, openly arrived at, good for the people of Tennessee, the people of Memphis, and good for the country, or, would we appropriate another $100 million on to a billion, $500 million we have already sent down there out of the taxpayers' money to build another steam generating plant, to produce subsidized, below-cost power to the advantage of that section of the country against all other sections of the country which do not have such a favorable arrangement.

Mr. BLAIR. The way you are talking this morning, Mr. HALLECK, it certainly sounds to us like you feel the issue is not completely dead?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, the issue of Dixon-Yates is dead. Memphis has said it is going to build its own steam plant. Well, that is what my little town of Rensselaer, Ind., did when I was just a kid. That is what Los Angeles did.

Now, if they want to borrow $100 million, pay interest on it, and build their own plant, that's fine. You see, TVA doesn't pay interest on the money the taxpayers of this country have advanced. They have had $1,500 million for power purposes already; at 3 percent a year that is $45 million that the taxpayers are putting up every year for the production of the energy down there.

Now there is quite a revolt on in Memphis, I understand. A lot of solid cittizens there think that this is a tragic mistake as far as Memphis is concerned. But certainly they have burned their bridges. They have said they are going to build their own steam plant, which will mean that the Atomic Energy Commission can get the power it needs from the TVA and go on with its business.

Mr. BLAIR. You know it has been charged by the other side of this question that it was improper for Mr. Adolph Wenzell to advise the Bureau of the Budget in this matter when his company, the First Boston Co., was to be a financing agency in the project. Would you clarify that for us?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, Mr. Blair, that is another one of the things that really have nothing to do with the issue. Wenzell, I don't know what part he played. I never saw the man in my life, but I would like the people of this country to know that as one of the congressional leaders, I sat in on White House meetings when the President was there, and Joe Dodge, the former Director of the Budget, and Rowland Hughes, the present Director, Admiral Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, this whole program of the contract was outlined for us. And I approved of it. I think it was a good contract to meet existing circumstances—even as the Paducah and Portsmouth contracts entered into in the time of President Truman were good contracts for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Now, as the President pointed out in a letter to STERLING COLE, of New York—Congressman COLE—here is what he said as to the fundamental issue: "My general thinking on the subject is this, it seems to me that all arguments for the construction by the Federal Government for the additional steam plant ignore this one and very important truth. If the Federal Government assumes responsibility in perpetuity for providing the TVA area with all the power it can accept, generated by any other means whatsoever, it has a similar responsibility with respect to every other area and region and corner of the United States of America."

In other words, the Wabash River in Indiana is quite famous. It goes through my district. Suppose we got the Federal Government to put up a little money to build a few Federal dams. We couldn't generate much power. We would generate a little. And then, after we got that going, we would come on down here and say you have got to build steam plants. We get the money. We pay no interest on it. Keep that in mind. The TVA doesn't pay normal taxes, so we could avail ourselves of the same right that is had in the Tennessee Valley region. And of course we would have this cheap subsidized power. But I ask you, who is going to pay those bills? And wouldn't that result in final socialization of the whole power industry?

Now, if that is what people want, why they can have it that way, but as far as I am concerned, I don't want it that way, and I know the President of the United States doesn't want it that way. And I must say, at this point, that some of these charges that even attack his integrity, coming from the area down there where we have gone along putting up a billion, five hundred million dollars to give them a more advantageous position than the rest of us, for them to attack the integrity of the great President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, at this very hour when he is going over to Geneva at what may be one of the most momentous conferences of all time, I say it comes with poor grace.

Mr. BLAIR. Of course, this is a domestic issue, Mr. HALLECK, and I fail to see too much connection with the Geneva Conference on it.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, possibly it has no connection with the Geneva Conference——

Mr. BLAIR. But let's talk about the——

Mr. HALLECK. That may be true, but at the same time, speaking for myself, that is the way I feel about it.

Mr. BLAIR. How about the 1956 elections? Do you think this business is going to have any effect on that?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I would say that in the areas, I don't know what the effect will be in Tennessee. I suppose that their frantic efforts to try to force us to put up another $100 million to build another steam generating plant was a kind of frantic effort, because if I may say so, it looks maybe as if the gravy train is running out down there. And I think the time has come for TVA to mature.

Mr. BLAIR. What do you mean by "mature," Mr. HALLECK?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, are we to go on, ad infinitum, as the President says, to pump more of the taxpayers' money, without interest, down there, to spread out, I don't know how far in their operations?

Now, then, as far as the issue is concerned, you know the reason we won that fight in the House of Representatives, and it did not involve the Dixon-Yates contract. It involved the simple question: Are we going to appropriate another $100 million to build

another steam generating plant at Fulton, Tenn.? The reason we won was that all over this country Members of Congress are beginning to hear from back home; they are beginning to find out that their people are just getting a little tired of continuing to pour money into this operation which in the final analysis, with its subsidized below-cost power, actually is siphoning off industries from New England, from New York, from Pennsylvania, and other areas where we have to build our own plants, borrow our own money, pay interest on it, pay taxes—but through a private utility—and do all of the other things.

If there is any issue, I will say that outside of the State of Tennessee or those immediate adjacent areas—and I am not even so sure of that down there—the people of the country will applaud the stand that the President of the United States has taken—that the Republicans in the Congress of the United States, aided by a lot of Democrats all over the country, who likewise see this thing as we do——

Mr. BLAIR. Charlie——

Mr. HALLECK. I say, the issue would be on our side.

Mr. BLAIR. Charlie, just time for one more question. I wonder, why don't you propose that the Government sell the TVA to private power interests?

Mr. HALLECK. No one has proposed that, may I say, in our plan. Maybe some have proposed it. We realize that the TVA which started out as a hydroelectric proposition—and may I refer to the original act of 1933 which says it is primarily for navigation and flood control, with the incidental development of power—of course the incidental now is 70 percent. But no one seeks to sell the TVA so far as I know.

Mr. BLAIR. Well, we certainly thank you, Mr. HALLECK, for being our guest this morning and giving us the other side of an issue that has been debated and that seems to still be raging in our Nation's Capital. Thank you very much.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Waco Times Herald of July 7, 1955:

GOOD NEWS OF STRICKEN SENATOR

The news that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, felled by a heart attack last Saturday, is recovering and may ultimately resume the duties of majority leader in the Senate next year, is welcome indeed.

Not only the Senate, but the Nation, needs his leadership. A résumé of Senator JOHNSON'S accomplishments since January 1, 1953, when he became the Democratic leader in the Senate, gives full proof that the United States has been served well by the tall, soft-spoken, hard-driving Texan.

Despite the recent exchange of political barbs between Senator JOHNSON and President Eisenhower, the two men, leading the two major political parties insofar as the Nation's affairs are concerned, have provided the kind of moderate but principled direction that best represents the American people. The President owes more to Senator JOHNSON than he is likely to admit, since the Texas dynamo has surely made the difference in the Senate between what could have been a strife-riven stalemate and the functional lawmaking body that it now is.

At 47, Senator JOHNSON still has resilience and stamina. Under the best care, which he is certain to have, and with God's help, he can go back to his position in the driver's seat of the Democratic Party in plenty of time to be effective during crucial 1956.

For Inter-American Unity—Joint Effort To Combat Communist Infiltration Is Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of June 4, 1955:

FOR INTER-AMERICAN UNITY—JOINT EFFORT TO COMBAT COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IS URGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Rumors of continued unrest in Guatemala highlight the problem of Communist infiltration and propaganda for all the people of the Americas. For the poor economic condition of some of these people makes them particularly vulnerable to Communist and Fascist propaganda. Since the people of the Americas are our best customers as well as the suppliers of many vital raw materials and since we have long been the defender of their freedom from European aggression, it behooves us to join with them in fighting off the atheistic Communist menace.

Our problem in the Americas is to sell the American way of life to the people who do not listen to our broadcasts, who have no TV's and at best read only what the Government-controlled press wishes them to read. The benefits of our free capitalistic enterprise system, our democratic Government, the very real contributions of American business to their industries, their standard of living, their culture must be made clear to these people.

It is my firm belief that this can be accomplished by reaching the youth of the country, for they are the future leaders.

As Ambassador to the Dominican Republic I wrestled with the problem and arranged to set up a scholarship at the University of Santo Domingo based on an essay which would require the applicant to delve thoroughly into our way of life, our economic system, the economic and military unity of our two countries, the economic contributions of the United States to their way of life. The university accepted my personal check and invested it in local bonds to yield a sum sufficient to cover the tuition of the essay contest winner. This endowment was made in perpetuity. The essay topics would be picked by the judges—the United States Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, the rector of the university and the director of the Dominican-American Cultural Institute.

It is my considered opinion that a similar plan, organized under the sponsorship and supervision of the Organization of American States, will be a powerful force in reaching the youth of the Americas with prodemocratic facts. This organization is ideally suited for such a task since it is made up of the representatives of every country in the Americas (except Canada). The cost is comparatively little, for tuition in most of their state universities is less than $100 a year. The resultant benefits should not be underestimated.

In such a study there can only be one result—a respect for the American way of life and a rejection of communism. If our Government is reluctant to finance such a project I am certain that it would be possible to enlist support from our industries operating in these countries and from educational foundations.

We cannot win the cold war by simply exposing Communist lies. We must win the minds of the people.

PHELPS PHELPS.

NEWARK, N. J., *May 27, 1955.*

Surplus Property Should Be Made Available to Local Civil Defense Units

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, during consideration of H. R. 4660, Freeholder William H. Falcey, Director of Civil Defense and Disaster Control of Mercer County, N. J., presented the following statement to the Special Government Activities Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Freeholder Falcey urged that surplus property of no use to educational or health organizations or the Veterans' Administration should be made available to local civil defense units such as that of Mercer County of which he is director. It would seem to be just that local civil defense units should be eligible for such property, supplies, and equipment.

The text of Mr. Falcey's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. FALCEY, DIRECTOR, CIVIL DEFENSE AND DISASTER CONTROL OF MERCER COUNTY, N. J., IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 4660, A MEASURE TO MAKE CIVIL DEFENSE UNITS ELIGIBLE FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. Chairman and members of the Special Government Activities Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, as director of the Mercer County, N. J., Civil Defense and Disaster Control Organization, I am well aware of the great need of a variety of property, supplies and equipment which might become available should H. R. 4660 become law.

Surplus property of no use to educational or health organizations, or the Veterans' Administration, would become available to local civil defense units such as the one of which I am director. It would seem only just to include civil defense organizations among those eligible for surplus property. Presently, the people of Mercer County pay taxes to the Federal Government for the purchase of property for the military, and when it is declared surplus the people of my county are doubly taxed as this property is resold at high cost to its civil defense unit. This appears to be a rather inequitable practice which H. R. 4660 would serve to remedy.

Passage of H. R. 4660 would, in my opinion, constitute one of the finest contributions toward the development of a civil defense that this Congress can render the Nation.

The President Is Requested To Demand Polish Freedom During the Meeting at the Summit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to include copy of the letter I addressed to the President, under date of July 13, 1955, urging him to demand, at the summit meeting, a Soviet guaranty of Polish liberation as evidence of the sincerity of the Russians to cooperate for world peace. President Eisenhower replied under date of July 14 and wrote in part:

I assure you that the matter will have our earnest consideration.

My letter of July 13 to the President follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As you prepare for the coming meeting at Geneva, I am sure you must be inspired from the knowledge that the prayers and the trust and the hopes of all the American people are going with you on your most difficult mission.

I am equally certain that, while your heart is hopeful, you are most keenly aware that unless some understanding of the basic problems currently generating atomic war tensions and preventing full peaceful agreement is arrived at, the conference may accomplish little other than another manifestation of the good will and intentions of the United States.

In that concept, therefore, may I most respectfully but earnestly urge upon you the advisability of including a request at the Conference for the Kremlin leaders to reveal plans for the liberation of the enslaved peoples of Poland whose tragic fate is an ever-present blot upon the character and honor of this country and the United Nations.

If such a request is refused, it most certainly would have to be interpreted as clear evidence of the continuing insincerity of the new Russian technique of apparent peace seeking while still adamantly adhering to their historically recorded objective of eventual world enslavement.

I am sure you will agree that the granting of freedom to the brave and heroic Christian people of Poland is basic to any honest negotiations of the United States with the Russian Government, and such concession by the Kremlin is essential to the accomplishment of peace in the world today.

I realize full well that your own heart and efforts are devoted to the promotion of freedom for Poland and all the other subjugated nations, and I am confident you will do all that you can at this Conference to persuade the Russian representatives to permit the Polish people to regain their free self-government, while reminding them that the United States will never abandon either the Poles or any other nation suffering unjust subjugation by a despotic power.

May God bless you and be ever with you in your heavy responsibility.

Very sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
Member of Congress.

There Can Be No Lasting Peace Without Russian Guaranties of Freedom to the Enslaved Peoples of Lithuania and the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert a copy of my letter of July 13, 1955, to the President requesting him to include, on the agenda of summit meeting discussion, a demand that the Kremlin representatives demonstrate the honesty of their loudly declared desire for a peaceful world by promising freedom to the persecuted peoples of Lithuania and the other Baltic States. The President acknowledged receipt of my request on July 14 and wrote in part:

I can assure you that the matter will have our earnest consideration.

My letter to President Eisenhower follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1955.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On the eve of your departure for the historical summit meeting with other Western Power representatives and the Soviets, the full support of the Congress, the confidence of the American people, and the prayers of all the Christian world are combined for the success of your mission.

I am positive that the most intensive work has been devoted to the assembly of proposals to be advanced by you at the Conference in providing a foundation upon which all parties can agree to work together toward easing the tensions of threatening atomic war and cooperatively pursue the practically universal desire for world peace.

Among such basic proposals, may I most respectfully advocate the inclusion of a request for the Kremlin representatives to promptly exhibit the honesty of their declared desire for a peaceful world by announcing their intention to bestow freedom upon Lithuania and the other subjugated Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia.

As a premise to such a request, the Soviet representatives might well be reminded that they were among the signers of the Atlantic Charter which solemnly guaranteed, and I quote, "Every Nation's right to a form of government and an economic system of its own choosing is inalienable. Any Nation's attempt to dictate to another Nation their form of government is indefensible."

You and I well realize from the history of our own country, and I am sure the Soviet officials very well realize it also, that peace cannot be attained in either a nation or a world that is half slave and half free.

From personal knowledge of your own sentiments on this subject, I am certain you will exercise every persuasion to convince the Russians that the solution of this basic problem of enslaved peoples is essential to any progress toward a peaceful world and that without such solution the Conference could be productive of no lasting contribution to peace.

Praying God's blessing upon your mission, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE.

The Economic Challenge of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a most interesting address by Millard Cass, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, which was recently brought to my attention. Mr. Cass' speech was made to the Men's Club, Ohef Sholom Temple, Norfolk, Va., on May 19, 1955:

THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGE OF PEACE

(Address by Millard Cass, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, before Men's Club, Ohef Sholom Temple, Norfolk, Va., May 19, 1955)

Peace is one of man's most cherished dreams. Yet through some 60 centuries of recorded history it has been one of his most elusive goals. Like hunger, which is a common enemy of all mankind, war has been the threatened or actual scourge of virtually every generation. And for the past 40 years, there has been a war somewhere in the world at nearly all times. This record of devastation and bloodshed does not augur well for man's ability to live at peace with man.

Nevertheless, the terrible weapons devised in recent years make it imperative that mankind work for peace. The time has passed when peace can be a pious hope. Everyone, everywhere must now work to make it a reality.

We Americans are striving for peace with every resource at our command. We are doing it through international organizations such as the United Nations and its affiliated agencies, through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the South East Asia Treaty Organization, and through military and economic aid to countries that want to be free.

Our job is complicated by the fact that much of the world does not understand and, therefore, does not fear communism. Many countries are so preoccupied with obtaining the basic necessities of life that it is difficult to alert them to the Communist menace.

It is hard to arouse people whose backs are bowed from primitive labors to oppose communism because it destroys their right to walk erect as free and proud human beings.

It is hard to explain to people who have never known democracy and personal liberty that communism destroys their right to pursue a free way of life.

It is hard to tell people who never have enough to eat that communism cannot support a high standard of living.

It is hard to tell people who live in mud huts, or never saw a toilet, or have no doctor within reach that our free-enterprise economy is far more efficient and productive than communism.

It is hard to espouse the doctrine of private property to people who have never had either privacy or property.

In spite of these difficulties, we must get our message across to people who want to be free. Consequently, we must carry our message in terms others can understand—in terms of bread as well as broadcasts; in

terms of medicine as well as munitions; in terms of clothing as well as cooperation; in terms of plows as well as planes; in terms of tractors as well as tanks.

On April 27, President Eisenhower appraised the world situation and concluded that the outlook for peace had brightened as a result of recent signs of abating East-West tension. Since then, the United States, Britain, and France have invited the Soviet Union to a top-level meeting designed to remove sources of conflict between us, and the invitation has been accepted. And on May 15, an Austrian treaty of independence was signed by the Big Four nations.

These developments make it appropriate to consider what will happen to our economy if the outlook for peace continues to improve. For at least 40 years the economy of the entire world has been affected directly or indirectly by war, preparation for war, or the aftermath of war. How would we Americans meet the economic challenge of peace?

Voltaire once said, "If you wish to converse with me, define your terms." Perhaps, therefore, I should define at the outset what I mean by peace.

In a world in which communism exists, peace must be based upon strength—political, economic, and military. We Americans will undoubtedly continue to maintain these three kinds of strength.

In the words of Walt Whitman:

"For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land or life if freedom fail?"

Realistically, therefore, peace in a world that is almost one-third Communist will not permit the complete abolition of Armed Forces. But is reasonable to hope in long-term objectives for at least a reduction in armaments on a worldwide basis and some kind of limitation on the use of nuclear weapons. The question, therefore, is what would happen to our economy if in the near future the United States were able, for example, to reduce defense expenditures and our Armed Forces by say one-fourth in 1 year or over a short period of years? If we could tighten our defense belt, could be expand our civilian consumption enough to take up the slack and keep our employment high and our country prosperous?

Recently we had a preview of what would happen. Since 1953, we Americans have adjusted to an international situation in which we must be prepared without being mobilized and which resulted in a one-fourth reduction in our defense budget in 2 years. How did we meet the economic challenge this created?

In the 18 months following the cease-fire in Korea, defense expenditures were reduced by some $10 billion. A softness soon appeared in the manufacturing end of the economy which persisted until the fall of 1954. During this adjustment period our economy proved its strength and resilience. We demonstrated that we could successfully absorb such a reduction in defense spending and still keep our economy at a high level, even when there was no deferred demand such as supported our prosperity immediately after World War II.

We made this adjustment and came bouncing back to a high level of prosperity. In fact, 1955 may well be the most prosperous peacetime year in American history.

It is a safe bet that this year's gross national production will substantially exceed the record set in 1953. The automobile industry is anticipating the biggest year in its history. Steel output is at record levels. Expenditures on new plant and equipment in 1955 are expected to exceed those in 1954 and be second only to the record rate in 1953. Housing construction is also at record levels.

Employment rose sharply in April and is now in excess of 61 million. Unemployment, at 3 million, is 4.6 percent of the labor force. It is likely that the rate of unemployment will average less than this during the rest of 1955.

The renewed strength of the economy, in terms of both production and employment, has been primarily due to civilian consumer demand. This national rise in the demand for consumer goods is based upon the record incomes of our people. The amount of money that people have left to spend after taxes and social-security deductions is at an all-time high.

The general stability in consumer prices over the past year has helped the worker stretch his pay envelope even further because his wages are increasing while his living costs are remaining relatively constant. This means he has more real purchasing power from his wages. As Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has said, "With the purchasing power of the average worker rising to new highs, there is every reason to believe that 1955 will be the best year on record for American workers and their families."

All of these facts show that we have mastered the problem of converting from a defense-oriented economy to one in which peacetime production predominates, but in which there is still a substantial level of defense expenditures. At present defense spending, including atomic energy and foreign military assistance, is just over 10 percent of our total production of goods and services.

Can we retain this general prosperity if there is either a sharp or a steady but gradual decline in defense expenditures? Are our purely peacetime needs strong enough to encourage and support high and expanding levels of production and employment? I believe the answer is definitely "Yes." It is safe to predict that we will continue to prosper and that we can meet the economic challenge of peace.

If defense expenditures and the Armed Forces were reduced, for example, by one quarter, what problems would we face? Such a cutback, by the way, sounds large, but actually it would be less than 3 percent of our total current output of goods and services.

First of all, in this hypothetical situation we would have to increase our civilian consumption of goods and services by around $9 billion just to make up for the reduction in defense spending. In addition, we would have to provide employment for three-fourths of a million men who would otherwise be in the Armed Forces. These would be over and above the preexisting need to absorb into the labor force a net growth of more than half a million men and women a year who enter it from schools, colleges, and the ranks of the housewives.

How would we do all of this? Well, I believe we would do it the same way we did it between 1953 and 1955. We would have a little trouble with our economic digestion for a while and then come back feeling better than ever.

The reasons why we could make this transition from defense activity to peacetime prosperity are the same reasons why we did it since Korea.

The four major factors which will keep demand for consumer products high and the peacetime needs of our people growing are (1) our rapidly increasing population, (2) our efforts to obtain an ever-higher standard of living, (3) a reduction in taxes that would undoubtedly follow any substantial curtailment of defense outlays and would enable consumers and businessmen to substitute their expenditures for those of the Government, and (4) the confidence of our people in the Government's determination and ability to help promote prosperity.

The recent increase in our birthrate and the gradual reduction in our death rate have both been dramatic. Last year births exceeded 4 million for the first time in our history, while the death rate was at an all-time low. Demographic experts now predict that our population will increase to between 200 and 220 million by 1975. This increase in population will stimulate the peacetime economy by creating growing markets for the products of farm and factory.

While our standard of living is already the highest in the world, there is no limit to what we Americans expect and will get in the way of increased comforts and services. The new products which are constantly being developed, the backlog of demand for existing products, the need for replacement, and the demands created by expansion of productive capacity all create heavy peacetime demands which will support a high-level economy. In addition, the distribution of income in our country is now so much more equitable that millions of families aspire to have comforts and conveniences which once were out of their reach.

We have been building over a million homes a year for 6 years, yet still have failed to provide literally millions of our people with the housing they need and want. There are housing demands created by our increasing population and by the need to replace or modernize dilapidated or substandard homes. Here is only one source of demand that should keep business booming. Many of our modern postwar homes are already inadequate and many of us have had to add bedrooms, half-baths, and recreation rooms.

While we have so much more than any other country in the way of modern conveniences, our demand for these products is obviously far from the saturation point. You may be surprised to learn, for example, that, in 1950, 25 percent of our American homes had no inside toilet facilities, 6 percent had no electricity, and 20 percent had no mechanical refrigeration.

Housing construction brings with it a demand for the thousand and one items which go into making a house a home—furniture, draperies, rugs, stoves, refrigerators, washing machines, radios, television sets, lawn mowers, and rakes. It also brings increased need for electric power, heating fuel, water, roads, sewers, libraries, schools, hospitals, and shopping centers.

It is well recognized that there is a substantial backlog of needed school and road construction. Our school construction has not caught up with the increased birthrate and rising educational standards. In the next 10 years we will need to spend at least $41 billion to meet increased needs resulting from population growth and to replace obsolete school buildings.

The tremendous postwar production of automobiles and trucks has outdistanced our road-building program. We have some 60 million vehicles on the road today, and our roads were designed for only half that number. By 1965 we expect to have 80 million vehicles in use. President Eisenhower recently suggested an expenditure of more than $10 billion a year for 10 years to put our highways and streets in condition to handle our growing vehicular traffic.

Meeting these backlogs of demand could be accelerated if a slack occurred in the economy.

There is virtually no limit to the potential need for electrical energy in the United States. It has been estimated that the electric power generating capacity of the Nation will need to be doubled within the next 10 years and quadrupled within the next 20 years. Here is another demand which will support growth in employment and production.

While we have modern health equipment in most areas of the country, our shortage of doctors, nurses, hospitals, sanatoriums, and other health facilities is one of our most

serious present and prospective deficiencies.

We could easily consume more food and clothing now and much more in the future. While we are very well clothed and very well fed as a people, it would take considerably more production to provide those at the bottom of the economic ladder with the food and clothing they really need.

The list is endless. There is no question that the need and demand for more of the peacetime products of farm and factory exists in America.

In addition, we can sell to the rest of the world in larger amounts the products that have made our lives more comfortable and wholesome, provided, of course, that we continue to increase our imports from other countries. We must buy from them if they are to be able to buy from us.

Over and above all of these prospective demands for existing products there is the demand for those new products developed by the inventive genius of our people.

Antibiotics have been a dramatic innovation in medicine, lengthening life and creating a strong demand for new products.

Chemical synthesis is creating new materials such as plastics and synthetic textiles which have great growth potentials, while new industries have been built for the manufacture and use of these materials.

Atomic energy will soon provide a tremendous additional supply of power. This will help offset existing world shortages and make it possible to keep up with the tremendous and growing demand for energy sources. This energy will be readily transportable and can make possible industrial development in areas which are now underdeveloped because they do not have adequate electric power.

We are already benefiting from the development of electronics through television, radar, and sonar devices.

To bridge the gap between any sudden decline in defense needs and these foreseeable expansions in civilian demand, we can sustain incomes and purchasing power by adjustments in Government fiscal policies, including tax reductions, and by means of other built-in stabilizers such as unemployment insurance. These economic devices would be made more effective if the recommendations of President Eisenhower and Secretary of Labor Mitchell for increased benefits, extension of duration, and increased coverage of unemployment insurance were adopted. Some substantial progress has been made in this regard, but a great deal more still remains to be done.

All these facts seem to me clearly to support the conclusion that America can and will meet the economic challenge of peace. We are not dependent upon war or the threat of war to maintain a healthy and prosperous economy in the United States. In fact, without them, we could provide a much better life and an even higher standard of living for our people.

While our outlook for the future, in terms of civilian demand, is very bright, I do not want to leave you with the impression that there are no problems. A number of difficulties which we now face could be intensified in the event of substantial reductions in defense spending.

It is true our tremendous prosperity is not universal. Unemployment is still too high for anyone to be complacent. A number of areas of the country still have substantial and persistent unemployment and are not sharing in the general prosperity.

The ultimate impact of automation and atomic energy on employment and our economy is not yet clear. Obviously, these developments must be watched closely and assessed carefully in order that sound decisions may be made by labor, management, and the government so that technological advances which will benefit all in the long run will not hurt some in the short run.

The economic impact of the transition to peace will be great or little depending upon our rate of economic growth. This growth must be great enough to absorb workers displaced by technological advances and the annual influx of new entrants into the labor force. If we achieve this as a matter of course, as we can in a healthy economy, the economic consequences of peace can be limited to the short-run problems or, diverting men and economic resources to meeting the new demands for civilian goods and services taking the place of old demands for military goods and services. The problem of utilizing more of our economic resources for peaceful ends is no different from that which we confront year by year in finding new jobs for men and new uses for economic resources released by technological progress. Since 1900 output per man hour has tripled. Today's 61 million civilian workers produce more than 193 million men and women could have produced in 1900.

The expansiveness of the American standard of living has been the source of demand which over the years, with some interruptions and failures, has employed manpower and economic resources more fully and effectively than in any other place or time. In a rising standard of living we have an internally generated source of demand. This we can count on if in the future, as in the past, we succeed in maintaining wage and price mechanisms in our free enterprise system that assure the widest possible distribution of the products of our farms and factories to the American people.

Thus the challenge of peace can be seen in the perspective of the economic problems we have already met and mastered. Over the years, our system of Government and our type of economy have met the problems of a changing world better than have those of any other nation. We may have full confidence in our ability to meet any challenge the future may present.

As President Eisenhower said on May 17: "We will stay strong and stay vigilant, but we are not going to extinguish the hope that a new dawn may be coming, though the sun rises slowly."

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. T. RUTHERFORD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following article which appeared in the El Paso (Tex.) Times on July 4, 1955:

GET WELL, LYNDON

The Times joins a host of others in wishing for the speedy recovery of United States Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who suffered a heart attack Saturday.

Senator JOHNSON, the majority leader in the Senate, is sorely needed on Capitol Hill. He has become a national figure, highly respected and deeply admired by Republicans and Democrats alike. His ability to marshal the Democratic forces in the Senate, and at the same time hold down friction, has become the subject of much discussion.

LYNDON JOHNSON is needed not only by the Lone Star State, not only by the Democratic Party, but by the Nation as a whole, particularly at a time when his leadership could help steer the ship of state safely through the narrow channel.

Hurry up and get well, LYNDON.

America Looks to Iceland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, slightly more than 100 years ago a group of intrepid Icelandic pioneers left their northern island homeland, fought the vast wilderness that was then the American Midwest, and settled in my home State, Utah.

During the past century, their faith in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—the cause of their coming to Utah—has never wavered, and this fine group of people has contributed greatly to the welfare and culture of Utah.

I am inserting at this point an address, "America Looks to Iceland," given by Marselis C. Parsons, Jr., officer in charge, Northern European Affairs, Department of State, at the Icelandic centennial celebration, Spanish Fork, Utah, June 17, 1955:

We are gathered here today to celebrate the centennial of those brave Icelandic pioneers who, forsaking their homes and associates, undertook that long trek that led them from Iceland to Europe, then across the breadth of the Atlantic and finally across two-thirds of the North American continent. The decision taken by this small band was of historic importance in several ways as we shall see. For it was a revival among Icelanders of an interest in North America that had not been manifest for some 800 years. And it kindled an American interest in Iceland that has grown until we who live in the United States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the northern frontier to the Gulf of Mexico look to Iceland and its people as to familiar neighbors, good friends.

In 1855 when these pioneers, these converts to the Mormon Church, left Iceland they left a country where they and their ancestors had been living a secluded life for nearly a thousand years. From its settlement about 874 through the next 10 centuries the people of Iceland had shown little desire to emigrate or even, for that matter, to partake in the troublesome political life of the European or American continents. True it is that they discovered a large area of the continent that lay to the west. They even settled in 1 or 2 places in numbers sufficient to indicate that they intended to stay permanently. But the eastern coast of the continent, enjoying a climate far less mild than Iceland, proved unsatisfactory for settlement and those who survived its rigors are believed to have returned to Iceland.

Likewise, although Iceland was partially embroiled in Norwegian and Danish political troubles with neighbors and others, it can be said generally that between 1262 and 1854 Iceland was insulated against foreign ideas and influences. In later years this was due in large measure to the Danish monopoly in trade. Only for a brief period toward the end of the Napoleonic wars was this monopoly penetrated by a few American and British traders who must have profited handsomely from their venture.

So if we regard the 100 years that have elapsed since those pioneers from Iceland settled in Spanish Fork as a long time, let us stop to consider how much longer—10 times as long—Iceland lay relatively immune from the political storms that plagued the world. True, Iceland had its share of woes in the Black Death and the eruptions of Mt.

Hekla that brought such loss of life and misery to Iceland. But the collective strife of men against men was happily unknown.

This millenium of peace and seclusion did much to form and to develop the character of the people of this small island. Enjoying the protection of hundreds of miles of open sea between themselves and Europe, they were safe in the knowledge that Greenland and Northern North America remained unsettled while to the southwest the expanding settlements on the coast both in colonial times and after independence had been won sought ever to extend their settlements in the West.

The Icelander knew no fear of hostile military forces on his borders nor could his country be used as a corridor like Belgium through which the marching and rolling forces of a mighty aggressor might move at will. Like Japan, his country remained closed to aliens until the middle of the 19th century when trade and commercial intercourse were suddenly permitted with the rest of the world, a world that was revelling in the marvels of steam, a factor that was revolutionizing transport and bringing inaccessible areas within reach of political and commercial centers.

It was under circumstances such as these that the earliest permanent immigrants from Iceland came to Utah 100 years ago. And they must have thought they were far better isolated here than on the island they had left behind.

We know well what the brief span of a hundred years held for those who settled in this new land. For those who remained in Iceland the century was marked by a long, drawnout struggle for self-government. The intellectual awakening that swept over Iceland from the beginning of the second third of the 19th century produced, according to the historian, Gjerset, "a literary renaissance which gradually broadened into a great national patriotic movement, political as well as literary in character." Goaded on by such great patriots as Jon Sigurdsson the people of Iceland joined in a chorus to demand freedom from oppression, restoration of the Althing, and recognition of their rights and character as a distinct nation.

The persistence of the people gradually bore fruit. In 1874 the Danish King granted a constitution restoring to Iceland much of its former authority for self-government. Forty-odd years later, in 1918 Iceland was proclaimed a sovereign kingdom in union with Denmark. As previously Norway and Sweden had shared a single monarch, so now Iceland and Denmark shared a common king—King Christian X.

In 1944 came the final step. The goal of complete independence which the people of Iceland had sought so long was attained. A referendum was taken in May that year calling for the severance of all ties with the Danish Crown. Its acceptance was marked with great rejoicing and, amid appropriate celebration, the republic was proclaimed on June 17, 1944.

While the century between 1840 and 1940 had brought a return of self-government to Iceland the island and its people continued to enjoy immunity from the cares of the rest of the world. Virtually the only contact Icelanders had with the world outside Denmark came from the visits of scores of tourists, American, British, and Scandinavian, who paid cursory visits during the twenties to see Iceland's natural wonders. Even the world conflict of 1914–18 left Iceland untouched to all intents and purposes. It seemed as if its people were destined to live their lives and work out the future of their country without feeling the impact of external forces.

Then came the storm.

Almost immediately as a general war broke out in 1939 it became apparent that the sea-borne lines of supply between the New World and Western Europe would be in far greater peril from enemy submarines and surface raiders than in the previous war. Every available base had to be used from which to fight this menace. However, it was not until after the occupation of Denmark and Norway and the invasion of Belgium and the Netherlands was imminent that British troops landed in Iceland to protect that defenseless island from enemy occupation and to build a base from which naval patrols could extend protection over the North Atlantic.

In July, 1941, over a year after the British had undertaken the defense of Iceland and 5 months before Pearl Harbor, United States troops were landed in Iceland under the terms of an agreement between the two governments with the object of relieving the British.

With the cooperation of the Icelanders, efforts to bring defense facilities to a desired goal were soon begun. By the time that General Eisenhower flew to Europe in May 1942, airfield construction was well along. As the President wrote in Crusade in Europe: "Our trip took us over the northern air route, developed by the Army Air Forces and destined to become a significant factor in the final defeat of the European Axis. Airfields in Maine, Newfoundland, Labrador, Greenland, Iceland and Scotland eventually made it possible to ferry all our planes, even fighters, to Europe. Without that route, built in spite of difficulty, discouragement, and even great skepticism as to its usability, we could scarcely have maintained the forces we put into Europe."

As the war progressed, the importance of Iceland became even greater. Norwegians set out for Iceland to recapture Spitsbergen; British and American naval patrols were able to find shelter and supplies there; countless American and Canadian men and planes passed through Iceland on their way to the great campaigns in France or on the shores of the Mediterranean.

Icelanders who had regarded their little country as removed from the threat of war saw so clearly that the age of air transport had placed their remote island on the main thoroughfares of the world; that the menace of the submarine was almost as great off the fishing banks of Iceland as it was in the narrow seas around the British Isles and along the tankers' highway off the coast of Florida.

How joyously they welcomed war's end in 1945 can well be imagined. The imminent threat was removed. They could join with those forces that had maintained Iceland's freedom in celebrating a victory that all, together, had helped to achieve. The nightmare of strife was over and the promise of a peaceful future was bright. Icelanders had "discovered" Americans, so many hundreds of whom had spent the long months of the war in Iceland on vigil. This country, too, had "discovered" Iceland and found admirable and stimulating friends. It was clear that a better knowledge of each other's countries was desirable, particularly since the war had made it apparent that Iceland was so close to this country not only in point of time but, more important, in its emphasis on the democratic way of life.

In furtherance of the mutual desire on the part of Icelanders and Americans to know each other's countries better, the United States has happily been able to grant facilities to a number of Icelanders who wished to pursue their studies here.

During the past 5 years students of science have come to pursue their education in botany, physiology, and theoretical physics. They have come to study medicine, dentistry, and banking. Teachers have been helped to come to America to look into our educational systems. Leaders and specialists, too, came for this purpose as well as to learn more about youth organizations, public administration, information media, etc. A constant flow of visitors have come here from Iceland in the past 5 years to see, to learn, to make lasting friendships, and to return to Iceland to tell something about America.

Meanwhile American specialists in music and in physical education have visited Iceland.

In addition Icelanders have recently had an opportunity to learn something more of music in America, thanks to the appearance in Iceland of some of our leading artists. Last year Blanche Thebom, mezzosoprano of the Metropolitan Opera Co. and the Philadelphia Woodwind Quintet visited Reykjavik. The pianist, Ervin Laszlo, and the violinist, Isaac Stern, have both scored great successes in Iceland; the latter making a generous gift to the Music Department of the University of Iceland. Soon one of America's leading organists, Mr. E. P. Biggs, and also a group of seven members of the Boston Symphony Orchestra will play in Iceland.

One of the most effective performances given by an American group was the appearance of the United States Air Force Band 2 years ago. This versatile assembly of musicians perform as a symphony orchestra, a symphonic band, as various instrumental groups, or as a 25-voice glee club. What could offer a more convincing proof of the improbable association of music with the art of war?

But to return from this digression into the realm of cultural affairs to the world of political problems. The postwar period as we know all too well failed to fulfill the promise of peace and good will that seemed within reach in 1945.

Within a brief space of time a new threat to freedom of the individual and national independence arose. Czechoslovakia had fallen in a minority putsch under the sights of foreign guns. An insidious penetration from within by a minority whose political creed was as alien as the guns which afforded them protection in a defenseless nation sapped the vitality of a people whose devotion to democratic processes had been admired by all free peoples in Europe. What happepned in Czechoslovakia in 1948 caused the whole free world to stop in wonder and in fear to ponder where next a minority of ruthless totalitarians would attempt to seize the slack reins of democratic government.

This great concern, spreading west across the Atlantic caused the United States to initiate discussion with certain nations, members of the community, with a view to setting up a regional security organization within the framework of the United Nations. These discussions which initially included the Brussels Treaty Powers, Canada and the United States led to the extension of invitations to Iceland and four other countries to join the Organization as original members. Iceland accepted and became one of the 12 original members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO, the name that has become a household synonym for international cooperation.

What has all this meant to Iceland?

In the first place it meant that if Iceland was indeed to become an active member of the group (which obviously could not regard the presence of inactive members with equanimity) it would be expected to make a contribution toward mutual defense. Lacking any sort of armed forces, Iceland clearly could not offer tangible help of this character. Furthermore, its small population, austere economy, and traditional opposition to military service ruled out the possibility of Iceland's joining the ranks of the world's military powers. On the other hand, the very importance of Iceland's participation in the great defensive alliance sprang from the fact that the island offered a haven for ships and planes of member nations as they crossed and patrolled the North Atlantic Ocean that links rather than divide these members of the community.

Iceland's most valuable contribution was therefore its land—to be used as a base for the mutual protection of all.

In May 1951, Iceland and the United States entered into an agreement, the terms of which are common knowledge, to provide for the establishment of an airfield at Keflavik in support of NATO and a force designed to protect this base and Iceland itself to be known as the Iceland Defense Force.

It was no easy decision for Icelanders to take this unprecedented action in welcoming forces from another country to their shores in time of peace. Americans for their part have found it hard to send their sons from home to be stationed in a foreign land for what seemed to be long periods of time. Probably all members of NATO were reluctant to undertake the gigantic task of creating an adequate shield against aggression. The job seemed well-night impossible back in 1949. But member nations and their peoples were willing then and still are willing to make the necessary sacrifices. Voices are raised questioning the necessity of continuing those sacrifices, of the current need for armed vigilance. Those voices have an appealing tone, even more effective as time goes on. What, one may well ask, is more monotonous than maintaining safety precautions. They bore us and tax us where it hurts. Anyone who has paid fire-insurance premiums on his house and barn for 25 years without a loss is fully aware of this fact.

But we did not have to wait 25 years for an illustration to convince us that NATO was a sound investment. Fourteen months after the NATO Treaty was signed the North Koreans, supported by external forces fell upon South Korea. There, no regional defense pact was applicable.

To claim that the forces of aggression would have been unleashed against the North Atlantic community if no treaty organization had existed may not be logical. The truth, however, is succinctly summarized by Lord Ismay in his report on the first 5 years of NATO when he writes: "How much our growing defensive strength has already contributed to maintaining peace in Europe no one can measure precisely. One thing at least is certain, and that is that peace has been preserved."

Thanks to the wisdom of its leaders Iceland today, on this 11th anniversary of the Proclamation of the Republic, stands shoulder to shoulder with its true friends seeking ever to establish a more secure defense for the protection of those principles of freedom, independence, and the dignity of man, principles that guided the Viking settlers of the island, the discoverers of Vineland and the pioneers who sought out this land of promise where we stand today.

Men and women of Icelandic descent gathered together here on this memorable occasion can enjoy a deep sense of satisfaction that Icelanders have severally and jointly worked with a devotion of which their forebears would be proud, to preserve the independence and well-being of like-minded peoples and to attain lasting peace.

He Fights for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy while reading my July 1955 issue of Sports Afield magazine that tribute was paid to our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, in an article entitled "He Fights for Conservation."

Following is the article which, under unanimous consent, I include in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HE FIGHTS FOR CONSERVATION

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican, from Johnstown, Pa., is one of the most determined and effective fighters in the Congress. His tenacity against the most discouraging odds on difficult issues has held the line for conservation principles, giving time for support to develop and show its strength.

When Representative SAYLOR gets his teeth into an issue, he digs deep for the facts, and comes up with the answers that have stopped specialized experts.

As a stanch supporter of national parks, he has fought against the proposed Echo Park Dam which would flood Dinosaur National Monument. Representative SAYLOR came up with documented evidence from almost forgotten Government documents to back up his analysis. Reclamation Bureau experts and engineers had to admit fuzzy and slipshod methods, and Representative SAYLOR won support for his views among his congressional colleagues.

Representative SAYLOR is a high-ranking member of the western-dominated Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which has legislative jurisdiction over a large share of natural-resource subjects. Representing an eastern district, and as a conservationist, he serves on this committee as an effective spokesman for natural-resource conservation.

His is the kind of representative service that is a real benefit to his own constituency and to the whole national interest.

Pardon Our Suspicions, But—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the New York Post of July 19, 1955, which is appropriate at this particular time:

PARDON OUR SUSPICIONS, BUT—

There was some eyebrow raising in Congress a few weeks ago when it turned out that a Reserve general handling military oil needs happened to be drawing pay from an oil company which employs him when he is not in uniform.

Then it developed that the man who heads the Interior Department's Oil and Gas Division was drawing a pension from another oil company.

Then came a revelation that a big zinc company hauled in some nice Government contracts while one of its own officials was serving as Deputy General Services Administrator on the Eisenhower team.

Now the Secretary of the Air Force, Harold E. Talbott, is being questioned by Senate investigators on charges that his own engineering firm has an interest in defense contracts coming out of the Pentagon.

And we're still a long way from home on the strange two-way role played in the Dixon-Yates fiasco by Adolphe H. Wenzell, who helped steer the Government into the big power deal while his own investment company was financial agent for the Dixon-Yates combine.

In the case of Dixon-Yates-Wenzell there are lots of things we don't know because the Budget Bureau developed a terrible shyness about letting Democratic Senators see the full record.

What brings all this up?

Well, we were just thinking back to the days of the 5 percenters and the "deep-freeze boys" and all the business about the gift mink coats of the Truman administration.

The Republican press blasted away, day after day, month after month, year after year, as though the Democratic "insiders" were about to carry off the White House itself. My, how they howled.

We only bring it up now because it seems to us that the more curious goings-on in GOP Washington aren't getting much of a break in the papers at all.

Corruption just isn't the story it used to be when the shoes were on other feet.

Dixon-Yates Is Undeserved Black Eye for Power Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the membership of this body an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal of July 16, 1955.

The editorial is entitled "Dixon-Yates Is Undeserved Black Eye for Power Industry." It aptly points out that the illfated Dixon-Yates deal, engineered secretly by administration officials who ignored other bids, has damaged public confidence in the power industry and brought no credit to the administration.

The Dixon-Yates contract was a sorry deal and I, for one, am happy that it has been scuttled under the pressure of public opinion.

The editorial follows:

DIXON-YATES IS UNDESERVED BLACK EYE FOR POWER INDUSTRY

No one knows better than the private power industry how low it sank in public esteem in the early 1930's.

Those were years of revelation of widespread watered stock and pyramided capitalization structures built to make a handful of insiders wealthy. The names of Insull, Hopson, and others became synonymous for mulcting the public. Financial collapses and scandals led to breakup by law of huge utility combines; the process probably went too far. There were overwhelming demands for tighter Government controls. Federal power yardsticks in some areas helped force down rate structures. Federally sponsored programs carried power into areas where service had been unfairly denied or considered uneconomic.

Those were antiutility days. Much of the feeling was justified. Some was not, but good private companies were caught in the net of reaction against the bad. Because of public feeling, utility stocks took longer than almost any others to recover from depression lows.

Since the debacle, private power companies have made notable comebacks. Service and

facilities have quadrupled. Since World War II $18½ billion has gone into private power expansion and construction. The American worker has been given more horsepower and production capacity than workers anywhere have ever had.

In 1952, this Nation produced 463,055,000 kilowatts of electric power, 322,126,000 by private companies. Public power accounted for 77,098,000 kilowatts, 52,492,000 of it Federal power. In 1930, total production was 91,112,000 kilowatts, 86,108,000 of it private power.

We have place and need in this country for many types of power development—private, Federal, regional, municipal, cooperative. We have place, too, for what President Eisenhower has called partnership projects in which two or more types of power developers work together. The important thing is that we keep an atmosphere in which intelligent power development can continue. As private power is our biggest producer, it is important that it share that atmosphere.

Yet, even today, private power must continue to reckon with suspicion, in spite of its fine record in the last two decades. Harllee Branch, Jr., president of the Georgia Power Co., recently told the Southeastern Electric Exchange: "The simple fact is that the political position of our industry is not good. There were evidences during 1954 that our political standing may have worsened."

In 1955 it has continued to worsen. Part is undoubtedly due to increasingly vociferous arguments over such power controversies as Niagara, Hells Canyon, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Echo Park, and others. Part is due to increasing political activity by some private utility interests, given encouragement by some of the more rabid "private enterprise" voices in the administration. Those voices are as dangerous as the equally rabid "antiprivate enterprisers" who held positions of power in the past.

A great deal is due to the Dixon-Yates mess. By pushing Dixon-Yates as an aid to "private enterprise" and power, the administration has aroused some of the public's old suspicions. Dixon-Yates contained the elements that bore the distrust of the past: What has been called whisperings in corners and cubby holes, secrecy, inside-track operations by favored utility and financial agents, promise of higher costs to taxpayers, higher rates to users, and higher and guarantied profits to utilities.

The whole business has been unfortunate. The administration and a small segment of the power industry have combined to stir up the old distrusts and revive old prejudices.

Dixon-Yates may go down in history as an administration disservice to the power industry, generally. Pledged to private enterprise, starting in a political climate favorable to compromise, the administration has, through sheer ineptness in this case, unnecessarily stirred up the dogs of the power war.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Mississippi?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage.

Of this total, Mississippi has more than 1,272,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multibillion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Mr. Adams' Role in Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article written by Doris Fleeson and which appeared in the July 19 issue of the Washington Evening Star. The article entitled "Mr. Adams' Role in Dixon-Yates" follows:

MR. ADAMS' ROLE IN DIXON-YATES—AT LAST THE DEMOCRATS SMELL AN ISSUE THAT REACHES RIGHT TO THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

(By Doris Fleeson)

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has addressed a polite note to Sherman Adams, President Eisenhower's chief aide, asking when it will be convenient for Mr. Adams to explain to the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee his role in the Dixon-Yates contract. The note suggests that, with the President in Geneva, there is no desire to press Mr. Adams to appear immediately since he must be unusually busy.

It could, of course, be added that there is no desire on the subcommittee's part to put on the star actor of Dixon-Yates while Geneva is monopolizing the Nation's headlines. For in discovering that Mr. Adams played a part in that controversial affair, Democrats have at last arrived where they have longed to be, which is squarely in the immediate vicinity of the President's desk.

Mr. Adams' duties can truly be described as those of Assistant President, and Mr. Eisenhower himself has said "Sherm" makes his life possible. This feeling of obligation was the real reason for the President's recent New England safari, Mr. Adams being a former governor and Member of the House from New Hampshire.

With Mr. Adams, Senator KEFAUVER hopes to break the jinx which has marked other Democratic efforts to put the foundlings in the President's lap. Parents worry about the vaccine confusion, but they blame Mrs. Hobby. Educators are angry about inaction in the school field but they blame Mrs. Hobby, Treasury Secretary Humphrey, and the Democratic Congress. The postal workers are mad at the Postmaster General. Secretary Dulles takes the rap on foreign policy.

It is all very discouraging for a party in search of an issue.

The circumstances under which Mr. Adams entered the Dixon-Yates inquiry were an investigator's dream. The Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, J. Sinclair Armstrong, was refusing to tell the subcommittee why the SEC suddenly canceled hearings on the financing of the contract the day the House was scheduled to vote on it. Mr. Armstrong said Attorney General Brownell had advised him this fell within the President's prohibition on private White House conversations.

With this clear indication that at last they were getting somewhere, the subcommittee sent Mr. Armstrong home to talk it over with the Attorney General. The next day the SEC Chairman testified that Mr. Adams had called and asked for the postponement. Then he clammed up again.

The subcommittee didn't mind that new dose of attempted secrecy at all. It is too happy to have reason to call a Presidential intimate, a man closely identified with the President in the public mind. Washington at least knows that "Adams calling" rates next to "Eisenhower calling" in the power to get action.

Mr. Adams, charming socially and gruff politically, has not been tested as a congressional witness. The question of how he will do in his baptism of fire will crowd the hearing with curious spectators.

He is in a difficult position. He must know the whole story of Dixon-Yates. If he takes refuge behind the President's prohibition, as Mr. Armstrong first attempted to do, it will produce an effect of secrecy bound to be harmful politically. This is one hearing in in which both sides will be wary and well prepared.

Pope Pius XII Praises Israel Philharmonic; Orchestra Touring Nine European Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 17, 1955, issue of the Israel Digest:

POPE PIUS XII PRAISES ISRAEL PHILHARMONIC; ORCHESTRA TOURING NINE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

One of the highlights of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra's current European tour was the special performance for Pope Pius XII in the Vatican's Consistory Hall. The Orchestra, under the baton of Paul Kletzki, played Beethoven's Seventh Symphony, one of the Pope's favorites.

Pope Pius smilingly expressed his appreciation, saying, "It was marvelous playing. What wonderful artists. It is not you who must thank me for this audience, but it is for me to thank you for the pleasure you have given me. I pray to God every day that such cruelties as happened should never happen again."

The performance for the Pope was a gesture of gratitude for the help which the Roman Catholic Church gave to all persons persecuted by the Nazis and Fascists prior to, and during, World War II.

VISITING 40 CITIES

The Israel Philharmonic Orchestra is now in the midst of its first major European tour. Under the direction of Paul Kletzki, Paul Paray and Leonard Bernstein, 90 members of the orchestra are performing before audiences in 9 countries and over 40 cities during a 9-week tour. Guest artists appearing with the orchestra are Isaac Stern, violinist, and Marian Anderson, contralto. Two works of Israel composers—Marc Lavry's

"Israel Dances" and I. Kaminsky's "Israel Sketches"—are in the tour repertoire.

Members of the orchestra carry keys of the city of Tel Aviv and letters of greeting from Mayor Haim Levanon for presentation to the mayors of the capitals of Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, France, Great Britain and Eire.

Following a concert before the Swedish royal family and 2,000 listeners in Stockholm, the Morgon-Tiningen termed the orchestra "one of the grandest of the world with a harmony and a discipline that only very few orchestras have." The Dagens Nyheter reviewer wrote, "the music we listened to was of such great beauty that it can be assumed that the President of Israel will get his hope realized: the orchestra is going to win the young state many friends."

In Copenhagen, the King of Denmark attended the philharmonic's appearance and in Florence and Milan the orchestra inaugurated the May festivals of those cities.

The Israel Philharmonic Orchestra has given over 3,000 performances since it was founded by the late violinist Bronislaw Huberman in 1936. Composed of musicians originating in 14 different countries, the orchestra was established both to provide a first-class symphony orchestra in the music-loving land of Israel and to give local talent and Jewish musicians salvaged from Nazi-oppressed Germany the opportunity to contribute to the musical development of the country. Maestro Arturo Toscanini conducted the inaugural concerts. Since its inception, the philharmonic has been host to many world-famed musicians and conductors including the late Dr. Serge Koussevitsky, Issai Dobrowen, William Steinberg, Bernadino Molinari, Charles Munch, Isler Solomon, Jascha Heifetz, Yehudi Menuhin, Zino Francisscatti, Arthur Rubinstein, Jan Peerce, and Jennie Tourel.

NEW CONCERT HALL

The activities of the Israel Philharmonic consist of subscription concerts given in Tel Aviv (home of the orchestra), Haifa, and Jerusalem, special popular concerts, performances in villages and agricultural settlements and youth concerts. Subscription concerts are repeated with exactly the same conductors, soloists, and programs at greatly reduced prices so that all sections of the population may attend.

A new I£3,000,000 concert hall, to be named after Mr. Frederic R. Mann, of Philadelphia, who contributed $250,000 toward its construction, is now being built in Tel Aviv. The auditorium's 3,000 seats will relieve some of the pressure for repeat performances required by the orchestra's present 1,100-seat hall.

The Opportunity That Is America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News on July 16, 1955, entitled "The Opportunity That Is America":

THE OPPORTUNITY THAT IS AMERICA
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

What is this old ideology of Marxism? It is the old doctrine of authoritarism. It is the ancient curse of the strong to rule the weak. It is the power of force—with guns and marching feet.

Herbert Hoover once said:

"At the time our ancestors were proclaiming that the Creator had endowed all mankind with the rights of freedom as a child of God with a free will, there was being proclaimed by one Karl Marx a satanic philosopher of agnosticism that the rights of man came from the state."

The greatness of America comes from the one philosophy. The other philosophy comes from the despair of Europe.

Our idea of democracy was embodied in the preamble of our Declaration of Independence and in the words of our Constitution.

It has as its philosophers Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Tom Paine, and Abraham Lincoln.

We are the first to present to the modern world a political faith based upon the dignity of the individual. We are the first to present to the modern world the equality and fraternity of mankind.

We never moved a battalion or a regiment on the continent of Europe in the 1800's yet the idea of our declaration produced the doctrine of the "Rights of Man" and broke the back of oppression and the power of kings.

The last two syllables of our great name that encompasses us all—those four letters which conclude the word "A-mer-i-can"—separated by themselves spells our "I can" A-mer-i-can.

"I can" has come to typify what we stand for in this hemisphere.

Every American has before him the inspiration, the gratification, the challenge to say "I can" as he takes part in the life of our blessed land.

Let me tell you a story that has come to me from Ulric M. Gwynn, Jr., of the North Dakota Junior Chamber of Commerce. It is a story that has its inception in the northern province of Czechoslovakia. It concerns two brothers—two small boys.

The youngsters were sprawled on the banks of the Elbe River. The afternoon was not unlike many others, for often they sat by the river and talked, sometimes until sundown.

"I'm going to be rich when I grow up," Karel would vow. "I'll own much land and everyone will point to me and say, 'there is Karel Mahousek. He is the richest man in all Czechoslovakia.' "

But brother Jan had dreams too—dreams that he dare not tell Karel because he would surely think them strange. He just sat there and looked out into the horizon. Somewhere beyond the Elbe there was an ocean—and beyond that? Well, one day he would know.

Old Eduard Mahousek considered his sons and what the future held for them. He even prophesied it many times. "Jan is a dreamer. He is one with imagination, but he is not as ambitious as Karel."

It happened that Jan was at a village dock when a river boat stopped for cargo. Perhaps it was fate when, on an impulse, he took a job on the boat and found his way to the sea—to a different way of life—for Jan came to America.

It wasn't easy at first, this new world. Jan used to write home about the strange American ways. Yet, there was always something wonderful to tell. He was making progress. He had a good job, with good pay.

As for Karel, his letters were different. He couldn't save the money with which to buy the land he had promised himself he would one day own.

What does the story of these two brothers mean? Why are their lives so different today? The answer is simple, for one is a symbol of America and the other a symbol of Europe.

There is no difference between the people here and the people there. We are all brothers under the skin.

We are the same people, with the same blood, with the same native ability.

But there is one essential difference.

Here in America we have the opportunity. Here in America we have the privilege, to use to the fullest extent our native talent. Here in America we are free—all of us—to express ourselves and to use and develop our talent and ability.

The great power that we have in America was gained and grew because of work.

It achieved this greatness because men bent to the task to accomplish an end.

Let us always remember that it is not what you have but what you want that makes you what you are—whether your dreams have all come true or are still afar. It is not what you have but what you want that makes you what you are—no task is too large, none too small, to receive exacting care in all.

Let us all strive for a great America, great for its freedom in all that we do, for ourselves, for our children, for all mankind.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, three physical and geological difficulties in addition to Echo Park make the project unreasonable and impractical.

(a) There is doubt whether Glen Canyon can support a 700-foot dam. In October 1954 Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer wrote that the Bureau's design specialists were quite concerned as to whether or not the foundation characteristics of the Glen Canyon site were capable of safely supporting a 700-foot dam. No further tests were made by the Bureau between October 1954 and March 1955. Nevertheless, Commissioner Dexheimer testified at that time before your Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation that a dam of 700 feet could be safely built.

At 700 feet Glen Canyon would be the second highest dam in the world, second only to Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. Yet the foundation rock at Hoover Dam is at least three times as strong as the sandstone formation at Glen Canyon. This formation is nothing more than a weakly cemented sand dune. It was created geologically by the wind depositing one sand dune on top of the other.

The minority members of your committee are not satisfied that the Bureau of Reclamation officials have proved their case sufficiently that a 700-foot dam can be safely constructed at the Glen Canyon site without costly additional safety features.

(b) The construction of Glen Canyon Dam will endanger Rainbow Natural Bridge. Rainbow Natural Bridge is a fragile structure of soft sandstone. Dynamite will be exploded within a mile on either side of the bridge, thus jeopardizing a rare natural wonder. In addition, seepage from the Glen Canyon Reservoir may back up under Rainbow Arch. If the sandstone of Rainbow Bridge gets wet and soaked up with water, it will be reduced in strength and may crumble.

(c) Large quantities of water may be absorbed and lost in the walls of Glen Canyon. Bureau officials concede that at least 3 million acre-feet of water will seep into the porous sandstone walls of Glen Canyon, but they failed to make studies to determine the exact quantity of water that may be lost in this way. However, it has been independently calculated, assuming 250 miles of canyon wall and an average depth of 200 feet, that 32 million acre-feet would be absorbed by the porous sandstone walls. This is more than the storage capacity of the entire Glen Canyon Reservoir. Stacked on a football field, this amount of water would tower over 6,000 miles into the sky. It would be taken out of use forever in this highly arid region that so badly needs every available drop of water.

The Need for Townsend Plan Legislation

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly subscribe to the philosophy of government expressed by our great President when he said:

> In all those things which deal with people be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy or their form of government, be conservative.

I believe that these criteria admirably fit the purposes and aims of H. R. 4472, commonly referred to as the Townsend bill.

Can we be otherwise than liberal and human when it comes to dealing with our senior citizens, men and women who have contributed richly to the life and prosperity of our Nation during the best years of their lives, and who now are seeking no other reward than the right to live out their lives in peace while younger generations take over where they have left off? I believe that H. R. 4472 would accomplish this human aim.

This great and pressing task of providing for our senior citizens naturally involves substantial amounts of money, the people's money, and in matters affecting the people's money I am conservative. As a conservative I endorse the principle embodied in H. R. 4472, because it is a pay-as-you-go method of financing, the soundest and safest method of financing known.

H. R. 4472 is geared to the cost of living, and by today's standards this is conservative, because it allows for the decline of pensions if the cost of living drops, while it automatically provides for increased pensions if the cost of living should rise.

Finally, as a conservative I endorse the Townsend bill because it is a national plan which recognizes a national problem instead of looking the other way at State lines. Its benefits and liabilities will be participated in and borne by all States, thus easing the excess burden now falling on the taxpayers in some of our States. In my own State of California our people are paying heavy taxes to support a pension system which is enjoyed not only by retired Californians but by many who have contributed in other States during the most productive years of their lives, and who, attracted by the superb climate, have gone to California to retire. A national plan equalizes burdens and benefits and is fair. It is, therefore, conservative.

Mr. Speaker, as coauthor of the Townsend bill I am not contending that it cannot be improved. On the contrary, I believe that the Committee on Ways and Means, in its wisdom, may find many features which can be improved upon after thorough hearings have been held and the bill has been debated. I urge that the Townsend plan, after due consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, be presented to this House so that the Members may debate it, and by voting may exercise their will in the American way.

An Answer to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the text of a little booklet written by Mr. Irving B. Hexter, an industrial publisher of Chicago, Ill. This booklet, which tells a charming story of two brothers' effective work against the spread of Communism in China, was sent to me by Mr. Williard F. Smith, of Darien, Conn. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the belief that they will not only enjoy reading it, but will find the Kadoorie brothers' plan a uniquely interesting method of combatting communism among the discontent.

The booklet follows:

There is an answer to communism. I saw it working effectively in Hong Kong recently. Two hard-headed businessmen in Hong Kong by the name of Lawrence and Horace Kadoorie, know that communism thrives on empty bellies. If a "have not" can be turned into a "have," he will never be a Communist. And it is on this hypothesis that one of the most interesting and effective experiments in the world is being successfully conducted in the British Crown Colony.

For the sake of orientation, remember that Hong Kong is not a city but a territory, the British Crown Colony, made up of a number of islands and a piece of the China mainland. On each of the islands there are many villages and towns, but the main city is Victoria. The mainland territory, which is about 12 miles deep and as much as 50 miles long in some places, contains Kowloon as its largest city and many small farming communities.

Outside of the residents who are the international traders and bankers whose skyscraper offices are in Victoria, the average little farmer on the mainland always has had to scratch for a living before Red China came into being, and his lot was considerably worsened when this Chinese market was taken away from him. When the insurmountable barbed-wire barrier separated him from a large part of his market, he had an almost impossible task of making a living. At the same time, in addition to the normal 1½ million souls who lived in the colony, there came another 1½ million refugees who did not want to live under Red rule. This created an almost insuperable problem which the Hong Kong authorities were ill-equipped to handle. The net result was unemployment, suffering and altogether a fine breeding ground for Communist activities. And the Commies didn't miss a bet.

Into this breach stepped the Kadoorie brothers. Both in their early fifties and sons of a wealthy father, they had great cause to hate communism and Communist China because they had lost a large part of their family fortune in Shanghai. There they owned the world famous Cathay Hotel and several other hotels, office buildings, land, and properties which made them one of the wealthiest European families in the Far East.

Further, through the Japanese occupation they had lost their revered old father, Sir Elly Kadoorie, and the family moved to Hong Kong, where they had additional holdings. The Hong Kong holdings still make them a wealthy family, but nothing like their halcyon days.

With the help of the local agriculture authorities, they set up the Kadoorie Agricultural Aid Association, an experiment in capitalistic agrarianism. At the risk of oversimplification, they bought several hundred families two pigs apiece. Pretty soon litters appeared, the excess pigs were sold on the market by the colony authorities for the account of the farmer, and the family became capitalistic.

Actually, the plan goes deeper than just a couple of pigs. As a starter, an experimental station was set up by the Crown Colony authorities at Tack Sang and 16 families living in the village were made interest-free loans of $26.20 Hong Kong (about $5 United States) to build simple pig sties. Free pigs were given to these families and any others who would build sties. Interest-free loans were made for food for the pigs. After the first experiments proved successful, the loaning pace quickened and standards for sties were adopted. The interest-free loans were stepped up to $112 Hong Kong and the sties were put on almost prefab basis, although the labor for erection was furnished by the families.

The pig raisers are constantly advised by the Crown Colony agriculture authorities so that only the most successful breeding results. Boar keepers were quick to appreciate the value of crossbred stock, and with the loan assistance of the KAAA they exchanged their local boars for pure bred stock. Inferior local boars were disposed of to butchers and better type boars were bought—on interest-free loans—by the pig raisers. In a number of locations, farmers were helped with loans for poultry, and in still others they were helped with vegetable planting.

At Castle Peak, 20 families were given sites and two pigs each to set themselves up as pig raisers. In addition, the usual interest-free loan was granted, and a road connecting the shore with the village was constructed by the association as a gift to the villagers.

Another group to receive assistance from the association were 13 families of vegetable growers who were in very poor circumstances. Sixteen pigpens were constructed, with gifts of pigs and the usual interest-free loan for pig food. This venture has been very successful. Not only have the people benefited from another source of income, and the pigs from waste vegetables, but also vegetable

growing has improved from the use of pig manure as a fertilizer.

Consider Kat-O, a small island which is about 6 miles from the Red border. The government authorities fearfully reported to the Kadoories that the whole island was going Communist. They set up Operation Pigsty there by erecting 6 double sties and stocking them with 12 sows and a boar as a breeding center. In addition, 100 pigs were given to the families on the island and interest-free loans were made to provide 6 months' food for the pigs. Within 6 months they saw the tide turning, and within 18 months they had created the most violent bunch of capitalists anyone ever saw.

Before the Kadoorie Agricultural Aid Association came into being, the average Chinese family among these refugees had annual earnings of about $100 Hong Kong ($16 U. S.) and had saved less than $50 Hong Kong. After 1 year under the Kadoorie plan the family was earning almost $1,000 Honk Kong, and in 3 years was up in the $3,500 to $4,000 Hong Kong class. New animal husbandry ventures had developed, new human dignities had resulted.

By April 1955 K. A. A. had made loans to 11,000 families. The Chinese family in this area consists of 4.8 persons, so they have affected over 50,000 people. Losses on all loans are less than one-half of 1 percent. The beneficiary families are almost fanatical in their desire to repay, because they understand that nonpayment might keep some other farmer from getting a loan. And the Chinese are honest people. The Kadoories have no direct contact with the people. Basic plans are made with the Agriculture Department of Hong Kong, and this department in turn administers the funds provided by the Kadoories. Today, no charity is given but no one is refused a loan. Loans have been out long enough now so that a revolving fund has been created by the repayments. Each year the Kadoories spread the scope of the work and sweeten the pot "a little bit" (their words), but it's probably a pretty good sweetening.

The Kadoorie brothers will tell you that there is vast difference between what we know as virulent and aggressive communism as a political organism and what these poor, wretched people practice. They don't know about the communism that the free world is fighitng, but the Kadoories know that empty bellies make willing slaves for political masters.

Navahos Victimized by Upper Colorado Project Press Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, America's concern and sympathy for the plight of the Navaho Indians is being played upon by upper Colorado River project proponents in a frantic effort to seduce an emotional wave of support for the project.

The truth is that H. R. 3383, the upper Colorado project bill voted out of the Interior Committee will not put one drop of water on Navaho farmland. The only thing in the bill about the Navahos is the use of their name in one project misleadingly called the Navaho Dam. This dam does nothing but act as a concrete plug in the river. It has no power features either. In order for it to be of any help to the Navahos whatsoever fantastically expensive pumping stations and canals would have to be authorized by later Congresses.

So expensive would it be to get this water to Navaho lands that the Indian Bureau itself has admitted that the cost would be $200,000 per farm for each of 1,100 farms. And it is not even known whether the Navahos would, or could, be irrigation farmers.

This is another example of the outrageous provisions of H. R. 3383. It is an example of why Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as for the project. A Congressman's vote in either case would be equally difficult to explain to his constituents.

Editorial columnist Larry Collins, Sr., of the Long Beach Independent, a perceptive observer of the current scene, exposes the Navaho Indian racket in the following editorial:

USING THE INDIAN

The newspapers of the country are being snowed under with propaganda about how the Indian problem will be solved if the upper Colorado River project is built. One tearful writer tells of how this will make the Navahos' land so productive there will be no more poverty. It tells of how the Navahos have only $150 a year per capita income compared with the Nation's average of $1,900. The Nation's sympathy for the poor Indian is being again used to promote something for the white man.

Actually there are about 400,000 Indians of all known tribes in this country. Of this number there are about 80,000 Navahos. Most of them live in the country which would be benefited by the fabulous upper Colorado River development. But it is estimated it will cost $2,000 an acre to water those lands. There is no crop adaptable to those areas that could be made to pay on such priced land. It would mean a $200,000 cost for an Indian family with 100 acres.

By contrast to this propaganda, Nation's Business tells of how the Government is striving to take the Indians off the reservation and place them in industrial areas. There is considerable success in the endeavor, but there is also disappointment as the Indian returns to the blanket and the less complicated life of the reservation. The Government employs one person to handle Indian affairs for every 30 Indians.

There are many examples of Indians taking their places in our industrial and business organizations. They are found to be skillful workers when they apply themselves. But the great trouble is in getting the movement away from reservations. On those reservations the Indian Affairs Department looks out for the Indians. They are fed and housed. It is on the whole a poverty existence. But efforts to move them to cities where jobs are guaranteed for them are getting results slowly.

A few reservation Indians enjoy lots of money from oil and gas found on lands assigned to them. But the great majority live in virtual slums. On some reservations health conditions are deplorable. Tuberculosis is prevalent. It is 8 to 10 times as high on the average as in the rest of the country. It is a condition that lends itself to promoters who use the Indian tragedy to promote a project from which the Indians of the Nation would profit little. Actually, only the Navahos would profit as a tribe. The cost of providing them valuable land would be completely out of reason. They would probably lease that land rather than work it. It is far better to relocate them, as the Government is doing, where they can actually live with, and like, the other Americans. Those seeking to exploit them should be condemned. (L. A. C.)

Sea Water Conversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as one of the first Members of Congress to sponsor legislation to provide for construction of demonstration plants to produce fresh water from sea water of a quality suitable for industrial, agricultural, and consumer use, I was especially pleased to support H. R. 2126 which passed both the House and Senate during the present session of Congress—Public Law 111—authorizing $6 million for research over a period extending to 1963.

I introduced my first bill, H. R. 6031, to provide for research to process sea water for general use in the 81st Congress on March 29, 1948. The purpose of this legislation was to strengthen national security and the common defense as well as to increase the national water resources by authorizing the construction of demonstration plans to carry on the necessary research to develop methods of converting sea water into fresh water at a cost that would justify its use as a substitute for other water sources.

No action was taken by the Congress on my original bill, and I reintroduced this legislation in the 82d Congress—H. R. 859.

In spite of my vigorous efforts to get action on this legislation because of its vital importance to the United States, and especially to southern California where we are dependent upon our water supply for survival, no action was taken until 1952 when the Saline Water Act of 1952 which I supported was finally passed authorizing an initial appropriation of $2 million for research to be carried on over a 5-year period.

As in my original legislation introduced 4 years previously, the act of 1952 provided for a research program with the objective of developing economically feasible processes for converting sea water and other saline water to fresh water of a quality suitable for agricultural, industrial, and municipal uses.

This program is of vital importance to the Nation because as a result of our expanding industry, growing population, and expanding agricultural production, we have experienced a demand for larger and larger quantities of fresh water which has placed a severe drain on our existing water resources, especially in the arid and semiarid regions of our Nation.

The sources of water on which we normally rely are gradually being exhausted and, through use and reuse, the supply derived from these sources is

being contaminated. There is, therefore, an urgent need for finding and developing every possible additional fresh water source.

We have known for some time that fresh water could be produced from sea water and processes were developed which have been used in certain instances to assure adequate water supply for naval vessels and other military installations where a fresh water supply was not available.

However, the process has been too expensive for extensive use, and a practical economical process must be developed before the conversion of sea water can be used as a regular source of water supply.

To date the results from the initial experiment and research under the Saline Water Act have been encouraging. At the beginning of the Government's program in 1952 the cost of converting sea water to fresh water by the best processes in use was estimated at about $400 to $500 an acre-foot. The initial cost goals for the program were set at $125 per acre-foot for municipal water and $40 per acre-foot for irrigation water on the basis that these amounts represented about the maximum that could be borne by these types of use.

Although considerable work remains to be done before these initial goals are fully realized, they are being approached now, and it is believed they can be reached and lowered if the research is continued as it will be under the amendment to the Saline Water Act already passed by this Congress.

It is also interesting to note that today research in this field is also in progress in other countries, and as a result of foreign research there is a strong indication that with the development of plants to convert sea water to fresh water at a reasonable cost, methods may also be perfected to produce power from the sea as well.

The University of California, in this connection, has been closely observing an experiment of French scientists on the Ivory Coast of French West Africa, and have already announced that the university calculations resulting from their own research pretty much coincide with the new French theory thereby indicating that obtaining both power and fresh water from the sea is a definite possibility.

Los Angeles County and all of southern California can use converted sea water as soon as it can be processed economically into fresh water to augment our existing water supply. In this area we realize that we must maintain a constant adequate water supply or face the ever-present danger of a major disaster in the event of a prolonged drought or any other serious threat to the sources of our water supply.

We must increase the available supply to meet the constantly mounting demands of our increasing population, now over 5 million in Los Angeles County alone, as well as the needs of our expanding industry and growing agricultural production.

As a result of the research carried out under the Saline Water Act, we may find the partial solution to the problem of dwindling water resources in many parts of the country. The research will be continued under present provisions to 1963, and we should reach our goal in the development of economical processes to convert sea water and other saline water to fresh water thus opening up the inexhaustible supply of the sea itself to southern California and all other areas in our Nation which can utilize water from the sea.

A Soldier Is Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Col. Chaim Herzog, which appeared in the June 17, 1955, issue of Israel Speaks.

The seventh anniversary of the death of David "Mickey" Marcus was observed June 9 in Israel and America. In New York a memorial meeting sponsored by the Marcus Foundation was held on June 9 at the Jewish Museum. In Ramat Chayil, Israel, a playground was dedicated in "Mickey's" memory by Defense Minister Ben-Gurion.

Colonel Herzog is at present serving as officer commanding the Jerusalem district:

Abba Eban: "When the forces of the Arab States invaded the country Israel was ready on every front, and it was ready, thanks to the strategy which David Marcus had planned and the preparations which he had made."

David Ben-Gurion: "His name will live forever in the annals of the Jewish people and we feel confident that American Jewry will be proud of its great and gallant son who has given his life for the liberation of Israel."

Moshe Sharett: "His example of personal courage had been an inspiration to our men and his rare gift of getting on with all types and all ranks had endeared him to the entire army and made him a figure that was fast becoming legendary."

A SOLDIER IS REMEMBERED
(By Col. Chaim Herzog)

JERUSALEM.—The scene was Jerusalem, the besieged city, in the spring of 1948. The British mandate still existed, but Jewish Jerusalem was, to all intents and purposes, under siege. Occasionally convoys of vital supplies broke through the Arab blockade. Armored buses plied their dangerous way through the hills of Judea under the watchful eyes of youthful Palmach escorts, many of whom would not survive the severe fighting which was yet to break out.

Out of one of these armored buses stepped 1 day a small-sized, broad-shouldered, exuberant American who was introduced to us as "Mr. Stone." It soon became quite obvious to us that he was no plain Mr. Stone. His questioning and his incisive remarks and observations indicated that here was a military man of considerable caliber who had acquired his professional knowledge in the school of experience and of war. His open-hearted manner, the confidence which he exuded, and his cheerful demeanor rapidly endeared him to all with whom he came into contact.

He observed the problems inherent in the defense of Jerusalem and moved on to the Negev. Word reached us in Jerusalem of this new personality who roamed the Negev with our forces and participated in many of their actions. His name was associated with a commando-type assault on any enemy unit in the neighborhood of Gaza. He was next heard of in Galilee, where he observed many of the famous operations in that area, including the capture of Safad by a handful of Jewish boys who put some 14,000 Arabs to flight.

We next saw "Mickey" at Latrun. This was the site of several hard-fought battles for the road to Jerusalem. Jerusalem was besieged, starving, and parched for lack of water, for the pipeline to the city had been cut. The Jewish forces at Latrun, composed primarily of new immigrants who had landed but a few days earlier in Haifa from the detention camps in Cyprus, fought desperately in an attempt to open the road. Heavy casualties were incurred. The brigade operating in the area succeeded in opening the famous Burma Road, which finally broke the siege of the capital.

Marcus appeared at Latrun during the height of the fighting. He bore in his pocket a letter signed by Mr. David Ben Gurion, the Prime Minister and Minister of Defense, appointing him to command the Jerusalem front.

During the heat of battle he was always well forward, observing, advising, and noting. He was fearless, and infected all around him with his courage and bulldog tenacity.

He left us to visit Jerusalem, with Brig. Yigal Alon, the Palmach commander. Two days later we heard of his tragic fate. Words are inadequate to describe the feelings of all when the terrible realization that "Mickey" was no longer with us dawned. Each and every individual felt a great personal as well as national loss.

His memory lives on. A village in his name, Mishmar David, flourishes near Hulda, overlooking the road to Jerusalem, where "Mickey" spent his last weeks. Neve David is a veteran officers development in Tel Aviv. In Bet Marcus on Mount Carmel, Israel soldiers receive instruction in good citizenship.

Like all great figures, "Mickey" Marcus has become a legend in Israel. His story will forever be an inspiration to the youth of Israel.

The Atlantic Union Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excellent editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Sunday Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass.

This editorial points up the current excesses and extremes of some internationalists in our midst, who are embracing all kinds of weird and unsound formulae for world organization. We cannot even settle our problems with the Russians, problems which constitute so much of a threat to the peace and stability of the whole world. Yet we have some among us, who are urging that we surrender our sovereignty or a large part of it to world organizations that could not possibly embrace the whole world.

There are, undoubtedly, many sincere people enlisted in these movements. They have the right to their opinions and views. On the other hand, it certainly would be pertinent for the Congress to find out the genesis, the financial support and the political outlook of the sponsors of some of these groups to determine what influences prompt and guide their activities.

The infiltration of subversion into many of our American institutions is more or less an accomplished fact. Noble pretexts are frequently used by the infiltrators to throw up a smokescreen around their activities. Peace, democracy, social advancement, world betterment, and universal brotherhood are often the shibboleths and the instruments of those who are endeavoring to spread the poison of communism.

I would not contend for a moment that all extreme internationalists are Communists for they are not. But I think that many extreme internationalists' proposals and activities should be examined with the view to estimating the extent, if at all, that they are influenced and guided by those who do not believe in our American system and are working to discredit and overthrow it.

In that connection, discrediting parliamentary institutions is one of the principal techniques of Communists and left-wing affiliates, and there is a constant propaganda designed either to deprecate or to lampoon our Government in every branch, particularly the Congress, which exemplifies the strength and power of representative government and, consequently, is the chief butt of the railleries, preachments, and scurrilous lies, which so often accompany communistic attacks.

This Nation has never been unaware of its obligations to mankind but certain other police-state nations are certainly not aware of their obligations to respect and honor our right to our way of life. We stand for sincere, wholehearted international cooperation with those willing to cooperate for disarmament and peace, for expansion of economic and cultural relationships.

But our way of life is dear to every American. It is cherished by our people, who intend to guard and protect it. No internationalist doctrines can ever replace our allegiance to our own great Nation, and no unsound proposals for the surrender of our sovereignty can ever blind the American people to the realities of the hour and the imperative need for defending their institutions.

To be a patriotic American is not only the highest political privilege in the world, but is the sacred duty of all who love our country. We should not stand by idly while subversionists heap insult upon insult upon those who adhere to vigorous Americanism. We should let it be known to those people and to the whole world that we intend to preserve our constitutional freedoms against sinister conspiracy and propaganda attacks, as well as against threats to our security.

The editorial follows:

THE ATLANTIC UNION PERIL

Advocates of world government—whose arguments are based on emotion rather than logic—are showing alarming strength in the United States. Sundry organizations with memberships comprising, in the main, loyal but misguided Americans, are waging a never-ending propaganda campaign in behalf of world federation under a single governmental authority.

Atlantic Union, one of the most active of the world governmental groups, is seeking congressional approval of a resolution that calls for a convention of the 15 North Atlantice Treaty Organization countries "to explore and to report to what extent their peoples might * * * form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union."

Atlantic Unionists openly state that a federal world republic is their ultimate objective, and a federation of the NATO countries would be a means toward that end.

World government promoters are winning adherents by associating their cause with such lofty ideals as universal peace and world brotherhood of man. They fail to realize—or emphasize—that union of the world is the means by which the Kremlin hopes to dominate the earth. Stalin as early as 1922 was calling for "amalgamation of all nations in a single world economic system." A world union of Soviet Socialist Republics is the goal toward which Russia has been working for more than three decades.

Under whatever name or form it might be attained, world government inevitably would reduce the country to the status of a province ruled by an international governmental organization whose authority would be supreme. The United States, with less than 7 percent of the earth's population, obviously would have a minority voice in any world government formed.

The United States today needs less emphasis on internationalism and more on Americanism. This country, by virtue of its military and industrial might, should, of course, accept a share of leadership in world affairs, but this does not justify a sacrifice of the principles and traditions upon which it was founded and has prospered.

Foundation stones of the great American heritage, the priceless possessions of every United States citizen, are national independence, individual freedom, and the highest standard of living in the world. All three would disappear if the United States sacrificed its sovereignty to a world government.

One would be naive, indeed, to believe that ruthless Communists, masters of infiltration who already rule half of all mankind, would not eventually gain control of any world government that might be created.

The growing murmur of world government forces in the United States warns of the need for greater appreciation of the blessings that are ours because of the sacrifices of our forefathers. It's time the forces of worldism were challenged, and put to rout, by exponents of genuine Americanism.

There was a time in America when "patriot" was a coveted label, and he who earned it was held in highest esteem. It is not too late for a stirring revival of patriotism.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, water rights upon which the project depends for power revenues are now in litigation before the Supreme Court and may never become available.

The whole financial structure of the Colorado River storage project depends upon power production at Glen Canyon Dam, and this in turn depends on whether or not the upper Basin States, under the Colorado River compact, have a right, as against the lower Basin States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, to accumulate and withhold water at Glen Canyon for power generation if it is needed for domestic and agricultural uses in the lower basin. The upper basin spokesmen are in disagreement among themselves on this point. Governor Johnson, of Colorado, submitted a prepared statement in the Senate hearings in which he said:

I am compelled to keep emphasizing that whatever water is stored in the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Reservoirs will be surplus to the agricultural and domestic needs of the upper basin, and must be delivered to the lower basin to satisfy the award of 1,500,000 acre-feet to Mexico and 1 million acre-feet to the lower basin.

Furthermore, should the lower basin require an additional supply of water for agricultural and domestic purposes, the water stored in these reservoirs must be released.

Under the 7-State compact the upper States must deliver at Lee Ferry in each 10-year period 75 million acre-feet to the lower States and 7½ million acre-feet to Mexico before they can use 1 drop of water themselves beyond what they used before the 7-State compact was ratified.

In the current 10-year period that will leave only 3,250,000 acre-feet per year for their total use. In the previous 10-year period they would have had 4,150,000 acre-feet a year. In 1902 the upper basin States under this formula would have had no water at all.

Governor Johnson bases his contention on articles III (e) and IV (b) of the Colorado River compact, which provide:

ART. III. (e) The States of the upper division shall not withhold water, and the States of the Lower Division shall not require the delivery of water, which cannot reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

ART. IV. (b). Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River System may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.

If Governor Johnson is right, all the estimates of power revenues at Glen Canyon are wrong, because they are based upon the assumption that if the upper basin States release to the lower basin 75 million acre-feet in each 10 years—the minimum required by article III (d) of the compact—they may keep everything else. Even at that, it would take 25 years to fill Glen Canyon Dam if the next quarter century is as dry as the last 25 years.

These questions of interpretation of the Colorado River compact are now at issue in the United States Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California et al. Whether or not the upper States, who have been impleaded by California, become parties to that case, the Court cannot divide the water in the Colorado River among Arizona, California, and Nevada, without ascertaining how much water these States

have a right to receive from the four upper States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. It is foolhardy to invest hundreds of millions in Glen Canyon Dam on an interpretation of the Colorado River compact which is challenged by the Governor of Colorado, and may be set aside by the Supreme Court in an action which is already pending in that Court. The consideration of this bill should await the Supreme Court decision.

The Alphabetical Police

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 12, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been disturbed by the apparent interventions of the Eisenhower administration in the work of the independent agencies of the Government, the quasi-judicial agencies set up by Congress to safeguard the public interest. I think "disturbed" is hardly a strong enough word.

I for one am delighted that a subcommittee of this House, headed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], has begun an investigation of the independent agencies to learn how they are functioning, and whether in fact they remain independent, under this administration.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has an excellent editorial pointing out the issues involved and what the Congress may learn from the work of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I include the editorial, as follows:

THE ALPHABETICAL POLICE

A House Small Business Subcommittee today begins an investigation in which every American has an interest. It is an inquiry into the workings of those Federal regulatory commissions with the formidable names which protect everybody's welfare.

What the Federal Power Commission does may change the price of gas in the housewife's stove. What the Interstate Commerce Commission does can alter the price of a railroad ticket. What the Federal Communications Commission does may affect programs on a television set.

The Federal Trade Commission can guard a consumer against false advertising, and the Securities and Exchange Commission can defend an investor against fake investments. And so on.

As Thomas L. Stokes reports in his column today, a House subcommittee under Representative JOHN L. EVINS, Tennessee Democrat, wants to know how all these agencies have been doing under the Eisenhower administration. They are independent agencies created by Congress to protect the public. Are they still independent and do they still protect the public?

Congressman EVINS had a remarkable premonition some 5 months ago. He asked then whether the independent commissions "have become political puppets on telephone wires leading from the White House." Just last week the public learned that Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams had held the Securities and Exchange Commission on a telephone wire from the White House, inducing SEC to recess a hearing on the Dixon-Yates power deal.

Earlier the former Chairman of the SEC, Ralph Demmler, was reported to have declined to tell a House committee whether President Eisenhower discussed the Dixon-Yates contract with him before the SEC approved the financing. Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of East St. Louis, now demands an inquiry into White House intervention in the SEC.

This is not the way an independent commission is supposed to work. The first Hoover Commission noted that these creations of Congress "are not in any way to be influenced by the policies of the administration which, with propriety, are colored by political policy."

Has the present administration tended to reshape the regulatory agencies in a manner favorable to the interests they are supposed to regulate? That is what the Evins committee will ask.

One way of changing the direction of governmental agencies is to change their personnel. In 2 years at least 10 persons have left the Federal regulatory commissions, including such outstanding defenders of the public interest as Leland Olds, champion of public power, and Frieda Hennock, who fought almost single-handed in the FCC for educational television.

As a result of the exodus, the Eisenhower administration has been able to name majorities for the Atomic Energy Commission, the SEC and the Civil Service Commission, and the chairmen of several similar bodies. It is the caliber of these appointments which suggests a change in attitude.

Edward F. Howrey, former lobbyist, was named Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, which is supposed to regulate the interests he represented. Similarly, George C. McConnaughey, Ohio telephone company attorney, was named head of the FCC which regulates the telephone business.

Jerome K. Kuykendall, foe of public power, was named chairman of the Federal Power Commission, which is supposed to control private power. Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel became head of the Tennessee Valley Authority and, though promising to support that independent though not regulatory agency, supported the Dixon-Yates private power scheme to invade TVA territory.

Everett Hutchinson, an Eisenhower Democrat, was named to the Interstate Commerce Commission to complete a patronage deal between Sherman Adams and Senator PRICE DANIEL of Texas, who supported the Eisenhower candidacy. To make room for Hutchinson, the White House refused to issue a waiver to permit Charles D. Mahaffey, a Hoover appointee and railroad financing expert, to complete his unexpired term. Earlier the administration had tried without success to get J. Monroe Johnson, then ICC Chairman, to resign.

Along with changes in membership, several regulatory agencies have been involved in attempts to change their policy. There was the early effort to get the FTC to approve advertising claims of that effervescent battery additive, AD-X2, though regulation won out in the end.

The Federal Power Commission has steadfastly refused to regulate prices of natural gas sold to pipeline companies, despite a Supreme Court decision that it should, and its Chairman has frankly attacked such regulation.

President Eisenhower himself overruled the Civil Aeronautics Board which had refused to give a monopoly air route from Seattle to Honolulu to Pan-American Airways, but the President later reversed himself.

In the Dixon-Yates case the administration not only invaded the domain of the SEC but also of the Atomic Energy Commission and TVA, both independent agencies of Congress. Joseph Campbell, former AEC member and now Comptroller General, was even quoted as saying he thought the AEC, of such vast importance to defense and progress, should be politically responsive to the administration.

These matters made news, but the public interest is equally involved in the many day-by-day decisions of regulatory agencies of which citizens are hardly aware. A rate increase here, a cease-and-desist order there, a radio license somewhere else, may affect the pocketbooks, business opportunities, health, or even entertainment of citizens for years hence.

Since no one citizen can inspect the work of all the regulatory agencies, the Evins committee is properly undertaking the task, for the many commissions with the alphabetical names are John Q. Public's personal police against predatory influences. If they are not protecting him, Congress ought to tell him about it.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

Appendix

Rochambeau Birthday Ceremonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an account of the proceedings, including the statements made on the occasion of the first American Rochambeau birthday ceremonies held at the Rochambeau statue in Lafayette Park opposite the White House on July 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Charles Parmer, general chairman, Interstate Rochambeau Commission of the United States (speaking in French, for Voice of America broadcast to France):

"I take this occasion to reaffirm the debt of gratitude we have contracted toward France, at the hour when our fate was at stake. At a time when we were weak, poor, without friends or support, she was our first and only ally, putting at our disposal not only her material resources, but also the wisdom, the experience, and the very life of the best of her sons."

Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth, daughter of President Theodore Roosevelt who dedicated the Rochambeau statue in 1902, laid a wreath of flowers gathered from the Mount Vernon gardens—where Rochambeau was a guest when en route with Washington to Yorktown in September 1781.

The Honorable HARRY FLOOD BYRD, United States Senator, Virginia, placed a wreath of Virginia flowers at the Rochambeau statue in the name of the people of the United States. He said:

"I place these flowers in honor of France, our first ally, and her great General Rochambeau, who with his valiant French soldiers played an important role in aiding Washington to achieve our independence as a nation."

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, United States Senator, Rhode Island, placed 13 blossoms from the Mount Vernon gardens (red, white, and blue) in honor of the Original Thirteen States. He said:

"Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, in opening may I offer a word of praise to you, Mr. Parmer, who have done so much to bring to our minds an awareness of the debt we owe to General Rochambeau. He has been responsible for the organization of Rochambeau commissions in all the States through which General Rochambeau and the French marched on their way to Yorktown. If the Rochambeau Commission of my own State is an example, these commissions are indeed active.

"It was exactly 1¾ centuries ago that 6,000 gallant French soldiers landed at Newport, then one of the capitals of my State of Rhode Island. They came in fulfillment of France's pledge to help the struggling United States achieve that "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" for which our forefathers were desperately fighting. The arrival of these French troops gave a tremendous impetus to the cause of George Washington and his beleaguered Continental Army. It was important to have brave and disciplined troops. It was equally important for them to have an able leader. In this respect the little French Army was singularly fortunate in being under the command of Jean-Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur, Count Rochambeau, a wise and experienced soldier who had worked his way up in combat to the rank of major general.

"Rochambeau has fought for his beloved France most of his 55 years. He possessed those qualities of personal bravery and of tempered wisdom, of concern for his men and of unfailing singlemindedness in the attainment of his military objective, which are necessary in any top, military leader.

"Although he was a great professional soldier, he was also a great man, willing to subordinate himself to the civilian soldier, George Washington. In this connection, he presented to Washington a marshal's baton in behalf of the King of France, in order that his relationship with George Washington might more nearly conform with military custom.

"Rochambeau was enough of a diplomat to be able to channel and profitably use the ebullient energies of Lafayette. He was enough of a politician to be able to leave Newport with his 6,000 troops at the end of a winter even so well respected as when he arrived. And, most important of all, he was enough of a soldier to be able to play a fully equal role with General Washington in securing the defeat of the British at Yorktown. In fact, when Cornwallis and the British surrendered there, they did so equally to the French and American generals, Rochambeau and Washington.

"Thus, it is that the debt of gratitude owed by the United States to France and to Rochambeau and his gallant army is indeed profound. Without French aid, the cause of American independence might well have failed. As a citizen of Rhode Island, in the Senate of the United States, I am glad to be here now to honor General Rochambeau and the country which sent him to our aid, by laying these symbolic flowers at the foot of his statue."

Maj. Gen. Charles R. Landon, USAF (retired), military chairman of the Interstate Rochambeau Commission, read General Washington's orders, issued October 20, 1781, commending the fighting roles of General Rochambeau, individual French officers, and his entire army, for their valiant aid in the Yorktown Battle.

Hon. Robert Valeur, counselor of French Embassy:

"M. Parmer, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the French Ambassador, who is in Paris, has asked me to express to you his sincere regret that he cannot be present today at this manifestation of Franco-American friendship.

"The French people are profoundly grateful to the American people for having preserved with such fidelity the souvenir of the assistance France brought to the United States at the time of its Revolution.

"The French negotiators of the historic treaty of amity and alliance signed in 1778 between the 2 countries did not seek nor expect any rewards, but were fully conscious that they were laying a solid and lasting foundation for the relations between the 2 Republics.

"Twenty-five years later, another memorable date was carved on the monument of French-American friendship. It was when, on Easter Monday, April 10, 1803, Napoleon decided to sell to the United States the whole Territory of Louisiana.

"Regretful as the French were to abandon a territory the immense value of which they fully realized, they were looking to the future, convinced as they were, in the words of Barbé-Marbois, the French negotiator, "that it was in the interest of the whole world to favor the growth in power and size of the United States." This sentiment, expressed several times by Napoleon, was reflected in the remarks of Livingston, the American Plenipotentiary, on signing the treaty:

" 'We have lived long and this is the most beautiful day in our lives. From this day on, the United States will rank among the first-class powers. Thus, if new wars cannot be avoided, France will find sometime in the New World a powerful friend, growing from year to year, who will inevitably become powerful and respected upon all the seas of the world.'

"No prophecy could have been more true. The 'infant' of 1778 has become a giant and a mighty friend. This mighty friend came in our days to the assistance of France in the First World War and insure the liberation of our country at the end of the second. The situation of France has changed; but the friendship has endured. Today as 175 years ago, it does rest and will continue to rest, on the principle so clearly and so simply enunciated, by the negotiators of the treaty of 1778: 'real good will,' and 'manifest interest.' "

Hon. C. Burke Elbrick, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, spoke for the United States. He said:

"Mr. Parmer; Members of the Congress of the United States; M. Valeur, Counselor of the French Embassy; Ladies and Gentlemen:

"It is an honor for me to represent the Department of State at this ceremony commemorating the 230th anniversary of the birth of that great soldier and marshal of France, Jean Baptiste Donatien de Vimeur, Comte de Rochambeau.

"This magnificent statue of Rochambeau by Ferdinand Hamar before which we are gathered today was a gift of France to the United States. It was unveiled by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. This gracious square, in which we find ourselves, bears the illustrious name of Lafayette. Much that surrounds us here is testimony to those early historic ties which have bound closely together the destinies of France and the United States.

"In the course of conducting pressing diplomatic relations between governments or in reviewing the contemporary relationship of the people of one country toward the people of another, it is indeed valuable to pause and evoke the wisdom of history. While personages, circumstances, places and dates change, one will usually find that the true and fundamental elements of relationship between countries do not. There is great truth in the adage that 'History repeats itself.' "

"Such it has been in the relations between France and the United States since the inception of this country. In 1778 Louis XVI

recognized the fledgling United States of America in the famous Treaty of Alliance and Commerce negotiated by Benjamin Franklin. In 1780 the King of France dispatched, under the command of the Count de Rochambeau, at that time a lieutenant general in the Royal Army, some 6,000 of his finest troops to help the American colonists. While Lafayette and other French officers had been rendering great service to General Washington and the American Army, the arrival of Rochambeau and his men at Newport in July 1780 constituted the first formal commitment of troops by the army of one country to the army of the other. This military alliance between France and the United States has continued intermittently, in time of danger to the two nations down through history—World War I, World War II, and now our great partnership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This spirit of the Alliance is to be found in dedication of our two peoples to the principles of liberty and democracy.

"It was Jules Jusserand, I believe, who pointed out in his book, With Americans of Past and Present Days that France of 1780 was inspired by enthusiasm for the Americans, not by hatred of the British—an enthusiasm which had its roots in the ideal of liberty that was then beginning to sweep the continent. This imperishable ideal of liberty has become today in the evolution of history one of the keystones of the United Nations, which is yet another firm bond linking together our sister Republics.

"The military fortunes of Washington were at a low ebb when Rochambeau arrived and they were to sink yet lower before joint action could begin. The British held southern New York; all Northern ports were blockaded; and in the South, Gen. Nathaniel Greene, aided by the intrepid Lafayette was fighting brilliantly though desperately against the vastly superior forces of Cornwallis. The situation on the continent had changed and additional troops which had been promised could not be spared. When the future looked darkest it was learned that Admiral De Grasse and his fleet had arrived as if by providence in the West Indies. Washington and Rochambeau heartened by this news conceived and carried out that brilliant combined military naval campaign, with which you are all familiar, that culminated in the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. At this decisive battle upon which depended the fate of our new Nation there were actually more French soldiers participating than Americans. The passage of time has perhaps dimned in the American consciousness the tremendous import of this fact. If so, this should not be.

"A sense of history is one of the great spiritual assets of any people. It is through the dedicated efforts of those organizations which are represented here today that such a sense is nourished. It is through such ceremonies as this commemoration of the birth of Rochambeau that your efforts prosper and cause us to pause in our busy life and to reflect on the verities of history. In those verities, which are exemplified so well by the noble place in our history of the man we honor today, we find those qualities of the heart, the mind, and the spirit that are the firm and lasting foundation of Franco-American friendship."

Flowers were laid on the Rochambeau statue by representintatives of leading patriotic socieites, and Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, and retiring Mayor Marshall J. Beverley, as well as representatives of Woodlawn and Gunston Hall.

The invocation was by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Chaplain of the United States Senate.

The music was by the United States Marine Drum and Bugle Corps from Quantico, Va., under the direction of S. Sgt. A. di Giova, who gave a spirited playing of the French Huron March, used by Rochambeau's troops.

The benediction was by the Right Reverend Monsignor John K. Cartwright, rector, St. Matthews Cathedral, Washington, D. C.

The Lyndon Johnson We Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The LYNDON JOHNSON We Knew," which was published a few days ago in the Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE LYNDON JOHNSON WE KNEW

The tragic illness of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, has grieved members of both parties. His serious heart attack, apparently removing him indefinitely from a place of active leadership, is a blow to the Democratic Party, and to the Nation.

We had the good fortune to become acquainted with Mr. JOHNSON during our assignment in Texas during part of World War II. He was then a recently elected congressman, on active duty with the Navy.

A valuable commentary on JOHNSON in those days appears in the book, Queens Die Proudly, by W. L. White, in which the author tells what happened after the crash-landing of the "Swoose," a flying fortress, on a remote Australian ranch. JOHNSON, then on duty as a Navy lieutenant commander, was aboard.

One of the crew said afterward, "Pretty soon Australian ranchers began crawling out of holes in the ground—I don't know where else they came from—and right away Lieutenant Commander JOHNSON gets busy. He begins to get acquainted. They tell him where we are and some of them go off to get a truck and take us into town where we can telephone and more keep coming, and JOHNSON is shaking hands all around, and he comes back and tells us these are real folks—the best damn folks in the world, except maybe the folks in his own Texas. Pretty soon he knows all their first names, and they're telling him why there ought to be a high tariff on wool, and there's no question he swung that country for JOHNSON before we left. He sure was in his element. I know he sure swung the *Swoose* crew. He can carry that precinct any day."

Later we knew him in Washington, and spent an afternoon in his home. He was a restless man, constantly on the move, yet one incident, of significance in his recent history, remains vivid.

About midafternoon, despite the presence of 3 or 4 guests, he calmly excused himself and napped for an hour on a couch out on the big porch where the rest of us continued to talk. We've remembered that, and thought, as he climbed from Congress to the Senate, and to majority leader and even to frequent mention for the Presidency, that this man probably was continuing to guard his health even as he approached the pinnacle of success.

But apparently we were wrong. He gave all he had to the struggle, and paid a heavy price. Americans everywhere—and especially southerners—are hoping this brilliant young leader will recover his strength, and return to the political arena.

Effect of Reciprocal Trade Act on Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that when the bill extending the reciprocal trade agreements program was before the Senate Finance Committee an amendment was added authorizing the President to restrict imports in a situation where the national security was threatened. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, and subsequently accepted by the House of Representatives.

That was only a short time ago, but I am happy to say that the amendment is having the intended effect so far as imports of petroleum, that vitally important resource, are concerned.

A report from the Austin Bureau of the Dallas Morning News carries the information that Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, member of the Texas Railroad Commission and an internationally recognized authority on the oil industry, says the legislation already is having a wholesome effect on petroleum imports.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story published in the Dallas News be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that all Senators may benefit from General Thompson's report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX.—Congress' act permitting the President to restrict imports when the national security is threatened already is having a wholesome effect on oil imports, a Texas official said Tuesday.

Ernest O. Thompson, railroad commissioner, noted that imports recently have shown a decline.

"The legislation has had a wholesome effect," said Thompson, just back from the World Petroleum Congress in Rome. "I thing it will continue to have a wholesome effect."

While some domestic producers believe greater restrictions should be imposed, Thompson said he expects the threat of presidential action will help to keep imports in check.

The commission next Tuesday will hold its first proration hearing in two months.

"There seems to be no great optimism nor any great gloom" for Texas producers at this point, said Thompson. He noted that "phenomenal sales" of gasoline have reduced stocks and that crude oil supplies are 2 percent lower than 1954, as of July 2.

"There's plenty of oil and gasoline, so the consumer should be happy," Thompson commented. "We're really in a period of surplus, yet drilling activity is high. We need to be careful (regulating production) in the last half of the year."

Safeguarding Food and Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have long been deeply interested in the effective functioning of the Nation's pure food and drug laws.

I have long felt that appropriations for FDA enforcement have been sadly lacking in relation to the ever expanding workload on this agency. A citizens advisory committee has commented very strongly along similar lines.

I send to the desk the text of an editorial from the Tuesday, July 19, Milwaukee Journal, highlighting this very significant issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I trust that appropriate remedial action will be taken.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMY JUST ABOUT KILLING FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

One of the most disturbing reports to come before the American people in many months is that of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration.

This Administration is the Federal agency entrusted with protecting the public from poisonous materials in food, insanitary conditions in food manufacturing, food adulteration, false and misleading food claims, dangerous drugs, adulterated or misbranded cosmetics, and deceptive packaging.

Every home in this country has foods, drugs, and cosmetics over which the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has jurisdiction.

According to the Citizens' Committee, the FDA is understaffed and underequipped. It is altogether unable to cope adequately with the increase in population, the increase in food-producing plants, the sensational technological development in production of food and drugs and the marked changes in consumer habits.

Here are highlights of the report:

There are fewer FDA enforcement agents in 1955 than there were in 1941, despite a 30-million growth in population.

There was a steady growth in the amount of funds appropriated for FDA activities in the period 1939–51. In succeeding years (under the Eisenhower administration) funds have been sharply cut.

At the present rate of inspection, statistics indicate that among all food establishments any 1 would be inspected only on an average of once every 60 years.

Of 1,900 cosmetic establishments, fewer than 200 will be inspected this year.

In the Chicago inspection area, which includes Wisconsin, Michigan, northern Illinois, and northern Indiana, there is a total inspection force of 17.

About 80 percent of the food, drug, and cosmetic imports coming through the New York international airport (Idlewild) must be passed without examination because the FDA can afford to station an inspector there only 2 days each week.

As a result of reductions in attorneys under FDA jurisdiction (from 20 in 1950 to 12 today) almost all formal rulemaking has stopped. Processing of criminal cases is no longer current. It is not possible to prepare findings on food standard hearings which have been held.

The advisory committee, named by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, consisted of outstanding people concerned with foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

The chairman was G. Cullen Thomas, vice president of General Mills, Inc. Members included: A vice president of H. J. Heinz Co., the president of the American Home Economics Association, the director of the School of Nutrition at Cornell University, and the dean of the College of Pharmacy of the University of Colorado.

The judiciary was represented by Federal Judge Patrick T. Stone of the western district of Wisconsin—a recognized authority on food and drug laws.

In a future editorial, recommendations of the committee for improving the FDA will be discussed.

Study of McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Italian News, Boston, Mass., concerning my proposal to create a commission to study the McCarran-Walter Act and offer suggestions for changes therein.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KENNEDY's proposal to create a Commission to study the McCarran-Walter Act and offer suggestions for changes is one that we hope will be seriously considered by his fellow lawmakers.

Long ago, the Italian News suggested that bipartisan action, such as that offered by Senator KENNEDY, be taken by Members of both Houses of Congress. The need for this is illustrated by the fact that there are now over 60 bills in Congress which would change provisions of the controversial immigration law.

A Commission to study the law and make recommendations could do much to pull together the forces in favor of a just and democratic immigration and naturalization laws. We are certain that if a Commission as Senator KENNEDY proposes—made up of objective and nonpolitical members—is set up, their recommendations would be much in line with those offered by the majority of serious students of immigration.

But whether anything is ever done to revise the law will depend on more than a Commission's study. It must be recalled that one Commission has already reported on the law and suggested that it be completely rewritten. This report has been forgotten.

What really counts, as does everything in a government under a democracy, is the action of the people. Italo-Americans, acting individually and in groups, must constantly make known their objections to the McCarran Act. Organizations should make this matter a permanent project. Literature should be distributed, letters written, debates scheduled, news releases issued, lectures delivered. In short, a vast and continuing public-information program is needed.

The forces opposing change in the McCarran Act are strong and well organized. We will not defeat them by sitting back and letting amendments collect dust in Congress.

Remarks Made by George E. Stringfellow, Imperial High Priest and Prophet, AAONMS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made by George E. Stringfellow, imperial high priest and prophet, AAONMS, at Acca Temple, Richmond, Va., June 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. GUY R. FISHER, PAST POTENTATE ACCA TEMPLE, AAONMS—REMARKS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW, IMPERIAL HIGH PRIEST AND PROPHET, AAONMS, AT ACCA TEMPLE, RICHMOND, VA., JUNE 4, 1955

Illustrious Potentate Andrew L. Tenser, your able, gracious and effective divan, past potentates, heads of units, presidents of shrine clubs—distinguished guests and fellow shriners, I am happy to share with you today the privilege of honoring a truly great American. One who has rendered service above and beyond the call of duty to the Shrine of North America and through it to our beloved country.

Virginia is famous for her historic battlefields, on which the fate of our Nation was once decided. Virginia is noted for her gracious culture. Virginia is noted for her great statesmen and as the birthplace of eight of our most distinguished Presidents. Virginia is noted for having provided leadership for the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Virginia is great not only because of her geographic location and her natural wealth, Virginia is great because of the character and the philosophy of her people.

Today we honor in Dr. Guy R. Fisher, past potentate, Acca Temple—the mother temple of Virginia—a truly great Virginian, who has been appraised on a number of occasions as a Virginia gentleman. No higher compliment can one man pay another, in my opinion, than to say, "He is a Virginia gentleman."

Ralph Waldo Emerson, one of the wisest of Americans, must have had such a person in mind as Dr. Fisher when he said, "I consider him a great man who inhabits a higher sphere of thought into which other men rise with difficulty and labor." I know of no man who inhabits a higher sphere of thought and who lifts the moral and ethical thinking of his fellowman to a greater degree than Dr. Fisher. He is the symbol of all that is good in a citizen. Dr. Fisher typifies the conscience of the Masonic fraternity and of the shrine.

SUCCESS

A wise philosopher years ago penned the following: "He has achieved much who has lived well, laughed often, and loved much; who has gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children; who has filled his niche and accomplished his task, whether by an improved poppy, or a perfect poem, or a rescued soul; who has never lacked appreciation of earth's beauty or failed to express it; who has always looked for the best in others and given the best he had; whose life is an inspiration and whose memory is a benediction." Such a man is Dr. Fisher and such is the measure of his success.

Dr. Fisher has employed his talents, his philosophy and his sterling character to elevate his profession and our fraternity to a higher pedestal of esteem and respect.

FAITHFUL SERVANT

This brings to mind the parable of the faithful servant, related by the Gentle Carpenter of Nazareth. You have read the story of St. Matthew's gospel, how the master, before going to a far away country, called his servants to him. To one he gave 5 talents, to another two and to another one. You will recall that one servant buried his talent in the ground, that he who had two gained still another two, and he who had five gained still another five. Therefore, when their master returned, he was pleased with the stewardship of the two servants who had made the most of their gifts, and because they had been faithful over a few things, he set them over many.

Dr. Fisher has indeed been a faithful servant. He is endowed with a philosophy and a spirit that helps to make this a better world. He is a man of talent and by the wise use of the talent committed to his care, he is by his conduct enriching the world and when he renders an accounting of his stewardship he will deserve to hear the Grand Master of the Universe say, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

But No Further Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a recent article written by Ernest K. Lindley, entitled "But No Further Retreat," which appears in Newsweek of July 11, 1955, under the subject Washington Tides. The article deals with the situation in South and East Asia. It is a most thought-provoking article, and I commend it to the reading of Senators.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON TIDES—"BUT NO FURTHER RETREAT"

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Several general impressions and conclusions emerge from the tour of 14 nations and colonies in south and east Asia from which I recently returned:

1. Except in Korea and among the mainland Chinese on Formosa, free Asian opinion is emphatically against war. But it is also overwhelmingly against any further retreat by the free world, especially in the face of force. It doesn't want to see Red China win any more victories. My impression is that most free Asian leaders would like to see the offshore islands relinquished to Red China, but as part of a wider settlement, or at least not in a way which would look like a defeat for the free world. Our determination to keep Formosa free is, I think, generally approved, despite the official Indian contention that the island belongs to Peking.

2. By their behavior at Bandung and since, the Communist Chinese have convinced most of free Asia that they don't want war—at least not a war with the United States. But they continue to build their own military strength. It would be foolhardy for free Asia not to do likewise or for us to let down our guard.

3. A respite from war does not mean that there will be any slackening of efforts by the Communists to win their ends by propaganda, infiltration, and subversion, backed where they think it is advantageous by violence, from general strikes to armed guerrillas. The struggle between freedom and communism is going on throughout this area, from Pakistan to Japan. In a few places communism is an important threat now. But there is determined opposition to communism throughout free Asia. And there is growing awareness of Communist techniques. Even such uncommitted Governments as India and Burma are firmly committed against communism internally. No country which communism has not already swallowed need be considered lost.

4. Every nation in free Asia urgently needs capital. It seems unlikely that private investors, here or elsewhere, will provide more than a part of this need in the near future. We should make soft loans where necessary, besides continuing our technical assistance and our special financial help to such countries as South Vietnam, Formosa, and Korea. Most free Asian countries are now stable enough politically to make substantial progress economically, and unless they do they will become politically unstable once again.

5. Free Asians are, in the main, friendly to the United States. They want to learn from us—especially about how to raise their standards of living. But they don't like to appear to be under our tutelage. We should be sparing and discriminating in our criticism and in our advice unless it is sought. Some of the advice, official and unofficial, freely proffered from this country has been resented. Some of it has advertised our own ignorance; also, we still suffer from the feeling in Asia that we look down on the colored races and that we are not fully against colonialism.

6. The second language of nearly all of free Asia is English. The most rapidly expanding enterprise in nearly all of free Asia is education. The USIS libraries which I visited in southeast Asia were crowded, largely with young people. We should enlarge some of them and open many more. We might also give at least a small library to every school in which English is taught. We should also provide many more scholarships, traveling fellowships, and exchange professorships. In most of the new Asian nations there is a dearth of trained men over a wide range of important public and private activities. Young people educated now and in the next few years will rise immediately to key positions. Thousands would come here to study if scholarships were provided for them.

There has been some frenetic reporting from Asia in the American press. There are many soft spots in free Asia. But my conclusion is that the prospects of preventing any further expansion of the Communist domain in Asia are good, if what can be done, with our assistance, is done.

Davis-Bacon Act From the Viewpoint of Construction Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to include an article by general counsel Vincent F. Morreale, which appeared in the July issue of the Laborer, official publication of the International Hod Carriers', Building & Common Laborers' Union of America, AFL.

This is a very interesting and enlightening discussion on current aspects of highway legislation from the viewpoint of construction unions.

The article follows:

DAVIS-BACON ACT—BACKGROUND, ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER STATUTE GIVEN IN GENERAL COUNSEL'S DISCUSSION

(By Vincent F. Morreale, general counsel)

Current efforts to apply the Davis-Bacon Act to the proposed Federal-aid highway program have focused public attention upon the act for the first time in 2 decades. The act is a time-tested remedial law, which has proved of immeasurable value to our Nation, and to craftsmen and contractors alike. We have come to regard it as a part of our heritage. It has not aroused controversy, but has been accepted by all elements of our society. But as time passes by, the memory of the sordid conditions the law was designed to remove, become dimmer. With the current consideration by Congress of the unprecedented, gigantic highway construction program which shall extend over the next decade, it is necessary and appropriate that we take stock of this heritage, and trace the act from its inception to the present day. By so doing, we shall be able to show that the need is as great today and the principle just as true and good as it was then; and that the arguments advanced against requiring the prevailing wage concept on the highway program are neither new, nor of special application to it.

Serious attempts to enact prevailing wage legislation date back to the middle twenties, when the industry was ablaze with strikes ignited by a few unscrupulous contractors who were obtaining the majority of Federal contracts solely because their bids were based on wage rates which prevailed in their low-wage States rather than the rates which were actually being paid to craftsmen on similar type projects in the locality where the work was to be performed.

NEEDS DEMONSTRATED

Typical of the incidents related to demonstrate the urgent need for remedial legislation was that described by Congressman Bacon in 1927:

"I want to cite the specific instance that brought this whole matter to my attention. The Government is engaged in building in my district a Veterans Bureau hospital. Bids were asked for; several New York contractors bid, and in their bids, of course, they had to take into consideration the high labor standards prevailing in the State of New York. I think I can say that the labor standards in New York are very high. The wages were fair, and there has been no difficulty in the building trades between the employee and the employer in New York for some time. And the situation existed therefore, and the New York contractors made their bids, having the labor conditions in mind. The bid, however, was let to a firm from the South and some thousand nonunion laborers were brought to New York in my own congressional district. They were hired onto this job, they were housed, and they were paid a very low wage, and the work proceeded. Of course, that meant that labor conditions in this part of New York State where the hospital was being built, were entirely upset. It meant that the neighboring community was very much upset."

HISTORY JUSTIFIES

The legislative history reveals that virtually every element in our society banded together to petition Congress to remedy this intolerable condition on Government con-

struction. Contractors demanded that they be protected from this unfair competition. Craftsmen protested because they were deprived of their livelihood, and because their wage scales and conditions were being broken down and destroyed. The communities requested assistance because projects which were intended to provide work for its citizens and purchasing power to it, not only failed to do so, but the imported workers after being housed in tents on the job and fed from company provisions, were usually dumped on its relief rolls when the job was completed. The public called upon the Government to eliminate the cause of the strikes once and for all.

PASSED IN 1931

The Davis-Bacon Act was passed in 1931, and was designed specifically to eradicate these abuses, and achieve the following objectives:

1. Provide equality of opportunity for contractors.
2. Provide—as far as possible—for employment of local craftsmen.
3. Prevent exploitation of the craftsmen and protect their standard of living built up through collective bargaining with local contractors over the years.
4. Promote industrial peace.
5. Encourage collective bargaining.
6. Prevent the disturbance of the local economy.

To attain these objectives, the Congress adopted the fundamental, conservative prevailing wage principle as public policy for Federal construction. The Federal Government recognized its responsibility of seeing that the construction wage structure, arrived at as a result of local collective bargaining and practice, was not upset. It imposed as one of the conditions for the expenditure of its funds, the duty of paying the prevailing local rates.

As originally enacted, the law required the payment of prevailing wages to laborers and mechanics engaged in the construction, repair, and alteration of public buildings. The act was amended in 1935 to:

1. Extend the coverage of the act by making it directly applicable to public works.
2. Require the Secretary of Labor to predetermine the minimum wages to be paid various classes of laborers and mechanics which shall be based upon the wages * * * prevailing for the corresponding classes of laborers and mechanics employed on projects of a character similar to the contract work in the city, town, village, or other civil subdivision of the State * * * in which the work is to be performed.

RESULTS ENUMERATED

In practice, the Davis-Bacon Act has excluded foreign wage practices on Federal construction, and has achieved the following results:

1. It has guaranteed equality of bidding opportunity to all contractors by protecting them against unfair competition, and restricting the area of competition to economy and efficiency.
2. It has assured local employment because no advantage can be gained by bringing in workers from lower wage rate areas.
3. It has protected the standard of living of the craftsmen.
4. It has promoted industrial peace by removing the prime cause of disputes on these projects.
5. It has encouraged collective bargaining.
6. It has prevented the disturbance of the local economies.

The act does not automatically cover the many "grant-in-aid" and "guaranteed" programs developed by the Federal Government during the past 20 years for pumping its resources into urgent State and local construction; but the Congress has long recognized the need for prevailing wage legislation on these programs, and the prevailing wage principle has been extended to these programs where Federal monies were involved because the law had worked so well on direct Federal construction. Ample precedent for applying the prevailing wage concept to the highway program can be drawn from the following federally assisted programs which contain express provisions making the Davis-Bacon Act applicable:

1. The Federal Airport Act.
2. School Survey and Construction Act of 1950.
3. Hospital Survey and Construction Act.
4. The Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal Program in the Housing Act of 1954.
5. National Housing Act.
6. Multi-Family Rental Housing under the FHA.
7. Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951.
8. Lease Purchase Contracts Act of 1954.

The opponents have advanced two major arguments for defeating the labor provision:

1. More roads could be built if the prevailing wages were not paid.
2. This is a local program. Control over labor provisions should be left to the States. The workers would be protected because half of the States have prevailing wage laws.

I. COST ARGUMENT

It would not increase the costs over similar type non-Federal projects, because the rates determined actually prevail where the work is to be performed. The cost argument would apply with equal force to all Federal construction programs. One could argue with stronger force that more roads could be built if slave or prison labor were employed or if workers were imported to work on this program at 25 cents a day, or if contractors were denied a profit, or if land were condemned at less than fair value. Should the Government employ its purchasing power to depress the purchasing power of its citizens? The very notion of the Federal Government permitting the highway robbery of construction workers because more roads might be built is utterly repulsive. No evidence has been advanced to support the cost argument.

II. LOCAL PROGRAM

This is not a local program, but a Federal program to construct a great, arterial, integrated national system over a span of many years with the Federal Government sustaining 90 percent of the costs. The provision requested by the unions would apply the Davis-Bacon Act to the Federal interstate system only.

The prevailing wage concept is even more appropriate for interstate highway legislation than the various grant-in-aid and insured programs where it applies now. Is not an integrated interstate highway network more directly related to the national legislative interest under our Constitution than a school, a hospital, apartment buildings, or a municipal airport, which are more local in nature and where the craftsmen possess protection already?

The Davis-Bacon Act applies presently to highway construction where the Government absorbs the entire cost. Ten percent less does not change the issue involved, because the Federal contribution is much less percentagewise on the many other grant programs governed by the prevailing wage concept, for, in the aggregate, the Government contributes only 50 percent of the costs; and on the insured programs, the Government does not absorb any of the actual costs.

With accelerated highway construction, the entry of many new firms in the field, and intensified competition, the situation has become urgent. Today the condition exists on many Federal-aid highway projects where the terms "local contractors," "local labor," and "prevailing rate of wages" have no meaning whatsoever. Into Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Connecticut, Indiana, Delaware, New Mexico, New Jersey, and other States have come certain foreign predatory contractors who have obtained large road contracts solely because they bid under the prevailing wage rates in the locality. The need of contractors, craftsmen, and communities is no less—in fact, is even much greater on a program of this gigantic magnitude—today for a prevailing-wage provision, unless we are to revert to the primitive stage of labor relations to settle these disputes, with consequent loss to all parties.

STATE LAWS NO ANSWER

State wage laws will not remedy this deplorable condition. If the application of State laws was permitted, the condition would not be rectified. Most State minimum-wage laws are completely inappropriate to construction. Nor would the "little Davis-Bacon" Acts possessed by some States alleviate the situation. Many of these laws do not apply to highway construction. Peculiarly, most of the States affected to date have prevailing wage laws on highway construction. They fail in their purpose here because there is nothing to prevent a contractor from obtaining several large contracts in a State by underbidding on wage rates and then repeating the offense in other States under this program. Only Federal enforcement, coupled with the powers to withhold moneys and prevent future violation by blacklisting on the entire interstate network, can act as a deterrent. The Federal Government has an obligation to protect the wage structure of its citizens in every community and every State in the Nation affected by this Federal program.

Age Requirements for Aid to Wives and Widows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Standard-Times, New Bedford, Mass., concerning age requirements for aid to wives and widows.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGE REQUIREMENTS FOR AID TO WIVES, WIDOWS DISCUSSED

To the EDITOR OF THE STANDARD-TIMES:

On May 27, Senator POTTER, Republican from Michigan, introduced a bill in Congress to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which wives and widows may qualify for old-age and survivors' benefits. On June 22 Senator KENNEDY, Democrat from Massachusetts, proposed the same thing. It will be remembered that the Truman administration back in 1949 recommended after a thorough study that the age at which women retire be lowered from 65 to 60.

There is talk of adopting a compromise and lowering the age from 65 to 62, instead of 60, for women because of the cost involved. This is laughable. It is estimated that the cost of lowering the age from 65

to 60 would cost the social security system $2,500 million. Yet we are giving away approximately $4 billion a year in so-called foreign aid. Billions of the taxpayers' money for Europe, Asia, and Africa, but for our aged here in America—well, they can wait.

In discussing lowering the age from 65 to 60 for women we must bear certain facts in mind. Under peace-time conditions there are relatively few women over 60 in paid employment. In 1950 they constituted only 13 percent of the workers aged 60 to 64.

In addition, a woman widowed at age 60, who has not been previously employed, has a harder time than a younger woman in finding a job. At present only about 1 widow in 4 of those without minor children is eligible for widow's benefits immediately upon the death of her husband. If the age were lowered to 60, about 40 percent of such widows would be eligible immediately. This is important when one considers that men do not live so long as women.

The Potter-Kennedy recommendation lowering the age from 65 to 60 for women would help aged couples in particular. At present, only one-fifth of the wives are eligible for a wife's benefit at the time the husband attains age 65. If the wife's benefits were payable at 60, 3 wives in 5 would immediately become eligible.

A number of people have asked me why the State does not lower the age from 65 to 60. Every year I have filed resolutions in the legislature asking the Congress to lower the age for women under social security and old-age assistance from 65 to 60. And the reason the State cannot embark upon such a program alone without the participation of the Federal Government is that the cost would be prohibitive. Therefore the liberalization of retirement laws for social security and old-age assistance must be done on a national basis.

The day is not far distant when men and women will retire under social security at age 60. But for the moment the question is having the law amended so that women may retire at 60. Congressman NICHOLSON and Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY no doubt would be glad to hear from their constituents on this issue.

THEOPHILE J. DES ROCHES.

Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MYRON V. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a report which shows the amount of money each State will need to build their proposed highways on the interregional road system.

These figures have been compiled by the various State highway departments and, of course, are estimates based on their needs. Some States may have overestimated or underestimated, as the case may be, but the total cost should average out.

It is my belief that the Members of the House will find these figures informative and that they should be carefully studied before final action is taken on our new proposed highway legislation.

The report follows:

Approximate apportionment of Federal funds and State matching funds for the national system under H. R. 7072, fiscal years 1957 to 1968, inclusive

[In millions of dollars]

State	Federal funds	State funds	Total program
Alabama	378	42	420
Arizona	217	13	230
Arkansas	210	23	233
California	2,396	217	2,613
Colorado	162	15	177
Connecticut	573	64	637
Delaware	68	8	76
Florida	512	57	569
Georgia	722	80	802
Idaho	110	9	119
Illinois	1,099	122	1,221
Indiana	895	99	994
Iowa	284	32	316
Kansas	214	24	238
Kentucky	508	56	564
Louisiana	509	57	566
Maine	152	17	169
Maryland	448	50	498
Massachusetts	865	96	961
Michigan	1,337	149	1,486
Minnesota	498	55	553
Mississippi	254	28	282
Missouri	618	69	687
Montana	158	15	173
Nebraska	109	12	121
Nevada	75	4	79
New Hampshire	68	8	76
New Jersey	1,401	156	1,557
New Mexico	243	19	262
New York	1,379	153	1,532
North Carolina	255	28	283
North Dakota	110	12	122
Ohio	1,405	156	1,561
Oklahoma	389	43	432
Oregon	329	27	356
Pennsylvania	784	87	871
Rhode Island	127	14	141
South Carolina	189	21	210
South Dakota	98	9	107
Tennessee	392	44	436
Texas	900	100	1,000
Utah	246	13	259
Vermont	184	20	204
Virginia	587	65	652
Washington	482	49	531
West Virginia	266	30	296
Wisconsin	333	37	370
Wyoming	305	23	328
District of Columbia	157	17	174
Total	24,000	2,544	26,544

Reporters' Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following program in which I participated, Reporters' Roundup, which was carried over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Monday, July 18, 1955:

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP

Guest: United States Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

Moderator: Robert F. Hurleigh.

Panel: Douglas Larsen, Newspaper Enterprise Association; Jim Roper, Washington Evening Star.

Mr. FISKE. Reporters' Roundup, where bylines make headlines. In a moment hear the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democratic United States Representative of Massachusetts 12th District and House majority leader of the 84th Congress, answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Congressman MCCORMACK, what are the accomplishments of the first year of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress?

Mr. ROPER. What about President Eisenhower's 1954 election predictions that there would be a cold war of partisan politics in a Democratic-controlled Congress and the Republican-controlled administration?

Mr. HURLEIGH. The members of the 84th Congress realize that the record made in Congress will be a major test for both Republicans and the Democrats. As politicians second-guess President Eisenhower's plans for next year, Democratic congressional leaders are uncommonly optimistic about holding the Senate and the House in next year's elections—based primarily on the record of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress. Our guest tonight is the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives—Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts' 12th District. Born in South Boston, Congressman MCCORMACK was elected to represent his district in 1928 and named majority leader in 1940. He has held that post in each Congress since, excepting the 80th and 83d in which he served as Democratic whip. And now, our guest is ready.

Mr. FISKE. Reporters' Roundup, which comes to you transcribed this evening from the House radio gallery in your Nation's Capital—is presented by Mutual and Facts Forum as part of Facts Forum's effort to stimulate interest in current issues. Facts Forum, nationwide, adult educational organization, is devoted to encouraging a desire in all Americans to listen, read, and think more about public affairs. Facts Forum has faith that the American people will inform themselves from sources of their own choosing, they will make wise decisions. May the opinions you will now hear expressed by our guest prompt you to further thought. United States Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat of the 12th District in Massachusetts, has served in Congress for the past 30 years and is now House majority leader of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress. Reporter's Roundup has invited this veteran congressional authority to discuss some of the accomplishments and problems of the 84th Congress as its 1955 session ends. And now, Congressman MCCORMACK is prepared to meet the challenging questions of this panel of well-known and able reporters: Mr. James Roper, staff correspondent for the Washington Evening Star, and Mr. Douglas Larsen, Washington correspondent of Newspaper Enterprise Association. Your moderater, Robert F. Hurleigh, direetor of Mutual's Washington operations.

Mr. HURLEIGH. And now, Mr. Roper, let's have the first question for United States Congressman MCCORMACK.

Mr. ROPER. Sir, in 1954 President Eisenhower said the election of a Democratic Congress would lead to a cold war of partisan politics. Well, as we know a Democratic Congress was elected. Do you think as a matter of fact a cold war of partisan politics has developed?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I think the evidence speaks for itself, Mr. Roper. The first session of the 84th Congress is now nearing its end and the record of this Congress and the interest of the people of America and our country both on the domestic level and the field of foreign affairs has been outstanding. As a matter of fact, in the last campaign I said in making various speeches that the best investment that the people of America could make would be to elect the Democratic Congress because in foreign affairs we have a united party, and the Republican Party is badly split. In the last Congress the Republican Party gave very little support to the President. In the field of domestic af-

fairs, important matters relating to our people, the Republican Party is also severely split with the old guard opposing every progressive piece of legislation. And the record of this session to date shows that the Democratic Party has been of invaluable aid to the people of the country in putting through legisaltion for their best interests, both in the field of foreign affairs and in the field of domestic activities.

Mr. ROPER. Sir, I have before me a statistical study of your votes on 29 issues which have been raised specifically by President Eisenhower and this study, which I believe is impartial, shows that you have supported the President on 2 out of 3 of his requests. Do you consider this a fair and full support of the President?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I do not know what the votes—what the particular measures are that you have in that compilation, but I would say if it is recorded that I supported the President 2 out of 3 of his recommendations, that that is a much better record than most of the Republican Members have. Furthermore, I want it distinctly understood so that there will be no misunderstanding, the probabilities are that those measures are ones that have been put on the statute books during the 20 years of wonderful Democratic control of our Government, so I have been supporting Democratic measures. And as a matter of fact, President Eisenhower is attempting to embrace the New Deal and the Fair Deal—so President Eisenhower has been following us Democrats pretty well. So, the record is that President Eisenhower supported us Democrats and it happened that we Democrats agreed that his recommendations were for the best interest of the country.

Mr. ROPER. I would like to say, that in the same study, it shows that on 10 foreign policy issues you and the President felt the same. I don't know who was supporting whom, but you and the President were together——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, when it comes to foreign affairs, Mr. Roper, the men in public life should realize that the Chief Executive, no matter who he is, whether Democrat or Republican by politics, is the leader of our country and establishes foreign policy, and sound legislators realize that in the world of today we have got to show the strength of our country through manifesting strength through our Chief Executive. It happens that the President's recommendations were consistent with the views that I entertain and fortunately were entertained by the great majority of the Democrats, and I am sure you will find that on rollcall votes of those issues and questions, that the Democrats largely and mainly voted for the measures and that the greatest opposition came from the Republican Party.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Mr. Douglas Larsen.

Mr. LARSEN. Well, Congressman MCCORMACK, to step down just a little bit from that high plane, and to get into the hard facts of politics, do you think that by supporting Eisenhower so completely and by being proud of it—boasting about it—that you did the Democratic cause any good nationally?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I haven't said that I supported President Eisenhower or that I haven't—I haven't been boasting about it, I just answered Mr. Roper's question by saying that the President has been supporting Democratic measures, and I am not going to vote against a measure recommended by a Republican President that is for the best interest of the people any more than I would one recommended by a President who is a Democrat, and in this case, President Eisenhower has been absolutely following the Democratic policy of the last 20 years. So it is the President who is following us, Mr. Larsen, so get that clear.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Would you say—Douglas, may I come in here—would you say that you have been supporting the program that the President has sent to the Congress rather than supporting the individual?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, that would be a fair statement. The program which is for the best interest of the people of our country—as a matter of fact that is the role of a minority party anyway. It should be constructive in criticism, constructive in opposition. It should be constructive in proposal and it should support when anyone makes constructive recommendations, and that has been the position of the Democratic Party—not like when the Republican Party was in minority, or in control of Congress, with a Democratic President—a party of blind opposition.

Mr. LARSEN. Well Congressman, do you think that you shaped up any major issues in this legislative session which are going to be a factor in the 1956 Presidential campaign? Would you pinpoint a couple?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why, absolutely. To begin with, one of the great differences in the two parties is the matter of utilization of power of our country for the best interest of our country. The present administration, under its theory of partnership, wants to give away the great natural resources of our country to private interest for the purpose of exploitation. We saw that in the case of Dixon-Yates. We see it now in the case of many other projects. The whole plan is there. We find it now in the $2 billion contracts being made with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in connection with our continental defense. The furnishing of communication services—that hasn't really come to the forefront yet, but it is one of those hidden contracts that are made and Congress is advised later on—so we have many issues—and furthermore, when any party goes to the country with the issue of having a record that is for the best interest of the country, that party never loses anything—it gains.

Mr. LARSEN. Congressman, did Ike pull the rug out from under you when he canceled the Dixon-Yates contract?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Pulled the rug out from under who?

Mr. LARSEN. From the Democrats.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why, no. The President admitted to the world that he was wrong.

Mr. LARSEN. Is that bad?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Bad in what respect?

Mr. LARSEN. Well, you said he admitted to the world that he was wrong——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HURLEIGH. But corrected himself—does that aid the cause?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, I don't think he corrected himself, not by any means. For when an administration undertakes to accomplish something of that kind and use such vigor to do so, as we know, using the powers of the administration to bring it about, even compelling members of the Atomic Energy Commission to change their minds and their vote, excluding competition—pressure that was exerted, even having a man represent two masters, one the Government and the other the First Boston Co. And, by the way, that company is not from Boston, Mass., that company is located in New York, I want that clearly understood.

Mr. LARSEN. Congressman——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Those things make a profound impression upon the people, and they cannot be eradicated by any slick or sly moves.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Congressman, assuming, as you and Democratic Party has, that Dixon-Yates controversy came about because the President was on unsound ground and because of that had to withdraw the plan of the Dixon-Yates program. Having withdrawn, does he not in the sense take away—and I think I am following Douglas Larsen's question—take away any of the strength of argument against this as it might have been in the next year's election campaign?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I don't think so, because Dixon-Yates is symbolic of the policy of the party, and in the campaign we have discussed the basic differences between the Republican and Democratic Parties in the field of power, and we have consistently referred to the Dixon-Yates as the concrete evidence showing what this administration symbolizes, so I think it is going to be a matter of very considerable import in the next election. But, of course, that is not the only thing we have. We have plenty of others. We have the big-business control of Government. Everybody now realizes that this administration is being conducted pretty well by not only big business, but big, big business—the big financiers of the country—and by the time a year from next July and August and October rolls around we ought to have shown the country many, many other things besides Dixon-Yates, because there are an awful lot of things going on in this administration that can be explored and exposed to the American people.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Mr. Roper.

Mr. ROPER. Mr. MCCORMACK, I would like to return to the subject of foreign policy, especially the Big Four Conference, which opened in Geneva today. Do you think the President will come a cropper there? So many of our previous meetings with the Russians at such Big Four meetings have just led to trouble.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, Mr. Roper, you have got to realize that at the outset the administration did not want to go over there to begin with. Secretary Dulles clearly indicated that. Then Senator GEORGE is the one who really brought it to a head when he made a statement that—and the President a day or two afterwards agreed with him—I think the British elections had a lot to do with our going in there. I think a call for help was made and that, at least enters into the picture. I don't say it was a determining factor, but it certainly was, in my opinion, a contributing factor . We have got to realize that it is pretty well stated by the President and the administration that they expect nothing to come out of here, that the meeting is more to try to infuse a new spirit into the field of diplomacy, to explore, to see if a new spirit can be developed, then to be followed by the operating teams, the foreign ministers as far as the later details are concerned, in trying to work out a more tractable and peaceful or compatable world. You have also got to realize that President Eisenhower has always been a general, leading, and that a general occupies a different position than negotiators in the diplomatic field, and he is going over there faced with the greatest diplomatic foxes of many decades. Not only Eden, the British and the French, who have been, are well experienced in the art of diplomacy and particularly in the actual act of negotiation, but also in the representatives of the Soviet Union and this is the first time that President Eisenhower has ever been in the position of a negotiator. And he is going up against negotiators of many years of experience and not uncomplimentarily, they are pretty sly foxes in that field, so that I hope there will be a new spirit infused, but we probably won't know for a year, a year and a half or two years, because when they have these diplomatic meetings, we usually don't get the truth for a long while afterwards. I am hoping for the best but I am not going to be disturbed if nothing particular materializes because we are dealing with a group of world killers when we are dealing with the Communists.

Mr. ROPER. Sir, you said that you were hoping for the best, but do you think Eisenhower is really up to this big league competition? You seem to be not too sure about this.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, only the results can show that. The President, as I said, has never been a negotiator before in the field

of diplomacy. His role has always been one of commander. I hope he rises to the highest level as a negotiator. I don't expect much from this meeting.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Mr. MCCORMACK, you are in a position of influence in the Congress. You do have sources of information. Do you think that either our Secretary of State or President Eisenhower had a program to carry to this Big Four Conference?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am unable to state that. I would assume they did. I would assume they had not only a maximum program, but a minimum program. I assume the other side has. We know what the other side's maximum program is. We don't know what their minimum is. It would seem to me that we should insist upon the disolution of the Cominform. We should also insist that the Soviet Union or the Communist Party in the Soviet Union stop its policy of further infiltration and subversion of other countries. We should insist that the Yalta Agreement for free elections for Poland and Lithuania and other countries be carried out under international supervision and Communist troops be withdrawn while free election is being carried out as to what form and kind of government those people desire. There are certain basic things we are entitled to have.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Congressman, on that point alone, did not your House, oftimes badly stated as the lower House of Congress——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Erroneously stated, too.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Erroneously stated as the lower House of Congress, but has not the lower House of Congress suggested——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Coequal House——

Mr. HURLEIGH. Coequal House of Congress established a better principle in suggesting to the President that something be done about the satellite nations rather than the Senate which many people think had a weak resolution which Senator KNOWLAND presented?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I prefer not to get into that except to make this observation. That there was no incompatibility between the Senate resolution and the House resolution, which I had the honor to introduce.

Mr. HURLEIGH. But yours was stronger, sir.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, yes, my resolution applied not only to subjected nations under Communist domination, but it also applied to people who were still free. Who had recently emerged from colonialism or who have the ambition to emerge from some form of colonialism and to have their own free and independent form of government. But the Senate resolution was not incompatible. Mine was the greater which include the lesser. On the other hand, being a Senate resolution as I said to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that I see no objection to reporting them both out if they want to, but the more effective resolution, I think, would be the resolution that I introduced because it is broader, it is affirmative, and it passed both branches of the Congress representing the feelings of the people of America.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Mr. Douglas Larsen.

Mr. LARSEN. Congressman, it is possible—have you heard any talk of the possibility of Congress extending this session beyond the estimated 1st of August as a result of anything that would happen at Geneva?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No, no, I have not, Mr. Larsen. Not as a result of anything that would happen at Geneva. It probably would have to be extended unless we complete our legislative business, but as a result of anything expected to happen at Geneva, the answer to that is no.

Mr. LARSEN. Congressman, to get back to the specific issues before Congress. I wonder if you could explain to me what the thinking was behind Congress' unwillingness to give the administration the Reserve bill that they asked for with the teeth in it with the ability to force young men into the Reserve organizations that they were legally bound to go into?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, all I can say is that I was for the strongest bill that could be passed. As a matter of fact, when the bill was on the floor of the House, if you will remember, I, in the course of remarks that I made, said that I was reluctantly supporting this bill because it was not as strong as I would like to see it, but it represented strength which was necessary in the world of today. I think there are an awful lot of people who honestly are opposed to universal military training. I am not. In the world of today, I think it is vitally important that we do everything possible to preserve America against the sinister forces that exist. However, there are many Members and many persons throughout the country who honestly are opposed to universal military training legislation. I assume that played a very important factor. Now speaking for myself, the bill is no way near as strong as I would like to see it. However, it represents progress in the direction of strength which we need in the world of today and I hope that the conference committee will report out the strongest bill possible, having in mind the differences between both branches.

Mr. LARSEN. Well, if they don't—if universal military training fails this time with all the pressure of the world behind it, the pressure of world events, of a military man in the White House, everybody behind it—will this country ever get universal military training?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, to say, Will it ever get such legislation? I cannot say that. But the chances of getting it for some time—unless this world situation worsens materially, and if it does it will have to go beyond that—is very remote. This bill here does not involve universal military training. There is compulsion though and there must be if we are going to get people into the Army and Navy and the different branches of our Armed forces. There has got to be some degree of compulsion. The bill is not strong enough for me, Mr. Larsen. To state why others voted against it is difficult—all I can say is there are many persons who honestly are opposed to universal military training. And might I say, President Eisenhower, in the campaign of 1952 did not help out the cause of universal military training. You remember he said that there is no need of having universal military training while we have a Selective Service Act—or something to that effect. Why, of course, nobody contemplated having both, but we had to have the selective service pending the building up of the Reserves.

Mr. HURLEIGH. I'm sorry, gentlemen, but I'm going to have to cut in here. Our board of judges has selected the prize-winning questions submitted by our listeners for this evening's broadcast. In a moment, Congressman MCCORMACK is going to answer these questions. Stand by for the names of the winners.

Mr. FISKE. A large portion of the responsibility for keeping the American people the best informed people in the world belangs to radio newscasters, commentators, and analysts. On Mutual you'll and veteran newsmen in every category who are experts in their fields and who take their responsibility to you, the listeners, with utmost seriousness. Whether you prefer a fast 5-minute digest of the big headlines of the moment or thoughtful, penetrating, and informed commentary, Mutual is your network for news, as you like it and when you like it. Weekday evenings there are Fulton Lewis, Jr. and Gabriel Heatter, with full quarter-hours of news, as well as Lyle Van and his 5-minute news capsule. The daytime favorites, Robert F. Hurleigh, heard every morning with news and commentary, and Cedric Foster, whose constant search for background takes him to many corners of the world. In addition, Cecil Brown, Bill Cunningham, Holland Engle, and Sam Hayes. These are but a few of the Mutual names for news. Hear them all regularly over most of these stations. Remember, Mutual is your network for news.

Mr. HURLEIGH. And now, Congressman MCCORMACK, here are those prize-winning questions from our listeners.

Mr. FISKE. From R. L. Robinson of Huntington, W. Va.

Mr. HURLEIGH. When conditions were reversed and a recent Democratic President had a Republican controlled Congress, that President complained bitterly and campaigned against it. Do you expect Mr. Eisenhower to react similarly toward the 84th Congress in the coming elections?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why, of course, I do. I expect Mr. Eisenhower to be the nominee of the Republican Party and I expect him to go under and campaign. But the situation is entirely different than former President Truman's was. The Democratic Party has been the one that has given him the support, as I said before we did it in the best interest of the people of our country. We have not been one—a party of blind opposition and when the President campaigns he is going to have more difficulty in establishing the fact.

Mr. FISKE. From Charles Demchik, Tonawanda, N. Y.

Mr. HURLEIGH. What can the Democrats offer to offset the Republican position if the coming Big Four Conference brings about peace up to the 1956 election?

Mr. MCCORMACK. If this present meeting that is going on, known as the summit, produces a sincere peace, why of course the answer to that is that it will have profound influence upon the minds of the American people and for anybody viewing it objectively to say otherwise would be finding himself guilty of intellectual dishonesty. If what comes out with it is real sincere success, why of course there is going to be a decided advantage for the President and his party, but on the other hand, if it does not, why the situation will be somewhat different.

Mr. FISKE. From Margot Herlinger, of New Haven, Conn.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Has the Democratic Party too many good candidates and not one outstanding one?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why, we have a number of excellent men who would make desirable candidates. The question is "Have we too many good candidates and not one outstanding one?" Well, if we have a number of good candidates, it must be that they are all outstanding no matter who is chosen. I would say, offhand, that with all due respects to the views of others, the nomination of the Democratic convention is not closed by any means. I think it is wide open. I respect Governor Stevenson very much, but I would say it is not in the bag for him, so to speak, and I look to the next Democratic convention in connection with the nomination of our candidate for President to be a very interesting one. And I wouldn't be surprised if somebody other than Governor Stevenson were nominated.

Mr. FISKE. Handsome Cyma dual-purpose clocks are being sent to the persons named for submitting the three prize-winning questions on this evening's broadcast. Mutual and Facts Forum have brought you this program with the hope of stimulating your interest in the matters you have heard discussed and in all other issues. Facts Forum does not offer a final word on either side of controversial issues, but asks further study—so that you, the American public, may hear, read, consider, and arrive at your own decisions. Transcripts of Facts Forum programs are published in the Facts Forum News, Dallas, Tex. Next week our newsmaking guest will be United States Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, of Iowa, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

who will be questioned on the accomplishments of the Big Four conference at Geneva. The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions for Senator HICKENLOOPER will each receive this handsome prize—a Cyma dual-purpose clock, made by the world famous Cyma watchmakers. This Cyma clock will be your companion at home or wherever you go. Send in your questions on a postcard with your full name and complete address. Mail it to Reporters' Roundup, Mutual Broadcasting System, Washington, D. C. The decision of the board of judges will be final. All questions remain the property of Reporters' Roundup.

Mr. HURLEIGH. I want to thank United States Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and House majority leader for being our guest on tonight's Reporters' Roundup, which came to you transcribed from the House Radio Gallery in your Nation's Capital. My thanks, too, to the reporters on our panel: Mr. Douglas Larsen, of NEA—Newspaper Enterprise Association, and Mr. James Roper, of the Washington Evening Star. Be sure to send in your questions for our newsmaking guest, United States Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER for next week. Until then, this is your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh.

Mr. FISKE. This broadcast of Reporters' Roundup will make news because its guest, United States Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and House majority leader of the 84th Congress, faced questions which are asked by all Americans. Next week and each week thereafter, Reporters' Roundup will seek out the top news and the man who makes it. You'll get the story behind the headlines as our guest answers the questions of Robert F. Hurleigh and a panel of veteran reporters.

Fred Fiske speaking.

Whose Ox?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 14, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the truth of the old saying that a man's position depends upon whose ox is gored was strikingly illustrated yesterday on the floor of the House.

The House had up for consideration a supplemental appropriation bill calling for $1.4 billion for the construction of military installations all over the world together with $200 million for other Government agencies.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, and the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. RABAUT, had charge of the bill.

As happens, the bill called for specific appropriations which some members of the committee wanted, some which they did not favor. The bill was probably the result of a compromise—not logrolling or trading.

In order to transact business, the House has adopted rules of procedure. One is that the legislative committees, but not the Appropriations Committee, shall write legislation, that is, determine where the tax dollars shall be spent and for what purpose. The Appropriations Committee recommends the amount to be spent.

The Rules Committee is the safety valve or gate through which legislation reaches the floor of the House. The Rules Committee is necessary because otherwise a Member might introduce any number of bills, demand consideration, and the House might never get to more important measures favored by the administration or the party in power.

So it has long been the custom to channel proposed legislation through the Rules Committee, subject to the right of the House on petition of a majority—218 Members—to bring a measure before the floor and subject to the call of the committees on Calendar Wednesday, at which time a legislative committee chairman on order of his committee may call up a bill favorably acted on by his committee.

Now the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is an expert parliamentarian, the author of several books published for the guidance of the Congress. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is also familiar with the rules. Both knew that the appropriations bill which they brought before the House contained appropriations which the House had not by previous legislation authorized.

Because the Rules Committee refused to report out a rule waiving all points of order against their bill and because the House overwhelmingly adopted that rule, the two gentlemen evidently became angry and by points of order scuttled their own bill, which called for $1,600,000,000, so that when adopted by the House it carried but some $222 million. Probably most of the stricken items will be restored in the Senate.

The sole apparent purpose was to take a slap at the Rules Committee. The proceedings remind one of the boy who, owning the ball and bat, gets mad, picks them up, and goes home.

The House wasted a day. The Members realized that the Rules Committee is necessary and that on many occasions it saves the Members from being placed in a ridiculous position. The incident again demonstrates that Members are just like other folk.

Perhaps the proceedings further demonstrate that the Appropriations Committee when writing a bill should itself comply with the rules of the House.

Tribute To Senator Lyndon Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, during the present illness of the majority leader of the Senate, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, literally hundreds of newspaper editorials have praised his record of accomplishment and extended warm wishes for his speedy recovery.

I know these friendly and encouraging expressions have meant much to Senator JOHNSON. And I am sure an editorial which appeared a few days ago in a weekly newspaper in the Texas town of Fredericksburg gave the Senator as much joy as any of the editorials published in great metropolitan journals.

Fredericksburg is in Gillespie County. Senator JOHNSON was born in that county and maintains his Texas residence there. Gillespie County is located in my district. I know the people there and I can well understand why Senator JOHNSON is proud to consider them his people and himself one of them. The people of the hill country of Texas possess those solid, sturdy, enduring virtues which have built Texas and the Nation.

I know this editorial from the Fredericksburg Radio Post meant much to Senator JOHNSON, and I am pleased to include it as part of my remarks here:

NATION PRAYS FOR SENATOR JOHNSON'S RECOVERY

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who is Democratic majority leader of the United States Senate, has the prayers of the majority of citizens of the Nation for a speedy recovery following a heart attack with which he was stricken recently. Never before, in the history of the Senate, did that sovereign body bow its head as one and offer a prayer for the recovery of one of its Members. Messages and letters have come to the Senator from all parts of the Nation and from his home county wishing him Godspeed, that he may again be able to participate, and soon, in the law-making chambers at Washington.

Possibly one of the finest tributes paid Senator JOHNSON came this week from Dudley Dougherty, of Beeville, who campaigned vigorously against JOHNSON in the last senatorial election. In a public letter to the San Antonio Express (Tuesday's issue), Mr. Dougherty publicly expressed his hope that Senator JOHNSON might recover quickly and that he be able to resume his work. Dougherty stated that he does not deny that Senator JOHNSON has been a "tireless, efficient, and energetic" worker, and that "I do now recognize that he has a place in American history today."

It is good to know that people, from all walks of life, will rally to a man in his hour of illness. It is also good to know that men, who at one time opposed Senator JOHNSON, now admit and respect his sincerity, his accomplishments, and his commanding position.

Senator JOHNSON not only is a great man, tall in stature with a fine disposition and friendly, courteous manner, he is also very modest and human. To cite but one instance, this reporter, after having taken numerous photos of the Senator last year at his ranch near Stonewall, asked that he wait a few minutes so that another camera with additional film could be secured from the car with which to take other photos. In the meanwhile the Senator busied himself cleaning out a trough for his prized Hereford cattle. When approached, your reporter suggested that it was certainly commendable that he leaned over to clean up the watering trough for his stock, but that it really was the work of others on his place to do that job. The Senator merely replied that "someone's got to do it, why not me; cattle need clean water, too." To which this reporter thought that anyone, with all the responsibilities vested in him, such as has been delegated to Senator JOHNSON, certainly is deserving of the greatest respect and admiration that can possibly be accorded any individual anywhere, anytime.

Senator JOHNSON, it is known, loves his farm and ranch near Stonewall, which he has improved considerably in recent years. He would, perhaps, much rather spend more of his time out here in the Texas hill coun-

try where the cool summer gulf winds blow day and night across his place, where he could relax, free from the work and responsibilities which have come his way. Yet we know that he has not shirked his duties; he has been, as Mr. Dougherty said, "tireless, efficient, and energetic." In his public service to his constituents, LYNDON JOHNSON has served his people well. When the history of our immediate area, our State, and Nation as well, is written, he will have earned a position that will be second to none.

We hope that Senator JOHNSON recovers completely, that he may be able to resume his work and his future activities.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of a letter I have recently received from a union member within my district and commenting on the pending minimum wage legislation. I think the statements which the writer makes in his letter should be of interest not only with regard to the minimum wage but also to many present practices of the unions themselves which, to my way of thinking, are very much in need of correction. I am not including the name of the signer for obvious reasons.

The letter follows:

IONIA, MICH., *July 5, 1955.*

MY DEAR MR. BENTLEY: The labor union officials are asking members to write to their Congressman, to urge them to press the fight for the $1.25 per hour minimum wage. I am a member of the UFWA through no choice of my own. I think the 90 cents per hour that President Eisenhower has suggested is high enough, I, therefore urge you to back the President. I think that this continually raising wages is the worst thing that can happen to this country, as the purchasing power of the money I'm getting today does not equal what I was getting in 1925 at the same factory. For an example in 1925 I averaged about $30 per week and I took it all home. Today my take home pay is $64 including the last raise which I just received. In 1925 you could buy 4 new Ford automobiles with what it cost for 1 today, and you could buy at least 3 new homes for what it costs for 1 today, and almost everything else has come up accordingly. For an example about the homes, a man was interested in a five-room bungalow priced at $12,500 which seemed to be the best buy he could find, this home was built about 27 years ago for a total cost of $2,400. Due to these facts I think the labor leaders idea of helping the little man is all wrong. In case it might help you in helping to make some law to protect the people who do not believe in everything the union does, I would like to mention a few things that happen in our union, and which I assume does in all unions. In election of officials, the president of the union appoints the tellers even though he is running for office himself, as a result last year there were 384 ballots cast and 397 counted for president and when a person mentions something like that he is a troublemaker and they try to hush it up. And for State and national elections, they are always donating money and campaigning for the Democrats, which you already know. I don't think they should be allowed to take money from a fund which approximately 2,000 people are forced to pay into, just on the vote of 15 or 20 people, which is usually the case. It would be far better if they wouldn't be allowed to discuss politics at all at their membership meetings, because for a Republican to attend a meeting in election year is about like an Odd Fellow attending an Elks lodge meeting. I really think that if you voted for everything that labor leaders want they still would recommend voting for a Democrat. I also think the age for social-security benefits should be lowered to at least 60 years—as long as it isn't compulsory, I don't think the load would be too heavy.

From a former Democrat but not a New Dealer.

Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, August 1 again this year will be the time when the great democracy of the United States extends its cordial greetings to the great democracy of little Switzerland. On that day, 664 years ago, the Swiss laid the groundwork for the development of a democratic way of life which is among the finest in the world today. Then it was that the people of three tiny cantons in the north of what constitutes modern Switzerland today gathered together to tell the Hapsburg monarchy to keep hands off.

Now, centuries older and 19 cantons larger, the Swiss people of Germanic, French and Italian origin, are the possessors of a sound, democratic tradition and healthy economy.

But, unlike its sister democracy, the United States, which is rich in natural resources, Switzerland has had to strive long and hard against a not too bountiful nature. Compelled by reason of its largely mountainous and unfertile terrain, the Swiss have had to import much of the foodstuffs and raw materials they need to maintain an enviable standard of living.

Pre-eminent in providing the wherewithal to secure these imports has been the development of an industrial skill recognized throughout the world. On the annual export of manufactured goods depends the functioning of Switzerland's economy. And with the money gained from its exports to the United States, Switzerland has been able to buy from America the grains, tobacco, automobiles and other products its people need. Indeed, it has been buying considerably more from the United States than it has been selling here. Switzerland, in fact, is America's best cash customer in Europe.

Unfortunately, there now exists to mar our friendship with the Swiss, a tariff wall against Swiss watches, one of Switzerland's chief exports, that can be only deemed excessive. This 50 percent higher wall has been up now for just about a year.

It would be in the interests of both ourselves and our good Swiss customers to lower this wall, and as quickly as possible. President Eisenhower alone can do it since it was he who created it on July 27, 1954, in the belief that he was protecting an "essential" domestic watch industry which subsequently our own Defense Department revealed was in no need of such "preferential treatment." Let us prevail upon him, in the face of this new and weighty evidence, to rectify a serious error.

Tribute To Heroism of Diane Kearney, of Greenwood, Miss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, all of us have an intense admiration for bravery, and especially for bravery born of loyalty and devotion. I would like to pay tribute today to an 11-year-old girl whose home is in my congressional district, Diane Kearney, of Greenwood, Miss., and to her brother and two sisters who aided her in the heroic rescue of their Negro nurse from drowning. The Kiwanis International Bulletin published an account of their deed, and I think the story is deserving of the attention and respect of everyone. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the Kiwanis account of the rescue, prepared by Kiwanian Virgil Adams, of Greenwood:

The four grandchildren of District Secretary Albert Brewerton recently distinguished themselves for heroism in saving their Negro nurse from drowning in Greenwood. They were paid special recognition for their action by the Greenwood Kiwanis Club and have been nominated for the Carnegie Award.

Diane Kearney, 11 years old, and her sisters, Bonnie and Barbara, were fishing on the day of the accident with their nurse when the nurse fell into the water. When she came to the top floating, they sprang into action. Diane went into the water and pulled the nurse in while the other two girls went for help. Johnny came to the scene about that time and administered first aid and saved her.

Johnny, who is a Boy Scout, holds the junior life saving certificate, which came in mighty handy. Diane is a Girl Scout and her two sisters, who are twins, are Brownies.

In an editorial on the incident, the Jackson Clarion Ledger remarked:

"It may be safely asserted that the anti-southern press largely ignored a brief news dispatch out of Greenwood the other day telling of a Mississippi planter's child saving the life of her faithful Negro nurse.

"* * * this vividly illustrates the spirit of friendship and devotion which has always existed between white and colored races here in the South. It is a spirit of understanding and good will which will bring about a mutually satisfactory solution of present racial problems confronting both races."

Better Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have advocated the social security changes that are before us today.

It is gratifying indeed that the House of Representatives will have an opportunity today to vote to improve the social-security law. These good and much needed changes in the law are very important to the people that I represent. As evidence that the people are four-square behind these proposals, I want to tell you of some of the results of the annual questionnaire I send out to secure the views of my constituents on matters before us. Unfortunately, this year, space limitations did not permit a question on social security. Despite this fact, a great number of people brought up the subject themselves by writing comments on the back of the questionnaire. Those who wrote in unanimously approved last year's passage of the Eisenhower social-security program, and they strongly suggested the same additional amendments now being proposed to the House and which I have urged in past years.

This is another example of the good commonsense of the American people. We often hear that personal thrift should be encouraged. Isn't social security an excellent example of national thrift, saving now in prosperous times to ease the retired years for all of us?

I have always been a strong supporter of our social-security system and during my years in the Congress I have made every effort to improve these benefits for our older people. I believe so strongly in this because it is only through the efforts of the people who are now in their late fifties and in their sixties that America has become so great and prosperous a nation. Who are more entitled to good social-security benefits than today's oldsters whose hard work put this country in the position today to pay them the old-age benefits they so richly deserve?

The bill before us does the following:

First. Extends coverage to all professional workers except doctors.

Second. Provides social-security benefits to eligible women at the age of 62, rather than 65.

Third. Pays the equivalent of full retirement benefits to disabled workers after the age of 50.

Fourth. Continues benefits for disabled children after the age of 18.

All of these steps are natural extensions of the Eisenhower social-security program which we adopted in the last session of Congress, and it is for this reason I am confident that if we in the Congress adopt these improvements, the President will sign the bill and give our deserving older people these added benefits to which they are justly entitled.

I have a great deal of respect for the members of the great medical profession who deal in grave problems of human misery. I know, too, that the rank and file of our doctors and dentists are sympathetic to the bill before us—as a matter of fact, they themselves want to be a part of the social-security program, but the ivory-tower leaders of the American Medical Association object.

I know that many of you have been asked to vote against this bill by the American Medical Association, and I cannot for the life of me understand their most unreasonable opposition to a program that is for the good and well-being of our American people.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Members of this House to disregard the selfish objections of the American Medical Association, and I urge you to vote for this bill and enact these good improvements in our excellent program for the older people of America.

Federal Control of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK IKARD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an extension of remarks by Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON, of Massachusetts, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1955, at page A5299. Congressman HESELTON undertakes to list the 30 largest holders of gas reserves and to state how much they stand to gain if H. R. 6645 is passed by Congress.

I have not undertaken to check the accuracy of Congressman HESELTON'S figures on gas reserves held by the various companies. I desire, however, to challenge the accuracy of his calculations of the increased revenues to be derived by gas producers by the passage of H. R. 6645.

Like many others who are opposed to this legislation, Congressman HESELTON has grabbed figures out of the air and placed them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He assumes that the Natural Gas Act is the only thing which prevents the producers from adding $806,500,500 to their annual revenues from natural gas. He says:

> If an increase of only 15 cents per thousand cubic feet could be secured, this would add to the cost annually, at the 1953 rate of use, $806,500,500, and, of course, the gas consumer would foot the annual bill.

The assumption of an increase of only 15 cents per thousand cubic feet, which he infers is the minimum to be expected, is beyond the realm of possibility, not only as a minimum, but as a maximum, for the foreseeable future at least. If the independents have the power to raise their prices for gas at will in the absence of Federal control, it is amazing that they did not do so prior to June 7, 1954, when they were free of Federal regulation.

The facts are that gas presently moving in interstate commerce is committed by long-term contracts specifying prices to be paid for the gas. This legislation will not free the independents from their contracts or permit them to obtain higher prices than their contracts call for. On the contrary, it specifically prohibits their termination and provides for controlling and limiting the increases which they provide for. The extravagant claims of increased prices resulting from this legislation, to be rational, must proceed upon the assumption that these contracts contain provisions for increases in those amounts, and must assume further that the Federal Power Commission would not allow any of them to go into effect if its jurisdiction is preserved. Neither assumption is warranted by the facts.

It is extremely doubtful that a single contract for the sale of gas to an interstate pipeline contains a provision for an increase of as much as 15 cents per thousand cubic feet over the entire life of the contract, and it can be stated with complete confidence that at least 99 percent of them do not.

Before any figures can be presented that would be of any value, it would be necessary to analyze the various contracts under which gas is moving in interstate commerce and ascertain the increases that are provided for therein and the volumes of gas that will move thereunder. Those figures would represent the maximum that could be expected. Before arriving at any realistic figure concerning increases which would result from the passage of this legislation, it would be necessary to compute the increases which the Federal Power Commission would allow if its jurisdiction is retained—which, of course, would be impossible—and deduct them from the increases provided by the contracts.

The gentleman from Massachusetts could just as well have assumed an increase of only 30 cents per thousand cubic feet and made his statement twice as impressive.

It is also said by opponents of this legislation that its passage will result in huge windfalls to the producing companies. This, too, is an unsupported and unfounded statement. Gas reserves have been acquired by the producing companies over a period of years. Probably 95 percent or more were acquired prior to the Supreme Court decision in 1954. Most contracts for the sale of gas to pipelines also antedated the Supreme Court decision. The passage of this legislation will restore the producers, with some substantial reservations, to the status which they held at the time the reserves were acquired and the sales contracts were made. Allowing one to receive what he worked for, risked his money for, contracted for, and had every right to expect, can hardly be characterized as a "windfall."

Efficient and Thoughtful Femininity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in this world of ours today women are becoming more and more important as we all know. Not only are there more women than men today, but the women are assuming more and more important jobs. As this occurs, it is most important that they realize the responsibilities they are assuming. That they are cognizant of this fact is shown quite clearly in a newspaper article by Kimmis Hendrick in the Christian Science Monitor of June 12, 1955, reporting on a convention held by the American Association of University Women.

It gave me a great deal of pleasure to read of the prominent part played at this AAUW convention by Katherine Elkus White, who is a close friend of mine and is mayor of Red Bank, N. J., as well as vice chairman of the Democratic State Committee of New Jersey. I quite concur with Mr. Hendrick's description of Mrs. White as a forthright, friendly, energetic woman. I also quite agree with Mrs. White's statement that "Being a mayor is much like keeping a house. You call in an expert to build a sewer system if you are mayor—you call the plumber, if you are a housewife, to fix the kitchen sink." I only wish all our mayors throughout the United States were as thoughtful and intelligent as the mayor of Red Bank.

I would like to include the article about the AAUW convention as a part of my remarks as I think we all should be in touch with what this great organization is doing, not only for the women of the United States, but for all the citizens of this great land.

The article follows:

"NOT GOOD ENOUGH," SAY THE WOMEN

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

LOS ANGELES.—Being a mere male, this reporter watched with fascination the American Association of University Women, in the course of their 1955 convention, saying in various ways that for all women are accomplishing, they aren't doing as much as they might. And whose fault? The ladies' own, they said, of course .

It seemed very impressive proof that American women have actually accomplished much since the AAUW began some 70 years ago. Insecure people normally don't criticize themselves—that is, if they're organized for promotional purposes. They blow their horns. These 2,000 women didn't.

First, they weren't satisfied that women are doing as well academically as they ought to. Women have distinguished themselves in higher education—but they were earning more money with their doctorates in the thirties than they are in the fifties. This may be no criterion in the absolute sense, but AAUW speakers said progress meant onwards and upwards for sure, and no patience with backsliding.

The conventioners pounded in this point by refusing to relax the standard for admission to membership their important organization has maintained for years. To be an AAUW member, a woman has to be the graduate of a college or a university requiring that at least two-thirds of her work be done in the liberal arts. There was a move on, started at the Minneapolis convention 2 years ago, to lower the requirement to one-half. It was decisively defeated.

It was offered simply because today many women are getting degrees in engineering, physics, and other fields calling for immense technical knowledge. Wouldn't they make good AAUW members? Of course they would—except that the ladies believed that today's complex world, as never before, calls for education in the broadest sense of the word. Never was there more necessity, they told themselves, for reaffirming the importance of those disciplines which teach, not precisely what to think or precisely how to do something, but which produce inquisitive, independent, teachable adults.

Apropos, one convention speaker, Katherine Elkus White, the mayor of Red Bank, N. J., told reporters that the liberal arts she got at Vassar, and particularly her dramatic training, had prepared her for public life as nothing else could.

Mrs. White is a forthright, friendly, energetic woman who has the distinction of being called America's "only woman highwayman." This is because she is one of the three members of the New Jersey Highway Authority that has been building the $300 million Garden State Parkway. New Jersey's Governor told her not so long ago, she said, that she held "the finest collection of nonpaying jobs" he knew about.

It was part of her message to the AAUW that women can afford to take such jobs when men can't. They can serve as mayors for nothing, as she does, in the thousands of smaller cities that need devoted public service. They can work on commissions, on boards.

"Being a mayor," she said with a laugh, "is much like keeping a house. You call in an expert to build a sewer system if you are mayor—you call the plumber, if you're a housewife, to fix the kitchen sink."

Mrs. White, who grew up in a family used to public service—her father, Abraham Elkus, was United States Ambassador to Turkey under Woodrow Wilson—touched on another AAUW self-criticism: Women aren't doing so well politically. They've had the vote for 35 years, and as was pointed out by Bertha A. Adkins, assistant to the chairman of the Republican National Committee, women have barely scratched the surface of effective political activity.

To be sure, Miss Adkins said, they are doing precinct work by the millions. But their record in public office, however heartening outstanding examples make it, is still slight. Partly, she thought, this is because women are just beginning to realize that politics isn't a sordid activity, it's the science and art of government.

Mildred Younger, a member of California's Republican State Committee, made a good deal of this point, drawn from her own career as homemaker, wife of a judge, mother, party worker, candidate. She also voiced a warning. Women, she said in effect, weren't being mediatorial enough. In their clubs, she submitted, women today are sometimes gossiping instead of studying, spreading rumor instead of working politically. She thought the tendency is deplorable, and ought to be reversed.

Probably Mrs. Younger couldn't have said this to a more sympathetic audience. These women were eager, obviously eager, to avoid just such pitfalls. They had behind them, further, a tradition of public service too big to fit into the gossip pattern. Looking around, this reporter, humbled by the sight of so much efficient and thoughtful femininity, quickly concluded that if an AAUW convention is what it looks like, the country is safe.

Due Process for Our Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, many Americans believe that current hearings on the Status of Forces Treaty are among the most important in many years, striking as they do the very heart of the constitutional rights of American individuals and the American concept of justice.

Fortunately a few newspapers have recognized this fact and are devoting both editorial space and news columns to reports of the hearings, and they stand out like beacons in the night from the remainder of the American press which is so in sympathy with the State Department giveaway program that they have virtually refused coverage of statements critical of that Department.

It is my pleasure today to offer for the record editorials from the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star and the Chicago Tribune, both dealing with the rights of American servicemen. The material follows:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star]

RESTORE CITIZENSHIP TO GI'S

A big congressional attack opened the other day against the Status of Forces Agreement. This infamous treaty allows United States troops in NATO countries and Japan to be tried, sentenced, and imprisoned under the laws of the country in which they are stationed. So an American GI serving in France is denied the protection of the United States Constitution and is instead subject to French law.

A case in point is that of Richard Keefe and Anthony Scaletti who have been convicted and are serving 5 years for taking a taxi away from the French driver while intoxicated. They are confined in a 12th century monastery near Chinon, France. Their cells, once used by monks, are unlighted and unheated and measure 4½ feet wide, 7 feet long, and 6½ feet high.

Yet administration spokesmen contend that servicemen fare better in foreign trials than they would at military courts-martial. This point would be difficult to defend if, for example, Devil's Island still existed or if the agreement included parts of the Near East where theft is punishable by cutting off a hand.

But it is the principle rather than the practice that is most objectionable. As Representative Bow of Ohio stated, the treaty repudiates "one of America's oldest and finest traditions—that the American flag and the American Constitution follow our soldiers wherever they go."

In 1811, Chief Justice Marshall clearly defined the principle that military forces sent to a friendly nation by invitation are subject to their own country's laws. But here is a case where executive treaty superseded constitutional law. It is this type of thing the Bricker amendment would prevent.

We doubt that the backers of the Status of Forces agreement would care to place themselves at the mercy of foreign courts. They would have little need to, since they are protected by the Constitution. Our soldiers, unfortunately, have been deprived of this protection.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

DUE PROCESS FOR OUR SERVICEMEN

Influential Members of the House, especially Representative CHURCH of Illinois, Bow of Ohio, and GROSS of Iowa, all Republicans, are demanding that the United States repudiate the status of forces treaties turning over American military personnel to the jurisdiction of foreign courts.

Foreign nations are accorded the right to try Americans on duty in these lands who commit offenses while off their military stations or off duty. The United States is given power over soldiers of allied nations stationed in this country, but they are few in number and not ordinarily assigned to organized componets, so that reciprocity does not really apply.

The chief objection to surrendering American servicemen to foreign jurisdiction is that they are thereby denied the constitutional guarantees of due process and fair trial, for the legal rights and procedures to which Americans are accustomed are not those prevailing in allied nations. A survey of cases in which Americans have been convicted by foreign tribunals suggests that our men on duty abroad can expect few breaks from the host countries.

We believe that the injustice of these treaties is heightened by the fact that most Americans assigned to foreign military duty are men who have been conscripted and are not there by any choice of their own. They have been assigned by Washington to protect the soil of other nations and should not be obliged to suffer the additional penalty of being deprived of constitutional protection.

The Republican Congressmen who are taking up the case of these Americans abroad deserve public support, for the cause is a good one. We are encouraged to see that Representative DODD of Connecticut, a Democrat, has joined with them, so that the issue cannot be considered partisan.

The Federal Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram from that distinguished democratic statesman, James A. Farley, on the subject of the Federal highway program. This telegram gives expression to Mr. Farley's usual foresight and concern for the welfare of this Nation.

I fully concur with Mr. Farley's statement.

The telegram follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 20, 1955.*

Congressman JOHN R. PILLION,
Member of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Before recording your position on pending highway program and related tax increases, I respectfully urge further study of the far reaching effects of such legislation on basic economy of our State. My appeal for your consideration is based on conviction that harmful results must follow imposition of huge burden on new taxes on motor vehicles now widely used in practically all branches of New York industry, agriculture, and commerce. Suggestion that more thought be given tax question is addressed to entire New York delegation regardless of party affiliation. Am certain every Representatives in both parties wants to safeguard the future prosperity of our State just as much as I do. Cannot help regarding proposed increases in excises on vehicles, other equipment, tires, tubes, etc., as burdensome and discouraging to operators, but wish to comment in particular on much larger sums involved in suggested increases on motor fuel. Some Members of Congress from New York may not realize that present State and Federal taxes on motor fuel now take $180 million yearly out of pockets of our vehicle owners. New State and Federal taxes passed this year or now pending would add $90 million beginning January 1, 1956, raising total to $270 million annually. Of this tremendous sum, motor-trucks—which are the work horses of the economy and provide service essential to every family and all business—will be forced to pay 30 percent or $80 million yearly. I believe such drastic measures call for more thorough study even if decision on question has to go over to next session.

Regards,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

Henderson To Confer With Residents of His District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the greatest responsibility of a member of Congress is to maintain close and constant contact with the people he has the honor to represent. He can best perform this duty in representing their interests in Washington if there is ample opportunity for personal conferences. A few moments of conversation permits the Congressman to learn the general attitude of the constituent toward public affairs far better than a letter or an impersonal poll of popular opinion.

Shortly before the current session of Congress convened, I visited each county seat town of my seven counties, specifically for the purpose of holding informal conferences with constituents. At every possible opportunity during the current session of Congress, I have returned to the 15th District of Ohio so as to be in a position to consult with the people for whom our laws are being enacted.

Now that Congress is about to adjourn, I will return to Ohio and endeavor to be of the greatest possible service to each person in the 15th District who wishes to express his opinion on public issues or who has a problem with some department or agency of our Federal Government. Accordingly, I shall be in attendance at the county fairs of each of the seven counties where those who wish to meet informally with me may do so. I shall be present at the fairs on the following dates:

Perry County Fair, August 5—if Congress has adjourned by this date.
Muskingum County Fair, August 19.
Noble County Fair, September 2.
Washington County Fair, September 5.
Morgan County Fair, September 8.
Monroe County Fair, September 22.
Guernsey County Fair, September 29.

In addition to the dates above mentioned, I will endeavor to be on the fair grounds at other times.

Continuing my established practice of arranging scheduled meetings in the county-seat towns, I will be in the courthouse of each county from 9 a. m. to 4 p. m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Perry County, September 12.
Muskingum County, September 13.
Monroe County, September 14.
Noble County, September 15.
Washington County, September 16.
Morgan County, September 17.

No appointment is needed, and I urge any individual or group to meet with me on the date most convenient. Of course, I shall be glad to meet with residents of the 15th District in my office in Cambridge any time that Congress is not in session.

Foreign Aid Program in Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to include a clipping from the July 20 issue of the New York Times regarding the difficulties in Yugoslavia with respect to our foreign-aid program in that country. I believe that every Member of the House should be familiar with these events before they are called upon to vote on the conference report for mutual security for the fiscal year 1956.

The article follows:

YUGOSLAVS RESIST ARMS AID REVIEW—SAY THEY COMPLY WITH PACT, BUT UNITED STATES INSPECTORS DO NOT SHARE THAT VIEW

(By Jack Raymond)

BLED, YUGOSLAVIA, July 16.—Yugoslav military authorities have turned back every recent effort by United States officials to increase their observation of the military aid program here.

The military officials have made it clear they intend to provide no additional type of information or facilities to Brig. Gen. Peter C. Hains, chief of the resident military aid group, and his staff.

The Yugoslavs believe they already are providing enough informaion and facilities under the terms of the bilateral military aid treaty, originally concluded in 1951. The treaty is automatically renewed as additional equipment is brought in.

Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of modern military equipment has been granted to Yugoslavia. The specific amount has never been made public. The program has been based on the policy of keeping Yugoslavia strong so long as she showed readiness to oppose possible aggression from the east.

JETS INCLUDED IN GRANTS

Yugoslavia has received jets as well as propeller-driven planes, tanks, trucks, and jeeps, cannon and a variety of engineering equipment.

It is the responsibility of General Hains and his staff to inspect the use of this equipment. He is also required to determine whether the Yugoslavs are prepared to receive and make use of scheduled deliveries.

The bilateral treaty calls specifically for the United States to be granted the right to exercise continuous "inspection and review" of the use of military aid.

The Yugoslavs' opinion that the terms of the treaty are being fully carried out by them is not shared by competent United States officials, it was learned.

These officials are said to be particularly sensitive to this problem at the moment because they were criticized indirectly during a debate in Congress on the foreign-aid bill. Some Congressman attacked the administration's policy of granting aid to Yugoslavia and added that United States representatives appeared not to be insistent enough in obtaining the information they required.

In a minority report to the House June 28, signed by four Republican Representatives, the situation in Yugoslavia was cited as an example of lack of Executive control over the administration's program. The Representatives were LAWRENCE H. SMITH of Wisconsin, MARGUERITE S. CHURCH, of Illinois, E. Ross ADAIR, of Indiana, and ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan.

The Yugoslav Government was charged with not having been fully cooperative in carrying out the requirements of the Mutual Security Act that the United States be permitted continuous observation and review of the use made of equipment supplied by the United States.

The report contained also a sharp distinction between the United States and its allies and the Government of Yugoslavia, whose support in the event of a struggle was asserted to be potentially only that of a neutral. The report charged that Yugoslavia was evading the terms on which assistance had been given.

ENVOYS LEARNED OF ATTITUDE

Authoritative sources here revealed that at about the time of the recent meeting of Ambassadors of Yugoslavia and the United States, Britain, and France, the Yugoslav attitude on military-aid facilities again was disclosed.

The unchanging Yugoslav attitude was understood to have been made clear to United States officials after the most recent criticism had been voiced in Congress.

According to certain United States officials here, the staff assigned to handle the United States aid program in Yugoslavia is too small. The Yugoslav officials have turned down past efforts to increase its size substantially, although it is now somewhat bigger than the staff the Yugoslavs originally admitted.

Reliable sources disclosed that specific information requested by Americans in connection with the aid program frequently has been refused or the requests ignored. United States efforts to observe the use of equipment already delivered have been hampered by refusal of the Yugoslavs to supply what American officers feel would be adequate background material.

At the same time it is known that when the Yugoslavs have permitted the Americans to observe their ability to handle planes and tanks, the impressions of the work of Yugoslav soldiers have been good.

Yugoslavia's attitude is said to reflect the experience she had with the Soviet Union before she broke with the Cominform in 1948. The Soviet Union had many military advisers and observers in this country. The Yugoslavs afterward charged that the Russian military personnel were engaged in spying and in attempting to subvert the regime.

With United States military aid, Yugoslavia has been able to reequip her army, one of the biggest in Europe, with largely American materiel instead of Russian. This has been evident in military parades.

It's Time Teachers Got Higher Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the greatest source of our country's present and future power is inexhaustible provided we properly develop it. I am speaking of the potential genius of our young people. Trained and nurtured as it should be, this powerful force will maintain America's world leadership indefinitely.

Having been a schoolteacher and principal myself, I am keenly aware of the need for intelligent and painstaking training of our young folk. Haphazard teaching in crowded schoolrooms by underpaid and harrassed teachers is the greatest mistake we could make. I hope to see the day when the teaching profession will be elevated to the very high position it deserves, when teachers will be paid salaries they deserve. I am in thorough accord with the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in declaring that $8,500 is a proper minimum salary for efficient and experienced teachers.

The Dayton, Ohio, Daily News recently carried an excellent editorial on this subject. The piece was widely reprinted and I saw it in the Indianapolis News. It is as follows:

The curse of a country which is both poor and ambitious is the necessity of choosing between convenience of consumers and creation of capital.

Soviet Russia has veered from one to the other. From Stalin's insistence on amassing first the tools of mass production. Malenkov swung to emphasis on long-postponed consumer satisfactions. With Khrushchev came the counter-counter-revolution. Now Soviet subjects toil to build up the sinews of heavy industry while taking new hitches in shrunken waistlines.

In America we are spared the hard choice that faces the Russians—and, in truth, so many other peoples in a world of imperfect prosperity. We can't have all the capital goods we need and all the consumer goods that fancy might dictate, but we can have a more than adequate supply of both.

We can have good schools and well-paid teachers, for instance, without sacrifices of living comforts remotely comparable to those exacted of peoples less prosperous. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers has just made a proposal that the average American, at first blush, will consider fantastic. It is that $8,500 a year be accepted as a proper minimum salary for experienced and efficient public school teachers.

Is it fantastic? Teachers are the machine tools in the manufacture of a nation's moral and intellectual capital goods. If America wants to be robust in citizenship and in leadership over the next half century, it will do well to purchase the finest kind of processing for its human raw material.

Here's a field in which sacrifice of a few fringe luxuries of everyday life would suffice to build the capital base that may be prerequisite to freedom's survival in the future. Even though there's small chance of paying experienced teachers $8,500 tomorrow, or even day after tomorrow, it's time we took a new look at our values.

Control of Natural Gas

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I read in the press on yesterday that we were likely to be called upon to consider the bill to regulate gas in this session of Congress. I am glad to have this good news, because I think it is very important that this piece of legislation be given consideration by the House, and I rise today to point out that some two weeks ago public acceptance as reported by the press of the Nation was 4 to 1 in favor of the passage of this bill.

In the last 10 days it has gone up to where the press in the great cities are 10 to 1 in favor of this legislation because they know that the passage of the legislation is a protection for and will be beneficial to the consumers.

May I say also that the President's Cabinet level committee that studied the energies of our country, including oil and gas, for some 8 months last year and the early part of this year has strongly recommended that the present controls be taken off the production of gas at the wellhead.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S COMMITTEE

Now, this committee had various task forces studying this problem for many months, and they strongly endorse the principle behind the Harris bill on the grounds of national defense. This so-called Cabinet committee was headed up by Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The committee retained the services of some of the most outstanding scientists, economists, and industrialists, and some of the ablest leaders in the gas and petroleum field, to make this important study.

On February 26 of this year, the Cabinet committee issued a report, in part, stating:

The Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me, and I believe you will agree with me, that when this comprehensive study was made under the direction of the members of the Cabinet, assisted by task

forces selected for their experience and ability in these fields, that the recommendation of this Committee ought to be accepted by the Members of this Congress, as a factual verdict, clear of any influence or prejudice, and should cause the Members of this House to feel, as the Cabinet-level Committee recommended, that in the interest of national defense and the building up of the industrial strength of our country, we should take their advice, along with our own good judgment, and remove these controls that are stifling, and will continue to stifle, the gas industry of the Nation.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION SAYS TAKE OFF CONTROLS

We find that the Federal Power Commission does not want authority to control the price of gas in the fields.

In a letter dated March 21, 1955, Jerome Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, told Chairman PRIEST, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, why the Harris bill should be passed. I quote here some of its more important excerpts:

We support this proposed legislation because we firmly believe that such legislation will, in the long run, result in the greatest good to the largest number of people of this country.

We are firmly convinced, from every aspect of public interest, and particular that of national defense, that Congress should not single out natural gas as the only one among those fuels over which an artificial ceiling should be placed.

The authorities I have just quoted should be enough to support the case for the Harris bill. Certainly, their statements—made after a long and serious study of the problem—should be sufficient to justify the passage of this legislation by an overwhelming vote by the Members of this body.

Robert and Helen Coar: 20 Years of Devoted Service to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleagues in extending my sincere congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Coar on the occasion of the 20th aniversary of the founding of the Joint House and Senate TV radio facility.

The founding and the subsequent history of this important service have been closely associated with the lives, the efforts, and the accomplishments of this remarkable couple. They pioneered in making available to the Congress the recording facility which has become so vital with the passage of time, and they guided its development during the years that followed.

Their pioneering spirit and their record of service are to be commended. I am certain that I reflect the sentiments of many of my colleagues when I say that Mr. and Mrs. Coar's cheerful, friendly helpfulness with regard to the many technical problems that arise in conjunction with the recording of reports, interviews, and so on, have been greatly appreciated.

In congratulating them upon their long years of service to the Congress, I also want to extend to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Coar my best wishes for the years that lie ahead.

The Status of Forces Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days representatives of the Defense Department including the new Secretary of the Army, Mr. Brucker, have been sitting in the Foreign Affairs Committee on the floor above us defending the sellout of American rights that is known as the Status of Forces Treaty.

Mr. Brucker and the entourage of aides that backstop him and endeavor to augment his limited knowledge of the subject have blithely disregarded the jeopardy in which our American servicemen are placed by this treaty and have glibly denied the loss of constitutional rights, the unfair treatment and the neglect suffered by Americans abroad.

It is obvious that they do not speak for the men of the Armed Forces who are acutely concerned about their situation.

I am beginning to hear from these men, and they are expressing to me their interest and their gratitude that some of us here in the House of Representatives are trying to do something to restore the constitutional safeguards that are their birthright.

One sergeant, whose name must be withheld, writes to me from France as follows:

Thank you for the resolution you are proposing to put all United States servicemen overseas under military law. I believe as you do that the Status of Forces Treaty violates constitutional rights. I have fought in World War II and Korea to preserve the Constitution.

A lot of men here in France are afraid to leave the camp area because some Communist might pick a fight with them and they will have to go to the French jail for defending the very principles they came over to fight for in the first place.

I believe that this young man has hit upon the situation that may be responsible for the difficulties of Airman Jose Montijo. Groups of young Frenchmen have made life difficult for American servicemen for years. They may include young Communists, young hoodlums, or just Frenchmen jealous of American success with French women, but I have heard many times of the taunts and attacks on our men. Airman Montijo ran into such a group, and when the scuffle was finished one Frenchman was dead. From the many reports I have read, I think I have stated fairly what probably occurred in his case.

Yet I wish to call attention to the fact that this young American has already been held for 3 months in a French prison under conditions usually imposed only upon convicted criminals. He is in solitary confinement. The bars of his cell window are covered so that only a thin ray of light may enter. His food is pushed in to him twice daily through a slot in a door. And from other reports we are told that the daily diet consists of a quart of coffee and a pound of bread for breakfast, a stew sometimes containing scraps of meat for the evening repast. In the case of another prisoner, we are told that gifts of American cigarettes are not permitted, but that they must be purchased at the prison canteen for 55 cents per pack. We are told that Montijo is trying to earn money by painting the eyes on lead soldiers for a prison concessionnaire, presumably so that he may purchase French tobacco and other articles. This American has not been convicted of any crime. The last Air Force report indicates that he has not even been charged formally. And it may be many more months before he is brought to trial.

Think of it, my colleagues; and if this does not make your blood boil, then something has gone out of the American spirit. I do not think we should tolerate these conditions for 1 minute. I am ashamed of Government officials who attempt to excuse them.

The Meaning of Our Flag Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a remarkable address by Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, before the Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association in Baltimore, Md., on June 12, 1955.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Governor McKeldin, Mayor D'Alesandro, President Swanson, members of the Star Spangled Banner Flag House Association, and your guests, for the honor of being with you here today, to pay tribute to Old Glory, I am deeply grateful.

This Star Spangled Banner Flag House stands on hallowed ground. It was at Baltimore that the British General Ross, who had just burned our Capitol, met defeat and death. Had the British prevailed here at Baltimore, it would have been a telling blow against American liberty.

It was 141 years ago, and within gunshot of this assembly today, that the rockets' red glare inspired Francis Scott Key's immortal Star Spangled Banner.

Today this honor being paid to our Star Spangled Banner has especial significance, because there exists a nationwide, sinister tendency to play down, even to discredit, the pure patriotism for which our flag is the symbol.

This unfortunate trend is especially prevalent in some of our colleges. As the result of personal inquiry, I have found that students in certain leading institutions are being taught that patriotism is old-fashioned. They are being taught that it is proper to display the flag, upon occasion, but that to wave our flag is a sign of narrow nationalism which might react unfavorably upon some of our foreign friends.

Such an inglorious attitude toward the Stars and Stripes is intended to relegate the high virtue of patriotism into disrepute. And for patriotism, some would have us substitute internationalism. After such an attitude is inculcated into a generation of college students, the next step is easy.

Our mission then becomes not the salvation of America and our own souls, but rather our mission becomes one of saving the world, despite the fact that some of the world doesn't want to be saved. This highly sophisticated international undertaking, in turn, leads to the buying of friendship—just as if friendship could be bought. And to insure success of the expansive undertaking, we find it necessary to clothe ourselves with the attributes of imperialism. But should our global undertaking falter, it must, we are told, be reinforced with more dollars, and even with the blood of our youth.

But our flag, like our religious faith, is something to which all real Americans turn in time of trouble. Let me give an illustration of what the flag means to soldiers.

During the dark days of Bataan, when the surrender of MacArthur's forces was imminent, a handful of spirited United States cavalrymen decided that they would not surrender. It would mean certain death if they were caught, but somehow they managed to escape into the great Zambales Mountain Range of Luzon, which parallels the China Sea. There they hid out for 3 long years. Loyal Filipinos, at the risk of torture and death, gave warning when the Japs came near. And what did these cavalrymen take with them into the Zambales Mountain fastness? It was the American flag—the colors of the defeated 26th Cavalry.

On sunshiny days when the mountain passes were clear of the enemy, these American patriots unfurled their emblem of freedom into the breeze, and they lay there by the hour feasting on its glory.

While Manila was being liberated, these lads made their way through the battlelines and proudly presented their honored flag to General MacArthur. Throughout the Japanese occupation, the colors of the 26th Cavalry had never been hauled down.

I should like to hear some of our promiscuous internationalists tell these hard-bitten cavalrymen not to wave the Stars and Stripes.

Shortly after Japan's surrender, your speaker of today, together with less than a dozen officers and a small color guard, stood at the American Embassy in Tokyo and General MacArthur, visibly moved, ordered the Stars and Stripes raised over the Embassy. It was the end of a long and frustrating and heartbreaking and bloody trail. And as our beautiful flag unfurled in the blue over Tokyo, emotion shook every one of us to the marrow of his bones.

I tell you our flag does have a meaning. And if it ever loses its meaning, it will not only be the end of freedom in America, it will be the end of freedom everywhere.

THE RED THREAT

Today America faces greater danger than ever before. The issues are joined. The Kremlin dictatorship over a population of 800 million is committed to world domination. The United States is the only power strong enough and willing to meet this challenge. Neither side wants total war, but each will doubtless accept total war rather than yield to the other.

Make no mistake, the present olive branch now being offered by the Kremlin serves only Moscow. The death of Stalin has left the Soviet Union dictatorless—there will have to be some killing-off before the real dictator can emerge. Moreover, the Kremlin faces internal unrest from its enslaved population. The Soviets need time—time to centralize their power—time to consolidate their vast gains—time to fight their famine—time to gather their strength for their next onslaught for world domination.

The Communist cause is the most ungodly and brutal yet devised. And the tragic element in this conflict is that we, ourselves, in a measure are responsible for some of the danger we face. It was we who in 1933 recognized Russia, when her Communist experiment was on the verge of collapse. It was our World War II European effort which enabled the Red army to move deep into Europe and remain there. It was we who insisted on unconditional surrender, thereby removing the straitjacket—Germany and Japan—which had long been holding Russia out of Europe and China.

In all these and in similar subsequent events it would seem as if a sinister and invisible hand were controlling our destiny. Each step we took in the international field appeared innocent and inescapable, but the sum total undermined our strength while it strengthened the Soviet Union. Thus, many of our own faulty decisions have contributed to the Communist conspiracy, the most ruthless and diabolical conspiracy for world domination in all history.

OUR GLOBAL UNDERSTANDING

In our struggle to meet this Communist threat—which is real, immediate, and inescapable—we have diffused our military strength on a global scale. American boys, in uniform, are now serving in 63 foreign lands defending no less than 950 military bases.

This stationing of Americans in uniform all over the globe has given rise to a most critical issue. Since the framers of our Constitution did not shape it to provide for our present global undertakings, the Constitution itself is being circumvented, even superseded by treaties, which, if properly made, become the supreme law of the land.

STATUS OF FORCES

It is well known that the GI's stationed in foreign lands are usually considered as our best American Ambassadors. Nevertheless, all self-respecting peoples naturally resent foreign troops stationed within their country. To make this situation more tolerable to our allies, our Government has made a concession known as the Status of Forces Treaty.

This agreement denies the full protection of the United States Constitution to servicemen and women stationed overseas. If an American member of a United States military unit commits a criminal or civil offense while serving abroad, he is subject to trial and punishment under foreign law. This may well deny him the protection of our Constitution, its Bill of Rights, writ of habeas corpus, and trial by jury.

Now it is a long-established principle of international law that when one nation invites the military forces of another nation to help defend it, the inviting nation waives criminal and civil jurisdiction over the visiting foreigners. Moreover, this principle is much older than international law. It goes back to the Bible.

It will be recalled that in the acts of the Apostles, "Certain of the Jews banded together and bound themselves under a curse saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul." But Paul, the Apostle, was a Roman citizen and he appealed unto Caesar for protection.

Palestine at that time was under Roman rule and the Roman officials there recognized Paul's right and took the stand that "It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die." And Paul, the Apostle, was not turned over to those who had sworn to kill him. For he was a Roman, under the jurisdiction and protection of the Romans. And the Romans assumed their responsibility to their citizens and saved Paul from death.

It is my understanding that more than a hundred American GI's have, under the Status of Forces Treaty, been tried and sentenced for civil or criminal offenses in foreign courts. There they were jailed by the foreign government.

The great State of Maryland has one of her sons now imprisoned in France. For stealing a taxicab and beating the driver, Pvt. Richard Thomas Keefe was sentenced by a French judge to 5 years of solitary confinement at hard labor.

A patriotic organization known as the Defenders of the American Constitution has carried this case all the way to our Supreme Court. The Defenders took the stand that Private Keefe should be returned to the jurisdiction of United States courts for trial. But our United States courts—including the Supreme Court—refused to hear the case of Maryland's Private Keefe.

On June 7, only 5 days ago, the Arizona Republic of Phoenix headlined: "Yank May Face Guillotine."

It seems that an American airman named Montijo, stationed in France, fatally stabbed a 19-year-old French lad in a brawl over a French girl. The Phoenix paper explains that under the Status of Forces Treaty, Montijo will be tried under French law and "is entitled to an American legal observer, who cannot take any part in the trial."

"Depending on the official charge, the news dispatch continues, "Montijo could face the guillotine if found guilty."

Now no one would argue that the abovementioned servicemen were not guilty, nor is it argued that they should not be punished. They should be tried and—if guilty—punished, but they should be tried under the protection which their own Constitution offers them.

In view of the Status of Forces Treaty, can it be argued that our flag—the symbol of American liberty—follows our troops? Can it be argued that under the Status of Forces Treaty our servicemen—who are ordered overseas—enjoy the full protection heretofore guaranteed by Old Glory?

There are hundreds of American servicemen held illegally by the Communist Chinese. Has Old Glory been permitted to follow them? What will be the inevitable result of such abandonment?

Long ago, Robert Ingersoll, speaking at Indianapolis, September 21, 1876, gave us the answer: "I want to know if the government that took you from your fireside and made you fight for it, I want to know if it is not bound to fight for you. The flag that will not protect its protectors is a dirty rag that contaminates the air in which it waves. The government that will not defend its defenders is a disgrace to the nations of the world."

The irony of the Status of Forces Treaty is obvious. Here in the United States, the Constitution extends protection to fifth-amendment Communists. But under the Status of Forces Treaty, full protection by the same Constitution is denied to servicemen who have been ordered to duty overseas by their own Government.

Since today some 55 percent of our Armed Forces are serving overseas, is it any wonder that conscription is necessary? Is it any wonder that morale in the Military Establishment is not what it should be?

CONTAINMENT

Our determination to oppose the Communist dream of world domination—which I am sure we all endorse—led us to adopt a policy of containment against Red aggression. Mr. George Kennan, formerly Chief of

the Department of State Planning Staff, is credited with having originated the containment concept.

Briefly, it provides that we shall meet Communist aggression, when and where it may occur, with an equal counterforce. Such a proposal really means that the NATO peoples, some 350 million strong, are being called upon physically to contain the Communist population of some 800 million people. On the basis of manpower resources alone, this containment policy has led us into an insuperable military undertaking.

This concept of physical containment is being implemented in Europe, where our ground and air forces are tremendously outnumbered. It was tried out in Korea, where the United States—for the first time in our history—failed to win its war.

At the moment, the sinister threat of Communist aggression dominates the foreign policy and the military planning of the free world.

All Asia is restless and threatened. In the Middle East—where lie more than half the known oil reserves of the world—there are no troops to prevent Red Army seizure of this priceless treasure.

North Africa is in open revolt against French colonial forces. Europe is an armed camp.

All American youth is being conscripted. And the Congress is being pressured to put every lad on a 10-year leash—held subject to call by the Government.

We hope and pray that the imminent Four Power Conference at the summit will alleviate world tension. But will it? Experience dictates that we can expect little from conferences with Communist gangsters.

BRICKER AMENDMENT

Possibly the world has never been more turbulent than it is today. Our commitments by treaty and by moral obligation are global.

We, 6 percent of the world's population, have virtually underwritten the security of the free world. How long can we continue this obligation and at the same time maintain the liberty which has characterized our incomparable way of life?

The mutual security pacts into which we have entered already impinge upon our sovereignty. There is a movement—on highest governmental levels—to take us into Atlantic Union. The only block to this and also world government is our Constitution.

One worlders are busy telling us that the only way America can avoid destruction by nuclear war is to create a world state authority to enforce law and deny national powers—including the United States—the means to make war. The corollary is—unmentioned of course by the one worlders—that under the guise of keeping the peace, the United States, stripped of sovereignty, would be defenseless.

Can we entrust a world state with American defense and American liberty?

Is it any wonder therefore, that our citizens, by the millions are demanding the Bricker amendment as a safeguard? It is my sincere hope that this demand will continue—and I am confident that it will—until adequate constitutional safeguards are established. If we yield our sovereignty, it will mark the end of our liberty.

SOLUTION TO RED THREAT

But the task of meeting the Red threat is not insuperable, because communism itself, contains the seeds for its own destruction. Communist powers are strongest on their borders; they are most vulnerable deep within these borders. Despite this fact, we continue to challenge Red strength and avoid Red weakness.

The solution to the Red menace does not lie in our military intervention. The solution lies within the Soviet Union itself. The Kremlin's great weakness is her tremendously dissatisfied population. Fifteen million of the Soviet people are in slave labor camps being worked and starved to death. This means that almost every family in the Soviet Union has a relative or member in a slave labor camp. The Soviet peoples are living under their own military occupation. They don't like it.

Moreover, famine stalks the land. The Communists can't even feed their people.

The solution to the Communist threat is therefore obvious. Why not create overwhelming American air supremacy as a war deterrent, or instrument of massive retaliation, should war be forced upon us. With this deterrent in being and ready to strike, we should then withdraw American diplomatic recognition. This would give the greatest possible encouragement to the enslaved Soviet peoples. It would close the Soviet Embassy and other agencies in the United States from which most Communist activities in our country are financed. It would deal a mortal blow to most subversive programs in the United States.

At the same time we should assist the anti-Communist underground in a vast educational program to convince the Soviet people that we want peace—not war—and that we will never again recognize the Kremlin dictatorship.

The recent cracks in the Kremlin's MVD, the desertion of key MVD agents in Japan, Australia, and Europe, together with reliable reports from inside the Soviet Union, disclose that since Stalin's death, the Kremlin grip on the Soviet people is not too firm.

Let us therefore avoid optimism over the olive branch now being extended by the Kremlin. Rather let us take immediate steps to confine the Kremlin's attention to its own internal turbulence. With overwhelming air power—if we will only build it—we can deter war. Meanwhile, there is real hope that during the time thus gained, the Soviet people and Red army itself will eventually overthrow the dictatorship of the Kremlin.

AMERICAN YOUTH HERITAGE

And now, as America is plagued and tormented and bedeviled with trouble, what of our great heritage can we pass on to our youth?

First of all, we Americans must regain control of our own destiny. We must demand that every candidate for office publicly declare where he stands on the Status of Forces Treaty—on the preservation of our sovereignty—on the principle that the flag must follow our troops.

If we continue to subject our Constitution and our law and our Armed Forces to the will of foreign peoples, then our youth will have no heritage of freedom. They will soon be victims of enslavement. It is imperative that we take our own destiny in our own hands, that we unshackle ourselves from foreign domination and proceed immediately to do precisely what is best for America.

This is not a selfish stand. We are the only great roadblock in the Kremlin's march to world domination. When liberty dies in America, the curtain will ring down everywhere on man's vast hope for freedom.

May this then be our prayer on Flag Day, 1955, at the Star-Spangled Banner Flag House in Baltimore: That we create overwhelming airpower, without conscription; that we exploit the Kremlin's weakness and avoid its strength; that our youth be free to seek its own destiny here in America; that the Stars and Stripes fly over an independent, sovereign United States forever.

The Great Seal of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, undear leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and memorandum from the Legislative Reference Service relative to the great seal of Massachusetts:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., July 7, 1955.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: This is in reply to your letter requesting certain information on the seal of Massachusetts. A friend of yours is interested in knowing why the seal uses "Reipublicae" rather than just "Republicae."

The Massachusetts seal was established by an act of the general court, in 1885: "The great seal of the Commonwealth shall be circular in form, and shall bear upon its face a representation of the arms of the Commonwealth, with an inscription round about such representation, consisting of the words 'Sigillum Reipublicae Massachusettensis.'" [The Seal of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.]

The Latin expression for state, or commonwealth, was res publica, also written as one word, respublica [literally, the public affair]. But whether written as 2 words or 1 word, it was subject to declension like other Latin terms. For example, office of state—munus reipublicae (possessive case); to oppose the state—oppugnare rem publicam (objective case). So in writing "The Seal of the Commonwealth," the term res publica, or respublica, would be put in the genitive, or possessive, case—i. e., rei publicae, or reipublicae. The Massachusetts authorities chose the one-word form.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.

THE GREAT SEAL OF MASSACHUSETTS

The following entries are from the printed House Journal, page 47, Saturday, August 5, 1775:

"James Prescot, Esq; brought down the Report of the Committee appointed to consider what was necessary to be done, relative to a Colony Seal, with the following Vote of Council thereon, viz. 'In Council, August 5, 1775, Read and Accepted with this Amendment, viz. Instead of an Indian holding a Tomahawk and Cap of Liberty, there be an English American, holding a Sword in the Right Hand, and Magna Charta in the Left Hand, with the words "Magna Charta," imprinted on it.'

"Sent down for Concurrence."

Page 51: "Eldad Taylor, Esq; brought down from the honorable Board the following Order, viz.

"In Council August 7, 1775.

"Ordered, That Mr. Greenleaf, with such as the honorable House shall join, be a Committee to direct the making a Colony Seal agreeable to the Form prescribed by this Court on Saturday last.

"Sent down for Concurrence.

"Read and Concurr'd; and Deacon Plympton, and Mr. Mills, are joined to the Committee of the honorable Board."

From an examination of the foregoing facts, which comprise all the record, it seems evident that though no copy remains of the design recommended by the committee, it was that of "an Indian holding a Tomahawk and Cap of Liberty, and that the motto was 'Petit sub libertate quietem." The Council substituted the English-American, and the House invigorated the motto till it read "Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem." Of the origin of this motto it may be briefly said that it was written about A. D. 1659, by Algernon Sidney, the famous English patriot, in the album of the University of Stockholm. The complete phrase is:

"Manus hoec inimica tyrannis. Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem."

This seal was probably engraved by Paul Revere, who certainly executed the copper plates for the State bills of credit issued in 1775, which bore the same coat-of-arms. Mr. A. C. Goodell states, in his edition of the Province Laws, volume 506: "The former great seal of the province remained in the council chamber, at Boston, whence, together with all the other public seals, it was secretly purloined, some time between the 9th of September and the 4th of October 1775. The loss of these insignia was considered so serious by the governor that he immediately communicated the fact to Secretary Dartmouth, but before they could be replaced, the progress of the Revolution had rendered them useless."

For 5 years the foregoing seal was in use, but when Massachusetts became a State, one of the first acts of the legislature was the establishment of a new seal.

Here again we find a certain lack of precision and almost a contradiction on the record.

The original paper preserved in the archives is as follows (Arch. Vol. 230, p. 64. Revolution Resolves):

"In the House of Representatives Nov. 4: 1780

"Ordered that Col. Dawes & Col. Baldwin with such as the Hon. Senate shall join be a Committee to consider & determine upon a Seal for this Commonwealth.

"Sent up for Concurrence Caleb Davis Speaker

"In Senate Nov. 4th 1780

"Read & Concurred & Israel Nickols Esqr is join'd

"JER. POWELL, *Pres.*

"the Committee of Both Houses to whom was Commited the Determination upon a Seal for this Commonwealth beg leave to report that the same be refeared to the Governor and Council which is submitted

"Israel Nichols p^{r} order

"In Senate Nov. 11th 1780

"Read & accepted

"Sent down for concurrence

"Jer Powell Pres.

"In the House of Representatives Nov. 10: 1780

"Read & Concurred. Caleb Davis Speaker

"Approv'd John Hancock"

But on the Senate Journal, pages 41, 42, will be found the following entry.

"Nov. 10. Report of the Committee of both Houses for devising a Common seal for the Commonwealth, not accepted, and ordered that Mr. Sumner, Mr. Phillips and Mr. Turner be a committee to consider the same and report.

"Nov. 11. Report of the Committee to whom was referred the consideration of a Seal for this Commonwealth, referring same to the Governor & Council. Read & accepted. Sent down for concurrence. Came up concurred."

As no other report is on record, it is impossible to make these entries agree. We can surmise however that the Senate at first preferred to take part in designing the seal, and that it rejected the report of the joint committee, on November 10, sending the subject to special committee of three Senators. Probably that special committee found good reasons for adopting the former report, and so made only a verbal report, not entered on the record, and the Senate quietly receded from its action and concurred with the House.

The next evidence of action will be found in the following citation from the council records, under date of Wednesday, December 13, 1780 (vol. 26, p. 49):

"Ordered That Nathan Cushing Esqr. be a Committee to prepare a Seal for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who reported a Device for a Seal for said Commonwealth as follows viz. Sapphire, an Indian dressed in his Shirt; Moggosins, belted proper, in his right Hand a Bow Topaz, in his left an Arrow, its point towards the Base; of the second, on the Dexter side of the Indian's head, a Star; Pearl, for one of the United States of America.

"CREST. On a Wreath a Dexter Arm cloathed and ruffled proper, grasping a Broad Sword, the Pummel and Hilt Topaz with this Motto: ENSE PETIT PLACIDAM SUB LIBERTATE QUIETEM—And around the Seal—SIGILLUM REIPUBLICAE MASSACHUSETTENSIS.

"Advised that the said Report be Accepted as the Arms of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

It seems certain from an inspection of the record that the punctuation has been changed since the entry was made.

It is believed that no action was subsequently taken by the legislature. Probably the members thought that the acceptance of the report referring the matter to the governor and council was sufficient, without the additional enactment of a law conferring on them the power to define and establish the seal. Had they so enacted the case would be similar to that of Louisiana, where it is prescribed that the seal shall be such as the governor shall direct.

It would seem, however, following the usual course of our later legislation, that a positive enactment should be made, to become a part of our public statutes, in order that every person should easily know what the proper form of the State coat of arms and State seal is.

Owing to the lack of such precise information easily attainable, there has been a ludicrous amount of variation from the standard. The original order of the council is a little vague, and the result is that the Indian is sometimes figured as of gold, and sometimes as proper, i. e., in natural colors. Some have evidently concluded that the words "belted proper" were separated so that the "proper" referred to all the preceding part. This, however, is not probable, and the word was intended to be used for "properly," i. e., belted properly. The blazon or description is not very clear, but the best practice apparently has been to depict the Indian, his garments, and his bow and arrow, all in gold. The minor details have been varied and the Indian is sometimes represented with moccasins and at other times with boots—his hunting shirt is sometimes close fitting, and again loose or with a flowing mantle. Especially the mistake is very common of representing the Indian as standing on a mound for which the original description gives no ground.

The following examples, taken from such cuts as were found in the hands of the State printers, show some of these errors. It should be said, however, that the seal used by the secretary of state is almost faultless, erring only in not showing the color of the Indian to be gold.

In one of these smaller cuts the arrow is held horizontally instead of having the point toward the base, and the crest has an arm in armor, instead of being "cloathed and ruffled." The well-known Massachusetts cent of 1788 has on its reverse the Indian dressed in a close shirt, belted, with moccasins on the feet and evidently with bare legs.

If the Indian were depicted in natural colors, as one reading of the council order would allow, such a bearing would be contrary to the rules of heraldy, being color upon color. Of course a sovereign or State can prescribe any coat he or it may choose, but it is not at all probable that our council so intended. The lions of England are gold on a red field; our Indian should be, and undoubtedly was meant to be, gold on a blue field. Above all, he should be depicted in the simple and graceful hunting shirt, and not disfigured with the addition of a cloak, blanket, or other impediment.

(Source: Documents. Printed by order of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts during the session of the General Court, 1885. No. 345, pp. 11–16.)

Point 4 Lessons "We Learned the Hard Way"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harlan Cleveland:

POINT 4 LESSONS: "WE LEARNED THE HARD WAY"

(By Harlan Cleveland)

To the American visitor, the Middle East is full of vivid impressions—the ancient dust and struggling young trees, the square pillars of old and the square houses of today, the trouble on the frontiers and the rumble of unaccustomed food in his own stomach.

But to this visitor, the most vivid impression is the fourth point of a speech made 6½ years ago in Washington. Nobody remembers what the other three points were. But point 4, the American promise to help the underdeveloped areas with technical advice and investment, is now a symbol that not only carries hope but describes solid work in process.

Those of us who were active in the early days of point 4 often wondered whether the reality could ever live up to the nobility of the idea. For when we Americans set forth on the untrod path of largesse oblige, we certainly had some queer ideas as to what it was all about. If Americans were not a people who learn fast from their own mistakes, point 4 would not now be the honored symbol it has become.

ADVICE WITHOUT AID

First we thought it would be enough to give advice. Dr. Henry G. Bennett, the saint of the earlier point 4 program, was the sinner in this: He went up to Congress and said, in effect, "I can get it for you wholesale." But sending out a technical adviser without the money and materials to put his advice into effect was often a remedy worse than the disease.

When a team of doctors in one Asian country told the Minister of Health that the way to get rid of malaria was to kill the anopheles mosquito, the Minister asked, "And so—where is the DDT?"

"Oh, we're not supposed to give you anything but advice," the team leader replied.

In another country an agricultural expert showed what could be done with a little concentrated fertilizer, and went away leaving nothing but a fat report behind him. The government officials were naturally upset.

"You talk about a 'revolution of rising expectations'," one of them said, quoting at me a favored phrase. "Why do you increase only our expectations and do nothing to help us increase our crop yield?"

Nowadays, the technical advisers are mixed in with economic aid.

Another early error was to think of point 4 as basically a technical and economic effort. Economic development is a good thing in itself—that was the burden of President Truman's fourth point in January 1949.

STRANGE TALES

So the doctors and the farm experts went out into the unknown, and came back to Washington bearing strange tales. This just wasn't a technical problem, they explained in their plaintive memoranda. The first problem in Asia was not how to select better rice seed, it was how to get the farmer a fairer share of what he was already producing.

There is a well-known story in America—probably duplicated in some form in the folklore of many another land—about the farmer who is advised to learn some new scientific way of farming.

"I don't need your advice," the farmer says, "I ain't farming now half as good as I know how."

In country after country in Asia, American experts came across farmers who weren't farming as well as they knew how—because a landlord or an oppressive government was taking two-thirds of what they produced in rent and taxes.

In every nation of the early point 4 program, the story was the same: The technical men found themselves in the position of a plumber who is hired to fix the plumbing and then finds there is no house yet. So he turns to and helps build the house.

The point 4 doctors learned that their main job was not to cure people, but to leave behind them a public health service that didn't depend on the presence of American doctors. The agricultural men learned that an agricultural college and farm extension service was the ideal endproduct of their work.

BUILDING INSTITUTIONS

We learned the hard way, that point 4's main job was neither technical advice nor the provision of supplies which other countries couldn't afford to buy from us. Our main job was to help build institutions to encourage the reforms, to create the administrative and political machinery which would enable a people and its government to close the widening gap between the expectations of progress and the reality of squalor.

Another grand illusion of earlier times was the notion that the main American contribution in an aid program was measured by the goods and services that could be bought for dollars.

In Southern Italy today, counterpart funds are being used (together with an international bank loan) to create an economic renaissance—land reform, better farming, new factories, new houses—that is in many ways comparable to the work now going on in the countryside of Israel. Driving to Tel Aviv from Jerusalem a few days ago, I looked around and thought I was in one of the newly developed sections of Apulia or Lucacia.

We Americans learned, I hope, another lesson; that we are in the world for keeps. Practically every aid program passed by our Congress since the Second World War has been called "emergency," "stopgap," "interim," or something of the kind. Even the Marshall Plan had a time limit of 4 years. We persist in the illusion that after some short period further, we can retire into isolation again.

We cannot, of course. With our 7 percent of the world's population, we produce over 40 percent of the world's goods. This fact alone will ensure our involvement in everybody's affairs for decades to come. Point 4, which has no legal time limit, is the first American aid program to recognize that America has joined the world for good.

As we get used to this fact, there is one lesson about our aid program that stands out from all the rest. It is this: We should look for results, not for gratitude.

Payments to Utilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRADY GENTRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must express my opposition to the provision of the highway bill which authorizes the States to give the utilities alomst $1 billion during the next 13 years out of funds sorely needed for highway construction.

If this provision becomes law for the 13-year period, it naturally will be reenacted, and payments to the utilities will thus become a permanent charge upon the highway users for service rendered not for them, but for others.

While the bill provides for permissive instead of mandatory action, the end result will be exactly the same. If it becomes law, one or more States will be pressured into making these payments. Finally, most or all of them will do so, not out of a sense of right and justice—because they are convinced it is neither just nor right—but out of a sense of giving the industries of their own States equal treatment to that accorded by other States.

The States have expressed their unyielding opposition to this legislation. George T. McCoy, of California, president, American Association of State Highway Officials, and many other highway officials making the long journey to Washington 2 months ago, testified that:

The obvious necessity of paying for utility relocation costs out of highway funds is apparent if we ask ourselves this question: Why should utility relocation costs be passed on to the motorist instead of to the consumers of utility facilities, in view of the fact that the consumers have received the benefit of free rights-of-way purchased at public expense?

The utilities are attempting to repudiate their contractual obligation to States, cities, and counties through Federal legislation.

Deeply alarmed at the possibilities of reimbursement legislation, the State officials again asked to be heard by the committee only last week. Frank D. Merrill, their first vice president, testified that—

We wish to say here today for the record that we approve of your action as to providing a construction program and for financing it. We want a Highway Act of 1955 this session and we will appreciate anything you can do to assure action. We do, however, strongly object to the utility reimbursement feature.

The American Automobile Association, in a recent statement, said:

The utilities are making an unconscionable raid to grab money sorely needed to meet critical highway deficiencies.

Just what are the facts and circumstances bearing on this whole question?

Telephone, telegraph, and gas utilities are more than 99 percent privately owned. Electric utilities are between 80 percent and 90 percent of private ownership. The REA has 3 percent of electric utility lines but less than one-tenth of 1 percent of telephone utility lines. However, the great majority of REA lines are either on unpaved roads or on farm-to-market roads which will not become major highways requiring extensive enlargement for generations, if ever.

A. T. & T. Co.—Bell System—owns 90 percent of all telephone lines. Its most recent yearly report, after reciting an unbroken record of substantial yearly dividends for many decades, noted additional retained earnings of more than $700 million. The class A and B electric utilities alone report retained earning of more than $2,200,000,000. The common stock of Western Union, a telegraph utility monopoly owning all telegraph lines, has increased in value more than 800 percent within the last 3 years.

The utilities are prosperous. Moody's Manual of Investments shows that they will make considerably more than $25 billion net profit for their owners during the 13-year period of this provision. Their net relocation costs will be only 48 percent of any amount paid since 52 percent of it would otherwise be paid as taxes. The net cost in any case will be an insignificant percentage of the utilities' absolute net profits of $25 billion.

The primary use of highways and streets is for the traveling public and all other use is subordinate thereto. Most utilities secured the use of highway rights-of-way through written agreements to readjust or relocate their facilities when necessary to permit highway improvement. Others occupy them by oral permission but the legal effect is the same. Not one court of last resort in American legal history has ever held otherwise.

The laws giving the utilities these rights were enacted at the specific request of the utilities. They have saved, and are saving, great sums of money as a result. Rights-of-way have been maintained for them at expense and inconvenience to the highway users and without expense to them. The new rights-of-way required for the interstate system will cost the highway user billions of dollars. The utilities will not pay one cent of it but they expect to occupy it, free of any charge. They also expect it to be maintained for them, free of any charge. The spokesmen of the utilities now demand that the highway users not only buy new rights-of-way for them and maintain it for them forever, but that they also move the utility facilities onto the new location and pay the removal bill—all without legal sanction

and, in most cases, in direct contravention of solemn contracts which the utilities asked the States to make with them by which they secured the valuable right to enter upon the highways in the first instance. This would completely and permanently change the historic and legal relationship between the parties. It would make the States completely subordinate to the utilities instead of the reverse, as it is at present under the States' police power.

Actually, good reasons might be advanced why utilities should not be allowed on highway rights-of-way at all in areas where they can acquire their own rightsof-way. These utility facilities are becoming extensive and a continuing greater expense and inconvenience to highway users. As our country's population increases, this condition will become worse. A time will come when it will be highly undesirable for rights-of-way to literally contain a network of utility pipes, wires, and poles. In addition, the many hundreds of millions of dollars invested today in automobile radios are being lost because of the maze of utility powerlines on the highways which destroy their reception.

It is obvious that if a utility reimbursement provision is to be a part of any highway law, any attempted justification of it must be on moral grounds, since it has no sanction in present law and is in direct violation of numberless existing contracts entered into with the utilities at their express request. If we are to entertain moral grounds in this matter, what about the tens of thousands of cafes, groceries, filling stations, motels, and other business establishments on the interstate system whose owners will lose their life savings because the highway will relocate at a distance that render their businesses valueless. These citizens were not allowed to use highway rights-of-way for their business, as were the utilities. They bought their own. They asked for and got no special favors such as the utilities received. Since most of them are humble citizens, they will not have a host of high-powered lobbyists to press their cases, as will the utilities. Also unlike the utilities, who will continue in a prosperous, guaranteed business, most of them will find it too late in life to reestablish themselves. They will simply be told that they are unfortunate, that they have a tough break. But the utilities seemingly are to have their own expenses paid for them regardless of law, regardless of solemn, valid, existing contracts that they would pay removal costs, and regardless of violence to State sovereignty and the States constitutional police power in the matter of highway rights-of-way.

Who is asking for this provision? Do the States request it? Does even one State approve of it? Not one State representative was heard in support of it. Without exception they implored us to defeat it. In fact, utility interests alone had the temerity to appear in its behalf. Its passage would not indicate too high a regard for the wishes and constitutional rights of the States. When the point is reached that solemn, written contracts, made under their police power, are disregarded—and at a time when the States are begging that these legal contracts be respected—it would appear that States rights and State sovereignty are no longer terms having valid meaning. It is made worse because the permissive language would make the States the seeming authors of their own undoing.

If we are not to respect the States' wishes and constitutional rights, but must legislate on this subject at all, it would seem more courageous to pass it as a mandatory provision, representing the full demand of the utilities. After these opposition pleas by the states, they certainly are not entitled to have the utility lobby thrown back at them under circumstances designed to make them yield to what they believe is an outright injustice.

If there are a few small utilities for which removal costs might be burdensome—and there will be only a few—the States can help them and they need no permissive legislation by Congress to help them and they need no permissive legislation by Congress to do so. In fact, the States have helped in some cases in the past and the Bureau of Public Roads has matched the States' payments. But, are we to do that which will give more than 90 percent of almost $1 billion to a few giant, prosperous corporations which do not need it as greatly as do either our taxpayers or our highways?

I express my belief that there should be no utility provision in this bill and my hope that the House, out of a sense of fairness and justice to our taxpayers, to the condition of our budget, and to the needs of our highways, will reject it.

Administration and Distribution of Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the letter from the Stuyvesant Democratic Civic Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., to the President concerning the administration and distribution of the Salk vaccine:

STUYVESANT DEMOCRATIC
CIVIC ASSOCIATION,
Brooklyn, N. Y., July 13, 1955.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: Enclosed please find petitions signed by over 1800 residents of the Crown Heights community in Brooklyn. These petitions were circulated by a committee of this association for a period of less than 3 weeks. We respectfully bring to your attention the sentiments therein expressed, convinced that it represents the overwhelming opinion of most people in our area—regardless of political affiliation or viewpoint.

Our community firmly believes that there is utter confusion and chaos in the recent handling of the Salk vaccine situation, and that the Federal Government has failed in its responsibility to the children of our country.

This situation need not have occurred. Our Government could well have done what the Canadian Government has done. There as you know, Mr. President, the Government manufactures, inspects and administers the vaccine free to all of the children—and without a single resulting case of polio.

This is what the people of our community want as expressed in the petitions:

The Federal Government should inspect the vaccine, control its distribution, and set a reasonable price.

The Federal Government should guarantee that those most likely to get the disease are vaccinated first.

The Federal Government should give the vaccine free to those who cannot afford it.

The Federal Government should guarantee that there shall be enough vaccine for all children.

This is the responsibility of your administration, Mr. President. It is your personal responsibility. We therefore call upon you to fulfill this responsibility. Only Government controls can save our children's lives.

Respectfully,

THE STUYVESANT DEMOCRATIC
CIVIC ASSOCIATION,
GLADYS M. FOSTER,
Civic Affairs Director.

Possible Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial "Possible Prayer," which appeared in the July 9 issue of the Pilot, the outstanding Catholic publication of the Boston Archdiocese.

Our beloved majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, has offered an excellent suggestion to the United Nations, and I am proud to call the article to the attention of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives:

POSSIBLE PRAYER

Now for longer than we can remember we have heard of people trying to find some way of bringing religion into the U. N. in some dramatic and impressive way. In spite of all the good will in the world, it was obvious that an opening prayer would be difficult to arrange because of the varieties of religions represented and the open atheism of the Soviet and the satellites.

Recently an ingenious and workable solution to the problem has been presented by our United States Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, which, if properly introduced, might be the beginning of this custom and point the way to something better in the years ahead. Mr. MCCORMACK's suggestion supposes a calling of the calendar every day in such a manner that the nation called each day would have the option, according to its dispositions, of offering prayer or not. This arrangement would permit those representing peoples of religious sensibilities to take advantage of the occasion for public prayer, while, at the same time, the preferences of the dissenters could be exercised on the day their own nation was called.

No one pretends that this is an ideal solution, least of all Representative McCormack, who is a man who clearly recognizes political realities, but, at the same time, it would provide a magnificent opportunity for God-fearing nations to declare their dependence on the Creator before entering upon those deliberations which may shape the history of man. We strongly suggest that our American representatives at the U. N. study this proposal with the thought of making it part of the machinery of operation both in the Assembly and Security Council. It deserves the support of all men of good will who should be grateful to Mr. McCormack for having provided a possible solution to an almost impossible situation.

The Nationalist Upsurge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the column of George Sokolsky which appears daily in the Washington Post and Times Herald carried an interesting topic today, The Nationalist Upsurge. He points out a recent statement by former Under Secretary of State Walter B. Smith to the effect that communism and nationalism are incompatible. He also touches lightly on the force of nationalism within the U. S. S. R. as reflected by the struggle of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. to throw off their chains of slavery. General Smith defined nationalism as the passionate desire of people to live their own lives in their own way. I know of no more accurate description for the historic struggle of the non-Russian nations to separate themselves from the exploitation and parasitic hold of the Russians.

Because this article touches upon the most explosive political force at work everywhere in the world today, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include it in the Record:

The Nationalist Upsurge

(By George Sokolsky)

While we in the United States, have tended to avoid nationalism as though it were a sin, in most other countries the postwar era has been marked by an intensified nationalism. This is particularly true among the weaker nations of Asia and Africa, which have emerged as independent nations and which are fighting against what they call colonialism. The Bandung Conference was attended by 29 such nations and they passed pronationalist, anticolonial resolutions.

At Geneva, the four gentlemen at "the summit" are faced by this trend toward intensified nationalism. President Eisenhower will have to consider the fact that nearly all of the newly emrged nationalist states prefer to be neutral as between the United States and Soviet Russia for two reasons:

1. Alliance with one of these powers is an affront to the other and may lead to perilous results:

2. Each of the new nationalist states hopes to gain comparative strength by the weakening of both of the great powers.

A year ago, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, when he was Undersecretary of State, said:

"Communism is a movement to bring all of the people in the world under one all-powerful central authority, and I define nationalism as the passionate desire of people to live their own lives in their own way. The two are incompatible, it seems to me."

This, it seems to me, is a correct statement. Unfortunately, the incompatibility is not as evident as it should be because it is not always recognized that the Russians operate through two branches; the Marxist church, which gives the impression of idealism; Russian imperialism, which is a secular effort to push the boundaries of the Soviet universal state outward.

Sir Anthony Eden, at Geneva, faces the fact that the most important of the new nationalist countries were British colonies and that some of them are still loosely and sentimentally tied into the British system through the commonwealth of nations.

The French are plagued by nationalism in all former and present French colonies and do not know what to do about it. France was the only colonial empire that gave some measure of equality to the colonies in the sense that the colonials sat in the French Chamber of Deputies. But that has not proved to be sufficient to keep these peoples loyal to France.

The Russians face this problem, too. Because of their censorshp, news on this subject is scant. But by the abolition of certain republics in the Soviet Union, it was made clear that there is some kind of a nationalist movement within Russia itself. The visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Yugoslavia and the apology to Tito for the errors of Stalin (they were blamed on Beria) were an acknowledgement of communistic nationalism. When Dimitrov of Bulgaria and Pauker of Rumania favored this concept, they encountered Kremlin opposition.

This changed attitude can only be the result of a recognition by the Kremlin of the up-surge of nationalism not only in Russia but in the entire Soviet universal state.

The Big Four in Geneva cannot ignore this state of mind among all peoples, except the Americans, who have not yet caught the nationalistic tone of the moment.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Texas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Texas has more than 3,928,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

Rudy Gamblin Has Maintained Fine Record Despite Handicap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Texas Association for the Deaf that held its convention in Amarillo, Tex., on July 15, 16, and 17. The moving force in the preparation and carrying out of the convention was Rudy Gamblin, one of the founders of the Amarillo Silent Club. Rudy's story is told in the most excellent manner by our good friend, Marianne Johnson. Marianne is a coming figure in the world of journalism. She is following in the footsteps of her father, the late T. E. Johnson, whose name and work commanded the highest respect in the journalistic world.

We in the Congress have among us a great champion for the cause of those who have been handicapped by the lack of hearing. He is our good friend and esteemed colleague, the Honorable Homer Thornberry, of Austin, Tex., who so ably represents his central Texas constituents. Homer's great work and outstanding contributions for the cause of the deaf are well known throughout this entire Nation. We are all deeply indebted to him for this fine work.

It is an honor to insert in the Congressional Record the story of such a fine man as Rudy Gamblin that so well portrays him as the outstanding citizen he has proven himself to be:

[From the Amarillo Globe Times of July 7, 1955]

Rudy Gamblin Has Maintained Fine Record Despite Handicap

(By Marianne Johnson)

Gathering in Amarillo the middle of the month will be more than 500 members of the Texas Association for the Deaf.

The occasion is the TAD's biennial convention, and delegates will come to Amarillo from every part of the State.

Supervising the convention is Rudy Gamblin, one of the founders of the host club, the Amarillo Silent Club. He extended the invitation 2 years ago at the Waco convention and is in charge of arrangements for the meeting scheduled here July 15 to 17.

Rudy Gamblin has literally hundreds of friends over the city. Youngsters whom he has coached stop in to see him and he is greeted warmly in almost any business place he might visit.

"Hi, Rudy," is a familiar greeting and though he hears it, through his eyes Gamblin always nods affably.

There are many reasons why Rudy Gamblin has so many friends, but perhaps it can be summed up in one friend's remark, "I've never known anyone who would go farther out of his way to do something for you."

Born 47 years ago in Stamford, Rudolph Delbert Gamblin had normal hearing and was learning the rudiments of speech, when an epidemic of spinal meningitis swept through the community. Rudy was one of three youngsters that survived the disease which claimed the lives of 14 others. One youngster was left sightless, another was crippled, and young Rudy lost his hearing.

Rudy became a good student at Austin's State School for the Deaf—and he developed into a superb athlete. After graduation from the State school, where he had served as captain of the football team, he was awarded a scholarship to renowned Gallaudet College in Washington, D. C.

His accomplishments would do anyone proud, but in view of his hearing handicap they seem particularly admirable.

A few of these accomplishments include:

1. Captain of his football team when he attended Texas State School for the Deaf.
2. Captain of his football team at Gallaudet College.
3. President of the student body at college.
4. Selection as honorable mention on the national all-star team.
5. Player on all-Washington, D. C., all-star team.
6. Coach of the Texas School for the Deaf, which won the national championship for schools of the deaf in 1943.
7. Coach of the first Amarillo High School baseball team when the sport was revived by the Texas Interscholastic League in 1948 * * * the team with a 16–2 win-lose record, lost 1–0 to Adamson in the game that decided the State championship that year.
8. Coach for several years at Nixson Junior High School and for Yannigans (the Amarillo High School B team).

He left the Amarillo public-school system 5 years ago and now is a machine bookkeeper with Amarillo Hardware. After being a coach for so many years, Rudy finds an 8-hour day still hard to believe. He noted that "you've got a 24-hour job when you're coaching."

His first job after he received his bachelor of arts degree from college was as a military instructor and coach at the New York School for the Deaf in New York City. While there he met his wife, the former Gustyne Fisk, who was studying at the National Academy of Arts.

"One of my college classmates arranged for us to be introduced," Rudy noted. "Both of our parents live here, but we had to meet in a city of 9 million people."

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Luke J. Gamblin, live at 1505 Line, and Mrs. Gamblin's parents are Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Fisk, 2423 Hughes.

Married in 1943, the Gamblins now have 3 youngsters (all of whom have normal hearing): Cathy, 10; Billy, 4; and Mary Eva, 2. Mrs. Gamblin also is deaf.

Young Cathy is adept at sign language and answers the telephone at the Gamblin house. She relays messages to her parents. The two younger children understand that their parents can lipread, but if there appears to be any misunderstanding, according to their father, "They just take our hand and lead us to what they want." Cathy also acts as an interpreter on such occasions.

Both he and his wife are active in the Amarillo Silent Club, and Rudy is a vice president of the Texas State Association for the Deaf. They helped organize the Amarillo club several years ago along with C. C. Abernathy.

That was in 1952—and the group formally organized with one purpose in mind: To stamp out the deaf peddling racket which was widespread in Amarillo and the rest of the State.

The group succeeded in having a city ordinance passed prohibiting begging and peddling by persons who claimed to be deaf and mute—many of whom were not handicapped.

The next year they carried out a successful campaign to explain to the public what jobs can be handled aptly by the deaf.

And, of course, this year the club's big project is the State convention—ramrodded by Rudy Gamblin.

Rudy attempts to disclaim responsibility and credit for the part he played in securing the convention—which convenes only every second year—but his friends and neighbors know better.

"This is Rudy's convention—whether he wants the credit or not," a friend said. "And because he's behind it, you can bet it's going to be the most entertaining and best meeting the association has ever had."

Rising Tide of Imports Endanger Balanced Conditions in the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter I received from M. Leon Lowenstein, chairman of the board, M. Lowenstein & Sons, Inc., on the subject of tariff reductions, which will greatly increase the imports of Japanese cotton goods. Many American mills cannot possibly meet this Japanese competition. In the last year importation of cotton cloth from Japan increased over 200 percent. We must find some way to protect ourselves from this low-wage competition in the interest of our textile industry. I am confident the following letter will be of interest to the Members of Congress:

M. LOWENSTEIN & SONS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., July 20, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: I have your letter of the 15th in answer to mine of the 13th.

In my letter I touched briefly on the subject of tariff reductions. I am now writing to you on this subject specifically as I do not believe there is anything more important that our representatives in Congress can handle at this time than this tariff situation.

I am enclosing reprints of articles which have appeared in the press recently. You will note that one of the articles reads, "Trade with Japan reported favorable to Philippines." The Philippines have been a very large market for textiles and other industrial articles. With products made by slave labor going into the Philippines, that market must be lost to American industry, and if we are going to lose our own markets where are we all going to be?

With regard to the article entitled "Great Imports From Japan Alarm Canada Shirt Men," the chain stores are selling shirts made in Japan for $1. Prior to this, this kind of garment was being sold by these same people for $1.98 and they couldn't get enough of them.

Regarding the article headed, "Textile Men Hit Cuba's Efforts To Renegotiate Duty," it looks like we are getting it from all sides.

I believe that the one thing that can lick the continued prosperity of this country is the dumping of products in this country produced by countries with slave labor, which would create unemployment. I am not so much concerned with how many people we have unemployed as I am concerned about how many people we have employed. In other words, if we have so many people employed, these people who are employed can support those who are not employed.

I know the subject of tariffs is receiving your most serious attention and trust that the enclosures will be of help to you.

Sincerely yours,

LEON LOWENSTEIN.

P. S.—Since dictating the above I have been advised that the Japanese Finance Ministry has estimated May exports to the United States of woven cotton shirts and blouses at 239,200 dozen. In all of 1954 only 189,214 dozen were exported. This tremendous increase was accomplished without tariff reduction.

Stretching Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial entitled "Stretching Social Security" which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, July 20, 1955:

STRETCHING SOCIAL SECURITY

Almost from the time of initial enactment of the social-security program in the early 1930's there has been nonpartisan acceptance of the idea that the system should be strengthened and expanded in its coverage. There have, in the years between, been legislative actions which implemented this intent—supported by Democrats and Republicans alike.

The Democratic-controlled House has now taken another long step in this direction—so long, in fact, that a proper question arises as to whether the legislation has been given adequate study and consideration. In brief, the bill now passed on to the Senate would do the following: (1) Reduce the age eligibility of women for social-security retirement benefits from 65 to 62; (2) continue monthly benefits for disabled children after they reach the age of 18; (3) extend old-age and survivors' insurance to an estimated 200,000 self-employed professional persons; (4) provide full social-security benefits to disabled insured individuals at the age of 50. This legislation of far-reaching effect was reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee after 6 days of closed-door consideration, without public hearings. It came to the floor of the House under a 40-minute limitation of debate, with no amendments permitted. It was passed there by a vote of 372 to 31, but only after House Republican Leader MARTIN had expressed the hope that the Senate would produce a "better and safer" bill. The Senate Finance Committee already has announced it would hold public hearings on the measure, with the clear implication that the financial obligations involved in such an extension of the system would be given serious consideration.

There appears to be a compelling reason for such consideration. For example, cost estimates on the provision for expanding adult disability benefits vary from $1 billion annually to twice that amount. Actually, both figures seem to be more guesswork than otherwise. Lowering the retirement age for women may cost an additional $1 billion annually. Obviously, the extension and improvement of coverage must cost additional dollars, but there is a point at which increased cost—translated into tax liability—could become so high as to destroy any sound insurance principles in the system. Such a result would not spell social security for any group.

The Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is chiefly distinguished from the Soviet by our faith and belief in a Supreme Being.

It is natural, therefore, that in this crucial hour when great decisions are being made that will vitally affect the future lives of all peoples, that we should turn our thoughts and our fervent prayers toward Geneva, asking the Almighty to imbue the leaders gathered there with the courage, strength, and wisdom to come to satisfactory and successful agreements which will insure the future peace of the world.

I earnestly believe with all my heart that the time is at hand to lay all our cards on the conference table and to ask the Soviet to do likewise. The results of this conference may well decide, whether we shall have peace, or whether we will have to continue to live in an armed camp for the rest of our lives, in a world filled with suspicion, distrust, hostility, and fear.

There are many great issues to settle. The unification of Germany and the establishment of collective security are vital. Disarmament and effective control of atomic and hydrogen energy and weapons are of great importance.

Some questions not on the agenda are of utmost importance. Foremost among these is the problem of coming to some agreement with the Soviet to stop the worldwide conspiracy being conducted by world communism and directed by Moscow.

And what American does not attach greatest importance to the question of liberating the oppressed peoples and all the victims of imperialism and colonialism who continue to be kept in a cruel bondage?

What American honestly believes that there can be a just, lasting peace on this earth so long as millions of worthy human beings are held in slavery under an abominable tyranny which to many is worse than death?

Every true American hopes and prays for the success of the conference and for divine guidance of our great President and his associates and all others at the conference.

Let no one minimize the problems which our leaders face in trying to deal with Communist negotiators whose point of view is so far away from our own. Their responsibility is surely grave.

But it is my opinion that if our leaders are inspired by the great principles and the great heritage of freedom which they represent at the conference, if they will be firm and uncompromising in the right, even as they strive earnestly for conciliation and understanding, if they persist with faith and devotion to the cause of humanity and liberty, and the great inarticulate peoples they speak for, in that course will lie the best chance for success.

And in that event, if they do their best to uphold our cause, and yet do not secure all we had hoped for because of the bad faith and aggressive designs of others, we shall at least know where we stand.

And if all the leaders of the conference will but listen to the pleas of the peoples of the world they will hear one great voice crying for peace. Pray God that they will harken to that voice and to the spirit of brotherhood and understanding and faith which alone can lead all nations out of the dark shadows of fear into the sunlight of friendship, tolerance, and security.

The Dutch-Indonesian Disagreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a large number of my constituents in Kent and Ottawa Counties are proud of their Dutch heritage and are interested in the present Dutch-Indonesian disagreement. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press entitled, "The Dutch Accuse" and "Indonesia Replies."

The editorials follows:

[From the Grand Rapids Press of June 16, 1955]

THE DUTCH ACCUSE

The Netherlands Government Monday released to the world the text of a white paper titled "Administration of Justice in Indonesia." This paper is concerned with the treatment accorded 34 Dutch nationals who have been held by Indonesian police authorities for more than a year on charges of espionage and related activities.

If the accusations made in this report are true they represent a shocking indictment of the young Indonesian Republic. And there is substantial evidence in the report to indicate that in the main the charges are true.

Among the allegations that can be proved easily is that H. A. Bouman, the Dutch counsel assigned to defend the accused persons, was balked and mistreated to the point where the Netherlands Government had to remove him as defense counsel. Bouman was subjected to the same ruthless questioning that allegedly had been practiced on the prisoners. He also was accused of having tried to bribe a witness and of having insulted the Indonesian police.

To replace Bouman, the Netherlands Government looked abroad for a competent attorney who would be acceptable to the Indonesian Government. It selected Derek Curtis-Bennett, Queen's counsel in Britain. The Indonesians, however, refused to grant him a visa. Currently the Dutch are looking for a prominent American lawyer to take the cases of the 34.

Whether an American would be any more acceptable to the Indonesian Government is yet to be seen. The fact is that among the charges made by the Indonesian Government is one that the accused persons conspired with the United States and Britain to foment rebellion in Indonesia. Specifically, these two countries are accused by certain of the Indonesian Government's "witnesses" as having supplied arms, munitions, and large sums of money to anti-government elements. These sources claim that aircraft of the American and British Embassies dropped arms and ammunition to gangs in West Java and that the American information service also has been guilty of sabotaging the Indonesian Government.

As an individual nation, therefore, the United States has a vital interest in seeing that the true situation in Indonesia is exposed and that the accused Dutch are given a fair trial. This country has a double interest since it is a member of the United Nations, and it was U. N. that may be said to have presided at the birth of the Indonesian Republic.

It long has been rumored that the Indonesian Government has come under the dominance of the Communists. And the tenor of the remarks in a large section of the Indonesian press, coupled with stories of brutal police activities, brainwashing and Soviet-style confessions, would strongly suggest that there is considerable foundation for the rumors.

If the stories are true, democracy and democratic methods are being flouted in Indonesia. Certainly it was not U. N.'s intent, when it guided Indonesia to independence, to deliver the East Indies to undemocratic factions. The best way Indonesia can prove that the rumors are unfounded is to grant the accused public trials free from threats and coercion and to repudiate the charges made by state witnesses of western complicity in any conspiracy to destroy the present Indonesian Government.

[From the Grand Rapids Press of June 24, 1955]

INDONESIA REPLIES

Last week The Netherlands Government published a white paper in which it charged that 34 Dutch citizens accused of espionage in Indonesia were not being given a fair trial. The Dutch Government also contended that counsel for the prisoners, H. A. Bouman, had been subjected to severe treatment, as had the prisoners, and had been forced to remove himself as counsel. The Indonesian Government, through its press attaché in Washington, now has filed an answer to the Dutch charges.

It is less than a complete answer. Concerning Dutch accusations that the prisoners had been mistreated, the Indonesians say merely that they have "categorically rejected" them. "Investigations made by the competent authorities," they go on to remark, "had proved that the points raised by The Netherlands high commissariat were without sufficient foundation." The "competent authorities" are not identified. Nor is any effort made to explain away the letters from prisoners with which the Dutch have documented their case.

Throughout the Indonesian reply there are protestations to the effect that the trial of the accused is being conducted in a democratic manner. But there is also this revealing statement:

"The request made at that time by the Dutch representatives to allow counsel to contact detainees [the prisoners] while the latter were still being examined by the police or the counsel for the prosecution could not be complied with, as this was not permitted by the existing law of procedure. According to the said law, only from the moment their case had been tried in open court has assistance been allowed to them."

Certainly these provisions do not square with the democratic concept of the right of an accused person to counsel. If the above paragraph is an accurate description of the way the Indonesian courts function it means that counsel for the defense has no time to prepare a case, summon witnesses, or exam-

ine the evidence against the accused, as is the case in this country.

The Dutch have not contended that the accused are guiltless, although failure to do so should not be interpreted as an admission of guilt. The Netherlands Government is willing to let the accused be tried on the charges placed against them. But it rightly insists that the trials should be conducted in conformity with the democratic practices the Indonesian Government professes to honor.

It was hoped at the time the Netherlands Government laid its complaint before the world that the Indonesian Republic would be able to present an acceptable explanation of its actions. The present reply leaves far too much unsaid to qualify as being acceptable.

Whither Geneva: Talk, Surrender, or New World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—This Four Power meeting in this famous Swiss town is just about the most elaborately prepared of the many international conferences this writer has attended.

It is also the most uncertain.

It came about not so much spontaneously as through Communist propaganda appealing to what has been called a "universal popular yearning for unity and peace." To meet this propaganda, the three Western governments decided to produce their own peace plan and either get it adopted or show up the Soviet leaders as "peace fakers."

For the last 2 months all four participants have been jockeying for position.

The three Western foreign ministers have made really remarkable efforts to get together on a common program and divide the several roles. They agree that the immediate problems are three: Disarmament, Germany, and a European security system. To these they added, as a bait to the Soviets, a fourth: An increase of East-West trade.

EACH HIS OWN

In June they decided that Faure would talk security system; Eisenhower, Germany; and Eden, East-West trade, apparently leaving disarmament to the foreign ministers who will meet both at the same time and after the chiefs of government.

(It is doubtful if they will keep to their respective parts.)

The declared purpose of the Big Four meeting is not to settle any of the above problems but to prepare for their subsequent settlement by "relaxing existing tensions."

Why does the U. S. S. R. want a conference? Students of foreign affairs differ. Some believe the U. S. S. R. is under such economic pressure at home it must relax its armament efforts. In this case, it should make real concessions.

Others insist the Kremlin is up to its old trick of trying to dupe its adversaries. Behind its peaceful mask lies—they think—the plan (a) to prevent the rearmament of West Germany as part of NATO; (b) to get the United States bases out of Europe; (c) to secure if possible some advantage for Red China; and (d) to lull the democratcies of half-sleep, during which the U. S. S. R. will secure real military predominance.

SETTLEMENT FIRST

Obviously, if the U. S. S. R. had wished to relax world tensions it could have done so without any conference. Moreover, it is easier to relax tensions by first settling problems than the other way around.

And if you look at the three main problems—European security system, Germany, and disarmament—the following seems clear:

There can be no security system without a settlement in Germany.

There can be no settlement in Germany without some disarmament.

There will be no disarmament without a security system that includes Germany.

Conclusion: The three problems must be settled simultaneously. Any Western readiness to settle them piecemeal might be disastrous. (That is why both West Germans and Italians are anxious about the outcome.) But the Westerners do not really agree on Germany. The United States and Britain (and West Germany) want Germany reunited, though not at cost of deserting NATO for neutrality. France would just as soon see Germany divided. (So, secretly, would some West Germans, but they dare not say so.)

MORE TALKS

Here manifestly is a fine basket of crabs. Hence the general scepticism in Washington. Many believe that nothing will emerge from the Geneva talks but more talks. A few even predict a "western surrender."

Optimists pin their faith on two factors:

The first is the possibility that the U. S. S. R. is ready to renounce further outside expansion rather than risk major war. Such readiness, communicated privately to President Eisenhower by his old comrade-in-arms, Marshal Zhukov, might account for our President's beaming optimism. In this case, the key to this conference will be the meetings of Eisenhower and Zhukov.

The second—which may be related to the first—is Mr. Eisenhower's determination to secure a new world along he lines outlined in his remarkable opening speech at the U. N. in San Francisco—a cooperative world without war or unnecessary poverty. That such a world is theoretically possible there can be no doubt.

But to eliminate poverty armament spending must be drastically reduced. To reduce spending one must eliminate or greatly reduce the fear of war. But the cure for war—perhaps the only cure—is some sort of enforceable world law—not just mere empty promises.

Are we Americans ready for this? Is Europe? Is the U. S. S. R.?

Arab Border Attacks Continue—Pipeline Blown Up at Kissufim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following news item which appeared in the June 24, 1955, issue of the Israel Digest:

ARAB BORDER ATTACKS CONTINUE—PIPELINE BLOWN UP AT KISSUFIM

JERUSALEM.—Jordanian and Egyptian attacks upon Israel life and property continued during the past week. On June 21, Jordanians opened heavy machinegun fire upon Nir Eliahu in central Israel from the police station at Kalkilia. This attack followed the blowing up of a farmhouse at Neve Yam in central Israel the previous day.

On June 18, an Israel patrol was attacked by members of the Jordanian National Guard in the same area. A Jordanian soldier was killed and the Israel-Jordanian Mixed Armistice Commission, meeting on June 20, censured Jordan for the crossing of its security forces into Israel territory.

On June 19, Egyptian infiltrators blew up the pipeline south of Kissufim and severed telephone communications to this southern settlement. The Negev pipeline was last blown up near Auja on December 4. It may be recalled that infiltrators from the Gaza Strip examined by United Nations Observers have testified that Egyptian Military Authorities in Gaza direct this type of sabotage.

A partial list of incidents perpetrated by Arab military and civilian personnel during the past 3 weeks follows:

On June 2, an Israel patrol uncovered a land mine laid by Egyptian infiltrators south of Kissufim.

On June 3, an Israel patrol uncovered an Egyptian land mine northeast of Kissufim.

On June 5, Egyptians opened fire upon an Israel patrol north of Nahal Oz.

On June 7, Syrians fired upon an Israel fishing vessel on Lake Kinneret.

On June 16, Syrians fired upon an Israel police patrol near Hagovrim in Upper Galilee.

On June 17, an 18-year-old girl, of Kfar Menahem in central Israel, was wounded by Jordanian infiltrators.

Salute to the Secret Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N. J., of July 20 saluting the celebration by the United States Secret Service on its 90th birthday:

SALUTE TO THE SECRET SERVICE

The United States Secret Service is celebrating its 90th birthday not with a cake and candles but with a new flag, combining white with Treasury colors of blue and gold.

The service was established during the Civil War to catch counterfeiters. That still is an important function. During the past fiscal year its operatives arrested 190 persons for counterfeiting and captured approximately $1 million in counterfeit bills and coins. It also goes after forgers of Government checks and bonds.

Overshadowing these activities today is its job of guarding the President, the Vice President, the President-elect and their families. The moment the votes are in, the Secret Service people close in on the man who is to be the next President and they are with him or within call at all hours of the day and night until he goes out of office.

Since for many years the Secret Service was the Government's only investigative agency it often was called on by other Departments than the Treasury of which it is a part. It may be that privately its men guarded Presidents occasionally from Lincoln down. But it was not until after the assassination of President McKinley in 1901

that the organization was officially assigned the task.

Today the President does not take a trip or make a move until the Secret Service has plotted his course in advance and taken every precaution against harm coming to him. It is a grave responsibility demanding eternal vigilance and iron nerves on the part of its personnel.

The public welcomes this opportunity to recognize the valuable task the Secret Service performs.

David Ben-Gurion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following very interesting article, written by Gordon C. Hamilton, which appeared in the July 17, 1955, issue of This Week magazine:

"IF WE ARE ATTACKED"

(By Gordon C. Hamilton)

"It's time to go see the Prime Minister—I mean the Defense Minister," the Israeli major said.

His mistake was natural enough to make about David Ben-Gurion, who might be called Israel's Churchill. Even the Prime Minister, Moshe Sharett, had just made a similar misstatement in the privacy of a cabinet meeting. Summing up remarks by Ben-Gurion, Sharett had said: "As the Prime Minister has stated * * *."

The major drove me toward Tel Aviv's Defense Ministry, a four-sided slab which looks like a sawed-off version of the United Nations Secretariat Building, but is nicknamed "the Pentagon." He parked nearly, outside a gracious villa almost hidden by flowers. From this peaceful establishment Ben-Gurion directed Israel's destiny as both Prime Minister and Defense Minister from 1948 until he retired in 1953 to a communal farm in the desert. Upon resuming the Defense portfolio on February 21, 1955, he again set up his headquarters in the villa rather than "the Pentagon." As the July 26 national parliamentary elections approached, there seemed a strong possibility that he might again become Prime Minister, too, especially in view of the fall of the Sharett cabinet on June 29.

On the dot of 11 a. m. I was ushered into Ben-Gurion's corner office on the second floor. I was not chaperoned by any public-relations man such as had sat in on my interviews with Sharett and four other cabinet members. "Mr. Israel" did not want one.

I had been tipped off that, on receiving my request for his first exclusive interview since his comeback, Ben-Gurion had protested: "Why should I see anyone from the American press? It's against me." Forewarned, I offered a statement about the need for understanding.

The Defense Minister, age 68, bounced up to a huge wall map of Israel and gave me a military briefing. He looked strictly nonmilitary. Barely 5 feet 4, he could not reach from Dan to Beersheba. His khakis were rumpled. His collar was open.

THE UNEASY ARMISTICE

He slapped the map at the Gaza strip, that ribbon of Palestinian sand which Egypt occupied under the 1948 truce. "If the Egyptians violations continue here," he said ominously, "there will be no more armistice agreement. What will happen? I don't know. We are willing to abide 100 percent. But this must be a two-sided affair."

His eyes narrowed in his canvas face as he went on: "I try to see everything from the Arab point of view. I can't understand today what the Egyptians are after. If they want a try at strength, they must know we will give them a good beating. And a military dictatorship cannot survive a defeat.

"I have nothing against Egypt. Oh, we had some trouble 3,000 years ago [he did not think it necessary to name Moses], but that's over. There's no reason for trouble between us now. There is a desert dividing us. That strip is only a burden for them. But according to the armistice, this is the line. We accept it. We don't want to change it."

To refute the Arab argument that Israel would be forced to expand by the pressure of population, Ben-Gurion said: "We believe a country has three dimensions—not just length and breadth, but productivity. If we need to bring in another one or two million refugees, we can make this country more productive to take care of them. We can absorb any foreseeable number of immigrants within our present frontiers."

WHO GAVE THE ORDERS?

Not once did "B. G."—as all Israel has nicknamed him—take refuge in the this-is-off-the-record shelter. Had the Israeli Government adopted a policy of retaliation—of two eyes for an eye? He retorted: "Retaliation is not the exact word. But under no conditions will we give up the right of self-defense. The army has standing orders, when they are fired on, that they should shoot back. They are to take the action necessary for their self-protection—that only."

The Defense Minister's wording left him open for the question which, I knew, one ambassador of a major Western power had been too diplomatic to put: Just who was responsible for the bloody Gaza incident of February 28, in which 38 Arabs and 8 Israelis were killed—only 7 days after B. G.'s return to office?

Frankly, I expected Ben-Gurion to alibi that Israeli soldiers were just protecting themselves and that higher authorities were not to blame. But without hesitation, he admitted that no military command, not even the army chief of staff, was empowered to order this operation on its own responsibility.

I pressed further: "Did you personally authorize the Gaza incident?"

Closing his eyes entirely as he searched for the exact words, Ben-Gurion replied: "In this country we have collective responsibility. The cabinet as such is responsible." In other words, the Israeli Army was acting in accordance with its orders; it was authorized by the Sharett cabinet to strike back at Arab provocation; although the cabinet doubtless had no idea that the incident would be so bloody, B. G. himself was not evading the blame.

THE PHILOSOPHER—THE WARRIOR

Was this then the best time for a showdown with Israel's neighbors? "I wouldn't say we're stronger than all the Arabs combined. But even if I knew we were stronger, the whole idea of preventive war is madness. It's either war or it isn't. It is the most terrible duty of a man to have to send out some of his people, knowing that it means sending them to their deaths.

"As a Jew I am an optimist," he continued. "I believe in the prophecy of the prophets, that the time will come when people will not learn to make war." But he declined to forecast how peace might break out.

Ben-Gurion went on: "The difficulty lies in that we are dealing with governments which are not stable and which are not elected by their peoples. There is no Arab leader who really cares for the people and who can take the responsibility. Whom do we have to deal with? Until the Arab countries get real people's governments—not in the Soviet sense—I'm afraid there will be no peace.

"But the Arabs are human beings. Some day they will assert themselves. If America is interested, it might do well to strengthen liberal and democratic forces as a long-term policy, so that in time they might take over."

Ben-Gurion the philosopher almost closed his eyes as he peered ahead: "The choice is between world destruction and world government—a real world organization for peace with power to enforce the peace, as the United States had to enforce the peace in 1861. I hope this will come. I may not live to see it. But I believe my children will. Either we'll find a way out of rivalries and war, or man will destroy himself."

Suddenly Ben-Gurion the warrior opened his eyes wide as he snapped back to present reality: "Until that time—if we are attacked, we will defend ourselves. Before taking away any piece of our country, the Arabs must destroy us. We will fight to the last."

Resolution Calling for Passage of S. 681

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a resolution adopted in State convention of the Department of Massachusetts, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in the RECORD. The resolution calls for the passage of S. 681, dealing with the question of sabotage of defense industries:

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
BOSTON, MASS., *July 11, 1955.*

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND. Enclosed herewith is a resolution unanimously adopted at the recent 35th State encampment of the Department of Massachusetts Veterans of Foreign Wars, held in Springfield, Mass., on the 24th, 25th, and 26th of June, which is self-explanatory.

Your support of Senate 681 will be deeply appreciated by the Massachusetts members of the VFW.

Deeply grateful for your many past favors, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. POWERS,
Quartermaster-Adjutant.

RESOLUTION

Whereas one of the principal concerns of any loyal American is to protect strategic defense facilities against individuals known to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion, or by stealing secrets for foreign nations; and

Whereas our laws, at present, are inadequate to protect our defense industries against these foreign agents and sympathizers: Be it

Resolved, That in view of the above facts, the delegates of the VFW in convention assembled, at Springfield, Mass., go on record requesting the State Department of the VFW of Massachusetts, to write to all Senators and Congressmen, requesting their support of S. 681, which will authorize the Federal Government to guard our defense

industries against these subversive foreign agents and sympathizers.

Unanimously adopted, 35th State Encampment, Department of Massachusetts, Springfield, June 24, 25, 26, 1955.

Need for Townsend Plan Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I regret I was unable to join my colleague and personal friend, the able Congressman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE M. RHODES, last Monday afternoon when he spoke on the need for the enactment of legislation to give to the retired citizens of our country an adequate income so that they could enjoy with dignity and comfort their twilight years. At that time we were in executive session in the Public Works Committee completing work on the proposed national highway program. I am in wholehearted agreement with the excellent statement made by Representative RHODES, and I want to commend him for the leadership he has given to our bipartisan committee supporting Townsend plan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7225, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1955, which passed the House last Tuesday, was a great step forward in the field of social legislation. Ever since coming to Congress I, along with Congressman RHODES and many others, have urged and fought for an extension and liberalization of the social-security laws so that the aged and infirm of this Nation could be more adequately protected and provided for—so their future could be more secure. H. R. 7225 goes a long way toward accomplishing this goal, and I wholeheartedly endorsed it for that reason, but I am of the opinion the bill does not go far enough. There is still much more to be done in order that the aged and infirm are adequately protected in this day of high cost of living.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind any Member of this House of the legislation now pending, and which has been pending without action for many years now, which provides for a comprehensive, universal, adequate, pay-as-you-go retirement program. The gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] and I have introduced identical bills, H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, providing for such a program. These bills are similar to the bipartisan attempts over the years to provide for a real, all-inclusive retirement program for all. They provide every adult citizens in the United States with equal basic Federal social security payments, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60. They give protection to widows with children, and further provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

This, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is the only final solution to the problem of the aged and disabled—a comprehensive pension system which provides liberal pensions as a matter of right to all retired and disabled persons. Since 1935, when the present Social Security Act became law, the problems of the aged and disabled have greatly multiplied. True, there have been improvements in the law, but always too little and often too late. The piecemeal improvements over the past 20 years still do not improve the lot of millions of our aged citizens and disabled persons who do not come under the protection of the act. There is no security, for instance, for disabled persons who, because of their disability, do not qualify under the present system. This is manifestly unfair. Because of the very disability for which they now need help, these people are unable to qualify for such help. While H. R. 7225 liberalized the present law with respect to disabled persons, still it does not begin to solve the problem of many, many others.

Lowering the age for women as provided in H. R. 7225 is definitely a step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker, but why limit it to women and why not lower the age of all to 60? We read day in and day out of the problems facing older workers today. The gentleman from California [Mr. CRAIG HOSMER] discussed this phase of the problem on Monday. These people just aren't being hired. Until recently our own Civil Service Commisssion refused to hire otherwise qualified persons for certain positions if they were over 35 years of age. We could go a long way in solving this problem by reducing the retirement age for all, men and women alike, workers and nonworkers, to the age of 60.

With all the changes and improvements which have been made, Mr. Speaker, we are still operating under a 1935 social security system which cannot begin to solve the problems of 1955. We are not being realistic in this regard. The present tragic plight of millions of our old folks calls for a reappraisal of our entire social security system, and every attempt should be made to provide true security for these many millions who are faced with such tremendous problems and with so little, if anything, with which to solve them.

Last year extensive and complete testimony in behalf of legislation similar to that introduced by the gentleman from California and myself was presented before the House Committee on Ways and Means. Over 100 Members of the House signed a discharge petition, strongly urging that the measure be favorably reported to the House for final debate and vote. While I surely support H. R. 7225 as a stopgap measure, Mr. Speaker, I again urgently appeal that the Committee on Ways and Means favorably report H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472 to the House so that this Congress can decide whether we are to have a real social security system or continue to be committed to the limited, halfhearted approach to the security of the aged of America.

All Hail to Brandeis University, of Waltham, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, up in the city of Waltham, Mass., in my congressional district, is located Brandeis University, an educational institution of which all of us in Massachusetts are justly proud.

The reasons for our pride are most impressively presented in an article by Hal Clancy, appearing in the June 1955 issue of the magazine Coronet.

The article follows:

THE BRANDEIS WAY TO BROTHERHOOD
(By Hal Clancy)

A Boston businessman spent most of a recent morning anxiously waiting while his partner was supposed to be making an important sale to the president of a large company.

When the partner returned wearing a smile of unmistakable triumph, he asked excitedly, "You were successful?"

"You bet I was," the partner said. "We never got around to talking business, but wait 'till you hear the contribution I got for Brandeis University."

It was just another example of the incredible enthusiasm that is making Brandeis—America's only Jewish-founded nonsectarian university—the fastest growing institution of higher learning in the Nation.

And there is nothing local about this "boost Brandeis" spirit. It is as heart warmingly keen in Texas, California, and the Deep South, as in the cities and towns surrounding the university's 200-acre campus in Waltham, Mass.

Resources are still modest and much more is needed because Brandeis is in the costly building period. But the annual income has tripled during the past 6 years—and no comparable institution has come even close to that record.

The campus, a beautiful, rolling expanse of woods and fields overlooking the Charles River, has doubled in area. Fourteen major buildings have been added to the 10 original structures. Further expansion is in the blueprint stage.

The building pace has been so spectacular that Dr. Abram Leon Sachar, Brandeis' first president, says with a smile: "I sometimes fear that Brandeis' next president will suspect I had an edifice complex."

Last year the president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, about to speak at ceremonies honoring the graduate school and the new $500,000 Brandeis Student Center, asked when the work on the building was actually completed.

"Thirty minutes ago," he was told.

Named after the late Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis, ardent champion of liberalism, Brandeis University began its career in 1948 with 13 faculty members. Now there are 130.

There were 107 students that first year. Now there are more than 900 undergraduates from Canada, South America, Europe, Africa,

the Middle and Far East—and almost every State in the Union.

The number of undergraduates would be far larger except for the rigid scholastic standards, which have brought about Brandeis' astonishingly quick acceptance by the academic world.

The university is mistakenly thought of by some as a Jewish university. It is not—any more than Harvard is a Congregationalist university.

Brandeis is Jewish-founded and primarily Jewish-supported, but it is so rigorously nonsectarian that nothing is known about a freshman when he arrives on the campus except his academic background. No student or faculty member is asked any question dealing with nationality, religious beliefs, or racial origins. No photographs are requested with applications for admission.

Little wonder when Brandeis fielded its football team last year one Boston sports writer asked: "Is this Brandeis or a rollcall at the U. N.?"

So cherished is the nonsectarian ideal, that Brandeis, during its early days of desperate financial strain, rejected without the slightest hesitation a handsome scholarship that would have been restricted to a student of Jewish faith.

"You're sure you won't reconsider?" asked the would-be donor, a wealthy Jewish merchant. "It's a lot of money to turn down."

President Sachar and the trustees responded with a flat, "No."

"Good," the merchant said. "I just wanted to make certain you were absolutely firm about the nonsectarian principle. Since you are, I am prepared to give much more."

A Jewish-founded nonsectarian university was being discussed back in post-Civil War days. But American Jews, though they contributed to our great universities far in excess of their numerical proportion, founded only strictly sectarian institutions, prior to Brandeis.

That fact was uppermost in the minds of seven Boston men—attorney George Alpert, grocery chain executive Norman S. Rabb, and manufacturers Joseph F. Ford, Abraham Shapiro, the late Morris S. Shapiro, James J. Axelrod, and Meyer Jaffe—when they banded together to make the Brandeis dream come true.

All were immigrants or the sons of immigrants, and only two had been to college. The odds against them were, at best, staggering. And, when Dr. Albert Einstein and a group of prominent Jewish educators and industrialists withdrew their support in a squabble over personalities, defeat seemed certain.

"We owe Brandeis to the country that gave us freedom and the right to lead happy and useful lives," Chairman Alpert told his six trustees. "We intend to pay that debt." And that was the spirit in which Brandeis was created: as a gift of love and gratitude to the United States.

But it took perspiration as well as inspiration. Alpert went on coast-to-coast speaking tours. The other trustees drove themselves relentlessly to raise funds.

Speaking to a group in Houston, Tex., Alpert was explaining that Brandeis would need a great amount of support because it would be many years before it would have an alumni.

"If you don't have an alumni," someone in the audience suggested, "why don't you form one?"

That suggestion resulted in the creation of a foster alumni group called the Brandeis Associates, some 6,000 persons who are contributing more than $600,000 annually to the support of the university. That is the equivalent of the income from a $10 million endowment fund.

This prompted a Brandeis professor to remark recently that Brandeis is the only university in the world supported by the devotion of an alumni body that is nonexistent and by the income from an endowment not yet realized.

Undoubtedly the biggest and most immediate problem facing the "founding seven" was acquiring a physical plant. Several sites were considered and the trustees were investigating the possibilities of acquiring the buildings and land of defunct Middlesex University in Waltham. Their sincerity and idealism so impressed C. Ruggles Smith, whose father had founded Middlesex and poured a personal fortune into the unsuccessful struggle to make it survive as a medical school, that he offered the buildings and land as a gift. The offer was made, however, with the stipulation that Brandeis never discriminate against anyone because of race or religion—an agreement which the founders heartily accepted.

Later, Smith, scion of a Protestant first-settler New England family, enthusiastically joined the Brandeis team and is now the university's director of admissions and registrar.

The most dramatic structure inherited from Middlesex is the castle, a frowning pile of masonry that abounds in glamorous turrets and flying buttresses, huge halls, and shadowy subterranean passages.

Undergraduates love to entertain visitors and freshmen in its dining room so that, as the entree is served, they can break the news:

"You know, this used to be where the students dissected cadavers when this was Middlesex."

It gets a guaranteed reaction—and it is true.

But the greatest triumph of the Founding Seven was the choice of a president. As later developments proved, Dr. Sachar possessed in nice balance the idealism, erudition, and clear-headed business sense that were needed.

Educated at Washington University, Harvard, and Cambridge, Dr. Sachar had taught history at the University of Illinois and been national director of the Hillel Foundations, an organization of Jewish students' centers on campuses throughout the Nation, before retiring to California.

Dr. Sachar plunged with fervor into the job of organizing an administrative staff and faculty, and raising funds.

"We owe it to America to provide this country with a Jewish-founded nonsectarian university," he said, "and we are going to do it if we have to lay the bricks with our own hands."

The enthusiasm kindled by Dr. Sachar and the tireless trustees swept across the Nation. A factory worker saved enough from his wages to sponsor a small scholarship. A Boston dowager was so impressed by what she had heard about Brandeis, that she left the university some $40,000 in her will.

Some, instead of cash, sent gifts in kind. Kegs of nails and crates of paper towels arrived. Well-wishers donated treasured stamp collections, pieces of furniture, cases of canned goods. Truckloads of lumber were delivered without warning. One man sent a fully equipped machine shop.

Outstanding educators were attracted to the faculty as soon as it became obvious that Brandeis was to remain a small, quality institution. Even now, with 325 courses available to undergraduates, the university maintains its ratio of 1 teacher for every 9 students.

Author Ludwig Lewisohn became professor of comparative literature; the brilliant young composer, Leonard Bernstein, professor of music. Irving Gifford Fine, another illustrious composer, quit Harvard and is now chairman of the Brandeis School of Creative Arts. Mathematician Aron Gurwitsch, Economist Svend Laursen, and Scientist Saul G. Cohen were among the many who saw what they wanted in the Brandeis ideal.

Benjamin (Benny) Friedman, Michigan's all-American quarterback of some three decades ago, is professor of physical education and a good example of the spirit of near dedication among the faculty. Friedman closed a successful automobile agency to take the job.

The importance attached by Dr. Sachar to gathering just the right faculty members is shown by his annual advice to Brandeis freshmen: "Pick people—not courses."

Brandeis welcomed its first class in 1948 and they began the fearless search for truth recommended by the great jurist after whom the university was named.

A relaxed, friendly relationship exists between faculty and students and they sincerely enjoy being together outside as well as in classes. Everyone is enormously fond of the professor who takes his cat for a walk on a leash, and the faculty member who until very recently drove a 1922 Franklin with the advice Keep Cool With Coolidge painted on the rear.

Brandeis students appear to be seriously intent upon getting an education. As one faculty member put it not long ago: "They aren't grinds, but they aren't fooling, either."

For instance, when Dr. Sachar instituted a full credit course on a working philosophy for a productive life, to be required of all seniors, some thought voluntary attendance at evening sessions might not work out. However, when Dr. Sachar attended one of these lectures recently, a student usher reported: "We have 159 seniors and 237 of them are here."

One member of the class of 1954 is 21-year-old Eliyahu Ahilea. Professor Bernstein, while conducting in Israel, heard Ahilea play the piano and brought him back to Brandeis as a musical prodigy at the age of 15. Short, spindly, and shy, Ahilea was promptly nicknamed "Spike" by fellow students.

However, "Spike" found a new interest at Brandeis—physics and engineering. Now he has forgotten music as a career and, after being graduated magna cum laude with distinction in physics, he entered MIT on a scholarship.

Brandeis prides itself on the way students find themselves at the university, and for that reason doesn't try to force music on an Ahilea. The students seem to respond well to being treated as adults.

Because Brandeis is new, students do not choose it aimlessly, or simply because a father or mother went there. Every undergraduate is there because he or she made a decision that it was, of several available schools, the right one.

Some were attracted by the illustrious educators on the faculty, some by the youth and promise of the institution, others by the school's most enthusiastic promoters—its students and alumni. The net result is that all are there for a purpose—which explains the university's atmosphere of vigor and sincerity.

William McKenna, a tall, husky redhead, who is president of Brandeis' Newman Club, an undergraduate Catholic organization, considered several schools before picking Brandeis.

"I wanted a school where I could prepare myself to be an electrical engineer and, at the same time, play good but nonprofessional football," he says.

McKenna, considered by some sports observers to be one of the best ends in New England football, also has achieved an enviable academic record, due, at least in part, to the individual instruction made possible by the small classes.

"I wanted a small school with a top-flight faculty, a place where one would get a broad and solid liberal arts education in preparation for the study of law," says Irving (Lenny) Markovitz, who is president of Hillel Foundation. "Brandeis offered that, along with several other inducements. For

instance, I am an Orthodox Jew and the university provides kosher food for students who want it.

"If I had to select one thing above all others that I like about Brandeis, it would be the emphasis on teaching you to think as well as remember mere facts. Take literature as an example: We have informal gatherings in which students will sit down with a professor for a couple of hours and discuss a book—a free exchange of opinions, interpretations, reactions. It's a really stimulating experience."

Norma Bassett, a pretty, blond senior and president of the Student Christian Association, a Protestant group, has different reasons for picking Brandeis.

"I'm interested in undergraduate activities and I was attracted by the opportunity in that area offered by Brandeis. Another thing—I had grown up in a small, Protestant community and I thought the experience in social relations, in working with and getting to know persons of different faiths and customs, would be valuable. Everything has worked out just as I hoped it would."

All of which means that Brandeis, which was not in existence 7 years ago, has already come of age as a university with its own atmosphere and its own achievements.

At this moment, which you always have to say when mentioning it, the university consists of two schools: the College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. The college is subdivided into four schools: Social Science, the Humanities, Science, and the Creative Arts. This is a radical departure from the traditional departmental system. Plans for expansion include, possibly, Schools of Medicine, Social Work, Public Administration, and Law.

The board of trustees, headed by Chairman Abraham Feinberg, has grown to 16 members, including Judge Joseph M. Proskauer and Eleanor Roosevelt. Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, is honorary chairman of the University Fellows.

But while most things at Brandeis have been expanding and changing with the dramatic growth of the University, one thing has remained completely constant: the devotion to brotherhood.

There was a perfect example of that when it was suggested that a building be erected to hold the planned Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic chapels. One of the trustees protested at once:

"No matter how you describe it, somebody's chapel is going to be in the basement and we will not subject anyone to that slight."

And that is why Brandeis, unlike most nonsectarian schools which provided one host chapel for all faiths, is building three separate and equal chapels, which will soon be completed. For at Brandeis, men of all colors, creeds, and national origins belong on the same level.

Bob and Helen Coar Tribute

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, best wishes and heartiest congratulations to Bob and Helen Coar on this 20th anniversary occasion. I have never known of two people more kind and cooperative in dealing with Members of Congress. Personally, they have been most considerate of me in all of my dealings with them. They have a wonderful record of achievement behind them and I wish them well in the days that lie ahead. They have discharged their service to the Members of Congress in such a way as to win the high respect of all of us.

Amendments to Federal Airport Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that this bill is merely an amendment to an existing law which continues in force and effect until 1958.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] has raised som rather pertinent questions with regard to it, particularly as to the extent to which local officials should make final determinations regarding the allocation of the funds provided in this bill. In that respect I must say I am in complete accord with what the gentleman is seeking to do. I realize that he has a local situation that he feels this bill fails to meet. We have situations in Mississippi in the same category. However, the people who are most vitally interested in gaining the maximum of local control over the allocation of these funds would appear to me to be the Council of State Aviation Officials.

The other day, just before the committee was to go into executive session to consider this legislation, I contacted the office of the Association of State Aviation Officials, and found that they would prefer that a bill be reported which would put final authority in the hands of State officials. However, they realized, as we did, that to place such an amendment in this legislation would probably tie up this bill in conference between the House and Senate, and consequently not get any legislation passed at this session. As a result, they are adding their wholehearted endorsement to this legislation.

I think if we should send this bill back to committee and seek to amend it along the lines advocated by my friend from Michigan, we had might as well give up for this session on the problem of strengthening the Airport Act.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say to the gentleman that I am supporting the bill, but I think that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should get its house in order in reference to the cooperation which is due by that administration with the Reserve program in flying.

It has come to my attention that the Fort Worth office, for instance, and perhaps other offices of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, has not been cooperating with the military program on Reserve flying throughout the country. I think we should get that straightened out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not certain whether the question raised by my good friend from Louisiana is one which will be affected by this legislation. However, permit me to say that I know of many instances, as he does, in which the CAA has appeared to act arbitrarily with regard to airports and flying programs. He has raised an issue which Congress might do well to explore.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Washington, Lafayette, Truth and Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 17, I was privileged to represent the great State of Iowa in the George Washington Memorial Chapel at Valley Forge. My remarks at these Iowa memorial services were such that I have been asked to have them extended in the Appendix of the RECORD. I take this opportunity to direct the attention of my colleagues to what I said on that occasion. That address, plus my introductory remarks, follows:

Through the will of the people I represent, I am privileged to sit in the hallowed Halls of Congress. I am their representative in the greatest Government on earth. I cherish this privilege to be a part of the Government in which the voice of the people plays such a vital part.

This was the principle laid down by our Founding Fathers when this great Republic was born. Each day, as I take my seat in Congress, I am reminded of the courage and integrity of the men who dreamed, fought for, and formulated this system of government.

I look upon the pictures of George Washington and Marquis de Lafayette and thank God that we were favored with such leaders and such stanch friends, because in these two men we have the outstanding example of mutual trust and understanding which must exist between all men of good will. From this, I take inspiration for what I have to say today. I speak to you of Washington, Lafayette, truth, and liberty.

At the outset, please accept greetings from the Honorable Leo Hoegh, Governor of the State of Iowa, Iowa's Representatives in Congress, and the thousands of people who live in and love this great State. I am indeed privileged to represent the people of Iowa here today. I do so gladly at the request of my Governor.

WASHINGTON, LAFAYETTE, TRUTH AND LIBERTY

In speaking on the hallowed soil of Valley Forge on the subject of Lafayette, I feel I must begin by linking the two names that were here cemented together by courage, by sufferings bravely undergone, and by an equal and selfless devotion to duty. Lafayette and Washington stand in the forefront of the heroes of America, and it is good to see that the shining of their united glory is undimmed by the slightest shade of jealousy or ill temper. The greatness of a man is never more apparent than in his appreciation of

another great man, and therefore I love to read and reread the wholehearted expressions of humility and devotion in LaFayette's letters to George Washington. I should like to read to you, if I may, the letter Lafayette wrote to Washington in camp at Valley Forge, December 31, 1777. Lafayette had, the previous day, written at length warning Washington of the intrigues against him headed by General Conway, and this letter is in acknowledgement of Washington's reply. I take the liberty of correcting some errors due to LaFayette's unfamiliarity with English.

"DEAR GENERAL: I should have much more reproached myself for the liberty I took in writing to your excellency, if I had believed it could engage you in the trouble of answering that letter. But, now, as you have written it, I must tell you that I received this favor with the greatest satisfaction and pleasure. Every assurance and proof of your affection fills my heart with joy, because that sentiment of yours is extremely dear and precious to me. A tender and respectful attachment for you, and an invariable frankness, will be found in my mind the more as you will know me better; but after these merits, I must tell you that very few others are to be found. I never wished so heartily to be entrusted by nature with an immensity of talents as on this occasion, when I could thus be of some use to your glory and happiness, as well as to mine own.

"What man does not join the pure ambition of glory to these other ambitions of advancement, rank, and fortune? As an ardent lover of laurels, I cannot bear the idea that so noble a sentiment should be mixed with any low one. In your preaching moderation to the brigadiers upon such an occasion, I am not supposed to recognize your virtuous character. As I hope my warm interest is known to your excellency, I dare entertain the idea that you will be so indulgent as to let me know everything concerning you whenever you will not be under the law of secrecy of particular circumstances.

"With the most tender and affectionate friendship and the most profound respect,

"Your most humble and obedient servant,

"LAFAYETTE."

The young man of 20 who wrote that humble letter was a major general on George Washington's staff, whose advice in matters of tactics and strategy Washington regularly sought, and who was soon to distinguish himself in military command by a cool efficiency, a wise patience, and a bold imagination rivaling the qualities of the commander himself. Lafayette, like Washington, could retreat indefinitely, or hole up in camp for a long while, disregarding clamors for impetuous action. Then, when the enemy had put himself at a disadvantage, he could strike like lightning and hold like steel.

But greater than his military skill or wisdom was the essential quality of the man Lafayette, showing through all his life, and in his successes as in his failures, in his sufferings as in his triumphs. He was at all times such a man as is envisioned in the words of the apostle James: "Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." Lafayette was a single-hearted and selfless seeker for truth, and justice, and liberty. He might well have said, with Thomas Jefferson: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." When, in his later political career in France, Lafayette was deceived and misled into aiding Napoleon's rise to power, and, in 1830, similarly aided Louis Philippe; these were the mistakes of a noble and trusting heart that saw in these graspers for personal power, not their base and petty designs, but the ideals of liberty and justice for which they claimed to be striving. In each case he was quick to speak out, with undaunted courage, against the abuses of entrenched power, and his last public speech was an attack upon the reactionary policies of Louis Philippe.

"Where the spirit of the Lord is," says St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, "there is liberty." I feel that the spirit of the Lord was surely with Lafayette, and the very breath of liberty was blowing about his every word and deed. When he was in prison, from 1792 to 1797, he lost no essential liberty thereby. "Ye shall know the truth," said Christ, as reported in John's gospel, "and the truth shall make you free." That is the kind of essential freedom that was Lafayette's. He was of those celebrated in Lowell's lines, in the Present Crisis:

"Careless seems the great Avenger; history's pages but record one death grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the Word; truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne—yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown, standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own."

I remember vividly how, on Palm Sunday a year ago, in a little church in Coronado, Calif., this spirit of truth and liberty seemed to breathe out through the pastor's sermon and fill the congregation. This minister, the Reverend Kenneth Baird Carson, was speaking on the theme of the Palm Sunday triumph of Christ, so soon to be followed by His betrayal and passion; and his sermon was called "The Triumph of Truth." It so impressed me, that I called on that minister, and obtained a copy of his talk, which I keep and often reread. Though he was not speaking directly of Lafayette, I feel that Lafayette is an outstanding example of the Christ-like devotion to truth that he was trying to inculcate. "God," he said, "has no minds but your human minds to accept His truth, no lips but your lips to proclaim His truth, no hearts but your hearts to love His truth. If you fail Him He will try again in the lives of another generation."

The generation that held two such shining and noble souls as Washington and Lafayette was, I am sure, no failure from this point of view. Here were minds to accept, lips to proclaim, and hearts to love God's truth. Here were men who would live out their Christian principles, through successes and failures, through good repute and ill, until death. A principle stressed in Mr. Carson's sermon, that "no man is free until he is morally free," might be counted as the keystone of the character of each of these patriots. Each had so strengthened his self-control, so bound himself to the Divine law of his own choosing, that his freedom was a mighty and inflexible current of determination. Either would obey authority because he chose to obey. This freedom in complete obedience is beautifully stated in a letter Lafayette wrote from Albany about March 13, 1778. He had been sent off on a northern expedition, insufficiently planned by Congress, his men and supplies hardly sufficient for any accomplishment, and his orders and position lacking clarity, and without authority to make a southward attack upon the British in and around New York. In commenting to General Washington on this situation, Lafayette said: "The command at Albany I don't look upon as fit for my desire of honorable opportunity, unless it would be extended below, and that I have not any right to request—in all, my dear general, my mind will be always supersatisfied to be as near you as possible, and I shall look upon anything you will believe fit for me, as the very best thing I can wish for."

The cordial friendship, the almost father-and-son relationship existing between George Washington and Lafayette, sprang from the recognition by each that the other was a kindred spirit, bound by an equal devotion to truth and to liberty. To each might well be applied that fine saying of Henry Adams, "They know enough who know how to learn." These two great men, one mature and in the position of supreme command, the other without command, but knowing himself fitted, by birth, talents, and training, to lead troops, were content to work together—Washington asking advice, and Lafayette eagerly requesting and following orders. Each, I think, was acting in the spirit of Roger Bacon's philosophic saying: "True knowledge stems not from the authority of others, nor from a blind allegiance to antiquated dogmas. Rather it is a highly personal experience—a light that is communicated only to the innermost privacy of the individual through the impartial channels of all knowledge and of all thought."

It is good to remember of Lafayette that late in life, in 1824 and 1825, he had a full year of triumphal touring and visiting in the United States, drinking to the full the glory and adulation tendered him by the grateful American people. "As an ardent lover of laurels," such as he recognized himself to be, from youth to old age, he was given a most spectacular award, being paraded and banqueted and feted from one end of the country to the other. This was his Palm Sunday of popular acclaim, but his Gethsemane of suffering and imprisonment lay behind him. When he died, he was an honored citizen of France and of the United States alike, and earth from Bunker Hill was laid upon his grave as a tribute recognizing the important part he played in bringing the Revolutionary War to its successful conclusion and obtaining for this country the priceless blessing of liberty.

Another Reason for Not Building the Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 5, 1955

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the bill includes projects which have been disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Budget Bureau has specifically recommended that the Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, and Navaho units not be authorized at this time. The Bureau has pointed out that there is no adequate basis for appraising the merits of these projects due to the lack of data on engineering, financial, and economic feasibility, detailed estimates of costs and benefits, and sufficient other pertinent information necessary for a complete understanding of the justification and necessity for the works.

With respect to participating projects outrightly authorized for construction in section 1 of the bill, the Bureau of the Budget has submitted that their authorization should be conditioned upon a new finding of favorable economic justification by the Secretary of Interior which must include (a) a joint study with the Department of Agriculture of the direct agricultural benefits of each project and (b) a reevaluation of the nondirect benefits of each project, based upon a reexamination of the methods presently used to compute the indirect and public benefits of reclamation projects. Based on the insufficiency of the available information regarding these participating

projects, which this bill would authorize, the Budget Bureau has stated that a reexamination is necessary "so that there could be no doubt about the economic justification of the projects finally undertaken."

Congress should not undertake to authorize questionable or unjustified projects. Until the information requested by the Bureau of the Budget is made available, Congress should not act on these projects.

The Governor of Pennsylvania in His Efforts To Levy New Taxes, Makes a Mockery of His Campaign Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, within a few days the House of Representatives will be called upon to consider H. R. 7474, commonly known as the highway bill, and which provides for the levying of increased taxes on gasoline, diesel oil, tires, and so forth, as a means of paying for the highway program.

According to my mail the people of my congressional district in Pennsylvania are sick and tired of the present high level of taxation and resist any attempt to saddle them with new tax burdens.

As an example of the attitude of the people of Pennsylvania and my congressional district regarding the efforts of the newly elected Democratic Governor, George Leader, to foist new taxes on residents of the great Keystone State, I wish to make part of my remarks an editorial from the July 2, 1955, issue of the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, and an exchange of views that followed its publication between Joseph M. Barr, chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Pennsylvania, and J. E. Holtzinger, editor of the Altoona Mirror. They follow:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of July 2, 1955]

THE LAND OF THE FREE

Monday we will celebrate our Nation's birthday. If it please God, generations of Americans as yet unborn will join in future celebrations marking the birth of this Nation; the stars in the heavens above will still shine down upon the stars of a flag that designates a land where free men live.

A new way of life was opened up for the oppressed people of the earth on the day that the Declaration of Independence was signed. The artist's conception of the American flag protecting a happy family group is an apt one because our Declaration of Independence was designed to protect all ages of Americans and to live throughout the ages as a charter for other peoples of the earth to guide them to better ways of life and to make life more livable.

Freedom is not an imperishable commodity. It is something which must be nourished and cherished and guarded throughout the years by all those who love liberty.

The infant Nation that was brought together into one unit by the signing of the Declaration of Independence was a weak Nation in regards to population, armed might and industrial potentials. One thing made it strong: The determination of the people to be free; their willingness to die if necessary to gain that freedom for themselves and for their fellowmen.

Today our Nation has grown to be the strongest Nation on the face of the earth in arms and industrial potential. We are still back of some nations in regard to population, but we are free, and free men count their strength in terms of will and initiative and their might stems from a willingness to sacrifice all that they have in order that they may remain free.

The only great danger that America and Americans really face is the danger of losing their faith in a free system of government, their faith in themselves or their faith in their fellow Americans. All the evil forces of the world cannot prevail if we as Americans present a united front when it comes to matters concerning our liberty and the rights of all Americans to be free.

There is little likelihood of our defense ever being crumpled by forces from the outside, powerful though they may be. We must, however, be continually on guard against the forces that would seek to weaken us from within. Not all of these forces will be malignant forces deliberately at work to weaken our structure of liberty; in fact, many of them will be well-meaning people seeking to do things for others and not mindful of the evil they can bring about through seeking ways and means to circumvent our State and national constitutions.

We in Pennsylvania at the present time are faced with just such a problem. We have as the head of this powerful Keystone State a young and ambitious Governor. When he campaigned for office he promised to bring about economies and lower taxes. Sometime between campaign time and inauguration someone evidently sold them on the idea of greatly increasing the expense of the State and inaugurating a new tax program to pay for these added expenses.

A graduated income tax is forbidden by the constitution of this State. Somehow our young Governor has been sold upon the idea of what is called a classified income tax which some tax experts and lawyers say will be constitutional. Many other tax experts and lawyers think it is unconstitutional and so far no one has come forth with the statement that it will not violate the spirit of the constitution.

This classified tax which the Governor and his experts call a "fair tax" does a few odd things for a tax that is supposed to be fair to all people.

For instance, a widow whose husband had thought to provide for her by insurance and who has invested her money wisely in common stocks and has an annual income of $1,000, will, under the provisions of this "fair tax" bill, pay a personal income tax of 5 percent on the dividends she receives or a total of $50 a year State tax.

A retired man with a pension of $100 a month would pay a total of $12 on that amount, but if he has rented out a portion of his home to augment his slender retirement pay and gets as much as $800 rental, he will be taxed $32 on the rentals, making a total tax of $44 on $2,000 of income.

A skilled workman earning $4,000 a year under the new tax bill would have the first $1,000 exempted from tax and would pay $30 tax on the additional $3,000.

A retired State official receiving a pension of $4,000 a year would, under the terms of the law, be entirely exempted from the tax and judges who received pensions up to $12,000 a year also would be exempt.

This is the tax which a misguided young man and his advisers call a fair tax. It removes one stone in the archway of freedom, the stone that stands closest to its foundation and is founded upon the principle that all men are equal before the law. In its awkward attempt to thwart a provision of the State constitution that was put in there for the protection of all the citizens of this Keystone State, it would crumple one of the great foundation stones that our forefathers built upon when they erected a temple to liberty and the rights of men versus the rights of those who seek to govern with a heavy hand to lay down a heavy tax burden upon citizens who have the right to say how much they shall be taxed and what their tax money shall be spent for.

Pennsylvania citizens are alert, however, and despite the best efforts of those who would transgress upon their liberties and place an unfair burden upon their neighbors, the tax bill has met with but small success. Those who will be charged with enacting it into law will be signing their own political death warrants if they vote for the bill and their constituents have not been at all backward in telling them so.

So long as the citizens of this State and other States of this Nation keep a constant vigil, this Nation will continue to enjoy the freedoms and the liberty guaranteed to them by the Declaration of Independence whose birthday we are about to celebrate.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of July 16, 1955]

WE ANSWER A LETTER

The EDITOR, ALTOONA MIRROR,
Altoona, Pa.

DEAR SIR: (1) The editorial captioned "The Land of the Free" may have been written with good intentions, but the linking of patriotism and freedom with the tax situation in Pennsylvania gave a misleading impression of the tax program devised by the Leader administration as the most practical solution of the Commonwealth's money worries.

(2) The classified income tax is the nearest possible approach to a graduated income tax which tax experts agree is the fairest and most equitable tax of all. But, under our constitutional limitations, the legislature must wait 2 years before it can seriously reconsider the overall preferability of a graduated tax plan.

(3) Meantime, the tremendous financial obligations inherited by the Leader administration cannot be swept into a corner. They exist; they are real; they must be met.

(4) Republican progapanda for a 3-percent sales tax does not fool any knowing person who is aware that the real benefactors of such a tax would be the rich and powerful minorities.

(5) The manner in which a stepped-up sales tax has won the all-out support of the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce, the Pennsylvania Bankers' Association, and the Grundy dominated Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association is clear-cut proof that the big fellows—representing about 8 percent of our population—view the sales tax as the best smokescreen to protect the coupon clipper and nip the little fellow.

(6) But what about the other 92 percent of our people?

(7) It is upon this group that a 3-percent sales tax will place the cost of government most heavily.

(8) More and more people through Pennsylvania are beginning to understand that a 3- or possibly 4-percent sales tax will cost twice as much in pocketbook extractions as the classified income tax.

(9) Moreover, it is estimated that 1 million Pennsylvanians now receiving social security and other retirement pensions will be exempt from any tax on those pensions under the administration's tax program.

(10) No tax program ever won a popularity contest, but the violent attacks upon Governor Leader's classified income tax clear-

ly impose upon the credibility of the average family.

(11) Obviously, the big labor unions—which bespeak the philosophy of the little guy—were not taken in by the drum beating of the chamber of commerce and other opponents of the administration's tax program.

(12) They saw in it the fulfillment of the fairest and most equitable conditions where labor is concerned. They recognized its superiority to a boosted sales tax where the average family is concerned.

(13) And seeing these advantages—and understanding the sincerity of a governor who tried first to consider the interests of the great majority of our people—organized labor gave his plan its unqualified endorsement.

(14) Of course, there are controversial defects in any tax plan, but the problem before the legislature is to enact a tax program that comes closest to approximating a graduated income tax—fairest of all broad-based taxes.

(15) We believe, in all sincerity, that Governor Leader's tax plan is the answer to our need until we can revise the constitution and pinpoint our attention on a graduated income tax.

(16) And even then, I predict, you will find the chamber of commerce, and the Pennsylvania Bankers' Association, and the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association running counter to the most widely accepted tax authorities in the Nation. They will scream to high heaven that such a tax militates against the workingman and they will have phony statistics to back up their story. They will shed crocodile tears for the little fellow while, actually, their chief concern will be the protection of the oligarchs of great wealth and privilege.

(17) Since time immemorial, I suppose, it has been the custom of the landed aristocrats and silk-stockinged bluebloods to look down their noses at the average guy and there seems to be an overt conspiracy in this age of taxes and more taxes to keep the very wealthy free and clear of any levies which might conveniently be shifted to the average citizen.

(18) The average citizen around Altoona—who has found jobs all too scarce in recent times—knows how the philosophy of protect the rich at the expense of the little fellow really works.

(19) Critics of the Leader tax plan adroitly ignore the fact that we wouldn't be in the fix we're in but for the improvidence and political mismanagement of our predecessors in office.

(20) They ran up the bills, compounded the debts, established a flock of mandated obligations without money in the bank to pay them, and they alone placed the Leader administration in the untenable position of finding the cash to offset the Commonwealth's financial dilemma.

(21) If the element of patriotism must be interjected into the controversy over taxes, we should consider first those responsible for jeopardizing what the Mirror calls our liberty and the rights of all Americans to be free.

(22) If acceptance of the responsibility of taxes is to be considered a blow against that freedom, the view-with-alarmists should look back to that period when the Republican leadership, in 16 years, pyramided the Commonwealth's debt and deficits and left Governor Leader a tremendous legacy of bankruptcy—one of the worst weak spots in the dike of American freedom. Governor Leader is trying to prevent a complete breakthrough in that dike.

(23) The question of taxes resolves itself into a matter of harsh realities and it does not impinge upon one's patriotism that the costs of government must be met by the best means available and in the best interest of the people as a whole.

(24) The best argument for the classified income tax is that its detractors have failed to spell out a substitute tax plan beyond generalizing on the "desirability" of a 3 or 4 percent sales tax.

(25) What is desirable about a sales tax that will cost the average family twice as much as the classified income tax?

(26) When the Governor's critics have answered that moot question, they will be on firmer ground in the great debate over the merits or demerits of the classified income tax.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. BARR,
Chairman, Democratic State Committee.

REPLY

DEAR MR. BARR: Your 3-page letter regarding the recent criticism of the unfair tax program which you label as Governor Leader's program received.

After reading it through carefully several times we still are unable to find in it any real answer to the charge of unfairness leveled against this program, which, incidentally, was written long before Leader's campaign for governor and certainly not by Leader. I believe that a careful study of the actual writing of the proposed tax levy would show that at least two of the collaborators on the program tried to sell some of its more infamous provisions to previous administrations.

Now let us take your very lengthy letter, paragraph by paragraph, in an attempt to answer it in such a way that there may be some hope of your understanding the answer.

In your second paragraph you say "the classified income tax is the nearest possible approach to a graduated income tax which experts agree is the fairest and most equitable tax of all." Is it the closest approach possible and, if you maintain that it is, what is your authority for such a statement? Do all tax experts agree that the graduated income tax is the fairest and most equitable tax of all? What is your authority for such a statement? There are quite a few tax experts who do not say it is the fairest and most equitable tax of all and your saying so does not make it so.

Your second sentence of this same paragraph is ambiguous. Do you seriously think that the liberty-loving people of this State are going to agree to a revision of their State constitution so that you and others like you may levy any kind of tax you please against them? If you think so, why not bring it to a vote?

Paragraph 3: If the Leader administration has a serious quarrel with the preceding administrations concerning financial obligations, why does it not seek their repeal? They have a definite majority in the house and the legislature has the power to repeal these laws if the governor thinks they are not in the best interests of the people. What about the big increases in governmental spending proposed by the Leader administration which will far outstrip the spending of any other administration?

Paragraph 4: I do not believe that you found any advocacy in the editorial for a 3-percent sales tax and of what possible benefit would it be to the rich and powerful minorities?

Paragraph 5: There is no concrete evidence that the opposition of the groups named in this paragraph reflects selfish thinking. It may represent the best possible expert advice on the subject. Our local chamber of commerce has many times as many little fellows in it as big fellows.

We believe that this is also the case in most of the local chapters of the chamber of commerce and, for your information, their position on tax matters and on other matters of importance is determined only after a poll is taken of the local chambers to get grassroots opinion on these matters. This, it seems to me, is a more democratic method than having a few men stand up and pretend to represent their entire organization in saying that labor is in favor of this tax upon labor's wages.

Paragraph 6: Yes; what about the 92 percent of the people of the State who have modest incomes? Did it ever occur to you that for every man collecting over $1,000 from dividends there are more than 500 who get less than that amount, and for every landlord who collects $100 a month or more in rent there are 9 landlords who collect less than $100 a month in rent and that in many of these cases this income is sorely needed to meet living expenses?

Paragraph 7: It is upon this same 92-percent group that the so-called fair-tax program of Governor Leader will place an even heavier burden.

Paragraph 8: If a 3-percent sales tax will cost twice as much in pocketbook extraction as the classified income tax, why should you or anyone else advocate more than a 1½-percent sales tax? Could you mean that the people who collect modest incomes from dividends and rents are too poor to afford pocketbooks?

Paragraph 9: If your estimate is correct, we are happy to know that at least 10 percent of our population will be protected in some measure from this iniquitous tax.

Paragraph 10: No argument about the popularity contest angle of this paragraph, but if you are so sure that the average family does not understand this attack upon the family pay envelope, why not ask for a vote of confidence from the rank and file of the people?

Paragraph 11: Let's not play coy. The unions did not vote in favor of this program—some of their so-called leaders did and there is quite a bit of discussion in the rank and file groups about ways and means in which to bring it to the attention of the public that the members of the unions did not have a chance to vote on this issue.

Paragraph 12: Whom do you mean by "they?" A few big shots who take a good living out of the dues or the guys who pay the dues? You know as well as I do that a lot of these big guys would like to get a similar cut from the pay envelope before the little guy gets it by means of Statewide and compulsory check-off system. Is that the "deal" that was made for their reluctant support?

Paragraph 13: This is an obvious misstatement of fact.

Paragraph 14: You bet there are defects. We attempted to point ont only a few of them.

Paragraph 15: Who do you mean by "we" when you say "until we can revise the Constitution?" My understanding is that the people of the State are the final authority on this. Do you also have a plan to circumvent them on this important phase of their inherited right to say what shall and what shall not be in their constitution?

Paragraph 16: Hurray, hurrah, great political malarky, etc.—but what about facts? Who are these heaven-sent tax authorities and what makes you think they are the most widely accepted ones? Name them, Mr. Barr, name them, also their affiliations birthplace and right to speak as experts.

Paragraph 17: The guys who happened to write the editorial has delivered papers, cut lawns, dug ditches, served as cub reporter, feature writer and editorial writer, and could mention a few snobs in high places in both parties, so he falls to be impressed by the obvious political slant of this paragraph. It could have come out of Karl Marx's book, but we believe that he would have said it better.

Paragraph 18: You are writing to one of them, Mr. Barr, and if it had not been for the much-maligned chamber of commerce there would be 3,200 less jobs here today than

there are. However, the average guy is not as dumb as you seem to think; he knows at whom this tax is aimed and it won't hurt 1 in 10 of the rich you speak so knowingly about, but it will hit every man who labors—right in the breadbasket.

Paragraph 19: Again we refer you to the dictionary and the word repeal.

Paragraph 20: Once again we refer you to some six-letter words, repeal, revise, and repair.

Paragraph 21: We believe that the voters of the State answered this paragraph last November. Too bad that they did not get the man they voted for as governor. He promised and promised economy—came up with the biggest budget in history of the State after he was elected. He promised and promised tax cuts and now as governor of the State wants us to swallow the biggest tax increase in our history.

Paragraph 22: Our memory goes back to Governor Earle and the largest single debt left in the history of the State up to his time.

Paragraph 23: Whose best interests are served when bills already in the legislative hopper are removed from the said hopper and the amount asked for doubled by the incoming members of the cabinet? Who promised economy and then came up with the biggest appropriations ever proposed?

Paragraph 24: It is the responsibility of the administration in power to see to it that the tax plan proposed is fair and that it is acceptable to the majority of the people and their elected representatives. If you feel that this is the case, why have you not brought the bill out of committees? Is it necessary to use some "persuasive" means to bring members of your own party in line? If so, just what "persuasive means" are to be employed?

Paragraph 25: There is no evidence that it will cost the average family twice as much; if it did it would yield twice as much revenue. Even your so-called tax experts will tell you that over 90 percent of this wage tax will come from the average family.

Paragraph 26: Since when has it become the duty of the critics to write a program for a young man who seemed so full of confidence, so sure of the answers and so sadly misled about the facts of life? As one of the thousands, yes, millions of people who listened to and liked the countenance of this young man from York County, let me report that I and millions of others like myself are sorry to have ever been taken in by a sales talk that can best be likened to that of the "spieler" at the county fair. We thought that at long last the "high command" had chosen a man of integrity and honesty to run for public office.

P. S.—Why not replay a few of the campaign speech records and refresh yourself about this young man from York County? Perhaps if he took a few weeks' swing about the State and talked to the honest critics who wished him well, he might remember the kind of man the people of this State wanted to be their governor.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. HOLTZINGER.

Bananas on Pikes Peak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low cost drainage.

Of this total, New York has more than 100,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

"Apple Surprise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 when the House received a message from the President vetoing H. R. 5188, it was heard with considerable surprise. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] and I both commented in this vein at the time.

Apparently the veto came as a surprise—and a shock—to the apple growers as well. This is reflected by a news article from the Shippensburg (Pa.) News-Chronicle for July 19, which I include as a part of my remarks:

IKE'S VETO OF APPLE BILL IS BIG SURPRISE—PRESIDENT REFUSES TO SIGN MEASURE IN OPPOSITION TO UNITED STATES CONGRESS—ANGERS GROWERS

The recent veto by President Eisenhower of House Resolution 5188 came as a big surprise to the supporters of the measure, who fought consistently for 2 years to have the bill passed.

According to a report from the Appalachian Apple Service, the bill passed both Houses of Congress with practically no opposition. All persons, including the Congressmen, were surprised at the action of the President, the service said.

The House bill was designed by the Nation's apple growers to prohibit the Agriculture Department from publishing predictions of the expected apple yield throughout the country.

SAY UNFAIR

The applegrowers complained many times to the Government that such predictions usually were wrong and proved to be an injustice to the many applegrowers throughout the country, the service said.

These false predictions caused the Nation's farmers to sell their apples far below their real value. The predictions of the Government were usually too high and forced the farmers to get a lower price for the apples because of the expected oversupply, the Appalachian apple service said.

All expected victory as the bill moved through the Congress in a few days with no opposition. Now it is doubtful the bill will ever get so far advanced again, the agency added.

EISENHOWER QUOTED

In vetoing the measure the President said, in part, "It is vital responsibility of the Federal Government to gather and disseminate accurate, timely, comprehensive, and useful information."

But, according to the applegrowers, this service of the Government really proved to be a disservice and an injustice.

They claim that it is even more surprising for the President to veto such a measure when he formerly signed a bill preventing the same predictions of the Agriculture Department concerning cotton.

In both cases the Government overpredicted the actual yield and caused hardships on the producers of the crops, the service claims.

GIVES CREDIT TO CONGRESS

Credit is to be given to three Congressmen from Virginia who pushed the bill through Congress so efficiently. The service cites the work of BURR P. HARRISON and WATKINS ABBITT, Representatives; and Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON.

It is stated by the apple service that these three Congressmen are mulling it over to see if they can't find other means to get the measure passed.

According to the Congressmen, there will not be enough votes in Congress now to override the veto. This is because, although it was passed by Congress almost unanimously, before, now many Republicans will not buck the President in this measure.

Facts About Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 11, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic, July 17, 1955:

FACTS ABOUT RECLAMATION

W. A. Dexheimer, United States commissioner of reclamation, recently gave forth with the sort of statistics that should be used more frequently in answering the enemies of reclamation. In a letter to Representative CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, of California, he laid low the argument that the taxpayers of New York State would have to pay $493 million to finance the upper Colorado River storage basin project.

Mr. Dexheimer pointed out that the reclamation fund set up in 1902 would pay 53 percent of the reclamation bureau's program in 1956, and by 1965 this fund will finance 73 percent of the bureau's activities. Thus the upper Colorado project would require only $18 million annually from the general fund, and New York's share of this amount would be only $2.2 million. Most of the money spent on reclamation will be spent outside the basin States, so New York will get a substantial share of the new business created. In addition, the new taxable wealth created by the project will boost Federal income taxes. "Many of the reclamation project areas now contribute more in Federal income taxes each year than the entire Federal investment," said Mr. Dexheimer.

The people of central Arizona know how much wealth the Salt River project has produced. They aren't fooled by what Con-

gressman ENGLE calls "the fantastic tax figures per State" used by foes of reclamation. But the figures do make an impression on Easterners, who are uninformed about reclamation problems in general. Mr. Dexheimer's figures should go a long way toward destroying the phony anti-reclamation propaganda coming out of the East.

The High Tax Program of Pennsylvania's Spendthrift Governor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Republican caucus of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania under the leadership of its able floor leader, the Honorable Charles C. Smith, has gone on record in no uncertain terms against the unfair and discriminatory wage and income-tax proposals by the Governor of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Legislature has been completely hamstrung in its sessions by the Governor's failure to furnish adequate estimates of income or to provide a fair and equitable method of securing the income needed. The legislature would do well to follow the suggestions of the Republican members to meet this problem.

The statement of Representative Smith and the resolution adopted by the Republican caucus are as follows:

The Republican caucus of the house of representatives, after a lengthy discussion of the Governor's budget and his wage and income-tax plan, unanimously agreed today as follows:

1. To oppose the Governor's wage and income tax because it violates the Governor's campaign pledges; it would be unconstitutional and it would impose unjust burdens on our citizens by levying different rates of tax on different kinds of income in complete disregard of ability to pay.

2. To reject the Governor's demands that the general assembly provide him with $500 million to $600 million in new revenue following the expiration of the 1-percent general sales tax on August 31 on the grounds that this is far in excess of what is required to balance the budget when the Governor carries out his promises of economies and reorganization of the State government.

3. To oppose action on appropriations until the Democratic majority of the house of representatives assumes its responsibility to provide the necessary taxes and to make a bona fide effort to prune the budget, both of which it has failed, so far, to do.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY REPUBLICAN CAUCUS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON TUESDAY, JULY 12, 1955

Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will require new revenue to meet our State's obligations for school subsidies, to provide adequate treatment for the mentally ill, to give relief to the needy and the unfortunate, and to continue essential governmental services without a breakdown, after the 1-percent general sales tax is allowed to expire on August 31; and

Whereas many of these moral and legal obligations are due or will shortly fall due; and

Whereas the constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania provides that all tax legislation must originate in the house of representatives where the ways and means committee and the organization of the house is completely controlled by the Democratic members who are in the majority; and

Whereas the general assembly has been in session since January without the Democratic leadership of the house of representatives presenting for a vote of the house any tax bills to raise the needed revenue; and

Whereas the Governor has submitted a budget calling for the expenditure of $1,800,000,000 in the current fiscal period, which is $400 million greater than any previous budget; and

Whereas the Governor has recommended to the general assembly that it enact a classified income tax to provide $411 million in additional revenue for general-funds purposes and other tax changes to provide an additional $100 million for the general fund, or a total of $500 million; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax has been called unconstitutional by competent constitutional authorities because it would unfairly and unreasonably levy taxes on different kinds of income in an effort to differentiate between classes of our citizens without just cause; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax, for the privilege of residing and working in Pennsylvania, will levy a flat income tax of 1 percent on all wages and salaries with the exception of the first $1,000 on the illegal subterfuge that it is a cost of earning deduction; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax, for the privilege of being self-employed in Pennsylvania, will levy a 2-percent income tax on the net income of all farmers, of all professional people, of all small-business men, of all gas station operators, corner grocers, barber-shop operators, newsstand owners, druggists, dry cleaners, contractors, and others, retroactive until January 1, 1955; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax, for the privilege of residing in Pennsylvania and the privilege of owning property in Pennsylvania, will levy a 4-percent tax on the net income of individuals from property which is rented, money in savings banks, income of small trust funds, royalties from books, or natural resources, or any other source, retroactive until January 1, 1955, and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax, for the privilege of investing in corporations in Pennsylvania, or for the privilege of Pennsylvanians investing in any corporation, including building and loan, or for the privilege of receiving dividends from farm cooperatves or other coooperatives, will levy a 5-percent tax on dividends whether they are owned by widows or retired people of small income, or other individuals, but not those owned by corporations; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax for the privilege of selling property in Pennsylvania, which has been owned by individuals for 6 months or more, will levy a 6-percent tax on the increased value of that property, whatever its nature, but not on the profits from property sold by corporations; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax will levy a tax of 1 percent on the profits made from short-term gains of property, including stocks and bonds bought and sold by individuals for speculation; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax will levy different rates of taxation against different types of income, but will not permit losses on one kind of income to be deducted from losses of other types of income; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax will levy a 1 percent tax on pension payments received by retired Federal workers or the retired employees of private employers, but not on retired State or municipal employees or retired railroad employees; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax will discriminate unjustly against persons with small income, particularly retired persons, and the beneficiaries of small estates; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax plan will clearly violate the spirit and the letter of our State constitution and its requirement that every tax be uniform; and

Whereas the enactment of the Governor's classified income tax will not only discriminate unjustly against many of our citizens but may also, through the fact that our courts will find it in violation of our constitution, compound the growing fiscal crisis of our Commonwealth; and

Whereas the Governor's classified income tax and other tax proposals will produce more than $200 million that is necessary to continue the essential services of our State government and to do those other things which are vital to our prosperity and our progress; and

Whereas the Democratic majority in the house of representatives is either unwilling or unable to bring from committee the Governor's unjust, unconstitutional, and unreasonable tax program; therefore

We, the Republican members of the house of representatives, in caucus assembled, this 12th day of July 1955, declare our unalterable opposition to this unfair and unconstitutional tax and urge the Governor forthwith to:

1. Recommend to the Democratic leaders of the house of representatives that the house ways and means committee call immediately a public hearing on the Governor's classified income tax to permit the public to express its views on this tax and other forms of taxation.

2. Direct the secretary of revenue to reestimate the expected revenues from existing tax laws and other sources of income for the present biennium.

3. Order the heads of all departments, boards, and commissions to reexamine their requests for appropriations for the present biennium with a view to eliminating all unnecessary and nonessential items.

4. Upon receipt of the new estimates of revenue and the revised budget requests, to submit new recommendations for raising the necessary revenue to the general assembly in consultation with the leadership of the general assembly.

5. Fix a deadline of August 1, 1955, for the solution of the Commonwealth fiscal crises so that our citizens may know the taxes for which they are liable and that the orderly operation of our State government and its local subdivisions can be proceed.

Bananas on Pikes Peak or Good Land in Ohio?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture reports there are more than 20 million acres of undeveloped fertile land in the humid areas of the United States which can be developed by low-cost drainage.

Of this total, Ohio has more than 95,000 acres waiting to be brought into agricultural production, when and if needed.

The cost would be from $60 to $100 an acre.

But it would cost the taxpayers of the Nation at least 50 times as much for each acre developed in the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The Congress might as well appropriate money to grow bananas on Pikes Peak as to approve the upper Colorado River project.

What American Help Has Meant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1955, the Jerusalem Post, Israel's only English language daily, published a special American independence supplement, the theme of which is an appreciation of the impact of United States grants-in-aid and technical assistance upon numerous aspects of the development of Israel. His Excellency Abba Eban, Israel's Ambassador to the United States, has sent me a copy of this newspaper which contained the following article entitled "What American Help Has Meant." It is with a deep sense of satisfaction that we find this expression of appreciation for United States assistance. The present level of assistance is one that must be maintained to insure stability and security.

The article follows:

WHAT AMERICAN HELP HAS MEANT

It is only when we pause to reflect that we fully appreciate the extent of the United States contribution to the economic development of Israel. There have been contributions of individual United States citizens, predominantly but not exclusively Jewish, to the United Jewish Appeal, to other institutions and agencies working or supporting work in Israel, to individuals, friend and relatives living in Israel and through purchases of bonds of the Government of Israel. Aside from all this, however, has been the economic assistance extended by the American people through their Government. This assistance so thoroughly permeates the economy that we tend to lose sight of the extent to which our economic life is based on it, and of the extent to which its continuation will be necessary until Israel achieves a position of economic independence.

The simple listing is impressive. The first Export-Import Bank loan of $100 million in January 1949, went a long way toward supplying the construction equipment, the industrial equipment, the trucks, the pumps, pipes, tractors, farm implements, and other materials necessary for the launching of new agricultural settlements and the extension of existing ones and other goods which were desperately needed by the state to provide housing and opportunities for work for the waves of immigrants flowing to the country. Other resources available to the state had to be used, first of all to provide food, clothing, and other elemental necessities. Without the Export-Import Bank loan the expansion of productive facilities would have come a good deal harder. The second Export-Import Bank loan in 1951, of $35 million, contributed greatly to the continuation of the program of irrigation and agricultural development. In 1951–52, the first grant-in-aid was made in the amount of $63.5 million. Each year since that date successive grants have been made totalling, all told, by June 30, 1955, $226 million. The United States Government has also sold to Israel, at nominal cost, very substantial supplies of milk powder, egg powder, potatoes, butter, cheese, peanuts, and other food commodities. More recently the United States Government extended a long-term loan of $13 million to the Israel Government for the purchase of additional surplus food commodities, partly to make up for losses sustained during the last winter's drought. The special feature which distinguishes this loan from others is that it is repayable not only over a very long-term period, but also in Israel pounds instead of in United States dollars.

From the beginning of the grant-in-aid program, there has been the accompanying program of technical assistance. Measured in dollars, this has amounted, up to June 30, 1955, to some $5 million. Expressed in what in this case are more meaningful terms, the contribution of technical knowledge and experience to Israel's young industry, agriculture, government, and other activities, the value of this assistance cannot be measured but is unquestionably far greater than its cost to the United States Government. The same type of technical assistance has been extended by the United States Government through the agency of the U. N. and its specialized agencies. Here, too, the value to Israel is not to be measured in money. The United States has also made available in exchange for Israel pounds American books, periodicals, and phonograph records.

Within the past few weeks, the United States Government has concluded an agreement with the Government of Israel under the terms of which it will supply fissionable materials and related equipment; information, and knowledge accumulated in the past few years so that Israel may move ahead with research toward peacetime uses for atomic energy.

In the past 7 years, Israel's import surplus, financed by gifts, loans, German reparations, and private investment has amounted to a total of approximately $1,750,000,000, a little more than $1,000 for every man, woman, and child here. The greatest part of this has come from the United States. The United States Government itself has provided approximately $400 million or almost one-fourth of the total. It is not to minimize aid from other sources, nor, of course, the achievement of citizens of Israel themselves, to say that without American aid, living standards in Israel today would be far below their present levels, the number employed in useful and productive work would be far smaller, if in each of the years since independence we had been forced to manage with some $60 million less of imported goods. We will still have a long way, probably an even longer way, to go before we reach a position of self-support. In 1954 we still earned only one-third or slightly less of the goods and services we imported. We still required and used gifts and loans aggregating about $200 million in that year.

It is no easy task to achieve the 50- to 70-percent increase in our production and the manifold increase in the export of what we produce that will be required if we are to pay for the imports we need to live and to continue our development. Assistance from abroad and from the United States Government will continue to be necessary for some years to come and in large amounts, although we expect and believe that we can move toward the eventual elimination of this aid. We trust that the United States Government itself shares our view. We know that it shares our objective. The recent discussions with respect to the development of the water resources of the Jordan River system seem to us to indicate clearly American readiness to continue to supply the assistance we so vitally need if we are to achieve our common goal.

Economic assistance by one government to another, contrary to some opinions, is no new phenomenon in world history. What is new and what is the special contribution of the United States to relations between peoples is the extension of such assistance without intervention in the political life and affairs of the country assisted and without an abridgment of the political independence of these countries. We have seen this new process at work in the relations between the United States and Israel. What is also new is the use of assistance for such planned construction, humanitarian, and positive purposes as in Israel in the last 6 years. This is an achievement for which the Government of Israel can claim credit.

JERUSALEM, *July 4, 1955.*

Crude and Poorly Camouflaged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, another one of southern California's crude attempts to delay development of the upper Colorado River States was defeated this week when a special master's report on the Arizona-California lawsuit found that the four upper basin States were not involved in the lower basin's squabble.

Nevertheless, representatives from southern California persist in stating that development of the upper basin is involved in the lawsuit. In order that Members may know the facts, I am inserting in the Appendix an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune:

AVOIDING A BOOBY TRAP

Right and justice were advanced this week when a special master for the United States Supreme Court refused to make the upper basin a party to the lower basin court fight of California and Arizona over the waters of the Colorado River.

California has announced it will file an exception and also requested that arguments be held before the Supreme Court but we are confident the high tribunal will uphold its special master's decision.

The ruling recognized that by the Colorado River Compact each basin was left to make its own intra-basin allocations of the river water. It held that joining the upper basin to the lower basin squabble would upset the operation of the 1949 compact by which Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and northern New Mexico are to divide their legal share of the upper basin's water. This has the effect of upholding the solemn treaties into which the States entered in good faith. Utah and New Mexico streams which empty in the river in the lower basin are involved in the suit, however.

The psychological effect also should be good since the special master's ruling comes just before the House Rules Committee is to decide whether the Upper Colorado Development Program can be brought out for floor action before Congress adjourns. Some reluctant lawmakers have been urging that

legislation be delayed until this phase of the litigation was settled.

Southern California's efforts to drag the upper basin into its complicated and time-consuming suit with Arizona was a crude and poorly camouflaged effort to stall development of the upper basin. A further delay in making beneficial use of the Colorado River in the basin would mean that the water would flow on to California and be utilized there. And water in use is very hard to take away.

The triumph in the court is a notable one but the total struggle for our rightful share of the Colorado River is not yet resolved. We must not relax.

Shotgun Rider

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am below setting forth an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of July 15, 1955, entitled "Shotgun Rider."

SHOTGUN RIDER

Whenever a strong President occupies the White House, some conflict almost inevitably arises between powers of the executive and the legislative. That has now happened in the case of the $31,882 million defense appropriation, to which Congress hitched a rider giving congressional committees authority to veto economy plans of the Defense Department.

Mr. Eisenhower wants to close down certain activities of the services which formerly were handled by civilian business concerns—such operations as Federal bakeries, laundries, coffee roasting, and ropemaking industries, perhaps shipyards and arsenals. If the defense chiefs find such functions can be handled as well or more economically by private concerns, Ike wants to shuck them out of service categories.

So Congress doped out what amounts to a shotgun rider, calculated to plug these plans whenever it wishes. Specifically, the rider provides the Defense Department must give Congress 90 days' notice, prior to transfer of any service business to civilian enterprise. Then the Appropriations Committee of Senate or House can vote the plan if it desires.

This section of the bill Mr. Eisenhower branded unconstitutional, an invasion by Congress of Executive authority. He said he would ignore it. If it were not that the measure for defense funds is so vital now, he would have vetoed the whole bill. He also assailed another feature of the act, a virtual ban against defense purchase of foreign (Japanese) spun silk for cartridges. This provision, he declared, forced the services to buy at higher prices and amounts to a deadly attrition of our world-trade program.

Principally, however, the President was officially wroth at the assumed function of congressional committees to invalidate Executive authority. Unquestionably Congress can approve or balk administrative plans by the appropriation power. It can grant or refuse funds for whatever it wishes. But whether it has the right to grant an appropriation, then decide whether a specific plan of administration shall or shall not be carried out, is extremely doubtful.

What Congressmen did in this matter was arbitrary, a design to prevent the President or Defense Secretary Wilson from abandoning shipyards, arsenals, even Government paint plants from baliwicks of influential Congressmen. It is overtly a political shenanigan.

It is unlikely a court will be asked to construe this law. Congressmen probably realize they have overreached their powers, and individual Members would not relish the role of pork clutching if the administration can show tax savings by shunting Government out of the normal fields of private business. The President probably can ignore the shotgun rider without much challenge.

Four Years of United States Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert herewith an article which appeared in the American Independence Day Supplement of the Jerusalem Post called "Four Years of United States Aid," by Lincoln B. Hale. Dr. Hale, former president of Evansville College in Indiana, was appointed Director of the United States Operations Mission in Israel in April 1954.

The article follows:

FOUR YEARS OF UNITED STATES AID

(By Lincoln B. Hale)

The 179th anniversary of the American independence reminds us anew of the essential bonds of unity between our two peoples: The common dedication to human freedom and the reverence for the inherent value of the right of the individual to life.

Independence Day coincides on this 4th of July with the conclusion of the 4th year of the United States Operations Mission economic and technical assistance to Israel—a noble expression of the common national ideals and aspirations of our two countries.

The United States, through no choice of her own, has found herself in a place of leadership among the nations of the world. Gone is preoccupation with the American hemisphere, the sense of security provided by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and even the self-sufficiency of a large land area. Rather the internal strength developed in the years of relative isolation is now being called upon to serve a world because of the annihilation of space. The response to this challenge of world leadership has been to extend the hand of friendship with the concern only that men and women in all the world may live in freedom and have a standard of living adequate to permit the pursuit of happiness and the fostering of individual creative abilities.

WORLD'S MAJOR TASK

President Dwight Eisenhower has described the world's major task, and its greatest opportunity in these words:

"It is this: the dedication of the energies, the resources and the imaginations of all peaceful nations to a new kind of war. This would be a declared total war, not upon any human enemy, but upon the brute forces of poverty and need.

"The peace we seek, founded upon decent trust and cooperative effort among nations, can be fortified, not by weapons of war, but by wheat and by cotton, by milk and by wool, by meat and by timber and by rice. These are words that translate into every language on earth. These are needs that challenge this world in arms.

"This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the undeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.

"The monuments of this new kind of war would be these: roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health.

"We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of the world."

In implementing such a program it was essential that full recognition be given to the right of self-determination, be it a nation or a group of people. To do otherwise would be to deny the basic assumption of individual freedom and liberty. I have found myself stating that there is no such thing as a United States Operations Mission in Israel apart from the representatives of the Israel Government. The entire concept is of a cooperative venture. So the discussion of our technical-aid and economic-assistance program is a joint venture planned and supervised by Israel and American leaders working together. Moreover, it is but part of a greater cooperative venture shared in by World Jewry, the United Nations, and the sacrificial devotion of the ctizens of Israel themselves.

Let me turn to consideration of the grant-in-aid or economic-assistance programs. Here the concern was primarily for funds that would help provide economic stability and contribute to the capital development of the nation. During the past 4 years, economic aid from the United States has been as follows:

1952	$63,500,000
1953	70,228,000
1954	52,500,000
1955	40,000,000
	226,228,000
In addition an Import-Export Bank loan	135,000,000
	361,228,000

As you well understand, these grant-in-aid funds, apart from the loan, have had two uses. In their original form the dollars have provided essential foreign exchange to buy commodities and have come to Israel in the form of wheat, fuel, cotton, medical supplies, building steel, oil seeds and fats, industrial equipment and other essential supplies that required foreign currency for import.

Of equal value has been the assistance rendered to the capital development program. As the commodities have been sold, they have generated Israel pounds which have been utilized for projects developed by the several ministries of the government, and jointly approved by the Finance Ministry and the USOM. As of June 1, the records indicate that IL175 million have been deposited in the so-called "Counterpart Fund," and IL167 million have been released to approved projects.

IMPORTANCE OF COUNTERPART

The importance of these counterpart funds for development shows itself in its contribution to the Israel development budget. In the past 2 years about 40 percent of the development budget has been financed by counterpart funds generated by United States aid. It is estimated that counterpart will constitute approximately 35 percent in the current year. These funds have been concentrated first in resettlement, and more recently in irrigation, agriculture and basic transport facilities. Now a major program

of counterpart loans to industry is getting under way.

Let me try to give flesh to the bones of such figures by discussing the nature of some of these activities. It should be remembered that United States funds directly or indirectly are not responsible for a complete development. Always the emphasis and the activity have been cooperative. Counterpart funds have supplemented direct government funds.

My visits to various parts of the country and the official reports indicate the remarkable progress made in providing adequate housing. It has been a magnificent achievement, with much still to be done. The record shows that an Import-Export Bank loan ($16,500,000) for building material and a counterpart expenditure of IL31 million have made their contribution from our joint venture. Behind this accomplishment are the shining faces of men, women and children grateful for homes to call their own, ready and eager to make their contribution as partners in the development of the country.

HAIFA PORT

The development of Haifa Port as an effective center for import and export trade has been aided in part by the joint effort. I have been much impressed as I have seen the housekeeping and noted the efficient working layout. The completion of the grain elevator known as the Dagon enterprise will be a major step forward. It makes it one of the leading ports of the eastern Mediterranean and should contribute substantially to economic stability.

Again we have aided in the rehabilitation of the railroads. The opening of the new railroad station in Tel Aviv last November 3 was but another step in the total task. Early this year four diesel engines were obtained through grant-in-aid. This gives the railways a total of seven diesel locomotives carrying all of the through business and practically all of the passenger traffic.

Now steam engines are used almost exclusively for shunting in yards service. The diesel engines brought about great economy in train operation, particularly in the cost of fuel amounting at present to IL30,000 a month.

Truck work is steadily being improved by efficient use of modern power equipment.

The construction of the new Negev railroad is progressing rapidly and at this time track has been laid up to Shalva, halfway between Na'an, the junction with the existing line, and Beersheba.

This is a land where sunshine, hard work, and water will let the land bloom. Of the three, water is a must. The day I inspected the Yarkon-Negev pipeline was a revelation of a modern engineering accomplishment. The 66-inch pipe, 75 miles long, with 3 pumping stations and 3 control reservoirs will make possible intensive cultivation of a large area of additional land, when water flows later this year. A considerable amount of counterpart funds has shared in this achievement.

These are but suggestions of the many ways in which our cooperative planning and implementation have taken the funds, made available through the grant-in-aid of the economic assistance program, and translated them into the very sinew and fiber of a nation seeking to develop itself in a minimum period into a modern western nation.

Let me turn now to the other aspect of our program, namely, technical assistance. Large dollar grants to ease the balance-of-payments problem and to aid capital development are an immediate and effective aid in bringing economic self-sufficiency and stabilizing a country's economy. However, they must of necessity be a temporary help. They cannot continue indefinitely. So there has been developed the complementary plan whereby the exchange of technical knowledge, skill, and know-how looks to the end of putting within the very life of a people the resources that will permit increased productivity, scientific use of natural resources including land, water, and minerals, intelligent economic development of industrial potential, and the creative emergence of products and activities indigenous to the life of Israel itself.

During the past 4 years technical aid from the United States has been as follows:

1952	$773,269.91
1953	2,636,489.49
1954	1,487,000.00
1955	1,426,000.00
Total	6,322,759.40

To this figure must be added the contribution of IL8,910,000 during the same period, which consists of Israel Government contributions to the technical-assistance program by way of services and facilities. These Israel monies are used for equipment, local personnel, and other expenses which are incurred as a direct local cost in implementing technical-assistance projects. They thus complement the United States contribution of personnel and equipment which require dollars and reflect in substance the cooperative nature of our activity that I have been stressing.

LASTING IMPRINT

The amount is small compared to the grant in aid total but may well leave a more lasting imprint upon the country. The funds are used mainly for the services of people. Men and women from America are selected with the joint approval of Israel and USOM to provide technical knowledge and skills. The latter are shared as the Israeli and American partners work together at common tasks so as to insure their permanent transfer to the Israeli know-how potential. Additional money is available for limited amounts of equipment essential for training and demonstration purposes. At the present time a staff of 82 Americans aided by 105 full-time Israeli employees comprise the mission.

A further asset is the provision for Israeli men and women to go to America for a practical educational training experience in specialized fields for a period of 6 to 12 months. I was impressed recently when a group leaving for America were sanitation experts from Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem. Surely such an experience should make a distinctive contribution to their respective communities through their increased effectiveness.

Last year 70 individuals selected by Israel and American technicians in all the fields of our activities were provided this opportunity. A similar number has been selected to go this year.

Who can judge its ultimate value? Beyond the practical value of the technical interchange involved in Americans coming to Israel to teach and Israelis going to America to learn, I rejoice in the bridges of understanding that these interchanges are erecting between our two countries. Here again is a value that may well transcend the original purpose.

May I share with you briefly a few of the projects in this area suggestive of the value of the technical assistance or point 4 program. Within 10 days after arrival in Israel I was taken to Shivta in the Negev to see the ruins of a Nabatean city of 10,000 persons, but more important to see were the remains of a water spreading device which some 2,000 years ago maintained the city.

Then at Mash'abim, a Negev settlement nearby, I observed the construction of dikes and a restraining dam which will spread over some 500 dunams of land the torrent of water as it rushes down the wadi once or twice during the winter. A ground penetration of 10 inches of water through this scheme means green fields in May and June and crops to sustain the settlement. With similar techniques, 100,000 dunams of land can be made fertile.

Operation Cowboy, known in Hebrew as Karei Deshe, was set up by Israeli and American technicians to help cover the lack of meat protein in the Israel diet.

A seed farm near Ashkalon is providing the grass seed for these potential grazing lands. Quality stock is being imported for breeding with native cattle. Israelis are learning to wear high heeled boots and ride ponies.

Irrigated fields of alfalfa are being developed to carry cattle through the 3 months of the summer when the hillsides will be parched. A training school for 25 to 30 boys to run the herd has been provided. Settlements are experimenting on a small scale to supplement the major project that will use lands bordering the northern side of the sea of Kinneret. Thus Israel will become more self-sufficient in her meat supply. This is technical assistance at work.

In Natanya, a public health team working hand in hand with the local officials is setting up a community health center that includes the villages which comprise the Natanya District as well as the city. A physician, a nurse, and a sanitarian comprise the group. It is the hope of the Health Ministry and our mission that cooperatively an effective center will be developed that will provide a model demonstration for other communities to emulate.

The Negev is a challenging and mysterious land. What does it hold in the way of natural resources? We know something of its secrets. Are there richer deposits of phosphate, copper and manganese? Are there additional secrets yet to be discovered? A contract has been signed with an American firm to bring expert knowledge to bear upon the problem which will direct exploration and train Israelis as the task is being done.

These are but a few examples of what the program of technical assistance is doing as we seek to share cooperatively the know-how and skill essential to develop within Israel herself the potential which in the long run will assure economic health and self-sufficiency. We of the mission have been deeply appreciative of the eagerness with which our partners in the various ministries have made use of the assets we have been able to supply. We as Americans are making our greatest contribution the sooner we work ourselves out of a job and are no longer needed. That situation means Israelis have made the skills their own.

Now what of the future? I am certain that there is no one who does not recognize fully the well-nigh impossible task which Israel has set for herself in seeking to become a self-sufficient nation with a high standard of living in a minimum period of time. Many and varied are the difficulties. Again none of us fails to recognize the achievement of the past 7 years. Truly it seems that a modern miracle has been wrought although to those who have shared in the fashioning of these years, it has the logic of planning, hard work and faith. What has been achieved suggests that ultimate success can be achieved although the way may be difficult and frustrating.

The economy has been improving. As the immigrants have been settled and capital improvements made with the help of various outside source of aid, the balance of payments has improved, and greater economic stability achieved. In frankness it must be recognized that the economic help has been made possible by funds from abroad.

The problem is essentially this: Can Israel become economically self-sufficient within the period of time which such aid from with-

out the country is available? The United States grant-in-aid is gradually being reduced and will ultimately be eliminated. The new provision that part of the 1955 grant-in-aid must be in the form of a loan is indicative of the trend. German reparations are to be received for a fixed period of time.

It has been a wise policy that has placed the large share of foreign aid in capital development and sought to keep the country self-contained for consumer needs. Already the results of investment in agriculture are evident in the steady decline in foreign exchange over the past 2 years.

Further progress seems assured. Our mission's shift of emphasis in the past year to the strengthening and development of industry for local consumption and export is indicative of further progress. The industrial audit made by the Stanford Institute supplies a basis for intelligent action, and stresses the need for rapid development of managerial skill and productivity.

If economic viability is to be achieved there will need to be constant improvement in agricultural production including industrial crops and intelligent development of industrial resources, that carefully calculates the economic justification of each activity, utilizes a maximum of local raw materials, and husbands the country's resources.

Yet of the greatest importance in achieving these results are the people themselves, their unity, their willingness to work, their spirit. Of these intangibles later.

This is a land of beginnings.

On every hand you see the young tree, the young vine, the new furrow in a long neglected field. I have gone into factories where production is in its sixth, seventh, and eighth month and have been amazed at the results knowing that operation started with three or four trained personnel. Men and women have the confidence that comes from trying the new and novel. They dare to venture into the "land of it has never been done before". Such a spirit of youthfulness is an asset but it needs to be tempered with a judgment that fully understands a calculated risk and moves forward with a determination to capitalize on the factors favorable to success.

DYNAMIC QUALITY

It is a land with a dynamic quality.

People are going places. They are busy with achievement. In a journey across the country, I've been impressed that men and women are working vigorously in the fields. There is a sense of urgency that stimulates activity. Here again is a tremendous intangible asset. Yet I've wondered at times about the danger of speed. There must be a deliberateness of decision and planning to assure that haste does not make waste. At times, my colleagues have felt that urgency has defeated itself.

It is a land of faith.

One cannot tarry here long without sensing a faith in the ultimate success of the dream whereby a State was founded as a nation was reborn. It was a visit to Beit Shearim that clarified my thought. Standing amid the ruins, blending my thought of this ancient cultural center with those that I have of Jerusalem as I am coming to know her, and remembering an hour's conference with Dr. Isaac Herzog, chief rabbi of Israel, I had an acute awareness of the spiritual tradition which with renewed vitality is a strong creative force unifying and undergirding the life and development of the new State. It is such faith that is undoubtedly the well spring from which has come the strength for past achievement and can be the source of tomorrow's success.

Increasingly I have come to realize that to understand this land is to understand that which has existed both in the span of the centuries and also in the span of the decades that preceded the emergence of the modern State of Israel. There is the rich heritage that goes back 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 years and more, there are the achievements of the last 30, 40, 50 years and more made by the various agencies and forces that make Israel what she is today. It is the fusion of the old and the new which gives Israel her unique source of strength.

It is my belief that it is these same intangible forces modified and strengthened by the passing months and years that will be the determining factors in shaping the immediate future of this land. It has been such ideals and aspirations that have lifted nations to greatness. Herein lies Israel's opportunity. She dare not be less than true to the great moral law which has been her contribution to the society of men. Her friends covet for her faithfulness to this great tradition that she may build a nation of quality and share in preserving the society of freemen.

Territorial Organization of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter I received from Mr. P. A. Hrobak, president, the Slovak League of America, in which Mr. Hrobak discusses in some detail the problems associated with the territorial organization of Czechoslovakia:

THE SLOVAK LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Middletown, Pa., July 14, 1955.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Please forgive me for not replying sooner to your letter of June 20. I have read and reread Congressman BENTLEY's speech carefully several times, but fail to see just how he might have left the impression that the policy of the State Department to the Slovak problem of a national state vis-a-vis Czechoslovakia had been changed completely. Of course, I am speaking only for myself, and it may be that others at the 34th congress of the league were so impressed.

It seems to me that Mr. BENTLEY, in his speech, May 23, simply wanted to point out the views of Mr. Shepardson of the FEC (Free Europe Committee) and those of the State Department. It is obvious from the State Department reply—a copy of which you sent me which in turn is an exact repetition of what the State Department told Mr. BENTLEY—that Mr. Shepardson was mistaken about State Department views regarding the future political status of the Slovak people.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. FLOOD, I must admit that I am not satisfied with the views of our State Department as expressed. To me the views are vague; State Department does not go or want to go far enough. For example, the third paragraph of the State Department's letter of June 3 to you: "With respect to the question of the future territorial organization of Czechoslovakia, it is the view of the Department that the Czech and Slovak peoples should themselves determine under free conditions whether they will continue to live together in a common Czechoslovak state."

Now, what does the State Department mean exactly? How would you interpret that statement? Does the State Department mean that the Czechs should themselves determine as Czechs, i. e., separately, and the Slovaks likewise should themselves determine as Slovaks whether they will continue to live in a common political State? Or does it mean that the Czechs and Slovaks of Czechoslovakia together—say, in a free election—should themselves determine whether they will continue to live together in a common Czechoslovak state—that is, the more numerous Czechs would outvote the Slovaks in the election and tell them that they must continue to live together in such a common state?

Mr. FLOOD, informed persons know that the Czechs would like to continue Czechoslovakia, whereas the vast majority of Slovaks would not. Why should the Czechs determine anything for the Slovaks—and vice versa? If the State Department means that the Slovaks—and only the Slovaks themselves—shall determine for themselves whether they shall continue with the Czechs in a common political state, why does it not say so unequivocally?

What the State Department holds to today, I have heard many times before. And in 1918 from T. G. Masaryk himself. The Slovaks were told not to worry about details, because they would be masters of their household, while the Czechs would be masters of theirs; in other words, Slovakia would be an equal partner of the Czech country and would enjoy full autonomy, i. e., states rights. We know what happened. Then we heard the promises of Dr. Edward Benes before the conclusion of World War II that Czechoslovakia would be different, the demands of the Slovaks would be met, the new Czechoslovakia would be a democratic federation, etc. Again, we know what happened. Does the State Department want the performance repeated, or, shall I ask, is it for a repeat performance?

If it is not, why are the followers of Dr. Edward Benes' ruinous pro-Soviet policy favored and looked upon as some sort of Czechoslovak Government-in-exile by the State Department? Why have the Czech National Socialists been allowed to influence State Department and various agencies of government, when we know that they have always been anti-Slovak freedom and independence? You find their people in the Voice of America, Library of Congress, the Army, CIA, etc. But not a single, true or genuine patriotic representative of the Slovak people. Does our State Department really believe that Dr. Joseph Lettrich, Fedor Hodza, Slávik, Papánek, Osusky, Kocvara, and others, who call themselves Slovak, are true representatives of the political will of the Slovak nation? They never were and never shall be. The vast majority of Slovak patriots consider them renegades—Judases in the pay of Dr. Benes' followers. Many of them, I dare say most of them, were members of the Communist-dominated national front government of the Benes-Gottwald coalition from 1945 to 1948.

Now, Mr. FLOOD, if the State Department's views regarding the future political status of the Slovak people are influenced by such people, what shall we honestly say about the future political status of the Slovak nation? Is it any wonder, then, that patriotic Slovaks at home and in exile and Americans of Slovak descent are really worried about the future political status of the Slovak nation, of their Slovak country? Is it any wonder, too, that Americans of Slovak descent resent the fact that American tax dollars are used to support such people? How much longer shall be allow them to compromise the good name of America?

Genuine Slovaks at home and in exile, as well as Americans of Slovak descent organized in the Slovak League of America, deeply appreciate all that you, Mr. Bentley,

Mr. Feighan, Mr. Machrowicz, Mr. Price, former Congressman Charles J. Kersten, and other Members of the United States Congress, have done for the cause of liberty with regard to the Slovak nation. I only hope and pray that you have the courage and strength to carry on in the work of exposing the political mess that was Czechovakia, and unmasking the pseudo-Democrats who promoted Dr. Benes' pro-Soviet policy in Czechoslovakia, and, therefore, are in a large measure responsible for the present terrible plight of both the Slovak and also the Czech nations. The Benes Czechs and their Slovak stooges have embarrassed America, our Congress and the administration entirely too long, and, therefore, should not be tolerated in positions of influence any longer.

I honestly will doubt the sincerity of our State Department, Dr. Flood, as long as the State Department does regard them favorably and allows them to influence United States Czechoslovak policy. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia was organized and controlled by Benes Czechs (Ripka, Zenkl, Majer, etc.), Czech Socialists. I believe that it is still controlled by them. Imagine my surprise and consternation when Mr. James C. H. Bonbright, of our State Department, wrote me February 26, 1954, saying that our State Department considers former members of the Communist-dominated national-front government of Czechoslovakia as "leading anti-Communist political refugees from Czechoslovakia." He said that our State Department still "considers the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to be an organization of leading anti-Communist political refugees from Czechoslovakia working for the liberation of that country from Communist domination."

What goes on in our State Department, Mr. Flood? The founders and members—most of them—of the council not only did not fight communism at home, but also collaborated closely with Communists and Moscow in the spirit of the December 1943 agreement of Dr. Benes. They did not know how to fight the Communists, or did not want to, at home, but here in America are considered as "leading anti-Communist political refugees from Czechoslovakia" by our State Department. Imagine the psychological effect of this on the wretched Czechs and Slovaks at home if you will. In my humble opinion, to defend an indefensible group of foreign politicians, who peddled the Moscow line for years, is today not only inexcusable but also highly reprehensible. And the more so in the case of an official of our State Department.

If, however, our State Department does change its policy with regard to the Slovak nation, it will do so because of the efforts put forth by Messrs. BENTLEY, MACHROWICZ, FEIGHAN, PRICE, yourself, and others. And it should do so as quickly as feasible to save itself further embarrassment. And for that, Mr. Flood, believe me, you and the others will be remembered by a grateful, long-suffering Slovak nation.

Sincerely yours,

P. A. HROBAK,
President, the Slovak League of America.

Old North and the Spire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Boston Traveler of July 8, 1955, with reference to the Old North Church, which is located in my congressional district in Boston.

While there were many who contributed, I feel that an especial vote of thanks should go to the children of our Nation for their splendid part in the restoration of this historical landmark.

The editorial follows:

OLD NORTH AND THE SPIRE

Now the steeple is back on the Old North Church, and the city is whole again. It was never quite the same with the steeple missing.

It would take far too much space to list the names of all the persons and organizations who made it possible to get the spire back.

There was never any question as to whether it should be restored. From the moment the gale winds of Hurricane Carol hurled it into the street last August, Boston wanted it back where it belonged. The problem was how to go about it, how to handle the cost and the work involved.

It was a gallant job, well done. And the city's thanks and praise are owed to everyone who had a hand in the task, some of them contributing from beyond the seas.

The ringing of the steeple bells at 5:17 Wednesday afternoon meant far more than the signal of a repair job completed. They meant the return of a symbol of history, a reunion of modern times with the days of Paul Revere and a Nation's birth.

Old Boston is sincerely grateful.

Salute to Sweden and Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 7, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include an editorial entitled "Scandinavian Anniversary," which appeared in the June 7, 1955, issue of the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram.

The article follows:

SCANDINAVIAN ANNIVERSARY

Today is an important Scandinavian anniversary. On June 7, 1905—50 years ago—Norway ended her union with Sweden. The two nations had been united under a king since 1814, almost a century. They found, however, that the union was not easy to maintain and foster. So they decided to go their separate ways.

When the union was established in 1814, both nations declared that it had been accomplished "not by force of arms, but by free conviction." The same spirit of voluntary agreement prevailed when the break was made. There were individuals on both sides of the border who were dissatisfied and resentful. But the 2 governments, the 2 nations, remained calm. No shot was fired. The whole process of separation was marked by orderliness and good feeling.

Sometime, between nations as between groups within nations, it requires as much patience and tolerance to bring about separation as it does to achieve union. Tact, the spirit of compromise, the willingness to refrain from exerting pressures—these are qualities which Norway and Sweden have shown during the past half-century of separation. Amiably and skillfully they have lived together.

Political Gallantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Daily Globe, Boston, Mass., Wednesday, July 20, 1955:

POLITICAL GALLANTRY

A review of the first 6 months in office of Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff, of Connecticut, points up a startling fact. A Democrat, he has refused to make the partisan attacks once so common in politics, or even to answer such attacks. He instead has declared that the State Republican leadership has "covered itself with glory."

The startling fact is that Governor Ribicoff is not the only example of such political gallantry. From Gov. Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, have come friendly and cooperative words for the Republicans who for so long controlled the Pine Tree State.

Another example is the many-termed Governor of Ohio, Frank J. Lausche. And it was only recently that Massachusetts own Governor Herter made the same type of gesture when he accepted part of the blame for the prison problem and said it was bipartisan.

The public appreciates such an attitude, though it is not to be expected during a campaign. Its essential fairness helps to give political office the dignity it deserves.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

Appendix

Subversives in Defense Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as one who has served now for a considerable period of time as a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, I am convinced that the potentiality for subversion and sabotage within our essential defense industries and facilities has not decreased with the changing attitudes of world affairs.

The Secretary of the Army, Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, has testified that—

There are known subversives now working in vital defense facilities without there being adequate authority in the Federal Government to meet this potential threat to our productive capacity and therefore to our military effectiveness.

To fill this gap in our internal-security structure, I have introduced, with the sanction of the administration, Senate bill 681, which would "guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion."

As was to be expected, this proposal has been the subject of criticism from certain misinformed and misguided persons and groups. However, the July 23, 1955, issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an excellent editorial entitled "New Law Needed To Bar Spies From War Plants," which very capably, in my opinion, demolishes these continuing attacks upon any legislation vital to our national defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with my newsletters of May 9, 1955, and July 11, 1955, on the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post of July 23, 1955]

NEW LAW NEEDED TO BAR SPIES FROM WAR PLANTS

Although a worker in an industrial plant can sometimes be fired for taking too long for a smoke in the washroom, it will be news to many people that it is impossible to get rid of suspected subversives and Soviet agents planted in our sensitive defense industries. To remedy this situation, the Department of Defense prepared a bill, which was introduced by Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, designed to give the Government the right to exclude these dubious characters from places where they could cause trouble. It does seem about time some attention was paid to this matter.

One explanation of this extraordinary situation is the almost pathetic anxiety of the Government not to be accused of violating somebody's civil liberties. A year ago a statement made on behalf of the General Electric Co. before the Senate Judiciary Committee pointed out that "Government agencies direct contractors to exclude from 'classified' defense work all employees whom they find to be 'security risks,' but the individual employer does not receive from the Government the evidence which supports its conclusion."

In its statement the company declared that when the Korean war broke out it attempted to have the Government give the names of any employees considered to be subversive. "We could not get such information and were advised that the entire security program was under study." It is obvious that FBI files cannot be turned over to private individuals, but it is a monument to the fatuous tolerance of democracy that subversives can't be disturbed in their activities because there is no legal way to identify them.

Undoubtedly, if an employer undertook to dismiss a suspected worker without having had access to the Government's information about the man, the employer would probably have his plant closed by a strike and in the end be compelled to restore the suspect to his job. Since the employer is unable to act by himself, and Government officials do not give the needed information, a statute is called for, making it mandatory for the Government to boot subversives out of our defense industries. The Butler bill was designed to fill this gap.

Although certain labor leaders, the Americans for Democratic Action, and other so-called liberal groups have criticized the Butler bill as setting up "an approximation to the police state," the measure seems adequately cautious in its approach to the subject. For example, before its terms can be carried out the President must issue a proclamation "that the security of the United States is endangered by reason of actual war or threatened war, or invasion, or insurrection, or subversive activity, or of disturbance or threatened disturbance in the international relations of the United States." Important as it is to protect the rights of individuals and to stay within the limits of "due process of law," the layman will wonder why spies cannot be hightailed out of defense plants until the menacing circumstances cited above are present.

Even when the FBI has put the finger on a suspected subversive in a defense plant, nothing could happen to him under this proposed law until he has been notified of the charges against him and given an adequate opportunity to defend himself against them. He may request a hearing, and if the charges are based on the testimony of informants whose identity must be withheld for security reasons, the suspect "shall be furnished with a fair summary of the information in support of the charges against him." The bill did provide that "any investigatory organization [meaning the FBI]" shall not be required to disclose the source of its information if such disclosure would "endanger its investigatory activity." The spy who is collared despite all the protections set up in the Butler bill may not destroy the FBI on his way out of the plant.

All this would appear to give subversives and suspected Soviet agents in defense plants protections which are denied to employees accused of "sassing" the foreman or arriving on the job 10 minutes late. One explanation seems to be that unions feel that communism, like portal to portal, should be a subject for negotiation with employers. The less practical complaints of the liberals are not so easily comprehended.

It ought not to be necessary to add that the mass of American labor is overwhelmingly opposed to communism and that the evil which the Butler bill was designed to meet concerns only a few people, many of them not members of unions at all. However, the important thing from the Soviet point of view is not how many rank-and-file union members can be turned into Marxists, but how to plant a few hundred spies and agents in key spots in our defense industries. Testimony before congressional committees has made it plain that these industries have been infiltrated to some degree. Senator BUTLER declared that, without this bill, the United States would be powerless to act against subversives in our industrial plants. Are we so drugged by peace propaganda that we don't care?

THE NATIONAL SECURITY
(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, July 11, 1955.—In the present posture of world affairs, the problems of national security, while not in the headlines as much as heretofore, have not decreased in magnitude or importance. There are those, however, who continue to argue that this problem is poppycock—a figment of the conservative mind.

As chairman of a Senate internal security task force created to review security procedures in our defense facilities, I have just completed hearings at which the real significance of this problem was revealed in its ominous potential. Expanding upon the accounts by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that there are still more than 20,000 Communists—active or passive—in this country, incoming Army Secretary Wilber M. Brucker testified that the Government does not have sufficient authority to remove subversives from certain of our vital industries. To fill this void I have introduced legislation which, when passed, would deny such individuals access to our defense plants.

It is in this setting, compounded by the ugly history of subversion and infiltration in the last quarter century, that the charge of poppycock has arisen. These misguided antagonists, despite their oftentime intellectual leanings, are quick to overlook a few axioms basic to the society of man. For example, back in the Roman days, Justinian, the Emperor of the East, proclaimed that "the safety of the state is the supreme law." President Madison once said: "Security against foreign danger is one of the primitive objectives of civil society." Of more recent gleaning, Supreme Court Justice Frankfurter has asserted that "the right of a government to maintain its existence—self-preservation—is the most pervasive aspect of sovereignty."

Through the ages self-protection and survival have been a motivating premise of government. Yet in recent years this maxim has become confused with the issue—not wholly unrelated, however—of due process of law. While there are many judicial precedents which capably disentangle these perplexities and place them in clear perspective, the courts have concluded that due process in the context of security programs is "properly definable in terms of the maximum procedural safeguards which can be afforded the individual without jeopardizing the national security."

Let those who contend that our internal security is not always in danger heed A. F. of L. President George Meany's warning of last week, "The sweet words of Soviet leaders betoken no change in their basic aim of world domination."

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, May 9, 1955.—All too frequently, we as freedom-loving people overlook the real meaning—or more aptly, the real menace—of the international Communist conspiracy. Unfortunately, we often seem to forget the creepy conquests of the Russian dictatorship, and the inhuman brutality and devious cunning of these conquests. As a dictatorship and conspiracy, world domination is the all-pervading goal. The evil operations of the Kremlin, its agents and pawns, influence practically every phase of our free society.

This penetration is ceaseless, taking many forms, and is but part of a precisely conceived plan. Responsible experts have concluded that more than 20,000 trained, hard-core Communist Party members continue to function in this country, mostly in cloak and dagger secrecy. Unimpeachable testimony records extensive and repeated exposures of Communist infiltration in our industrial and defense plants. In accordance with a basic Communist doctrine that "the end justifies the means," it can be accurately predicted that infiltration is a prelude to active sabotage and subversion.

With utter abhorrence of the frightening prospect of another global conflict, and with full realization of the delicate international situation, there is no alternative to preparation and security. We must be alert to any eventuality. It is in this setting that I have introduced legislation which would prevent access to all defense facilities of persons likely to commit sabotage, espionage, and other subversive acts.

As expected, the self-appointed saints of American liberalism, with neurotic denunciation, are attacking this measure on the grounds that the rights of workers will be violated. These deluded individuals endeavor to popularize such idioms that my proposal would result in "a lot less freedom but no more security." These unfounded assaults tend to cloud the true purpose of the legislation and the vital need for adequate precautions. Contrary to these assertions, this bill would protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans and simultaneously safeguard our Nation.

I would remind these self-styled liberals that: "Communism is the religion of the devil; it is a distillation of evil; it is the very antichrist. We will never be safe from this evil faith until it is driven back to the hell from which it came." These are the words of Adm. William H. Standley, a wartime Ambassador to Russia, who, can, with authority, attest to the real meaning and foreboding of the Communist conspiracy.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Yugoslavs Resist Arm Aid Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the mutual security bill for 1956 was before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, there was testimony that Yugoslavia was refusing to comply with the conditions of receiving military assistance from us. They were refusing to permit our officials to observe their military program. In view of their attitude, there was considerable doubt as to the advisability of furnishing more aid. The same situation existed when the bill was before the House for final action. However, a majority of the Members of this body insisted that, notwithstanding the belligerency in the part of the Yugoslavs, aid be furnished.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the New York Times on July 20 under a dateline of July 16 from Yugoslavia written by Mr. Jack Raymond. His article supports the position of those Members who have opposed aid to Yugoslavia.

YUGOSLAVS RESIST ARMS AID REVIEW—SAY THEY COMPLY WITH PACT, BUT UNITED STATES INSPECTORS DO NOT SHARE THAT VIEW

(By Jack Raymond)

BLED, YUGOSLAVIA, July 16.—Yugoslav military authorities have turned back every recent effort by United States officials to increase their observation of the military aid program here.

The military officials have made it clear they intend to provide no additional type of information or facilities to Brig. Gen. Peter C. Haines, chief of the resident military aid group, and his staff.

The Yugoslavs believe they already are providing enough information and facilities under the terms of the bilateral military aid treaty, originally concluded in 1951. The treaty is automatically renewed as additional equipment is brought in.

Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of modern military equipment has been granted to Yugoslavia. The specific amount has never been made public. The program has been based on the policy of keeping Yugoslavia strong so long as she showed readiness to oppose possible aggression from the East.

JETS INCLUDED IN GRANTS

Yugoslavia has received jets as well as propeller-driven planes, tanks, trucks and jeeps, cannon and a variety of engineering equipment.

It is the responsibility of General Hains and his staff to inspect the use of this equipment. He is also required to determine whether the Yugsolavs are prepared to receive and make use of scheduled deliveries.

The bilateral treaty calls specifically for the United States to be granted the right to exercise continuous "inspection and review" of the use of military aid.

The Yugoslavs' opinion that the terms of the treaty are being fully carried out by them is not shared by competent United States officials, it was learned.

These officials are said to be particularly sensitive to this problem at the moment because they were criticized indirectly during a debate in Congress on the foreign aid bill. Some Congressmen attacked the administration's policy of granting aid to Yugoslavia and added that United States representatives appeared not to be insistent enough in obtaining the information they required.

In a minority report to the House June 28, signed by four Republican Representatives, the situation in Yugoslavia was cited as an example of lack of Executive control over the administration's program. The Representatives were LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin; MARGUERITE S. CHURCH, of Illinois; E. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana; and ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan.

The Yugoslav Government was charged with not having been fully cooperative in carrying out the requirements of the Mutual Security Act that the United States be permitted continuous observation and review of the use made of equipment supplied by the United States.

The report contained also a sharp distinction between the United States and its allies and the Government of Yugoslavia, whose support in the event of a struggle was asserted to be potentially only that of a neutral. The report charged that Yugoslavia was evading the terms on which assistance had been given.

ENVOYS LEARNED OF ATTITUDE

Authoritative sources here revealed that at about the time of the recent meeting of Ambassadors of Yugoslavia and the United States, Britain, and France, the Yugoslav attitude on military-aid facilities again was disclosed.

The unchanging Yugoslav attitude was understood to have been made clear to United States officials after the most recent criticism had been voiced in Congress.

According to certain United States officials here, the staff assigned to handle the United States aid program in Yugoslavia is too small. The Yugoslav officials have turned down past efforts to increase its size substantially, although it is now somewhat bigger than the staff the Yugoslavs originally admitted.

Reliable sources disclosed that specific information requested by Americans in connection with the aid program frequently has been refused or the requests ignored. United States efforts to observe the use of equipment already delivered have been hampered by refusal of the Yugoslavs to supply what American officers feel would be adequate background material.

At the same time it is known that when the Yugoslavs have permitted the Americans to observe their ability to handle planes and tanks, the impressions of the work of Yugoslav soldiers have been good.

Yugoslavia's attitude is said to reflect the experience she had with the Soviet Union before she broke with the Cominform in 1948. The Soviet Union had many military advisers and observers in this country. The Yugoslavs afterward charged that the Russian military personnel were engaged in spying and in attempting to subvert the regime.

With United States military aid, Yugoslavia has been able to reequip her army, one of the biggest in Europe, with largely American materiel instead of Russian. This has been evident in military parades.

A Commentator Looks at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 21, 1955

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the script of a recent broadcast by Charles Collingwood, distinguished CBS news commentator, has

come to my attention. It deals with the trials and tribulations of Members of Congress and cites the recent unfortunate illness of the distinguished majority leader of the Senate and the fate of some of his predecessors in this most responsible position.

As Mr. Collingwood wrote to a member of my staff:

It seemed to me that those of us who, with varying degrees of accuracy of aim, take pot shots at the Congress ought to put things in perspective once in a while.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed the script of Mr. Collingwood's broadcast in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the script was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Americans have some curious attitudes toward our public servants, particularly the ones we elect to Congress. We entrust to them a good share of the Nation's destiny, expect them to be as wise as Solomon and as accommodating as the neighborhood druggist, shower them with attention, and even confer on them the title of "The Honorable So and So"—a form of address in England limited to the sons and daughters of the nobility. Yet at the same time, the stock image of a Congressman is a figure of fun, loud of mouth, empty of idea, bone idle, and if not downright larcenous at least of extraordinary moral elasticity.

There's nothing new about this point of view. Back in 1896 Henry Adams observed: "You can't use tact with a Congressman. A Congressman is a hog. You must take a stick and hit him on the snout." Mark Twain wrote: "Reader, suppose you were an idiot. And suppose you were a Member of Congress—but I repeat myself." And one of the oldest Washington stories is of the Chaplain of the Senate who, upon being asked what he did, replied, "I look at the Senate and pray for the country."

This attitude toward Congress has its serious side. A few years ago the National Opinion Research Center took a poll and discovered that 5 out of every 7 Americans believed it impossible for a professional politician to be strictly honest. Another study showed that only 18 percent of American parents would like to see their sons go into politics as a career. Later polls may have changed those figures but not enough to impair the point that Americans think of their Congressmen as pompous hypocrites, too lazy to do honest work, with their nose in the pork barrel, and quite likely, their hand in the till.

It's too bad that that is the picture, because, of course, it isn't true. The Congress undoubtedly isn't as good as it ought to be and probably it never will be, but your average Member of Congress is not only as intelligent as the next man and probably a little more conscientious, but he is also overworked, by any standard, underpaid in relation to the responsibilities he bears, and considerably underappreciated.

These reflections were inspired by some comments this morning on the illness of Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, by one of Washington's most distinguished observers, Arthur Krock of the New York Times. Mr. Krock was quoting former Senator Scott Lucas, who once had Senator JOHNSON's job, on the heavy toll which congressional leadership exacts. There was Henry Rainey, of Illinois, who became Speaker of the House in March of 1933. In August 1934 he died. His successor was Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee, who took office in January 1935 and died in June 1936. W. B. Bankhead, of Alabama, succeeded him, and he died in 1940. In the Senate, Majority Leader Robinson, of Arkansas, died during the struggle over President Roosevelt's Supreme Court packing bill. In 1951, Senator Wherry, of Nebraska, was Republican floor leader when he was fatally stricken. At the beginning of the present administration Senator Taft was carried away after only a few weeks as majority leader.

Not all the causalties have been fatal, but a heavy price has been paid. One remembers Scott Lucas himself, almost doubled up with ulcers, his face gray with pain and fatigue, holding on to his desk as he tried to keep the Senate in line for Harry Truman's program. And ALBEN BARKLEY coming back from a long siege in Walter Reed Hosiptal thin as a wraith and still wobbly in his pins. And now its LYNDON JOHNSON, bedded down in Bethesda Naval Hospital with a bad heart attack at the age of 45.

The burdens of congressional leadership are heavier than those borne by the rank and file. A good majority leader like LYNDON JOHNSON must be in touch with every member of his own party and a good share of the other party, too. He must be abreast of the progress of business both on the floor and in committee. He must in turn, persuade, cajole, compromise, stand firm. He must think of the interests of his party and the interests of his country, and sometimes, if he's going to hold onto his job, he must think of the interests of his State, too. And all this means that he lives with a thousand things on his mind, a dozen phone calls to answer at once, a hundred letters to get written, decisions to make, appointments to keep, people to see. No wonder they get sick. The wonder is that they can still keep their eye on the broad path of policy and still preserve some balance of thought and sweetness of disposition.

That is true of the leadership, is only slightly less true of the rest of the Congress. It's no place for a lazy man. The vast extension of the Government of the United States has given Congress more work than there are hours in the days or months in the year properly to perform. And the peculiar relationship of the Congressman to the public which expects him to be part statesman, part fixer, and always accessible takes up a fantastic amount of his time. The laziest Senator in Washington probably works harder than 90 percent of the people in private life. Of course, they are all human—some of them all too human—and sometimes they are ridiculous and often they are wrong. But a people deserves the Congressmen it elects and if we want better ones we'll have to elect them. Meanwhile, the Congress of the United States is made up in the main of serious, diligent, and thoughtful men and women who sometimes give of themselves more prodigally than they should. It's ironical that it takes the death of a Taft or the illness of a Johnson to make us realize it.

For Students of the Techniques of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "For Students of the Techniques of Communism," by Louis F. Budenz. I point out that it was written before the Big Four Conference began.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR STUDENTS OF THE TECHNIQUES OF COMMUNISM

(By Louis F. Budenz)

Examination of every important Communist document of directives—from the New Times of Moscow to the Daily Worker—shows that the Communists are driving for the following objectives with all the energy at their command:

1. THE BIG FOUR MEETING, BASING ITSELF ON THE YALTA MODEL

The current issues of the Daily Worker, specifically from May 15 on, express jubilation at the proposed Big Four conference at the summit. At the same time, they urge the comrades to create the atmosphere under which West Germany will be disarmed, the United States will surrender in the Far East, and will give up its superiority in atomic materials.

The Red daily organ of May 15 runs a huge headline "Big Four Meet Stirs Hopes of World," and at the same time lets it be known that this is a victory for the Communist line by asserting in a front-page story that the Daily Worker boasts of constantly standing for top-level negotiations.

The very fact that there is to be a Big Four meeting is, therefore, a marked gain for what Moscow wants us to do.

We will remember that Andrew Stevens—probably the name for the Communist international representative—in his famous report to the secret national conference of the Communist Party in September 1953 made the following the center of his instructions to the comrades: "Both the need and the possibilities of the present moment call for the development of a veritable crusade for peaceful negotiations, for a top-level meeting of the Big Powers to settle differences over the conference table."

Stevens hammered this home in the following directives: "It is to this end that we must turn all our energies, our utmost skill, tenacity, and resourcefulness, in overcoming all abstacles that hinder or delay the unfolding of the broadest united and parallel actions directed toward this end." (New Opportunities in the Fight for Peace and Democracy, by Andrew Stevens, New Century publishers, 1953, p. 27.)

The Communists were therefore lashed on into the campaign to pervade every avenue of American life with the necessity for top-level negotiations.

Political Affairs for January 1955 declared "the peoples' will for peace is forcing coexistence into the forefront of discussion everywhere." And the first Communist condition for peaceful coexistence—as stressed by William Z. Foster in Political Affairs for November 1954—is Big Power negotiations.

This campaign is directed specifically at undermining the United States by persuading it, with the aid of our allies, to give in to Moscow's demands. Putting it in the language of Political Affairs for January 1955: "In concrete terms, in today's struggle for peace, our own country is a decisive area; for here is the commanding center of world imperialism, the heart of the war danger." (Lenin and Peaceful Coexistence, Political Affairs, January 1955, p. 3.)

2. A NEUTRAL GERMANY AND A NEUTRAL BELT

The biggest drive of Moscow and its agents, next to Big Power negotiations, is the disarmament of West Germany. The New Times of May 7, 1955, shows that the Austrian Peace Treaty—which provides for a neutral Austria—was entered into by Moscow in order to bring about a neutral Germany.

The New Times says in part: "The immense interest the Austrian decision has aroused in Western Germany is quite understandable. On the 10th anniversary of the

conclusion of the war, the German people are still without a peace treaty, are living in a country split into two parts, instead of in an integral, independent, and democratic state. And they are well aware that this intolerable situation can only be ended by great power negotiations and agreement, and not by separate decisions and the militarization of the western part of their country and its integration into aggressive, military alliances."

The Daily Worker from May 15 (week-end edition) carries this propaganda forward by stressing on page 4 that the first object of a Big Four conference would be settlement of the German question.

The Daily Workers adds: "A German solution could be foreseen only if both sides agreed as on the Austrian question, that German armed forces must not be incorporated in any alliance directed against any of the Big Powers."

These quotations—which could be multiplied manyfold—light up the whole subject, making it clear as day.

At the Big Four meeting, the United States is to be persuaded (according to Moscow's plan) to agree to proposals which will lose us the aid of the people of West Germany.

Our allies are counted upon to bring pressure in this direction. Issue after issue of the Daily Worker has recently emphasized that Great Britain favors Soviet proposals on various points, as over against the reluctance of the United States.

If West Germany is disarmed, then Moscow will have driven a huge neutral belt through the center of Europe, from Tito's Yugoslavia to Sweden. This neutral belt will be an easy prey to Soviet aggression and disruption, when it suits Moscow's purposes. The friendly governments which Dean Acheson declared on November 14, 1945, must be on the Soviet borders have all become satellite regimes. This furnishes a forewarning of the fate of the "neutral" nations, now being taken into Moscow's camp by Marshal Tito.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

1. Write the President, Secretary of State Dulles, your Senators and Representatives, citing these quotations and insisting that there be no new Yalta.

2. Raise the slogan "Not one step backward"—both in regard to Europe and against the current Communist cry, "Hands off Quemoy and Matsu."

3. Urge in Washington and in letters to the press the breaking off of relations with Soviet Russia and the satellite regimes. Show that Moscow was obliged to rearrange its tactics when we did give some show of firmness—in the Formosa resolution and the Paris agreement.

The Communists are acting. The time for us to act is now.

Use of Dollar-a-Year Men in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ruth Montgomery, which appeared in the New York Daily News on July 21, relating to the use of dollar-a-year men in Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

D. C. WASH

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON, July 20.—That popular refrain of World War I days: "How you gonna keep 'em down on the farm after they've seen Paree?" needs some present day revision.

Confronted with the castigation and character assassination that seems to lie in wait for businessmen who try to serve their Government in Washington, Uncle Sam might well sigh:

"How'm I gonna keep 'em here at their desks after they've seen the pillory?"

Yesterday's Senate debate about dollar-a-year men is a case in point. Only because two Democrats—Senators HARRY BYRD and A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia—voted with Republicans was the administration's defense production bill saved from an amendment that might have crippled our preparedness program beyond repair.

BIRTH AND GROWTH OF $1-YEAR MEN

It was a real party-line fight. As a ranking Republican observed after the 46-to-45 vote: "Democratic President Woodrow Wilson originated the dollar-a-year man. Democratic President Franklin D. Roosevelt resurrected him. Democratic President Harry S. Truman gave him his present status by the Defense Production Act of 1950 under which we still operate. But the Democrats obviously don't want a Republican administration to have the benefient of his advice and service."

There is, of course, room for honest difference of opinion about the wisdom of bringing into Government on a no-compensation basis business executives who remain on their company's payrolls. But the Eisenhower administration firmly believes that it has provided ample safeguards.

Ever since their creation, the Labor and Agriculture Departments have been dedicated to promoting the interests of labor and farmers respectively.

SEEK TO RESTORE OUTLOOK OF HOOVER

For 24 years of the New and Fair Deals, however business was a dirty word in Washington. What the Commerce Department is now trying to do is to restore Herbert Hoover's conception of the function of that Department while he served as Commerce Secretary in the Cabinets of Presidents Harding and Coolidge.

By law, the Commerce Department is directed to look after the welfare of business and to seek its advice. No one seems to question the wisdom of promoting the welfare of those enormous voting blocs—labor and farmers—but the breast-beating New Dealers apparently feel there's something crooked about doing the same for the businessman.

Bernard Baruch was the first of a long line of invaluable dollar-a-year men. The elder statesman served both Wilson and Roosevelt during the two World Wars when, fortunately, our protective oceans gave us time to prepare for hostilities after war had already been declared against us.

THERE WOULD BE HOUR OF HORROR

But this is the atomic age, and if war should come today our first warning would undoubtedly be the destruction of large segments of our productive capacity in a single hour of horror.

For this reason, the Eisenhower administration has set up 25 industrial divisions within the Commerce Department and has recruited a number of top-flight business experts to advise the Secretary on stockpiling and industrial mobilization in the event of attack.

The salaries of these private businessmen average from $25,000 to $75,000 a year. For nothing, Uncle Sam is getting the benefit of their experience and gray matter, and turning them into a trained manpower reserve corps which can be recalled to duty in Washington overnight, if any emergency arises.

These highly skilled executives, remaining on their company payrolls but completely divorced from their companies' business, serve full time in Washington on 6-month assignment.

AIM AT SETUP IN COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

At the end of that period, their capital chores assumed by a replacement, they return to their businesses much wiser in the ways of government, and Uncle Sam much wiser for their advice.

At present, 29 such executives are serving the Commerce Department. Thanks to the rotation program, 150 of them have completed the Washington stint and are ready, in the event of enemy attack, to throw their broadened knowledge into overnight mobilization of American industry.

With the aid of these skilled technicians, the Commerce Department has mapped out a mobilization plan that could immediately divert peacetime production to war material. It has stockpiled strategic materials. It knows exactly which segment of industry can undertake which wartime production stint with the least delay.

COUNTRY GAINS AND THEY LEARN

Senate Democrats sought vainly yesterday to bar these dollar-a-year men from any executive posts in Government. They aimed particularly at the Commerce setup, in which 15 or the 25 industrial divisions are headed by these payless experts.

Commerce officials argued, however, that few companies would be willing to lend high-salaried officials to the Government for 6 months unless the men are given some stature in the Department. They stressed that the alternative would be to accept underlings whose advice would mean little to the Government in this emergency.

As a sop to the Democrats, the administration agreed to an amendment barring these business executives from policymaking jobs. Commerce had nothing to lose by the gesture. The dollar-a-year men have never made policy, but simply advised.

With Vice President NIXON standing by in the event of a tie, the Republican amendment saving the program won out by a slim one-vote margin.

American businessmen can still come to Washington to serve their country—if they are willing to risk the possible villification.

The Coal Miners of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem written in testimony of the 115,000 miners who, over the years, have lost their lives in the coal industry. Their memory richly deserves this honor.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COAL MINER

(NOTE.—Over 115,000 heroes of our great American industrial front have lost their lives in the coal mines of this country. These brave Americans who died that our Nation might live—industrially, now sleep in unhonored graves over the coal fields of the United States, without any national honor, tribute, or memorial. Not even a

postage stamp has been issued as a tribute to these usung heroes.)

Deep, grave, thoughtful eyes
That daily face stark tragedy below;
The marks of suffering we are stamped there
By the years of hard toil do show.

'Twas a rockfall that got his buddy—
There—crushed, broken at his feet—gone!
A terrible explosion that took many others
Scenes his sad eyes have too oft' looked upon.

Blackened face and horny hands of honest toil,
His life he daily stakes against odds great
And carriers on, unheralded, unsung—oft misunderstood —
Only a poor miner gambling with cruel Fate!

In the pitch-black darkness of his world,
He thinks of wife's goodbye and baby's coo—
A big lump comes up in his throat at this,
If something should happen, what'd they do?

For shame that men of selfish, greedy minds
Would you dare to paint him the brute and knave;
He, their fellow man of God-given equal birth,
In this fair land that long freed the slave!

True, he plays no grandstand role in life,
But his importance is vital, great and just,
For without his toil in earth's caverns deep
Civilization would soon crumble into the dust.

—Vachel Davis, the coal miner artist.

Our Land and Water: Basic Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid essay entitled "Our Land and Water: Basic Resources," written by Mr. Jon Stuart Olson, of Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Jon Stuart Olson was the winner of a first-place award in the 12th annual conservation essay contest. His essay reveals mature understanding of the importance of planned conservation and utilization of our land and water resources. It is encouraging that young men like Mr. Olson are exhibiting a sincere and continuing interest in the conservation of our God-given resources. I encourage all Members of the Congress to read this essay. It reminds us of our responsibilities as legislators in developing sound conservation policies.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR LAND AND WATER: BASIC RESOURCES

(By Jon Stuart Olson)

I. Soil and water conservation are closely related to watersheds.

A. A good watershed is essential and is of primary importance.

B. We must be assured of having a good watershed in our locality.

II. Much is being done in the United States and Minnesota to conserve the soil.

A. The conservation program's origin began in 1907.

B. Legislation acted to set up bureaus.

C. Soil conservation districts aid in promotion of soil conservation.

D. Minnesota's resources must be carefully safeguarded.

III. Soil conservation and water control are interrelated.

A. The soil and water grant a priceless supply of life.

B. Erosion upsets the soil and water balance.

IV. Soil conservation is related to forest conservation.

A. Vital statistics serve as a warning.

B. Soil conservation affects the forest crop.

V. Soil conservation is closely related to wildlife conservation.

A. Soil promotes growth of plants for animal food.

B. Soil conservation affects the animal's habitate and common protection found in nature.

VI. Soil conservation directly affects outdoor recreation.

A. Better soil management influences recreational playgrounds.

B. Outdoorsmen find that conservation greatly affects their outdoor recreation.

"America is a nation of rich resources." How often we have heard this statement but have never given thought to the subject. The words perhaps stem from the early settlers on the New England coast who wanted to cultivate a new life in a nation where "soil was rich and waterways plentiful." This virgin country of outstanding fertility was destined to become our United States, and here we were to reap the crops and use the waterways for fishing and navigation. Perhaps the early pioneers of our country were completely overcome with the beauty and usefulness of our land and waterways. But did the land and waterways benefit from the actions of farmers, lumbermen, and fishermen? Are they benefiting today? Only too often we see people who take advantage of the numerous resources and yet unthinkingly show no concern in preserving their valuable sources of wealth. Does our greed and selfishness display our utter lack of appreciation for that which helped to build our Nation's success? Are our future resources safeguarded? Perhaps we have failed to develop a successful system for promoting and encouraging a basic and needed conservation program. Perhaps we have "milked" the resources of our country to near exhaustion. What can be done? Each one of us can help. First of all we must want to conserve our resources. No matter what problem, subject, or topic involved, unless we are interested we can be of no assistance or help. Without a definite interest, our opinions and ideas are of little value. Assuming that we have the required interest, we must then study the situation which is presented in the problem of conserving our land and waterways. The main idea, of course, is to use our resources intelligently—in such a way as to be assured of sufficient forests, lands, and water supplies to indefinitely serve future generations.

A well-developed watershed is of priceless importance and is essential in resource conservation. Therefore, it will be of definite value if we understand exactly what a watershed is and how it operates. "A watershed or drainage basin, is an area of land from which a stream gets its supply of water. The watershed may be a small farm or as large as several States." [1] A watershed functions like a blotter. The porous, spongy earth and the roots of trees and grass absorb the water from the rain. This aids in preventing and controlling floods. At the same time, the earth becomes richer and the trees and plants become healthier. Naturally, some of the water feeds the surface streams, and some seeps deep below the ground and feeds the underground streams. Thus, the underground streams are assured of a water supply which will feed the springs and insure the rivers to flow even in dry seasons. We can further understand the need of a good watershed when we see how necessary they are in controlling floods, retaining topsoil, encouraging plant growth, and promoting uniform streamflow.

Our communities must be assured of having good watersheds serve them. Often, we see cities and towns plagued by floods. We can trace the cause back to the watersheds. By examination, we can see that they were damaged by fire, incorrect crops, overgrazing, incorrect logging methods, or other opprobrious [2] measures. Of course, even well-sodded watersheds cannot prevent floods caused by extremely heavy rainfalls. However, even these watersheds do delay the water from reaching the streams and greatly reduce the amount of debris carried off by floodwaters. Our watersheds are under good management when the soil is spongy and the cover growth is thick. We benefit from the clear streams and good water which flow from such watersheds. We can more readily realize that by making wise use of our soil and waterways, watersheds increase in fertility and usefulness. A well-managed watershed promotes harmony in nature. The basic step in conserving resources should be the building up of a good watershed.

Only 48 years ago, in 1907, the modern conservation program had its start. President Theodore Roosevelt, in office at that time, said: "The conservation of our natural resources and their proper use constitute the fundamental problem of our national life." [3] Because of President Roosevelt's deep concern over conservation, he appointed an Inland Waterways Commission, and in 1908 he appointed a 50-member National Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission's first inventory was published in 1909.[4] It is interesting to note that the inventory called attention to the poor lumbering methods and the loss of soil fertility.

The legislature soon acted to set up several bureaus in order to eliminate waste. The Soil Conservation Service, Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Reclamation, Geological Survey, National Park Service, and the service of the Department of the Interior were among the important bureaus which were organized. It is the Soil Conservation Service with which we are basically interested. It is primarily responsible for land and water conservation.[5] The bureaus contribute definite conservation policies. However, we must remember that such a full-scale attempt to conserve resources is our problem as well as that of the bureaus. Without our cooperation, these bureaus are of little value.

Soil conservation districts are a valuable asset. On February 26, 1937, Franklin D. Roosevelt suggested to the State governors that they encourage the State legislatures to pass laws enabling landowners to join in soil conservation districts. All State legislatures, including Alaska and Hawaii, had passed such a law by 1947. By July 1, 1952, 2,443 soil conservation districts were organized.[6] They covered 84 percent of America's farmland. In Minnesota we have 69 soil conservation districts which cover areas where wind erosion is a problem.[7] In these districts the people formulate their own soil conservation program, which is governed by local cities.

Such a program is a great step in promoting soil conseravtion and offers every person a chance to participate in a soil conservation program. "Each person should take an active interest in conservation groups, clubs, and committees." [8] Through our actions, we reveal our seriousness and willingness to take part in major movements to conserve resources. It is inspiring and encour-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

aging to know that we have dedicated individuals who serve wholeheartedly in promoting conservation. Let their efforts be shining examples for others to follow!

We in the State of Minnesota, must safeguard our resources. Minnesota has 80,009 square miles of land and 4,059 square miles of inland water.[9] Such a tremendous area requires our utmost support in resource conservation. Great strides have been made in our State in organizing programs for conserving the soil. Watershed projects, topographic mapping, forestry operations, tree planting, State park systems, conservation education, youth groups, essay contests, and sportmen's clubs all contribute in promoting fundamental principles of soil conservation. By actively participating in one of the countless conservation programs, we will be automatically aiding our State in safeguarding its resources.

All life and all United States riches stem from water and soil. They grant our country's prosperity.

"No food without plants and animals.
"No trees without soil and water.
"No furs and wools without animals.
"No animals without plants.

"No plants without soil and water."[10] Problems of water use and control are intimately interwoven with the use and abuse of land."[11] We can readily see that both soil and water are inseparably linked, and one will be acutely damaged if the other is unwisely used.

A great problem today is the gully erosion which plagues our fields and consumes our topsoil. "Another century of uncontrolled soil erosion might reduce the acreage of productive soil to a point where the land could not feed well our present population."[12] What a startling warning this offers and what a challenge to prevent this prediction from coming into reality! However, by proper use and protection of every acre of land, we can prevent it. By employing crop rotation, terracing fields to catch rain water, plowing in parallel terraces (contour plowing), alternating plowed land and seeded fields (strip-cropping), and by starting vegetation growth in gullies, we can ward off depleted soil and exhausted waterways. Crops will then thrive, waters flow clear and steady, and water and soil will be linked in harmony.

Our forests and the soil work hand in hand to safeguard our country. By conserving the soil, we encourage forest growth. Likewise, when we protect plants and trees, we guard against soil erosion. If we disregard forest conservation, erosion results and the topsoil is carried away. We lose over a thousand million dollars worth of topsoil yearly. It is this top 6 inches of soil that gives us the productiveness on which the very lives of plants and trees depend. This 6-inch layer takes 3,600 years to be formed, and it can be ruined in 20–40 years. If we continue our wasteful methods, we will lose the greatest source of wealth in our country—soil productivity.

If we were to take no interest in soil conservation, we would automatically take no interest in forest conservation. The security of one depends on the prosperity of the other. If we carelessly exhaust the soil and pay no attention to preserving it, how can we expect the trees to grow? Lumber industries would deeply suffer with no trees. No more homes, paper, furniture, or paints could be obtained without forest crops. We must preserve the soil to be assured of lumber products.

Ever since the beginning of time, most forms of wildlife have used plant growth as a source of food. Bark, berries, and roots fill the animals with life-giving nourishment. However, if the soil is sick, we cannot expect the animals to be healthy. Plants which are raised on deficient soils have poor feeding value for animals.

Forests provide protection for wildlife. Here they have cover to hide and raise their young. When we practice soil conservation, we help to sustain plant growth which wild animals take advantage of. We realize this when we recall that very few birds ever nest in barren fields. Therefore, we must conserve the soil, so nature's balance will be uniform and the wildlife will equally prosper from abundance of food and protection.

It would be discouraging to swim in muddy water and picnic in dusty, barren parks. Such would be the result if we disregarded soil conservation. Our outdoor recreation would be an unpleasant affair rather than an appealing enjoyment.

Hunters today should appreciate their sources of happiness. Wildlife supports hunting interests and clear, fresh water makes boating and fishing both fun and interesting. This we credit to good soil management.

America has always been deeply concerned over bettering and insuring happiness and success for the succeeding generations. Certainly, by pledging ourselves to heeding resource conservation, we can better further the welfare of these coming citizens. Each person should feel it his duty to pledge, "I give my pledge as an American to save and faithfully defend from waste the natural resources of my country—its soil and minerals, its forests, waters, and wildlife."

Governor Freeman has said, "In discussing conservation one quickly discovers that there are no easy answers to the questions that are asked, or solutions to the difficulties that are pointed out. However, practically everyone understands that our natural resources are all interrelated." Perhaps there is only one answer. Only when everyone earnestly strives to improve resource conditions will the problems be solved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold, Joseph I., Challenges to American Youth, Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson and Co., 1946.

Butler, Ovid, American Conservation, Washington, D. C., American Forestry Association, 1937.

Caldwell, Bailey, and Watkins, Our Land and Our Living, Syracuse, N. Y., L. W. Singer Co., 1947.

Chase, Stuart, Rich Land, Poor Land, New York, Whittlesey House, 1936.

Encyclopedia Americana, New York and Chicago, American Corp., 1951 edition, volume 7, pages 546d–546e.

Freeman, Orville L., Minnesota's Conservation Problems, Conservation Volunteer, volume 18, pages 1 and 2, January–February 1955.

Gustafson, Axel, Conservation in the United States, Comstock Publishing Co., 1949.

Hovland, Dwight, and Burson, Paul M., Better Soils for Better Living, Conservation Volunteer, volume 17, pages 2–6, September–October 1954.

Kauffman, Erle, the Conservation Yearbook for 1954, Baltimore, Md., Monumental Printing Co., 1954.

Know Your Watersheds, Washington, D. C., United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, 1953.

Lord, Russell, Behold Our Land, Boston, Mass., Houghton Mifflin Co., 1938.

———, To Hold This Soil, United States Department of Agriculture, August 1938.

Mitchell, Bowman, and Phelps, My Country 'Tis of Thee, New York, N. Y., Macmillan Co., 1940.

Nation Looks at Its Resources, The, Washington, D. C., Resources of the Future, November 1954.

Robert, William A., Our Mineral Wealth, Conservation Volunteer, volume 17, page 21, May–June 1954.

Soil Conservation, New York, the Garden Club of America, Conservation Commission, page 2, 1953.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] Know Your Watersheds, p. 2, 1953.
[2] Abusive.
[3] The Encyclopedia Americana, vol. 7, p. 546d.
[4] Ibid., p. 546d.
[5] Ibid., p. 546e.
[6] Erle Kauffman, the Conservation Yearbook for 1954, p. 95.
[7] Orville L. Freeman, Minnesota's Conservation Problems, The Conservation Volunteer, 18:6, January–February 1955.
[8] Nicholas J. Faymoville, 205 Gloucester Road, Minneapolis (from a personal interview).
[9] Kauffman, op. cit., p. 86.
[10] Soil Conservation, p. 2, 1953.
[11] Ovid Butler, American Conservation, p. 120.
[12] Axel Gustafson, Conservation in the United States, p. 149.

The Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two thoughtful editorials concerning the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. One editorial is from the Charlotte Observer of July 2, 1955, and the other from the Rocky Mount Telegram of July 15, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer of July 2, 1955]

OTHER INDUSTRIES ARE BETTER ABLE THAN TEXTILES TO AID JAP MARKET

The importation of Japanese textiles into the United States had already begun to hurt the American industry before the reduction in tariffs was ordered last month.

These cuts, amounting in some cases to as much as 48 percent, are due to go into effect in September. If imports from Japan are already causing trouble to the American mills, much greater difficulties can be expected in the future.

The textile industry is one of those that can least afford to be hurt, that have the smallest margin for making sacrifices to help keep Japan out of the hands of Communists.

It is one of the very few industries in the United States in this period of booming business that is suffering from chronic unemployment. While almost all other industries are expanding and pushing for greater production, we in the South know that within 20 miles of Charlotte textile mills are in trouble.

Our difficulty is not nearly as bad as conditions in the New England textile industry. The slowdown is nationwide in textiles.

If, therefore, some branch of the American economy had to make sacrifices to give Japan a market and thus keep her from trading with Communist China, why does this sacrifice have to be exacted from an industry that is having a hard time as it is?

Japan is now exporting a billion and a quarter square yards of cotton textiles a year, or more than the United States and Great Britain combined.

Her textile industry is not suffering. It pays its workers just about one-tenth as much as the American textile employee gets, and yet it has machinery fully as modern as ours.

It got that machinery as a gift from the United States. During the war a large part of the Japanese industry was bombed out. The obsolete machinery was blown up. After the war it was replaced through our foreign-aid program with the latest machines available.

So Japan, for free, got a modernized textile industry able to compete with any in the world. That she is now the largest exporter of cotton textiles shows the result.

If, with this new, modern machinery she pays her workers only one-tenth as much as the American worker gets, it can easily be seen that the competition now is between the Japanese worker and the American worker, with all the advantage on the side of the former.

One of two results can be foreseen: either we cut our textile workers' wages and freeze a lower standard of living, or our industry will push automation at such a feverish rate that many workers will be put out of jobs before they can readjust to the new system.

A recent study by Northwestern University shows that textile workers find it especially difficult to get into other industries if they lose employment in textiles. Their skills are not adaptable to other jobs.

Automation in the long run does not result in a general loss of employment if it is brought in gradually to give the workers time to adjust themselves to it. This tariff cut, however, may force our textile industry to push automation too fast and thus cause unnecessary unemployment during the period of transition.

[From the Rocky Mount (N. C.) Evening Telegram of July 15, 1955]

OUR THROAT IS BEING CUT

This newspaper heartily endorses the Governor's plan to study the effect on North Carolina's economy of lower tariffs on Japanese textile goods.

There is no doubt in our mind that a study will quickly indicate that an avalanche of cheap Japanese textiles into this country will be disastrous for the State's cottongrowers, textile industries, and textile workers.

The scheduled study is the first necessary step on which the State can base vigorous action in Washington. Since the proposed tariff slashes are scheduled to take effect on September 10, there isn't a minute to lose if the threatened economic catastrophe is to be headed off.

We don't like the role of an alarmist, but this is precisely the time to be alarmed.

Spencer Love, chairman of the board of Burlington Industries, Inc., the world's largest textile company with its industry centered in North Carolina, recently warned that Burlington Mills would consider shutting down its domestic mills and buying unfinished cloth from Japan if the proposed tariff cuts go through. Indeed, what choice will he and other textile officials have but to buy the cheaper Japanese cloth? The consumer, after all, is going to buy the cheapest goods he can find.

If lowered tariffs make it impossible for North Carolina textile mills to operate profitably in competition with cheaper Asiatic labor, and companies like Burlington become mere jobbers who purchase their cloth abroad and ship it duty free into the United States, it could be the end of one of the principal industries of North Carolina, and indeed in the whole Nation. It would certainly be a disastrous blow to the Rocky Mount area with its splendid textile industry.

Historians will search a long time to find a greater example of insanity and economic suicide than that embodied in the recent State Department policy of sabotaging the United States textile industry. What we've done is to give modern textile machinery to Japan (paid for, of course, by United States taxpayers) which in turn will be used by cheap Oriental labor to destroy a large segment of the American economy and the livelihood of literally millions of American taxpayers. That is just what the Eisenhower administration now proposes.

The fact that 80 percent of the threatened textile industry is in the South makes one wonder if the Republicans, dominated by northern industrialists are not out to pull an economic Gettysburg on the South just as it is getting on its feet and competing with them.

Southern textile leaders frankly say the textile industry so vital to southern economy is doomed if Japanese goods, produced by labor paid only one-tenth of the American wage, flood the country.

A. K. Winget, of American and Efird Mills, Albemarle, and president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, warns: "It is my considered opinion that, if something is not done, we shall see in our lifetime a transfer of the American cotton-mill industry to Japan."

As we have said so often before, trade, not aid is the sensible solution to our international economic problems. Yet, it makes no sense for the Eisenhower administration to protect northern industries and make the South bear the entire brunt of competing with cheaper foreign labor.

The time is now past when the South can be treated as an economic colony of the Nation. Southern leaders ought to bestir themselves before it is too late. We don't have to submit to having our throat cut.

Address by Dr. Foster C. Nix, Director of Research of Edison Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Foster C. Nix, director of research of the Edison Industries, before the graduating class of Indiana Technical College on May 22, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Fruechtenicht, President Keene, members of the board of directors, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a great privilege to be invited to address this distinguished body. I have selected as a message to you some thoughts on a subject which I believe is uppermost in the minds of graduating technical students; that is, the role of scientific research and development in the growth of American industry.

Through the centuries of history, technical advances have come about through man's curiosity to understand the nature of the physical world in which he lives. Frequently the particular direction of his inquiry—be it purely scientific, i. e., a desire to push back the frontiers of knowledge, or to develop useful articles to be used by man—was dictated by the needs of the society in which he lived. In many instances they were stimulated by the needs of warfare, as illustrated by many of the inventions of Leonardo di Vinci, and by diverse needs of commerce. In most instances down to the present century, the inventors were individuals—in most cases, dedicated individuals. We can recall the products of many such—the steam engine which revolutionized transportation both on land and on sea; the sequence of purely theoretical investigations concerning the nature of electromagnetic phenomena, including light by Clerk Maxwell soon followed by the attempts to test the Maxwell equations with electromagnetic waves longer than light waves by Hertz. This basic fundamental groundwork led Marconi to the most important invention—radio.

I need not continue to relate many such great inventions in order to illustrate the point that they invariably evolved in their scientific progress from individual to individual and frequently culminated in a great invention by a single individual. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that, in most cases, they were based on a firm scientific foundation created by the scientific inquiries of many people.

An excellent example of a basic invention that was followed by other fundamental inventions, which can be looked upon as a radical modification of the original one, is illustrated by the carbon filament incandescent lamp by Thomas Edison. This was followed by the excellent work of Langmuir on the nature of absorbed gases on surfaces, leading us to a knowledge of the means of producing high vacua. Concurrently with Langmuir's investigations, Coolidge discovered a means of producing ductile tungsten. This series of developments led to the modern incandescent lamp containing a tungsten filament.

With the turn of this century, beginning in the large and rapidly growing chemical industry in Germany and with Edison in this country, the individual research worker began to gather teams of coworkers to assist in a broader attack on scientific problems. Such men as Edison possessed many more ideas than they could possibly explore with their own hands in the laboratory. In Edison's case he employed assistants whose duty it was to carry out his ideas. At this time there began to be felt the need for research departments to not only improve existing commercial products, but also to create new ones. This early beginning of organized industrial research evolved rapidly through the years to the pattern now commonly found in many modern progressive industries.

In most industrial laboratories the director of research, as we now call him, is chiefly an administrator. He needs to have a good scientific training and experience in the execution of creative research, and most important, the ability to gather around him a well-balanced team. The team should consist of senior, mature scientists and engineers, scientists of junior rank with comparable training but less experience, as well as technicians to carry out the more humdrum work—a necessary part of any research program. In this modern laboratory, the original creative ideas most frequently arise in the minds of the scientists—both of the senior and junior ranks.

The early inventor usually financed himself or occasionally was fortunate enough to be blessed with an "angel" as a backer—a terminology I am borrowing from the theater. In contrast with this type of difficult and uncertain financial support, the modern research laboratory receives its monetary backing from the central company treasury where it is considered a part of its normal operating expenses. The reseach and development laboratory is looked upon as an integral part of the company structure.

Before passing on to my main theme—the role of scientific research and development in the growth of American industry—I wish to point up some highlights to indicate the

manner in which scientific inquiry evolves step by step, finally culminating in useful articles of commerce. I shall take my illustrations from the field known today as electronics.

While Edison was studying the behavior of carbon filaments, he observed that charged particles literally boiled out of the filament, i. e., in modern terminology, thermionic emission, and known as the Edison effect. This basic scientific discovery led deForrest to the invention of the famous triode or, as it is more logically called by our British cousins, an electronic valve. This again was only made possible by the basic work of Langmuir on the production of high vacua. These sequences of discoveries led to the vacuum tube, making possible television, radio, and all forms of modern communications.

The evolution of scientific and technical progress, beginning with a basic scientific discovery, followed rapidly to its useful application by a team of scientific researchers and engineers in a large modern research laboratory can be illustrated by the case of the electronic device known as a transitor.

A team of theoretical and experimental physicists was formed in the Bell Telephone Laboratories to study the basic properties of semiconductors. It was thought that such materials possessed properties which might be of great interest to the science of communications—a field of obvious interest to the Bell System. These scientists had no assignment other than to learn more about the nature of the class of substances known as semiconductors. John Bardeen, a theoretical physicist of prominence and a member of this team, proposed some concepts of so-called surface-states of electrons in a semiconductor known as germanium. In order to test these ideas experimentally, his colleague Walter Brattian conceived experiments which were thought suitable for such a test. In addition to proving Bardeen's theoretical conception of the surface-states, they observed that the three electrode configuration used in this experiment acted as an amplifier or a valve. This fine team contained in addition to physicists, metallurgists and physical chemists. It took the combined efforts of this group to achieve the transitor as we know it today. Following this group of basic scientists, the engineers then began to play their very vital role of finding uses for the transistor and to study its characteristics as applied to electronic circuity. This great discovery and invention is now rapidly forming the basis of a new industry and will undoubtedly displace a great many of the standard vacuum tubes now used in the electronics industry and will unquestionably permit many other useful devices to be made which were not practical with the classical vacuum tube.

The few examples I have just given demonstrate the tremendous part that large, well-developed industrial laboratories play in our economic life. They have also proven themselves to be of indispensable value in time of warfare where they were again able to bring to bear a well developed and coordinated group to solve new problems. We need only to recall the role of these labortories in the research and development of radar and sonar, so widely used in submarine detection in World War II, and in atom bomb projects, to appreciate the great impact these well-directed industrial teams make on our social and economic life.

I am not predicting the passing from the scene of the lone industrial inventor in demonstrating the value of well-organized scientific teams, but we must face the fact realistically that it is becoming more and more difficult for them to make a substantial contribution in our more advanced and complex industrial structure.

If one looks at the growth of our gross national product it is interesting to observe that it increased substantially along with our population growth until a point somewhere in the early thirties at which time it began to rise substantially faster than the increase in population. I feel that this is not a coincidence. This also marks the point where the fruits of the labors of the ever increasing number of industrial laboratories began to make themselves felt in our economic life. Well-organized industrial laboratories have in general been limited to our country and to Germany, whereas most of Western Europe, including England, have to date not possessed many industrial laboratories. The value for the year 1953 of our gross national product per capita was $2,255 whereas for free Western Europe it was substantially less, namely, $577. Our expenditures for industrial research have increased very substantially over the last 25 years: in 1930 they were approximately $200 million; by 1940, $350 million, and by 1953 they had arisen to $1,430,000,000. The total expenditures for 1953, including governmental, were approximately $3½ billion. It is estimated that total research expenditures for 1975 will be approximately $10 billion.

In recent years the rate of growth for research expenditures has been approximately 11 percent per year. Most industrial companies, active in the chemical and electrical fields, spend approximately 3 percent of their gross sales for research and development. In some areas, such as instrumentation, it will rise as high as 10 percent whereas in the pharmaceutical field it is frequently as high as 15 percent of their gross sales.

One has only to recall a few areas with which we are all thoroughly familiar to recognize the number of the products sold by many American companies which have been created exclusively in the last 20 years. In the pharmaceutical field we can remember the famous wonder drugs such as penicillin, streptomycin, etc., which were unknown before World War II. Some of the large companies such as DuPoint estimate that as many as 60 percent of their products were developed in the last 20 years.

I sincerely feel that the basic progress made in our society must be essentially based upon the increasing and efficient use of our manpower and only by such efforts will man lighten his burden and shorten his work hours, while in the same process increase his overall economic good health. The fruits of the labors of the scientists and engineers in our great industrial laboratories contribute materially to this increasing national wealth. Many products of our pharmaceutical companies, such as the antibiotics and other drugs, are already winning the battle over some of our devastating diseases, thereby giving the assurance of greater life expectancy to our peoples. The increasing life span resulting in part from eliminating or at least diminishing the ravaging effects of these diseases, naturally introduces other complications into our society such as the large increase in the number of people past the normal retirement age of 65. This will in time require a reevaluation of our concept of the industrial usefulness of the average employee and will doubtless give rise to revised retirement plans in the not too distant future.

In the foregoing, I have attempted to illustrate some of the methods and procedures found effective in the conduct of research in our modern industrial laboratories and to illustrate the yielding with the years of the lone inventor to these modern effective scientific and engineering teams. I think you, as fresh graduates entering our industrial world, should look forward with much pleasure and anticipation to participating in the creation and growth of many new and unpredictable developments in the future. You will indeed be the fortunate ones to be a party to the application of atomic energy to our economic life and to assist in the further development of this interesting electronic field called the transistor which I have already discussed. You will be able to contribute to the many and varied uses of the large computing machines now being found so successful in the solution of many of our difficult and complex mathematical problems associated with long-range weather forecasting, guided missiles, as well as many problems met in our industrial and economic life.

Many of our citizens look upon this period in the middle 20th century as one of unrest and uncertainties. Many of them look longingly back to the placid epoch called the Victorian period. I find myself in disagreement with these friends of mine and feel that we who are living in this era are very fortunate indeed in being able to participate in an extremely stimulating and challenging period of our growth. You, as scientists and engineers, will become active members in groups that will give rise to new developments for the future which I am sure you will find extremely stimulating and enriching. I feel confident that you will share my feeling that we are all indeed privileged to be living in an era where our scientific talents can be applied toward increasing our economic well-being as well as contributing to the philosophical and cultural enrichment of our society.

Korean War Prisoner Veterans Entitled to Monetary Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it might be well to publicize the fact that quite a number of Korean veterans who were prisoners of war and who would be entitled to monetary benefits under the provisions of Public Law 615, enacted in the 83d Congres, have not applied for benefits. As a matter of fact, the former Claims Settlement Commission has been unable to locate a substantial number of the Korean veterans, and I am including herewith a list of those veterans and their serial numbers in the hope that through the publicity afforded by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of them may be alerted to the fact that there is a deadline for the filing of an application for the benefits provided under this act.

Applications must be postmarked on or before midnight, August 21, 1955, as required by existing law.

These veterans would be entitled to payment at the rate of $2.50 per day for each day they were in prison. I might add that those members of the United States Armed Forces who are still prisoners of war as a result of Korean hostilities would be eligible to file their claims within 1 year after returning to American military control. In the case of survivors of prisoners of war who have not returned to the jurisdiction of the United States Armed Forces, such survivors may file claims not more than 1 year from the date that the Defense Department determines that the pris-

oners of war actually died or was presumed to be dead.

Here, then, as of June 30, 1955, is the list of Korean prisoners of war whose addresses are unknown to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, who are entitled to these benefits. I sincerely hope that the list will have wide publication because these men are deserving of these benefits for the service they rendered.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNSOLICITED KOREAN POW'S ADDRESSES UNKNOWN TO FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION, JUNE, 30, 1955

Acevedo, Francisco, US 50107130.
Agustynovich, Stephan, US 15219105.
Allen, Taggett, RA 15421724.
Auman, Neil C., Pvt. 2, US 52274157.
Ball, Joe L., US 53026595.
Bancroft, Russell J., Pvt. 2, RA 16320729.
Blair, Rovert L., ER 55021425.
Boyden, Melvin, Pfc. RA 13355354.
Bradley, George W., RA 13306767.
Brown, Johnnie C., Sfc., RA 14291360.
Burns, Peter J., Pfc. ER 42200296.
Bruner, Joseph M., RA 18279404.
Cerino, Joseph Jr., RA 12312845.
Dean, Ercel W., Sgt., RA 15282501.
Di Gardi, Anton, RA 21936768.
Dutro, Darrell W., O–1997521.
Enoki, Ted T., RA 10735192.
Escobar, Torres Vic., RA 30432249.
Fernandez, Joseph, RA 33559586.
Fitzgerald, William, RA 20219234.
Gibson, Maxie L., Pvt., RA 14314631.
Garrison, Herbert D., RA 16307477.
Gifford, Allen J., RA 13282225.
Gilardi, Robert W., O21766.
Gonzales, John, RA 19332137.
Good, Vernon L., RA 16302082.
Goodburlet, Raymond, RA 12283162.
Gouin, Phillip A., RA 16315443.
Grailales, Nueves, US 50114497.
Greenwood, Charles, RA 12349405.
Grizzard, Lewis, O–2008593.
Groulx, George E., RA 19032085.
Groyum, Elden F., 407127.
Guynn, John E., RA 35902554.
Hamilton, Raymond L., RA 16323889.
Harris, Charles L., RA 44104771.
Heffler, Kenneth J., RA 18275585.
Hicks, Joseph E., O–2208560.
Higgins, John H., O–1048407.
Holley, Freddie, RA 15274722.
Holmes, Roy E., RA 14291279.
Huffner, Robert A., RA 15419699.
Hughes, Melvin D., RA 13333238.
Hunter, Carson, RA 16254447.
Huntley, Robert M., RA 06558601.
Irizarry Jose B., ER 30430402.
Jackson, Warren F., RA 13282069.
James, Davis E., RA 35759615.
Kastuch, Joseph J., ER 06933367.
Key, Joseph E., RA 33379856.
Locke, William S., 12453A.
Lovett, John M., RA 20246176.
Lyda, Gedion P., Jr., 54065042.
Marsh, Harold L., RA 06919920.
Martin, John E., RA 16322959.
McMillan, George, RA 12326889.
Melsness, Earl W., RA 16282172.
Montejano, Edward, NG 28127358.
Moreland, Harry D., O–0555419.
Mueller, Herbert, RA 16316790.
Naranjo, Pete D., RA 19314062.
Nolan, Lawrence T., RA 12319287.
North, Charles R., RA 15415785.
Nunnery, Edward D., ER 14260535.
Obrien, William F., RA 14285858.
Paillette, Ted Eugene, 4237278.
Paruolo, Salvatore R., 652045.
Patterson, Joseph H., RA 52033759.
Pickett, Herbert L., RA 16620A.
Pizzamiglio, Edward, RA 26333377.
Potts, Hubert W., O–2014804.
Pritchett, Alexander, RA 13344545.
Purser, Trenton E., RA 14291324.
Quentin, Rudy S., RA 19364440.
Radcliff, Warner R., RA 13347491.
Raines, Earl L., RA 15413103.
Ransier, James H., ER 57149266.
Rockett, Edward M., 058504.
Schairb, George D., RA 15271296.
Sarnowski, Francis, RA 13285991.
Scott, Howard, 226403.
Seger Jake L. Pvt., 1151464.
Smith, Robert Pfc., RA 15274357.
Sugrue, Daniel, US 51063967.
Sweet, Richard L., RA 18260543.
Tamura, Akira, RA 37714253.
Thompson, Jackie R., RA 18315371.
Thompson, Paul W., RA 11166974.
Triplett, James, RA 13322265.
Trollope, Harry B., O–1688430.
Truscott David J., RA 16284907.
Walter, Arthur E., US 53001801.
Warren, Edgar O., Pvt. 2, RA 15294163.
Warrington, John M., RA 14313938.
Wayland, John N. RA 13321136.
Webb, Marvin J., RA 19346846.
Wetmore, Carl E., RA 15260289.
Whirley, Bobby G., 1324900.
White, John P. Pfc., 1234100.
Wiese Eugene A., RA 46082739.
Wildinson, Joseph M., RA 13328571.
Williams, Victor K., RA 17255863.
Willis, Jack J., RA 16303934.
Wilson, Theodore R., RA 15214004.
Wilson Winston W., RA 14005329.
Wolfe, Raymond E., ER 52031455.
Wright, Kenneth R., RA 15379133.
Ywung, Gerald R. Cpl. RA 18271945.

The Guiding Genius of Bob and Helen Coar

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 20, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, I have a special reason for appreciating the fine work of Bob and Helen Coar. They have cooperated with me as though I had been here for years. Each time I have worked in front of the camera or a microphone, either Bob or Helen Coar have offered those little suggestions in format that do so much to help improve our reports to our constituents.

I feel certain that the American people are better informed about the workings of their Government because of the devoted and imaginative work of the Coars in operating an efficient Joint Senate and House Recording Facility.

Working with the Coars is a staff of proficient technicians who are always racing with the Members against a deadline. By some miraculous feat the Coars and their staff always managed to get a film or tape-recording made on time.

Such good professional standards and cooperative spirit are a welcome thing for any new Member of Congress to find. It means that even the youngest Member can begin his duties on Capitol Hill confident that he can communicate to the people of his community hundreds of miles from Washington with the most advanced techniques of television and radio at his disposal.

And making this possible has been the guiding genius of Bob and Helen Coar, as much a helpful counselor to a new Member as to our senior colleagues.

Georgia Supreme Court Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 13, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the strained efforts of the Supreme Court of the United States to palm off the views of its members on the public as being the law of the land have caused that Court to do some peculiar things.

Its members have trifled with the Constitution. They have attempted to usurp legislative functions which they do not posses. They have attempted to amend the Constitution in effect, a right and a function which belongs to the States and to Congress. They have attempted to change the laws. A right and function which belongs to Congress alone. In its efforts to override the rights of the sovereign States, the Federal Supreme Court has run squarely into one roadblock. The Supreme Court of Georgia, in a unanimous opinion, written by Chief Justice Duckworth of the court, flatly and courageously stated that it would not surrender sovereign powers of the State of Georgia. Justice Duckworth and the Georgia Supreme Court deserve commendation and thanks of the people for the stand they have taken. The case in which the opinion was rendered is the case of Williams against the State, No. 18548, and the opinion of the court is as follows:

NO. 18548. WILLIAMS *v.* THE STATE

Duckworth, Chief Justice: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." (Constitution of the United States, 10th amendment; Code 1–810.) Even though executives and legislators, not being constitutional lawyers, might often overstep the foregoing unambiguous constitutional prohibition of Federal invasion of State jurisdiction, there can never be an acceptable excuse for judicial failure to strictly observe it. This court bows to the Supreme Court on all Federal questions of law but we will not supinely surrender sovereign powers of this State. In this case the opinion of the majority of that court recognizes that this court decided the case according to established rules of law and that no Federal jurisdiction existed which would authorize that court to render a judgment either affirming or reversing the judgment of this court, which are the only judgments by that court that this court can constitutionally recognize.

The Supreme Court undertakes to remand the case for further consideration and in their opinion have pointed to Georgia law vesting in the trial judge discretion in ruling upon an extraordinary motion for new trial and apparently concluded therefrom that this court should reverse the trial court because that discretion was not exercised in the way the Supreme Court would have exercised it. We know and respect the uni-

versally recognized rule that the exercise of discretion never authorizes a violation or defiance of law. In this case, as pointed out by us, that law is that the question sought to be raised must be raised before trial and not otherwise.

Not in recognition of any jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to influence or in any manner to interfere with the functioning of this court on strictly State questions, but solely for the purpose of completing the record in this court in a case that was first decided by us in 1953, and to avoid further delay, we state that our opinion in *Williams* v. *State* (210 Ga. 665 (82 S. E. 2d 217)), is supported by sound and unchallenged law, conforms with the State and Federal Constitutions, and stands as the judgment of all seven of the justices of this court.

Judgment of affirmance rendered May 10, 1954, adhered to. All the justices concur.

The Metropolitan Herald, published in Atlanta, Ga., has editorially commented upon the forthright action of the Georgia State Supreme Court. In my opinion, this editorial comment deserves to be brought to the attention of the Congress and the people of the country. I join the editor in the pride and appreciation he expresses regarding our State Supreme Court and I include the editorial herewith as a part of these remarks:

GEORGIA SUPREME COURT SPEAKS OUT

In one of the sharpest criticisms directed toward the United States Supreme Court in recent years, the Georgia Supreme Court last weekend warned the Federal tribunal that it would "not supinely surrender sovereign powers of this State" to the Federal courts.

In a unanimous decision, the Georgia court denied an extraordinary motion for a new trial to Aubrey Lee Williams, who had been found guilty of first degree murder and rebuked the United States Supreme Court for its opinion in remanding the case back to the Georgia court for "further consideration" after the Georgia Supreme Court had refused to order a new trial.

The opinion of the Georgia court quoted from the Constitution of the United States that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Chief Justice Duckworth, in the opinion, wrote:

"Even though executives and legislators, not being constitutional lawyers, might often overstep the foregoing unambiguous constitutional prohibition of Federal invasion of State jurisdiction, there can never be an acceptable excuse for judicial failure to strictly observe it.

"This court bows to the Supreme Court on all Federal matters of law, but we will not supinely surrender sovereign powers of this State."

This should be ample and clear warning of where the Supreme Court of Georgia stands in this grave matter. It is a forceful and forthright statement.

It might be well to point out that in recent years there has been a growing tendency of even the lowest Federal courts to set aside rulings by the supreme courts of the various States in matters not involving Federal affairs. It reached such proportions that last year the chief justices of the supreme courts of the several States took note of this highly questionable constitutional procedure by the Federal courts.

The Georgia court has spoken out wisely and without reservation and the people of Georgia are proud of their stand. We need more such forthright justices on the benches of our highest courts and we need such constitutional authorities on the United States Supreme Court.

Summary of the Program of the National Historical Publications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission, I am privileged to lay before the House a brief summary of its current program:

SUMMARY OF THE PROGRAM OF THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

A knowledge of their history is of great importance to a free people who are determined to preserve their liberties and their democratic institutions. Congress has created an agency that is charged with important responsibilities regarding the history of our country. This agency is the National Historical Publications Commission, which is composed of representatives of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government and of the historical profession. I have the great honor to represent the House of Representatives on this Commission, and I should like to report to you at this time on what it is doing.

The Commission is not engaged in writing history. Its function, rather, is to help preserve and make known by publication and otherwise, the documents that are basic to a knowledge and understanding of our national development—the raw materials from which history is written.

After extensive consultation with many persons throughout the country, the Commission has submitted to the President of the United States a report on a national program for the publication of historical documents. This outlines a comprehensive program for the preservation and the selective publication of documents that deal with the political, agricultural, industrial, scientific, technological, religious, and other important aspects of the history of the United States. All sections of our country and all periods of its history are covered, but emphasis is placed on the early years of our existence as a free and independent Nation.

One part of the proposed program would be the publication—by microfilm as well as by the printing press—of the correspondence, speeches, and other papers of individuals in the United States who have been leaders in many varied fields of activity. The Commission lists the names of more than 300 persons whose papers have been brought to its attention for possible inclusion in a publication program, and it provides some detailed information about more than 100 of these and the location of their papers. Another part of the program would deal with documents selected because of their relationship to important developments or significant events rather than to particular individuals. Such, for example, would be documents on the establishment of government under the Constitution, Indian relations, public-land policy, the westward movement of population, and the growth of a national transportation system.

The Commission feels that the program should be carried out objectively and impartially, free from partisan bias, and without racial, religious, or other prejudice. It should be flexible. It should be undertaken cooperatively, participated in by many colleges and universities, historical societies, libraries, State and Federal agencies, and individuals.

Already, under various auspices, several projects for the collection and publication of papers within the broad framework of the program have been established. Among them are projects for publishing the papers of the following: John, John Quincy, and Charles Francis Adams, by the Massachusetts Historical Society, Harvard University, the Adams Manuscript Trust, and Life Magazine; Bishop Francis Asbury, by the Association of Methodists Historical Societies; Archbishop John Carroll, by the American Catholic Historical Association; John C. Calhoun, by the University of South Carolina, Clemson College, and the South Carolina Archives Department; Henry Clay, by the University of Kentucky; Benjamin Franklin, by Yale University and the American Philosophical Society; and Alexander Hamilton, by Columbia University. Plans are also well advanced for the publication of the papers of James Madison. Copies of the papers of John Marshall are being assembled by a group representing the Cincinnati Bar Association and the Law School of the University of Cincinnati. Copies of the papers of James Monroe are being assembled at the University of Virginia. The National Archives, with which the Commission is closely associated, is undertaking the microfilm publication of the official records of the Continental Congress, which was the governing body for the United States during and immediately following the American Revolution. The Commission itself is collecting papers which throw light on two of the most important events in our history—the ratification of the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and the work of the First Congress under the Constitution.

A program such as that outlined in the Commission's report was envisioned by President Truman in 1950. On the occasion of the publication at Princeton University of the first volume of a comprehensive edition of the papers of Thomas Jefferson, he said that there was need also to collect and publish the papers of other persons "who have made major contributions to the development of our democracy," and he requested the National Historical Publications Commission to look into this matter and report thereon. President Eisenhower has stated that the fulfillment of the program set forth in the Commission's report would be of lasting benefit to all Americans; that it is through the publication of the source materials of our history "that we will be reminded of the real wellsprings of our national strength."

As you see, the National Historical Publications Commission is making excellent progress and deserves, I think, the continuing support of Congress, the States, and the people of our country.

Twenty Years of Public Service

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure I join my colleagues in congratulating Bob and Helen Coar on their 20th anniversary of outstanding service to Members of the House and Senate.

The radio, film, and television facilities are run so smoothly and efficiently by Bob and Helen I suppose once in a while some of us are apt to take for granted their excellent service and perhaps overlook for the moment the tremendous amount of work and thought they have contributed throughout the years in

making this enterprise the success it is.

I am one of the many Members of the House who are very much in debt to Bob and Helen Coar for their uniform kindness and assistance throughout the years in handling my radio and television work. I know that Bob and Helen have been as helpful to others as they have to me when we started to cut film for television programs. That was a tricky new field in which some of us had had no experience whatever. Their experienced advice in setting up my first programs contributed immeasurably to their success in the district and my own sense of well-being in putting them on.

It is reassuring to know that Bob and Helen Coar are on hand when a radio or television program is being set up and worked out, and I want to personally and publicly express my appreciation to them, and I compliment my colleague for arranging for this time on the floor of the House so that I and others who are grateful to Bob and Helen Coar could pay them some measure of the tribute they deserve.

Increasing the Number of Foreign Language Experts in Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for a long time I have been deeply interested in increasing the reservoir of American specialists in foreign languages.

The fact of the matter is that we have a very insufficient number of Americans who can read and write with genuine familiarity foreign tongues, in many areas which heretofore have been almost unknown to us, but which now occupy great strategic significance.

Three-quarters of a year ago, I took this matter up with many Federal agencies. I pointed out that if the United States is to combat communism through greater economic, political, and cultural contact and through military assistance, it would be unthinkable for us not to be able to communicate with the very people whom we are trying to assist maintain their sovereignty.

One of the public officials whom I contacted was the distinguished Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Honorable Allen W. Dulles, who indicated his deep recognition of this problem of an insufficient number of foreign-language specialists and his desire for a remedy to this problem.

Months have passed, but unfortunately the remedial action which Director Dulles and other public officials and I have sought has been lagging. On June 29, the Hoover Commission Report on Intelligence Agencies of the Government pointed up this problem as one of its many findings dealing with the United States intelligence effort. The Hoover Commission task force stated:

> Lack of adequate linguistic preparation often has proved to be a serious handicap to our representatives abroad. This became painfully apparent during the Korean war. The ability to write and speak the language fluently, and to interpret foreign words and idioms accurately always helps an American to get around in an alien land, to win the confidence of its people, and to understand them.

And so the Commission went on to make as its formal recommendation No. 9:

> That a comprehensive, coordinated program be developed to expand linquistic training among American citizens serving the intelligence effort; and
>
> That the Department of Defense expand and promote language training by offering credit toward Reserve commissions to ROTC students and drill credit to Reserve personnel for completion of selected language courses.

By way of further background on this subject, I send to the desk the text of an editorial from the Superior (Wis.) Telegram of October 20, 1954, endorsing my effort to overcome the international language barrier. I append excerpts from Director Dulles' reply of the same period. Also included is the text of a letter from the Acting Director of the United States Information Agency, Mr. Abbott Washburn. In it he reflected USIA's deep concern with this problem, particularly in view of the then imminent move of the Voice of America from New York to Washington, which resulted in making it difficult to fill various foreign specialist vacancies.

I ask unanimous consent that all three of these items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram of October 20, 1954]

FOREIGN LANGUAGE BARRIER

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY says not enough Americans speak foreign languages, with the result that it's exceedingly difficult for us to reach people in Communist dominated countries.

Wisconsin's chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committe says "It is almost as tough as the Iron-Curtain barrier which separates us from the slave world." He hopes Americans will face up with the situation by overcoming the language barrier.

WILEY, of course, isn't speaking about such languages as French, Spanish, German, and some of the others that get more or less attention in our schools. He's referring to such less familiar languages as Amharic, Chuvash, Kurdish, Burmese, and quite a few others. Only a few persons in America can speak such languages fluently.

WILEY's committee is so concerned about the matter that it engaged the American Council of Learned Societies to make a survey of how many Americans can speak foreign languages. It's findings were far from encouraging.

The Council found for example, only one American familiar enough with a knowledge of Thai to carry on a convincing conversation in Thailand. Also, only 1 person claimed complete fluency in Vietnamese, and but 3 indicated proficiency in Burmese.

In all, the Council listed only 25,500 persons in the United States with professional training in languages. That is not many for a Nation with a population well over 150 million.

Senator WILEY is right in maintaining that if Americans are to exchange ideas with other countries, we must have people who can talk their languages.

He is also right in contending that it is important that sufficient language scholars be available to such Government branches as the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, and the Defense Department.

These agencies should always have at hand personnel so familiar with the tongue of a foreign land that they could be placed there at a moment's notice to deal intelligently with any emergency that might arise.

Wisconsin's Senator has announced his intention to recommend to the next Congress a greatly stepped up language training program. He deserves all-out support on this commendable effort.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., October 9, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is in response to your letter concerning a reservoir of language specialists. It is gratifying to learn of your awareness of a problem which concerns not only the Central Intelligence Agency but also many other agencies of Government which must communicate with and understand foreign peoples.

You have identified an important element in the overall problem in observing that the greatest difficulty lies in connection with peoples with whom we have had comparatively little contact but who now, or may in the future, occupy a status of great strategic significance. Previously, scholarly endeavors in the fields of language and area studies in the United States have rather closely paralleled our commercial interests. No doubt there was a time when United States commercial interests and the interests of national security lay in the same areas and peoples of the world, and our educational centers were geared to produce sufficient language specialists to satisfy both commercial and Government demands.

With regard to the matter of programs which our Government might set in motion to increase the availability of language specialists, several thoughts occur to me: (1) the Government might ascertain its requirements in the way of active and reserve specialists in the various languages; (2) a national inventory of language specialists might be compiled; (3) a schedule of our resources might be undertaken to determine the adequacy of our educational centers for producing language specialists equal to our requirements.

Since these projects require considerable time, the determination of requirements, inventory and resources would probably require about 5 years each. The institution of a program of scholarships in 1955 to encourage students to study some of the more exotic languages would contribute nothing to the reservoir of language specialists before 1960. It may well be that the needs of the Government for some years to come can only be satisfied by a program of training competent, qualified career Government employees at public expense.

In mid-1951 an Inter-Agency Committee on Area and Language Specialists was established for the purpose of exploring the problem on a Government-wide basis. Copies of the initial reports of that committee are enclosed.

In this era of science and technology most of us have become aware of the factor of lead-time in the development of new devices and weapons. Lead-time is no less a factor in the development of other national assets, and I trust that you will be encouraged to press for a solution of this problem which

you have correctly identified as of great strategic significance to our country.

Sincerely,

ALLEN W. DULLES,
Director.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, August 27, 1954.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I was pleased to receive your letter enclosing an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled, "Reservoir of Language Specialists."

The basic function of this Agency is communication with people abroad. To be effective we must reach them in languages they understand. Finding proficient language specialists is, as you point out, a serious problem for this Agency. The full magnitude of our problem can be appreciated when language proficiency and our high employment standards are taken in combination with the requirements for professional competence in communications media and techniques and for area or country knowledge. The number of Americans who can offer that combination of skills is indeed small.

We are now in process of conducting a civil-service examination for foreign language information specialists to staff the language desks in the International Broadcasting Service. Many of these vital positions will become vacant when the Voice of America moves from New York to Washington (a move now completed—Senator WILEY). We are experiencing difficulty in locating an adequate number of American citizens who can write professionally in a foreign language for radio broadcasting purposes.

Fortunately, in our missions abroad, we employ citizens of other countries who are dedicated to the program, who work effectively with their countrymen, and who know sufficient English to serve as a channel of communication for us. In an effort to increase the language knowledge available to the Agency, we have installed a modest area and language training program for a few carefully selected American employees. Also we are installing a modest language training program at selected overseas posts for American employees. However, we cannot hope, through these training programs, to attain even an optimum level of language proficiency within any reasonable period of time.

I am sure you will excuse my stress on the immediate importance of language competence to the work of this Agency. I do recognize its continuing importance to the work of other Government programs. Its importance as a vital manpower resource to the United States Government and the American people during these times of global emergency may well warrant the attention and study of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ABBOTT WASHBURN,
Acting Director.

American Legion Auxiliary's Girls State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 19, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article by Mrs. Bess Lainson, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, in which she points out that the American people can take pride in the work that is being done by the American Legion Auxiliary through its Girls States programs in most of the States in this Union. Her article follows:

"WE CAN TAKE PRIDE—"

This wonderful America we know today is the creation, under God, of its good citizens who have served and sacrificed to make democracy work. As we look into the future we see increasing need for good citizens able to make democracy work amid the growing complexity of our civilization. In our American Legion Auxiliary we have taken action to help provide the good citizens who will assure America's future as the land of the free.

Again this year the American Legion Auxiliary's Girls States are giving more than 12,000 of the Nation's most promising young women an opportunity to try their hands at the operation of democratic government. The number of girls who have had this citizenship training is now well above the one hundred thousand mark, and their influence radiates throughout almost every community in this land. They are among our auxiliary's most important contributions to our country.

America's rapidly growing population, its mushrooming cities, its expanding industry, its revolutionary developments in almost every field are presenting new problems and difficulties in the operation of government of, by, and for the people. As never before, America's citizens must be intelligent, interested in and capable of performing their citizenship duties. We of the American Legion Auxiliary can take high pride in the trained and capable future citizens our Girls States are giving to the Nation each year.

Mrs. P. A. LAINSON,
National President.

Dedication Ceremonies at the Tacoma Waterway, Tacoma, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALAN BIBLE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, dedication ceremonies were held today in Tacoma, Wash., at the opening of the Tacoma Waterway. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] made an address on this occasion, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The Case of the Industrial Waterway" is drama.

In a play we have to have stars. One of them is Maurie Raymond—your own port commissioner. His supporting cast includes some stellar performers. It is a huge supporting cast. It includes everyone in this room, plus the Corps of Engineers, plus the Congress of the United States.

The story begins July 1953 when Maurie Raymond came to Washington. The Port Industrial Waterway was on dead center. We needed an economic and engineering survey. The Corps of Engineers said they did not have the money. He came to my office—we got busy—and 2 weeks later we had an allocation of $5,000.

Act I was underway.

You will remember some of the episodes. The Corps of Engineers held a hearing in Tacoma. Their engineers and economists went to work with the port commission and by March 1954 the district office had a favorable report.

The curtain went up on act II.

Action was then focused on the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. It was moving through the House. Could we get the engineers' report through the Rivers and Harbors Board, through the Chief of Engineers, through the Secretary of Army, through Bureau of Budget in time to catch the bill before it got through the Senate?

June 15 was the deadline—the last meeting of the Rivers and Harbors Board. The project could not be authorized—or so we thought—without that Board's approval.

The supporting cast went to work. The report moved out of Portland in jig time, but jig time in this case meant the middle of May.

The chief's office had been alerted. The report was sent to the Rivers and Harbors Board. At that point one of the chief actors stubbed his toe, and the report was sent back to the field for further information.

In the meantime the omnibus bill had moved out of the House and into the Senate. The next episode took place before the Public Works Committee of that so-called august body. On hand was Senator JACKSON and myself.

We sold the committee on the project. They voted it into the omnibus bill without clearance from the Rivers and Harbors Board or Chief of Engineers or Secretary of Army or Bureau of Budget. As a matter of fact Bureau of Budget did not clear the report until about 2 weeks ago.

The curtain went down on act II. All and sundry declared it a stellar performance.

The curtain went up on act III.

Part of the cast decided to risk $373,000 of your hard-earned tax money to start dredging, to gain time, to anchor down this oil refinery. The reviews said the curtain went down on act III with great applause, and I should add, the gnawing of fingernails. The question was, Would you ever get the $373,000 back?

The curtain went up on act IV. The locale is the Senate Appropriations Committee. The supporting cast was meager—myself; outsiders are not allowed when that "club within a club" is marking up a bill. After a fight the committee agreed that the project was worthy, that it should be built, and that $616,000 is a small price to pay for admission when a $10 million refinery and corollary development is hanging in the balance.

The Senate approved it. We held it in conference. The Senate committee had added the punch line—$373,000 to reimburse the port of Tacoma for money they had already spent on the project.

The curtain goes down on the case of the industrial waterway and even when the cast came out for a final encore, without the Secretary of Army, Bureau of Budget, and administration approval.

It was a great play. All of you here in Tacoma deserve top billing.

The finale, however, is only the beginning so far as Tacoma is concerned.

I like an occasion like this. This is growth and development for Tacoma and that's the story we have been having in the Pacific Northwest for the last 2½ decades. If we weren't dedicating a project, we were planning one, and every one of those projects brought in new industries, new people, new optimism, and added to Washington's future.

But dedicating this project recalls one of the worst foes we have to face.

We congratulate each other on the part we played. We recall the history and what led up to the eventual victory. But there's

too much of a tendency to consider this the end, not the start.

The Tacoma Waterway isn't the end of the line. It shouldn't be the end of the line. We should use it to build bigger and better industries that can be pointed to 30 years from now as an example of what can be done with planning and work.

Our Nation is a good example of what I mean. No question about it, we lead the world and most of the world allows us to lead. Backward peoples come to us for ideas. They want to use our skilled personnel. We are their teachers. No question about it, there is a light in their backward eyes of not only appreciation, but actual awe of what we have been able to do. It is right for that light to be in their eyes, but let us not misinterpret it and be so busy taking bows that we fail to look at the work undone behind stage.

Our Pacific Northwest has had more visitors of this type than most section of the Nation. They have come to see our system of dams along the Columbia River. They have looked at blueprints and taken them home to start projects of their own. They have stood at Seattle-Tacoma Airport, marvelled at the modern terminal we have constructed. They have gone to the Boeing Aircraft Co. to see the efficient way we put airplanes together. They have watched arid acres produce fabulous crops in the Columbia Basin project, and I think they have caught some of the spirit from our Pacific Northwest leaders who aren't content with the past, who won't be content unless the future develops at the same pace with the same results. No one knows better than those who have had a hand in the development of the last 2½ decades that there is still plenty to be done. We can never stand still and make achievement.

Before coming to Tacoma, I asked the Department of Defense, for example, exactly how much was going to be spent by that agency in the State of Washington during fiscal 1956. I got the answer that $282 million is the estimated expenditure in the State of Washington. That breaks down into these figures: $110 million for the Army; $63.6 million for the Navy, and $108.8 million for the Air Force. Now that's an example of what I mean about never standing still. To the casual observer driving by Larson Air Force Base, or the Hanford project, or Fort Lewis, or McChord Field, or the Bremerton Navy Yard, those projects look pretty complete. Yet, to equip these bases with the housing facilities needed and the latest available technical equipment it's going to take $282 million this next year to do the job.

The expansion of the Tacoma Waterway reminds me of the dock modernization program this Nation is going to be forced into very shortly. As chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the Senate, I have had occasion to sit down with industry and labor representatives to discuss dock modernization. The casual observer driving by a dock may think the facilities are the most modern in the world. Certainly they are better than most, but they are not up to the standards we need for complete efficiency.

For example, most of the cranes at our docks are between 20 and 30 years old. They aren't as efficient as the new cranes turned out. In too many cases we are still doing by hand what should be done by machine. We are moving by stevedore, a piece at a time, what can be done in bulk. We might assume that labor would protest any modernization, but it doesn't take that view at all. It knows that through proficiency in mastering new techniques it not only gains more skill, but more money; because in dock management, time is money, and the faster goods can be moved the more money is available for those who utilize the new techniques.

Undoubtedly, the Federal Government is going to step into the dock modernization picture, probably through a matching funds program. And it should, because it's in the national interest to have docks ready for instantaneous handling of goods in case of national emergency. I am happy to report that labor and management stand united in this program of progress.

Our shipping lags far behind the times. I fought in the last Congress for several prototype ships which the Maritime Administration could build to show the way for efficient shipping for the next decade or longer.

Those ships should have been off the drawing boards and on the ways by this time, but they aren't. Perhaps the delay comes under the heading of economy, or maybe it's strictly red tape. But, whatever the reason, we are not moving fast enough in this field.

I was still pressing to get the prototype ships underway when the President came out with his atomic showboat plan. Now that, in a way, comes back to what I was talking about, about being so busy with curtain calls that we forget what we are supposed to be doing. He wanted an atomic ship to show the rest of the world. I have been calling since 1950 for one that would work, that would cut costs in shipping, that could iron out the bugs so atomic engines could be installed in our present ships.

In other words, I want one that is practical, one that during the space of a comparatively few years can clear the way for utilizing atomic power on the high seas as we have used it on dry land.

Of course, there is a long way to go before we get our merchant fleet equiped with atomic reactors, but the day will come.

We also should be looking ahead to the day of the atomic engine in airplanes.

Those are some of the problems our 20th century pioneers in industry and Government face right now. There are others. Just as you faced problems in getting this Tacoma Waterway. Before you could effectively move on this project you had to have public backing. The people of Tacoma had to want this project badly enough to fight for it. It reminds me very much of the way the Columbia River was developed, the way we obtained dams at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Hungry Horse, Chief Joseph, and McNary, and the way we are getting them at The Dalles and John Day and Ice Harbor.

We have been shown the course in hydroelectric projects, but suddenly we have been confronted with a new problem, which I consider to be apathy. Entirely too many of us are resting on laurels at this point. We are so busy taking bows for what has been accomplished, and reciting history to all who will listen, that we forget there is still a job to be done.

Our Northwest won't have complete hydroelectric development until every last dam that can be built economically and face the test of paying back the loan advanced to build it, is constructed, generators installed, and the power surging through the lines to Hanford, or its successor; to Boeing and its B–52's; and to the thousands of industries which aren't here now, but will be when these other dams are completed. Midway in this battle for Northwest development, we have allowed ourselves to be stymied, at least we were until Ice Harbor went into the public works appropriation bill in this 84th Congress.

We had been so busy accepting congratulations that we forgot two things: One is, how the dams were obtained to start with, and, secondly, how we are going to get the rest of them.

Figures used in the latest attack on our area showed a breakdown of what each citizen in the Nation has invested in Pacific Northwest projects.

Congress has known per capita costs ever since starting on the Northwest program, Congress considers that 1.2 billions invested by the Federal Government in Columbia Basin dams, one of the soundest investments the people of this Nation have ever made; for example, the 1954 annual report of the Bonneville Power Administration plainly shows that this investment is being repaid $65 million ahead of schedule. You have to look far in the Nation's portfolio investments to find any more gilt-edged than these. Dams like Grand Coulee, Hungry Horse, Bonneville, McNary, and Chief Joseph not only pay their own way, repay cost of construction plus interest on the money borrowed to build them, but they pay off in other respects too.

Look at the new jobs established in the Pacific Northwest. Look at the B–52's flying away from Boeing Aircraft Co. because we had low-cost power to produce the aluminum that went into the planes. Look at the people employed in that aluminum industry. How much safer is the Nation today because we had low-cost power which would make all this possible.

We are not going to stand by and see our Pacific Northwest development picture discredited in the eyes of the general public through use of slight-of-hand statistics.

We ask the Nation's taxpayers only to advance the money for such great and worthwhile projects so that we can utilize the power, pay for it with interest, and provide employment opportunities for the boys and girls who are growing up in the State of Washington.

My chief concern now, is that sitting at the dawn of victory, we will be content with what we have, will spend our time defending that, instead of fighting on until orderly development of the Snake River is achieved, just as we have done on the Columbia River. As long as there is 1 kilowatt of energy that can be rung economically from the Columbia or the Snake or its tributaries, as long as there is 1 plant that needs to be located in the Pacific Northwest from the standpoint of national security, a higher standard of living, for economic betterment of this Nation, our job has not been completed and we will be letting down those who had the vision and the courage and the stamina to give us this steppingstone to victory.

Virginians Pay Homage to General Rochambeau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following articles taken from the Alexandria Gazette and the Fairfax Journal, respectively, concerning the 230th anniversary of the birth of General Rochambeau, French hero of the American Revolution:

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of July 2, 1955]

VIRGINIANS PAY HOMAGE TO GENERAL ROCHAMBEAU

(By Medora Mason Wolfe)

On the eve of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, a distinguished group of persons, led by Mrs. Nicholas Longworth, daughter of the late President Theodore Roosevelt, and Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, honored a man who aided materially in making American independence a reality.

He was General Rochambeau, French hero of the American Revolution, to whom tribute was paid yesterday on the 230th anniversary of his birth. The ceremonies were held at his statue, in Lafayette Park, directly across from the White House. The statue was dedicated in 1902 by Teddy Roosevelt.

Mrs. Longworth, who was the world-famous "Princess Alice" at the time of the dedication, and who attended the ceremonies, presided over by her father, presented flowers yesterday from the gardens at Mount Vernon, where Rochambeau and Washington walked and talked long ago.

The program, attended by many Alexandrians and others from Congress, patriotic and civic organizations and embassies, was broadcast to France by the Voice of America and, by the way of Luxembourg, behind the Iron Curtain. It was a refutation of Communist propaganda that the United States forgets her benefactors.

Mrs. Longworth, who was about 20 at the time of the dedication remembers it vividly. The *Rochambeau*, a French ship, was in harbor here and it was a very gay time, she said.

Reminded that there must have been a large crowd at the ceremony since her father was dedicating the statue, she replied in characteristic fashion, "Of course." Princess Alice of that other day, as well as the dignified, charming woman of today, who is the toast of the present administration, admired her famous father greatly, and was very close to him when he was in the eyes of the world and she, his eldest child, was world-known, too.

Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate, and former pastor of Foundry Methodist Church in Washington, gave tone to the anniversary program when he delivered the invocation in the colorful setting near the White House.

His prayer is most significant on the eve of the Fourth of July, in these troubled times. Dr. Harris prayed:

"God of our fathers, who hath made and preserved us a nation, in this commemorative hour we came with sacramental memories of old, unhappy, far-off things and battles long ago. Reverently we stand at the sculptured likeness of a valiant warrior who in a time of destiny crossed the treacherous seas to help the colonies of the New World win their freedom.

"We remember with abiding gratitude the fightingmen of France who joined Washington's ragged forces, as together they made tyranny tremble and, at last, surrender.

"With kindling spirits we pay tribute to the brave hearts and the marching feet of the French legions under the intrepid leadership of the hero we honor today, who, with his brave battalions, buttressed the hard-pressed troops, who, under heavy odds, with heroic devotion were signing their own names to the Declaration of Independence in blood and sweat and tears. And so, as French hands helped light the perpetual flame under the triumphant arch of our liberty, may the fundamental kinship of our two nations keep us welded in this dangerous day in a comradeship which the sophistry of tyrants cannot break.

"We pray that ever our starry banner and the tricolor of our brave ally, waving together on freedom's ramparts, may hurl our combined strength against the wrong that needs resistance and for the right that needs assistance, until all men shall breathe the air of freedom, in the spirit of Rochambeau and Washington.

"We ask it in the name of the God of righteousness and justice. Amen."

Charles Parmer, to whom great credit was given for the organization of the Interstate Rochambeau Commission of the United States, which has brought attention to Rochambeau and his service to this country, spoke to the people of France at yesterday's ceremony, in French, and presided at the program.

Other speakers were Senator Byrd; Senator Theodore F. Green, veteran Member of Congress from Rhode Island, the State where Rochambeau and his troops first landed in America; Robert Valeur, representing the French Embassy since the Ambassador is in France; Maj. Gen. Charles R. Landon, United States Air Force, retired, who read Washington's message to his troops relative to Rochambeau, and C. Burke Elbrick, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State.

"A sense of history is one of the great spiritual assets of any people," Mr. Elbrick said. "It is through the dedicated efforts of those organizations which are represented here today that such a sense is nourished. It is through such ceremonies as this commemoration of the birth of Rochambeau that your efforts prosper and cause us to pause in our busy life to reflect on the verities of history.

"In these verities which are exemplified so well by the noble place in our history of the men we honor today, we find those qualities of the heart, the mind, and the spirit that are the firm and lasting foundation of Franco-American friendship."

The Marine Drum and Bugle Corps of Quantico, colorful in uniforms which vied in brilliance with the tricolors of France and the red, white, and blue of the United States, played during the ceremonies.

As the Children of the American Revolution and representatives of northern Virginia groups led by Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, of the 10th Virginia District, and former Mayor Marshall J. Beverley, of Alexandria, placed wreaths and sprays at the monument, the Corps play the Huron March, the martial air to which Rochambeau and his troops marched through Alexandria September 11, 1781, bearing aloft the fleur de lis of France.

Significant among the wreaths placed before the Rochambeau Monument, which faces the sparkling fountains, the green lawns, and the front of the White House, was one of magnolias from Gunston Hall, home of George Mason, placed by Frank Griffiths, director, and another from Woodlawn, made of boxwood, placed by Meredith Johnson, director.

The wreath Mrs. Longworth laid, as the first portion of the wreath-laying ceremony, was of boxwood and purple asters from the Mount Vernon estate, where Rochambeau visited.

The old-fashioned, laced-edged bouquet placed by Senator GREEN, representing the Thirteen Original Colonies, also was from Mount Vernon.

Among the many other floral contributions placed by Alexandrians and others was a spray of red and white carnations from the Alexandria Gazette, which has recorded historical events since 1784.

Members of the Mount Vernon Guard, in their Colonial uniforms, were bearers of the stars and stripes and the tricolors of France at the speakers' stand, and were escorts at the wreath-laying ceremonies.

[From the Fairfax (Va.) Journal of July 7, 1955]

MANY VIRGINIANS PARTICIPATE IN ROCHAMBEAU ANNIVERSARY

Tribute to General Rochambeau was expressed by individuals, Government officials, and representatives of patriotic groups at a commemorative ceremony held at the Rochambeau statue in Lafayette Park in Washington, on Friday morning. The occasion marked the 230th anniversary of the French general's birthday, and was attended by many from Virginia.

Distinguished guests included Mrs. Alice Roosevelt Longworth, who had been present at the time the statue was dedicated by her father, President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1902. The former "Princess Alice" presented a boxwood wreath with a cluster of purple asters, from the gardens at Mount Vernon.

M. Robert Valeur, counsellor of the French Embassy, represented the French Ambassador who was in Paris, and placed a massive floral piece which featured the French blue.

The program, carried by the Voice of America, was broadcast over the three networks in French to France, in Russian to Russia, and by way of Luxembourg translated from the English to be interpreted by the monitor and beamed to a dozen countries.

"The United States never forgets its friends," was the opening sentence beamed to France by Mrs. Charles Parmer, general chairman for the Rochambeau Interstate Commission, who continued, "At a time when we were weak, poor, without friends or support, France was our first and only ally, putting at our disposal not only her material resources, but also the wisdom, the experience, and the very life of the best of her sons."

Here in front of the White House, was broadcast over the radio Luxembourg to Russia before dark, the Government using this statement with others, as proof that the United States never forgets a friend.

SENATOR BYRD SPEAKS

Immediately thereafter, the voice of Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, was heard saying as he placed a wreath at the foot of the Rochambeau statue, "I place these flowers in honor of France, our first ally, and her great General Rochambeau, who with with his valiant French soldiers played an important role in aiding Washington to achieve our independence as a nation."

One of Virginia's distinguished residents, Maj. Gen. Charles R. Landon, USAF (retired), military chairman for the Rochambeau Interstate Commission, read General Washington's general orders, issued the day after the Yorktown battle, praising highly General Rochambeau and his various officers by name, as well as his entire army.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, commended Mr. Parmer for originating the Rochambeau movement, saying it had spread to other States. He then told of the great personal services Rochambeau gave to our General Washington during the presence of the British army at Yorktown; also of the greatness of Rochambeau in subordinating himself to General Washington; and of Washington's great wisdom as Commander in Chief, in accepting Rochambeau's advice. Thus, Senator GREEN added another chevron to Washington's greatness. Senator GREEN presented an old-fashioned bouquet of red, white, and blue flowers, also from the Mount Vernon gardens, as a tribute from the Thirteen Original Colonies, and from Rhode Island, as Rochambeau's starting point on his march to Yorktown in 1781.

HISTORY RECITED

The history of the Rochambeau statue was given by Mr. C. Burke Elbrick, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, speaking for the United States. He quoted the great French Ambassador Jusserand as saying that France of 1780 was inspired with an enthusiasm for the Americans, not by hatred of the British. In 1778, Louis XVI recognized the fledgling of the United States of America in the famous treaty of alliance and commerce negotiated by Benjamin Franklin. The treaty of the alliance is to be found in the principles of liberty and democracy.

"A sense of history is one of the great spiritual assets of any people," Mr. Elbrick continued, complimenting those who represented the patriotic societies present. "It is through the dedicated efforts which are represented here today, that such a sense is nourished. It is through such ceremonies as this, commemorating the birthday of Rochambeau, that your efforts prosper and

cause us to pause in our busy life and to reflect on the verities of history," Mr. Elbrick said.

"This magnificent statue of Rochambeau by Ferdinand Hamar, before which we are gathered today, was a gift from France to America. It was dedicated by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902," he said, bowing to Mrs. Longworth, a guest of honor and daughter of that President.

"PRINCESS ALICE"

Standing a few feet away, listening, among the spectators, was a man who had been present when the Rochambeau statue was dedicated by President Roosevelt that day in 1902. Mr. William F. Griffith, 3018 South 12th Street, Arlington. Later, Mr. Griffith told the Journal reporter, "Yes, I was present that day, being the drum major of the United States Cavalry Band. During the ceremony, of course, everyone was looking in admiration at a charming young girl, the Princess Alice of America, the daughter of our President. And there she is today, a guest of honor and looking as charming as she did then."

Mrs. Parmer and her group of hostesses greeted Mrs. Longworth and other guests. Mrs. Parmer also represented Gov. Caleb Boggs, of Delaware, one of the first members of the Rochambeau Interstate Commission, who was unable to accept his invitation to be present, and at his request Mrs. Parmer presented his flowers.

A group of high officers of the Society of the Cincinnati attended as their president general, Mr. Richard Wilmer, presented their society's wreath. Mr. Parmer announced from the platform that the Republic of France had sent to the Society of the Cincinnati, a large collection of miniature statue figurines, representing in full uniform, the various regiments fighting under Rochambeau at Yorktown. The only exhibit of its kind in the United States, it may be seen at the society's headquarters, 2118 Massachusetts Avenue NW., in Washington.

DAR REPRESENTED

Other official representatives of organizations were Miss Lillian Chenoweth, Honorary Vice President General, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution; and Mrs. Bessie Pryor, of the State of New Jersey DAR. Also Miss Frances M. Webster, Washington, from the Daughters of the Cincinnati; Mrs. E. Stewart James, Gloucester, National President, National Society Children of the American Revolution; Mrs. C. Marbury Seaman, Alexandria, Virginia State President, Children of the American Revolution; Mrs. Albert J. Kraemer, Vice Regent, Alexandria, placed a wreath for the Mount Vernon Chapter, DAR; and Mrs. Frances Billingsley, chairman, New York State Rochambeau Commission, through whose efforts the Rochambeau State Park was established in Westchester County near Yorktown Heights, where Rochembeau was commissioned, flew to Washington for the event, as did also Mr. A. Glenn Mower, Harrisburg, flew here to represent Pennsylvania. Mr. Mower was present at the organization meeting at Mount Vernon on April 16, 1953, at which time Mr. Parmer was named general chairman for the commission.

Besides Mount Vernon, other nearby historic shrines sending flowers for the occasion, were Gunston Hall, with Mr. Frederick J. Griffiths, director, presenting a wreath of Gunston Hall magnolia leaves; and Woodlawn Plantation, represented by Mr. Meredith Johnson, superintendent, placing a wreath of Woodlawn box.

MOUNT VERNON GUARDS

During the placing of the floral pieces, a squad from the Mount Vernon Guards as honor for the occasion, assisted in the ceremony, and in escorting the distinguished guests. They were M. Gordon Herndon, John and Francis Klisch, and Richard Minnich, with their director, Mr. John Charles Harris, assisted by Maurice G. Herndon, the latter a member of the Society of the Cincinnati.

Others from Virginia were Congressman Joel T. Broyhill, State Senator Hon. J. A. K. Donovan, and Past Mayor Marshall Beverley, of Alexandria who is a great-great-grandson of Chief Justice John Marshall. Others were Miss Ellen Coolidge Burke, librarian of Alexandria, a great-great-granddaughter of Thomas Jefferson; and Medora Mason Wolfe, who placed a wreath for America's oldest newspaper, the Alexandria Gazette.

A colorful part of the program was the processional of 50 children of the American Revolution, led by Marbury Seaman, Junior State Society, Virginia CAR, who dropped flowers over the base of the Rochambeau statue. Among this group were Miss Terry Yates and Miss Jean Forshee, in riding clothes, honoring Rochambeau as the horseman. Present also was Miss Annie Laurie Martin, District of Columbia junior state president, CAR, and other Washington CAR members.

Miss Florence Harris and her sister, Miss Becky Harris, daughters of former Congressman Winder Harris, were ushers; and Charles R. Landon, son of Major General Landon, Jr., served as aide to his father. Charles Bacon, son of Mr. and Mrs. Bacon, was aide to Mr. Parmer during the ceremonies.

The Rochambeau commission thanked Lemuel Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the United States Marines, for the magnificent cooperation of his corps; and Mr. Parmer especially commended Staff Sgt. A. di Giovani, the drum major who directed the drum and bugle corps who came from Quantico for the celebration. The uniforms and the fine precision of the martial accompaniment played by the musicians were impressive features of the program. It was during the playing of the historic Huron March that the children dropped flowers about the base of the monument.

In closing his report, Mr. Parmer added that the support of the newspapers had been excellent, indeed, and he commended highly "the generous space allowance and accurate reporting of the event by the Journal newspapers."

Mr. Parmer has received letters from over the United States and Europe commending the celebration and urging that it be made an annual event.

Mr. and Mrs. Parmer, who live at 318 North Washington Street, Alexandria, will go this week to Newport for the celebration marking the landing of Rochambeau and his 6,000 French troops in 1780. The celebration there will be July 9, 10, and 11.

A Victory on Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an editorial which appeared in the July 22, 1955, issue of Labor's Daily. The editorial entitled "A Victory Against Odds" follows:

A VICTORY AGAINST ODDS
(By Willard Shelton)

The people owe small thanks to President Eisenhower's leadership for the new $1-an-hour minimum wage bills that have passed both Houses of Congress and now are subject to agreement on minor differences.

Never a word did the White House or the Department of Labor say, until after both the Senate and House had acted, to indicate that $1 an hour would be acceptable to the President.

Labor Secretary Mitchell and President Eisenhower persistently stuck to a proposal to raise the minimum from the present 75 cents an hour to merely 90 cents.

Even when the bill for $1 had passed the Senate, even when it was pending in the House Labor Committee, Mitchell declined to say whether he would recommend that the President sign or veto such a measure.

Mr. Eisenhower's last public comment at a news conference indicated that he was still sticking to 90 cents, although he had been deserted by such conservative Republicans as Senator GOLDWATER, the Arizona department-store owner who wanted $1 an hour so long as coverage wasn't extended to protect chainstore operators.

The Republican leadership in the House this week protested piously that the President had deep sympathy for underpaid workers. Said Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, in arguing for the Republican substitute for 90 cents, it just wasn't wise to wreck the small-business men.

What small-business men did he imagine would be wrecked by the requirement that they pay their workers a minimum of $1 an hour?

The law covers only business and industry involved in interstate commerce, not the corner druggist or delicatessen owner.

The low-wage industries that would be affected directly by the $1-an-hour minimum are textiles, lumbering, turpentine, and similar operations. They are not pathetic "small business" with purely local effects.

Deep sympathy may be greatly appreciated by people in time of personal trouble or misfortune. But it is scarcely a substitute for a realistic concept of the fact that even in this Nation prosperity is not universal, that many people are underpaid by any decent standards when there is no excuse for underpaying them.

No business has a right to stay in operation by exploiting its workers with substandard wages.

The case for $1 an hour was proved in the labor committees of the House and Senate.

It was proved by application of the cost of living figures, by the figures on the growing productivity and output of individual workers.

The Republican Senators who voted for $1 an hour, without even bothering to ask for a rollcall, knew that the case had been proved. That's why they voted as they did.

The administration made one last pitch, however, to hold the increase to 90 cents. Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams rallied his forces, and the official GOP House leadership fought for the 90-cent program.

The country is getting $1 an hour because Congress simply refused to be bound by the Eisenhower recommendation.

Put a Flood Rod on the Deluge and Save $20 Billion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1955

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are told that 10 million people live in the flood plains of the United States. This represents 7 percent of our population and 3 percent of our land.

Flood plains are the spillways nature has reserved to itself when its cup runneth over.

We are told that $20 billion will have been spent when our flood-control projects become current.

In a book entitled "Floods," recently published by the Princeton University Press, Authors Hoyt and Langbein tell us that nature has a possible deluge scheduled for the flood plains, come the turn of the century.

The question is, do we continue to settle and develop the flood plains and, like Noah, ride out the big wash when it comes, or, can the Congress build a flood rod, in effect like a lightning rod, to parry damage when the deluge strikes? The book offers many interesting observations.

In page 11, of chapter 1, entitled "Flood Problems," the authors state:

It is inevitable that some future Congress or Congresses will recognize that a sound approach to floods must be broader than flood protection alone, and they will find it is in the national interest that the following be done: (a) States, river communities, and conservation districts should foster wise use of valley lands and discourage obstruction of rivers and their flood plains. (b) River communities should encourage organization of well-trained, alert rescue squads. (c) Flood-forecasting services should be recognized as an essential part of flood management and be appropriately supported. (d) The collection and dissemination of information concerning flood damage should be systematized and coordinated. (e) In order to foster local adjustments and to shift some of the burden of taxation for flood protection from those who receive no direct benefit, our policy should be modified to require those who receive direct benefits from flood-control projects to share equitably in the costs. (f) Citizens should be encouraged to establish local districts or other types of administrative bodies for the purpose of meeting local problems on a local basis. (g) Loans and grants and other forms of relief, whether by Federal or semiofficial organizations, should be so awarded that they will not encourage imprudent occupancy of flood plains. (h) An equitable system of flood insurance should be developed to discourage misuse of flood-hazard lands. (i) We should adopt only such programs and practices for flood protection as are demonstration to be measurable, effective, and economically sound. (j) Finally, social, economic, and political activities in connection with relief, as well as strictly agricultural programs such as improvement of crop yields, should be recognized as such and should not be disguised as parts of flood-protection or flood-management plans.

In the prologue, on page 3, the following appears:

PROLOGUE

Land of Canaan, c. 2957 B. C.: Vast flood, probably centered around Ur on the Euphrates, subsides. Noah and family are reported safe. Word has just been received that the deluge resulting from 40 days and 40 nights of continuous rainfall has abated. Floodwaters are reported to have greatly exceeded 15 cubits. Lands have been inundated for 150 days. All living creatures have been drowned, except Noah, his immediate family, and the animals "two by two," who rode to safety in a homemade ark and finally have come to rest on Mt. Ararat.

Egypt, XXIII Dynasty, c. 747 B. C.: Floods follow droughts. Pharaoh has just reported that whole valley of the Nile is turned into an ocean, temples are full of water, and men look like waterfowl. Apparently embankments are not high or strong enough to confine floodwaters in normal channels. Present catastrophe well illustrates vagaries of nature, for it is recalled another Pharaoh complained: "For 7 years the Nile has not risen. There is no grain, the fields are dry, no man buries his neighbor, everyone flees, to return no more, the children weep, the young men faint, the old men wither. Their legs have lost their strength; with folded arms they crouch on the ground." (Emil Ludwig, The Nile.)

Mississippi River near mouth of Arkansas River, March 10, 1543: De Soto's expedition in search of gold and silver delayed a month by Mississippi River flood. Garcilaso de la Vega reports party stranded when river overflowed wide level ground and rose to top of cliffs in an immense flood. There was nothing to stop inundation.

Richmond, Va., May 27, 1771: James River on a rampage. Worst flood and disaster at Richmond since settlement in 1637. City virtually destroyed and 150 people reported drowned.

Kansas City, Mo., July 1951: Floodwaters of Kansas River roll into Missouri River and into history as new flood marks are set. Previous alltime records of stage and discharge are greatly surpassed. Manhattan, Topeka, and Kansas City are inundated again following rains of unusual duration and intensity. Loss of life may exceed 50. Property damage may approach $1 billion. President and Red Cross ask for money to meet emergency; New Deal and Fair Deal Senators ask for valley authorities; commentators would divert floodwaters into drought-stricken Southwest; conservationists clamor for more conservation measures; engineers promptly revise their plans upward; and funds are requested to complete authorized projects and to build bigger and better ones.

Somewhere in the United States, year 2000 plus or minus: Nature takes its inexorable toll. Thousand-year flood causes untold damage and staggering loss of life. Engineers and meteorologists believe that present storm and flood resulted from a combination of meteorologic and hydrologic conditions such as may occur only once in a millennium. Reservoirs, levees, and other control works which have proved effective for a century, and are still effective up to their design capacity, are unable to cope with enormous volumes of water involved. This catastrophe brings home the lesson that protection from floods is only a relative matter, and that eventually nature demands its toll from those who occupy flood plains.

In the preface, we read this: "Floods have been many things to many people, and so forth."

PREFACE

Floods have been many things to many people. To Noah and his people the deluge was a manifestation of a wrathful God. To the Pharaohs 16 "ells" on the Nile gage meant wafa—a period of abundance, a contented people, and above all, a freedom to tax without fear of unrest. To the 500 million people of the Far East floods have made plains and deltas on which to subsist in spite of a lifelong threat of death by drowning. In the United States they probably stimulate more interest among more diverse groups than any other natural phenomenon.

To reporters and editors of the daily press they are dramatic news.

To those caught in the swirling mud-laden waters they represent days and nights of terror.

To Red Cross workers, National Guard units, or citizens hurriedly pressed into service to carry sandbags or to contribute money, food, and clothing, or to provide shelter for the homeless, they represent a call to action, a summons that is gladly met.

To hydrologists floods mean the immediate translation of measurements of rain, snow, wind, and ground conditions into forecasts of river stages and their widespread dissemination by radio, telephone, and the press. If the danger is overestimated, the forecasting service may be discredited; if it is underestimated, the result is added damage and loss of life.

To river engineers floods mean measurements of stages and volumes under the worst possible conditions; the study of ways to reduce damage; and the design, construction, and operation of extensive dikes, levees, floodwalls, channels, dams, and reservoirs—protective works which must not fail but which must function effectively to the limits of their designed capacity.

To farmers they mean erosion and loss of topsoil on barren or newly planted sidehill fields, and inundation and flooding of crops on valley bottom lands.

To conservationists the gullied fields and loss of valuable topsoil indicate a need for improved land-use practices and measures to increase infiltration and retard erosion.

To legislators and constitutional lawyers floods have often represented a peg on which to hang measures and practices apparently designed not so much to reduce flood damage as to stabilize the economy, promote the general welfare, or in some instances just curry political favor.

To journalists they provide material for magazine articles which in many instances have been deplorably misleading.

To water users, especially in the West, they mean recharged ground water and the filling of storage reservoirs.

To city and State planning boards and commissions they represent a need for rules and regulations whereby flood-hazard lands may be appropriately utilized.

To statisticians they mean a series of events among which they look in vain for the alchemy of cyclic variations.

To insurance executives they represent almost the only loss or damage that apparently cannot be profitably underwritten.

To bankers they reflect the size and suitability of loans.

To political scientists and economists they may present a picture of management or mismanagement which can only be corrected by more Federal control, more regional authorities, or more State and local participation, depending on the point of view.

To some people floods may be only a source of inconvenience; to others they may be an immediate danger; to all of us as citizens they are a natural phenomenon on which we will have spent some twenty or more billion dollars under our present flood-control policy.

In this volume we have tried to present some facts and fundamentals for the increasing number who are directly concerned with flood problems. We also hope that the book will be of general interest, because everyone of us, at least as taxpayer, is indirectly concerned and affected by floods.

WILLIAM G. HOYT,
United States Geological Survey (retired).
WALTER B. LANGBEIN,
United States Geological Survey.
JUNE 1953.

To those who might be interested in a further followup of the topic, the table of contents appears as follows:

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	V
Acknowledgments	VII
Prologue	3
1. Flood problems	5
2. Why we have flood problems (flood plains, rainstorms, thunderstorms, hurricanes, maximum rainfalls, snow, ice jams)	12

CONTENTS

	Page
3. Life history of a flood (on the land, in the channel, analyzing floods, where floods occur, when floods occur, flood magnitude, flood frequency, how floods are measured, maximum flood discharge)	35
4. Damage from floods	77
5. Man's adaptation to floods (zoning, insurance, forecasting, relief and rehabilitation)	91
6. Protection through the control of water (dikes and levees, channel improvements, diversion of flood waters, reservoirs, land-use practices)	138
7. Floods and the Constitution	162
8. Our present flood-control policy (in the channel, on the land)	169
9. Basin problems, projects, and plans (New England, the middle Atlantic region, the South Atlantic and eastern gulf streams, the Ohio River Basin exclusive of the Tennessee River Basin, the Tennessee River Basin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River region, the upper Mississippi River Basin, the lower Mississippi Basin and its alluvial valley, tributaries to the lower Mississippi from the Southwest, the Missouri River Basin, the Red River of the North, the western Gulf of Mexico, the Pacific Southwest, the Pacific Northwest)	187
10. Flood history (before 1900; since 1900; floods by streams)	331
Bibliography	433
Index	445

Why Gas Prices Must Be Regulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Gas Prices Must Be Regulated," published in the Denver (Colo.) Post of July 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY GAS PRICES MUST BE REGULATED

Back in the 1930's the Federal Trade Commission made a study which showed that consumers of natural gas were being charged unfair and unreasonable prices by interstate pipelines.

Since the individual States were powerless to regulate interstate business, Congress passed the Natural Gas Act of 1938 to bring gas prices under the control of the Federal Power Commission.

The regulation of utilities—transportation companies, electric companies, water, telephone and telegraph companies—had long been an accepted part of the American economic system, which provides for Government controls only when there is an absence of natural controls as through the operations of supply and demand.

Hence gas regulation did not introduce anything new or socialistic into our way of life.

One of the early results of the regulation of natural gas by the FPC was a reduction of approximately 24 percent in the price of natural gas prices for consumers in Denver and other cities served by the Colorado Interstate Gas Co.

At first the FPC regulated only the interstate pipeline companies. It regulated their charges for transporting gas and also the charges made by the pipeline companies for the gas they produced from their own wells.

When a pipeline company bought gas from an oil company, such as Standard of Indiana, the FPC did not claim the authority to regulate the price of such a sale—it merely regulated the amount charged for transporting that gas to the consuming area.

The FPC took the position that its jurisdiction did not extend to sales made by oil companies to pipelines. And actually, in the early days of regulation, the cost of gas was a minor factor in determining the price to the ultimate consumer.

In those days, oil companies normally received only 3 or 4 cents per thousand cubic feet (M c. f.) for their gas.

A new era for the gas business began about the end of World War II. With war restrictions at an end, gas pipelines began to stretch into cities all the way across the country. That expansion is still continuing.

By 1953, there were 20 million gas customers as against less than 7 million in 1938. In the same period the miles of pipelines had more than doubled and the annual consumption of gas had increased four times.

The sudden expansion of the demand for gas enabled oil companies, whose prices were not regulated, to charge constantly increasing rates. Wellhead prices rose from 4 cents per M c. f. to 6 cents, to 8 cents, to 10 cents, to 12 cents, to 15 cents, and even higher.

Every company promoting a new interstate pipeline was faced with a problem of getting a gas supply large enough to justify a huge, long-term investment in pipe and compressor stations.

The important thing for the pipeline company was to obtain a large reserve of gas which would permit it to lay its line and get into business. The amount paid for the gas was a minor consideration as far as the pipeline was concerned. The pipeline could pass along to the consumer whatever it paid for the gas, whether the price was 5 cents or 15 cents.

The pipeline could make just as much money transporting 15-cent gas as it could transporting gas for which it paid only 5 cents.

As they began paying more and more for gas, the pipelines began deluging the Federal Power Commission with applications for higher rates. It seemed obvious to many consumers that a runaway price situation was in the making.

One element in determining the price to the consumer was the price paid to the oil company by the pipeline, yet the pipeline had no incentive for driving tough bargains. The pipeline was bidding for gas with the consumers' money, not its own.

Finally a group of consumers in Wisconsin and Chicago asked the Federal courts to rule that the FPC should regulate the prices paid by the pipelines to the oil companies and the other nonpipeline producers of gas. In the Phillips Petroleum Co. case, more than a year ago, the Supreme Court held that the duty of the FPC extended to the regulation of the prices paid by the pipelines.

That ruling, of course, has aroused the petroleum industry to demand of Congress that the price they charge for gas be exempted from regulation.

An able pleader of the petroleum industry's case is J. E. Swearingen, vice president of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, whose guest editorial appears elsewhere on this page.

Mr. Swearingen's argument has the unusual merit of simplicity. He says there is no monopoly in the business of producing natural gas; therefore, there should be no regulation of gas prices and we should rely on supply and demand.

He sets up three rules for judging when monopoly exists. To our mind, he fails to mention a condition that justifies regulation regardless of whether a monopoly exists. That condition we have explained above—a lack of hard bargaining on prices between the pipelines and the gas producers. It is a result of competition among those who want to buy gas, but a lack of competition among those who have gas for sale.

That condition has already caused gas prices at the well to increase 100 to 200 percent in many instances. It will cause those prices to go still higher if Congress should be persuaded to do away with the regulation of producers.

Mr. Swearingen believes the Nation's gas reserves are large enough to insure fair prices without regulation and cites the growth of those reserves from 148 trillion cubic feet in 1945 to 212 trillion cubic feet in 1954.

The reserves are not, however, growing in proportion to the use of natural gas. The most recent figures, in fact, indicate reserves are not growing at all, although the business of drilling for gas was never busier. Our gas supply situation is such that we are beginning to import some gas from Canada.

As proof that gas prices are reasonable without the regulation of nonpipeline producers, Mr. Swearingen quotes the Denver retail price as being 47 cents per thousand cubic feet as compared with much higher prices in cities farther east.

The average price paid by Denver residential consumers was 47 cents in 1953—partly because more than half of the gas used in Denver that year was produced under regulation from wells owned by the pipeline company itself.

If the pipeline company had bought all its gas from other producers, the price would have been considerably higher. It also should be noted that the Federal Power Commission held recently that the 47-cent price was excessive and unreasonable by approximately 3 cents per thousand cubic feet.

Since 1953 Denver consumers have had two gas rate increases and they are now paying not 47 cents but 53.4 cents per thousand cubic feet, after taking off the 3 cents which was found to be excessive.

These two increases are being collected although they have not had final approval of the FPC. A hearing on the increases is scheduled to start in Washington next week. For all the customers of the Colorado Interstate Gas Co., the two increases amount to approximately $16 million a year in new charges—a good illustration of how seemingly minor changes in gas rates add up to huge amounts in the course of a year.

The issue, it seems to us, is not how Denver gas rates compare with rates in Chicago or New York City but whether the Denver rates give the pipeline company or the producers from whom the pipeline buys an unreasonable profit.

Mr. Swearingen and many others in the gas business do not like to talk in terms of reasonable return. They prefer to take the position that as long as gas is cheaper fuel than oil or coal, the consumers have no basis for complaint and regulation is unjustified.

That, we believe, is like arguing that bus fares should not be subject to regulation unless they get higher than taxi fares.

Many gas men say gas prices should be allowed to rise without regulation until they approximate the cost of heating with coal. That would mean an increase of wellhead prices to at least 20 cents and possibly as much as 40 cents per M c. f., from the present average wellhead price of about 9 cents.

At 9 cents per M c. f., the 212 trillion cubic feet of gas reserves to which Mr.

Swearingen has referred, are worth $19 billion. At 20 cents, they would cost American consumers an eventual $42 billion.

Thus, we can understand that the oil companies and other gas producers are playing for high stakes in their effort to escape regulation. But the American consumers have a sizable stake in this matter, also.

The consumers have invested $10 billion in home appliances which are worthless except for burning gas. They made that investment in the expectation that gas prices should be kept fair and reasonable under regulation. Most of those consumers have already had 1 or 2 gas rate increases and they will have still more increases if Congress should yield to the arguments presented so ably by such spokesmen as Mr. Swearingen.

Effect of Reciprocal Trade Act on Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that when the bill extending the reciprocal trade agreements program was before the Senate Finance Committee an amendment was added authorizing the President to restrict imports in a situation where the national security was threatened. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, and subsequently accepted by the House of Representatives.

That was only a short time ago, but I am happy to say that the amendment is having the intended effect so far as imports of petroleum, that vitally important resource, are concerned.

A report from the Austin Bureau of the Dallas Morning News carries the information that Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, member of the Texas Railroad Commission and an internationally recognized authority on the oil industry, says the legislation already is having a wholesome effect on petroleum imports.

Mr. President, yesterday, through inadvertence and mistake, there was presented for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which purported to have been submitted by the junior Senator from Florida. Actually, the junior Senator from Florida submitted it on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I therefore ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], that this article be again printed in the Appendix, and that the RECORD show, as it should have shown, that the article was submitted on behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX.—Congress' act permitting the President to restrict imports when the national security is threatened already is having a wholesome effect on oil imports, a Texas official said Tuesday.

Ernest O. Thompson, railroad commissioner, noted that imports recently have shown a decline.

"The legislation has had a wholesome effect," said Thompson, just back from the World Petroleum Congress in Rome. "I think it will continue to have a wholesome effect."

While some domestic producers believe greater restrictions should be imposed, Thompson said he expects the threat of Presidential action will help to keep imports in check.

The commission next Tuesday will hold its first proration hearing in 2 months.

"There seems to be no great optimism nor any great gloom" for Texas producers at this point, said Thompson. He noted that phenomenal sales of gasoline have reduced stocks and that crude oil supplies are 2 percent lower than 1954, as of July 2.

"There's plenty of oil and gasoline, so the consumer should be happy," Thompson commented. "We're really in a period of surplus, yet drilling activity is high. We need to be careful (regulating production) in the last half of the year."

The Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on July 20 there appeared in the Montgomery Advertiser a column written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop under their heading "Matter of Fact." It is a very thoughtful article. It deals with the Geneva Conference and some of the problems which have arisen there. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

GENEVA.—Even more than usual on these occasions, the great central question here is, of course, "What are the Russians really up to?" Communist Party Secretary Khrushchev has babbled happily to President Eisenhower about such matters as weddings and grandchildren, while Premier Bulganin, in his formal remarks, has sung an old familiar song as regards all the really important issues. The fact is that there is as yet very little really solid evidence as to whether there has been a genuine and important change in Soviet foreign policy. But at this early stage it is at least encouraging that the most experienced observers of all three Western powers, both here in Geneva and in Moscow are unanimous on one point. The Soviet rulers really do want to lessen tensions. They really do want to reduce the risk of world war. Interpreting Soviet policy, according to one who has interpreted it successfully in the past, is more a matter of the sense of smell than of assessing hard evidence.

And the best smellers all smell the same thing—a real if temporary and tactical change. The best smellers also agree rather closely on the reasons for the change. These may be listed about as follows:

First, the Soviets, having exploded their own hydrogen bomb, have had time to ponder the nightmare meaning of hydrogen warfare. In Moscow there are reports—of course impossible to confirm—that the Russian experts, like our own underestimated the power of the bomb; and that as a result large numbers of Soviet scientists and soldiers were killed in their first test. In any case, there is plenty of evidence that the Russian, having had a good first-hand look at the new weapons, take them far more seriously than in the days before they broke the American monopoly.

Paradoxically, the fact that the Chinese have not had the same sobering experience is one reason why experienced observers here believe that the threat of general war now lies far more in China than in Russia. Second, the Soviet leaders also want a breathing space from external danger in order to clean up all sorts of messy situations within the Soviet Empire and the Soviet Union itself. Here it should be said, hastily and flatly, that the Soviet system is not on the point of collapse, or anywhere near the point of collapse. The Soviet rulers face a serious agricultural problem and a serious problem of inflation. But a system which has survived deliberate mass starvation and history's most terrible war is not going to founder overnight because of a drought. In fact the internal problem is realy less economic than political.

The political problem confronting the Soviet leaders has been defined as the problem of running a dictatorship without a dictator. But it is even more complicated than that. It is also a problem of trying to run a dictatorship without even a clearly defined No. 1 man here in Geneva, for the truth is, no one really knows who is the Soviet No. 1—sometimes it looks like Bulganin, and sometimes Khrushchev.

Just before this reporter left Moscow last Saturday, there were widespread reports that the question of a No. 1 had been finally settled, and that after this conference Khrushchev would take over from Bulganin as Premier. But no one believes that the wiley Khrushchev is within striking distance of wielding supreme power. And the Soviet system absolutely requires a dictator for it is a system which by its very nature must dictate every aspect of life, from the acreage of corn planted to the design of ladies' summer print dresses.

Yet the present Soviet rulers, probably even including Khrushchev, are united on one point—they do not want to repeat the unpleasant experience of the Stalin-Beria period, when they themselves lived in constant, deadly danger. Strange as it may seem to western minds, those who know Russia well are profoundly convinced that this problem of running a dictatorship without a dictator is one of the gravest and most insoluble problems the Russians face, and a major reason why they now want a real breathing space.

By the same token, the Soviet rulers have also failed to find an efficient way to run their empire without an emperor. In a recent chat with the Indonesian Ambassador in Moscow, the always talkative Khrushchev frankly admitted that the satellites were proving troublesome. In the old days, he remarked nostalgically, when Russia was the only Communist country, the Communist Parties elsewhere did what Moscow told them without question. But nowadays, with Communists actually running the government in the "peoples democracies," they had begun to develop a regrettable habit of putting their own national interests first.

The satellites are not going to liberate themselves overnight. But satellite restlessness is certainly a greater problem for the present formless junta than for the all-powerful and greatly feared Stalin. There are even serious observers in Moscow who are convinced that the Soviet policy of populating the "new lands" in central Asia is moti-

vated more by fear of Chinese expansion than by the need for increased food resources.

This by no means exhausts the list of reasons advanced by the experts for the Soviet change. There is the real fear of a rearmed Germany, and the hope that honey may succeed in preventing German rearmament where vinegar failed. There is the heavy expense of equipping the huge Red Army with tactical atomic weapons. And there is the development of a new, conservative middle class in Russia—in the factories, this new class wears clean linen smocks, to distinguish its members from the lesser breed of manual workers. Some observers would put this last phenomenon at the top of the list, rather than the bottom. At any rate, there are plenty of reasons why the Soviets may want to reduce the international temperature.

But there are no sound reasons to support the favorite American theory that it is simple weakness that causes the Russians to smile so coyly and continually at President Eisenhower here. On the contrary, in some ways the Russians are stronger than ever before, as anyone who witnessed their recent air show would agree. Nor is there anything to suggest that the Soviets are now prepared to alter their basic doctrine, or to make really major concessions to the West in order to win a settlement.

Analysis of Natural Gas Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 22, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able analysis of the pending proposals to amend the Natural Gas Act by Father Benjamin L. Masse, which appeared in the July 9 issue of the National Catholic Weekly Review, America.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL-GAS PRICES: REGULATED OR FREE?

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

(Unlike some other issues before Congress, the question of amending the Natural Gas Act to exclude independent producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission transcends political lines. Fort Masse, who is beginning his 15th year on the staff of America, discusses the pros and cons of the subject. He recently participated in the annual Jersey Standard Round Table.)

Within the next few weeks Congress is scheduled to decide the bitter, 20-year-old controversy over the pricing of natural gas. Unlike most protracted controversis, this one has not mellowed with age. On the contrary, like good cheese, it has grown sharper with the passing of time. The reason is that over the past two decades, and more especially since the end of the war, the number of producers and consumers of natural gas has grown enormously. Thus the financial stakes are very much higher today than they were when Congress passed the Natural Gas Act of 1938. With some 4,365 companies producing gas for interstate sale to some 60 million consumers, the pressures on Washington are nothing short of terrific. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved.

What is the fighting all about?

It is not about the method of pricing natural gas to the ultimate consumer. No one questions that local utilities, which buy gas from interstate pipelines and bring it into homes and business establishments, should be regulated by local or State authorities. They are clearly monopolies, like the local water workrs or electric powerplant, and hence are natural candidates for public regulation.

Neither is there much dispute any more about the prices which pipeline companies charge local utilities. The Federal Power Commission has been successfully regulating these prices for nearly 20 years.

Nor is the controversy concerned with sales of natural gas made within the borders of the various States. Such sales are beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

THE INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS

The fighting has to do solely with the method of pricing the gas which the so-called independent producers sell to interstate pipelines. These independents, which produce but do not transport gas, insist that the price of their product should be determined by competition. Some pipeline companies, notably those which supply part of their needs from their own fields, agree with them. On the other hand, most of the people charged with protecting the interests of consumers advocate Government regulation. It is scarcely necessary to add that both sides in this controversy claim to have the well-being of consumers at heart.

Before examining the arguments pro and con, it may be helpful to take a closer look at the independent producers. As was mentioned above, there are 4,365 companies producing natural gas for sale in interstate commerce. The vast majority of these firms are so small, however, that it is no insult to them to term their sales insignificant. According to FPC figures, 3,736 producers, or 85 percent of all producers, together furnished only 2.1 percent of the gas sold to pipelines in 1953. At the other end of the scale, 174 companies sold more than 90 percent of all the gas the pipelines bought. The five largest producers accounted for 27 percent of the total sales.

These big gas producers, or, more correctly, their parent companies, are well known to the general public. They are the Nation's major oil companies—Standard Oil of New Jersey, Phillips Petroleum, Shell Oil, Standard Oil of Indiana, and Socony Vacuum.

Why are these companies opposed to Federal regulation?

ARGUMENTS AGAINST REGULATION

They argue, in the first place, that regulation of gas prices at the wellhead, or in the field, is unnecessary because, with so many companies in the business, competition can be relied on to insure fair prices to consumers. They insist that this is the American way, the same way the country follows in pricing other natural resources such as coal, oil, lead, and copper.

The producers contend, furthermore, that regulation would be impractical and extremely expensive. They point to the large number of producers, all of whom would have to file rates and other data with FPC, and whose costs of exploration and production, which the regulating agency would have to take into account in fixing prices, vary considerably.

Finally, producers warn of the consequences which may be expected to follow from Government regulation. In their 1954 report to stockholders, the directors of Jersey Standard note that Federal regulation "could retard development of the natural-gas industry in the United States and reduce supplies of this fuel to industrial and private consumers." Regulation would, in other words, destroy the industry's incentive to search for new sources of supply. In the long run, dwindling supplies of gas would affect consumers adversely. They would, so the argument goes, pay more for gas under regulation than under competition. Other producers have openly warned that regulation would lead them to abandon the interstate market for more profitable operations within the borders of the producing States.

FOR REGULATION

Spokesmen for consumer interests base their case chiefly on the contention that at the producing end of the gas business no real competition exists or, in the nature of things, can exist. Pipelines involve tremendous expense, costing, in the case of large-diameter lines, from $40,000 to $100,000 a mile to construct. Before they are laid down, their owners must be assured of a large and long-time supply of gas. That is why contracts between pipelines and producers generally run for 20 years or more. Once a pipeline has been built to a field, it is at the mercy of those who own the gas reserves there. Its owners cannot shop around for better prices among four thousand-odd producers because few of them have wells adjacent to the pipeline. Anyway, most of these producers, as we have seen, are tiny operators with insignificant amounts of gas to sell.

This inability to shop around among various producers is the cardinal fact, say the consumer spokesmen, which differentiates gas from other unregulated natural resources. Gas can be transported in only one way—by pipeline. It cannot, like oil or coal, be brought in by ship, or moved by truck or rail to the point of ultimate consumption. So the pipeline companies which distribute the gas are bound to one supplier, or to a group of suppliers producing in one geographical locality. The terminus of the pipeline determines who the supp'ier must be.

With gas in short supply today, and likely to remain so, consumer spokesmen argue that competition among producers to attract pipeline companies is completely nonexistent. The only competition in the gas industry, they maintain, is competition among pipelines seeking a supply of gas. But in view of the supply-demand situation, that kind of competition can have but one effect—an increase in the price of gas.

The producers are well aware of this. That explains why in their long-term contracts with pipelines they insist on escalator clauses of one kind or another. One such clause, the favored nation clause, obliges pipelines to pay a producer, regardless of the figure stipulated in the contract, the highest price they pay to any of their other suppliers.

During the hearings conducted last month by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, an economist for Standard Oil of Indiana disparaged the immobility of pipelines as a factor inhibiting competition among producers. He argued that pipeline companies can tap alternative sources of supplies by interconnections with other pipelines. Actually, say the consumer spokesmen, pipelines buy little gas from one another, and even when they do, the buyer has no voice in the price which the seller originally paid the independent producer.

With the other antiregulation arguments, the consumer spokesmen are not much concerned. They do not seem to take very seriously threats to withhold gas from interstate commerce, or to abandon the search for new sources of gas. The big market for gas is not in Texas, Louisiana, Kansas, and Oklahoma—the major gas-producing States—but in the East and Middle West and on the Pacific coast. The proponents of regulation are fairly certain that the big gas producers are not capable of the financial self-denial required to forego their most profitable markets in the North in favor of relatively piddling sales in the Southwest.

For the same reason they feel that the search for gas will continue. Under FPC rules allowing a fair profit over and above all costs, including exploration costs, the search

for gas will still be reasonably remunerative. (The pipeline companies have done very well for themselves under FPC regulation.) Anyway, natural gas is generally found mixed with oil. So long as the big oil companies continue their ceaseless hunt for new sources of crude, they will automatically continue the search for gas.

As for the administrative difficulties of regulation, these are certainly not insurmountable. Much of the difficulty would be removed if Congress would exempt from the rules of the Federal Power Commission the 85 percent of the firms which produce only a tiny part of the gas in interstate commerce. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS introduced a bill on May 11 which would remove from Federal regulation all producers whose sales in interstate commerce for reseale do not aggregate 2 billion cubic feet of gas a year. This would exempt from control all but about 175 producers.

THREE BILLS

The legislative fight revolves chiefly around three bills, the Fulbright bill and its companion in the House, the Harris bill, and the Douglas bill. The Douglas bill reaffirms the decision of the Supreme Court in the Phillips Petroleum case. That was the key 1954 decision which held that independent producers selling to interstate pipelines are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The Fulbright-Harris bill exempts the independent producers from direct FPC regulation but provides for a kind of indirect control. The bill places the onus of keeping prices at the wellhead within bounds on the interstate pipelines, which in turn are subject to direct FPC regulation.

Consumer spokesmen oppose the Fulbright-Harris compromise on the ground that it is inadequate to protect the public interest. So do the local gas utilities. The rest of the industry, including the pipelines, are supporting these bills.

Ultimately, since the vote in Congress promises to be close, the decision may well rest with the President. In 1950 President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill, which would have exempted the independent producers from Federal regulation. What will Mr. Eisenhower do if Congress approves the Fulbright-Harris bill? Some of his advisers, conscious of the voting power of northern gas consumers, are reported to be urging a veto. On the other hand, a leading New York daily observed recently that the oil and gas interests were heavy contributors to the President's 1952 campaign fund. If Mr. Eisenhower follows the advice of his Cabinet Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources, his decision seems a foregone conclusion. Last February this committee, though recognizing the need of some Federal control over wellhead prices to protect consumers, recommended that the independent prdoucers be exempted from FPC regulation. The oil and gas interests seem confident that if the Fulbright-Harris bill can be steered through Congress, the President will not veto it.

From a moral standpoint, the controversy largely hinges on the effectiveness of competition as a regulator of the price of gas at the wellhead. If the reader feels, after studying the facts, that competition cannot be counted on to assure reasonable prices to consumers, he should logically, it seems to me, support Government regulation. If, to pursue the question further, he does not believe that the type of idirect control provided for in the Fulbright-Harris bill is likely to succeed, he is then left with no alternative except to support regulation of producers by the Federal Power Commission. For whatever it's worth, at the present stage of his inquiry this writer inclines to the opinion that only Federal regulation of gas prices at the wellhead can do the job.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.